## ETYMOLOGICA

The naturalistic interpretation of language, especially names common and proper, is as old as the Homeric poems (see e.g. Od. 19. 562-7) and becomes particularly frequent in the lyric poets and Attic tragedy. Being unsystematic and fanciful, it produced many absurdities, but to designate it 'word-play' instead of 'etymology' is to obscure the vital fact that the early poets believed that names might conceal the character or action or destiny of the bearer (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 682) and that in interpreting them they were exercising a species of insight not granted to the layman. The early philosophers adopted the practice from the poets and applied it to the investigation of ultimate truth; when Heraclitus supported his metaphysical arguments on such etymologies

as ξύν νόω λέγοντας ίσχυρίζεσθαι χρή τῷ ξυνῷ πάντων (fr. 114 Diels) he was simply claiming for the philosopher the same kind of insight conceded to the poets. In Pindar especially the practice is so well established that etymologies are regularly introduced by implication, i.e. without an assertion that the subject is 'properly' or 'truly' named; in this category are e.g. Ol. 2. 53-6 Snell (cf. G. Norwood, Pindar, p. 137), Ol. 6. 38, 47, 55 (Norwood p. 252 n. 45), Nem. 2. 8 (cf. Fennell), Pyth. 2. 72–3  $(x\alpha\lambda\delta c/x\alpha\lambda\lambda\lambda\alpha c)$ . In Aeschylus, on the other hand, etymologies are more often than not explicit, and for names 'properly' assigned we have δρθώνυμος (Ag. 699-700), δρθῶς (Sept. 829), άληθως (Suppl. 314), εὐλόγως (fr. 27. 3 Mette), ἐτητύμως (Ag. 682, Cho. 948), given by R. Pfeiffer, Sitzgsb. Bayer. Akad., Phil.-hist. Abt. 1938. 2. 9 n. 2, ἐτύμως 1) and probably δοχίμως (δοχίμως πολυπενθή in Pers. 547 seems to etymologise πολυπενθή as = πολλών ἀνδρών πενθητικόν). In the following notes I am concerned only with etunos and its reduplicated form etnujos (Frisk, Griech. Etym. Wört., pp. 580-1, s. v.  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi c$ ), since the special use of these words has often been mishandled by editors and lexicographers. In LSJ 9, for instance, the etymological sense of Etumos is represented as starting with Aristotle and έτυμος λόγος in Pind. Pyth. 1. 68, which I shall deal with here, is parcelled up with  $\varphi \eta \mu \eta \nu$ έτυμον in Eur. El. 818. The etymological sense of ἐτήτυμος seems not to exist; ἐτήτυμος Διὸς χόρα in Aesch. Cho. 948-9 is not differentiated from ετήτυμος παις in Soph. Tr. 1064, and πρέσβυς έτητυμίη μεμελημένος in Call. Aet. 3. fr. 75. 76 (Pf.) appears to instance  $\epsilon \tau \eta \tau \upsilon \mu i \alpha = truth$ , whereas the old man, Xenomedes of Ceos (cf. Pfeiffer on 1. 54), was notoriously addicted to etymologies. If this is a true picture of the history of these words, we can but wonder why, as Verrall said, the essentially poetical etupos was appropriated entirely for etymological terminology in late prose (to etupov, etupologeiv, έτυμολογία). I list here five early passages illustrating this special use.

<sup>1)</sup> Fourteen Aeschylean instances of ἔτυμος and ἐτήτυμος were collected by Verrall, Sept., App. ii, but his conclusions, contested by Headlam, are in some cases too extravagant to be credible. For more recent literature see K. Strunk, 'Frühe Vokalveränderungen in der griechischen Literatur', Glott. xxxviii (1960). 77. n. 3.

 Pind. Pyth. 1. 67—70 (beginning of ἀντ. δ'): Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰεὶ δὲ τοιαύταν ᾿Αμένα παρ' ὕδωρ αἰσαν ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν διακρίνειν ἔτυμον λόγον ἀνθρώπων. σύν τοι τίν κεν ἁγητὴρ ἀνήρ, υίῷ τ' ἐπιτελλόμενος, δᾶμον γεραίρων τράποι σύμφωνον ἐς ἡσυχίαν.

In l. 60 Pindar calls upon his muse to join with him in a hymn of praise for Dinomenes, the regent of the new Syracusan foundation, Aetna, to which Hiero the founder has paid honour by having himself proclaimed as an Aetnaean after his victory. The hymn develops in the form of a parallel drawn between the Dorians of the Peloponnese, their political creed and military prowess in occupying Amyclae, and the Dorians of Aetna, who Pindar prays may likewise achieve political unity and so withstand the Carthaginians and Etruscans, already defeated by Hiero off Cumae (71 ff.). The sense correspondence between strophe and antistrophe is precise, and 67-70 are paralleled by 62-5 in the strophe: 'It is the desire of the descendants of Pamphylus and, verily, of the Heraclidae too, who dwell beneath the heights of Taÿgetus (ὄχθαις ὕπο Ταϋγέτου ναίοντες), ever to abide (alei μένειν) as Dorians in the statutes of Aegimius.' τοιαύταν αίσαν means, therefore, the maintenance of Dorian political institutions, which is the necessary condition to unity within the city and security from outside foes; Gildersleeve's notion that it refers to θεοδμάτω σύν έλευθερία, predicated of Aetna in 61-2, would leave the Peloponnesian parallel without any point.

The question now arises, what is the subject of  $\delta i\alpha x \rho i v \epsilon i v$ (= 'to mark off', as a piece of ground, Ol. 10. 46, or 'to pronounce, determine an issue', Ol. 8. 24). Boeckh, followed by Gildersleeve, Farnell and Norwood, p. 103<sup>2</sup>), thought that it was  $\xi \tau u \mu o v \lambda \delta \gamma o v$ ; Gildersleeve renders, 'Grant that the judgment of the world may with truth assign such a lot to citizens and kings.' Pindar, however, for all his appreciation of the power of human report, knew very well that it did not presume to mete out human destiny, and to assert that it did, after a solemn invocation of Zeus Teleios, would have been

144

<sup>2)</sup> Mommsen also agreed, but suggested dog totav for totavtav on the strength of the scholiast's  $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \chi \sigma \omega$ . But for the acc. and infin. of wish cf. Pyth. 2. 24.

tantamount to blasphemy. The dispensation of aloa was the prerogative of Moira or Zeus, and neither needed the λόγον ἀνθρώπων as intermediary. Alternatively, to take διαχρίνειν as imperative in force, with Zeus as the subject (so Schroeder) leaves us with aloav and loyov as two strange objects in apposition. aloav, then, is the subject (so Hermann, although he missed Pindar's point), and we should render, 'O Zeus the Perfecter, may ever a like portion by the waters of Amenas, for citizens and kings, pronounce men's account to be a true one.' What account is meant? The etymological account of Amenas, alel  $\mu$   $\varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \nu$ , supplied in advance in the strophe and reasserted by alel in emphatic position at the beginning of the antistrophe. Unless valortes in 64 is also intended to suggest alel/valeiv  $= A \tilde{\iota} \tau v \alpha$ , which is doubtful, the stream Amenas alone is being etymologised as an omen for the city built on its banks. Pindar's motive is clear: since Amenas or Amenanos, the feeble, was notoriously irregular in flow (Ov. Met. 15. 280, Strabo 240), he is at pains to repudiate an etymology which would have augured ill for the new foundation, and to maintain that the etymology which proved the opposite was also the popular one. For further etymological activity over the new foundation see Aesch. Altvalal fr. 27 Mette. If this interpretation is right, it would be tempting to take σύμφωνον in the double sense 'harmonious' and 'concordant with the name' (cf. Plat. Crat. 395e, και τελευτήσαντι έν "Αιδου ή ύπερ της κεφαλής τοῦ λίθου ταλαντεία θαυμαστή ώς σύμφωνος τῷ ὀνόματι, sc. Ταντάλω).

(2) Aesch. Eum. 532—4: ξύμμετρον δ' ἔπος λέγω, Ι δυσσεβίας μὲν ὕβρις Ι τέχος ὡς ἐτύμως.

## (3) Ion of Chios fr. 4. 3—4 Diels: είπερ Πυθαγόρης ἐτύμως σοφός, <öς> περὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων γνώμας εἶδε καὶ ἐξέμαθεν.

In l. 3 I adopt the conjecture proposed by F. H. Sandbach, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. clxxxv. n.s. 5. p. 36, instead of the reading ėτύμως δ σοφός given by Diog. Laert. 1. 119, and follow him in construing ἀνθρώπων, separately from περὶ πάντων, with γνώμας. Why has Ion seen fit here to illustrate Pythagoras' σοφίη on the after life by appeal to his knowledge of other men's γνῶμαι? Perhaps, as Sandbach suggests, he is hinting that Pythagoras drew the views on immortality which he fathered on Orpheus from the Egyptians. But ἐτύμως indicates that the process of thought has been actuated by something more elementary, viz. the etymology of Pythagoras' name. ἐτύμως σοφός directs attention to  $\sqrt{\pi u\theta}$  and  $\sqrt{\alpha \gamma o \rho \alpha}$ , and the clause δς . . . ἐξέμαθεν provides the proof that Pythagoras was 'wise in accordance with his name'.

(4) Pind. Ol. 10. 49—55: καὶ πάγον | Κρόνου προσεφθέγξατο πρόσθε γὰρ | νώνυμνος, ἄς Οἰνόμαος ἄρχε, βρέχετο πολλᾶ νιφάδι. ταύτα δ' ἐν πρωτογόνω τελετᾶ ! παρέσταν μὲν ἄρα Μοῖραι σχεδὸν | ὅ τ' ἐξελέγχων μόνος | ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον | Χρόνος.

The context is the institution of the Olympian Games by Heracles. The traditional name of the Hill of Kronos, being apparently regarded as a slight to Zeus, the vanquisher of Kronos, is reinterpreted here with all the resources available to Pindar.  $\pi \dot{\alpha}\gamma \sigma \nu$  has already been etymologised correctly with  $\pi \dot{\alpha}\xi \alpha \varsigma$  in 1. 45, and now, with appeals to myth, 'chronology' and the sanction of the Molpan, Koóvou is outrageously connected with Xρόνος, for 'Time alone can put the genuine truth (sc. of a name) to the proof'. For  $\dot{\epsilon} t \dot{\eta} \tau \mu \rho \sigma r$ . 7. 63 and for  $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$ )', looks for the etymology indeed repel oblivion ( $\dot{\alpha} - \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta - \epsilon \iota \alpha$ )', looks for the etymology in the wrong place.

(5) Aesch. Ag. 160—75: Ζεύς, ὅστις πότ' ἐστιν, εἰ τόδ' αὐ- Ι τῷ φίλον κεκλημένψ, Ι τοῦτό νιν προσεννέπω. Ι οὐκ ἔχω προσηκάσαι Ι πάντ' ἐπισταθμώμενος Ι πλὴν Διός, εἰ τὸ μάταν ἀπὸ φροντίδος ἄχθος Ι χρὴ δικεῖν ἐτητύμως. οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας Ι παμμάχψ θράσει βρύων, Ι οὐδὲ λέξεται πρὶν ὤν· ὃς δ' ἔπειτ' ἔφυ, τρια- | ϰτῆρος οἴχεται τυχών. | Ζῆνα δέ τις προφρόνως ἐπινίκια κλάζων | τεύξεται φρενῶν τὸ πᾶν· ==

166 βαλεϊν codd. δικεϊν βαλεϊν Hesych. cf. Verrall, Sept. p. 144.

M's original reading προσημάσαι, which I have verified from the facsimile, yields, with the accentuation corrected,  $\pi \rho \sigma \eta \varkappa \dot{\alpha}$ σαι άπ.  $\lambda$ εγ., 'to put in the scale before'. σηχός is basically an enclosure, and the simple on nation means 'to pen', as animals or men (Il. 8. 131, Xen. Hell. 3. 2. 4) or even πυρούς καί άστάχυας (Orph. fr. 268). Neither word is found in the sense 'scale', but the scale as an enclosure for wares is a natural image (cf.  $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \mu \delta \varsigma$ ), and  $\sigma \eta \kappa \sigma \delta \nu$ ,  $\sigma \eta \kappa \omega \mu \alpha$  (the thing scaled, *i. e.* weight, load) and avtionxoc, avtionxouv (e. g. Aesch. Pers. 437) prove that this sense existed. Words for 'to scale' are not in common demand, while a word for 'to counter-scale' is; hence the lack of evidence for σηκός, σηκάζειν and of classical evidence for  $\sigma\eta x o \tilde{v} v$ , and the abundance of classical evidence for avtigniouv etc. With this reading we establish a uniform μώμενος and τὸ μάταν ἄχθος, to match the wrestling metaphor of the antistrophe.

Fraenkel's note on 681 ff., the Helen etymology, acknowledges the special sense of  $\epsilon\tau\eta\tau\circ\mu\omega\varsigma$  there, but although he notes Aeschylus' preoccupation with the god and his name in 160–2 and, oddly, cross-references  $\epsilon\tau\eta\tau\circ\mu\omega\varsigma$  166 with  $\epsilon\tau\eta\tau\circ\mu\omega\varsigma$  682, he finds no etymology here. The chorus' difficulty, stated with  $Z\epsilon\circ\varsigma$ ,  $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \pi\circ\tau'$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iotav$ , is to find for the god his proper name, *i.e.* the name which conforms with his nature, and since even to invoke the god as  $Z\epsilon\circ\varsigma$  prejudges the issue, the name  $Z\epsilon\circ\varsigma$  is said to be provisionally accepted ( $\epsilon\epsilon$ .....  $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\nu\epsilon\pi\omega$ ). The subject is then divided into two parts; the strophe deals with  $\Delta l\alpha$ , the antistrophe with  $Z\eta\nu\alpha$ . The two solutions are presented in emphatic position at the beginning of the corresponding lines 165 and 174, where the change from trochees to 'mantic' dactyls emphasises that the solution comes only by prophetic insight.

In the strophe the  $\varphi \rho o \nu \tau i \varsigma$ , which here, as in Ag. 912, is the faculty which cares, is conceived as a balance, with the god

<sup>163</sup> προσεικάσαι ex προσηκασαι corr. M: προσηκάσαι scripsi

set in one scale and a succession of possible names being tried in the other.  $\Delta \iota \delta \varsigma$  165 is not the god but the name, which properly understood enables the chorus to discard the others as being a 'futile weight' in the scale, μάταν ἄχθος sc. σηχοῦ, a phrase probably suggested to Aeschylus by ετώσιον αχθος αρούρης, Il. 18. 104 (cf. γης άλλως άχθη, Plat. Theaet. 176 d). "As I bring all names to the balance, I cannot put in the scale first any save  $\Delta \alpha$ , if it be granted me to throw, dixeiv, in the proper meaning of the word, from my pondering heart those that would be but a futile weight in the scale." What Fraenkel's rendering of βαλείν ετητύμως, 'to cast in real truth', means I am unsure, but if it means 'to cast thoroughly' or 'successfully' (and he maintains it is the opposite of Baleiv matny), it presumes an unparalleled sense for ετητύμως. If, alternatively, it means 'to cast in the proper sense of the word', it is otiose unless it refers implicitly to dixeiv. Like Verrall, I believe that the etymology should here be explicit and dixeiv restored to the text from the Hesychius lemma. Zeus was the throwing god, and since Cho. 949 gives us  $\Delta i \varkappa \alpha = \epsilon \tau \eta \tau \upsilon \mu \circ \varsigma \Delta i \circ \varsigma \varkappa \circ \rho \alpha$ , Aeschylus' etymological grouping seems to be  $\Delta i\alpha$ , direir,  $\delta ir$ .

In the antistrophe the chorus eliminates Uranos and Kronos, both dead and gone, from the list of possible contenders, and then realise, with a flash of insight, that Zeus is the living god,  $Z\eta\nu\alpha$   $\zeta\eta\nu$ . This etymology seems, as Zeller suggested, to be involved in Heraclitus fr. 32 Diels, and perhaps from him via Cratylus derives Plat. Crat. 396a—b (with a philosophical development):  $\sigma\mu\mu\beta\alpha(\nu\epsilon\iota \ o\nu\ o\rho\theta\omega\varsigma \ o\nu\mu\alpha \zetaeoθaι oυτος δ θεός είναι, δι' δν ζην del πασι τοις ζωσιν υπάρ$ χει διείληπται δὲ δίχα, ώσπερ λέγω, ἕν δν τὸ ὄνομα, τῷ "Διὶ"καὶ τῷ "Ζηνί"; cf. Eur. Or. 1635, Ζηνός γὰρ ουσαν ζην νιν (sc.'Ελένην) ἄφθιτον χρεών. For τεύξεται in an etymologising context cf. τυχόντες καλῶς Cho. 951, and ἐν τύχα Ag. 685.

The University of Sydney Australia

J. H. Quincey