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](#)

A Note on the Date of Tyrtaeus, and the Messenian War

Reginald W. Macan

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / February 1897, pp 10 - 12

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025944, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025944

How to cite this article:

Reginald W. Macan (1897). A Note on the Date of Tyrtaeus, and the Messenian War. The Classical Review, 11, pp 10-12 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025944

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

southern Spartan outpost was stationed about nine stades from the south end of the island. With scarcely more warrant he assumes that the Athenians, when they landed on the harbour side to attack the outpost, were also about nine stades distant from the south end.¹ He then asks us to believe that the distance between these positions and the Sikia Channel was mistaken by Thucydides for the total length of the island. Has it occurred to Mr. Grundy to wonder with what possible object the Spartans or Athenians should have taken measurements from these points to the northern end of the island? When had they to walk, or sail, the distance? Who could have cared to estimate it at all, except, indeed, an observer who was at the moment intending to point out that it was not the whole of the island which the Spartans occupied? We are asked, then, to believe that Thucydides was so bad an historian that he never noticed the point which a measurement was deliberately intended to bring out, but went out of his way to use it in a perversely different sense.

Notice the difference between such a mistake and that which I have suggested as the reason for his only allowing a passage of eight or nine ships abreast through the southern entrance. The number of ships abreast with which the Athenian fleet

entered the harbour would be remembered naturally, and without special effort, by any of its responsible commanders. They would not in their thoughts connect it in any way, for truth or falsehood, with the breadth of the entrance, because their knowledge was not acquired with reference to that question. Thucydides, therefore, would get no warning or caution from his informants, and his mistaken inference does not stamp him as incompetent. But the measurement of the island from the Athenian landing place or the Spartan outpost must, if made at all, have been consciously made with a definite object in view, and the fact would be passed on in its entirety, unless the historian was either incompetent or, what is perhaps the same thing, content to take it third or fourth hand. This is not 'intrinsic evidence.' Far better to frankly allow that Thucydides, before the days of surveys, made an error in measurement. Still better to accept the sane and moderate reconstruction of the text, which Mr. Clark first proposed.

In conclusion, I apologise once again if I have appeared over polemical, and assure Mr. Grundy that no one can realize more fully than I do the importance and permanent value of his excellent survey.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

[This reply was received towards the end of November, but too late for publication in the December number.—G. E. M.]

A NOTE ON THE DATE OF TYRTAEUS, AND THE MESSENIAN WAR.

In a passage from the orator Lycurgus (*c. Leocrat.* §§ 102-102) quoted by Dr. A. W. Verrall in a recent number of this *Review* (vol. x. No. 6. pp. 269 ff) an approximate date is given for the *floruit* of Tyrtaeus, for the Messenian War with which his name is associated, and for the poems, or poetic fragments, which bear his name. Dr. Verrall has attempted to prove that the date in question is placed by Lycurgus after the Persian Wars, that the Messenian War in question must therefore be the 'third' Messenian War (*circa* 464-454 B.C.), and that the literary character of the poems in question confirms this hypothesis. It is the object of the present note to show that this novel hypothesis is unacceptable.

(a) *The date of Tyrtaeus.* Tyrtaeus, the

Messenian War in which he served (or led) the Spartans, his poetry and the use made of it in Spartan education, all these points, Lycurgus *l.c.* undoubtedly dates with reference to the Persian Wars, and as undoubtedly dates them all before, and not after, the Persian Wars. This statement will be self-evident to anyone who considers the passage translated from Lycurgus by Dr. Verrall, and considers it in its entirety. The orator asserts that at Thermopylae the Spartans, by their heroism, showed the effects of the poems of Tyrtaeus upon their education, and were enabled to dispute with Athens the primacy, or lead, gained by the Athenians at Marathon, where Athens had acted as the champion of Hellas against the 'barbarians.' Dr. Verrall in explaining the

passage from Lycurgus has post-dated and unduly extended the competition for the primacy, or *hegemony*, between Athens and Sparta, as conceived by the orator. There is not a word in the passage cited, nor in the context, about Salamis, or the development of the Confederacy of Delos: and unless Dr. Verrall dates the defence of Thermopylae to the year 445 B.C. he should not have represented the argument of Lycurgus as running to the effect that 'Sparta from about B.C. 445 began to dispute that pre-eminence of Athens [displayed at Marathon] by virtue of an education adopted'—from Tyrtaeus after the Messenian War.

(b) *The date of the Messenian War.* It is 'now surely manifest beyond all possibility of debate' that the Messenian War with which Tyrtaeus is associated by Lycurgus *l.c.* cannot be a Messenian War subsequent to the defence of Thermopylae; nor is any such hypothesis necessary to explain the mention of Tyrtaeus and the Messenian war after the first mention of Marathon and the Athenian championship of Hellas upon that field. Lycurgus is a rhetorician defending a thesis not an historian chronicling a series of events. Lycurgus does not specify how many years before Thermopylae Tyrtaeus lived and wrote, but he must be understood to allow sufficient time after the Messenian War in question for Tyrtaeus to have passed away, bequeathing to Sparta his poems, and 'a system of discipline,' in virtue of which the Spartan people of later days, 'which was in the habit of hearing this poetry, was so disposed to bravery, that they disputed [in the lines of Thermopylae] the primacy which Athens had asserted at Marathon.' In order to prove that Lycurgus dates the Messenian War before the Persian War, it is not necessary in explaining the words τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις πολεμοῦσι πρὸς Μεσσηνίους ἀνείλεν ὁ θεὸς παρ' ἡμῶν ἡγεμόνα λαβεῖν to take ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις with πολεμοῦσι. The era of the Messenian War is obtainable, as above shown, from the context, irrespective of these words. And, however these words be taken, they in no case contradict a date for the Messenian War before the Persian War. Dr. Verrall discusses four alternative ways of understanding them, nor am I sure that he has exhausted all the legitimate possibilities of the case. One question is, whether the words 'in former times' are to be construed with ἀνδρειοτάτοις or with the verbs πολεμοῦσι...ἀνείλεν. Another question is, whether in *former* priority is measured in relation to the date of the speech or

in relation to events narrated, or implied, in the immediate context. If *former* is relative to the date of the speech, it manifestly leaves the date of the Messenian War an open question, so far as this sentence is concerned, while the context, as above shown, fixes the Messenian War at some date before the Persian War. If *former* is relative to events narrated or implied in the immediate context, then manifestly it dates the Delphic response, the Messenian War, or, it may be, the whilesome courage of the Lacedaemonians, before Marathon and the Persian War. I am captivated by Dr. Verrall's preference for the grammatical connexion of ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις with ἀνδρειοτάτοις, and on such a point I defer gladly to his admirable scholarship: but on the material interpretation of the words I venture to suggest that the 'prior bravery' of the Spartans is to be conceived as preceding, not the Persian War—that goes without saying—but the Messenian War, in which notoriously, or *ex hypothesi*, the Spartans were at first defeated and their reputation for 'martial qualities' discredited, and only thereafter restored by the advent and the influence of Tyrtaeus. The argument would then run that in days of yore the Spartans no doubt were very brave fellows, but all the same, when fighting Messenians they were worsted, until the god directed them to take an Athenian, to be their leader (ἡγεμόνα), under promise of victory, if they did so. The Spartan lack, or loss, of bravery was shown by their requiring a leader from outside in order to defeat the Messenians. There are, perhaps, other exegetical possibilities in the sentence, but none—so far as I see—that require us to date the Messenian War, or the revival of Spartan prowess, after the Persian Wars—a date which would indeed be wholly inconsistent with the remainder of the passage.

(c) *The date of the Poems.* Dr. Verrall finds some support for his conclusion in the literary character of the extant fragments ascribed to Tyrtaeus. He points out the improbability of the belief that 'in Lacedaemonia, a century before Solon, popular audiences were regaled' with such poems as the poems of Tyrtaeus, to judge by the extant remains, appear to have been. So be it: but surely the better inference would be that the fragments are, in whole or in part, wrongly ascribed to Tyrtaeus and not that Tyrtaeus was 'a contemporary of Sophocles.' It would be a real service to Greek history if Dr. Verrall could be persuaded to give us a study on the authenticity of the Fragments ascribed to Tyrtaeus, such for example as we

have just received from M. Hauvette, upon the authenticity of the *Épigrammes* ascribed to Simonides. But he must proceed upon the hypothesis that the real Tyrtaeus, whatever his nativity and franchise, was not a contemporary of Sophocles: he must resign the theses that 'Lycurgus dates Tyrtaeus not in the seventh century B.C. but in the fifth, and that the Messenian War, with which the name of Tyrtaeus was associated, is the 'third' Messenian War, circa 464-454 B.C. What precise dates Lycurgus would have assigned to Tyrtaeus and to the Messenian Wars, is another question. If anyone maintains that Lycurgus expressly places Tyrtaeus in the seventh century B.C., I promise Dr. Verrall an easy victory over him. The true

dates, and the true story of the earlier Messenian Wars, so far as recoverable, cannot here be discussed, nor even the genesis of the later romance, which Pausanias preserves for us: but it may be suggested that Grote came short in tracing the legend no further back than the foundation of Messene in 369 B.C. We have some pretty clear indications that the 'story,' as distinct from the 'tradition,' of the Messenian Wars was already generated and flourishing before the end of the fifth century, and we may feel pretty sure that the hero Aristomenes, or his legend, had already done good service against Sparta before the middle of that century.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

I.—LATIN *ingens* 'HUGE.'

§ 1. For *ingens* I find two etymologies current. One proceeds from Danielsson (Pauli's *Altital. Stud.* iv. 149) who posits an Aryan base **ngn-t* 'unknown' = Eng. *uncouth*. Schulze (*K.Z.* 28, 281) independently compares Ir. *ingnād* 'wunderbar.' This etymology is mentioned without definite acceptance by Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 123, and accepted by Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 274. Another etymology advocated by Bréal (*Bréal et Bailly's Dict. Etym. Lat.* s.v. and *Mém. Soc. Ling.* ix. 42) derives *ingens* from *√gen* 'become' compounded with an indeterminate preposition. Neither of these etymologies is conclusive regarding the signification of *ingens*, for 'uncouth' does not mean 'huge,' nor is there question of a *-to-* stem in the Latin word.

§ 2. I would therefore compare *ingens* with Sk. *mahānt* 'large' <Aryan **mgh-ént*-, recognizing gradation of course for the suffix *-ent-*. In Sanskrit we should expect **ahānt*, but *māhi* 'great,' and *māhas* 'greatness,' were influential to check gradation, though in Greek we have *dyav* 'much, very.' I can see no reason why this explanation, which suits both the sense and inflexion, is not preferable to either of the others. That *ingens* is but an emphatic *magnus* is proved by Ter. *Eun.* 391: *Magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi?* Gn. *Ingentis*: on which Cicero (*Lael.* 98) makes the comment: *satis erat respondere magnas*. The only previous comparison of *ingens* and *mahānt* I can find

in the literature accessible to me proceeds from Bury, *B.B.* 7, 82, where it is not clear whether he makes claim to it as new or not.

§ 3. Even in Sanskrit we have, I believe, a trace of the stem **mgh-*. In a stanza of the wedding hymn, *R.V.* 10, 85, 13 (= *A.V.* 14, 1, 13) we have the form *aghāsu*, but *A.V.* *maghā-su*. Now *maghāsu* means 'in the month of *maghā*,' while *aghāsu* means 'in the evil [-month].' Weber (*Abhandl. Ak. Wiss. Berlin*, 1861, p. 364) believes that *aghāsu* was a *mala fide* alteration of *maghāsu*, for our stanza prescribes a sacrifice of cows preparatory to the bridal procession, and the cow subsequently grew to have a sacrosanct character. This reasoning would be more valid if the alteration assumed had taken place in *A.V.*, which is the more superstitious volume.

§ 4. The month of *Maghā* was sacred to the Manes, and, though its *-gh-* is probably a 'velar,' it is not to be separated from *māh-* in *pitāmāhā-s* 'Manes' (cf. *māh-ē pitr-ē*, dat. sg., used of a dead ancestor in *R.V.* 1 71, 5; 6 20, 11; see *P.W.* s.v. *pitāmāhā*). The velar is also warranted in Goth. *manags*, O. Bulg. *mānogū* 'much' beside Sk. *mānha-te* 'is large, generous,' *maghā-m* 'fulness, riches' (v. Brug. *Gr.* ii. § 596, 5), if these have an infixed *-na-*. On the interchange of 'velars' and 'palatals' I refer to Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, § 55, and the literature there cited. Inasmuch as the Roman and Hindu cults of the Manes are equally well developed (cf. Schrader *Sprachvergleichung*²