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](#)

Zeus Askraios

W. R. Paton

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 02 / March 1907, pp 47 - 48

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00181648, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00181648

How to cite this article:

W. R. Paton (1907). Zeus Askraios. The Classical Review, 21, pp 47-48 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00181648

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

cogito id quod res est, is a good commentary on *sed ego hoc hariolor*, 202, as I interpret those words.

Langen (*Beiträge*, 260 ff.) discusses all the passages in Plautus in which *hariolor* occurs;¹ he refuses to believe that the word anywhere in Plautus, 'gleichbedeutend ist mit *nugas agere, nugari*': it has in Plautus, he says, 'überall den Sinn "prophezeien," speciell "die Wahrheit verkünden."' For the latter sense he cites *As.* 315 ff., 579, 924, *Cist.* 746, *Mil.* 1256, *Rud.* 347. *Rudens* 377, too, certainly belongs here, though Langen says that there 'es dann doch fraglich bleibt, ob die Prophezeiung eintrifft oder nicht.' The passage runs: *scivi lenonem facere ego hoc quod fecit: saepe dixi. Capillum promittam optimumst occipiamque hariolari. Rudens* 1139 ff. is interesting: *quid si ista aut superstitiosa aut hariolast atque omnia quidquid insit vera dicet? ... DAE. Non feret, nisi vera dicet: nequiquam hariolabitur.* Here, too, *hariolari = vera dicere; nequiquam hariolabitur* does not militate against this view, for Daemones is merely quoting the verb *hariolor* as used by implication in Gripus's speech, 'she will do her "prophesying" in vain.' In no case, then, in Plautus is *hariolor* 'entwertet.'

¹ I have verified his list by the collections of Professor Lodge, the author of the monumental *Lexicon Plautinum*.

Further, several times *superstitiosa (superstitiosus) est* is used, always as = *vera praedicat*: see *Am.* 322, 323 *Curc.* 397, *Rud.* 1139 ff.

Langen, however, after thus setting the editors of Plautus right, himself lapsed sadly, by declaring that in Terence *Phorm.* 492 and *Adel.* 202 *hariolare* = 'du faselst.' I have shown above, I hope, that this view is wrong. Langen went on to show that in Ennius, *Trag. Frag.* 42 Ribb., *superstitiosae hariolationes* occurs, 'wo der ganze Zusammenhang den Begriff von *nugae* völlig ausschliesst,' and that later still Pomponius, 109 ff. Ribb., clung to the old sense. His conclusion was: 'Es scheint fast, als wenn eben nur Terenz das Wort in dieser Bedeutung gebraucht hat.' Even this is disproved by the considerations advanced above, and an array of notes in editions of Plautus and Terence is in sad need of correction.²

CHARLES KNAPP.

² In *Cas.* 353-356, *Most.* 571 certe hic homo inanis est. TR. Hic homo est certe hariolus, *Rud.* 1139, *Poen.* 791 *hariolus (hariola)* = 'a speaker of truth.' In *Am.* 1132, *Men.* 76, *Mil.* 693, *Truc.* 602, the only other passages in which the noun occurs, it certainly does not = *nugator*. Parry's index cites *hariolor* from Terence only twice, in the places already discussed. It cites *hariolus* only from *Phorm.* 708, where Geta is saying, 'We can advance excuses enough for breaking off the marriage: *interdixit hariolus, haruspex vetuit*. Here, surely, the *hariolus* is not a *nugator*, but one whose utterances are received with respect.

ZEUS ASKRAIOS.

THE following inscription was recently found at Myndus. As I have two independent transcripts, there can be no doubt about the reading.

Πο[σίδεος Κλεωνύμου καθ' ὑποθεσίαν
δὲ] Ποσιδέον καὶ ἡ γυνὴ Ἥδεῖα Ἀπολλωνίδου
καὶ] οἱ υἱοὶ Κλεώνυμος καὶ Ἀπολλωνίδης
Ἀλ]ικαρνασσεῖς Δὲ Ἀκραίῳ

Letters of about the first century B.C. or A.D.

Apollonius the Paradoxograph (Westerm. p. 107) describes a Halicarnassian sacrifice to Zeus Askraios. This Zeus Askraios has

owing to the gloss of Hesychius ἄσκρα· δρῦς ἄκαρπος been identified with the Zeus who on coins of Halicarnassus stands between two trees. But several instances are quoted in the Thesaurus where Ἀσκραῖος has been wrongly substituted in MSS. for Ἀκραῖος (*Ascra* was of course well known to literati as the birth-place of Hesiod), and I expect that we should restore Ἀκραίῳ in the text of the *Paradoxographi* and also in Plutarch *Animine an Corporis Affectiones sint pejores* p. 501 F. This treatise, or rather speech, cannot be by Plutarch. The writer of it was

residing in the province of Asia.¹ He mentions *Λυδίων καρπῶν ἀπαρχάς* as being offered to Zeus. The town he wrote in was a *conventus*. It may have been *Sardeis*.

¹ It is true that the reading *ἐκτραχύνουσα τὴν Ἀσίαν* is vouched for as far as I know only by the interpolated MSS., the rest having *οὐσίαν* or *δοσίαν*, but the mention of Lydian products is decisive.

There may have been a Zeus Akraios anywhere.

Of course this inscription does not prove that there was a Zeus Akraios at Halicarnassus, as it comes from the neighbouring Myndus, but it makes it probable that the Halicarnassian god's name was Akraios and not Ascraios.

W. R. PATON.

NOTES

A NOTE ON THE *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES.

SOPH. *Antig.* 885-888 :—

καὶ κατηρεφεῖ
τύμβῳ περιπτύξαντες, ὡς εἶρηκ' ἐγώ,
ἄφετε μόνην ἔρημον, εἴτε χρῆ θανεῖν
εἴτ' ἐν τοιαύτῃ ζῶσα τυμβεύειν στέγη.

In this speech of Creon the commentators have invented an intransitive meaning for *τυμβεύειν*, which is elsewhere transitive, and translate *ζῶσα τυμβεύειν* by 'to live a buried life.' But in view of the fact that Antigone's crime consisted in performing the rites of

burial over her brother's body, why may not *τυμβεύειν* be transitive with ironical signification, and the passage translated 'whether she wish to die, or, shut in such a home, to spend her life in making tombs'? This view seems to be confirmed by the following line, where, the severity of his speech having shocked even Creon himself, he apologises with the words, 'for we are not to blame in the matter of this maiden' (*i.e.* she had sufficient warning).

T. M. BARKER.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Now that the two associations of headmasters have declared in favour of a reformed pronunciation of Latin, a timely publication is Dr. Postgate's *How to Pronounce Latin: A Few Words to Teachers and Others* (Bell, 1s.), which not only tells the way to pronounce Latin, but sketches the evidence on which our knowledge rests, and discusses the arguments for and against a reform. An appendix gives three pieces of Latin verse and prose with phonetic transcript. This pamphlet should be in the hands of every teacher of Latin. Messrs Atkinson & Pearce have also issued a cheap reprint of the *Rules for Latin Pronunciation* for Dent's First Latin Book, with some of the exercises in phonetic transcript (6d.).

The Board of Education has just issued a paper directing that the reformed pronunciation of Latin be adopted in schools which come under the Board. Unfortunately, the

Board still leaves a loophole of escape, in asking a school which 'prefers to adopt some other system' to 'explain it clearly' to the Board. This is, however, a long step in advance.

The death of Prof. Pelham, President of Trinity College, Oxford, removes prematurely one of the most capable workers in the Classical field. His influence was that of the teacher, the lecturer, and the administrator, rather than the student or writer, good as his work was in this department, and he had an important part in the development of newer branches of classical study at Oxford.

A correspondent draws attention to a curious error in Munro's translation of Lucretius. The passage is Book VI. line 992. Here *vitro* is translated by 'brass,' the cause evidently being the collocation in the text with *argentum*, and the similarity of sound