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](#)

Cauer on the Groundwork of Homeric Criticism *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. Von Paul Cauer. Hirzel: Leipzig. 1895. Pp. 322. Hirzel. 6 Mk.

Walter Leaf

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 09 / December 1895, pp 463 - 465

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202746, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202746

How to cite this article:

Walter Leaf (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 463-465 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202746

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

length. Particularly interesting are his lists of the peculiarities of word-formation that are characteristic of African Latin (p. xlv.), and of the *sermo rusticus* (p. xlvii.).

The body of the work is divided into two parts under the headings 'Derivation' and 'Composition.' Under 'Derivation' are treated in order substantives, adjectives, diminutives, adverbs and verbs. Under 'Composition' are discussed prepositional compounds, nominal composition, and hybrids. Under the different terminations are given lists of words wholly or mainly confined to the plebeian Latin. These lists are one of the most important and valuable features of the book, and will certainly be of signal service to lexicographers. They are based in part upon lists previously published by Carl von Paucker and others, but the author has made extensive additions. He does not claim that they are absolutely complete, but they are certainly fuller than any that have hitherto appeared; and though I have noted some omissions these

are by no means numerous. Each word is placed under the name of the writer in whose works it first appears, and in the notes at the foot of the page is added as complete a list as possible of the authors who subsequently used it. Thus it is easy to trace a given word through the history of its usage.

Where so much has been well done, it is invidious to point out defects. I will however remark that the most unsatisfactory part of the book is that which treats of hybrids and words derived from the Greek. This part might have been made much more complete had the author consulted the works of Saalfeld and Weise mentioned above.

The book is however a valuable and important one; and it is much to be hoped that the author will publish the companion volume on Plebeian Syntax of which he speaks in his preface.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Harvard University.

CAUER ON THE GROUNDWORK OF HOMERIC CRITICISM.

Grundfragen der Homerkritik. Von PAUL CAUER. Hirzel: Leipzig. 1895. Pp. 322. Hirzel. 6 Mk.

DR. CAUER is to be congratulated on a book which is large and tolerant in purview and luminous and learned in composition. Though he has no theory of startling novelty to propound, he is a skilful exponent of views which he has made his own by force of a judicial mind and liberal sympathy. His critical sobriety well suits him for his task of impartially reviewing results which have been gained by inquirers in the many fields of the Homeric demesne, and drawing from them conclusions which are always interesting, even when one cannot agree with them. In all these respects his book is welcome, and does credit to the manners and literary style of German philological controversy.

It is impossible to follow Dr. Cauer through the whole range of subjects with which he deals. I must be content to give a list of his chapters. Book I., on 'Textkritik und Sprachwissenschaft,' has four chapters: Aristarchos, Præ-Alexandrian Text, 'Die Erste Niederschrift,' Mixture of Dialects. Book II. is entitled 'Analyse des

Inhalts,' and its chapters are: (1) the Historical Background; (2) Stages of Culture; (3) the Gods; (4) Homeric Composition; (5) Iliad and Odyssey. They are all to be read with profit; and though there is much with which I do not agree, everything is worthy of careful consideration. If I take for special discussion the chapter on *Culturstufen*, it is because it contains a courteous challenge to myself personally, with which I am glad to have this opportunity of dealing.

The general attitude which Cauer adopts in discussing the relation of the poems to early Greek culture as we are beginning to know it is one with which it is impossible to quarrel. The groundwork of the Epos is Mycenaean, in the arrangement of the house, in the prevalence of copper, and, as Reichel has shown, in armour. Yet in many points the poems are certainly later than the prime at least of the Mycenaean age. How is this to be explained? Is it that the poets are deliberately trying to present the conditions of an age anterior to their own? Or are they depicting the circumstances by which they are surrounded—circumstances which slowly change during the period of the development of the Epos?

Cauer decides for the latter alternative, the only one which is really conceivable in an age whose views are in many ways so naive as the poems themselves prove them to have been. Or rather we must recognize everywhere a compromise between two opposing principles; the singer on the one hand has to be conservatively tenacious of the old material which serves as the substance of his song, on the other hand he has to be vivid and actual in the contributions which he himself makes to the common stock.

Is it then possible to trace in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the marks of this gradual development? Cauer makes the attempt in three important directions, and arrives at an affirmative result. I can deal at length only with his treatment of the use of iron, starting from Professor Jevons' paper in a recent number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. Mr. Jevons' conclusions were purely negative; assuming my own analysis of the *Iliad* as correct, he showed that there were no positive signs of development between the strata which I call I. and II. on the one hand, and III. to V. on the other. No doubt, as Cauer says, he might have brought out more clearly the fact that my theory is only one among many, and must not be taken as an admitted certainty. But, even so, a somewhat closer analysis on Mr. Jevons' part might have led to a more definite conclusion, which I will endeavour to draw.

In the *Menis*, as I have analysed it, iron is twice mentioned. The first passage is A 133. This recurs exactly in Z 46 ff. It obviously must have been borrowed in one place from the other, but I do not see that there is any particular reason for saying which is the original, unless the mention of iron itself be permitted to decide the question. To avoid a circular argument, however, we can only say that this case is doubtful, and that the chances appear to be equal. The other case is in X 357. This is one of the purely metaphorical uses (*σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός*) which admittedly do not prove more than a knowledge on the poet's part that there existed a substance of remarkable hardness called *σίδηρος*.

In the next place, it is hardly right to treat the whole of my stratum II. as if it were homogeneous. I have myself divided it into three stages; and it is at all events possible—I now think it almost certain—that later parts of it may be contemporaneous with parts of later strata. Dividing up among the divisions of II. the various occurrences of iron, we find the result to be

as follows: II. A, 4: II. B, 1: II. C, 3. In Stratum III. we have 8, in IV., 5. Now the difficulty in the way of a gradual development here is to be found only in the four occurrences of iron in II. A. These occur in two pairs; one pair is the double allusion to the iron mace of Areithoos (H 141, 144): the other two are in almost equally close neighbourhood, in Δ 485, 510. Thus the argument which Cauer directs against my theory really touches only these two passages. With regard to the end of Δ, the introduction to the aristeia of Diomedes in E, there can be no certainty that it is not a later editorial passage intended to fit E into the general structure of the *Iliad*: the question of the mace of Areithoos depends on the relative position which we assign to the two duels in iii. and vii. Cauer himself has given reasons for holding the duel in the third book to be the earlier; if he is right, and I feel it to be very possible that he is, then we have a steady progression in the mention of iron from the earlier stages of the *Iliad* to the later. And taking my three strata in order without any subdivision, we find the following progress: I. 2?: II. 8: III. 8: IV. 5. As the three strata contain approximately equal numbers of lines, the numerical test is fair, and, without leading to any positive result, is on the whole certainly not opposed to the accuracy of my division, assuming the iron test to be a valid one.

But this assumption is one which seems to me extremely rash, in consideration of the very few cases in which iron is mentioned. The difficulty is still greater in dealing with another test which Cauer applies—the mention of temples. He is of course right when he says that the poems contain clear traces of the older custom of worshipping the gods in the open air, especially among or under trees; and that houses for them are a latter innovation. The only two actual temples named in the *Iliad*, as he says, are those of Apollo and Athene in Troy, leaving out of sight the Erechtheum in Athens, which is generally recognized as an Attic interpolation (B 547). But it is not legitimate to draw from this the conclusion that the whole of books E—H, in which alone these two temples occur, belongs to the latest portions of the *Iliad*. Even assuming that temples were unknown in the earlier period of the Epos, which in itself is by no means certain, Cauer's analysis can at most prove that certain passages of E—H are late; he has no right to regard

these books, any more than any other part of the *Iliad*, as a contemporaneous unity.

And thus we are led back to the conclusion that *Culturstufen* can only be a very unsafe guide to unravelling the structure of the *Iliad*. At best they will serve, when used with great caution, as a test for individual passages. It is only when considered in the broadest way that the digamma itself can be shown to have gradually died out during the Epic period: yet we can test the presence of the digamma in thousands of passages, while questions of culture arise at most in a few score. And

even in these few score the ground is not safe beneath our feet: even since Cauer's book has appeared, the inference which he draws from the mention of writing in Z has been immensely weakened by Mr. Arthur Evans' recently published discoveries in Crete. While thanking Dr. Cauer therefore for the spirit of fairness and the suggestiveness with which he writes, I cannot feel that his discussion of culture has done much to advance the question.

WALTER LEAF.

WATTENBACH'S ANLEITUNG ZUR GRIECHISCHEN PALAEOGRAPHIE.

Anleitung zur griechischen Palaeographie, von W. WATTENBACH. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1895. 3 M. 60.

THE first edition of Wattenbach's well-known *Introduction to Greek Palaeography* appeared in 1867, the second in 1877. The last eighteen years have, however, seen the material and the literature of palaeography increased in so many directions, that a new edition has naturally been called for. It differs from its predecessors, not only in contents, but in arrangement. The autographed description of the palaeographical history of each letter now appears in print,—a great gain in clearness, especially to the English reader,—and is followed by a useful section on the abbreviation-marks common in late Greek manuscripts. The lithographed facsimiles of MSS. which accompanied the former editions disappear, being unsatisfactory in themselves, and no longer necessary now that good photographic reproductions are easily accessible; and with them go also the descriptions of them. Finally, the form of the volume is changed from a quarto to a more convenient octavo. In its new shape, and with its considerably altered contents, the work seems to call for a few words of notice.

The most obvious criticism to pass upon Prof. Wattenbach's work is that it is not so much an introduction to Greek palaeography as to the literature of Greek palaeography. Not only the section on 'Geschichte und Litteratur der griechischen Palaeographie,' but also that which is entitled 'Die Hauptgattungen griechischer Schrift,' tells the reader far less about the

history of Greek writing than about the works in which he may find that history. The principal manuscripts of each century are mentioned, but in place of any full description of them we have a list of the editions and facsimiles in which they are reproduced. For the English student, at least, this is a great advantage. Instead of going over the ground already adequately occupied by Sir E. Maunde Thompson's recent *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography* (here described as 'die bedeutendste Erscheinung' and 'ein Meisterwerk, mit vollster Kenntniss des Gegenstandes und aller neuesten Entdeckungen geschrieben'), Prof. Wattenbach supplements it by the fullest bibliography of the subject to be found anywhere. This is the most valuable part of the book, supplying as it does not merely a very complete list of publications, but also a brief description of the character of the most important of them. On the other hand, the section dealing with palaeography itself ('Die wesentlichsten Veränderungen der griechischen Buchstaben') is rendered far less useful than it would otherwise have been by the absence of any indication, in very many cases, of the dates at which the successive forms of each letter are to be found. A table with dated columns, such as those given by Gardthausen and Thompson, would be infinitely more useful than these descriptions. Moreover, several of the commonest and most notable forms found in the papyri are omitted; e.g. the very characteristic forms of η and σ in the Roman period, and of μ and ν in the Ptolemaic. The tables of abbreviations, however, which follow, will be found useful.