

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 Pindar, *Nem.* II. 14

D. B. Monro

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 3 - 4

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184458, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184458

How to cite this article:

D. B. Monro (1892). On Pindar, *Nem.* II. 14. The Classical Review, 6, pp 3-4 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184458

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the generating sound *y* produced ζ. This *gy* became modified to *dy* in the Boeotian, Cretan and Laconian dialects, so that *δυγόν* seems to be for *δρυγόν*. Modern analogies are interesting. Thus *juvenis* is represented in Italian by *giovane* and in French by *jeune*, while in English we have *juvenile*. In each of these instances the original *y* has evolved a *j* sound, exhibiting the same tendency as that which developed ζ from *y* in Greek.

So far my criticism of Mr. Conway's essay has been negative. I venture now to suggest another and independent theory of the origin of the gerund. I quite agree with him that *regendus* = *regent-nus* is a very dubious equation. I also agree with him that any explanation advanced must take account of *-undus* as well as *-endus*. Now, let us note first that one form of the Infinitive suffix was *uen*. Thus *φέρειν* is for *φερε-εν* = *φερ-ε-φεν*. Similarly *δοῖν* (*Theognis*) is for *δο-φεν* (*Brugmann, Gr. Gr.* 146, 4). This being admitted we obtain an archaic infinitive *reg-uen*. The next step was to affix the adjective termination *-dus*. This termination usually appears in the form *-idus*, but this is non-essential, and is simply due to the partiality of this suffix for verbs in *-eo*. Thus *pallidus* = *palle-dus* from *palleo*, *torpidus* = *torpe-dus* from *torpe-o*, &c. &c. We have however pretty certainly a few instances of the attachment of the suffix to a consonantal verb-stem. Thus *ūdus* = *ug-dus* (= *ὕγρός*). An interesting example is *surdus*.

This word as applied to colours means *dark*, *dull*, *indistinct*. *Sordes* is evidently connected, and the original form of the latter word was *suerdes*, just as *soror* is for *sues-or*. And finally Gothic *swart-s* (= *syōrto-*), *schwarz* and *swart* belong to the same root. The primitive root however is *suer-*, Sanscrit *svar* (injure) and *surdus* means *impaired* either as regards colour or sound. Again, it is probable that *tardus* is for *tarc-dus* = *targh-dus* from *targh*, *tragh* = *trah-o*, and means properly *dragging*. Whether *-dus* is from *dha-* or from *da-* is uncertain. See an interesting account of this suffix in Osthoff's 'Das Verbum' p. 121 f. To resume: we have now the form *reg-uen-dus*, which will mean *having the property of being ruled*, as *pallidus* is *having the property of being pale*. Now the weak form of *uen* is *un*; hence *regundus*, implying an archaic accentuation *régun-dus* or *regundús*. It is further probable that the form *-endus* for *-vendus* arose primarily in verbal roots with vocalic auslaut. Thus *capi-endus* for *capi-vendus*. The dropping of intervocalic *v* is of course extremely common in Latin: as a single example take *fuimus*, *fuissent* for *fuvimus*, *fuvisissent* (*Ennius*).

This theory seems to me to be based on morphological processes quite legitimate and conformable to analogy, and as such I respectfully commend it to the consideration of philological experts.

G. DUNN.

St. Andrews.

ON PINDAR, *NEM.* II. 14.

Καὶ μὰν ἂ Σαλαμὶς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατὰν
δυνατός· ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἐκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν·
ὦ Τιμόδημε, σέ δ' ἄλλὰ
παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει.

The words Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν were anciently interpreted in two different ways, as will appear from the scholia. I transcribe two annotations which are run together in the existing text:—

(1) ἦσθετο τῇ πείρᾳ; ὡς καὶ Ὀμηρος τοὶ δὲ
πληγῆς αἰόντες, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰσθόμενοι.

(2) εἴκε δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος τὸ παρ' Αἴαντος
ῥηθὲν πρὸς Ἑλλήνας ὑπονενονκέναι εἰρῆσθαι πρὸς
Ἐκτορα· φησὶ γὰρ ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νῆϊδά γ' οὕτως
ἔλπομαι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε.
εἰ μὴ ἄρα τις τῇ πείρᾳ μεμαθηκέναι ὑποστήσεται
τὸν Ἐκτορα ὡς ἐπιτηδῆως ἡ Σαλαμὶς ἔχει πρὸς
τῇν τῶν ἡρώων γένεσιν.

The first scholium gives the meaning 'perceived by experience,' which has been generally adopted by modern editors. The writer of the second evidently assumes that ἄκουσεν means 'heard from,' 'was told by,' and that the words refer to the famous boast of Ajax (*Il.* 7. 198). He points out accordingly that Pindar seems to have supposed it to have been addressed to Hector, whereas it was addressed to the Greeks. He then mentions the other explanation as an alternative apparently to be adopted if this difficulty is thought insuperable.

Mr. Bury in his recent edition of the *Nemean Odes* has done us the service of insisting that ἄκουσεν cannot mean 'learned by experience,' but would rather mean the reverse, viz. 'knew by hearing only.' But

neither he nor any other commentator, so far as I know, has told us why he rejects the other explanation 'heard from Ajax,' which is surely the obvious one, and fits the context perfectly. 'Salamis was ever the nurse of heroes: such was the boast of Ajax to Hector: and thou, Timodemus, hast proved it once more by thy victory.'

There is the obvious objection, as the scholiast saw, that on this view we make Pindar guilty of an inaccurate reference. But without impeaching Pindar's knowledge of Homer, or the correctness of his text of the poet, I venture to think the mistake a most natural and probable one. The defiance launched at Hector (*Il.* 7. 226 ff.) follows about twenty-five lines later than the speech now in question (191—199). The two were therefore associated by contiguity: but the confusion was doubtless due primarily to the law or tendency by which striking details are connected with the most interesting figure or event. The boast of Ajax about Salamis is in its right place in a speech addressed to his countrymen: but by a kind of psychological attraction it is drawn towards the central incident of the meeting with Hector.

Whatever may be the difficulty in supposing Pindar to have forgotten or neglected the exact context of the passage to which he alluded, it is surely much more difficult

to maintain that he intended no such allusion. Could he use the name of Ajax to prove that Salamis nursed (*θρέψαι*) warriors without thinking of *ἄπομαι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε*? If this seems possible, let any one compare the fragment 163 *a*, where Pindar says of himself οὐ τοί με ξένον οὐδ' ἀδμήμονα Μοισῶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταὶ Θῆβαι—*an evident adaptation of the same words.* But if Pindar wished to recall the familiar Homeric lines, or even if he wrote with them in his own memory, Ἐκτωρ Αἰάντος ἀκούσεν can have but one meaning.

If this interpretation is right, we have an interesting addition to the small number of instances in which Pindar refers to a particular place in Homer. And we have also some help towards a measure of the degree of exactness which is to be expected in such a reference. Scholars who base theories upon discrepancies and other forms of inaccuracy are apt to forget that they begin with an unknown quantity, which it may or may not be possible to eliminate. It should be a canon of the higher criticism that conclusions which rest upon the assumption that an ancient author is infallible are not valid till he has been proved to be so.

D. B. MONRO.

HERODAS.

iii. 60—62.

οὐ ταχεὺς τουτον

αριτ ἐπ' ὤμου τημ' Ἀκέσσεω σελήναιη

διζὼν τε σ' αἰνεῶ ταργα Κοτταλ' α' πρησσις

Reading διζόντες, *i.e.* δείζοντες, and placing a full stop after this word, I would translate—'Make haste and hoist him, so that you may show him to the light for which Aceesus waited.—Cottalus, I like your doings, etc.' For the proverb, see Dr. Rutherford's note. Accessaeus delayed that he might have light for his operations, ἵνα ἐν φωτὶ ὁ πλοῦς αὐτῷ γένοιτο: Cottalus is to be hoisted so that there may be plenty of light, and therefore no occasion for delay.

iv. 35, 36.

τον Βατταλῆς γὰρ τουτον οὐχ ὀρης Κύννοι

ὠκος β.β. ἀνδριαντα

I conjecture βεβαυῖ σ': 'See, Cynno, how that statue of Battale confirms what you are saying!'

iv. 68.

οὐχι ζῶν βλέπουσιν ἡμερὴν πάντες

It is plain that *ἡμερὴν* requires explanation. Accordingly Dr. Rutherford hesitatingly compares our phrase 'still life,' and others have conjectured βλέπουσι νημερτῇ. To Dr. Rutherford it may be objected that the picture in question does not represent 'still life'; and to those who propose νημερτῇ, that this word means 'sure' rather than 'real.' Now on Aristophanes *Clouds* 699 οἶαν δίκην τοῖς κόρεσι δώσω τήμερον, the scholiast comments as follows: ΤΗΜΕΡΑ. ὡς ἐν Ὀλκάδιν' ἢ Λακεδαίμονι, τί ἄρα πείσῃ τήμερα; τήμερος ὁ σημερινός. καὶ ἔστι τεταγμένος [*leg.* τεταγμένον] ἐπὶ σώματος, τὸ δὲ τήμερον ἐπὶ χρόνου λέγεται. Compare Hesychius and Suidas *s.v.* τήμερος. In view of this testimony to the existence of an adjective τήμερος equivalent to σημερινός, I would read in the passage before us οὐχι ζῶν