

# 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 Waterfowl Goddess Penelope and her Son Pan

A. Shewan

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 02 / March 2015, pp 37 - 40

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00047934, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00047934](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00047934)

### How to cite this article:

A. Shewan (1915). The Waterfowl Goddess Penelope and her Son Pan. The Classical Review, 29, pp 37-40 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00047934

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

proper name and added a geographical note! It appears that he had either this passage before him or *H. P.* 3. 14. 1. ἐν ταῖς κωρυκίσι τὸ κομμί. The blunder was detected by Bodaeus, who however points out that there was actually a mountain in *Pamphylia* called Κώρυκος: and Sir William Thiselton-Dyer informs me that one wych-elm (*ulmus montana*), the species most afflicted with leaf-galls, does grow in the Cilician Mountains: so that a case for Pliny might be made out.

(The word κύτταρος, which Wimmer wishes to restore here, is mysterious. In *H. P.* 3. 3. 8. it is the name given to the male flower of the pine, and the text is confirmed by a scholium on *Ar. Vesph.* 1111. Θεόφραστος κυρίως λέγει κύτταρον τὴν προάνθησιν τῆς πίτνους. But in what sense could this be called a 'cell'? In *H. P.* 4. 8. 7. the use is intelligible enough.)

III. *H. P.* 3. 18. 12. Description of σμίλαξ:

τὸν δὲ καρπὸν ἔχει προσεμφερῆ τῷ στρύχνῳ καὶ τῷ μηλώθρῳ καὶ μάλιστα τῇ καλουμένῃ σταφυλῇ ἀγρία· κατακρέμαστοι δ' οἱ βότρυνες κίττου τρόπον· \*παρθρυγίξει\* δὲ ὡς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν· ἀπὸ γὰρ ἐνὸς σημείου οἱ μίσχοι οἱ ῥαγικοί.

παρθρυγίξει is Wimmer's conjecture, but it seems impossible to supply, as he does, τὰ ἄνθη τὸν καυλόν, and he gives up ὡς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν. In the MSS. the sentence runs thus:

*Cod. Urbinas* παρωγγύζει δὲ παρθρυγίξει δὲ ὡς.

*Codd. Medicus* and *Vindobonensis* παραγγίξει δὲ παρθρυγίξει δὲ ὡς.

The Aldine edition has παρεγγύζει δὲ ὡς. Gaza's version is *verum ad labruscam propius accedunt*, whence Schneider conjectured παρεγγίζουσι δὲ μᾶλλον. It looks as though παρεγγίξει δὲ was right, and the gibberish which follows in the MSS. concealed some unusual noun, the subject of παρεγγίξει: ὡς perhaps conceals its termination -ος: the missing noun should mean 'setting' or 'arrangement' of the berries. Now just below we have ἴδιον δὲ τὸ τῶν βοτρυῶν, ὅτι ἐκ πλαγίων τε τὸν καυλὸν παρθρυγίζουσιν καὶ κατ' ἄκρον ὁ μέγιστος βότρυνς τοῦ καυλοῦ ('a peculiarity of the clusters is that they make a row along the sides of the stalk, and the largest cluster is at the end of the stalk'), where παρθρυγίζουσιν is Schneider's certain restoration for παρθρυγίζουσιν, παρθρυγίζουσι of MSS. (παρθρυγίζουσι Ald.).

I suggest, then, παρεγγίξει δὲ ὁ παρθρυγισμὸς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν.

'The fruit is like that of nightshade and bryony, and most of all like the berry which is called the "wild grape." The clusters hang down as in the ivy, but the regular setting of the berries resembles the grape-cluster more closely: for the stalklets which bear the berries start from a single point.'

ARTHUR F. HORT.

*Harrow.*

## THE WATERFOWL GODDESS PENELOPE AND HER SON PAN.

WE have recently been told that German results are accepted too readily. That is notoriously true of the Greek epic, and it has come nigh to be the undoing of Homer. It may well be applied to the work of the 'Saga-displacement' school in Germany, whose *métier* it was to make plausible, if startling, cases by stringing together a number of weakly indications in history, saga or story, and then saying Q.E.D. without a proper scrutiny of the credentials of the

authorities or the quality of the evidence adduced. Thus it was, for example, that the Trojan War became a struggle on Greek soil and Hector a Boeotian. Otto Crusius invalidated these speculations to some purpose, Andrew Lang and others helped, and they passed out of fashion. But they have proved useful in this country for the traditional-book theory of the epic. Several instances are embedded in Professor Murray's *R.G.E.*, and Mr. Thomson inclines to the same style of

demonstration in his companion volume. As an example, the evidence on which he concludes that Penelopé was a waterfowl goddess of Mantinea is briefly examined below. The copious literature will be found quoted in Pauly-Wissowa, Roscher, and Gruppe.

First, at Mantinea, where there were a number of graves of heroes and heroines, one mound was pointed out to Pausanias as Penelopé's. She had come to Mantinea, by way of Sparta, when turned out of house and home by Odysseus as a bad lot. Pausanias does not appear to think much of this story, for he notes a conflict with the *Thesprōtis*, and immediately afterwards disbelieves a similar tale of the Mantineans about Maera. To Mr. Thomson it is a 'memory of Penelopé as an ancient goddess of the land.' But this village talk really negatives divinity. *Non vera patet dea*; surely the character given Penelopé is enough. And then the mound. Some gods did shuffle off their immortal coils, generally for a time only, but I have not been able so far to find a case of a deity being laid to permanent rest like a mere mortal in an *ἀνδρόκμητος* tumulus. Pausanias, I think, mentions no such case, and he does not say there was worship or sacrifice at Penelopé's mound. Eugammon's story that Circe made her immortal is also against her divine origin.

But 'divine Penelopé must be' because she was the mother of Pan. Is that necessarily so? Semelé and Leda were not, I think, divine, to Greek story at least, whatever they may be now to scientific anthropo-mythologists. And was she mother of Pan? According to some accounts a Penelopé was, but sometimes she is a Nymph of that name, and Pan is *νυμφαγενής*. Other versions gave other mothers. Mr. Thomson's statement of the case is inadequate and not un-biassed. He chiefly relies on a parenthetical remark of Herodotus (one of those *λεγόμενα* which the historian says he is bound to report, *πείθεσθαι γὰρ μὲν οὐ παντάπασιν*), and the authorities who favour the view Mr. Thomson does not like are said not to 'count.' He even sets aside the Hymn to Pan

because it is bound to follow 'Homer.' But what then? It is the rule for the Hymns to follow 'Homer.' Most people will think, I feel sure, that the Hymn would be the very best evidence in a paternity proceeding. Some of the witnesses, none apparently earlier than Pindar (as reported by Servius; but a different account is also attributed to the poet), do seem to mean our Penelopé, but there are a number of other claimants, and Pan's variety of parentage deserves a paper to itself.

Again, Odysseus himself had a connection with Mantinea, and it was there, it is suggested, that he 'met' the waterfowl goddess and married her. The Mantinean connection is argued from the fact that he came there, an oar on his shoulder, to find, by order of Teiresias, people who did not know the sea and ate food without salt. When he found them, he was to sacrifice to Poseidon. This oracle, Mr. Thomson says confidently, 'conceals some historical fact,' to wit, 'the foundation of a cult of Poseidon in some inland place remote from the sea,' but he cannot really know this. Mantinea is selected as the place in question on the authority of a paper by Svoronos, which is, on the whole, a careful statement of the evidence. He and Mr. Thomson reject the belief of the ancients that Epirus was meant, partly on Eustathius' *vetus locus* about the *βαρβαρόφωνοι δοῖποι* of the names of the towns mentioned, and partly because Epirus had a seaboard.<sup>1</sup> But these are small matters compared with the insuperable difficulty attaching to Mantinea. It is not reasonable to ask us to believe that Odysseus tramped through Elis and over nearly the whole breadth of Arcadia, leaving its secluded central mountains severely alone, and did not find what he sought till he came to its eastern border, at a place only twenty miles from the sea (which must be visible from its hills in the atmosphere of S. Greece nearly every day of the year), and with two tracks to the Gulf at Argos. The Mantineans may, like

<sup>1</sup> There is much to be said for it. But would any place in Greece suit? Libya's claims have been urged. Kretschmer is satisfied with Epirus.

the Arcadians generally, have had no concern with *θαλάσσια ἔργα*, as Mr. Thomson quotes from the *Catalogue*, but that they did not know the sea and did not use its salt is quite incredible.

Yet again, Didymus and scholiasts preserve as names once borne by Penelopé, Ameiraké (Amirakis, Amerakis), Arnakia (Anarkia), Arnea and Arnaia. The two last and, somewhat rashly, the second, Mr. Thomson thinks *may* mean 'she of Arné,' and this Arné *may* be a spring of that name near Mantinea, unknown to fame save for one story. The possibility is held to confirm Mantinean connection, and to suggest that Penelopé was a waterfowl goddess, though there is nothing in the notices that points to a spring or to Penelopé's divinity. But I find that three ladies among her earthly ancestors bore the name of Arné (sometimes spelt Arené), that there was a man Arnaios in Ithaca, and that there was an Arnaios or Arneos in the family into which Penelopé's uncle Tyndareos married. As to the origin of these names, no one seems to have discussed it till now,<sup>1</sup> a derivation of Arnea from *ἀρνέισθαι*, though supported by an oracle, being evidently folk-etymology. There may be a connection with *ἄρνα*, *oppidum* or *arx*, which is thought to be prehellenic. That with the spring Arné is a mere possibility till Penelopé's relation to it is established or inferable *aliunde*.

Various explanations of her name have been given, but none better than those based on the famous Web. She, like the homonymous Nymph, is *Weberin*. Fick formerly derived it from the bird *πηνέλοψ*, but changed to the interpretation *Gewebe auflösend*. Solmsen has recently returned to the bird, and Mr. Thomson approves. There was a story that Penelopé was once rescued by *πηνέλοπες* when flung into the sea, and this 'proves that the Greeks'—some of them—'connected Πηνελόπη with πηνέλοψ.' Her rescue from the sea by marsh birds described of old as 'like a duck, but the size of a pigeon' is not merely 'a quaint myth'; it is a story so absurd that

folk-etymology is suggested at once. Mr. Thomson finds support in the fact that Penelopé is sometimes represented in art with a *pēnelops* beside her. If the *pēnelops* has been finally identified as a mallard or widgeon or some other species—Professor D'Arcy Thompson only gives 'a kind of Wild Duck or Goose'—and Mr. Thomson knows that the bird drawn by the vase-painters is of that species, there is no more to be said. But can he be sure on those points? Does not one of Penelopé's pet geese (*καί τέ σφιν λαίνομαι εισορόωσα*, *Od.* xix. 537) suit equally well, as the dog Argos does for pictures of the Foot-washing?

The argument here breaks away to the analogy of the Stymphalian Artemis, who is also said to be a waterfowl *koré*, though her *Wesen*, like that of most other gods and heroes nowadays, takes many other forms. The analogy with Artemis is not new, but the statement is long and involved, and I am not concerned with it. The evidence that Penelopé was a Mantinean goddess is doubtful in every particular. The strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, and if every link is weak, the chain is weak indeed.

It is easy to see how the story that Penelopé died at Mantinea *may* have arisen. A connection with Pan once started, her expulsion by her husband and her removal to the seat of her own family in Lacedaemon, and thence to one of the principal places in Pan's Arcadia, would easily follow, and a mound for her burial-place also. But how did the relationship to Pan start in vulgar minds? May not that again be referable to folk-etymology?—of which, as of superior philology, one may say with the French savant, *que de sottises il nous faut avaler en ton nom!* Can anyone who has seen the form Πανελόπα doubt that this is a reasonable explanation? The folk *ἐφλνάρουν*, to use Tzetzes' word, with the lady's name as they did later with the god's.<sup>2</sup> Gruppe suggests that Πάν is a *Kurz-*

<sup>1</sup> I now see that Goerres suggests 'robber' for Ameiraké, comparing Athené Ἀητίς. He gives no authority, and we are not helped.

<sup>2</sup> He became the symbol of the universe, τὸ πᾶν. The Hymn makes him the all-gladdening. He owed his origin to all the Woovers. Possibly Panticapaeum, Panea and Pandosia owed their cults to their names.

form for Πανέλοπος (of which δασύπους, appropriate of Pan, might be a possible interpretation) through Πάνελος, a name that does occur. But that is doubtful, and an original Πάων, though it has the high sanction of Drs. Farnell and Roscher, and though the form is supported by an inscription, has not satisfied all. It is curious that the schol. and Eustath. on *Il.* xxiii. 762, by connecting Πάν with πηνίον, πανίον, brings us round again to Penelopé. Gruppe says these words may be from an original \*πάν = \*σπάν, *Spinnsaar*. It looks as if the mythologists should pause, in regard to the Pan-Penelopé connection, till the philologists reconsider the names of the heroine and the god.

The monstrous regiment of folk-etymologists went very far. The shameless, lustful Wooers being ready to hand in the saga, or in the *märchen*

welded into it, first one and then another was dragged in, and finally there was that φαυλεπίφαιλον invention that Pan ἐκ πάντων (μνηστήρων) ἐσπάρη, *sicut ipsum nomen Pan videtur declarare* (Servius)—a startling contrast this to the Great Pan of later ages! He was, it may be observed, late in coming into his kingdom as a respectable god. In early days he was but a sprite of the Arcadian wilds, and ἐβαρβάρωτο χρόνιος ὧν ἐν Ἀρκάσι. Things were said of him in his unregenerate character which make us wonder the less that a nasty explanation of his origin was accepted by some people. The Hymn shows a better way. But for all those who refuse to believe that Homer and Hesiod are late and Athenian and vamped up, there is no necessity for any special vouchers for the character of περίφρων Πηνελόπεια.

A. SHEWAN.

## IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.<sup>1</sup>

### I. iii. 35-6.

tandem te nostro referens iniuria lecto  
alterius clausis expulit e foribus.

The first clue to the understanding of this is in IV. viii. 27:

cum fieret nostro toties iniuria lecto.

A conjugal infidelity is the 'outrage.' 'Has the other woman's outrage kicked you out?' is the gist of Cynthia's question.

But what does *te referens nostro lecto* mean? A dative of place whither? They say so. *Clamor caelo*, etc. Let them say. A small correction in that part of the verse, where the very rhythm betrays something amiss, will mend all. For *tandem* read *tene vicem*.

tene vicem nostro referens iniuria lecto  
. . . expulit.

Has her outrage, *vicem referens nostro lecto* avenging my (outraged) bed . . . .  
*vicem referre* = *ulcisci* is Ovidian.

at, puto, non poteras ipsa referre vicem?  
Ars. i. 370.

I wish *eadem referre* were attested in the same sense (as ταῦτ' εἰσφέρειν in Greek, e.g. Dem. *Mid.* 101), but I cannot find an instance. Palaeographically it would be easier than *vicem*; but an Irish *ic* is easily mis-read as a *d*. *Te*, I take it, was then interpolated to stop the gap of a syllable and to supply an object for *referens*.

There still remains the difficulty of *expulit ex clausis foribus*. Lachmann's *aspulit* seems the best correction.

### I. x. 2.

O iucunda quies, primo cum testis amoris  
affueram vestris conscius in lacrimis!

Probably *thalamis*, as Huschke conjectured.

### I. xiii. 21-24.

non sic Haemonio Salmonida mixtus Enipeo  
Taenarius facili pressit amore deus,  
nec sic caelestem flagrans amor Herculis Heben  
sensit in Oetaeis gaudia prima iugis.

*tantus . . . inter utrosque furor* will suggest to anyone who is intimate with Propertian refinements that, of the two mythological testimonies adduced, one

<sup>1</sup> Continued from *Classical Review*, vol. xxviii., Nos. 1 and 3.