The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Mehercle and Herc(v)lvs

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 12 / Issue 02 / April 1918, pp 58 - 58

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800013355, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800013355

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1918). *Mehercle and Herc(v)lvs*. The Classical Quarterly, 12, pp 58-58

doi:10.1017/S0009838800013355

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The conclusion is obvious. The true Present belonging to ἐξῆλθον, ἐξελήλυθα, etc., is not ἐξέρχομαι, but ἐκπορεύομαι (as φέρω is the Present belonging to οἶσω, etc.), and similarly in the other cases.

This may be confirmed by passages in which the Present or Imperfect occurs in close proximity to the other tenses which really belong to it. Thus in Polyb. X. 15, 3-4 (see above) the persons designated as οἱ διὰ τῆς πύλης εἰσπορευόμενοι are referred to a little later as τοὺς εἰσεληλυθότας, and in Polyb. IV. 17, 9-18, 1, the words τῶν καταπορευομένων are followed at a short interval by παραχρῆμα κατελθόντες and τῶν κατεληλυθόντων. In Ezekiel 46, 10, we read: ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξελεύσεται μετ' αὐτῶν.

Other compounds have been purposely omitted from the table because their figures are too low to permit of any conclusion.

The uncompounded ἔρχομαι is not at all rare in Hellenistic Greek, and maintains its existence as the true Present belonging to ἦλθον, ἐλήλυθα, etc. It is found about 200 times (Present and Imperfect) in the Septuagint.

RODERICK MCKENZIE.

MEHERCLE AND HERC(V)LVS.

EVERYONE interested in Latin Etymology knows the last word on *mehercle*, that the old vocative of *meus* is prefixed to the old Second Declension form *Herc(u)lus*, Voc. -*le*. Without discussing whether this explanation is wholly true or partly wrong, I wish here to disqualify two pieces of evidence. Both originate from a marginal annotation on Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Church History* (4, 9, 3 'illud mehercule magnopere curabis') in, I think, a seventh-century English MS. These marginalia were used for the Leyden Glossary and for the common source of the EE (Épinal and Erfurt) and Corpus Glossaries. The compiler of Leid. transferred them unaltered to his pages; and in the section devoted to Rufinus glosses we find (§ 35, 19) *Mehercule: mi fortis*. The other compiler often recasts them for dictionary purposes. He gave this item the form *Herculus: fortis* (Ep. 11 A 26 = C.G.L. V. 364, 23 = Corp. H. 54). But of course the original annotation *mi fortis* was a mere lucky guess, and the substitution of 'Herculus' for *Hercules* was sheer ignorance.

Latin Glossaries have many such pitfalls for the unwary. Occasionally a young scholar who intends to spend his life in the pleasant sport of conjectural emendation tries his prentice hand on glosses, but with comical results. Knowledge is necessary for successful emendation. In all cases, knowledge of 'Ueberlieferungsgeschichte' and the practice of medieval scribes. In the case of an author, knowledge of his diction and style. In the case of glosses, knowledge how the glossary was compiled.

W. M. LINDSAY.