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](#)

Adam's Hesiod and Pindar *A Comparative Study of Hesiod and Pindar*. By John Scott Adams. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. PP. 47. 1899.

W. T. Lendrum

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 01 / February 1900, pp 63 - 64

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080318, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080318

How to cite this article:

W. T. Lendrum (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 63-64 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080318

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON MANILIUS V. 555 sq. and 133.

supplicia ipsa decent: ninea ceruice reclinis
moliter ipsa suae custos est ipsa figurar.

The three *ipsa*'s in two lines are insufferable, and either the second or the third superfluous. Critics have generally removed the last and disagree profoundly about its substitute. But it is the second, which appears to have come from the preceding verse, that should be the object of attack. *Illa* seems an easy and unobjectionable correction. I take this opportunity of stating that the word which I proposed for fundamenta, v. 133, 'illa (the she-goat) Tonanti | fulcimenta dedit' in *Silva Maniliana*, p. 45 had already occurred to Prof. M. Warren (*American Journal of Philology*, xiii. p. 102, in a review of Ellis's *Noctes Manilianae*). Whether Prof. Warren understood it as I do (as meaning *alimenta*), I do not know; but if he did, he should not have illustrated it by 'Phocas Vita Vergilii 27 (said of Terra) herbida supposuit puero fulmenta uirescens.'¹

J. P. POSTGATE.

* *

THE ETYMOLOGY OF εὔχομαι.

Εὔχομαι is usually compared (see Prellwitz, *Etym. Wörterbuch* s.v.) with the Vedic *vāghat* 'prayer'

¹ I wish also to correct an error in a detail in my note on Manilius V. 372. Bentley based his *suo* on the reading of a 'Venetus codex' in which he actually found *suos*.

'offerer' and Latin *voveo*; but this derivation fails to account for the sense of 'claiming' 'boasting' &c. in εὔχομαι εἶναι. In Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* xxxv pp. 501-3 Baunack, writing of 'Bhujyu, ein Schützling der Aqvin,' has a discussion of the root *ūh*, to which he ascribes two senses, (1) *sich gelten machen vor anderen bei einem Wettstreit* 'to assert one's superiority in any kind of competition,' (2)—transitive—'to assign superiority to.' The former is illustrated by *anyo net sūrir ohate bhūridāvattaro janah* 'no other proves himself a more liberal lord' *yayoh çatrur nakir adeva ohate* 'whose enemy no godless man may boast himself,' the latter by *devāh ohānah* 'honouring the gods.' So we have the noun (instrumental) *ohasā* 'in estimation,' and *ohabrahman* 'a proven priest.' Although Baunack has thrown new light on the word, the senses given are neither entirely new nor doubtful, as may be seen by a reference to the dictionaries of Grassman and Böhlingk and Roth. *Oha* is actually given by the latter as meaning 'devotion' (*andacht*). But Baunack has brought out the double signification in a way which clearly shows the connection with εὔχομαι. The sense of 'praying' is therefore that of εὔχομαι in *πρῶτον μὲν εὐχῇ τῇδε πρεσβεύω θεῶν τὴν πρωτόμαντιν γυῖαν*.

This etymology is mentioned in the form of rejection by Uhlenbech (*Et. Wb. d. Altind. Spr. s.v. ohate*), who however has not observed how strongly it is supported by the *meaning*.

F. W. THOMAS.

* *

REVIEWS.

ADAM'S HESIOD AND PINDAR.

A Comparative Study of Hesiod and Pindar.

By JOHN SCOTT ADAMS. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. pp. 47. 1899.

THAT Pindar was a close student of Hesiod, whom he once quotes by name and often refers to by indirect allusion, is no secret to readers of the former poet. Not that Pindar stood alone in this respect, for strains of Hesiod's teaching shoot thickly through the web of all succeeding literature. His poems formed the Bible of the Greeks. Along with Homer, to quote a familiar passage of Herodotus, it was Hesiod 'who created for the Greeks their theogony, assigned to be gods their titles, distinguished their prerogatives and functions and specified their characteristics.' And Aeschines, quoting *Op.* 203. f., observes that such γνῶμαι were learned in childhood that they might be practised in manhood, while from later writers we gather that the 'Works and Days' was still a school-book in the fourth century of our era (*Libanius* 1,

502: iv. 874). But the works of the old Ascræan moralist had a special claim on his fellow-countryman, Pindar; and a clear statement of the relation between the two Boeotian poets would doubtless be welcome to students of either. Such a statement is here attempted by Mr. Adams, and the material he has collected is by no means devoid of value. His methods, however, hardly merit unqualified approval. To begin with, he sows with the sack. Dividing his subject under three main heads—Religious beliefs, Mythology and Language—he proceeds to quote the same passages often twice and sometimes three times under successive divisions. Thus, to take one of many instances, *Op.* 353 τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν is first compared with *P.* ii 83 φίλον εἶη φιλεῖν to illustrate the view of 'Man in relation to Fellow-men' common to both poets and the same passage recurs a few pages later to exemplify their similarity in language. Again on p. 32-3 the reader is presented with more than forty of the

veriest Homeric commonplaces, 'in none' of which, Mr. Adams naively admits, 'can it be assumed that Pindar was under the influence of Hesiod, although he may have been.' This straining of the legitimate use of evidence proves too much, and, by swelling Mr. Adams's pamphlet to some 45 pages of parallels, enables him to present a more plausible case than the facts warrant. He would have deserved better of his readers had he noted some of the less obvious echoes of Hesiod in Pindar. Thus the *lóγos* ('proverb,' of *N.* iii. 29 : iv. 31 : ix. 6) of *P.* i. 35 is surely the familiar *ἀρχὴ δέ τοι ἥμισυ παντός*; and the whole passage (*P.* iv. 79 ff), describing the dress of Iason, is clearly written under the influence of Hesiod: there Iason, who has been ploughing in the mountains (76, cf. schol.) is made to observe the rules implied in *Op.* 388 ff for the dress of mountaineers, as a protection against the 'shivering showers' (*φρίσσοντας ὄμβρους* *P.* iv. 81 : cf. *Op.* 540).

Further, in many cases an examination of the context will raise a doubt, whether Mr. Adams's alleged parallels are really parallel at all. Thus *Op.* 366 *πῆμα δὲ θυμῷ χρηίζειν ἀπεόντος* means something quite different from *P.* iii. 21 *παπταίνει τὰ πόσσω*; nor does *Op.* 25 *κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ* give the same thought as *P.* i. 84 *ἀκοὰ ἀστών κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει* κτλ. So (*p.* 10) *I.* ii. 11 *χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ* is not due to *Op.* 686, but is directly referred by Pindar to an anonymous 'Argive,' as Mr. Adams himself remembers in a later citation of the passage (*p.* 40); and it is surely an error to quote *Op.* 47 to show that 'Zeus was easily deceived by Prometheus': in that passage *ἐξαπάτησε* means 'cheated' of the flesh, not 'deceived' which Zeus certainly was not (*Theog.* 551 : *γῶ ῥ' οἶδ' ἠγνοίησε δόλον*).

The section on Mythology is less open to criticism: here Mr. Adams gives an

interesting list of cases where Pindar deserts Homer for Hesiod in his versions of the legends of the gods. To his note on Hephaestus (*p.* 19) should be added *N.* vi. 63, where that god is referred to as Daedalus. He gives a new and probably true interpretation of *N.* xi. 1 *πρώταν θεῶν*, 'first-born of the gods,' quoting *Theog.* 453 : and on *P.* iv. 227, *ὀρθὰς δ' αὔλακας ἐντανύσας ἤλαυν'*, he seems right in joining *αὔλακας* with *ἤλαυν'* on the strength of *Op.* 443 *ἰθεῖαν αὔλακ' ἐλαύνει*. Elsewhere Mr. Adams is less successful in controverting received views: on *p.* 38 he rejects the MSS. reading of *N.* iii. 14 *παλαίφατον ἀγοράν*, 'which neither gives an adequate meaning nor satisfies the metre; a spondee, not an anapaest, being required.' Well, it satisfied Bergk's view of the metre, for he keeps *ἀγοράν*, and it may be noted that in this very poem *παρὰ μείβει* (27) corresponds to *κατέμαρψεν* (35); while, as for the meaning, a wholly adequate sense results by comparing *Πυθίου Θεάριον* (70), for that building, the victor's dwelling-place, no doubt stood in the market-place of Aegina, as did the Temple of Apollo (*Müller* 'Aegina' *p.* 146).

May it be permitted in conclusion to protest against the old heresy, which dies so hard, that Pindar was an Aegeid? Mr. Adams seems to share in this view, describing the poet as 'an aristocrat' (*p.* 1). There is really not a shred of evidence to support it, except the erroneous interpretation of *P.* v. 75, where the words *φῶτες Αἰγείδαι, ἐμοὶ πατέρες* are clearly spoken, not by Pindar, but by the Cyrenean chorus (cf. *Studniczka* 'Kyrene,' *p.* 94 : *Pauly* s. v. *Aegeidae*). Pindar was an itinerant singer for pay, and such a position is wholly inconsistent with membership in the priestly and noble caste of the Aegeids.

W. T. LENDRUM.

FENNELL'S NEMEANS AND ISTHMIANS OF PINDAR.

Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes.

With Notes, Explanatory and Critical, Introductions and Introductory Essays, by C. A. M. FENNELL, Litt. D., etc. New Edition. (Cambridge University Press.) pp. xvi. 275. 1899. 9s.

DR. FENNELL has done a good deal of work in the way of excision and remodelling on

his edition of 1883, but his views in general remain unchanged, with regard alike to points of interpretation and to wider questions such as the organization of the Pentathlon. Among the few passages in which a novel view is taken we may congratulate the editor on restoring sane grammar in *Nem.* i. 8 by taking *ἀρχαὶ θεῶν* to mean 'a foundation of gods (for stones)':