The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Fennell's *Pindar, the Olympian and Pythian Odes* *Pindar, the Olympian and Pythian Odes*, edited with Notes, Introductions, and Essays, by C. A. M. Fennell, LL.D. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1893. 9s.

W. R. Hardie

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 49 - 50
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187335, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187335

How to cite this article:

W. R. Hardie (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 49-50 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187335

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

six faces, the person who is asking his fortune may be able to select a verse out of the 216 verses that have been transcribed, 216 being the cube of six, and the number of possible throws. The verses however, seem to be a singularly stupid collection, and the oracle must have often needed an interpretation.

We must bring our remarks to a conclusion. The whole volume is one of much interest, and its production is worthy of no ordinary thanks. The transcriptions, moreover, will be found peculiarly accurate, and a marvel of eye-sight as well as insight.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

FENNELL'S *PINDAR, THE OLYMPIAN AND PYTHIAN ODES*.

Pindar, the Olympian and Pythian Odes, edited with Notes, Introductions, and Essays, by C. A. M. FENNELL, LL.D. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1893. 9s.

'THIS edition is virtually a new work,' Mr. Fennell tells us in his Preface. In the earlier edition, published a good many years ago, there was much that was incomplete and that would inevitably be modified by later studies. The present edition, though it has some flaws, is perhaps the safest and most pleasing commentary on Pindar extant in English.

The introduction is unequal. At page xiii. and onwards there is an admirable, and at the same time very simple, account of Pindar's poetic genius. At page xxii. again Mr. Fennell lays it down that Pindar 'mixes metaphors, not confusedly, but by rapid and daring leaps from one to another,' and in his commentary he defends *Ol.* vi. 82, *δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ γλώσση ἀκόντας λιγυρὰς κ.τ.λ.*, a passage which has been often denounced or emended. This swiftness of transition has not always been allowed for by editors, though they probably would not be at all offended by such a passage as this in English:—

Surely the bitter and the rooted love
That burns between us, going from me to
thee,
Shall more endure than all things.

At page xix. Mr. Fennell has some very sensible remarks on the subject of 'signals' or verbal echoes. His conclusion is that 'Tautometric responsion of single words is as a rule without significance and may sometimes be due to chance.' The last paragraph on page xxxii. conveys no clear idea to the unmusical reader—it may even be doubted whether a musician would see his way

through it. In the pages which follow there is some confusion of ideas, as in writing $\cup | _ > ||$ and in making $- > = ||$ (top of page xxxiv.). The symbol $- >$ was devised to denote two long syllables which were *not* to be taken as $||$. 'The Aeolian odes read admirably as prose-poetry' (p. xxv.) justifies a rather objectionable proceeding—taking a work of art in some other way than that which its creator intended. The account of the MSS. on page xxxvi. is too slight to be worth printing at all—a summary of Mommsen and Lehrs, on texts and scholia, extending over two or three pages, would have been undoubtedly useful.

Mr. Fennell prefixes to each Ode a general introduction—sometimes headed by a very serviceable chronological table—an analysis of the metre, and an analysis of the contents. The last is rather unsatisfactory and misleading, for a mere enumeration of the topics of a Pindaric Ode necessarily gives the impression of disconnectedness. The general introductions are good and complete. In the metrical analyses, Mr. Fennell works upon a principle which is of more value than some of the theories expounded in the introduction to the book. The principle is to designate by letters the chief recurrent phrases of an ode and then write out its structure by their help. If he had carried this out in a lucid and consistent way, he might have rendered some service to the student of Pindar. But he sometimes recognizes phrases which, while they *may* have some musical justification, are far from convincing to the ordinary reader. Thus in *Ol.* ix. one of the constitutive phrases of the piece is set down as $\cup | _ \cup ||$ or $\cup | _ \wedge, (B)$, and the last line is analyzed BBA, i.e. $\cup | _ \cup || \cup | _ \cup || _ \cup | _ \cup ||$. Making a *κῶλον* begin with a contracted foot is his favourite device.

Thus the first line of *Ol.* i. 1 is read: $\cup : \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup || \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup >$, and the second $\cup \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup | \cup \cup || \cup >$. Mr. Fennell here speaks of 'the inevitable symmetry which results from J. H. H. Schmidt's method as well as from mine': the symmetry found by the latter may be trustworthy—that is another enquiry—but his own period 3, 4, 2, 4, 1 does not on the face of it look 'inevitable.'

I append a few notes on particular passages.

Ol. ii. 78, Πηλεύς τε καὶ Κάδμος ἐν τοῖσιν ἀλέγονται. 'ἀλέγονται,' 'are numbered among them,' requires illustration. The best parallel is to be found in the *παρθένιον* of Aleman, οἷον οὐ Δύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω, 'I count him not among the dead.'

Ol. v. 10, αἰδεῖ μὲν ἄλσος ἄγρόν is not so obviously intelligible as to require no note. Is it 'fills with song,' as we have in the passive αἰλεῖται δὲ πᾶν | μέλαθρον, or is it like ὃν πατέρ' Ἀκρων' ἐκ ἄρ' υἱε καὶ τῶν νέοικον ἔδραν, makes the theme of heralds or of singers, heralds or sings 'by an agent' as Mark Twain would say?

Ol. vii. 49, 'note that P.'s point is to show—' This is the evil example of Gildersleeve! The cost of printing 'Pindar' in full is not so enormous as to justify an editor in causing irritation to a large class of sensitive readers.

Pyth. i. 76, ἀρέομαι | παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν | μισθόν κ.τ.λ. 'I shall win from Salamis the gratitude of the Athenians as my reward.' Has it never been suggested that this is a simple case of *Χιασμός*? παρὰ μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἀρέομαι μισθόν Σαλαμῖνος χάριν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δὲ κ.τ.λ. Is it more puzzling than Aristophanes' words in the *Peace*

ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν οὖν οἶδ' ὥς τὰ τούτων μῶρ' ἔμ' εἰ
πύθοιτ' ἂν ἐπιτρίψει

or than a passage where Mr. Fennell himself recognizes 'interlacing' of words, *Pyth.* iv. 24, ἀνὶκ' ἀγκυραν ποτὶ χαλκόγενυν ναὶ κρημνάντων ἐπέτοσσε (ἄγκ. χαλκ. ποτὶ ναὶ κρ.)! Another passage where 'interlacing' should be recognized is *Ol.* ii. 63, ὅτι θανόντων μὲν ἐνθάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες κ.τ.λ. Mr. Fennell rejects Rauchenstein's explanation on the ground of the position of 'ἐνθάδε'!¹

Pyth. iii. 34, ἐπεὶ παρὰ Βοιβιάδος κρημοῖσιν ὥκει παρθένος. An unpleasing and unnecessary note of Mr. Fennell's occupies space which would have been better filled by quoting the graceful opening of one of the *Ἥοιαι*

ἡ οἷη Διδύμους ἱερούς ναίονσα κολωνὸς
Δωτῶ ἐν πεδίῳ πολυβότρυος ἄντ' Ἀμύροιο
νύματο Βοιβιάδος λίμνης πόδα παρθένος ἀδμῆς.
(*fr.* 142, Kinkel.)

Very likely Pindar had this passage in mind.

Pyth. iv. 57. Mr. Fennell does not venture upon a theory about ἡ ρα. But surely it is a thing about which an editor must say *something*. Is it the Homeric 'spoke,' with the *schema Pindaricum*?

Ib. 105, οὐτ' ἔπος εὐτράπελον. He suggests οὐτε *ἔπος τραπελόν*, 'shifty.' But is not *εὐτράπελον* the happiest possible expression—'frivolous,' a euphemism for 'disrespectful' or 'insulting'?

Ib. 189, ἐπαίνησας 'gave praise to each.' Mr. Myers' 'thanked them' is more exact.

W. R. HARDIE.

¹ Demos. *Ol.* ii. 30 is a prose passage where Chiasmus has sometimes been ignored, εἰ δὲ τοῖς μὲν ὥσπερ ἐκ τυραννίδος ὑμῶν ἐπιτάττειν ἀποδώσετε κ.τ.λ. The construction is τοῖς μὲν ὑμῶν, not τυραννίδος ὑμῶν.

RUSHFORTH'S LATIN HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS.

Latin Historical Inscriptions, by G. Mc N. RUSHFORTH, M.A. Clarendon Press. 10s.

THIS book is very significant of the change which has come over the teaching of ancient—and especially perhaps of Roman—history in Oxford in the course of the last fifteen or twenty years. Those who can recollect the ordinary history lectures in—say the early seventies—will remember that they consisted

very much of summaries, not so much of facts as of tendencies, and of generalisations, more or less wide, based on these as to the social or political characteristics of a particular period. The lectures were often highly suggestive, but they were suggestive of the ultimate results of historical investigation, not of the process of constructing history. The student learnt from them the faculty of writing extremely good essays on his-