

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](#)



Notes and Emendations

J. U. Powell

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 06 / September 2012, pp 181 - 183

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00200279, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00200279

How to cite this article:

J. U. Powell (1912). Notes and Emendations. The Classical Review, 26, pp 181-183
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00200279

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

93 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι· ἐς δὲ τὸ ΠΑΝ
ἙΡΜΗΝΕΩΝ

is tautometric with

101 αὐδάσσομαι ἐνὸρκιον ΛΟΓΟΝ ἀλαθεῖ
ΝΟΩΙ.

Hermes and *Nous*, Pan and *Logos*—these are the expressions which will be φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι. Zielinski (*Arch. f. Religionswiss.* ix. p. 34) points out that Plato (*Kratylus* 408 D ἐστὶν ἥτοι Λόγος ἢ Λόγου ἀδελφός ὁ Πάν, εἴπερ Ἑρμοῦ υἱός ἐστιν) 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: *Noûs* (= Zeus), *Noûs δημιουργός* (= Hermes), and *Λόγος*. 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 pæans. 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. 174⁴) pointed out another case in this ode:

19 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ
85 πόσις ὁ πάντων Ῥέας (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 αὐδάσσομαι λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόφ 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 Φεῖδῶς φυᾶ·
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι
παγγλωσσία, κόρακες ὥς, ἄκραντα γαρ-
νέτον
Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

Pindar is, of course, the σοφός, 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 πάγ-γλωσσοι: their *logos* comes only from the tongue; it is mere chattering (τὸ λαλαγήσαι, l. 106), not fathered by the Mind. As Heracleitus says, πολυμαθὴ νῶον οὐ διδάσκει. Bacchylides, a few years later (468 B.C.), openly takes up Pindar's challenge in Ode III. 85 φρονέοντι συνετὰ γάρυω—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 πάγ-γλωσσος κόραξ, but a μελίγλωσσος ἀηδών (l. 96). If the cap fitted so well, Bacchylides and Simonides must be the pair of crows.

F. M. CORNFORD.

Cambridge.

NOTES AND EMENDATIONS.

THUCYDIDES V. 103, 1.

Ἑλπίς δὲ κινδύνφ παραμύθιον οὔσα κ.τ.λ.

Editors have long felt that the sense required by the passage is 'an encourage-

ment 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:

ἐλπίς καὶ κίνδυνος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν
ὁμοῖοι,
οὗτοι γὰρ χαλεποὶ δαίμονες ἀμφότεροι.

There translate: 'Hope and the Spirit of Adventure'; and write Κίνδυνος with a capital letter.

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

φράζο· Κίνδυνός τοι ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἴσταται
ἀκμῆς,

and perhaps 585

πᾶσιν τοι κίνδυνος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν, οὐδέ
τις οἶδεν
πῇ σχήσειν μέλλει, πρήγματος ἀρχο-
μένου.

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

So again in Pindar, *Pythian* iv. 125:

τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας;
τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος δῆσεν
ἄλοις;

the point is given exactly by the Scholiast:

ποία ἰσχυρὰ καὶ κινδυνώδης ἀναγκὴ
παρώρμησεν;

where ὥρμησε is correctly used of an inward impulse.

With this key, we can now approach the dative κινδύνῳ. Παραμυθεῖσθαι with the dative 'to stimulate, encourage' is found in the *Iliad* I. 417, Καὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἐγὼ παραμυθησαίμην, I. 684, O. 45.

The substantive παραμύθιον, then, may have a dative after it, like Plato, *Euthyphro*, 17 C δόσις θεοῖς; *Rep.* 493 D διακονία πόλει. *Apol.* 30 A ὑπηρεσία with dative: Kühner, ii. 1, p. 427. An exact parallel is found in the use of παρακελεύομαι and παρακέλευσις: the verb takes a dative; and for παρακέλευσις followed by a dative see Plato, *Sympos.* 182 D:

ἡ παρακέλευσις τῷ ἐρῶντι παρὰ πάντων
θαυμαστῇ.

The passage then should be written 'Ελπίς δὲ Κινδύνῳ παραμύθιον οὔσα, and translated 'Hope is an encouragement to the Spirit of Adventure.' Κίνδυνος will be another of the personified abstracts like Πενίη, 'Αμυχανίη, Πειθώ and 'Αναγκαίη in *Hdt.* viii. 111, Εὐλάβεια *Eur. Phoen.* 782, 'Ελπίς *Iph. Aul.* 392, and *Theognis* 1135: all called θεοί.

THUCYDIDES VI. 78, 3:

καὶ εἰ γνώμη ἀμάρτοι, τοῖς αὐτοῦ κακοῖς
ὀλοφυρθεῖς κ.τ.λ. So edd.

Editors have not decided whether ὀλοφυρθεῖς is used here in a passive or a middle sense. But it seems clear that ὀλοφυρθεῖς 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 ἰδίαις συμφοραῖς ὀλοφυρόμενος, where again the meaning is uncertain. It is true that Thucydides elsewhere vii. 30, ii. 46 (ἀπολοφ-), viii. 81 (ἀνολ-) uses ὠλοφυράμην, not ὠλοφύρην, in the middle sense; but he also uses the two forms of the aorist of μέφομαι in the middle sense (see Veitch s.v. ὀλοφύρομαι), ἐμεμφάμην in iii. 61, ii. 64, and ἐμέμφθην in iv. 85, 1. May we not conjecture here εἰ γνώμη ἀμάρτοι, <ἐπὶ> τοῖς αὐτοῦ κακοῖς ὀλοφυρθεῖς, 'lamenting over?' The preposition would give a lawful construction.

SOPHOCLES, *Oedipus Rex*, 1492-1495:

ἄλλ' ἤνικ' ἂν δὴ πρὸς γάμων ἦκητ'
ἀκμάς,
τίς οὗτος ἔσται, τίς παραρρίψει, τέκνα,
τοιαῦτ' ὄνειδη λαμβάνων, ἃ ταῖς ἐμαῖς
γοναῖσιν ἔσται σφῶν θ' ὁμοῦ δηλήματα.

So Jebb, for MSS. τοῖς ἐμοῖς γονεῦσιν, 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

ἃ ταῖσιν αἰς
γοναῖσιν ἔσται σφίν θ' ὁμοῦ δηλήματα.

There seems no valid reason for questioning the use of *σφιν* as a dative singular. The passages in which it occurs have been discussed by Jebb on *Oedipus Coloneus*, 1489, where *σφιν* is used clearly referring to *ἄρ' ἐγγὺς ἀνὴρ*; 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., <i>Eumen.</i>	462	with <i>νιν</i> .
" <i>Suppl.</i>	760	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>Pers.</i>	348	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>Sept.</i>	689	" <i>πως</i> .
" <i>Agam.</i>	1123	" <i>τφ</i> .
" <i>Suppl.</i>	399	" <i>περ</i> .
Soph., <i>Phil.</i>	741	" <i>τφ</i> .
" <i>Phil.</i>	824	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>Aj.</i>	829	" <i>του</i> .
" <i>Phil.</i>	446	" <i>πω</i> .
" <i>O.C.</i>	972	" <i>πω</i> .
" <i>O.C.</i>	896	" <i>περ</i> .
Eur., <i>Alc.</i>	181	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>El.</i>	892	" <i>τφ</i> .

The phrase in 1486 *καὶ σφὼ δακρύω* and 1488 *οἶον βιώναι σφὼ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων χρεῶν* immediately before,

and the general tenor of the speech, which ends in 1511 with

σφῶν δ', ὦ τέκν', εἰ μὲν εἰχέτην ἤδη φρένας, πόλλ' ἂν παρήνουν,

may well have caused the mistake *σφῶν* 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 Λαῖου <παλαί-
φατα> θέσφατ' ἐξαιρούσιν ἤδη*

though the addition *παλαίφατα* is not certain, Mekler's conjecture *Δαλίου* 'the Delian God' is much more appropriate to the context than *Λαῖου*. *Ταῖσιν αἰς* is Sophoclean: Prof. Housman, I find, has restored the possessive relative pronoun with his *τοῖσιν οἷς γόνοισιν*, which is adopted by Prof. Tyrrell in his text: but *γοναῖσιν*, as Kennedy argued, and as the Index shows, is more Sophoclean than *γόνοισιν*.

J. U. POWELL.

Oxford.

LUCANEA.

MR. SMALE'S notes in *Classical Review*, Vol. XXV., No. 7 (November, 1911), suggest some remarks:

Bk. IV. 618.

*colla diu grauibus 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 immovable."' 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 cervix lassata quati, tum pectore pectus urgueri*. . . . 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 l. 422.

¹ I follow Hosius' designation of the MSS.