

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](#)



The Heliconian Prelude to the Theogony

Hugh G. Evelyn White

The Classical Review / Volume 31 / Issue 07 / November 1917, pp 157 - 158

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00009215, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00009215

How to cite this article:

Hugh G. Evelyn White (1917). The Heliconian Prelude to the Theogony. The Classical Review, 31, pp 157-158 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00009215

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

mind of the ripe scholar. An impulse laudable enough, one would think; but a moment's reflection would prove it to be wrong. Have these associations for the scholar himself accrued from poring over notes and commentaries? No; they have come from a wide reading in Greek and Latin literature. So we should let the pupil likewise read widely and gather his own associations.

These results may seem negative rather than positive; but to determine what should not be done is a great help towards arriving at what should be done. And if editors would allow themselves to be guided by the one positive principle of writing nothing which does not help the pupil simply to understand his text, while rigidly foregoing indulgence in any of the three classes of comment here deprecated, there could not but result a most considerable

diminution in the bulk of school commentaries as we at present know them. Incidentally, the commentary would *ipso facto* become far more useful.

There is one other thing which might be done far more frequently than is generally the case, *i.e.*, to preface the notes with a short *excursus* upon the style and idioms of the particular writer. This is often done—though generally in far too exhaustive a way—for authors who wrote in an unusual dialect, as in Doric. But it would also be a great help, if short (otherwise a boy will 'skip' it) for almost all authors. When a boy passes from, say, Caesar to Livy or Tacitus his progress is at first slow, and it might easily be accelerated by help of this nature.

R. B. APPLETON.

Cambridge.

THE HELICONIAN PRELUDE TO THE THEOGONY.

THE Heliconian Prelude (*Theog.* 1-35) presents certain features, not unusual in the Hesiodic poems, which lead to a conclusion not previously drawn (so far as I can remember¹) by critics who have examined the conglomerate of preludes to the Theogony. These features are partly aesthetic and partly substantial; and, though aesthetic considerations often play the part of will-o'-the-wisp in matters of criticism, they should here receive first mention, both because they give the most obvious sign of something amiss in this passage, and for their own intrinsic weight when associated with other and harder evidence.

1. In ll. 9 ff. it is curious that the Muses have to take a midnight walk to sing of the gods. Why could they not do so as they danced?

2. The evident design to introduce a summary of the Theogony (ll. 11 ff.)

disguised as the Muses' song is so weak and obvious as to cause surprise when we remember the beauty and originality of ll. 22 ff.

3. The summary itself includes names of slight importance, while omitting striking figures, such as Uranus and Prometheus: it gives the impression of being an unconscientious piece of work introduced for the grandiose effect of its list of names.

4. L. 22 ff. (*αἶ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίόδον κ.τ.λ.*) are very abrupt after the thirteen lines of the catalogue; and the reader involuntarily must pause to recall the antecedent to αἶ.

The prelude as a whole, then, is remarkable in that one half of it is flat, artificial, and uninspired, while the other is poetry of a high order. The internal features will lead us to an explanation of this.

1. Ll. 3-4 are essentially duplicated by ll. 5-8, which merely elaborate the *κρήνη* . . . *ὀρχεῦνται* of the preceding lines.

2. L. 21, (*ὑμνεῦσαι ἄλλων τ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἔόντων*) is almost identical with l. 33 *ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἔόντων*: indeed the Muses' song

¹ I am not in a position to consult the studies which deal with this subject. [This article was already in type when I found that Fick (*Hesiods Gedichte*, pp. 69 ff.) had taken a very similar view of the Heliconian prelude. We differ, however, in details as well as in our reasons for believing the prelude to be composite.]

(11—21) is, in substance, merely an explicit form of l. 33.

3. Ll. 8-10 are a patchwork of Epic tags, one of which, *κεκαλυμμένοι ἥερι πολλῇ* (l. 9) is apparently compounded from *W. and D.* 198 and 125, 223, 255.

The conclusion to be drawn from these points should now be pretty clear. The Prelude is not homogeneous, but contains two versions. Of these the first and best can be recognised confidently as including ll. 1-4, 22-35¹—a strong, fresh, and vigorous piece of work. The second version (ll. 5-21) was probably designed to follow after ll. 1-2. This, again, is probably composite: ll. 5-7 are unobjectionable and of local origin. As we have seen, they are an elaboration of ll. 3-4, and are therefore likely to be an alternative

¹ L. 25 (in which the Muses are addressed as Olympian) is surely a thoughtless interpolation of a 'stock line,' taken from l. 52 (cp. ll. 966, 1022), just as *W. and D.* 124-5 is copied from *id.* 254-5.

version of ll. 3-4. This would seem to be confirmed by the facts that either group is introduced by *καί τε*, and that in the Hesiodic poems variants commonly begin with the same or closely similar words; thus in *W. and D.* 227, 232 *τοῖσι τεθῆλε πόλις . . . τοῖσι φέρει μὲν γαῖα*; 239, 242 *τοῖς δέ . . . τοῖσιν δ'*; *Theog.* 590, 591 *ἐκ τῆς γὰρ γένος ἐστί . . . τῆς γὰρ ὀλῳίου ἐστι γένος*; *Shield,* 203, 205 *θεῶν . . . θεαί*.

Lines 9-21 will then stand alone as a clumsy substitute for ll. 22 ff., and the first of our aesthetic difficulties is explained; for since neither of the variants 3-4, 5-7 would permit the Muses² song to be made an accompaniment to their dance, the author of 9-21 was obliged to dispatch the Muses on a nightly progress during which they could chant their Theogony.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

² Line 8 may well be an interpolation of a familiar class.

THE PHILOXENUS GLOSSARY.

OF the famous Latin-Greek Glossary known generally, if incorrectly, as the 'Philoxenus' Glossary, only one copy has survived, a ninth-century MS. now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (*lat.* 7651). The neat appearance of the page photographed in Vol. II. of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* rouses an editor's suspicion. He associates that 'whited-sepulchre' type with an inferior type of MSS., whose scribes have aimed rather at a blotless page than a conscientious transcript. He expects to find omissions not supplied, miswritings left uncorrected; in short, all manner of corruption hidden under a fair appearance. Before he has read far in Goetz' apograph (*C.G.L.* II., pp. 3-212) he learns (p. 10, Nos. 21 ff.) that the columns have been transcribed from the exemplar separately, first the left-hand column (with the Latin lemma-words), then the right-hand column (with the Greek interpretations). By this easy-going practice the omission of any item in either column makes a page resemble a misbuttoned waistcoat:

to each lemma-word is attached its neighbour's interpretation.

But it would be unfair to lay all the sins of the MS. to the charge of the ninth-century scribe. The frequent confusions of Latin with Greek letters or syllables (*e.g.* 57, 22 'Dum *ταξαρ*: *μόνον*,' etc.) must be charged to a transcriber from an uncial exemplar. And if the exemplar at all resembled the famous uncial MS. of Lactantius at Bologna, such confusion would be pardonable; for the beautiful Latin uncial of the Bologna MS. is so exactly of the Greek type that an occasional Greek word is easily taken for Latin; unless it has the horizontal straight line above, which early scribes used for marking foreign words (like our use of italics or inverted commas). It is likely that a series of transcribers share the blame between them. Glossaries are far more retentive of errors than texts; and that is what makes Hagen's *Gradus ad Criticem* (a collection of the errors of some glossary scribes) of little use for the editor of a Latin author. Not