Bruce Karl Braswell

Adolf Roemer, Zu Aristarch und den Aristonicusscholien der Odyssee, Blätter f. d. bayr. Gymnasialschulwesen 21, 1885, 273–293 u. 369–399 (auch als Sonderdruck erschienen).

Adolf Roemer, Homerische Studien, Abh. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl. 22, 1905, 387-452.

Martin Schmidt, Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias, München 1976 (Zetemata Heft 62). Albert Severyns, Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, Liège u. Paris

1928 (Bibliothèque Liège 40).

Marchinus van der Valk, Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad, 2 Bde., Leiden 1963/64.

Ζαμενής: A lexicographical Note on Pindar

By Bruce Karl Braswell, Berlin

The adjective $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \zeta$ occurs eight times in the extant text of Pindar. In four of these instances, Pyth.~4.10,~9.38,~Nem.~3.63, frag. 156.1 Snell-Maehler, the word is alleged by the latest author of a Pindar lexicon to mean "inspired" and to be used especially "of those with prophetic gifts" 1). Although this particular sense of the word has not been claimed for its use elsewhere in Greek, it seems generally to have become the received interpretation of its meaning in the first two at least of these passages 2). Since this supposed sense is markedly at variance with the usual meaning attested for the word ("very strong", "mighty", "fierce"), it would be of interest to interpreters of Pindar in particular and to lexicographers in general to consider the available evidence.

Let us examine first the formation of the compound. The initial element ζa -, familiar as the Aeolic form of $\delta \iota a$ -, appears as an

Copyright (c) 2007 ProQuest LLC Copyright (c) Vandenhoek und Ruprecht

182

¹⁾ W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), s.v. For his friendly criticism of an earlier version of the following study I am endebted to Prof. L. Woodbury.

²) For some examples of commentators and translators who have adopted this interpretation over the past hundred years see the relevant works of Fennell (1879–83, 1893–99²), Mezger (1880), Gildersleeve (1885, 1890²) who is partly sceptical, Bury (1890), Puech (1922–23), Farnell (1930–32), Lattimore (1947), Werner (1967), and Conway (1972). Cf. also I. Rumpel, Lexicon Pindaricum (Leipzig, 1883), s.v., who cites Fennell's "inspired" as a translation of $\zeta \alpha \mu e \nu \dot{\eta}_{\varsigma}$ for Pyth. 9.38 and compares Pyth. 4.10 with it. This interpretation was not adopted, e.g. by Fraccaroli (1894, 1914²), Schroeder (1922), or Bowra (1969).

The final element $-\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \zeta$ represents an adjectival suffix formed from the neuter substantive $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu o \zeta^4$). Basically the noun designates a "power" or "energy" of any kind but often refers specifically to that which manifests itself in mental or emotional activity 5). Its full range of meaning can be exemplified from Homer. For the most general sense, "strength" or "force", which may be possessed by inanimate objects as well as by animals and men, cf. Π . 13.444 (spear), 5.524 (wind), Od. 11.220 (fire), Π . 23.190 (sun), 12.18 (rivers). In referring to living creatures $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu o \zeta$ can be used quite generally to designate their strength in the sense of "vital energy", "life force" (Π . 3.294, 5.296). More often the word indicates strength in the realm of emotions, such as that of anger (Π . 1.103, 9.679) or, typically in the context of the Πiad , that of martial

³) The prefix $\zeta \alpha$ - need not be regarded as an Aeolic influence on epic language, since it may have been common to both. In fact ancient grammarians normally treat it as an intensifying prefix like ¿qu- without any specific reference to Aeolic; cf. e.g. the treatment of both prefixes in the Sch. Vaticana to Dion. Thrax, Ars gram., ed. A. Hilgard, Gram. Graeci, 1, 3 (Leipzig 1901), 149,23-26. Similar remarks are to be found in sch. Pind. Nem. 3.110 (3, 57, 18 Drachmann), sch. Apoll. Rh. 1.1029 (91,12-13) Wendel), and the Et. Gud., s. ζαμενής (579, 10-12 De Stefani). However, the Et. Magn., s. $\zeta \dot{\alpha} \vartheta \varepsilon o \varsigma$ (407,4-12 Gaisford), while explaining the intensifying function of $\zeta \alpha$ -, also mentions that it is the Aeolic equivalent of $\delta \iota \alpha$ - (cf. also 248,17-18; 407,16-22, 28-30 G.). This of course proves nothing about its origin in the language of Homer. On $\zeta \alpha$ - as a common element of epic language and Aeolic dialect v. K. Strunk, Die sog. Äolismen der hom. Sprache. Diss. Cologne (Munich 1957), 117-19. On the prefix v. further A. Debrunner, Griech. Wortbildungslehre (Heidelberg 1917), 31, § 60, and E. Risch, Wortbildung der hom. Sprache² (Berlin 1974), 216, § 77a. With the use of ζα- / διαas an intensifying prefix, the original meaning of which was "through and through", the Latin per-should be compared.

⁴⁾ On the formation of the suffix v. Debrunner, Griech. Wortbildungslehre, 72, § 140, and, on the accent, 78, § 155.

⁵⁾ Cognate with it are Sanskrit mánas- (neut.) "heart", "thought", "spirit", "understanding" and Old Persian manah- (neut.) "thinking power", "power of will". See further Hj. Frisk, Griech. etym. Wörterbuch, 2 (Heidelberg 1973), s.v., 208, and especially Rüdiger Schmitt, Dichtung und Dichtersprache in idg. Zeit (Wiesbaden 1967), 103–22, §§ 180–216.

courage (2.387, 536, etc.). Occasionally $\mu\acute{e}vo\varsigma$ has a distinctly volitional sense without any particular implication of fierceness or violence (Π . 8.361, 24.198). Although a god can be said to "breathe $\mu\acute{e}vo\varsigma$ into" someone (Π . 15.60, 20.110), this is an infusion of purely physical strength and should not be confused with the spiritual inspiration of a prophet?). In fact $\mu\acute{e}vo\varsigma$ is never used in Homer or elsewhere to refer to any kind of power which implies prophetic inspiration. To express this notion another word, $\mu av\acute{a}$, was later used. It should be carefully distinguished in meaning and usage from $\mu\acute{e}vo\varsigma$.

Although we have established the fact that $\mu\acute{e}vo\varsigma$ itself is not used to mean "prophetic inspiration", we must still consider whether adjectival compounds formed from $-\mu \epsilon v\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ and a prefix other than ζa - may not in fact reveal some traces of the meaning we have eliminated for the substantive. The compounds in question are the following: $\mathring{a}\mu\epsilon v\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ("feeble", Eur. Supp. 1116; cf. also $\mathring{a}\mu\epsilon v\eta v\acute{\varsigma}\varsigma$, Hom. $\Pi.$ 5.887), $\delta v\sigma\mu\epsilon v\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ("hostile", $\Pi.$ 5.488), $\epsilon \mathring{v}\mu\epsilon v\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ("kindly", h. Hom. 22.7, Pind. Pyth. 2.25), $\epsilon \mathring{v}\varrho v\mu\epsilon v\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ("broad and

⁶⁾ Cf. the denominative verbs μενοινάω "desire eagerly" and μενεαίνω, the latter of which, however, has the meaning "rage" as well; v. A. W. H. Adkins, JHS 89 (1969), 14–18. On their formation v. Frisk, Griech. etym. Wörterbuch, 2, s. μένος, 208.

⁷⁾ On two passages in which the use of $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\pi\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ might be thought to point in that direction, Hom. Od. 19.138 and Hes. Th. 31, v. West on the latter and esp. Ed. Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 106.

⁸⁾ On the Homeric use of μένος v. further E. R. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational (Boston, Mass., 1957), 8-11. Dodds (p. 8) remarks that μένος is "a state of mind". This is indeed an important part of the effect of μένος in a sentient being, but it does not exhaust the semantic range of the word. It is therefore misleading when R. Schmitt, Dichtung und Dichterspr. in idg. Zeit, 104, § 181, writes: "Es steckt jedenfalls etwas Dynamisches, Krafterfülltes in diesem homerischen μένος, aber es meint — wohlgemerkt nicht etwa die 'Kraft' selbst." Passages such as Il. 5.524, 13.444, Od. 11.220, et al. make it clear that the word sometimes means "power", "energy" without any reference to subjective awareness of it. In the case of human beings it is more accurate to say that it is "eine im Menschen sich regende Kraft"; v. H. Fränkel, Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums³ (Munich 1969), 86, n. 8. Moreover, it should be remarked that some discussions of $\mu \acute{e}\nu o c$ are vitiated by impossible etymological assumptions; cf. e.g. E. Struck, Bedeutungslehre² (Stuttgart 1954), 98, who assumes that μένω "remain" is ultimately related to μένος, on which v. Frisk, Griech. etym. Wörterbuch, 2, s. μένω, 209.

⁹) That the two words are in some way related etymologically (cf. Frisk, Griech. etym. Wörterbuch, 2, s. $\mu\alpha i\nu \rho\mu\alpha$, 161) does not prove that one word has the same meaning as the other.

strong", [Orph.] Argon. 987 Abel), $\pi \varrho \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$ ("gentle", Aesch. Agam. 840), and $\delta \pi \epsilon \varrho \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$ ("exceedingly mighty", Hom. Il. 2.116). All of these compounds reflect one or another of the senses already established for $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \varsigma$. For example, $\mathring{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$ may be regarded as the opposite of $\zeta a \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$ in the same way as $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$ is of $\epsilon \mathring{\epsilon} \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$. No overtones of inspiration are to be found in any of these adjectives.

Turning to the use of $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \zeta$ outside of Pindar, we find that it uniformly reveals the expected meaning "very strong", etc. The following instances may be noted: h. Merc. 307 ($\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau a\tau \epsilon$) 10), Soph. Aj. 137, Apoll. Rh. 1.1029, Nic. Ther. 181 ($\epsilon \pi \iota \zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \zeta$) 11), Opp. Hal. 1.369, 561, 2.226, 242, 469, [Opp.] Cyn. 3.448, Nonn. Dion. 21.33, 30.209, Paraph. Joan. 12.43, 19.161, [Orph.] Argon. 677 ($\epsilon \pi \iota \zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \zeta$), 1008 Abel, Hy. 8.8 Quandt, Synes. Cyren. Hy. 1.7 Terzaghi, Sammelbuch griech. Urkunden aus Ägypten 5829.8 Preisigke, Etym. Gud., s.v. (579, 10–12 De Stefani) 12), Hesych., s.v. (2,257,47–49 Latte), Etym. Magn., s.v. (407,42–44 Gaisford), Souda, s.v. (1,2,500,8–9 Adler), Zonaras, s.v. (1,949 Tittmann) 13). It may be further observed that several of the literary texts just cited are provided with scholia, none of which suggests a meaning in any way approximating "inspired" 14). Likewise unproblematical is the

¹⁰) Although this superlative is the earliest attested occurrence of the word, the verbal form $\zeta \alpha \mu \acute{e} \nu \eta \sigma \varepsilon$, which assumes the existence of the adjective, is found at Hes. Th. 928, on which v. West ad loc. At h. Merc. 495 we also find $\pi \epsilon \varrho \iota \zeta \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \breve{\alpha} \varepsilon$.

¹¹⁾ The double compound should be read here (as also at [Orph.] Argon. 677 Abel) with the majority of the manuscripts; there is no reference to the MS reading in the critical apparatus of Gow and Scholfield (Cambridge 1953), 40, who adopt ἐπὶ ζαμενές, but v. Otto Schneider, Nicandrea (Leipzig 1856), 229, and cf. LSJ, Gk.-Engl. Lexicon⁹, Suppl., s.v., 59. Nicander is imitating with variatio the hexameter ending at Apoll. Rh. 4. 1672 ἐπιζάφελον κοτέονσα, which is in turn a variation of Hom. Il. 9. 525 ἐπιζάφελος χόλος. Cf. also Opp. Hal. 1. 561 (= [Opp.] Cyn. 3. 448) ζαμενῆ χόλον.

¹²⁾ The article ζαμενής in the Et. Gud. derives from the Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν inadequately published by F.W. Sturz, Etym. Graecae Ling. Gudianum (Leipzig 1818), where (625, 9–11) the text should read: ζαμενής εὔψυχος μέγα μένος ἔχων, τουτέστι ψυχὴν ἢ προθυμίαν ἢ ζαμενὴς ὁ ἄγαν ὀργίλος.

¹³⁾ In addition we may note that the variant form $\zeta a\mu \epsilon r \delta \zeta$ is implied at Porph. Plot. 22 in v. 48 of the "oracle" reported there; cf. also Hesych., s. $\zeta a\mu \epsilon r \delta \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota$ (2, 258, 50 Latte).

¹⁴) Cf. schol. on Hes. Th. 928 (116 Di Gregorio), on Soph. Aj. 137 (14 Papageorgius, with which cf. Souda 1, 2, 500, 8–9 Adler), on Apoll. Rh. 1. 1029 (91, 12–13 Wendel), on Nic. Ther. 181 (98 Crugnola), on Opp. Hal. 1. 369, 561, 2. 226, 242, 469 (281, 291, 311 bis, 320 Cats Bussemaker), on [Opp.] Cyn. 3. 448 (256 C. B.).

meaning of the word in four of the eight instances of it in Pindar: Nem. 4.13, Pae. 8 (frag. 52i). 64, frag. 169.35, frag. 231¹⁵).

We may now consider the four Pindaric passages in which it has been alleged that $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \varsigma$ means "inspired".

(1) Pyth. 4.9–11.

καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι έβδόμα καὶ σὸν δεκάτα γενεᾶ Θήραιον, Αἰήτα τό ποτε ζαμενής παῖς ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος, δέσποινα Κόλχων.

When Battus founded Cyrene in the seventeenth generation after the Argonautic expedition, he "redeemed" what Medea at Thera had once told Iason and his men would one day happen. Medea is given the epithet $\zeta a\mu \epsilon r \eta \varsigma$, which the ancient scholia explain as follows: ή ἄγαν ὀργίλη καὶ πικρά. τὸ δὲ ἐπίθετον ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας, ὅτι ύπέμεινε καὶ τοὺς ἑαντῆς ἀποσφάξαι παῖδας 16). Clearly for the writer of this scholion ζαμενής means here what it does elsewhere in Greek literature. The first Pindaric scholar to suggest the interpretation "inspired" seems to have been Erasmus Schmid, who in commenting on ζαμενής at Pyth. 4.10 wrote: "Periracunda, propter facinus illud, qvo & Absyrtum fratrem concidit, & liberos proprios interfecit. Vel verius, Magnos animi motus habens, cordata, propter vim vaticinandi."17) For the first explanation Schmid is of course following the scholia, as he often does, but the second is apparently his own. This he continues in the gloss which follows (a. 4): "ἀπέπνευσε] tangvam ἐνθονσιουμένη"(!). No real argument is offered for this interpretation. It is simply stated as a deduction from the context 18).

¹⁵⁾ No one except Fennell and Bury seems to have suggested that ζαμενής has anything to do with inspiration in any of these passages. Bury interpreted Nem. 4. 13–14 εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίφ | σὸς πατὴρ ἐδάλπετο, in that way (cf. ad loc.). But there Pindar is simply providing a forceful variant for the Homeric phrase ὁρᾶ φάος ἠελίοιο, i.e. "to be alive" (Π. 18. 61, etc.), influenced no doubt by another Homeric phrase μένος ἠελίοιο (Π. 23. 190). Curiously Fennell, who assumed without argument that ζαμενής elsewhere in Pindar means "quickened by inspiration", was undecided as to whether the word at Nem. 4. 13 should be taken in a "metaphysical" sense "quickening", "inspiring" or in the obvious physical meaning; cf. ad loc.

¹⁶⁾ Schol. 17a (2, 99, 13-15 D.). After παίδας MS C has in addition καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἄψυρτον (i.e. Άψυρτον); v. apparatus to 1. 15.

¹⁷⁾ See $\Pi IN \triangle APOY$ $\Pi EPIO \triangle O \Sigma \dots$ ([Wittenberg] 1616), Pyth., ad loc. (a. 3), 176 (the four parts are numbered separately).

¹⁸⁾ Nowhere else in his commentary does Schmid adopt this interpretation of $\zeta a\mu \epsilon r\dot{\eta}\varsigma$. Why he chose to offer it in the present context does not of course concern us here, but we may suspect that the Wittenberg professor was not unaffected by contemporary notions of a furor poeticus et vaticinus.

When we look more closely at the context in which $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \zeta$ is used in Pyth. 4, we fail to find any concrete grounds for assuming that the word there means "inspired". Schmid's explanation of ἀπέπνευσ' as implying that Medea is ένθουσιωμένη would, if true, support that interpretation, but it is, as we shall see, completely untenable. The phrase, (ἔπος) τό ... ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος, is Pindar's elaborate way of saying "the word she spoke". He is in fact varying a poetic phrase used to describe the act of speaking in which the organ of speech from which the sound comes is mentioned together with a verb of motion or articulation. Most familiar is the Homeric description of Nestor, τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων δέεν αὐδή (Π . 1.249) 19). More immediately Pindar may have been influenced by the way Theognis describes a statement which he places in the mouth of the Muses and the Charites: τοῦτ' ἔπος ἀθανάτων ἦλθε διὰ στομάτων (18, cf. also 266) 20). Against Schmid's interpretation we may further add the observation of Otto Schroeder: "Wer hier ἀπέπνευσε mit 'begeisterter' Prophetenrede interpretiert, der verwechselt Aktiv und Passiv und übersieht die Präposition ἀπό." 21) Moreover, it should be noted that the use of ἀθανάτου as an epithet of στόματος could not be taken by itself to suggest in any way prophetic powers 22).

We must therefore conclude that at Pyth. 4.10 $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \zeta$ is employed in its normal sense. Pindar has given Medea an epithet which appropriately characterizes her actions in the narrative that follows. She shows "great spirit" in helping Iason through his trials and in joining the Argonauts $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu a \dot{\nu} \tau \ddot{q}$ (v. 250) for the dangerous voyage back to Greece. We need not with the ancient

 $^{^{19}}$) Cf. also Hes. Th. 97 γλυμερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ξέει αὐδή and further 39–40 and 84.

²⁰⁾ That this kind of expression became almost a mannerism of a more formal poetic style is suggested by a fragment of Simonides, PMG 585 πορφυgέου ἀπὸ στόματος ἱεῖσα φωνὰν παρθένος. Pindar himself employs it elsewhere too, e.g. Olym. 6. 12–14, Pyth. 3. 2, Pae. 12. 16–17, Dith. 2. 1–2. For more examples v. R. Führer, Formproblem-Unters. zu den Reden in der frühgriech. Lyrik. Zetemata 44 (Munich 1967), 32–33.

²¹) Pindars Pythien (Leipzig-Berlin 1922), ad loc., 36.

²²) In using ἀθανάτου Pindar is presumably alluding rather to the tradition that Medea was originally a goddess; v. Hes. Th. 992–1002 (cf. West on 992), Alcm., PMG 163, and Musae., F. Gr. Hist. 455 F 2. This is the way the epithet was understood by the ancient critic Chaeris, who rightly referred to Hesiod's Theogony in support of his interpretation; v. sch. 18 (2, 99, 19–21 D.). The early evidence is ample enough to refute Farnell's claim (ad loc.) that Pindar is not likely to have known anything about this tradition.

commentators invoke the story of the murder of her children (and brother) to allow her to qualify for this descriptive adjective. Pindar's Medea amply deserves the heroic epithet the poet has given her at the beginning of his most epic of odes.

(2) Pyth. 9.38–39.

τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανᾶ χλοαρὸν γελάσσαις ὀφρύϊ, μῆτιν εάν εὐθὺς ἀμείβετο.

The young Apollo has just seen the girl Cyrene wrestling with a lion and, strongly impressed by the scene, calls his tutor Chiron out of the cave nearby to ask with charming naïvety who she is and whether it is right for him to direct toward her his newly awakened sexual feelings. Verses 38–39, which describe the kindly, understanding smile of the Centaur, serve to introduce his answer ²³). Here again $\zeta a\mu \epsilon r \dot{\eta} \zeta$ is used as an epithet of a person who is about to tell someone else of future events. Once "inspired" had been suggested as the meaning of the word at Pyth. 4.10, it was doubtless inevitable that it would sooner or later be so interpreted here too ²⁴).

²³) Chiron's reaction to Apollo's question has often been misunderstood, but see now the interpretation of L. Woodbury, *TAPA* 103 (1972), 561–73.,

²⁴) The first to do so was, it seems, not a professional scholar but Fr. Hölderlin, who in the course of the year 1800 translated both Pyth. 4 and 9. In each he rendered ζαμενής by "begeistert"; v. Sämtliche Werke und Briefe, ed. by G. Mieth, 2 (Darmstadt 1970), 289, 307. The source of Hölderlin's interpretation is of some interest, since it is certain that the poet worked almost exclusively from the Pindar text of Chr. G. Heyne's third edition (Göttingen 1798-99); v. G. Zuntz, Über Hölderlins Pindar-Übersetzung (Kassel 1928), 3. In Pyth. 4, however, Heyne understood the word to mean "magnanima" (2, 1, 58) and in Pyth. 9 "gravis" (2, 1, 83). Likewise, Heyne's pupil, Wm. von Humboldt, in his influential translation of Pyth. 4 of 1795 had rendered ζαμενής by "muthig" and in that of Pyth. 9 of 1805 by "ernst"; v. Gesammelte Schr., 1, 8, Übers., ed. by A. Leitzmann (Berlin 1909), 43, 79. Although Hölderlin did not use the edition of Erasmus Schmid, he was in fact indirectly influenced by it in his interpretation of ζαμενής. Among the reference works which he used (v. Zuntz, op. cit., 86) was Chr. T. Damm, Novum Lexicon Graecum Etymologicum (Berlin 1765), where under ζαμενής (col. 1617) he could read: "Py. 4, 17, Medea, quae ad iram magnam facile compelli poterat, praeterea magna vi vaticinandi et incantandi praedita". The latter explanation clearly echoes Schmid's "propter vim vaticinandi". Hölderlin obviously found it compatible with his notions of Pindaric poetry and went on to apply it to what he considered a comparable usage elsewhere. The first classical philologist to adopt this interpretation for both Pyth. 4.

(3) Nem. 3.59-63.

ὄφρα θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων διπαῖσι πεμφθείς ὑπὸ Τροΐαν δορίκτυπον ἀλαλὰν Λυκίων τε προσμένοι καὶ Φρυγῶν Δαρδάνων τε, καὶ ἐγχεσφόροις ἐπιμείξαις Αἰθιόπεσσι χεῖρας ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ', ὅπως σφίσι μὴ κοίρανος ὀπίσω πάλιν οἴκαδ' ἀνεψιὸς ζαμενὴς Ελένοιο Μέμνων μόλοι.

¹⁰ and 9. 38 was, so far as I have been able to ascertain, Fr. Thiersch, who did so without comment; v. Pindarus Werke . . ., 1 (Leipzig 1820), 213 (Pyth. 4. 10 "begeistert"), 301 (Pyth. 9. 38 "zukunftskundig"). Thiersch could hardly have known Hölderlin's translations, which were first published in 1910. The Munich classicist may of course have been directly influenced by the commentary of Erasmus Schmid, but, more likely, he like Hölderlin was using the lexicon of Damm and likewise adopted the same interpretation of Pyth. 9. 38 that he found there for Pyth. 4. 10. In any event the completion in the following year of the monumental edition of Pindar by A. Boeckh and L. Dissen, in which $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \varsigma$ is translated by "animosus" or an equivalent, exercised a counterinfluence on the "enthusiastic" interpretation of the word which was begun by Erasmus Schmid. Although that interpretation is still occasionally found in the middle of the century, e.g. in Cookesley's comment (1844) on Pyth. 4. 10, it reappears regularly in the Pindar commentaries only after Fennell's (1879–83).

²⁵) Although the ancient schol. 65 (2, 226, 7–10 D.) are divided as to whether $\zeta a\mu \epsilon r \eta_{\varsigma}$ here means $\sigma v r \epsilon \tau \delta_{\varsigma}$ ("intelligent", "wise", "clever") or $i\sigma \chi v \varrho \delta_{\varsigma}$, they give no indication that anyone in antiquity took it to mean "inspired".

²⁶) The contrast is underlined not only by the opposition of meaning implied in the use of the two words $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \zeta$ and $\dot{a}\gamma a\nu \ddot{q}$ but also by the deliberate placing of them next to one another.

Chiron has so raised Achilles that he should prove himself a great warrior in the Trojan War. Pindar calls his opponent Memnon " $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \varsigma$ ", a thoroughly appropriate epithet for a great hero, if we understand it in its usual sense. No one would have thought of explaining the word as meaning "inspired", if this supposed sense had not already established itself for Pyth. 4.10 and 9.38. Nowhere is there the least suggestion that Memnon had anything to do with prophecy²⁷). Clearly $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \varsigma$ has its normal meaning here as well.

(4) frag. 156.

δ ζαμενής δ' δ χοροιτύπος, δν Μαλέας ὄρος ἔθρεψε, Ναΐδος ἀκοίτας Σιληνός.

The Silenus of Malea is a "mighty", hardly a prophetically "inspired" dancer ²⁸). Again there is nothing here which implies that a prophetic gift is at all relevant to the figure described ²⁹). What is important is his strength $(\mu \acute{\epsilon} vo\varsigma)$ and endurance in the dance.

Now that we have concluded our examination of Pindar's use of $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \zeta$, it should be clear that he always employs the word in the extant texts to mean the same thing: "very strong", "mighty", "fierce". This is exactly the meaning which the formation of the word and its use elsewhere led us to expect it to have. We may therefore confidently banish the alleged meaning "inspired" from our commentaries, translations, and lexica.

²⁷) That he is called the cousin of Helenus, the Trojan seer, is irrelevant for the interpretation of $\zeta a\mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \varsigma$. It would be ridiculous to suggest that such kinship with a seer makes a person one himself.

²⁸) On the identity of this Silenus v. U. von Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 33 (1898), 515-16 (= *Kl. Schr.* 4 [Berlin 1962], 26-27), and *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), 324, n. 1.

²⁹) Slater, *Lexicon*, s.v., 218, after classifying this example under those which are supposed to mean "inspired", refers to Aelian, *Var. hist.* 3. 18, presumably in support of this interpretation. The passage, however, describes, a conversation between Silenus and Midas in which Silenus imparts various geographical and ethnological lore to the Phrygian king. In the course of it no prophecy is made. What we have instead is a straightforward narration of alleged facts. With it we may compare Virgil, *Ecl.* 6, in which Silenus has just as little to do with prophecy as he does in the passage of Aelian.