

dix to Fornara's article,<sup>25</sup> concerns the possibility that the same mason cut the texts of the Samian Treaty and of the Chromon decree, to be published as *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 145, which preserves little more than the name of its proposer.<sup>26</sup> Fornara suggested in passing that the Chromon decree might in fact belong to the same inscription as the top stones of the Samian Treaty. Quoting the forthcoming *IG* entry, Lewis asserted 'Lapidaria idem n. 48 [the Samian Treaty] incidit', and he stated that the stoichedon pattern and letter-forms of the two documents were indistinguishable. The poor condition of the Chromon stones obscures physical evidence useful for comparison: the marble appears similar but the patterns of veining and fracture are not clear.

As for stoichedon pattern and letter-forms, there seems to be a noticeable difference between the two documents. Most striking is the horizontal compression and expansion of the letter spacing in the Chromon decree (see PLATE IVc) which does not match the more regular appearance of the Samian Treaty; in line 3 of the Chromon decree, for instance, the width of the chequer-units (averaged over groups of several letters) varies remarkably from 13.3 to 15.5 mm. An occasional errant letter would cause no concern but the disarray on the Chromon stones seems systematic and unlike the comparative neatness of the Samian Treaty. The letters also have a different aspect. On the Chromon decree *mu* is more squat, less balanced, and more floating; *pi* and the aspirate are more squat; and *omicron* is generally much larger. The troughs carved by the chisel also seem much larger, though the difference in appearance may be due to varied circumstances of preservation.

Although one cannot disprove Lewis's claim of the identity of the mason of the two sets of stones, we should regard it with scepticism. We have too little evidence, and what we have is too poor to sustain the assertion. Fornara admits: 'Unfortunately I can find nothing in the (meagre) text of these fragments [the Chromon decree] that ties them into the Samian decree.'<sup>27</sup> With no clear epigraphical evidence to link the two decrees, the epigraphist and historian must continue to regard them as separate documents.<sup>28</sup>

ANDREW PHILLIP BRIDGES

Merton College, Oxford

<sup>25</sup> *JHS* xcix (1979) 18–19.

<sup>26</sup> The text of the decree is given in the *IG* i<sup>3</sup> entry reproduced in the appendix cited in n. 25; its two pieces were originally published as *IG* i<sup>2</sup> 141/2 d and *Hesp.* xiv (1945) 94–7 no. 8 (*SEG* x 51).

<sup>27</sup> *JHS* xcix (1979) 17 n. 53.

<sup>28</sup> I should like to thank the Rotary Foundation, the Lancelyn Green Fund (Merton College), and the Charles Oldham Classical Scholarships Fund (University of Oxford) for financial assistance enabling me to study the inscriptions in Greece; I am grateful also to the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and to the British School at Athens for sponsoring my work in the Epigraphical Museum. I am indebted to C. W. Fornara for graciously providing me with a copy of his article before publication and to D. M. Lewis for discussion regarding issues raised by the stones.

### AΙΓΑΙΩΝ in Achilles' Plea to Thetis

When Achilles asks Thetis to plead his cause before Zeus, he urges her to remind the god of her past favours towards him (*Il.* i 396–406):

πολλάκι γάρ σεο πατρός ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἄκουσα  
εὐχομένης, ὄτ' ἔφησθα κελαυνεφεί Κρονίωνι

οἷη ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀεικέα λοίγον ἀμύναι,  
ὅππότε μιν ξυνηῆσαι Ὀλύμπιοι ἤθελον ἄλλοι,  
Ἥρη τ' ἠδὲ Ποσειδάων καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη·  
ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν γ' ἔλθοῦσα, θεά, ὑπελύσασο δεσμῶν,  
ὡχ' ἑκατόγχειρον καλέσασ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,  
ὃν Βριάρεων καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δέ τε πάντες  
Αἰγαίων'—ὁ γὰρ αὐτε βίην οὐ πατρός ἀμείνων—  
ὅς ῥα παρὰ Κρονίωνι καθέζετο κύδει γαίων·  
τὸν καὶ ὑπέδεισαν μάκαρες θεοὶ οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔδησαν.

A major problem attends the phrase ὁ γὰρ αὐτε βίην οὐ πατρός ἀμείνων (*Il.* i 404). It has been suggested that the name *Αἰγαίων* represents a patronymic in *-ίων* based on *Αἰγαῖος*.<sup>1</sup> The suggestion is unexceptionable in itself, in view of the close connexions between Poseidon and Aegae;<sup>2</sup> but it does nothing to resolve the difficulty of supposing that Poseidon was Aegaeon's father and, above all, it does not tell us how the name *Αἰγαίων* is explained by the phrase ὁ γὰρ αὐτε . . . In a note on these words, M. M. Willcock accepted the common view that they give an 'etymological' explanation of the name *Αἰγαίων*, but suggested that they would be more easily intelligible as an explanation of the giant's other name, *Βριάρεως* (after *βριαρός* etc.).<sup>3</sup> Willcock was right to raise this objection. There is no reason to suppose that the father of Aegaeon/Briareos was different from the father of the other giants, and Hesiod specifically says that his father was Uranus (*Th.* 147–9). The paternity of this giant might therefore be a scholarly invention; and not a happy invention, for however strong Aegaeon may have been he could hardly be said to be mightier than Poseidon.<sup>4</sup>

It seems self-evident that the words ὁ γὰρ αὐτε . . . have no significant meaning unless they provide an etymological explanation of what precedes. While, as Willcock says, they would appear to go better with *Βριάρεως*, there must be some way in which they account for the form *Αἰγαίων*. The reason may be that *Αἰγαίων* is a variant of \**αἰγίων*,<sup>5</sup> a comparative adjective with a meaning similar to that of *ἀμείνων* or *ἀρείων*, which has been altered under the powerful influence of *Αἰγαί* and *Αἰγαῖος*.

What grounds are there for postulating the existence of a form \**αἰγίων*? A. Thumb discerned in such words as *αἰγανέη* and *αἰγίς* a stem *αἰγ-* which he thought must have meant originally 'swing' or 'toss'.<sup>6</sup> He considered that this stem had no connexion with that of *αἶξ*, 'goat'. But Thieme discovered a way of reconciling the two stems: he proposed that the original meaning of *αἶξ* was 'creature which moves nimbly' (the stem being cognate with Sanskrit *ej-*).<sup>7</sup> If this suggestion is regarded as plausible, it seems possible that *Αἰγαίων* (<\**Αἰγίων*) means 'the

<sup>1</sup> *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, s.v.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. Schachermeyr, *Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Götterglaubens* (Bern 1950) 21.

<sup>3</sup> *PCPS* clxxxiv (1956–7) 25–6.

<sup>4</sup> I am not, however, convinced by Willcock's subsequent argument that the episode is an invention of the poet. On the contrary, I see it as a fragment of a poetical tradition represented elsewhere in the *Iliad*: cf. E. Hedén, *Homeric Götterstudien* (Uppsala 1912) 43–4; W. Krause, *WS* lxxiv (1949) 10–54; A. Heubeck, *Gymnasium* lxxii (1955) 519; W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*<sup>3</sup> (Darmstadt 1966) 118.

<sup>5</sup> For the formation of personal names in *-ίων* see C. J. Ruijgh, *Minos* ix (1968) 141–7.

<sup>6</sup> *Indogerm. Forsch.* xiv (1903) 345.

<sup>7</sup> *Die Heimat der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache* (AAW Mainz xi 1953) 43. It remains true, as Thumb saw, that both *αἰγανέη* and *αἰγίς* have the underlying sense of 'that which is swiftly-moving'. That fits *αἰγίς* not only in its Homeric meaning ('shield of Zeus and Athene') but in its post-Homeric meaning ('rushing storm'): cf. H. Schrader, *Götter und Menschen Homers* (Stuttgart 1952) 82–3.

swifter one', so called because he is 'swifter' or 'stronger' than his father. I believe that in this way sense can be made of the 'etymologizing' words  $\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\tau\epsilon$ .<sup>8</sup> An etymological explanation of the sort involved here, far from being sophisticated, is in fact one of the naive elements in Homeric poetry. At *Il.* xx 404 also a name is given an 'etymological' explanation of a highly unsophisticated nature:  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota\omicron\nu$ .<sup>9</sup> And, as would be expected in a corpus of poetry which contains many allusions to folk-lore and popular belief, etymological explanations abound in the works of Hesiod.<sup>10</sup>

As is well known, three other passages of the *Iliad* contrast the human and the divine term for one and the same thing: *Il.* ii 813–14, xiv 291, xx 74. In none of these passages, nor elsewhere in the Homeric poems, is there an indication of the motive which has led to the adoption of the human appellation. In each case we are presented with a simple, unexplained opposition: the gods call a certain bird  $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , men call it  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\mu\nu\nu\delta\iota\varsigma$ ; the gods call a river  $\Sigma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ , men call it  $\Xi\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ; and so on. The opposition has been accounted for in three different ways.

(i) The suggestion made by J. van Leeuwen, and sometimes revived, that in these pairs the divine appellation represents what was 'barbarous' or 'had vanished from Greek speech' and the human appellation represents the gloss<sup>11</sup> is rendered untenable if we take account of  $\text{A}\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu/\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ , for both of these terms are transparently Greek.<sup>12</sup>

(ii) The theory which holds that the divine name is a creation of the poets, while the human name belongs to the vernacular language, also fails to account for the  $\text{A}\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu/\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  doublet.<sup>13</sup> If  $\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  was a poetical construction, it is that name, and not  $\text{A}\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ , which would call for an etymological gloss. The poet gives an explanation of  $\text{A}\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$  precisely because it is *not* the usual name of the giant, for the same reason that Hesiod explains his use of the term  $\eta\rho\omega\varsigma$ , *Op.* 159–60.

<sup>8</sup> The  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ , however, seems pointless in Zenodotus' variant  $\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\tau\epsilon$   $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\ \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ , which Wackernagel thought might be the older reading: *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 233. I prefer to regard it as a substitution made by someone to whom 'the history of the gods which is lost to us' (Wackernagel's words) was equally unknown.

<sup>9</sup> Wackernagel (n. 8) 241–2.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. E. Risch, *Eumisia: Festgabe für E. Howald* (Erlenbach/Zürich 1947) 72–91; K. Deichgräber, *ZVS* lxx (1952) 19–28; K. Strunk, *Glotta* xxxviii (1959) 79; W.-L. Liebermann, *Donum Indogermanicum: Festschr. A. Scherer* (Heidelberg 1971) 130–54; M. L. West on Hesiod's *Op.* 3, 66 (1978 edn.).

<sup>11</sup> *Mnem.* xx (1892) 139–40.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. A. Heubeck, *Würzburger Jahrbücher* ii (1949–50) 214.

<sup>13</sup> A theory expounded by H. Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* (Halle 1921) 111. C. Watkins reverts to it, using the ponderous jargon of modern linguistics, whereby Güntert's 'poetical' terms are called 'rarer, more "charged", semantically marked': *Myth and law among the Indo-Europeans: studies in Indo-European comparative mythology* (1970) 2. But the theory is no more acceptable in this guise than it was when put forward by Güntert. We have only to apply Watkins' principle to the passage under consideration to see how meaningless it is; for in what sense can  $\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  be said to be 'semantically marked', in contrast to  $\text{A}\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ ? R. Lazzaroni maintains that 'men call Briareos by the name Aegaeon because he is stronger than his father Poseidon' and that 'men bestow upon Briareos the epithet proper to his father because he is stronger than his father': *Studi linguistici in onore di T. Bollelli* (Pisa 1974) 167, 169. To my mind, Lazzaroni is doubly mistaken in this mode of argumentation: first because he takes it for granted that the giant was regarded as stronger than Poseidon (an assumption which seems to me impossible), but also because he wrongly interprets the text. If this were the only Homeric passage referring to a double system of nomenclature, it might be possible to understand it in the way postulated by Lazzaroni; but our passage should, if possible, be interpreted according to a method which is applicable also to the other Homeric instances of double nomenclature.

(iii) Many scholars, including Güntert and Watkins, have compared the etymological explanations of the Greek poets with passages of the Elder Edda such as *Alvismál* x, which present a whole series of synonyms used by different races of beings: men, aesir, vanir, and so forth. But the comparison is unapt. The recitation of such synonyms points to a profound stylistic difference between Homeric and Eddic poetry. The Eddas are much concerned with the vital importance of *knowledge*, especially knowledge of the appropriate names to bestow on things. In such knowledge great power often resides. But Homer says nothing of this. His heroes are already aware of their own destiny, and they do not have to seek it out by mastering names through the kind of guessing-game described in the Edda.<sup>14</sup>

It seems best, following Lobeck's example, to find no essential difference between the human and the divine terms used by Homer.<sup>15</sup> For, in truth, the divine terms do not amount to a linguistic 'system' of the sort envisaged by the Eddic poets. In Homeric poetry the double terminology is used very sparingly: that it is used at all perhaps arises from a feeling on the part of the epic poets that, if they did not call attention to *some* respects in which gods differ from men, the distinction between them would become intolerably blurred. Immortality the gods had to enjoy, if they were to be distinguished from men in any essential particular. The other differences observed by Homer are not essential, but they do help the listener to keep separate the mortal from the immortal order. For example, the gods dwell in serenity on Olympus; and it may be no coincidence that the only formal description of Olympus is inserted at *Od.* vi 42–46, as if to make it clear that even the Phaeacians, with all their enviable advantages, nevertheless live in circumstances markedly inferior to those of the gods.<sup>16</sup> Other differences are not very significant in themselves, and they should not be invested with a significance which they do not possess. These include the fact that  $\acute{\iota}\chi\omega\rho$  and not  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$  flows in the veins of the gods, that they use ambrosia and nectar as food and drink respectively, and that on occasion they call a person or an object by a name different from that used by mortals.

J. T. HOOKER

University College London

<sup>14</sup> Watkins (n. 13) again goes astray in explaining the word  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  (*Od.* x 305) in terms of black magic. The correct account of the matter is given by J. Clay, *Hermes* c (1972) 127–31.

<sup>15</sup> *Aglaophamus* (Königsberg 1829) 858–63.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. R. Spieker, *Hermes* xcvi (1969) 136–61.

## ΒΟΥΠΠΟΡΟΣ ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ

In the *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110.44–6 Pfeiffer) Callimachus mentioned Mount Athos and the canal dug for Xerxes at the northern end of the Akte Peninsula:

$\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\nu}\alpha\ ]\mu\omega\ ]\nu\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\ ]\pi\epsilon\rho\phi\acute{\epsilon}\ ]\rho\ ]\epsilon\tau\ ]\alpha\iota,$   
 $\beta\omicron\upsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\Lambda}\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\eta\varsigma\ \mu\eta\eta\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omicron,$  και διὰ μέσσου  
 $\text{M}\eta\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \delta\lambda\omicron\alpha\iota\ \nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \acute{\Lambda}\theta\omega.$

Two problems require solutions in these lines: (1) Why is Athos called the 'ox-piercer of Arsinoe'? (2) Who is the descendant of Theia? The second of these problems, I shall argue, is solved by the solution to the first.

Arsinoe, wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, is here given