

DE NOVIS LIBRIS IUDICIA

G. FRANÇOIS, *Le polythéisme et l'emploi au singulier des mots ΘΕΟΣ et ΔΑΙΜΩΝ dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon* (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, 147). Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1957. 374 p. Pr. F. 22.—.

We often find (δ) θεός or (δ) δαίμων in a situation where no special god is mentioned. The author of the book under review believes that in most of these cases the singular is used in a collective sense. The arguments adduced in support of this thesis, however, are not very convincing. Let us take some examples from the *Iliad*: 24, 538 θεός is preceded by θεοί (525, 534) and followed by Οὐρανίω-νες (547). The author maintains: „θεός est employé au singulier sans qu'il puisse être question d'un dieu particulier” (p. 25). Why not? The possession of offspring is a special fact naturally to be attributed to the influence of a special god. No specification is added, however, because this is thought unnecessary. The resemblance between 1, 178 εἰ μάλα καρτερός ἔσσι, θεός που σοὶ τό γ' ἔδωκεν and 1, 290 εἰ δέ μιν αἰχμητήν ἔθεσαν θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔόντες is commented upon as follows: „il est inconcevable que le même homme, parlant d'une influence divine sur la personnalité d'un même héros, l'attribue, en l'espace de cent vers, à deux Puissances distinctes” (p. 27). But to be καρτερός is a more special quality than to be an αἰχμητής, and accordingly a special, but unnamed, god is made responsible for it. Similarly 20, 100-1 εἰ δὲ θεός περ/ἴσον τείνειεν πολέμου τέλος is taken by the author (p. 30) to be equivalent to 7, 102 νίκης πείρατ' ἔχονται ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν, but ἴσον qualifies the action as a special one. After quoting 15, 473 συνέχευε θεὸς Δαναοῖσι μεγάρας and 16, 119-20 γῶ δ' Αἴας κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα ῥίγησέν τε / ἔργα θεῶν, the author writes: „ce rapprochement montre que le singulier θεός et le pluriel θεοί se recouvrent assez exactement. N'est-ce pas, en effet, le même Ajax qui rapporte une influence du même type ici à θεοί et là à θεός?” (p. 32). But why could Aias in the first passage not refer to a single god?

It seems superfluous to pursue this criticism, because the author's interpretations constantly show the same kind of mechanical approach. Three more examples will be sufficient. Waltz correctly explained Hesiod *Op.* 756 θεός νύ τι καὶ τὰ νεμεσσᾶ as „le dieu auquel le sacrifice est adressé”. The author dismisses this view by referring

to 741 τῷ δὲ θεοὶ νευεσσῶσι and by remarking: „aux vers 755-756, le poète ne fait qu'allonger la liste des préceptes que l'on ne peut transgresser sans encourir la vengeance des dieux; l'emploi de l'adverbe καί au vers 756 est tout à fait significatif à cet égard” (p. 56). But the function of καί τά is to connect νευεσσῶ and νευεσσῶσι, rather than θεός and θεοί. When Telamon says to Aias: τέκνον, δορι/βούλου κρατεῖν μὲν, σὺν θεῷ δ' αἰεὶ κρατεῖν, and Aias replies: πάτηρ, θεοῖς μὲν κἄν ὁ μηδὲν ὦν ὀμοῦ/κράτος κατακτήσαιο (Soph. *Ai.* 764-8), the author concludes (p. 106) that θεῷ is equivalent to θεοῖς. But αἰεὶ here has a distributive meaning, so that θεός is the god who belongs to each special occasion. Plato *Laws* 893 b ἄγε δή, θεὸν εἴ ποτε παρακλήτέον ἡμῖν, νῦν ἔστω τοῦτο οὕτω γινόμενον — ἐπί γε ἀπόδειξιν ὡς εἰσὶν τῆν αὐτῶν σπουδῆ πάση παρακεκλήσθων is commented upon as follows: „L'acceptation collective du mot θεός est ici nettement établie par l'accord sylleptique de εἰσὶν et de αὐτῶν” (p. 247). But this conclusion is based on the erroneous translation of γε by „donc”.

In all these and similar passages θεός (or δαίμων) is “a god” or “the god in question”, who is left undefined because a definition is felt to be impossible or irrelevant in the context. This is admitted by the author for some cases (p. 323 ff.), but even here his classification is too mechanical. It cannot be maintained, e.g., that there is a difference between ὁ θεός in Hdt. IV 119, 3 („tel dieu particulier que l'auteur ne s'est pas soucié de nommer”) and in Hdt. IV 60, 2 („totale indétermination”).

ZEIST, Homeruslaan 53

W. J. VERDENIUS

W. PEEK, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. I: Grab-Epigramme. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1955. XXX, 695 S. Pr. DM 70.—

W. PEEK, *Verzeichnis der Gedicht-Anfänge und vergleichende Übersicht zu den Griechischen Vers-Inschriften I*. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1957. 44 S. Pr. DM 10.50.

W. PEEK, *Griechische Grab-Gedichte*. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1959. XII, 379 S. Pr. DM 29.—

Der stattliche erste Band der Griechischen Vers-Inschriften (GV), ist, “obwohl es sich um eine schlichte philologisch-epigraphische Textausgabe handelt” (S. VIII), ein beredtes Zeugnis der Liebe und Arbeitskraft, die der Herausgeber während fast dreier Jahrzehnte den Epigrammen gewidmet hat, und wird mit seinem reichen Material für lange Zeit eine bequeme Grundlage für weitere Untersuchungen bleiben. Mit seinen 2095 Inschriften (und noch dazu 43 Zusätzen, vgl. unten) zeigt er das riesige Anwachsen des Materials seit G. Kaibels *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta*