

Chromios sont impliqués dans une même aventure, et si Chromios peut aider Pindare dans l'acquisition d'un sort heureux, il est évident que c'est Pindare qui aide Chromios dans la conquête d'une „bonne réputation“. Donc, deux éléments contrastés se rattachent à un dénominateur commun, comme dans les vers 25—28. Or, le métier de poète se profilait sur le fond d'une variété d'arts (τέχνας δ'ἑτέρων ἕτεροι 25) avant que d'être opposé au métier de guerrier: il est donc probable que le métier de Chromios est lui aussi présenté sur le fond d'une diversité possible des conduites, exprimée par τῶν τε καὶ τῶν: on peut même dire que c'est ainsi seulement que s'explique l'articulation avec le passage gnomique qui suit, et qui vient dessiner sur le fond des multiples voies ouvertes un cheminement proposé en exemple.

Dernier cas retenu ici: le vers 35 de la quatrième de la Isthmique (chez Snell-Maehler le v. 51 du groupe 3—4). La fortune est imprévisible: (33—35) ἔστιν δ'ἀφάνεια τύχας καὶ μαρναμένων/πρὶν τέλος ἄκρον ἐκέσθαι/τῶν τε γὰρ καὶ τῶν διδοῖ. Ces génitifs sont des partitifs, comme l'a bien vu le scoliaste de 52a, et comme l'a compris Triclinios lorsqu'il a supprimé τέλος pour rétablir un mètre correct. L'interprétation par l'ambiguïté, ne saurait être évitée: elle convient aussi bien au texte qu'au destin changeant de la famille du vainqueur thébain (cf. *schol. ad loc.*).

Received Febr. 7, 1981.

FRIC P. HAMP
 Universiti of Chicago
 Department of Linguistics
 Chicago

UDC 807.5—541.2

ANTHROK^wOS ONCE MORE

A. Gluhak wishes to explain ἄνθρωπος (ŽA 29, 1979, 223. 5) on the basis of a Nostratic descent. It is not my purpose to debate here the entire Nostratic theory. But it is pertinent to make my position clear. I have not yet been persuaded of the correctness of the Nostratic claim; I do not see it as having the potential promise even of IE-Kartvelian or IE—Uralic proposals, which latter I regard as interesting but unproven. Nothing like the requirements for distant familiar genetic relation have yet been met. A Nostratic unity remains possible, de-

finitely worth reasoned contemplation, but undemonstrated, and net a viable source for reconstructed lexemes to be proposed as bases for specific etymologies¹.

Specifically, Gluhak will have ἄνθρωπος from Nostratic **Ganda*. But his proposal ignores the entire final portion of the Greek word, the portion which has been the center of the problématique for this lexeme. Such analysis ignores the principle of total accountability, while neglecting the formulation of plausible interstages — the formal history.

Until a more explanatory elucidation of ἄνθρωπος comes forward I rest with my proposal (*ánthrōk^wo-* < **H_{anr}-H_{ok^wo-}* = *Mensch*) set forth in *Atti e memorie del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Miceneologia, Roma 1967* (Roma 1968) 786—90, and elaborated in the discussion *BSL* 68, 1973, 78ff. That proposal respects the phonetics, the phonology, the morphology, the syntax, and the semantics² — as any history worth a hearing must. The entire explanation can be accommodated within the terms of IE and the known history of Greek. This is not to deny the usefulness and possible validity of outside comparisons³. But a proximate comparandum is always to be preferred in the first instance.

For the present, if my 1967 proposal cannot be rejected or bettered, it will be seen that ἄνθρωπος can not descend from a Nostratic **Ganda*. But that fact is not the main point of this note.

Received, Oct. 28, 1980.

¹ This criticism applies to Gluhak's proposal for Hittite *akk* -'to die', *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 25, 1980, 262—3. It applies in a stronger sense to his claim, *RRL* 25, 1980, 651—2, for Etruscan *θυπθα*. Not only is Etruscan a notoriously weak and unconfirmed base for comparisons, but the IE base **dheub-* 'deep' is remarkably unfitted for long-range comparisons beyond IE. The etymon carries the apparent segment **b* which seems scarcely to have occurred in the stage of IE which our secure reconstructions reach; if we consider instead **dheupH_a-*, as a set extension of a root, the combination **dh—p* violates the constraints on typical IE root structure; finally, the attestation of **dheub-* seems to be restricted to the North and West of IE.

² The supposed Nostratic equation (Gluhak, *RRL* 25, 651) 'deep' = 'lake, pool, dip' fails to meet minimum standards of proof for genetic semantic (cultural) equivalence; moreover, the equivalence of 'deep' with 'underworld' is not adequately demonstrated for Etruscan *θυπ(θ)-*. Such loose equations prove nothing.

³ This principle is urged by Gluhak, *RRL*, 25, 272, and it has long been well recognized. There are countless examples; to name just a few: the pre-Mycenaean explanations of ἀροκόπος or πίσυρες, my proposal for Umbr. *a'fertur* (*JIES* 1, 1973, 318 ff.), the Scandinavian words for 'day' (Studies for George S. Lane [1967], 146 ff.), Makedonski *dzid* 'wall' (Naučnata Diskusija, Ohrid 1977), or the Algonquian word for 'sun' (P. Proulx, *Papers of the Eleventh Algonquian Conference*, ed. W. Cowan, Ottawa 1970, 79—82). But it must be emphasized that such comparisons must be made from comparanda of highly probable relation and between relata of known approximate formulation. With decrement in the last requirement credibility drops proportionately.