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](#)

Homerica. I. The Achaeans

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 25 / Issue 08 / December 2011, pp 233 - 236

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00047417, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00047417

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1911). Homerica. I. The Achaeans. The Classical Review, 25, pp 233-236
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00047417

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1911

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

HOMERICA. I. THE ACHAEANS.

PERSONS interested in Homer have to make up their minds on all points connected with Homer. This is my excuse for venturing into a province like ethnography with which I have no proper concern.

The picture which Homer gives of his heroes and their people lies under an antinomy. Part is confirmed by that other world, the subterranean; part hangs foundationless, like a Venetian house. The topographical and political description is seen to be correct, a rendering of a world which once existed. The boundaries of Greece, the divisions within it, the colonisation of certain islands, are real; and the barbarian world, Thrace and Asia, is real. Homer's account records actual facts and the kind of knowledge of the distant world in possession of his Achaeans at the time of the Trojan War. Excavation has shown us Agamemnon at Mycenae, Nestor at Samicum, Meges at Dulichium (Leucas), Menelaus on the left bank of the Eurotas, and has confirmed his vague notions of Asia past the sea.¹ When we turn to the civilisation or anthropology of Homer's heroes, the case is different. The people who lived and were buried at Mycenae and Pylos have not the same habits in Homer as they had in fact; their clothing is different, they live in a different metal-age, and they dispose of their dead differently.

I need not give the details for this assertion, which is common knowledge.

The Homeric account therefore is supported by archaeological facts as to the one part, unsupported as to the other. Or, if we start from the archaeological side, we should say that we can find a time and locus in the history of the Levantine world for the political and geographical cosmos of Homer; but his cultural world cannot be placed.

To avoid this contradiction a hypothesis has been current in England (and I believe nowhere else) for some ten years past; namely, that the Achaeans (that is to say, the people whom Homer designates by this name with two others) were a separate race, who possessing the culture Homer ascribes to them occupied the seats where archaeology discovers a race with other (and earlier) cultural characteristics. Thus the Homeric picture would be justified at all points. Professor Ridgeway is generally believed to have originated this theory in his *Early Age of Greece*, Cambridge, 1901. The Achaeans were precursors of the Dorians, descended from more or less the same parts; cased in mail and wielding iron swords, they made short work of the naked bronze-using Mycenaean. Homer when he said χαλκός meant σίδηρος.² This

² The same view was held in antiquity: schol. Ap. Rhod. I. 430 Ἀπολλώνιος φησιν ἐν τῷ ᾧ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων τὸν σίδηρον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων χαλκὸν λέγεσθαι, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι μηδέπω εὑρεθέντος σιδήρου χαλκῷ ἐχρῶντο, ὡς καὶ Ἡσίοδος φησι [OD. 151].

theory, clear, trenchant and attractive, made captive at the time of the writer, among more important people. It has recently been applied by Mr. Lang, with the devotion and acuteness which we know, to Homer. Mr. Lang's views are not identical with Mr. Ridgeway's; they are identical insofar as he posits a *tertium quid* between Mycenaeans and Dorians. Mr. Lang's originality is that he pours into this recipient the whole of the Homeric culture—metal, cremation, clothing, and religion. When Homer said bronze he meant bronze. This account again is sympathetic as endeavouring to confer reality upon Homer, which the expurgation-theory, exploited in this country by Professor Murray, takes from him. Mr. Lang has dealt with expurgation with the ease appropriate to such a toothless victim, but his own counter-theory is difficult to the best-intentioned Unitarian. The idea of a race or period intermediate between Mycenaeans and Dorians has met also with the qualified approval of some English archaeologists (Mackenzie, *B.S.A.*, 1908; Hogarth, *Ionia and the East*, p. 101; *Enc. Brit.*, 1910, p. 250 b) and of Kretschmer, *Glotta*, i. 23; but it may be doubted whether the evidence, anthropological or literary, proves more than a new element or development in or of the same race. In particular Kretschmer's conclusions do not demand the sequence Mycenaeans-Achaeans-Dorians, though he accepted the parallel from Mackenzie. These conclusions were that an analysis of the historical dialects of Greece showed in the North three strata, in the South two; deduction made of the last, the Dorian, two are left in the North, one in the South. Accepting these results, I think a better ethnological parallel may be found by positing in the South a pure Mycenaean (or, in my language, Achaean) race, in the North the same race dominating Mr. Wace's neolithic people. Civilisation and language spread northwards, not *vice versa*. The Scotch Lowlands are another case. Mr. Wace's magoula folk would therefore provide the specific Aeolic element of later times.

The idea of an Achaean race occupying Mycenaean seats but enjoying an

Homeric culture encounters the obvious and daily more obvious difficulty that the race in question has left no trace behind it. The race used *ex hypothesi* a great deal of iron and burned their dead. The Mycenaean sites show only minute quantities of iron and only sporadic human ashes. It is ten years now since Mr. Ridgeway published his *Early Age*; excavation has gone on busily since then all over Greece. The first-class sites, we are told, are exhausted, and Mycenaean and other prae-Dorian remains have been found in most unexpected places. But the required evidence has nowhere appeared, and it is now plain that it nowhere exists. Is it then allowable to suppose, as a second resort, that the assumed Achaean race really left no trace? Arguments have, indeed, been adduced to support this position—the Achaeans were few in number, a dynasty, a caste, a military handful; but it is plain this is special pleading. There may indeed have been a dynasty, a caste, at Mycenae, but the monarch was he whose bones and mask Schliemann found at Mycenae, and the dynasty or caste came as it did in tradition from Asia, not from Macedonia. For, again, what ground is there for bringing the Achaeans from the inhospitable North except the iron and pinned cloaks of Homer, which gave Mr. Ridgeway a picturesque parallel to Lombards crossing the Alps? The Achivi or Akaiuasha (I refer for the authorities to Mr. H. R. Hall's *Oldest Civilisation of Greece*, 1901, p. 173, etc.) where we first meet them (about 1250 B.C.) are sea-pirates who plunder the Egyptian delta. Next we find them in the Homeric poems, in a local and a general sense: locally they are (a) a part of the mixed population of Crete, (b) a part of the mixed subjects of Peleus on the Spercheus [and from the persistence of the name in history as Achaea Phthiotis we may fairly infer that they inhabited the north side of the valley]. This is the most northerly point at which we find the name in a specific sense. Generically of course they are one of three names which Homer gives without distinction of race or place to the whole of Agamemnon's subjects from Dulichium to

Rhodes.¹ If the Achaeans were immigrants from anywhere they will have come from any point of the compass rather than from the north. The local name in Crete and the plundering of the Delta suggest the opposite pole.²

Moreover, the recent excavations in Boeotia and Thessaly, conducted by various explorers and made known to us chiefly by Mr. A. J. B. Wace and Mr. Maurice Thompson, appear, so far as they incline one way or the other, to tell against Mr. Ridgeway and Mr. Lang. A martial race descended from the North and conquered the effete Mycenaean. We should expect to find their traces if anywhere in Thessaly through which their path lay, where for example they might have been in subjection to southern masters until, like the Germans, they moved south and inverted the rôles. It now appears that during the whole Blüthezeit of Mycenae Thessaly and North Boeotia were populated by a feeble neolithic people, living on hilltops, devoid of all kinds of metal, and using very rough pottery. Such advances in culture as they received came from the south: first a pottery resembling the Orchomenian, and eventually shortly before the sites ceased to be inhabited a little bronze. These people were not the Achaei, hardy bronze-clad mountaineers descending upon an overblown civilisation. After them there is nothing in Thessaly till we come to the entirely different Dorian world—different in site and in culture.

I think, then, that the attempt to find the Homeric culture in a hypothetical Achaean race, intermediate between the Mycenaean and the Dorians, fails. There

was no such race; as it has left no trace of itself in *rerum natura*, so it never existed. The 'nameless' Mycenaean were the Achaeans, and had two other names besides.

Mr. Lang will now ask me how, supposing the world of Homer never existed *en toutes pièces* at any one time, it comes that Homer made the Achaeans use iron and burn their dead, when they did not do so? Homer anachronised, is my answer, and anachronism, as Mr. Lang and others have told us, is so invariably the habit of artists and poets in matters of costume and manners that the probability of Homer having anachronised may stand without specific evidence. Have we not just been told that in Thackeray's illustrations to *Vanity Fair* he dressed his characters in the clothes of his own day and not in the costumes of 1815? That Homer's picture of history and political geography is correct I have tried to show in a paper on the Catalogue, *J. H. S.*, 1910, 292 *sqq.* My position therefore is that his history is correct, but his culture anachronistic; thus I entirely agree with Mr. Hall *l.c.* p. 223: 'The Homeric culture is evidently the culture of the poet's own days; there is no attempt to archaïse here, unless the indulgence in wondering descriptions of the masterpieces of bygone days is archaïsing. But it is otherwise when political conditions are dealt with. Paul Veronese arrayed the wife of Darius in ruff and farthingale, but he knew full well that she was a queen of ancient Persia, not a sixteenth-century Italian princess.'

The next question is more searching. If Homer anachronised, that is to say gave the heroic Achaeans the accoutrements and habits of his own age, what was that age? Well, believing with most of the Greeks that Homer, father of the Homeridae and creator of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, lived in Chios about the year 900, I have no difficulty in saying that the Homeric cultural age was the Early-Colonial. I am fully aware that there is no archaeological evidence for the culture of the Early-Colonial age; we do not know (so far as I am aware) that the Chians or Smyrnaeans of 900 used iron and practised cremation. It may therefore

¹ The *Δαναοί* also have Egyptian warrant (Hall, *l.c.*, p. 175). I have endeavoured (*Classical Quarterly*, 1909, 81 *sqq.*) to explain the third appellative 'Αργεῖοι (which has no monumental evidence) as a political derivative from the Agamemnonian Argos. My article, which was written under the prepossessions of a follower of Mr. Ridgeway, requires some modification. The statistics of Della Seta (*Acc. d. Lincei*, xvi. 133 *sqq.*) prove nothing, except that 'Αχαιοί is the most, *Δαναοί* the least, frequent term.

² The post-Dorian usages of the name (Phthiotis, the north coast of Peloponnesus, the Achaean colonies) are derivative. I confess I see no real explanation of the application of the name to the Peloponnesian Riviera.

be thought that my hypothetical Early-Colonial culture is as supposititious as Mr. Lang's Achæan world. There is this difference: the soil of Greece, and of many outlying places, has been raked over almost to exhaustion, and has yielded nothing which bears Mr. Lang's required characteristics. The shores of Asia Minor and the great islands are practically untouched; the spade has hardly gone below the middle-historical period. Even Mr. Hogarth's temple-offerings at Ephesus are not dated earlier than 700 B.C. Here therefore the negative cannot be proved as it is

proved in the case of the mainland. Archaeology does not forbid Homer to have anachronised from his own age; it does forbid him to have given a true description of the civilisation of the Achæans. Until excavation has shown that the Ionians of 900 enjoyed a culture unlike the Homeric, this seems to me the account to accept. We thereby escape the impossible task of accommodating Homer to material evidence, and the equally impossible duty of compelling archaeology to admit a period for which it has no place.

T. W. ALLEN.

THE ORIGINAL FUNCTION OF THE BOULE AT ATHENS.

THE 'Αθ. πολ. c. 4 § 3 attributes to Draco the institution of a βουλὴ of 401 members, chosen by lot from the whole body of citizens over thirty years of age. This is the only notice we have of a Draconian Council; and scholars are more inclined to believe that the Boule was first instituted as part of the Solonian constitution. Βουλὴν δ' ἐποίησε τετρακοσίους, says Aristotle, 'Αθ. πολ. c. 8 § 4; and, as Dr. Sandys points out, these words could hardly have been used if it was meant that Solon merely substituted a new Boule of 400 for the Draconian Boule of 401. This view is further supported by Plutarch's statement, *Solon*, c. 19. What was the original function of the Boule in Solon's constitution? It is noteworthy that Aristotle in 'Αθ. πολ. l.c. gives us no certain information on that point. He does indeed contrast the new Council with the already existing Boule of the Areopagus, but only to say that the latter was appointed ἐπὶ τὸ νομοφυλακεῖν, and exercised a general supervision over all the most important matters—τὰ τε ἄλλα τὰ πλείστα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πολιτικῶν διετῆρει. It took cognisance, too, of cases of high treason. Plutarch says more definitely that Solon assigned to the 400 the duty of preparing measures for the people—οὓς προβουλεύειν ἔταξε τοῦ δήμου κοὶ μηδὲν ἔαν ἀπροβούλευτον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εἰσφέρεισθαι.

Grote (c. xi.) regarded the Council

as in the first instance a probouleutic assembly, and this is the view adopted by Bury (c. iv.). It was undoubtedly an important function of the Boule in later times to prepare business for the Ecclesia; but can it have been the sole or the chief reason of its creation in 594 B.C.? In the sixth century the Ecclesia was not engaged in the civil and criminal legislation which occupied it in the fifth century. Its two chief duties were to elect certain public officials and to call them to account at the end of their year of office—Σόλων ἔοικε τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην ἀποδιδόναι τῷ δήμῳ δύναμιν, τὸ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν (*Ar. Pol.* II. 12. 1274a 16); and none of our authorities suggests that in Solon's time the powers of the Ecclesia went further. It does not, then, seem probable that the main object of the establishment of the new Council by Solon was to prepare for the introduction of these two pieces of business into the Ecclesia. For how could a προβούλευμα anticipate the public election of magistrates by the δήμος? And if a προβούλευμα were passed before the magistrates submitted to the εὐθυνα in the Ecclesia, it can have been a merely formal act, except in the case of the financial officials ('Αθ. πολ. c. 45). As the business submitted to the Ecclesia grew in quantity and variety in the course of the fifth century, it was only natural that the smaller and more expeditious body should act as a committee