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 problem. 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 choose.

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.”

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.


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 choice.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>editors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 δ’ ἐκλυε / δὲ κλῦε</td>
<td>ἐκλυε ἐκλυε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 ὑπερθ’ ἐπεφύκει / ὑπερθε πεφύκει</td>
<td>πεφύκει πεφύκει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 οὐδ’ ἔγνων / οὐδὲ γνῶν</td>
<td>ἔγνων ἔγνων / ἔγνων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

Secondly, the iterative usually does not have an augment. 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 aorist. Thus at 280 the augmented form must be right: αὐγῆς δ’ ἐπλήσθη πυκινὸς δόμος ἀστεροπῆς ὡς.

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

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*.’

J. Drewitt, ‘The augment in Homer’, *CQ* 6, 1912, 50.


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 method\textsuperscript{13}. When Barrett looks at the case of \(\sigma\varepsilon\chiρ\eta\nu / \sigma'\varepsilon\chiρ\eta\nu\) at E. *Hipp.* 1072, he uses the following method\textsuperscript{14}. He starts from meter, and enumerates instances which are

(a) certainly \(\chiρ\eta\nu\), i.e. unaugmented form guaranteed by meter,

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

(c) certainly \(\varepsilon\chiρ\eta\nu\), 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 \(\chiρ\eta\nu\), while in Euripides and Old Comedy, he sometimes adopts \(\varepsilon\chiρ\eta\nu\). Following Barrett, I compare the total number of takes the augment; cf. Monro, *Homerīc Γrammar*, 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.

\textsuperscript{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, *Homerīc Γrammar*, 62; Chantraine, *Grammaire*, 484 and Bekker, “*Similes*”, 8.

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

\begin{quote}
39 φωνη ὑπ' ἀθανάτη, τῆς δ' ἔκλυε / δὲ κλῦε πότνια μήτηρ

Subject of investigation: the imperfect of κλῦω.

(1) certain ἐκλῦ- 24 instances.

(2) uncertain 22 instances (19; 3; 0; 0)\textsuperscript{16}.

(3) certain κλῦ- 15 instances.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{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 -e belonged to the front word, a scribe added it to the back word, or vice versa. (b) ὄπ' ἔκλυον / ὄπα κλύον or ἡπτετ' ἐπιπτε / ἡπτετο πιπτε, 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 λιγυφθόγγοις 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) δὴ καὶ ἐμέλλεν Ὀδυσσεύς / δὴ καὶ μέλλεν Ὀδυσσεύς, 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, \textit{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 μάλω μὲν κλύων ἢδ' ἐπίθωντο, while the examples of certain ἐκλυ- are found in various types of readings. Therefore I think δ’ ἐκλυε is probably right.

111 οὐδ’ ἔγνων / οὐδὲ γνῶν• χαλεποὶ δὲ θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ὀρᾶοθαι
Subject of investigation: the second aorist of γιγνώσκω.
(1) certain ἔγν- 27 instances.
(2) uncertain 15 instances (12; 3; 0; 0).
(3) certain γν- 9 instances.
The instances of certain ἔγν- are more numerous than those of certain γν-. Moreover, the examples of certain γν- occur only in the 3rd sing. γνῶ, while the examples of certain ἔγν- are found in various forms. I therefore think οὐδ’ ἔγνων is probably right.\[17\]

313 εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς ἐνόησεν ἐφ’ ἐφράσσατο / τε φράσσατο θυμῷ
Subject of investigation: the first aorist of φράζω.
(1) certain ἐφρασ- 13 instances.
(2) uncertain 6 instances (5; 1; 0; 0\[18\]).

\[17\] 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...ἥρατο) 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. II. 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’ ἐφασκε / ποτε φάσκε θυώδεος

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 ποτε20, while there is only one example of certain οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτε.21 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’ ἐφασκε 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. II. 6.124 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ’ ἐπώπα μάχη ἐνι κυδιανείρη. II. 13.556 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ’ ἀνευ δήσων ἤν, ἀλλά κατ’ αὐτοὺς; Od. 10.93 πλησίαι· οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ’ αέξετο κύμα γ’ ἐν αὐτῷ.

21 Hom. Od. 18.132 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτε φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὁπίσω.

22 When I count the number of diaereses, the enclitics δέ, μὲν, γάρ, κεν, ἀν, 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
Subject of investigation: the first aorist of κελεύω.
(1) certain ἐκέλευσ- 25 instances.
(2) uncertain 35 instances (17; 6; 12; 0).
(3) certain κέλευσ- 3 instances.

The instances of certain ἐκέλευσ- are more numerous than those of certain κέλευσ-. 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.

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 ἀκοντ' and ἀέκοντ' in early epics. I therefore think ἀκοντε πετέσθην is probably right.

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.


I include Hom. *Od*. 2.263 καί μ’ ἐν νη’ κέλευσας ἐπ’ ἡροιδέα τόντον as certain κελευσ-. In this line νη’ ἐκέλευσας is almost impossible, because the -ι of the dat. sing. is rarely elided (see Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, 349).

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

*h.Cer.* 2.437 \[γηθοσύνας δ' ἐδέχοντο παρ' ἄλληλων ἔδιδον
tε
\]

Nonn. D. 4.236 \[μισθοφόρους ἐδέχοντο. καὶ ἡρέμα σύμπλοος
άνηρ
\]

Nonn. D. 14.287 \[καὶ τελετὰς ἐδέχοντο καὶ ἠσπάζοντο χορείας
\]

Nonn. D. 47.477 \[οἱ δὲ μὲν οὐκ ἐδέχοντο, χοροπλεκέας δὲ
γυναίκας
\]

Nonn. P. 19.85 \[Ἰησοῦν ἐδέχοντο θελήμονες· ὤκύμοροι δὲ
\]

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>editors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 δ' ἐκλυε</td>
<td>ἐκλυε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 ύπερθε πεφύκει</td>
<td>πεφύκει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 οὐδ' ἔγνων</td>
<td>ἔγνων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 δ' κρύπτεσκε</td>
<td>κρύπτεσκε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 δ' ἐπλήθη</td>
<td>ἐπλήθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 τ' ἐφάρσαστο</td>
<td>ἐφάρσαστο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 ποτ' ἐφασκε</td>
<td>φάσκε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 δ' ἐκέλευσε</td>
<td>ἐκέλευσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379 ἰκοντε πετέσθην</td>
<td>πετέσθην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437 δ' ἐδέχοντο</td>
<td>ἐδέχοντο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 λύθρωλ.
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.
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