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](#)

Greek Mythology *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie.* **Herausgegeben von W. H. Roscher. Parts 1–12 (A—Hera), each part 2 mks.**

L. R. Faenell

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 05 / May 1888, pp 133 - 138
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192558, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192558

How to cite this article:

L. R. Faenell (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 133-138 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192558

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS.

GREEK MYTHOLOGY.

Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Herausgegeben von W. H. ROSCHER. Parts 1-12 (A—Hera), each part 2 mks.

THE task to which the compilers of this Lexicon have set themselves is certainly very heavy, and, however the quality of the different parts of the work may vary, its contributions to the study of Greek and Roman religion, and of the religious and mythological monuments of the two countries, must be very highly estimated. The object of the undertaking as expressed by the editor is to present by means of an equal statement of the literary and monumental evidence a complete account of the facts of the myths and cults. Questions concerning the 'Deutung' or the origin and significance of these facts are to be of secondary importance, and are only to be admitted when the answers are certain or extremely probable. Whether this promise is strictly observed may be noted later. The Lexicon occupies itself with foreign, and particularly with Oriental, myths and forms, only so far as these affect the classical. The work is exclusively a work of German scholarship; and the names of thirty-seven scholars who have contributed, many of them names of eminence in particular lines of research, are given in the preface, and Roscher himself is the author of some important articles. The editor expresses a hope not only that an exhaustive statement of the material is given, but that his fellow-workers have been able in some articles to solve certain problems and to present certain new and original views. This hope can only be tested by a review of the separate articles in detail; these being distinct monographs containing often distinct principles of interpretation, and displaying different merits and defects of form and statement. Editorial supervision seems to have produced unanimity only in the arrangement. On the whole the Greek articles—with which alone the present notice is concerned—are prepared with characteristic thoroughness and wealth of detail, though generally the account of the literature is more satisfactory than that of the monuments. It was inevitable that the work of so many hands should be somewhat unequal, and one is occasionally obliged to note lacunae in the statement and the irrelevance of certain references to the matter in hand.

The plan of most of the longer articles, those on the divinities, for example, is fairly clear, and one does not feel much difficulty in gathering the main points.

An attempt is usually made to discover the original and essential conception of the divinity, to enumerate the various functions and aspects of the figure, and to deduce them if possible from that; then a full mention is usually given of the various local beliefs and centres of worship; lastly of the myths in which the divinity figures. After this follows a detailed account of the monuments, tracing out in historical sequence the changes in the treatment of the type from the archaic to the last period, noting any monumental illustration of special local beliefs and traditions, and collecting and frequently illustrating the various artistic representations of the characteristic and important myths. As a set-off against much that is excellent, one notices sometimes the exaggeration of the principle of reducing to a logical unity or order the manifold characteristics of an Athene, an Artemis, or a Hekate; again, one rarely finds any distinction expressed between the original prehistoric idea and the idea that was present to the mind of a Greek worshipper of a particular period. These are some of the most frequent material defects. The worst formal defect is the defect of style which, except in a few articles, is ultra-professorial. A fearful obscurity hangs upon the structure of the sentences and the marshalling of facts and arguments. The obscurity is generally greatest when the writer is not merely giving materials, but is advancing a special theory of his own. As regards the archaeological side of the work, the chief cause of complaint might be the slight or comparatively slight attention given to the inner quality, the religious or spiritual meaning, the imaginative aspect of the monuments that deal with divine types. A striking technical flaw in the Lexicon is the very inferior execution of the plates, which are far below the level of the engravings in Baumeister's *Denkmäler des Classischen Alterthums*.

For any fair review of the work it is necessary to notice briefly some of the more important articles. That on Achilles by Prof. Fleischer contains a very complete and clear account of the Homeric and post-Homeric legends; but the archaeological account of the monuments is only given

incidentally in confusion with the literary statement; and the section entitled 'Achilleus in der bildenden Kunst' is very meagre, the writer disclaiming special knowledge of this side. In speaking of the various mythic actions of the hero he notices specially his relations with Telephos, but nowhere refers to the very important representations on the smaller Pergamene frieze; nor, in speaking of the records of the death of Protesilaos, to the Gjölbaschi reliefs at Vienna, which in all probability deal with this theme. Nor is any notice taken of the frequent representations of the combat between Achilles and Memnon.

The fallacy of endeavouring to resolve all mythic personages into their physical elements is pleasantly exemplified by his section on 'Die Deutung.' Among the various 'Deutungen' of 'Achilleus' he mentions 'River-god' (Forchhammer); 'God of Light—the clear-shining one'—a very familiar title (Max Müller); a deity somewhere between water and sun, 'ein fluthender Licht-heros' (Gerhard), &c. One thinks that this page is intended to be humorous until one finds that Dr. Fleischer himself declares for the river-god.

More judgment is shown by Klügmann, who has written a good article on the Amazons, in his explanation of the origin of the myth, for which he finds a quasi-political source in the institutions of tribes north of the Euxine, the Scythae and Massagetae. Of the great monuments that deal with the battles of the Amazons, especially of the Fugger sarcophagus, he does not give a very full account, nor does he notice that symbolical value of these representations which explains their connection and frequent juxtaposition with such myths as the gigantomachy.

The article by E. Meyer on Ammon forms a useful chapter in the history of Greek religion, as he establishes the purely foreign character of the Greek cult, against Parthey and Overbeck, who claim for it a genuine Hellenic origin. In his account of the monuments the writer omits to mention the changed treatment of the different periods of sculpture; the vital spiritual distinction between the earlier purely Hellenic rendering, of which perhaps the work of Calamis was the archetype, and the later bizarre expression given to the face of the god in the Hellenistic period, when the Greek was debased by a certain Oriental character.

Roscher's article on the worship of Aphrodite, as presented in literature, shows a

more scientific method than appears in the rest of his work in the Lexicon. He starts with the distinction between the Oriental and the Hellenised Aphrodite, then gives a methodical and sufficient statement of the essential characteristics of the first, and shows these reappearing in a Hellenic guise in the second. Towards the close he admits, as he was bound to admit, the existence of a primitive and native Hellenic Aphrodite; but he thinks that this was at a very early period confused with the Oriental. Only he does not suggest any content for this primitive type that was lost; and he gives no place to the theory that many of the functions of the later Aphrodite which he deduces from the borrowed Oriental cult may be lineally descended from the aboriginal native idea of a goddess powerful over the processes of love and birth. For instances, an Aphrodite *Κουροτρόφος*, *Κωλιάς*, *Γενετῆλλίς* might be thus explained; and certainly nothing is gained by resorting to the Moon for explanation of these titles of the goddess, as Roscher is inclined; for if he is right in speaking of the Aphrodite of the East or Astarte as a moon-goddess, he cannot show that Aphrodite was ever thus regarded in genuine Greek belief. The most important omission in this part of his article is the absence of any proper discussion of the two titles so frequently misinterpreted, Aphrodite Pandemos and Aphrodite Ourania. The right interpretation involves a delicate handling of texts and monuments. He does not even sketch out the lines of this question, which is of great weight in the history of Greek religion and religious sculpture. In the archaeological section written by Dr. Furtwängler, where from his special learning we should have expected most, the work is very disappointing. He assumes a good deal and omits a good deal. He discovers the 'Aphrodite' Sosandra of Calamis in a bas-relief; but he does not attempt to justify his very questionable belief that the Sosandra of Calamis is an Aphrodite at all and not rather a Hera. He finds an imitation of the Aphrodite of Alcamenes in the so-called 'Venus Genetrix,' a type of which the best example is the statue in the Louvre (Fröhner, No. 135); but he does not notice several incongruities in the statue which clash with its ascription to so early a period, and which suggest rather the eclectic manner of a later school. Among so many assumptions he might have noticed the much more probable one that the recumbent figure from the east gable of the Parthenon represents the Pheidian ideal of Aphrodite; and he

might have mentioned the striking head in the Louvre—probably of Aphrodite—a great work of Greek religious sculpture, to which Overbeck gives a place among the sculpture of the Parthenon, but which perhaps belongs to a generation later. Of the Aphrodite of Cnidos, and of the Melian figure, both works of the very highest importance for the spiritual expression of the idea, he only gives a dull and mechanical account; and no mention at all of the semi-Oriental Venus of Libanus, or of those monuments of the later period in which once more the Oriental and Hellenic ideas are seen to meet.

The account of Apollo by Roscher and Furtwängler is very defective on both sides; while it illustrates the method of exposition which Roscher usually employs. He starts with the elementary physical idea from which the divinity is born, and then deduces from this the various moral and spiritual or political qualities that give character to him. In this case the method is open to less objection, because it is certain the conception of Apollo as the sun-god, from which the writer proceeds, is the original one, and he is able to show that this aspect of the god is preserved in much of the ritual of the Apolline feasts, the Hyacinthia and the Daphnephoria. But it is a questionable belief that the idea of the musical Apollo and of Apollo Delphinios, the god of the seafarers, was consciously developed from the primitive idea. In this, as in other cases, we may suppose that certain qualities and functions become as it were mechanically ascribed to the deity, as these derive importance from the growing culture or special habits of the nations among whom his worship is prominent. Again, the writer never touches on the question, which to the student of the historical periods of Greek religion is the primary one—To what degree does the physical conception survive in the consciousness of the worshippers of the different ages? He does not note that the solar character of Apollo has receded from view in the Homeric hymn, nor does he note certain monumental evidence of its late survival. But he omits much else besides this: such designations as Apollo ὠροφάγος, Apollo Smintheus, which savour of primitive and backward conceptions, and which only with great effort can be explained by solar principles: such as Apollo Οἰλῖος, Διδυμαῖος, Hieropolitanus, which convey peculiar and perhaps Oriental religious thought, should surely find their place in a Lexicon which promises an exhaustive statement of the material.

In the archaeological section there are certain things that we may challenge among the theories, and certain omissions we may again note among the facts. Dr. Furtwängler gives the two antique types of Apollo, the rigid pose with the arms hanging straight by the sides, and the freer pose of the extended arms, and he rightly asserts that there were contemporary instances of the two types, but he omits to notice that the former is obviously the earlier. He accepts the theory of Conze that the Choiseul-Gouffier Apollo and the cognate statues are to be referred to the Apollo Ἀλεξίκακος of Calamis, disregarding the incongruities between the style of the British Museum statue and the account given us of Calamis' style. A much worse paradox is his reference to the coins of Rhegium as illustrations of the Apollo Pythoetonos of Pythagoras. He has nothing at all to say of the spiritual treatment of the ideal in the sculpture of the transitional and Pheidian period, while his exposition of the fourth century and Praxitelean types is much better. But it is very remarkable that he should have made no mention of the Apollo of the Pergamene frieze, one of the most important fragments of the Pergamene discoveries. It is a work of independent value; it bears on the question of the Apollo Belvidere, and it might have been noticed in his description of the chief Apolline myths, a description marred by the omission of the myth of the Gigantomachy. Lastly, one may fairly complain that no word is said of the striking passage in Libanius concerning the Apollo at Daphne.

The article by Schreiber on Artemis is fuller and more exact on both sides. And he keeps free from the temptation to deduce the various forms of the cult and tradition from one primitive idea. He rightly refuses to consider that the goddess was in all the localities of her worship originally a moon-goddess. And he touches, though perhaps not sufficiently, on the question at what periods this view is more or less prominent. He states separately the various main aspects of the goddess, and collects the special designations, grouping them under each. This plan is sufficiently and carefully carried out, but for one misquotation of Hesychius concerning the epithet 'Hegemone.' And his account of the fusion of Oriental cults with the Hellenic is clear and useful. The section on the monuments would be complete, if he had mentioned the recently acquired Artemis statuette at Vienna, the Artemis of the Pergamene frieze, and the Tanagran terra-cotta published by Furt-

wängler (Sabouroff Coll. Livr. xii. pl. 126, 7), a rare motive, which well illustrates the Alexandrine method of handling the divine types.

Thraemer's article on Asclepios is well arranged, giving a clear abstract of the various opinions on the origin and significance of the god—*quot capita tot studia!*—and a satisfactory account of the cults and cult-names. He himself abides by O. Müller's view (Orchomenus, p. 187 and 194), which alone he considers to have solid foundation: that Asclepios is the national god of the Phlegyae and Lapithae, and that the Phlegyan worship is opposed to that of Apollo, who originally has nothing to do with Asclepios. The genealogy which affiliates him to Apollo may have been as it were a formula of the adoption of Asclepios into the Hellenic Pantheon, for we have the same kind of fiction in the genealogy of Dionysos. A valuable contribution to the subject is Thraemer's proof that the original popular view and the view of epic and lyric poetry concerning Asclepios are distinct; that while for the author of the *Ioiai* and Pindar he was nothing more than a hero of the art of healing, he was originally a god, and remained a god in the popular religious and local cults. He mentions the very few exceptional cases of local ritual in which he appears as Hero; to these perhaps we might add the cult of the enigmatical *Ἰατρός* at Athens, the *καλαμῆτης ἥρως* twice mentioned by Demosthenes. His exposition of the various types in art, their history and prevalence, is good and clear. He refers that ideal, in which the *ἡπιότης* is the essential trait, to the younger Attic school. But this remains uncertain so long as the Melian head of the British Museum in which this quality is conspicuous is of uncertain significance. If this head is not Zeus but Asclepios, the creation of the ideal of which Thraemer speaks belongs to the generation before the younger Attic school.

The account of 'Astarte' by E. Meyer is entirely irrelevant, and a violation of the plan of the work, for the only relevant question—the relation of the Oriental belief to the types and forms of the early and late periods of Greek religion and religious art—he leaves almost untouched.

The short note on Ate by Von Sybel takes no notice of any monumental evidence at all, and the accounts of this personification and of others such as Dike, Eirene, Deimos, are very unsatisfactory, as they often ignore the importance of the monuments, and the importance of these abstractions in the general

survey of the growth of Greek religion and moral thought.

The defects that appear in Roscher's section of the article on 'Apollo,' are more glaring in his article on 'Athene.' We have here a *reductio ad absurdum* of his theory, and the first part of the article, though very learned, is scarcely serious reading. Various departments of the physical universe have been chosen by various mythographers to supply 'das Wesen' of Athene, although the belief that there is some physical idea in the background of Athene's person is nothing more than a suspicion, and that the Greeks of history ever knew what this idea was is not even an allowable conjecture. But Roscher is certain—past all conjecture—that Athene was the goddess of thunder and lightning, or the thunder-cloud. And thence, with mathematical precision, he deduces her status and functions in life. Apparently Homer knew that she was a goddess of lightning and thunder, for he makes her surround Diomed's head and shoulders with a gleaming light, and Achilles with a golden nimbus, and he supposes her to ride in a fiery chariot! Her relations with Gorgo and the giant Pallas, and the giants in general, are regarded by him as further proofs of her cloudy and stormy origin; but her relations with these powers are on the whole hostile, and the theory as stated by Roscher causes an inextricable confusion in the myths, unless we resort to the theory—unnoticed by him—of a dual personality, beneficent and harmful, supposed in certain myths to be present in various departments of nature. With the postulate then that Athene may be thunder, lightning, or cloud, as required, he explains Athene Salpinx as Athene with voice of thunder, because the thunder is loud and the trumpet is loud, and poets often compare the two. Thus she becomes a goddess of war, because thunder is a bellicose power, and so she becomes interested in ships and chariots; or we may bring—as he actually suggests—the ship and the chariot a degree nearer to the thunder-cloud, because these have often been symbols of it. Athene therefore may have to be responsible for all those highly heterogeneous things that have been discovered by students of mythology to be symbols of the thunder. In fact, according to his suggestion, she does become the patroness of the arts of weaving and spinning, because of her connection with the clouds, for the clouds are regarded as a woollen fleece (*e.g.* *αἰγίς*, vellus, and Bellerophon), and the goddess of spinning becomes natur-

ally the goddess of wisdom in general, because the art of spinning implies a certain degree of intellect. And thus we have the perfect deduction: from the thunder-cloud emerges the notion of spinning, from spinning the notion of wisdom in general, and so social and political wisdom, and the character of Athene is complete. It is strange that the German public should not be as weary of this legerdemain as are most of us.¹ The two main positions of the party of opposition are (1) that the existence of these mythological syllogisms cannot be proved in any known period of Greek thought; (2) that, if even we allow a physical fact to form the background of the personal idea, the intellectual or moral concepts could be brought into it without any dependence on that fact, as the goddess might become the pre-eminent divinity of a progressive race that would connect with her name the various stages of their progress. Being occupied with his main deduction, Roscher omits to notice many local cults that are of great importance, and certainly claiming mention in a lexicon, but which cannot be referred back to the clouds or the thunder: among such is the worship of Athene Ἐλλωρίς, of Athene Itonia, of the Προνία Ἀθήνης, and Athene Nike, the last being one in which the study of Greek religion and Greek sculpture is especially interested. Again, there is scarcely anything said of the chief myths in which Athene is a *dramatis persona*. He mentions indeed the myth of Erechtheus, Pandrosus, Aglauros, and Herse, but only to extort from it the evidence that Athene is here the kindly cloud-goddess, while he disregards the fact that one essential element of the story is Athene's maidenhood, and that the clouds are not elsewhere in Greek mythology regarded as virginal. The archaeological account by Dr. Furtwängler is better, but this also is thin and defective in parts. His mention of the Pheidian types of Athene is very unsatisfactory, as he takes only superficial notice of the statuette at Athens, which is a miniature of the Athene Parthenos, and scarcely notices at all other and larger surviving works which can be traced back with more or less directness to the Pheidian masterpiece. He has no word to say of those monuments, which illustrate

her quasi-maternal character or her almost tender relations with Herakles, and he does not note the change which comes over the spirit of the representations in later Alexandrine work, the infusion of a voluptuous sentiment.

The article on 'Bellerophon,' by Rapp, follows the same method, with rather better results. Bellerophon, being of marine origin, becomes somehow the hero who binds the storm-cloud (Pegasos), and from the clouds hurls his dart against the cloud-monster—the Chimaera; who, by the way, is explained by Engelmann in the same lexicon as a volcano. He is in fact the good influence in the storm-cloud contending against the bad, and his name is probably given him 'because he makes the fleecy ones appear,' i.e., the clouds (Φέλλερο, vellus, etc.). But the writer is not very clear in fixing the department of Bellerophon; nor is it by any means a trustworthy axiom that a hero is himself of the physical element because he has to do with beings who themselves once were regarded or might have been regarded as forces of the elements. The whole legend gives a good instance of the very limited value of the solar and nebulous theory, for to be content with proving that Bellerophon is sun or lightning or cloud is to shirk two-thirds of the required work. Rapp does not succeed in, and scarcely attempts, the task of explaining from the original concept the remarkable relations of the hero with Sthenoboea, and his strange hallucination at the close of his life. The human part of the story, and this is the greater part, remains unaffected by the 'Deutung.' And the illustration which the madness of Bellerophon affords of the early and pure doctrine of Nemesis and the envy of the gods is far more interesting than the traces of any prehistoric physical concept in the myth. In the account of the monuments mention is omitted of the important work of Bellerophon and Pegasus dedicated in the temple of Poseidon Isthmios at Corinth (Paus. i. 7, 8).

Similar and more serious omissions mar the value of the archaeology in his articles on the 'Boreaden' and on Boreas, as he is silent about the Ficoroni cista, the Boreas of the Rhodian *répoussé* work and the Pergamene frieze. He may regard the pursuit of the Harpies by the sons of Boreas as Rapp, following Mannhardt, regards it: it may be a figure of the storm and a Greek parallel to the pursuit of the 'Trollweiber' by the Wild Huntsman. But there is no necessity to argue that therefore the blind Phineus is the darkened heaven. His explanation of

¹ It is a pity that Mr. Lang in his excellent polemic against this view in *Myth Ritual and Religion* should not have taken the trouble to discover the real offender: throughout he attributes to Furtwängler, who only wrote the latter part of the article, the paradoxes of Roscher who wrote the first.

the mysterious double-headed Boreas—'the two heads may symbolise the double-nature, harmful and beneficent, of the wind'—is not satisfactory, for we might by parity of reasoning expect a double-headed Apollo or Poseidon. We may perhaps seek the meaning in the twofold character of Boreas as a god of the lower and upper world.

Furtwängler's account of the Charites is good and clear on both sides. He maintains that the original conception was a physical one, the Charites having been originally the goddesses of the growth and bloom of things in the natural world. This aspect of them is indeed pre-Homeric, and he ought to have

more precisely pointed out that the only sure grounds for the theory are certain rites in the worship of Orchomenos, the name of the Charis Auxo at Athens, and the connection found between the Graces and Dionysos. However, the theory is very probable, and will explain the vivid reality that still attaches to the figures when they have become no more than personifications of the charm of human life. Dr. Furtwängler has not taken sufficient notice of those frequent passages in Pindar that illustrate the transition from the more concrete to the more abstract character of the Charites.

L. R. FARNELL.

(To be continued.)

JEBB'S *ANTIGONE*.

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part III. The Antigone, with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose. By R. C. JEBB, Doctor of Letters, Cambridge; Hon. LL.D. Edinburgh and Harvard; Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Cambridge University Press, 1888. 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR JEBB has now given us enough of his work on Sophocles to show clearly that his is destined to be the edition of the great Athenian. He has made Sophocles his own as Munro made Lucretius his own, and the future student will no more think of dispensing with his labours on Sophocles than of studying Juvenal without Mayor. However familiar the reader may be with the *Antigone*, he will find in almost every page of the commentary some delicate nicety of language or feeling which had hitherto escaped him, or some enhancement of the beauties which he had already perceived in this marvellous blossom of Attic genius. The translation alone would suffice to stamp the book with its true character as a splendid monument of British scholarship. Perfect feeling for literary expression and the keenest insight into Greek style and usage make every line of the English version pay a double debt as commentary too. Thus the editor has ample space in his notes for wide illustration, for minute attention to the aesthetic aspects of the play, for nice discussion of points in grammar, and for the maintenance of his excellent practice of warning the student against pitfalls in his path, of telling him not only how the words

in the text should be understood, but also why other views which will at first solicit him must be rejected.

But it is waste of time to acknowledge here excellences which by this time every scholar has learned to expect as a matter of course from Professor Jebb, and one must resist the temptation to turn a review of so very attractive a work into a note of admiration. In an edition so distinguished by accurate perception and fine analysis, it is almost superfluous to say that the critical part of the work has been excellently done, for in reality interpretation and criticism when carried to the highest point meet and coalesce. The more thorough the interpretation, the less need will there be for conjectures, which often—even the most attractive—have their origin in a lack of insight into the meaning of the text, or an impatience of the attention requisite to grasp it. The text before us is certainly the best text of the *Antigone* yet given to the world. Yet it might on the whole be called conservative. We may safely say that never is a reading of the MSS. condemned unheard. No conjecture, however specious, finds its way into the text until the editor has satisfied himself that the MS. tradition is certainly erroneous. Of course in such cases the editor will sometimes fail to command our assent to his conclusion. But this rarely happens, and even when we differ from his own solution, we feel that his handling of the discussion has largely helped to make the problem soluble, or to show that with our present *data* it is insoluble. I will now point to some places which seem to me still debate-