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](#)

Beiträge zur Griechischen Religionsgeschichte III
Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte III. By S. Eitrem. One volume. 10" × 7". Pp. 202. Kristiania, in Kommission bei Jacob Dybwad, 1920.

H. J. Rose

The Classical Review / Volume 34 / Issue 5-6 / August 1920, pp 108 - 110

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00013810, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00013810

How to cite this article:

H. J. Rose (1920). The Classical Review, 34, pp 108-110 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00013810

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BEITRÄGE ZUR GRIECHISCHEN RELIGIONSGESCHICHTE III.

Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte III. By S. EITREM. One volume. 10" x 7". Pp. 202. Kristiania, in Kommission bei Jacob Dybwad, 1920.

THE debt of scholarship to the activities of the Scandinavian savants grows steadily. In this book, largely a supplement to the *Opferritus* of the same author, we have a not inconsiderable contribution. A series of articles of varying length discuss the use of water in ritual, the avoidance of foreign elements in cult—with some curious exceptions to the general rule that whatever is not native is unacceptable—the *ὄλοθυγή*, and religious and other processions; while the last three essays ('Aineias und die Kaukonen,' 'Zwillingspaare und mythische Doppelbildungen,' 'Die mythische Kolonialbegründer der Griechen') also include points of literary and historical criticism. We do not propose to give a full analysis and critique of these works, a task which could not be completed in a moderate space, but simply to draw attention to a few points of interest, particularly those on which we think that the views of the author might be enlarged or modified.

One matter which calls for notice is what seems to us to be a tendency to explanations simpler than the facts will allow. The chief illustration of this is the frequent assumption (e.g., pp. 22, 24, 25, 33, 37) that hero-cult is the oldest and simplest form of ritual, at any rate of chthonian ritual, and that the more elaborate forms may be supposed to derive from or replace it. Now we would by no means deny that such development or replacement has often taken place in Greece and elsewhere; what we would emphasise is, that to picture an early stratum of cult consisting wholly of ghost-worship is to give a one-sided and incomplete view. It needs no very deep research into anthropological data—a kind of research which our author can and does make with profit—to teach us that, while we find no example of human beings quite without any ideas of magic

or religion, we find not a few wholly without a cult of the dead, or even a fear of ghosts or a regular ritual of burial. Hence we should not lightly assume that if the Greeks mostly avoided using any material from over the local border in ritual, it was because the border, and the land within it, were sanctified by ancestral graves. They were indeed so sanctified, and the resulting cult was usually an intensely local one; but the idea of avoiding anything foreign may be older yet. This place is holy ground; it has *mana*, as shown by its power to produce food-plants or what not; that place also has *mana*: both are mysterious and potent forces, and to mix them is dangerous. What if they should not agree? A more analytical age told tales of strife between two heroes, or reflected, *χωρίς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν*; but the idea is so widespread and so ancient that it may well have appeared among the Greeks before hero-cult began, early as that undoubtedly is. Especially, we would not assume that the cult of Gaia is later than the cult of heroes or other local daimones. To personify and worship the Earth, meaning thereby the whole planet, or such part of it as is known to the worshippers, involves indeed a considerable power of abstraction; but we very much doubt if originally Gaia was anything more than the particular plot of ground with which the celebrants were most familiar; just as Demeter seems to have been originally no goddess of corn in general, but the Corn-mother of some particular field. Eitrem well remarks (p. 27) that the intense fondness for the native soil is likely to last as long as 'die Menschen ein Heimatsgefühl kennen,' and draws attention to the very vague Latin expression *tutela huius loci*. We would suggest that a potent factor in such feelings was originally that liking for the known which every child shows, and in particular the strong preference for known magic.

While dealing with this essay, we would point out what seems to us an ill-advised comparison—namely, that

which is drawn on p. 22 between human sacrifices to chthonian powers, whether ghosts or other, and the Roman *deutio*. The former seems to us to be originally a simple gift of blood, or life, to strengthen the power of the soil or its spirits; the latter is much more sophisticated, for it is a contract whereby the infernal deities are offered a life on condition that they take at the same time the hostile army. They must have both or neither.

The discussion of the *ὄλολυγή* brings out the important fact that it is not necessarily, though it is often, a cry of joy, still less one of grief, as some have tried to make out. We would suggest that it is in its origin nothing more than a natural cry of excitement, and that this explains its utterance at a critical moment of a religious ceremony, such as the death of the victim or the manifestation of a divine presence. In either case the rite has succeeded in producing a magically potent force, and in face of this it is no easy task to keep quiet. We feel that a close investigation of sacrificial ritual by a good psychologist, especially one who had studied the psychology of crowds, would yield very instructive results.

The excellent discussion of processional ritual suggests the following, among other considerations. The Greek funeral procession differs but little in its arrangements from any other; contrast, *e.g.*, our own military funerals, in which the cortège seems to make an elaborate pretence of going backwards (senior officers in the rear, arms reversed, etc.), presumably with the original intention of misleading the ghost. It would seem, then, that the Greek dead were but little feared, but rather treated like any other honoured persons, human or divine, and that consequently we should not be too ready to deduce their ritual from terror of the ghost.

The least satisfactory of all the essays seems to us that on Aeneas, which rests upon what we venture to characterise as the exploded separatist theory of the authorship of the *Iliad*, and also upon the idea, less common in Great Britain than on the Continent, that much information about Greek cult and saga is to be found in small details of the

Homeric poems, such as the exact names of the actors in minor episodes. Why, the author asks, does Poseidon, in T 328, rescue Aeneas from Achilles, and bring him to the ranks of the Kaukones, who elsewhere appear only in the 'late' Doloneia? He suggests that it is because the Kaukones are really a Peloponnesian tribe and Aeneas a Peloponnesian divinity. We do not criticise the arguments—to our thinking, often very hazardous—by which these conclusions are arrived at; we merely ask why, in that case, the author of T, whoever he was, supposed that Aeneas was a Trojan prince and the Kaukones an Asiatic people. If the theory of Eitrem rid us of real difficulties of interpretation, we might be content to waive such objections; but we fail to find any such difficulties. Poseidon's quarrel is with the reigning House of Troy, not with its junior branch, to which Aeneas belongs; he knows that that prince is destined to rule over the remnant of the nation which survives the war, and like all the gods, even Zeus when the latter is not identified with Moira, he bends to its decrees and rescues the future king. And how could he do this more effectually than by snatching him from his post of danger opposite Achilles, somewhere about the centre of the line, to the extreme left, where the poet has placed the Kaukones, whoever they may be (K 430)? That the same obscure name is to be found in the Peloponnesos, and that Aeneas had a cult there, are facts which strike us as no more extraordinary than that in later times there were Lokrians in Italy as well as in Greece, and that in that same country the worship of Herakles and Diomedes flourished.

The appendix to this article contains some interesting remarks on the cult of Hades in the Western Peloponnesos, and its probable conjunction with solar ritual; this last being a possibility to which some of us are perhaps apt to pay too little attention, now that it is no longer fashionable to find solar myths everywhere. The sixth essay we could have wished longer, especially in view of the researches of Dr. Rendal Harris on the 'Heavenly Twins,' since it deals with an allied subject; while the last to

some extent continues the same subject, owing to the large number of pairs of brothers who are credited with founding colonies in very early times. In this connexion more might perhaps have been made of the magical importance of twins or, as is seen in the legend of Herakles, of the elder twin. Much of the material naturally consists of names,

which the author rightly characterises (p. 171) as 'spröden Stoff, der . . . viele Irrwege bietet'; but to criticise his conclusions, many of which are not at all obvious, would involve going into much detail and extending this notice beyond due limits. H. J. ROSE.

*University College,
Aberystwith.*

BYWATER'S *FOUR CENTURIES OF GREEK LEARNING IN ENGLAND.*

Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England. Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on March 8, 1894. By INGRAM BYWATER, Regius Professor of Greek 1893-1908. 8vo. One vol. Pp. 20. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1919. 1s. 6d. net.

THIS lecture, which Bywater probably thought too slight for publication, has been found among his notebooks and is issued from the press of his University. It is the business-like performance of a good scholar who did not aspire to be an indifferent man of letters; and readers who wish to hear about the Greek spirit may leave it alone.

The greatest part of it is occupied with matter of the least importance. The renaissance of learning in England is history in which Bywater was at home, and he collects a large number of details which I presume to be accurate and which have some interest of a purely antiquarian sort. But those were the years when we were learning Greek and were not yet in case to teach it: our contribution to the European fund begins with the seventeenth century. In Bywater's account of this period there is nothing which I can gainsay of my own knowledge; though I should have thought that Pearson, of whom Bentley said that the very dust of his writings was gold, and Porson that he would have equalled even Bentley as a critic in Greek if he had not muddled his brains with divinity, deserved more prominence than is given him. The two pages on Bentley himself are excellent; and laymen who wonder at the fame of this tasteless and

arbitrary pedant, and the reverence paid him by every competent judge, will hardly find elsewhere in so small a compass so clear a definition of his unique originality and greatness.

But in Bywater's sketch of Greek scholarship after Bentley there are places where I find his judgment or his knowledge defective. He says with truth that Bentley's chief successors, excepting Taylor and in some measure Toup and Tyrwhitt, were mostly occupied, like Bentley himself, with the poets; and I surmise that for this very reason they were not familiar to Bywater.

The school of Bentley, if the expression may be hazarded, Markland, Dawes, Musgrave, Warton, and the rest, allowed itself to be absorbed in the study of the Greek poets. If I were asked who was the strong man and chief figure in this company, I should say with little hesitation, Richard Dawes.

Warton makes a strange appearance here, though far be it from me to blame Bywater or anyone else for ignorance of his large and empty Theocritus; and I should have liked to watch Bentley from a safe distance in Elysium when he heard the expression hazarded that Warton was one of his school. Although the preeminence assigned to Dawes is disputable, I will not dispute it, and I grudge him no praise; but *strong* is not the right word to praise him with. His special virtue was a preternatural alertness and insight in the two fields of metre and grammar, the more extraordinary because his mere learning was not profound. The *strong* man of the company was Markland, devoid of these peculiar qualities, but superior in range and vigour and general activity of mind.