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](#)

A Note on the Vague Use of ΘΕΟΣ

W. H. S. Jones

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 08 / December 1913, pp 252 - 255

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00006041, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00006041

How to cite this article:

W. H. S. Jones (1913). A Note on the Vague Use of ΘΕΟΣ. The Classical Review, 27, pp 252-255 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00006041

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

- 341b34 καὶ] z 100 FS, καὶ κατὰ HN.
 342b25 καλουμένου] z 100 FS, λεγο-
 μένου HN.
 345a17 τὸν τόπον τοῦτον] τὸν τόπον z,
 τοῦτον τὸν τόπον 100 FS, τοῦτον τὸν
 τρόπον HN.
 346a36 τοιούτων ἀστέρων] z 100 FS,
 ἀστέρων τοιούτων HN.
 348a8 καὶ] z 100 FS, om. HN.
 349a15 λεγόμενον τοιούτον] z 100 FS,
 τοιούτον λεγόμενον HN.
 349a31 ἂν εἴη] z 100 FS, εἴη ἂν HN.
 350b9 μετὰ] z 100 FS, περὶ HN.
 350b35 νομίζειν εἶναι] z 100 FS, εἶναι
 νομίζειν HN.
 352b16 τοῦ] z 100 FS. om. HN.

To S attaches the barest suspicion of contamination.¹

There results the following stemma:²

¹ This is suggested by six cases of agreement of S with E against 100 FHN, in passages where either of the two readings makes satisfactory sense; if there were not so many of these cases, it would be easy to believe that the reading of S was due to individual error:

- 339a16 πᾶσι τούτοις] FHN, πᾶσιν τούτοις 100, τούτοις πᾶσιν Sz.
 339b2 δ δὴ] 100 FHN, δ ES, δ 314.
 339b6 δὴ] 100 FHN, om. Sz.
 339b25 καὶ] 100 FHN, om. Sz.
 345a2 νικομάχου ἐγένετο] 100 FHN, ἐγένετο νικομάχου Sz.
 348a31 μεγίστας] 100 FHN, μεγάλας Sz.
 Compare also 348b1 τὸν] zS, τὸ 100 FHN.

Such contamination from z as there may be does not, of course, impair the value of S where the latter differs from E and 314. Perhaps also a late hand corrected S on E:

- 343b31 τινὶ] E corr. 314 100 FS₁HN, τινὰ E₁S rec.
 351a9 θάλατταν (θάλασσαν)] 314 100 FS₁HN, θάλατταν (θάλασσαν) φανερά E S rec.

² In this stemma I have not included the contaminated MSS. Parisini 2032 and 2034 (both closely related to F), Parisinus 2035, Parisinus suppl. 642. The last two also belong on the y side; they are closely related to one another; 2035 is apparently contaminated from v and z; 642 from 314, N, and the group comprising

Whether v springs from y or from w, it is plain that a critical edition should have regard to at least five of the MSS. represented in the stemma—100, F, one of the v group, 314, and E. Perhaps N could be spared better than H, since N has numerous individual errors, whereas in H I have noted only three. Of the four late MSS. 314 is the most valuable, affording, as it does, a check on E, which has many more individual errors than has 100.³

F, 2032, and 2034. Nor have I included the Escorial fragment (f. 382 of cod. Ψ-I-11) s. XI, a few readings from which are given in E. Miller's *Catalogue*, p. 415.

³ Bekker occasionally goes wrong because of the lack of such a check:

- 343a33 πάντων] 314 100 F corr. S rec. HN, πάντων EF₁ Bekker (καὶ μὴ φαινομένων πάντων om. S₁).
 347b7 ἀρμίξει] 314y, ἀρμίζειν E Bekker.
 350b26 αἰὶ] 314 FSH, αἰὲ 100 N, αἰὲ δὴ E Bekker.
 351a9 θάλατταν] 314 100 F S corr. m. i H, θάλασσαν S₁, θάλατταν φανερά E S rec. Bekker. (The Escorial fragment (Ψ-I-11) omits φανερά.)

F. H. FOBES.

A NOTE ON THE VAGUE USE OF ΘΕΟΣ.

A FEW years ago I began to collect in the course of my reading instances of θεός, ὁ θεός, δαίμων, ὁ δαίμων, used without reference to any particular god. As my object was to see if these pas-

sages throw light upon the development of popular monotheism among the Greeks, I took no notice of the philosophers. As time went on I began to feel that such evidence affords too in-

secure a foundation upon which to build a theory, and accordingly ceased to collect it. Nevertheless, as a summary of the facts is interesting, I venture to put before readers of the *Classical Review* my list of passages, which, of course, does not pretend to be complete.

Excluding references to a particular god, *θεός* may mean—

(a) A god, some god.

(b) Deity, divine power, the properties common to all gods.

Similarly *ὁ θεός* may mean—

(a) The god *par excellence*, the great god.

(b) Divine power.

(c) 'God-kind' (generic), as *ὁ ἀνθρώπος* may mean 'mankind.'

It is this uncertainty of meaning that wrecked my inquiry. In particular I would insist that *ὁ θεός* is very often generic. Unless we bear this in mind, we may translate the famous definition of Epicurus (*πρῶτον μὲν τὸν θεὸν ζῶον ἄφθαρτον καὶ μακάριον νομίζων κ.τ.λ.*, Diog. Laert. X. 123) as though that philosopher were a monotheist! In this passage *τὸν θεόν* is neither 'god' nor 'godhead,' but 'a god,' 'any god *quā* god.'

These are my passages. Only those with an asterisk have the article; very striking examples are printed in full.

Homer:

Il. VII 4, 377; IX 445 (*οὐδ' εἴ κέν μοι ὑποσταίη θεὸς αὐτός . . . θήσειν νέον ἡβᾶοντα*); XIII 730; XIV 142; XVII 98, 327, 688; XIX 90, 410; XXIV 534-538.

Od. II 134; III 27, 131, 158, 166, 173, 183, 215, 231; IV 275; V 396; VII 248, 286; VIII 177; IX 381; XI 292; XII 38, 88, 169; XIII 317; XIV 242, 440 foll.; XVI 64, 194 foll., 370; XVII 484; XVIII 37, 146, 265; XXI 213, 280; XXII 347; XXIII 185.

Hesiod, *Works* 756.

Semonides I (1) 5; 7 (8) 1, 21, 72, 104 (throughout the poem *Ζεὺς, θεός, Ὀλύμπιοι* are used indiscriminately).

Mimnermus I (1) 10.

Simonides 3 (12) 5; 44 (33) (*θεοί* clearly = *θεός*); 45; [76].

Solon 12 (4) 69; 29 (24) 2.

Theognis 123, 321, 350, 381, 403, 432, 589.

Pindar:

Ol. I 66, 109; II 23; IV 13; V 24; VI 101; VIII 67; IX 103; X 22; XI 10.

Pyth. I 56; II 49, 88; III 110; IV 274; V 25, 117; VIII 76; X 10; XII 30.

Isth. III 23; V 11; VIII 10.

Nem. VI 24; VII 32; VIII 17.

Frag. 108 (75); 140 (104) (*τί θεός; ὅτι τὸ πᾶν*); 141 (105); 142 (106); 145 (109); 225 (247).

Bacchylides V 36, 50; X 34; XIII 18.

Epicharmus *ap.* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* V. p. 708 (*ἀδυνατεῖ δ' οὐδὲν θεός*).

Aeschylus:

P.V. 859.

Sept. 21, 35.

Pers. 739*.

ἐς δὲ παῖδ' ἐμὸν

Ζεὺς ἐπέσκηψεν τελευταίην θεσφάτων· ἐγὼ δέ που

διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου τάδ' ἡὔχουν ἐκτελεστήσειν θεούς·

ἀλλ' ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις αὐτός, ᾧ θεὸς συνάπτεται.

(*Ζεὺς = θεοί = ὁ θεός*.)

Ag. 1424.

Choëph. 958 (*τὸ θεῖον*).

Frag. 156.

Sophocles:

Ai. 86, 278, 949, 1060, 1128, 1129 (*θεός = θεοί*).

O.R. 38, 724, 871.

O.C. 253, 521, 1626, 1629, 1658.

Ant. 624, 1273.

El. 199, 1264-1266 (*θεοί = θεός*).

Tr. 145.

Ph. 464, 627, 781, 841.

Frag. 704*; 1019* (*dubium*); 1025.

Euripides:

Hel. 711* (*ὦ θύγατερ, ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἔφυ τι ποικίλον*); 752*; 914*.

Orestes 1545.

Supp. 214-218*; 331*.

Her. Fur. 1243*; 1338; 1339* (*ὁ θεός = θεοί*); 1345*.

Phoen. 413-414* (*ὁ δαίμων = ὁ θεός*).

Iph. Aul. 394 (*τὸ θεῖον*).

Frag. 53*; 104; 258; 435; 724; 905; 935; 1007; 1014; 1058*; 1074*.

Herodotus I 105* (where see Stein's note with other instances in Hdt.); III 108*.

Thucydides V 104, 105, 112 (all τὸ θεῖον); VII 77, 4* (so MSS. Some editors give τοῦ θεῖου).

Antiphon III γ 8*; IV α 2 (bis)*; IV α 3*; IV β 7*; IV β 8*.

Xenophon:

Mem. I 4, 17*; I 4, 18 (τὸ θεῖον = *numen divinum*; in I 6, 10 it = *natura divina*); IV 7, 6*.

Oeconom. VII 12 (τέκνα μὲν οὖν ἦν θεός ποτε διδῶ ἡμῖν γενέσθαι); VII 22-29*; VIII 16*; XVII 2*, 3*, 4*; XX 11* (ὑδωρ μὲν ὁ ἄνω θεὸς παρέχει).

Hell. IV 4, 12*; V 2, 18*; VII 4, 9*; VII 5, 26*.

Inst. Cyr. II. 2, 18*; II 3, 4*; III 1 6*; IV 1, 4*; VI 2, 29*; VII 1, 20*.

Ap. Soc. 5*, 7*.

Phrynichus 9 (Meineke)*; Antiphanes 186*.

Isocrates fr. III (α') 7 (οἱ ἄνθρωποι τότε γίνονται βελτίους, ὅταν θεῶ προσέρχωνται· ὁμοιον δὲ ἔχουσι θεῶ τὸ εὐεργετεῖν καὶ ἀληθεύειν).

Demosthenes, *De Corona* 97*; 193* (ἐν γὰρ τῷ θεῷ τὸ τούτου τέλος ἦν); 200*.

Theophrastus, *Char.* XXV*.

Theocritus X 17; XXV 50.

Menander 534, 535* (Meineke); 565.

Plutarch, *Mor.* 153 A; 165 C (τὸ θεῖον); 166 D*; 236 D*; 423 D*; 423 E, F; 551 B*, C*; 553 A*, C*; 558 D*; 560 F*; 561 C*; 562 A*, D*.

Pausanias VIII. 36, 5.

Lucian:

Hermotimus 81 (826)* (ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστίν κ.τ.λ.).

Vit. Auct. 4 (544)*.

Cyn. 5 (542)*; 7 (543)*.

[Cf. Minucius Felix XVIII, audio vulgus, cum ad caelum manus tendunt, nihil aliud quam *Deum* dicunt, et, *Deus* magnus est etc.].

One might add the scores of inscriptions beginning with θεός (never, I believe, ὁ θεός).

Of course the number of instances would be at least doubled if the philosophical writers were taken into account.

I append a few of the more interesting examples:

Xenophanes 1 (21) 13, 14; 12 (1) — 17 (6); 25.

Plato, *Apol.* 42* (ἄδηλον παντὶ πλὴν ἡ τῷ θεῷ, translated by Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 99, utrum autem sit melius, dei immortales sciunt).

Rep. 380 C*; 381 B*.

Diagoras I; 2.

Aristotle:

Eth. 1178b*.

Met. 1000a*; 1072b*.

De Caelo I 4* (ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἡ φύσις οὐδὲν μάτην ποιοῦσιν).

The Peripatetic treatise *Melissus*, *Xenophanes*, *Gorgias* 977a* (εἰ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς ἁπάντων κράτιστον ἓνα φησὶν αὐτὸν προσήκειν εἶναι).

Diogenes Laertius, VII 135, 147; X 123*.

Stobaeus *Ecl.* I 58 [Διογένης καὶ Κλεάνθης καὶ Ὀϊνοπίδης (τὸν θεὸν) τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ψυχὴν].

Musonius *ap. Stob. Flor.* 117, 8 (θεοῦ, ἐν θεοῖς, ὁ θεός used with no apparent discrimination).

Philodemus, *De Pietate* c. 7* (παρ' Ἀντισθένης δ' ἐν μὲν τῷ φυσικῷ λέγεται τὸ κατὰ νόμον εἶναι πολλοὺς θεοὺς, κατὰ δὲ φύσιν ἓνα).

Cicero, *N.D.* I 12 (31). Xenophon ... facit ... Socratem ... dicere ... modo unum, tum autem plures deos.

From even this imperfect list a few conclusions may be drawn.

1. The vague use of θεός is common at all periods. It is therefore misleading to speak, as some writers do, of 'the vague use of θεός in tragedy.'

2. Although the article begins to be regularly added just at the time that philosophic monotheism was developing, it is dangerous to connect these two phenomena, because—

(a) The addition of the article is partly due to grammatical changes in the language.

(b) Metrical reasons may have influenced the poets. It is interesting to note that Euripides, the lover of 'resolved feet,' is the first poet to use the article freely.

3. The important passage Aeschylus *Pers.* 739 foll. (where ὁ θεός occurs for

the first time), compared with several others, shows that a Greek could use *ὁ θεός*, *Ζεὺς*, *θεοί*, in close juxtaposition without appreciable difference of meaning.

4. These passages do not help very much in tracing the growth of popular monotheism. The unity vaguely referred to is that of divinity, not that of personality. Compare on this point P. Decharme, *Traditions religieuses*, p. 209 note 5: 'On sait d'ailleurs que le mot *θεός*, chez Xenophon et chez Platon, désigne souvent la divinité en général, quelle qu'elle soit, et sans ex-

primer l'idée de l'unité de la personne divine.' The tacit limitation to Xenophon and Plato is of course careless.

5. The following points, too, may be noticed: (a) The article is often generic; (b) Homer, Pindar, Antiphon and Xenophon afford very valuable evidence; (c) in some of the passages the reference *may* be to a special god, but I have tried to exclude those where it *must*. The frequent possibility of two or even three interpretations is a most perplexing factor in the inquiry.

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

THE TACTICS AT SALAMIS—A REPLY.

UNWILLING as I am to discourage any attempt to solve the riddle of Salamis, I feel bound to point out that the suggestion made by Mr. P. W. Dodd (*C. R.* XXVII. 117-20) is not supported by sound or adequate arguments. To the all-important question 'Why did the Greeks win?' he gives an answer which is absolutely misleading. He first argues that the Persians need not have found their numbers a handicap in the narrow waters, because Phormio assumes (*Thuc.* II. 89) that his own *smaller* fleet is at a disadvantage in a confined space. In so doing he misunderstands the whole point and meaning of the passage cited. It was the great superiority in manœuvring power acquired by the Athenian navy in the fifty years after Salamis, and the absolute inexperience of his Peloponnesian opponents (*Thuc.* II. 89, cf. I. 49), which justified the daring tactics of Phormio and his preference for the open sea (*Thuc.* II. 84, 90 f). But in 480 B.C. the Greek ships were heavier and slower than the Persian (*Hdt.* VIII. 10, 1, 60a); hence there can be no question that it was essential for them to fight in a confined space, whether at Artemisium or at Salamis. On this question we may safely prefer the clear statement of Herodotus (VIII. 60) to the perverted reasoning of Mr. Dodd.

Secondly, he states that the Greek victory was secured by falling upon the flank of the Persian line as it sailed up

the strait. This view, first put forward by Dr. Macan (*Hdt.* VII.-IX., vol. ii., p. 313) is not acceptable.¹ Even if the Greeks succeeded in breaking the column and so in cutting off the vanguard of the enemy, they would in turn have exposed their own flank to the attacks of the Persian centre and rear. The result would probably have been destructive to Greek and barbarian alike. But it is far more probable (cf. Tarn, *J.H.S.* XXVIII. 226) that the Persian ships, being lighter and handier than the Greek, would have had plenty of time by a half-turn to form line abreast facing the enemy, while the Greeks were hesitating and backing water (*Hdt.* VIII. 84) before their final attack. Thus the supposed advantage of a commanding position turns out to be illusory, and Mr. Dodd's answer to the question 'Why did the Greeks win?' falls to the ground.

I pass to his second question, 'Why did the Persians enter the strait?' The new suggestion made by Mr. Dodd that a feigned flight (executed by the Corinthians) formed the necessary complement to the message of Themistocles is at first sight attractive. But the

¹ It is rather strange that Dr. Macan should not recognise that an objection which he himself makes (*op. cit.*, p. 298) to Leake's theory of the battle applies also to his own—viz., that the Persian fleet, when defeated, would have been driven back on the shore of Attica, under Mount Aigaleos, and not through the Straits into the open sea.