

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](#)



Roscher's Greek Mythology

L. R. Farnell

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 06 / June 1888, pp 164 - 167
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192686, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192686

How to cite this article:

L. R. Farnell (1888). Roscher's Greek Mythology. The Classical Review, 2, pp 164-167
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192686

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

association, and so levelled into more or less of likeness: and at last we get something as near regularity as, *e.g.*, the Sanskrit verb: Greek and Latin retain to late days something more of the old irregularity: absolute regularity and system is achieved by no language.

Again, in II. Mr. Walker does not say why he thinks the common view unsatisfactory. According to it the perfect in its oldest ascertainable—not necessarily its oldest—form had one set of flexions: 1, sing. *a* (original or for orig. *m*); 2, *tha*; 3, *e*: the *s*-aorist had the common ones *m*, *s*, *t*: these were levelled completely in Greek, and also in Latin (into the perfects in *i*, and those in *si*): this levelling is just what always occurs when some one or two forms, out of two sets of forms originally distinct, coalesce phonetically, and when also the functions of the two sets become more or less identical—so here, when the perfect became (as in Latin) in the main a mere preterite like the aorist. Vedic preserved the old state of things: and the difficulty arising from the Vedic is, on Mr. Walker's view, as pointed out by Mr. Snow in the April number of the Review, almost insuperable. The 'reigning theory' which Mr. Walker finds unsatisfactory is, to my mind, as clear as any scientific principle can be, though some of the details may be wrong, and difficulties may remain which cannot be solved with any certainty. But here again what is the actual objection to the theory? Mr. Walker only mentions 'the identification of scripsem with scripsi' as 'an effort of philological despair.' No one has 'identified' them, so far as I am aware: though it may be held that scripsem is an analogically altered form of *scripsēm, representing an original *scripsm, which would be a proper aorist: while scripsi is a form which, by a wholly different process, and at a different period of the language, has been substituted for the original aorist: this is an explanation which

is quite tenable: it may be right or it may be wrong. But it is a mere detail: and it has nothing to do with the truth of the general theory that the identity of the personal suffixes of the Greek perfect and aorist is merely a Greek development, and is due to the common principle of form-association.

Lastly, in III. I see no reason to reject the accepted Greek phonetic rule that orig. *nti* when *n* was sonant, if accented, became *αντι* (*ānti*), and if unaccented *ἀντι* (*ānti*): these last were levelled out of the ordinary language. (It is true that the Homeric *πεφνκάσι*, *λελογχάσι*, were conclusively shown by Mr. Leaf in the *Journal of Philology* to be late; but they must have been formed on true types, though these have perished.) Hence forms like *πεποιθασι* (for *πεποιθ-γντι*): then by analogy *άσι* passes into vowel-stems, like *γεγάσι*, and even into reduplicated presents like *τιθέασι*, for the original *τίθεντι* (*τιθέωσι*). This explanation accounts for all forms, including *έθώκατι*. The difficulty of *ίσασι*, which seems to have started Mr. Walker's hypothesis, is surely quite a different one: it is the presence of the first *σ* (instead of *δ*), not the second one: this can only be guessed at: the form may be worked backwards from the preterite *ίσαν* (for **ίσσαν* for **φιδ-σαν*), as Brugmann holds, or it may be due to the analogy of *ίμεν*, *ίστε*, which changed **ιδ-ασι* into *ίσασι* (but this would not explain the parallel *είξασι*): we cannot know for certain. But assuredly this form gives us no ground to assume an original suffix *si* for the third pers. plur. And Mr. Walker's lengthening of an imagined **ιδσι* into *ίσασι* 'on the analogy of *έασι* and *ιασι*' is barely conceivable.

As to the Latin forms *uidēront*, etc., Brugmann has long ago shown (to my mind conclusively) that they are *s*-aorists and not perfects. Here however we shall decide accordingly as we decide on II.

JOHN PEILE.

ROSCHER'S GREEK MYTHOLOGY.

(Continued from page 138.)

THE most important article on Greek religion that has hitherto appeared in the *Lexicon* is that on Dionysos by Thraemer. The statement of the literary material is very full, and the discussion of the questions

is interesting and sometimes original. The writer belongs to the new school of mythologists, and we have very copious illustrations from folk-lore, and an extensive comparison of primitive rituals. The chief

blemish is the obscurity, that so darkens much of the argument that two or three readings are often required in order to extract the sense of a paragraph. But one is repaid by a certain freshness and reality in the exposition. The miraculous birth of Dionysos he refuses to explain by any reference to natural phenomena: we are delivered from remarks on sun, lightning and cloud, for Thraemer knows—what Preller did not know—that lightning does not ripen grapes. He follows Bachofen in interpreting the story about the birth of the child from the thigh of Zeus as a reminiscence in the old myth of the institution of the Couvade: Zeus by lying-in asserts his paternity, and this is desirable, because the Thracian Dionysos can thus be most naturally received into the circle of Greek divinities.

In Greece proper one of the centres of the Dionysiac worship was Delphi, and Thraemer assumes with some probability the existence of an oracle of Dionysos as the earth-spirit at Delphi prior to the Apolline; but he leaves out of sight the tradition, which certainly concerns his theory, that Apollo succeeded there to the worship of a Ge-Themis. He holds the view, which seems to be proved by ancient records, cult-names, and rites, that Dionysos as the wine-god is only a special form of a wider and earlier conception of Dionysos as the god of the vegetative powers of the earth. Hence comes his oracular power, his connection with the lower world and with the life of the soul after death; hence are explained many of the mysterious rites and names and persons that are attached to his worship. In his explanation of the Maenad ceremonies the clue that Thraemer follows was given by Mannhardt in his *Wald- und Feld-Culte*. The orgiastic dances of the Maenads are regarded as a kind of incantation whereby the 'vegetation-demon' is aroused in the spring and constrained to exert his fructifying powers for the good of man. This explanation is supported by parallel practices in the Tyrol, such as the 'Perchten Tanz' (a dance of masquerading mummers), and accords with what we know of the facts far better than Preller's theory that the orgiastic ecstasy represents the sorrow over the death and joy over the birth of the year. As Thraemer holds, the tumult is to awaken the sleeping god; and in the rites the god, the worshippers, and the victim are partially identified. For the goat or kid that they rend and devour is the god himself, and the Maenads thus become one with him in a sacramental union. Mr. Lang would find analogies among totemistic

tribes, who are specially prone to devour their own totem. But Thraemer, who is not an expressed devotee of totemism, contents himself with the explanation that votaries, by devouring his body, acquire the virtue and power of the god. The myth of Zagreus and the Titans, of which he does not make sufficient account, may be only the mystic counterpart of this rite, invented to explain the apparently hostile act against Dionysos. On the same view that the actual has been translated back into the mythic, Thraemer would explain the mythological Maenads and nurses of Bacchus. But on the other hand he rightly objects to Welcker's theory that the satyrs were merely the 'doubles' of the shepherds who celebrated the Dionysiac dances. The satyrs, like Puck, have their own right to exist. And he argues that Dionysos leading the satyrs in his train is only an enlargement of the primitive myth of the man who by the powerful magic of drink can control Silenus, or the wild man; but in order to establish this he ought to show that the satyrs ever appear as 'Natur-Geister,' constrained to follow Dionysos against their will. In the statement of most of these arguments there is obscurity, and occasionally a real confusion of thought: for example, he does not distinguish between the above-mentioned sacrifice, where the victim is regarded as the god who is offered 'himself to himself,' and those where obviously it is some one else who is offered to the god, where the god appears as a flesh-eater, a man-devourer, who must be appeased with human sacrifice. Among those Dionysiac myths that were invented as explanations of ritual he might have mentioned the adventure of Dionysos with the pirates, a myth which is probably of comparatively late origin, arising from the actual practice of crowning a mast or ship with ivy and vine-sprays in his honour.

His account of the archaeology, while being no less full and careful, is much clearer in its statement and arrangement. Among much that is interesting here we may note his view that the prevalence of the type of the youthful Dionysos in the fourth century and later art is due to the influence not only of local cults, but of the epic and dramatic poetry. A few omissions may nevertheless be noticed: in the list of archaic representations in which Bacchus appears the return of Kore should have been mentioned; and he does not emphasize sufficiently the relation between the Dionysiac worship and the belief in the lower world and the immortality of the soul; nor does he refer to the

vases which seem to express this idea. Lastly, he is silent about the Pergamene head of Bacchus, a work of some importance for the estimate of the later Alexandrine religious sculpture.

Furtwängler's account of the Dioscuri is full and clear, although among the monuments he omits one or two important representations, *e.g.*, the vase in the British Museum showing Demeter Persephone, the Dioscuri and Heracles, and the Tanagrean vase at Athens, which I described in the *Hellenic Journal*, showing the Twin Brethren in a gigantomachy. His article on Eros shows defects noticeable in some of his other articles: while the statement of the mere archaeological facts is excellent, he scarcely touches on the spiritual ideal of Eros in art and the means by which the expression of it was achieved. His account of the probable origin of the Thespian worship is valuable, but he is very vague in dealing with the question of the connection between the later Eros and the earlier cosmic power of the 'Uroeros' (!) whom Welcker distinguishes from the former.

The article on the Giants by Ilberg, who writes the literary, and Ernst Kuhnert, who writes the archaeological account, is defective and erratic on both sides, and contains many paradoxes and some irrelevant hypotheses. The first section gives a fair statement of the authorities, and ventures only on one theory, namely, that the conception of the giants was always a physical conception of volcanic and tempestuous disturbances, never the human ethical conception of a lawless primitive race. To maintain this Ilberg has to explain away the words of Homer and to forget other evidence that he himself has recorded, the tradition of Pallantids, of the Πηλαγόνες. In fact he gives only one element of a myth that contains at least more than one; and both he and Kuhnert are almost silent about the moral symbolism to the purposes of which the myth was so largely devoted. The great Pergamene monument, which concerns so intimately both sides of the question, receives very scant notice from both. In enumerating the deities which are certainly present, Ilberg mentions Klotho, who is not recognisable on the frieze at all, unless the suggestions were accepted that I made in the *Hellenic Journal* concerning a club-bearing goddess found among the combatants, and concerning an emendation in Apollodorus' account of the battle. The archaeological criticism of the monument is also very barren, and that group of sculptures that are supposed to belong to the

Attalid dedication are not at all properly mentioned and discussed.

Many objections might be stated, if there were space, to Kuhnert's theory of the origin and development of the forms in which the giant appeared in early and late art. It has been often noticed that in Homer their forms are human, and remain so till the date of the early Alexandrine monuments. Kuhnert ignores all this evidence, and declares on general grounds that the monstrous form must have been the primitive, chiefly because Alexandrine art was not original enough to effect on its own account a change in type. His incredulity is in defiance of the facts: the explanation of the facts, the reason why the change to the monstrous type was made comparatively so late, I have elsewhere tried to suggest. The positive and special evidence that his theory requires he obtains by misinterpreting certain vases and charging Pausanias with a foolish misstatement. He finds winged and serpent-footed giants on two or three vases of the archaic period where others have seen only Typhoeus; but he objects to call these figures Typhoeus because they are not as terrible as the Hesiodic figure, forgetting both the reserve and the helplessness of the early vase-painters; nor does he mention an archaic vase in the British Museum with a similar figure of a monster with whom Zeus is contending, and who is spitting fire more or less as Hesiod imagines him to do, and therefore is more probably Typhoeus than any other person. The passage in Pausanias which he manipulates is from the description of the Amyclean throne of Apollo, in which Pausanias says that he saw, serving as architectural supports, the figures of Typhon and Echidna. Kuhnert declares that he really saw giants (snake-legged sixth-century giants), and mis-called them. But Pausanias shows himself capable of distinguishing between a male and a female, and shows by a learned passage in the eighth book that he had studied the subject and could recognise a Greek giant when he met one.

The article by Scherer on Hades is one of the weakest in the handling of the literature and the literary questions. Much is taken from Preller, not only the matter but occasionally the words. He distinguishes between two conceptions of Hades, the one earlier and the other later, that of the stern and gloomy god of the lower world, and that of the mild and benevolent god, Hades-Plouton. He speaks of the influence of the mysteries, and to these we might ascribe the prevalence of the later concept. But he

supposes that even in the earlier period we find those titles that mark the more benign aspect of the god; yet none of those that can be proved to belong to the early period express anything of the milder character, and the epithet *Εὐβουλεύς* is not found before the fifth century. His account of the worship of Hades as Plouton in connection with Demeter and Persephone is very badly stated. The archaeological material is well given: he omits little of importance except the valuable fragments of fourth-century sculpture now at Athens from Epidauros, belonging to a representation of the rape of Persephone. He notes that in ancient art the form and idea of Hades was not very clearly defined.

The first part of the article on Hekate by Stending is full of wrong references and wrong application of passages referred to. He starts with the concept of Hekate as a lunar goddess, and, following the plan of Roscher, he deduces most of her nature and qualities from this. But though he may be right as regards the original idea, he does not seem sufficiently aware how scanty is the evidence that in any historic period of Greek religion the lunar was the prominent aspect of the goddess. We have evidence sufficient in monuments and in ritual that the idea was embedded in the worship of Hekate, though by no means all the ritual that he quotes as proving the moon-goddess has of necessity any such reference; but there is only one passage in the comparatively early literature in which she is prominently presented as a lunar figure, the well-known Sophoclean fragment of the *Πυρρόμοι*; and the passage from Plutarch (*De Defectu Orac.* ch. 13), which he misquotes, speaks as much to the Chthonian as to the lunar Hekate. He attracts far too many epithets and functions of Hekate into the lunar system: *φωσφόρος* is as applicable to a personage of the lower world as to one of the moon: *καλλίστη* is a complimentary title that should not be insisted on: the hound is as appropriate to the nether world as to the moon: the triple shape cannot with as much certainty as he claims be referred to the three phases of the moon, an interpretation for which Cornutus is our sole and not very trustworthy authority: she was the goddess of the crossways not necessarily because if we travel by night the moonlight is desirable when we come to them, but very possibly

because she was the mistress of ghosts and magic, and crossways were haunted. It is remarkable, though he does comment on the fact, that neither in the Homeric hymn to Demeter, nor in the passage he quotes from Apollonius Rhodius (3, 1223), nor in the 6th *Aeneid*, nor in the amusingly terrible account of her in Lucian's *Philopseudes*, p. 13, is there any designation of her as a goddess of the moon. In fact this concept had partially faded from the popular consciousness, to revive in the systems of the later mythologists. Where a record of her is preserved in the chief periods of Greek religion she is presented conspicuously as a goddess of the lower world; as such she may have been styled *κουροτρόφος*, almost for the same reason as Gaia or Demeter bore this title, and may have been occasionally regarded as a goddess that aided childbirth, although most of the passages which Stending quotes as proving that she had this function are very irrelevant and contain no clear reference to Hekate. And it is far more probable that the propitiatory offerings for the expiation of sin were made to her because of her connection with the lower world, the mysteries, and Demeter and Persephone, than, as Stending assumes, because of her lunar character. On the other hand the larger view, expressed in the Hesiodic fragment which celebrates her power in many spheres, was never altogether obscured: it is displayed in Euripides, in Plutarch's abstract of Xenocrates' statement, and it is the most probable explanation of the introduction into sculpture of the triple form. The second section of the article is more valuable than the first, although Roscher does not deal sufficiently with the important questions concerning the works of Scopas and Polycleitos, nor does he take adequate notice of the Pergamene representation.

Many of such defects as have been noticed might be eliminated by more careful editorial supervision; and no one who has used the Lexicon can help valuing it for its wealth of material, and frequently for its theory and exposition. Neither Baumeister's *Denkmäler* nor Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire* give quite so much as is given here, and the whole work promises to become a valuable aid to the study of Greek mythology, religion, and archaeology.

L. R. FARNELL.