

A COMPANION TO HELLENISTIC LITERATURE

Edited by

James J. Clauss
and Martine Cuypers

 **WILEY-BLACKWELL**

A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

2010

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Sung Poetry: The Case of Inscribed Paeans

Marco Fantuzzi

In answer to his father's exhortation to follow the traditional custom of the symposium and sing some lyric poetry (*melē*) of Simonides, Aristophanes' Pheidippides protests that he would rather perform a tragic speech (*rhēsis*) by Euripides because singing a song to the lyre at a symposium is terribly passé (*Clouds* 1353–71). A movement away from song is also observable in Athenian drama. In the fourth century BCE the most prominent lyric sections of tragedy and comedy, the choral odes, became repertory pieces, more or less remote from the dramatic action and only occasionally composed by the dramatists themselves. The trend was never reversed. In the next century, Theocritus and Callimachus often adopted the two recitative meters *par excellence*, the dactylic hexameter and the elegiac couplet, for types of poetry that would formerly have commanded lyric meters. As for these meters themselves, the increasing separation between music and meter, which Plato laments especially in connection to the dithyramb (*Laws* 2.669d–e), may explain why we find Hellenistic poets using lyric meters, which the Archaic poets had employed in responsive strophic structures, in stichic or epodic poems, or composing free-flowing songs comparable to the monodies of the later plays of Euripides and the *Fragmentum Grenfellianum*. And although Hellenistic stichic poetry occasionally mimics the strophic structure of sung poetry (notably in Theocritus; lastly Prauscello 2006: 185–213), no actual strophic lyric survives from any of the major Hellenistic poets. In this light it comes as no surprise that there is almost no evidence for singing competitions in Hellenistic Egypt, and although such competitions are recorded elsewhere (for example in mainland Greece and Delos), it is clear that reciting dactylic poetry was the dominant form of poetic performance throughout the Hellenistic world (Hardie 1983: 206).

The Hellenistic poems that still employ lyric meters fall into a number of groups. Callimachus' four short *Melē* (frs. 226–9 Pf.), Theocritus' short *Idylls* 28–31, and a

small number of epigrams by Callimachus, Theocritus, Asclepiades, and others (listed in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 39 n.155) take up, if not in meter at least in language and imagery, the tradition of short lyric poetry such as that composed by Sappho, Alcaeus, and Anacreon. We also find stichic re-use of lyric meters in a small number of “popular,” mainly mime-like texts (CA pp. 180–96) of a kind similar to the *Fragmentum Grenfellianum* (Esposito in this volume). Other poems are the work of experimental virtuosos who are little more than names to us – indeed they are mentioned by later writers only for their metrical “inventions.” Philicus, one of the members of the Alexandrian Pleiad, who composed a *Hymn to Demeter* in choriambic hexameters in the first half of the third century, explicitly offered his abstruse invention as a “gift to the grammarians” (SH 677); and Boiscus of Cyzicus, who dedicated his invention of the catalectic iambic octameter to Apollo, presented himself as the proud “author of a new poem” (SH 233). Lyric-iambic meters feature in the so-called *technopaignia* or “figure poems” ascribed to Theocritus, Simias of Rhodes, Dosiadas, and Besantinus, which are perhaps the most playful and virtuosic kind of poetry produced by the Hellenistic Age. They are replete with arcane glosses and riddles, and the succession of verses of different length gives the poem itself the shape of a particular object. The length of the lines is dictated by pictographic necessity, without any regard for the traditional strophic organization of lyric *cola*: here metrics has really become “the art of measuring,” a manipulation of length. Lyric meters were also adopted for social satire. The *poète maudit* Sotades produced lyric verses of a new kind that subsequently took their name from him, sotadeans. In this meter he wrote hard-hitting attacks on the political powerhouse of the Ptolemies, and he likewise expressed a subversive spirit towards the highest power of literary tradition by re-writing the *Iliad* in sotadeans. Another satirical moralist, Cercidas from Megalopolis, invented iambic-lyric meters (*meliamboi*) based on the *kat’ enoplion* epitrites of the lyric-choral tradition (Scodel in this volume).

A small number of lyric texts of the Hellenistic Age continued to be composed in strophes. Most of them are paeans or religious hymns preserved on stone (metrical analyses in Parker 2001: 32–5). Through indirect literary transmission we have testimonia or fragments of a few other paeans and encomiastic hymns, celebrating kings or military leaders, but in most cases too little to ascertain their precise structure. Honorands of such compositions were Antigonus Monophthalmus and Demetrius Poliorcetes (SH 492; for the latter is also CA pp. 173–4, in strophes of iambic trimeters and ithyphallics), Craterus (SH 40), Seleucus (CA p. 140), and Titus Quinctius Flamininus (CA p. 143). The context of all these texts is not Alexandrian or even Egyptian (apart from the *Erythraean Paean*, a copy of whose text was also found in Ptolemais, an exception which confirms the rule): they rather appear to be linked to a conservative tradition of religious singing, which still flourished in the sanctuaries of the Greek homeland, and to the practice of the epinician paean, which was as old as Homer (*Il.* 22.391–4; Rutherford 2001a: §5d). The cultic paeans that survive epigraphically are all either anonymous or by authors who are otherwise unknown, and none of them, as far as we know, was ever recorded in any other medium than stone. Set against Callimachus’ and Theocritus’ preference for recitative meters and stichic composition, these poems would seem perfect examples of the activity of “minor” or “popular” poets, writing for hire or for agonistic festivals

(Cameron 1995a: 47–53) in a tradition that was more or less uninfluenced by “Callimachean” tastes. This impression, we will see, is only in part correct.

Isyllus

Not long after the Macedonian king Philip (perhaps Philip II, 338 BCE, but more probably either Philip III, 317/16 BCE, or Philip V, 218 BCE) “had led his army against Sparta with the intention of dismantling the power of the kings” (lines 63–4), the Epidaurian Isyllus, son of Socrates, dedicated “to Apollo Maleatas and Asclepius” (2) a long inscription of 84 lines in the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus, which includes a short paean to both gods but notably to Asclepius (40.37–61 Käppel 1992; CA pp. 132–6). Isyllus may have composed the entire text himself or had parts of it composed by a hired versifier; in any case, hardly any parallel can be found for the complex form and the artistic engagement and ambitions of this inscription, which, together with the paean itself, includes a full narrative of the events leading to its composition, instructions for its performance, and several expositions of Isyllus’ political views. It is structured in seven sections, some in prose, others in various meters, each with its own topic and goal.

The first two lines, in prose, introduce the dedicator, Isyllus, and dedicatees, Apollo and Asclepius. Surprisingly, there is no object here for ἀνέθηκε, “dedicated,” a technical term which usually introduces the offering, for example a statue, a trophy, or professional tools, which the dedicatory inscription (supposedly) accompanies and “explains.” Here the verb remains self-referential and points not simply to the paean, which might be expected to be the dedicated “object,” but to the whole inscription, a point which the final line of the text restates more clearly (ταῦτά τοι . . . ἀνέθηκεν Ἴσυλλος, 79).

The section that follows this heading starts with an undisguised political declaration, which is at first sight surprising in a religious inscription. Lines 3–9 state, in trochaic tetrameters, that the demos is stronger if it empowers aristocrats to be “directed” (ὀρθοῦνται) by their “manly virtue” (ἀνδραγαθία, 4); but in case one of the nobles is affected by “baseness” (πονηρία, 5), the demos must restrain him for the sake of stability: “this is the opinion I had in the past; I expressed it then and express it now. I vowed to inscribe this opinion if the law which I presented ratified it for us. This has indeed happened, and not without the gods’ will” (7–9).

In Section 3, composed in dactylic hexameters (10–26), it becomes clear that Isyllus’ sacred law ratified his political ideas because it involved or presupposed a specific role for the nobles in the celebration of Phoebus and Asclepius. Cleverly stressing his personal vow, which he presents as almost atemporal and thus less arbitrarily partisan, Isyllus legitimates the inclusion in the inscription of his political advice to the Epidaurians with the fact that the existence of a noble leading class is a necessary requisite for the procession in honor of Asclepius that he proposes. At 14–26 Isyllus prescribes that the demos of Epidaurus choose among themselves “those who are the best” (οἱ τ’ ἀριστεύωσι, 14), publicly proclaim their names, charge them to march in a procession “in honor of Phoebus and of his son Asclepius” bearing

wreaths of laurel for Apollo and olive branches for Asclepius (17–21), and pray that “good health for children” (τέκνοις ὑγεία), “physical and ethical excellence” (καλοκαγαθία), “peace” (εἰρήνη), “good order” (εὐνομία), and “irreproachable wealth” (πλοῦτος ἀμεμψής) may last forever at Epidaurus (21–4). If the Epidaurians respect this law in years to come, they may hope that Zeus will keep them from harm (25–6). Isyllus’ faith in the Epidaurian aristocracy perhaps also intrudes upon his religious language in the following paean. The name of the daughter of Malos quoted at 45, Kleophema, recalls two key aristocratic values, κλέος and φήμη, and later Asclepius is called ὦ μέγ’ ἄριστος θεῶν (83) with an epithet, ἄριστος, that is very rare for gods but a crucial term in aristocratic ideology (Sineux 1999: 165; Vamvouri 2004: 171).

The lines that express Isyllus’ political credo (3–9) also show what is in my opinion a key goal in his self-presentation: they invite readers of the inscription to identify him as a sort of new Solon, an intertextual connection which so far does not seem to have received any scholarly attention. Isyllus’ idea that the demos has to accept to be directed by a morally superior oligarchic class, but also has to monitor the nobles constantly to ensure that they do not become “base” (πονηρίας, 5) and their wealth is “irreproachable” (ἀμεμψή, 23) find precise parallels in Solon’s appreciation of only wealth that is “rightful” (δίκαιος), his criticism of the excesses (ὑβρις) of the wealthy, and his appeal to the demos to obey the leading class but also control it and restrain its tendency toward excess. These thoughts are expressed, for example, in fr. 13.7–32 (*IEG*), on righteous wealth and Zeus’ punishment of unlawful people, and in fr. 4, which warns the rich to avoid excess for the sake of political stability (εὐνομία), claiming that “through the dispensation of Zeus” (κατὰ Διὸς αἵαν) the city of Athens would never perish, but that the foolishness of the “leaders of the demos” (δήμον ἡγεμόνας) might lead to its destruction (1–8). Similar points emerge in fr. 4c.1–3, 6.1–4, and 11.3–4.

Solon’s preference for an enlightened “pre-democratic” rule over the demos by the traditional leading class and Isyllus’ encouragement of an enlightened oligarchy might be deemed a casual and partial coincidence. For example, Isyllus’ oligarchic ideas also to some extent match Tyrtaeus’ defense of the Spartan political system (fr. 4; although the idea that the demos has to check the aristocracy seems to have no parallel in Tyrtaeus). What is strikingly Solonian, however, is the way in which Isyllus frames his political credo and accomplishments in order to fashion himself as a successful authority figure. Isyllus’ claim that the opinion he expresses at this moment is an opinion he has also defended and communicated in the past (τάνδε τὰν γνώμων τόκ’ ἤχον καὶ ἔλεγον καὶ νῦν λέγω, 7), and his statement at the end of the introduction that what he undertook and vowed to do “has indeed happened, and not without the gods’ will” (ἔγεντο δ’, οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν, 9), voice the same feelings Solon expresses about his own political project, most probably after accomplishing it, in order to defend himself against criticism: “for what I said I would, I have accomplished with the gods’ will” (ἃ μὲν γὰρ εἶπα, σὺν θεοῖσιν ἤνυκα, fr. 34.6). Moreover, while the poetry in which Solon explicates his moral and political ideas is composed in elegiac distichs, the fragments of his “apology” for his reforms, in which he emphasizes that his opinions are as they were before, significantly use the more conversational iambic trimeter (36–7) and trochaic tetrameter (32–4; Noussia

forthcoming). It will hardly be coincidental that it is precisely the trochaic tetrameter, a meter seldom found in Hellenistic poetry outside Menander, which carries the political program in lines 3–9 of Isyllus' inscription. Apart from this specific connection, Isyllus may have also more broadly followed the paradigm of Solon in adopting different meters for the different contents and tones of the sections of his inscription, just as Solon varied between elegiacs, iambs, and tetrameters. And on a more speculative note, one may wonder if there is not also a connection between Isyllus' choice to present his sacred law (lines 10–26) in dactylic hexameters and the story that Solon started composing his laws in hexameters but in the end abandoned this form for prose, found by Plutarch in his sources for the *Life of Solon* (3.5) together with the purported opening lines (Solon fr. 31). The lines and the story are surely spurious, but it is a fact that, with the exception of sacred laws decreed by oracles, we have no other evidence for inscribed regulations such as that of Isyllus composed in metrical form until the early Empire, i.e., well after Isyllus' time (Sokolowski 1962; A. and I. Petrovic 2006). It is at least possible, therefore, that Isyllus' choice for the hexameter was directly inspired by the Solonian tradition.

It should come as no surprise that Isyllus, a supporter of an enlightened aristocracy, adopted Solon as a validating figure. Already in fourth-century Greece "even critics of popular rule could put up with democracy, if only it was ancestral" (Hansen 1989: 75), and the Athenian lawgiver had attained an almost mythical status. Although there is a tendency in the orators to position Solon as the father of the radical democracy of the fifth century, Aristotle interpreted Solon's original constitution as an indirect and representative democracy, where the role of the *demos* mainly consisted in electing the magistrates. Similarly, Isocrates suggests a return to Solon's constitution as a remedy against the problems of radical democracy, and the oligarchic Council of the Four Hundred, established in Athens in 411 BCE, also seems to have used Solon's constitution as its model (Hansen 1989: 88–9, 93–7; Ruschenbusch 1958: 407).

The two sections that follow Isyllus' *nomos* on the ritual for Apollo and Asclepius (Sections 4 and 5, lines 27–31 and 32–6) provide authoritative justifications for both the ritual and the paean that follows. Section 4 starts with an elegiac distich commemorating how a certain Malos founded the cult of Apollo Maleatas by building an altar and sacrificing to the god (the dedicatory character of the lines probably explains the choice of meter). The three dactylic hexameters that follow state the vitality and Panhellenic importance of these sacrifices: even in Asclepius' sanctuary at Trikka nobody can enter the inner sanctum without first sacrificing to Apollo Maleatas. Section 5, composed in prose, is parallel in structure and immediately juxtaposed to Section 4, suggesting an analogy between Malos' and Isyllus' contributions to the cult: it was Malos who built the first altar; it was Isyllus who composed a paean, consulted the Delphic oracle, and was told to inscribe it "for the present and future time" (36).

The text of the paean proper, in ionics, follows (37–56, Section 6). The introduction indicates who are to sing it: all the *demos* (ἀείχετε λαοί, / ζαθέας ἐνναέτα[ι] ῥάδ' Ἐπιδαύρου, 37–8), and not only, for example, the aristocrats leading the procession or the city's *houroi* (as in the *Erythraean Paean*, discussed below). The body of the song is almost completely devoted to legitimizing the joint cult of Apollo

Malcatas and Asclepius at Epidaurus through an elaborate Epidaurian genealogy. According to this genealogy, which is authoritatively presented as a “revelation” that “came to the ears of our ancestors” (ὤδε γὰρ φάτις ἐνέπουσ’ ἦλυ/θ’ ἐκ ἀκοῦς προγόνων ἀμετέρων, 39–40), Zeus married his daughter, the Muse Erato, to Malos; then Phlegyas, who came from and lived at Epidaurus (43), married the daughter of Erato and Malos, Kleophema; from them was born Aigla, also called Koronis, who was raped by Apollo “in the house of Malos,” i.e., at Epidaurus; with the help of the Moirai and Lachesis, Aigla gave birth to a child whom Apollo called “Asclepius” after the name of its mother. Most of these details are unique. The marriage between Malos and Erato, the figure of Kleophema, and Aigla as the name of Asclepius’ mother are not found elsewhere. In all other sources Phlegyas comes from Thessaly, not Epidaurus, and Asclepius’ mother is simply called Koronis. The etymological connection of the god’s name to the otherwise unattested Aigla, as linguistically far-fetched as it may seem, effectively caps a genealogy devised to appropriate Asclepius as an Epidaurian god (cf. τὰν εὐν’ Ἐπίδουρον μητρόπολιν, 59), which is licensed by its presentation in a paean – and not just any paean but one which Apollo himself, through the Delphic oracle, told the Epidaurians to inscribe and preserve for all time.

The beginning and end of the paean’s final section are marked by the cry *ie Paian ie Paian* (58, 61), the formula which makes a paean a paean (Ford 2006: 287–8) but which elsewhere in this song appears only in the very first line (iē Παῖάνα, 37). It seems significant that the first cry comes immediately after Asclepius has been qualified as “healer of illnesses, giver of health” (νόσων παύ/[ε]τορα, δωτήρ’ ὑγίαια, 56–7) and the second caps the wish “may you bestow upon us manifest health in mind and body” (ἐναργῆ δ’ ὑγίαιαν ἐπιπέμποις φρεσὶ καὶ σώ/ματιν ἄμοις, 60–1). Paian (also called Paiēon) was perhaps in origin an independent healing god, but in literature and cult this name typically appears as an epithet or allonym of Apollo as a healing or apotropaic god. Isyllus’ song is certainly not the first to address Asclepius with the words *ie Paian*: the earliest version of the *Erythraean Paean to Asclepius* dates from 380–360 BCE and already Sophocles may have composed paeans to this god (PMG 737b). Yet it seems that Isyllus, by directly linking the cry *ie Paian* to Asclepius’ healing powers, justifies its own existence as a paean to Asclepius by way of a subtle aetiology, the implicit argument being that *ie Paian* addresses Apollo as a healing god, and therefore it can be transferred to his son Asclepius, who is also a healing god. That this connection is not self-evident is shown by the “miniature paean” within Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo* (97–104) and Orpheus’ song to Apollo in Apollonius’ *Argonautica* (2.705–13), which provide a competing *aition* of [*h*]ie Paian focusing on the first element ([*h*]ie), which they explain from the Delphians’ exhortations to Apollo to shoot (*hie*) his arrows at the dragon Pytho (cf. also Ephorus FGrH 70 F 31).

The final section of Isyllus’ inscription, in dactylic hexameters (57–79), celebrates Asclepius’ power by describing one of his achievements. These lines are in form an aretalogy (καὶ τόδε σῆς ἀρετῆς, 62), reminiscent in style and form of the *Homeric Hymns*. Yet they are also a personal testimony of the greatness of the god, because the event which Isyllus records does not derive from the realm of myth but from his own experience. When “Philip” (on whose identification see above) led an army against Sparta in order to abolish the power of the kings, Asclepius came to the Spartans’ aid

from Epidaurus. At that moment “the boy” Isyllus (67 ὁ παῖς, 72 μοι, 77 ἐμέ) returned from the Bosphorus with an illness and prayed to Asclepius. The healer then appeared to him in golden armor and said (73–82):

“Θάρσει· καιρῶι γάρ σοι ἀφίξομαι – ἀλλὰ μὲν’ αὐτεῖ –
 τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις χαλεπὰς ἀπὸ κῆρας ἐρύξας,
 οὐνεκα τοὺς Φοῖβου χρησμοὺς κῶζοντι δικαίως 75
 οὗς μαντευσάμενος παρέταξε πόλιν Λυκοῦργος.”
 ὣς δ’ ἐμὲν ὤχετο ἐπὶ Σπάρτην· ἐμὲ δ’ ὤρσε νόημα
 ἀγγελῆαι Λακεδαιμονίοις ἔλθόντα τὸ θεῖον
 πάντα μάλ’ ἐξείας· οἳ δ’ ἀδῆσαντος ἀκουσαν
 αὐτεῖραν φῆμαν, Ἀσκληπιέ, καὶ σφε σάωσας. 80
 οἳ δὲ ἐκάρυξαν πάντας ξενίαις σε δέκεσθαι
 σωτήρα ἐδρυχόρου Λακεδαίμονος ἀγκαλέοντες.

“Do not worry, I will come to you in due course – just wait here! – but first I must save the Spartans from dire destruction. For they justly observe the decrees of Phoebus which Lycurgus imposed upon the city after consulting the oracle.” After speaking these words he was off to Sparta, and my mind urged me go and report the epiphany to the Spartans, all of it, word for word. They listened to the prophecy of salvation I spoke, Asclepius, and saving them you did; upon which they sent word that all should receive you hospitably, addressing you as savior of Sparta with the broad dancing-places.

When immediately after these lines Isyllus closes his text with the formula “Isyllus dedicated this” (ταῦτά τοι . . . ἀνέθηκεν Ἴσυλλος, 79), these words, like the opening formula “Isyllus dedicated” (Ἴσυλλος . . . ἀνέθηκε, 1), clearly do not point just to the central sections of the inscription, the sacred law and the paean: all sections – Isyllus’ political advice, his ritual prescriptions, the text of the paean, and the account of his encounter with Asclepius and embassy to the Spartans – form part of an encompassing persuasive strategy to build up Isyllus’ political authority through divine validation. Isyllus is the new Solon whose political views are confirmed by a sacred law approved not just by the people of Epidaurus but by Apollo himself. His service to Apollo and Asclepius is comparable to that of Malos, founder of the joint cult of Apollo Maleatas and Asclepius and ancestor of the latter. Isyllus is on familiar terms with and dear to both gods: Apollo, who in an oracle told him his paean was to be preserved for all time, as well as Asclepius, who appeared to him when he was a child and whose message of salvation he conveyed to the Spartans, to the benefit of the Spartans, Asclepius, and himself. Isyllus’ strategy resembles that of Zaleukos of Locri, whose code of laws, if we are to believe to Plutarch, “found favor with the Locrians not least because he asserted that Athena had constantly appeared to him and had in each case guided and instructed him in his legislation” (Plu. *Mor.* 542e–543a; cf. Arist. fr. 548 Rose 1886). Indeed, Asclepius’ speech to the boy Isyllus in the final lines brings us back to the project of the older Isyllus enshrined in this inscription. The reason, so Asclepius declares, why he supports the Spartans against the Macedonians is that the Spartans had respected Apollo’s oracle by adopting the laws of Lycurgus. The Epidaurians, then, would be fools to disregard the law of Isyllus, the protégé of Apollo and Asclepius, who as an eyewitness of Asclepius’ epiphany, a beneficiary of his healing power, and carrier of his message of salvation, constituted living evidence of the god’s power and benevolence.

Long and detailed inscriptions recording religious laws are not uncommon in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. The Milesian *nomos* of the Molpoi, which was re-inscribed at the end of the third century BCE but dates from 450/449 and probably resumes even older ritual prescriptions, runs to 45 lines (Herda 2006); the prescriptions about ritual purity preserved in a third century BCE inscription from Cos (LSCG 154) fill more than 90, and the 92 BCE rules of the mysteries from Andanie (LSCG 64) no fewer than 193 lines. The constituent parts of Isyllus' inscription are also partly unsurprising. Cults were often supported through oracles, which could be proudly evoked in inscriptions recording their foundation or revival. A case in point is the long text set up by a certain Mnesiepes for the cult of the poet Archilochus in Paros, which records no fewer than three oracles of Apollo to Mnesiepes and one to Archilochus' father Telesicles (Archil. test. 3 Gerber 1999 = SEG 15.517). Even so, there do not seem to be any parallels for a religious song being cast in an explanatory and legitimizing framework as elaborate as that of Isyllus' inscription, where the paean constitutes less than a third of the entire text.

In order to appreciate the boldness of Isyllus' framing of his religious law and song and the peculiarity of his paean, it helps to compare his text to an inscription from Erythrae in Asia Minor which has already been mentioned several times above. Datable to 380–360 BCE, this inscription is at least half a century older than Isyllus. Recorded in 40 lines of prose on the recto of the stone is a sacred law detailing rituals and sacrifices to be performed for Asclepius and Apollo, including the instruction to sing a paean (παῶν(ξεν)), first to Apollo and then to Asclepius, after a successful incubation in the temple or the fulfillment of a prayer. The verso contains the scanty remains of a paean to Apollo and a much better preserved paean to Asclepius (36 and 37 Käppel). The *Erythraean Paean to Asclepius* became the standard paean to Asclepius and may have been initially composed with this goal in mind. The person who devised the inscription not only chose to completely separate the paean from the sacred law that regulates its performance (inscribed in prose on the opposite side of the stone, as was the most common epigraphic practice, rather than integrated with the paean in a prosimetric text as in Isyllus' inscription) but he also composed, commissioned, or selected an entirely generic song.

The *Erythraean Paean*, structured in strophes with a mesymnion and ephymnion *ie Paian*, faithfully reproduces the most marked formal features of the traditional paean to Apollo ("automatization of the form" in the terminology of Käppel 1992: 189–206), while limiting the song's content to a bare genealogy of the god, a list of his children, and an appeal to Asclepius to "be gracious to my city of the broad dancing-places" (Ἰλαος δ' ἐπινίξο/τὰν ἐμὴν πόλιν εὐρύχορον, 19–20) and allow "us" (ἡμᾶς, 20) to enjoy a healthy life. This reduction is only partly explainable from the fact that while there was a stock of paeanic stories for Apollo from which a poet could draw, such a tradition did not really exist for his son Asclepius. In comparison with what remains of the earlier literary paeans of authors such as Pindar and Bacchylides, we find among the paeans inscribed during the Hellenistic era a noticeable fluctuation in authorial individuality and narrative ambition. This applies first and foremost to the *Erythraean Paean*, whose narrative section consists in – or rather is substituted by – a meager list of Asclepius' children, which seems to place it in a class of less ornate cult poetry, without the literary aspirations of texts such as the paeans of Pindar or Isyllus

(Schröder 1999: 62–96). Yet, as was recently argued by LeVen (2008: 262–7), even this at first sight unambitious paean shows a certain degree of self-consciousness and subtly justifies its status as a paean not to Apollo but to Asclepius. The sacred law on the recto of the stone, listing the rituals to be performed by the worshippers praying for *Asclepius*' help, ends with a paean to *Apollo*, which runs on from the bottom of the recto to the top of the verso. The paean to Asclepius on the verso opens immediately after the end of the paean to Apollo, with the following words: “Sing of Paian, famous for his skill . . . who fathered a great joy for mortals . . . ; iē Paian, Asclepius, most famous god, ie Paian” (Παιᾶνα κλυτόμητιν ἀείσατε / . . . ὅς μέγα χάρμα βρότοις ἐγένεατο . . . / ἡ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιόν / δαίμονα κλεινότατον, ἑ Παιάν, 1–9): the song seems to open as if it is going to be another paean to Apollo, but in reality “transfers” the appellation Paian to Asclepius. Significantly, Asclepius' epithet κλεινότατος, “most famous,” in line 9 is a standard epithet for Apollo; here it picks up Apollo's epithet κλυτόμητις, “famous for his skill,” in line 1, a word which allegedly qualified not Apollo but Asclepius in Sophocles' prototypical paean to this god (*PMG* 737; but cf. Rutherford 2001a: 461–2).

As indicated, this “generic” or “essential” paean became a classic, which was still sung more than five centuries after its first attestation. Copies of it, more or less unchanged, were recorded at Ptolemais in Egypt (97 CE), Athens (first or second century CE), and Dion in Macedon (late second century CE). The absence of details restricting this paean to a specific location or context meant that it could be used in every circumstance and place. It could also be easily adapted as desired, as has happened in the version from Ptolemais, which includes an additional fourth strophe with the wish for regular floods of the Nile. In the same vein, a paean composed by a certain Macedonicus (41 Käppel), found near the Athenian Asclepieum and datable to the first century BCE, closely follows the structure of the time-honored Erythraean model but adds some final verses asking for Asclepius' protection specifically for Athens. It may not be just a matter of chance that the *Erythraean Paean* remains the only instance among the epigraphically attested paeans from the fourth to the first centuries BCE whose author remains unknown to us. That is to say, it is quite possible that the author of this song or his patrons purposely chose not to record his identity exactly because anonymity was essential to its desired dissemination as a standard text. However this may be, read against the *Erythraean Paean*, Isyllus' provision of a uniformly “literary” and authoritative form for every aspect of the political and religious context of his message appears bold and original indeed.

Philodamus

As it turns out, Isyllus' inscription is not a completely isolated phenomenon. Some other paeans of the Hellenistic Age, though not as elaborately and artistically framed and presented as that of Isyllus, likewise have a religious-political dimension and show similar rhetorical strategies. Close in time to the earliest possible date for Isyllus is a Delphic inscription which contains a long paean to Dionysus going under the name of Philodamus of Skarpheia (39 Käppel). The paean itself, which is fragmentarily

preserved, is followed by a prose subscription which not only specifies who wrote the paean – Philodamus and his brothers Epigenes and Mantidas – but also authorizes the preceding song. It states that, under the eponymous magistrate Etymondas (probably 340/339 BCE), the Delphians granted Philodamus, his brothers, and their descendants a number of privileges (including proxeny, preferential consultation of the oracle, first-rank seats at ceremonies, and exemption from fees) to honor them for the preceding paean to Dionysus, which the three brothers composed “according to the oracular command of the god” (κατὰ τὰν μαντείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπαγγελιατ[ο]). This official endorsement is particularly significant because the paean, like Isyllus’ paean to Asclepius, takes an innovative approach to its subject, pushing an identification of Dionysus and Apollo which goes far beyond what we find in earlier sources.

Forms of association between (Delphic) Apollo and Dionysus may already have been promoted by the Pisistratids (Ieranò 1992) and are not foreign to fifth-century Athenian tragedy (Aesch. *Eum.* 24–6; Rutherford 2001a: 133). Delphic evidence includes, for example, a fifth-century inscription of the Labydae detailing sacrifices for Dionysus to be performed at Delphi in mid-summer (*CID* 1.9.43–5), and the much later testimony of Plutarch, who reports that it was customary to celebrate Dionysus at Delphi with dithyrambs in winter, when Apollo was supposed to be among the Hyperboreans (*Mor.* 388e–f; cf. *Bacch.* 16.5–12). Our paean, however, pushes a far more radical idea. It opens with an invitation to Dionysus to come to the Delphic Theoxenia, the spring feast that celebrated Apollo’s return from the Hyperboreans (3–4). This in itself already seems odd. One would expect Delphic Dionysus to be celebrated with a dithyramb, while a paean, especially one for this occasion, would naturally be addressed to Apollo; in antiquity these two genres were often seen as opposed (Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 172; Plu. *Mor.* 389a–b; Rutherford 2001a: §7g and §12). Philodamus’ paean self-consciously draws attention to its crossing of genres and syncretistic agenda right from its first line, where Dionysus is addressed as Διθύραμβε, and it continues to blur the distinction between Apollo and Dionysus, and between paean and dithyramb throughout. For instance, the epithet καλλιπαῖα usually qualifies Apollo’s mother, Leto; here, and here alone, it is the mother of Dionysus who is “with beautiful child” (7). Many other moves of this type, some more, others less obvious, can be identified.

The text of the paean consists of twelve strophes, each including a mesymnion (5, 18, etc.) and ephymnion (11–13, 24–6, etc.) As we saw, strophes with such refrains were perceived as a key formal feature of the traditional paean. Yet the phrasing of this mesymnion is by no means traditional. Its formula εὐοῖ ᾧ ἰὸ Βάκχ’ ᾧ ἰὲ Παιάν prefixes a Dionysiac address εὐοῖ ᾧ ἰὸ Βάκχ’ to the traditional Apollinian invocation ᾧ ἰὲ Παιάν, achieving an equation of Dionysus to Paean and hence to Apollo – an equation which automatically extends to the invocation of Paean in the song’s more traditional ephymnion, “ie Paian, come as savior, be benevolent and protect this city so that it may continue to prosper” (ἰὲ Παιάν, ἴθι σωτήρ, etc.).

The first five strophes describe a series of locations where Dionysus brought his blessings, landmarks of his cult. After seeing the light in Thebes (strophe 1) and establishing his rites there, Dionysus is presented as first visiting Delphi (strophe 2), where “revealing his starry frame [he] stood among his Delphic maidens in the folds of Parnassus” (21–3). He then went to Eleusis, where he came to be invoked in the

Mysteries as "Iakchos" (strophe 3), and after the unreadable strophe 4 we find him in Olympus and Pieria (58-61):

Μοῦσαι [δ'] ἀντίκ' αὐτῆς παρθένου
 κ[ι]κκαί] τε[ψ]άμενοι κάλυψαι σε πάσαι
 μ[έ]λψαν] ἀθάνα[τον] ἐς αἰεὶ
 Παιῶν' ἐνὶ κλέα τ' ὀπί κλέου-
 και, [κα]τάρξε δ' Ἀπόλλων.

And immediately the maiden Muses, having crowned themselves with ivy, in a circle all hymned you as forever immortal and famous Paian, and Apollo led their chorus.

Because strophes 6-8 are almost completely unreadable we cannot say for certain whether Olympus was the last stop on Dionysus' journey. However, the content of strophe 5 and the preserved letters πυθοχη[ε?] in strophe 6 strongly suggest that in that strophe the narration came full circle and Dionysus returned to Delphi, the location where he had established his own chorus at the very start of his journey. This is also where Philodamus and his brothers, in the present, honor him under the title of "Paean," as is licensed by the "owner" of this appellation, Apollo, through the song of the Pierian Muses in strophe 5, and paralleled by Dionysus' acquisition of the sobriquet "Iakchos" at Eleusis in strophe 3.

Regardless of whether Philodamus' song is really the first paean ever composed for Dionysus, it certainly aetiologizes its own existence. In strophe 9 the main point of its mythological tale – legitimizing the singing of paeans to Dionysus – is sanctioned once again by Apollo, this time explicitly. Here the god is said to have ordered the Amphictyons (the Delphic confederation), surely by means of an oracle (compare the oracle given to Isyllus), first of all to "present this hymn for his brother (Dionysus) to the family of the gods" (110-12) on the occasion of the Theoxenia; secondly, to restore the old temple built by the Alcmeonids, which had been destroyed by a landslide in 373; and finally, to set up a statue of Dionysus in a holy grotto and honor the god with a sacrifice and a choral competition.

The reference to the new temple of Apollo, built between 370 and 320 BCE, might be said to provide the key to Philodamus' song, since its decorations parallel the syncretistic program of the paean on significant points. Whereas the east pediment of the new temple displayed the usual Apollo *kitharōdos*, accompanied by Artemis, Leto, and the Muses, the decorations of the west pediment showed Helios, Thyades (maenads), and a Dionysus who holds a *kithura* and lacks any trace of that ecstatic mobility which is typical of this god and which the presence of the Thyades would lead one to expect. Furthermore, this Dionysus is not clad in any of his usual garments, but "wears the heavy, high-belted, full-length chiton and cloak of Apollo *kitharōdos*" (Stewart 1982: 209). If we are here indeed dealing with a Dionysus Musagetes ("leader of the Muses"), as seems likely, mirroring the Apollo Musagetes of the east pediment, then the song of Philodamus and his brothers can plausibly be read as an *aition* for this arrangement: the syncretistic paean supports the syncretistic decorations and vice versa. Apollo's approval, in the song, of Dionysian paeans as well as his instructions regarding the new temple, involving the accommodation of a cult of Dionysus within the precinct, provides an explanation for the

iconographical syncretism of the temple decorations. The decorations meanwhile, there for all to see and made to last, lend a tangible and lasting authority to the divinely sanctioned song.

The ideological project supported by Philodamus' song may also have had a political dimension, because the push toward a closer association of Apollo and Dionysus at Delphi probably came from one specific direction: from Athens. On a very general level our paean, as a poem celebrating a god that provides an *aition* for the building of a temple to Apollo, invites comparison with the indirect pro-Athenian propaganda constituted by the "aetiological" references in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (56, 76, 80, 253–60, 285–93) to the temple of Apollo erected by Pisistratus at Delos (Burkert 1979; Aloni 1989: 47–61). It is a fact that Athenian artists, Praxias and Androstheneas, were in charge of the iconographic planning of Apollo's new temple at Delphi, and there is evidence to suggest that Praxias was also involved in the decoration of the temple of Dionysus at Thasos; this temple featured a Dionysus *kitharōdos* dressed in the garb of Apollo Musagetes and surrounded by personifications of tragedy, comedy, and dithyramb, i.e., in the role of patron of the performative arts which he held most prominently and iconically in Athens. It is not implausible that at Delphi, too, the promotion of Dionysus in a role which hitherto had been reserved for Apollo was essentially an Athenian project (Vamvouri 2004: 200–7).

Athenaeus, Limenius, Aristonous

Other Hellenistic paeans whose religious discourse is interwoven with politics are two texts which were inscribed on the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, one by an Athenaeus (45 Käppel; on the name, see Bélis 1988), the other by Limenius (46 Käppel). The latter advertised itself as "the paean and prosodion to the god which the Athenian Limenius, son of Thoinos, composed and performed to the lyre." The prosodion or "processional song" is not physically marked off from the paean but unquestionably starts in the middle of line 33. Both parts (so the introduction implies) were to be sung to the lyre (D'Alessio 1997: 30) and interlinear musical annotation is provided throughout to facilitate future performance. Next to Limenius' song stood an inscription in prose (*Feuilles de Delphi* 3.2.47.22) which functioned somewhat like the framing elements of Isyllus' integrated text: it includes Limenius in a list of *technitai Dionysou* ("artists of Dionysus") who in 128/127 BCE participated in the Pythais, a ritual procession from Athens to Delphi organized by the Athenians. This context suits the prosodion as well as the lines of the paean that present the *technitai* singing the paean (19–21):

Παιήονα κινλήϊσμεν ἅπασ
 λ]αός αὐ[το]χθόνων ἠδὲ Βάκχου μέγας θυρσοπλή[ξ]
 ἐμὸς ἵερὸς τεχνιτῶν ἔνοικος πόλει Κεκροπίαι.

Paian we celebrate, we the entire nation of autochthonous people and the great sacred thyrsus-banging throng of artists of Bacchus living in the city of Cecrops.

These lines stand between a description of Apollo's stay in Attica during his voyage from his birthplace Delos (13-19) and the narration of the rest of his voyage to Delphi (21-33), and thus also at the level of the inscription function as a *trait d'union* between Athens and Delphi. The Athenian stop-over is otherwise only mentioned at *Eumenides* 9-11, where the scholiast comments that Aeschylus included it to "flatter" Athens. The text of the paean also advertises Apollo's connection with Athens in other places. At 6-7, Leto holds a branch of olive, symbol of Athena and Athens, against the pains of childbirth (contrast *h.Ap.* 117-18 and *Call. h.* 4.210, where Leto holds a palm branch). At 15-17, the Athenians, and not the Delphians, seemingly invent the address *παῖόν ἔκ παῖόν το*, as they welcome the god's arrival in Attica with *kithara*-songs that present an *aition* for the *technitai*'s performances in the Pythais. And last but not least, the Athenians are presented as an autochthonous Greek race of peaceful farmers (19-20, 13-14), the very opposite of the wandering Gauls, the warlike barbarians (31-2) whom Apollo turned away from Delphi (in 278/277 BCE).

The objectives of Athenaeus' paean seem to have been less ambitious. This text too includes musical annotation and it resembles Limenius' paean in structure. Both paeans start with a long invocation to the Muses, inviting them to come, and praise Apollo (Limenius 1-5, Athenaeus 1-8), while the last part of Athenaeus' paean that survives (19-27; the stone is in a bad condition), just like the final section of Limenius' paean (23-33) associates Apollo's killing of the dragon Pytho (the foundation myth of Delphi) with the god's defeat of the Gauls. The middle sections differ. Athenaeus does not seem to have dealt with the journey of Apollo from Delos to Delphi and his stop-over at Athens but to have included instead a lengthy self-description of the *technitai*, who present the Athenians as worshipping and themselves as playing the *kithara* for Apollo at Delphi (9-18). The *technitai*'s song for Apollo (16) parallels the songs sung for him by the Muses in the opening section (4), and the architecture of the passage as a whole recalls *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 146-76, where we find a description of a blissful gathering of Ionians at the festival of Apollo at Delos next to a description of the chorus of Delian maidens and an authorial self-reference (Lonsdale 1993: 68-70).

As we saw, the longer remains of Limenius' inscription include at the end some lines which its preface calls a prosodion. In these lines, the singer asks Apollo to assist and protect Athens and support the military power of Rome (33-40). The setup of the song as a whole (a paean closing with a prosodion) and the content of the prosodion (a prayer for the wellbeing of the patron city) have a parallel in Pindar's *Paeon* 6 (Snell and Maehler 1964 = D6 Rutherford 2001a), a text composed for a Delphic Theoxenia that has survived on papyrus. Here the lacunose final section (123-83) is marked off by an *asteriskos* and identified as a prosodion in a scholion to line 124. It is certainly concerned with Aegina and its local hero, Aeacus, and very likely contained a prayer to the gods involved in the Theoxenia for Aegina's wellbeing (so D'Alessio and Ferrari 1988; D'Alessio 1997: 49-59).

The precise relationship between the poems of Limenius and Athenaeus cannot be established with certainty. Were both performed on the same occasion or does Athenaeus' paean belong to another Pythais, for example the previous one of 138 BCE? The inscription honoring the *technitai* participating in the Pythais of 128 includes, together with Limenius, an "Athenaeus son of Athenaeus," whom it is

tempting to identify with the author of the preserved paean. The main objection to this identification is that Athenaeus' paean is very similar in wording, *topoi*, and music to Limenius' paean: it would be odd if two so similar songs had been performed at the same festival by the same *technitai*. A text for the Pythais of 97 BCE throws some light at least on the similarity of the compositions in referring to the song performed by the *technitai* on that occasion as *πάτριος παιάν*, "the traditional paian." The paeans of Athenaeus and Limenius indeed look like variations on an established pattern (Furley and Bremer 2001: 130–1). Yet their variance in the middle section (Athenaeus 9–18, Limenius 6–22) is substantial and significant. Limenius' paean emphasizes the connection between Athens and Apollo in the past, focusing on the celebration of Apollo's coming to Athens with the first paean. With this it provides an *aition* for the Athenian *technitai*'s singing of paeans to Apollo in Delphi, the focus of Athenaeus' paean, which emphasizes the connection between Athens and Apollo in the present. Regardless of whether the two paeans were performed on the same occasion, it seems plausible that they were inscribed on the Treasury together because they complement each other as propaganda for the city and *technitai* of Athens. What is more, it cannot be ruled out that the particle *δέ* in the preface to Limenius' paean (*Παιάν δὲ καὶ π[ροσό]διον, κτλ.*) points to a placement close to Athenaeus' (earlier) text, inviting a complementary reading of the two inscriptions.

A third paean to Apollo, composed by Aristonous of Corinth, was found close to the Athenian Treasury (42 Käppel). Although its inscription, which dates to the fourth or third century BCE, cannot be linked to the Treasury with certainty, the discourse of this paean too seems to have an Athenian dimension. The prose preface resembles that of the paean of Philodamus and his brothers, stating that the Delphians endorsed Aristonous' paean by awarding him many privileges (proxeny for him and his offspring, preferential consultation of the oracle, etc.). The paean itself emphasizes Apollo's gratitude for favors he receives, using myth as a paradigm for present worship. In its treatment of Apollo's coming to Delphi, a standard theme we already saw in Limenius, it focuses on the help provided to the god by Athena, who advised him to go to Delphi and persuaded Gaia and Themis to let him take over their oracle (19–24), and on the honors with which he thanked her for her assistance, to wit a share in his Delphic cult as "Athena Pronaia" (25–32). After outlining Apollo's gratitude to Athena, Aristonous adds that in fact many immortals – Poseidon, the Corycian Nymphs, Dionysus, Artemis – bestowed gifts on Apollo, enhancing the prestige of his cult (33–40). The logical connection is not made explicit, but it is clearly implied that these gods give gifts because Apollo is a grateful god who knows how to reciprocate. This idea is applied to the present in the next and final strophe (41–8), where the author presents himself and other singers of this song also as givers of gifts, which he hopes will be reciprocated: "May you find favor with our songs, o ie Paian, and always give us wealth obtained with decency and grace me with your protection" (*χαρεῖς ὕμνοισ ἡμετέροισ, / ἄλβον ἐξ ὀρίων διδοῦς / ἀεὶ καὶ κόϊζων ἐφέποισ / ἡμᾶς, ὦ ἱὲ Παιάν, 44–8*).

This commerce of favors between singer and god in a hymnic context (*do ut des*) recalls the *Homeric Hymns*, but by selecting the cult of Athena Pronaia as his key example of Apollo's generosity, Aristonous has focused the *topos* in a very

specific way. It is commonly assumed that this emphasis reflects a pro-Athenian agenda, not in the last place because both the prominence of Athena Pronaia and Aristonous' list of other gods associated with Delphic Apollo recall the prayer of the priestess of Delphic Apollo which opens Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (1–33, cf. esp. 21–9). But if this is true it is strange that Athens is never mentioned in the paean. It is possible that Aristonous, a Corinthian, was simply inspired by the construction at Delphi of a new porch to Athena Pronaia (Vamvouri 2004: 212–16).

Tentative Conclusions

For the Archaic and Classical periods we have no archaeological or testimonial evidence for paeans inscribed on stone. Paeans such as those composed by Pindar and Bacchylides were transmitted through performance, oral transmission, and probably a manuscript tradition of some sort; there is no reason to believe they were ever inscribed. Yet their commissioners were surely no less concerned with durability than their fourth-century and Hellenistic counterparts. A plausible reason why these texts were inscribed seems to me that their authors or patrons were less prepared than their predecessors to rely on re-performance as a sole or primary means of preservation. This might also explain the elaborate contextualization of the songs, which provides a key to a propagandistic subtext which might not have been so obvious in later re-performances. The texts of Isyllus, Philodamus, Athenaeus, Limenius, and Aristonous all show more or less complex strategies of self-legitimation and contextualization. All in one way or another establish their own authority. Some of them thematize and justify hymning a god other than Apollo, the original addressee of paeans. Some reserve much space for promoting the author or patron. Some include, either within the paean or in an accompanying text, the rules of the ceremony in which they were or are supposed to be performed. This last element may perhaps be compared to Callimachus' presentation, in his hymns to Apollo, Athena, and Demeter, of the celebration of a god at a festival through a "master of ceremony" (*h.* 2, 5, 6), or to his re-use of sacred *nomoi* especially in the hymn to Apollo (on which see I. Petrovic forthcoming). But it may also draw on the tendency in Pindar's victory odes "to represent the poet as creating the song as the audience hears it" and mimic "the performance as experience" in the text of the song (Carey 1995: 100 and 101; see also Slater 1969; Pfeijffer 1999).

The odd one out among the songs discussed in this chapter is the *Erythraean Paean*, the oldest of the epigraphic paeans. Although it too subtly justifies the singing of paeans to Asclepius, it is by far the least contextualized and most generic paean of the series, easily separable from (and in later versions indeed separated from) the religious law that accompanies its earliest incarnation. I have suggested above that the conformity to generic rules and sheer simplicity of this paean may be a stratagem rather than a sign of literary poverty, as has often been assumed. It would be wrong to conclude on the basis of this text that after the fifth century religious poetry became less concerned with its function and occasion of performance, or more broadly its social setting. While the conditions for the composition and performance of religious poetry changed in the fourth and third centuries – as did the position of authors,

patrons, and sanctuaries – context remains a vital concern in these poems and crucial to the interpretation of their underlying messages. In this respect they are not far removed from the topicality of the paeans of Pindar and Bacchylides or from the self-propaganda which Pisistratus or Polycrates managed to include in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.

Perhaps more typically Hellenistic in these paeans is their tendency toward self-conscious innovation, intertextuality, self-justification, and self-reflection. This is not to say that we should imagine their poets as local Callimachuses, eager to construct a new poetics and redefine the genre (Kolde 2002/3: 163). What we can see at work in these poems is a general awareness of contemporary poetic trends and techniques in conjunction with a pronounced concern with contextualization. Their “reality effects” differ somewhat from those pursued in “high” poetry in hexameters and elegiacs which represents the experience of taking part in a religious festival, such as Theocritus’ *Adoniazusae* (*Id.* 15) and Callimachus’ hymns to Apollo, Athena, and Demeter, poems whose “realism” is at least in part fictional (Bulloch in this volume). Yet the concern with realism per se is shared, and these poems likewise brim with encomiastic elements and politically charged discourse. We should therefore perhaps not rule out the possibility that, in its concern with politics and contextualization, the fictionalized festival poetry of authors such as Callimachus and Theocritus reflects religious poetry such as the paeans discussed in this chapter, that is to say, poetry composed for actual religious festivals.

FURTHER READING

The most comprehensive edition of the paeans and other religious lyric poems from the Hellenistic Age is still Powell 1925. All the paeans have been re-edited in Käppel 1992, with testimonia for the genre and extensive bibliography, and most of them also appear in Furley and Bremer 2001, with English translations and commentary.

Good surveys of the genre, from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Age, are provided by Käppel 1992 and Rutherford 2001a. Käppel’s analyses of the *Erythraean Paean* and Philodamus’ paean should be read with the qualifications of Schröder 1999. See also Vollgraff 1924–27, Reiner 1975, and Stewart 1982. For the political implications of the paeans of Limenius, Athenaeus, Philodamus, and Aristonous, see especially Vamvouri 2004 (on Limenius, already Vamvouri 1998); on Limenius and Athenaeus, see further Bélis 1988. For Isyllus’ inscription, Kolde 2003 is fundamental; see also Kolde 2002/3, Sineux 1999, Stehle 1997: 132–7, Wilamowitz 1886. For a survey of Greek sacred laws, see Lupu 2005: 3–112.