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](#)

On the Interpretation of Aesch. *Agam.* 6971

Lewis R. Farnell

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 06 / July 1897, pp 293 - 298

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032340, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032340

How to cite this article:

Lewis R. Farnell (1897). On the Interpretation of Aesch. *Agam.* 6971. The Classical Review, 11, pp 293-298 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032340

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the paternal inheritance (iv. 50, and p. 116, Bücheler-Zitelmann).

Giseke's interpretation avoids these difficulties. He proposes (see Ebeling's *Lexicon*, s.v. *ἐπί* p. 451b) to give *ἐπί* a final sense: the gifts of the suitors should accompany them 'ut ematur filia.' But his one Homeric parallel for this (I. 602) is insufficient and uncertain. Aristarchus and HL read *ἐπὶ δώρων* | *ἔρχεο*, but A and other MSS. give *δώροις*; *δώρω*, accepted by Van Leeuwen and Da Costa, may be the original of both readings.

However, there is, I think, another course, viz. to take *φίλης παιδός* as a genitive of price dependent on *ὄσσα* (*ἔδνα*). There would be no objection to the genitive in such a sentence as 'ὄσα ἔδνα φίλης παιδός παρασκευάζεσθαι ἔοικε, τόσα ἀρτυνέουσιν, and therefore none to it in 'ἔδνα ἀρτυνέουσιν, ὄσα φ. π. π. ἔ.' By the word *παρασκευάζεσθαι* I have indicated the meaning that I wish to get from *ἐπὶ*—*ἔπεισθαι*. I refer it to *√sep*. This root is limited to divine service in the Rig-Veda (cf. Leaf, *Journ. Phil.* xiv. 248), but herein is no sufficient reason against our recognising (cf. Fick, *Wb.*⁴ i. 138) that *ἔπειν* in ξ 195 *ἐπὶ ἔργον ἔποιεν* etc. is not from the *√seq.* of *ἔπεισθαι* 'to accompany,' and of (P 190, ξ 33 *ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι*) *μετασπών* 'rushing after' and of (*πότμον*, etc.) *ἐπισπεῖν* or *ἐφέψειν* 'to attain to' (cf. Leaf, *l.l.* p. 249), but from *√sep.* 'betreibe, besorge.' Whether our *ἐπὶ*—*ἔπεισθαι* is passive or middle, is hard to decide. The passive may find a Greek parallel in the expressions Δ 314 *γούναθ' ἔποιτο*, υ 237 φ 202 *χεῖρες ἔπονται*, in which Leaf (*l.l.* p. 242) is inclined to see a proper passive of *ἔπειν*, meaning 'to be wielded.' The middle would find parallels in the Rig-Veda, e.g. *sápante abhi rātīm* 'they prepare a gift' (see Grassmann *Lex. z. R.V.* col. 1472): *ἐπί* (=Sk. *ápi*) has supplanted **ebhí* (=Sk.

abhi), according to Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* i. p. 676.

There remains the question whether the suitors or the relatives *γάμον τεύξουσιν κ.τ.λ.* The words γ. τ. seem rather pointless, if the suitors are intended, as they are only too willing to arrange a marriage as things are, i.e. with Penelope in Ithaca; but the relatives would be better able to influence matters, if she were with them. It is no objection to this view that of the three verbs *τεύξουσιν*, *ἀρτυνέουσιν*, *ἔπεισθαι*, only the last, if any, is middle. In β 53 *αὐτὸς ἐδνώσατο θύγατρα* the argument is that Icarus would better protect his interests, if the suitors dealt directly with him; but here the important point is that Penelope's interests would be served by her going home, inasmuch as the *ἔδνα* would be more, and the greater the *ἔδνα* to her relatives, the greater the glory reflected on her. For the use of the article to denote persons not explicitly mentioned before, but only indicated in the expression 'to the hall of her father' (α 276 *ἐς μέγαρον πατρός*, β 195 *ἐς πατρός*) cf. γ 4 *οἱ δὲ Πύλον...ἔξον τοὶ δ'* (sc. Πύλοι) κ.τ.λ., and see Ebeling's *Lexicon*, vol. ii. p. 4 s.v. ὁ *Κγ*. The interference of other relatives than the father in settling the marriage is represented as possible in Athene's false message:—

ο 16

ἤδη γάρ ῥα πατὴρ τε κασίγνητοί τε κέλονται
Εὐρυμάχῳ γήμασθαι· ὁ γὰρ περιβάλλει ἅπαντας
μνηστήρας δώροισι καὶ ἐξώφειλλεν ἔδνα,

where by the way an aorist seems necessary. *ἐξώφειλεν* would be a regular form, and, its -ει- not being a diphthong, would once have been identical in writing, though not in speech, with the form in our text, both being written with ε followed by a single λ.

C. M. MULVANY.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF AESCH. AGAM. 69-71.

AESCH. *Agam.* 69-71.

οὐθ' ὑποκλαίων οὐθ' ὑπολείβων
οὐτε δακρύων ἀπύρρον ἱερὸν
ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλει.

It is the object of this paper to propose a simple explanation for an important passage in Aeschylus, that has been darkened by
NO. XCVIII. VOL. XI.

errors of scribes and by modern commentators who take no account of the facts of Greek ritual. But if it is hazardous to hope that a new theory can be established and accepted, something may be gained by proving that all the received explanations of the text are untenable.

Before dealing with these in detail, we may gather one or two facts concerning

A A

these lines and their context that most people will accept as obvious. The words allude to the impossibility of assuaging some one's wrath by a libation: therefore the poet has in mind some divine wrath, and not the wrath of any mortal, such as Clytemnestra resenting the sacrifice of Iphigenia, as Paley is inclined to maintain in a very careless note: it is scarcely necessary to say that libations are intended for the deity. In the next place, if the words have any special allusion at all, they point to Paris and not to Agamemnon or any other sinner. The poetic logic of the context and the whole ode proves this. The chorus begins with reflections on the sin of Paris who has violated the rites of Zeus Xenios; the Atreidae are compared to the desolate vultures who have been robbed of their young: and 'Zeus will send a late-avenging Fury against the transgressors.' The first part of the ode in fact is penetrated with the belief that the cause of the Achaeans is the cause of God and will ultimately triumph. It is not until line 131 that the singer touches on the crime of Agamemnon, the immolation of his daughter, which may bring retribution on himself and on his people. Looking now at the various translations that have been offered of this mysterious sentence, we may group together (A) those which agree on the whole in the interpretation of ἀπύρων ἱερῶν, the words that are the key of the whole passage, as a phrase signifying unhallowed or inauspicious offerings. Some who thus interpret the phrase explain the ὀργὰς ἀρενέας ἀπύρων ἱερῶν as (1) the wrath of the gods or Clytemnestra against Agamemnon on account of the unhallowed sacrifice of Iphigenia; this is the view of Hermann, Donaldson, Dindorf, and Paley. Others, e.g. Schneidewin, Keck, Wecklein, and Verrall, interpret the phrase as (2) the stubborn wrath of the sacrifice that will not burn, all of them, except Verrall, referring it to the inauspicious marriage rites of Paris and Helen. Another mode of interpretation (B) is that which explains ἀπύρων ἱερῶν as unburnt and therefore unoffered sacrifice, a concrete in place of the more abstract expression 'neglect of religious duties': thus Klausen refers it to the neglect on the part of Paris of the laws of hospitality, of the rites of Zeus Xenios. Prof. Robinson Ellis makes a suggestion in the *Classical Review* (1889 p. 132) that the words allude to the story preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus from a work by Menecrates of Xanthus to the effect that Paris had excluded Aeneas

from certain sacrifices of the Priamid family; and he would translate the whole sentence thus 'neither by counter-offering (ἀποκαλῶν) nor by counter-libation nor by tears shall Paris soothe the steadfast anger (of Aeneas) against him for sacrificial rites withheld.' Lastly we may mention the interpretation (C) of the questionable words which Conington, following Schneider, has maintained: ἀπύρα ἱερά are victims that are not victims in the ordinary sense of the word, victims not offered by the fire, but by the sword, the dead on the battle field; 'Paris will not soften the stubborn wrath of heaven against the doomed victims of the sword, that is against himself and his friends' (Conington); or 'the fierce desire of Zeus and Fate for victims to be offered on the field of battle' (Schneider). Among the daring phrases of Aeschylus, we are familiar with 'the unbarking dogs of Zeus' as a synonym for eagles, 'the blameless poison of bees' for honey, 'the voiceless messenger' for the dust; in all these cases the epithet denies that the noun possesses a quality that in its strict sense it must possess; therefore on the supposition that all sacrifices were with fire, a fireless sacrifice would be a sacrifice in the figurative sense, perhaps a sacrifice of the sword.

Now a very slight knowledge of Greek ritual is sufficient to convince us that all these interpretations of ἀπύρα ἱερά are quite indefensible. The main distinction in Greek sacrifice is between the animal offerings and the bloodless offerings of fruit, cereals and liquids, such as water, honey and milk. Of the former we may say that they were almost always burnt, and were called generally ἔμπυρα, fire being the more civilised process of conveying the offering to the deity; it may be true that the ancient votaries of Dionysos Ὠμάδιος devoured the raw flesh of the victim as a sacrament; we hear of horses being offered as victims by being driven into the water and drowned, and according to Plutarch (*Quaest. Graec.* xxxi.) the Eretrian women in their Thesmophoria did not use fire for the sacrificial flesh, but dried it in the sun. Still the term ἔμπυρα would on the whole apply to the blood-offering and the animal victim. On the other hand, the name, ἀπύρα would be fitly applied to the larger number of the bloodless offerings; for though cakes or corn might sometimes be burnt on the altar, (Porph. *de Abstin.* 2, 17, quoting Menander) fruit certainly was not; and we may conclude that the 'sober offerings,' τὰ νηφάλια, which were frequent

in Greek ritual, were also *ἄπυρα*,¹ for they were identified with *μελίσπονδα*, libations of honey (Plut. *Moral.* 672 C). Now the bloodless offerings were certainly common in Greece; we hear of them as proper to the worship of Zeus *Ὑπατος* at Athens, of Artemis in Samos, of Sosipolis at Elis; the *νηφάλια* were consecrated to the Erinyes, Mnemosyne, the Muses, Eos, Helios, Selene, the Nymphs, Aphrodite Ourania, Zeus *Γεωργός*, Poseidon and even Dionysos.² What dictated the choice of sacrifice is a doubtful question which need not now be discussed; the same deity might be often worshipped now with *ἐμπυρα*, now with *ἄπυρα ἱερά*. What is important is to note that certain of the ancients regarded the bloodless as the more acceptable sacrifice of the two kinds. The altar at Delos on which no blood was shed was called the pious altar (Porph. *de Abst.* 2, 28); and Pausanias contrasts the innocent ritual of Zeus *Ὑπατος* at Athens to whom *πέμματα* alone were offered, with the cruel rites of the Arcadian Zeus Lycaeus. Now not only is it clear that the name *ἄπυρα ἱερά* would apply to a large portion of these innocent sacrifices, but—what is more important—we know that it actually was applied. The fragment of Euripides (904), which the commentators have strangely neglected, proves the meaning of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* and disproves all the interpretations of the passage in the *Agamemnon* hitherto mentioned: the fragment contains a pious prayer to Zeus and a profound religious thought:

Σοὶ τῷ πάντων μεδέοντι χοῖν
πελανὸν τε φέρω, Ζεὺς εἴτ' Αἰδῆς
ὀνομαζόμενος στέργεις· σὺ δέ μοι
θυσίαν ἄπυρον παγκαρπείας
δέξαι πλήρη προχυθείσαν.

The sacrifice of all the fruits of the earth is here 'the fireless sacrifice,' which is regarded as the holier; and the votary of Zeus *Idaeos* who speaks in the fragment of the *Κρήτες* boasts of his austere abstinence from animal food. We may now compare the passage of equal importance in Pindar's Olympian ode (vii. 89–90): *τεῦξάν δ' ἀπύρους ἱεροῖς ἄλλος ἐν ἀκροπόλει*. So far from these words justifying the interpretation of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* as an inauspicious sacrifice, the legend

proves the reverse. Combining the somewhat obscure statement of it in Pindar with the fuller account in Diodorus (v. 56) we have the following story: the Rhodians or the Heliadae, on the occasion of the birth of Athena, were informed by Helios that the community that was the first to offer sacrifice to Athena would enjoy her perpetual presence among them; in a moment of carelessness, as Pindar's words may mean, and as Diodorus expressly says, the Rhodians offered her a fireless sacrifice; and Diodorus adds that Cecrops offered her a sacrifice with fire on the Acropolis of Athens: and that both states maintained this distinction of ritual down to his own time. Diodorus nowhere says but may be understood to imply, that Athena preferred Athens, because, as we find almost invariably in her ritual, she preferred animal food. But the Rhodians certainly did not regard their *ἄπυρα ἱερά* as inauspicious, or they would not have maintained the ritual; nor did Pindar regard them as inauspicious, but on the contrary, as the cause of the divine favours which Zeus and Athena showered upon the island.³ That *ἄπυρα* may have sometimes connoted a more ideal sacrifice, even in the latest period of Greek literature, is suggested by a passage in Philo, *βωμοῖς ἀπύρους περὶ οὓς ἀρεταὶ χορεύουσι γέγηθεν ὁ θεὸς ἀλλ' οὐ πολλῶ πυρὶ φλέγονσιν* (*de Plant.* ii. p. 154).

Looking then at these facts that show the prevalence of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* in Greece and the high estimation in which they were often held, we must reject all the interpretations in class A; for Aeschylus would have committed an outrage on Greek religion, had he used the expression as a synonym for 'unhallowed' rites. The cause of the error has been partly the wrong association of the phrase with the line in the *Antigone* (1006) *ἐκ δὲ θυμάτων Ἥφαιστος οὐκ ἔλαμπε*—which belongs to Teiresias' description of the ill-omened signs in the burnt offering: no doubt it was a bad omen if a bright flame refused to gleam from the victim when the fire was kindled: but such rejected victims were never called *ἄπυρα ἱερά*, nor does the passage in the *Antigone* bear at all on the

¹ Liddell and Scott, *s.v.* *νηφάλια*, suppose that these might be offered with fire, but this is an error arising from a wrong interpretation of the Scholiast's statement on *Oed. Col.* 100.

² *Vide* my *Cults of the Greek States*, Vol. 1, p. 88).

³ Philostratus in his description of the picture of *Ἀθηνᾶς γυναι* gives us the same story; and he calls the Rhodian sacrifices, *ἄπυρα καὶ ἀτελεῖ*, not because such sacrifices were usually 'imperfect,' but because in this special case it failed to win the highest blessings, though Rhodes was abundantly blessed for that sacrifice. The sacrifices offered at Thebes by the commander of the horse at the tomb of Dirce were *ἄπυροι ἱεραυργίαι*. Plut. 578 B: it is needless to say that a state-ritual like this was not intended to be 'inauspicious.'

point concerning the auspiciousness of a fruit-offering for which no fire was needed.

The second group of interpretations which would explain *ἄπυρα ἱερά* as neglected or unoffered sacrifices is met by an equally fatal objection; if a great number of sacrifices were regarded as duly and most righteously offered without fire, as we know they were, how could *ἄπυρα* signify 'un-offered'? Such an interpretation might at first glance seem to get support from the gloss in Hesychius s.v. 'Ἀθύτον· Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Μυσοῖς. It would, however, require more than the authority of Hesychius to make us believe that Sophocles could use a phrase in a sense contradictory to its use in Pindar and Euripides and to the well-known facts of Greek ritual. But we need not suspect Hesychius or criticise Sophocles; for we are absolutely ignorant of the application of the word, or of the noun to which it was attached, in the *Μυσοί*. The word *ἄπυρος* was applied to many other things; it might even have been applied to an animal that was not to be sacrificed or not yet sacrificed. All we gather from Hesychius that concerns us now is that the phrase *ἄπυρα ἱερά* did not occur in the passage he was quoting. As regards interpretation C, it stands self-condemned. All dogs can bark; therefore 'an unbarking dog' is no real dog. But many sacrifices were without fire; therefore a fireless sacrifice was none the less a real and literal sacrifice.

In fact the whole expression *ὄργας ἀτενεῖς ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* if the words are to be taken together must mean *either* 'the stubborn wrath (of the Gods) on account of a sacrifice of fruits or liquids'; but there is no story in myth or history about any personage or community incurring the wrath of the gods by this innocent ritual; the *ἄπυρα ἱερά* could not have been understood as an allusion to the offerings made by Paris on the occasion of his marriage, the proper name for the wedding ritual being *προτέλεια*, and the sacrifice being, as far as we know, a burnt sacrifice of animals; *or* 'the wrath of the sacrifice of fruits or liquids.' Now the personification of sacrifice at all, which such an interpretation implies, is entirely alien to Greek religious thought, though familiar to the Vedic religion; and 'the stubborn wrath of a sacrifice of fruits' is simple nonsense. Akin to this last interpretation is that of some older commentators, Schütz for instance, who thought that the phrase might signify the wrath of the Furies, because the Furies were sometimes worshipped with *νηφάλια* or *ἄπυρα* and the rite might stand

for the divinity of the rite. The interpretation is really more scientific than those of more modern scholars, and yet it is obviously wrong. Even if the word for the rite could be used as a synonym for the divinity, which I believe impossible in Greek religious phraseology, yet the 'fireless rites' could not be an intelligible synonym for the Furies, since a score or so of other divinities preferred the ritual without fire, and the Furies sometimes partook of animal food at the sacrificial meal.

It seems then that the words *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* cannot be construed at all with *ὄργας ἀτενεῖς*. It has been the persistent attempt to do so which has long made havoc of an important passage. Still less can they be taken with *οὔτε δακρύων* which precedes them in the MS. Three courses then are open to us. In despair we may believe that some words have fallen out after *οὔτε δακρύων*, which would have explained *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*; but if they have, we shall never convince ourselves or others that we have found them. Or we may regard *οὔτε δακρύων* as a corruption of some obliterated or misunderstood phrase; Keck's emendation *Πάρις Ἡραίων* leaves the construction and sense as hopeless as ever; Ahren's suggestion *οὔτ' ἀναρύων* 'drawing off liquids' gives us a word that might possibly be appropriate to the fireless offering which often consisted wholly of liquids, but the verb *ἀναρύω* has no sacrificial use; *οὐδ' ἀτερύων* is a good ritualistic expression, only as it is used of the sacrifice of animals it cannot be constructed with or connected with *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*. Or lastly, until the palmary emendation can be proposed, we may expunge the words *οὔτε δακρύων* wholly from the text as most editors, without fairly considering the question, have already done. Obviously if Aeschylus had already written *ὑποκλαίων*, he could not have committed so foolish a tautology as to have written *οὔτε δακρύων* after it; but as it is almost certain that he did not write *ὑποκλαίων*, we cannot dismiss *οὔτε δακρύων* thus. The phrase must be tried on its own merits. We have seen that standing where it does it renders the following words entirely untranslatable; and if we preserve it in its present place we must assume a lacuna. But the phrase must be regarded with the greatest suspicion by those who are familiar with Greek religious phraseology and religious thought. In a Christian narrative the repentant sinner might naturally be said to go away in secret, and weep bitterly: but with Greek methods of atonement for sin weeping and tears have nothing to do: in the days of

Homer (vide *Il.* ix. 499) as in the days of Aeschylus, the sinner among the Greeks who wished to clear himself would approach the gods with 'incense and goodly prayers, libation, and the smoke of sacrifice': if he prayed to Zeus Meilichios or the Furies, he might proffer his prayer with a fireless ritual; if to Zeus Phyxios or to Apollo at Delphi, an animal sacrifice would be in place.

In the elaborate description of the cleansing of Jason and Medea from the sin of kindred bloodshed in *Apoll. Rhod.* iv. 702, in Pausanias' account of the fruitless remorse of the Spartan King for slaying the Byzantine maiden, and of the means of atonement which he sought, tears of repentance are nowhere mentioned. And in the fragment of the Niobe of Aeschylus, a passage very similar to our present one, concerning the implacable character of Death, about whom a modern poet might say 'prayers and tears and gifts are fruitless all,' the ancient poet thinks only of the usual mode of appeasing deities, and says 'Alone among the gods Death loves not gifts, nor can'st thou win ought by sacrifice or libation; there is no altar raised to him, no holy chant.' In fact public ritual, not secret repentance was the usual *καθάρσις* for the Greek sinner; and, though the most advanced thinkers may occasionally have maintained that the pure heart and the good will were better than sacrifice, never, so far as I am aware, are tears mentioned as efficacious. Now Aeschylus was more conversant with Greek ritual religious thought and phraseology than most other poets. If his chorus of Argive elders wished to say, as it is clear that in this passage they did wish, that by none of the usual modes of atonement could the sinner whom they have in mind assuage the stubborn wrath of the gods, then they would most naturally say—by no manner of sacrifice can he do so: and if they wished further to specify the usual modes of sacrifice, they could not express themselves better than by saying 'neither by burnt-sacrifice nor by a libation of fireless sacrifice can he assuage God's stubborn wrath.' And this simple statement is what I believe Aeschylus to have actually made in this place. We must read *ὑποκάων* and *ἐπιλείβων*, very slight changes of the MS. text, which have long been made, the first by Casaubon the second by Schütz, though the value of the first and the inevitableness of the second have not always been recognised, nor have they always been rightly translated by the many editors who have adopted them.

ὑποκαίειν would be a ritualistic word such as we want in this passage, exactly describing the act of the sacrificer who lit the fire on the altar under the victim; so that the word would be generally applicable to burnt sacrifice. If Aeschylus really used the word here, it could convey no other save this literal and simple sense to the Greek audience. It is true that we do not find the word, so far as I am aware, used elsewhere in reference to sacrifice; but we may compare the curious title *ὑπεκκανοστρία* borne by the priestess of Athena at Soloi (Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 3). In a sentence where the expression *ἅπνυα ἱερά* was to be used to designate one of the two species of sacrifice, and a verb was wanted to denote precisely the burnt offering, no other verb was so suitable for Aeschylus' purpose as *ὑποκαίειν*: therefore we may believe he would have used it, even if it had not been so applied before, which is more than we know.

As regards *ὑπολείβω* it is almost a *ῥαγ* *λεγόμενον*, with no possible meaning relevant to this place. I do not consider that it could possibly signify counter-libations (Robinson Ellis) or secret libations: it could only naturally mean to make a libation underneath something else: but a libation was always made on the top of something else, on the top of the victim or cake, or at least on the top of the altar; nothing was ever offered on the top of the libation. This fact has such ample literary and archaeological evidence that it may be sufficient to refer to *Il.* 1. 462: *καίε δ' ἐπὶ σκίλγης ὁ γέρον, ἐπὶ δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον λείβε.* (cf. *Verg.* vi., 256 and *C.I.A.* iii. 73). *Ἐπιλείβων* exactly describes the process of ritual and was a word sanctified by Homeric use; *ὑπολείβω* describes no known process of ritual, and is a slight error due to the common carelessness of the scribe whose eye was confused by the first three letters of the preceding verb. Now with *ὑποκάων* and *ἐπιλείβων*, restored and οὔτε *δακρύων* expunged, I venture to suggest what has not been suggested before, so far as I know, that the phrase *ἅπνυα ἱερῶν* should be taken with *ἐπιλείβων* towards which word it naturally gravitates. If we can thus translate the three words, 'making a libation of, or from, fireless offerings,' the sense is perfect, for the *ἅπνυα ἱερά* were usually liquids, *μελίσπονδα* or *νηφάλια*; and I do not feel that such a genitive is a grammatical solecism, as we have such a phrase as *πάσσε δ' ἁλός* in the *Iliad* and in Lucian's dialogues. If this were granted, we shall gain a simple meaning for a vexed sentence by an inter-

pretation that is entirely in accordance with usual Greek ideas and practice; and we shall be freed from monstrous fancies about the wrath of sacrifices that will not burn, or from the necessity of charging Aeschylus with writing mythological puzzles. Lastly those who reject οὔτε δακρύων may explain the interpolation either as an unprovoked intrusion of an alien idea into the text, or as a marginal gloss written after ὑποκρίων, the rarer word, had been changed to the more familiar ὑποκλαίων. But if the general reasons which I have given for excluding

any mention of tears in this passage be unconvincing (and general reasons, proving a negative, are rarely wholly convincing) then we may at least take οὔτε δακρύων away from its present hopeless position between the libation and the fireless sacrifice, and place it at the beginning of the sentence, where its position would be far less incongruous; this would neither affect the metre nor my interpretation of the remainder of the sentence.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

LATIN *CORTINA* 'POT': *CORTEX* 'BARK.'

I FIND the following entry in Wharton's *Etyma Latina*: 'cortina curtina caldron: fr. *curtus* 'cut down,' not tall like the *amphora*, cf. *Lucr.* 4, 1026 *dolia curta*.' Inasmuch however, as *Lucretius* is speaking of *broken chamber-pots* I find nothing to defend this derivation from the charge of being far-fetched.

To justify the suggestion of my title I note the fact that cooking-vessels were made of basketry in classical antiquity¹ as well as by our savages of North America.²

The objection will arise that *cortina* can not be derived from **cortegna*: *cortex*, which must give **cortigna*.³

The following words however seem to show the resolution of *a^{gn}*, *a^{cn}* into *āⁿ* in Latin, viz. *fenum* 'hay': *φαγ-εῖν* 'eat,' *fenus* 'interest': Sk. *bhag-* 'share,' *tēna* 'panderess': *λαγ-ρός* 'salacious': *Mānes* 'deified ancestors': *māgnus* 'great,' cf. *māiores* 'ancestors.' All of these words are right completely isolated in Latin, while *dignus* 'worthy' and the like may have been influenced by *decet* 'it becomes.'⁴ The

only apparently completely isolated word I am acquainted with that shows permanent *gn* is *ignis* 'fire,' and I have, I trust, made it probable that *ignis* 'lightning-dart' belongs to *agere* 'drive' but has formed besides a popular relationship with *ictus* 'lightning.'⁵

Now *cortina* may be referred for its phonetics to the above group where *a^{gn}*, *a^{cn}* pass into *āⁿ*. The etymologies here proposed do not stand or fall however by the phonetic process which I claim is exhibited in them. Nay, *luna* 'moon' shows in an old Latin inscription the form *losna*, for which by comparison with Avest. *raoxšna* 'shining,' O. Pruss. *lauxnos* 'stars' the base **lougsno-* 'shining' has been set up. One may therefore write for *fenum*, say, a base **bhag-s-no* and thus the phonetics of *fenum* will not violate the phonetics of *dignus*. I have no quarrel with writing a base like **lougs-no* for which warrant can be found in several actually existing forms in various ones of the derived languages; and the claim of a base **bhag-s-no* has the Sk. root *bhaks* 'eat' to rest on, but I could feel no confidence in a base **majh-s-ni* for *Mānes* because of Vedic *maks-ū* 'quick,' Lat. *mox* 'soon,' and I feel a similar hesitation in deriving *vanus* 'vain' from **vac-s-no* 'made empty,' rather than **vac-no*. I have claimed that the change of -*a^{gn}*- to -*āⁿ*- took place in isolated words only, and this seems to me much more simple than the assumption of an extension of all the roots involved by an -*s*-.

An illustration of the various devices used by scholars to produce rigid phonetic

⁵ Cf. the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xvii. 24 sq., and add *Ov. Trist.* l. iii. 11, *Iovis ignibus ictus*,

¹ Guhl u. Kohner, *Leben d. Griechen u. Römer*, p. 200.

² Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, p. 101.

³ I cite from the *American Journal of Philology* xvii. 180 the following footnote of Mr. L. Horton-Smith as a recent utterance of the prevailing phonetic school: '*vanus* cannot come from the form **vac-nus* as suggested by King and Cookson—*vacnus* must have yielded *vagnus*, cf. *ilignus*: *ilex*, *salignus*: *salix*, *dignus* from **dic-nus*.'

⁴ Cf. the author, *Proceedings Am. Phil. Assoc.* Special Session 1894, liii. In the list there given I propose the following new and, I believe, indubitable cognations, *segnis* 'lazy': *sagina* 'fatling' (cf. *pinguis* 'fat': *piger* 'lazy'), *signum* 'mark statue': *secare* 'cut, carve,' *lignum* 'firewood': *ligare* 'bind up,' cf. *deral* 'faggots': *δέω* 'bind.'