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](#)

Ilios et Iliade: les ruines d'Ilios—la formation de l'Iliade—essai de restauration de l'Iliade primitive—l'Olympe et l'art Homériques. Par Gaston Sortais, S. J. Paris, Bouillon, 1892.

Walter Leaf

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 04 / April 1892, pp 175 - 176
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185403, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185403

How to cite this article:

Walter Leaf (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 175-176 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185403

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

words distinctions between English synonyms are frequently blurred: e.g. 'system' is scarcely the meaning of *ratio* in *B.G.* iv. 17, 3 *rationem pontis hanc instituit*. Perhaps many of the defects in word-treatment find their explanation in this lack of appreciation of the finer distinctions of the language, which is detected also in frequent ambiguities of expression and in such un-English idioms as 'on flight' (s.v. *fuga*). A number of false references have been met with in only a cursory examination.

We have dwelt on the short-comings of this book because we have felt that the author has not fully appreciated what scholars demand in a special lexicon. The book claims too much. It is an admirable index, better than Holder's because it con-

tains much useful matter that does not properly belong to an index; but as a scientific and convenient 'complete lexicon of the Latinity of Caesar's Gallic War,' we are obliged to say that it is far from being what we should have wished. There is need of such a lexicon. This book could well be made the basis for it. But it must contain fuller citations, the subject-matter must be more carefully and scientifically handled, it must be more convenient in its arrangement and more advantage must be taken of the work of other lexicographers to Caesar. We hope that a second edition of Dr. Sihler's work will furnish us with such a lexicon.

EDWARD CAPPS.

Yale University.

Ilios et Iliade: les ruines d'Ilios—la formation de l'Iliade—essai de restauration de l'Iliade primitive—l'Olympe et l'art Homériques. Par GASTON SORTAIS, S. J. Paris, Bouillon, 1892.

FATHER SORTAIS writes avowedly for schoolboys, and his work makes no such claim either to originality or profundity as to demand a lengthy notice in the *Classical Review*. His first section is a rather bare *précis* of the results of Schliemann's discoveries at Hissarlik: the last is an aesthetic study of the principles of Homeric art and mythology which contributes nothing very new to a well-worn theme. The essay towards a restoration of the primitive Iliad is the part which merits the most attention: but even this is in principle only a popular presentation of the views advocated by M. Maurice Croiset in his first volume of the *History of Greek Literature*. And where Father Sortais departs from his original it is not for the better.

To the general theory set forth by M. Croiset and expounded by M. Sortais, that the Iliad is a growth, I should be the last to offer any objection in principle. The exposition of the difficulties involved in the acceptance of the Iliad as the work of one man, planned on a uniform design, is, as we expect from a Frenchman, luminous, and for those who are prepared to receive it, convincing. Needless to add that when the theory has to be applied constructively, it lays itself open to criticism like all the rest. It is briefly as follows. There is a series of primitive lays, treating of the great scenes of the Wrath of Achilles. They are not completely independent, as the school of Lachmann would have it, nor completely consecutive, as is argued by those who would reconstruct a primitive poem of the Wrath. They are separate rhapsodies, each forming a whole sufficient for a recitation, but are at the same time connected by the thread of a common subject. Subsequent bards added to these similar rhapsodies expanding the older theme: these are classed as 'chants de développement.' Finally all these lays were made into the Iliad as we have it by the addition of 'chants de raccord,' by which the lays were joined together into the semblance of a continuous poem.

The primitive Iliad consists of the following parts.

1. The quarrel and the promise of Zeus, book i. 2.

The defeat of the Achaeans, book xi. 3. The embassy to Achilles, book ix. 4. The Patrokleia, xvi. 5. The grief of Achilles, xviii. 1-242. 6. The reconciliation, xix. 1-275. 7. The parting of Hector and Andromache, vi. 313-528. 8. The death of Hector, xxi. 525-611, xxii. 9. The ransoming of Hector, xxiv.

Of course an elastic theory like this has obvious advantages: for if any inconsistency between two lays of the primitive Iliad is pointed out the author can always take refuge in the plea that the original Iliad never formed a complete whole. But then one does not see why the lays should be called an 'Iliad' at all. The same objection may be raised as against Lachmann's theory. How did it come to pass that all these lays should be composed on one small incident of the Trojan war, if they were not meant from the first to be one poem? In fact the whole conception, whatever MM. Croiset and Sortais may think, is but a restatement of Lachmann's position. It introduces moreover difficulties of its own in the conception of a second class of lays meant to develop the 'primitive Iliad.' Father Sortais rashly multiplies these by his own additions to Croiset; by the reference, that is, of the episodes 3, 7, and 9, to the original lays. He holds for instance, rightly no doubt, that the wall round the camp was unknown to the primitive poet: but he quite forgets that it comes into the scene of the embassy. Or at all events, if he does not forget that it comes in, he forgets to translate the lines in which it is mentioned: he does not say a word about rejecting them, for which there is indeed not the least reason. As for the parting of Hector and Andromache, how is it possible to class this among lays which are connected by their relation to the great story of the Wrath of Achilles? The Wrath of Achilles has nothing to do with the scene. And what excuse is there for separating this episode from the preceding description of the return of Hector from the field and his visit to Paris and Helen? Unless it be so separated, it is clear that it cannot be transposed, as Father Sortais would have it, to come immediately before the death of Hector: for it is intimately related to the Diomedea.

The principle which has guided him in making these additions to the theory which he is copying is

quite clear. He is profoundly impressed, as every one must be, with the beauty of these scenes, and he has not the heart to say that they belong to a later part of the poem. He is in short still under the ban of the prejudice which regards 'late' as identical with 'inferior.' It is not too much to say that until he has cast aside this pernicious 'idol' he is not likely to do much for the advance of Homeric criticism, except in helping to shake the prevailing belief in the unity of the *Iliad*. There I gladly welcome him as a somewhat misguided but useful ally.

WALTER LEAF.

Il Riso e il Pianto in Omero: Studio di VITTORIO GRAZIADEI. Rome, 1890.

THIS tract makes no claim to be philological or critical: it is a study of the Homeric gods and men from the standpoint of modern psychology, as set forth by Darwin, Spencer, and Bain, whom Graziadei frequently quotes. With this is combined a good deal of aesthetic and literary criticism, as may be expected: but this is of course on rather well-worn tracks, and the freshness of presentation depends chiefly on the comparison of the emotional condition of the Homeric Greeks with that of children which the doctrine of evolution would lead us to expect. The work is not one which can be fairly illustrated by short quotations, for the style is somewhat rhetorical and diffuse: but the reader will find it, if I may judge from my own experience, fairly interesting, if not particularly instructive.

W. L.

Homeri Odyssea. Recensuit ARTHURUS LUDWICH. Editio Minor. Teubner, 1890. Mk. 1.50.

Homeri Odyssea. In usum scholarum editio et commentario instruxit J. LA ROCHE. Vindobonae (Tempsky), Lipsiae (Freitag): 1892. 2 Mk.

Commentar zu Homers Odyssee. Von J. LA ROCHE, Heft 1: Gesang I-VI. Tempsky, Freitag. 1891. 1 Mk.

THE publication of school texts of Homer goes on apace in Germany. Ludwig's hardly calls for notice, as it is merely a reprint from his larger critical edition, which is elsewhere discussed. La Roche's on the other hand is perhaps to be taken as an authoritative expression of his latest views: but as no critical information is given either in text or commentary it is not easy to deal with it in this way. He certainly however does not adhere to his own earlier critical text. For instance he now reads in ζ 286 (καὶ δ' ἄλλη νεμεσῶ ἦτις τοιαῦτά γε βέ(οι) νεμεσῶμ', on the ground that it is required by the following optative. On the other hand he will have none of the far more likely conjecture ἀποξύνουσιν for ἀποξύνουσιν in ζ 269. Can this be because the latter is adopted by Ludwig?

The commentary proper is quite elementary and only suited for the lower forms at schools. There is however an appendix of more general interest in which various points of Homeric language are discussed and illustrated at some length. The Homeric use of the participle, for instance, covers more than eight pages.

W. L.

The Discourses of Epictetus with the Encheiridion and fragments, reprinted from the translation of GEORGE LONG. Bell and Sons. 1891. 10s. 6d.

THE praise bestowed on the translation of Antoninus in a late number of this *Review* may be extended to

that of Epictetus, so far as the general appearance of the book is concerned, and the satisfaction one naturally feels in reading a translation which was evidently a labour of love to the translator. At the same time it is right to point out that the Epictetus at all events is not without grave defects, as regards (1) the text chosen, (2) the accuracy, (3) the intelligibility and ease of the version.

(1.) III. 20. 10 is thus translated: 'The exercise master does right when he says: Raise him up with both hands, and the heavier he is, so much the more is my advantage.' In a note it is said 'the meaning is not clear if we follow the original text. Schweighäuser cannot see the sense "with both hands" in the Greek, nor can I.' It is true that Schweighäuser gives in the text the reading ἄρον ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων, but in his note he suggests ἄρον ὑπερον ἀμφοτέρων, which is accepted by Dübner in the Didot edition, and gives the sense 'raise the club with both hands.' In the same chapter § 13 L. translates 'What will you do with death? Why, what else than that it shall do you honour, or that it shall show you, by act through it, what a man is who follows the will of nature?' The Greek which L. attempts to render by the last clause is ἡ ἴνα δείξῃ σε ἔργῳ δι' αὐτοῦ τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ., justly characterized by Schweighäuser as *scabra oratio*, and for which we read in Dübner ἴνα δ' εἰς ἔργῳ κ.τ.λ. In like manner Fragments 29 and 35, which have been put into intelligible shape by Dübner, are vainly attacked in their old shape by L.

(2.) I. 7. 30 'If then I shall make a mistake in these matters may I not have killed my father?' This is L.'s translation of ἂν οὖν ἐν τούτοις πλανηθῶ, μή τι τὸν πατέρα ἀπέκτεινα; altogether mistaking the force of μή τι. Mrs. Carter translates rightly 'But suppose after all I have made a mistake in these points, have I killed a father?' IV. 7. 17 'I have been made free; I know his commands, no man can now lead me as a slave. I have a proper person to assert my freedom; I have proper judges. (I say) are you not the master of my body? What then is that to me?' The Greek which L. is here translating is ἡλευθέρωμαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔργων αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς, οὐκέτι οὐδέτι δουλαγωγῆσαι με δύναται καρπιστὴν ἔχω οἷον δεῖ, δικαστὰς οἷους δεῖ. Οὐχὶ τοῦ σώματός μου κύριος εἰ; τί οὖν πρὸς ἐμέ; Here the end of the first clause has been lost, making nonsense of the second: 'proper' is a poor translation of οἷους δεῖ, which means rather 'such as Providence ordains.' The penultimate sentence should be translated 'Is it not my body (in contrast with my soul) you are master of?' I. 2. 'To the rational animal only is the irrational intolerable' (τῷ λογικῷ ζῳῷ μόνον ἀφόρητόν ἐστι τὸ ἄλογον). I. 5. 6. 'Do you comprehend that you are awake? I do not, this man replies, for I do not even comprehend when in my sleep I imagine that I am awake.'—Here 'comprehend' is a wrong word for καταλαμβάνεις, which Mrs. C. more correctly translates 'are you certain,' and 'not even' is a wrong translation of οὐδέ, for which Mrs. C. gives the correct 'neither.' III. 24. 112 τούτου με ὁ Ζεὺς αὐτὸν παρ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαβεῖν ἀποδείξειν ἠθέλησε, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ γινῶναι, εἰ ἔχει στρατιώτην οἷον δεῖ, πολίτην οἷον δεῖ, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις προάγειν με μάρτυρα τῶν ἀπροαιρέτων ἴδετε, ὅτι εἰκὴ φοβείσθε, μάτην ἐπιθυμεῖτε ὦν ἐπιθυμεῖτε. L. translates 'Of this Zeus has willed that I shall receive from myself a demonstration, and shall myself know if he has a soldier such as he ought to have, a citizen such as he ought to have, and if he has chosen to produce me to the rest of mankind as a witness of the things which are independent of the will. See that you fear without reason, that you foolishly desire.' I have marked the blunders by italics; in the first a nominative is translated as an