



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON *πίαρ* AS AN ADJECTIVE.

In the Fragments of Solon, XXXVI, vv. 18-21 (ed. Bergk) occurs the following passage:

κέντρον δ' ἄλλος ὡς ἐγὼ λαβῶν
 χαροφρυδῆς τε καὶ φιλοκτῆμων ἀνήρ
 οὔτ' ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον οὔτ' ἐπαύσατο,
 πρὶν ἂν ταραξῆς πῖαρ ἐξέλη γάλα.¹

Now it is commonly held that *πίαρ* is a noun, and noun only, and accordingly it has been so translated here. This would make the passage mean: "before he had stirred up the milk and taken out the fat." But as it is not usual to stir up milk when it is wanted to skim off the cream, this is hardly a satisfactory interpretation, and it seems necessary to take *πίαρ* as an adjective, and to understand with Buchholtz, from the preceding line, *δῆμον* as the object of *ταραξῆς*; or simply to render it: "before he had stirred up and filched away the creamy milk," i. e. the milk made fat by being

serenade or rather *aubade* under the windows of a prisoner. In fact my impression of the plaintive character is so strong that I cannot force myself to read v. 273 (τί ποτ' οὐ) and v. 281 (τάχα δ' ἂν) logaologically or otherwise than as a modification of *ionici*, as Dindorf and Fritzsche would have us to do. Metricians should remember that Aristophanes could be frolicsome. Of course the orthodox thing to do, as soon as the notion of parody presents itself, is to look for the original word. After I had amused myself with the parallel between Philokleon and the lovely heroine, I examined the fragments of the Danae of Euripides. Unfortunately there are no lyric remains. The prologue and the beginning of the first scene are by a late hand, but it would appear from certain indications that the play began at the point in the story where Danae is still shut up in the tower after having borne the babe Perseus to Zeus; and we can readily imagine Akrisios to have announced to the chorus the sin or the misfortune of the heroine, and the chorus to hold converse with Danae, who wishes to come out or to be metamorphosed in common with all the disconsolate widows, wives and maids of Euripides. But I maintain that the fun of the situation is not dependent on the parody of any definite scene, and we must be satisfied with that general travesty of the mythological world which was one of the elements of the old comedy.

B. L. G.

¹ Mr Allinson's note reminds me that I have always been tempted to give v. 21 its normal syntax by reading: *πρὶν ἀναταραξῆς πῖαρ ἐξελεῖν γάλα*. The reading *πρὶν ἂν* with the subj. after an unreal condition of the past requires a rather violent *repraesentatio*, such as I cannot at the moment parallel for this conjunction. Of course we might also have *ἀναταραξῆς ἐξελεῖν* as in Eur. Alc. 362. In looking over my collection I find a droll coincidence under *πρότερον ἦ* in Hdt. 8, 93: *οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσατο πρότερον ἦ ἐλεμν*.

B. L. G.

stirred up with the cream. "A man less pure than I," says Solon, "would have broken down class distinctions to take advantage of the result."

Were this the only instance where it seemed preferable to translate *πίαρ* as an adjective, we might well hesitate to do so; but in Homer Od. II 135, ἐπεὶ μάλα πίαρ ὕπ' οὐδ' αὖς, the sense is certainly better, if we translate the word as an adjective. Buttmann, it is true, in his *Lexilogus* (art. *πίαρ*), denies very emphatically that there is any ground for considering it an adjective. But he had neglected altogether the passage of Solon quoted above, which, as will readily be admitted, more than doubles the uncertainty about translating the word as a noun in the Homeric line. Buttmann's objections to the sense of the translation, "fat is the ground beneath," seem entirely without weight, as it surely requires no imagination to speak of the ground as "beneath," whether it be in relation to anything in particular (as here to the *standing crop*) or left indefinite (as in the imitation of the passage in the *Odyssey*, Hymn. ad Apoll. v. 61). Furthermore, it seems perfectly evident that *πίαρ* stands just in the relation to *μάλα* that *βαθύ* does to the same word in the preceding line.

One further consideration to be weighed against Buttmann's arguments is the definition of Hesychius, who gives us as the third meaning of *πίαρ*, "καὶ λιπαρόν."

Turning now to the structure of the word itself, we find this form *πίαρ*: the adjective of two terminations *πίων*, *πίον*: the rather anomalous feminine adjective *πίειρα*: and finally, in Aristotle and Hippocrates, the adjective *πιάρως* or *πειρός*. All of these come from the root *πι* and are perfectly well established.

The Sanskrit correlates are very striking, and help to throw light on the question: 1. *Pīvan*=*πιFon*. 2. With the derivative suffix *vara* is formed *pīvara*, which is the same as *πιFαρα* (stem of *πιάρως*). 3. As feminine of the Sanskrit adjective *pīvara* we have *pīvari*; if this, as is very probable, represents an original *pīvariā*, we should have an exact correspondence with the Greek *πιFερια*, which by metathesis gives us the existing form *πιFειρα*.

Without further support, this correspondence, complete as it is, might seem only a curious coincidence. Some corroboration, however, may be obtained within the Greek itself. The adjective *μάχαρ*, *μάχαιρα* (*μάχαρ*), seems to have been formed nearly, if not quite, analogously to *πίαρ*. Buttmann, it is true, notices it only to deny this analogy; but the word is composed of *μαχ* (cf. Lat. *mac-to*)

and the suffix *αρ*, which is the same in both words whatever it represents. It is further objected that the feminine form *πίειρα* cannot bear the same relation to *πίαρ* that *μάκαιρα* does to its masculine. But Curtius, Gr. Etym. No. 455, says: "*μάγειρος* ist wohl aus älterem *μαγαρο-ς* wie *ξταιρος* aus *ξταρο-ς*, *δνειρος* aus *δναρ* abgeleitet." These examples furnish analogy for the change of *a* to *ε* and of the metathesis of the *ι*. But it is thought that *πίειρα* as a feminine to *πίων* is justified by the analogy of *πέπων*, *πέπειρα*, and that they are all to be referred to a group (cf. Mehlhorn Griech. Gram. 1845) of adjectives forming their feminines with the suffix *-ειρα*, to which are also referred *πρέσβυς*, *πρέσβειρα* and *ἴλαος*, *ἰλάειρα*. But there existed (date uncertain) a masculine *πέπειρος*, and *ἰλάειρα* is probably to be referred to *ἰλαρός* (vid. Lobeck Paralip. p. 210); hence, with the exception of *πρέσβυς*, none of this group of five can be quoted against the proposed theory, while some of them support it. But the metaplastic (?) nominatives *μάχαρος* (vid. Boeckh T. I. 449 b.) and *πιαρός* (cf. the adj. *φαρός* from *ψάρ*) can scarcely be more than illustrated by reference to the Sanskrit stem *ṛivara*.

The existence, then, of an adjective form *πίαρ* parallel to *πίων* may be inferred:

1. From the interpretation of the two passages quoted.
2. From the testimony of Hesychius.
3. From the survival of the corresponding feminine form *πίειρα*, supported by the analogy of *μάχαρ* and other words.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

JE NE SACHE PAS.

Mr. Samuel Garner, in his remarks on *je ne sache pas*, in the second number of this Journal, gives his reasons why he does not believe *sache* in that phrase to be a subjunctive, and concludes with the words, "It is an indicative or it is nothing."

If this statement be correct, the phrase *je ne sache pas* ought to be equivalent to *je ne sais pas*; but whoever has observed how Frenchmen use the phrase in question, knows that such is not the case. I do not see any reason to doubt the correctness of Bescherelle's remark, that it is "une des nombreuses délicatesses" of the French language, or to differ from Mr. Littré when he says: "D'ailleurs le sens dénote un subjonctif plutôt qu'un indicatif; car *je ne sache pas* implique quelque chose de plus dubitatif que