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](#)

***Histoire de la Littérature Grecque.* Par A. Croiset et M. Croisbt. Tome I. Homère; La Poésie Cyclique; Hésiode. Par M. Croiset. Paris: Thorin, 1887. 8 fres.**

F. B. Jevons

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 08 / October 1888, pp 255 - 257

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193394, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193394

How to cite this article:

F. B. Jevons (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 255-257 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193394

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

representative of the whole citizen body, and as such could swear to treaties. Here, and in his description how the *δικαστήρια* gradually took the place of the weakened Areopagus, the author's views have no doubt been influenced by Fränkel. The question of the number of *δικασταί* is discussed, and as a result we are relieved from the picture of the 'fourth part of the entire civic body distributing themselves into their various courts.' The author now quite gives up (p. 223) the idea that it was Pericles, or even a contemporary backed by Pericles, who introduced payment for attendance at the *ἐκκλησία*. He now pronounces that it was certainly an innovation, not truly democratical, of a later date, but the actual time of the change is confessedly unknown. He has also given up the idea (p. 227) that there was in Periclean or even pre-Euclidean times such an official as *ἐπιμελητής* or *ταμίης* of the public revenues, holding office for four years. The relation of the island states to Athens under Pericles is largely expanded (pp. 241-244), in view of new inscriptional evidence; particular reference is made to the grouping of the states for taxation purposes, though the author does not seem to mention how curiously Thucydides' notice of the Athenian allies in II. 9, confirms this view. Particulars of the amount of tribute paid by individual states, the storing and management of the same, the *μῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσθμίων* given to Athens, are described on p. 247f. To this succeeds (p. 255f.) a vastly improved historical account of the origin and development of the *κληρουχίαι*, much of which is drawn from recently discovered inscriptions, and (p. 262) some new paragraphs about the *μέτοικοι*. A much fuller account is now given (p. 310f.) of the origin and progress of the fine arts at Athens, of the influence of the islands of the Archipelago, of architectural Athens in general, and of the recognition and influence of Athenian art in the Peloponnesus. The estimate of the character of Pericles (pp. 418-423) is largely added to, his panhellenic policy is regarded as his weakest point. More information is given (pp. 482-3) on the relations of Cleon and Aristophanes; the raising of the tribute, probably on the motion of Cleon, and the imposition of the first *εἰσφορά* are new points, and so is the mention (p. 498f.) of the pamphlet on the Athenian Constitution, written in 424, expressing confidence in the position of Athens and her allies, just before the expedition of Brasidas to Thrace showed how precarious that position really was. Passing on to events succeeding the peace of Nicias we find Athenian designs on Epidaurus and the events leading up to Mantinea much more clearly put than heretofore (pp. 596-600). Succeeding this is a useful addition (pp. 606-609) in a description of affairs in *τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης* after 421. No change is made in the author's earlier views on the Hermocopidae (pp. 633-645). He still seems to regard the event as the result of a combination of men of all political parties, with the object of ruining Alcibiades. He still regards Pisander and Charicles, the leading members of the committee of *ζητηταί*, as disguised enemies of the constitution, 'directly or indirectly responsible for the mutilation itself.' It seems strange that the author has not been able to adopt the views of Gilbert (*Beiträge*, pp. 250-260), who places the whole matter in a far more probable light. Scarcely any alteration is made in the account of the Decelean war. Professor Curtius still maintains (with Herbert and Gilbert) his view of the innocence of the generals at Arginusae, in opposition to Grote's refusal to believe anything evil of a democracy. A useful map of the tribute-paying allies and the *κληρουχίαι* of Athens, divided into their proper sectional groups, concludes the volume.

A. H. COOKE.

Histoire de la Littérature Grecque. Par A. CROISSET et M. CROISSET. Tome I. Homère; La Poésie Cyclopie; Hésiode. Par M. CROISSET. Paris: Thorin, 1887. 8 frs.

THIS is the first volume of what promises to be an excellent history of Greek literature. It contains ample evidence of acquaintance with modern work on the Homeric question, it shows a fresh and independent appreciation of the original Greek, and it is written with the grace and lucidity which we are accustomed to look for in French work. Add to this that the work is eminently sober and you will have a fair idea of the good points of the volume. The author is, as regards Homer, a Separatist. But, let me hasten to add, he is a very reasonable Separatist. He does not believe that the *Iliad* for instance is made up of a number of rhapsodies composed independently of each other by poets working in ignorance of each other's productions. He does not believe that the elements out of which the poem is composed were put together once for all on one definite occasion. On the other hand he does not believe that the original poet of genius left a sketch of the future poem for his successors to fill in. Nor do we hear from M. Croiset of diastrophs or revisers. If he cannot believe in the very simple theory that the *Iliad* is the work of one author, neither can he believe that it is a fortuitous concurrence of lays or the mechanical production of a commission. His creed is that of organic growth. The way in which he pictures this organic growth is somewhat as follows: we have first to imagine that the tale of Troy was fixed in its main outlines as a matter of tradition or legend before poets began to embroider on it. The *Iliad* itself presupposes that the tale of Troy is known to the listener, and we have a still more pertinent example afforded in *Odyssey* VIII. of the circumstances in which epic poems grew up. In this book of the *Odyssey*, Demodocus when bidden to sing chooses as his theme an incident in the Trojan war, a quarrel between Achilles and Ulysses. Subsequently, the disguised Ulysses suggests that Demodocus should take as his theme another incident in which Ulysses figured, that of the wooden horse, and thus we have an example of the way in which a bard was naturally and necessarily led to embroider on two subjects which, though not connected, still as being drawn from the same tale might come to be connected. In the next place, a careful examination of the *Iliad* shows that different parts are of different ages, that the oldest are the fewest, and that they bear the marks of a common origin. Further, the parts thus shown to have a common origin do not form a continuous poem (this is an instance of M. Croiset's sobriety—he could just as easily have obtained a residuum which did form a continuous poem), though they are connected by the order which they observe and by the fact that they are developments of one and the same situation (this situation I should say is the Quarrel of Book I.; the other primitive parts which develop it are the Exploits of Agamemnon, Book X., the Patroclia, Book XVI., and the death of Hector, Book XXII.). These rhapsodies were evidently composed to be sung singly; at the same time the author when he composed the first, the Quarrel, had the rest vaguely in his mind; and with a very few lines introduced for the purpose these lays, though originally designed for separate recitation, could be strung together so as to make a tolerable whole. This rudimentary epic, however, does not constitute the whole of the inheritance bequeathed by the first great poet to his successors. He seems also to have composed certain

other lays, which have to do with the Trojan war, such as the Exploits of Diomed, Book V., the Farewell of Hector and Andromache, Book VI., the Embassy, Book IX., and perhaps some others. These lays are distinguished from the first set by the fact that their places in the story are not marked so clearly by the necessities of the dramatic development of the tale. It is now plain what there was left for succeeding poets to do: they might and did develop situations only hinted at in the first set of original lays; they had to pin down the second floating set of original lays to a fixed place, and then they had to insert other lays in order to make the whole run easily and continuously. The poets who thus expanded the original series of connected though not continuous lays were, like the great poet who composed the original lays, of Chios, and they were a *genos*. These Homeridae were not the only authors of epic poems, but they had the great advantage over other epic bards that they were a *genos* and that they worked continuously from generation to generation on the same poems, adding and unifying, and so they produced the epics which have outlived all others. The Homeridae were the authors of the Homeric poems.

It is not necessary to remind English readers that Dr. Monro has put the right value on the literary performances of the Homeridae and that there is no sufficient evidence for ascribing to them anything like the importance in shaping the Homeric poems that M. Croiset would credit them with. The Homeridae and diaskewasts are phantoms that ought not now to be pressed into the service of any theory of the origin of the Homeric poems. They do but little real service to the expansionist theory. If the expansionists could prove that the demand for a long epic originated in comparatively late times, their opponents would probably be ready to admit that the demand was supplied somehow, even if the exact means by which or the precise persons by whom it was satisfied could not be ascertained. Wolff thought that by demonstrating the non-existence of a reading public in early Greece he had proved that there could have been no demand for a poem of the length of our *Iliad* or *Odyssey* in the age to which the Homeric poems were commonly ascribed. Professor Paley has shown, and the service he has thereby rendered to the 'higher criticism' of Homer cannot be over-estimated, that a reading public did not exist in Greece before B.C. 420. But both Wolff and Professor Paley have proved too much for the objects which they had respectively in view. Wolff's argument would prove that there was no demand for lengthy epics, and consequently that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* did not exist until B.C. 420. Professor Paley's argument shows that if our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* existed before B.C. 420 (and most people believe they did), they must have been composed for a non-reading public. It is therefore the business of expansionists and aggregationists to show that in the period, the long period, during which the only means of publication was oral delivery, the conditions determining the occasions on which a poet could recite his poem changed in such a manner that in the earliest times he had not an opportunity of delivering a poem of the length of our *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, while later the conditions were such as made the recitation of a long poem both possible and advisable. As a matter of fact however the course of things did not follow this but precisely the opposite direction. With the growth of society the occasions on which an audience could be got together changed in such a way that the poems recited had to be shortened not lengthened, and in this fact lies the solution of the Homeric

question. It is, if not absurd to imagine, at any rate highly improbable that the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* was ever at any period recited right through at a single sitting. We have to suppose that it was begun at one sitting and continued at another, and finished at a third or fourth. Now the larger the audience, the greater the difficulty there is in getting it together on several occasions. The smaller the audience, the more easily it can be collected to hear on one day the continuation of the story it heard commenced the day before. Such an easily collected audience might be found in the village communities which were the largest social aggregates known in the times commonly called Homeric, while in the town life which succeeded village life it was only on stated feast-days that the community could be got together, and then not for a length of time admitting of the recitation of the whole of the *Odyssey* or *Iliad*. If any proof of this were needed it would be found in the fact that the poetry which sprang up, during the period of town life and after the time of the village community, was lyric poetry, which shows by its form that the conditions under which a poet addressed his audience were such as did not admit of long poems. The good king Alcinous and the princes of the Phaeacians would have found it slow work sitting drinking their wine night after night had it not been for Demodocus, and doubtless the longer he could make a tale last out, the more nights he could keep one story going, the better they were pleased. But these conditions did not occur after the patriarchal stage of Greek society. Under oligarchy and democracy, life, town-life, was not so leisurely. The pace was forced, and a short lyric, or twice or thrice a year a drama, was as much as the Greek of those days had time for. The fate of the Homeric poems therefore was precisely the reverse of that imagined for them by the expansionists and aggregationists. As time went on the cry was not for longer but for shorter poems, and the response was partly the production of lyric poetry and partly the cutting down of epics by the rhapsodists. Hence the discrepancies which the separatists make so much of. The rhapsodists wished to pick out for recitation two or three books which would of themselves make a tolerably complete story, and if the connection could be helped by the interpolation of a line or two to make the selection hang together they would not hesitate to put in the requisite verses. A line or two also to introduce and to conclude the selection would be necessary, and of course if these or the connecting lines just mentioned became incorporated into the text of the whole poem the result would be the confusion and inconsistencies of which we have an instance in N. 656-659, where Pylaemenes, who had been killed in E. 575-579, is brought in as chief mourner at his son's funeral by a rhapsodist who was reciting a single rhapsody and thought the appearance of Pylaemenes would make an effective climax.

I find it somewhat difficult to make out what M. Croiset conceives to have been the motive the Homeridae had in expanding and unifying the lays which the first great poet composed. On the one hand when he is attacking the theory of original unity, he is very definite in maintaining that the only way to understand a poet's producing such an enormous work as the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* would be to imagine grand, continuous recitations analogous to those which were held subsequently at the Panathenaea at Athens, and it is of course out of the question to imagine any such public recitations in the times called Homeric. On the other hand M. Croiset is inclined to think that the period of organic growth was over, and that the poems were complete,

as we have them, about B.C. 850. But as the Panathenaea did not exist in B.C. 850, and as no other festival, as far as we know, was in existence at that time at which the *Iliad* could be recited as a whole, I do not see how from M. Croiset's point of view the Homeridae in B.C. 950—850 should have had more inducement or opportunity to produce a lengthy epic than their great founder had before that period.

In conclusion, readers of this volume will look with interest for the next and following volumes.

The introduction and the chapters on the Art of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* are written so freshly and with such evident appreciation of the subject that one wishes to hear what the authors have to say of other departments of Greek literature, where their powers of literary criticism will not be so unfortunately cramped as here they are by the constraint imposed by the expansionist theory.

F. B. JEVONS.

[Our readers will be glad to have the Ode composed for the Bologna Centenary, which we print by the kind permission of the author. We regret that our space does not allow us to give also the excellent translation into Italian verse by Prof. G. Pelliccioni.]

ΤΩΙ ΕΝ ΒΟΝΩΝΙΑΙ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΩΙ

ΕΚΑΤΟΝΤΑΕΤΗΡΙΔΟΣ ΟΓΔΟΗΣ ΕΟΡΤΗΝ ΑΓΟΝΤΙ.

- Μᾶτερ ἀρχαία σοφίας, ὅθεν Εὐρώπη πάλαι
τᾷς ὀρθοβούλου φῶς Θέμιτος νέον ὥρτο,
ἐργμάτων ἱαμα βιαιοτάτων, στυγνῶν ἐλατήριον αὐτῶν,
Εὐνομίας ἀγανὸς κάρυξ βροτοῖς,
5 χείματος ὡς δνοφεροῦ
ὅτε φοινικάνθεμον
ἦρ πεδάμευσαν γύαι, στρ. α'.
- φαιδίμας χαῖρ' Ἰταλίας θύγατερ, τὸν ἀστέων
πρέσβυστον ἐξ ἄλλων ἐφίλασεν Ἀθᾶνα,
10 παῖς θ' ὁ Λατοΐδας, ὃ τ' ἐλευθερίᾳ χαίρων πολιάοχος Ἑρμῆς
νῦν σε μάλ' ἀδυνόοις δαιδαλλέμεν
καίριον εὐλογίαις,
ὅθ' ἐορτᾶς γέυεται
παντοσέμνου χάρματος. ἀντ. α'.
- 15 ὦραι γὰρ ἐπερχόμεναι θνατοῖς Διὸς
εἰς ἑκατοντάδας ὀκτῶ δὴ τελείας ἐτέων
δόξαν εὐστέφανον Βονωνίας
μαρτυρέοντι γεγάκεν
τᾷ καὶ ἀγαλλόμεναι ξείνων πολυγαθῆς ἵλαι
20 παντοδαπῶν ἀπὸ πεμφθείσαι πολλίων ποτινίσονθ' ἐστῖαν
φιλάταν Πιερίδεσσι, τεὰν
κοινᾷ κλείξοισαι χάριν.
- φαντὶ Τυρσανοὺς μὲν ἀρηϊφίλους κτίσσαι βάθροις
ἐν τοῖσδε Φελσίναν, ὅθι χεῖμα Σαβάνας στρ. β'.
25 γείτονος Ῥήνῃ πεδίων βρέχει Ἀπεννινόθεν εὐρυμέτωπον,
πίονα δῶρα τρέφον Δαμάτερος
οὐδ' ἀπαδὸν Βρομίῳ
ὅσα δ' ἔστ' Αἰνειαδᾶν
ἐν λόγοις, σιγᾷ σομαι.
- 30 Μοῖσα, τὴν δ' ἀρχὰ γλυκερῶν ἵποκείσθω φβεγμάτων,
τηλοῦ τις ὡς στίλβων ἀριδείκετος ἀστήρ,
οὐκ ἀμαυρωθὲν γενεαῖς ἅμα πολλαῖσιν κλέος Ἰρνερίοιο¹
λαμπάδα κείνος ἀνέσχ' ὀρθὰν Δίκας,
σπέρματα βαυὰ πυρὸς
35 ἀνεγείραις κείμενα
δαρὸν ἐν ψυχρᾷ σποδῶ.

¹ Irnerius (circ. A.D. 1080–1118), 'merito appellatus *lucerna iuris*, tanquam primus illuminator

nostre scientie' (Diplovataccius ap. Sarti P. II. 263).