

the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, founded by Karl Krumbacher at Munich, carried on after his death until August 1914, and begun again in 1920 with the third and fourth parts of Volume XXIII. This omission cannot pass without notice in view of the great services rendered to Byzantine studies by Krumbacher, and it is in this case all the more curious as the new periodical follows exactly the admirable arrangement of the *Zeitschrift* in dividing its contents into three parts, original articles, reviews and short notices. The present undertaking is purely private:—the editor writes, ‘Das Unternehmen ist—ich betone dieses ausdrücklich—nicht von irgendeiner Regierung angeregt, sondern rein privat.’ It is published by Dr. Bees himself, and the necessary expenses have been found first by Mr. George Pianos, a Greek of Dresden, and then by subscriptions from a number of Greeks, all resident in Germany. A very wide field is to be covered; the new periodical is to deal with Byzantine literature both learned and popular, internal and external history, language, folklore, art, religious life, the geography, topography and ethnology of the lands which formed part of the Byzantine empire, epigraphy, numismatics, sigillography, jurisprudence, medicine, and other departments of Byzantine and modern Greek science. In addition the editor lays stress on his intention to deal with papyri and manuscripts, the *koine*, early Christian art, the Greek *diaspora*, and the influence upon other peoples exerted by the Greeks both in the Middle Ages and in modern times. The character of the periodical is to be international, and articles will be admitted in Greek, Latin, German, French, English, and Italian, although everything at present has been in German, except two articles and two reviews in Greek and one review in French, which is, however, by the Greek Professor Andreades. The future of the periodical largely depends upon whether it can obtain the support of Byzantine scholars outside Germany and Greece, but to this beginning a warm welcome can be extended. All readers of the old *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* know how much such a periodical is needed, and Dr. Bees will have all good wishes with him in his enterprise. The articles published are various and interesting, and it will be especially gratifying to members of the Hellenic Society to read the editor’s warm appreciation of the work of the late Mr. F. W. Hasluck and his wish for a complete edition of all his papers. In conclusion the price is moderate; for this country 25 French francs for each annual volume, and this first volume contains 456 pages.

R. M. D.

---

**Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality.** The Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of St. Andrews in the year 1920. By LEWIS RICHARD FARNELL. Pp. 434. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. 18s.

“This,” says Dr. Farnell of a somewhat foolish theory, “is ingenious, but much that is ingenious is not worth saying.” To the Thucydidean ideal of scientific investigation here implied he remains himself true. He is not concerned to make a demonstration of dexterity nor to balance inverted pyramids of hypothesis upon some random analogy, and his investigations start inductively from a collation of all the facts ascertainable about particular problems.

The result of this method is deadly to the assumptions of most schools of mythologists, from the champions of the solar myth to those who would read into every legend an hieratic meaning. The only assumption upon which Dr. Farnell insists, and here the trend of modern scholarship is with him, is that saga, whatever accretions of folklore it may have collected, contains a nucleus of historical tradition. Not that he believes in any single master key which will unlock the mysteries of the origin of all Greek hero cults. The Greeks themselves supposed that all their heroes had once been mortal men; Usener, on the other hand, was sure that they were all faded deities. Dr. Farnell gives uncritical adherence to neither view, but his bias is rather towards the Greeks. He recognises a small group of heroes, Trophonios, Linos and the like, who appear to have their origin in cult, and he acknowledges the existence of some functional heroic powers. But of the other five classes into which he divides the heroes of cult, all consist of persons who at the time of their canonisation were, rightly or wrongly, believed to have once been living men.

Opinion may perhaps be divided as to the assignment of particular heroes to particular categories, but the broad lines of Dr. Farnell's classification would appear difficult to shake. *ἐκ δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων τεκμηρίων ὅμως τοιαῦτα ἂν τις νομίζων μάλιστα ἀ διήλθε οὐχ ἁμαρτάνοι ἠρῆσθαι ἡγησάμενος ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανιστάτων σημείων ὡς παλαιὰ εἶναι ἀποχρώντως.*

The most important cults considered are those of Herakles, the Dioskouroi and Asklepios, to all of whom a heroic origin is assigned. The weakest case is that of Asklepios, for here the most certain of Dr. Farnell's tests fail. The meaning of the name is unknown and the evidence of cult, appropriate equally to a hero or a chthonian deity, is inconclusive. The case rests ultimately upon general probability and the fact that Homer appears to consider Asklepios the human father of Machaon and Podaleirios. The analogy between Asklepiadae and such professional patronymics as Talthubiadae, Homeridae and the like supports upon the whole the heroic theory. But though doctors are from Homer onwards the 'sons of Asklepios,' the remarkable thing about the cult is the lateness of its emergence as a Pan-Hellenic worship of the first importance and the extraordinary success which it then achieved. From the fifth century B.C. to the end of Paganism its popularity steadily increased. Although Trikke was the original home of the cult, this expansion was certainly due to Epidauros. It is true that various cults, both in the Peloponnese and elsewhere, derived directly from Thessaly, but we know very little about them before the period of Epidaurian influence and nothing about the parent cult, except that it had a subterranean *adyton*. Perhaps the most satisfactory feature of the discussion of the cults of Herakles and the Dioskouroi is the clearing away of much obscuring lumber. The criticism of solar and stellar explanations is ruthless and convincing. Throughout Dr. Farnell rightly emphasises the importance of historical perspective and the chronological sequence of the evidence. It is important that Kastor and Poludeukes are not called Dioskouroi earlier than the Homeric Hymns, and that not before Euripides is there any trace of their stellar associations. Similarly the apotheosis of Herakles in the flames of Oeta is unknown to Homer and Hesiod, and therefore points not to the Phoenician origin of Herakles, but to a confusion resulting from the identification in historical times of the Greek hero with the aliens Sandan and Melqart. The advisability of treating evidence in its chronological sequence may seem too obvious to need emphasis, but in practice it is often ignored.

The book is full of matter which demands reflection, and most readers will find that postulates, which they have uncritically held, need re-examination. For example, it may come to others also as a surprise to find that the distribution of the cult of Herakles has little or no connexion with the movements of the Dorians; the facts which Dr. Farnell adduces appear conclusive upon this point. But upon the whole the very great value of the evidence of cult upon questions of tribal movements is once more demonstrated in this volume, and interesting results would be likely to follow a systematic examination of the religious material from the ethnographical standpoint. Boiotia would seem here as central a point of importance as in the Catalogue.

In view of the mass of material which is contained in the book, it is perhaps a pity that the index is not more elaborate. There is no entry, for example, under 'Minyans,' though there is much in the text which throws light upon the distribution of that people. There are one or two misprints, chiefly caused by the difficulty of maintaining consistency in the transliteration of Greek names upon an uncompromising system of letter for letter. Praisos upon p. 159, where the allusion is clearly to the Hagia Triada sarcophagus, must be a slip for Phaistos. The most notable omission as regards subject matter is the absence of any reference, whether for praise or blame, to Sir William Ridgeway's theory of the origin of tragedy.

---

La Religione nella Grecia antica fino al Alessandro. By RAFFAELE PETTAZZONI. Pp. 416. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1921. L. 20.

This little book suffers by comparison with Dr. Farnell's *Outline History of Greek Religion*. The author has read widely, but may be suspected of a better acquaintance with theories both ancient and modern than with the actual facts of Greek cult. His work lacks the