

# εῦ or εὐσ in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*

*Ichiro Taida*

**T**HE LATEST EDITED TEXT of the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* (hereinafter *Pan*) is included in the 2003 edition of the *Homeric Hymns* by Martin West (*LCL*). Let us focus on line 27, in which West used ὑμνέουσιν, but all existing manuscripts as well as editors print ὑμνεῦσιν:

ὑμνέουσιν δὲ θεοὺς μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον (West)

ὑμνεῦσιν δὲ θεοὺς μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον (MSS. and other editors)

The purpose of this paper is to determine which form we should consider the correct one, based on a study of the language of *Pan*, ὑμνεῦσιν or ὑμνέουσιν; in other words, to determine which form the poet of *Pan* used.

West did not comment on his emendation, as might be expected for a Loeb edition, but he wrote in the preface: “The nature of the Loeb series precludes the provision of the fullest philological detail about variant readings or scholars’ conjectures. I have nevertheless tried to ensure that the reader is alerted to the significant textual uncertainties. In places I have made minor orthographical changes without signalling the fact.”<sup>1</sup> Thus, West apparently considered it a mere orthographic correction.

We can only speculate on why he chose ὑμνέουσιν. In Homer and Hesiod the present third-person plural of -εω verbs usually ends in -έουσι(ν) because it is metrically required.<sup>2</sup> But -εῦσι(ν)

<sup>1</sup> M. L. West, *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2003) ix–x.

<sup>2</sup> The εὐσ of -έουσι(ν) is usually heterosyllabic, so e.g. *Il.* 2.286 ἐκτελέουσιν (– υ υ – υ).

is also a generally accepted form,<sup>3</sup> and some -εω verbs have -εῦσι(v).<sup>4</sup> At *Pan* 27, -έουσιv is not metrically necessary.

We can find the reason for West's emendation at *Pan* 27 in the preface to his *Iliad*: "Contractio vocalium εο (vel εδ) saepe per scripturam εv redditur: [...] At hoc ex usu recentiorum Ionum novatum est, qui quarto a.C. saeculo ita scribere coeperant, ut titulorum testimonio constat: antea cum sono tum scriptura distabat εο contractum ab εv diphthongo primitiva. Ex Homero igitur exterminandum est falsum istud εv, restituendum εο sive εου [...]."<sup>5</sup> Thus, according to West, before the fourth century B.C. the contracted εο was distinguished from εv, but thereafter εο was written as εv. The form εv should therefore be excluded from the text of Homeric epics and replaced by εο or εου. As West pointed out, there is general agreement among scholars<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> For the inflection of -εω verbs (-έουσι[v]/-εῦσι[v]) see H. W. Smyth, *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects: Ionic* (Oxford 1894) 528.

<sup>4</sup> In the following examples, εου is not metrically necessary and εv has been generally used: *Il.* 9.384 ἐξοιχνεῦσι, *Il.* 20.254 νεικεῦσ', *Od.* 3.322 οἰχνεῦσιν, *Od.* 9.120 εἰσοιχνεῦσι, Hes. *Theog.* 48 ὑμνεῦσι, 89 τελεῦσι, *Op.* 227 ἀνθεῦσιν. Except in the *Theogony*, West used -έουσι(v) in his editions *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966), *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978), *Homerus: Ilias I* (Stuttgart 1998), and *Homerus: Odyssea* (Berlin 2017).

<sup>5</sup> West, *Ilias* XXII. West made a similar argument in his *Works and Days* 62 and *Odyssea* XX, excluding εv from his texts of these epics. In addition, see D. B. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1891) 55: "Verbs in -εω rarely contract -εο or -εω, except in the Participle (-ευμενος for -εομενος). This rule is confirmed from New Ionic inscriptions [...], as well as the MSS of Herodotus." Monro said further that for εv in ποιέυμην (*Il.* 9.495), θεῖντο (*Il.* 7.444), ὀχλεῦνται (*Il.* 21.261), ἐγγεόνεον (*Od.* 9.47, 17.161), and a few similar forms we should write εο. Also G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge 1972) 158, argued that the combination *e* + *o* is especially resistant to contraction.

<sup>6</sup> C. D. Buck, for example, argued that the fourth century B.C. was a turning point (*The Greek Dialects* [Chicago 1955] 33 and 40). P. Chantraine writes: "Chez Homère se lisent concurremment εο- et -εv-, mais si l'on songe que la notation -εv- n'apparaît pas dans les inscriptions ioniennes avant le iv<sup>e</sup> siècle on admettra que εv a souvent été substitué à -εο- par des Ioniens ; là

that εῦ began to appear in Ionic instead of εο and εοῦ<sup>7</sup> in the fourth century B.C. He considered that *Pan* had been composed in the fifth century: “*Hymn 19* celebrates the Arcadian god Pan, who did not become widely known until the early fifth century. The language of the Hymn and the romantic imaginative description of Pan dancing with the nymphs suit a fifth-century dating.”<sup>8</sup> Since in the fifth century εοῦ was widely used, West must have supposed that the poet of *Pan* originally used ὑμνέουσιν, but a scribe later changed it to ὑμνεῦσιν. ὑμνεῦσιν would then reflect the transmission rather than the composition of the poem.

However, there are objections which can be raised against West. We find examples of εῦ in Greek inscriptions before the fourth century.<sup>9</sup> Passa argued that the spelling εῦ for εο/εοῦ was already used in antiquity,<sup>10</sup> and it is impossible to eliminate εῦ entirely from the text of Homer.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, Passa pointed out that in metrically monosyllabic places in Homeric texts, εῦ is always used; εοῦ as *varia lectio* does not appear in this case.<sup>12</sup>

même où la contraction est métriquement nécessaire, il est probable que εῦ remplace un εο monosyllabique” (*Grammaire homérique* I [Paris 1958] 61).

<sup>7</sup> For the contraction of εο/εοῦ into εῦ see H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, (Harvard 1956) 21: “Ionic (and less often Doric) may contract εο, εοῦ to εῦ: σέῦ from σέο *of thee*, φιλεῦσι from φιλέουσι *they love*.”

<sup>8</sup> West, *Homeric Hymns* 18.

<sup>9</sup> See Buck, *Greek Dialects* 40: “But it occurs also Rhodes, Cos, Thera, Cyrene, Megara, Delphi, Corcyra, etc., mostly late but an exceptionally early example is Corinth. Θευγένεξ of the sixth century B.C.” Also, the form Θευγένεξ appears in an Attic inscription of 408–406: L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* I (Berlin 1980) 415. E. Passa, “L’antichità della grafia εῦ per εο, εοῦ nell’epica: a proposito di una recente edizione dell’*Iliade*,” *RivFil* 129 (2001) 385–417, at 391, wrote that Eastern Ionic inscriptions provide a large amount of evidence of εῦ since the end of the fifth century B.C.

<sup>10</sup> Passa, *RivFil* 129 (2001) 397, argued that εῦ began to be used for εο between the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.

<sup>11</sup> Passa, *RivFil* 129 (2001) 386, 387, 416.

<sup>12</sup> Passa, *RivFil* 129 (2001) 411.

Of course, even though there are persuasive reasons against West's choice of εο and εου, it is not easy to dismiss it entirely given that εο and εου long predated the fourth century. But must one exclude ευ from the text of *Pan*? A fifth-century date for *Pan* is hardly certain and West's reasoning for it is naïve and subjective. If the date is uncertain and unreliable, West's emendation would also be unreliable.

Before turning to the question of the date of *Pan*, we must draw attention to the manuscripts of the *Homeric Hymns*. If ὑμνεύουσιν is the original form, we must suppose that scribes accidentally or intentionally changed it to ὑμνεῦσιν; and we would expect similar variants of ευ for εου elsewhere in the manuscripts of the *Homeric Hymns*.

*εου, εο, and ευ in the Homeric Hymns*

To determine whether the scribes often changed εου into ευ, let us look at the manuscripts of the hymns.<sup>13</sup> Other than *Pan* 27, there are only two cases in which both εου (contracted by synizesis) and ευ are metrically possible.<sup>14</sup> The two concern ὑμνεῦσιν, as in *Pan* 27:

*Ap.* 190 ὑμνεῦσιν ῥα θεῶν δῶρ' ἄμβροτα ἦδ' ἀνθρώπων

*Hymn.Hom.* 27.19 ὑμνεῦσιν Λητῶ καλλίσφυρον ὡς τέκε παῖδας

In these two lines, as in *Pan* 27, all manuscripts give ὑμνεῦσιν. But three cases are not enough to establish scribal habits.

It is evident that scribes knew εου as well as ευ. We can find

<sup>13</sup> Existing manuscripts of the *Homeric Hymns* are divided into five groups: M, *f*, *a*, *b*, and *p*. I have referred to the manuscripts as follows: M, D (*f*), E (*a*), T (*a*), L (*b*), Π (*b*), P (*p*), and V (*p*). For variation in the use of εο/εου in Homer, one can refer to Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* 61–63. We are also aware of similar variations in the manuscripts of the *Homeric Hymns*: e.g., *Ap.* 394 M, Θ ἀγ(γ)έλλουσι, *p* ἀγγελλέουσι; *Herm.* 241 M προκαλούμενος, Ψ προκαλούμενος; *Hymn.Hom.* 32.6 Θ χρυσέου, *p* χρυσοῦ.

<sup>14</sup> Passa, *RivFil* 129 (2001) 413, focused on two similar examples from the *Theogony*, ὑμνεῦσαι and ὑμνεύσαις, and argued that they are not replaced with ὑμνεύσαι and ὑμνεύσαις in accordance with the basic metric rule.

many examples of εου in the manuscripts, e.g. *Ap.* 2 τρομέουσιν, 234 κροτέουσιν,<sup>15</sup> among others.<sup>16</sup> Scribes did not change εου into ευ in these examples. They were aware of both -εου(σιν) and -ευ(σιν).

Moreover, if we consider εο/ευ, we find that, although εο is also metrically and grammatically possible, in the following places all manuscripts have ευ: *Dem.* 181 ἡγεῦνθ' (ἡγέονθ' is not attested) and *Ap.* 196 ὄρχεῦντ' (ὄρχέοντ' is not attested).<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, although ευ is also metrically and grammatically possible, in the following loci all manuscripts have εο: *Dem.* 218, *Ap.* 282 ἴκεο (ἴκευ is not attested), and *Ap.* 135 θάμβεον (θάμβευν is not attested).<sup>18</sup> It is clear that ευ and εο coexist in the manuscripts.

This survey shows that εου, εο, and ευ all survive in the manuscripts. All three are widespread in the hymns and no one spelling has been standardized throughout the collection. There is therefore no evidence that εου/εο were changed by scribal habit into ευ, as West supposed. The reason manuscripts have ὑμεῦσιν must be that scribes found this form in their sources and copied it faithfully. Moreover, because West rejected ευ at *Pan* 27 and used ὑμέουσιν, he was also forced to assume synizesis.

However, the synizesis of εου is very rare. In the epics of Homer and Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns* we find only a

<sup>15</sup> Manuscript M has κρατέουσιν.

<sup>16</sup> See also *Ap.* 236 κομέουσι, 373 καλέουσιν, 426 κρατέουσιν, *Herm.* 56 κερτομέουσιν, *Aphr.* 211 φορέουσι, 246 στυγέουσι, *Hymn.Hom.* 33.9 καλέουσι.

<sup>17</sup> See also *Ap.* 268, *Aphr.* 293, etc. σεῦ (not σέο) and *Ap.* 311, 337 μευ (not μεο). West, *Homeric Hymns*, almost always rejected ευ in favor of εο. Exceptionally, West used σεῦ at *Hymn.Hom.* 30.6.

<sup>18</sup> See also *Dem.* 360, *Hymn.Hom.* 24.4 ἔρχεο; *Dem.* 467, *Herm.* 378 πείθεο; *Ap.* 261 βάλλεο; *Ap.* 325a φράζεο; *Ap.* 399, *Herm.* 548, etc. (ἔ)πλεον; *Herm.* 231, *Pan* 21, etc. οὔρεος; *Herm.* 381 αἰδέομαι; *Herm.* 491, *Hymn.Hom.* 33.4 ὄρεος; *Aphr.* 177 ὄρσεο; *Hymn.Hom.* 30.5, 31.18, etc. σέο.

handful of instances<sup>19</sup> of synizesis of εου:<sup>20</sup> *Il.* 2.268 σκήπτρου ὑπο χρυσεύου· ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἔζετο τάρβησέν τε; *Ap.* 9 πασσάλου ἐκ χρυσεύου· τὸν δ' εἰς θρόνον εἶσεν ἄγουσα; *Dem.* 325 αἰτίς ἔπειτα πατήρ μάκαρας θεοὺς αἰὲν ἐόντας. Synizesis of εου is very rare in the later epics too. There are no examples in Apollonius Rhodius, the *Orphica* (A., H., and L.), or Quintus Smyrnaeus. Therefore, it is hard to justify the assumption of synizesis in West's emendation at *Pan* 27.

*Date of Pan's composition*

West substituted ὑμνέουσιν for ὑμνεῦσιν and read it in synizesis. But no manuscript supports this form and the synizesis of εου is too rare to be plausible. The only support left for ὑμνέουσιν is the belief that *Pan* was composed in the fifth century when εου was widespread.

But there is little agreement concerning the date of *Pan*. Like West, Janko argued that the hymn was composed at a point between the end of the sixth century and the middle of the fifth century.<sup>21</sup> Villarrubia supported a somewhat earlier date, at a time not far from the old epic tradition.<sup>22</sup> Citing Janko, Fröhder seemed to prefer the earlier date but concluded that it is impossible to date the hymn exactly.<sup>23</sup> Càssola argued that if the

<sup>19</sup> As we saw above (n.4), West changed ευ to εου and he had to read εου in synizesis in some cases, including *Pan* 27. See also *Od.* 6.157 εἰσοιχνεύσαν (West, *Odyssea: εἰσοιχνεύσαν*).

<sup>20</sup> Synizesis is also found where εου of χρυσεύου unites with the initial vowel of a following word: *Ap.* 185 χρυσεύου ὑπὸ πλήκτρου καναχὴν ἔχει ἡμερόεσσαν; *Hymn.Hom.* 32.6 χρυσεύου ἀπὸ στεφάνου, ἀκτῖνες δ' ἐνδιάνονται.

<sup>21</sup> R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge 1982) 185.

<sup>22</sup> A. Villarrubia, “Una lectura del *Himno Homérico a Pan*,” *Habis* 28 (1997) 7–13, at 13: “Más bien, habría que considerar este poema un eslabón más de la cadena literaria que condujo al florecimiento de una nueva época que asumió sin grandes rupturas toda la tradición anterior.”

<sup>23</sup> D. Fröhder, *Die dichterische Form der Homerischen Hymnen, untersucht am Typus der mittelgrossen Preislieder* (Hildesheim 1994) 304–305: “Entstehungszeit

hymn was performed for the first time in Arcadia, where the cult of Pan had been established earlier, the date of *Pan*'s composition could be prior to the fifth century.<sup>24</sup> However, we should remember that the place where *Pan* was created is uncertain.<sup>25</sup> Andrisano held that the poet of *Pan* was influenced by Sophocles and Euripides, and dated the hymn from the end of the fifth century to the fourth century, or even during the Alexandrian age.<sup>26</sup>

Thomas wrote that it is yet to be established whether *Pan* was composed in the fifth century: "Pan's cult began to spread from Arcadia c.500 BC. This is a secure *terminus post quem* for the hymn, since we hear nothing about Arcadian rhapsodic traditions before this date, and since the nymphs so prominent here seem to have been unusually unimportant in Arcadia. [...] It is equally hard to identify a *terminus ante quem*."<sup>27</sup> Therefore, it is almost certain that *Pan* was composed after the fifth century, but its date cannot be specified with greater precision.

und -ort des Preislieds lassen sich somit trotz seiner Länge nicht genau bestimmen."

<sup>24</sup> F. Càssola, *Inni Omerici*<sup>6</sup> (Milan 1997) 364–365.

<sup>25</sup> Although studies have been made on the place of *Pan*'s creation, it is still controversial. A. Baumeister, *Hymni Homerici* (Leipzig 1860) 350–351, suspected that *Pan* was recited at the Panathenaic Games. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 185: "the use of *n*-mobile might suggest an Attic poet, but inconclusively." See also O. Thomas, "The *Homeric Hymn to Pan*," in A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford 2011) 151–172, at 172: "I have mentioned some regions which are less likely (Boeotia, Attica, Arcadia) and some such as the Argolid which are marginally more likely, given our limited information."

<sup>26</sup> A. Andrisano, "La datazione di [Hom.] Hymn. Pan," *Museum Criticum* 13/14 (1978/9) 7–22, at 22.

<sup>27</sup> Thomas, in *Interpretative Essays* 169. See also T. W. Allen and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (London 1904) 262: "It is to be regretted that so interesting a poem cannot be dated with any certainty. On one point, however, scholars are substantially agreed—that the hymn is one of the latest in the collection, and that it could hardly have been composed before the age of Pindar at the earliest."

The language of *Pan* is very different from the diction of the Homeric epics and those hymns that are usually considered older than the fifth century.<sup>28</sup> First, comparing *Pan* to the longer *Homeric Hymns* we find that non-Homeric words are more frequently used in *Pan*:<sup>29</sup>

- one in every 1.89 lines in *Pan*
- one in every 5.25 lines in *Dem.*
- one in every 7 lines in *Ap.* (*D.Ap.* and *P.Ap.*)
- one in every 3.2 lines in *Herm.*
- one in every 12.75 lines in *Aphr.*
- one in every 4.21 lines in *Dion.*

There are thus many non-Homeric words in *Pan* (26 words).

Further evidence suggests that the language of *Pan* is morphologically different from Homeric language. The following words are worthy of attention:

<i>Pan</i>	Homer
line 32 ὄν	ἔόν
line 40 χέρα	χεῖρα

While in Homer the present participle of εἰμί is ἔόν (ἔουσα, ἔόν), the poet of *Pan* used the Atticism ὄν at line 32.<sup>30</sup> While χεῖρα is used in Homer,<sup>31</sup> the poet of *Pan* used χέρα at 40.<sup>32</sup> In Homer,

<sup>28</sup> In this paper I cite statistics compiled by previous scholars for the language and meter of the Homeric epics and the four longer *Homeric Hymns*. Following their methods and using the text of West, *Homeric Hymns*, I determined the corresponding figures for *Pan* and *Dion*.

<sup>29</sup> Figures for the four longer hymns are drawn from R. Thiele, *Prolegomena ad Hymnum in Venerem Homericum quartum* (Halle 1872) 43.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Ap.* 330 οὔσα and *Hymn.Hom.* 29.10 ὄν. See P. Chantraine, *Morphologie historique du grec*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1961) 281, who called ὄν, οὔσα, ὄν “l’attique emploie.” Concerning οὔσα at *Ap.* 330, Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 117, acknowledged that it is an Atticism, but wrote: “It seems to be found in poetry of varied origin, and thus, whether in origin an Atticism, archaism, or replacement for some other form, such as εὔσα (Cos, Rhodes, Hdt.) or ἔσσα (Lesbos, Argolid, Laconia), this occurrence is rather uninformative.”

<sup>31</sup> E.g. *Il.* 1.219 and 2.389.

<sup>32</sup> For χέρ- see *Soph. Aj.* 97, *Eur. Alc.* 35, *Theoc.* 11.55, etc.



χεῖρ- is always metrically long.<sup>33</sup>

For the morphological features, Janko's study is noteworthy.<sup>34</sup> Among his statistics, we focus on the neglect of digamma: *Pan* 83.3%, *Il.* 17.2%, *Od.* 17.9%, *Dem.* 45.9%, *DAp.* 34.6%, *PAp.* 22.4%, *Herm.* 53.6%, *Aphr.* 15.9%, and *Dion.* 28.6%.<sup>35</sup> These

<sup>33</sup> The following words are also worth noting. At *Pan* 2, the MSS. have πίση, while πίσεια is used in Homer (*Il.* 20.9, *Od.* 6.124). The contraction of -εα to -η is rare in Homer; cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> 21. G. Hermann, *Homeri Hymni et Epigrammata* (Leipzig 1806) 168, and A. Gemoll, *Die Homerischen Hymnen* (Leipzig 1886) 335, held that πίση indicated that *Pan* was created in a later period. F. A. Wolf, *Homeri Odyssea cum Batrachomyomachia, hymnis, ceterisque poematibus* (Halle 1784) 609, used πίσεια. For examples of -εα at the end of a line see Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* 59: e.g. θεοειδέα (*Il.* 3.27, 3.450, etc.), Πολυδεύκεα (*Il.* 3.237, *Od.* 11.300), and Διομήδεα (*Il.* 4.365, 5.881). Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 144, wrote that the contracted forms (-η) are common in the late *Homeric Hymns* (cf. *Hymn.Hom.* 28.15 τεύχη). See also Càssola, *Inni Omerici*<sup>6</sup> LIV–LV, who commented on -εα/-η in the *Hymns*. At *Pan* 3, Νύμφαις is used, whereas in Homer the plural dative is Νύμφησι (*Od.* 13.350, 14.435), or Νύμφης could have been possible. For -ης see Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* 199. The feminine dative plural ending -αις is rare in Homer, but it is more commonly used later. Cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*<sup>2</sup> 86: “The Fem. -αις appears only in the forms θεαῖς (*Od.* 5.119), ἄκταις (*Il.* 12.284), and πάσαις (*Od.* 22.471). Hence, it is a question whether the forms in -οις, -αις are Homeric.” Also, ῥέιθροισιν is used in *Pan* 9; however, the Homeric form is ῥέεθρ- (*Il.* 2.461, 21.244, etc.). ῥέιθρ- is the Attic contraction: cf. Smyth 20. This seems to justify ascribing a later date to *Pan*. But one might object that these words reflect the transmission rather than the composition of the poem. For such an argument see Càssola LIV–LV.

<sup>34</sup> Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 184–185, argued that *Pan* dates from the end of the sixth century to the middle of the fifth century B.C. and offered evidence suggesting that *Pan* was composed at roughly the same time as other earlier epics. The use of *n*-mobile before consonants diminished in later poetry, but there are five such cases in 49 lines of *Pan*. The percentage of lines containing the *n*-mobile before a consonant is higher in *Pan* than in other earlier epics: *Pan* 10.2%, *Il.* 3.56%, *Od.* 3.72%, *Dem.* 4.44%, *DAp.* 6.08%, *PAp.* 1.37%, *Herm.* 1.55%, *Aphr.* 4.78%, and *Dion.* 3.39%. Cf. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 64–66, 185.

<sup>35</sup> Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 47, 183–184.

numbers indicate that *Pan* was composed later.<sup>36</sup> From a study of the presence or absence of digamma, Allen and Sikes concluded that “*H. Pan* cannot belong to an early epic date.”<sup>37</sup>

Sometimes the language of *Pan* is semantically different from that of Homer. The following words in *Pan* have different meanings from those in Homeric epics. At *Pan* 15, *δονάκων* means “reed pipes,” as in Pindar (*Pyth.* 12. 25), Aeschylus (*PV* 574), and Theocritus (20.29), while in Homer *δόνναξ* means “a reed” or “the shaft of an arrow.” At *Pan* 16, *μελέεσσιν* means “songs,” as in Theognis (761) and Pindar (*Ol.* 9. 1), whereas in Homer the word always means “limbs.” At *Pan* 23, *λαῖφος* (... *λυγκός*) means “(a lynx’s) skin”; however, in Homer it means “shabby, tattered garment.”<sup>38</sup> At *Pan* 38, *τιθήνη* means “mother,” as in Coluthus (372, V/VI A.D.); on the other hand, in Homer, it means a “nurse.” Thus, the forms and meanings of several words in *Pan* are different from those in the early epics.

*Metrical analysis*

Metrical analysis also suggests that the language of *Pan* is different from the language of archaic epic. As evidence, I have collected the following statistics on meter. As Thomas points out, the forty-nine lines of *Pan* might seem too small a number to extract reliable statistics.<sup>39</sup> But the numbers show differences between *Pan* and other epics not recognized to date. My analysis

<sup>36</sup> Regarding digamma, Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 42: “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.” However, A. Vergados, *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Berlin 2013) 143, holds that no firm conclusions can be drawn regarding the date and provenance of *Herm.* from observances and neglects of digamma.

<sup>37</sup> Allen and Sikes, *Homeric Hymns* lxxii.

<sup>38</sup> We do not find any examples in which *λαῖφος* means animal skin. On this word see Vergados, *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 357–358.

<sup>39</sup> Thomas, in *Interpretative Essays* 170.

includes the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, which has fifty-nine lines and is as short as *Pan*. It shows that the language of *Pan* is also different from the language of *Dionysus*. Moreover, it will become clear that *Pan* is actually closer to poems of the Hellenistic and later periods.

First, we consider the frequency of hiatus and irregular lengthening<sup>40</sup> in the following texts:<sup>41</sup>

	Hiatus	Lengthening
<i>Pan</i>	0%	0%
<i>Il.</i>	0.78%	1.36%
<i>Od.</i>	0.96%	1.16%
<i>Dem.</i>	2.23%	0.2%
<i>DApp.</i>	1.1%	1.1%
<i>PApp.</i>	2.47%	2.19%
<i>Herm.</i>	0.52%	1.55%
<i>Aphr.</i>	0.34%	1.02%
<i>Dion.</i>	6.8% <sup>42</sup>	0%

There are no examples of metrical irregularities (hiatus or irregular lengthening) in *Pan*; the data indicate that the hymn was

<sup>40</sup> The list shows the percentage of lines containing a hiatus or an irregular lengthening. For instance, there are eleven examples of hiatus in *Dem.*, which is made up of 495 lines, and thus  $11/495 = 0.0222$ .

<sup>41</sup> Figures are drawn from Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 36. We should not regard the following places in *Pan* as metrical irregularities. Line 8 διὰ ῥωπήϊα: -ἰα is long, because an initial ῥ- always appears to have the power of lengthening a preceding vowel; cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*<sup>2</sup> 344. Line 44 πᾶρ δὲ Ζηνὶ: -ἔ is long, because Ζ is a double consonant; cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> 11. Line 48 χαῖρε ἄναξ: it is common for the hiatus to occur after a short vowel at the feminine caesura, as here; cf. M. L. West, “Homer’s Meter,” in I. Morris et al. (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden 1997) 218–237, at 232. Moreover, we must remember that ἄναξ used to begin with the digamma, and the effect did not disappear in later poetry: e.g. Theoc. 17.135, Callim. *Ap.* 113 χαῖρε ἄναξ, and Apol. Rhod. 1.908 τοῖο ἄνακτος. For the same reason, we do not admit the hiatus between δέ and οἱ at *Pan* 31. For the digamma of ἄναξ and οἱ, see Monro 364, 370, and Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* 126–127, 145.

<sup>42</sup> *Dion.* 6 εὐστέλμου ἀπό; 24 ὄρση ἀργαλέους; 30 ἐρεῖ αὐτοῦ; 38 παρὰ ἰστίον.

composed somewhat later than the other works. See Janko’s comment: “Another of Parry’s insights was that some metrical irregularities in Homer may be attributed to the juxtaposition and adaptation of formulae in oral composition, and might well have been avoided by a literary poet.”<sup>43</sup>

Second, we look at the bucolic caesura (word-ending after uncontracted fourth-foot biceps).<sup>44</sup> Twenty-eight lines of *Pan* (57.1%) have the caesura, and the frequency is higher than that in other poems:<sup>45</sup> *Homer* 47%, *Dem.* 48%, *DAp.* 42.1%, *PAP.* 52.9%, *Herm.* 51.2%, *Aphr.* 51.7%, and *Dion.* 50.8%. Even West noted that “the ‘bucolic’ caesura, is a conspicuous feature of Alexandrian and later versification,” e.g. Callimachus 79% and Apollonius Rh. 63%.<sup>46</sup>

Third, the following table shows the frequency of spondees in each foot:<sup>47</sup>

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
<i>Pan</i>	30.6%	28.6%	14.3%	20.4%	0%
<i>Il.</i>	39.1%	39.8%	14.9%	29%	5.1%
<i>Od.</i>	37.9%	42.4%	16.2%	30.2%	4.7%
<i>Dem.</i>	31.4%	37.2%	16.6%	28.9%	12.7%
<i>DAP.</i>	42.1%	46%	24.7%	29.8%	11.2%
<i>PAP.</i>	36%	45%	21.8%	26.7%	12%
<i>Herm.</i>	34.3%	33.3%	13.4%	23.4%	6%
<i>Aphr.</i>	44.8%	42%	23.8%	25.5%	10.3%
<i>Dion.</i>	32.2%	35.6%	8.5%	33.9%	3.4%

<sup>43</sup> Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* 33.

<sup>44</sup> S. D. Olson, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Berlin 2012) 37.

<sup>45</sup> The figure for Homer is drawn from M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 154, and those for the four longer hymns are from Olson, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 37.

<sup>46</sup> West, *Greek Metre* 154.

<sup>47</sup> Figures are drawn from Olson, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 36.

The poet of *Pan* never used a spondee in the fifth foot. We should remember that the epic formulae are commonly used in the latter part of a line.<sup>48</sup> The difference between *Pan* and other epics concerning the fifth foot suggests that the poet of *Pan* did not completely rely on Homeric formulae and that his style was different from that of other epics. Like *Pan*, later poems show none or few spondees in the fifth foot: e.g. Nicander 2.55% and Nonnus 0%.<sup>49</sup>

The fourth foot is also noteworthy. *Pan*'s percentage (20.4%) is the smallest in this table. Like *Pan*, Hellenistic poems only occasionally feature a spondee in this position: e.g. Aratus 19.16%, Callimachus 19.33%, Apollonius Rh. 17.28%, and Dionysius Periegetes (II A.D.?) 20.74%.<sup>50</sup>

Fourth, *Pan* shows a clear preference for dactyls. Only 18.78% of its feet are spondees. Compare this with *Il.* 25.58%, *Od.* 26.28%, *Dem.* 25.36%, *DAp.* 30.76%, *PAP.* 28.3%, *Herm.* 22.08%, *Aphr.* 29.28%, and *Dion.* 22.7%.<sup>51</sup> In the evolution of the hexameter, the use of spondees decreased in favour of the dactyl:<sup>52</sup> e.g. Callimachus 21.82%, Triphiodorus (III/IV A.D.) 20.72%, Quintus Smyr. (IV A.D.?) 16.96%, Nonnus 14.95%, Pamprepis (V A.D.) 16.2%, and Musaeus (V/VI A.D.)

<sup>48</sup> A. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford 1987) 9.

<sup>49</sup> A. M. Pascual, "El hexámetro de Dionisio el Periegeta. I," *Myrtia* 28 (2013) 39–55, at 51.

<sup>50</sup> Pascual, *Myrtia* 28 (2013) 51. M. Van Raalte, *Rhythm and Metre: Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse* (Leiden 1986) 37, 40, also pointed out that in Homer, Hesiod, the *Homeric Hymns*, Parmenides, and Empedocles, more than 20% of verses have a spondee in the fourth foot, while in Hellenistic hexameters (Aratus, Callimachus, Apollonius) a spondee is less frequent in this position (under 18%).

<sup>51</sup> I have calculated the percentage in the *Iliad* as 25.58%, based on the frequency of spondees in each foot (the average of 39.1%, 39.8%, 14.9%, 29%, and 5.1%).

<sup>52</sup> Pascual, *Myrtia* 28 (2013) 53.

15.39%.<sup>53</sup>

Fifth, the following percentages also suggest that the compositional style of *Pan* is different from that of other epics. In this table, ddddd for example means that the first five feet of the line are made up of five dactyls:<sup>54</sup>

	<i>Pan</i>	<i>Il.</i>	<i>Od.</i>	<i>Dem.</i>	<i>DAp.</i>	<i>PAP.</i>	<i>Herm.</i>	<i>Aphr.</i>	<i>Dion.</i>
dddddd	28.6	19.1	18.6	20.6	12.9	16.9	24.4	14.1	22
dsddd	20.4	14.5	14.9	13.4	13.5	14.4	15.2	14.8	16.9
sdddd	14.3	13.9	12	8.5	10.7	12.5	16	16.2	13.6
ddsdd	8.2	4.2	4.2	5.7	6.2	4.1	4.3	3.4	3.4
sddsd	8.2	6	6.5	5.5	6.2	4.6	5.7	6.6	6.8
dddsd	6.1	8.5	8.4	9.3	7.3	5.4	7.2	5.9	10.2
ssddd	6.1	8.1	8.1	6.6	7.3	6	5.7	7.9	6.8
ddssd	4.1	1.3	1.4	0.8	0.6	2.7	1	1.4	3.4
dsdsd	2	6.1	6.8	6.8	4.5	7.4	4.3	3.8	8.5
sdsdd	2	2.7	2.8	2.1	1.7	2.5	1.2	3.4	1.7

There are thirty-two potential arrangements of dactyls and spondees, and the poet of *Pan* used only ten. By contrast, Homer used every one of them,<sup>55</sup> and the verse forms of the longer hymns are also full of variety in this regard: *Dem.* 27, *DAP.* 25, *PAP.* 26, *Herm.* 27, *Aphr.* 26, *Dion.* 13.<sup>56</sup> Like the poet of *Pan*, later

<sup>53</sup> Pascual, *Myrtia* 28 (2013) 53–54.

<sup>54</sup> Figures for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are drawn from J. L. Lightfoot, *Dionysius Periegetes* (Oxford 2014) 65; for the four longer hymns, from Olson, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 35, 40–42.

<sup>55</sup> S. E. Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*<sup>2</sup> (Maryland 2003) 142; Lightfoot, *Dionysius Periegetes* 65.

<sup>56</sup> Olson, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 35, 40–42.

poets also tend to use fewer forms: e.g. Callimachus 21 and Nicander 20.<sup>57</sup> Moreover, as Pascual pointed out, since the Hellenistic period a gradual reduction in the number of schemes is evident into the time of Nonnus and the late hexameters: e.g. Nonnus 9, Pamprepicus 9, Musaeus 10, and Coluthus 15.<sup>58</sup>

In *Pan*, the total frequency of the five most common verse forms is 85.8%. Compare this with those of *Il.* 64.1%, *Od.* 62%, *Dem.* 58.6%, *DAp.* 51.7%, *PAP.* 57.5%, *Herm.* 68.5%, *Aphr.* 59.6%, and *Dion.* 71.2%.<sup>59</sup> It is thus evident that *Pan* does not have a great diversity of metrical forms and, even considering its length, its composer used fewer than one might expect. Conversely, as in *Pan*, the frequency of the five most common verse forms in later works is rather high: e.g. Callimachus 74%, Nicander 73.66%, and Nonnus 93.34%.<sup>60</sup>

The statistics show that *Pan* is metrically different from earlier epics and close to later epics.

### *Conclusion*

West adopted ὑμνέουσι because he believed that *Pan* was composed in the fifth century, and εου was widely used before the fourth century. He believed that ὑμνεῦσι in the manuscripts was a scribal form.

But the scribes of the *Homeric Hymns* did not habitually change εο/εου to ευ. Moreover, ὑμνεῦσι is metrically preferable as ὑμνέουσι presupposes an unusual synizesis. Furthermore, a fifth-century date for *Pan* is unlikely. Its language and meter are very different from those of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and from the other *Homeric Hymns*. Metrical statistics suggest that *Pan*

<sup>57</sup> Lightfoot, *Dionysius Periegetes* 65.

<sup>58</sup> Pascual, *Myrtia* 28 (2013) 43–46.

<sup>59</sup> Lightfoot, *Dionysius Periegetes* 65; Olson, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 35, 40–42.

<sup>60</sup> Pascual, *Myrtia* 28 (2013) 47. Lightfoot's statistics (Callimachus *Hymn to Delos* 79.3% and Nicander 73.69%) are slightly different from Pascual's (see *Dionysius Periegetes* 65).

shares features typical of Hellenistic and even later poems. There is a lack of evidence to support the fifth-century date, and one cannot therefore accept West's emendation.

While the date of *Pan* remains uncertain, it is undeniable that ὕμνεῦσιν is the manuscript form. There is no sound reason to reject it and editors should print ὕμνεῦσιν.<sup>61</sup>

*January, 2022*

Toyo University  
taida@toyo.jp

<sup>61</sup> This paper is based on an oral presentation delivered in 2017 at the 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference of the Taiwan Association of Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Studies at Tainan National University of the Arts, Taiwan. I wish to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions and comments.