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](#)

Farnell's Cults of the Greek States *The Cults of the, Greek States*, by L. R. Fabnell. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1896. Vols. 1 and 2. 32s. net.

W. M. Ramsay

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 02 / March 1898, pp 111 - 113

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025609, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025609

How to cite this article:

W. M. Ramsay (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 111-113 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025609

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

title referred not to the form of the compilation, but to the use which was to be made of it. As to the purposes to which the official Athenian 'Homer' of the sixth and fifth centuries was applied, we have evidence abundant and undisputed. It was framed to be recited solemnly on certain public occasions, and also—a use far more important—to be the staple of a new and literary type of education. It was intended, as we should say, to be read by public authority 'in churches and schools'. It was the course which recitation and reading were to follow and, when it was finished, were presumably to repeat. In short it was *the circle* upon which Athenian study was to revolve.

The supposition, that the unity and consistency of the *Cycle* was due in great part to harmonizing compilers, does not of course exclude, or rather it requires, the belief that in the mass of traditional poetry, out of which the *Cycle* was framed, there was already a community of subjects, personages, incidents, style, and colour. Without this, a harmony would have been impossible; and this, from the circumstances under which the Epic narrative seems to have been first made and circulated, it is not difficult to presume. But that the corpus was actually constructed and formed by individual literary poets, consciously and systematically continuing and completing the work of their predecessors—this appears to me inconceivable. There have been ages, since the foundation of fixed literature, when such a proceeding was possible and took place. But that the seventh or eighth century B.C. was such an age, there is neither proof nor likelihood. And indeed, since the *Cycle*, which was vastly more than a tale of Troy, seems to have included nearly all the poetry of the pre-bibliographic age, excepting the corpus (similar in character and probably in

history) called Hesiod, of which later times had any real cognizance, such a theory practically means, that in that age the whole business of poets was continuation. Doubtless the reciters in general followed closely a common tradition, including, for certain parts of their narratives, many famous and successful variations. But probability confirms authority in the assertion, that the final combination was a process distinct from the first composition, and that it was performed at Athens in the sixth century.

It will be seen that, thus interpreted, the tradition does not give us any direct information respecting the points to which the 'Homeric question' is often too much confined, the origin and composition, that is to say, of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It is compatible with the tradition to suppose that these parts of *The Circle* were incorporated in it without alteration, and determined the rest. But the foregoing supposition will manifestly affect the spirit and expectation in which we approach the internal evidence of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Much that has already been done in this department may be seen, as it was seen by Seeck, in a new illumination; much, especially in the *Iliad*, remains to be done. Let these conceptions only be applied to the evidence as it is presented, for example, by Grote, Professor Jebb, and Dr. Leaf; and let us see where it leads us, and whether we are thus enabled to make further steps towards the solution of the problem. But this must be for another place and time. We have already run far enough, perhaps—too far, from Professor Murray, of whom in conclusion this may be said, that what he writes always represents the real genuine opinion and feeling of at least one competent person. This is not a universal merit; it is not even very common.

A. W. VERRALL.

FARNELL'S CULTS OF THE GREEK STATES.

The Cults of the Greek States, by L. R. FARNELL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896. Vols. 1 and 2. 32s. net.

MR. FARNELL has essayed a very difficult task. To perform any large enterprise in scholarship to the satisfaction of every one is hardly possible, and probably there is no subject in which it is so entirely impossible

as in the one which he has chosen. The persons who will use the book may be divided into two classes: those who intend to write on Greek mythology, and those who don't. A person who belongs to the first class could be satisfied with only one book, viz., the one he dreams of writing himself, or, if he has already published one, the revised edition thereof. As a rule, the

critics of any book on Greek mythology or religion belong to this class; and, as a rule, they praise the book under review in so far as it carries out their own special theory, and blame it in so far as it differs from their opinions. The present reviewer has, what is, perhaps, not a disadvantage for the task of criticising: he has written his book, and recognised that it was not good enough: then, being forced to choose between two crimes, breaking an engagement and printing a book with which he was dissatisfied, he perceived that the latter was the greater crime, and placed the great pile of manuscript in the seclusion where it has lain nearly twice nine years. Chastened in spirit by his own failure, and having a wholesome fear of the difficulties which he found insuperable, he may perhaps be better qualified to represent the larger but less articulate class of persons, who do not even dream of writing on the subject, and are content to make the best of the existing books, and to find something useful in most of them. From this point of view, it may be confidently said that, so far as its range extends, Mr. Farnell's book is the best in existence; and the collections of authorities, grouped together conveniently at intervals, are wonderfully useful.

The book is arranged according to the names of the great Gods; Cronos, Zeus, Hera, and Athena take up one volume; and Artemis, Hekate, Eileithyia, Aphrodite fill a second. The author intends to complete the enterprise in a third volume; but he will have to reduce his scale of treatment very much, if he is to compress the rest of the great gods into a single volume. The principle of arrangement can hardly be avoided, and yet it is not quite satisfactory. But there cannot at present be any really satisfactory treatment of Greek religion and the mythology that is inseparable from it. Mr. Farnell sees, and sometimes states very plainly, that the name is no index to the character of a god; that the god expresses the religious conception of a tribe or people at some period of its development; that from some reason certain gods were fixed and stereotyped at a particular stage in the social evolution of the people, while in another god a more developed stage is crystallised. By what accident or through what cause is it that you find a Hera both in Samos and in Argos, nominally one personality, really two widely differing conceptions of the divine nature, corresponding to the different character and civilisation of their worshippers? In the ancient con-

ception the divine nature was regarded as the prototype and guarantee of existing human nature, and the Greeks never thought of divine nature as a moral ideal beyond themselves towards which human nature should strive. It is clear that the goddess of one district took form when the tribe knew no true marriage, and that she exemplifies in the holy drama of her divine life the temporary relationships that filled the place of marriage. It is clear that, in another district, a more permanent conception of marriage expressed itself in a different divine idea. It is clear, too, as I think, that among some tribes their conceptions of a god or a goddess developed in such a way as to cause a development of the ritual; but that everywhere this development of the divine conception and of the ritual was arrested, sometimes at an earlier stage than in others. With much of what has just been stated, Mr. Farnell would, I imagine, agree more or less completely. But is it possible to arrange a systematic and complete account of the religion of the Greek states according to those ideas? Mr. Farnell thinks not, or he would doubtless have tried it. I agree with Mr. Farnell, for I spent great part of the years 1880 to 1882 in the attempt, and abandoned it in despair. There are too many cross-currents of influence; there is too much room for subjective impression, too little certainty as to details; and, above all, our authorities are too tantalisingly fragmentary and inadequate.

In using the book one feels, sometimes, that too much attention is given to theories which Mr. Farnell rejects, and too much space devoted to his reasons for rejecting them. But, considering that the work is addressed to the entire body of persons interested in Greek mythology and religion, and that almost all books which treat systematically and in detail about that vast subject are dominated and guided by views which he rejects, one cannot fairly blame him for this method of unfolding his own views. A different method would be appropriate, if Mr. Farnell were setting forth a definite theory, and showing how many facts of Greek religion are illuminated and made intelligible thereby; but, when his object is to discuss the entire complicated body of phenomena connected with the names of all the chief Greek deities—phenomena which cannot be all explained from one point of view or on one theory of origin—I do not see how he could avoid constant references to the views of such

writers as Preller, Roscher, etc. Theirs are the books that we always have had to turn to for a conspectus of the facts; and there is hardly a page in them that is not coloured and made misleading to the unwary reader by their theories. Perhaps some writers, more insignificant, but not more extreme or extravagant than Roscher, might have been with advantage left unnoticed.

But many critics who are ready to blame the polemical form of setting forth one's own views by stating one's reasons for not accepting those of one's predecessor, would be equally ready to say, 'the author has apparently not observed the presentation of a contradictory view by the learned —,' if Mr. Farnell had not explicitly shown why he dissented from that learned gentleman. Moreover, where a subject is in the stage of growth, and has not yet arrived at the fully developed stage in which an accepted body of principles can be laid down as a foundation, polemic is unavoidable, for it is in many cases the best, and in some cases the inevitable method of placing one's own view before the reader.

A very large book like this, which has been written amid the pressure of college work, lecturing and administrative, and has not been a part of the author's regular duties, but rather a relaxation from them, has necessarily taken a long time in composition; traces of development in the writer's views and method might be found; and perhaps that is the reason why some principles, with which one strongly sympathises, are used in one case, and not in another. But it is equally probable that, in Mr. Farnell's opinion, a certain principle which explained the recorded facts in one

case, was inadequate to do so in the other, or that in one case there was sufficient evidence to establish it, while in another the evidence was so vague and so various that the principle of interpretation was not sufficient to explain the whole of them; and he might declare that there is no single key to all mythology. Personally, I confess that I should be inclined to apply much more freely principles which he sometimes uses very effectively.

There is, however, too much tendency among reviewers to yield to the temptation of picking out from a voluminous work like this points on which one differs from the writer, and concentrating attention on them. The readers of the *Classical Review* wish to learn what they will find in Mr. Farnell's work, and whether it is usefully and suggestively set forth. From that point of view the reviewer's duty is thoroughly pleasant. The reader will find a very complete statement of the facts, and judicious and admirable criticism of the theories, prominent and sometimes even obscure, concerning the deities mentioned; he will meet with many things said clearly and well, with some things better said than they have been said in any other place; and he will find a long and well-chosen series of illustrations, containing all the most important artistic embodiment of the religious conceptions. The monuments are discussed with great care and skill; and often the reader feels that the part of his work which Mr. Farnell has performed with most love and most enjoyment has been the exposition of the developed Hellenic ideal, as set forth in the best art of Greece.

W. M. RAMSAY.

MARCHANT'S THUCYDIDES, BOOK VI.

Thucydides, Book VI. Edited by E. C. MARCHANT, M.A., Trinity College, Oxford, Assistant Master in St. Paul's School, Fellow and late Assistant-tutor of Peterhouse, Cambridge, late Professor of Greek and Ancient History in Queen's College, London. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd. pp. liv. 299.) 3s. 6d.

Mr. MARCHANT's close attention to matters of grammar and exegesis, his knowledge of Athenian affairs and of the political situation in B.C. 415, and his acquaintance with the

topography of Syracuse and its environs render his 'Thucydides Book vi.' a valuable addition to Messrs. Macmillan's list of school class books. Indeed his familiarity with the labours of preceding commentators, his knowledge of MSS. and his genuine critical ability entitle this work to higher recognition than is claimed for it in the catalogue, and mark it as one in which scholars of every rank may take a respectful interest.

The editor has included in this edition a new collation of M, the eleventh century codex Britannus, and has in two places