

ELISION AND AUGMENT IN THE *HOMERIC HYMN TO DEMETER*

I

In editing the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (hereafter cited as *h.Cer.*), the choice between the augmented or unaugmented form of past tenses is a recurring problem¹. In early epics, and also in Attic tragedies, the augment is sometimes omitted. For example, in the manuscript M (*Mosquensis*, now *Leidensis* B.P.G. 33 H, *saec.* XV), which alone preserves this hymn, δ' ἔκλυε is written at verse 39. However, δὲ κλύε is also a possibility. How do we decide? We may not, of course, freely add or omit the augment. Therefore we must choose².

Although M usually divides words, the information of the manuscript is not entirely reliable. West says, "Texts were written without word-division down to the end of antiquity, and even later the division is sometimes incomplete or inconspicuous. Many mistakes result from a copyist seeing part of one word as part of another, or one word as two, etc."³.

¹ First of all, I give simple explanations of the metrical words which are cited in this paper. For detailed explanations, see M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, 191-201 and D. B. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, Second Edition, Bristol 1998 (=1891), 338-41. (1) Biceps: a pair of short positions (~ ~). (2) Caesura: this occurs when the pause between two words falls within a foot. (3) Diaeresis: by diaeresis is meant the coincidence of the division between words with the division into feet. (4) Hermann's Bridge: the rule that the fourth biceps is normally undivided. (5) Princeps: a position in the verse that calls for a long syllable.

² See M. L. West, *Homerus, Ilias*, Vol. I, Stuttgart 1998, XXVI-XXVII. He says, 'Saepissime manet in incerto, utrum poeta augmentum syllabicum apposuerit an omiserit, σπλάγχν' ἐπάσαντο an σπλάγχνα πάσαντο et sim... Et editor hodiernus ne sibi quidem sanus videatur, si dura ac rigida lege, ubicumque per metrum liceat, vel inferciat augmenta vel amputet.'

³ M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique: Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*, Stuttgart 1973, 26.

This problem of the management of the augment is, of course, not peculiar to *h.Cer.*, but is also a common problem in Homer, Hesiod, other *Homeric Hymns* and Attic tragedies, etc. We need some criteria to choose between the augmented or unaugmented form apart from information in the manuscripts, and we must put forward reasons why we choose the form which we print. However, the editors of *h.Cer.* have not always given an intelligent reason for their choice⁴.

In this paper I try to reconstruct forms which the poet of *h.Cer.* intended, depending not on the information of M but on the meter and vocabulary of epic poetry.

The cases in question are the following:

	M	editors
39 δ' ἔκλυε / δὲ κλύε	ἔκλυε	ἔκλυε
100 ὑπερθ' ἐπεφύκει / ὑπερθε πεφύκει	πεφύκει	πεφύκει
111 οὐδ' ἔγνων / οὐδὲ γῶν	ἔγνων	ἔγνων / ἔγνον ⁵

⁴ I refer to the following editions: (1) F. A. Wolf, *Homeri Odyssea cum Batrachomyomachia, hymnis, ceterisque poematibus*, Halle 1784. (2) G. Hermann, *Homeri Hymni et Epigrammata*, Leipzig 1806. (3) F. A. Wolf, *Homeri et Homericarum opera et reliquiae*, Vol. V, Leipzig 1807. (4) A. Baumeister, *Hymni Homerici*, Leipzig 1860. (5) E. Abel, *Homeri hymni, epigrammata, Batrachomyomachia*, Leipzig 1886. (6) A. Gemoll, *Die homerischen Hymnen*, Leipzig 1886. (7) A. Goodwin, *Hymni Homerici*, Oxford 1893. (8) D. B. Monro, *Homeri opera et reliquiae*, Oxford 1896. (9) T. W. Allen and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*, London 1904. (10) T. W. Allen, *Homeri Opera*, Vol. V, Oxford 1912. (11) H. G. Evelyn-White, *Hesiod, Homeric Hymns, Epic Cycle, Homeric Hymns*, Cambridge Mass. - London 1914. (12) T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*, Second Edition, Oxford 1936. (13) J. Humbert, *Homère. Hymnes*, Paris 1936. (14) N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974. (15) F. Càssola, *Inni omerici*, Milan 1975. (16) G. Zanetto, *Inni omerici*, Second Edition, Milan 2000. (17) J. B. Torres Guerra, *Himno Homérico a Deméter*, Pamplona 2001. (18) M. L. West, *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*, Cambridge Mass. - London 2003.

⁵ Here Abel, *Homeri hymni*; Gemoll, *homerischen Hymnen*; Evelyn-White, *Homeric Hymns*; Càssola, *Inni omerici*; Torres Guerra, *Himno*; and West, *Homeric Hymns* adopt ἔγνον. The difference between the -ων and -ον is irrelevant to the main subject.

239 δ' ἐκρύπτεσκε / δὲ κρύπτεσκε	κρύπτεσκε	κρύπτεσκε
280 δ' ἐπλήσθη / δὲ πλήσθη	ἐπλήσθη	ἐπλήσθη
313 τ' ἐφράσσατο / τε φράσσατο	ἐφράσσατο	ἐφράσσατο
331 ποτ' ἔφασκε / ποτε φάσκε	φάσκε	ἔφασκε/φάσκε ⁶
359 δ' ἐκέλευσε / δὲ κέλευσε	ἐκέλευσε	ἐκέλευσε
379 ἄκοντ' ἐπετέσθη / ἄκοντε πετέσθη	πετέσθη	πετέσθη
437 δ' ἐδέχοντο / δὲ δέχοντο	δέχοντο	ἐδέχοντο ⁷ / δέχοντο

II

First, the caesura must be a criterion. The caesura may depend on an elision, but such a case is rare⁸. Drewitt says that unaugmented aorists and imperfects following the feminine caesura are counted as metrically certain⁹. Therefore at 100 the unaugmented form must be right: ἐν σκιῇ, αὐτὰρ ὑπερθε πεφύκει θάμνος ἐλαίης.

Secondly, the iterative usually does not have an augment¹⁰. At 239 δὲ κρύπτεσκε must be right. On the other hand, the syllabic augment is seldom omitted in the aorist in similes or the gnomic aorist¹¹. Thus at 280 the augmented form must be right: αὐγῆς δ' ἐπλήσθη πυκινὸς δόμος ἄστεροπῆς ὥς¹².

⁶ Here, Wolf, *Homeri Odyssea cum hymnis* and Humbert, *Hymnes* adopt ποτε φάσκε.

⁷ Here, Baumeister, *Hymni Homerici*; Abel, *Homeri hymni* and Evelyn-White, *Homeric Hymns* adopt δ' ἐδέχοντο.

⁸ See West, *Greek Metre*, 36. Of the caesura which depends on an elision, he says, "There are ten examples of this type in *Iliad A*."

⁹ J. Drewitt, "The augment in Homer", *CQ* 6, 1912, 50.

¹⁰ Cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, 62; Drewitt, "The augment", 44; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, Vol. I, Paris 1958, 482 and M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford 1966, 214.

¹¹ Cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, 402; Drewitt, "The augment", 44; Chantraine, *Grammaire*, 484 and M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works & Days*, Oxford 1978, 243.

¹² It is a recurring linguistic problem why the iterative does not take the augment while the aorist in similes can hardly exist without augment. In some earlier publications it is argued that the augment is chiefly omitted where the context shows that past time is meant. Therefore the iterative, which is only used in historical tenses, does not take the augment, and the aorist in similes, which lack specific temporal reference, nearly always

I will treat other examples mainly by applying Barrett's method¹³. When Barrett looks at the case of $\sigma\epsilon \chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$ / $\sigma' \acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$ at E. *Hipp.* 1072, he uses the following method¹⁴. He starts from meter, and enumerates instances which are

(a) certainly $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$, i.e. unaugmented form guaranteed by meter,

(b) uncertain, i.e. a form not guaranteed by meter,

(c) certainly $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$, i.e. augmented form guaranteed by meter,

and then he treats instances under (b) in the light of the figures for (a) and (c). For 5th-cent. Attic poets figures for (a), (b) and (c) are as follows: A. (a) 2, (b) 2, (c) 0; S. (a) 8, (b) 1, (c) 0; E. (a) 65, (b) 30, (c) 19; Old Comedy (a) 19, (b) 22, (c) 16. On the strength of these he prints instances of (b) in Aeschylus and Sophocles with $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$, while in Euripides and Old Comedy, he sometimes adopts $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$. Following Barrett, I compare the total number of

takes the augment; cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, 62 and Chantraine, *Grammaire*, 484. On the other hand, Bekker says, 'verbal augment originally was a deictic suffix marking an event as "near" with respect to the speaker's present and immediate situation.' (E. Bekker, "Similes, Augment and the Language of Immediacy", in J. Watson [ed.], *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, Leiden 2001, 15). He explains that the iterative's suffix $-\sigma\kappa$ - that marks an action that is performed repeatedly or by more than one person is inherently incompatible with a deictic marker denoting concrete, positive occurrence within a speaker's perceptual orbit. On the other hand, the augment is compatible with the Homeric simile, which strains the similarity by looking for unexpected connection between the two scenes, the epic and the domestic one. For further details, see Bekker, "Similes", 1-23. Also see E. Bekker, "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer", in J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart 1999, 50-65.

¹³ If we do not find any criteria, we must choose the unaugmented forms in these examples. The reason is that they are in narrative and augment is relatively less common in narrative; cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, 62; Chantraine, *Grammaire*, 484 and Bekker, "Similes", 8.

¹⁴ S. Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964, 361-2.

augmented forms with that of unaugmented forms in early epics (Homer, Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*¹⁵).

39 φωνῆ ὑπ' ἀθανάτη, τῆς δ' ἔκλυε / δὲ κλύε πότνια
μήτηρ

Subject of investigation: the imperfect of κλύω.

- (1) certain ἐκλυ- 24 instances.
- (2) uncertain 22 instances (19; 3; 0; 0)¹⁶.
- (3) certain κλυ- 15 instances.

¹⁵ This method is applied on the assumption that the language of *h. Cer.* is the same as the language of Homer, Hesiod and other *Homeric Hymns*. This is not absolutely true, but on the whole the language is similar.

The texts used: *Il.*: T. W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias*, Vols. II-III, Oxford 1931. *Od.*: P. von der Muehl, *Homeri Odyssea*, Basel 1962. *Th.*: West, *Theogony. Op. and Sc.*: F. Solmsen, *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum. Fragmenta selecta*, ed. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, Oxford 1970. *Hes. fr.*: R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford 1967. *h. Hom.*: Allen, Halliday and Sikes, *Homeric Hymns*.

¹⁶ I include the following examples among (2), and for reference subdivide in brackets: (a) τ' ἔκλυον / τε κλύον, i.e. there is the possibility that originally -ε belonged to the front word, a scribe added it to the back word, or vice versa. (b) ὄπ' ἔκλυον / ὄπα κλύον or ἦπτετ' ἔπιπτε / ἦπτετο πίπτε, i.e. there is the possibility that originally -α or -ο belonged to the front word, a scribe added it to the back word, or vice versa. (c) ἔτ' ἐφάσκεθ' / ἔτι φάσκεθ' or λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε / λιγυφθόγγοις ἐκέλευσε, i.e. there is the possibility that originally -ι belonged to the front word, a scribe added it to the back word, or vice versa. (d) δῆ καὶ ἔμελλεν Ὀδυσσεὺς / δῆ καὶ μέλλεν Ὀδυσσεὺς, i.e. there is the possibility that a scribe resolved biceps by adding the augment or contracted it by omitting the augment. At line 39, of 22 instances 19 are (a), 3 are (b), 0 is (c) and 0 is (d).

In order to collect more reliable statistics, the following rules have been applied:

- (1) I count augmented aorists in gnomes and similes as certain.
- (2) I count augmented or unaugmented forms as certain if alternative forms would make caesura coincident with elision or would not make caesura in the third foot.
- (3) I count augmented or unaugmented forms as certain if alternative forms would violate Hermann's bridge, because exceptions for Hermann's bridge are very rare (about once in 550 lines in Homer; cf. West, *Greek Metre*, 38 [n. 18])

The instances of certain ἐκλυ- are more numerous than those of certain κλυ-. Moreover, the examples of certain κλυ- occur only in the formula μάλα μὲν κλύον ἦδ' ἐπίθοντο, while the examples of certain ἐκλυ- are found in various types of readings. Therefore I think δ' ἔκλυε is probably right.

111 οὐδ' ἔγνω / οὐδὲ γνῶν• χαλεποὶ δὲ θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ὀρᾶσθαι

Subject of investigation: the second aorist of γινώσκω.

- (1) certain ἔγνω- 27 instances.
- (2) uncertain 15 instances (12; 3; 0; 0).
- (3) certain γνω- 9 instances.

The instances of certain ἔγνω- are more numerous than those of certain γνω-. Moreover, the examples of certain γνω- occur only in the 3rd sing. γνῶ, while the examples of certain ἔγνω- are found in various forms. I therefore think οὐδ' ἔγνω is probably right¹⁷.

313 εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς ἐνόησεν ἑῷ τ' ἐφράσσατο / τε φράσσατο θυμῷ

Subject of investigation: the first aorist of φράζω.

- (1) certain ἐφρασ- 13 instances.
- (2) uncertain 6 instances (5; 1; 0; 0¹⁸).

(4) I count resolved biceps in the fifth foot as metrically certain, because the contraction is not frequent in the fifth foot (only 5% of lines; cf. West, *Greek Metre*, 37).

¹⁷ At 111, 313, 331 and 379 the verbs are negated. Bekker argues that augment is disfavored in negated verbs. He says that in 63 examples of negated verbs in character speech in the *Iliad* the number of augments required by meter is 14 while the number ruled out by meter is 27 (Bekker, “*Similes*”, 13-4). However, in character speech in *h.Cer.* the number of augments required by meter is 1 (at 129 οὐ...ἤρατο) while the number ruled out by meter is 2 (at 57 and 68 οὐκ ἴδον). There are only a few examples, so that it is not certain that augment is disfavored in negated verbs in *h.Cer.* Therefore it is difficult to choose between the augmented or unaugmented form in *h.Cer.* depending on the criterion that ‘augment is disfavored in negated verbs.’

¹⁸ I did not include such examples as Hom. *Il.* 23.453 | ἔγνω, φράσσατο / | ἔγνω, ἐφράσσατο. I think that ἔγνω, φράσσατο must be right, because the augment of ἐφράσσατο in the latter would be short, but the augment in 13 examples of certain ἐφρασ- is always long.

(3) certain φρασ- 9 instances.

The instances of certain ἐφρασ- are more numerous than those of certain φρασ-. Moreover, the epsilon of τ' ἐφράσσατο or τε φράσσατο is long by position. If τε φράσσατο is adopted here, the long -ε is at the biceps of the fourth foot. However, there are 102 examples of the long -ε before φρ- in early epics and the -ε is always at the princeps in these examples. The τε φράσσατο would be an unusual form in epic vocabularies. I therefore think τ' ἐφράσσατο is probably right.

331 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ἔφασκε / ποτε φάσκε θυώδεος
Οὐλύμποιο

Subject of investigation: the imperfect of φάσκω.

(1) certain ἐφασκ- 10 instance.

(2) uncertain 8 instance (4; 0; 1; 3).

(3) certain φασκ- 3 instance.

The instances of certain ἐφασκ- are more numerous than those of certain φασκ-. Also, the examples of certain φασκ- occur only at the beginning of the line¹⁹, while the examples of certain φασκ- are found in various places. Furthermore, there are three examples of certain οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ'²⁰, while there is only one example of certain οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτε²¹. Finally, ποτε φάσκε makes the diaeresis after the second foot, but such diaeresis is less common in this hymn (70 examples, 14.14%)²². I therefore think ποτ' ἔφασκε is probably right.

¹⁹ See Richardson, *Hymn to Demeter*, 264. He says, 'φάσκε is used only at the beginning of the verse, in *Od.* 24. 75, *Hes. Th.* 209.' (We can give another example in *Hom. Od.* 10.331.)

²⁰ *Hom. Il.* 6.124 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ὄπωπα μάχη ἔνι κυδιανείρη; *Il.* 13.556 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ἄνευ δητίων ἦν, ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτούς; *Od.* 10.93 πλησίαι· οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ἀέξετο κῦμά γ' ἐν αὐτῷ.

²¹ *Hom. Od.* 18.132 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσασθαι ὀπίσσω.

²² When I count the number of diaereses, the enclitics δέ, μέν, γάρ, κεν, ἄν, the proclitics καί, ἀλλά and the monosyllabic prepositions cohere so closely with the preceding or following word that divisions after or before these words are not regarded as word-boundaries. For an explanation of the coherence, see M. L. West, "Homer's Meter", in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, 223. For a survey of

359 ἐσσυμένως δ' ἐκέλευσε / δὲ κέλευσε δαΐφρονι
Περσεφονείη

Subject of investigation: the first aorist of κελεύω.

(1) certain ἐκελευσ- 25 instances.

(2) uncertain 35 instances (17; 6; 12; 0).

(3) certain κελευσ- 3 instances²³.

The instances of certain ἐκελευσ- are more numerous than those of certain κελευσ-. Moreover, ἐσσυμένως δὲ κέλευσε makes feminine caesura in the second foot, but such caesura is less common in this hymn (81 examples, 16.36%). I therefore think δ' ἐκέλευσε is probably right.

379 σεῦε διὲκ μεγάρων τῷ δ' οὐκ ἄκοντ' ἐπετέσθην / ἄκοντε
πετέσθην

Subject of investigation: the imperfect of πέτομαι.

(1) certain ἐπετ- 1 instance.

(2) uncertain 21 instances (18; 2; 1; 0).

(3) certain πετ- 7 instances.

The instances of certain πετ- are more numerous than those of certain ἐπετ-. Moreover, there is no example of the elided form ἄκοντ' and ἀέκοντ'²⁴ in early epics. I therefore think ἄκοντε πετέσθην is probably right.

437 γηθοσύνας δ' ἐδέχοντο / δὲ δέχοντο παρ' ἀλλήλων
ἔδιδόν τε

Subject of investigation: the imperfect of δέχομαι.

(1) certain ἐδεχ- 0 instance.

(2) uncertain 1 instance (1; 0; 0; 0).

(3) certain δεχ- 0 instance.

word-boundaries, see M. Van Raalte, *Rhythm and Metre: Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse*, Leiden 1986, 162-5.

²³ I include Hom. *Od.* 2.263 καὶ μ' ἐν νηϊ κέλευσας ἐπ' ἠεροειδέα πόντον as certain κελευσ-. In this line νηϊ κέλευσας is almost impossible, because the -ι of the dat. sing. is rarely elided (see Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, 349).

²⁴ Abel, *Homeri hymni* and Evelyn-White, *Homeric Hymns* adopt ἀέκοντε at line 379.

It is very difficult to judge which form is right, but we find some examples of ἐδέχοντο in the same position in later works²⁵:

<i>h.Cer.</i> 2.437	γηθοσύνας δ' ἐδέχοντο παρ' ἀλλήλων ἔδιδόν τε
Nonn. <i>D.</i> 4.236	μισθοφόρους ἐδέχοντο. καὶ ἡρέμα σύμπλοος ἀνήρ
Nonn. <i>D.</i> 14.287	καὶ τελετὰς ἐδέχοντο καὶ ἡσπάζοντο χορείας
Nonn. <i>D.</i> 47.477	οἱ δέ μιν οὐκ ἐδέχοντο, χοροπλεκέας δὲ γυναῖκας
Nonn. <i>P.</i> 19.85	Ἴησοῦν ἐδέχοντο θελήμονες· ὠκύμοροι δὲ

On the other hand, we find no example of δέχοντο in the same position. Moreover, γηθοσύνας δὲ δέχοντο makes feminine caesura in the second foot, but such caesura is less common in this hymn, as mentioned above (at 359 δ' ἐκέλευσε / δὲ κέλευσε). I therefore think δ' ἐδέχοντο is probably right.

III

I will print the following forms:

	M	editors
39 δ' ἔκλυε	ἔκλυε	ἔκλυε
100 ὑπερθε πεφύκει	πεφύκει	πεφύκει
111 οὐδ' ἔγνων	ἔγνων	ἔγνων / ἔγνον
239 δὲ κρύπτεσκε	κρύπτεσκε	κρύπτεσκε
280 δ' ἐπλήσθη	ἐπλήσθη	ἐπλήσθη
313 τ' ἐφράσσατο	ἐφράσσατο	ἐφράσσατο
331 ποτ' ἔφασκε	φάσκε	ἔφασκε / φάσκε
359 δ' ἐκέλευσε	ἐκέλευσε	ἐκέλευσε
379 ἄκοντε πετέσθην	πετέσθην	πετέσθην
437 δ' ἐδέχοντο	δέχοντο	ἐδέχοντο / δέχοντο

Nearly all instances of elision or addition of the augment in M seem to be correct, in accordance with my other criteria, except 331 and 437. This might be considered noteworthy. Also, my

²⁵ The following example is less certain: *Q.S.* 11.319 τεύχεα πάντ' ἐδέχοντο κακῶ πεφορυγμένα λύθρῳ.

forms are the same as those of the editors except for 331 and 437. At 437 in particular, most editors adopt δέχοντο. However, they do not give any reasons for their choice. Therefore it should be concluded, from what has been said above, that ἐδέχοντο is more authentic than δέχοντο.

ICHIRO TAIDA
I-Shou University, Taiwan
ictmh111@yahoo.co.jp