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](#)

***Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst.* By Maximilian Mayer. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1887. 10 Mk.**

L. R. F.

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 09 / November 1888, pp 288 - 288

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193539, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193539

How to cite this article:

L. R. F. (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 288-288 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193539

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the same way that he has done in his own papers on mythological and religious subjects, he would have produced, not a new edition, but a new work. On the whole the changes introduced leave undisturbed the good qualities which have made Preller's work so popular, while they have eliminated many of its faults in detail, and have immensely improved its general tone and trustworthiness.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst. By MAXIMILIAN MAYER. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1887. 10 Mk.

THIS book is of about 400 pages and intends to be a contribution to the study of Greek religion and to Greek archaeology. Throughout there is much learning, and in the first part some ingenuity—often paradoxical enough. But on both sides the main result is unsatisfactory, chiefly because of the writer's incapacity for clear statement or clear argument, and in the first part also because of the narrow range of his hypotheses, which are chiefly solar. In his first chapter on the giants he is more or less successful in expounding the myth; he rightly emphasises their human aspect, which is perhaps their earliest: they are to be regarded—as has been elsewhere pointed out—as *ἀνθρωποειδὲς γίγαντες*, as the quasi-human generally lawless figures of a faded past, being, as he dexterously suggests, the same as Hesiod's bronze race. But he does not call attention sufficiently to their other character as elemental forces, which they undoubtedly bear in certain localities. When we come to his explanation of the character and myth of the Titans we find more unproved conclusions and more instances of unskilful and unreal argumentation than can be mentioned in a short notice. Showing little feeling for the popular mythopoeic mind, he makes an unreal distinction between the 'Volks-glaube' and 'die nach dem Ursprung der Dinge forschende Speculation'—unreal, because the 'Volks-glaube' in most parts of the world is full of speculations on the origin of things. He maintains then that the Greeks never had any chief god but Zeus, and that 'the whole idea of an earlier pre-Olympian world had no firm ground in the people's belief.' That the name Zeus is as old as the Hellenic people may be granted, and also that in the national cultus there never existed any other cycle of divinities organised under a supreme god except the Olympian; but we may still believe that in pre-Homeric times at least there were many localities that in their worship cared less for Zeus or for any 'Haupt-Gott,' and more for the local Demeter or Artemis or Asclepios, or 'Aegaeon': that in fact there was a 'pre-Olympian' stage but no 'pre-Olympian' systematic theology. We may object then to his method of explaining all the shadowy personages of the Titanic world as so many 'Hypostasen' of Zeus, Poseidon, or Helios. For instance there is evidence of an early local worship of Briareus-Aegaeon in Euboea; and in late authors like Callimachus (certainly not, as he supposes, in Euripides' *Alcestis*) Poseidon is himself called 'Aegaeon.' He argues then that in the earliest days also Aegaeon was a mere title of Poseidon, which then became detached from him and 'hypostasised,' and as an independent divinity became worshipped in Euboea. Is it not rather, to say the least, as probable that the cult and name of Poseidon here is not the earlier but the later, that Briareus-Aegaeon at Euboea was the cruder and more barbaric figure, a mere personification of the element, displaced afterwards by Poseidon who then occasionally assumes his name, as in other cases it may be that the

Olympians assume the name of their dethroned predecessors? His theory about 'Hypostasen,' that an adjective sometimes becomes a substantive and then a person, will hold good for certain developments in Greek religion; but he applies it extravagantly when he tries to prove that Atlas, Prometheus, Bellerophon, Ixion, and Endymion (!) are all aspects and forms of the sun-god: and this new application of a time-honoured theory is not made plausible without certain misquotations, or wrong estimates of passages. He seems to take as a general axiom that the many may be resolved back into one; originally there is one Cyclops, not many Cyclopes, one Erinyes, not many Erinyes, &c. This may hold good of Cyclops, but certainly not of the Erinyes: each case must be tried by itself; and the counter-axiom also prevails in Greek religion. And the one into which the many are resolved by Dr. Mayer is too often Zeus: thus Cyclops becomes Zeus Cyclops, that is, Zeus Triops, the three-eyed god, and Dr. Mayer in a foot-note disclaims any connection with those who might object that the Cyclops had only one eye: he curiously argues that though we only hear of his one eye he must have had three, else his face would have been a deformity.

Much of his theorising is occupied with the philological analysis of names, and this is very irritating when the writer is not a professed comparative philologist. Dr. Mayer skirmishes on the ground in amateur fashion, as one might in the old days when vowels did not matter. Neither his philological nor his other exposition suffices to prove his main point, that 'Titan' is the name of a supreme god, a Zeus-Helios, nor to reconcile us to the theory—which all this seems to imply—that later Greek polytheism emanates from a quasi-monotheism—a theory devout perhaps but dangerous. As against Dr. Mayer it might be maintained that Titan in the ancient texts is proved to be the characteristic appellative of many gods, not the personal name of one, and that it connotes a figure generally divine of the earlier half-remembered period of religion. It was the disappearance of the older cults and titles that may well have given rise to the legend of the Titanomachy, which Dr. Mayer in vain strives to prove to be a contest with the wild forces of nature.

Generally, Dr. Mayer's mythological theorising has many weaknesses: he emphasises contradictions which were nothing in the ancient mythopoeic mind: he takes slight verbal connections of names as proving identity of things and persons; and he would crystallise into hard substance what is floating, vague and half-formed.

The archaeological part of his book is a valuable compendium of the various monuments that refer to the gigantomachy, and he has omitted little. There is very little discussion of general questions—for instance of the important question, to what influences was due the changed form in which the giants come to be represented. His remarks on the larger monuments of sculpture are not of first-hand value. As regards the slabs from the altar at Pergamon he has nothing important to say that is new, and he shows little skill or intuition in his estimate of the Pergamene style. L. R. F.

De Pontificum Romanorum inde ab Augusto usque ad Aurelianum condicione publica.
By PAULUS HABEL (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen).

THIS is an able and interesting monograph intended to supplement for imperial times the treatise of C. Bardt which dealt only with the republican epoch. Not the least useful part of the essay is the complete