

less find the presumption against an original construction in lays of exactly 300 lines strong enough to warrant the rejection of Mr. Smyth's scheme out of hand. But he has something to say on that point, and in our ignorance of conditions which obtained in the early days of the epic, it is dangerous to dogmatise. It is enough to say that the detailed proof fails. We had better rest content with Drerup's suggested limits of the various rhapsodies as they were, it is known, recited.

An index would have been a useful addition, especially as the lays are not considered in the order of the text. On p. 183, 'p. 184' should apparently be 'p. 218.' A. S.

**Homer, Dichtung und Sage. I.—Ilias.** Von ERICH BETHE. Pp. 374. Leipzig : Teubner, 1914. M. 8.

It is difficult to review a German book on the morning (August 29) when we hear of the sack of Louvain.

Herr E. Bethe, who has been active in more than one province of philology, and has started various theories, of no great probability, by which Homer is affected, now comes forward with a pleasantly written and well printed book on Homer himself. He advances that the *Iliad* as we have it is the work of a sixth-century Athenian poet who enlarged an original poem on the wrath of Achilles of about 1500 lines by the addition of various 'Kleinepen' and parts of more. Personally I regard this statement as inconceivable, and the argumentation on which it is based as a mere illusion. The book however deserves to be read; it displays more taste, moderation and even common-sense than we are accustomed to, and is certainly the best German book on Homer written for some while. It is nearer the truth than anything published by Belzner, Drerup, Finsler or Römer. In fact, Bethe's conclusion expressed as a formula, 'the *Iliad* is the result of a great artist working upon traditional material,' is acceptable; unfortunately, the application given to the principle results in the obvious absurdity of the greatest architectonic poet of the world being hidden in the period of Solon and Theognis and imposing himself on the historical memory of the Greeks (which was quite a long one), as three or four hundred years older and the father of a school whose latest member (Eugammon) wrote about the time that the real Homer was getting born. Who was this sixth-century genius? Someone, at best, of the calibre of Onomacritus, whose style even Pausanias could distinguish from the real Musaeus, and who could not forge an oracle successfully. Transfer Herr Bethe's architectonic Homer from 550 to 900, and he becomes credible. Along with this general want of perspective goes the detail that the text of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* descends from archetypes of the sixth century. This is the result of the belief in Athenian interpolation, which it is apparently impossible to extirpate from people's minds. Herr Bethe may fight the matter out with Mr. Bollig (*Am. Journ. Phil.* 1914) who holds that our MSS. are children of an archetype of B.C. 150.

The analysis, of which the book consists, is acute, though perverse in places. Book IX is made to be original; the sixth-century genius fabricated Book XIX. The next volumes may afford better food for controversy. There are some curious errors in spelling: p. 41, 'Boche di Cattaro'; p. 51, 'Vindobonnense'; p. 281, 'Verral'; p. 360, 'Guilb. Murray.' Professor J. A. Scott is shorn of his first initial; 'Flaxmann,' 'Rise of the Greek Epik,' are not English; 'treffsicher,' p. 50, does not seem German; 'Twl.,' p. 51, is not the right abbreviation for Townley. T. W. A.