

D'altra parte in epoca arcaica la voce di un poeta o di un oratore viene descritta proprio come un liquido che fluisce omogeneo e ininterrotto o che viene riversato dalla bocca: *ῥέει ἀνδρή* (A 249; Esiodo, *Teogonia* 39, 97 = *Inno omerico* XXV 5; cfr. *Inno ad Afrodite* 237, τ 521, Esiodo, *Scudo* 396). Questo ritmico scorrere sembra essere tra i requisiti tecnici essenziali della comunicazione orale<sup>2</sup>), ed è perciò dono ambito delle Muse, divinità acquatiche (ad esempio *Teogonia* 96–97; cfr. F. Solmsen, T.A.Ph.A. 85, 1954, pp. 6 e 8, R.B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge 1951, p. 67). Per la concezione fluida della dizione, il parallelo più vicino a *οὐδ' ἀφαρματοεπής* è *ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύει* / -ων di θ 171 e di Esiodo, *Teogonia* 86, due passi tra loro in rapporto molto dibattuto (cfr. H. Schwabl, *RE*, Supplb. XII, 1970, s.v. *Hesiodos*, col.482). *ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύει* va interpretato con Walter Marg (*Hesiod. Sämtliche Gedichte*, Zürich/Stuttgart 1970, p. 31): „er spricht ohne Straucheln“, cioè senza fratture ritmiche. Così intendeva anche Elio Aristide, *Sulla retorica* II 131 Dindorf, che rendeva *ἀσφαλέως* con *ἀπταλστως* (e si ricordi il valore ritmico-eufonico implicito nel termine *ἀπταισία* di Platone, *Leggi* 669e).

Dunque con *ἀφαρματοεπής* in Γ 215a l'attenzione non è rivolta tanto al senso, inopportuno, delle parole (come accade nel semplice *ἀμαρτοεπής*, in *ἀμαρτάνειν μύθων* e in espressioni simili usate da Platone e Sofocle), ma solo sulla forma espressiva, disdicevole, delle parole: per errore si intende qui la mancanza di ritmo e di toni uniformemente adeguati.

## A Note on the Etymologies of *διάκτορος* and *χρυσάορος*

By R. JANKO, Cambridge

The epithet *διάκτορος*, used solely of Hermes in early Greek epic, has for long eluded scholarship's attempts at an explanation. In ancient times various ideas were offered, most of which can readily be rejected. The only one still worthy of consideration is the derivation from *διάγω*, with the apparent meaning 'conductor': it appears to be thought to mean *ἡγεμών* by the poet of the Hymn to Hermes (v. 392). Even this view has fared badly in modern times, as it is

<sup>2</sup>) Cfr. l'analisi di C. O. Pavese, *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*, Rom 1974, pp. 43-44.

accepted in this century only by K. F. Ameis<sup>1</sup>) (ad *Od.* 1.84), who is followed by J. Chittenden (p. 29). Ameis suggests that the epithet is derived from the rare word *διάκτωρ*, just as *χρυσάορος* is from *χρυσάωρ*. Chantraine (s. v.), summarising the position in 1968, joins Frisk (s. v.) in dismissing without qualms any connexion with *διάγω*. The latter further suggests that, as in the case of *διάκων* formed after *διάκονος* (or, better, *τιμάορα* after *τιμάορος*, Aesch. *Supp.* 42), *διάκτωρ* is a back-formation from *διάκτορος*. Neither appears satisfied with the suggestions of Østergaard (from *\*kter-* as in *κτέρας*, *Hermes* 37 p. 333ff.) or Thieme's derivation from *\*δια-ακτ-τορος*, and thus they are left without a positive suggestion.

But the word *διάκτωρ* repays further investigation. It occurs only twice: in the Doric epigrammatist Bianor (A.P. X 101), *βοντὰν διάκτορα*: and in Hesychius, in the gloss *διάκτορσι· ἡγεμόσι, βασιλεῦσι*. These glosses are sometimes taken from Arcado-Cypriot dialectal sources, which often present interesting archaisms—for example, the derivation of *ἐριώνιος* from the root seen in the Arcadian gloss *οὔνει· δεῦρο, δράμε*, also found in Hesychius. But of course it could be from other dialects. There is no need to suppose that it is a late back-formation, and a cursory examination of Buck and Petersen reveals a few parallels for the development, mostly but not all late:

*ἀλάστορος* (Pherecyd., trag.) — *ἀλάστωρ* (trag.): *προπάτορος* (Epi-phanes, not in LSJ) — *προπάτωρ* (Pind., Hdt.): *τετραίστορον* (Tzetzes), *πολύιστορος* (Schol. Lyc. 5): *ἀλέκτορον* (P. Lond. 1259.25, saec. iv A.D.) — *ἀλέκτωρ*.

A learned scholiast of the first century B.C. gives us a long list of examples of this type of fluctuation (P. Oxy 1087 col. i 21ff., on H 76: = Erbse II p. 223<sup>2</sup>). Nine of his twenty-four examples are drawn from early epic, and seven more from writers of before the fifth century; the Suda (s. v. *Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀλεξανδρεύς*) and other sources attest the existence of treatises on *παρώνυμα*, one of which was apparently used by the scholiast here. His examples are not limited to stems in *r*, of which he gives four—*ἀπάτωροι* < *ἀπάτωρ* in the Wedding of Ceyx (fr. 179 M-W), (*ἐπι*-)*μάρτυρος* < *μάρτυς* (H 76 al.), *χρυσάορος* and *διάκτορος*. We do not need to resort to lexicographical methods to show that one of his other examples does support the drift from athematic to thematic declension: for

<sup>1</sup>) References are to works listed at the end of this article.

<sup>2</sup>) I owe my knowledge of this scholion to the kindness of Prof. Erbse. cf. H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* II, Berlin 1971.

*Χαρόποιό τ' ἀνακτος* (B 672, cf. *Χάρον* A 426) must have replaced an earlier *Χάροπός τε ἀνακτος*, where digamma is admissible. The scholiast suggests that the shift in declension is mediated through the athematic genitive singular in -ος, and we shall see that there is some evidence to support this, at least for the two adjectives with which we are here concerned.

Before discussing *χρυσάορος* in detail, it may be worth noting that the frequent compounds in -άορος from the root of *ἀείρω* (< \**ǵFérew*) are probably not connected with *ἄορ*, if the Mycenaean man's name a-o-ri-me-ne (PY Qa 1296) is correctly interpreted as [*Ahorimenēs*], without an internal *w*. Moreover, the compounds such as *παρήορος* give no indication of ever having been athematic: at best they do no more than provide an analogy for the shift in declension, and Chantraine's observation, that the variety of persons who are given the epithet *χρυσάορος* may be due to a connexion with *ἀείρω*, may rest on no more than an ancient popular etymology, or even the extension of an epithet whose exact signification had been forgotten to deities for whom it was inappropriate.

Although F. Sommer (p. 135ff.) and E. Risch (pp. 6–7, 183–4) do not commit themselves as to which form is earlier, Hoekstra (p. 23) follows Zumbach (p. 6) in suggesting that *χρυσάωρ* is more archaic than *χρυσάορος*. It will be helpful to tabulate the uses of the two forms (they are applied to Apollo unless stated):

athematic	thematic
nom. Proper name, <i>Theog.</i> 281, 287	( <i>δολιχάορος Phoronis</i> ap. POxy 2260, Philetas 23, both of Athena)
acc. <i>Erga</i> 771, <i>Del. Ap.</i> 123 Pind. <i>Py.</i> V 104	O 256, M-W fr. dub. 357.3
gen. —	E 509, <i>Pyth. Ap.</i> 395, <i>Hy.</i> 27.3: <i>Dem.</i> 4 (of Demeter): Oracle ap. Hdt. VIII 77 (of Artemis)
dat. Proper name, <i>Theog.</i> 979	Ap. Rhod. III 1283 plur. <i>χρυσάοραις</i> Pind. ap. POxy. 1087

The change from athematic to thematic declension seems to be mediated through the genitive singular in the formula *Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσάορου*, before a vowel at the bucolic diaeresis (E 509, *Py. Ap.* 395, reversed at *Hy.* 27.3). The alternative *χρυσάορος* is not found, but could well have stood here once. In the other cases the forms are not interchangeable. We may suppose that, at some point in the tradition, it was no longer understood as a genitive and a

P. A. Hansen, DAA 374—375 and the Early Elegiac Epigram 195

thematic form was substituted. It is my belief that *διάκτορος* suffered the same fate.

Like *χρυσάορος*, *διάκτορος* gravitates to the space before the bucolic diaeresis. A formula similar in shape to *Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσάορον* did exist: *Ερμείας διακτόρον* (μ 390), cf. ο 319, *Aphr.* 147–8. If *διάκτορος* (genitive) once stood there, passage from one declension to the other would not be difficult, particularly if there were a line with scope for taking the epithet as agreeing with a noun in the nominative instead of in the genitive, especially if the true meaning and derivation of the epithet had been forgotten. In fact the epic tradition does preserve such a line:

*Ζηνὸς ἐφημοσύνησι διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης* (*Aphr.* 213)

Here *διάκτορος* could well be ambiguous. Although I would not dare to suggest on this evidence that the epithet was originally peculiar to Zeus, it is eminently suitable for him in the meaning given for *διάκτωρ* by Hesychius.

References: C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, Chicago 1944; K. F. Ameis and C. Hentze's commentary on the *Odyssey*, Leipzig 1920; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue grecque*, A–Δ, Paris 1968; J. Chittenden, 'Diaktoros Argeiphontes' *AJA* 52 (1948) 24–33; H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960–70; A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Oral Tradition*, 1969; E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2nd. ed. 1974; F. Sommer, *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Nominalkomposita* Abh. Bayr. Ak. d. Wiss. 27 (1948); O. Zumbach, *Neuerungen in der Sprache der homerischen Hymnen*, 1955.

## DAA 374—375 and the Early Elegiac Epigram

By P. A. HANSEN, Oxford

While formally being a refutation of certain combinations of inscribed fragments from the Athenian Acropolis, the following pages discuss various points of general interest in connexion with early verse inscriptions. The most important is the chronology and earliest history of the elegiac epigram; other comments are concerned with phraseology and word order; the use of the dual; etc.

IG i<sup>2</sup>. 739 and 740 were tentatively combined by A. E. Raubitschek in his DAA<sup>1</sup>) to form one dedication, and, completing the restora-

<sup>1</sup>) DAA = Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis (1949); other abbreviations are listed in e.g. L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic*