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 Use of προδανείζειν

W. Wyse

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 06 / June 1892, pp 254 - 257

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185889, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185889

How to cite this article:

W. Wyse (1892). On the Use of προδανείζειν. The Classical Review, 6, pp 254-257
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185889

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

belonged to Euripides, but that the lines in question (1056—58) were originally given to the chorus and read thus :

μὴ δῆτα θύμα, μὴ σὺγ' ἐργάσῃ τόδε.
 ἔασον αὐτοὺς, ὦ τάλαν· φεύσαι τέκνων.
 ἐπεὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ζῶντες εὐφρανουσί σε.

As will be observed, only three slight changes have been made, *θυμέ* into *θύμα*, *τάδε* to *τόδε*, and *ἐκεῖ* to *ἐπεὶ*, and by these emendations the otherwise obscure line 1058 has been rendered completely intelligible. Medea has just fully and finally determined not to yield to her own timidity and tenderness of heart. She has bidden those present who were unworthy (or unwilling) to attend her sacrifice (*θύματα*) to keep away, when most naturally the chorus exclaims in answer to this direct address to themselves: 'Let there be no sacrifice, we pray thee; do thou not do this thing. Let the boys live, O wretched one, and spare thy children, since living here with us (in *Corinth*) they will rejoice thy heart.' Medea then in accordance with her set resolve answers passionately: 'Nay, by the avenging powers below, I shall never leave my children here (in *Corinth*) to suffer insult at my enemies' hands. They must die.' In favour of my emendation, I may add:

(1) This interference on the part of the chorus conforms exactly with the *μὴ προβαίη* of line 907, the *μὴ τέκνα φονεύσης* of 855 and the *ἀπενέπω τάδε* of 813.

(2) *θύμα* well re-echoes the *θύμασιν* of line 1054, and *ἔστω* may be easily understood; or we may regard it with *τόδε* as the object of *ἐργάσῃ*, *ἐργάζομαι* being used like *ἔρδω* or *ῥέζω* in the sense of 'performing' a sacrifice. I might even suggest *θῦε* in place of *θύμα*.

(3) The earnest entreaty *μὴ δῆτα*, 'I pray thee,' and the expression *ὦ τάλαν* are both better suited to the chorus than to Medea (cf. ll. 990 and 436). *τάλαν* for *τάλαινα*, masc. for fem., is frequently found (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 559).

(4) *ἐκεῖ*, in 1058, could only refer to Athens where Medea purposed going, but the three following lines show that Medea rejects the thought not of leaving them in Athens, but *Corinth*.

(5) The occurrence of *ἡμῶν* with *σέ* in the same line, both referring to Medea herself is scarcely allowable. Medea in this whole speech of hers has spoken of herself in the singular number only.

I wonder indeed that the use of the pronouns alone in these lines has never before convinced any commentator of the propriety of transferring the three lines to the chorus. After all, do we lose much by making Medea renounce her resolve but once instead of twice? Is not the double victory over her own inward repugnance and the remonstrance of the chorus even more powerful and more dramatic?

K. E. CROSBY.

Princeton.

ON THE USE OF *προδανείζειν*.

It is stated in the dictionaries that *προδανείζειν*, *προδανειστής*, *προδανεισμός* mean respectively 'to lend before or first,' 'a first lender,' 'a previous loan.' I shall endeavour to show that this meaning is sometimes excluded by the context and nowhere required.

I begin with the examples cited in the Paris edition of Stephanus, and in Liddell and Scott. They are (1) *Dio Cass.* 51. 17 *τοὺς τε προδανείσασί τι πάντα ἀπηλλάγη*, (2) *Lucian De Sacrif.* c. 3 *ὁ Χρύσης.....ἐπειδὴ ἀπρακτος ἀπῆε παρὰ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὡς ἂν καὶ προδανείσας τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τὴν χάριν δικαιο-λογεῖται καὶ ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἀμοιβὴν καὶ μόνον οὐκ ὀνειδίζει* (L. and S. give this reference as illustrating the middle; Jacobitz in his critical preface mentions no variant, and

προδανείσας is given in the Index verborum ac phrasium Luciani published by Reitz in 1746, the ultimate source of most of the quotations from Lucian in our dictionaries), (3) *Plut. Per.* c. 13 *ἡ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν εὐχέρεια καὶ ταχύτης οὐκ ἐντίθησι βάρος ἔργῳ μόνιμον οὐδὲ κάλλους ἀκρίβειαν· ὁ δ' εἰς τὴν γένεσιν τῷ πόνῳ προδανεισθεὶς χρόνος ἐν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γενομένου τὴν ἰσχὴν ἀποδίδωσιν*. I submit that in these three passages the notion of a 'previous loan' is otiose and inapt, I should even have said impossible, had not so many distinguished scholars acquiesced in this translation. But surely no one will tolerate a temporal reference of *πρό* in a fourth passage which L. and S. mention as 'Inscr. in Newton's Halicarn.' but do not quote. The inscription will be

found in the *History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Branchidae*, II. 2. p. 689. Sir C. Newton found it at Halicarnassus and treats it as a decree of the Halicarnassians: I do not know on what grounds M. Dareste (*Bull. de Corr. Hell.* iv. p. 341) assigns it to Cnidus. The passages pertinent to the enquiry are these: l. 3 sqq. ὅπως ἂν οἱ προδανείσαντες εἰς τὴν στοὰν ἦν ὁ δῆμος ἀνατίθῃσι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ φανεροὶ ὥσιν πᾶσιν, τοὺς ἐξεταστὰς ἐφ' ὧν ἂν συντελεσθῇ ἡ στοὰ, ὅσοι ἂν προδανείσωσιν ἀτοκα μὴ ἔλασσον ἢ φ', ἀναγράφαι αὐτῶν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν τῇ παραστάδι τῆς στοᾶς πατριστί, προσγράφοντας ὅτι οἶδε ἔδωκαν τῷ δήμῳ ἀτοκα χρήματα εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τῆς στοᾶς, l. 9 ὅπως δ' ἂν κομίσωνται οἱ προδανεισταί, πόρους ὑποκείσθαι αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ. It should be added that the revenues which are to form the security are already mortgaged, so that the translation 'first lenders' is here singularly inappropriate. This inscription indicates the significance of the compound; πρό is 'forward' and προδανείζειν is 'to make an advance.' But this is not all: the word appears to have acquired the sense of 'lending without interest.' To prove this with absolute certainty is difficult, but the following passages appear to point to this conclusion. In the decree of Stratocles in honour of Lycurgus, Ps.-Plut. *Vit. x. Or.* 852 B we find πολλά δὲ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν διὰ πίστεως λαβὼν καὶ προδανείσας [καὶ] εἰς τοὺς τῆς πόλεως καιροὺς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τὰ πάντα ἑξακόσια καὶ πεντήκοντα τάλαντα. U. Köhler in *Hermes* i. (1866) p. 314 set beside this two fragments from an inscription found in 1864, which deals with Lycurgus' administration, πρ[ο]δεδανεισμένα ἑξα..., now *C.I.A.* ii. 162. c. 7, and . . . λακτικὸν εἰς τὰ προδεδανεισμένα, *ib.* c. 9, and concluded that Lycurgus had been able to borrow money for state purposes from private persons without security and probably without interest. The language of the Athenian decree as reported by Pseudo-Plutarch is not as appropriate as that of the decree of the Halicarnassians, since persons who trust their money so unreservedly to a minister of finance seem to have a better claim to the title προδανεισταί than the official who converts it to the public service, and the example of Halicarnassus inspires some doubt about the absence of security. The absence of interest on the other hand appears essential and suits excellently the use of the word in *Ἀθ. Πολ.* c. 16 καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἀπόροις προεδάνειζε χρήματα πρὸς τὰς ἡγασίας. I take this opportunity of retracting my conjecture προσεδάνειζε 'he

also lent money,' which rested on the belief that προδανείζειν meant 'lend beforehand' and was consequently unsatisfactory. The inscription *C.I.G.* 2717 b add. (= 2700 e) cited by L. and S. for προδανεισμός probably recorded a loan on terms similar to those granted at Halicarnassus; note l. 7, προσόδων] δημοσίων ὑποκειμέν[ων], and there is not the least ground for assuming that the words in l. 11 προδανεισμοῖς ἰδίῳ τῶν ἱερ.... must mean 'previous loans.' That this is not necessarily the force of the compound is indicated by the analogy of πρόχρησις and προχρήσθαι. See the examples collected by Kumanudis in his *Συναγωγή Λεξέων Ἀθησαυρίστων*, e.g. *C.I.G.* 2927 σιτωνήσαντα. . . . καὶ προχρήσαντα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὴν τεμὴν τοῦ σίτου καὶ τὰς γενομένας μέχρι(ς) ἐνθάδε δαπάνας πάσας, and *Μουσ. κ. βιβλ. εἰσαγγ. Σχ. Σμύρνη* 1878, p. 95 πολλάκις τῇ πόλει εἰς τὰς χρείας τῶν καιρῶν κεχαρισμένον καὶ προχρήσεις χρήσαντα, and compare Bekk. *An. Gr.* I. 472. 7 ἀφορμὴ ἰδίως παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς ἡ πάροδος (πρόσδοδος ?) ἣν νῦν πολλοὶ πρόχρηιαν καὶ ἐνθήκην λέγουσιν.

There remains a sense of προδανειστής which may prove to have a different history. In the accounts of the ἱεροποιοί of Delos of the year when Demares was archon (180 B.C. according to M. Homolle, *Archives de l'Intendance sacrée à Délos*, p. 142) published in the *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* vi. 1882, there occur the words προχρησάμενοι p. 25, l. 208 and προδανεισταῖς *ib.* l. 209. M. Homolle, *ib.* p. 69, illustrates the latter word from two other Delian inscriptions, (1) the accounts of the ἱεροποιοί of the year of Charilas (269 B.C., *Archives* p. 126), l. 77—79 ἑδανείσαμεν μηνὸς ἑκατομβαιῶνος τῇ πόλει καὶ προδανεισταῖς (3 names) καὶ ἀναδόχοις (3 names) X X X κατὰ συγγραφὴν τὴν παρ' [Ἐπι]κύνει Κριτοβούλου κειμένην τῇ πόλει καὶ προδανεισταῖς (3 names) and (2) the accounts of the year of Sosisthenes (250 B.C., *Archives* p. 130) l. 120—121 ἑδανείσαμεν μηνὸς Ἀθηναίωνος κατὰ ψήφισμα τῇ πόλει καὶ προδανεισταῖς [τοῖς βουλ]ευταῖς δραχμὰς X X X ἐπὶ ὑποθήκει ταῖς προσόδοις ταῖς δημοσίου· ἡ συγγραφὴ παρὰ..... Further (*Archives* p. 137) he recognises as Delian an inscription *C.I.G.* 2953 b attributed to Ephesus and corrects lines 11—12 thus: τοῦτο ἑδανείσ(α)μεν τῇ πόλει κ[ατὰ] τ[ὸ] ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου καὶ προδανεισταῖς τοῖς β[ουλ]ευτ[αῖς] τοῖς ἐπὶ Κ[αλλί]ου]. In these three passages temple treasures are lent to the state and to προδανεισταί. What then is the meaning here of προδανεισταί? M. Homolle has answered this question in *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* vi. p. 69, and xiv. p.

439. I cannot do better than quote his words. 'L'État doit fournir des garanties et de double manière, par une hypothèque et par des cautions. Il engage les revenus publics et se fait représenter par des répondants; ces répondants sont de deux sortes: d'abord les *προδανεισταί*, qui signent le contrat et s'engagent comme s'ils empruntaient eux-mêmes, ensuite les *ἀνάδοχοι*, qui sont les cautions des *προδανεισταί*, et tiennent la place des *ἐγγυηταί* dans les contrats passés avec les particuliers. Les prêts faits à l'État se distinguent de ceux qui se faisaient aux particuliers par leur courte durée: ce ne sont à proprement parler que des avances qui se règlent pour l'ordinaire dans le cours de l'exercice, ou d'une année sur l'autre.....Le remboursement est fait par les membres de conseil, comme aussi l'emprunt était contracté par eux, au nom de la ville; les ressources qui y sont affectées proviennent des impôts publics donnés en gage' (*l.c.* xiv. p. 439 *sqq.*). Further, it is shown that there is no trace of interest. M. Homolle does not discuss the origin of this use of *προδανειστής*, nor does he state whether his interpretation is based simply on the passages which I have quoted or finds support from the terms of the numerous unpublished financial documents of the temple, but if this explanation be accepted—and independent criticism is hardly possible until the whole body of Delian inscriptions is given to the world—these *προδανεισταί* must be persons who *borrow for another*. Although *δανειστής* never seems to mean 'borrower' and *ἐκδανεισταί* (Ditt. *S.I.G.* 253. 38, *cf. ib.* 233 *passim*) are officials appointed to invest public funds, still *χρήστης* is used for 'debtor' as well as for 'creditor' and there is the valuable testimony of *B.A.G.* i. 192. 26 *προδανειστής* ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ δανειζομένου γραφόμενος τὴν ὁμολογίαν. It is natural to ask if there is any example of *προδανεῖσθαι*, 'to borrow for another.' Not, it would seem, in the Delian records. The inscription of the year of Demares (*Bull.* vi.) contains the verb *προχρησθαι* *i.e.* p. 8. ll. 24. 25 *ἔθεσαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ταμίαι Καίβων καὶ Μησηκλειδῆς εἰς ἀπόδοσιν τῷ θεῷ οὐδ' προεχρήσατο ἡ πόλις εἰς τοὺς στεφάνους τὸν τε βασιλεῖ Φιλίππῳ καὶ τὸν βασιλεῖ Εὐμένει καὶ τὸν εἰς Ῥόδον*: p. 9. ll. 42. 43 *ἔθεσαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ταμίαι Μένυλλος καὶ Φωκαεὺς κατὰ τὴν διάταξιν.....εἰς ἀπόδοσιν τοῦ προχρησθέντος εἰς τοὺς στεφάνους τῷ βασιλεῖ Φιλίππῳ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ Μασσαννάσῃ*: p. 13. l. 87 *ἔθεσαν ταμίαι Καίβων καὶ Μησηκλειδῆς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, τὸ ἀποταγὴν εἰς τὰς εἰκόνας, οὐδ' προεχρήσατο ἡ πόλις τῆς δοθείσης δωρεᾶς τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου* H H

H H: ll. 89–90 record the payment of a second instalment of this debt. In these passages ἡ πόλις *προεχρήσατο* plainly corresponds to ὁ θεὸς *προεχρήσε* τῇ πόλει, so that *προχρησθαι* will mean 'to borrow without interest.' There happens however to be an example of the middle *προδανεῖσθαι* in Attic, which has not yet, so far as I know, been explained with any clearness. I refer to Hyperides *c. Dem.* xii. (iv.) 27 *sqq.* Blass: (τοσούτον καταπεφρόνηκεν Δημοσθένης ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν νόμων) ὥστε τὸ μὲν πρῶτον.....ὁμο[λογεῖν μὲν εἰληφέ]ναι τὰ χρήμα[α ἀλλὰ] κατακεχρησθαι αὐτὰ ὑμῖν προδεδανεισμένους εἰς τὸ θεωρικόν· καὶ περιὼν Κνωσίων καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι φίλοι αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι ἀναγκάσουσι τὸν ἄνθρωπον οἱ αἰτιώμενοι εἰς τὸ φανερόν ἐνεγκεῖν ἃ οὐ βούλεται καὶ εἰπεῖν ὅτι τῷ δήμῳ προδεδάν[ε]ιστ[αι] τὰ χρήματα εἰς τὴν διοίκησιν. ἐπειδὴ δ' ὑμῶν οἱ ἀκούσαντες πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡγανάκτουν ἐπὶ τοῖς κατὰ τοῦ πλῆθους τοῦ ὑμετέρου λόγ[ο]ς εἰ μὴ μόνον ἐκ[α]νὸν εἰῆ αὐτῷ [τῷ] δεδοροδοκ[ε]ναι: *desunt c. vers. xi.*

Arnold Schaefer's version is not close enough to show his view of the middle: see *Demosthenes u. s. Z.* iii. p. 322, 'Demosthenes erklärte, er habe allerdings diese Summe (20t.) empfangen, aber sie zu einem Vorschusse an die Theorikenkasse verwendet.' Blass, *Att. Ber.* iii. 2. p. 65 gives this paraphrase: 'Anfänglich sagten Demosthenes und seine Freunde, er habe das Geld allerdings genommen; aber als Ersatz von Vorschüssen für die Theorikenkasse, womit er also das Volk beschuldigte.' He agrees, I think, with Holm, *Gr. Gesch.* iii. p. 420, who translates 'Er sagte...er habe dem Theorikon 20 Tal. vorgeschossen und diese nun vom Harpalosgelde zurückgenommen.' Holm apparently holds that Demosthenes pretended to have advanced the money before the arrival of Harpalus, for he asks what right had the orator to abstract twenty talents from the sequestered treasures, even if he had really lent such an immense sum to the state. Whether Blass and Holm take the preposition to mean 'previously,' I do not venture to decide, but the force of the middle *προδανεῖσθαι* is certainly not made plain. The problem is this. Did Demosthenes represent himself as a *προδανειστής* in the sense assigned to the word by *B.A.G.* i. 192 and by M. Homolle's interpretation of the Delian inscriptions? Or did he only claim to have borrowed from Harpalus without interest 20t., which he then advanced to the state at his own risk? In the first case the responsibility of the people was very serious; for though Demosthenes was

intermediary, signing the bond and incurring liability, yet the state or officers of the state were involved in a formal contract with Harpalus. On the second hypothesis Demosthenes' action is exactly similar to that of Lycurgus, except that I can find no evidence that Demosthenes held any financial office in the first half of 324 B.C. Pseudo-Plutarch *l.c.* describes Lycurgus as lending to the state without interest (προδανείσας) large sums of money entrusted to him by private persons; Demosthenes, if Hyperides is to be believed, professed to have borrowed without interest (προδεδανωμένος) from Harpalus in order to pass on the money to the state. The two writers seize on different aspects of one and the same transaction. It is unfortunate that Hyperides' denunciation of Demosthenes' plea is cut short by a gap in the papyrus, but his indignation whether real or simulated is not inconsistent with the second interpretation. For if Demosthenes' assertion was true the board that administered the Theoricon might be required to restore the 20*t.* and Demos would be in danger not only of finding his amusements curtailed but of falling under the displeasure of the all-powerful Alexander. For my own part I incline here to the second explanation, but at the same time *B.A.G.* i. 192 is evidence that προδανειστής in the special sense discussed above was not confined to Delos, since the δικῶν δνόματα which form the fourth Lexicon Seguerianum will be found on examination to be drawn from Athenian institutions and the speeches of Athenian orators.

Two Latin words are affected by the results of this discussion. The Graeco-Latin

glossary ('Cyrilli') in the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* II. p. 417 interprets προδανείζομαι by 'promutuo', which is translated in *Lewis and Short* 'to be loaned beforehand.' The same volume of the *Corpus* contains also προχρεῖα hoc antecessum hoc promutuum, προχρησθαι procommodare (p. 425), promotum προχρεῖα (p. 505). I do not know whether any one has proposed to substitute 'promutuum' for 'promutuum' and 'promotum' in these articles: the correction is simple. *Lewis and Short* translate the substantive 'promutuum' simply by 'an advance, a loan,' but the adjective 'promutuus' in Caesar, *B.C.* 3. 32. 6 (*imperabatur publicanis, ut in Syria fecerat, insequentis anni uectigal promutuum*) by 'demanded in advance as a loan.' This version, like that of *Merguet*, 'vorausbezahlt als Vorschuss,' is a little confusing. The adjective need mean nothing more than 'as a loan,' 'als Vorschuss' (*Menge and Preuss*); the fact that in c. 31 Scipio's proceedings in Syria are described by 'insequentis anni pecuniam mutuum praeceperat' is not conclusive proof that in c. 33 the 'pro' of 'promutuum' must refer to time. Whether, as the dictionaries say, 'promutua uectura' of the *Digest* means 'carriage prepaid,' I leave for the present undetermined. Doubt is justifiable.

In conclusion it may be worth while to point out that the reading of *C.I.A.* ii. 834. b. i. 39 is τὸ προσδανεισθὲν εἰς τὸ διατείχισμα τὸ Ἐλευσίνι παρὰ ταμίον στρατιωτικῶν καὶ παρὰ ἀποδεκτῶν καὶ παρὰ τοῦ τραπέζιτου. *M. Dürrbach* in his valuable study on the orator Lycurgus has τὸ προδανεισθὲν (p. 98. n. 4) probably by an oversight.

W. WYSE.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF ἐλεῖν.

In the *Philologische Rundschau* i. 1591 Osthoff compared ἐλεῖν with Lat. *uelle*, Germ. *wollen, wählen*. This etymology he has since given up (*Paul u. Braune's Beiträge* xiii. 457) on account of the Homeric forms which show no certain indication of digamma, and because the Gortyn inscription, in which digamma at the beginning of a word is kept, has in this word no traces of digamma, ἐλῆν, ἐλόνα, etc. He now connects (*l.c.*) ἐλεῖν with Teut. *saljan* 'übergeben, einhändigen' (properly causative **solejo* 'cause to take'); Ags. *sellan*, Eng. *sell*. Solmsen (*K.Z.* xxxii. 280) rejects Osthoff's etymology partly for

semasiological reasons, partly on account of traces of the digamma in Homer, particularly in the substantives ἔλωρ, ἐλώρια, which he says cannot be separated from ἐλεῖν. He himself supposes that ἐλεῖν originally began with digamma, but gave it up under the influence of αἰρέω, which he connects doubtfully with old Bulg. *silā* 'kraft,' Lith. *syli* 'kraft,' *sylyti* 'zwingen.' The possibility that one of two verbs united together to form a system may have acted upon the other in this way cannot be denied; if it were certain that ἐλεῖν at one time had digamma, it would be hard to find any other explanation of the loss of it. In the case of the verb