

WILLIAM D. FURLEY

REVISITING SOME TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN THE DELIAN SARAPIS ARETALOGY
BY MAIISTAS (IG XI 4 NO. 1299)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 180 (2012) 117–125

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

REVISITING SOME TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN THE DELIAN SARAPIS ARETALOGY
BY MAIISTAS (IG XI 4 NO. 1299)

The text of Maiistas' aretalogy of Sarapis in hexameters contains a number of difficulties which, despite extensive commentary, still puzzle.¹ The notes below are an attempt to take a fresh look at some of these difficulties. I work on the assumption that the stone cutter who carved the inscription on a small column for dedication in the humble sanctuary of Sarapis in Delos around 200 BC,² worked from a fair copy of the poem which Maiistas, its author, supplied directly or indirectly.³ There are quite a number of minor errors in the stone-cutter's work which previous editions identify and correct. Since the stone-cutter's replication of his exemplar is not infallible, one is justified in seeking improvements to the transmitted text where sense and grammar seem to falter.⁴ Conversely, it is preferable not to smooth the orthography of the inscription where spellings differ from book Attic. A number of previous commentaries and editions have indicated that Maiistas may not have had perfect Greek, being an Egyptian, let alone perfect command of Homeric idiom, to which he partially aspires in his aretalogical narrative.⁵ The notes below bear on this issue because, if accepted in part or in whole, some of the textual problems in Maiistas' poem will appear to be the result of imperfect copying rather than imperfect composition. I am aware of the methodological pitfall of editing out all the solecisms in Maiistas' composition: if they are genuine they should be left in the text as testimony to his imperfect knowledge of Homeric Greek. But if they (or most of them) are merely the result of our imperfect reconstruction of his intended text, then they should be removed. *Discernat lector*. I have not seen the original inscription, only the photographs in Bruneau and Bricault, and must rely mainly on epigraphists' views of the readings.⁶ For convenience I give the whole text of the poem, keeping the line numbering as in the editions (i.e. running continuously on from the prose preface), and using bold face for the words which I comment on or conjecture. However, I do not print the prose preface by Apollonios II, priest of Sarapis, which occupies the first twenty-eight lines of the inscription. In these, an account is given of the cult history leading to the building of the first public temple of the god in Delos by Apollonios II. It is said specifically that Maiistas composed his poem in hexameters according to the outline history provided by the prose inscription.⁷ Where the prose preface bears on the formulations chosen by Maiistas I quote the relevant lines in the notes.

¹ See bibliography at the end. – I am grateful for the critical suggestions made by J. Hammerstaedt on this contribution.

² Sarapeum A, cf. Dignas (2008) 76. L. Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*, Berlin 1969, no. CE 1 pp. 63, dates to 'Saec. III ex.–II in.' BC; cf. Moyer (2008).

³ Of course, even the exemplar may not have been perfect, whether *autographon* or not.

⁴ Cf. Wilhelm 1934, 17. It would be an interesting empirical study to see how a stone mason actually goes about copying: presumably he takes in a word or two, or perhaps whole verse, of the original composition and then proceeds to chisel out the letters with varying degrees of attention to sense as opposed to letter shapes, spacing, private thoughts, distractions etc. Particularly with a difficult poetic text and a less than erudite *lapicida*, it must be quite a fallible process. And there is little chance of correcting errors as stone knows no backspace key, and physical alteration is unsightly.

⁵ For Maiistas as an Egyptian name cf. Engelmann (1975) ad 29. At the same lemma he writes 'There is something touching about his verses; clearly versification did not come easily to him. Although he had read Homer and, of the tragedians, especially Euripides, and, of the Alexandrians, Theocritus and perhaps Lycophron, the Greek language of poetry remained unfamiliar to him'. On p. 31 ad 40–41 (on αἰών and μοῖρα) he concludes 'Homeric language was an unfamiliar idiom to Maiistas'. This view had been disputed in P. Vidal-Naquet's review of the original German language version of Engelmann's commentary. Powell (1925) p. 71: 'Εναλλαγαὶ durae ... eā usus Epici imperitiā ...'

⁶ The photographs in Bruneau and Bricault are, unfortunately, not good enough to work from. But I am not a trained epigraphist anyway, so it may be methodologically preferable to work from experts' readings of the stone rather than from my own impressions.

⁷ Line 29 γράφει δὲ καὶ Μαίιστας ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱεροῦ εἰς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ταύτην. For this sense of ὑπόθεσις cf. Engelmann (1964) ad loc.: 'Thema, Stoff'; Paarmann–Dillon (perhaps as paraphrase): 'about this lawsuit'.

Text of Maiistas' poem

Μυρία καὶ θαμβητὰ σέθεν, πολύαινε Σάραπι, 30
 ἔργα, τὰ μὲν θείας ἀνὰ τύρσιας Αἰγύπτιοι
 ἠϋδῆται, τὰ δὲ πᾶσαν ἀν' Ἑλλάδα, σείο θ' ὀμεύνου
 Ἰσιδος· ἐσθλοῖσιν δὲ σαώτερες αἰὲν ἔπεσθε
 ἀνδράσιν οἱ κατὰ πάντα νόωι ὅσια φρονέουσιν.
 Καὶ γάρ τ' ἀμφιαλεῖ Δήλωι ἀρίσημα τέλεσσας 35
 τὰπολλωνίου ἱρὰ καὶ εἰς μέγαν ἤγαγες αἶνον·
ἑαυτὸς δ' οἱ δηναῖα πατὴρ ἐκόμισσεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς
 Μέμφιδος, ὅπποτε νηὶ πολυζύγῳ ἤλυθεν ἄστυ
 Φοίβου, ἔνδον **εἰῶι** δ' ἀέκων ἴδρυσε μελάθρῳ
 καὶ σε φίλως θυέ(ε)σιν ἀρέσσατο. Τὸμ μὲν ἄρ' αἰὼν 40
 γηραιὸν κατέπεφνε, λίπεν δ' ἐν σείῳ τεράμῳ
 υἷα θυηπολέεν Δημήτριον, ὧι ἐπίπαγχε
 γήθησαν θέραπες. Τοῦ μὲγ κλύες εὐξαμένοιο
 εἰκῶ χαλκείην νειῶι θέμεν εὐ δὲ τελέσσαι,
 ἔννουχος ἀντὶ **πατρὸς(ς) κᾶθ'** ὑπνώοντι φαανθεῖς 45
 δεμνίῳ ἤνωγες τελέσαι χρέος. Ἄλλ' ὅτε καὶ τὸν
 γηραλέον λίπε μοῖρα, πάϊς γε μὲν ἐσθλὰ διδαχθεῖς
 ἐκ πατρὸς μεγάλως σέβεν ἱερά, πᾶν δὲ κατ' ἦμαρ
 σὰς ἀρετὰς ἤειδεν, ἀεὶ δ' ἐλλίσι(σ)ετο νειὸν
 ὄππῃ σοι δείμειεν ἀριφραδέως καταλέξαι 50
 ἔννουχον ὑπνώοντι, διηνεκὲς ὄφρα κε μίμοις
 σηκῶι ἐνιδρυθεῖς, μηδ' ἄλλυδις ἀλλοδαπῶι ἐν
 οὔδει ἐνιχρίμπτοιο. Σὺ δ' ἔφρασας ἀκλέα χῶρον
 ὄντα πάρος καὶ ἄσημον, ἀεὶ πεπληθότα λύθρῳ
 παντοῖῳ μετὰ πολλὸν ἔτι χρόνον· ἐννύχιος γὰρ 55
 εὐνῆι ἐπιπρομολῶν λέγεις· Ἐγρεο· βαῖνε δὲ μέσσα
 παστάδος ἀμφὶ θύρεθρα, καὶ εἴσιδε γράμμα τυπωθὲν
 τυτθῆς ἐκ βύβλοιο τό σε φρονέοντα διδάξει
 ὄππῃ μοι τέμενος τεύχῃς καὶ ἐπικλέα νειόν.
 Αὐτὰρ ὁ θαμβήσας ἀναέγρετο, βὰς δὲ μάλ' ὠκὺς 60
 ἀσπασίως ἴδε γράμμα, καὶ ὅπασεν ἀργυραμοιβὸν
 τιμὴν **οὐδ'** κτέαρ ἔσκε· σέθεν θ' ἅμα βουλομένοιο
 ῥηιδίως καὶ νειὸς ἀέξετο καὶ θυόεντες
 βωμοὶ καὶ τέμενος, τετέλεστο δὲ πάντα μελάθρῳ
 ἔδρανά τε κλισμοὶ τε θεοκλήτους ἐπὶ δαίτας. 65
 Καὶ τότε δὴ ῥα κακοῖσι κακὸς φθόνος ἔνβαλε λύσσαν
 ἀνδράσιν οἱ ῥα δίκηι ἀνεμωλίῳ **ἐκλήισαν**
 δοιῶ σὸν θεράποντα, κακὸν δ' ἐπὶ θεσμὸν ἔτευχον
 ἢ τί χρῆ παθεῖν ἢ ἐκ τίνα τίσαι ἀμοιβὴν
 θῶῃς **ἐνγράφαντε**, κακῶι θ' ὑπὸ δείματι πᾶσαν 70
 ἠῶ **τεῖ(ν)** νύκτας τε περὶ κραδίην ἐλέλιζεν
 τάρβος θειοπόλοιο. Σὲ δὲ σταλάων ἅμα δάκρυ
 λίσσετ' ἀλεξῆσαι μηδ' ἀκλέα τεύξαι ἀμοιβὴν
 σῶι ἰκέτει, θανάτου δὲ κακὰς ἀπὸ κῆρας ἐρύξαι.
 Οὐδὲ σύ, παμ(μ)νήστοισιν ἐφροσπόμενος πρᾶπίδεσσι, 75
 λήσασο τοῦ, νύχιος δὲ μολῶν ἐπὶ δέμνια φωτὸς
 ἠϋδησας· Μέθες ἄλγος ἀπὸ φρενός· οὐ σέ τις ἀνδρὸς

ψῆφος ἀϊστώσει, ἐπεὶ εἰς ἐμὲ τείνεται αὐτὸν
 ἦδε δίκη, τὴν οὔτις ἐμεῦ περιώσιον ἄλλος
 ἀνὴρ αὐδήσει· σὺ δὲ μηκέτι δάμναο θυμόν. 80
 Ἀλλ' ὅποτε χρόνος ἶξε δικασπόλος, ἔγρετο ναοῖς
 πᾶσα πόλις καὶ πάντα πολυμμιγέων ἅμα φύλα
 ξείνων, ὄφρα δίκης θεομήτιδος εἰσαίοιεν.
 Ἔνθα {σα} σὺ κεῖνο πέλωρον ἐν ἀνδράσι θάμβος ἔτευξας
 σὴ τ' {ε} ἄλοχος· φῶτας γὰρ ἀλιτρο(νό)ους ἐπέδησας 85
 οἷ ῥα δίκην πόρσυνον, ἐπὶ γναθμοῖς ὑπανύσσας
 γλῶσσαν ἀναύδητον, τῆς οὔτ' ὅπ' ἐνέκλαεν οὐθεὶς
 οὔτε γ(ρ)άμμα δίκης ἐπιτάρροθον, ἀλλ' ἄρα θεῖως
 στεῦντο θεοπληγέσσιν εὐκότας εἰδώλοισιν
 ἔμμεναι ἢ λάεσσιν· ἅπας δ' ἄρα λαὸς ἐκείνῳ 90
 σὴν ἀρετὴν θάμβησεν ἐν ἡματι, κα(ὶ) μέγα κῦδος
 σῶι τεῦξας θεράποντι θεόδητον κατὰ Δῆλον.
 Χαῖρε, μάκαρ, καὶ σεῖο συνάρορος, οἷ τ' ἐνὶ νειῶι
 ὑμετέρῳι γεγάασι θεοί, πολύυμνε Σάραπι.

Apparatus

35 ἀμφιαλεῖ lap.: ἀμφιαλεῖ edd.pl.: ἀμφιάλει ed.pr., Wilhelm, Engelmann 37 αὐτὸς lap.: πατρὸς post Wilhelm, Engelmann 39 εἰῶι lap.: εἰῶι Engelmann (1975), ἐῶι id. (1964) 40 θυεσσιν lap., corr. Rous-
 sel 44 τέλεσσας post Vidal-Naquet Bricault 45 πατρὸς (iam Wilhelm) κᾶθ' Furley: ἀντιπατροιοκαθ
 lap.: Ἀντιπάτροιο καὶ Wilamowitz: πατρὸς δὲ καθ- Wilhelm: ἀντιπάτρ(οι) δὲ καθ- Merkelbach ap. Engel-
 mann (1964 p. 41 et 1975 p. 33) 49 ἐλλισετο lap., corr. Engelmann 51 ἔννουχον: ἐννουχος lap., corr.
 Robin 61 ἀσισιως lap., corr. Roussel 70 ἐνγράψαντε Wilhelm: ἐνγράψαντα lap. 71 τεῖ{ν} (i.e. τῆι)
 Furley: τειν lap.: τε{ν} Wilamowitz, edd.pl. 78 εἰσιμε lap., corr. Roussel 82 πολυμμιγεω lap., corr. Rous-
 sel 84 σα del. Roussel 85 ἀλιτροους lap., corr. Wilamowitz 87 ὅπ' ἐνέκλαεν (vel ἐνίκλαεν) Furley:
 οπινεκλεεν lap.: ὅπιν ἔκλεεν edd. 88 γαμμα lap., corr. Wilamowitz 89 lap.: εὐκότες Wilhelm 91 κα
 lap., corr. Roussel 92 τεῦξας edd. pr.: ζεῦξας leg. et scr. Moyer, *TLG* 94 ὑμετέρῳι leg. Moyer: ἡμετέρῳι
 edd. pl.

Notes on the text

For a translation of the whole text please see the end of this article.

37 αὐτὸς δ' οἷ edd.pl.: αὐτοσδοι lap.: πατρὸς δ' οἷ post Wilhelm Engelmann. The initial problem in this line beginning is that αὐτὸς δ' οἷ πατήρ should mean 'and his very own father' or 'and his father himself'. This comes immediately after mention of the 'sacred cult of Apollonios' (36 τὰπολλωνίου ἱρὰ) which must refer to the cult as refurbished by Apollonios II. Now, as we learn from the introductory prose text and Maiistas' poem itself, Apollonios II was the *grandson* of the first Apollonios who brought the Sarapis cult from Memphis to Delos. So 'his very father' involves a near-impossible extension of the meaning of 'father' to mean 'ancestor' or 'founding father' (see Engelmann's note, following Roussel). The difficulty here led Wilhelm to emend to πατρὸς at line beginning, which gives the correct genealogy: 'And the father of his father ...', i.e. his grandfather. This certainly mends sense, but involves quite a radical emendation.

Are there any alternatives worth considering? (i) One might consider emending the first word to αὐτόσε, 'to that place' (Delos). This would relieve the emphasis in 'his own father himself' somewhat and connect well with the context: Apollonios brought the cult 'from Memphis itself to that place'. αὐτόσε is not a Homeric word, being more at home in Attic prose, with sporadic appearances in Attic comedy (Aristophanes *Lys.* 873; id. *Thesm.* 202; Metagenes fr. 1.4). Perhaps the reading would be admissible in Maiistas, as his epic diction contains atticisms. The whole phrase would be rendered: 'And the father (father of the

family line, i.e. grandfather) brought the cult from Memphis itself thither for him (οἱ referring to Apollonios II, mentioned in the previous sentence).’

(ii) A radical repair to the problematic family relations in αὐτὸς δ’ οἱ πατήρ would be to emend πατήρ to the genealogically correct προπάτωρ, ‘grandfather’; this would necessitate inverting the word order of δηναῖα: e.g. αὐτὸς δ’ οἱ προπάτωρ δηναῖ’ ἐκόμισσεν. But the solution surely involves too much change: why would the copyist have so garbled Maiistas’ text?

(iii) Might one take οἱ as οἶ, ‘whither’ = ‘thither’ (to Delos), which would at least remove part of the emphasis in ‘the very father for him (= his own very father)’? I think the postponement of οἶ combined with δέ makes this impossible. We cannot take οἱ as equivalent to ‘to that place’, although Paarmann–Dillon seem to have been thinking in this direction when they translate: ‘The father himself had brought the ancient things *there* from Memphis’ (my italics). Even if, by a huge stretch, we accept οἶ as ‘thither’, we are still left with αὐτὸς πατήρ, which remains difficult.

For me the problem is a *non liquet*. Like Engelmann, I think I finally come down in favour of Wilhelm’s solution, which restores sense and comes at the lowest price of alteration in the original. If we leave the text unemended we have to accept that Maiistas was content to use πατήρ with an abnormal extension of its sense. As Wilhelm himself suggested, αὐτῆς at the end of the line might have triggered the stonemason’s lapse at line beginning. A final point worth mentioning is that οἱ does not need to be equivalent to the possessive pronoun (‘for him’ = ‘his’), although this is a common idiom. Quite often we find the reflexive pronoun placed in a position as if it had possessive sense, but in fact applying to the sentence as a whole. That seems to be the case here: so not necessarily ‘his father’s father’, but rather ‘the grandfather brought the *sacra* from Memphis *for him*’ (*dativus commodi*); cf. Kühner–Gerth vol. I 429c for this phenomenon.

39 ἐῶν. As Engelmann says, ‘metre and meaning demand the reading ἐῶν’. He takes the iota as a ‘consonantal glide’, citing Meisterhans–Schwyzer, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Berlin 1900, 46–47.

45 πατρὸς (iam Wilhelm) κᾶθ’ Furley: ἀντιπατροιοκαθ lap.: Ἀντιπάτροιο καὶ Wilamowitz: πατρὸς δὲ) καθ- Wilhelm: ἀντιπάτρ(ωι δὲ) καθ- Merkelbach ap. Engelmann (1964 p. 41 et 1975 p. 33). This line in context is the most troublesome in the whole poem. As the inscription stands the two main verbs in the sentence ἔκλυες (43) and ἤνωγες (46) lack coordination. Moreover, the reading ἀντιπατροιο (lap.) is not a known Greek word, unless genitive of the proper name Antipater, a person not mentioned elsewhere in the inscription, and baffling for that reason. For previous conjectures and full discussion of their relative merits see the apparatus and Engelmann’s discussion. Engelmann himself follows Merkelbach’s proposal to read ἀντιπάτρωι δὲ, with the sense ‘der in die Stelle seines Vaters eingertückt ist; der den Dienst seines Vaters versieht’ (1964 p. 41–42); the whole sentence is glossed: ‘In der Nacht erschienst du dem Schlafenden, der den Dienst seines Vaters versah.’ In support of the otherwise unattested substantive ἀντίπατρος, Merkelbach points to Mithraic inscriptions from Dura Europos where, apparently, ἀντίπατρος or ἀντιπάτηρ represents a religious rank (Engelmann 1975, 33). But the emendation is not so economical: it leaves the genitive ἀντιπατροιο of the stone and the lack of connecting particle unexplained.

Recently Moyer preferred to leave the stone’s reading untouched, except for punctuation after ἀντιπάτροιο. He speaks of ‘explanatory asyndeton’ in the following clause and translates: ‘You heard the father’s successor (sc. ἀντιπάτροιο) / praying at night to put a brazen image in the temple, and to finish it well: / for having appeared to him as he slept / in his bed, you ordered him to fulfil his obligation’ (103). There is, however, no ‘for’ in the Greek. The suggestion has the fatal weakness, in my opinion, of dividing ἔννοχος from the nocturnal apparition (φρανοθείς). We do not know whether Demetrios prayed at night or not, nor is it particularly relevant whether the god ‘heard’ (ἔκλυες) by day or night. In fact it is more likely that Demetrios prayed by day. But it is extremely relevant and plausible that the god appeared to Demetrios at night (ἔννοχος) while he was sleeping in bed (45–46).

My new attempt at solving the conundrum involved in these lines is to retain a genitive ἀντὶ πατρὸς for ἀντιπάτροιο, and to read κᾶθ’ for καθ of the stone. We arrive at the sense: ‘You heard him praying [...], and then you appeared to him in the place of the father while he slept in bed and instructed him to complete the mission.’ This provides a very natural sequence: first the god heard Demetrios’ prayers to

dedicate the bronze statue; *then* he appeared to him in a nocturnal vision and told him to proceed with the plan. In detail: κῶθ' (= καὶ εἶτα) provides the necessary connection between the two main verbs. The *krasis* is not Homeric but is in accordance with Maiistas' 'atticizing' epic diction. Compare the instance in line 36 τῶπολλωνίου with Engelmann's note. The genitive πατρὸς is a simple alternative to πατροιο of the stone, which the stone cutter perhaps mistakenly wrote after εὐξαμένοιο in 43. The simple verb ὑπνώω is used again by Maiistas in line 51 for another nocturnal apparition of the god, and may be thought marginally preferable to the composite verb καθυπνώω. The 'masculine' caesura introduced by the conjecture is, perhaps, not Maiistas' favourite form of hexameter, but finds many instances in the poem. The meaning of ἀντὶ πατρὸς I take to be 'in the shape of the father', i.e. Sarapis appeared to the sleeping Demetrios in the guise of his dead father Apollonios I. This is standard Homeric theology (e.g. Athena appears to Telemachos in the guise of Mentor in *Od.* 3). This sense of the phrase is discussed by Engelmann (1975) p. 33 (interpretation (b)) and recommended to me *per litteras* by J. Hammerstaedt.⁸ Perhaps the strongest argument for this reconstruction comes later in the poem itself, where the same structure is repeated: the priest Apollonios II prayed constantly to Sarapis (by day, note, in 48–49) for instruction where to build him a temple; he even asked Sarapis to appear to him in a dream at night. Sarapis did just this, according to the aretalogy, appearing by Apollonios' bed at night and speaking to him (55–56). It is not said, however, in this passage, what form the god adopted to appear to Apollonios. The important point is the parallel sequence in both appearances of the god: first the god's servant prays to the god for illumination; the god then answers the prayer by appearing, presumably in a dream vision, to the supplicant.

62 οὐ lap. As it stands, the sentence is a non-sequitur: 'he handed over the money-changing price (= price of purchase) whose property it was'. Engelmann thinks the οὐ is genitive *pretii*, 'he gave the estate agent the price for which the plot was for sale' (ad loc. p. 40). But can we tolerate neuter οὐ next to feminine τιμήν, which means price itself? Surely if that was the sense, the reading would have to be ἦς. More probably, the relative pronoun refers to the person to whom the property belonged. Thus Paarmann–Dillon: '[he] gave the price to the moneychanger whose property it was'. The problem with this is that there is no antecedent in the main clause. We hear only that Apollonios paid the 'money-changing price'. One is tempted to emend to dative ἀργυραμοιβῶι, giving this word its normal status as noun, 'money-changer', and restoring an antecedent to the sentence. But that is not satisfactory either as the land presumably did not belong to the money-changer (= estate-agent, as Engelmann says) but rather to someone else for whom an agent acted as intermediary. Should one then emend to ᾧ? – 'he gave the price of purchase [to] whom the property belonged'; ᾧ would then = τούτῳι, οὐ (possessive genitive with *tractio relativi*), or indeed ᾧ (dative of possession). That seems slightly preferable syntax, but one wonders whether the marginal improvement merits emendation. On the whole I think we should leave the sentence as it is, on the assumption that Maiistas left the antecedent to οὐ understood; it is one of his less elegant constructions.

67 ἐκλήισσαν. Although Engelmann (following ed.pr.) argues that the form should be derived from κλήιζω, 'issue a summons to' – an otherwise unparalleled sense (but related vaguely to the attested sense 'call'), one must insist that the form in epic diction belongs to κλήιω, the older form of κλείω, 'shut', 'debar', and that what Apollonios' enemies are doing is to have him locked up on their 'windy charge'. For the sense 'confine' cf. LSJ s.v. κλείω III (examples below). Apart from Homeric instances we find -κλήισσ- in simple and compound verbs in later hexametric texts with the sense 'close', 'close in': e.g. Nonnos *Dion.* 4.55 ἐνεκλήισσε; id. *Par.Ev.Jo.* Demonstratio 19, line 214 συνεκλήισσαν. True, there are instances in later epic of ἐκλήισσ- from κλήιζω: Manetho Astrol., *Apotelesmatica* 2.137 Koechly (Χηλαί θ', ἄς καὶ δὴ μετεφήμεσαν ἄνδρες ἱροὶ καὶ Ζυγὸν ἐκλήισσαν, '... which the holy men renamed and called Zugon'); and probably *Suppl. Hell.*

⁸ Hammerstaedt also suggests emending τελέσσαι in 44 to τέλεσσας, 'and you accomplished it well', with punctuation after the line, and retaining Wilhelm's δὲ as connective in the following line. This gives good sense to lines 44–45 'You heard his prayer ... and you brought to satisfactory accomplishment', but it leaves lines 45–46 rather awkwardly dangling, as a kind of appended explanation of how the god accomplished his purpose (but then why δὲ?). Previously, Bricault (2005) had also suggested reading τέλεσσας in 44 and (δὲ) in 45, but his translation is more of a paraphrase than a literal rendering: 'Et toi, tu as accompli durant la nuit le vœu formé par son père de placer dans ton temple sa statue en airain et d'atteindre l'objet de son désir.'

fr. 953.16; but here κλήζω means, exclusively, as far as I can tell, ‘name’, ‘call’, without any juridical sense at all. Conversely, the closest parallels for the sense of κλείω which I maintain here ‘confine’ = ‘lock up’ are Aesch. *Supp.* 956 πόλιν ... πύργων μηχανῇ κεκλιμένην, ‘the city closed in by the contrivance of towers’; Eur. *Andr.* 502, χέρας βρόχοισι κεκλιμένα, ‘with hands bound up by knotted ropes’, and (metaphorically) id. *Hel.* 977 ὄρκοις κεκλήμεθα, ‘we are bound by oaths’; in the Septuagint 1 Ki. 23.20 we find κλείω with the sense ‘deliver bound’: τινὰ εἰς τὰς τοῦ βασιλέως χεῖρας, which is exactly the sense I advocate here in Maiistas. Even if we concede to Engelmann that κλήζω, ‘call’, here might have the extended meaning ‘call to justice’, i.e. ‘issue a summons’, I think one can see that this reading would be weaker and less dramatic than ἐκλήσσαν, ‘they locked up’, ‘had confined’. Nor should one forget that it was common practice then (as now) to lock up a person accused of a serious crime before his trial came on lest he abscond.⁹

70 ἐνγράψαντε Wilhelm: ἐνγράψαντα lap. Wilhelm’s suggestion to write dual ἐνγράψαντε going with δοῖω in 39 seems to me the only feasible solution. A θεσμὸν (39) cannot ‘write’ anything, as Engelmann concedes, although he retains the stone’s reading, following Powell (1925 p. 71: a ‘harsh enallagē’).

71 τεῖ{ν} (i.e. τῆι) Furley: τεῖν lap.: τε{ν} Wilamowitz, edd.pl. Wilamowitz’ correction is certainly possible but hardly elegant: πᾶσαν / ἡῶ τε νύκτας τε, ‘every dawn (= day) and nights’ is crabbed English, to say the least. But, if correct, whence came the superfluous letters ν? Moyer (2008 p. 105) argues that the extra nu ‘was written intentionally in order to represent the lengthening of the initial consonant of νύκτας as required by the metre’.¹⁰ He goes on to argue that ‘the extraneous iota, on the other hand, may represent the scribe’s or letter-cutter’s additional and unconventional attempt to lengthen the epsilon’. I agree that this is a possible scenario, but would like to suggest an alternative. First, it is unlikely that the stone’s τεῖν represents a Doric form of the personal pronoun τιν or τεῖν as that would be exceptional in Maiistas and make awkward sense (‘for you’ i.e. for, or with respect to, Sarapis). But τῆι, ‘there’, ‘in that place’ (LSJ s.v. ὁ VIII.1a), written τεῖ in this inscription, seems to me to be a distinct possibility. Apollonios II is describing his anxiety while held in prison where he was cooped up (38 ἐκλήσσαν with note) following the accusation. At several points the stone-cutter writes -εῖ for -ῆι, a spelling which Engelmann (note on lines 10 and 20 of the prose preface) refers to Attic inscriptions, citing Meisterhans–Schwyzer, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* 1900, 38. The extra nu would simply be an error of duplication. Taking τεῖ in this sense alleviates the difficulty in πᾶσαν ἡῶ νύκτας τε, as, without τε, the nouns are paired less closely and πᾶσαν no longer clashes with νύκτας; νύκτας is simply appended to the first expression, ‘every day’.

87 ὄπ’ ἐνέκλαεν (vel ἐνίκλαεν) Furley: οπινεκλεεν lap.: ὄπιν ἔκλεεν edd. There are two major and one minor difficulty with the common reading ὄπιν ἔκλεεν. (1) ὄπις does not mean ‘voice’ but ‘divine anger’ or ‘reverence’ (LSJ s.v.), as e.g. Engelmann acknowledges. Most believe Maiistas simply confused ὄπις with ὄψ because of his imperfect knowledge of Greek (LSJ s.v. ὄπις following Wilamowitz). (2) ἔκλεεν is not a Greek word, despite Engelmann’s special pleading that it may be a strong aorist of κλύω.¹¹ Even if that were theoretically possible it remains the case that this form never occurs. An easy correction would be ἔκλυεν, and that is possibly right. (3) Any reading in which the verb means ‘heard’ runs into difficulties with the following line γράμμα δίκης ἐπιτάρροθον: on the one hand, there is some illogicality in saying ‘no one heard the voice, nor the helping writ of law’ (in what sense ‘heard’?); on the other, what is this ‘helping’, ‘saving’ writ of law which no one heard? ἐπιτάρροθος is normally used of a divine force which saves or helps the afflicted; but according to this construction of Maiistas’ sentence, the law in question would be cited in support of the plaintiffs *against* Apollonios (Paarmann–Dillon: ‘whose voice and the indictment in support of their cause no one praised (heard?)’). It seems to me that ἐπιτάρροθον, as a word with positive connotations (see e.g. Makedonikos’ paian to Asklepios (*Greek Hymns* no. 7.5 line 7 with note there)), suits the defendant’s case better than the wicked plaintiffs’.

⁹ E.g. Andokides, *De Mysteriis* 45.

¹⁰ Cf. Engelmann (1975) *ad loc.*

¹¹ Powell (1925) p. 71 defends ἔκλεεν as a corrupt form of ἔκλυεν, too, citing πτέον for πτεύεν and ‘other examples’ in T. Kalén, *Quaest. Gramm. Gr.*, Göteborg 1918, pp. 2, 11ff.

My suggestion ἐνέκλαεν (or ἐνίκλαεν) involves the verb ἐγκλάω, ἐνικλάω in epic, ‘thwart’ or ‘frustrate’. The sense is: Sarapis with Isis bound the tongues of the wicked plaintiffs; no single person (οὐθεὶς) nor saving writ of law obstructed their speech, which showed that it was really the god who was responsible for the miracle (θείως 59). The suggestion has a number of advantages: (1) a correct word ὄπ’, ‘voice’, is restored to Maiistas. If I am right, the stone cutter reversed epsilon and iota in σπενικλ (quite an easy reversal, I think) and wrote κλαεν instead of κλαεν. Perhaps he did not understand the verb. (2) The conjecture lends emphasis to the intention of the aretalogy: to praise the god’s miraculous power. When the trial came on, the wicked plaintiffs were miraculously tongue-tied. No external factor seemed responsible for this impediment (a person or law), so the conclusion was inevitable: the god checked their tongues: ἄλλ’ ἄρα θείως στεῦντο ... ἔμμεναι, ‘they (the people present) declared they (the plaintiffs) were miraculously like god-smitten shades (‘zombies’)¹² or stones’ (88–90).¹³

We find ἐνικλάω in *Il.* 8.408 αἰεὶ γὰρ μοι ἔωθεν ἐνικλᾶν ὅτι κεν εἶπω. Note that it is Zeus’ voice which is obstructed, blocked, by Hera; Callimachus *Ait.* fr. 75.22 Ἀρτέμιδος τῇ παιδί γάμον βαρὺς ὄρκος ἐνικλᾷ. The lexicographers define the Iliadic sense as equivalent to ἐμποδίζειν, ‘obstruct’. Interestingly, Philodemos uses a participle of the verb to describe a weak, feeble voice: φωνὴ ἐγκεκλασμένη (*Mus.* IV col. 128, 25f Delattre, with note). As in the Iliadic passage, the verb seems particularly to suit the impeding of vocal utterances. Cf. Appian *Civ.* 1.33 οὐδὲ Μετέλλου ... ἰκετεύοντος αὐτὸν ἐν ὄψει τοῦ δήμου ... ἐνεκλάσθη. Elsewhere ἄτη can impede action (Apollonios *Rh.* 3.307), or a person’s will can be broken (Callimachus *Hymn to Zeus* 90 ἐνεκλασσας δὲ μενοιήν. My conjecture postulates an uncontracted imperfect form ἐνέκλαεν/ἐνίκλαεν (ν – ν ν).

92 τεῦξας edd.: ζευξας lap. teste Moyer, qui ζευξας scr. Moyer does not persuade me that ζευξας, ‘you harnessed’, is a better reading than τεῦξας, even if the first letter on the stone does appear to be zeta. His parallels from Pindar are not quite convincing as, in the first case (*Nem.* 1.7), the metaphor of ‘joining an honorific song to triumphant deeds’ (ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζευξαι μέλος) is prepared by the mention of a racing chariot (ἄρμα); and in the second (*Isthm.* 1.6) the verb has its usual meaning of ‘yoke’, ‘join’. True, ζεύγνυμι is attested often enough in a metaphorical sense (LSJ s.v. 3) but, as far as I can make out, usually in the sense of a person being ‘subjugated’ by a greater force such as necessity or fate. Another common meaning is ‘join in marriage’, but here again, the underlying sense is that a young woman (usually) is placed ‘under the yoke’ of marriage. I cannot see an instance in which ζεύγνυμι has the positive sense of ‘give as attribute’, ‘confer on’. The many sigmas in σῶι ζευξας might also be thought displeasing. Elsewhere Maiistas uses τεύχω of divine action in line 84 of the poem; the same verb is also used for the hostile action of the litigants ‘constructing’ their suit against Apollonios II (68).

94 ἡμετέρωι lap. teste Moyer: ἡμετέρωι edd.pl. Moyer says that the stone indubitably reads second person plural, not first, and – other things being equal – I agree with him that this reading is then preferable. The second person plural reads naturally enough immediately after the address of Sarapis in the second person singular with his consort Isis. It is more in accord with the tone of humble adoration of the god that Apollonios should emphasize that the god(s) own the temple rather than the human founders (ἡμετέρωι).

Translation of Maiistas’ poem

Many and wonderful, O much-praised Sarapis, are	30
your works. Among the sacred towers of Egypt some	
are sung, some throughout Greece – yours and your wife’s,	
Isis. As saviours you always accompany the virtuous	
among men who universally think righteous thoughts.	
In sea-girt Delos too you raised to prominence	35

¹² Wilhelm (1934) 17, correctly, ‘Gespenste’.

¹³ For this interpretation of στεῦντο cf. Powell (1925) *ad loc.* (‘adseverant volgus’) against Roussel (‘ils demeurèrent semblables’).

Apollonios' worship and led it to great esteem.
 His father's father had brought it from the very town
 of Memphis, when he came in an oared ship to Apollo's
 town, where, reluctantly, he housed it in his home
 and pleased you dearly with sacrifice. But life's span 40
 ended in old age and he left behind in your temple
 his son Demetrios as priest, in whom absolutely
 the attendants took joy. And you heard his prayer
 to set a brazen image in the shrine and make it well,
 and at night, in the likeness of his father, while he slept 45
 in his bed, you bade him accomplish it. But when him too
 fate left in age, his child, who had learned good deeds
 from his father, honoured your cult greatly, all day long
 sang your praises, prayed constantly that you should tell
 exactly where to build a temple for you, by night while 50
 he was sleeping, such that you could stay permanently
 established in a precinct and not move now to one place,
 now another randomly. And you indicated an unseemly place
 till then and unimpressive, always full of all manner
 of defilement for a long time past. Indeed, by night 55
 you visited his bed and spoke: "Awake. Go to the central
 doors of the portico and look for a written notice
 on a slip of paper which will tell you if you're clever
 where you may build a precinct for me and a famous temple."
 And he woke up and wondered, and went very quickly 60
 and joyfully saw the notice, and payed the asking price
 to the property's owner. And with your aid and assistance
 the temple easily took shape and the aromatic
 altars and perimeter, and all in the hall was completed,
 seats and couches for the meals in god's company. 65
 At that point malicious envy instilled in wicked men
 madness and a pair of them had your servant arrested
 on specious charge, and they fabricated a wicked case
 naming the punishment, or what penalty he should pay
 for the crime, in writing, and in sore trepidation 70
 fear by day and night tormented there the heart
 of your humble servant. With tears pouring down
 he entreated you to help, not to bring an ignoble end
 on your suppliant, but to ward off the evil threat of death.
 Nor did you, in the all-remembering goodness of your heart, 75
 forsake him, but coming in the night to the man's bed
 you spoke: "Dismiss pain from your heart. No man's vote
 will be your undoing, since this court case concerns
 me personally, which no other man will speak with more
 authority than me. No longer be downcast in your heart." 80
 But when the day of the trial came on, the whole town
 assembled in the temple and all nationalities of foreigners
 as well, so they might hear divine judgment at the trial.
 There you caused intense astonishment among men, you

and your bride. For you laid impediment upon the sinful men 85
 who were preparing the charge, in their mouths you rendered
 their tongue speechless, whose voice no person thwarted
 nor helping writ of law, no, people stared to see them
 miraculously made to look like ghosts struck dumb
 or lifeless stones. On that day the entire population 90
 marvelled at your power and grace and you conferred
 great honour on your servant in Delos, home of gods.
 All hail, Almighty, and your wife, and the company
 of gods in your temple, O much-hymned Sarapis!

Bibliography

- P. Roussel (1914), *IG XI 4*, Berlin, no. 1299 (ed.princ.).
 P. Roussel (1916), *Les cultes égyptiens à Délos du IIIe au Ier siècle avant J.C.*, Nancy, no. 1.
 J. U. Powell (1925), *Collectanea Alexandrina*, (originally) Oxford, pp. 68–71.
 A. Wilhelm (1934), Zu dem Gedichte des Maiistas *IG XI 1299*, *Symbolae Osloenses*, 13, 1–18.
 H. Engelmann (1964), *Die delische Sarapisaretalogie*, Meisenheim.
 P. Vidal-Naquet (1966), Review of Engelmann 1964, *RPh* 143–145.
 V. Longo (1969), *Aretalogie nel mondo Greco. I. Epigrafi e Papiri*, Genova, no. 63, pp. 106–16.
 Ph. Bruneau (1973), Le quartier de l'Inopos à Délos et la fondation du Sarapieion A dans une "lieu plein d'ordure".
 III. La fondation du Sarapieion A dans un "ΤΟΙΙΟΣ ΚΟΙΠΟΥ ΜΕΣΤΟΣ", *BCH Suppl. I*, Athens, 130–36.
 H. Engelmann (1975), *The Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis*, Leiden (revised English version of Engelmann 1964. English translation by Ewald Osers).
 M. Totti (1985), *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapis-Religion*, Hildesheim, no. 11 pp. 25–28.
 L. Bricault (2005), *Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes Isiaques (RICIS)*, Paris, vol. I no. 202/0101 (with photograph in the final volume of plates; a number of misprints in the Greek text).
 B. Dignas (2008), Greek Priests of Sarapis?, in: B. Dignas and K. Trampedach (edd.), *Practitioners of the Divine. Greek Priests and Religious Officials from Homer to Heliodoros*, Cambridge, MA and London, 73–88.
 I. S. Moyer (2008), Notes on Re-reading the Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis (*IG XI.4 1299*), *ZPE* 166, 101–107.
 B. Paarmann – J. Dillon, The Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis (*IG XI.4, 1299*). End 3rd century. BCE, unpublished hand-out for a paper delivered by B. Paarmann at a workshop in Heidelberg on 13/14th July 2009 (English translation by J. Dillon).

William D. Furley, Universität Heidelberg, Seminar für Klassische Philologie, Marstallhof 2–4, 69117 Heidelberg
 william.furley@skph.uni-heidelberg.de