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](#)

Beloch's *Storia Greca Storia Greca, Parte prima. La Grecia antiquissima*, Giulio Beloch. Roma, 1891. Mk. 3.50.

Evelyn Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 318 - 318

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186275, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186275

How to cite this article:

Evelyn Abbott (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 318-318 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186275

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

$CD\Delta EV_2$ are few in number and those cited by Scheuer turn only upon minutiae. The list is however somewhat increased by a number of readings unjustly relegated by the author to the doubtful column: 12, 12 et malis; 17, 20 fateretur; 19, 12 laudabat; 22, 24 et; 25, 5 constat; 41, 14 obscuriorque; and perhaps 12, 21 ac, and 32, 26 ego. The figures as revised will therefore be as follows. Out of *seventy-four* actual variants $X(AB)$ furnishes the correct reading in but *fifteen* cases, $Y(CD\Delta EV_2)$ in *forty-five*, while in the remainder neither the context nor a careful examination of Tacitean usage

enables us to fix confidently upon the genuine reading.¹ In an appendix Scheuer gives a minutely accurate collation of the codex Vindobonensis.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

¹ There remain about 100 such variants unnoticed by Scheuer in which the two classes seem to blend into one another. The majority of these arise out of orthographical differences and common scribal errors. They in no way, however, invalidate the conclusion reached by Scheuer, as might appear at first sight. But regarding this point, I must refer to the Prolegomena of my forthcoming edition.

BELOCH'S *STORIA GRECA*.

Storia Greca, Parte prima. La Grecia antiquissima, GIULIO BELOCH. Roma, 1891. Mk. 3.50.

THIS is the first part of a History of Greece by Professor Beloch, whose name is of course well known to students of the subject. It is concerned with Greece in the earliest times and contains five chapters: (1) The Greeks and their Origin; (2) Myth and Religion; (3) The Popular Epopee; (4) The Legends of the Races; (5) Homeric Greece. These are on the one hand well-worn topics, but on the other fresh information is constantly coming in and fresh opinions are being formed. When views differ and the last word cannot be said, it is all the more interesting to have before us the judgment of a thoughtful and learned writer. Thus Beloch is of opinion that the Greeks entered the peninsula from the north (p. 8); that the Thracians and Illyrians were not Greeks (*ibid.*); that the Epirots and Macedonians were Greeks (p. 9); that the names of Dorians and Ionians were formed in Asia and transferred to Europe (p. 17). He is especially interesting in his remarks on the dialects of the Greeks (p. 25), and on their physical, moral and intellectual character (p. 21). He rightly separates myth from religion (p. 39); and while attributing little importance to Semitic influence, and a good deal to Asiatic, he yet regards Greek religion as essentially a national product.

With regard to the Homeric Poems he adopts the nucleus theory. There was an original Iliad which by successive accretions has grown up into the present poem, but this original Iliad was of no great compass and

was the work of one poet (p. 65). He adopts this view because on the one hand there are differences between the various parts of our Iliad so great that they cannot be explained if the work is that of one man, and on the other there is too great a unity in the poem for it to be the result of a mere putting together of ballads. On p. 66 Beloch gives a sketch of this original Iliad and on p. 67 ff. follow the amplifications.

But this hypothesis of a gradual development of the Iliad involves us in as great contradictions as those which it attempts to remove.

(1) If the original Iliad was so excellent that poets chose to develop it rather than adopt another theme, why is so little of the original left?

(2) How can we explain the consistent, and on the whole homogeneous excellence of our Iliad if it is the work of a number of poets of different ages and perhaps places?

(3) How are we to account for the unity of the present poem, and why did not the later poets extend the range of it?

(4) How do we explain the fact that the poem went on growing for, say, two hundred years, and then never grew at all?

(5) It is true, as Beloch reminds us, that 'the newest song is the most pleasing,' but this truth holds good of ballads, rather than epics. So far as we know, the most important point in recitations from Homer was that 'Homer' should be recited, and this is inconsistent with the theory that the poem was being constantly enlarged during one or two centuries.

EVELYN ABBOTT.