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](#)

The Gortynian Infinitive In -μην

J. Straohan

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 01 / February 1903, pp 29 - 30

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020721X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020721X

How to cite this article:

J. Straohan (1903). The Gortynian Infinitive In -μην. The Classical Review, 17, pp 29-30
doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020721X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ferred to the thick rich growth of corn, whether etymologically it suggests corn which could not stand upright (cf. *κεκλιμένος*, 'lodged' grain, as one hears in New England) and we connect it with the root *legh-lie*, including the Greek derivatives *λεχ*, *λοχ*, or not.

It thus seems likely that the inscription designated a statue of or an offering to two goddesses of fertility called Damia and Lochaia and that these suggest the Aeginetan cult of Damia and Auxesia described by Herodotus and recently confirmed by an inscription which turned up in Thiersch's excavations (see *C.R.*, xv. pp. 474 and 477).

Now in L. Meyer's *Grammatik*, p. 935, under the root *lagh* the word *λάχεια* is cited with the remark, 'dunkles Beiwort einer Insel (Odys. 9, 116) und des Meeresufers (Odys. 10, 509) statt dessen Bekker und Nauck aber *ἐλαχεία* "klein" lesen.' See also L. Meyer's *Hdbch. d. griech. Etymol.* iv. p. 564.

The first passage referred to (9, 116) describes the island which lay just off the land of the Cyclopes, where Odysseus and his companions disembark to engage in the chase. Νῆσος ἐπειτα λάχεια παρέκ λιμένος τετάνυσται are the words. The second passage (10, 509) is in Circe's description of the shore upon which Odysseus must land when he makes his descent into Hades.

ἐνθ' ἀκτὴ τε λάχεια καὶ ἄλσέα Περσεφονείης.

It should be said that in Hom. Hym. in Apol., 197, the word *λάχεια* appears in some MSS., but there is little doubt that *ἐλαχεία* should be read in this place.

In these passages from the Odyssey, as has already been said, some editors read *ἐλαχεία*. This was the reading of Zenodotus.

Aristarchus probably gave *λάχεια*, and this has been retained by most editors. The scholiasts interpret the word by *εὐγεως*, *εὐσκαφος*, and seek to connect it with *λαχαίνω*. Whatever their idea of the etymology may have been, it is clear that they thought it referred to the fertility of the soil. Many modern editors, however, have not shared this view. For example, Nitzsch tried to connect the word with *λάχνη*, *λάχανον*, understanding it to mean 'overgrown' and 'rough' (see Lobeck, *Path. Proleg.* p. 177 note, who accepts this view); Döderlein on the other hand associated it with *λεχ*, and interpreted 'low-lying.' See also Prellwitz *Etymol. Wbch.* p. 177, where 'flach' is used to explain the *λάχεια νῆσος*. In Hesychius we get again the scholiasts' interpretation: *λάχεια*· εὐσκαφος, εὐγεως· παρὰ τὸ λαχαίνεισθαι, ὃ ἐστὶ σκάπτεσθαι πυκνῶς.

Now this notion of fertility is distinctly the meaning the context calls for in the first passage from the Odyssey. The second passage is too brief a description of the locality referred to to make it of much help, but here too *λάχεια* may well mean 'with rich soil,' since the trees in the grove of Persephone are abundant. But of the island off the country of the Cyclopes it is said at line 134,

ἐν δ' ἄροσις λείη· μάλα κεν βαθὺν λήμιον αἰεῖ,
εἰς ὥρας ἀμῶεν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πῖον ὑπ' οὐδας.

The poet thus certainly thought of the island as being of wonderful fertility for the raising of crops, had there been any inhabitants to till it.

May we not then connect *λάχεια* with the divinity Δοκ(η)αία or Αὐξήσια? It is for the etymologists to say.

J. R. WHEELER.

THE GORTYNIAN INFINITIVE IN -μην.

THE infinitive ending -μην, which appears in inscriptions of Gortyn¹ in Crete, has been explained in two ways. Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ 228, would derive -μην from an Idg. locative -mēn. On the other hand G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.*³ 665, is inclined to regard -μην as an analogical transformation of -μεν. That the latter view is the correct one, is shewn by the distribution of the forms in the inscriptions of Gortyn.

¹ -μην is a purely Gortynian ending. In *ἡμην*, Cauer² 121, η seems to denote *ei*.

In the collection of old Cretan inscriptions published by Comparetti, *Monumenti Antichi* vol. iii., the oldest inscriptions of Gortyn shew the ending -μεν:—*διαπορθήμεν* 12-13, *ἡμεν* 18, 19, *ἀποδόμεν* 18. Later inscriptions have -μην:—*ἡμην* 152, 153, 154, 171, *κατισσταμην* 152, *θεμην* 152, *δομην* 152, *καταδομην* 175. Such a distribution is obviously incompatible with the derivation of -μην from an Idg. -mēn.

The distribution of the endings -μεν and -μην has a curious parallel in the distribution

of the endings *-εν* and *-ην* from verbs in *-ω*. Doric dialects, in which verbs of the type *φέρω* have the infinitive in *-εν*, have likewise infinitives in *-εν* from verbs of the type *φάλέω*; contraction had taken place before the¹ analogical development of *-εν*. Examples are Delph. *ἐνοικεν, ἀπογραψεν, Ἀργ. πωλεν*, Ther. *διοικεν, τελεν, λειτουργεν*. The early inscriptions of Gortyn have *-εν*:—*μῶλεν* 2, *ἐνφοικεν* 18, like *ἔκεν, λειπεν*. In the later inscriptions verbs in *-ω* have still *-εν*, but verbs in *-ω* have now *-ην*:—*καλην, μωλην* 152. As Professor Thurneysen has pointed out to me, this is doubtless a secondary distinction analogical to the distinction between verbs in *-ω* and verbs in *-ω* in other parts, e.g.

¹ As to *-εν*, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ 361, suggests that *δόμεν* by *δόμην* may have led to *ἐχεν* by *ἐχην*. But as *-μην* has turned out to be simply a late Gortynian form, that explanation is impossible. The Rhodian ending *-μεν* is a contamination of *-μεν* with *-ειν*. Is *-εν* a similar contamination of *-ην* with *-μεν*? Such an explanation would be possible in the Doric dialects. The difficulty lies in Arcadian, which has *-εν* but not *-μεν*. But our knowledge of the Arcadian verbal system is very imperfect; it is possible that *-εν* originated here otherwise than in the Doric dialects.

φέρετε and *καλῆτε*. We may compare Delph. *καταγορεῖν, ἀδικησεῖν, ἐπιτρεψεῖν, οἰσεῖν*.

The parallelism between *-μεν -εν* and *-μην -ην* in the earlier and later inscriptions of Gortyn can hardly be accidental. The only reasonable explanation is that one of the two forms has been influenced by the other. Now *-ην*, as we have seen, admits of a very simple explanation. Hence the inference can scarcely be avoided that *-μεν* became *-μην* under the influence of *-ην*. Why the verbs in *-ω* should have exerted this influence is not very apparent. In the Cretan forms which I have before me the only coincidence is in the subjunctive, e.g. *θῆ* and *καλῆ*. Perhaps further discoveries in Crete will make this clear too.

Many of the infinitival forms quoted above have been left unaccented, because the true accentuation is to a great extent very uncertain. However, there can hardly be any doubt that *μωλην, καλην* should be accented *μῶλην, καλῆν*. This suggests that *ἡμην, δομην, θεμην, ἰσταμην* should be written *ἡμῆν, δομῆν, θεμῆν ἰσταμῆν*.

J. STRACHAN.

EPILEGOMENA ON LUCRETIUS.

When the observations, with which the writers in the *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Class. Altertumswissenschaft* garnish their reports, proceed from a critic of Professor A. Brieger's candour and competence, they command a consideration which might not otherwise be theirs. So when the Lucretian scholar complains (*op. cit.* 109, p. 156) that he does 'not understand' what I mean by certain emendations propounded in the *Cambridge University Reporter*, and subsequently mentioned in the *Classical Review* (vol. xiv. p. 353), I am impelled to take an early opportunity of enlightening him.

I will deal with the longest passage first, which, to avoid prejudice to the argument, must be set out in its context:

V. 380 *sqq.*

Denique tantopere inter se cum maxima
mundi 380
pugnent membra, pio nequaquam con-
cita bello,
nonne uides aliquam longi certaminis
ollis
posse dari finem, uel cum sol et uapor
omnis

omnibus epotis umoribus exsuperarint?
quod facere intendunt, neque adhuc
conata patrantur: 385
tantum suppeditant amnes ultraque
minantur
omnia diluuiare ex alto gurgite ponti,
nequiquam, quoniam uerrentes aequora
uenti
deminuunt radiisque retexens aetherius
sol,
et siccare prius confidunt omnia posse 390
quam liquor incepti possit contingere
finem.
tantum spirantes aequo certamine
bellum
magnis inter se de rebus cernere
certant,
cum semel interea fuerit superantior
ignis,
et semel, ut famast, umor regnarit in
aruis.

To bring out the requirements of the passage and the difficulties of the vulgate rendering I print Munro's translation with certain portions italicised:

'Again since the chiefest members of the world fight so hotly together, fiercely stirred by no hallowed