The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Odyssean Books of the *Iliad*

A. Shewan and A. S.

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 4 / Issue 02 / April 1910, pp 73 - 79

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800018772, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800018772

How to cite this article:

A. Shewan and A. S. (1910). The Odyssean Books of the *Iliad*. The Classical Quarterly, 4, pp 73-79 doi:10.1017/S0009838800018772

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL 1910.

THE ODYSSEAN BOOKS OF THE *ILIAD*.

DISSECTING criticism of Homer has proved to its own satisfaction that certain books of the *Iliad* are late, and have special affinity with the *Odyssey*. This Odyssean connexion is established by collecting verbal and metrical peculiarities and grammatical usages, which are found outside these parts of the *Iliad* only in what is held to be the later poem. The chief delinquents are I, K, Ψ and Ω; but many would add the *Apaté*, Nestor's reminiscence in Λ, and other tracts. There is not complete agreement as to the limits of the category; but generally it is assumed that the four books, and, when necessary, other parts of the *Iliad*, have the Odyssean taint. Strangely enough, Θ is not so treated. Yet, as Mr. Andrew Lang has remarked, it *ought* to be Odyssean, if, as so many think, it was composed as a 'prologue' to I.

I have examined with some care the language of one of these unfortunate books, K, and have given due consideration to this theory of Odyssean affinity as a whole. My investigations have led me to doubt whether it has any real basis; and two recent publications have confirmed my scepticism. Miss Stawell, in *Homer and the Iliad*, has attacked the theory so far as it relates to Ψ and Ω, and seems to have cut away the grammatical grounds. Mr. John A. Scott, in *Classical Philology* for January, 1910, has dealt with vocabulary, and has had no difficulty, so far as that goes, in vindicating the tainted books. I would only add that if, following the models of the Higher Criticism, we take into account forms, meanings, formulae, etc., the case can be made even stronger. A itself, which to destructive critics, with the exception of a few neo-Homerists, is sacred as the earliest part of the *Ur-Ilias*, can be shown to reek of Odysseanism. I may give one example. There are more than ten formulae used in A which, outside it, are confined almost exclusively to the *Odyssey* and the so-called Odyssean sections of the *Iliad*.

K, or the Doloneia, is now regarded as the pariah of the *Iliad*, an outcast for which every traveller along the Homeric ways should have a stone. The

book has, as Mr. T. W. Allen says, 'been persistently written down.' The linguistic attack was commenced by Ad. Holm in 1853; it was developed by Düntzer in an essay now printed in his *Hom. Abhandlungen*; and it culminated in an onslaught by K. Orszulik in a pamphlet published in 1883. I do not know of anything in Homeric literature to compare with Orszulik's catalogue of the enormities of K. If it proves anything, it is that the author of the lay (who is often classed as a late *imitative* poet!) was endeavouring, by eccentricities of diction, to prove how thoroughly un-Homeric such work could be made, and yet gain admission to the canon. But these attacks have not been answered, and they have had their effect. Professor Henry has reason when he affirms that the verdict of the philologists is 'unequivocal.'

The success of the philological campaign has encouraged the prosecution of destructive criticism by the many means known to the patrons of that art. The style, the narrative, the *Realien*, the connexions of the book, have all been studied with the greatest minuteness by writer after writer in special monographs and in works on the Homeric Question. Nearly all have reached the same conclusion—that K is spurious, late, and Odyssean. Even Dr. Monro gave up the Doloneia. Messrs. Allen, Lang, and Jevons still preserve their belief in its genuineness; but they form a very small minority.

I humbly think that the case, in all its phases, has won acceptance too easily, and that the judgment against K should be reviewed. The lay seems to emerge unscathed from every ordeal, and I have submitted it to many. Try it, for instance, by the Digamma, a test that has always been dear to disruptive criticism. The criterion is certainly not a good one. The learned are far from being agreed as to the words which were digammated in Homer, or even as to what are to be considered as neglects of *F*. Many deny absolutely that there is any difference between the Digamma-phenomena of so-called late and early parts of the poems. But apply the test, such as it is. There is no difficulty in proving K as early as A, and that, whether you examine and compare individual neglects in the two books, or, with Sikes and Allen (*Hom. Hymns*, LXIII ff.), collate all the phenomena. Yet there are authorities, including Dr. Leaf and the late Sir R. Jebb, who would date K as late as 650 B.C., when *F* had been dead in Ionic for perhaps two centuries, and when Archilochus was writing poetry absolutely innocent of its influence (Thumb, *I. F.*, IX 325, 329, 334, and Fick, *Odyssey*, 8). Or apply the metrical test. It has hardly even been suggested that the Doloneia differs in its versification from the rest of the *Iliad*. But Hesiod and the Hymns and the remains of the Cyclics show decided degeneration in verse-structure. The Doloneia shows none. Try it again by the Article. Dissectors condemn passages on a *τόν* or a *τοῦ*. It is a poor test. Its patrons have no regard to the modernizers, who certainly often put in an Attic Article (Agar's *Homerica*, *passim*). But take the phenomena as they are on the face of the poems, and as they have been collected for every book by Miss Stawell (*op. cit.*, 278 ff.). The Odyssean books of the *Iliad* are not a whit worse than the others. And if we compare K and

A, there are in the latter occurrences of the Article in one of its highest uses—*τά τ' ἔδντα, τὰ κάκ'*, etc.—which are not to be paralleled in K.

The presence of strange words and forms has also been made ground of attack. L. Friedländer's well-known work, *Zwei hom. Wörterverzeichnisse*, has generally been taken as proving the futility of using *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* as a criterion; but some high authorities continue to lay stress on them. They are not unduly numerous in K. Friedländer (*op. cit.*, 746 ff.) finds the proportion for the *Iliad*, one to every $14\frac{1}{3}$ lines and for the *Odyssey*, one to 14. For K it is one to $14\frac{1}{2}$. The solitary occurrences in K, which have been made so much of, are explained by the subject of the book. When the critics point out words in it which are, without apparent cause, used in place of words which are in common use elsewhere in the poems, we may pause to consider them. Rare forms and meanings and constructions are also relied on, but there is no difficulty in meeting the case founded on them. I cannot, of course, give particulars here, but I may cite one form to show that conclusions have been reached somewhat hastily. *τοῖσδεσσι*, which is found only in K (once) and five times in the *Odyssey*, is one of the trump cards of the opposition. From the terms in which it is referred to, one would gather that the ordinary form of the dative plural of *ὅδε* is common in the *Iliad*. On the contrary, the dative plural is not found in the *Iliad* outside K at all. How, then, can we say that *τοῖσδεσσι* was an abnormal form to the (supposed) mass of contributors to the *Iliad* other than the poet of K?

As for the Odyssean character of K, one has only to look at Düntzer's enumeration (*Hom. Abh.*, 323 f.) to see what a poor foundation it is to build on. He gives some twelve words and forms, with two verbs which happen to be used in the middle only in K and the *Odyssey*! But an attempt has been made to prove 'the dependence of K on the *Odyssey*,' as it is called, in another way. Dr. A. Gemoll (*Hermes*, XV 557 ff.) claims to have shown, by comparison of parallel passages, that K is later than the *Odyssey*, and borrows from it. But when one examines his parallels, one finds that in some there is no great similarity, that in others there is nothing more than the free use of epic commonplace, and, most important of all, that in the leading cases the critics are not only not agreed as to whether the matter is original in K or in the *Odyssey*, but also exhibit a diversity of opinion which is quite remarkable. I may illustrate this by one famous case. The similarity of K 243 f. and *a* 65 f. has always attracted attention, and I have collected the opinions of fifteen critics. Nine favour K and six the *Odyssey*. All come to judgment with the settled conviction that there is plagiarism in the one poem or the other, but their united wisdom cannot convince anybody that the one or the other is the offender. Surely there is room for the suggestion that the lines are original in each place.

The scandalous misuse of the Repetitions in Homer has been exposed by Dr. Carl Rothe times without number, and his work on the *Wiederholungen* has almost closed the discussion of the subject. But probably nothing will ever

stop the abuse in practice. It may be seen in full force in two recent works, Fick's *Entstehung der Odyssee*, and Witte's *Studien zu Homer*. It is a process that is absolutely barren of results. It disregards what is one of the most prominent characteristics of the poems, and proceeds on the preposterous assumption that, in the words of G. Lange, 'every verse in Homer has its *one* appropriate place.' I will only add, with reference to Gemoll's proof that K is later than the *Odyssey*, that Düntzer has satisfied himself (*op. cit.*, 472) by the *same method* that K is older than the *Odyssey*. I myself have found no difficulty in proving by it that K is older than books of the *Ur-Ilias*. The Odyssean case against K is a complete failure.

As regards the four Odyssean books as a group, there are other difficulties. Examine their case as one may, they do not hang together. Rothe, perhaps the leading Homerist in Germany, has remarked (*Jb. d. philolog. Vereins*, 1907, 324) how little K agrees with the other *Odysseebüchern*. Blass (*Interpol. in d. Odyssee*, 296) contrasts Ψ and Ω alone with the rest of the *Iliad*. Certain metrical peculiarities are specified by Dr. Monroe (*H. G.*, 357) as Odyssean. Ψ and Ω exhibit them; I and K do not. From his Introduction to I in his *Iliad*, one gathers that he hesitates to class that book as late and Odyssean. And it is strange that, when a critic breaks up the *Iliad* by means of some criterion, it is seldom, if ever, that the quartette are found to belong to the same stratum or age. From Hentze's inquiries into *ei* with the conjunctive (*Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforschg.*, N.F., XLI 356 ff.) it would appear that I and K attach themselves to the *Ur-Ilias* books, A, Λ , II. Signor Della Seta has satisfied himself (*Rendic. d. R. Accad. d. Lincei*, 1907, 201 f.), on the occurrences of certain appellatives, that I belongs to the third, K and Ψ to the second, and Ω to the earliest of the four strata of the *Iliad*. Witte, on the other hand, in his *Singular und Plural*, makes Ω the most modern of all the additions. And so on.

The final touch in the elaboration of this Odyssean theory was put by Dr. Monroe in the *H. G.* See the Index under '*Iliad*, characteristics of particular books, especially I, K, Ψ , Ω ,' and also the Introductions to these books in his edition of the *Iliad*. There was to him a strong linguistic bond between the books themselves and between them and the *Odyssey*, so much so that one would think the comparison he makes, in the Appendix to his *Odyssey*, between the language of the *Iliad* and that of the *Odyssey*, should rather have been between the former *minus* I, K, Ψ , and Ω , and the latter *plus* those four books. And anyone who examines the details of that comparison will be struck by the fact that a number of the phenomena which Dr. Monroe classes as Iliadic and not Odyssean are found in these Odyssean books, while many Odyssean usages are absent from them. The instances are numerous enough to cast most serious doubt on the theory we are discussing. But more, it frequently happens that when we examine an Odyssean book for occurrences of some usage which critics regard as a sign of late Odyssean work, we find, not merely that it does

not occur—that might be due to a variety of causes—but also that the old and genuine usage, which is the alternative to the modern and objectionable practice, is there in full force. The novelty which, as superseding or having superseded the ancient way, is considered one of the marks of the beast, is eschewed altogether. For instance, Fick and others have proscribed the contracted form of the genitive plural of the first declension. But in the late Odyssean book I such genitives occur twelve times, and in every case it is the old open form in *-ων* or *-ων*. Again, it pleases certain authorities, without—so far as I can discover from philological works—any good warrant, to regard iterative verbs as a sign of lateness. The criterion succeeds only if you grant with it unlimited freedom of excision. It fails utterly when applied to K, which has only one certain iterative. But a fact more striking still is this, that there is a passage in K, 5-16, which Fick (*Iliad*, 477) condemns as a late interpolation in this late book, in which its very late author had many opportunities of using this late form most appropriately. But he does not use it there *once*. Other cases could be added, but let these suffice. If these books are late and Odyssean, there is surely little virtue in some of the stock linguistic tests.

And no one, as far as I am aware, has given a thought to affinity with the *Iliad*. But if certain phenomena which appear only in K and the *Odyssey* prove affinity between K and the *Odyssey*, and tend to dissociate K from the *Iliad*, surely phenomena of the same description occurring only in K and the rest of the *Iliad* will tend to prove the same kind of affinity between K and the *Iliad*, and will in the same way tend to dissociate K from the *Odyssey*. It seems undeniable. I have drawn out particulars for K and the *Iliad*. They seem to be crushing to the Odyssean case. I may cite one item. Dr. Monro finds in K uses of prepositions which are Odyssean. But there are also, according to the *H. G.* (pp. 173, 180, 186), uses of *περί*, *ἐπί*, and *ἀνά* in K which are found elsewhere only in the *Iliad*. If some prepositional uses prove K to be late and Odyssean, others prove it to be early and Iliadic; which seems absurd, except on one obvious supposition. For the uses of prepositions which are styled Odyssean by Monro, reference may be made to Miss Stawell's work, *App. C*; they vanish under examination. Professor Murray, in the *Nation* of 9th October last, has attacked her demonstration in regard to the uses of *ἐν*. He shows that some of the lines which Miss Stawell quotes as examples of uses have been suspected or were read differently by Zenodotus, Dionysius Thrax, Dr. Leaf, or Herr Müller, while others are tabooed because they occur—or something like them—in other parts of the poems. But surely by the same free treatment we could demolish most of the rules and theories in the *H. G.* itself. Abnormal uses of prepositions are everywhere, as the chapter on the subject in the *H. G.* abundantly shows. Attempts to find different delicate shades of meaning are all affected by what G. Curtius (*Andeutungen*, 34), referring to Giseke's well-known effort, calls a *sehr subjectives Gepräge*. And generally no regard is had to metrical convenience.

But it certainly has its influence. If the poet of K says *ἔειπον ἐν ὑμῶν*, which is objected to, he also says *ταῦτα μετ' Ἀργεῖους ἀγορεύεις*, which is good and Iliadic.

Returning to affinity with the *Odyssey*, it cannot be denied that there are parts of the *Iliad* in which the connexion is more marked than in others. In A, as we have seen, it is very conspicuous. The explanation is not far to seek. Several causes could be specified. I confine myself to one—difference of subject-matter. A and I, K, Ψ, Ω, unlike the greater part of the *Iliad*, do not deal with fighting in the field, and we are consequently not surprised to find that their language approximates to that of the poem with the more peaceful theme. To test this I selected a fighting passage from a good fighting book, Λ. I chose lines 210-410, expecting to find but little correspondence between its diction and that of the *Odyssey*. In fact, in these 201 lines there are not more than twelve words and expressions which recur only in that poem. And where do they occur in this part of Λ? Six in a passage, 221-45, in which the poet turns for a moment from the fight to the story of Iphidamas, which contains a series of domestic details, and three in similes, leaving only three for the martial narrative, which is about four-fifths of the whole passage. Here we have in brief the origin of this Odyssean theory.

If, with Miss Stawell, we go further afield and examine the details of Monro's comparison between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as wholes, we shall, I think, be forced to her conclusion that no difference that can be deemed significant has been established. If this be so, it does not matter what degree of Odyssean affinity any or all of the books of the *Iliad* exhibit. The section of Dr. Monro's examination which deals with vocabulary is far from convincing. When allowance is made for difference of subject, for which I refer to Colonel Mure's admirable statement (*Hist. Gr. Lit.*, II 131), the residuum that is relevant is extremely small, so small (Friedländer, *op. cit.*, 813 f.) that it may be entirely neglected. As to grammar, Miss Stawell's refutation seems conclusive. I might quote in illustration one item, the strongest, I think, for the Choric case that can be selected. Three uses of the optative are relied on as being confined almost exclusively to the one poem or the other. If such a difference in usage were proved, one might concede its importance. I humbly think they are none of them established. For two of them I refer to Miss Stawell's discussions; in the third case, the optative with *κεν* of an unfulfilled condition, I differ from her. I venture to think, after consulting Goodwin and other authorities, that there is grave reason for questioning the existence of this optative. But if it is accepted as a Homeric usage, it is only necessary to set out the occurrences in the *Iliad*, the poem in which they are supposed to preponderate, and to classify them, to see what the reason is why they are more numerous in the epic of the battle-field.

Here I leave the question for the present; but the hope may be expressed that Miss Stawell's book and Mr. Scott's paper are only the commencement of a discussion which will not cease till this questionable theory has been finally

disposed of. My belief is that it has, like many other notions convenient for the purposes of dissection, grown up and gathered strength, and at last almost attained to the dignity of *chose jugée*, simply because—I think I may say ἡγεμόνων κακότητι— it has never been ‘met and fought with outright.’

A. SHEWAN.

P.S.—Since the above was written, Mr. Andrew Lang has, in a recent issue of the *Athenaeum*, asked for an analysis of the Odyssean usages in I. It appears from the statement on pp. 98 ff. of Miss Stawell’s work that there are eight. Four are prepositional uses, and these Miss Stawell has disposed of. Another is ὥστε with the infin. This occurs once in I, and only once in the *Odyssey* (Miss Stawell, p. 271). For another, ‘Final Relative Clauses with the subj.,’ see p. 300 of her work. The usage is quite common in her *Original Iliad*. A seventh is ‘εἰ and the opt. after a pres. indic.’ It can hardly be called Odyssean, seeing that there are three cases in the *Iliad* and only four in the *Odyssey*. The last is μὲν οὖν, once in the *Iliad*, I 550, and five times in the *Odyssey*. There is not much to the debit of I.

A. S.