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](#)

Rohde's Psyche, Part II *Psyche-Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, von Erwin Rohde. Zweite Hälfte. Freiburg & Leipzig. 1894. 11 Mk.

J. E. Harrison

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 04 / April 1894, pp 165 - 166
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187979, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187979

How to cite this article:

J. E. Harrison (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 165-166 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187979

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ROHDE'S *PSYCHE*, PART II.

Psyche-Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen, von ERWIN ROHDE. Zweite Hälfte. Freiburg & Leipzig. 1894. 11 Mk.

By an instructive coincidence Mr. Verrall's article on 'the problem of the *Bacchae*' in last month's issue appears almost at the same moment as the second part of Dr. Rohde's *Psyche*. Mr. Verrall is concerned of course primarily with the methods of Euripidean criticism, Dr. Rohde with a no less well worn subject, the belief of the Greeks as to the immortality of the soul; they meet and pass in the dark and, all unknowing, flash brilliant light each on the other's track.

The first part of Dr. Rohde's book was reviewed on its appearance (*Classical Review*, 1890, p. 376) and need not here be resumed—the writer sought and sought in vain, through an examination of Homer, of local cults, of burial rites, and even of the Eleusinian mysteries, for traces of anything that could fairly in the modern sense be called a belief in the immortality of the soul. Such a belief, in the days of the Orphics, of Plato, and later of Plutarch, unquestionably existed—where, when did it rise? The answer comes in the second part of the book just issued and comes as a surprise, almost a paradox. This tenet, the touchstone of any religion worth the name, the keystone of spirituality, was the main doctrine of the religion of—Bacchus. For his 'spiritual blindness,' for his misconception and persecution of this divine revelation, Pentheus died.

Examine the genesis of other Hellenic worships, of the rites of Athene, of Hera, of Apollo, even of Demeter, and we come on quite other, quite material beginnings—we come on ploughing ceremonies, seed-sowing ritual, sympathetic magic of every kind to secure practical well-being, the fulfilment of primitive needs, of the fertility of crops and herds and of man himself. Bacchus we think of perhaps as the wine-god; such an old Dendrites there certainly was, but the impulse of the Thracian god was, to begin with, quite other. The keynotes of his religion are two, *ecstasy* and its correlative *askesis*—its end and aim one, absolute communion, even identity with the divinity worshipped, and *thereby*—in the only possible way—attainment of eternal life. Here is the difference

—no worshipper of Athene or Apollo or Hera seeks to be made one with his god, seeks by fasting, by dancing, by exhaustion, by intoxication, by any other form of *asceticism*, to stand out of his own nature and be made one with the god, to put off this corruptible and put on the incorruptible. The way is hard: 'πολλοὶ μὲν νάρθηκοφόροι, παῦροι δέ τε Βάκχοι.' 'Many bear the narthex but few there be that are made one with Bacchus.' And what a madness it must have seemed! To the rational self-contained carefully poised Greek, what foolishness! And since we do not understand, let us condemn without delay, let us dub it dangerous, disreputable, immoral, a peril to hearth and home. So common sense, so the thoroughly British Pentheus, and yet—

'O blest who glad at heart has known
The deep things of the god his own,
And lifts up holy hands;
And who with sacred cleansing rites
Is one in soul upon the heights
With Bacchus' sacred bands.'

To some their souls were more than their social status, and of these were honourable women not a few.

It has long been a puzzle whence the non-Hellenic, the spiritual, element in Greek religion came; it is so obviously un-Greek and yet so interpenetrates the Greek spirit. Some have attributed it to the East, some to the sub-stratum of a pre-Hellenic 'Pelagian' population, some to Orphic sectaries. This last is in part, according to Dr. Rohde, true. The Orphic dogmas are a formulation and a reassertion of the old Thracian immigrant faith. And as such they become at once intelligible. How is it a man *can* become one with the god? By virtue of the fact that his soul is a particle of the divine nature. Dionysos Zagreus is torn to pieces; each of us has a fragment of him within us, and by virtue of this divine spark or atom each of us is a potential Bacchus. To dance till we are dizzy, to toss our heads in ecstasy, may not seem to us the best means of promoting spirituality, but to any one who has watched either the dancing or the howling dervishes at work the whole faith becomes historically intelligible. The dervish, by a process of rocking himself to and fro in a hideous and almost dislocating fashion to the music of a rude chant, or by

turning steadily on his own axis, becomes slowly possessed. That he is regarded as actually divine is shown by the fact that at the close of the dance he has miraculous powers, and is allowed to step upon sick children before him by way of healing them. Immortality is but one attribute of divinity. Mantic art is another; and here Dr. Rohde makes the interesting remark that oracular *possession*, as opposed to the mere Homeric soothsaying, is always of Dionysos, not of Apollo. Soothsaying is rational (or rather, which is for our purpose the same, irrational); oracular possession is non-rational, emotional, religious. Dionysos held Delphi and possessed the Delphic priestess — a priestess note, not a priest—before Apollo came and slew the dragon of superstition.

I have stated Dr. Rohde's view; the evidence will be found in the countless pas-

sages cited in his notes. It will not be forgotten that in Thrace dwelt the Getae who, Herodotos noted, held themselves to be immortal, and that the oracles of Dionysos were given among the Bessae exactly in the way that the Pythia prophesied at Delphi (Herod. vii. 11); and, to take but one other instance, when Plutarch writes to comfort his wife for the loss of their little daughter, he bids her remember τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ὀργασμῶν ἀσύνισμεν ἀλλήλοις οἱ κοινωνοῦντες.

Well indeed might those honourable women, the Bacchae, goddesses themselves, one with the god, come to their high estate through *kátharsis* and *áskhesis*, inspired Sibylls of a new and higher religion, bid the mad fools forsake the revels of Aphrodite and seek austerer joys upon Olympian heights.

J. E. HARRISON.

[The following article arrived too late for insertion in its proper order at the beginning of this number.]

THE 'PROSPECTIVE SUBJUNCTIVE' IN GREEK AND LATIN.

IN the *Classical Review* for Feb. 1893, Professor Sonnenschein maintained a thesis, then of five or six years standing in his own teaching, that the subjunctive in a number of relative clauses in Latin is prospective, not, as generally held, final. His list includes clauses with *dum*, *donec* and *quoad*, clauses with *antequam* and *priusquam*, and clauses of result.

With regard to the two first sets of clauses, it gave me pleasure to learn that I could now appeal to Professor Sonnenschein's support for a doctrine which I also had long held. Notes taken by a student of mine in 1886 show that I was teaching it at that time, and I am sure that the notes of others would carry the teaching back a number of years further. From the beginning I gave the evidence which I am about to offer. Like Professor Sonnenschein, I have long meant to publish upon the question; but, since I was engaged upon a piece of work of larger range, in which I planned, by the comparative method, to lay the foundations for an intended treatment of the Latin Modes and Tenses, I withheld my view on this point, together with a number of other results to which I had been led. Accordingly, in my discussion of the force of the

tense in clauses with *antequam*, *priusquam*, *dum*, *donec* and *quoad*, in my article on the Sequence of Tenses in Latin, published in 1887 in the *American Journal of Philology*, viii. 1, I contented myself with saying that the subjunctive represents the act as 'pictured,' as 'existing in somebody's brain at a certain time which the narrator has in mind,' which force I illustrated, à propos of Livy's *priusquam inde digrederentur* (i. 26, 1), by the phrase 'with that departure in view.' By 'in view' I meant the same thing that Professor Sonnenschein means by the phrase 'in prospect.' And similarly, in the concluding paper, in ix. 1 (1888), in dealing with the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctives to indicate how I should prepare the way for a doctrine of the 'Sequence of Tenses,' I contented myself with saying 'the imperfect subjunctive pictures an act as in process, or a state as existing, at a certain past time which the speaker or writer has in mind; and it also pictures an act or state as looked forward to from such a past time.' 'The pluperfect...also pictures a finished act looked forward to from such a time (a future perfect from a past point of view).' By 'looked forward to from a certain past time' I meant to cover, together