

VERHANDELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE
AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN, AFD. LETTERKUNDE
NIEUWE REEKS — DEEL LXXV — No. 2

THE SUB-EPIC STAGE OF THE FORMULAIC TRADITION

Studies in the Homeric Hymns to Apollo,
to Aphrodite and to Demeter

A. HOEKSTRA

NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY AMSTERDAM · LONDON 1969

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
CATALOGUE CARD NUMBER: 69-18380

AANGEBODEN IN DE VERGADERING
VAN 10 JUNI 1968

JANTINAE

CONTENTS

I. DATA AND CRITERIA.	7
II. APOLLO	21
III. APHRODITE	39
IV. DEMETER.	49
APPENDIX	62
INDEX OF PASSAGES	66
GENERAL INDEX	73

PREFACE

The Homeric formula is not a kind of Aristotelian *εἶδος* which was realised in the *ἔλγῃ* of words. Whatever unfathomable inspiration may have led the singers to conceive it, it is a concrete historical phenomenon and it can be studied only as such. Moreover, as we know since Milman Parry, the formulae did not lead an isolated existence but were part of a repertory which was dominated by tradition in its subdivisions and in their mutual relations. If, however, this traditional diction was a historical reality, it must have been subject to change like everything else in this world. It cannot have been a monolith, it must have dropped old and absorbed new elements from the earliest times onwards, like other oral traditions (cf. e.g. C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* 232 f., 563 f. and A. B. Lord, *Homer as Oral Poet*, HSCP 72 (1968), 6). Moreover, one may assume that the sequence of certain changes was conditioned by the development of the spoken language.

And although, because of the flexibility of the organism on the one hand and of the scarcity of linguistic and prosodic data on the other a good many uncertainties crop up in the inquiry, in principle these changes should be as ascertainable as those which occurred in, for instance, geometric vase-painting. Provided the concept "stage" is handled without rigid limitations, one is entitled to speak of stages of development or, if preferred, decomposition.

The problem this study tries to solve is: do the three *Homeric Hymns* which, rightly or wrongly, are regarded by the present author as the oldest of the collection, show a stage of development of the formulaic diction different from the one he believes to have found in the Homeric epics? In an earlier work, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes*, a number of phenomena have been signalled that point in this direction, in the *Hymn to Aphrodite* in particular. The question raised here is: do the character and number of the modifications of formulae in these *Hymns* entitle us to consider the poems representatives of a post-Homeric stage of development of formulaic diction, a stage to which Allen's term "sub-epic" could be applied?

To answer this question a road had to be followed different from the one we find in the so-called formulaic analyses which, mostly with a view to showing the oral character of a given piece of poetry, have been published with increasing frequency of late. For our purposes such registrations could, in the majority of cases, not yield more than what Milman Parry called "un catalogue de documents plus ou moins comparable au *Parallèle-Homer* de Schmidt".

The method followed here is a continuation of the one that has been used in *Modifications*. Of course this does not mean — and I want to state

this emphatically — that I would attach any intrinsic value to the classification applied, far from it. It is no more than a rather crude instrument for anatomy. In this connection I feel I should apologise for quoting *Modifications* so often. However, if endless repetitions were to be avoided this was the only way out, although I did not particularly like it.

What I do like, though, in writing this preface, is the recollection of all the help rendered me by good friends. Dr. H. Bolkestein, Dr. J. B. Hainsworth, Professor J. C. Kamerbeek, Dr. C. J. Ruijgh, Professor W. J. Verdenius and Professor G. J. de Vries have taken the trouble to read the not very absorbing manuscript, drawn my attention to a number of mistakes and given me useful suggestions. I am much obliged to them all for their kindness.

It would have been virtually impossible for me to make English the vehicle of this study, but for the assistance of Mr. E. M. H. van Gendt and Dr. J. B. Hainsworth. My sincere thanks to them for their good offices.

Besides I am indebted to the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen for publishing this work and especially in this connection to Professor Kamerbeek and Professor Verdenius.

In conclusion, it need hardly be said that I accept full responsibility for any errors and imperfections.*

Rotterdam, June, 1968.

*) I regret I could not profit from Dr. J. B. Hainsworth's book *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*, the manuscript of this study having already been submitted to the Koninklijke Akademie at the time of its publication.

I

DATA AND CRITERIA

In the introduction to what is still the standard edition of the *Homeric Hymns*,¹⁾ this collection is called a 'post-Homeric set of poems'²⁾ and, with a reference to *Origins and Transmission*, 60 f., is assigned by Allen and his collaborators to 'the sub-epic period'³⁾. Of course the editors, both in the general section of the work and in the commentary, go on to examine the problem of dating the separate poems and discuss this in great detail, but the post-Homeric origin of the hymns is never called in question. This attitude, it seems, reflects the view which, among Homeric unitarians at least, was common at the time and it is still being maintained by several leading scholars. Lesky, for instance, speaks of a rhapsodic tradition which was indebted to the Homeric idiom even "in den einzelnen Wendungen" and likewise calls this kind of poetry 'subepische Dichtung'⁴⁾.

In antiquity, as handbooks and editions point out, opinions were divided. It is common knowledge that Thucydides ascribed at least *Ap.* 1-178 (and perhaps the whole of the hymn) to Homer, and later we find similar statements concerning *Apollo* (Pausanias), *Hermes* (Diogenes of Carystus), *Dionysus* I (Diodorus Siculus), etc.⁵⁾. On the other hand there are traces of a more cautious (Athen. 22B) and even of a contrary judgement (schol. Nicander *Alex.* 130). The latter stand was probably taken by the Alexandrian scholars since, with one or two possible exceptions, the *Hymns* are constantly disregarded by the scholia which derive from this source.⁶⁾

For general reasons it has always been my opinion that the four great hymns of our collection (not to mention the others) are rightly considered post-Homeric and I think their style, in particular, is adequately described by the term 'sub-epic'. In recent years, however, divergent ideas have been expressed by some scholars who, working from a stylistic point of view, have advocated agnosticism in dating the creation of these poems and feel uncertain about their post-Homeric origin. First H. N. Porter, who shortly afterwards was to write a remarkable study on metrical problems in early Greek hexameter poetry, stated in treating the repetitions in *Aphr.*, that "there is no real evidence whatever for dating this hymn later than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*".⁷⁾ A few years later, when reviewing O. Zumbach's *Neuerungen in der Sprache der homerischen Hymnen*, M. Forderer not only emphasised the preservation of archaisms in the poems but also took exception to the starting-point implied in the title of the book.⁸⁾ A direct attack, finally, was launched on the orthodox view by J. A. Notopoulos.⁹⁾ This attack was based on the author's studies in the field of still living oral Greek poetry and above all on the results the inquiries of Milman Parry have produced — or are thought to have produced.

The principle Notopoulos applied and which had already been laid down by Rothe and Drerup is a sound one and is nowadays, I think, generally accepted.¹⁰⁾ It can be briefly summarised as follows. Before Rothe, Drerup, Scott, Calhoun, Bowra and Parry had put the Homeric repetitions in their proper perspective, it was taken for granted that if poet A and poet B were found to use the same expression, either A must have borrowed it from B or B from A. It would follow then that, if A could be shown to be earlier than B, B must have taken it from A, and vice versa. On the other hand, if the expression in question should appear to suit the context in A but to be less appropriate in B, B must be later than A, and vice versa. It is well known that this method was applied to Homer in particular in order to detect interpolations and was used by the analysts to discern different layers. After its deficiencies had been exposed by the scholars to whom I have just referred and the part played by the traditional formulae had been brought out by Parry, this kind of argument has been definitely rejected in modern work on Homer. It can no longer be held that under the conditions mentioned the later poet must have borrowed the expression or passage in question from the earlier or that a less appropriate use proves a later creation. Both poets may, independently of each other, have drawn on the common formulaic stock-in-trade.^{10a)}

So far, so good. It has to be emphasised, however, that this reasoning is apt to lead to a confusion of the issues. First it is only negative; the most it can do is to invite caution. It cannot be used against factual evidence, whether internal or external. Secondly we have to distinguish between the actual dating of a given poem and establishing the stage of development of its diction.¹¹⁾ In the latter case the possibility of borrowing from a common traditional repertory does not affect the argument. If it can be shown, for instance, that the *Hymn to Aphrodite* employs a number of expressions in a less appropriate way than Homer does and that there is no evidence to the contrary, it will be clear that, whatever doubt may be felt about the date of its composition, it marks a later phase in the evolution of epic diction. The same is true if the borrowing of older material is found to involve linguistic and prosodical innovations. It may well be that a poet consciously and constantly employs the old traditional formulae and yet gives himself away by using them in such a manner that on closer inspection his diction has to be assigned to a later stage of development. This, for instance, is certainly true of Hesiod, whose employment of formulae can only be explained by his having adopted epic diction at a time when it was already considerably more Ionicised and modernised than it is in Homer.

As regards the *Hymns to Apollo, to Aphrodite* and *to Demeter* it is not my purpose to raise questions of dating.¹²⁾ My only object is to study the stages of development of their diction as compared with Homer's. Of course such an inquiry is bound up with certain difficulties. These I

intend to discuss beforehand, but it seems that first of all I have to give some attention to the theoretical aspect of the matter. It would never have occurred to me that, when dealing with a diction which is generally recognised to be at least partly traditional, it might be necessary to justify the approach chosen here, had it not been for a statement by Notopoulos in the article just mentioned. It runs as follows: "The fondness of evolutionary patterns of development or decline, a conception influenced by Darwinian science, is fast giving way today when it is more and more being realized that form is not something separate, like an envelope, from dramatic and poetic meaning"¹³). In passing it may be noted that the conception of form as a 'garment' thrown over the 'body' of content, a legacy of ancient rhetoric, has not been taken seriously by any competent student of literature for some seventy or eighty years at least.¹⁴) The essential objections, however, to the statement just quoted are of a different kind. First it is hard to see what connection there may be between its former and latter part. Are we to suppose that the possibility of discerning certain stages of evolution has to be denied *because of* the fact that form is not an 'envelope' of meaning? I, for one, fail to see the connection. Secondly one may wonder what may be the exact significance of the principal clause. Would it do to deny, for instance, the evolution of the language of Attic Tragedy or of the style of individual tragedians, blaming Sophocles, for example, for his "fondness of evolutionary patterns" on account of the view he expressed about his own development? ¹⁵) And in the field of Greek pottery-styles this idea would lead us nowhere.

It is curious that precisely ardent followers of Parry should take this stand. For even if epic diction was somewhat less traditional than the master taught (as we may be sure it was), its considerably traditional character implies that its development and decomposition cannot have taken place much more abruptly than the changes we find, for instance, in the evolution of the pottery-decoration of the same period, from proto-Geometric up to late Geometric.¹⁶) Therefore, even at the risk of appearing backward in the field of aesthetics, I think we may with some confidence attempt to discern certain stages in its development — provided, of course that the evidence does not prove to be too scanty to authorise a few conclusions.¹⁷)

In the course of this inquiry some use will be made of statistics. Since on account of the study by Zumbach — who does not employ them in the proper sense of the word — it has been argued by Forderer ¹⁸) that statistics are of no value at all as criteria of style, it has to be pointed out that Parry himself achieved his most important results by this very method.¹⁹) Thus I cannot see why statistics, among other things, could not be used to investigate the *evolution* of epic diction, especially since we have to allow for the possibility that most of the elements mentioned by Forderer²⁰) were subject, within the scope of the tradition, to more or less gradual modification. It is not clear why, if a series of interrelated changes could

be found, such a complex of phenomena should not be regarded as an indication of a more recent development.

The material at our disposal for such an inquiry, it need hardly be said, is very scanty indeed. *Dem.* contains 495 lines in all. We are in an even worse position as regards *Aphr.* This poem numbers only 293 hexameters and 20 of these are either identical with Homeric lines or show but trifling variations.²¹⁾ What is more, this correspondence is symptomatic of the whole of its diction, since the hymn abounds in hemistichs and formulae that also occur in Homer. Accordingly it is called the most 'Homeric' of the whole set by A.H.S. and it is quite understandable that some scholars refuse to admit its post-Homeric origin. If we were to judge from its general appearance we would have to resign ourselves to a similar negative view concerning its style.

In addition to its limited extent, *Ap.* confronts us with the problem of its unity and, if we assume a divided authorship, with the question how and to what extent the Delian part was reworked. If, further, the poem consists of two separate hymns, the maximum length admissible for this Delian part is 181 lines, 15 of which (30–44) are made up of geographical proper names and their epithets. This is too narrow a basis on which to found a stylistic inquiry.

I think that any attempt at showing the sub-epic character of the diction of *Herm.* would be forcing an open door. The composition of this poem must be put considerably later than that of the *Odyssey* and the same is true of its style.²³⁾ Since, however, examining the later stages of the development of epic diction may give us a more adequate idea of its earlier phases, a few of its phenomena will be referred to when they are likely to illustrate the evolution.

We now come to the question which of the phenomena provided by this very poor material are to be admitted as evidence for stylistic development. Zumbach proceeded from the supposition that the four great hymns (as well as *Dion.* I) had been created later than *Il.* and *Od.*²⁴⁾ and went on to discuss a number of cases which he regarded as innovations. Our own starting-point—which is not to bias the inquiry by assuming the priority of Homer—does not allow us to steer this easy course. Accordingly we have to ask ourselves what we mean when, under these conditions, we call a phenomenon occurring in the hymns an innovation. Linguistically of course, the term is unambiguous enough, but there would be little point in saying, for example, that *κούρη* in *Dem.* is an innovation (with respect to *κόρφα*). Stating that a phenomenon is an innovation in a given text implies that we have data about earlier conditions available for comparison. But what if, in our case, we do not assume the priority of Homer? Since we are concerned with diction and style only, the objection is not fatal to the use of the term. The adjective *καματηρός*, for example, is found for the first time in *Aphr.* (246) and, on account of its formation, is relatively

late.²⁵⁾ On the other hand we know that in the epics, in a kind of poetry, that is, which was composed in a style strikingly similar to that of the hymn, the word was never used in more than 27500 lines. Hence, *so far as the evidence goes*—that it does not go very far is another matter, which will be discussed presently—, it points to the stage of development of the Homeric diction being the older one, whatever the respective dates of composition of the epics and the hymn.

The example chosen above is an isolated form and so are all the cases examined by Zumbach. Since, moreover, this scholar looked at them from the angle of Homer's priority, his reviewer could easily cast doubts on the assumption that they were post-Homeric innovations and could stress, in his turn, the presence of a few archaisms not occurring in the epics (e.g. *ἄνωγμεν*, *Ap.* 528). To find out whether or not there was a development of the diction, it is risky to go by isolated forms. Contrary to Parry's ideas on the subject, epic diction never was a monolith nor curtailed off from common speech.²⁶⁾ In the course of its evolution it not only dropped ancient words and forms, but also took up many new ones.²⁷⁾ This is of course a very obvious fact, but owing to Parry's insistence on traditionalism it tends to be forgotten in certain quarters. In Homer *κύμβαχος*²⁸⁾, *Φῆρες*²⁹⁾, *ἔθω*³⁰⁾, *ὀλοφυνδός*³¹⁾, to mention only a few examples, are in the act of disappearing, *ιδέ* has already lost much ground,³²⁾ but abstracts such as *ἀληθείη*, *ἀμυχανίη*, *ἀτιμία*, *ἐννομία*, *ἐνφροσύνη*, *ὄνησις*, *σκέδασις*, begin to increase in number and frequency in the *Odyssey*³³⁾. With the exception of the definite categories of words considered vulgar³⁴⁾ or excluded by their metrical forms, every element of the contemporary idiom could be admitted by the singers if they had use for it, and probably even a few colloquial formulae gained admittance.³⁵⁾ The choice, however, depended primarily on the subject of the poem and the spirit in which the poet conceived it—which is one of the causes why the *Iliad* has proportionally fewer abstracts than the part of the *Odyssey* called 'a comedy of manners' by ps.-Longinus.³⁶⁾

First of all, then, we shall to leave out of account certain elements of vocabulary the relative age of which cannot be assessed by applying the rules of word-formation.³⁷⁾ Even if we did not know, for example, that *γλήχων* (*Dem.* 209) already existed in Mycenaean Greek,³⁸⁾ we would not be entitled to regard it as an innovation. Further, if we have to do with words or forms which for linguistic reasons are to be looked upon as recent, we should specify the meaning of the term. If for instance, we call *καματηρός*, *Aphr.* 246, an innovation, we mean that in this hymn this particular case of an adjective derived from an o-stem and ending in -ηρός occurs for the first time.³⁹⁾ If we call *ἐξαπάφησε*, *Ap.* 376,⁴⁰⁾ an innovation we state the same about this particular instance of an aorist in -ησα deriving from an older thematic aorist (*ῥπαφον*, cf. ξ 379, etc.). Thus far, then, we are arguing on the same lines, but next we have to point to the difference of the two cases. It is this: in neither the *Iliad* nor the *Odyssey*

is a single instance of a formation such as *καματηρός* to be found, but on the other hand the statement that *ἐξαπάφησε* is an innovation in *Ap.* has to be qualified by referring to the Homeric parallels *ἡκαχε/ἰκάχησε* (*Π* 822, etc. / *Ψ* 223), *ἄμαρτε* / *ἄμαρτήσας* (*Λ* 233, etc. / *φ* 188, cf. *ν* 87), *τύχε*, *ἔτυχε*, etc. / (*ἐ*)*τύχησε* (-*σας*) (*Ε* 587, etc. / *Ο* 581, etc.) and so on. So in the case of *ἐξαπάφησε* the term 'innovation' is considerably less significant than when applied to *καματηρός*.

In so far as it concerns *Dem.*, *Ap.*, and *Aphr.*, the bulk of the material discussed by Zumbach consists of isolated elements comparable with *γλήχων*, *καματηρός* and similar types. It would serve no useful purpose to examine such phenomena in detail. At most they provide circumstantial evidence, but in themselves they do not contain sufficiently reliable criteria to establish a particular stylistic development. Here follows a synopsis in which, I hope, the most characteristic items have been adequately brought out.

1. *The 'new' abstracts.* *Herm.* is the only poem in which they are conspicuously frequent: *όδοιπορίη*, 85, *ἐντροπίη*, 245, etc. In *Dem.* (*ἐπηλυσίη*, 228, 230, *δρημοσύνη*, 476) and *Ap.* (*φραδοσύνη*, 99, *ζηλοσύνη* 100, *τλημοσύνη* 191, *ἀνακτορίη*, 234) the proportions at best equal those of the average book in the latter half of the *Odyssey*. In *Aphr.* I do not find a single abstract which is wanting in Homer (*ἐφημοσύνη*, 213, *P* 697, etc.) nor, it seems, did Zumbach. Nor is there much to be learned from the formation of the words in question. *Ἐπηλυσίη* cannot be proved in this respect to be a symptom of a more recent development of the diction, though it has no Homeric parallels (*νεήλυδες* is found *K* 434, 558)⁴¹. *Φραδοσύνη*, *τλημοσύνη*, *ζηλοσύνη* and *ἀνακτορίη* have, in a greater or less degree, parallels in: *τέκτων* / *τεκτοσύνη* (*ε* 250), *μνήμων* / *μνημοσύνη* (*Θ* 181), *τάρβος* (!) / *ταρβοσύνη* (*σ* 342) and *κέρδος* (!) / *κερδοσύνη* (*δ* 251, etc.), *ἀνακτόριος* (*ο* 397)⁴². The abstract *δρημοσύνη* may have been formed by a false analogy from *δρᾶν*, whereas Homeric *δρηστοσύνη* presumably goes back to *δρηστήρ* or *δρήστης*⁴³. Yet even if this is admitted, the difference seems slight, from an evolutionary point of view, and in the epics, moreover, we find *ὑποθημοσύνη* (*Ο* 412, *π* 233) and *ἐφημοσύνη* (*P* 697, *μ* 226, *π* 340). It will be clear that in terms of stylistic development these facts do not even suggest a certain relation between Homer on the one hand and *Dem.*, *Ap.*, *Aphr.* on the other⁴⁴. For our purpose they are completely immaterial.

2. *The poetic compounds.* The case of these is different but it does not open any better perspectives. In contrast with the abstracts they are used lavishly in all three hymns. Yet in view of the freedom which, even at its pre-Homeric stages, epic diction seems to have permitted the singers in the field of compound-formation (cf. e.g. *ἐριούνιος*, *πολλίπορθος*, *πολύτλας*,⁴⁵ *ισόθεος*,⁴⁶ *ἀργυρόηλος*⁴⁷) no inference can be drawn with any degree of probability from *ἀγλαόδωρος*, *Dem.* 54, *πολύπυργος*, *Ap.* 242, *ἀπαλόχρως*, *Aphr.* 14 and the like.⁴⁸ Among the words of this group⁴⁹) only *εὐτείχητος*, *Aphr.* 112, on account of its formation,⁵⁰) and perhaps

καλυκῶπις, *Dem.* 8, 420, *Aphr.* 284, because of its lyrical flavour,⁵¹) are likely to go beyond the Homeric stage.

3. *The remaining elements of vocabulary.* The vast majority of these, either because of their formation or for whatever other reasons, do not allow us to use them for our purpose. Not only does this apply to γλήχων (above p. 11), ῥόδον, *Dem.* 6 (cf. Mycenaean *wo-do-we* (Φορδόφεν), Homeric ῥοδόεντι, *Ψ* 186),⁵²) but also to ὑμέω, *Ap.* 19, etc., δράκαινα, *Ap.* 300 (cf. θέαιναί, *Θ* 5, etc.), σεμνός, *Ap.* 478 (cf. σέβessθαι, *Δ* 242, etc., and, on the other hand ἄζεσθαι — ἄγνός, *ε* 123 etc.). The words of the former group are pre-Homeric without a shadow of doubt, those of the latter category have such close parallels in Homer that their evidentiary value is negligible. It may be of some use to stress this because Zumbach, though recognising that some items of this group are no innovations at all, still gets involved in circular reasoning on account of ῥόδεος, *Dem.* 427⁵³). In this category, as far as I can see, only πρέσβεια, *Aphr.* 32⁵⁴) and θεμιτός in οὐ γὰρ θεμιτόν οἱ ἔφασκε | πίνειν οἶνον ἐρυθρόν, *Dem.* 207, may be symptoms of deviation from the stage of development represented by Homer. Πρέσβεια (< πρέσβα) is artificial and without parallels.⁵⁵) The formation of θεμιτός (from θέμι-, not from θέμιστ-) is likely to be Ionic and comparatively late.⁵⁶) This does not prove, of course, that the word did not yet exist in Homeric times. Indeed, it may already have been part of common speech. Homeric diction, however, not only ignores it, but, what is more, contents itself with using the formula [ῥῆ, ῖ, οὐ] θέμις ἐστί (ῖεν), *B* 73, etc., 18 ×.⁵⁷)

When arguing in this way, it will be clear, we no longer confine ourselves to examining isolated forms. We bring in another factor, viz. the relations of such forms to the formulaic diction. We thus anticipate the second part of this inquiry, in which these very relations will be studied. It appears inevitable, however, to do the same in dealing with the last category of isolated forms, which now has to be examined.

4. *Morphology.* It will be wise to leave out of account cases such as πολυπιδάκον, *Aphr.* 54 and σχήσησθα, *Dem.* 366. They have parallels in Homer which disqualify them as evidence.⁵⁸) (It is fair to say that Zumbach himself is sceptical about several of them). The material which deserves a closer examination is scanty. It comes solely from verbs. This is not surprising. Zumbach, on account of the non-Homeric adjectives (the formation of which is nearly always correct) points out that “die bei Homer noch vielfach nach indogermanischen Ablautsprinzipien flektierenden Verba dem Sprachgefühl der Dichter ungleich viel stärker “unregelmässig” vorkamen und dadurch eher zu “poetischen” Formen gebildet verlockten, währenddem die Bildungs- und Kompositionstypen der Adjective viel schärfer und “regelmässiger” fixiert waren und somit nicht leicht falsch verstanden und angewandt werden konnten”.⁵⁹) This is obviously true, in particular if one realises, as Zumbach does indeed, that these poets were working with a poetic idiom, which to them was already

a "Kunstsprache".⁶⁰) Accordingly, since in their eyes "epic" had its own laws, they were inclined to create forms on false analogy. A further reason is to be found in the fact that, even at early stages of development of the formulaic diction, verbal forms were less firmly incorporated in formulae than nouns and their epithets. Hence they could be treated more freely and were more easily adaptable to the exigencies of the diction. They were, therefore, to a greater extent subjected to modernising and it is not without reason that exactly after verbal forms we find, for example, such a large proportion of neglected digammas in Homer.⁶¹) On the other hand the same conditions gave the poets a greater opportunity to create new 'epic' forms on false analogy when they had to do with verbs than in the nominal part of the diction.

Let us now look briefly at the forms in question. The case of *ἐξαπάφησε*, *Ap.* 376, has already been examined above. Since at this stage of the argument it is inevitable to anticipate the second part of the inquiry by taking into account the formulaic aspect of the morphological differences, one observation should be added to what has already been said. Homer always has *ἐξαπάτησε(ν)* (*ι* 414, end of the line, *X* 299), *ἐξαπατήσεν (-ῆσαι)* (*I* 371, *ν* 277, end of the line). Since these forms do not occur in the hymn, strictly speaking we cannot consider the use of *ἐξαπάφησε* as a breach of the 'law' of economy. Instead, as *ἀπατάω* must have been at the disposition of the poet, we might regard it as a more significant feature: in it we could see an attempt of this poet to do better than his forerunners by being more 'epic'. This, despite the doubts I have expressed with regard to the form as a criterion, might tip the scales of probability in favour of *ἐξαπάφησε* being a symptom of a post-Homeric stage of development.

A similar indication is not available, as far as I can see, for *διδασκήσαιμι*, *Dem.* 144. The phrases *κ' ἔργα διδασκήσαιμι* (*Dem.*) and *τ' ἔργα διδάξαμεν* (*χ* 422) — which both show neglect of digamma — might be modifications and go back to a formula such as **Φέργα διδαζέμεν*, **Φέργα διδάξε*, or something like it. However this may be, it is doubtful whether *ἀλέξω* / *ἀλεξήσαιμι* (*Ω* 371, etc.) > *διδάσκω* / *διδασκήσαιμι* would have been too long a step for a poet who used *Αἰθιοπῆας*, etc. (see *Add.*, p. 20).

The same applies to *κεχάγηντο*, *Dem.* 458, as compared with *κεχαρήσεται*, *Ψ* 266 (both from *κεχαρηώς*, *H* 312)⁶²) and to *ἐβίβασκεν*, *Ap.* 133 (*Hom.* *βιβάς*, etc., and *βάσκ'*)⁶³:

As regards *ιάχησε*, *Dem.* 20, Zumbach is probably right in his view of the origin of the Homeric aorist-forms **ἱαχε*, **ἱαχον* (in *μεγάλ' *ἱαχε*, *μέγ' *ἱαχον*, *A* 482, *B* 333, etc.) Yet the interpretation of *μέγα *ἱαχον*, *μέγα *ἱάχων* as aorists⁶⁴) can only have occurred after the digamma had been dropped, and since its disappearance in such words must antedate the composition of the Homeric poems,⁶⁵) the subsequent creation of *ιάχησε* is not necessarily post-Homeric. On the other hand the formulaic nature of the expressions containing **FíFaχ-* and **ἱαχ-* stands out very clearly in Homer and the number of occurrences is large. Under these circumstances the fact that

the epics never have *ιάχησε* (-σαν) whereas e.g. **σμερδαλέα ιάχησε* would have been a very convenient conjugation of *σμερδαλέα ιάχων*⁶⁶⁾ for the singers, probably points to a post-Homeric origin of this -ησ- aorist.⁶⁷⁾

The problem of the relation between *βέομαι*, *O* 194, *βέη*, *II* 582 = *Ω* 131, *βείομαι*, *X* 431, on the one hand and *βιώμεσθα*, *Ap.* 528, on the other is a difficult one. If *βέομαι* is the original form — which I think is certain —,⁶⁸⁾ *βιώμεσθα* may be regarded as an innovation by analogy, but, in view of the possibility that Homeric *ἀεργίη*, *ὑπεροπλήσι*, etc., have to be read as *ἀεργείη*, *ὑπεροπλείησι*, etc.,⁶⁹⁾ it could equally well be a modernised reading.

Thus, for different reasons, the forms *διδασκῆσαιμι*, *κεχάρηντο*, *ἐβίβασκεν* and *βιώμεσθα* do not seem to be convincing symptoms of a stage of development more recent than the Homeric one. As to the two remaining cases, *τεκεῖσθαι*, *Aphr.* 127 and *ἐκγεγάονται*, *Aphr.* 197, it would be an overstatement to say that I regard them as conclusive, yet I think there is a perceptible difference. Admittedly, this difference is only a matter of nuance and its assessment may be wholly subjective.

As a parallel of *ἔτεκον* / *τεκεῖσθαι* Zumbach suggests *ἔπεσον* / *πεσέεσθαι*.⁷⁰⁾ The future of *πίπτω*, however, is never contracted in Homer, so the parallel is only a linguistic one and does not take into account the specific functioning of the formulaic diction. From the latter point of view I would refer to *ἐσσεῖται* (*B* 393, *N* 317, *ἀπεσσεῖται*, *τ* 302).⁷¹⁾ Now *ἐσσεῖται* seems to be a 'formulaic conjugation' of *ἔσσεσθαι*: *δηρὸν ἀπεσσεῖται*, *τ* 302, *∞ δηρὸν ἀπέσσεσθαι*, *σ* 146; *ἄρκιον ἐσσεῖται*, *B* 393, *∞ λώιον ἔσσεσθαι*, *Z* 339 (cf. *αἰπύ οἱ ἐσσεῖται*, *N* 317). In the same way the artificial form *τεκεῖσθαι* is likely to be a conjugation of *τεκέσθαι*: *τέκνα τεκεῖσθαι*, *Aphr.* 127, *∞ τέκνα τεκέσθαι*, *χ* 324 (and also *Dem.* 136, *Ap.* 116, cf. moreover *χ* 481, *δ* 387). The evidence is slight, but it might suggest that in trying to be 'epic', the poet of *Aphr.* goes one better than Homer. More traces of the same tendency, on the part of this poet, will be discussed below.⁷²⁾ *ἐκγεγάονται*, *Aphr.* 197 (*καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερὲς ἐκγεγάονται*), is not so unique an artificial form as it might look at first sight. In Homer we find *ἐρχατόωντο*, *ξ* 15, derived from *ἐρχατο* (*Σ* 354, etc.).⁷³⁾ *ἐκγεγάονται* was likewise developed from a perfect. It is a formulaic conjugation of *ἐκγεγαῶτι*, *ἐκγεγανῖα* (*Φ*185, etc., 7×) and probably meant to be a so-called *praesens propheticum*. In this case the specific conditions in which the form is used provide some evidence for post-Homeric modification. They will be discussed below, p. 39f.

The upshot of this long discussion is not very impressive and is fraught with many uncertainties. Among the isolated forms occurring in *Dem.*, *Ap.*, *Aphr.*, there are only a few that may enable us to assess the stage of development of the diction as compared with the phase of evolution represented by the epics. They are: *ἐξαπάφησε* (?), *Ap.* 376, *πρέσβειρα* (?), *Aphr.* 32, *εὐτείχητος* (?), *Aphr.* 112, *τεκεῖσθαι*, *Aphr.* 127, *ἐκγεγάονται*,

Aphr. 197, καματηρός, *Aphr.* 246, καλυκῶπις (?), *Aphr.* 284, *Dem.* 8, 420, ἰάχῃσσε (?), *Dem.* 20, θεμιτός, *Dem.* 207.

On the other hand we have found that what little information could be gleaned from isolated cases was, to a certain extent, obtained by relating them to the formulaic diction. In the following section of this inquiry we shall see if more can be learned from the diction proper.

NOTES

¹⁾ Allen-Halliday-Sikes, 2nd ed., 1936.

²⁾ *O.c.* LXXXI. Reinhardt, *Zum homerischen Aphroditehymnus*, Festschr. B. Snell 1956, 1–14, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (ed. U. Hölscher), 1961, 507–521, would ascribe *Aphr.* to the poet of the *Iliad*. *Contra* e.g. E. Heitsch, *Aphroditehymnos, Aeneas und Homer*, Göttingen 1965.

³⁾ “There is a certain parallelism between the *Hymns* and another post-Homeric set of poems, the Epic Cycle—They date both from the sub-epic period, the eighth century and onwards—”.

⁴⁾ *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*², 104.

⁵⁾ For the testimonies see A.H.S., LXIV–LXXXII.

⁶⁾ See e.g. A.H.S., LXXIV ff., Lesky, *o.c.* 81, Humbert, *Homère, Hymnes*, 9.

⁷⁾ *AJP* LXXX (1949), 250.

⁸⁾ *Gnomon* XXX (1958), 94–100.

⁹⁾ *The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry*, *AJP* LXXXIII (1962), 337–368.

¹⁰⁾ Drerup, *Das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart*, 369 ff.

^{10a)} See J. A. Davison, *Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature*, *Eranos* LIII (1955), 125–140.

¹¹⁾ We know, for instance, that Euripides’ *Bacchae* was not completed earlier than his *Orestes* (407/6: 408). Yet its style is considerably more archaic—and notably more Aeschylean—than that of the earlier tragedy, cf. Dodds, ed. XXXIV. The same may be true of Aeschylus’ *Supplikes* as compared with his *Persae* and *Septem* (though here there is some room for doubt, cf. H. Lloyd Jones, *The Supplikes of Aeschylus*, *AC* XXXIII (1964), 361 f.).

¹²⁾ The only departure from this rule will be found in the discussion of *Aphr.* 196 f. Here, in my view, the nature of the passage involves examining the possibility of literary influence.

¹³⁾ *O.c.* 364.

¹⁴⁾ It is the writings of the German Romantics (especially those of young Goethe, A. W. Schlegel, Jean Paul and W. v. Humboldt) that seem to have contributed primarily to this development of aesthetic views, see e.g. O. Walzel, *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*, Wildpark-Potsdam, 1929, 144–159, A. Preminger, F. J. Warnke and O. B. Hardison Jr., *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton 1965, s.v. Form, 286 f. Yet according to Walzel the theory of ‘innere Form’ can be traced back to Shaftesbury and Giordano Bruno, who, in their turn, were influenced by Plotinus. This philosopher, as can be seen from *Enn.* I, 6, 1–2, is concerned with opposing the Stoic *συμμετρία* doctrine (the editors refer to *SVF* III, 278 f.), but the *ἔνδοξον εἶδος* conception, which he substitutes for it, implies an a fortiori rejection of the much more superficial notion mentioned by Notopoulos. The same view is already found in Ps. Longinus (*De Subl.* I, 4; IX, 2; XV, 4, V). Of course this is not the proper place to mention the extremely difficult problems concerning ‘meaning’ and ‘form’ raised by theorists of literary expression and aesthetics (cf. e.g. R. Wellek and A. Warren, *Theory of Literature*⁵ (1961), 18 and *pass.*).

¹⁵⁾ Plut. *Mor.* 79 B.

¹⁶⁾ In fact we see the influence of the formulaic style slowly dying out in the poetry of the early elegists and of Theognis and Solon. Some formulae linger even in Panyassis, though far fewer than W. McLeod (*Studies on Panyassis*, Phoenix XX (1966), 95–100) thinks. Of course all this has always been known—and ascribed, though too exclusively perhaps, to Homeric influence (see further below, n. 20).

¹⁷⁾ The assumption that the four great hymns were composed orally has been used to contest their post-Homeric *dating*, so it is not relevant here. As to the supposition itself, the most that can be said is that it is not impossible. In support of it one might adduce the extreme fluidity of the transmission which appears in *Ap.* 146–150 and *Dem.* 404 ff. (below p. 26 n. 7). Yet with regard to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where the problem of transmission is similar, the hypothesis of oral composition is incapable of proof (cf. e.g. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications* 16–19) and with the *Hymns* we are in the same position. The assumption can be proved least of all by underlining words and expressions such as *μνήσομαι*, *Λητώ*, *ἐρχομένοιο*, *φαρέτρην*, *τόξον*, *τὴν μὲν*, *τρομέουσιν ἰόντα* (with reference to *Οἰχαλίηθεν ἰόντα*, *B* 596), etc., and by calling *μνήσομαι* *οὐδὲ λάθωμαι* a ‘formula created by analogy’ with reference to *β* 210 *λίσσομαι οὐδ’ ἄγορέω* and the like. By the standard applied in the “formulaic analysis”, *o.c.* 355–359, all hexameter poetry from Homer up to Quintus Smyrnaeus as well as much of the elegy (and the *Batrachomyomachia*! see now Kirk, *Formular Language and Oral Quality*, YClS XX (1966), 161 ff.) could be proved to be oral. In this way McLeod, *o.c.* 109, comes to the conclusion that “Panyassis exhibits no essential difference from Homer in his use of traditional language”—to see himself, consequently, confronted with the ludicrous picture “of archaic Greece swarming with opportunistic scribes, all busily engaged in hunting down bards to sing a song for the record”—a result he rightly calls a *reductio ad absurdum*. Of course even at a more formulaic stage than is found in Homer, epic diction must have contained many variations, transitional elements, related types, etc., etc., and, in general, must have shown a considerable degree of freedom (cf. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 36 ff. and the penetrating and clarifying investigation of this subject by J. B. Hainsworth, *Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression*, CQ N.S. XIX, 2 (1964), 155–164.). Yet when it comes to showing that the diction of a given poem is to some extent formulaic we have to adhere to the strict definition of the formula as closely as possible. See now W. H. Minton, *The Fallacy of the Structural Formula* TAPA 96 (1965), 241–253.

¹⁸⁾ *O.c.* 100: “Der jeweilige Stil einer Dichtung steckt ja im ganzen Komplex aus Wort- und Formenwahl, Wortstellung, Satzbau, Satzverknüpfung, Metrum, Rhythmus, Klang und Komposition, der in keine Statistik eingeht”. His reference to K. Meister, *Homersche Kunstsprache*, 246, is not to the point. Meister questions the value of statistics as a method of ‘Schlichtenanalyse’ and of dating.

¹⁹⁾ Cf. *L’épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*, 23, 112 ff. and *pass.*

²⁰⁾ Composition should be excluded because, in view of their different subjects, and purposes, the epics and the *Hymns* have no common standard by which we might judge.

²¹⁾ A.H.S., CVI.

²²⁾ This I prefer, though I do not feel certain about it. Of course this is not the proper place to discuss the question. I confine myself to refer to its recent treatment by Van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque*, 304–336. For several reasons I doubt whether the sequence 141–146 could go back to an original one which would have been available to Thucydides in the form (140–142–146) *Ἀντὸς δ’ Ἀργυρότοξε, ἀναξ ἑκατηβόλ’ Ἀπολλων, ἄλλοτε μὲν νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἡλάσκαζες, ἄλλοτε Δῆλῳ, Φοῖβε, μάλιστα γε θυμὸν ἐτέρφθης* (*o.c.* 317 f.). Yet this hypothesis is immaterial to Van Groningen’s discussion itself and his study, I think, leaves little doubt that

there must have been some rewording of the final part of the Delian hymn.

²³⁾ See e.g. Lesky, *o.c.* 83. This is not to say that the chronological gap which seems to separate *Herm.* from the epics and the other major hymns is necessarily as wide as linguistic, stylistic and metrical characteristics (cf. Porter, *The Early Greek Hexameter*, YCIS XII (1951), 33 f.) would suggest. To some unknown extent the differences existing in these respects between *Herm.* and the other poems, as Professor Kamerbeek points out to me, may be due to the mainland origin of the hymn (Boeotia? Olympia? Athens?? (N. D. Brown, *Hermes the Thief* 102 ff.). For its correspondences with Hesiod see A.H.S., 274, Humbert, 112 f., for its allusions to *Ap.* Dornseiff, *Zum homerischen Hermes-hymnus*, Rh. Mus. LXXXVII (1938), 80–84, for those to Homer Radermacher, *Der homerische Hermes-hymnus*, 224 f.).

²⁴⁾ *O.c.* Einleitung (1).

²⁵⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 15; later the word is found in Aristophanes, Aristotle and other authors (LSJ *s.v.*); see below, n. 39.

²⁶⁾ Cf. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey*, 156 f. with notes.

²⁷⁾ Page, *ibid.*

²⁸⁾ Cf. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 212, 231 ff.

²⁹⁾ *Mod.* 152.

³⁰⁾ Leumann, *o.c.* 212 f.

³¹⁾ *Mod.* 66.

³²⁾ P. Wathélet, *Mycénien et Grec d'Homère*, 2, *La particule καί*, AC XXXIII (1964), 1, 17–23, 31–44, Hoekstra, *Mod.* 63.

³³⁾ Cf. e.g. Croiset, *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, I, 385–387, whose figures, however, are based upon the part of the *Iliad* he considered authentic (see Bolling, CR XIV (1919), 328 ff.), Cauer, *Grundfragen*³, 436–441, Page, *o.c.* 151 f., 161 f.

³⁴⁾ Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters. zu Homer*, 224–231.

³⁵⁾ *Mod.* 37, 169.

³⁶⁾ *De Subl.* IX, 15: τοιαῦτα γάρ πον τὰ περὶ τὴν τοῦ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἡθικῶς αὐτῷ βιολογούμενα οἰκίαν, οἷονεὶ κωμωδία τις ἐστὶν ἡθολογουμένη. Already Aristoteles: ἡ μὲν Ἰλιάς ἀπλοῦν καὶ παθητικόν, ἡ δὲ Ὀδύσσεια πεπλεγμένον (ἀναγνώρισις γὰρ διόλου) καὶ ἡθικῇ, *Poet.* 1459 B 15–16. Though its less heroic spirit does not necessarily indicate that the *Odyssey* was created later than the *Iliad*, the concurrence of several unrelated types of evidence (cf. e.g. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*, 136 f.) makes this all but certain—as is also recognised by scholars who uphold unity of authorship (cf. e.g. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, 282). Difference of schooling too might have contributed to the increase of abstracts (Page, *o.c.* 149–164). After the criticism by Webster (*o.c.* 276–282) and Hainsworth (*No Flames in the Odyssey*, JHS LXXVIII (1958), 49–56) the evidence was re-examined by Kirk, *The Songs of Homer*, 292–299. See now also M. H. A. L. van der Valk, *The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry and the Relation between the Iliad and the Odyssey*, AC XXXV (1966) 1, 47 ff. Van der Valk clearly shows that “the formulae and words listed by P. must not be isolated—but have to be studied in their surroundings”. It appears unnecessary to advance the hypothesis of composition in separate regions, once it has been realised that the differences in vocabulary and formulae are often determined by subject-matter (e.g. in the use of ποιή, ἄποινα, ἀνάποιος, p. 57 ff.), conception and especially by “a fine feeling for the ethos of a passage” (as is apparent from the formulae used for daybreak and sunset, p. 47–52).

³⁷⁾ Zumbach (who does not raise the question of the part played by innovations in a largely traditional diction) is ready to admit that the ‘new’ substantives do not justify “essential linguistic conclusions” (*o.c.* 2) and ascribes the absence of certain words in Homer to chance (e.g. πέδον, *Dem* 455, cf. πέδονδε, N 796, λ 598), *o.c.* 37 ff., see also 17 (on poetical compounds). Metrical necessity is advanced as a further cause (*ibid.*), yet this covers only a small proportion of the words (and their inflexional forms) in question.

³⁸⁾ *ka-ra-ko*, MY Ge 605, cf. e.g. Docs 226, Bennett, *The Mycenae Tablets*, II, 71, 107.

³⁹⁾ Modelled upon ἀνιη-ρός, cf. πονηρός, μοχθηρός. Zumbach, *o.c.* 15. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, 231 ff., who lists the Homeric forms in —ηρός: αἰψηρός, ἀνιηρός, πενταέτηρος, λαιψηρός, ἀταρτηρός, ὄτρηρός. With καματηρός we can parallel ὄμβρηρός, Hes. *E.* 451.

⁴⁰⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 32.

⁴¹⁾ See below, p. 57 (on ἄλφι). O. Szemerényi, *Syncopé in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of Indo-European Accent*, 9–17, convincingly argues that *-ῆλυθία is older than (νε-)ῆλυθ- (see in particular pp. 10 and 15).

⁴²⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 9.

⁴³⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 8.

⁴⁴⁾ As I have said above, the frequency of abstracts depends largely on the spirit in which the hymns have been conceived. This becomes particularly clear when we compare *Aphr.* with *Herm.* The poet of the former hymn is bent on being as classical as possible, whereas the well-known humorous treatment of the subject in the latter brings about an analogous handling of epic style, e.g. in 295 f.: οἰωνὸν προέηκεν ἀειρόμενος μετὰ χειρσὶ, τλήμονα γαστρὸς ἔριθον, in 301: θάρσει, σπαργανιῶτα, Διὸς καὶ Μαϊάδος νιέ, and in 336: παῖδά τιν' εἶρον τόνδε, διαπρύσιον κυθαριστήν.

⁴⁵⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 21.

⁴⁶⁾ *Mod.*, 32.

⁴⁷⁾ Kirk, *S.H.* 111 f., 114 f.

⁴⁸⁾ The Homeric parallels are given by Zumbach, who rightly adds that ἀγλαόδορος etc., are no innovations in the proper sense of the word.

⁴⁹⁾ On φερέσβιος, *Dem.* 451, etc., see Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 442. It would be risky to consider it a symptom of post-Homeric innovation. The archaism φερεσσακής, on which it was probably modelled and which is likely to have been an element of pre-Homeric diction, is wanting in *Il.* and *Od.* as well, below p. 26, n. 1.

⁵⁰⁾ Cf. Zumbach, *o.c.* 26: "Das Vorbild . . . bleibt noch zu suchen im Kreise der Adjektive wie ἐνκόσμητος; vielleicht auch εἰδμητος II 700 (πύργος)". Heitsch, *o.c.* 24 f., points out that εὐτειχίστοιο (from τευχίζω, *H* 449) would have been possible.

⁵¹⁾ Cf. Heitsch, *o.c.* 25 (who calls it "eine sehr gesuchte Neubildung").

⁵²⁾ Bennett, *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos*, Minos, Suppl. 2 (1958), 17 ff. On σατήνη see Heitsch, *o.c.* 25 with literature.

⁵³⁾ *O.c.* 14.

⁵⁴⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 8.

⁵⁵⁾ Cf. Zumbach, *o.c.* 8. Mr. H. Bolkestein draws my attention to 'Ιλάερα, *Cypr.* fr. VIII A. (=Paus. III, 16, 1), ἰλᾶερα, Empedocles fr. B 40 D.-K., ἰλ'ᾶερα, *ibid.* fr. 85, and κτεάτειρα, Aesch. *Ag.* 356, cf. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, 104.

⁵⁶⁾ The genitive Θέμιος is found Hdt. II, 50. The supposition put forward by Frisk (*Die Stammbildung von ΘΕΜΙΣ*, *Eranos* XLVIII (1950), 12) that the -στ- flexion is due to rhapsodes (obviously meant in the sense of the present-day term 'singers') and that θέμιστες is a "rein literarische Pluralvorstellung" which originated "neben dem abstrakten Singularbegriff der 'Satzung'" has been convincingly contested by H. Vos, *ΘΕΜΙΣ*, (Assen 1956), 37 f. Starting from the results of his semantic inquiry, Vos argues first that there is no reason, why θέμις ('Recht', 'Gebühren', 'due') > privilege, prerogative of the king) should have lacked a plural in common speech. Secondly he points to the weak point in Frisk's view, namely that the occurrence of τᾶς Θέμιστος, τᾶ (ταῖ) Θέμισσι and Θεμιστιος (a month in Larissa) in Thessalian inscriptions should be ascribed to the epic tradition (*o.c.* 38, 45 n. 2); it will not do to regard the flexion of a name of a goddess and of a month as epic when a more natural explanation is available. He prefers to consider the -στ- flexion a Thessalian Aeolism in Homer (cf. Penestae), *o.c.* 38.

The spelling conventions of Linear B prevent us from using the evidence found in PY Ac 1278 (*te-mi-ti-jo*), PY On 300, 10 (*te-mi-ti-ja*), etc., for our purpose. Ruijgh, *Études sur le grec mycénien* (Amsterdam 1967) 180, proposes to read these forms as *Θεμίσιος*, *Θεμισία* but explicitly states he does so on the strength of Homeric *θέμιστ-* (*ibid.* n. 414). We are confronted with the same difficulty in KN As 821, e-ne-ka ti-mi-to, cf. e.g. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, 129. (Mr. Ruijgh points out to me that in Mycenaean *Θεμίτιος* would have tended to become *Θεμίσιος* (cf. *ra-wa-ke-si-jo* *lāFāγέσιος*: *ra-wa-ke-ta* *lāFāγέτας*, cf. also **Αρτεμίσιος*: gen. *a-te-mi-to* **Αρτέμιτος*) but that this argument is not absolutely conclusive since *-τιος* could have been analogically restored (cf. *ti-nwa-ti-ja-o* coexisting with *ti-nwa-si-ja*).

⁵⁷⁾ Cf. Mycenaean *o-u-te-mi*, *o-u-ki-te-mi*, Docs 311, KN V 280). The lengthening of the final syllable of *θεμιτόν* before *οί* need not be due to *θεμιτόν οί* being an old epic formula showing observance of the digamma, since the use of a dative is as natural with *θεμιτόν* as it is with *ἔξεστι* and the like, cf. *Mod.* 116 n. 2 and e.g. Hdt. V 72 *οὐ γὰρ θεμιτόν Δωριεῦσι παρῆναι ἐνθαῦτα*, Eur. Or. 97 *σοὶ δ' οὐχὶ θεμιτόν*. Moreover, in such expressions as *θεμιτόν* the prosodic value of *οί* is a doubtful criterion anyway, cf. Ruijgh, *Lingua* 18 (1967), 1, 97 (review of *Hom. Mod.*). On the other hand it is to be noted that in Homer the combination *οὐ γὰρ μοι* (*οί, τοι, πω, πως, πρὶν*, etc.) nearly always forms the beginning of a line, cf. *κ* 73 *οὐ γὰρ μοι θέμις ἐστί*. In this respect too the structure of the latter hemistich of *Dem.* 207 may be a stylistic innovation, cf. *Mod.* 58, 79.

⁵⁸⁾ With *σχήσησθα* compare *τίθησθα*, ι 404, *εἰσθα*, K 450, *διδοῖσθα*, T 270 (Chantraine, *G.H.* 470).

⁵⁹⁾ *O.c.* 12.

⁶⁰⁾ *O.c.* 28.

⁶¹⁾ *Mod.* 50 f.

⁶²⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 33, Chantraine, *o.c.* I, 448.

⁶³⁾ Zumbach, *o.c.* 30; see, however, below p. 24.

⁶⁴⁾ *Mod.* 53.

⁶⁵⁾ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶⁾ $7 \times$ (*ibid.*; $P_1 > T_1$).

⁶⁷⁾ This is to a certain extent supported by the onomatopoetic and graphic nature of the context, see below p. 55.

⁶⁸⁾ See Frisk *s.v.* *βλος*.

⁶⁹⁾ K. Meister, *o.c.* 36.

⁷⁰⁾ *O.c.* 31.

⁷¹⁾ On this so-called Doric future see e.g. Schwyzler, *Gr.Gr.* I, 785 f., Chantraine, *Morphologie historique du grec*, 252.

⁷²⁾ pp. 40, 44.

⁷³⁾ Wackernagel, *o.c.* 60. Cf. also *λαμπετόωντι* (A 104 = δ 662) (*<λάμπειτον?*) Leumann, *o.c.* 181 f. and, in general, K. Meister, *o.c.* 71 ff.

Addendum ad p. 14 (*Dem.* 144). I prefer Voss' correction of the impossible *διαθήσαιμι* to the other conjectures because *γυναικός* is otiose after *γυναικός ἀφήλικος*, 140, and since the simplest emendation, *γυναικας*, almost necessarily involves a form of *διδάσκω*. At the same time this verb fits the proposals made by Demeter in 141–143, for these strongly suggest the position of old Eurycleia (Odyssean influence is conspicuous in the whole of passage 100–160).

II

APOLLO

THE DELIAN HYMN

The maximum length admissible for this poem is 181 lines. Of these 30–44 are made up of geographical proper names and their epithets and descriptions, almost all of which are either wanting in Homer or couched in identical formulae.¹⁾ The rest of the hymn contains 7 whole verses, about 20 half lines and a great many shorter formulae that occur in the same form or with slight variations in the epics.²⁾ The scanty material provided by the Delian part of *Apollo* is further reduced by the fact that in some places, which might otherwise be informative, we have *variae lectiones*. It would bias the inquiry to assume that the most modern reading is the authentic one. Besides, the problem is complicated by our ignorance of the extent to which the final part of the poem was reworked in order to adapt it to the Pythian hymn.³⁾ From the above it will be clear that we cannot hope to find sufficiently useful material. This expectation is borne out by the facts.

A. Inflection

There is no convincing case of inflection which entails modification suggesting a stage of development more recent than the Homeric phase. Admittedly the counterpart of

ἀῖτις δ' αἶ Ἀητώ τε καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν 159

is found in Homer in the form

ἦτοι τὸν Ἀητώ τε καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιρα E 447

and the final syllable of the accusative of *Ἀητώ* occurs nowhere in the *Il.* and *Od.* in arsis (so that there the uncontracted form *may* be original everywhere). Yet the evidence of such a case seems too slender to go by, the more so since the corresponding syllables of *Ἀητοῦς* and *Ἀητοῖ* (dat.) are, as a matter of fact, found in arsis Ξ 327 and Ω 607 respectively ^{3a)} and because in *Ap.* 25

Ἀητὼ τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι

has an accusative parallel in λ 287

Πηρὼ τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι

so that it might even be argued that the hymn has preserved the proto-type.⁴⁾

Neglect of digamma, as found in 46 *θέλοι οἰκία θέσθαι* and in 177 *οὐδ' ἰγὺν ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα / ὑμνέων*, is frequent in Homer, cf. e.g.

βούλεται οἶκον ὀφέλλειν, ο 21, (cf. also οἱ περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί' ἔθεντο, B 750, βῆσαν ἐκηβόλω Ἀπόλλωνι, A 438, etc.⁵)

In 20 νόμοι βεβλήσθαι ᾠδῆς (νόμοι Matthiae, νομοὶ Barnes, νόμος mss) can, of course, be read as νόμοι βεβλήατ' ἀοιδῆς.⁶)

B. Substitution

In Homer we find some instances of replacement of constituents of older formulae. The only case I can find in *Ap.* 1–181 is:

Λητοῖ, κνδίστη θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κοίοιο 62,

cf. Ἥρη, πρέσβα θεά, θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο, Ξ 194 = 243 ∼ E 721 = Θ 383.

The case, it seems, is doubtful and an isolated one at that.^{6a})

C. Separation

Cases of the type Ἀπόλλωνά τ' ἄνακτα (15) are numerous in Homer: Χαρόποιό τ' ἄνακτος, B 672, etc. In 181 Δήλοιο περικλύστης (-ου M) μέγ' ἀνάσσεις, may come from an older prototype which lacked μέγα and had an adjective ending in -οιο, e.g. *[Δήλοιο περικλύστ]οιο Φάνασσε (-εις, -ει, etc.), cf. πεδίοιο ἀνάσσεις, δ 102. In Homer only the old instrumental *ἴρι* is allowed to enter the ubiquitous ἀνάσσειν -formulae; instead the addition μέγα is sometimes found with κρατεῖν, cf. Π 172 μέγα κρατέων ἦρασσε. The reading is not absolutely certain, however, for the ms. Γ⁷) has a suprascript οιο, which might point, as A.H.S. observe, to περικλύστοιο ἀνάσσεις. Hence, in order to err on the safe side, we shall do well to leave the case out of account. The same applies to 46 εἴ τις οἱ γαιέων νιέϊ θέλοι οἰκία θέσθαι.⁸) Here γαιέων and irresolvable -ει in νιέϊ suggest a post-Homeric stage. Homer has only γαῖων (but cf. θ 284 ἦ οἱ γαῖων πολὺ φιλτάτη ἐστὶν ἀπασέων); among the 26 datives of νιός⁹) found there, the only case of final syllable in arsis is νιέϊ Πριάμοιο (Φ 34) and even this is likely to represent νῆι Πριάμοιο, cf. B 791¹⁰). In *Ap.* 46, however, there is a *v.l.* εἴ τις γαῖων (p) and νιέϊ θέλοι could easily be corrected into θέλοι νιέϊ¹¹). The ms. tradition does not allow us to regard 46 as a reliable symptom of post-Homeric composition.

D. Juxtaposition and Transposition

μὴ ὁπότ' ἂν τὸ πρῶτον ἴδῃ φάος ἡέλιοιο 71

In this line τὸ πρῶτον is no less authentic than πάμπρωτον before ἐρύσσαμεν, etc., in δ 577 ∼ κ 403, 424 ∼ λ 2.^{11a}) On the other hand these cases show that this type of juxtaposition is not post-Homeric.

πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαὶ τοι ἄδον καὶ πρόωνες ἄκροι 22

If there were any specific prototype of τοι ἄδον, it cannot, at all events, be identified. The expression might be a reminiscence of *Φοι Φάδε (-ον, -οι,

etc.) cf. ζ 245 καὶ οἱ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μῦναι, but could also be considered a modification of a 'formula' reflected by *Aphr.* 10 ἀλλ' ἄρα οἱ πόλεμοί τε ἄδον. However this may be, Homer has a parallel in ὥς ὄφελεν θάνατός μοι ἄδειν, *I* 173, so from our point of view the case is not significant.^{11b)}

τῇ δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐπειθεν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι 113

I now have to raise a question which is among the thorniest in this kind of investigation. It is this: in how far does *v*-movable constitute a reliable indication of modification? It need not be said that the evidence is extremely complicated and sometimes contradictory,¹²⁾ so the problem should be tackled with many reservations. I cannot refrain, however, from suggesting the following points. 1. It seems that there is some connection between the disruption of ancient prototypes and the use of *v*-movable.¹³⁾ 2. This connection is shown in the first place by *v*-movable making position (cf. e.g. *Aphr.* 54 ἐν ἀκροπόλοις ὄρεσιν πολυπιδάκον Ἰδης against ἐν (ἐπ') ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσι, τ 205, *E* 523.¹⁴⁾ 3. The evidence is less conclusive, but still fairly strong for *v*-movable obviating hiatus in a number of cases that show various types of modification and innovation (cf. e.g. *Aphr.* 128 δεῖξε καὶ ἔφρασεν against φράσε (1 ×) *Κίρκη* (λ 22), against ἐπέφραδε πότνια *Κίρκη* (μήτηρ), κ 549, *A* 795, etc.¹⁵⁾ It may be typical of a certain evolution that in Homer the archaism ἔλλαβε (18 ×)¹⁶⁾ only once has *v*-movable obviating hiatus (σφέλας ἔλλαβεν, σ 394, and that the only time the form occurs in *Dem.* and in Hesiod, it is found as ἔλλαβεν: ἄχος ἔλλαβεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαίταις (*Dem.* 40) and ἔλλαβεν ἄρπην, *Th.* 179.¹⁷⁾ 4. It is a curious fact that, with a few exceptions (e.g. ἐὺς παῖς Ἀγχίσαιος, Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής) the formulaic systems of noun-epithet formulae employed between the trochaic caesura and the end of the line begin, or used to begin, with a consonant: βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη, ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων etc., etc. This suggests that originally — at a pre-Ionic stage, that is, — there was a tendency to avoid hiatus after *T*₁ formulae ending in a past tense of a verbal form. It remains to be asked, then, whether there is evidence to show that after the formulaic diction had reached Ionia, the singers, having *v*-movable at their disposal to fill up hiatus in the trochaic caesura and thus being less tied to the old types, proceeded to break up these types and that they availed themselves of this opportunity to an increasing extent.

Elsewhere I have called attention to some symptoms in *Aphr.* which point in this direction.¹⁸⁾ In *Dem.* there are 15 verbal forms ending in *v*-movable before the trochaic caesura (e.g. ἔθηκεν, 195, ποίησεν, 242). Of their Homeric counterparts, the vast majority do not have this -*v* under conditions originally not requiring its use.¹⁹⁾ In the category of those occurring before the trochaic caesura the difference is determined to a great extent by the fact pointed out above: in Homer *T*₂ formulae beginning with vowels are relatively scarce, whereas in *Dem.* such combinations as τῇσι δὲ μνηδῶν ἦρχεν ἐύζωνος Μετάνειρα are proportionally frequent (7/15). If, for this reason, we consider this phenomenon inconclusive, the fact

remains that in the hymn we see a tendency to shift forms such as *ἔδηκε*, *ποίησε*, (*ἐ*)*μίμνε*, *ἀνήκε*, *ᾤωπε* and their metrical equivalents from the end of the line to the place before the trochaic caesura. Undoubtedly the same treatment had already been practised by Homer,²⁰ yet in *Dem.* it was remarkably developed. All this is in accordance with the few phenomena of this kind found in *Aphr.*²¹ In *Ap.* 1–181 I find only three cases of a verbal form used before the trochaic caesura, and all of them have *ν*-movable. 113 looks epic enough, but on closer examination it appears that, apart from β 106 = ω 141 *ἔπειθεν* *Ἀχαιοῦς*, Homer has only a single example of *πείθεν* (and not a single one of *ἔπειθεν*) in which *ν*-movable is necessary: *ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ' οὐ πείθεν, ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσήδα*, *P* 33. In contrast with *θυμὸν ἔπειθεν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι*, 113, we find in Homer *θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ἔπειθε (-ον)*, *Z* 51, etc., 6 × and once *θυμὸν ἔπειθε*, *X* 78, at the verse-end.

A similar indication is found in 133

ὥς εἰπὼν ἔβιβασκεν ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης

In itself the formation of *ἔβιβασκεν*,²² though the form is wanting in Homer, is not necessarily a symptom of post-Homeric evolution.²³ It is curious however, that among the approximately 90 different lines beginning with the formula *ὥς εἰπὼν* (some of which are very frequently used) only three have a verbal form ending in *ν*-movable before the trochaic caesura: *ὥς εἰπὼν ἀπέπεμπεν ἀδελφρόν* (*K* 72), *ὥς εἰπὼν παρέπεισεν ἀδελφειοῦ (!) φρένας ἥρωος* (*H* 120 = *N* 788), *ὥς εἰπὼν ἔρρουπεν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος* (*T* 130). In *Ap.* (taken as a whole) there are two different *ὥς εἰπὼν* lines. One of them is *ὥς εἰπὼν διέθηκε θεμέλια Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων* (254 = 294), the other is 133.

The Delian hymn has three cases of a verbal form used before the trochaic caesura. Two of them have been discussed, the third is *μνησάμενοι τέρπουσιν, ὅταν στήσωνται ἀγῶνα*, 150, yet this line had better be left out of account, since, originally at any rate, a glide may have bridged the hiatus after forms ending in *-ι*.²⁴

As to *ν*-movable making position, we have very little to go by. Apart from the cases which have parallels in Homer (e.g. *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὄρκον*, 89 = *E* 280) nearly all the phenomena are uninformative. Some of them seem to be bound up with enjambement (*ἐνθα καθίζουσιν*, 12, *ὔμνον ἀείδουσιν*, 161) but they cannot be traced back, as far as I can see, to prototypes as recognisable as, for instance, *ἐν ἀκροπόλοισι ὄρεσιν*, etc., in *Aphr.* There is one case, however, which is typical of a stage of development which is not found in Homer. It is 163

μυμῖσθ' ἴσασιν φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος

Alongside *ν*-movable making position the digamma is twice neglected in this line. The evolution seems to have proceeded as follows: *οὐδε ἴσασι / οὐδέ τι οἶδε* (*ἦδη*, *ἴδμεν*) (*A* 657, *B* 486, *N* 674, etc., between the diaeresis

and the end of the line) ∞ (>?) [*νήπιος*] οὐδὲ τὸ (τὰ) ἤδη (οἶδε) / [*νήπιοι*] οὐδὲ ἴσασι (*B* 38, etc., Hes. *E.* 40, before the trochaic caesura) >οὐδέ τι ἴσασιν [*θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν*] (*β* 283, *P*₁, cf. *πλείονα οἶδα* (*ἤδη, εἰδώς*), *T* 219, etc. > *πλείονα ἴσασιν*, *Ψ* 312, *P*₁) (still with 'observed' digamma) > *μιμεῖσθ'* ἴσασιν, *Ap.* 163, *P*₁, with contraction and neglected digamma in addition to *ν*-movable making position.²⁵⁾

It does not seem fortuitous that, whereas the rest of the Delian hymn shows no recognisable traces of drastic modification and innovation, its final part has this striking symptom of disintegration of a formula. It is exactly here that we find an accumulation of late phenomena: irresolvable *ἀγήρω*s, 151,²⁶⁾ irresolvable *Λητώ*, 159, *ὔμνον αἰείδουσιν*, 161, *μιμεῖσθ'* ἴσασιν, 163, *αὐτὸς ἔκαστος*, 163, *οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρησεν αἰοδιή*, 164, *ὑποκρίνασθ'* ἀμφ' ἡμέων (?) (*-θαί ἀφ' ἡμέων?*), 117²⁷⁾. In the personal part of the hymn the poet is seen to compose much more freely than in the story.

NON-HOMERIC ARCHAISMS

It remains for us to see whether the Delian hymn shows traces of old formulae which are wanting in Homer. It has two certain archaisms and one possible. The latter is *φοίνικι* in 117 *ἀμφὶ δὲ φοίνικι βάλε πήχεε*. This might be taken as an old form of the dative,^{27a)} comparable with *δίφιλος* and *χρυσείῳ δέπαι* (*γ* 41, cf. *Ω* 285) in Homer.²⁸⁾ On the other hand the line could be a modification of *ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πήχεε*, *ρ* 38, *ω* 347, or a similar expression.²⁹⁾

The two certain archaisms are *εὔβων*, 54, and *κατέβρω*s, 127. The line *οὐδ' εὔβων σέ γ' ἔσσεσθαι οἶομαι οὗτ' εὔμηλον* can hardly be traditional in its present form.³⁰⁾ It seems impossible to decide whether it has preserved more than a single isolated archaism. The same is true of 127 *κατέβρω*s *ἄμβροτον εἶδα*. The odds are against this expression being, in its existing form, an archaic formula because, generally speaking, the truly ancient formulae of this type had the third person of the verb,³¹⁾ which would result in hiatus. Is it, then, a conflation of something like **κατέβρω καρπὸν ἀρούρης* and *ἄμβροτον εἶδα* which, though it is wanting in Homer as well, has no late characteristics? All such considerations are to remain purely speculative.

In addition to these cases the Delian hymn has two phrases a modernised counterpart of which is found in Homer. One is *πάντες ἀφ' ἐδράων*, 4, cf. *αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἐδρέων*, *ν* 56, cf. *αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἐδρης*, *T* 77. The other is 123 *οὐδ' ἄρ' Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα θήσατο μήτηρ*, cf. Hes. *E.* 771 (!) *τῇ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα γείνατο Λητώ*, cf. Zumbach, *o.c.* 66. The *Iliad* has *Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσάορον*, *δς μιν ἀνώγει*, *E* 509, and *Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορον*, *δς σε πάρος περ*, *O* 256, cf. *Dem.* 4, *Ap.* 395 (*-ος?*). In these cases the modifications (by declension and juxtaposition) are Homer's.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the foregoing discussions are not impressive. They can be summarised as follows: 1) Nothing much is to be learned for our purpose from isolated formations such as *φραδοσύνη*, 99, *ζηλοσύνη*, 100, etc.³²⁾ 2) They are moreover counterbalanced by *εὖβων* 54, *κατέβρω*, 127, and perhaps by *φοίνικι*, 117 (?). However, being isolated forms, the latter provide little evidence to the contrary. It is far from certain that these phenomena have been preserved in formulaic combinations. 3) There are no cases of modification sufficiently outstanding and numerous to justify the conclusion that the type of diction of 1 – c. 138 is post-Homeric. The most significant indication might be found in *θυμὸν ἔπειθεν*, 113, and *ὥς εἰπὼν ἐβίβασκεν*, 133, as compared with the customary treatment of such types by Homer, and with similar cases found in *Aphr.* and *Dem.* But *Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα*, 123, provides some evidence to the contrary.

The final part of the poem, however, is a different thing altogether (\pm 140–181). It looks as if the poet, though handling the diction in a more or less ‘Homeric’ way in the story, kept much less to – indeed was unable to manage – the traditional combinations, when he had to describe the contemporary gatherings at Delos.

NOTES

¹⁾ On all this see W.O.C. Windisch, *De Hymnis Homericis Maioribus*, 5–8. Cf. 30 *δῆμος Ἀθηναίων* \sim *ἄχρον Ἀθηναίων*, γ 278, against older *ἐς γονόν Ἀθηναίων* *ἱεράων*, λ 323, cf. *Mod.* 36. It may be interesting to notice the modification of this formula first attested in ps. Hes. (*P.I.F.A.O.* 322, 17 = fr. 43a, 67 Merkelbach–West, cf. P. Oxy XXVIII (1962) 2495, 11) *ἱερέων ποτὶ γονόν Ἀθηναίων*, but perhaps of a much older date, cf. *φερεσσακίας Καδμείους*, (**φερε-τ-Φακίης*), ps. Hes. *Sc.* 13.

²⁾ Windisch, *ibid.*

³⁾ If the suspicion voiced by O. Regenbogen, *Gedanken zum Homerischen Apollo-Hymnus*, *Eranos* LIV (1956), 49–56 = *Kl. Schr.*, 29 ff. (“dass schliesslich das Ganze unter Zusätzen eine Art von Überarbeitung erfuhr, die es vielleicht geraten sein lässt, von einem Rhapsoden-Exemplar zu reden”) should be right, all the efforts that will be made in this inquiry will of course prove futile. To me, however, the linguistic indications adduced by Regenbogen are not cogent and mere compositional analysis can hardly obtain reliable results in this field.

^{3a)} In thesis *A* 9, *Λητοῦς καὶ*.

⁴⁾ *Mod.* 132 f.

⁵⁾ On the question of conjugation involving neglect of digamma see *Mod.* 49 ff. As regards the phenomenon in the epithets of the gods, the matter has a different aspect, which will be discussed below p. 31 ff.

⁶⁾ Preferred by Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, 443 n. 1. On *πρῶτον ἴδη*, 71, see below.

^{6a)} *μεγάλιοι Κρόνοιο* edd., *μεγάλον* (and *Κόιοιο*) Barnes.

⁷⁾ According to Humbert's *sigla*. The fact that the only papyrus-source of the *Hymns* (apart from the Orphic quotations *BKT* V, 1), the little scrap containing part of *Dem.* 402–407 (*POxy* XXIII, 2379), differs from *M* in four readings (among them *τ[ι]νι σ' ἐξαπάτησε*, (Ruhnken) instead of *τίν' ἐξαπάτησε*) suffices to warn us against jumping to conclusions in the matter we are concerned with in this inquiry.

⁸⁾ On the neglect of digamma in *οἰκία θέσθαι* see above, p. 21 f.

⁹⁾ *vū, vī', vīē.*

¹⁰⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* 228, cf. Zumbach, *o.c.* 55.

¹¹⁾ Kaibel according to Wilamowitz, *o.c.* 446 n. 2. The emendation would 'restore' the digamma at the same time.

^{11a)} *Mod.* 60. In these cases emendation is unnecessary.

^{11b)} On the other hand, the phrases *πᾶσαι σκοπαι* and *πρώονες ἄκροι*, as Mr. J. B. Hainsworth reminds me, are found juxtaposed in Homer (Θ 553 = Π 299) and in all probability they are prototypes of *Ap.* 22. Hence the neglect of the digamma in *τοι ἄδον*, though not post-Homeric in itself, is probably related to the modification of the formula *πᾶσαι σκοπαι καὶ πρώονες ἄκροι*.

¹²⁾ *Mod.* 71–75.

¹³⁾ *Ibid.* 78 ff.

¹⁴⁾ *Ibid.* 80, see below p. 42.

¹⁵⁾ *Ibid.* 83.

¹⁶⁾ E.g. *ἔλλαβε γυῖα* (3 ×), *ἔλλαβε θυμόν* (2 ×), cf. also *ἐλλάβετ' αὐτῆς*, ε 325, and *Mod.* 96 n. 4.

¹⁷⁾ *Mod.* 83 f., cf. *ἔλλαχεν ὤς*, *Dem.* 86. Just as *ἤρπαξεν*, 3, *ἤκουσεν*, 23, *ἄϊεν*, 25, *ἤθελεν*, 45, 193, *ἔτρεφεν*, 235, *ἔντυεν*, 376, *χώρησεν*, 430, *μέλλεν*, 454, it is found in enjambement, cf. *Mod.* 85 ff., 101 ff., 131 f., 146 n. 1.

¹⁸⁾ *Mod.* 79 (*μέμνηλεν, δίδαξεν, ἀτίταλλεν*).

¹⁹⁾ Cf. e.g. *περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἔθηκε* (4 ×), *ἐνὶ γούνεσσιν ἔθηκε, ἐν χερσὶν ἔθηκε, κύδος ἔθηκε*. I do not count, either in Homer or in the *Hymns*, those cases where an iota precedes the -ν, because originally, at all events, the hiatus was probably bridged by a glide, *Mod.* 72. Nor, of course, at the end of the line.

²⁰⁾ *Mod.* 58, etc.

²¹⁾ *Mod.* 79 f.

²²⁾ Above, p. 14.

²³⁾ Though I refrain from discussing the peculiarities of the *Hymn to Hermes*, its treatment of *ἀντεβόλησε* (not in *Ap. Aphr. Dem.*) seems to be a case in point. It is used twice, once at the end of the line (143) and once in the form *ἀντεβόλησεν* (*ἐπ' αὐλείῃσι θύρῃσι*) before the trochaic caesura, 26. In Homer it occurs 4 times at the end of the line (N 210, etc.), once before *θεὰ γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη* (η 19) and once in the form *ἀντεβόλησεν: ἡὲ σοὶ ἀντεβόλησεν ὀρωμένῳ κατὰ δῶμα, χ* 360. The difference of these proportions does not seem due to chance. The forms of *ἀντιβολέω* occur 25 times in Homer. In 9 of these cases they could not be used before the trochaic caesura (*ἀντιβολήσαις δ* 547, etc.). Apart from η 19 and χ 360 they are always used at the verse-end. Moreover, they have formulaic inflection-forms: *ἀντιάσειε, ἀντιάσαντα, ἀντιάσαντι*, etc., and these too are found at the verse-end. Although Homer had ν-movable at his disposal, he generally stuck to the old types, but the more the development progressed, it seems, the more poets were inclined to shift the 3. p. sing. of past tenses.

²⁴⁾ *Mod.* 72.

²⁵⁾ More details in *Mod.* 91 with note 2.

²⁶⁾ And possibly *σὺν σφοῖσιν τεκέεσσι*, 148 (Thuc.).

²⁷⁾ See edd.

^{27a)} -ī having replaced older -ei.

²⁸⁾ See now P. Wathélet, *Mycénien et Grec d'Homère*, I, *Le Datif en -i*, AC XXXI (1962), 5–14.

²⁹⁾ Cf. *πυρὶ ἐνὶ πολλῶν*, *Dem.* 248 (< ἐν πυρὶ πολλῶν), below, p. 51, *Παρθενίῳ φρέατι*, *Dem.* 99, below, p. 55 with note.

³⁰⁾ On *εὔβων* see Zumbach, *o.c.* 18.

³¹⁾ *Mod.* 50 ff.

³²⁾ Above, p. 12.

THE PYTHIAN HYMN

A. Inflection

Of the strange duals found in 456, 487, and 501¹⁾ only *κάθετον*, *λύσαντε* (487) (and possibly *ἱκησθον* (501)) come within the category of inflected prototypes. Since, however, the underlying cause of all these phenomena is the same—inflection being merely its outward appearance—they will be discussed together.

Whether the dual was still part of living speech or not in East Ionic at the time when the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were created, it is certain that their poet(s) used it spontaneously himself (themselves) and did not merely adopt it as an element of older formulae.²⁾ These new employments were certainly not always correct, but in this respect there seems to be a perceptible difference between nominal and verbal forms. With nominal forms, though there are a few superficial adaptations of formulaic remnants³⁾ and some signs that to the poet of the *Iliad* the dual had lost its original meaning,⁴⁾ we find no cases of striking misuse, misunderstanding or morphological confusion, not even in the famous passage of the Embassy.⁵⁾ In his use of verbal forms, however, the poet shows himself less sure. Alongside archaic elements such as *βάτην*, *έικτην*, etc., we find the well-known cases of *-τον* in the imperfects *διώκετον*, *K* 364, *έτεύχετον*, *N* 346, *λαφύσσετον*, *Σ* 583 (3rd pers.). These occur before the bucolic, diaeresis, in a position, that is, in which the singers had learned of old to put most verbal forms.⁶⁾ At a time when in spoken East Ionic the difference between the old dual-endings *-τον* and *-την* had become blurred, the poet of the *Iliad*, still clinging to the general patterns of oral verse-making introduced *έτεύχετον*, etc., in a position in which originally it had been customary to put forms such as *έπλετο*, *έκέκλετο*, *ώρορε*, *ήλυθε*, *έκλυε*, *έπέσσυτο*, *άπημβροτε*, etc., etc.⁷⁾

The examples found in the Pythian hymn, however, show a treatment which goes much further. To this poet *κάθετον* was obviously 'epic' for *κάθετε* (imperative), *ήσθον* for *ήσθε* (ind.) and *ἱκησθον* for *ἱκησθε* (coni.). In contrast to *διωκέτην*, *έτευχέτην*, *λαφυσσέτην* none of the forms *κάθετε*, *ήσθε*, *ἱκησθε* were impossible in hexameter poetry. Debrunner rightly regards *κάθετον*, *ήσθον*, *ἱκησθον* as due to "die metrische Bequemlichkeit und sprachliche Unkenntnis des Verfassers". He also signalises the prototypes of two of the expressions of *Ap.*:

τίφθ' οὕτως ήσθον τετιηότεις< 456
 „ „ *έστητε τεθηπότες* Δ 243

To Δ 243 we might add:

τίφθ' οὕτω τετίησθον, Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη; Θ 447

ἰστία μὲν πρῶτον κάθετον, λύσαντε βοειάς < 487
 „ „ „ *κάθεσαν, λῶσαν δὲ* „ *Ap. 503*

It is characteristic that the modification was used *before* its prototype. 503 need not be post-Homeric, but its modification (487) certainly is.

Of 501

εἰς ὃ κε χῶρον ἱκησθον, ἵν' ἔξετε πῖονα νηόν

Debrunner gives no parallel. One might refer to:

οἱ δ' ὅτε χῶρον ἱκανον, ὅθι σφίσι πέφραδ' Ἀχιλλεύς	Ψ 138
αἶ ,, ,, νηόν ,, Ἀθήνης ἐν πόλει ἄκρη, etc., cf. <i>K</i> 526,	Z 297
	Σ 520, ρ 28
ἀλλ' ,, δὴ ῥ' ,, ὅθι ξανθὸς Μενέλαος, etc., cf. <i>E</i> 780, ο 101	A 210
εἰς ὃ κε τοὺς ἀφίκηται, οἱ οὐκ ἴσασι θάλασσαν ∞ ψ 269	λ 122
νηα δ' ἔπειτα θοήν ἐπὶ ἡπείρου ἐρύσασθε	488

Instead of ἐπὶ (involving hiatus) *M* and *T* have non-metrical ἐπ'. Agar proposed ἀν' ἐπ' (in view of 506), whereas Matthiae would read μέλαιναν ἐπ', cf. Hom. *A* 485.⁸) So much is clear, at any rate, that the second hemistich is a modification of the old prototype ἐπ' ἡπείρουιο ἔρυσσαν (*A* 485, etc., 3 ×) based upon both -οιο and original digamma.⁹) In *Ap.* 488 these are mutually exclusive ¹⁰).

νηόν δὲ προφύλαχθε, δέδεχθε δὲ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων 538

Unlike the cases discussed so far, προφύλαχθε cannot be shown to be due to modification of a prototype, nor is it likely that such a formulaic ancestor ever existed. It is a free and rather wild innovation, modelled upon δέδεχθε, cf. Zumbach 29. It shows just like ἐκγεγόνται, *Aphr.* 137, and other cases¹¹) how much was allowed to be 'epic' by the poets of these hymns.^{11a})

B. Substitution

Perhaps ἐξαπάφησε, 376 (above, p. 14).

No cogent evidence.

C. Separation

Apart from 361–62 (below, p. 30) I do not find a single case which might be typical of a post-Homeric development.

D. Juxtaposition

ὅπως μνωόμενος ἔκιες Ἀζαντίδα κούρην ¹²) 209

Parallels:

ἔκιες, ἐκατηβόλ' Ἀπολλων	229 239 277
ἔκιε ξανθὸς Μενέλαος	ο 147
κίε ,, ,,	P 113 = γ 168
κίε σθένει βλεμεαίωνων	Θ 337 = Υ 36

In Homer *ἔκλεις* is wanting, nor do we find *ἔκλειν* or *κίεν* with the final syllable in arsis. *Ap.* 209 may or may not be significant.

πεζός, δ' ὃ' ἵπποισιν; οὐ μὲν Τρῳόπος γ' ἐνέλειπεν 213

With *ἵπποισιν* we may compare

ἔξ τε πόλιν ἐρατὴν καὶ δώματα καλὰ ἑκαστος 477
and *Aphr.* 25 ἦ δὲ μάλ' οὐκ ἔθελεν ἀλλὰ στερεῶς ἀπέειπεν ¹³⁾

Both 213 and 477 are probably due to rather free innovation, the former perhaps after the pattern of Homeric *ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν*, *E* 219, etc., $8 \times$ ¹⁴⁾. With respect to *πόλιν ἐρατὴν* it deserves notice that *ἐρατός* is found only once in the whole of Homer (*I* 64, δῶρ' ἐρατά), but $3 \times$ in *Ap.* (380, 477, 515) and $5 \times$ in *Herm.* Similar proportions are found for *πολύηρατος*, below, p. 54. In view of such a case as *ἐλθῆσιν*, γ 422, the phenomenon found in 213 and 477 cannot be regarded as a symptom of post-Homeric innovation.¹⁵⁾

Permutation of P₂ and T₂ ¹⁶⁾

παῖσι θεμιστεύοιμι χρέων ἐνὶ πτόνι νηῶ 253 = 293

No prototype can be traced, but Homer still has *χρείων*, θ 79, and *χρησόμενος*, θ 81, cf. *χρείων*, *Ap.* 396, *χρησόμενοι*, *Ap.* 252 ~ 292. Was the second hemistich derived from a *P₂* formula **χρείων ἐνὶ πτόνι νηῶ*? Because of the scarcity of occurrences of the verb in Homer and the impossibility of proving their formulaic nature, 253 provides no proof of post-Homeric modification.

Conflation

The dragon is being killed by Apollo:

λείπε δὲ θυμὸν 361-62
φοινὸν ἀποπνείουσ'

In the preceding part of the inquiry we had to do with changes in matters of technique which in various degrees were brought about by the influence of the spoken dialect. In 361-62, however, we come across a different phenomenon. Here it is primarily a change of outlook, which is reflected by technical alteration.

The expression *λείπειν βίον*, common in classical poetry and prose (cf. e.g. *Soph. El.* 1414, *Eur. Hec.* 1034, *Heracl.* 450, 534, etc., *Pl. Leg.* 827 E) is not used by Homer.¹⁶⁾ Instead he has *λείπειν* (*λιπών*) *φάος ἡελίοιο*, Σ 11, λ 93, which is complementary to *ζώειν* (-ει) καὶ *ὄρᾱν* (-ᾱ) *φάος ἡελίοιο*, Σ 61, etc., $8 \times$ ¹⁸⁾ His use of *θυμός*, further, ranges from its original meaning (*θυμὸν αἰσθων* (-θε), *Π* 468, *Υ* 403, *θυμὸν ἀποπνείων*, Δ 524, *N* 654) to *ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον*, *I* 343, *ἐκ θυμοῦ πεσέειν*, Ψ 595, *ἀπὸ θυμοῦ* / *μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ ἔσσει*, *A* 562-3, on the one hand and to *θυμός ἐνὶ στήθεσσι πάτασσε*, *H* 216,¹⁹⁾ *πάτασσε δὲ θυμός ἐκάστον*, Ψ 370, on the other.

In what way exactly the evolution proceeded we do not know,²¹⁾ but we have to note the fact that in Homeric diction the word never attained (bypassed ?) a sense so abstract and detached from the subject that the poet could have said *λίπε θυμόν* or *θυμόν ἔλειπε*.²⁰⁾ The poet of the Pythian hymn, however, went much further. On the one hand he took *θυμός* in an 'abstract' sense (having about the same meaning as *βίος*), on the other he added the adjective *φονίος* and, at the same time, he made it depend on *ἀποπνέουσα*²²⁾ in the Homeric manner.²³⁾ In Homer we find conflation of formulaic remnants resulting in figurative use,²⁴⁾ but not the extent of contamination found here.

It deserves notice that at a much later time Aeschylus, who could give his imagination free play—and who was a much greater poet of course—did much better when writing (*Ag.* 1387–89)

*οὕτω τὸν αὐτοῦ θυμόν ὀρυγάνει πεσὼν
κᾶκφρυσίων ὀξεῖαν αἵματος ῥαγὴν
βάλλει μ' ἐρεμνῇ ψακάδι φονίας δρόσον*²⁵⁾

than the man who, still clinging to the old repertory, said *λείπε δὲ θυμόν φονιὸν ἀποπνέουσ'*.

ἐκ δ' ἄλως ἡπειρόνδε θοήν ἀνὰ νῆϊ ἐρύσαντο 506

This line is given by a papyrus²⁶⁾ instead of our *A* 485 *νῆα μὲν οἷ γε μέλαιναν ἐπ' ἡπείροιο ἔρυσσαν* but it does not belong there (it is preceded by *ἐκ δὲ κ]αἰ α[ὖ]τοὶ βάντε[ς ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης*, which does not suit the context of the passage). The relation between the pap., *Ap.* 503 ff. and *A* 484 ff. has been clarified by Cauer.²⁷⁾

About the structure of *Ap.* 506 little need be said. It is a queer conflation of old prototypes: **Φερυσσέμεν ἡπειρόνδε*, **ἐπ' ἡπείροιο Φέρυσσαν* and *νῆα θοήν*. Nothing of the kind is found in Homer.²⁸⁾

Non-Homeric archaisms

It remains to look for archaisms which have not been preserved by Homer. I can find no more than a single case of this kind in the Pythian Hymn. It is *τό σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγμεν*, 528. The expression can be paralleled with *τὰ δέ σε (σὲ δὲ) φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα*, *π* 312, etc., 4 ×. Since Homer does not use **ἄνώγαμεν* or **ἄνώγομεν*, the athematic conjugation of the formula does not clash with the view that the Pythian hymn shows a post-Homeric stage of development.

About the possible date of the formula *Πελοπόννησον πείραν* (250 = 290, 419, 432) we are completely in the dark. The proper name is alluded to in the *Cypria* 6, 3 *K* (schol. Pind. *N.* X 114, Allen fr. XI), *νῆσον ἅπασαν / Τανταλίδου Πέλοπος*, cf. also Tyrt. 2, 4 *D.*, *εὐρεῖαν Πέλοπος νῆσον*.

The treatment of Apollo's name and epithets

In the past much has been made of the statistical digamma-criterion in order to establish chronological relations. A.H.S., though, are sceptical

about its value ²⁹⁾ and I think they are right. For our purpose — which is not to fix the relative age of the *Hymns* and the Homeric poems but to inquire into their diction and to get some idea of its stage of development as compared with that of the epics — the indiscriminate application of the criterion is fraught with the same difficulties. These, moreover, are much aggravated by what we have learned about the nature of the formulaic diction since the publication of the second edition of the commentary (1936). Apart from the fact that, as regards the *Hymns*, the value of statistics is severely limited by the shortness of these poems, the essential deficiency of the method is that for Homer no adequate data are available for comparison. Already in 1909 Hartel's figures ³⁰⁾ were contested by Meillet.³¹⁾ Nowadays, for both linguistic ³²⁾ and what may be called 'stylistic' ³³⁾ reasons, their value appears to be still further reduced. Chantraine, probably because he realised the debatable nature of the evidence in question, confined himself to giving round numbers ³⁴⁾ without making it clear exactly what cases should be regarded as instances of neglect or observance.³⁵⁾ Thus, by whatever standards we draw up the totals for the *Hymns*, we have no corresponding Homeric figures available for comparison. There is still another point to be considered. The ratios for each poem are primarily a reflection of the extent to which its poet reproduces or modifies formulae created when the digamma was still a living sound and of the degree to which he does or does not combine these formulae in the traditional way. Yet the stage of development of the diction is equally expressed by the proportional occurrence of such late phenomena as metathesis, contraction and introduction of *ν*-movable in certain conditions, modernising substitution, etc.³⁶⁾ In *Aphr.* for instance, the rate of neglect may be somewhat lower than in the epics,³⁷⁾ which is only natural because it has a smoother style and since the narrative element is predominant. This same poem, however, has many symptoms which point in the opposite direction.³⁸⁾ So even if every one of the three *Hymns* could be exactly compared with the epics as regards digamma-figures, the proportions could hardly be regarded as conclusive criteria.³⁹⁾

This is not to say that they are completely useless. If the material available is not too scanty and if it is examined according to the same rules, something may be gleaned from it which, with due caution, could be considered a significant indication. It seems that the name of the god and his epithets, as used in the epics and in the hymn, would meet these conditions. (For statistical reasons *Ap.* has now to be taken as a whole since the limited extent of the Delian hymn does not warrant conclusions).

Homer mentions the god c. 208 times.⁴⁰⁾ In 67 of these cases he gives his name without adding an epithet. In the remaining 141 cases he denotes Apollo either by name + epithet (e.g. *Φοῖβος Απόλλων*, (*ἄναξ*) *Διὸς νιός* 'Απόλλων, *ἐκηβόλον* 'Απόλλωνα, etc., etc.) or by one or more epithets without name (e.g. *Φοῖβος*, (*ἄναξ*) *Διὸς νιός*, *ἐκηβόλον*, *ἐκατηβόλον*, *ἐκάτοιο ἀνακτος*, etc.). Since it is debatable whether in cases such as *φίλε Φοῖβε*,

O 221, there is from our point of view an appreciable difference between *Φοῖβος* and *Ἀπόλλων*, the 5 cases of single *Φοῖβος* had better be left out of account.⁴¹⁾ Among the remaining titles (136 occurrences) those containing *ἄναξ Διὸς υἱός, ἐκάεργος, ἐκηβόλος, ἐκατηβόλος, ἐκατηβελέτας, Ἀπόλλωνα ἄνακτα, ἐκάτοιο*, and their combinations had certainly become archaisms at the time when the epics were created. In Homer they occur 44 times. If we draw up the corresponding figures for the hymn using the same criteria we get the tabulation:⁴²⁾

	A Epithet with or without name	B Name only	C <i>ἄναξ Διὸς υἱός, ἐκάεργος, etc.</i>
Hom.	c. 136	67	44
<i>Ap.</i>	40	4	27

The proportions of A and B thus appearing for Homer and the hymn make the attitude and intention of the poets of *Ap.* abundantly clear. Theirs is a predilection for the hieratic and the archaic in the description of the god (4: 40 *versus* Homeric 67: 136).⁴³⁾ The same conception is probably reflected by their preference for the type of expressions of the C-group (27: 13 *versus* Homeric 44: c. 92). But now comes the surprising feature: among the 44 Homeric occurrences of the *ἐπικλήσεις* containing *ἄναξ, ἐκάεργος, ἐκηβόλος, ἐκατηβόλος, ἐκατηβελέτης, ἑκατος* and their *casus obliqui* we find 4 failures to observe digamma.⁴⁴⁾ This means that the modifications and the employments conforming to the original types are in a proportion of 1: 10.⁴⁵⁾ For *Ap.*, however, the corresponding figures are 5 and 22, *i.e.* 1: 4.4.⁴⁶⁾ The fact that in the hymn the modifications are more than twice as numerous as in the epics is the more significant because, as we have seen, the poets of *Ap.* were much more intent on conferring the archaic titles on the god than Homer was.⁴⁷⁾

CONCLUSIONS

A survey of the above analysis suggests the following conclusions:

1) As far as we are able to judge, no formulaic remnants which are wanting in Homer can be identified in the Pythian hymn. *Πελοπόννησον πύριον*, 250, etc. is a dubious case. Nor is there evidence of formulae in the hymn which appear in a modernised form in the epics; *τό σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγμεν*, 528, does not provide such evidence.

2) The hymn shows a number of modifications which either do not go beyond the Homeric stage (e.g. *τηλόθεν οὔσα*, 330, *ὀππότεν . . . ἔλθωσιν καμάτω ἀδηκότες*, 459–60⁴⁸⁾ or do so to an inconclusive degree (e.g. *ἔς τε πόλιν ἔρατην*, 477, *χρέων ἐνὶ πτόνι νηῶ*, 253 = 293). About the degree of probability presented by other cases there may be disagreement (e.g. *ἐξαπάφησε*, 376).⁴⁹⁾

3) The modifications which exceed anything done in this respect by Homer, are scarce but their nature definitely suggests sub-epic composition. They are found in the use of the duals in 456, 487, 501, in the strained expression *λείπε δὲ θυμὸν φοινὸν ἀποπνείουσ'* and in the turning of the old prototypes **ἐπ' ἡπείροιο Φέρυσσαν* and **Φερυσσέμεν (Φερύσσομεν) ἡπειρόνδε* into *ἐπ' ἡπείρου ἐρύσασθε*, 488, and *ἡπειρόνδε θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆ' ἐρύσαντο*, 506. Properly speaking, the case of *προφύλαχθε*, 538, does not come within the definition of modification, but it too points to a late stage of development.

4) The absence in 1–181 of any modifications which are as drastic as those listed under (3) may or may not be due to chance. It can hardly be adduced in support of the separatist view.⁵⁰⁾ The same applies to the treatment of the god's name and epithets.

5) This treatment, however, goes far to show that, taken as a whole, the *Hymn to Apollo* reveals an attitude on the part of its poets which is more archaistic than Homer's. This fact, in its turn, is largely due to difference of genre.

NOTES

1) Cf. A.H.S., *ad loc.*

2) *Mod.* 114 f.

3) E.g. P 387, Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 28, *Mod.* 92.

4) K. Meister, *o.c.* 35, A. Debrunner, *Zum erweiterten Gebrauch des Duals*, Glotta XV (1927), 14–25, Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 22–29.

5) Cf. Kühner–Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Satzlehre*, I, 72, Chantraine, *o.c.* II, 28, *contra* Debrunner, *o.c.* 17.

6) Many examples in Parry, *E.T.* 53 ff. On *διώκετον*, etc., cf. Chantraine, *o.c.* I 474, K. Meister, *o.c.* 35 f.

7) Cf. *ἀκούετο*, Δ 331, *διώκετο*, Φ 602, σ 8, etc., K. Meister, *o.c.* 19, *Mod.* 106. Because of Homeric *ἀπειλήτην*, *προσανδότην* Mr. C. J. Ruijgh thinks it more probable that at the time when the Aeolic tradition was taken over by Ionian singers, the dual-endings had already disappeared in East Ionic (in these athematic forms *-τᾶν* became *-την* on the analogy of *-μᾶν > -μην*). This would the more easily account for *ἐτεύχετον*, etc.

8) See below, p. 31.

9) *Mod.* 60.

10) Though the rite alluded to in 235 *εἰ δέ κεν ἄρματ' ἀγῆσιν* (*ἄγῃσιν* codd., *ἀγῆσιν* Cobet) is likely to have been performed with one chariot only (see L. Deubner, *Der homerische Apolllohymnus*, Sb. Pr. Ak. W. 1938, 31 f.), the plural *ἄρματ'(α)* is necessary because of *τὰ* in 236. We cannot exclude the possibility, however remote, that *ἄρμα ἀγῆσι* is the corresponding prototype, but in view of Homeric *ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων* (<*ἄρμα ἀνακτος*?), II 371, 507, the expression cannot be considered a symptom of post-Homeric development. The same applies to 330 *τηλόθεν οὔσα*. Here *οὔσα* certainly results from conjugation and substitution: *τηλόθεν ἐσσί*, ζ 312, *τηλόθεν ἐστί*, η 194, *τηλόθ'(ι) ἐόντα* (*-τι*, *-τας*), Θ 285, etc., 5 ×. Homer too, however, has *όντες* (τ 230), *όντας* (η 94), *ούσης* (τ 489), *ῆσι*, *ῶσι* (Chantraine, *o.c.* 286 f.).

In order to err on the safe side I shall also pass over 236 *ἵππους μὲν κομέουσι*, *τὰ δὲ κλίναντες ἐῶσιν*. Alongside *ἐάας*, *ἐάα*, *εἰῶμεν* (<*ἐάωμεν*), etc., we find at least four irresolvable forms in Homer: *μνηστῆρας ἐῶμι*, π 85, *ἦ ἔτ' ἐῶ*, υ 12, *ἀλλ' ἐῶμέν μιν*, K 344, and the notorious *τρεῖν μ' οὐκ ἔῃ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη*, E 256 (Cases such as B 236 *τόνδε δ' ἐῶμεν* and κ 536 *μηδὲ εἶαν* are likely to be superficial modifications—if not modernisms

introduced by rhapsodes or copyists—of τὸν δ' εἰώμεν and μηδ' εἰάν; εἶα (imperf. and imperative) may represent old athematic forms). Though the 3rd. pers. plural, occurring as εἰώσι (εἰῶσ', B 132) or as εἰῶσι, is always reducible in Homer, the contractions shown by εἴῳ, etc., make it somewhat risky to regard τὰ δὲ κλίναντες εἰῶσι as a trace of post-Homeric evolution.

¹¹⁾ Above p. 15.

^{11a)} Mr. C. J. Ruijgh draws my attention to ἄνωχθε. This Homeric imperative, when re-interpreted as a present tense (ἀνώγω), may have suggested προφύλαχθε to the poet of *Dem.*

¹²⁾ The emendations δππως μνωόμενος and Ἀζαντίδα are Martin's. On the mss. readings see the edd.

¹³⁾ *Mod.* 79.

¹⁴⁾ From *ἱπποῖν καὶ ὄχεσφι*? *Mod.* 92 ff.

¹⁵⁾ Anyhow, 459–60

δππόταν ἐκ πόντοιο ποτὶ χθονὶ νηὶ μελαίνῃ
ἔλθωσιν καμάτῳ ἀδηκότες

is to be left out of account, because in Homer we find a much more striking case (γ 421–22): ὄφρα τάχιστα / ἔλθῃσιν, ἐλάσῃ δέ, cf. *Mod.* 104, and on the whole subject of *v*-movable making position in enjambement 85 ff., 101 ff., 121 ff., 131 ff. Yet, in order to show how such forms came to be used at a comparatively late stage and served to loosen the structure of the traditional diction, I refer to

K 49 μὴ τοὶ μὲν καμάτῳ ἀδηκότες ἦδε καὶ ἔπνῳ

and especially to

K 471 οἱ δ' εὔδον „ „ , ἔντεα δέ σφι.

A further illustration of the connection between *v*-movable making position and enjambement is, in our poem, provided by

252 ∼ 292 *χρησόμενοι, τοῖσιν δ'*, by 190 *ὕμνευσίν ῥα* (with *v*-movable and contraction), and in the Delian Hymn by

12 *ἔνθα καθίζουσιν*

161 *ἕμνον αἰείδουσιν*

163 *μμεῖσθ' ἴσασιν,*

above, p. 24 f.

¹⁶⁾ *Mod.* 61–68, 93, 112, 116–119, 126 ff., 145.

¹⁷⁾ Nor does he use *λείπειν ψυχὴν*. A.H.S. refer to Pindar, *P.* III, 180, *ἀπὸ ψυχὰν λιπών*, cf. fr. 236 (schol. κ 240, see Snell) *φιλόνορα δ' οὐκ ἔλιπον βιοτάν*. The compound *λιποψυγέω* is found in Sophocles and afterwards (observation made by Professor J. C. Kamerbeek).

¹⁸⁾ On complementary formulae (e.g. *μνήσαντο δὲ χάρις* ∼ *λήθοντο δὲ χάρις*) see *Mod.* 56.

¹⁹⁾ “Audacter nunc pro κῆρ vel κραδίη, ut dicitur *N* 282”, v. Leeuwen *ad loc.* (ἐν δὲ τέ οἱ κραδίη μεγάλα στέγνοισι πατάσσει).

²⁰⁾ The relevant cases have been listed by J. Böhme, *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos*, Leipzig 1929, 100 ff. Böhme has several good remarks on this much discussed subject, but misses the point when stating that “die in homerischer Zeit herrschende *θυμός*-Vorstellung” had lost the aspect of breath and took *θυμός* as a “Träger des Innenlebens” (my italics: where? with whom?). Generalisations of this sort are of course inept. The only thing we know for certain is that *Homer* uses the word in widely divergent meanings and that his treatment of gods and of Mycenaean weapons and customs has similar aspects. Probably, therefore, the

different meanings of *θυμός* correspond to different periods of formula-making. Though the concept of "der homerische Mensch" may to some extent contribute to a better understanding of Homer, it should not take precedence over what is learned from the most elementary facts of his poetry (as it does also in H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, 110 f.; more convincing is Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*³ 27 ff.).

²¹⁾ The explanation might be that expressions such as *λίπε δ' ὅστέα θυμός* (*ἀγῆνωρ*), *M* 386, etc., *ὥς τὸν μὲν λίπε θυμός*, *Δ* 470, *μιν λίπε θυμός*, *Π* 410, just like formulae describing family-history, belonged to a comparatively protected area of epic diction, cf. *Mod.* 51 ff., 140.

²²⁾ I take *φωιδόν* predicatively: *θυμόν ἔλειπε*, *φωιδόν (μιν) ἀποπνείουσα*.

²³⁾ *Δ* 524, *N* 654.

²⁴⁾ *Mod.* 116 with note.

²⁵⁾ *σφαγήν F*, *Tr.*, *δαγήν E*. Fränkel (who, however, did not put it in the text), *σφαγήν Wil.*

²⁶⁾ *P* 53 Allen (containing 484-494).

²⁷⁾ *Grundfragen*, 44 ff., where further information about the papyrus is to be found (with literature); see now Mrs S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of the Iliad*, 33-35 ("—the additional lines found in the papyrus are a superficial excrescence, remarkable only for their source").

²⁸⁾ *Mod.* 60 f.

²⁹⁾ CII-CVII.

³⁰⁾ *Homerische Studien* (Sitzungsber. der Philosoph.-Histor. Classe der kais. Ak. der Wissensch., Wien, 1874), III, 7-74.

³¹⁾ *Sur la valeur du F chez Homère*, Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris XVI (1909), 32 ff.

³²⁾ *Ἑλένη* is supposed to have had a digamma (p. 72) but *ἔθνος*, *ῆθος*, *ῆδύς* do not figure in the list of once digammated words; *εἰοικα*, *ἑίσκω*, *εἰκελος*, *ἔκελος* have been listed separately but have not been counted (p. 74).

"Bei der Zählung der Positionsvernachlässigungen habe ich von dem *v* *ἐφ.* geglaubt absehen zu sollen", v. Hartel writes p. 61. This is obviously right, but the point is that cases such as *ἄτρυνεν ἀναξ* should, on the contrary, if our object is the study of the development of the diction and not Homer's practice, be included in the observances and from v. Hartel's statement we have to infer that he did not (This is confirmed by testing some of his figures. For *ἐκών*, *ἐκηλος*, *ἐκητι* in the fifth foot he counts 16 examples of observance and none of neglect. This can only mean that he excluded *ἐνὶ μεγάρουσιν ἐκηλος* (-ον), *π* 314, *E* 805 (moreover it appears that he failed to list *ἐπιβαῖεν ἐκηλοι*, *Θ* 512, and *εὐφραίνεσθαι ἐκηλοι*, *β* 311, as neglects). It is the same with *ἔτης*: unless *σοῖσιν ἔτησιν*, *Z* 262, and *πολλοῖσιν ἔτησιν*, *δ* 3, are excluded, his figure (4) does not tally.) Now Isler, *Quaestiones metricae*, 18 f., puts the total of these cases at 507, certainly not a negligible number. The difficulty thus arising is reflected in A.H.S. CIV f.

³³⁾ "Verse wie *Δ* 203 *ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα κτλ.* und *O* 48 *καί μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα* — — — sind nur einmal gezählt". Yet this method should either be applied to all repeated lines or to none of them. Still, if the second alternative is chosen, it may well be asked nowadays what essential difference there is between wholly and partly repeated lines and even between the latter and shorter formulae which always occur in the same form (e.g. *ποτὶ ἄστυ*, *ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἔκαστος*). We should distinguish between (1) formulae based on *F*; (2) modifications involving neglect of *F*; (3) formulae based on absence of *F*; (4) other cases ('free' innovations and dubious cases); in each instance the number of occurrences should be added. There is not much point in just counting cases of observance and neglect, but if we do, we should do it consistently and except no repetition whatever.

³⁴⁾ They have been partly adopted from Meillet, *Aperçu*³, 151 f.

³⁵⁾ From the lines quoted (p. 153) it appears that cases having *v*-movable before once digammated words as well as some restitutions have been counted as observances by Meillet.

³⁶⁾ Webster, *Notes on the Writing of Early Greek Poetry*, Glotta XXXVIII (1960), 252, gives the following totals for late phenomena (*v*-movable not included): *Il.* 11, *Od.* 13, *Aphr.* 16.4, *Ap.* 19.5, *Dem.* 21.8, *Aspis* 22, *Th.* 23, *Herm.* 24.5, *Erga* 40.4 per 100 lines.

³⁷⁾ According to A.H.S. the ratio of observances (cases of *v*-movable included) and non-observances is 58:12=4.83:1. For Homer the total of the (approximate!) figures given by Chantraine is c. 3310: c. 570=c. 5.8:1. Yet A.H.S. count *κέδν' εἰδυῖαν* (44) (< *κεδνὰ Φιδυῖαν*), *κέδν' εἰδυῖη* (134), *γὰρ ἔεστο* (86; cf. Chantraine *G.H.*, I, 297) as examples of neglect. The very fact that in this case the conclusion to be drawn from the comparison depends on such questionable items proves the criterion to be unsound.

³⁸⁾ Below, p. 39 ff. See also G. Freed and R. Bentman, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, *The Classical Journal* L (1954-55), 158.

³⁹⁾ Cf. also A.H.S. CVI, note: the presence or absence of the digamma "cannot be held as more than one factor in determining the date of a document". The same applies to our subject.

⁴⁰⁾ The total may be a little higher since a few isolated epithets (without the name added) may have escaped my attention. Yet this can hardly invalidate the ultimate conclusion (see below). Mere *ἄναξ* (e.g. *A* 390, *ἀγροῖα δὲ δῶρα ἄνακτι* has not been counted, *ἄναξ Διὸς νιός*, *E* 105, has.

⁴¹⁾ But *Φοῖβος ἀπερσεκόμης* (*Y* 39, *Ap.* 134), *ἦτε Φοῖβε* (*O* 365, *Y* 152, *Ap.* 120) have been included).

⁴²⁾ The figures for Homer have been drawn from the data provided by the indices of Prendergast and Dunbar, revised by Marzullo (Darmstadt 1962). Those for *Ap.* are based upon Dunbar-Marzullo and have been checked by the present writer.

⁴³⁾ This conclusion is carried too far. Mr. H. Bolkestein reminds me of the obvious fact—which I should have observed myself—that in this hymn to *Apollo* the frequency of the epithets is due to a considerable extent to the desire, on the part of the poet, to avoid repetition of the name of the god. In Homer the large number of the gods makes the situation quite different. The two factors determine the choice of the poets' phraseology. This argument tallies with the proportions found in *Hermes* (below, n. 47).

Since single *Φοῖβος* is relatively frequent in *Ap.*, we might prefer to err on the safe side by counting it as a 'name only'. The ratios then obtained are 72:136 and 10:40 for Homer and the hymn respectively. The difference still appears to be striking.

⁴⁴⁾ As it is impossible to have any certainty about the number of inconclusive cases (e.g. *A* 147 *ὄφρ' ἡμῖν Ἐκάεργον ἰλάσσαι* certainly is, *E* 439, *Ap.* 474 *προσέφη Ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων*, originally at any rate, is likely to have been an observance, *Mod.* 74 with note 4) all cases that cannot be shown to ignore digamma have been counted as observing it. In view of the fact that in *Apollo* we find *Ἐκάεργος(-ε)* no fewer than 5 times preceded by *ἄναξ* and of similar phenomena, this way of approach does not seem to be in favour of the argument.

⁴⁵⁾ The modifications are *A* 21, 438, *P* 333, *X* 15.

⁴⁶⁾ The modifications are 15, 177, 275, 276, 437. Above it has been pointed out that the *nature* of these modifications does not perceptibly differ from that of the Homeric ones. Here, however, we are concerned with their comparative frequency.

⁴⁷⁾ For the sake of comparison I add the corresponding figures concerning *Apollo* in the *Hymn to Hermes*:

A	B	C
20	6	18

Here the ratio of modifications (464, 500, 509, 522) and 'original' employments is $4:13 = 1:3.25$ (cf. *Ap.* 1:4.4, *Hom.* 1:10).

⁴⁸⁾ Of course modifications found in the same form in Homer and in the hymn (e.g. 447 $\xi\mu\beta\alpha\lambda'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omega$ *A* 12 ∞ *E* 152) have been ignored.

⁴⁹⁾ Above, p. 14.

⁵⁰⁾ Nor can the supposition that the slaying of the serpent (300–374) is a later addition be supported by similar argument.

III

APHRODITE

A. Inflection

1. Declension

ἵππους ἀρσίποδας, τοί τ' ἀθανάτους φορέουσι 211

In Homer we find the older form ἵπποι ἀρσίποδες, *I* 327, *Ψ* 475.¹⁾ The case, as far as one can judge with such phenomena (see note), seems significant.²⁾

2. Conjugation

τούς οἱ δῶρον ἔδωκεν ἔχειν, εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα 212

The *ν*-movable of εἶπεν never makes position in Homer. In 212 it may result from conjugation of εἶπω (-ης, -η) δὲ (τε) ἕκαστα, cf. *Mod.* 81. In itself the case may or may not be significant, but cf. *Mod. ibid.*

καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερές ἐκγεγόνται 197

According to the explanation advanced by Chantraine this form ³⁾ is a future and was created after the model of ἐλάω, καμοῦμαι, etc.⁴⁾ On this supposition it is a post-Homeric coinage.⁵⁾ On its meaning it is difficult to voice an opinion. It has generally been taken as a future ⁶⁾ or a future perfect,⁷⁾ but I think the poet of *Aphr.* may have intended it to be a so-called *praesens propheticum*.⁸⁾ If so, its formation is at least as artificial as it would be on Chantraine's hypothesis. This, however, is not prejudicial to the interpretation proposed, for in Homer we have at least one close parallel in ἐρχατόωντο, formed from ἐρχατο. ⁹⁾ Now in *Y* 307–8, lines appositely quoted by A.H.S., Homer makes Poseidon prophesy on the future of Aeneas and his offspring in the following terms:

νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει
καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται

Since, further, the poet of *Aphr.* must of necessity have been familiar with what is one of the elements most typical of epic technique, viz. the use of γεγάσι, ἐγγεγάσι, ἐκγεγαῶτι, ἐκγεγανῖα, etc., at the verse-end, and perhaps with such types as νῖός . . . (εὔχεται) ἐκγεγάμεν (*E* 247–48, or *Y* 208–09), it seems more than likely that 197 καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερές ἐκγεγόνται results from an 'epic' remodelling of *Y* 308 καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.

Scholars of former generations were prone to assume remodelling on the slightest occasion. Since Parry we are rightly sceptical about borrowings by one author from another, and in the preceding part of this inquiry I have consistently avoided putting things that way. Here, however, the

specific nature of the circumstances referred to make a common formulaic source most unlikely. Now if the argument outlined above is valid,¹⁰) the borrowing must have been done by the poet of *Aphr.* and this raises a still more awkward problem: what made this poet turn *καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοὶ κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται* into *καὶ παῖδες παίδεσσι διαμπερὲς ἐκγεγάνονται*?

I would suggest an answer to this problem, but I am well aware of its hypothetical nature. The editors both of Homer and of the *Hymn* unanimously refer to the statement by Strabo (who had his information from Demetrius of Scepsis)¹¹) that the descendants of Hector and Aeneas settled at Scepsis *καὶ δύο γένη ταῦτα βασιλεῦσαι πολὺν χρόνον ἐν τῇ Σκήφει λέγεται*.¹²) What is less often quoted is its sequel: *μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν μετέστησαν, εἴτα Μιλήσιοι συνεπολιτεύθησαν καὶ δημοκρατικῶς ὥκουν· οἱ δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους οὐδὲν ἦττον ἐκαλοῦντο βασιλεῖς, ἔχοντές τινας τιμάς*. Now the former part of this statement merely reflects the claims made by certain aristocratic families, which may have been as unfounded as those of the Julii. Yet it would not be a good method to question the information contained in the latter part, especially that referring to the situation which developed since the Milesian colonisation.¹³) It follows then that, *if* the poet purposely avoided adopting the Homeric version, his motive could be found in circumstances having changed after the *πολὺς χρόνος*. If the members of the families who claimed descent from Aeneas had, in the meantime, become oligarchs and, *a fortiori*, if they had been reduced to the status of mere honorary (presumably religious) functionaries, they could not be said to *ἀνάσσειν* any more, so the prophecy of the goddess as given by Homer would have proved false by the facts—and in a manner quite painful to the persons concerned.

Unfortunately this supposition, supposing it should be correct, does not enable us to date the hymn more accurately than has been done so far. The most we can say is that it does not contradict what seem to be the most reasonable assumptions as yet advanced, a dating, that is, somewhere near the middle or in the latter half of the seventh century.¹⁴) It is well known that the Milesians began to colonise at the Hellespont in the second quarter of that century and that in the time next ensuing their activities increased.

B. Substitution

ἐστᾶσ' ἡλίβατοι, τεμένη δέ ἐ κυκλήσκουσιν

267

This is said of the trees with which the lives of the nymphs are bound up. There is one parallel of *τεμένη* (or *τεμένεα*) in Homer: λ 185 *Τηλέμαχος τεμένη νέμεται καὶ δαΐτας εἶσας*. Yet *Aphr.* 267 goes beyond the Homeric case. First the word *τέμενος* is not used in the same sense as in Homer¹⁵) — where, according to the old meaning, the stress is never on the trees alone and the owner is always indicated¹⁶) — and the 'learned' addition put in the mouth of the goddess is typical of a later stage of development —

if not of a later poet! Secondly this later character is shown by ε used for a plural, an ungrammatical innovation brought about by the modification of the type $\cup\cup$ — $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \varepsilon\ \kappa\iota\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$, cf. $\delta\ 355\ \Phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \varepsilon\ \kappa\iota\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$.¹⁷⁾ The case is certainly significant.

σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ, ὄφρα <κε> ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ πάντα διέλθω 276

The expression ὄφρα ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ . . . διέλθω is awkward. The normal epic phrase—and the natural one—is ἐνὶ (ἐν) φρεσὶ θείῳ (θῆκε, θήσω), *Π* 83, *T* 121, *λ* 146, *ξ* 227, etc. The strained effect (see below and n. 20) in *Aphr.* 276 results from the fact that the poet, on the one hand, was composing to a traditional pattern (cf. e.g. ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῆσι μελόντων *Σ* 463, etc., $5 \times$)¹⁸⁾ and, on the other, introduced the new verb διέρχομαι which, after *Aphr.*, is used in this sense for the first time by Pindar, *Nem.* IV, 72.¹⁹⁾

Ἀγκίσσω δέ με φάσκε παρὰ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι 126-27
κουριδίην ἄλοχον

Here there is no trace of a post-Homeric idiom, but the expression παρὰ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι κουριδίην ἄλοχον is very queer.²⁰⁾ This is due to modification of παρὰ λεχέεσσι κλιθῆναι or something like it, $\alpha\ 366 = \sigma\ 213$. The form λέχεσιν is wanting in Homer (who always has λεχέεσσι, λέχεσσι) and the *v*-movable making position gives away the innovation. See *Mod.* 80.

ὥς δὲ ἴδεν δειρὴν τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' Ἀφροδίτης 181

Here again *v*-movable making position, a deviation from Homeric usage, cf. ὥς δὲ ἴδε(ν) νεῦρον *Δ* 151, *Mod.*, *ibid.*

C. Separation

πᾶσιν δ' ἔργα μέμηλεν ἐνστεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης 6

cf. Hom.: θαλάσσια ἔργα	{	μεμήλει	<i>B</i> 614
		μέμηλεν	<i>ε</i> 67
ἀήσυλα	„	„	<i>E</i> 876
πολεμήϊα	„	„	<i>μ</i> 116

οὐ γάρ οἱ εὔαδεν ἔργα πολυχρόσου Ἀφροδίτης 9

No exact formulaic parallel in Homer, only:

ἐπεὶ νύ τοι εὔαδεν οὕτως	<i>P</i> 647 \sim <i>Ξ</i> 340
ὥς γάρ „ „ εὔαδε θυμῷ	<i>π</i> 28.

πόρπας τε γναμπτάς θ' ἔλικας κάλυκας τε καὶ ὄρμους 163

No Homeric parallel at all; cf. *Aphr.* 87:

εἶχε δ' ἐπιγναμπτάς ἔλικας κάλυκας τε φαιινάς

These cases (6, 9, 163) are not different from similar phenomena in *Il.* and *Od.*, where neglect of digamma resulting from introduction of *δέ*, *γάρ*, *τε* is common.²¹⁾

147-148

ἀθανάτου δὲ ἔκητι διακτόρου ἐνθάδ' ἰκάνεις
'Ερμέω, ἐμὴ δ' ἄλοχος κεκλήσεται ἥματα πάντα

This is probably an extreme case of separation, the like of which, as far as I can see, is not found in Homer. The disintegration of **Ερμείαιο διακτόρο*' (via *Ερμείαιο ἔκητι διακτόρου*, ο 319 ?) goes hand in hand with the use of the metathesised genitive of *Ερμῆς* (or *Ερμῆς* (?), a contracted form itself) and of irresolvable *ἀθανάτου* (neither of them in Homer), *Mod.* 40.^{21a)}

D. Juxtaposition and Transposition

As far as I am aware, there is no unambiguous case of juxtaposition in *Aphr.*²²⁾ There are, however, a few complicated cases which may be discussed under this heading. They show a kind of handling we might call transposition.

54

δς τότε ἐν ἀκροπόλοις ὄρεσιν πολυπιδάκον Ἰδης

The form *ὄρεσιν* does not occur in Homer, cf. *λέχεσιν*, *Aphr.* 126. Like *λέχεσιν* it ends in *ν*-movable making position. The Homeric parallel is the undoubtedly older—and formulaic—expression ἐν (ἐπ') ἀκροπόλοισι(ν) ὄρεσσι,²³⁾ τ 205, *E* 523.²⁴⁾

Permutation of *P*₂ and *T*₂

29

τῇ δὲ πατὴρ Ζεὺς δῶκε καλὸν γέρας ἀντὶ γάμοιο

Some at least of the relevant parallels must be quoted. In Homer we have on the one hand:

σὸν δ' οὐ πώ τις ἔχει <u><i>P</i>καλὸν γέρας</u> , ἀλλὰ ἔκηλος	λ 184
δῶκε δὲ Τηλεμάχῳ <u><i>P</i>καλὸν δέπας</u> ἀμφικύπελλον	γ 63
Ἥρῃ δὲ χεῖρσιν <u><i>P</i>καλὸν δέπας</u> ἐν χειρὶ θῆκε	Ω 101
ἦε λοετροχόῳ <u><i>P</i>δῶν γέρας</u> ἦε τῷ ἄλλῳ	ν 297

and so on.

On the other hand we find:

ἦ ἔτι παρὰ κείνοισιν <u><i>T</i>ἐμὸν γέρας</u> , ἦε τις ἦδη	λ 175
αὐτὸς ἰὼν κλισίῃνδε <u><i>T</i>τὸ σὸν γέρας</u> , ὄφρ' εἴδῃς	Α 185
ἀλλ' ἔα, ὦς οἱ πρῶτα <u><i>T</i>δόσαν γέρας</u> νῆες Ἀχαιῶν	Α 276

and other combinations.²⁵⁾

Moreover we find:

αὐτὰρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δῶκε *T*διακτόρω Ἀργειφόντη *B* 103
 αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς δῶσι *T*παλίντιτα ἔργα γενέσθαι *a* 379 = *β* 144

and:

οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι *T*πατήρ Ζεὺς ἔσσετ' ἀρωγός *Δ* 235

and similar lines having πατήρ Ζεύς after the trochaic caesura.²⁶⁾

Just like the rest of *Aphr.*, 29 is wholly made up of elements which also occur in Homer: τῇ δέ, πατήρ Ζεύς, Ζεὺς δῶκε, καλὸν γέρας, γάμοιο. Of these the expressions πατήρ Ζεύς, Ζεὺς δῶκε and καλὸν γέρας are related in one way or another to the median caesuras in the epics and show a good many variations according to the *P* or *T* character of these caesuras: *T* πατήρ Ζεύς, Ζεὺς δῶκε (δῶσι) *T*, *P* δῶν γέρας, *T* δόσαν γέρας, *T* ἔχω (-ει, -εις, -ης) γέρας, ἔχει *P* καλὸν γέρας, δώσω *P* καλὸν θρόνον, *P* καλὸν γέρας (*P* καλὸν δέπας), *T* ἐμὸν γέρας, *T* τὸ σὸν γέρας.

The same relations between καλός / καλός and the *P*/*T* caesuras appear to exist in the description of the life of the nymphs in

καί τε μετ' ἀθανάτοισι *T* καλὸν χορὸν ἐρρώσαντο 261

In this line Trueber finds influence of *Ω* 616: νυμφάων αἶ τ' ἀμφ' Ἀχελώιον ἐρρώσαντο. This supposition is probable (below, p. 46), but from an evolutionary point of view another line is much more interesting. It is:

ἐνθα δ' ἔσαν νυμφέων *P* καλοὶ χοροὶ ἧδ' ἐθόκοι μ 318

The initial hemistich of this line certainly is a modification, but the original quantity of the *a* in καλός has been maintained (*P* caesura). One is tempted to suppose that both καλὸν χορὸν and νυμφέων καλοὶ χοροὶ go back to the prototype *νυμφάων *P* καλοὶ χοροὶ (καλός (-ν) χορός (-ν)). However this may be, the influence of the proximity of the *P* and *T* caesuras in 261 as well as in 29 is clear.

Homer has many modifications of ancient formulae which have resulted from this very propinquity (τε καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρῷ, *M* 162 *∞* *O* 397, etc., etc.).²⁷⁾ Yet in spite of these two facts, the original quantity of the *a* in καλός (which is due, of course, to compensatory lengthening) is nowhere changed in the epics, though in the lines quoted above—and in many more similar verses—the poet(s) of the *Il.* and *Od.* might easily have been induced to shorten the first syllable of the adjective.

The most obvious and simple explanation of this curious fact is to date the composition of *Aphr.* later than that of the *Il.* and the *Od.* and to accept the same view with regard to Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Erga*, cf.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε καλὸν κακὸν ἀντ' ἀγαθοῖο *Th.* 585
 and παρθενικῆς καλὸν εἶδος ἐπήρατον, αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνη *E.* 63,²⁸⁾

of which the latter shows a still more drastic innovation.²⁹⁾ Though for many other reasons I think it is correct, theoretically at least, this view

is not a cogent explanation of the difference between the Homeric treatment of original *καλφός* and its handling by the poet of *Aphr.* Yet so much is certain that, even if the word was pronounced *καῶλος* in Homer's vernacular,³⁰) this poet kept more closely, in this respect, to the traditional formulaic systems. It seems beyond doubt, therefore, that notwithstanding the 'Homeric' style, practised by the poet of the hymn, 29 reveals a later stage of development.

E. Related cases

There are four cases left, which have this in common that their linguistic peculiarities may be—and in one of them have to be—asccribed to the fact that a formula or a formulaic remnant was shifted from the end of the line into the initial hemistich. Their evidence is very weak, but they will be discussed because they lend some support to the opinion (already expressed and illustrated by K. Witte) that this kind of shifting is one of the causes of *-οιο* becoming *-ον*, and to my own way of thinking, put forward elsewhere, that it goes hand in hand with a growing incidence of *v*-movable as well, especially before the trochaic caesura.³¹) That, however, the transposition itself, though certainly Homeric and probably even pre-Homeric, is likely to have increased in accordance with the development and decomposition of the formulaic diction, is suggested by the following cases:

τὸν δὴ ἔπειτα γόασκε διαμπερὲς ἥματα πάντα 209
οὐκέτ' „ „ , γεγῆθαι δὲ φρένας ἔνδον 216

Homer has *γόασκε*, but only once: ἄν 'Οδυσσεὺς κατὰ κρᾶτα καλυψάμενος γόασκε, θ 92. The use of *κρᾶτα* as an acc. sing. certainly is a symptom of recent innovation. Though this does not mean that *καλυψάμενος γόασκε* is equally late, we cannot be sure that the expression was a formula. Hence the contraction in 209 and 216 does not provide reliable evidence for modification by shifting.

τόξον ἀπ' ἀργυρέου προῖη βέλεα στονόεντα 152

The form *ἀργυρέον* is not found in Homer, but *ἀργυρέοιο* is frequent, e.g. in (*ἀπ'*) *ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο* (!), *A* 49, *Ω* 605. In *Aphr.* 152, moreover, *-ον* is irresolvable; *τόξον* is used instead of the archaic *βιός*. The phrase is undoubtedly much more recent, but since Homer has *τόξον ἄπο κρατεροῦ Τρώων ὀλέκοντα φάλαγγας*, Θ 279, it provides no evidence for a later stage of development.

οἰωνούς τε διυπετέας καὶ θηρία πάντα 4

If the prototype was *διυπετέος ποταμοῖο* and if this meant "the river falling from Zeus" (which, I think, is more plausible than *διυπετής* = *διαυπετής*, *καταφερέης*)³²), the archaic formula was declined, shifted, broken up and perhaps re-interpreted (*διυπέτας*, cf. Hom. *αἰετὸς ὑμυπέτης*) by the poet of *Aphr.* We cannot be sure, however, that this poet had in mind the

Homeric noun-epithet expression. The prototype might have been *διυπετέες (διυπετέες ?) τ' οἶωνοί.

εἴπη μετὰ πᾶσι θεοῖσιν 48-49
ἡδὺν γελοῖσασα φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη

Homer has αἰοιδιάω, etc. The expression ἡδὺν γελοῖσασα may be a 'declension' of ἡδὺν γελώνοντες (σ 111) but could also go back to the formula ἡδὺν γέλασσαν (ἡδὺν γελάσσας), B 270, etc., 6×, which always occurs at the end of the line. It is impossible to make out whether we have to do with a case of shifting or with 'declension' involving $P_1 > T_1$.

F. Enjambement

Though the evidence of 152 and 209 ~ 216 is far from cogent when taken singly, the fact that it falls into line with the phenomena found in *Ap.* 113 (above, p. 23f.) and in *Dem.* 23 (below, p. 55) and 314 (below, p. 51) lends some support to the supposition that in the course of the evolution verse-end formulae were increasingly shifted (and broken up in the process) into the initial hemistich. It would seem that this way of handling the tradition, which is also practised by Homer, was used on a larger scale in the *Hymns*. It appears especially in enjambement³³):

βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ἐοικώς 55

Homer has βοῦς βουκολέεσκε(ν).³⁴ In *Aphr.* 52 the rhythm—which is highly unusual—and the ν-movable making position both suggest modification by shifting. The inversion may have a parallel in 152. The case seems to be a symptom of post-Homeric development.

In the form of a run-over word it also occurs in 148 (above, p. 42) and in:

νῦν δέ σε μὲν τάχα γῆρας ὁμοῖον ἀμφικαλύφει 244-245
νηλειές

Homer always has νηλεές: νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, A 484, etc., 9× at the end of the line (the voc. at the beginning II 33, 204). Yet νηλειές has not necessarily resulted from post-Homeric modification or innovation (though Hes. has (κύων) νηλειής, *Th.* 770). It might simply be a formulaic declension of νηλεός or νηλεῖ (not in Homer) or reflect a nominative νηλειής due to metrical lengthening, cf. Hes. *Th.* 770.³⁵ If so, Homeric νηλεά, νηλεῖ would be later. As far as I can see we have no means to choose from these explanations. The phenomenon, then, cannot be regarded as a trace of post-Homeric modification. The epics do not provide us with an expression which might be considered a prototype.³⁶

CONCLUSIONS

It need not be repeated that the *Hymn to Aphrodite* is by far the most Homeric of the collection. Nevertheless in this comparatively short poem we have found a number of modifications which have no counterparts

in the whole of Homer and thus clearly show that its diction represents a later stage of development. Among these the most significant cases are: 197 (καὶ παῖδες παίδεσσι) διαμπερὲς ἐκγεγάονται, 267 τεμένη δέ ἐ κικλήσκουσι, 276 (ῥφρα κε ταῦτα) μετὰ φρεσὶ πάντα διέλθω, 126 παρὰ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι (κουριδίην ἄλοχον), 114 ἦ δὲ διὰ πρὸ (σμηκρήν παῖδ' ἀτίταλλε³⁷), 181 ὥς δὲ ἴδεν δειρῆν, 147-8 ἀθανάτου δὲ ἔκητι διακτόρου ἐνθάδ' ἱκάνεις, Ἑρμέω, 54, ἐν ἀκροπόλοισι ὄρεσιν, 29 δῶκε καλὸν γέρας, 128 δεῖξε καὶ ἔφρασεν, 152 τόξον ἀπ' ἀργυρέου (?), 55 βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς.³⁸)

As far as I can see, the hymn has only a single phenomenon that might be regarded as a non-Homeric archaism: τιμάχος, 31, which is also found *Dem.* 268.³⁹) In *Aphr.* its use cannot be shown to have formulaic connections.

The fact that 197 and 199 (ἔσχεν ἄχος ἔνεκα βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμπεσον εὐνῇ) point to direct imitation of Homer effected by means of crude modifications, suggests that the hymn was created by a poet who was much more literary than those of *Ap.* and *Dem.*⁴⁰) This of course—it need hardly be said—does not detract from the value of his work.

NOTES

¹) *Mod.* 133. Much material is to be found in H. Trueber, *De Hymno in Venerem Homericum*. Diss. Halenses XV (1905), 109-183.

²) In Homer *Y* 247 οὐδ' ἂν νηῦς ἐκατόζυγος ἄχθος ἄροιτο (cf. Chantraine *G.H.* I, 388) shows a curious conflict between meaning (*αἰρομαι*) and morphology (*ἄρυνμαι*), which seems to be even more typical of the decomposition the formulaic style underwent in its later stages than *Aphr.* 211: cf. on the one hand κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄροιτο, *E* 3, ν 422, κῦδος ἄροιτο, *K* 307, *X* 207, and, on the other, (νέες) ἄχθος ἄειραν, γ 312 (<*νῆες θοαὶ ἄχθος ἄειραν, *νηῦς ἄχθος ἄειρε or something like it?). ἄχθος ἄροιτο, at any rate, is a formulaic conjugation of ἄχθος ἄειραν (-ε, -αι) created under the influence of κῦδος ἄροιτο, etc.

In δ 107 ὅσσ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐμόγησε καὶ ἦρατο the interpretation of ἦρατο is subject to doubt (cf. Chantraine, *o.c.* 137). We have 3 Homeric cases left in which αἶρω is certain: *P* 724 νέκυν αἰρόντας Ἀχαιοῦς, *N* 63 ὅς ῥά τ' ἀπ' αἰγίλιπος πέτρης περιμήκεος ἀρθεῖς, ε 393 μεγάλων ὑπὸ κύματος ἀρθεῖς (in *N* 63 and ε 393 the form might be due to modification of ὑπόσ' ἀερεῖς (θ 375, μ 432) or a similar formula). Against these 3 (4?) cases we find c. 75 cases of ἀερ- in the epics: λᾶαν ἀείρας (*M* 453, etc., 3 ×), τεύχε' ἀείρας (*X* 399, ω 165), ἔγχος ἀείραι (*Θ* 424) ∞ ἔρχε' ἄειραν (*Y* 373).

³) Against Baumeister's emendation ἐκγεγάοντες A.H.S. rightly object that one would expect ἐκγεγαῶτες.

⁴) *Grec ἐκγεγάονται (Hymne homérique à Aphrodite, 197)*, Bulletin de la Société Linguistique, XXVI (1935), 131 f.

⁵) All the Homeric reduplicated futures (περιδῆσεται, κεκλήση, βεβρώσεται, κεχολώσεται, etc.) have ('restored') σ.

⁶) Zumbach (?).

⁷) A.H.S.

⁸) Zumbach's objections "Der Sinn verlangt ein Futurum" and "Die anderen Parallelverben dieser Prophezeiung stehen im Futurum (ἔσται, ἔσσεται)" are not valid of course. As to the latter, cf. e.g. *Ar. Eq.* 1087 αἰετὸς ὥς γίγνη καὶ πάσης γῆς βασιλεύσεις, and many more examples in Kühner-Gerth (I, 138) and Schwyzler-Debrunner (II, 273).

⁹) Above, p. 15, K. Meister, *o.c.* 72 f.

¹⁰⁾ The same applies, though less strongly, to 199 ἔσχεν ἄχος ἔνεκα βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμπεσον εὐνή ∞ Σ 85 ἡματι τῶ δτε σε βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμβαλον εὐνή, below, n. 14.

¹¹⁾ Strabo XIII, 1, 52 (607).

¹²⁾ On Scepsis see *RE* s.v. Skapsis, 3A 1, 445 f.

¹³⁾ There were of course many other traditions about the adventures of Aeneas and Ascanius (see e.g. A.H.S. *ad. loc.* and Jacoby on Hellanicus fr. 31, *FGH* Ia², 445), but they are not relevant here. We only have to do with the claims, whether authentic or spurious, made at Scepsis. Jacoby says *l.c.*: “der endpunkt Τροία - - beruht vielleicht eher auf lokalen geschlechtstraditionen und ansprüchen als die behauptung des Demetrios”. I fail to see why.

¹⁴⁾ Gemoll: before 650. Humbert: between 630 and 610. Of course the argument outlined above does not exclude a much earlier dating. I agree with G. Freed and R. Bentman (*o.c.* 157 f.) in so far that the “Homeric-purity” of the language is apt to make us suspicious and that, when the poem was composed, genuine epic poetry was no doubt a thing of the past. The lack of ‘openness’ of the diction gives away the later poet (above, pp. 10, 39 f.). On the other hand his technique is still sufficiently traditional, in a natural way, to allow it to be called ‘sub-epic’. An Alexandrian origin – deemed most probable by the authors – is, in my opinion, excluded because of its lack of studied variations, mannerisms and of the kind of epicisms which are found in Apollonius. In this connection the use of ἔνεκα in our passage (above, n. 10) has to be mentioned. 198–99 are the most Alexandrian-looking lines of the hymn and it has been pointed out that the meaning ‘because’ is also found in Ap. Rh. IV, 1523, Call. *Aet.* I, 6 Pf. and III, 75, 6 Pf., cf. ὄνεκα, Bion XI, 5 G. This interpretation, however, is uncertain. We may put a colon after ἄχος and read with asyndeton ἔνεκα βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμπεσον εὐνή. If we choose the former alternative we have to conclude that in the poet’s mind ἔνεκα = ὄνεκα was ‘epic’. Such a view, however, is not surprising when we have to do with a hymn-poet; it has analogies in the use of the duals in Ap. 456, 487, 501, in προφύλαχθε, Ap. 538 (cf. *Herm.* 527 κραιῶν ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς καὶ γαῖαν ἐρεμνὴν). Anyhow the structure of 198–99, just like that of e.g. 126 παρὰ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι κουριδίην ἄλοχον, does not suggest Alexandrian composition, but modification within the formulaic cadres, probably resulting, in this case, from direct imitation.

¹⁵⁾ Cf. λείπε δὲ θυμόν, Ap. 361 (above, p. 30), Διὸς βασιλῆος, *Dem.* 358 (below, p. 49).

On ἐπεσθαι in the same passage (259) see Solmsen, *Zur Theologie im grossen Aphrodite-Hymnus*, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 1 n. 2 (“eine verblaszte und abstrakter gewordene Spielart des Gebrauchs”). “There is no parallel to this use”, A.H.S.

¹⁶⁾ This is in accordance with the Linear B testimonies (*wa-na-ka-te-ro, ra-wa-ke-si-jo*) A. Morpurgo, *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon* III s.v. *te-me-no* (= agri portio).

¹⁷⁾ In B 197 ἐ need not be used as a plural, since it may refer to Agamemnon, the grammatical subject of 195:

μή τι χολωσάμενος ῥέξῃ κακὸν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ Διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων,
τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἐστι, φιλεῖ δὲ ἐ μητιέτα Ζεύς

¹⁸⁾ See now Heitsch, *o.c.* 32, who rightly remarks that in a case like this the epic phrases no longer call up any distinct mental images, cf. p. 48 n. 20. (in this and similar expressions μετὰ φρεσὶ simply is a metrical formulaic variant of ἐνὶ φρεσὶ, *Mnem.* S. IV, X (1957), 3, 197).

¹⁹⁾ Homer already has (once) διύξομαι, I 61: ἐξείπω καὶ πάντα διύξομαι, cf. *Dem.* 416: ἐξερέω καὶ πάντα διύξομαι. Here the word fits in with the context. Heitsch, *o.c.* 32, n. 6, refers to Solon 24, 17 D., where διήλθον is more or less synonymous with διήρυσσα. But the corruption may be worse than was supposed by Barnes and the editors who follow him; see now J. C. Kamerbeek, *Remarques sur l'Hymne à Aphrodite*, *Mnemosyne* XX (1967), 4, p. 393.

²⁰⁾ On *διὰ πρό* in *ἡ δὲ διὰ πρό* / *συμκρῆν παῖδ' ἀτίταλλε*, 114, see Heitsch, *o.c.* 29, who quotes B. Suhle, *De Hymno Homérico Quarto* (Schulpr. Stolp 1878), 18 f.: “atqui hanc [sc. *διαμπερές*] non naturalem vim vocis *διαπρό* esse intellegitur ex ea vi quae inest in voce *πρό*”. Heitsch’s term ‘misapplication’ (‘miszbräuchliche Verwendung’) can be extended to the whole formulaic combination *ἡ δὲ διὰ πρό*, cf. *E* 66, *H* 260, *Y* 276 (*ἦλνθεν, ἦλνθ'*, etc.), *οὐ δὲ διὰ πρό, τῆς δὲ διὰ πρό* (*E* 281, *M* 404, etc. The same is true of *καὶ ἀγλαὰ δέχθαι ἄποινα*, 140 said of a dowry; cf. *A* 23 = 377, Heitsch, *ibid.*

²¹⁾ Cf. e.g. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 126 ff., *Mod.* 54 ff. and *pass.*

^{21a)} *ἀθανάτων δὲ ἕκατι M.* The other mss have *ἀθανάτοιο δ' ἕκατι* (*ἕκατι*) with neglect of *F*.

²²⁾ On the Homeric parallels to cases such as *ἐς λέχος εὖστρωτον, ὅθι—*, 157, (e.g. *βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον, ὅθι—*, *θ* 277) see now A. G. Tsopanakis, *Problems in the Homeric Hexameter*, Thessaloniki 1966, 367 ff.

²³⁾ On glides between *-ι* and vowel *Mod.* 72.

²⁴⁾ *Mod.* 80.

²⁵⁾ E.g. *T ἔχης γέρας, A* 133, *T ἔχω γέρας, A* 163, *T ἔχεις γέρας, I* 111, *T ἔχει γέρας, B* 240, *T δόσαν γέρας, A* 276.

²⁶⁾ *T πατὴρ Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀρέξῃ, E* 33, *πατὴρ Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀρήγει, P* 630.

²⁷⁾ *Mod.* 61 ff. and *pass.*; cf. also *Aphr.* 85 *εἶδος τε μέγεθος τε καὶ εἵματα σιγαλόεντα, 232 σίτω τ' ἀμβροσίῃ τε καὶ εἵματα καλὰ διδοῦσα, Hes. Th.* 15 *Γαίηοχον Ἐννοσίγαιον*. See also on *Dem.* 439 (*κόρην Δημήτερος ἀγνῆς*).

²⁸⁾ On the Homeric treatment of initial digamma in *εἶδος* see on *Dem.* 66, cf. also Hes. *Th.* 908 (*πολύηρατον εἶδος*) (pp. 53 and 54). *κᾶλός* in *Aphr.* and in Hesiod’s poetry (Boeotian has *καλῶς*) is likely to be explained as a relatively late Aeolism, cf. E.-M. Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, 18 (“Nur *κᾶλος* mit 19 Beispielen von metrisch gesicherter Kürze, 5 Beispiele metrisch unsicher”) and above, p. 40.

²⁹⁾ Cf. *Hésiode et la tradition orale*, *Mnem.* X, 3 (1957), 210 ff. and now H. Troxler, *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*, 234 ff.

³⁰⁾ K. Meister, *o.c.* 205 ff.; or the pronunciation may have fluctuated, cf. Chantraine *G.H.* I, 161. Mr. C. J. Ruijgh prefers to regard these forms as relatively late Aeolisms. This explanation would neatly fit in with the presence of *κᾶλός* (*κᾶλος* in Sappho and Alcaeus) in *Aphr.* and in Hesiod’s poetry.

³¹⁾ Above, p. 23 f.

³²⁾ M. Treu, *Glotta* 37 (1958), 258 ff.

³³⁾ Cf. *Ap.* 12, 161, 163.

³⁴⁾ *Mod.* 80.

³⁵⁾ See Troxler, *o.c.* 33.

³⁶⁾ Cf. 170–171 *τῆμος ἄρ' Ἀρχίση μὲν ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ὕπνον ἔχευε / νήδυμον*. Heitsch, *o.c.* 30, has observed that Homer nowhere joins *γλυκὺς* and *νήδυμος* to *ὑπνος* at the same time and rightly infers from this fact that *νήδυμος* (i.e. *ἥδυμος*, Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer*, 150) had not altogether lost its meaning to the poet(s) of *Il.* and *Od.* This difference is more significant than the use of *νήδυμος* in enjambement, which is also found in Homer, *Ψ* 62–63, *ὑπνος — νήδυμος ἀμφιχυθείς*, cf. *Ξ* 253.

³⁷⁾ See above, n. 20.

³⁸⁾ To these one may add the conspicuous frequency of *ν*-movable in ordinary words.

³⁹⁾ Below, p. 56.

⁴⁰⁾ I can find no evidence tending to show that any of these poets was illiterate.

IV

DEMETER

A. Inflection

1. Declension

τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων ἡ ἐ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, cf. 259, 325. 55

Zumbach points out that in the whole of Homer *θεός* occurs only twice with synizesis: *A* 18 ὅμιν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν and *ξ* 251 θεοῖσιν τε ῥέξεν, and regards the three cases of *Dem.* as innovations.¹⁾ Against this Forderer objects: “Aber unhomerisch sind sie jedenfalls nicht und es wird schwerlich ein Gesetz gegeben haben auf wieviel tausend Verse man *θεός* einmal in Synizese gebrauchen darf”.²⁾ This is witty, but misses the point. In general, synizesis results from a secondary development³⁾ and whatever may be the formulaic origin of the Homeric cases—for they are certainly innovations—⁴⁾ the formulaic background of *τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων* is already evident from the epithet *οὐράνιος* (which is wanting in Homer). The synizesis has been brought about by ‘declension’ of *θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες*, *A* 570, etc., 6 ×.

(αἴτις ἔπειτα πατήρ) μάκαρας θεοὺς αἰὲν ἔόντας 325

The formulaic prototype is of course *μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔόντες*, *Ω* 99, etc., 5 ×, cf. *μάκαρες θεοί*, *A* 406, etc., 6 ×.⁵⁾

On 259, which is a much more complicated case, see below, p. 61 n. 70.

2. Conjugation

ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενέροθεν ὤμους 279

We have already seen that the poets of the three *Hymns* created new forms supposed to be ‘epic’ on false analogy (e.g. *ἐξαπάφησε*, *Ap.* 376)⁶⁾. Moreover it appeared certain that conjugation of formulae in *Aphr.* goes beyond the Homeric stage: *τέκνα τεκεῖσθαι*, 127, certainly comes from *τέκνα τεκέσθαι*, *παῖδες . . . ἐκγεγάονται*, 197, probably from a formula such as *υἱὸς (εὐχεται) ἐκγεγάμεν*, *E* 247–8, *Y* 208–9.⁷⁾ Anyhow, confusion of singular and plural is certain in 279.⁸⁾ Whatever may be the detailed linguistic explanation of Homeric *ἐπενέροθε*, *B* 219, *K* 134), *ἀνέροθεν* (*A* 266) (pluperfects) and *ἐπενέροθεν* (*θ* 365), *ἐνέροθεν* (*ρ* 270) (perfects⁹⁾), the use of *ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενέροθεν ὤμους* suggests a recollection of an expression having *ἐνέροθεν* (or a compound of this form) in the same position. Since the poet of *Dem.* was no longer familiar with the form, he used it as an aorist ending in *-θεν* on analogy of *ἔκταθεν*, *ἀπέφθιθεν*, etc.

B. Substitution

οὐδ’ ἀπίθησε Διὸς βασιλῆος ἐφετμῆς 358

It is common knowledge that Zeus, as well as Apollo, Poseidon and other

gods, is often called *ἄναξ* in Homer (*Zeṽ ἄνα*, *Γ* 351, etc., *Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι*, *B* 102, etc.). On the other hand, as has already been observed by Wackernagel,¹⁰ the titles *βασιλεύς* and *βασιλεία* are never given to gods and goddesses. Yet in Ionia, as elsewhere in Greece, the monarch is always called *βασιλεύς* (a usage abundantly reflected in Homer) and it is in Ionia that we have epigraphical evidence for a cult of *Ζεὺς βασιλεύς*.¹¹ The explanation of this contradiction is only to be found, as far as I can see, in the fact that the *qa-si-re-u*, although we do not have precise information about his rank and importance, was, at any rate a very subaltern functionary^{11a}) in the Mycenaean society.¹²) Surprising as it may be—in particular to those who, like myself, hold that the extent to which Bronze Age poetry has survived in Homer should not be over-estimated¹³)—the Mycenaean component of the formulaic tradition appears to be still so vigorous in the epics, as regards the epithets of the gods, that it even acts in a negative way.¹⁴) This is clearly reflected in the noun-epithet formula Homer employs for Zeus in the genitive after the trochaic caesura. It is *Διὸς μεγάλιο* (-ου) and is found in the following lines:

ἐγγὺς ἑὼν, χαλεπὸς δὲ Διὸς μεγάλιο κερανός	Ξ 417
ἀλλὰ καὶ δς δειδοικε „ „ κερανόη	Φ 198
ἢ οἱ ἀπαγγέλλεσκε „ „ νόημα	Ρ 409
εἰ μὲν κ' αἰνήσωσι „ „ θέμιστες	π 403
αἶ δ' αἶτις πρὸς δῶμα „ „ νέοντο	Ε 907
ἄνδρε δῶω, γενεῇ δὲ „ „ ἔικτον	δ 27 (F)
τὼ κρατερῶ θεράποντε „ „ γενέσθην	λ 255
γείνατ' ἐν ἀγκοῖνῃσι „ „ μιγεῖσα	λ 268
ἐννέα δὴ βεβᾶσσι „ „ μέγαλον ἐναντοί	Β 134 (<-οι' ?)
ἐννέωρος βασιλεὺς „ „ δαριστής	τ 179 (<-οι' ?)
νοῦσόν γ' οὐ πως ἔστι „ „ ἀλέασθαι	ι 411 (<-οι' ???)
Τρωσὶ τε καὶ Δαναοῖσι „ „ διὰ βουλᾶς	θ 82 ¹⁵)
ἢ ἐκδὸς μέγαροιο „ „ ποτὶ βωμόν	χ 334 ¹⁵)
ἐξέσθην δ' ἄρα τῷ γε „ „ „ „	χ 379 ¹⁵)

Of course from a prosodical point of view *Διὸς βασιλῆος* is not exactly equivalent to *Διὸς μεγάλιο*. Still the poet(s) of the epics did not compose a single *T*₂ hemistich by joining a final word beginning with a vowel to *Διὸς* ∪—∪, whereas nothing could have been easier but to turn *Διὸς μεγάλιο* into *Διὸς βασιλῆος*. What is more, the poet of δ 27 preferred admitting what, according to contemporary pronunciation, must have been hiatus to modifying the old formula. It appears to be certain, therefore, that *Διὸς βασιλῆος* is an innovation.¹⁶)

245 σκέπατο κῶκυσεν δὲ καὶ ἄμφω πλήξατο μηρό

At first sight this line looks 'epic' enough, yet from Gehring we learn that the sigmatic aorist of the middle voice of *πλήττω* is found only once in the whole of Homer.¹⁷) In the *Il.* and *Od.* the thematic reduplicated form

(πεπλήγετο,¹⁸) πεπλήγοντο)¹⁹) prevails and was undoubtedly preserved through being a constituent of formulae. This is clearly seen in

δή ῥα τότ' ὤμωξέν τε καὶ ᾧ πεπλήγετο μηρώ *M* 162
 ὤμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα „ „ „ „ *O* 397 = *v* 198

To be sure, καὶ ᾧ πεπλήγετο μηρώ is a modification itself. It is one of those rather frequent cases in which, after the digamma had disappeared, an original P_2 formula (*καὶ $F\omega$ πεπλήγετο μηρώ) came to function as a T_2 formula.²⁰ In *Dem.* 245 the poet could have used it under the same conditions. Nevertheless he was led by his current idiom to say καὶ ἄμφω πλῆξατο μηρώ, thus leaving out two archaisms²¹) at the same time.

C. Separation

- 35 αὐγὰς τ' ἡελίου, ἔτι δ' ἤλπετο μητέρα κεδνὴν
 cf. Hom. χαίρει τ' ἐν θυμῷ ἐπὶ τ' ἔλπεται ἥματα πάντα *Ω* 491
 ἕως ὅγε τῷ πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ' ἤλπετο νίκην *O* 539
 et similia (<*ἔτι $F\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron$)
- 458 ἀσπασίως δ' ἴδον ἀλλήλας, κεχάρηντο δὲ θυμῷ
 (ἀσπασίως ἴδε, *δ* 523, *θ* 450)
 cf. Hom. τὸν δ' ἴδεν Αἰνείας (<*τὸν δὲ $F\acute{\iota}\delta\text{'}$ Αἰνείας ?) *E* 166
- 474 δ[εῖξε,] Τριπτολέμω τε Διοκλεῖ τε πληξίππῳ^{21a})
 (Διοκλῆα μεγάθυμον, *E* 547
 Διοκλῆος ποτὶ δῶμα, *γ* 488 = *ο* 186,
 etc.)²²)
- cf. Hom. χαίρετ', ἐπεὶ μέγα χάσμα πόλει τ' ἦν παντὶ τε δημῷ *Ω* 706,
 cf. *Mod.* 115 f.

These modifications by separation do not go beyond the Homeric stage.

D. Juxtaposition and Transposition

There is, as far as I am aware, no clear-cut example of juxtaposition in *Dem.*²³) The case we have in 302 is more complicated and had better be called a conflation of two formulae.

There is evidence for shifting combined with separation in

ἄκουσαν δὲ βίη με προσηνάγκασσε πάσασθαι 413

cf. βίη ἀέκοντα (καθέξει) *O* 186, βίη ἀέκοντος (ἀπνύρων, ἀπνύρα) *A* 430, *δ* 646,
 cf. ἀέκοντα βίηφι (κτῆματ' ἀπορραΐσει) *α* 403. None of the 44 forms of ἀέκων occurring in Homer show metrically necessary contraction.²⁴)

The lengthening of ι in *πυρὶ ἐνι πολλῷ*, 248, is certainly due to inversion, cf. (ἐν) *πυρὶ πολλῷ*, *μ* 237, *Φ* 362, on which (ἐν) *πυρὶ κηλέῳ*, *Σ* 346 etc., $7 \times$, was probably modelled (<σὸν *πυρὶ κηλείῳ* (*O* 744); *κηλείῳ* <**κηαλέῳ* (*καναλέῳ*? Fick) <**κηφαλέῳ*, Bechtel, o.c. 193. The reading $\text{]}\lambda\lambda\eta$ of the P. Berol., *BKT*, V, 1, seems to point to *πυρῇ ἐνι πολλῇ* (Allen *ad loc.*), which is likely to have been introduced in order to restore the normal prosody.

A similar treatment is likely to be found in 210: ἡ δὲ κυκεῶ τεύξασα (with synizesis) <*τεῦξε (τεῦχε) δέ οἱ κυκεῶ (cf. τεῦχε δέ μοι κυκεῶ, τεύξει τοι κυκεῶ, κ 316, κ 290) <τεῦχε (*τεῦξε) κυκειῶ, Δ 624. Such a series, it seems, is typical of the development.

E. Conflation ²⁵⁾

βάν ῥ' ἔμεν οἴκαδ' ἕκαστος · ἀτὰρ ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ 302

The *language* of this line is thoroughly epic, its *diction* is not. In Homer the ancient formula βάν / βῆ ῥ' (δ') ἔμεν is never followed by a once digammated word. Moreover, the regular formula for "they went home, every one of them" is ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος (A 606, etc., 4 ×, at the verse-end), that for 'to go home' is οἴκαδ' ἔμεν (A 170, etc., 3 ×, at the beginning of the line) or οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι (B 290, etc., at the end) ²⁶⁾. The extent to which several formulaic elements have been conflated in 302 far exceeds anything done by Homer in similar contexts and can only be paralleled with the case of *Ap.* 506:

ἐκ δ' ἄλός ἤπειρόνδε θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆ' ἐρύσαντο

which equally consists of epic words combined in an utterly untraditional way. ²⁷⁾

τοιγὰρ ἐγώ σοι, μῆτερ, ἐρέω νημερτέα πάντα 406

In Homer ἐρέω (ἐρέεις, etc.) is found c. 77 times. It never shows contraction or synizesis. According to Chantraine its digamma is neglected in 3 (2) cases: Δ 176 ὦδ' ἐρέει (= ὦς ἐρέει ?), Ψ 787 εἰδόσιν ὕμν' ἐρέω πᾶσιν, φίλοι, and μ 156 ἀλλ' ἐρέω μὲν ἐγών.

In *Dem.* there is no other line which has ἐρέω (-εις, -ει, etc.) and 406 shows both neglect of digamma and synizesis. Homer has several systems, on the one hand:

ἄλλο δέ τοι	} ἐρέω,	17 ×
ἀλλ' ἐκ „		7 ×
τοῦτο δέ „		4 ×
τοῦνεκα „		3 ×
τοιγὰρ ἐγών		3 ×

etc., on the other:

νημερτέες	{	ἐνίσπες (-ε, -η)	γ 101, etc.	} 14 ×
		ἐνίψει	λ 148	
		ἐειπες	Γ 204	
νημερτέα		εἶπε (-ω, etc., εἶρω)	γ 19, etc.	

and

νημερτέα πάντ'	{	ἐνέποντα	ρ 549, 556
		ἐνέποιμι	ρ 561.

F. *Related cases*

Above it has been pointed out that the classification applied in this inquiry has no intrinsic value. It is no more than a grossly defective expedient employed to get a clearer insight into the way in which epic diction is treated in the *Hymns*. This is obvious in *Dem.* 210, 302, 314, 406, and it is in particular true of the motley group of phenomena which remain to be discussed. In the cases examined so far the innovations could be shown to have resulted from modifications of clearly recognisable prototypes. This is impossible, however, for the vast majority of the phenomena which are proved to be late by their linguistic nature. Now we might note these elements in the same way as Zumbach has done and abstain from comment. Because, however, the influence of the formulaic diction is still extremely powerful in the *Hymns* and since this tradition may even have left in these poems a few faint traces of formulae wanting in Homer, we cannot be absolutely sure that all the innovations in question are wholly 'free' and have nothing to do with older types of formulaic framework. What is more, we cannot rule out the possibility that their intrusion was somehow facilitated by the existence of such cadres. In any case we shall do well to look for corresponding phenomena in Homer.

πρόφρων, οἷα γυναικὸς ἀφήλικος ἔργα τέτυκται 140

Juxtaposition? Or declension? Cf. e.g.:

φραδέος νόον ἔργα τέτυκται Ω 354,
 υἱέος ἡδὲ θνηατρος ἀμόμονος φ̄ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ δ 4.

Not significant. ^{27a)}

αἶ δ' ὦστ' ἦ ἔλαφοι ἦ πόρτιες εἶαρος ὦρη 174

Was there a formula **ἔαρος ὦρη* (Hom. *ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὦρη*, Z 148, *ὦρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ* <**ὦρη* *ἑαρινῇ*? B 471, etc. 4×), so that we have to do with juxtaposition or declension? At any rate not significant, cf. e.g. B 720 *τόξων εἷς εἰδότες ἱφι μάχεσθαι*, etc., etc.

δείσας φ̄ περὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀάσθη μέγα θυμῷ 246

Not significant, cf. *καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, etc., etc.

κούρην τὴν ἔτεκον, γλυκερὸν θάλας, εἶδεῖ κυδρὴν 66

The expression *εἶδεῖ κυδρὴν* looks rather strained.²⁸⁾ The closest parallels to the use of the dative I am able to find in Kühner-Gerth and Chantraine are *γένει ὕστερος* (Γ 215) *εὐρύτερος δ' ὥμοισι* (Γ 194), *βίη . . . ἀμείνων* (Α 404), *βίη . . . φέρτερος* (σ 234), but in all these expressions it is used with comparatives. Anyhow, there is nothing to suggest that the phrase is formulaic. (cf. Homeric (*Διὸς*) *κυδρὴ(ν) παρὰκοιτις(-ιν)*, Σ 184, etc., 3×, *ἐπὶ εἶδεῖ* ρ 308, 454). It was almost certainly coined by the poet. In Homer the digamma is neglected in 3 of the 42 occurrences at most, the only certain case being Γ 224 *ἀγασσάμεθ' εἶδος ἰδόντες*.²⁹⁾ In *Dem.* the proportion is 2:6 (see *ad* 315). The case is typical of a later stage of development.

Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον, πολυήρατον εἶδος ἔχουσαν 315

cf. Hes. *Th.* 908 Ὠκεανοῦ κόρη, „ „ ἔχουσα

On εἶδος see *ad* 66, on πολυήρατος *Mod.* 81. In the course of time this compound seems to have been increasingly favoured by the poets: *Il.* —, *Od.* 4 ×, *Hes.* 3 ×, *Aphr.* 2 ×, *Dem.* 1 ×. πολυήρατον εἶδος in *Th.* and in *Dem.*, as well as ἔχεν πολυήρατος ἥβη³⁰⁾ in *Aphr.* seems to be a post-Homeric innovation.

πολλὰ δ' ἄρ' ἀμφαγάπησε κόρην Δημήτερος ἀγνῆς 439

Homer has such forms as ἄνω, ἐνάτη, κενός, etc.³¹⁾ Whatever may be the explanation of their presence in the epics, none of them has any formulaic connections. In *Dem.* 439 κόρη is generally considered an Atticism, a notion which, in view of the subject of the hymn and some of its linguistic phenomena,³²⁾ is undoubtedly correct. Yet even if it should be questioned, the fact remains that, just like ἄνω, etc., it is a late phenomenon. The conditions under which it is used suggest, moreover, a still more recent development. In Homer we find the formula [*Ἀθηναίη,*] κόρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, *E* 733, etc., 5 ×.³³⁾ At the same time the old formulaic organism is seen to be still functioning in the epics, for this P_2 formula has a T_2 counterpart which is used after verbal forms ending in a short vowel, e.g. in [*εὐχομένη δ' ἠρᾶτο*] Διὸς κόρη μέγαλοιο.³⁴⁾ Not having such a T_2 formula at hand for Persephone, the poet of the hymn, probably on analogy of κόρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, created the phrase κόρην Δημήτερος ἀγνῆς. The phenomenon has parallels in ἄναξ Πολυδέγμων (see below) and in καλὸν γέρας, *Aphr.* 29;³⁵⁾ these cases seem to go beyond the Homeric stage.³⁶⁾

Νύσιον ἄμ πεδίον, τῇ ὄρουσεν ἄναξ Πολυδέγμων 17

χώρησεν, τῇ δ' ἔκθορ' ἄναξ κρατερὸς Πολυδέγμων 430

Whatever may be the (epic or religious) background of Πολυδέγμων³⁷⁾ so much is certain that neither the formation of ἄναξ Πολυδέγμων nor that of ἄναξ κρατερὸς Πολυδέγμων is authentically epic. In Homer ἄναξ is never used after the fourth trochee. Word-end in this place, we must conclude, was already avoided by the singers to whom the creation of the formulaic systems is due.³⁸⁾ They equally avoided making formulae of the type ἄναξ κρατερὸς — — —, perhaps because the collision -ξ -κρ brings about a somewhat strident sound and a jerky rhythm. In the epics κρατερὸς Διομήδης, κρατερὸς Λυκόοργος, etc., are never preceded by ἄναξ. On the other hand the systems for which ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων, etc., were created remain completely intact so that we nowhere have a case of elision before these old T_2 formulae. *Dem.* 430 treats the pseudo-formula ἄναξ κρατερὸς Πολυδέγμων as though it came within the (scarcely represented) category of T_2 formulae beginning with a vowel, cf. e.g.

ὧς ἔφατ', ὄρουντο δ' αὐτίκ' Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας Ψ 488 = 754

(In a line such as 430 it is not surprising to find a run-over word ending in *v*-movable making position). *Dem.* 17 and 404 show a composition which is typical of post-Homeric development.

Enjambement

οὐδέ τις ἀθανάτων οὐδὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων 22
ἤκουσεν φωνῆς 23

Elsewhere I have argued that in the course of the development and decomposition of epic diction, innovation and breaking up of old prototypes often went hand in hand with introduction of *v*-movable, and that this is notably the case with enjambement.³⁹) In *Dem.* *v*-movable is found 9 × under such conditions, always in verbal forms.⁴⁰) It is in the nature of things that, this kind of innovation being mostly 'free', the phenomena in question cannot generally be retraced to ancient prototypes. This does not mean, however, that we are never allowed to see this type of verse-making against an earlier background.

In *Dem.* the archaic word **δψ* is found only once, significantly, in the formula *δπ' ἄκουσα*, 67.⁴¹) Apart from this formula Homer has the phrases *δπα σύνθετο*, *v* 92, *ἄιον δπα*, *Σ* 222, *ὀπὸς ἔκλυον* (*αὐδήσαντος*) *Π* 76, *X* 451, *δ* δὲ *ξυνέηκε θεᾶς δπα φωνησάσης*, *B* 182 = *K* 512, and *ἄκουσε θεοῦ δπα φωνήσαντος*, *Y* 380, some of which may not be very ancient.⁴²) However that may be, Homer nowhere makes *φωνή* depend on *ἀκούειν*. In the epics the influence of the ancient formulae is evidently still stronger than in *Dem.* In 67 as well as in 23 Persephone's crying out is described, but in 23, where it is an element in the actual description of the rape,⁴³) the poet intended his words to be as suggestive as possible; hence his use of *ιάχησε*,⁴⁴) the repetition *φωνῇ—φωνῆς*, the avoidance of the old formula **ῥόπ' ἄκουσε* and the onomatopoetic use of *v*-movable making position.⁴⁵) The case resembles *Ψ* 152–53.⁴⁶)

Associating *ἀκούειν* with *φωνή*, just as *βασιλῆος* with *Διώς*, 358, was of course a most natural thing, but it appears to have been a departure from the ancient technique. And once poets preferred to be more individual in such simple matters, it is not unlikely that they had to adapt other elements of the old diction too. In 284

τοῦ δὲ κασίγνηται φωνῇν ἐσάκουσαν ἔλεεινήν

ἐλεεινήν had either to be pronounced with synizesis or to be contracted.⁴⁷) The phenomenon does not yet occur in Homer, cf. e.g. *φίλον ἐλθεῖν ἦδ' ἐλεεινόν*, *Ω* 309, *ζ* 327.⁴⁸)

We have a few cases left that show shortening of *η* (coming from *ā*), synizesis and/or contraction but which cannot be retraced to older prototypes: 99 *Παρθενίῳ φρέατι*,⁴⁹) 269 *δνεαρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται*,⁵⁰) 137 *ὥς ἐθέλουσι τοκῆες*, *ἐμέ δ'—*,⁵¹) 425 *παλζομεν ἦδ' ἄνθεα δρέπομεν*, 455 *ἦρος ἀεξομένοιο*,

494 *πρόφρονες ἀντ' ᾧδῃς*. They have been discussed by Zumbach⁵²⁾ and I do not see more can be gleaned from them.

Non-Homeric archaisms

268. Zumbach regards *τιμάοχος* (*εἰμὶ δέ Δημήτηρ τιμάοχος*, cf. *τιμάοχός ἐστι*, *Aphr.* 31) as an Atticism.⁵³⁾ Professor Kamerbeek, however, points out to me that later the current form is *τιμοῦχος* and that, therefore, the form found in the hymns (*Dem.* 268 and *Aphr.* 31) is a non-Homeric archaism.⁵⁴⁾ It remains to ask ourselves whether *τιμάοχος* is a word originally belonging to the sacral language of Eleusis which found its way into the Hymn, or perhaps a relic of pre-Ionic epic poetry. Now the form is also found in *Aphr.* (31) and an Attic origin of this poem is improbable.^{54a)} If, on the other hand, some conspicuously common feature of *Dem.* and *Aphr.*^{54b)} should be regarded as symptoms of literary influence, the borrowing must have been done by the poet of *Dem.*^{54c)} Thus we are led to explain *τιμάοχος* as an ancient epic Aeolism⁵⁵⁾ (cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* 1, 19 ff.) which was not adopted by the Homeric tradition. As contrasted with its 'Attic' alternative, this explanation is not at variance with what seem to be the most plausible assumptions concerning the period and the region in which *Aphr.* was composed.⁵⁶⁾

103, 215 *θεμιστοπόλων βασιλήων*, 473 *θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλεῦσι*, cf. Hes. *fr.* 7, 3 *θεμιστοπόλοι βασιλῆες*.⁵⁷⁾ The relative age of the adjective is uncertain,⁵⁸⁾ so we cannot tell whether we have to do with a formula of post-Homeric origin or not. The same is true of:

3, 334, 441, 460 *βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς*. In the present form it does not, at any rate, go back to a highly archaic stage, cf. Homeric *εὐρύοπα Ζεύς* < *εὐρύοπα Ζῆν*. Homer's *T*₂ formulae for *Ζεύς* are *πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* and *Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω*.⁵⁹⁾ The formula *βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς* may be para-Homeric, it could be a post-Homeric creation as well.

101 *γρηῖ παλαιγενεῖ ἐναλγίκιος*, cf. *Γ* 386 *γρηῖ δέ μιν εἰκνῖα παλαιγενεῖ προσέειπεν*, *χ* 395 *δεῦρο δὴ ὄρσο*, *γρηῖ παλαιγενές*, *P* 561 *Φοῖνιξ, ἄττα, γεραῖε παλαιγενές*. The long *ι* does not seem to be due to conservation of a very ancient formula, for we also find it in 99 *Παρθενίῳ φρέατι, ὅθεν* —⁶⁰⁾ and in 248 *πυρὶ ἐνι πολλῶ*. Nevertheless *γρηῖ παλαιγενεῖ* may be older than the expression found in *Γ* 386.

141 *καὶ κεν παῖδα νεογνὸν ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἔχουσα*. The adjective *νεογνός* is without any doubt an archaism.⁶¹⁾ *παῖδα νεογνὸν* may be a para-Homeric formula (or even an older one), but there is no support for this supposition.

208 ἄλφι καὶ ὕδωρ. Here too we find an archaism in an expression the formulaic nature of which cannot possibly be established.⁶²⁾

τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ ῥίξης ἑκατὸν κάρα ἐξεπεφύκει 12

Is κάρα an innovation? Even on this supposition *Dem.* 12 does not go beyond the Homeric stage of development, cf. κῶῤῥα, acc. sing. in *θ* 92. Moreover, in ῥύεται δὲ κάρη θαλερῶν αἰζηῶν, *K* 259, κάρη could be a plural.⁶³⁾ On the other hand κάρα may be a (non-Homeric) archaism (<*κάρα[σ]α).⁶⁴⁾ On this difficult problem I do not feel competent to voice an opinion.

398 πᾶσα πάλιν. The active athematic aorist also occurs in Hes. *E.* 98 (οὐδὲ θύραζε / ἐξέπτῃ) and in later literature;⁶⁵⁾ Frisk s.v.: "kann alt sein". There is no evidence for formulaic connections.

327 καὶ πολλὰ δίδον περικαλλέα δῶρα, 437 ἐδέχοντο παρ' ἀλλήλων ἐδιδόν τε,⁶⁶⁾ cf. Hes. *Th.* 30 καὶ μοι σκηπτρον ἔδον, *E.* 139 οὐκ ἔδιδον μακάρεσσι θεοῖς.⁶⁷⁾ In Homer we only find ἐδίδοσαν, but no more than 3 occurrences, all of them in the *Odyssey* (ξ 286, ρ 367, 411). Thus the possibility cannot be excluded that the absence of formulae such as *πολλὰ δίδον (alongside πολλὰ δόσαν, η 242, ι 15, τ 281) is due to lack of situations requiring the imperfect-formula.⁶⁸⁾

CONCLUSIONS

1. The number of archaisms used in *Dem.* seems proportionally somewhat larger than in the two other hymns. The evidence for formulaic connections of these phenomena is slight. This might be accounted for by the comparative shortness of the poem.

2. As far as I can see, with the possible exception of 101 γρηῖ παλαιγενεῖ, there are no formulae the counterparts of which are found in Homer in modernised forms.

3. Apart from the inconclusive cases (e.g. ἀσπασίως δ' ἴδον ἀλλήλας, 458) the hymn shows a considerable number of modifications which are not found in the epics. Some of these have been brought about by a comparatively slight change of technique (e.g. θεῶν οὐρανίων, 55, μάκαρας θεούς, 325, ἄμφω πλήξατο μηρῶ, 245), others are very drastic (e.g. βάν ὃ ἴμεν οἶκαδ' ἑκαστος, 302, τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ σοι, μῆτερ, ἐρέω νημερτέα πάντα, 406, ἤκουσεν φωνῆς, 23), others again, inconspicuous enough at first sight, are none the less significant (Διὸς βασιλῆος, 358, φωνὴν ἐσάκουσαν ἑλεεινὴν, 284).

The poet of this hymn, though he keeps much less to Homeric phrases than the author of *Aphrodite* does — resembling Hesiod in this respect — treats epic diction as a very living organism. Yet both the quantity and the quality of the evidence show a treatment which is rapidly developing beyond the Homeric stage.

NOTES

¹⁾ And as Atticisms (*o.c.* 53, 59). For this, however, there does not seem to be sufficient evidence. At any rate it is not permissible to relate phenomena of the iambic trimeter to hexameter poetry (Zumbach does not support his view by giving parallel cases).

²⁾ *O.c.* 99.

³⁾ See Witte, *Die Vokalkontraktion bei Homer*, Glotta IV (1913), 211 ff., *Mod.* 32-41, 115 f., 118, with several typical cases.

⁴⁾ *ὑμῖν μὲν, θεοῖσιν τε* (on the latter case cf. *Mod.* 103 ff.).

⁵⁾ In this connection Homer presents two curious phenomena. First the accusative *θεούς* never has an epithet which immediately precedes or follows. Secondly, Homer has only three cases of *θεούς . . . αἰὲν ἑόντας* (*a* 263, *a* 378 = *β* 143, *θ* 364-65), two of them having features which might suggest that they are comparatively recent: *θεούς ἐπιβώσομαι αἰὲν ἑόντας* (*a* 378 = *β* 143), with a very late contraction and *ἐλαίῳ / ἀμβρόσιῳ ἰα θεούς ἐπενήνοθεν αἰὲν ἑόντας* (*θ* 364/65 = *Aphr.* 62); on *ἐπενήνοθεν* see Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 423 and Frisk *s.v.*

⁶⁾ Above, p. 14.

⁷⁾ Above, pp. 15, 39.

⁸⁾ On confusion of dual and plural see above, p. 28 f.; on the possibly artificial form *κάρα*, *Dem.* 12, see below, p. 57.

⁹⁾ See Frisk *s.v.* *ἐνθεῖν*, Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 423, above, n. 5.

¹⁰⁾ *Sprachl. Unters. z. Homer*, 210.

¹¹⁾ Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*³ (1959) I, 137, n. 1 with references (Erythrae and Paros).

More evidence from other parts of Greece in A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, see Indices to II and IV (e.g. II, 731 [ὀμνῶ τ]ὸν Δία τὸμ Βασιλέα, Lolling, *Ath. Mitt.* 1878, III 19 ff.). Ar. *Nub.* 2, 153, etc., show that the invocation *ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ* (also Aesch. *Ag.* 355, *Pers.* 532) was current in fifth century Athens (more in E. Fränkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, ad 355).

^{11a)} L. R. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, 138: "mastercraftsman", see also pp. 39, 283.

¹²⁾ "Quod ad potestatem attinet . . . q. longe abesse a gr. βασιλεύς, 'rex', auctores consentiunt", A. Morpurgo, *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon s.v.* (III 272) (with literature). Palmer, *o.c.* 39, thinks the linguistic identification open to serious doubt (glossary *s.v.*: "Not βασιλεύς"), but adds (p. 228): "If we link up etymologically with βασιλεύς, we should remain fully aware of the semantic gap to be bridged, though parallels for such a development (e.g. steward, constable) are not far to seek." One might in particular add "marshal". See also Ruijgh, *E.G.M.* 137 f. ("chef" in Dutch).

¹³⁾ *Mod.* 131-146.

¹⁴⁾ A similar phenomenon is found in the treatment of *ἰσόθεος* which, though metrically equivalent to *ἀντίθεος* in Homeric times (i.e. after the digamma had disappeared), is never replaced by it, *Mod.* 22 (on archaisms ousted by later forms *ibid.* 36, 110, 127, 135 f., 146).

By "acting in a negative way" I mean that Διὸς βασιλῆος and *ἀντίθεος φῶς were not deliberately avoided, but that the employment of Διὸς μέγαλοιο and ἰσόθεος φῶς had become so much fixed a tradition that the variations in question did not suggest themselves to the epic poets.

¹⁵⁾ Διὸς μέγαλον followed by a consonant is of course a later modification. It developed in its turn into μέγαλον Διὸς, *Φ* 187 (*T*₂ becoming *P*₂, cf. *Mod.* 61 ff., etc.), Hes. *Th.* 29, 76 (>μέγαλον δὲ Διὸς, *Th.* 1002).

¹⁶⁾ It is significant that among the non-Homeric traces of development which are common to *Dem.* and Hesiod's poetry, we find Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεύς, *Th.* 886 (now see M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony*, ad loc., who rightly takes θεῶν βασιλεὺς in

a predicative sense), Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς, *E.* 668, θεῶν βασιλῆι καὶ ἀνδρῶν, *Th.* 923 (said of Zeus). Cf. also Κρόνῳ βασιλῆι, *Th.* 476, θεῶν προτέρῳ βασιλῆι (Kronos), *Th.* 468, βασιλευμένῳ ἡδὲ ἀνάσσειν . . . Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν, *Th.* 884 f. (The formula Διὸς μέγας is found *E.* 4, etc., Διὸς μέγαν *Th.* 465, etc.). If further proof were needed (above, p. 48 n. 28 f.), these facts in themselves would suffice to show that Hesiod's poetry cannot possibly be a purer representative of the "Achaean Epic" than Homer's, as Notopoulos, *Hesperia* XXIX (1960), 177–197, would have it.

¹⁷⁾ μηρὼ πληξάμενος at the beginning of the line, *II* 125. The phenomenon can be paralleled with φράσε (λ 22, against ἐπέφραδε, *A* 795, etc., 4 ×), ἐφρασεν (!) *Aphr.* 128, cf. *Mod.* 80.

¹⁸⁾ See below.

¹⁹⁾ Σ 31, 51; cf. ἐπέπληγον, *E* 504, etc., 5 ×. In the active, however, the sigmatic aorist is much more frequent.

²⁰⁾ *Mod.* 65 ff., 93 f., 116 ff. 145, 150 n. 1.

²¹⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 397.

^{21a)} δεῖξε Pausanias II, 14, 3, εἶπε m.

²²⁾ At the end of the line the genitive is turned into Διόκλον in 153! cf. Hom. Πατροκλῆος (= Πατροκλέος) / Πατρόκλον.

²³⁾ Such as Homeric καὶ μιν φωνήσας' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, etc., etc.

²⁴⁾ Cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 28.

²⁵⁾ Cf. *Mod.* 54, 103.

²⁶⁾ In such a context it is not surprising to find the comparatively late (and Ionic) ἀτάρ cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique* 43 ff. and *Mod.* 108 f.

²⁷⁾ *Mod.* 61. The value of 448 ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε θεὰ Διὸς ἀγγελιάων as evidence is perhaps not negligible. In Homer ἀπίθησε has the dative of the person obeyed (*A* 198 = *M* 351, *Z* 102); the genitive ἀγγελιάων is used with ἐπέκλυεν, ε 150, but not with ἀπιθέω. On the other hand we often find ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη / θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη, etc., *B* 166 etc., c. 24 ×. The line seems to have been modelled upon this type.

^{27a)} On ἀρήλιξ used in the sense "beyond youth" see L.S.J. s.v. (e.g. in Hdt. and Hippocr.).

²⁸⁾ Cf. above, p. 41.

²⁹⁾ The other cases are ἄλλος μὲν γάρ τ' εἶδος, θ 169, ἄλλος δ' αὐτ' εἶδος, θ 174; in both lines τ may be a later addition.

³⁰⁾ On the ν-movable see *Mod.* 81.

³¹⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 161, K. Meister, o.c. 205.

³²⁾ See e.g. A.H.S., 110, Zumbach 56 ff. (ἀνει, 403, Ἀιδη, 347, etc.).

³³⁾ And, of course κούρη Διὸς αἰγυόχοιο, 2 ×, κούρην Διὸς αἰγυόχοιο, 1 ×.

³⁴⁾ *Z* 304 ~ ζ 323 ~ *Z* 312 ~ *K* 296, *I* 536, cf. ζ 151, ω 521.

³⁵⁾ Above, p. 42 f.

³⁶⁾ δεδισκόμενος δὲ προσήδα, ο 150, <δεδισκόμενος δὲ προσήδα (γ 41) is different in so far that in Homer's time *δηδίσκομαι had become strange to the singers. Other examples of permutation of P_1/T_1 and P_2/T_2 expressions in *Mod.* 61–68, 93, 112 n. 1, 117–119, 126 ff., 145. For linguistic reasons they all seem to be earlier than the cases of *Dem.* 439 and *Aphr.* 29.

³⁷⁾ Πολυδέμων is also found in 404 (κρατερὸς Πολυδέμων) and in 31 (πολυσημάντωρ Πολυδέμων). Since according to Nilsson, *G.Gr.R.* I, 452 f., Hades had hardly any cults, it is not surprising that Πολυδέμων and Πολυδέκτης are only found here and that Πολύξενος is likewise confined to poetry (Aesch. *Suppl.* 156, fr. 228 N.²). It goes without saying, though, that the epithets reflect a wide-spread and very old element of popular religion and folk-tale, cf. e.g. Usener, *Kleine Schriften* 440 f., Rademacher, *Zur Hadesmythologie*, Rh. Mus. LX (1905) 593, Preller–Robert. *Gr. Myth.* I⁴, 1, 804 f.

- 38) See Appendix.
- 39) See above, p. 35 n. 15.
- 40) Above, p. 27 n. 17.
- 41) *H* 53, *A* 137 ∞ Φ 98, μ 52, 185, 187; ἤκουσα ὅπα, *λ* 421 cf. *Mod.* 56. αὐδή is not represented more than once either, viz. in the formula ἔκλινον ἀδῆσαντος, 299, cf. *K* 47, *II* 76, etc.
- 42) In *θεοῦ*, *Y* 380, the final syllable is irresolvable; unless we prefer to assume neglect of digamma, Ἀτρεΐδεω is irreducible in *II* 76.
- 43) In 67 it is reported to Helios by Demeter.
- 44) Above, p. 14 f.
- 45) Cf. Homeric ἦρσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον, *Θ* 227, etc., 6 \times .
- 46) *Mod.* 105 f.
- 47) Cf. Witte, *Vokalkontraktion* 215 ff., *Mod.* 105, 116, 118.
- 48) Zumbach, *o.c.* 54. A similar case is found in 50: οὐδὲ χροά βάλλετο λοντροῖς. In Homer bathing is always described by means of the verb only: λοέσσατο ζ 221, etc., etc. The way it is represented here is certainly new and has involved contraction.
- 49) Perhaps we should read Παρθενίῳ φρελάθ', as the source is an item of Attic topography and since in the Attic dialect the *a* is long. In that case the form should be regarded as an adapted Atticism. I owe this suggestion to Professor J. C. Kamerbeek.
- 50) ὄνεαρ Ilgen (*θυητοῖσι τ'* Ruhnken) for ἀθανάτοις θυητοῖσιν ὄνεαρ.
- 51) Zumbach notes βασιλῆς, Hes. *E.* 263 (τοκῆς always at the verse-end in Homer).
- 52) 52 ff.
- 53) p. 57.
- 54) Schwyzer, *Del.* 631 *A*₂ (p. 299). Already in the fifth century τιμοῦχος is found at Teos, Schwyzer *Del.* 710 *B* 29 (p. 347), cf. Heitsch, *o.c.* 38.
- 54a) ἐδόκουν, 125, is likely to be a copyist's emendation of ἐδόκεον (*φρυσίζον*) cf. *A* 308 ἐπόρθουν vulg., ἐπόρθεον *A*, *T* and a few other mss. On κάλος see above p. 42 f.
- 54b) Cf. Heitsch, *o.c.* 38 f.
- 54c) Heitsch, *o.c.* 39.
- 55) Later Aeolic has τιμῶχος (<*τιμοόχος), Methymna, 2nd century B.C., Schwyzer, *Del.* 631 *A*₂ (p. 299).
- 56) Above, p. 40. Now see Kamerbeek, *o.c.* p. 387.
- 57) Cf. Troxler, *o.c.* 144.
- 58) Vos, *o.c.* 4, thinks θεμιστοπόλος is a poetical word created on analogy of δικασπόλος; Wilamowitz ad *Erga* 221 holds the contrary view.
- 59) βαρύκυπος not in Homer.
- 60) Above, n. 49.
- 61) Zumbach refers e.g. to *privignus*, *o.c.* 23, cf. Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 357.
- 62) Could ἄλφι come from sacral Eleusinian language? On Eleusinian influence see K. Deichgräber, *Eleusinische Frömmigkeit und homerische Vorstellungswelt im homerischen Demeterhymnus*, S.B. Akad. Mainz 1950, 523 ff.
- 63) As it certainly is in *Herm.* 211 κάρη δ' ἔχεν ἀντίον αὐτῷ, cf. Witte, *Glotta* II (1910), 20, *Singular und Plural* 89, 161 ff.
- 64) Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 583, see also Frisk, *s.v.*, and Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 231 ("analogique des pluriels neutres en -α?").
- 65) A.H.S. *ad loc.*
- 66) ἐδίδ[*M*, ἐδίδοντο *m*, ἐδιδόν *τε* Ruhnken.
- 67) ἐδίδουν, ἐδίδων cdd., ἐδιδον Rzach.
- 68) Hesiod's καί μοι σκηπτρον ἔδον is not necessarily a personal creation. *καί Φοι σκηπτρον ἔδον would be perfectly feasible in heroic poetry, e.g. in the myth

of the Pelopids. In the epics *ἔδοσαν* may sometimes be a modification and result from substitution for **ἄρ' ἔδον*, since the replacement of *ὥς ἄρ' ἔφαν* by *ὥς ἔφασαν* (κ 46, υ 384) has already set in. With *ἔσταν* / *ἔστησαν* and *ἔβαν* / *ἔβησαν* such substitutions were impossible because of the different metrical values. *ἔλέλιχθεν* could become *ἔλελίχθησαν* by shifting, *Mod.* 136.

⁶⁹⁾ Addendum *ad* n. 4: Though *οὐρανίων* was formed from *οὐράνιος*, Ruijgh, *Les noms en -won*, etc., *Minos* IX (1968), 1, 140. It is only within the frame-work of epic diction that *θεῶν οὐρανίων* is an innovation, cf. above, p. 13.

⁷⁰⁾ Addendum *ad* 259: Did the poet telescope Homeric *Στυγὸς ὕδωρ, ὃς τε μέγιστος ὄρκος δεινότατός τε πέλει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι* (ε 185–86, *O* 37–38) into *θεῶν ὄρκος, ἀμείλικτον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ*? The expression *θεῶν ὄρκος* may have been suggested to him by the existence of the formula *θεῶν μέγαν ὄρκον (ἀπώμνυ)*, β 377, *Ap.* 83, *Herm.* 519 (*ὀμόσσαι*), cf. *θεά, μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμόσσαι*, ε 178, κ 343, *Ap.* 79. The case shows some resemblance to the innovation found in *Hes. Th.* 886, *Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεύς* (above, n. 16), cf. *Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης*, A 354, etc. (6×), and, in terms of versification, looks like a *substitution* (pp. 22, 29, 40, 49 ff.), cf.

ἴστω νῦν τόδε Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε	ε 184, O 36
„ „ Ζεὺς αὐτός, ἐρίγδοντος πόσις Ἥρης	K 329
„ „ „ πρῶτα, θεῶν ὕπατος καὶ ἄριστος	τ 303, T 258
„ „ „ „ θεῶν, ξενίη τε τράπεζα	ξ 158, etc., 3×

It should be added that in β 377 the use of the formulaic element *θεῶν* shows a modification of *sense* (objective genitive, cf. Stanford *ad loc.*), whereas in *Ap.* 83 and *Herm.* 519 its old meaning has been preserved.

APPENDIX

The poet of the Hymn to Demeter and Hermann's law

I do not think the term 'word-end' is particularly well-suited for tackling the difficult questions related, one way or another, to Hermann's law (*Orphica*, 692 ff.). One may ask whether the character and the pre-history of epic poetry allow us to regard 'words' as its essential elements (as is done by O'Neill, *The Localization of Metrical World-Types in the Greek Hexameter*, YCIS VIII (1942) 105). In order to get an unambiguous answer to this question with respect to Hermann's law it suffices to cast a brief look at the cases listed by Van Leeuwen, *Homeric* IV, *De caesura quae est post quartum trochaeum*, Mnem. N.S. XVIII (1890), 3, 265–276. From this it appears, first, that in some of the relevant cases the terms 'word' and 'word-end' have no meaning at all: **Ἀρηι φατός* or *ἀρηίφατος*, **Ἀρηι φίλος* or *ἀρηίφιλος*? Secondly, their use leads to inconsistencies. If, for instance, trochaic 'word-end' is ruled out in *γοόωσά τε (μυρομένη τε)*, Z 373, and in *χιτώνα τε (ἔννυτ' Ὀδυσσεύς)*, ε 229, — as of course it is — we have to assume it by the same rule in e.g. *θός περ ἔων πολεμιστής*, E 571, etc., *ἐπεὶ κε κάμω πολεμίζων*, A 168, etc., etc. Thirdly: how are we to view the probably very old formula *ἄρπυιαι ἀηρέεσαντο*, α 241 = ξ 371, in which, owing to the ante-vocalic shortening, the two elements constitute a prosodic unity and, on the other hand, *καὶ ὄψε δύνοντα βοώτην* ε 272,¹⁾ *ἄνευθε πόνου καὶ ἀνίης*, η 192, *μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς τελέσειεν*, ρ 399, where there exists a dominant unity of sense between the two elements flanking the critical point of the line?

The truth behind both Hermann's and Wernicke's laws²⁾ seems to be that for reasons we can only guess at,³⁾ the epic poets avoided making a marked cut after the fourth *natural* trochee, after a syllable, that is, which was undivided (combinations containing monosyllables not counted of course) and which, if isolated, was pronounced — ∪.

When do we have to do with a case of 'word-end' which does entail a more or less incisive pause? It is generally agreed upon — and rightly of course — that such a pause is out of the question with elision (a large number of examples in Van Leeuwen, *o.c.*). Further, because of the fact that the quantity of the final syllable of *ἄρπυιαι* is determined by the following word (if not for other reasons), a rhythmical gap is also excluded in α 241 = ξ 371. Moreover, apart from the prosodical factors, we have to take into account those of language (and especially those of syntax): *γοόωσά τε μυρομένη τε*, Z 273, *ἐπεὶ κε κάμω πολεμίζων*, A 168, *ἔπειτα δὲ τέυχε' ἐσύλα*, E 164, etc., etc. (To the numerous examples noted by Van Leeuwen many more may be added.) These, in their turn, are obviously intricately bound up with the element of meaning, (e.g. A 168, E 164, *καὶ ὄψε δύνοντα βοώτην*, *ἄνευθε πόνου καὶ ἀνίης*, *μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς*

τελέσειεν) and even, as is shown by the very simple example of Ἄρηι φίλος, with formulaic usage, (e.g. βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη,⁴) καὶ Λήμνον ἀμιχθαλόεσσαν, Ω 753).⁵) In all these cases it can safely be assumed that the cut was hardly more marked than in e.g. Ἄρηι φίλος Μενέλαος, etc.

It stands to reason that there are cases in which it is difficult to assess the degree to which 'word-end' entailed a pause in recitation. In these places we can only be guided by the consideration whether or not we have to do with a unit of sense and by what knowledge we have of language and idiom. Unity of sense is, of course, often a relative thing, but in Ω 60

θρέφα τε καὶ ἀτίτηλα καὶ ἀνδρὶ πόρον παράκοιτιν

the meaning of the sentence is necessarily incomplete after ἀνδρὶ and this involves anticipation of a verb at least.⁶)

The same applies to the famous line I 394

Πηλεύς θήν μοι ἔπειτα γυναιῖκα γαμέσσεται αὐτός

The verb has been considered corrupt because of the unique sense required for the middle voice (γε μάζεται Ar., cf. Leaf *ad loc.*), but I do not think 'violation' of Hermann's law could be adduced in support of this view. Few words could belong more closely together than γυναιῖκα γαμεῖν (this expression, though it belongs to the vernacular, is used by the poet of the Odyssey: ἐνθα δ' ἔγημε γυναιῖκα, ο 241; incidentally, this hemistich has three successive trochaic cuts!)

There is less unity of sense between the elements flanking the critical point of the line in

αὐτὰρ δ μοῦνος ἔην μετὰ πέντε κασιγνήτησιν	K 317
πατρὶ τ' ἐμῷ πύσυνος καὶ ἐμοῖσι κασιγνήτοισι	σ 140

and especially in

ἄγχι μάλ', ὥς ὅτε τίς τε γυναικὸς ἐνζώνοιο	Ψ 760-61
στήθεός ἐστι κανών	

Here the epithet ἐνζώνοιο does nothing to produce a certain unity of meaning in the latter hemistich of Ψ 760. Instead it shows a degenerate use of the 'épithète générique' (ἐνζώνοιο γυναικός, A 429, ἐνζώνοιο τιθήνης, Z 467).

It has further been observed (Leaf, *o.c.* 631 ff., Th. Stifter, *Das Wer-nickesche Gesetz und die bukolische Dihärese*, Philologus LXXIX, 322-354) that even after the fourth natural spondee pauses tended to be avoided. In the whole of the *Iliad* (15762 lines) Leaf counted no more than 933 lines "where a fourth foot without caesura ends with a word". To a considerable extent this fact must be bound up with the interrelations existing between the diaeresis and verbal forms of the 3rd. p. sing. of past tenses. (M. Parry, *E.T.* 57-60). It must certainly have been even more conspicuous at a time when contraction was scarcer and infinitives in -(έ)μεν and short-vowel

conjunctives were more numerous. On the other hand it often happens that the form of the verb excludes the types *παρίστατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς* and *ὃ δ' ἔργετο, δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*. In that case we find *νόησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*, etc.^{6a)}

This brings us to the only Homeric line which is more or less comparable with *Dem.* 17. It is the well-known verse

πολλὰ δ' ἄρ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθ' ἵθυσε μάχη πεδίοιο Z 2

The two lines have this in common that the element preceding the trochaic 'pause' is a verbal form in the 3rd p. sing. of the aorist. If in Homer such forms (of the metrical types $\cup - \cup$ and $- - \cup$) occur in the fourth foot, the pause is 'bridged' by *δέ*, etc. e.g. *γέλασσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια*, ρ 542, *νόησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*, π 5, *γῆθησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*, ν 104.⁷⁾ The unique characteristic of Z 2 is the fact that the traditional part played by the diaeresis has been taken over by the trochaic 'pause'.⁸⁾ In the epics not a single noun-epithet expression (let alone a formula) can be found after 7½.⁹⁾ In Z 2 Homer may be said to deviate, in an individual manner, from the traditional usage. The poet of *Dem.* behaves in a different way. Disregarding the interrelations existing in genuine epic poetry between formulae and the switch-points of the line he creates a noun-epithet expression on the model of formulae which of old used to function differently. He imitates and in doing so runs counter to the tradition.

NOTES

1) Regarded as an 'exception' by Hermann; Van Leeuwen added η 192 to the 'excusable' cases.

2) If O'Neill had not purposely disregarded the 'natural' quantities, he would, as far as I can see, have been the first to observe the close connection between the two 'laws'. When we look at them from the angle of the fourth natural trochee, they state exactly the same thing. When we bring in lengthening by position, Wernicke's 'law' appears to mean no more than that the poets generally felt that "position" was an inadequate remedy. [I now see that this was already observed by J. A. J. Drewitt, *Some Differences between Speech-scansion and Narrative-scansion in Homeric Verse*, CQ II (1908), 104. This article, which I regret to have overlooked (it was brought to my attention by Mr. J. B. Hainsworth), is important in other respects as well. From his analysis of scansion, scansional functions of *ν*-movable and from the proportions of augmented and unaugmented aorists its author infers that Homeric speeches show "a tendency to minimise the function of metrical pause" and "enjoy a comparative freedom, both metrical and linguistic". Originally, therefore, "Greek epic was for the most part limited to narrative and similes". These conclusions point in the same direction as those independently arrived at by Miss D. Gray (on the evidence of Mycenaean names in Homer) and by the present writer (from a formulaic point of view). For evidence from the Near East now see P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East*, 8 f.]

From our point of view it is not surprising that the categories of 'exceptions' are largely the same: elision, enclitics, 'monosyllables' and, of course, formulae. As to the last group, already Leaf, who was not concerned with formulae, admitted

their influence in practice, ed. *Iliad* ², II, Appendix N, 637 (ἄλλος (-ν) λαός (-ν)). (Mr. H. Bolkestein reminds me that the first three categories are also exceptions in Porson's law.)

³) Fear of 'false close'? (Leaf) Desire to avoid "any strong possibility of three successive trochaic cuts"? (Kirk, *The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter*, YCLS XX (1966), 103; likewise already K. Meister, *o.c.* 55. Both views are partly correct, at any rate, but they may be too specific at the same time. With regard to Porson's law W. J. W. Koster writes, *Traité de métrique grecque* ², 106: "avec M. de Groot je crois que la tendance à accentuer le rythme vers la fin du vers [...] en est la cause première." I would prefer to put it like this as regards the hexameter.

⁴) A highly archaic formula. On the hiatus see Ruijgh, E.G.M. 53.

⁵) Cf. Ruijgh, *E.A.* 145.

⁶) This factor was already taken into account by Leaf with regard to the cases 'violating' Wernicke's law.

^{6a}) See M. Parry, *E.T.* 60 f.

⁷) Cf. M. Parry, *E.T.* 61.

⁸) In a line like this hiatus is not surprising, so we could as well read *ἐνθα ἴθυσε*, see *app. cr.*

⁹) On such cases as *καὶ Ἀγήνορα δῖον* (*A* 59, etc., cf. *καὶ ἀγήνορι θυμῷ*) see Van Leeuwen, *o.c.* 267.

INDEX OF PASSAGES

I HYMNS

Apollo

3	27, n. 17	151	25	330	33; 34, n. 10
4	25	159	21, 25	361	47, n. 15
12	24; 35, n. 35	161	24 f.; 35, n. 15	361 f.	29 f.
15	22; 37, n. 46	163	24 f.; 35, n. 15	376	11 f.; 14 f.; 27,
19	13	164	25		n. 17; 29; 33;
20	22	171	25		49
22	22; 27, n. 11 ^b	177	21; 37, n. 46	380	25
23	27, n. 17	181	22	396	30
25	21; 27, n. 17	190	35, n. 15	419	31
30	26, n. 1	191	12	430	27, n. 17
45	27, n. 17	193	27, n. 17	432	31
46	21 f.	209	29 f.	437	37, n. 46
54	25 f.	213	30	447	38, n. 48
62	22	229	29	454	27, n. 17
71	22, 26, n. 6	234	12	456	28; 34; 47, n. 14
79	61, n. 70	235	27, n. 17; 34,	459 f.	33; 35, n. 15
83	61, n. 70		n. 10	474	37, n. 44
89	24	236	34, n. 10	477	30; 33
99	12; 26	239	29	478	13
100	12; 26	242	12	487	28 f.; 34; 47,
113	23 f.; 26; 45	250	31 f.		n. 14
116	15	252	30; 35, n. 15	488	29; 34
117	25 f.	253	30; 33	501	28 f.; 34; 47,
120	37, n. 41	275 f.	37, n. 46		n. 14
123	25 f.	277	29	503	28 f.
127	25 f.	290	31	503 f.	31
133	14, 24, 26	292	30; 35, n. 15	506	29; 31; 34; 52
134	37, n. 41	293	30; 33	515	30
148	27, n. 26	294	24	528	11; 15; 31; 33
150	24	300	13	538	29; 34; 47, n. 14

Aphrodite

4	44	54	13; 23; 42; 46	147 f.	42; 46
6	41 f.	55	45 f.	148	45
9	41 f.	62	58, n. 5	152	44 ff.
10	23	85	48, n. 27	157	48, n. 22
14	12	87	41	163	41 f.
25	30	112	12; 15	170 f.	48, n. 36
29	42 f.; 46; 54;	114	46; 48, n. 20	181	41; 46
	59, n. 36	126	42; 46; 47, n. 14	196 f.	16, n. 12
31	46; 56	126 f.	41	197	15 f.; 39; 46; 49
32	13; 15	127	15; 49	199	46; 47, n. 10
48 f.	45	128	23; 46	209	44 f.
52	45	137	29	211	39; 46 n. 2

212	39	244 f.	45	267	40; 46
213	12	246	11; 16	276	41; 46
216	44 f.	259	47, n. 15	284	13; 16
232	48, n. 27	261	43		

Demeter

3	56	174	53	366	13
4	25	195	23	398	57
8	13; 16	207	13; 16	402 ff.	26, n. 7
12	57; 58, n. 8	208	57	403	59, n. 32
17	54 f.; 64	209	11	404	59, n. 37
20	14; 16	210	52 f.	404 ff.	17, n. 17; 59, n. 37
22	55	215	56		
23	45; 55; 57	228	12	406	52 f.; 57
31	59, n. 37	230	12	413	51
35	51	242	23	416	47, n. 19
40	23	245	50 f.; 57	420	13; 16
50	60, n. 48	246	53	425	55
54	12	248	27, n. 29; 51; 56	427	13
55	49; 57	259	61, n. 70	430	54 f.
66	48, n. 28; 53 f.	268	45; 56	439	48, n. 27; 54; 59, n. 36
67	55	269	55		
86	27, n. 17	279	49	441	56
99	27, n. 29; 55 f.	284	13; 55; 57	448	59, n. 27
101	56 f.	302	52 f.; 57	451	19, n. 49
103	56	314	45; 53	455	18, n. 37; 55
125	60, n. 54 ^a	315	53 f.	458	14; 51; 57
136	15	325	49; 57	460	56
137	55	334	56	473	56
140	53	347	59, n. 32	474	51
141	56	358	47, n. 15; 49; 55; 57	476	12
144	14			494	56

Hermes

26	27, n. 23	245	12	519	61, n. 70
85	12	295 f.	19, n. 44	527	47, n. 14
143	27, n. 23	301	19, n. 44		
211	60, n. 63	336	19, n. 44		

II HESIOD

Theogony

15	48, n. 27	468	59, n. 16	886	58, n. 16; 61, n. 70
29	58, n. 15	476	59, n. 16		
30	57	585	43	908	48, n. 28
76	58, n. 15	770	45	923	59, n. 16
197	23	884	59, n. 16	1002	58, n. 15
465	59, n. 16				

Erga

4	59, n. 16	139	57	668	59, n. 16
40	25	221	60, n. 58	771	25
63	43	263	60, n. 51		
98	57	451	19, n. 39		

Aspis

13	26, n. 1; 37, n. 36
----	---------------------

Fr.

7, 3 Rz., 10, 1 M.-W.	56
43a, 67 M.-W.	26, n. 1

III HOMER

Iliad

	A	134	50	203	36, n. 33
		166	59, n. 27	210	29
9	26, n. 3 ^a	182	55	235	43
18	49	195 ff	47, n. 17	242	12
21	37, n. 45	219	49	243	28
23	48, n. 20	236	34, n. 10	308	60; n. 54 ^a
49	44	240	48, n. 25	331	34, n. 7
133	48, n. 25	270	45	470	36, n. 21
147	37, n. 44	290	52	524	30; 36, n. 23
163	48, n. 25	333	14		
168	62	393	15		<i>E</i>
170	52	471	53	3	46, n. 2
185	42	486	24	33	48, n. 26
276	42; 48, n. 25	596	17, n. 17	66	48, n. 20
354	61, n. 70	614	22	105	37, n. 40
377	48, n. 20	720	53	164	62
390	37, n. 40	750	22	166	51
404	53	791	22	219	30
406	49			247 f.	39; 49
429	63		<i>Γ</i>	256	34, n. 10
430	51	64	30	281	48, n. 20
438	22; 37, n. 44	173	23	439	37, n. 44
482	14	194	53	447	21
484 ff	31	204	52	504	59, n. 18
485	29; 31	214	53	509	25
562 f	30	224	53	523	23; 42
570	49	327	39	547	51
606	52	351	50	571	62
		386	56	587	12
	B			721	22
38	25			733	54
73	13		<i>Δ</i>	780	29
102	50	151	41	805	36, n. 32
103	43	176	52	876	41
132	35, n. 10	198	59, n. 27	907	50

	<i>Z</i>	364	28	194	15
2	64	434	12	221	33
51	24	450	20, n. 58	256	25
102	59, n. 27	471	35, n. 15	365	37, n. 41
148	53	512	55	397	43; 51
262	36, n. 32	526	29	412	12
297	29	558	12	539	51
304	59, n. 34			581	12
312	59, n. 34		<i>A</i>	744	51
373	62	12	38, n. 48		
467	63	59	65, n. 9		
		137	60, n. 41		<i>II</i>
	<i>H</i>	233	12	33	45
		266	49	76	55; 60, n. 41
53	60, n. 41	484	45	83	41
120	24	624	52	125	59, n. 17
216	30	657	24	172	22
260	48, n. 20	795	23; 59, n. 17	204	45
312	14			299	27, n. 11 ^b
449	19, n. 50		<i>M</i>	371	34, n. 10
		162	43; 51	410	36, n. 21
	<i>Θ</i>	351	59, n. 27	468	30
5	13	386	36, n. 21	507	34, n. 10
181	12	404	48, n. 20	700	19, n. 50
227	60, n. 45	453	46, n. 2	822	12
279	44			852	15
285	34, n. 10		<i>N</i>		
337	29				<i>P</i>
383	22	63	46, n. 2		
424	46, n. 2	210	27, n. 23	33	24
447	28	282	35, n. 19	113	29
512	36, n. 32	317	15	333	37, n. 45
553	27, n. 11 ^b	346	28	409	50
		654	30; 36, n. 23	561	56
	<i>I</i>	674	24	630	48, n. 26
		788	24	647	41
61	47, n. 19	796	18, n. 37	697	12
111	48, n. 25			724	46, n. 2
343	30		<i>Ξ</i>		
371	14				<i>Σ</i>
394	63	152	38, n. 48		
		194	22	11	30
	<i>K</i>	243	22	31	59, n. 18
		253	48, n. 36	51	59, n. 18
47	60, n. 41	280	24	61	30
72	24	327	21	85	47, n. 10
98	35, n. 15	417	50	184	53
134	49			222	55
259	57		<i>O</i>	346	51
296	59, n. 34			354	15
307	46, n. 2	33	45	463	41
317	63	36 ff.	61, n. 70	520	29
329	61, n. 70	48	36, n. 33	583	28
344	34, n. 10	186	51		

	<i>T</i>	98	60, n. 41	475	39
77	25	138	29	488	54
121	41	185	15	595	30
130	24	198	50	754	54
219	25	362	51	760 f.	63
258	61, n. 70	602	34, n. 7	787	52
270	20, n. 58				

X

	<i>Y</i>	15	37, n. 45		Ω
36	29	78	24		
39	37, n. 41	207	46, n. 2	60	63
152	37, n. 41; 55	299	14	99	49
153	55	399	46, n. 2	101	42
208 f.	39, 49	431	15	131	15
247	46, n. 2	451	55	285	25
276	48, n. 20			309	55
307 f.	39			354	53
			Ψ	371	14
373	46, n. 2	62 f.	48, n. 36	491	51
380	60, n. 42	186	13	605	44
403	30	223	12	607	21
		266	14	616	43
	Φ	312	25	706	51
34	22	370	30	753	63

Odyssey

	α		δ		ζ
241	62	4	53	151	59, n. 34
263	58, n. 4	27	50	221	60, n. 48
366	41	102	22	245	23
378	58, n. 4	107	46, n. 2	312	34, n. 10
379	43	251	12	323	59, n. 34
403	51	355	41	327	55
		387	15	365	49
	β	523	51		
106	24	547	27, n. 23		η
143	58, n. 4	577	22	19	27, n. 23
210	17, n. 17	646	51	192	62
283	25			194	34, n. 10
311	36, n. 32			242	57
378	61, n. 70				
			ε		θ
	γ	67	41		
19	52	123	13	79	30
41	25; 59, n. 36	150	59, n. 27	81	30
63	42	178	61, n. 70	82	50
168	29	184 ff.	61, n. 70	92	44; 57
278	26, n. 1	229	62	169	59, n. 29
312	46, n. 2	250	12	174	59, n. 29
421 f.	35, n. 30	272	62	277	48, n. 22
422	30	325	27, n. 16	284	22
488	51	393	46, n. 2	364 f.	58, n. 4

375	46, n. 2		ν	561	52
450	51	56	25		σ
		87	12		
	ι	198	51	8	34, n. 7
15	57	277	14	11	45
404	20, n. 58	422	46, n. 2	140	63
411	50			146	15
414	14		ξ	213	41
		15	15	234	53
		25	49	342	12
	κ	158	61, n. 70	394	23
46	61, n. 68	227	41		τ
73	20, n. 57	286	57		
290	52	371	62	179	50
316	52	379	11	205	23, 42
343	61, n. 70			230	34, n. 10
403	22		o	281	57
424	22			302	15
536	34, n. 10	21	22	303	61, n. 70
549	23	101	29	489	34, n. 10
		147	29		
		150	59, n. 36		v
	λ	186	51		
2	22	241	63	12	34, n. 10
22	23, 59, n. 17	319	42	92	55
93	30	397	12	104	64
122	29			297	42
146	41		π	384	61, n. 68
148	52	5	64		φ
175	42	28	41		
184	42	85	34, n. 10	188	12
185	40	233	12		χ
255	50	312	31		
268	50	314	36, n. 32	324	15
287	21	340	12	334	50
323	26, n. 1	403	50	360	27, n. 23
421	60, n. 41			379	50
598	18, n. 37		ϱ	395	56
		28	29	422	14
	μ	38	25	481	15
52	60, n. 41	270	49		ψ
116	41	308	53		
156	52	367	57	269	29
185	60, n. 41	399	62		ω
187	60, n. 41	411	57		
226	12	454	53	141	24
237	51	542	64	165	46, n. 2
318	43	549	52	347	25
432	46, n. 2	556	52	521	59, n. 34

IV OTHER AUTHORS

Aeschylus

Ag. 355 – 58, n. 11

356 – 19, n. 15

1387 f. – 31

Pers. 532 – 58, n. 11*Suppl.* 156 – 59, n. 37*Fr.* 228 N.², 377 M. – 59, n. 37

Apollonius Rh.

Arg. IV, 1523 – 47, n. 14

Aristophanes

Eq. 1087 – 46, n. 8*Nub.* 2, etc. – 58, n. 11

Callimachus

Aet. I, 6 Pf. – 47, n. 14

III, 75, 6, Pf. – 47, n. 14

Cypria, *Fr.* VIII A. – 19, n. 55*Fr.* XI A. – 31

Empedocles

Fr. B 40 D.-K. – 19, n. 55*Fr.* B 85 D.-K. – 19, n. 55

Euripides

Hec. 1034 – 30*Heracl.* 450, 534 – 30*Or.* 97 – 20, n. 57

Herodotus

II, 50 – 19, n. 56

V, 72 – 20, n. 57

Pindarus

N. IV, 72 – 41*P.* III, 180 – 35, n. 17*Fr.* 236 Sn. – 35, n. 17Schol. *N.* X, 114 Dr. – 31

Solon

24, 17 D. – 47, n. 19

Strabo

III, 1, 52 – 40; 47, n. 11

Tyrtaeus

2, 4 D. – 31

GENERAL INDEX

Abstract nouns - 12

Aeolisms - 19, n. 56; 48 nn. 28, 30; 51; 56

Aeschylus - 16, n. 11; 31

Allen-Halliday-Sikes - 5 and *pass.*

Aorists - (in $-\eta\sigma-$) 14 f.; 55; (in $-\theta\epsilon\nu$) 49; (sigmatic/reduplicated) 50 f.; ($\pi\tau\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$) 57; (in $-\sigma\alpha\nu$) 57

Archaisms (archaic elements, etc.) - 7; 23; 25; 31; 33 f.; 46; 56 f.

Aristotle - 18, n. 36

Association (late) - 49 f.; 55

Atticisms - 54; 56; 58, n. 1; 60, n. 49

Batrachomyomachia - 17, n. 20

Bechtel, F. - 38, n. 36

Bennett, E. L. - 19, nn. 38, 52

Böhme, J. - 35, n. 20

Bolkestein, H. - 19, n. 55; 37, n. 40; 65, n. 2

Bowra, Sir C. M. - 5

Brown, N. D. - 18, n. 23

Cauer, P. - 18, n. 33; 36, n. 27

Chantraine, P. - 19, n. 45 and *pass.*

Chronology - 7; 31; 39 f.; 43

Compounds - 12 f.; 54

Conflation - 30 f.; 51 f.

Conjugation - 15; 34, n. 10; 39; 49; 53

Contraction (*see also* Synizesis) - 21 f.; 25, 51; 55; 60, n. 48

Cook, A. B. - 58, n. 11

Croiset, M. - 18, n. 33

Dative (sing., in \tilde{i}) - 25; 31 ff.; 51; 56

Davison, J. A. - 16, n. 10^a

Debrunner, A. - 28; 34, n. 4

Declension - 21; 25; 39; 44 f.; 49; 53

Decomposition - 5 and *pass.*

Deichgräber, K. - 60, n. 62

Demetrius of Scepsis - 40

Deubner, L. - 34, n. 10

Digamma - 14; 21; 24 f.; 29; 36, n. 32 ff.; 42; 51 ff.

Dionysus (Hymn to) - 7; 10

Dodds, E. R. - 16, n. 11

Dornseiff, F. - 18, n. 23

Drerup, E. - 16, n. 10

Drewitt, J. A. J. - 64, n. 2

Dual - 28 f.; 34

Economy - 14

Enjambement - 24; 35, n. 15; 45; 55

Epithets (of Apollo) - 31 ff.

Equivalentents - 50

Euripides – 16, n. 11

Evolution – 5 and *pass.*

Forderer, M. – 9; 49

Freed (G.) and Benthman (R.) – 37, n. 37; 47, n. 14

Fränkel, E. – 36, n. 25; 58, n. 11

Fränkel, H. – 36, n. 20

Frisk, H. – 49, n. 56 and *pass.*

Genitive – (of Ἑρμείης) 42; (with ἀπιθέω) 59, n. 27

Gemoll, A. – 47, n. 14

Glides – 24

Gray, D. H. F. – 64, n. 2

Groningen, B. A. v. – 17, n. 22

Hainsworth, J. B. – 17, n. 16; 18, n. 36; 27, n. 11^b

Hamm, E.-M. – 48, n. 28

Hartel, W. v. – 32

Heitsch, E. – 16, n. 2; 19, nn. 50 ff.; 47, n. 18 ff.; 48, n. 36; 60, n. 54^b f.

Hermann's law – 54; 62 ff.

Hermes (Hymn to) – 10; 12; 18, n. 20; 19, n. 44; 27, n. 23; 30; 37, nn. 37, 40, 47;
47, n. 14; 61, n. 70

Hesiod 8; 18, n. 23; 37, n. 36; 43; 48, n. 29; 57; 58, n. 16; 60, n. 68

Humbert, J. – 18, n. 23; 47, n. 14

Imperfects (ἔδιδον/ἔδιδόσαν) – 57

Inflection – 21; 28 f.; 39 f.; 49

Innovation(s) – 11 and *pass.* (in vocabulary) 11–13 (in verbal forms) 13–15; 28 f.; 51

Inversion – 51 f. (*see also* Transposition)

Irreducible (irresolvable) forms – 22; 25; 34, n. 10; 42; 44; 60, n. 42

Isolated forms – 11–13; 26

Isler, F. – 36, n. 32

Jacoby, F. – 47, n. 47

Juxtaposition – 22; 25; 29; 42; 51 ff.

καλός/καλός – 43 f.; 54

Kamerbeek, J. C. – 18, n. 23; 35, n. 17; 47, n. 19; 56; 60, n. 49; 60, n. 56

Kirk, G. L. – 17, n. 19; 19, n. 47; 65, n. 3

κούρη/κούρη – 54 f.

Koster, W. J. W. – 65, n. 3

Kühner (R.) – Gerth (B.) – 34, n. 5; 46, n. 8; 53

Leaf, W. – 63; 64, n. 2; 65, n. 3

Leeuwen, J. f., J. v. – 35, n. 19; 62; 64, n. 1; 65, n. 6

Lesky, A. – 7; 16, n. 6; 18 n. 23

Leumann, M. – 18, nn. 28, 30; 20, n. 73

Literary influence – 39 f.

Lloyd-Jones, H. – 16, n. 11

Longinus, Ps. – 16, n. 14; 18, n. 36

Lord, A. B. – 5; 17; n. 17

McLeod, W. – 17, nn. 16, 17

Meaning (modification of) – 28 f.; 30 f.; 40 f.; 44 f.; 46, n. 2; 47, n. 14 f.; 48, n. 20 f.; 61 f.

Meillet, A. – 32; 36; n. 34 f.

Meister, K. – 17, n. 18; 20; n. 73; 34, nn. 4, 6, 7; 46, n. 9; 59, n. 31; 65, n. 3

Metathesis (quantitative) – 42 f.

N-movable – 23 ff.; 27, n. 23; 30; 35, n. 15; 39; 41 ff.; 55; 59, n. 30; 64

Nilsson, M. P. – 18; 36; 59, n. 37

Notopoulos, J. A. – 7 ff.; 16, n. 14; 17, n. 16; 59, n. 16

O'Neill Jr, E. – 62; 64, n. 2

Onomatopoeia – 20, n. 67; 55

P₁, P₂ hemistichs – 20, n. 66; 25; 30; 42 f.; 45; 51 f.; 54; 58, n. 15; 59, n. 36

Page, D. L. – 18, nn. 26 f., 33

Palmer, L. R. – 20, n. 56; 58, nn. 11^a f.

Panyassis – 17, n. 16

Parry, M. – 5 and *pass.*

Permutation – 30; 42 f.; 59, n. 36

Plotinus – 16, n. 14

Πολυδέγμων – 54; 59, n. 37

Porson's law – 35, n. 2 f.

Porter, H. N. – 7; 18, n. 23

Praesens propheticum – 39

Preller (L.) – Robert (C.) – 59, n. 37

Preminger (A.) – Warnke (F. J.) – Hardison Jr (O. B.) – 16, n. 14

Radermacher, L. – 18, n. 23; 59, n. 37

Regenbogen, O. – 26, n. 3

Reinhardt, K. – 16, n. 1

Re-interpretation – 35, n. 11^a; 44

Repetitions – 7 f.

Runover words – 45; 55

Ruijgh, C. J. – 20, n. 56 f.; 34 n. 7; 35, n. 11^a; 48, n. 30; 58, n. 11; 59, n. 26; 65, nn. 3, 5

Scepsis (Milesian colonisation of) – 40

Schwyzler, E. – 20, n. 71 and *pass.*

Separation – 22; 29; 41 f.; 51 f.

Severyns, A. – 20, n. 66

Shortening – 55; (ante-vocalic) 62

Snell, B. – 36, n. 20

Solmsen, F. – 47, n. 15

Solon – 17, n. 16

Stanford, W. B. – 61, n. 70

Stifter, Th. – 63

Suhle, B. – 48, n. 20

Synizesis – 49; 52; 55

Szemerényi, O. – 19, n. 41

T₁, T₂ hemistichs – 22; 42 f.; 45; 50 f.; 54; 59, n. 36

Τέμενος (meaning of) – 40 f.

Theognis – 17, n. 16

Transposition - 22 ff.; 42 ff.; 51 ff.

Troxler, H. - 48, nn. 29, 35; 60, n. 57

Trueber, H. - 46, n. 1

Tsopanakis, A. G. - 48, n. 22

Usener, H. - 59, n. 37

Valk, M. H. A. L. v. d. - 18, n. 36

Vocabulary - 11 ff.

Vos, H. - 19, n. 56; 60, n. 58

Wackernagel, J. - 18, n. 34; 20, n. 73; 50

Walcot, P. - 64, n. 2

Walzel, O. - 16, n. 14

Wathelet, P. - 18, n. 32; 27, n. 28

Webster, T. B. L. - 18, n. 36; 37, n. 36

Wellek (R.) - Warren (A.) - 16, n. 14

Wernicke's law - 62; 64, n. 2; 65, n. 6

West, M. L. - 58, n. 16

West, S. - 36, n. 27

Wilamowitz, U. v. - 26, n. 6; 58, n. 11; 60, n. 63

Windisch, W. O. C. - 26, n. 1 f.

Witte, K. - 44; 58, n. 3; 60, nn. 47, 63

Word-end - 54; 62 ff.

Zεύς βασιλεύς - 49 f.; 58, n. 16