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Hermes and Nous, Pan and Logos—these are the expressions which will be tautometric. Zielinski (Arch. f. Religionswiss. ix. p. 34) points out that Plato (Kratylus 408 D-409 Ε) takes it as given that Hermes is father of Logos; and this gives us the equation Pan = Logos, as a mystic doctrine probably to be referred to the old Arcadian Hermetic, from which Zielinski derives the Strassburg Cosmogony (Reitzenstein, Zwei religionsgesch. Fragen, Strassb. 1901). Hermes, as son and messenger of Zeus, was equated with Logos already in the sixth century by Theagenes of Rhegium (Diels Frag. d. Vors. ii. p. 511). Later mysticism developed the trinity: Nous (= Zeus), Nous (etymology (= Hermes), and Logos. If I am right, we have in the second Olympian one germ of this development: Hermes = Nous, Pan = Logos. It will be remembered that Pindar had at his doors a cult of the Great Mother and of Pan, who sang one of his paeans. The ancient Lives emphasise his connection with Pan. (See also my note on Hermes, Pan, Logos, Classical Quarterly, iii. p. 281.)

Though I think that the theory of tautometric responsions has sometimes been overdriven, no student of Pindar can doubt that they occur and often give the key to the interpretation of difficult passages. I have elsewhere (From Religion to Philosophy, London, 1912, p. 174) pointed out another case in this ode:

19 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ
85 πόσις ὁ πάντων Ρέας (i.e. Kronos), which gives us the Orphic equation Kronos = Chronos, again at least as old as the sixth century (Pherekydes, Diels Frag. d. Vors. ii. p. 507). The points which make me think that the present instance is not a mere coincidence are (1) that Pindar expressly warns us that he is writing cryptically; (2) that the form πάν needs some special justification; (3) that the phrase αὐτόσωμαι λόγου ἄλαβει νόος is itself not an obvious expression, and has the air of being dragged in with a purpose.

Finally, the thought that Nous is the father of Logos—Wisdom the father of Speech—is peculiarly appropriate to the context, which continues:

σοφὸς, ὁ πολλὰ Φειδώς ὕμα: μαθόντες ἐδέ λάβρου παγγισμός, κόρακε ὦς, ἀκραντα γαρ- νέτον Δίως πρὸς δρυίχα θείον.

Pindar is, of course, the σοφὸς, whose poetry comes of native wisdom: his logos is born of Nous. The noisy crows, whose knowledge is only learnt at second-hand, are not πάν-σοφοι but πάν-γλυσσοι: their logos comes only from the tongue; it is mere chattering (τὸ λαλαγήσαι, l. 106), not fathered by the Mind. As Heracleitus says, πολυμαθὴς νῦν οὐ διδάκη. Bacchylides, a few years later (468 B.C.), openly takes up Pindar's challenge in Ode III. 85 φρέωντι συνετά γαρώδι— as much as to say: 'My words have meaning enough for one who really has the Mind you boast of'—; and claims to be, not a πάνγλυσσος κόραξ, but a μετέγλυσσος ἄρδας (l. 96). If the cap fitted so well, Bacchylides and Simonides must be the pair of crows.

F. M. CORNFORD.

NOTES AND EMENDATIONS.

THUCYRIDES V. 103, 1.

'Ελπίς δὲ κινδύνωρ παραμύθιον οὖσα κ.τ.λ.

Editors have long felt that the sense required by the passage is 'an encouragement to risk,' rather than 'a solace, a relief, to danger; danger's comforter,' but the dative has been a stumbling-block: hence some have fallen back upon κινδύνου of Dion Hal. and Sto-
baeus. But if we look at the first sense of κίνδυνος, we shall find this difficulty disappear. There are two lines in Theognis, 637-8 to which our passage almost appears to look back:

\[\text{εἰς τὴν κίνδυνον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὤμοι, οὐδεὶς γὰρ χαλεπόν δαίμονες ἀμφότεροι.}\]

There translate: ‘Hope and the Spirit of Adventure’; and write KLVŚWOS with a capital letter.

The whole chapter in Thucydides is highly poetical, even lyrical in its tone, and this use of KLVŚWOS appears to be Theognidean: cf. Theognis 557:

\[\text{φράξει Κίνδυνος τοι ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται ἁρμής,}\]

and perhaps 585

\[\text{πᾶσιν τοι κίνδυνος ἐπὶ ἔργασιν, οὐδὲ τις οἶδεν πὴ σχήσεων μέλλει, πρήγματος ἄρχομένου.}\]

The words indeed have a Theognidean, a poetical cadence, such as is sometimes found in Thucydides; for instance ἀνδρῶν ἐπισφαλῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος and τὸ γὰρ φιλότιμον ἄγγηρον.

So again in Pindar, Pythian iv. 125:

\[\text{τὸ χαρὰ δέξατο ναυτίλεος; τὶς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατερῶς ἀδάμαντος δήσεω ἄλος;}\]

the point is given exactly by the Scholiast:

\[\text{ποῖα ἴσχυρα καὶ κινδύνωδος ἄναγκη παρώρμησεν;}\]

where ὄρμησον is correctly used of an inward impulse.

With this key, we can now approach the dative κινδύνῳ. Παραμυθεῖται with the dative ‘to stimulate, encourage’ is found in the Iliad I. 417, Καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλοισιν ἐγὼ παραμυθησάμην, I. 684, Ο. 45.

The substantive παραμῦθιον, then, may have a dative after it, like Plato, Epithrhythro, 17 C ὑδαίνου θεοὶ; Rep. 493 D διακοινὰ πόλει. Apol. 30 A ὑπηρεσία with dative: Kühner, ii. i, p. 427. An exact parallel is found in the use of παρακέλευμα and παρακλήσεις; the verb takes a dative; and for παρακέλευσις followed by a dative see Plato, Sympos. 182 D:

\[\text{ἡ παρακέλευσις τῷ ἔρωτι παρὰ πάντων θαυμαστή.}\]

The passage then should be written Ἐπις δὲ Κίνδυνῳ παραμῦθιον ὀύσα, and translated ‘Hope is an encouragement to the Spirit of Adventure.’ Κίνδυνος will be another of the personified abstracts like Πενή, 'Ἀρμαχινή, Πειθώ and 'Ἀναγκαία' in Hdt. viii. π. Π. Εὐλάβεια Eur. Phoen. 782, Ἐπις Ἰπ. Αιλ. 392, and Theognis ῥι: all called θεοὶ.

Thucydid, vi. 78, 3:

καὶ εἰ γνώμῃ ἄμαρτοι, τοῖς αὐτῶν κακοῖς δολοφρείδες κ.τ.λ. Σο edd.

Editors have not decided whether δολοφρείδες is used here in a passive or a middle sense. But it seems clear that δολοφρείδες cannot be twisted into meaning ‘commiserated for.’ But if it is middle, ‘lamenting for,’ it would require an accusative: the reference in LS to Plato, Rep. 329 A for a dative is misleading, for there is no dative there. The Scholiast has ἐπὶ ταῖς ἱδίαις συμφοραῖς δολοφρομένοις, where the meaning is uncertain. It is true that Thucydid elsewhere vii. 30, ii. 46 (ἀπολογ.-), viii. 81 (ἀνολογ.) uses ὀλοφραμήν, not ὀλοφρήθην, in the middle sense; but he also uses the two forms of the aorist of ἐξεφραίη in iii. 61, ii. 64, and ἐμφρέθην in iv. 85, i. May we not conjecture here εἰ γνώμῃ ἄμαρτοι, ἤπει ὁτι αὐτῶν κακοῖς δολοφρείδες, ‘lamenting over?’ The preposition would give a lawful construction.

Sophocles, Oedipus Rex, 1492-1495:

\[\text{ἀλλ’ ἤμικ’ ἄν δὴ πρὸς γάμον ἥκη τ’ ἀκμᾶς, τὶς οὕτως ἔσταται, τὶς παραρρίσχει, τέκνα, τοιαῦτα ὀνειδή λαμβάνων, ἄ ταῖς ἐμαῖς γοναῖν ἔσται σφών θ’ ὁμοῦ ὀηλήματα.}\]

So Jebb, for MSS. τοῖς ἐμοῖς γονεῖσιν, which yields no tolerable sense. ‘Such reproaches as must be disastrous alike to my offspring and to yours,’ is his version. But the sense required by the situation itself, as well as by the context is rather ‘et proli suae et sibi exitiosa mox futura,’ and this can be obtained by

\[\text{ἀ ταῖς αἷς γοναίν ἔσται σφών θ’ ὁμοῦ ὀηλήματα.}\]
There seems no valid reason for questioning the use of σφων as a dative singular. The passages in which it occurs have been discussed by Jebb on Oedipus Coloneus, 1489, where σφων is used clearly referring to ἀρ' ἔγγος ἀνήρ; in l. 1486. The enclitic in the caesura need cause little hesitation. Dr. Headlam, in the Classical Review iv. 355, gives the following instances:

Aesch., Eumen. 462 with νυ.
" " Suppl. 760 " τυ.
" Pers. 348 " πυ.
" Sept. 689 " πως.
" Agam. 1123 " τυ.
" Suppl. 399 " περ.
Soph., Phil. 741 " τυ.
" Phil. 824 " τυ.
" Aj. 829 " του.
" Phil. 446 " πω.
" O.C. 972 " πω.
" O.C. 896 " περ.
Eur., Aj. 181 " τυ.
" El. 892 " τυ.

The phrase in 1486 καὶ σφω δικρῶν and 1488 οἶνον βιώναι σφω πρὸς ἀνθρώπων χρεῶν immediately before, and the general tenor of the speech, which ends in 1511 with σφων ἃ', ὁ τέκνη, εἰ μὲν εἰχέτην ἣδον ἰχθύνοις, πόλι' ἀν παρήγον,

may well have caused the mistake σφων in this line. In another place in this play the memory of the general context seems to have led the scribe astray:

906-7 φθίνοντα γὰρ Λαῖτον καὶ παλαίφατα
θέσφατ' ἐξαροῦσιν ἢδη

though the addition παλαίφατα is not certain, Mekler's conjecture ΑαΧάνον 'the Delian God' is much more appropriate to the context than Λαῖτον. Ταῖς φως is Sophoclean: Prof. Housman, I find, has restored the possessive relative pronoun with his τοῖς ὕσι γόνωσιν, which is adopted by Prof. Tyrrell in his text: but γοναῖσιν, as Kennedy argued, and as the Index shows, is more Sophoclean than γόνωσιν.

J. U. Powell.

LUCANEA.

Mr. Smale's notes in Classical Review, Vol. XXV., No. 7 (November, 1911), suggest some remarks:

Bk. IV. 618.

colla diu grauius frustra tentata lacertis immotumque caput fixa cum fronte tenetur.

Mr. Smale finds it difficult to refer the lines to the action of each wrestler. 'The heads of both could not be 'gripped tight with brow immoveable.' So he takes 618 as representing the attitude of Hercules, 619 that of Antaeus.

But is tenetur 'gripped tight'? Does the line not mean, 'each holds his head stiff without yielding to the other's pressure on his neck and with the face muscles tense'? If Antaeus is in the position Mr. Smale's 'vivid picture' denotes, could Lucan continue (620) miranturque habuisse parem? Antaeus would have other thoughts, and the phrase fixa cum fronte of a wrestler being 'screwed,' even if possible for Lucan's defective sense of humour, has less force than as ordinarily interpreted. Again, the rest of the narrative is quite inconsistent with the position Mr. Smale has in view. Cf. l. 624, etc., tum curnix lassata quati, tum pectore pecum urgeri. . . . If Mr. Smale is right, we would expect a change of attitude from the application of the 'screw' to be clearly indicated. Both lines should be taken of either wrestler, neither of whom so far—Hercules is reserving himself (620)—has gained any advantage. Colla is a poetical plural, not 'the necks of the two' but 'the neck of each.' Francken rightly keeps tenetur (V1 has tenentur), but his explanation 'oratio post lacertis continuatur et tenetur pertinet ad utrumque subiectum' seems less simple than to supply sunt with tentata. See, however, Oudendorp on 1. 422.

1 I follow Hosius' designation of the MSS.