

“Starting from the Immortal Father”: The *Incipit* of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*

Marios Skempis

Abstract: I propose a plausible supplement for the incipit of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (1) that is meant to illuminate the *priamel* structure of Fragment A. Consequently, I give a full account of how ring composition works in the surviving fragments of the opening and the end of the *Hymn*. I argue that the Nyse variant is corroborated in way concomitant with another *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (26). The hymnic instance is supported through recourse to interformular occurrences in the *Homeric Hymns*, in Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*, in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*. I conclude with an appreciation of contextual parameters that make the *priamel* structurally cohere.

Keywords: *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*; textual criticism; ring-composition.



IN 1994, ANDRÉ HURST brought to light fragments of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* preserved in the Geneva papyrus 432. Fragment A, part of which was known through indirect transmission,¹ deals with Dionysus’ birth from Zeus’ thigh at Nyse² in the frame of a *priamel* that valorises this variant as *true one* among several competing birthplaces it disqualifies as *false* (*hBacch.* 1A.7 ψευδόμεινοι).³ The *priamel* structure may overwhelm the opening section of the *Hymn*, but the actual *incipit* is missing, except for four letters that leave much to figure out. In this article, I do not set out to supplement the text *exempli gratia* as is usually the case in similar situations. On the contrary, I use intertextual evidence from the *Homeric Hymns*, signs of interformularity in the discourse of early Greek epic and hymn, and, finally, contextual cues that accentuate structural conformity. [A] The way to conceptualise intertextuality is by specifying the relation of an epigonic text to its predecessor.⁴ Current philological criticism uses an entire taxonomy of concepts in order to describe varying forms of connection between texts, such as allusion, echo, parallel, model, reminiscence/recollection, evocation, cue. In the *Homeric Hymns to Dionysus*, intertextuality warrants a category of verbal connections (however one may wish to call them) with other poetic compositions

✉ marios.skempis@gmail.com

¹ 1A.2–10: D. S. 3.66.3; 1A.9–10: D. S. 1.15.7, 4.2.4; Schol. in A. R. 2.1211.

² On the myth of Dionysus’ birth see Gasparri 1986, 417; Gantz 1993, 112.

³ For the *priamel* see Dihle 2002, 428; Furley 2011, 225–6; Bernabé 2013, 59.

⁴ According to Genette 1997, 1–2, intertextual is “a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts: that is to say, eidetically and typically as the actual presence of one text within another”.

of a literate, rather than oral,⁵ song-culture, which proves itself by the sheer fact that the story at hand competes with the existence of a plethora of further known (therefore, obviously well-attested in written form) story variants⁶ about the birth of this particular deity.⁷ [B] Interformularity is “[s]peech [...] introduced in a way of signaling that a number of events [here: of discursive instantiations] are judged to be *similar to each other*. No single instance [...] has primacy in the sense that it is “first”, a prototype “quoted” by other, secondary, instances [...]”.⁸ I shall argue that interformular connections are a mean to the end of construing associative thinking expressed through the medium of typified language. [C] Context denotes ‘a joining together’, a conjunction, which consists of a number of components. It “is [...] a frame that surrounds the event being examined and provides resources for its appropriate interpretation”.⁹ Understanding context in hymnic narration designates how individual narrative segments are put together in the form of a sequence, and the reasons that underlie them. Hence, my method of doing textual criticism is one that reduces the degree of idiosyncratic textual conjecture, and thus draws on structural plausibility in ways that render a supplement consonant with intertextual, interformular, and contextual environments.

Given the sorry state of the opening line in the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, I supplement it in the following way by taking heed of several respects, which I discuss in detail below:

πῶς Διόνυσον πατρὸς ἀπ’ ἀθάνατοιο αἰείσω;

How should I sing of Dionysus, starting from the immortal father?

In my apprehension, the hymnic narrator affectedly wonders how he should commit to the task of praising a deity as dubious as Dionysus. Since the succeeding part of the narration gives an account of the Nyse variant of Dionysus’ birth from Zeus’

⁵ Based on surveys that draw attention to linguistic commonality between archaic literature of Homeric and Hesiodic origin and *Homeric Hymns* (Janko 1982, 99–187; Vergados 2013, 40–73), I come to the conclusion that literacy is undisputed because: [1] word-recurrence is a phenomenon explained through application of generic prescriptions that exceed memorational capacity and conform to tradition, which is reasonably beyond memorational command; [2] structure is *per definitionem* the outcome of meticulous thought-process that segues into complexity, therefore exclusive of orally geared compositional impulse; [3] epicisation is accomplished through recourse to standard features (episodic division, occurrence of typical scenes, figures of special provenance and traits) in manner that makes its impressive consistence alien to orality due to the high degree of cohesion; [4] hymnicity in particular derives from epicity with mythic tenor in a way that attests to validation of the aforementioned points. Due to this cognateness of archaic epic poetry and *Homeric Hymns*, chronological proximity is plausible.

⁶ On story variants of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* see Currie 2012; of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* see Felson 2009; of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* see Vergados 2011, 88–93.

⁷ For intertextuality in archaic poems as early as the Homeric ones see Bakker 2001; Tsagalis 2008. On the textual fixity of the *Homeric Hymns* see Garner 2009, 389. For skepticism in the *Homeric Hymns* as “oral or literate composition[s]?” see Vergados 2013, 73–5.

⁸ Bakker 2013, 163.

⁹ Goodwin & Duranti 1992, 3.

thigh, I foreground the distinctive aspect of his single-parented birth by referring to Zeus, the begetter of men and gods, through the *periphrasis* ‘immortal father’. I also find it proper to infer that the divine *laudandus*’ personal name occurs in the very beginning of the narration.

I organise my argument along the lines of nine major points in order to be as lucid as possible about how I proceed with my belief that the *Hymn* opens in the way, which I suggested above:

1. objections to diplomatic transcription;
2. acknowledgment of Dionysus’ birth from Zeus in fragment A;
3. ring composition in fragments A and D;
4. link with the Nyse variant in the *Third Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*;
5. naming of the divine *laudandus* in the opening line;
6. hymnic self-reference in the *incipit* through a form of αἰίδω;
7. intertextuality with Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*;
8. *priamel* as pointer to Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*;
9. etymological wordplay.

I regard these nine thematic aspects as tokens of cogency for my argument.

Here, I print the text together with the conjectured *incipit*:

πῶς Διόνυσον πατρὸς ἀπ’ ἀθ[ανάτοιο αἰίσω;
οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνωι σ’, οἱ δ’ Ἰκάρωι ἡνεμοέσσηι
φάσ’, οἱ δ’ ἐν Νάξωι, δῖον γένος εἰραφιῶτα,
οἱ δέ σ’ ἐπ’ Ἀλφειῶι ποταμῶι βαθυδινήεντι
κυσαμένην Σεμέλῃν τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνωι¹⁰, 5
ἄλλοι δ’ ἐν Θήβησιν ἀναξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι
ψευδόμενοι· σέ δ’ ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
πολλὸν ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων, κρύπτων λευκώλενον Ἥρην.
ἔστι δέ τις Νύση ὕπατον ὄρος ἀνθέον ὕληι
τηλοῦ Φοινίκης σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτωιο ῥοάων· 10

(*bBacch.* 1A.1–10)¹¹

How should I sing of Dionysus, starting from the immortal father?
For some say it was at Drakanos, some on windy Ikaros,
some on Naxos, divine offspring, sewed-up,
and some at Alpheios the deep-swirling river
that Semele conceived and bore you to Zeus whose sport is the thunderbolt,

¹⁰ On the problem of omitting this line see Hurst 1994, 319. The standard editions of the *Homeric Hymns* do not omit the line: Allen, Halliday, Sikes 1936, 1; Càssola 1975, 18. I consider the line authentic (see my discussion about the structural conceit of ring composition).

¹¹ Concerning 1A.2–10, I follow the text of West 2001, 10; 2003, 26. For different line sequence between the Geneva papyrus and the indirect tradition see Hurst 1994, 319–20; Schubert 1996, 17.

while others, Lord, say that it was at Thebes you were born.
 All false! The father of gods and men gave you birth
 far from humankind, to conceal you from white-armed Hera.
 There is a place Nyse, a mountain most high, burgeoning in forest,
 in a distant part of Phoenicia, almost at the waters of the Nile.¹²

Line 1 on the papyrus counts four letters, which are hard to discern. The photograph of the Geneva Library (P. Gen. 432, 3 118 recto)¹³ leaves several questions still open.¹⁴ Contrary to popular opinion that reads Π, I take the first letter to be C whose lower sideline is written in unison with the following letter in manner similar to the sequence OPOCAN in line 8. Lower and upper section of the preceding part of the papyrus are severely damaged. There could be remnants of the lower part of a horizontal stroke on the right side of a letter or signs of shading such as the ones above line 1 and elsewhere in the document. I cannot rule out the possibility of a round-shaped letter, given the squareness of O in the sequence MENQEIKEA in line 14. Upon this very possibility rests my interpretation ΠΑΤΡΟC, which is endorsed by the seemingly quadruple shape of the fifth letter, presumably Θ according to West, which is written in a high position compared to the other letters of the line, just as my conjectured O may be. Anyhow, Π is impossible due to dead-end solutions such as forms of ἐνέπω, παπταίνω, παππάζω or elision after Π. Second and third letter can be identified as A and Π, judging from hand-writing in the rest of the document. Fourth letter resembles the contours of A in micro-scale compared to the first one, though far less discernible. Scraps of a fifth letter have a curve on the left side, which points to O, E or Θ.

My main quibble against the three propositions put forward so far has to do with an aspect entirely irrelevant for the reconstitution of the text: it focuses on the uncomplicated part of the diplomatic transcription that deals with the placement of words in the exact position designated by the papyrus with respect to the other lines, which are wholly transmitted. For instance, André Hurst, in the *editio princeps*, prints]παπ.[approximately three letters after its original position, for the papyrus clearly reads that the in-between α is located directly above ο of οί δ' in the succeeding line:

¹² I use the translation of West 2003, 27, *incipit* excepted. The form Ἐρραφεώτης, which is transmitted by Alcaeus (fr. 381 L-P), the epithet's earliest attested form, is a firm indication that it derives from ἐρράφθαι [< ἐρραφ- (Perfect stem) + -ε/-ώτης (ending); see OF 328; Eur. Ba. 242–3; bOrph. 48.2–3; Nonn. D. 42.315; Hdn. Orth. 3,2 p. 502 Lentz; Hsch. ε 1000; Eust. Comm. in D. P. Orb. des. 566 Müller; Ps.-Zon. E 627; Sud. ε 177; EG s.v. Εἰραφιώτης p. 425 de Stefani; EM s.v. Διώνυσος p. 280 Gaisford], and that Εἰραφιώτης is a poetically elaborated, extended form. For the notional equation of the two forms see West 2011, 40.

¹³ West 2001, 10; 2003, 26.

¹⁴ A digital photograph of the papyrus has been published on the website of Bibliothèque de Genève: http://www.ville-ge.ch/musinfo/bd/bge/papyrus/resultat_detail.php?limite=0. Date of electronic access was October 21, 2020.

1]παπ.[
2 οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάν]ω οἱ δ' Ε[ικάρωι ἡνεμοέσσηι.¹⁵

Paul Schubert sets his own version].παιδε[one letter before ο of οἱ δ' in the line that follows:

1
2].παιδε[
3 οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάν]ω οἱ δ' Ε[ικάρωι ἡνεμοέσσηι.¹⁶

Martin West goes even further than Schubert and places the first α of his version]παπαθ[approximately three letters before ο of οἱ δ' in the next line:

1]παπαθ[
2 οἷ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνωι σ', οἷ δ' Ἰκάρωι ἡνεμοέσσηι.¹⁷

Should one judge from the metrical position of *hBacch.* 1A.2 (οἷ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνωι σ', οἷ δ' Ἰκάρωι ἡνεμοέσσηι), one may reasonably come to the conclusion that what survives in the *incipit* of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* according to the Geneva papyrus, must occupy the latter part of a caesura κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον (υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-).¹⁸

The *priamel* consists of five placenames that rival each other for the birth of the god (Dracanus, Icarus, Naxus, Alpheius, Thebes), and end up losing the contest over Nyse: the site, which is finally prioritised. The hymnic narrator disqualifies these five placenames as fake and goes on to approve the latter as the only true one.¹⁹ In spite of what appears to be a multifarious contest over Dionysus' birthplace, the actual rivalry concerns Thebes and Nyse, judging from the way these sites parallel each other in terms of discourse: whereas the *periphrasis* διὸν γένος εἰραφιῶτα “you, divine offspring, sewed-up” (*hBacch.* 1A.3),²⁰ which is placed after the first two variants, Dracanus and Icarus, alludes to the birth from Zeus, the Thebes variant deploys the verb ‘beget’ in order to designate the birth from Semele (*hBacch.* 1A.6 ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβησιν ἀνάξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι). The parallel γένος/γενέσθαι somewhat compromises the dynamic of the *priamel* because it sets up a narrative framework, which is marked by the allusion to Dionysus' birth from Zeus' thigh, on the

¹⁵ Hurst 1994, 319.

¹⁶ Schubert 1996, 18.

¹⁷ West 2001, 2, 10; 2003, 26. Hurst and Schubert disregard the not clearly transmitted ι of Δρακάνωι, which is, however, logical to gather, as opposed to West, who does not fail to do so.

¹⁸ For occurrences of this caesura in opening lines of early Greek poetry see Hom. *Od.* 1; *hAp.* III 1; *hVen.* V 1; *hDian.* IX 1; *hVen.* X 1; *hDiosc.* XVII 1; *hMerc.* XIX 1; *hHeph.* XX 1; *hAp.* XXI 1; *hPos.* XXII 1; *hJup.* XXIII 1; *hHest.* XXIV 1; *hBacch.* XXVI 1; *hGa.* XXX 1; *hSol.* XXXI 1.

¹⁹ Jacob 1998, 46 argues that the poet of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* emerges as claimant of self-esteem with regard to the untraditional stance toward established versions of the myth and defender of truth in a mouldable tradition.

²⁰ The junction διὸν γένος, a Homeric *hapax* attributed to Artemis (Hom. *Il.* 9.538), is placed right after the text refers to how the Curetes fought against the Aetolians over Calydon (9.529–30) – apparently a rival setting, though fairly different in nature.

one hand, and by the explicit attestation of his birth from Semele, on the other. It is most likely that the *incipit* accommodated the personal name Διόνυσος, followed by the circumlocution δῖον γένος in the second line, which serves as etymological explanation. In this way, the opening *priamel* makes sense for it answers the initial question of the hymnic narrator about how he ought to praise Dionysus' birth from his immortal father: by recounting the Nyse variant.

The conjectured *incipit* I put forward, forms a ring composition with the Nyse variant of Dionysus' birth, which is prioritised over others on the basis of veracity in 1A.9–10. The proposed junction πατρὸς ἀπ' ἄθ[ανάτοιο “starting from the immortal father” that fits the four-letter-space from metrical and notional point of view, given that *Homeric Hymns* acknowledge the divine *laudandus*' parentage in their beginning,²¹ comes full circle in 1A.7 (σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε)²² in which it is explicitly stated that the narration at issue privileges Dionysus' birth at Nyse from (the thigh of) Zeus, the father of men and gods, over several other discredited stories. I draw special attention to the structural conceit of ring composition because the surviving fragments of the narration itself pay tribute to this compositional strategy:

1. 1A.1 πατρὸς ἀπ' ἄθ[ανάτοιο ~ 1D.6 κρατὸς ἀπ' ἄθανάτοιο
2. 1A.1 Διόνυσον ~ 1A.3 δῖον γένος ~ 1A.5 τεκέειν Δίι ~ 1A.7 ἔτικτε πατήρ
3. 1A.3 εἰραφιῶτα ~ 1D.11 εἰραφιῶτα
4. 1A.5 Σεμέλην ~ 1D.12 Σεμέληι
5. 1A.6 ἄναξ ~ 1D.5 ἄνακτος
6. 1D.8 Ἰληθ' ~ 1D.10 ἐπιληθόμενον
7. 1D.8 αἰδοί ~ 1D.9 αἰδομεν ~ 1D.10 αἰοιδῆς

One may deduce from the items listed above that the narration as a whole engineers three different sorts of ring composition: [1] ring composition that occupies the start (items 1–2); [2] ring composition that occupies the end (items 6–7); [3] ring composition that occupies beginning and end (items 3–5). As opposed to the in-between disclaimer of diverse traditions concerning the birth of Dionysus, the conjectured junction πατρὸς ἀπ' ἄθ[ανάτοιο,²³ a modifier of the interformular junction

²¹ See Furley & Bremer 2001, 54.

²² See West 2011, 30.

²³ The implication is that Dionysus, the divine offspring of the immortal father, is also immortal. On the immortality of Dionysus see Hes. *Th.* 941–2; Philod. *Pae. in Dion.* 57–62 CA; Ar. *Ra.* 631. For the junction ἀθάνατος Ζεύς see Hom. *Il.* 2.741; 14.434; 21.2; 24.693; *h.* Eijs *Ξέν.* 5; Nonn. *D.* 25.242.

κρατὸς ἀπ’ ἀθανάτοιο,²⁴ sets the stage for the focalisation of Dionysus’ paternal descent, which constitutes the theme of fragment A.²⁵

The *priamel*’s structure juxtaposes Dionysus’ birth from Zeus at Nyse (1A.7–10)²⁶ to his birth from Semele at Thebes (1A.5–7), which is rejected as a lie next to further traditions. The reign of the father, the supreme authority of Zeus, which is exemplified through the singularity of paternal filiation, is what the narration of this particular hymnic instantiation, the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, recognises as truth. The conjectured junction πατρός ἀπ’ ἀθ[ανάτοιο should be viewed in context with the Nyse variant of the *Third Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, which furnishes two references to Zeus as Dionysus’ father: [1] nymphs receive Dionysus from the divine father to rear and foster (26.3 παρὰ πατρός ἄνακτος); [2] he grows up at a distance from his father in company of numerous immortals (26.5 πατρός ἐκῆτι).²⁷ The emphasis put on paternal filiation in the Nyse variant of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*²⁸ is in accord with references to Zeus as father of Dionysus in the *Third Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (26.2 Ζηνὸς [...] υἱόν; 26.5 πατρός ἐκῆτι) and justify the conjectured junction in the *incipit* in terms of thematically determined intertextuality.

A typical referential habit of *Homeric Hymns* is to name the divine *laudandus* in the opening section.²⁹ Considering that δῖον γένος ‘divine progeny’ (1A.3) functions as *antonomasia* for Διόνυσος³⁰ in the ring compositional framework set up by the sequences δῖον γένος εἰραφιῶτα (1A.3) in the beginning and Διώνυσ’ εἰραφιῶτα (1D.11) in the end, one expects an occurrence of the *laudandus*’ name in the *incipit* (Διόνυσον).³¹ The name Διόνυσος is etymologically thought to derive from Διός

²⁴ Hom. *Il.* 1.530; *bBacch.* 1D.6; *bLun.* XXX 4; *AP Epigr. sep.* 635.15 κρατὸς ἀπ’ ἀθανάτοιο; cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.177 ἐκ κράτος ἀθανάτοιο. The formula κρατὸς ἀπ’ ἀθανάτοιο “from his/her immortal head” always occupies the initial metrical position of a hexameter verse. This is a symptomatic instance of ‘traditional phraseology’, as John Miles Foley has termed it, which “locates “words” of substantial metrical extent” within semantically “available units” (Foley 1995, 52) and thus pays tribute to what he comprehends as ‘register’, “a particular selection of words and structures” [...] “in terms of meaning” (Foley 1995, 50). For ‘dedicated register’ in *Homeric Hymns* see Foley 1995, 150–60. On the genitive singular -οιο (here, in the adjective ἀθανάτοιο) see Horrocks 1997, 207–8; Foley 1999, 77, 294 notes 40–1.

²⁵ In *AP Epigr. sep.* 635.15 (κρατὸς ἀπ’ ἀθανάτοιο πατρός θεῶν μειδιῶντος), the junction is followed by the genitive πατρός, which may betray influence from an earlier text, possibly the *incipit* of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*.

²⁶ *Il.* VI 133 mentions the ‘Nysean [mountain]’ (ἡγάθειον Νυσηῖον) in the frame of the Lycurgus episode where Dionysus is said to have been taken to this site by nymphs so he may be nurtured. See *Lfgre s.v.* Νύση, Νυσηῖον (δρος); Kirk 1990, 174.

²⁷ For further instances outside the *Homeric Hymns* see Eur. *Ba.* 1340–3; Nonn. *D.* 9.16–24. One may also compare the presentation of Heracles’ contested descent from Zeus: Hom. *Il.* 5.635.

²⁸ At different places, when early Greek poetry talks about Dionysus’ birth, it mentions Semele only (Hes. *Th.* 940–2; *bBacch.* 7.1, 7.56–8; see Herrero de Jáuregui 2013, 236–7) or both parents (Hom. *Il.* 14.325; *bBacch.* 26.2).

²⁹ See West 2003, 3; Nagy 2011, 327.

³⁰ On Dionysus’ polyonymy see Bierl 2013.

³¹ The majority of the *Homeric Hymns* name the *laudandus* in the first line. There are two exceptions to this general rule: [1] the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, which addresses Hermes as father of Pan in

(gen.) and the Thracian gloss νῦσος ‘son’, and, thus, to convey the sense ‘son of Zeus’.³² The junction δῖον γένος may acquire a Thracian connotation with a view to the etymology of Dionysus’ name for a Thracian mountain clan bears the name Δῖοι ‘offspring of Zeus’.³³ Note that Nyse was thought to be located, next to other places, in Thrace, a variant that is not supported here by the hymnic narration.³⁴ Thus, the junction δῖον γένος suggests a glossing of the name Διόνυσος as ‘son of Zeus’ against a Thracian linguistic backdrop, apart from its rendition as ‘divine offspring’ in the epic-Ionic discourse, especially since the follow-up appellation εἰραφιῶτα ‘sewed-up’ points to Dionysus’ birth from the thigh of Zeus.

The hymnic function of *Homeric Hymns* is frequently conveyed in the *incipit* with a verbal form of αἰίδω ‘to sing’³⁵ or the congener αἰοιδή ‘song’. Verbal forms with the stem αἰεισ- usually occupy the midpoint of a line in the *Homeric Hymns*,³⁶ yet αἰέσω, my supplement for the *clausula*,³⁷ occurs in connection with Dionysus in particular in the opening section [!] of Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca* (1.29 Διόνυσον αἰέσω) where he is referred to as ‘son of Zeus’ (1.24 ὑμνήσω Διὸς υἱά; cf. 1A.3)³⁸ and as ‘son of Thyone’ (1.26–7 υἱά Θυώνης | αἰέσω; cf. 1D.12).³⁹ A further reason that compels me to deploy this form in the *clausula* is metrical: after the conjectured junction πατρός]ς ἀπ’ ἀθ[ανάτοιο, there is room for three syllables. Next to the metrical con-

the opening line and then proceeds to a ring composition based on anagram (19.2 ἀνὰ πίσῃ ~ 19.5 Πᾶν’ ἀνακεκλόμεναι); [2] the *Homeric Hymn to Selene*, which uses the byname Mene in the opening line and names Selene for the first time in line 8.

³² Kretschmer 1890, 28; Kern 1903, 1011; Frisk 1960, 396; Nilsson 1967, 567; Chantraine 1968, 285.

³³ Thuc. 2.96.2 παρεκάλει δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀρειῶν Θρακῶν πολλοὺς τῶν αὐτονόμων καὶ μαχαιοφόρων, οἱ Δῖοι καλοῦνται, τὴν Ροδόπην οἱ πλείστοι οἰκοῦντες; 7.27.1 ἀφίκοντο δὲ καὶ Θρακῶν τῶν μαχαιοφόρων τοῦ Διακοῦ γένους ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας πελτασταὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ θέρει τούτῳ τριακόσιοι καὶ χίλιοι, οὓς ἔδει τῷ Δημοσθένει ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν ξυμπλεῖν. For the etymology of Dionysus’ name see Eur. *Ba.* 1–2, 27, 84–5; A. R. 4.1134; Theocr. *Id.* 26.31–3.

³⁴ Schol. D in Hom. *Il.* 6.133.

³⁵ αἰδεῖ(ν): *hCer.* 2.1; *hMin.* 11.1; *hCer.* 13.1; *hAscl.* 16.1; *hAp.* 21.1; *hPos.* 22.1; *hBacch.* 26.1; *hMin.* 28.1.

³⁶ *hHerc.* 15.1 αἰέσομαι; *hDiosc.* 17.1 αἰέσεο; *hHeph.* 20.1 αἰέσεο; *hJup.* 23.1 αἰέσομαι; *hMat.* 30.1 αἰέσομαι.

³⁷ In dactylic hexameter, *hiatus* (ἀθανάτοιο αἰέσω) may occur after the consummation of a semantically coherent lexical unit. See Chantraine 1958, 89–90; Stoevesandt 2008, 2 (5.6). For *hiatus* in the opening lines of *Homeric Hymns* see *hAp.* III 1 μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο; *hVen.* V 1 Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης [Olson 2012, 130 postulates an original πολυχρύσοι Ἀφροδίτης]; *hDiosc.* XVII 1 Κάστορα καὶ Πολυδεύκε’ αἰέσεο, Μοῦσα λίγεια; *hMerc.* XIX 1 ἀμφὶ μοι Ἑρμείω φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα; *hJup.* XXIII 1 Ζῆνα θεῶν τὸν ἄριστον αἰέσομαι ἥδὲ μέγιστον; *hHest.* XXIV 1 Ἑστίη, ἥ τε ἀνακτος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο; *hMus.* XXV 1 Μουσᾶν ἄρχωμαι Ἀπόλλωνός τε Διός τε; *hHest.* XXIX 1 Ἑστίη, ἥ πάντων ἐν δώμασιν ὑψηλοῖσιν; *hGa.* XXX 1 Γαίαν παμμήτεραν αἰέσομαι, ἥ ὑθήμεθλον.

³⁸ On the semantic cluster ‘sing + name of deity’ see *hAp.* III 158 αἶ τ’ ἐπεὶ ἄρ πρῶτον Ἀπόλλων’ ὑμνήσωσιν (with Bakker 2005, 143–4) and 177–8 Ἀπόλλωνα | ὑμνέω; *hMerc.* IV 1 Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει, Μοῦσα, Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν.

³⁹ Cf. Vergados 2013, 216: “In several *Hymns* the praised divinity is mentioned in the accusative at the beginning of the first verse, as the object of a verb denoting singing (αἰεῖν, ὑμνεῖν, ἐννέπειν).”

finement, I have taken into consideration the influential imitation of the *priamel* in the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* by Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*:⁴⁰

Ζηρὸς οἶ τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῆσιν ἄειδεν
 λῳίον ἢ θεὸν αὐτόν, αἰ μέγαν, αἰὲν ἄνακτα,
 Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπύλον Οὐρανίδησι;
πῶς καὶ νιν, Δικταῖον ἄεισομεν ἤε Λυκαῖον;
 ἐν δοιῇ μάλα θυμός, ἐπεὶ γένος ἀμφήριστον.
 Ζεῦ, σέ μὲν Ἰδαίοισιν ἐν οὔρεσσι φασὶ γενέσθαι,
 Ζεῦ, σέ δ' ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ· πότεροι, πάτερ, ἐψεύσαντο;

(Call. *Iov.* I-7)

The correspondences between the two texts are worth noting: [a] honorific appellation of the *laudandus* as ‘lord’ (1A.6 ἀναξ ~ *Jov.* 2 ἄνακτα); [b] enquiry into lineage (1A.3 γένος ~ *Jov.* 5 γένος); [c] *Du-Stil* (1A.2 σ’, 1A.6 σέ, 1A.7 σέ ~ *Jov.* 6 σέ, *Jov.* 7 σέ); [d] dependence on tradition (1A.3 φᾶσ’ ~ *Jov.* 6 φασί); [e] antithetical ordering of views (1A.2 μὲν [...] δ’, 1A.3 δ’, 1A.4 δέ, 1A.6 δ’, 1A.7 δ’ ~ *Jov.* 6 μὲν, *Jov.* 7 δ’); [f] competing birthplaces (1A.2 Δρακάνωι [...] Ἰκάρωι, 1A.3 ἐν Νάξωι, 1A.4 ἐπ’ Ἀλφειῶι, 1A.6 ἐν Θήβηισιν ~ *Jov.* 6 Ἰδαίοισιν ἐν οὐρεσί, *Jov.* 7 ἐν Ἀρκαδίηι); [g] condemnation of lying (1A.7 ψευδόμενοι ~ *Jov.* 7 ἐψεύσαντο). Taking the major influence of the archaic hymn on the Hellenistic into account, which deploys twice a verbal form of αἰεῖδω, once in the *clausula* of the *incipit* (*Jov.* 1 αἰεῖδεν) and a second time in aporetic manner (*Jov.* 4 πῶς [...] αἰέσομεν [...]);⁴¹ I supplement the *incipit* of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* with a direct question in future tense (πῶς [...] αἰέσω;)⁴² whose verbal element takes heed not only of formal conventions of *Homeric Hymns* as I argued above, but also of hymnic instantiations of Dionysus in classical and late antique poetry.⁴³

Having brought forth intertextual arguments for my supplement, I turn to the contextual environments that make it plausible from a structural point of view. In a hymnic narration that aims to validate truth (1A.9 ἔστι δέ τις) over falsehood (1A.7 ψευδόμενοι), a preliminary question about *how* one should commence his topic, is due (1A.1 πῶς). Etymologising the personal name of the *laudandus* is a habitual practice that enhances the ingenuity of the hymnic narration (1A.1 Διόνυσον ~ 1A.3 δῖον γένος).⁴⁴ The theme of divine birth is central (1A.7 σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν

⁴⁰ See West 2011, 41; Stephens 2015, 55.

⁴¹ For the affected hymnic *aporia* cf. *hAp.* 19 = 207 πῶς τ' ἄρ' σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὖμνον ἔόντα; with Nagy 2009, 211–12.

⁴² On the final section of the *First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* that gives emphasis to song performance with forms of ἀειδῶ (1D8–10), see Bierl 2017, 252–3.

⁴³ Eur. Ba. 72, 155.

⁴⁴ For (par)etymologies of divine names in *Homeric Hymns* see: *hDem.* II 122 ὤς (μὲν) ἐμοί γ' ὄνομ', ἐστί· τὸ γὰρ θέτο πότνια μήτηρ (διδῶμι/Δημήτηρ); *hAp.* III 47–8 αἰ δὲ μάλ' ἐτρόμεον καὶ ἐδεΐδισαν, οὐδέ τις ἐτλην | Φοῖβον δέξασθαι (Φοῖβος/φοβός), 52–3 Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνος, θέσθαι τ' ἐνί πόνον ἄλλος | ἄλλος δ' οὐ τις σείῳ ποθ' ἄψεται (Ἀπόλλων/ἄλλος: Ἀ[πό]λλ[ων]ος), 140–3 αὐτὸς δ' ἀργυροτόεσ ἀναξ ἑκατήβολ' | Ἀπολλων, ἄλλοτε μὲν τ' ἐπὶ Κύνθῳ ἐβήσας παυπαλέντος, ἄλλοτε δ' ἀν νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἡλάσασαες.

τε θεῶν τε) and, in this particular case, involves the acknowledgment of divine descent (1Α.1 πατρὸς ἀπ' ἄθ[ανάτοιο], a starting-point for putting the narration in theogonic context, and the birthplace of the *laudandus* (1Α.9 Νύση),⁴⁵ which contrives a wordplay by drawing on νύσσα 'starting-/turning-point'⁴⁶ that a truthful variant signifies over false ones, and on the personal name Διόνυσος (< Διό[ς] + νύσος 'son'), thus setting the initial naming practice in contextually circular course.

Bibliography

- Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R., Sikes, E. E. 1936. *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford.
- Bakker, E. J. 2001. "Homer, Hypertext, and the Web of Myth," in U. Schaefer & H. Spielmann (eds.) *Varieties and Consequences of Orality and Literacy / Formen und Folgen von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit: Franz Bäuml zum 75. Geburtstag*. Tübingen, 149–60.
- 2005. *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Cambridge, Mass./London.
- 2013. *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- Bernabé, A. 2013. "L'epiteto Εἰραφιώτης e la legittimità di Dioniso," in A. Cosen-tino & M. Monaca (eds.) *Studium Sapientiae: Atti della giornata di studio in onore di Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, 28 gennaio 2011*. Soveria Mannelli, 57–73.
- Bierl, A. 2013. 'Der vielnamige Dionysos: Wesen und Funktion des Gottes im Spiegel seiner Beinamen', in M. Philipp (ed.) *Dionysos, Rausch und Ekstase*. München, 30–9.
- 2017. "Hail and Take Pleasure! Making Gods Present in Narration through Choral Song and Other Epiphanic Strategies in the *Homeric Hymns to Dionysus*

| πολλοί τοι νηοί τε καὶ ἄλσέα δενδρήεντα (Ἀπόλλων/ἄλλο-τε/πολλο-ί), 299–31 ἐνθεν δὲ προτέρω ἔκies ἐκατηβόλ' Ἀπολλων, | [...] ἐνθα νεοδμῆς πῶλος ἀναπνέει (Ἀπόλλων/πῶλος); *hMerc.* IV 1–6 Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει Μοῦσα [...] | ἄντρον ἔσω ναίουσα παλίσκιον (cf. *hMerc.* XVIII 1–6), 23–5 οὐδὸν ὑπερβαίνων ὑψηρεφέος ἄντροιο. | [...] Ἑρμῆς τοι πρώτιστα χέλυν τεκτῆνατ' αἰοδόν (Ἑρμῆς/ἔρμα 'pile of stones' ~ ἄντρον 'stony cavern'), 46–8 ὡς ἄμ' ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἐμήδετο κύδιμος Ἑρμῆς. | [...] πειρήνας διὰ νῶτα λιθορρίνιοι χελώνης (Ἑρμῆς/ἔρμα 'pile of stones' ~ λίθος 'stone'), 145–8 Ἑρμῆς | [...] ἰθύσας δ' ἄντρον, 401 ἐνθ' Ἑρμῆς μὲν ἔπειτα κιὼν παρὰ λαῖνον ἄντρον (Ἑρμῆς/ἔρμα 'pile of stones' ~ ἄντρον 'stony cavern'), 404 πέτρῃ ἐπ' ἡλιβάτω, τάχα δ' ἤρετο κύδιμον Ἑρμῆν; *hPan* XIX 1–4 ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμείῃσσι φίλον γόνον ἐννεπε Μοῦσα, | [...] αἶ τε κατ' αἰγίλιπος πέτρης στείβουσι κάρηνα (Ἑρμῆς/ἔρμα 'pile of stones' ~ πέτρῃ 'stone').

⁴⁵ The placename Νύση is etymologically linked with the word νύσσα, which according to Pherecydes, denotes the tree (*FGrHist* 3 F 178 δηλοῖ δὲ ὁ Φερεκύδης, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνον Ἀντίοχος, λέγοντες καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κεκληθῆναι Διόνυσον, ὡς ἐκ Διὸς ἐς νύσας ρέοντα· νύσας γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐκάλουν τὰ δένδρα). The Nyse variant supports this etymological derivation of the placename because it "flourishes in forest", and puns on the name of Dionysus.

⁴⁶ See *Lfgre s.v.*

- and *Apollo*’, in C. Tsagalis & A. Markantonatos (eds.) *The Winnowing Oar – New Perspectives in Homeric Studies*. Berlin/Boston, 231–65.
- Cassola, F. 1975. *Inni omerici*. Milano.
- Chantraine, P. 1958. *Grammaire homérique. Tome 1: phonétique et morphologie*. Paris.
- 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris.
- Currie, B. 2012. “Perspectives on Neoanalysis from the Archaic Hymns to Demeter,” in O. Andersen & D. T. T. Haug (eds.) *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge, 184–209.
- Dihle, A. 2002. “Zu den Fragmenten eines Dionysus-Hymnus,” *RhM* 145, 427–30.
- Felson, N. 2009. ‘Epiniian Apollo in Story Time: *Pythian* 9, *Olympian*, 6, *Pythian* 3’, in L. Athanassaki, R. P. Martin, J. F. Miller (eds.) *Apolline Politics and Poetics*. Athens, 149–68.
- Foley, J. M. 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington/Indianapolis.
- 1999. *Homer’s Traditional Art*. University Park, Pennsylvania.
- Frisk, H. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Band I: A - Ko*. Heidelberg.
- Furley, W. D. 2011. “Homeric and Un-Homeric Hexameter Hymns: A Question of Type,” in A. Faulkner (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford, 206–31.
- & Bremer, J. M. 2001. *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period. Volume 1: The Texts in Translation*. Tübingen.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore/London.
- Garner, R. S. 2009. “Epic and Other Genres in the Ancient Greek World,” in J. M. Foley (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. Malden, Mass./Oxford/Chichester, 386–96.
- Gasparri, C. 1986. “Dionysus,” *LIMC* 3.1, 414–514.
- Genette, G. 1997. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln/London.
- Goodwin, C. & Duranti, A. 1992. “Rethinking Context: An Introduction,” in C. Goodwin & A. Duranti (eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge, 1–42.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, M. 2013. “Dionysus in the *Homeric Hymns*: the Olympian Portrait of the God,” in A. Bernabé, M. Herrero de Jáuregui, A. I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, R. Martín Hernández (eds.) *Redefining Dionysus*. Berlin/Boston, 235–49.
- Horrocks, G. 1997. “Homer’s Dialect,” in I. Morris & B. Powell (eds.) *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden/New York/Köln, 193–217.
- Hurst, A. 1994. “Un nouveau papyrus du premier hymne homérique: le papyrus de Genève 432 (2ème - 1er siècle avant notre ère),” in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.) *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Congress of Papyrologists. Copenhagen, 23–29 August 1992*. Copenhagen, 317–21.
- Jacob, D. 1998. Η ποιητική της αρχαίας ελληνικής τραγωδίας. Athens.

- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge.
- Kern, O. 1903. "Dionysus," *RE* 9, 1010–46.
- Kirk, G. S. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: books 5–8*. Cambridge.
- Kretschmer, P. 1890. "Semele und Dionysus," in *Aus der Anomia: Archaeologische Beitræge, Carl Robert zur Erinnerung an Berlin dargebracht*. Berlin, 17–29.
- Nagy, G. 2009. *Homer the Classic*. Cambridge, Mass./London.
- 2011. "The Earliest Phases in the Reception of the *Homeric Hymns*," in A. Faulkner (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford, 280–333.
- Nilsson, M. 1967. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion. Erster Band: Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die Weltherrschaft*. München.
- Olson, S. D. 2012. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Berlin/Boston.
- Schubert, P. 1996. "118 Hymne homérique à Dionysus," in P. Schubert (ed.) *Les Papyrus de Genève. Troisième Volume: Nos 118–146. Textes littéraires et documentaires*. Genève, 15–20.
- Stephens, S. 2015. "Callimachus and his Narrators," in A. Faulkner & O. Hodgkinson (eds.) *Hymnic Narrative and the Narratology of Greek Hymns*. Leiden/Boston, 49–68.
- Stoevesandt, M. 2008. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Band IV: Sechster Gesang, Faszikel 2: Kommentar*. Berlin/New York.
- Tsagalis, C. 2008. *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Vergados, A. 2011. "The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Humour and Epiphany," in A. Faulkner (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford, 82–104.
- 2013. *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin/Boston.
- West, M. 2001. "The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus," *ZPE* 134, 1–11.
- 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, Mass./London.
- 2011. "The First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus," in A. Faulkner (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford, 29–43.

