CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

HOMER, HESIOD AND THE HYMNS

By

RICHARD JANKO

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Material com direitos autorais

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521238694

© Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge 1982

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1982
This digitally printed first paperback version 2007

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number: 81-7666

ISBN-13 978-0-521-23869-4 hardback
ISBN-10 0-521-23869-2 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-03565-1 paperback
ISBN-10 0-521-03565-1 paperback

Material com direitos autorais

CONTENTS

	List of tables and figures	vi
	Preface	ix
	Abbreviations	xiv
1	Introduction and methodology	1
2	The problem of oral composition	18
3	Digamma, alternative morphs and other criteria	42
4	Diachronic and regional developments	70
	Excursus: the date of Hesiod and the Lelantine War	94
5	The Hymn to Delian Apollo	99
6	The Hymn to Pythian Apollo	116
7	The Hymn to Hermes	133
8	The Hymn to Aphrodite	151
9	Other Hymns	181
10	Conclusions	188
	Appendices	
A	Figures for the individual books of Homer, and Zenodotus' text	201
B	The diction of *Erga* 1-200	220
C	The language of *Th* 901-1022 and *Cat*	221
D	*Exemplum* and *imitatio* in the oral epic	225
E	Possible absolute chronologies	228
F	Eumelus and the Black Sea colonies	231
G	Thucydides' version of the Hymn to Delian Apollo	233
H	γαῖα/γῆ, ξύν/σύν, κεῖνος/ἐκεῖνος	234
	Notes	239
	Bibliography	281
	Indices	297

Material com direitos autorais

TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables

1	The nominative epithet-system for Apollo	21
2	The nominative epithet-system for Hermes	22
3	The dative epithet-system for 'men'	24
4	Non-Homeric phrases shared between poems	27
5	The frequency of necessary enjambement in the epos	32
6	The frequency of hiatus and irregular 'lengthening'	36
7	The frequency of breaches of Meyer's First Law	38
8	The frequency of spondees before the bucolic diaeresis	39
9	Classification of the instances of digamma in *Dem* and *Aphr*	46
10	The criterion of digamma	47
11	The criterion of masculine a-stem genitive singulars	49
12	The criterion of a-stem genitive plurals	51
13	Classification of the o-stem genitive singulars in *Dem* and *Aphr*	51
14	The criterion of genitive singulars in *-οιο*	53
15	The criterion of genitive singulars in *-ου*	54
16	Classification of the o- and a-stem dative plurals in *Dem* and *Aphr*	56
17	The criterion of 'long' o- and a-stem dative plurals	57
18	The criterion of 'short' o- and a-stem dative plurals	57
19	The criterion of o-stem accusative plurals	59
20	The criterion of a-stem accusative plurals	60
21	The criterion of *Ζηνός/Διός* etc.	63
22	The frequency of n-mobile before consonants in the epos	66
23	The frequency of n-mobile before consonants in elegy and iambus	68
24	Clusters of criteria and the errant results	81
25	The criteria in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Hymn to Delian Apollo*	107
26	The distribution of *εἰς* and *ἐς* before vowels in the epos	126
27	Contraction in the name *Hermes* in the epos	134
28	Light a-stem accusative plurals in the epos	145
29	Mobility and separation in noun-epithet formulae	153

Material com direitos autorais

30	Neglects and observances of digamma in δέος etc.	154
31	-ηις and -αις in the epos	172
32	The criteria in shorter pieces over 15 lines	187
33	Digamma in the individual books of Homer	201
34	The genitive singular of masculine a-stems in Homer	202–3
35	The genitive plural of a-stems in Homer	204–5
36	The genitive singular of o-stems in -οιο in Homer	206
37	The genitive singular of o-stems in -ου in Homer	207–8
38	The dative plurals of o- and a-stems in -οισι and -ηισι in Homer	209
39	The dative plurals of o- and a-stems in -οις, -ηις and -αις in Homer	210–1
40	O-stem accusative plurals in Homer	212–3
41	A-stem accusative plurals in Homer	214
42	Alternations in the paradigm of Zeus in Homer	215–16
43	N-mobile before consonants in Homer analysed in detail	217–18
44	N-mobile before consonants in other works analysed in detail	219
45	Clusters of criteria and errant results, from amended figures	223
46	Intervals in the dictional development expressed in terms of their lowest common denominator	229
47	Possible absolute chronologies	229–30
48, 49	Ranges of absolute dates	231
50	The incidence of γῆ and γαῖα in the epos	235
51	The incidence of ξύν and σύν in the epos	236
52	The incidence of κεῖνος and ἐκεῖνος in the epos	237

Figures

1	The correlation of the criteria	72–3
2	The criteria in the different poems compared	74
3	The relative dating of developments in pre-Homeric epic diction	88
4	The history of the epic tradition	200

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

those unfamiliar with these techniques. While not needed to show that the clusters of results in Chapter 4 are not fortuitous, as this is plain even without applying such methods, they are indispensable when one wishes to test the hypothesis that any particular result is unlikely to be due to random variation from any given value. The tests used are all standard: I refer here to *Principles of Statistics* by M. G. Bulmer, and *Statistics Made Simple* by H. T. Hayslett.

The criteria tested in this study are all binomial (I have avoided testing the distribution of n-mobile here, as it conforms to the Poisson distribution). Binomial distributions, involving a choice between alternatives as in tossing a coin, can be tested directly when small numbers of trials are involved (Bulmer 81–90, Hayslett 62–71); when more instances are counted, we can use the *normal approximation to the binomial* (Bulmer 139–45; Hayslett 91–8), the results of which will be found expressed in terms of z and π_0, e.g. 'z = 1.68 if π_0 is set at 0.476'; π_0 denotes the expected or hypothetical frequency of the phenomenon (i.e. what I usually express as a percentage, recast as a decimal), and z denotes the value of the *standard normal variable*, which can be looked up in tables (e.g. Hayslett 230–1) to establish the area under the curve for this value, i.e. the probability of the event occurring by chance (the 'level of significance'). Thus if $z > 1.64$, the result is significant at the 5% level (i.e. the chance of random occurrence is under 0.05, or 1 in 20). These tests will be one-tailed unless stated; i.e. they determine the likelihood that extreme results at one end only of the bell-shaped graph will occur. Statisticians regard 5% significance as a reasonable basis for judgement, but the greater the level of significance the better.

Another means of comparing results is the χ^2 test, which tests two sets of observed values against one another, or observed values against those predicted (expected) on a given hypothesis, taking into account different sample-sizes (Bulmer 124–9, 154–61; Hayslett 169–76, and the table on p. 223). This cannot be used for samples where less than 5 cases in one or other alternative are expected. The higher the

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

οὔπω δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέραι διεληλύθεσαν, καὶ προσελθὼν ἐγὼ Ὁμήρωι τωῖ ποιητηῖ, σχολῆς οὔσης ἀμφοῖν, τά τε ἄλλα ἐπυνθανόμην καὶ ὅθεν εἴη· τοῦτο γὰρ μάλιστα παρ' ἡμῖν εἰσέτι νῦν ζητεῖσθαι . . . καὶ μὴν κἀκεῖνο ἐπεθύμουν εἰδέναι, εἰ προτέραν ἔγραψεν τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὡς οἱ πολλοί φασιν · ὁ δὲ ἠρνεῖτο.

Lucian

Oral poetry, traditional and indeed archaistic though it is, cannot avoid the continuous process of slight and unconscious modernization.

G. S. Kirk

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

y has *ἄντηις βουκολίοισι καὶ εἰροπόκοις ὀίεσσιν* for *ἀντήσηις ἀγέλησι βοῶν καὶ πώεσι μήλων*. For the first cf. *εἰροπόκοις ὀίεσσι* *E 137, for the second *ἀγέλην τε βοῶν καὶ πῶυ μέγ' οἰῶν* Λ 696, *πώεσι μήλων* *δ 413. Other examples, usually with good formular parallels for both readings, are found at 322, 326, 366 and 563. Elsewhere (where extant) the celebrated Mosquensis sometimes affords lections of a similar type, e.g. (here with *y*) *Aphr* 214 *ἴσα θεοῖσι* for *ἤματα πάντα*. Compare its readings at *Aphr* 18, 67, *Hy* 10.4f. and *Hy* 15.5–6.[11]

This evidence for the oral transmission of *DAp*, *Herm*, *Aphr* and some shorter pieces does not of course solve the problem of whether they were orally composed. Pieces composed in writing can undergo oral transmission, like many English ballads.[12] The question of oral composition (as distinct from transmission) will be examined in the next chapter.

Although we know nothing of when or where the *Hymns* were committed to writing, it may be possible to make some conjectures about the orthography that was used. All epichoric Greek scripts except Ionic had no separate signs for inherited $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$, and most, including Attic and Boeotian, did not mark $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$ caused by compensatory lengthening. Many early inscriptions wrote out elided vowels, and still more did not mark geminated sounds: it is impossible on the present evidence to establish any regional or chronological tendencies. For texts transmitted in manuscripts two sources of evidence exist: ancient errors in transcription and manuscript variations. The former is of course rare: a good example is the variant reading *ἔπλετο, ἔνθεν* for *ἔπλητ', ἔνθεν* at *Th* 193; the original text may have read ΕΠΛΕΤΟΕΝΘΕΝ – or again *Th* 74 *διέταξεν ὁμῶς* corrected by van Lennep to *διέταξε νόμους* from ΔΙΕΤΑΞΕΝΟΜΟΣ.[13] In the *Hymns* note the following:

DAp 54 *εὔβων* (*εὔβουν p*) from ΕΥΒΟΝ, cf. *βῶν* H 238.[14]

PAp 487 (cf. 503) *λύσαντε βοείας*. Apollonius Rhodius read this, as at III 206 he has the certain echo[15] *κατειλύσαντε βοείαις*, where *βοεῖα* is used in the usual sense of 'oxhide'; here it means 'thongs, halyards', for which the Homeric word is *βοεύς*, *β* 426 = *o* 291, *PAp* 407. The inconsistency is intoler-

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

extensive chronological uncertainties that persist. In the discussion that follows, we will consider the use made of them by their various exponents.

(i) *Historical*. The only case where external evidence exists is *DAp*, about which the scholiast on Pindar's Second *Nemean* 1 gives plenty of information; but most scholars have wished to alter the date. Allusions and quotations provide a *terminus ante quem* within the fifth century for *DAp* and perhaps *PAp*, both of which are certainly imitated in Alexandrian poetry, and *Herm* is referred to then.[19] Although the first reference to *Dem* is in Philodemus, Richardson thinks that its influence is possible as early as Ibycus and Pindar, and certain in Apollonius Rhodius.[20] *Aphr* is never mentioned or quoted: the clearest imitation of it appears to be Vergil *Aeneid* I 314–35, 402ff.

(ii) *Internal* evidence is more plentiful and more controversial. There are several types – alleged reference to known events (or lack of such reference), topographical and archaeological arguments about the foundation dates of temples which might be the one referred to by the poet, the continuity of festivals, use of myth for political purposes, etc. These must be assessed individually on their merits: among the weakest are those based on the spread of religious ideas, and supported only by our ignorance; such an idea is first in Hesiod, therefore it must have been borrowed from him. Unless we are sure on other grounds that Hesiod is earlier, this is a risky argument.[21]

In some cases it is possible to obtain accurate dating in this way: the best example is the historical work of Guillon on the *Aspis* and *PAp*, which he associates with the First Sacred War. We may also be told or be able to guess the origins of the poet and the occasion of the poem: the poet of *DAp* says he was a Chian composing for a festival on Delos: Guillon shows that the author of *PAp* was probably Boeotian but not Theban: *Dem* was probably composed at Eleusis, *Aphr* in the Troad.[22]

(iii) Another form of internal evidence is literary imitation and influence. Until Parry, a great deal of scholarly effort was

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Hoekstra has demonstrated that formular modification and linguistic innovation proceed together both in Homer and in the *Hymns* (and also in Hesiod, although he has not treated this at length).[32] He shows that the study of modification in the light of known linguistic developments can illuminate not only the pre-Homeric stages of the epic tradition[33] but also the subsequent evolution. In *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Oral Tradition* he examines the major hymns (except *Herm*) for archaisms and innovations, and succeeds in proving by the accumulation of examples that the *Hymns* represent a more evolved phase of the tradition than does Homer, from which he concludes that they are chronologically later also: he supports this by adducing other types of evidence, such as word-formation, 'literary' imitation and historical evidence, but with admirable caution and awareness of the pitfalls and limitations. Examples of the way in which formular modification is associated with the introduction of more advanced diction will be given when we come to study that diction.

In general Hoekstra avoided statistical techniques, and gives a detailed account of his reasons in one case, to which we will return.[34] Consequently his studies do not permit a more exact placing of the hymns within the post-Homeric tradition, or in relation to Hesiod.

(vii) Previous advances have been combined and applied to the whole of early epic by Pavese, but with a shift of emphasis. He rightly rejects Hoekstra's view that the increased frequency of modification found in later poetry such as the *Hymns* necessarily represents a decline from Homer's standards into decadence, and believes that the oral tradition flourished into the fifth century. The increase in modification and advanced diction can be seen as an aid to greater flexibility and not a sign of decline.[35] But Pavese is more concerned with the problem of the relationship between Ionian epic and other 'schools' of poetry. His belief that a tradition of oral epic survived on the mainland (manifested in the epichoric verse inscriptions) has led him to resurrect Fick's view that the Ionic appearance of poems such as Hesiod's is due to the later transmission of the text under the influence of Homer: they are, he says, in-

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

not substantially differ in diction from the rest of the poem to which they belong, despite the different subject-matter.

Before further work of a statistical type can proceed, two objections by Hoekstra, when he refuses to use digamma for dating purposes, must be met.[46] Firstly, the value of the statistics is severely limited by the size of the hymns: and no adequate data from Homer are available for comparison, because of advances in philology since Hartel and the fact that he counted repeated verses (but not formulae!) only once. There is but one reply to the second objection – new figures must be compiled. Regarding the first, more criteria would provide a check; and if necessary simple mathematical methods do exist to calculate how likely it is that a difference exists between two proportions based on samples of differing sizes. Edwards[47] makes the same point in a commonsense way when he says that we need to know the range of variation in such proportions within a 'monolith' like the *Iliad* for single books or even shorter segments. And as he remarks, the difficulty of compiling accurate statistics from texts is being mitigated by the computer.

In the work that follows I will be extending the method of studying the alternatives in the traditional diction which may have chronological or regional implications, such as digamma. In a tradition that consists of oral improvisation rather than accurate memorisation, it is inevitable that, in those fields where the tradition hands down no ready-made diction, the improviser will draw on the only other diction he knows, that of his vernacular. The pre-Homeric stages of the tradition must have been of this nature, and the findings of Shipp[48] that advanced forms of various sorts are concentrated in Homer's similes and other digressions (without which the monumental epics would lack so much) suggest that this was true of Homer also: we will examine the problem of the extent of oral composition in the next chapter. As the oral tradition admitted change and new creation to supplement what was lost as it was handed down through the generations, the amount of archaism having its origin at any specific date will fall as inno-

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

not counted by the same person throughout the corpus, and accord with one's intuitive expectations. The percentage of verses containing formulae or formular expressions falls in the range 77–83% in *Th*, *Erga*, *Dem* and *Herm*, but elsewhere from 87% upwards. Pavese does not usually state on how many verses his figures are based, but did survey over a hundred lines in each of *DAp*, *PAp* and *Herm*. It would be hazardous to argue from this evidence that the poems that are slightly less formular are thereby any less oral; it could be a feature of poems close to Hesiod, where a greater proportion of formulae might be attested only once and therefore escape recognition.

Simple formularity does not prove orality; the formulae must be examined in terms of the qualities Parry named extension and economy. This is harder to do in the smaller and somewhat heterogeneous *Hymns* than in Homer; but it is still possible to observe that they use the same noun–epithet systems as Homer, and sometimes fill them out. Whether this extra coverage is a further and useful extension achieved by the post-Homeric tradition, or whether it is fortuitously unrepresented in Homer, is problematic.

The noun–epithet system for Apollo, an important character in Homer, illustrates the point that the Hymns use much the same systems. In the nominative, excluding a few separated and mid-line phrases, we find the system shown in table 1 (the poems in which the formula occurs are given, then the number of occurrences in each in the same sequence, and then the total).

The system seems fairly homogeneous throughout: the doublets found in Homer persist in the hymns. Most can be explained as arising from the loss of digamma, when phrases beginning with that sound became equivalent to those beginning with vowels, and new phrases with initial consonants began to be created to avoid the apparent metrical anomalies: thus *Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱός* / *ἄναξ* ∪ ∪ – ∪ *Ἀπόλλων* and *Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων* / *ἐκάεργος* ~ / *κλυτότοξος* ~. Phrases beginning with vowels are noticeably absent. The few non-Homeric

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Table 3. *The dative epithet-system for 'men'*

/ –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–	+C	*θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις*	*Th Erga Cat Melampodia Dem* (6)
/ –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑	+C	*ἀνδράσω ἀλφήστησιν*	*Th Erga* [*Aspis*] (*τ'*) (3)
,,	+C	*θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν*	*Th Hy* 30 *Cypria* (3)
,,	+V	*θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι*	*Th Erga Herm* (3)
,, (sep.)	+V	*ἀνδράσι (τε) θνητοῖσι*	*Il* (4)
⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–– /	C+	*καταθνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις*	*Aphr* (1)
,,	C+	*καταθνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι*	*Th* (1)
,,	V+	*ὀιζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι*	*Il Od* (2)
,,	V+	*ἐπιχθονίοισι βροτοῖσι*	*Hom. Epigram* 10 (1)
–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–– /	V+	*ἀνδράσιν ἀλφήστησιν*	*Th Erga* (2)
⏑⏑–⏑⏑–– /	(C)C+	*μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν*	*Il* (1)
,,	(C)C+	*δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν*	*Il Od Erga* (7)
,,	CC+	*θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν*	*Od Th DAp Hy* 7 (7)
,,	CC+	*θνητοῖς (τ') ἀνθρώποις*	*Cat Dem Aphr* (3)

he would resemble the hymns, judging by his developed diction, which is intimately linked with modification.

At the same time Postlethwaite calculated that the percentage of gaps in proper-name–epithet systems is very close to that in Homer, and so is the frequency of doublets: he argues for an identity of technique. Edwards reached similar conclusions about Hesiod, regarding both extension[14] and economy.[15] However, the suggestion that flexibility and thence coverage increased will explain another observation of Postlethwaite's, that the more poets used common nouns and epithets (there is an increase from one per 6 lines *Il*, to 4.6 *Od*, to 3–3.5 *Hymns*: a rough count of *Th* 1–100 and *Erga* 1–100 reveals 3–3.5 there too), the less they used formulae, and the more they used formular expressions.

The tendency to economy is only properly applied within the poetry of the same composer, and even there, as Edwards has shown, it was less strict than has been thought.[16] A few examples of how it may come to be disregarded have already been given; some more may be of interest. In *Aphr* some pairs are already found in Homer, e.g. *Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη* thrice beside *φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη* (4x, and once with *δ'*).

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

of *Aspis* may justify talk of it belonging to a Hesiodic 'school', but this is not a very useful concept, as *Cat* is about as close as four of the Hymns. If we are to think of these poems as later than Hesiod, then the evidence suggests that *DAp* alone had no knowledge of him, which accords with the Ionic origins of the poem: *Cat*, *PAp* and *Herm* (a grouping we will encounter again) resemble only *Th*, while *Dem* and *Aphr* knew both his works. The position of *Aphr* is interesting, as it has been called ὁμηρικώτατος! Apart from *DAp*, it will emerge that all the major Hymns are as late as Hesiod, or later still: only if *DAp* is later also will it be at all useful to say that all the poems we are investigating, except for *DAp*, belong, to varying degrees, to the Hesiodic 'school'.

Another method of approaching the problem of oral composition, proposed by Edwards,[25] is what he terms 'parallels of sound', the subconscious effect of the sound and rhythm of the traditional diction on the poet's craft. There is a good example at *DAp* 21:

DAp 21 ἠμὲν ἀν' ἤπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἠδ' ἀνὰ νήσους
cf. *Aphr* 4–5 . . . θηρία πάντα,
ἠμὲν ὅσ' ἤπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἠδ' ὅσα πόντος
Hy 30.3 ἠμὲν ὅσα χθόνα δῖαν ἐπέρχεται ἠδ' ὅσα πόντον
Th 582 κνώδαλ' ὅσ' ἤπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἠδὲ θάλασσα[26]
Cypria 7. 12 θηρί' ὅσ' ἤπειρος αἰνὰ τρέφει, (ὄφρα φύγοι νιν)

πορτιτρόφον is found elsewhere only at Bacchylides XI 30; its use here has puzzled commentators. In fact we may well be seeing the moment of its creation. The underlying idea of the formular line on which ours is based is 'beasts, as dreadful (many) as the land and sea nurtures', but the beasts are dropped and the sea altered to islands. The version is closest to the version of *Aphr*, as both have ἠμέν and ἠδέ, and the adjective following ἤπειρος begins with πο-. Did the Chian poet know this very line, and hastily change it as he sang? The influence of the traditional line was such that, instead of πολυβώλακα, used of ἤπειρον at **Cypria* 7.11 (he would need to alter the last two feet to καὶ κατὰ νήσους), he invented this slightly implausible compound.

Material com direitos autorais

There is a similar example at *PAp* 410:

πὰρ δὲ Λακωνίδα γαῖαν ἀλιστέφανον πτολίεθρον

ἀλιστέφανον is not found elsewhere in early epic. Matthiae wished to emend to *Ἕλος τ' ἔφαλον* ~, from B 584, but as Allen and Sikes remark,[27] such a poetic phrase would hardly be invented by a copyist; the epithet is eminently appropriate. The Laconian context has influenced the poet into using this instead of the nondescript *ἐυκτίμενον* ~.

Another adjective thus explicable is at *Dem* 113:

τίς πόθεν ἐσσὶ γρηῦ παλαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων;

This line is a conflation of three formulae: *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν*; (8x Homer), *γρηῦ παλαιγενές* (*χ 395, *Dem* 101 dat., sep. Γ 386) and *χαμαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων*.[28] After *παλαιγενές* there would have been the difficult gap –⏑⏑–– / to be filled with 'men' in the genitive: the creation of this compound might be an oral poet's improvised solution to an impasse, while adhering to traditional patterns.

In *Aphr* compare 112:

. . . Φρυγίης εὐτειχήτοιο ἀνάσσει

This novel formation is for *εὐτείχεον* (6x *Il*), always of Troy, *πόλιν εὐτείχεα* Π 57. A good parallel is *DAp* 181:

. . . Δήλοιο περικλύστου μέγ' ἀνάσσεις

(*περικλύστοιο* ms. Γ). Compare also *εὐποιήτοιο* (**Aphr* 173 etc.) and *τεῖχος ἐυδμήτοιο πόληος* / *Φ 516, **Cat* 235.4.

These 'parallels of sound' could be multiplied from the major hymns, and some are striking, but I am doubtful whether they are as significant as Edwards has suggested. The importance of the voice and ear in selecting words applies to all poets concerned with the aural properties of poetry. Most, probably all, ancient verse was intended for oral performance, and it is possible to find such parallels in literary poets. Compare:

Herm 263 *οὐκ ἴδον, οὐ πυθόμην, οὐκ ἄλλου μῦθον ἄκουσα*
(≅ ψ 40)

Theoc. II 82 *χὠς ἴδον, ὡς ἐμάνην, ὥς μοι περὶ θυμὸς ἰάφθη*

Note the parallel *μῦθον* – *θῡμός*. Given Edwards' necessarily loose definition of parallels of sound, how can this from Theocritus be distinguished? Similar cases may be found in such poems as *Id*. XXII. They are thus no proof on their own

Material com direitos autorais

of oral composition, but only one witness to be considered.

We now turn from the study of formulae themselves to other features of the formular style which have been advanced as evidence for orality.

Parry[29] was the first to suggest that oral and literary poetry differ in their use of enjambement, which he classified into three types:

I No enjambement, i.e. the line ends with a complete sentence.

II Unperiodic enjambement, by the addition of a free verbal idea, using a dependent clause, participial clause or genitive absolute, or an adjective describing a noun in the previous line, or an adverbial phrase, or an addition by a coordinate conjunction.

III Necessary enjambement, where the sense is incomplete at line-end.

On the basis of 600-line samples Parry concluded that sophisticated literary poets such as Apollonius and Vergil use less type I and more type III enjambement than does Homer, by a very substantial margin. The difference is to be ascribed to the pressures of oral composition-in-performance.

Since then Kirk[30] has elaborated the terminology in a detailed study of Π, Edwards[31] has shown that Hesiod's use of enjambement on Parry's criteria is close to Homer's, and Richardson[32] was first to extend the enquiry to the *Hymns*. His work has been repeated unwittingly by Clayman and van Nortwick[33] in a computerised study of a broad range of poems, Hellenistic included, and again by Barnes[34] in reaction to this. The repetition of the count is worthwhile, since it demonstrates the extent to which the classification of enjambements is subjective; thus exact agreement is not to be expected, but approximate consensus suffices.

There is much variation in the proportions of types I and II relative to each other; but in any case it is now widely perceived that this is a side-issue. Literate poets are perfectly capable of writing verses without much enjambement. The *Batrachomyomachia* is known to be a literate composition

Material com direitos autorais

from the reference at 2f. to writing it down on tablets. Using the OCT, with all numbered verses but no plus-verses (total 303), I found 43.2% type I, 33.7% type II and only 22.7% type III enjambement: in other words, this poem has a lower frequency of necessary enjambement than any piece of poetry studied by any of the scholars mentioned above. Again, the mock-heroic *Idyll* XXII of Theocritus is indistinguishable from real epic in terms of enjambement, with average percentages of 34.8 type I, 26.9 type II and 31.3 type II enjambement.[35] Barnes produces very similar figures based on a different text, and finds that this pattern is characteristic of the epyllia as a whole.[36] These results reveal two important points: first, that enjambement is a negative test only, i.e. that the 'oral style' of enjambement can be used by literate poets; secondly, the practice of Theocritus shows that there will be borderline cases where the amount of necessary enjambement is on the high side, but does not reach such levels as in Apollonius or Vergil.

Thus we should be suspicious, if Parry is right, of any early hexameter poems with very high levels of necessary enjambement. However, even this modest gain has been put in question by Clayman and van Nortwick, who find very high average levels of type III enjambement in the *Iliad* itself. Their percentage of necessary enjambement (37.7%) was not even approached in a four-book sample examined by Barnes, who obtained figures of 19.6% for Γ, 28.3% for Λ, 26.6% for Ξ and 32.3% for T with the average at 26.7%.[37] Finally, Barnes draws attention to the work of E. Lyding,[38] who compiled figures based on the whole *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and found levels close to Parry's for necessary enjambement (26.7% *Il*, 27.5% *Od*).

If we tabulate the frequency of necessary enjambement found by these scholars, and discount the aberrant results for Homer found by Clayman and van Nortwick, most of the poems behave consistently. In table 5 their figures are juxtaposed with Barnes' and those calculated by Parry (P), Edwards (E) and Richardson (R). Richardson's figures for *Aphr* are misleading, as the first hundred lines which he counted are

Material com direitos autorais

Table 5. *The frequency of necessary enjambement in the epos (%)*

	Clayman and van Nortwick	Barnes (and Lyding)	Parry, Edwards and Richardson
Il	37.7 (1562)	26.7 (L)	26.6 (P:600)
Od	32.0 (1296)	27.5 (L)	28.5 (P:600)
Th	27.8	26.4	27.9 (E)
Erga	31.2	29.1	29.7 (E)
Aspis	34.8	33.6	36.2 (E)
Dem	40.4	37.2	42.9 (R)
DAp	32.2	26.9	31 (R)
PAp			33 (R)
Herm	27.9	22.8	28 (R)
Aphr	27.9	28.3	27.6
Ap. Rhod.	48.6 (1002)	45.4	49.1 (P:600)
Aratus	43.9	43.7	–
Callim. *Hy*	36.0	35.5	34.6 (M)
Theoc. varia	29.5	31.2	–

abnormal: a count of the whole found 38.6% type I, 33.4% type II and 27.6% type III. The figures above are based on complete works, unless the sample-size is stated in brackets after the percentage. The editions used can be ascertained from the works of the scholars as cited: but experience suggests that the results are affected far more by divergent rules for counting than by the choice of editions. Lyding's results are marked 'L': the figure for Callimachus' *Hymns* marked 'M' is from G. R. McLennan.[39]

It is noticeable that Barnes' figures are consistently lower than the others', but if account is taken of the different scales *Dem* is always conspicuously high. However, Clayman and van Nortwick demonstrated that the result for *Dem* is largely due to its author's trick of placing a verb in first position of the line following the rest of the clause;[40] as Richardson

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Herm 345 *κόνις ἀνέφαινε μέλαινα*, cf. *140 *κόνιν δ' ἀμάθυνε μέλαιναν* (note however *κόνῑς* Aesch. *Suppl.* 180, 783): similarly 371 *ἠελίοιο νέον ἐπιτελλομένοιο*, cf. *197 ~ *νέον καταδυομένοιο*.
Aphr 198–9 *οὕνεκά μ' αἰνὸν / ἔσχεν ἄχος, ἕνεκα* . . . The common formula *αἰνὸν ἄχος* is found separated at X 43, *π* 87 (*ἄχος* –◡◡ *αἰνόν* /), but never split between lines (compare *Aphr* 147–8 for a similar drastic modification with violent enjambement). For the prosody compare Π 55, / *αἰνὸν ἄχος τό* . . .

These two metrical irregularities have the same causes, and to them could be added a third – the hiatus formed when a long vowel or diphthong remains long before a word starting with a vowel. This too is less frequent in Hellenistic and later hexameter verse.

We may use a quantitative check to confirm that the hymns do behave in the same way as Homer and Hesiod in the admission of both prosodic irregularities here studied (table 6). Figures for Homer were compiled by Knøs,[46] for Hesiod by Hartel[47] for irregular 'lengthening', and by Athanassakis for short-vowel hiatus: figures for the hymns are my own. There is no doubt some inaccuracy involved in using different sources, but anomalies caused by digamma are of course excluded. The first pair of columns relates to hiatus, the second to 'lengthening': in each case the absolute number of occurrences is followed by the number of cases per thousand lines (‰).

We must beware of making too much of the figures for very uncommon phenomena, but some results are conspicuous: *Dem* has more hiatus, but less 'lengthening', hiatus is rare in *Herm* and *Aphr*, both faults are exceedingly common in *PAp*.

In general these results, if not purely random, must be due to the degree of competence in handling the traditional diction possessed by different poets, but the behaviour of *Herm* (and perhaps the shorter *Aphr*) accords with the preferences of Callimachus and Theocritus, while the converse in *Dem* resembles the practice of the *Batrachomyomachia*, where there is only one case of 'lengthening' but five of hiatus in

Material com direitos autorais

Table 6. *The frequency of hiatus and irregular 'lengthening'*

Work	Verses	Hiatus	‰	'Lengthening'	‰
Il	15693	123	7.8	214	13.6
Od	12110	116	9.6	140	11.6
*Th**	1020	16	15.7	7	6.9
Erga	828	10	12.1	5	6.0
Cat†	c. 750	14	18.7	10	13.3
Aspis	424	4	10.4	4	9.4
Dem	495	11	22.3	1	2.0
DAp	181	2	11.0	2	11.0
PAp	365	9	24.7	8	21.9
Herm	580	3	5.2	9	15.5
Aphr	293	1	3.4	3	10.2

* Cf. West *Th* pp. 95f.
† Cf. p. 27 n. to Table 4a.

270 verses.[48] This might suggest literary influence or interference in these poems.

Porter, in his work on the 'inner metric' or use of caesurae in the hexameter, has made important chronological claims about the Hymns. Despite a number of drawbacks in his methods, elements of them may be applied to the problem of oral composition. Porter's theory of a quadripartite hexameter has been refuted by Kirk[49] and Beekes,[50] who argues persuasively that the 'rules' for the hexameter are due to the desire to avoid the pattern $-\underline{\cup\cup}-\underline{\cup}$, with a premature closing cadence. He states that the following 'rules' govern the hexameter:

1. Word-end is obligatory after the arsis or trochee of the third foot (masculine and trochaic caesurae).
2. Word-end is desired at the end of the fourth foot (bucolic diaeresis).
3. Word-end is forbidden after the trochee of the fourth foot to avoid a closing cadence (Hermann's Bridge).
4. Word-end is avoided after the trochee or spondee of the second foot, if the word starts in the first, for the same reason (Meyer's First Law).

Material com direitos autorais

5. Word-end is forbidden after the fifth spondee, and avoided after the fourth, for the same reason.
6. Word-end is avoided after the arsis of the sixth foot.

Eschewing Porter's approach, these features will be examined separately. As can readily be ascertained from his Table I (type 10), omission of the third-foot caesura is very rare. It is rarer than in Homer (11–13 cases per thousand lines) in *Dem* (8‰), *DAp* (5‰), *Herm* (2‰) and *Aphr* (4‰). Contrast Hesiod (21–27‰), *Aspis* (15‰) and *PAp* (20‰). *Cat* has 14 cases in 816 usable verses (17‰), by my count. Such a rare feature could easily give a false impression in any particular poem, but *Herm* and the short *Aphr* are again prominent in the direction of Alexandrian practice.

The frequency of the bucolic diaeresis is also easily gleaned from Porter's Table V, and can be checked against O'Neill, who adds figures for some Hellenistic poets. In no case do the hymns differ substantially from Homer; nor do Apollonius or Aratus.

Hermann's Bridge is violated very rarely indeed, and it would be unwise to draw conclusions from it; there are breaches in *Dem*, and at *DAp* 36.[51]

Meyer's First Law is more promising. There are three types of violation, when words beginning within the first foot end after the trochee, dactyl or spondee of the second, e.g. *Dem* 16 / *καλὸν ἄθυρμα λαβεῖν*, or 441 / *ταῖς δὲ μετάγγελον ἦκε*. It is important that no exceptions be made for prepositions and postpositives.[52] Thus examples like *DAp* 115 / *εὖτ' ἐπὶ Δήλου ἔβαινε* are violations, but e.g. *Th* 764 / *τοῦ δὲ σιδηρέη μέν* is not.[53] Violations may be caused by enclitics or similar particles, e.g. *PAp* 190 / *ὑμνεῦσίν ῥα θεῶν*, but not unless they end before the third foot (e.g. δ 141). Occasionally textual uncertainty has led me to reject cases. Because it is not clear how Porter and O'Neill treated these matters, new figures are given in table 7, based on the OCT series, excepting Callimachus (Budé). After giving the work and its length, ordinary violations are listed, followed by the frequency per thousand verses (‰), and then the cases due to enclitics, and their ‰.

Material com direitos autorais

Table 7. *The frequency of breaches of Meyer's First Law*

Work	Verses	Ord.	‰	Encl.	‰
Il N	837	29	34.6	47	56.1
Il Π	867	30	34.6	45	51.9
Od δ	847	34	40.1	44	51.9
Od ν	440	17	38.6	21	47.7
Od π	481	18	37.4	32	66.5
Th	1020	33	32.3	51	50.0
Erga	828	29	35.0	39	47.1
*Cat**	704	19	27.0	38	54.0
Aspis	424	15	35.4	12	28.3
Dem	495	12	24.3	19	38.5
DAp	181	8	44.2	6	33.1
PAp	365	15	41.1	14	38.3
Herm	580	10	*17.2*	21	36.2
Aphr	293	14	47.8	15	51.2
*Batrach.**	270	4	*14.8*	16	59.2
Ap. Rhod. I	1–1000	30	30.0	9	*9.0*
Call. *Hy*†	941	3	*3.2*	5	*5.3*

* In *Cat* all usable verses, even when restored, are counted: in *Batrach.* those rejected by Allen are not.

† *Hy* I–IV, VI.

This gives a more complicated picture than expected. The lower figure for enclitics in all the hymns except *Aphr* is curious, but less striking than the rarity of ordinary cases in *Herm* (nearly significant, when tested against even *Dem*). Could literary interference account for the greater perfection of its verse in this respect?

The avoidance of long final syllables before the bucolic diaeresis has been more widely studied, by K. Meister[54] and Felix Solmsen,[55] as well as O'Neill and Porter. The latter do not exclude cases of enclitics and proclitics,[56] but Felix Solmsen appears to have done so, and his figures are included in the first pair of columns in table 8, giving the number of instances per thousand lines (‰): the third column gives the total frequency per thousand lines when enclitics are taken into account, followed by the source of the figure:

Material com direitos autorais

Table 8. *The frequency of spondees before the bucolic diaeresis*

Work	Verses	Ord.	‰	+ Encl. ‰
Il A*	611	41	67.1	118.0 Porter (*Il*)
Z*	529	47	88.8	123.0 O'Neill (*Il*)
N*	837	43	51.4	
Ω*	804	46	57.2	
Od α*	444	30	67.6	125.0 Porter (*Od*)
ι*	566	27	47.7	96.0 O'Neill (*Od*)
ν	440	20	45.4	
π	481	34	70.1	
υ*	394	28	71.1	
Th	1020	35	34.3	108.0 Porter
Erga	828	38	45.9	112.0 Porter
Aspis	424	15	35.4	66.0 Porter
Cat†	872	56	64.2	97.5
Dem	495	33	66.6	110.0 Porter
DAp	181	8	44.2	71.8
PAp	365	17	46.6	79.4
Herm	580	26	44.8	86.0 Porter
Aphr	293	7	23.9	52.0 Porter
Batrach.†	270	21	77.8	96.3
Ap. Rhod. I	1362	15	11.0	20.0 O'Neill

* The results for ordinary violations here are from Solmsen; cf. n. 55.

† In *Cat* all usable verses, even when restored, are counted; in *Batrach.* those rejected by Allen are not.

In this criterion also *Aphr* has a conspicuously low result, but is joined this time by *Aspis* and perhaps *Th* in tending towards Hellenistic versification (compare 11‰ including enclitics, O'Neill's figure for Callimachus). Note that many cases are 'resolvable' at a more archaic stage, e.g. *Dem* 293 *ἄμ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφιν*, *PAp* 452 *πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα*, *Herm* 300 *καί μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε* (for *ποτί*).

For the avoidance of any of these metrical blemishes, literary interference is not the only possible explanation; they might conceivably be related to the change from sung to spoken poetry. A singer might be able to disguise them more easily than a reciter, such as Hesiod may have been (the Muses

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

CHAPTER 3

DIGAMMA, ALTERNATIVE MORPHS AND OTHER CRITERIA

The role played by the statistical analysis of common features of the poetic diction has been touched on already in Chapter 1, especially regarding digamma. It is a pity that this is where it was first applied, as in fact the case is among the more complicated. It is now usually accepted that the phoneme /u̯/ disappeared in initial prevocalic position from the epic diction of the Ionian poets at the same time as it was lost in their vernacular.[1] However, in poetry of other than Ionian origin, difficulties arise. As we shall see, in no extant specimen of extended verse is there any example of the complete retention of this phoneme (written *ϝ* and termed digamma), even from areas such as Boeotia where word-initial digamma survived. We must conclude with Edwards[2] that the influence of Ionic diction was such that digamma was not pronounced, even where it was possible to do so. Traces of it persist because of the conservative nature of the traditional diction; however, if the tradition is at all open to innovation, then we expect these traces to become less frequent in less conservative or later poetry, and we are not disappointed.

Edwards[3] has remarked that in Hesiod digamma is often neglected in connexion with features that are peculiarly 'Hesiodic', such as 'indirect names' (*kenningar*) or such unhomeric features as the a-stem accusative plural in -ᾰ̆ς or forms like κᾰ̆λόν. By 'neglected' it is meant that there is elision, epic correption of a long vowel or diphthong, or the maintenance of a light closed syllable before a word which we know from epigraphical and/or comparative evidence to have begun with prevocalic /u̯-/. Each of these types of neglect proves that the phoneme could not have been pronounced there, whereas the observances do not prove the contrary. Observances are of two kinds: where hiatus (whether of a short vowel, long vowel or

Material com direitos autorais

diphthong) occurs before once-digammated words, and where an initial consonant or double consonant seems to be needed to make a naturally light syllable heavy (occasionally both are combined, e.g. *πατέρᾱ ὄν*). These two types correspond to the two types of metrical blemishes which sometimes occur without the agency of digamma, and were studied in the previous chapter:[4] but these account for a very small proportion of the cases.[5] For our present purposes it is as irrelevant to distinguish between the different types of observances as between the neglects.

Edwards' innovatory contexts include modifications, which are already beginning to appear in Homer, e.g. the declension *μελιηδέος οἴνου* / Σ 545, γ 46, *Dem* 206 (accusative 2x *Il*, 5x *Od*, *Hy* 29.6), which also involves a contracted genitive singular in *-ου*; or the alternation *καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* with ~ *φωνήσασ'*, cf. *ὡς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἀπέβη. . . :* *ἔργα τέτυκτο* or ~ *τέτυκται* is frequent at line-end – 3x *Il*, 2x *Od*, *Dem* 140, *Herm* 12; digamma is observed at λ 610 and *Herm* 12 only. This is modification in the sense that the environment in which the formula is used is altered; note that in this instance mere frequency is not the best guide to discerning the original usage. Moreover study of the cases of modification involving neglects of digamma would not yield statistically satisfactory results for any particular hymn without including neglects where they cannot be conclusively proved. Hence we should look at the problem from the other direction: do a higher proportion of observances than of neglects occur in traditional phrases?

This question is complicated by the problem of defining traditional phrases or formulae.[6] Here the best that can be done is to make arbitrary definitions and apply them consistently:

Class A: Forms found in the same phrase as in Homer, even if only once there; this is to guard against underrepresented formulae. The phrase is defined as occupying five or more syllables or two or more feet, and consisting of two words as printed in the OCT. Shorter phrases are assigned to Class C.

Material com direitos autorais

Class B: This consists of Homeric phrases found in slightly modified form, i.e. by declension or conjugation that does not affect the syllables either side of the *u̯-.

Class C: Forms exactly attested in Homer, but not in phrases as defined above; n-mobile is ignored for these purposes.

Class D: Forms not found in Homer, including cases of neglect where Homer always observes digamma.

The criteria for observations and neglects have been stated above; internal digamma, and initial **dw-*, **wr-* etc., are of course excluded, but **sw-* is not. A further difficulty is whether certain lexemes began with digamma or not. Chantraine[7] succinctly lists most of the evidence, and I have in general followed his lead. In detail the following arbitrary decisions are applied consistently:

(a) No words in *ὀ-* or *ὠ-* are counted, excepting those in *οἰ-*.[8] This entails the omission, not only of words like *ὀφείλω*, where Mycenaean has overthrown weak inscriptional evidence for digamma, but also *ὄχος*, where it has reinforced it, and made the total neglect of digamma in epic still more curious, and *ὄπα*, which Homer treats in the same way as other digammated words.

(b) The following are not counted: *ἀρνειός*, *ἐᾱνός* adj., *ἐλέλιξεν*, *εἰλίποδας*, *ἐπέεσσι*, *ἔρυμαι* 'save' (despite Myc. */wruntoi/*?), *εἰδυῖα/ἰδυῖα* (due to the activities of editors), *ἴφθιμος*,[9] *ἑός* as from **sewos* > *suus*.

(c) The following are counted, despite misgivings in some cases: *εἴλη*, *εἶρος*, *ἐμέω*, *ἔργμα*, *ἔρση*, *ἐρύκω*, *ἦλος*, *ἴαχε*, *ἴδιος*, *ἰδρώς*, *ἴλαδόν*, *ἶρηξ*, *ἰστίη* and the proper names *Ἑκάτη*, *Ἑλένη*, *Ἑλίκη*, *Ἑλικών*, *Ἔργινος*, *Ἑσπερίδες*, *Ἰλήιος*, *Ἰλιονεύς*, *Ἴλιος*, *Ἰόλαος*, *Ἶρις*, *Ἶρος*, *Ἰστίαια*, *Ἰφιμέδεια*.[10]

(d) Enclitics are not counted (*ἐ*, *οἱ*, *ἕο*, *ἔθεν*), as the digamma may in fact be internal, as West has argued.[11] The special status of enclitics is reflected in our manuscripts of Homer: as Chantraine noted,[12] n-mobile and paragogic *κ/χ* are not added to a preceding vowel in cases like *δαῖέ οἱ* E 4, *οὔ οἱ* B 392 etc. Digamma persists here in the Lesbian of Sappho and Alcaeus while lost elsewhere:[13] but I have counted possessive *ὅς* despite their usage.

Material com direitos autorais

(e) All compounds as printed in the OCT are excluded. While I am reluctant to exclude such forms as *ἀποεῖπεν*, it is then difficult to know where to draw the line.

(f) A number of environments were excluded by Garbrah from his count of digamma. The length of the vowel in *πρίν* is ambiguous and so cases following it are discounted. Garbrah excludes cases of hiatus after *τί*, *τι*, *νῶι*, *περί*, *ὁ*, *τό*, *τά*, *πρό*, *ἀντί*, *ὅτι*, but in fact very few cases exist where words with initial vowels follow these. Nor do I follow him in his exclusion of the following morphological categories: a-stem plurals in *-αι*, aorist active endings in *-αι*, aorist infinitives in *-σαι*, athematic infinitives in *-ναι*, and words with final *-ν*. Although none of these are elided, there seems no reason to suppose that poets tolerated hiatus with them to any extent: e.g. *ὀξύ* is never followed by a vowel not once digammated, and there are only 13 cases of *εὖ/ἐύ* in hiatus with vowels beside 53 cases involving digamma in the early epic corpus. But Garbrah is certainly right to exclude cases involving n-mobile and paragogic *κ/χ* as proving nothing.

(g) Instances of contracted genitive singulars standing in arsis before words beginning with digamma are counted, although these could conceivably stand for *-οι'*.[14] Figures for these are given later in this chapter, and are not sizable.

Before presenting comprehensive statistics for initial digamma, we will first examine its use in more limited samples to test whether a higher proportion of observances than of neglect occurs in traditional phrases. Cases in *Dem* and *Aphr* are classified according to the scheme detailed above, regarding their occurrence in Homeric phrases. The results are shown in table 9.

In *Dem* there are sixteen cases of observances involving enclitics, but no neglects, in *Aphr* ten observances and one neglect; this accords with the situation in Homer, where of about 780 examples there are about twenty-five neglects, or about 3%.[15] The sharp contrast with the general rate of neglects shows that we are right in excluding enclitics. The hypothesis that observances of digamma are less frequently introduced in non-Homeric (and therefore often innovative) contexts than

Material com direitos autorais

Table 9. *Classification of the instances of digamma in* Dem *and* Aphr

Class	*Dem* Observances	Neglects	*Aphr* Observances	Neglects
A	16	5	16	2
B	4	2	4	0
C	10	10	14	4
D	3	11	3	1

are neglects is confirmed by the test: 45.7% of observances but only 20.0% of neglects occur in Class A phrases.

This demonstrates the validity of the digamma criterion as a yardstick for the evolution of the early epic diction, but not of course a yardstick that is sufficient by itself: others will be offered shortly. In the past its use has been vitiated by the failure to do this, and by the failure to compile statistics on the same basis throughout early epic. Although there may be some disagreement over the somewhat arbitrary choices that have had to be taken in our selection of lexemes and environments in which we see traces of digamma, it will not be disputed that these choices must be applied consistently everywhere. The results are shown in table 10.

The range of variation in individual books of the *Iliad* is 7.0–27.7% neglects, in the *Odyssey* 5.7–31.0%, due to the smaller book sizes. The important observation to be made is that *Od* is slightly more advanced than *Il*, but much less than Hesiod and most hymns: and the *Erga* is more advanced than *Th*. We will come across this pattern again.

We must now discuss two methodological problems: how reliable are these results? and why examine the proportion of neglects and observations rather than the frequency of neglects per thousand lines?

If we use the proportion of neglects as the criterion, the statistical tests for calculating the limits within which the result may reasonably be expected to lie (the confidence limits) are straightforward, as we are dealing with a series of

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Table 11. *The criterion of masculine a-stem genitive singulars*

Work	-āo	% -āo	-εω/-ω +V	~+C	Total	Grand total
Il	173	77.9	28	21	49	222
Od	80	72.7	25	5	30	110
Th	5	41.7	0	7	7	12
Erga	5	55.5	0	4	4	9
Cat	27	90.0	0	3	3	30
Aspis	3		0	0	0	3
Dem	3		0	1	1	4
DAp	2		0	0	0	2
PAp	0		0	0	0	0
Herm	1		0	1	1	2
Aphr	0		1	2	3	3

Edwards'.[20] In the first column are the results for *-āo*, followed by the percentage of the total they account for; then the number of cases of *-εω/ -ω* before vowels; then the frequency of the same endings before consonants or at line-end, where they are guaranteed, followed by the total of these two columns and the grand total. The two cases of *-ov* are not counted.

Clearly little can be learnt about the hymns from a morpheme as rare as this. It is interesting to discover that *Cat* is more conservative than Hesiod here, and that as with digamma the latter shows little sign of being influenced by his old-fashioned vernacular speech, but excels Homer in *Ionismus*.

(b) The genitive plural of a-stems

This has also been handled by Edwards,[21] who finds its behaviour in Hesiod similar to the preceding case. In early epic we find five different endings: *-άων*, closest to inherited **-āsōm*; *-έων*, with the Ionic quantitative metathesis of *-ᾱ́ων* via *-ήων* to *-έων*, which is very rarely disyllabic but usually

Material com direitos autorais

scanned with synizesis; the contracted *-ῶν*, normally post-vocalic but exceptionally found even in Homer in pronouns, adjectives and nouns; and *-ᾶν*, a non-Ionic contracted form used twice by Hesiod. In table 12 these are tabulated from left to right in the same order, except that the percentage comprised by *-άων* is given in the second column, and at the end the total of more advanced morphs is followed by the grand total. Details of compilation are as for the preceding tables; *ἐάων* is omitted.

This is more informative. The increase in the use of the developed forms of the morph proceeds in roughly the same ratios between the works of Homer and Hesiod as in the two previous cases studied. Their use exceeds the Homeric frequency in *PAp* and *Herm*; the result for *DAp* is unusably small; *Dem* and *Aphr* have a lower frequency. As we shall see, there is reason to suspect 'false archaism' over *-οιο* in *Dem*, but in this case, of thirteen examples of *-άων*, eight are in Class A phrases as defined above,[22] four in Class C, and the only non-Homeric form is *ἀρουράων ἐριβώλων* at 471, paralleled in the accusative singular at Φ 232, which suggests that it may be an old traditional phrase.

(c) The genitive singular of o-stems

The old o-stem genitive singular in *-οιο*, apparently attested in Mycenaean *-o-jo*, is essential to many old formulae of the epic language, but disappeared from all the inscriptional dialects (surviving only as *-οι* in East Thessalian) to be replaced by the contracted product of **-οο*, which appears as *-ου* in epic. Troxler[23] has demonstrated that instances where this cannot be resolved into **-οο* in thesis before a consonant, or **-οι'* or **-ο'* before vowels, in arsis and thesis respectively, are more common in Hesiod than in Homer. Thus there are three categories of forms: *-οιο*, the resolvable cases, and *-ου* that cannot easily be removed. There are also some lines in Homer where an underlying *-οο* is certified by metrical irregularities,[24] e.g. *κ* 60 *Αἰόλου κλυτὰ δώματα*. These are included under **-οο* in the results that follow, where care has been taken to

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Table 14. *The criterion of genitive singulars in -ουο*

Work	-ουο	% -ουο	Others	Grand total
Il	1094	51.9	1012	2106
Od	715	46.6	819	1534
Th	78	38.8	123	201
Erga	36	28.8	89	125
Cat	64	39.3	99	163
Aspis	36	42.3	49	85
Dem	37	49.3	38	75
DAp	11	34.4	21	32
PAp	21	45.6	25	46
Herm	41	55.4	33	74
Aphr	16	39.0	25	41

resolvable cases of *-ου* according to the forms into which they may be resolved, followed by cases where digamma might have stood (these are bracketed and not included in the totals) and the total number of resolvable cases; next the number of irresolvable cases of *-ου*, and cases involving digamma (again bracketed and not counted in the totals); lastly the grand total, and the percentage of irresolvable cases (headed *-ου*).

The percentage ranges in the books of the *Iliad* are 43.6–61.5% *-ουο*, and 25.7–54.2% certain *-ου*; the corresponding figures in *Od* are 32.2–62.2% and 26.7–75%, showing how dangerous it is to rely on single criteria. Nonetheless both criteria present the same pattern of change that we have observed already between *Il* and *Od*, *Th* and *Erga*, with a very big shift between *Od* and *Th*. Elsewhere the pattern is less consistent: while *-ου* is commoner everywhere except in *DAp* (where the sample is smallest), there are high totals for *-ουο* in *Dem*, *PAp* and *Herm*. This is false archaism, which was not practised in the use of *-ου*, which was more convenient for the declension of formulae, as well as an innovation that poets would not be aware of as such. But we must await the correlation of a wider range of criteria before we can establish the full extent of such 'false archaism'.

Material com direitos autorais

Table 15. *The criterion of genitive singulars in -ου*

Work	*-οι'	*-οο	*-ο'	+*F*	Total	-ου	+*F*	Grand total	% -ου
Il	111	289	237	(7)	637	375	(13)	1012	37.0
Od	87	211	173	(4)	471	348	(8)	819	42.5
Th	4	6	47		57	66		123	53.6
Erga	11	4	15		30	59	(1)	89	66.3
Cat	9	13	26		48	51	(1)	99	51.5
Aspis	4	2	9		15	34	(1)	49	69.4
Dem	5	2	6	(1)	13	25	(1)	38	65.8
DAp	0	3	12		15	6		21	28.6
PAp	0	3	9	(1)	12	13	(2)	25	52.0
Herm	2	7	9		18	15		33	45.4
Aphr	2	0	9		11	14		25	56.0

(d) The dative plurals of o- and a-stems

There are six endings in early epic: -οισι(ν), -οις: -ηισι(ν), -ηις, and rarely -αισι(ν), -αις. The first of each pair will be termed 'long' endings, the second 'short'. The situation is not in fact so simple: the short endings are found more frequently before vowels than before consonants in Homer, which has led to the suggestion that in prevocalic environment they are (or were originally) elided long endings. Thus, as in the o-stem genitive singulars, we have three categories – long forms, doubtful cases before vowels, and short forms before consonants and at the ends of lines which are thereby guaranteed. But the history of the morphs is more controversial. Ruijgh[26] has argued that the short endings in Homer go back to 'Achaean' and appear in Mycenaean as *-o-i*, *-a-i*. Both he and Shipp[27] reject the argument that they are more frequent in the *Odyssey*. By my figures there are 48 cases of certain short forms in *Il* and 70 in *Od*. Shipp suggests that this is hardly of significance when ἐρετμοῖς (1x *Il*, 9x *Od*) and μεγάροις (2x *Il*, 13x *Od*) are deducted. This gives 45x *Il*, 48x *Od*, which I still find suggestive in view of the difference in length between the epics, and confirmed by the usage of other poets.

Material com direitos autorais

Ruijgh supports his theory by arguing that the endings are formular in character, and conserved because convenient for the declension of formulae. This is the reverse of the truth, as Shipp has shown. To his list of short endings in Homer introduced by modification I add the following:

Ω 25 / *ἔνθ' ἄλλοις μὲν πᾶσιν*	*nom. 2x *Il* 5x *Od*, acc. 2x *Od*
E 465 *λαὸν Ἀχαιοῖς* /	*λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν* 4x *Il*, *λαὸν* ~ 20x *Il*.
Γ 274 *Ἀχαιῶν νεῖμαν ἀρίστοις* /	*ω 38 Ἀ. *υἷες ἄριστοι*, *λ 179 κτλ. Ἀ. *ὅστις ἄριστος*

Ruijgh's interpretation of Mycenaean *-o-i*, *-a-i* is often rejected in favour of */-oibi*, *-ābi/*,[28] while the distinct instrumental in *-o* is identified with the IE instrumental in **-ōis* (Sanskrit *-aiḥ*) and thought ancestral to *-οις*, whence short a-stem forms were developed by analogy. The short endings were generalised in all mainland dialects, including Arcadian; Argive (and Cretan) and Attic are but partial exceptions. Long endings survive in Pamphylian, and alongside short forms in Ionic and Lesbian, particularly in the article, for which reason Kretschmer suggested that the latter arose by haplology in cases of homoeoteleuton; but elision seems as good a cause. This situation is true of both literature and inscriptions.[29]

The distribution of these morphs in early epic has already been charted by Reichelt in Homer and Hesiod, and by Troxler[30] in the latter: Richardson[31] has added the *Hymns*, but rejects this as a dating criterion due to the peculiar behaviour of *Herm*. As usual, we will first test the extent to which these forms are introduced in innovative contexts on the smaller sample of verse comprised by *Dem* and *Aphr*, classifying the instances according to the system devised above[32] (cases before digamma are not included in the totals, nor are those involving *δεπάεσσι*, *ἐπέεσσι* and *ὀχέεσσι*, where long endings may easily be restored – another pointer for the direction of change: for the purposes of table 16 no distinction will be made between a-stems and o-stems, and short endings before vowels will be denoted 'dub.').

The preponderance of long forms in Class A Homeric phrases and short forms in Class D proves beyond doubt that short

Material com direitos autorais

Table 16. *Classification of the o- and a-stem dative plurals in* Dem *and* Aphr

	Dem			*Aphr*		
Class	long	dub.	short	long	dub.	short
A	21	5	0	17	0	0
B	11	1	0	8	0	0
C	22	3	5	19	5	0
D	12	1	20	9	4	4

endings tend to occur in innovative contexts, and the reverse for long endings.[33] We have already seen some examples of their introduction by modification.[34] This increase in the use of short forms is confirmed by the figures for the use in all early epic. As with the genitive singulars, there are in fact two criteria here – the frequency with which long endings are used, and when they are not the proportion of short endings that are guaranteed by initial consonants following or the line-end. Table 17 gives the numbers of the various long endings, their total, the percentage they comprise and the grand total of all o- and a-stem dative plurals.

The decline in the usage of long endings outside Homer is similar to that in the other criteria we have examined, excepting only *PAp* and *Herm*, which as we shall see are cases of false archaism. As with the o-stem genitive singulars, short endings are less amenable to this. In table 18, which shows short and doubtful endings, the three types of doubtful ending are given in the order *-οις'/-ηις'/-αις'*, then the total number of these prevocalic cases, the number of cases before digamma (bracketed, and not included in the totals), then the three short endings in the same order *-οις/-ηις/-αις*, followed by the total number of guaranteed short endings, the percentage they represent, and the grand total of short and doubtful cases. *τοῖσδε* and *τοίσδεσσι* are not counted, and cases involving *δεπάεσσι*, *ἐπέεσσι* and *ὀχέεσσι* (26x *Il*, 20x *Od*) are excluded.

Again the developed forms are found least often in the

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

(e) The accusative plurals of o- and a-stems

This criterion is more complicated and controversial than those preceding. Edwards[35] has demonstrated that by Hesiod (as distinct from the poet of *Aspis*) these accusative plurals were regarded as light syllables, and consequently were placed far more often before consonants than vowels. Occasionally he actually used the ending -*ăς*, also found at *Cat* 150.15 *ἰδὲ Σκύθας ἱππημολγούς* / and *Herm* 106 *ἀθρόας οὔσας* / (the case of *λαγός*, *Aspis* 302, is isolated and possibly corrupt).[36]

These endings originated in Common Greek **-ans* and **-ons*. Compare Argive and Cretan, where the *n* was lost before consonants but retained before vowels, e.g. *τὸς καδεστάνς* but *τὸνς ἐλεύθερονς*. Elsewhere, after the loss of the nasal, syllabic weight was maintained either by lengthening the preceding vowel, or by combination with a consonant beginning the next word. In East Thessalian, Arcadian and some West Greek dialects the preconsonantal form -*ος* was generalised, and presumably so too was -*ăς*; but evidence for the length of the a-stem forms is not available from inscriptions, and the orthography does not always reveal the quantity of the o-stem morph. Elsewhere the prevocalic form prevailed, in Lesbian (and Elean)[37] diphthongised to -*αις*, -*οις*; in Ionic and Attic the change occurred after the shift of *ᾱ* to *η* was completed. No short forms are found in Homer (a few apparent instances are dismissed by Edwards).[38] Edwards also demonstrated that many cases of heavy accusative plurals in Hesiod are dependent on traditional phraseology,[39] as we might expect.

Edwards' study of the problem in Hesiod did not include the examination of the wider range of poetry found in the hymns: the following statistics repair this deficiency, and are compiled on the same basis as those preceding. Cases at the ends of lines are excluded, as they provide no evidence (although Hesiod's derivation of *Πήγᾰσος* from *πηγάς* / (*Th* 281–2) suggests that he pronounced them short): so too *τούσδε*, *τάσδε*. Cases before digamma are listed separately, and not included in the totals. In table 19 are given the numbers of cases of -*ους* before vowels and consonants, then the

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Table 20. *The criterion of a-stem accusative plurals*

Work	-ᾱς +V	-ας +C	-ᾰς	+ϝ	% +V	Total
Il	180	203		(2)	47.0	383
Od	112	154		(3)	42.1	266
Th	7	35	(6)		16.7	42
Erga	2	15	(3)		11.8	17
Cat	6	13	(1)	(1)	31.6	19
Aspis	5	7			41.7	12
Dem	1	15			6.3	16
DAp	1	2			33.3	3
PAp	5	4			55.6	9
Herm	5	16	(1)	(1)	23.8	21
Aphr	6	8			42.9	14

high results like Homer's. The application of statistical tests to see which results are random[40] leads to the following conclusions. In *Herm* the o-stem results are considerably more advanced than those of the a-stems. In *Cat* however there is no significant divergence, and both endings may in reality stand at levels slightly anterior to Hesiod's *Theogony* (as in other criteria).[41] It is at least clear that the o-stem result is not a random divergence from a Homeric value, as found for instance in the *Aspis*; a peculiar divagation as is possible in *PAp* cannot be excluded entirely. If these two poets did treat the o-stems as short and the a-stems as long, I cannot explain why. In contrast, results like those of *Herm* can be accounted for quite straightforwardly by supposing that the poets thought that the a-stem accusative plural was in poetry the same as the consonant-stem ending, but had no hesitations about the o-stem morph as offered by their vernacular. Such behaviour will belong to a self-conscious stage of the tradition, when it was more artificial than before: we shall see below that *Dem* to some extent, and *Herm* with *PAp* to a greater degree, did originate in such a stage of the epic tradition.

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

oddities, *see* isolated forms
Odyssey, accusative plurals in, 61; differences from *Iliad*, see *Iliad*; ending of, 130–1; ethnicity of poet, 83; genitive plurals in, 249n.43; influence on later poetry, 78, 129–31, 171; sequel to *Iliad*, 83–4; 'short' dative plurals in, 54; use of εἰς/ἐς in, 62
Oedipodia, 9
Onchestus, 128, 148–9
O'Neill, E. G., 37–9, 175
oral composition, 16–17, Ch. 2, 188–9
oral dictated texts, 191; *see* fixed texts, literacy
oral formular style, 19, 40
oral transmission, 2–4, 18, 191
orality, criteria for, 18–26, 28–41; definition of, 18–19; of Homer, 7, 18–19, 30, 41, 277n.6; of Hymns, 18, 40–1; and literacy, 41, 78, 190–1; and imitation, *see* imitation
oratio obliqua, *see* direct speech
Orchomenus, Boeotian, 128, 145, 224, 264n.60
originality, *see* hexameter; innovation; metre
Orpheus, 278n.13
Orsippus of Megara, 248n.38
orthography of hymns, 4–6
*-*oso*, 248n.41
overlengthening, avoided in Homer, 244n.40

P_1 formulae (i.e. filling the line to the penthemimeral caesura), 138, 235
P_2 formulae (i.e. filling the line from the penthemimeral caesura), 153–5, 279n.3
Palmer, L. R., 249n.44
PAp (= *Hymn to Pythian Apollo*), Ch. 6; accusative plurals in, 125; archaisms, 122–4, 126; Atticisms, 117, 127; date of, 119–21, 127–8, 132; dative plurals in, 111, 117, 121–2, 125; digamma, 99, 121–3, 125–6, 129; dialect forms, 117–18, 124, 127; economy, 110, 118, 130–2; ethnicity of poet, 8, 126–9, 264n.44; 'false' archaism in, 77–8, 93, 123–7, 132; genitive singulars in, 117, 121; Hesiodic phrases, 27–8, 118–19, 260n.82; imitation of Homer, 111, 129–31, 268n.22; integrity of, 116–21; metre of, 35; modification in, 121–4, 130–2; n-mobile, 100, 118, 125; place of composition, 120–1, 127–8; non-Iliadic forms in, 117; post-Homeric diction, 121–2; relation to *DAp*, see *DAp*; relation to *Dem*, 118–19; relation to Hesiod, 27–8, 118–19; relation to *Hy* 27, 111–12; source of interpolation, 278n.17; use of εἰς/ἐς in, 125–6; use of Ζηνός in, 63, 79, 93; whether oral, 41, 126–7
paragogic κ/χ, 44
'parallels of sound', 28–30, 111
Parry, M., 7–8, 10, 18, 20, 30–3, 93, 107, 176, 225, 243n.1, 249n.44, 274n.171
Pausanias, *see Index of Passages*
Pavese, C. O., 12–13, 15, 18–20, 25–6, 61, 80, 84, 105–6, 122–4, 138–9, 147–8, 157, 159, 171, 243nn.17–18, 269n.38, 279n.11
Peabody, B., 241n.31
Pegasus, etymology of, 58
Perse, 247n.37
Perses, 169
Pfister, R., 234, 258n.77
Philochorus, *see Index of Passages*
Phocis, *see* Delphi; Sacred War
Phrygian, 172, 272n.132
Pindar, 142, 149, 248n.38, 265n.60
'Pisistratean recension', 191, 255n.43, 261n.88

Material com direitos autorais

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

You have either reached a page that is unavailable for viewing or reached your viewing limit for this book.

Paperback Re-issue

This book investigates the history of the ancient Greek tradition of oral epic poetry which culminated in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. These masterpieces did not exhaust the tradition, and poems were composed in the same style for several generations afterwards. One group of such poems is the 'Homeric Hymns', ascribed to Homer in antiquity. In fact the origins of these Hymns are as mysterious as those of the Homeric epics themselves, with little external evidence to assist. However, by close examination of the language in which the major Hymns are composed, and especially by statistical comparisons of the use of innovative and archaic diction in the various poems, including those of Homer and Hesiod, Dr Janko has evolved a method of dating the poems in a relative sequence. His conclusions often undermine accepted views, affecting such controversial topics as whether Homer or Hesiod was the earlier, the relation of the two *Hymns to Apollo*, the homogeneity of the Homeric epics, the prehistory of the epic, dialectal elements in epic diction and the impact of writing on what was in origin an oral tradition.

This book will be of interest to scholars concerned with Greek philology and dialects, Homeric epic and Greek literature of the Archaic period. It should also find readers amongst specialists in other oral poetries and those using computers in the Humanities.

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
www.cambridge.org

ISBN 0-521-03565-1

9 780521 035651 >

Material com direitos autorais