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](#)

Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*. By Wolf Aly. Large 8vo. Pp. iv, 301 + 12. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1921. 12s.

R. W. M.

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 3-4 / May 1922, pp 85 - 87

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016322, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016322

How to cite this article:

R. W. M. (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 85-87 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016322

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

reason, as when he rightly refuses Ihm's proposal for the corrupt passage in Cap. III. about Domitia. But his main purpose is to provide a full historical commentary, and here the result is of considerable value. He prints at length a generous selection of parallel authorities, and adds to these his notes on such a scale as often to leave a page with no more than a single line of text. Inevitably in such a mass of matter there are lapses of judgment and even of fact; but in most cases the notes are good and take account of recent work, though it would have been more convenient if the references to Friedlaender's *Sittengeschichte* had been made to a later edition than the sixth. The chief defect of the commentary at large is one to be expected in a dissertation—its tendency to stray. Discursive learning has a charm that is its own, but there is a point, left far behind by Janssen, at which this sort of thing becomes absurd. In Cap. I., for instance, Suetonius casually mentions some tittle-tattle to the effect that Nerva's relations with the young Domitian were not all they might have been; whereon the editorial comment is a profound examination of the discrepancy between Cassius Dio and the *Fasti* of Philocalus on the year of Nerva's birth. The learning is admirable, but here it is buried alive. Again, in Cap. X. the fate of Civica Cerealis—presumably Gaius of that name—leads to an account of his shadowy relative, Sextus, while nothing is said about a much more interesting point, the reason why Suetonius thought it worth the trouble to add that he was put to death 'in ipso Asiae proconsulatu.' But this is a small defect which will not prevent the book from serving as a most useful collection of material for Flavian history.

A short notice is not the place for a discussion of all the detailed points on which criticism might be made, but it may be worth while to end with a few disjointed observations. (1) In Cap. IV. Suetonius says that at the Agon Capitolinus of 86 Domitian presided 'adsidentibus Diali sacerdoti et collegio Flavialium,' on which Janssen's comment is 'adsidebat ei utpote Iovi flamen Dialis, sacerdos Iovis.' If this means what it appears to do, we are entitled to ask, first, for some evidence to support its rather sweeping implication, and,

secondly, for a reason why Domitian, when masquerading as Jupiter incarnate, should have worn a crown bearing figures of the Capitoline Triad. The editor quotes nothing, unless he means support to be found in a reference on p. 63 to the quite inadequate passage of Martial XIV. 1, 2. But probably this is only another instance of the rash talk which too often says on no good ground that various people in Rome, particularly triumphators, were in the habit of personating Jupiter. (2) On p. 39 there is an unfortunate reference to Professor Rostowzew's article 'Frumentum' in *P.-W.* VII. 129. What he says of Rome is applied to Italy in general. (3) Janssen's notes on the army reform are sound, but a reference might have been added on p. 40 to the sacellum of Lambaesis. In addition, it would have been wise of the editor to reject the view that the legions of Egypt were paid on a different scale from the rest—*vide* Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte*, p. 251. This was very improbable, even before the influence of the exchange was understood. (4) The statement on p. 63 that 'Augustus suam (statuam) poni nisi provinciis non concesserat' seems to have arisen from a confusion with his policy in regard to temples. *Mon. Anc. Lat.* IV. 51 ff. is enough to show there must have been hundreds of his statues in Rome, nor is this denied by Suet. *Aug.* 52, and Cassius Dio. LIII. 22. The only peculiarity of Augustus in this respect was his way of dealing with statues made of precious metal. (5) The notes on Cap. IV. naturally include a discussion of saecular games in general, and here Janssen—as, indeed, he has a perfect right to do—decides that Hirschfeld's account of the Claudian celebration is to be preferred. But he does not reveal the weakness of a case which sets aside the view unquestionably backed by the authority of Tacitus in favour of a piece of gossip recorded by Suetonius (*Claudius*, 21) and implicitly denied by him in the same sentence on the authority of Claudius himself. Nor does he suggest that against the alleged support of Censorinus and Zosimus there may be set in favour of Mommsen the weighty evidence of the officials responsible for the celebration of Pius.

HUGH LAST.

VOLKSMÄRCHEN, SAGE UND NOVELLE BEI HERODOT UND SEINEN ZEITGENOSSEN.

Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen. By WOLF ALY. Large 8vo. Pp. iv, 301+12. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1921. 12s.

HAVE we of late been taking Herodotos too seriously as an historian, and unduly exalting his work as an historical source? Here is a volume to recall us from any exaggerated reverence for the 'Father of History' as such, and to replace in full light the non-natural,

the fictitious, the poetic elements in his immortal museum. There is, no doubt, a deal both of *Dichtung* and of *Wahrheit*, of fancy and of fact, in the packed pages of Herodotos; and, if the two constituents could be so nicely separated throughout, as might seem assumed in the elaborate 'Analysis of the Histories of Herodotos,' which forms the middle trunk of the text in this volume under review (177 pages out of 301), it would not much matter whether we

extracted the facts and treated the remainder as fiction, or extracted the fictions and treated the remainder as matter of fact. But, unfortunately, the problem is not quite so simple as all that. There is much in the work of Herodotos which is matter of fact, in one kind or another; albeit the incidental, the contemporary, the fossilised data furnish the purest history ('in our sense of the word'). There is much in the work of Herodotos which is manifest fiction; albeit such fiction sometimes transmits incidentally a genuine historical point, a valuable historical *aperçu*. But the great bulk of the Herodotean work, even in its most authentic section—that is, the last three books—is neither pure fact nor mere fiction, but is transfigured tradition, largely based on the living voice, and having all but contemporary authority, yet saturated in local prejudice and permeated by afterthought of various kinds. In the story, or stories, told by Herodotos history ('in our sense of the word') hardly ever shows itself pure and undefiled, and the hard antithesis between fact and fiction is beside the point. The attempt to apply it reminds one, to take a major analogy, of Grote's unfortunate dualism between 'Legendary' and 'Historical' Greece: we have long since realised that Legendary Greece is much more historical, and Historical Greece much more legendary, than this grotesque dualism assumed. So, too, the representation of Herodotos as a double nature, a *Dipsychos*, alternately the conscientious and scientific researcher (say, Dr. Jekyll) and the artful and consummate story-teller (or Mr. Hyde), is a trifle crude: especially unhappy appears the notion that he started as the scientific researcher, to be found in the first three or four books, and ended as the triumphant literary artist of the last three books. There are quite prosy or 'scientific' sections and passages in the last three books—for example, the genealogy put into the mouth of Xerxes, which is as exact as the List of the Seven Conspirators in Bk. III., or the Army and Navy Lists, which are as good statistics and ethnography as the List of Satrapies, while the itinerary of

Xerxes might hold its own with the List of Oases in Bk. IV., or the account of the King's Highway in Bk. V. But the varying dominant in the matter (or music) of this or that section of the Herodotean work is surely to be traced rather to the times and places and events and persons represented, and the varying nature of the sources accordingly, than to any inherent *dipsychism*, or duplicity, in the great Logograph himself. Most lovers of Herodotos have conceded to their darling a remarkable simplicity, a high degree of *naïveté*, and will ascribe the variation of style in different parts of his work rather to differences in his materials than to inconsistencies in his nature. The relative closeness of texture in the sections dealing with Babylon, with Egypt, with Skythian and Libyan ethnography, indicate of course that these sections are largely drawn from written sources, whether Hekataios or others. It does not arise from Herodotos having begun his literary career as a man of 'science' or research and having ended it as a man of letters or art, even if you could convince me that the first three or four books were of earlier composition than the last three books.

These observations, which might be indefinitely developed or prolonged, have been evoked by the suggestive and stimulating work of Professor Aly here under review. To describe the work more precisely: its contents are divided into three parts, the middle and largest comprising the analysis already specified, which is accompanied by, indeed mainly consists in, a running commentary, designed to elucidate the elements and items of folk-lore (*Volksmärchen*), of legend, or quasi-epic story (*Sage*), and of dramatic interest (*Novelle*), everywhere visible throughout the work, except in the prosiest passages, such as genealogies, itineraries, inventories, and cartographicalities (all apparently assignable to the 'scientific' or 'historic' Herodotos). This Commentary is illustrated by many just and acute remarks upon the language, style, and literary merits of Herodotos; but its general tendency makes for the depreciation of the historical value of Herodotos, in relation,

for example, to the Age of the Tyrants, or the rôle of Delphi in Greek politics and history, or the domestic and foreign policy of Athens, and so forth; albeit the obvious competence of the writer, and his complete acquaintance at least with the German literature of his subject, dispose one to believe that this tendency may be due to his method and preoccupation, his purpose being to elucidate not the historical value of the work of Herodotos, but the extent to which folk-lore, legend, and romance—in one word, *Logos* (in a limited sense of the word)—has left its mark upon the *Histories*. All the same the two sections anterior and posterior to the Analysis, or Analytical Commentary, make better reading. The former (some thirty pages) proposes the application of the results of the science of Folk-lore (itself, by the way, merely a department of anthropology) to early Greek Literature, including Herodotos' work—a proposal which the proposer proceeds to carry out more completely than any of his predecessors, and as a preliminary establishes the independent origin in Greece, or at least in Ionia, of the prose-tale, fable, anecdote, and so forth, in a way which sheds fresh light upon the beginning of Greek prose literature. With the recognition of the anonymous prose-story as more ancient than the Homeric epos, with the establishment of the primitive prose-story-teller side by side with the rhapsode, the pre-literary age of the *Logos* gains substance, the early *Logopoi* and *Logographoi* obtain a fresh significance, and Herodotos takes rank not so much as the 'Father of History' (in our sense of the word)—though he is still that in a sense—but as the literary prince of story-tellers, the writer who first gave artistic and permanent form to the

floating corpus of good stories, from divers sources, Hellenic and Oriental, extant round the shores of the Mediterranean in the first half of the fifth century B.C.—the prince, but not the only, nor the first of such story-tellers. And so, in the latest section of the work before us (some ninety-four pages), his literary predecessors are partially reconstructed, and a good case is made out for the importance of Charon and Xanthos—not, indeed, as his masters—that claim is confined to Hekataios—but on their own merits. The art of Herodotos is further detached from the Homeric mirage, and put in closer relation to the tragedians (especially Sophokles), to the early Sophists, and even to the oratory of the Perikleian Age. He is finally, to some extent, rehabilitated as *Pater historiae* (in our sense of the word), though that be a phrase 'which one uses without much meaning attached.'

The volume under review is furnished with four useful indexes (though 'Aesop' is missing), but would be more acceptable if printed in Roman type and on better paper. Such drawbacks may be ascribed to the material and moral effects of the war, to which *per contra* we owe the work itself; for, as the Dedication to Hermann Diels indicates, it was conceived by the author 'during the quiet months of the war of positions (*Stellungskrieges*),' over a Teubner text of Herodotos, a gift from Alfred Körte. Happy in his friends, his labour, and his return from the trenches, the author need not take to heart our exception to his *format*, especially as enough has been said to show that his work is one which no serious student of Herodotos, or of Greek literature and history, can afford to overlook.

R. W. M.

ANCIENT FARM-LABOUR.

Agricola. A study of agriculture and rustic life in the Greco-Roman world from the point of view of labour. BY W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. One vol. Pp. x + 492. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. 47s. 6d.

THIS very important contribution to the social and economic history of

antiquity is not light reading; if it proves slightly bewildering to some students, this is not Mr. Heitland's fault, but the inevitable result of the nature of his subject and the method which he rightly adopts in dealing with it. A modern writer on the ancient world whose main object is to be 'in-