The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Hermes- *Nous* and Pan- *Logos* in Pindar, *Ol.* II

F. M. Cornford

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 06 / September 1912, pp 180 - 181

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00200267, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00200267

How to cite this article:

F. M. Cornford (1912). Hermes- *Nous* and Pan- *Logos* in Pindar, *Ol.* II. The Classical Review, 26, pp 180-181 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00200267

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

have been here. Against Φόλος it may fairly be urged that it is unlikely in this list just because it is the name of another kind of creature, though on the other side it must not be forgotten that 'Ανθεύς, one of the names in our list, is also a local name of Pan. On the whole, however, Weiske's Πόλος appears to me better. But is there not yet another and a stronger candidate to be found? Xenophon has made 'Τλεύς from ὕλη—that needed some δεξιότης—and he has coined Γηθεύς from γηθῶ. He shares, in fact, the notorious δεξιότης of Athenian authors in the field of etymology, especially in that branch of it that is concerned with proper names. Why should he not have made Πολεύς, 'Rover,' out of πολεῖν? He might similarly have given Στιβεύς, but he preferred the hypocoristic Στίβων, just as he preferred the hypocoristic Φόναξ to Φονεύς.

E. C. MARCHANT.

P.S.—In c. v. 20 we read in A, ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἀλλὰ δόξαντες ἢ πεισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτά, παρὰ τὰ αὐτά, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἐπαλλάττοντες ἄλματα, ἐμποιοῦντες ἔχουσιν ἵχνη ἀποχωροῦσι. Something is clearly wrong with ὑπ' αὐτά, and πεισθέντες calls aloud for an infinitive. Surely ὑπαντᾶν is the right word. The hares 'are persuaded that the hounds

are after them.' The verb occurs as a hunting term in c. vi. 17. It seems to me equally clear that ἐκάστης should be altered to ἐκάστην in c. x. 7 ὑπὲρ δὲ ἐκάστης (ἄρκυος) ἐμφράττειν τῇ ὕλῃ καὶ τὰ δύσορμα. Mr. Richards proposes περὶ for ὑπὲρ; but the sense is 'beyond the net.' C. ii. opens with this amorphous jumble: πρῶτον μὲν οὖν χρὴ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐπιτηδεῦμα τὸ τῶν κυνηγεσιῶν τὸν ἥδη ἐκ παιδὸς ἀλλάττοντα, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐπιτηδεύματα, τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα σκεψάμενον τὴν οὐσίαν· ᾧ μὲν ἱκανή, ἀξίως τῆς αὐτοῦ ὠφελείας, ᾧ δὲ μὴ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' οὖν τὴν γε προθυμίαν παρεχέσθω. Xenophon is not writing hunter's jargon here any more than in the epilogue. Radermacher has cut out from εἶτα to ἐπιτηδεύματα and so has made a better sentence. But surely it is not only ὁ ἔχων who is to 'look to his means.' It looks as if τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα is a corruption of τὰ ὄντων ἔχοντα (ἐπιτηδεύματα). Lastly, in c. i. § 7, A, the best MS., has the unmeaning reading Νέστωρ δὲ παρελήλυθεν ὡς ἀφ' ἐνὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰς ἀκοάς. For ἀφ' ἐνὸς read φρόνιμος, comparing Isocrates *Panegyricus*, § 72, Μεσσήνη μὲν γὰρ Νέστορα παρέσχε τὸν φρονιμώτατον ἀπάντων. The condition of A (for which now see Ruehl *praef.* p. xi) fully justifies such a conjecture.

HERMES-NOUS AND PAN-LOGOS IN PINDAR, OL. II.

OF all the cryptic passages in Pindar, none has been more clearly marked as such by the author than *Olympian* ii. 91 ff.:

πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη
ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας
93 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν
ἐρμηνέων χατίζει.

Schol. (152 E) ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος οὕτω· διάδηλά (?) φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος τοῖς συνετοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινὸν ἀγόμενα ἐρμηνέως χρῆζειν. Τοπᾶν Boeckh; ἐς δὲ μέσον Oelschlaeger, ἐς δ' ἄπορον Schwickert. τοπᾶν was defended by Verrall (*Journ. of Philol.* xvii.) as derived from a conjectural *τοπή (τοπάζειν).

The difficulty, of course, lies in the words ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν, the metre demanding

that πᾶν shall be scanned short. Christ's note (*Pind. Carm.*, 1896) is: ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν, in vulgus; vocalem nominis πᾶν in adverbiali formula corripuit ex analogia nominum compositorum πᾶμπᾶν et σύμπᾶν. Kühner-Blass (*Ausführl. Gram.* i. § 133) report the short form πᾶν as Aeolo-Doric, referring to Herod. i. 533, ii. 12. 903 and to this passage. It appears to be unparalleled in classical Greek. What I wish to suggest is that Pindar used this unexampled form here because he had a special reason for setting this phrase, ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐρμηνέων, exactly where it stands: no other words and no other place would do. The reason is to be found in the words which fill the corresponding place in the antistrophe:

93 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι· ἐς δὲ τὸ ΠΑΝ
ἙΡΜΗΝΕΩΝ

is tautometric with

101 αὐδάσσομαι ἐνὸρκιον ΛΟΓΟΝ ἀλαθεῖ
ΝΟΩΙ.

Hermes and *Nous*, Pan and *Logos*—these are the expressions which will be φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι. Zielinski (*Arch. f. Religionswiss.* ix. p. 34) points out that Plato (*Kratylus* 408 D ἐστὶν ἤτοι Λόγος ἢ Λόγου ἀδελφός ὁ Πάν, εἴπερ Ἑρμοῦ υἱός ἐστιν) takes it as given that Hermes is father of *Logos*; and this gives us the equation Pan = *Logos*, as a mystic doctrine probably to be referred to the old Arcadian Hermetic, from which Zielinski derives the Strassburg Cosmogony (Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgesch. Fragen*, Strassb. 1901). Hermes, as son and messenger of Zeus, was equated with *Logos* already in the sixth century by Theagenes of Rhegium (Diels *Frag. d. Vors.* ii. p. 511). Later mysticism developed the trinity: *Noûs* (= Zeus), *Noûs δημιουργός* (= Hermes), and *Λόγος*. If I am right, we have in the second *Olympian* one germ of this development: Hermes = *Nous*, Pan = *Logos*. It will be remembered that Pindar had at his doors a cult of the Great Mother and of Pan, who sang one of his pæans. The ancient Lives emphasise his connection with Pan. (See also my note on *Hermes, Pan, Logos*, *Classical Quarterly*, iii. p. 281.)

Though I think that the theory of tautometric responsions has sometimes been overdriven, no student of Pindar can doubt that they occur and often give the key to the interpretation of difficult passages. I have elsewhere (*From Religion to Philosophy*, London, 1912, p. 174⁴) pointed out another case in this ode:

19 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ
85 πόσις ὁ πάντων Ῥέας (i.e. Kronos),

which gives us the Orphic equation Kronos = Chronos, again at least as old as the sixth century (Pherekydes, Diels *Frag. d. Vors.* ii. p. 507). The points which make me think that the present instance is not a mere coincidence are (1) that Pindar expressly warns us that he is writing cryptically; (2) that the form *πάν* needs some special justification; (3) that the phrase αὐδάσσομαι λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόφ is itself not an obvious expression, and has the air of being dragged in with a purpose.

Finally, the thought that *Nous* is the father of *Logos*—Wisdom the father of Speech—is peculiarly appropriate to the context, which continues:

σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ Φεῖδῶς φυᾶ·
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι
παγγλωσσία, κόρακες ὥς, ἄκραντα γαρ-
νέτον
Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

Pindar is, of course, the σοφός, whose poetry comes of native wisdom: his *logos* is born of *Nous*. The noisy crows, whose knowledge is only learnt at second-hand, are not πάν-σοφοι but πάγ-γλωσσοι: their *logos* comes only from the tongue; it is mere chattering (τὸ λαλαγήσαι, l. 106), not fathered by the Mind. As Heracleitus says, πολυμαθὴ νῶον οὐ διδάσκει. Bacchylides, a few years later (468 B.C.), openly takes up Pindar's challenge in Ode III. 85 φρονέοντι συνετὰ γάρυω—as much as to say: 'My words have meaning enough for one who really has the Mind you boast of'—; and claims to be, not a πάγ-γλωσσος κόραξ, but a μελίγλωσσος ἀηδὼν (l. 96). If the cap fitted so well, Bacchylides and Simonides must be the pair of crows.

F. M. CORNFORD.

Cambridge.

NOTES AND EMENDATIONS.

THUCYDIDES V. 103, 1.

Ἑλπίς δὲ κινδύνφ παραμύθιον οὔσα κ.τ.λ.

Editors have long felt that the sense required by the passage is 'an encourage-

ment to risk,' rather than 'a solace, a relief, to danger; danger's comforter,' but the dative has been a stumbling-block: hence some have fallen back upon κινδύνου of Dion Hal. and Sto-