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](#)

Pischel and Geldner's *Vedisohe Studied Vedische Studien*. Richard von Pischel und Karl F. Geldner. Dritter Band. Pp. [ii], 215. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1901. M. 7.

F. W. Thomas

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 04 / May 1902, pp 233 - 234
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206045, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206045

How to cite this article:

F. W. Thomas (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 233-234 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206045

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

quam cetera participia, de quibus supra egi, 'necessario' passivam esse. Quod confirmare videntur adjectiva illa suff. -undo- -cundo- formata, de quibus supra p. 63 egi: haec enim omnia a participiis passivae significationis repetere vix licet (p. 91).

Thus, in fine, *legendus* originally meant neither 'being read' nor 'to be read' nor even 'reading,' but bore the indifferent sense of the noun-adjective in such a phrase as 'a reading desk.' In accordance with this view Dr. Persson regards the names of the divinities *Adolenda*, etc. as properly nouns of action. It seems somewhat inconsistent, if one may raise a small point,

after this to treat *calendae* as an adjective with *dies* understood, when we may easily suppose the original sense to have been 'hustings.' *Dies* would probably have demanded a masculine *calendi* (cf. *fasti*), and if anything were to be substituted, our preference would lie, in spite of Dr. Persson's protest, p. 96 n., with *feriae*.¹ The Greek words in -ado seem to me for the most part to come not from *ndo*, but from -ado-. But Dr. Persson (pp. 35-7) does not insist overmuch upon this point. F. W. THOMAS.

¹ It is curious that the Slavonic dialects which have a word *kolenda*, 'new year's day,' supposed to be borrowed from Lat. *calendae*, exhibit also a form *merendya* denoting 'provision for a journey': cf. Lat. *merenda*.

PISCHEL AND GELDNER'S *VEDISCHE STUDIEN*.

Vedische Studien. VON RICHARD PISCHEL und KARL F. GELDNER. Dritter Band. Pp. [ii], 215. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1901. M. 7.

In this third volume of the *Vedische Studien* the distinguished authors continue the application of their now well-understood principles to the interpretation of Vedic lexicography. The view that the Rg-Veda is essentially an Indian book and cannot properly be held apart from subsequent literature is one which commands assent. In no language can the meanings of texts or even of words be determined by mere etymologizing, a fact which was familiar to the Indian grammarians, who distinguished between the *rūdha*, or conventional, and the *yaugika*, or etymological, sense. But though this was, of course, not overlooked by the school of Roth and Whitney, in practice they assigned a very inconsiderable weight to the tradition of native grammarians and lexicographers. The reliability of these is now much more highly appreciated in many departments. It is the merit of Pischel and Geldner to have considered their opinions more attentively in connection with the Veda. We must add also that they have more carefully than their predecessors employed the comparison of similar passages in the interpretation of the Veda from itself, and such comparison has indeed formed the bulk of the matter in these three volumes. It would be difficult to name two scholars whose combined command of the

great range of Sanskrit and Iranian literature better fits them for the task which Pischel and Geldner have undertaken.

One or two interesting propositions of a general character are enunciated, though not elaborated, in the present volume. On p. 152 the old view that the hymns were composed on the banks of the Indus is rejected in favour of Brahāvarta, the holy land of Brahmanical India. 'Though in R.V. times single Aryan tribes may have been established on the banks of the Indus and its tributary streams, nevertheless the region of the Sarasvatī, i.e. Brahāvarta, Kurukṣetra, the land of the Brahmarshis in general, was its proper home. All geographical data of the R.V. combine to prove this. The Sarasvatī is never the Indus. In the broad, mostly dry and barren plains of the Panjab, lying between the Indus and the Sarasvatī, the R.V. people could not be settled, since in fact no people could permanently fix its abode there.' The importance for all Vedic questions of this proposition, stated, indeed, though less definitely, in vol. 2, p. 218, cannot be overestimated, and it will no doubt attract the attention of scholars. A more hazardous suggestion is made, p. 26, that writing was known to authors of R.V. hymns: a Vedic employment of writing was thought not impossible by Bühler *Indische Palaeographie* p. 4. The date of the *pada* text is an old *streitfrage*: Geldner proposes to accept the traditions which make its originator Śākalya a contemporary of Aruṇi and his pupil

Yājñavalkya, and the *pada* text therefore as old as the White Yajur Veda (pp. 144–6). We hope that Pischel's discussion of the phrase *sūre duhitā* will not escape the observation of comparative philologists, who have adopted with too great enthusiasm the explanation of *sūre* as a genitive derived from *sūraz* (Brugmann now accepts Pischel's view *Indog. Forsch.* xiii, p. 149 n). On p. 126 we are told that the 'cloud-mountains' are a dream of the Comparative Mythologists.

It is impossible for a reviewer to discuss in detail the many new interpretations of words and phrases which form the bulk of the volume. The lion's share belongs to Geldner, his colleague having been much preoccupied with his Prākṛit Grammar and his duties as Rector at Halle. The longest articles deal with the words *ari*, of which the general meaning is given as 'rich man,' *vip* = 'tongue,' *yakṣa* = 'marvel,' and 'a marvel,' and the roots *ṛj* and *yat*. We may refer briefly to one or two points. The word *dvitā* is now explained as meaning 'by oneself,' 'alone,' 'in person,' &c. It is, therefore, equivalent in root and sense to the Greek *δίχα* and as regards *tmanā*, which is used to convey the same meaning, we may add that the classical *ātmanā* is similarly employed. Whether *ātman* is really to be separated from *athem*, etc., and to be derived from *vat* (p. 116), one would not like to

decide in haste. On the other hand Pischel's explanation of *apsaras* as = *arūpa* and the opposite of *sapsaras* (p. 197) is convincing. *Dhenā* in the sense of 'sister' belongs of course to the root of *θῆλη*, *τιθήνη* *filius*, etc., and may be used in support of the derivation of *duhitar* from *duh*. *Svasara*, as denoting a time of day, recalls the Greek *βουλυτός*. In connection with the word *āścarya* 'marvel' p. 130, we may note that the same root appears in *avaskara* 'secret,' etc., and in the Zend *skar* 'leap,' Greek *σκαίρω*, etc. In equating the Sanskrit *ohate* to the Greek *ὄχεται*, Geldner is in agreement with a note printed in this *Review*, Vol. iv. p. 63.

A very interesting feature of this, as of the earlier volumes, is the treatment of whole hymns. This forms an admirable test of the principles followed, and no one who examines Geldner's discussion of the hymn R.V. I, 105 will deny that in this case the light derived from later literature has restored the poetry of the old Rsi's verse.

A work dealing with many debated questions could scarcely pass by the views of other authorities, and without criticism there is no progress. We welcome the courteous tone here maintained and the absence of acrimony in the references, in some cases necessarily frequent, to the authors of controverted views.

F. W. THOMAS.

REPORTS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—HILARY TERM, 1902.

ON January 31st, Prof. COOK WILSON read a paper on the 'ὑποζώματα of Greek ships.'

The view connected with the name of Böckh though really due to J. G. Schneider, that the *ὑποζώμα* passed from stem to stern outside the vessel horizontally, seemed to be abandoned by the most recent writers, who return to the improbable view that the *ὑποζώμα* was a straight hawser stretched from stem to stern inside the vessel; probably because they (as well as even writers who agreed with Böckh), were unaware of the existence of an important piece of evidence which it was the main object of the paper to resuscitate. This was a small bronze, representing the fore part of a trireme shewing ropes passing exactly as Böckh supposed. Though Böckh himself referred to it and to a representation of it in an old book—Breger's *Thesaurus Brandeburgicus*, vol. III p. 406,—there was no sign in the more modern writers that they knew of its existence, and it had apparently been lost sight of for perhaps sixty years. [Since reading the paper Mr. Wilson has been able by the kindness of Dr. E.

Pernice of the Königliche Museen to verify the existence of the bronze in the Berlin Museum, and to obtain photographs of it which he hopes to publish.]

Further it was probable that there were two kinds of *ὑποζώματα*, not only one of the kind supposed by J. G. Schneider carried by triremes under all circumstances, but also one applied temporarily after storms or sea-fights, to prevent leakage and passing in a vertical plane under the keel.

The passages, cognate to the subject, on the construction of battering rams in Vitruvius and Athenaeus (*Mechanicus*) were also discussed, and it was maintained that their bearing had been misunderstood and that they really contained evidence of the existence of the two kinds of *ὑποζώματα*.

['Since reading the above paper I find I have overstated the neglect of the bronze relief. Its importance has been curiously misunderstood, but Böckh's reference to it has been remarked upon. I hope to publish a detailed discussion of the subject shortly.—J. COOK WILSON.']