

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](#)



Roscher's Mythological Lexicon

W. Warde Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 10 / December 1888, pp 307 - 312

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193655, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193655

How to cite this article:

W. Warde Fowler (1888). Roscher's Mythological Lexicon. The Classical Review, 2, pp 307-312 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193655

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

rived his catalogue already possessed the 'first text' and the 'second text' of *Physics* B. VII., which we hear of in Simplicius? If so, it was not between the times of Alexander Aphrodisiensis and Simplicius that the double text arose (or, as Mr. Shute would say, the one text was differentiated into two): on the contrary, the two texts are carried back to the Alexandrine age: this is admitted for Diogenes' catalogue (p. 93). Thus one way of accounting for repetitions fails the first time it is tried. Next it is applied to the two texts, as they are called, of the *Politics*. This seems unfortunate. There is hardly a vestige of evidence that rival schools of commentators ever took up the *Politics* in the way in which Alexander, Themistius, Philoponus, Simplicius and others worked away at the *Physics*: and it is not to the labours of rival schools, but rather to time and careless copying, or the revision of Byzantine pedants, that one would ascribe such discrepancies as are found in the *Politics* between two classes of manuscripts, or between all extant manuscripts and the *Versio Antiqua*. Mr. Shute is on his own ground, however, when he shows from *Physics*, VII. (p. 127 sqq.) how, when two texts had in whatever way arisen, the copyists were sure in the course of time to make confusion worse confounded by 'contamination'; how the variant was certain to creep first into the margin and then into the text. This, which is all excellent, is then applied to the far more complex case of *De Anima*, II. III., whether rightly or wrongly remains to be seen. The last two chapters of the essay are intended to exemplify the positions previously laid down, especially as to citations and repetitions, by a closer examination of the *Ethics* and *Politics*. The latter work is said to consist of two parts, six books of political lectures and the 'finished (*sic*) tract

of the Perfect State.' Here, strange to say, the analysis might have been carried further. Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 459, n. 3) at once fastened on book E, on *Revolutions*, as a separate treatise: nor is the connexion of books Δ Z either with the first three, or with 'the tract of the Perfect State,' one whit less obscure than the connexion between those two portions of the work themselves. Are we then to amend Mr. Shute's 'certain result' and say that the *Politics* is made up, not of two, but of *four* independent treatises of different classes? Before this be done it is worth while to weigh well the indications pointed out by Susemihl some time ago, and quite recently by Mr. Newman, of unity of plan and structure pervading the work, although none of its various parts fits exactly with the others. For example, the writer who sketches a perfect state is found to embody exactly the good points which are praised, and to avoid exactly the bad points which are censured, in the constitutions reviewed in B. II. The essay supposes that the two books containing a sketch of the Perfect State 'whoever was their author, were not written as part of the general course to which the remaining books of the *Politics* belong.' Then how to explain these 'undesigned coincidences'?

We take leave of this essay with the conviction that it is creditable to English scholarship. It is not probable that it would have won acceptance for its conclusions, even if published while they were held as yet unchanged by the writer himself. But it really grapples with its subject, it sets the reader thinking perforce, and displays qualities as rare as they are intrinsically valuable in research of this kind, originality to seize novel points and courage to follow out every hypothesis to its conclusions.

R. D. HICKS.

ROSCHER'S MYTHOLOGICAL LEXICON.

ARTICLES ON ROMAN RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.

THESE articles form only a small portion of the twelve parts of the Lexicon which have as yet appeared, and are altogether inferior in interest, and perhaps also in workmanship, to the extensive mass of writing on the Greek deities so elaborately and ably criticised by Mr. Farnell in recent numbers of this Review. A long delay seems to have occurred in the publication of the thirteenth

part, which is to contain an account of the Italian Hercules; and this delay may mean, it is to be hoped, that as the more important figures in the Roman religion are approached, the contributors are taking greater pains, and the editor exercising his rights with greater vigilance.

For in spite of the labour bestowed on some of the articles, and the learning brought to-

gether in them, it is hardly possible even for the English student to feel satisfied with the work as a whole. The writer of this review, having been engaged for some years in a study of the old Roman life on its religious side, naturally looked forward to the appearance of each part with the expectation of being saved much trouble, and of learning much in the way of method which might lead to increased accuracy and a sounder habit of judgment in questions where accuracy and judgment are the scholar's most essential qualifications. Looking back upon the use that he has been able to make of the *Lexicon* so far, he is obliged to confess that, though he is greatly indebted to it in certain particulars, *e.g.* for references to modern periodicals, and for much trouble saved in handling the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, he has not gained from it nearly so much as he had hoped, at any rate in the study of those articles which deal more particularly with the history of the older and genuinely Italian forms of the Roman religion.

It may be that this is as much the result of the nature of the subject, as of the shortcomings of the writers; for there is nothing in the world more difficult than to draw up a succinct and yet complete account of subjects which are often so obscure and almost always so teasingly complicated as are for us the religious ideas of the Romans. But it is a fact that the modern German scholar does not, as a rule, get the better of his materials as did the masters of an older generation, such as were Ambrosch, Schwegler, Preller, and Marquardt. The material it is true has grown, in quantity if not in quality, and those great writers were not so liable as the present generation to have the edge of their minds blunted by the incessant perusal of ill-written 'Forschungen,' which cannot be entirely neglected, but weary and distract the mind, and insidiously habituate it with misleading methods and illogical ways of reasoning. These four scholars, together with Mommsen, brought our knowledge of the older Roman religion up to a point which cannot be greatly improved upon until a fuller and more certain light is poured upon it from other regions of research—from anthropology generally, from comparative philology, and especially from Etruscan and Celtic mythology and language. No amount of delving among the old materials will produce much more that is valuable. There is plenty of opportunity for web-spinning, but little chance of getting at truth. And this is exactly the reason why the articles on the older religion are so inferior in value

to those which deal with the pseudo-religion of the Empire. In the latter case, the material is for the most part really new, and the work consists largely of compilation and inference from the vast stores of the volumes of the *Corpus*; in the former, the real material is old and well-sifted, but often very meagre, and rendered very difficult to work upon by the deposit overlying it, which has been brought down by a stream of indifferent researchers, since the days when it was first opened up by the labours of men in all respects worthy of the name of scholar.

Before criticising some of the most important articles, it may be as well to mention two main shortcomings which seem to affect the value of the work as a whole. The first of these is the uncertainty of the method applied, and the consequent want of a clear order in the arrangement of the matter. Not unfrequently the article narrowly escapes being an unintelligible jumble; yet if there is one thing which is a *sine qua non* in a dictionary, it is orderly clearness. Now Marquardt, a most experienced hand and the safest guide in this kind of work, laid it down long ago that in Roman religious antiquities, rich in cult but poor in mythology, the true method is to proceed *from the cult* to the spiritual conception underlying it. When Marquardt laid down this rule for himself, he was perhaps mentally contrasting his own object and method with that of Preller, which was very different and less strictly scientific; but he was at the same time enunciating a truth which is based on the very mental and moral fibre of the Roman character itself. To put it shortly, you can only get at what the Romans thought about their gods, by examining what they did in worshipping them. Even then you cannot get very far; for ritual is very difficult to interpret, and there will still be a thick veil between you and the inner sanctuary of the Roman mind; nor can you easily form an idea as to how much or how little that sanctuary may have contained. Half a century ago, in a short treatise, the fine quality of which still commands respect, Krahner declared it impossible for us moderns ever really to discover the inner religious life—or whatever was the equivalent for a religious life—of the ancient Roman. To this weighty and unimpeachable maxim scholars have not held as they should have done; and perhaps only one of the writers of these Roman articles (Wissowa) has really learnt the '*difficillima ars nesciendi*.'

The second shortcoming that invites criticism is the confused style of writing which

pervades many of these articles, and which results chiefly from an over-abundance of citations inserted in parentheses, not only at the end, but in the middle of long sentences. Here again the work of Dr. Wissowa shows that it was not impossible to avoid confusion, by strictly keeping in mind the object and limits of a dictionary article, and distinguishing between what is really necessary and what is under the circumstances superfluous. The result is that his articles are for the most part finished work, easily intelligible, and worthy of the editor of the last edition of Marquardt's volume on the Roman 'Sacralwesen': while many others are not only most unpleasant to read, but look more like extracts from the writer's commonplace-book than maturely thought out *résumés* of our existing knowledge of the subject-matter. R. Peter is the worst offender perhaps in this way, though he has done in other respects some of the best work in the Lexicon. Take his article on *Dis Pater*; the first sentence, twenty-five lines in length, is almost wholly made up of a cloud of parentheses, containing a great variety of citations, ancient and modern, out of which the eye has to pick, with most unnecessary labour, the small fragments of the main sentence, which appear and as suddenly disappear, like the streams in the limestone of Mantinea. In one case a parenthesis actually incloses another one—an atrocity which is perpetrated more than once in the articles by this writer. There cannot be a doubt that such confusion could have been avoided by any one who had a little patience and a modicum of literary skill. It is indeed just this lamentable absence of literary skill among the learned Germans of to-day that is degrading the quality of their work, and is likely to give the palm, at some future time, to the French scholars, who are steadily improving in thoroughness, yet retain the lucidity which is natural to them. For literary skill does not only imply neatness of style, but also clearness of thinking and the capability of mastering materials; and as it has been in the past, so in the future those works will live and be of most use in the world over which most pains have been taken by the most skilful workman.

The simplest way to deal with the various articles will perhaps be to take them in groups according to their respective writers. The Roman work has been mainly done by four of these, viz. Wissowa, R. Peter, Birt, and Steuding. Rapp has written on the Furiae, Drexler has contributed some useful work in the later numbers, chiefly on monu-

mental evidence, and to Professor Meltzer, the Carthaginian specialist, was entrusted, perhaps with doubtful discretion, the account of Anna Perenna.

As has been already said, the most masterly work is undoubtedly Wissowa's, but there is unluckily too little of it. His articles on Angerona, Consentes, and Consus, are models of clearness and good sense, and in these, and also in a little group of notices under letter C, he sets an excellent example by pointing out the present limits of our knowledge, and by declining to be enticed into the fairyland of pure hypothesis. In writing, for example, of the obscure goddess Carna (a subject about which a good deal of dust has been raised of late by O. Gilbert in his book on Roman religious topography) and also of Canens, he judiciously remarks that it is and always will be impossible to distinguish in Ovid the genuine folk-tale from what may be the invention of the poet's fancy. All these articles too are readable, and not overloaded with citations and parentheses.

There are, however, two contributions of Wissowa's which seem to invite a few words of respectful criticism, viz. those in which *Dius Fidius* and *Faunus* are respectively handled. In the former of these two articles there are two assumptions which seem to detract from its value. Abandoning his usually cautious method, Wissowa starts with the assertion that *Dius Fidius* is the *Genius Iovis*, and this assertion is surely not proved, as he imagines, by the false etymology of *Aelius Stilo* (*Diovis filius*, in Varro, *L.L.* 5, 66), nor yet by the alleged discovery of Reifferscheid that *Hercules*, underlying whose personality we may certainly look for *Dius Fidius*, was also the *Genius Iovis*. Unluckily Wissowa has forgotten to tell us where Reifferscheid's discovery is to be found, and it is still more unfortunate that a fellow-contributor, Birt, in his article on 'Genius,' has emphatically laid it down that the idea of the *genius* of a deity belongs to a comparatively late period, when the Romans had become familiarised with anthropomorphic notions of their gods, and applied to them the same strange doctrine of *genii* which they believed of human beings. Perhaps these inconsistencies will be cleared up in the important article on *Hercules*, which however, we regret to say, is not being written by Wissowa. The other assumption, that *Dius Fidius* = the *Fise Sansie* of the great Iguvian inscription, may very possibly be sound, but it is rejected by at least one learned editor of that inscription (Bréal), and it is hardly strong enough to justify

the dismissal of 'Fisius' in this Lexicon with a mere reference to the article we are considering.

In his account of Faunus, Wissowa has, we think, taken a wrong view of that mysterious being, though it is a view for which a good deal may be said. Like most Germans, he makes Faunus a single deity, derives his name from 'favere,' and sees in him, as Faunus Lupercus, the god of the Lupercalia. We may leave the etymology alone, though if Wissowa had read Professor Nettleship's chapter on 'The earliest Italian literature,' he might have found reason to modify his views both of the derivation and the nature of Faunus. But we must point out that the combination 'Faunus Lupercus' is a very doubtful one, resting directly only on the authority of Justin, and that it is by no means certain whether the Lupercalia and Faunus had anything to do with each other; and secondly, that if Faunus was a single deity, and not a multiple semi-deity, it is necessary to conclude (as Wissowa does) that wherever in Latin literature *Fauni* appear, they are importations from Greece—a conclusion which leaves the Romans without any representatives of those wandering, prophetic semi-deities, so powerful for good or evil, which are common to the mythologies of every other people. There is, at least, some evidence that the plurality of the *Fauni* was a belief of *rustic* folk in Latium, *i.e.* of those who would be least affected by Greek ideas, and it is doubtful whether the Greek Satyr would have taken root in Italy if he had not at least had a predecessor whose place he might occupy. Lastly, Wissowa is obliged on his hypothesis to find a very lame reason for the curious fact that there is not extant a single votive inscription to Faunus, a fact which may be explained without difficulty if we trust the Romans themselves, and conclude that, except in the fancy of the Graecising poets, Faunus was never really a god in the proper sense of the word. The difficulty of distinguishing between what is Greek and what is native in the Roman religion is of course enormous; but as in Greek art and religion we are now-a-days compelled to pull up and reflect that it could not *all* have come from the East, so in Latium we must always allow for a certain substratum of ideas, which were not borrowed from Greeks, Etruscans, or Gauls, but were common to those and to other peoples.

The contributions of R. Peter would be of a far higher order than they are, if he were a little less pedantic and a little more mer-

ciful to his readers. These faults have been already commented upon; in other respects high praise may be accorded him. As a collector of 'Stoff' he shows to the greatest advantage in the long but excellent article on Fortuna, the best thing ever yet written on the subject. He does not trouble himself to determine whether Fortuna was in her origin a goddess of the Dawn, the Sun, or the Moon (the two latter theories, it may interest Prof. Max Müller's readers to know, have been suggested by M. Gaidoz and O. Gilbert respectively), but gives a full and valuable account of all the many localities and forms of her cult. Some of these, *e.g.* that of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, are extremely interesting and very tempting to an incautious theorist: but luckily Jordan's well-known paper on the Praeneste worship was published just before this article was written, and the hesitation of that great scholar probably kept Peter from being too venturesome. Very interesting also is the account of the later identification of Isis with Fortuna and Panthea, on which Drexler adds a valuable appendix to the article, illustrated by wood-cuts from the monuments; and the latter part of the article constitutes in fact the best extant commentary on the famous sentence of Pliny (*N. H.* II. 22), in which the universality of the Fortuna-cult in his day is so strikingly recorded. Only in the reference to the myth of Fortuna does there seem room for a word of criticism: Peter has not tried to explain the connexion of Fortuna with Servius Tullius, as might seem natural, and as was suggested by Deecke in his edition of Müller's *Etrusker*, by identifying her with the Nortia of Volturnus, who may very probably have been brought by Mastarna to Rome. The other articles by the same writer are of the same useful character, but spoilt by pedantry. The three columns of the article '*Damia*' are almost entirely occupied with a collection of the opinions of German scholars during the last quarter of a century; if this were really what is wanted, what will the dictionary of the next century be? The article *Epona* is good, but Peter seems just to miss the interesting point. How did it come about that this deity from the north secured a footing in Italy? From the east came plenty, from the north and west hardly any. *Epona* was undoubtedly a horse- and mule-deity, and was indigenous in the mountainous region of Central Europe; and it may have been that the importance then, as now, in the Alpine passes of beasts of burden, whose owners worshipped

this goddess, brought their protecting deity south of the Alps. Peter also writes a sufficient account of *Avernus*, but holds to the old derivation from *āpivos*. It may be worth while to point out that Dr. Guest, in the first chapter of his *Origines Celticae*, proposed a Celtic etymology of this word, which seems to have escaped the attention of scholars.

Birt treats of *Ceres, Dea Dia, Diana* and *Genius*. The last of these is a useful piece of work, and the facts brought together in it may be of use to anthropologists. It is perhaps just as well that its writer is not an anthropologist himself, and does not attempt to trace the development of the doctrine of *Genius*. He deduces it indeed, rightly no doubt, from the belief in a life after death; but in the primitive idea of such a life it was the body and not the soul that survived, and who shall say at what point the Roman belief grew out of this elementary notion? The account of *Dea Dia* is carefully worked up from Henzen's *Acta Fratr. Arv.* but, as the task was not a difficult one, might have been turned out with greater finish. The other two articles, and especially that on *Diana*, are open to serious objection. *Diana* is, we are told at the outset, derived from the root *di*, to shine; she is therefore 'a goddess of the clear heaven' (through *dium*), or 'of the clear day' (through *dies*). With the moon she has nothing to do, as we used to think, nor is she the feminine form of *Janus*. Now these conclusions rest largely on the assumption that the 'i' in *Diana* was originally long, and on this point there is at least some uncertainty. The etymology in fact of this and kindred names is not yet sufficiently established to justify Birt in basing his account of the goddess entirely on his own view of it. (Cp. Jordan's cautious note on Preller, i. 313.) He requires us, for example, to put down everything in her cult which seems to connect her with the moon, as derived from the worship of *Artemis*. In writing of the cult of *D. Nemorensis*, described by Statius (*Silv.* iii. 1. 55), he will have it that her festival took place by day and not by night (in spite of a torch-procession), because Statius uses the words 'jam dies aderat.' And he seems to have persuaded himself that the connexion of *Diana* with the animal and vegetable world is easier to explain on the hypothesis that she represents the sky rather than the moon. All this may be true, but it is not proved by Birt's reasoning, which rests on the etymology alone. Even in the same author's

account of *Ceres* it would have been as well to take the cult first, though the etymology of the name is certain. After showing that the cult is entirely Greek and simply that of *Demeter*, the question would naturally arise as to the substitution of the name *Ceres* for that of the Greek goddess. Birt explains this by assuming that *Ceres* meant originally *bread*, and that the plebeians, who were specially concerned in the worship, invoked the foreign deity by the word which expressed the national needs supplied by her; rejecting Henzen's identification of *Ceres* and the *Dea Dia* of the Arval brotherhood, and neglecting the unquestionably spiritual rather than material meaning of kindred words in the Umbrian and Oscan dialects. We prefer to think that *Ceres* was the name of a goddess before *Demeter* arrived; but on such a point as this every one is free to maintain his own opinion.

A great proportion of the work has been done by Steuding. To him has been entrusted the writing of short notices of the numerous Teutonic and Celtic deities whose names appear in inscriptions from Britain, Gaul, Switzerland, &c. Some few articles of more importance have fallen to his share, and of these one (*Feronia*), is excellent both in the ordering of the matter and in the method pursued; though we must add that it was hardly necessary to account for the connexion of a 'collegium aquatorum' at *Aquileia* with this goddess, by reverting to the cloudy theories of Kuhn and Schwartz, and making her a development from 'a motherly deity of cloud-water.' Steuding's work is however not always to be relied upon, as the editor himself seems to have discovered; for he has allowed R. Peter to make so many additions and interpolations in the article on 'Ferentina,' as to render it a jumble quite unworthy of a place in any good dictionary. Dr. Roscher has also, it is greatly to be regretted, allowed two bad blunders to stand in the article on *Flora*, which must go some way to destroy our confidence in his editorship. In a well-known and valuable paper on Italian Myths in the *Rheinisches Museum* (vol. xxx.), H. Usener made a singular mistake which has been taken over bodily with all its consequences in this article by Steuding. Wishing to show that nine months elapsed between the conception of *Mars* by *Juno* and his birth on March 1, Usener asserts that Ovid tells the pretty folk-tale of that conception under date of June 2; and Steuding has not troubled himself to verify the reference, which is, it need hardly be said, to the 5th, not the 6th book of Ovid's

Fasti, and is to be found under date of *May 2*. Again, in writing of the *Floralia*, he is guilty of wholly misconstruing a passage of *Valerius Maximus* (ii. 10, 8), in which the story is told how Cato the younger declined to stay at these games and witness the customary undressing of the 'meretrices.' Moved by his withdrawal, says *Valerius*, the people reverted to the 'priscus mos' of the festival, i.e. gave up a disgusting practice which had grown up with the corruption of society. Steuding noticed the words 'priscus mos,' and jumped at the conclusion that *Valerius* meant that this undressing was itself a really primitive custom. Will it be believed that he is actually drawn on by this blunder to suggest that this immodest stripping was symbolical of the fall of the blossoms 'nach der Befruchtung?' Perhaps these are only two examples among many of the way in which attention is drawn now-a-days away from the ancient texts themselves, and devoted to the consideration of what has been written about them by the learned German world of to-day. If such a process were allowed to go on for long, the honest search for truth would become impracticable and hopeless.

Though it is impossible to avoid disappointment with a good deal of the work presented

to us in these articles, and equally impossible to feel that it has in all cases realised the expectations raised by the editor's original preface, we may gladly acknowledge that our dissatisfaction is based quite as much on defects of form as of matter; and bearing in mind the extreme difficulty of treating subjects so complicated in a limited space, we may readily allow that many of them are handled as well as could be expected from men whose natural bent is not in the direction of succinct compilation. And as was said at the beginning of this review, there are already some signs of improvement. The work is moving more slowly, which may mean that *Dr. Roscher* has begun to realise the vast amount of labour entailed on the editor of such a *Lexicon*. The addition of *Deecke* to the staff is a great accession of strength, though it will need all an editor's care to avoid confusion between the conclusions of an *Etruscan specialist*, and those of scholars who have studied Roman worships without a very complete knowledge of other Italian religious ideas. Lastly, we may repeat that for all the later aspects of the religion of the Roman world, this *Lexicon* contains the best work that has as yet been published.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

OLD-LATIN BIBLICAL TEXTS.

Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. III. The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (g) with a Fragment from St. John in the Hof-Bibliothek at Vienna. Edited, with the aid of *Tischendorf's Transcript* (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury), by *HENRY J. WHITE, M.A.*, of the Society of St. Andrew, Salisbury. With a Facsimile. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 4to. pp. lvi. 166. 12s. 6d.

THIS, the third part of the *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, issued by the Clarendon Press, contains, as the title indicates, the text of the *Codex Monacensis*, known since *Tischendorf's* time as *g*. It formerly belonged to the monastic library at Freising, which has the distinction of being mentioned in the Preface to the Authorised Version of the Bible, where it is referred to as containing *Bishop Valdo's* translation of the Gospels into 'Dutch rhyme.' The monastery was founded by *Corbinian* († 730) about 724;

the library by *Bishop Hitto*, fifth in order from *Corbinian*. The present MS. was probably there from the first, as it bears no library marks except that of Freising and its present Munich number (Lat. 6224).

The text is printed from *Tischendorf's* transcript, carefully revised with the MS. by *Mr. White*. It is written in semi-uncials of the seventh century (although *Tischendorf* assigned it to the sixth), and in double columns. The initial sentences of the Gospels and of the chapters into which each Gospel is divided are marked by capital letters outlined in ink and ornamented in colours, without gold, the two or three lines following being also written in colours. The initials are also frequently adorned with figures of birds, and the blank spaces at the end of the chapters are similarly adorned with figures of birds, beasts, and fishes. The last page is ornamented with a cross, in the head of which is a half-length portrait of a man (intended for the scribe