

# 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 Ilias Und Ihre Quellen *Die Bias und ihre Quellen.* Von Dietrich Mülder. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910.

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 25 / Issue 04 / June 1911, pp 114 - 115  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00046643, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00046643](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00046643)

### How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1911). The Classical Review, 25, pp 114-115 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00046643

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tion of detailed material, it is needless to attempt any elaborate description, or to examine points in which there might be differences of opinion. As far as we can judge, after using the book for teaching purposes, it could hardly be improved, unless possibly we might ask

for a yet fuller Greek Index, containing every occurrence of a dialectic word, with an abbreviation after it to show under which dialect it comes. The opportunity of this extension ought to arrive soon.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

### DIE ILIAS UND IHRE QUELLEN.

*Die Ilias und ihre Quellen.* Von DIETRICH MÜLDER. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910.

THIS is a strange book, about which it is easier to hold an opinion than to express it. Still, if the propositions ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν γνώσεσθε αὐτοὺς and *librum si malus est nequeo laudare* are arranged syllogistically, the conclusion must be unfavourable. The fruits of this book—that is, the writer's theory of the *Iliad*—are as follows. About the last quarter of the seventh century Homer, an individual, composed, probably in Ionia, our actual *Iliad*, which is an organic whole. He composed it mainly out of already existing poetical literature, with additions of his own and free treatment of his sources. He drew chiefly from two poems, one on the Theban War, another containing the exploits of the Thessalian peoples under the leadership of Achilles in the district of Adramyttium. Impelled by an 'universaler stoffordnender Idee,' Homer (A) generalised the canton-warfare of the Seven against Thebes into a national enterprise; (B) sent the host over the water against an alien race after the precedent of the Thessalian poem. One detail was still wanting—the name of the place or people against whom the generalised Argives fought: this was found in a third poem which described the relations of Hercules with Laomedon, king of Ilios. The *Iliad* was made. The reader will observe that not only did Homer about 625 B.C. compose his poem, but he by the same act invented the Trojan War—an event which had no real existence and had never been heard of before. The *Odyssey* was composed by another individual, after the

model of the *Iliad*, in the time of Pisistratus.

Such a theory it is neither possible nor necessary to criticise formally. The method is only the old Kirchhoffian method of the discovery of discrepancies and inconsistencies, and the inference from them to the circumstances of composition of the poem. These discrepancies thirty years' experience has shown to be illusory, and the circumstances of composition which were imagined to result from them are given the lie by every new addition to the facts of language and ethnology. Herr Mülder's method, I say, is the same as that of the school of Kirchhoff; but whereas Kirchhoff and his followers use their method to detect the diaskeuast, harmoniser, or anachronist, Herr Mülder, with nothing less than second sight, descries in the same places the poet at work upon his sources—sources which Herr Mülder has invented *ad hoc*. The book is indeed a hard nut for evolutionists to crack, seeing that arguments essentially the same as theirs and which in their hands prove four centuries of development reduce, in Herr Mülder's laboratory, the same corpus vile to entirely different dust.

I do not argue with the writer, but I will suggest to my reader some consequences of this theory. When Homer composed the *Iliad* and invented the Trojan War in 625 B.C., it was a hundred years, according to Peripatetic and local chronology, since a series of poems had been begun which covered the Tale of Troy exactly to the beginning of our extant *Iliad*, took it up again at the last line of our *Iliad*, and continued it to the beginning of our *Odyssey*; the same period since Cynaethus had

composed the hymn to Apollo and recited Homer in Syracuse for the first time after its foundation. Early in the seventh century Magnes, at the court of Gyges, sang the wars of the Lydians and the Amazons, Aristaeas sang his own adventures, Terpander and Tyrtaeus swept their lyres, Arion toured in Sicily, Callinus ascribed the *Thebais* to Homer, and Alcman told how Circe anointed the men of much-enduring Ulysses. Silently, unknown to tradition, at the end of this century, when epos was all but thrust from the scene, at the very moment when the humble Eugammon was winding up the family history of Ulysses in his *Telegonia*, and Stesichorus was refreshing the epic themes with new measures, this prodigious birth, the greatest achievement of the Greek spirit, came to the light. Its effect was miraculous; within a generation after the *Iliad* was pieced together in Ionia, Clisthenes of Sicyon was expelling Homeric rhapsodes from his town, and in three generations the Athenians based a claim to Sigeum upon their place in the Homeric Catalogue, a document of international authority.

I do not expect any of these considerations to weigh with the writer, but I invite the reader to consider how lightly, at the bidding of what the history of the Homeric Question has shown to be non-existent criteria, the course of Greek history and even the development of the Greek mind are sacrificed. Two questions must occur to any but a frivolous critic: (1) How could the Greek national poem, Bible, Libro d'oro, and Domesday Book, be born a generation before Solon, all unknown to the world, and in a century bustling and ringing with professional life and active professional rivalry?<sup>1</sup> If the fact were true, how

could it have been forgotten? Where did Herodotus find the materials for his estimate of 400 years? How did the Parian marble arrive at 900-910? (2) How within a century could the Homeric theology have moved Xenophanes to his protest? and how could the Spartan before Gelo have appealed, as to an international feat, to a literary fabrication 150 years old? It is passing the bounds of decent speculation to suppose the good faith of any nation could be so quickly and so completely surprised, much more so that of the Greeks, who were born genealogists, retained a lively recollection of how the Dorians descended from Pindus, and how this and that family came of Cadmus, or Neleus, or the Lapiths.

The writer purposely puts archaeological and linguistic evidence on one side; he calls them *Materialismus*. His observations in detail have often a kind of bewildered acuteness, but his general principles prevent them arriving at any possible conclusion. They have the pathetic interest of the American who is at present engaged in the bed of the river Wye. He often lands an attack well on the Separatist target, and in one thing it must be said he seems on the right track: the *Iliad* is to him the work of an individual, its characteristics are the result of individual talents and failings. It is a long time since this obvious truth has been stated in Germany.

Many strange things have been written about Homer, from Wolf to Kirchhoff inclusive; and Kirchhoff's living disciples have worthily carried on the torch. It may be hoped that in this book we have touched bottom, and that, for all the credulity and elvishness of our English Homerists, the daily increasing output of archaeological and linguistic evidence may at length bring judgment and truth back to these studies.

T. W. ALLEN.

<sup>1</sup> Theopompus, it is true, put Homer at the same date, ol. 43; but if Clement and Tatian report him correctly, he must have based an inference on some anachronism in a Cyclic poem which went currently as Homer's. The older critics were dead to language, if Aristotle

gives the *Margites* as Homeric. Even Theopompus, however, did not bring the Trojan War down to this period.