

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](#)



Campbell's Religion in Greek Literature Religion in Greek Literature; a Sketch in Outline by Lewis Campbell, M. A., LL.D. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. x, 424 pp. Price 15s.

Arthur Bernard Cook

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 08 / November 1899, pp 414 - 421

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00078872, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00078872

How to cite this article:

Arthur Bernard Cook (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 414-421 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00078872

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

through *Forum Latinum* we see the same independence. Dr. Arnold studies the conditions of each problem of teaching for himself, and refuses to run in the groove. We are a little startled to find the conjugation of our verbs begin with *capio* until we remember how very much used are these verbs in *-io*. Both nouns and verbs are arranged according to their stem, with which no fault can be found; but then the infinitive should have been placed at the head of the paradigm and not the indicative present. The distinction between quantity (short and long) of vowels and weight (heaviness and lightness) of syllables is a clear and practical one. But we cannot equally approve of the new name for the Deliberative or Dubitative Subjunctive, the Subjunctive of the Dilemma, though we may readily grant it to be no worse than the old one. It is only necessary to take Dr. Arnold's first example 'quid agāmus?' *What are we to do?* and change the order of the words *Let us do—what?* to see that the subjunctive differs in no way from that of 'agāmus hoc' in which no one has ever seen or will see dilemma, doubt or deliberation. No one can hope to write an elementary Latin book without some mistakes, nor is

this book quite free; for example, the rule for the conversion of questions in reported speech (p. 275) is incorrect. But as a whole, it may be cordially recommended to all teachers of elementary Latin. Even if they do not teach from it, they may learn from it.

Amongst *Separat-abdrücke* (from the 24th supplement volume of the *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*) deserving of the attention of scholars, we mention the following: *Ueber die bei den Attischen Rednern eingelegten Urkunden*, by Engelbert Drerup, a useful monograph on the much-disputed question of the authenticity of the documents inserted in the texts of the Attic orators, *Nomina propria Latina oriunda a participiis perfecti*, conlegit Gualterus Otto and a companion one *N.p.L. oriunda a participiis praesentis activi, futuri passivi, futuri activi* scr. Joannes Schwab, and, from the 25th supplement volume of the same, another elaborate monograph, for which also the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* has been ransacked, and which is of importance for Romance as well as for Latin scholars, *De M finali epigraphica* scr. Ernestus Diehl. These monographs are all published by Messrs. Teubner. J. P. P.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

CAMPBELL'S RELIGION IN GREEK LITERATURE.

Religion in Greek Literature; a Sketch in Outline by LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. x, 424 pp. Price 15s.

IN 1894-5 Prof. Campbell as Gifford lecturer in the University of St. Andrews gave two courses of lectures on the Religion of the Ancient Greeks. The present volume claims to embody one portion only of the subject then treated. *Religion in Greek Literature* is however understood to include much more than a mere summary of the religious opinions expressed by the principal Greek writers. The author defines his task in a liberal spirit (p. 5): 'I do not propose... to give anything like a complete account of Greek religion. Mr. Farnell's learned work on the *Cults of the Greek States* supplies a want which has long been felt in England,

and deals with the subject of Hellenic worship on lines that are more rational than those followed by many Continental writers. But there is still room for an attempt to exhibit in a continuous treatise the way in which the ritual and mythology reacted upon the higher minds in Hellas, as this is clearly reflected in classical Greek literature. The aim of my endeavour is to trace, not origins chiefly, but rather tendencies—not whence, but rather how and whitherward the religious consciousness in Greece was moving.' Accordingly Prof. Campbell discusses at length not merely the moral and religious ideas to be found in Homer or Herodotus but also such phenomena as hero-worship and the mysteries; he even finds it advisable to incorporate a résumé of Laconian and Athenian cults. In short, the scope of the book is more comprehensive than might have been inferred from its title.

Fifty pages of introductory matter lead up to the subject proper. Various types of

primitive worship are touched upon (animism, reverence of plants and animals, procreation-cults, nature-worship, adoration of ancestors). Certain descriptions of the distinctively Greek spirit are set aside as inadequate (beauty, reason, serenity, moderation). The relations of religion to mythology, to superstition, and to secular life, are indicated. Then follows a somewhat tentative treatment of the early age of Greece with its 'welter of facts and opinions still awaiting settlement.' The view taken is that an immigrant Aryan stock was modified through intercourse (1) with aboriginal tribes and (2) with Semitic traders, but through all modifications retained its identity. The religion of the family in the patriarchal form was its essential core; the institutions of marriage and inheritance were never obliterated; and the sacredness of the hearth persisted through all changes of public ritual. But the Aryan tradition thus evidenced repeatedly absorbed into itself (1) old-world usages that clung to the localities successively occupied and (2) foreign influences operating chiefly at such centres as Argos or Thebes.

An excellent chapter on the *Iliad* characterises each member of the Homeric pantheon and discusses the moral features in the poem. Among various points of interest raised is the question whether heroes were already worshipped. Prof. Campbell inclines to the belief that, as a rule, the poet deliberately and for artistic reasons ignores the divine honours paid to them in his own day. To the same convenient assumption of selective taste he attributes (pp. 54, 68, 76, cp. p. 144) the absence of many primitive customs, superstitions, and immoralities, that appear for the first time in post-homeric literature. A corresponding chapter on the *Odyssey* traces further the beginnings of hero-worship, collects available evidence for the details of early ritual, and notes an advance in mythological and ethical conceptions. We are next taken more rapidly through the poetry of Hesiod, Theognis, the elegiac and lyric writers, and the Homeric hymns. After this the subject of hero-worship is resumed, and sundry other growths more or less closely connected with the transitional period are considered (panhellenic influences, Spartan institutions, Greater Greece, the birth of philosophy). Typical of the succeeding age are Pindar and Herodotus, between whom a good contrast is drawn. But the account given of religion in Pindar is not altogether satisfactory; for, though it makes true points, it neglects great and

important ones. It is surely misleading to say that in the Pindaric odes 'the gods . . . retain all the fulness of individual life' (p. 171). Rather, the gods are omniscient and omnipotent; and the thought of divine perfection is already leading on towards that of divine unity. The gods of Homer and Hesiod were distinguished in part at least by their defects. Pindar allows no ugliness physical or moral to taint them. His theology, perhaps under the influence of philosophy, has been purified and elevated till his separate deities are but traditional names for one God. Again, as regards human life Pindar's creed was two-fold: (1) recognise your limitations; and (2) make the most of them. Where, as happens not unfrequently, either of these commandments occurs apart from the other, we may easily mistake the poet's attitude. Doctrines of this sort should have been outlined with a firm hand, as is done e.g. by Croiset, *Hist. de la litt. grecque*, ii. 375-386. Prof. Campbell's treatment of Herodotus with its distinction between his references to contemporary belief and his own religious opinions is clearer and more adequate. Chapters ix-xii take a survey of the Greek world during the Pentekontaetia. Most of the religious issues of the age are here noticed, including some topics that are only partially or indirectly connected with worship, such as Idealism in Art and the rise of Medical Schools. Due stress is laid on the fact that 'the experience of the race was outgrowing its traditions, and the more advanced minds were having recourse either to innovations in mythology and ritual, or to philosophical speculation' (p. 204). Interest is next concentrated on Athens, and a fairly full account is given of Athenian cults (pp. 209-237). Demeter-worship involves a discussion of the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinia. The latter rite is interestingly handled, the parallelism of the Homeric hymn to Demeter and the celebration at Eleusis being drawn out in detail. Foucart's daring hypothesis (*L'origine et la nature des mystères d'Eleusis*, 1895) with regard to the Egyptian source of the whole Demeter-cult is neither accepted nor rejected; but parts of it have a strong attraction for the author. He thinks that the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinia may have been originally identical in character, but gradually modified through special influences. He admits, however, that we are by no means forced to consider this original form as Egyptian. On the whole, he concludes, 'it is at least conceivable that some Asiatic

influence working upon an Aryan village rite may sufficiently account for all that is known of the religion of Demeter before the seventh century' (p. 241). Another question of importance here discussed is the relation of Orphism to Pythagoreanism. Prof. Campbell harks back to the old view that, so far as their points of resemblance are concerned, both systems had a common source — Egyptian or otherwise — rather than that either was indebted directly to the other. Accepting Diels' theory that mystic doctrines of similar complexion arose simultaneously at various centres, he supposes that 'besides Egyptian influence, or even apart from it, some phase of pantheistic or at least of ascetic and pessimistic teaching, of which no clear trace remains, existed antecedently both to Pythagoras and Onomacritus' (p. 249). Dionysiac worship, the theme of Chapter xii, brings us back again to the strictly literary aspect of religion. Most writers on Aeschylus sow with the sack the epithets 'solemn,' 'awful,' 'majestic,' 'stupendous.' Prof. Campbell in a fresh and delightful passage dwells rather upon 'a progress from discord towards harmony, from Chaos to Cosmos, from tyranny and rebellion . . . to the triumphs of liberty and order,' and shows how 'the dark traditions of the past, which it is his cue to dramatise, are transfigured with a light from heaven, calculated to lead mankind into a more excellent way.' An interesting sequence of extracts proves that the new light dawned upon the poet himself with increasing clearness. Less space is given to Sophocles in whom no such sudden illumination can be found: it is, however, remarked that in some respects, e.g. as regards the law of retribution, the later plays and especially the *Philoctetes* contain the results of maturer reflection. Before proceeding to Euripides Prof. Campbell indicates the philosophic drift of contemporary thought and the religious reaction that it provoked, aptly describing the fin de siècle mood as an 'intermediate mental condition . . . in which sceptical doubts and questionings grew side by side with religious anxieties and an increasing scrupulosity of observance.' The views of the ordinary Athenian about divine government are illustrated by quotations from Andocides and Thucydides. The ten pages devoted to Euripides are one of the best parts of the book. Prof. Campbell's interpretation is shrewd and sound. He does not believe in the view that the poet, with a profoundly moral design, so handles the legends that the common folk are enter-

tained, while the more intelligent detect inconsistencies and draw their own salutary conclusions. Robert Browning has his master-word 'There are no gods, no gods; | Glory to God, who saves Euripides!' took the poet too seriously. In truth, towards the end of the fifth century it was no longer the tragedian but the rhetorician or the sophist who was the acknowledged teacher of the age. Euripides' métier was to interest, not to instruct: had not the *θεαποικασία* already begun? Besides, traditions that are losing their reality are not on that account consciously derided and discarded. 'Men do not so easily divest themselves of the garments of the past; for a time at least they content themselves with shaping them anew, and patching them with vivid colours taken from present things. They do not at once realise that the new piece will rend the old.' For the rest, Euripides' scepticism may have been deeper than is commonly assumed: the pathetic complications of his dramas had more reality both for him and for his audience than their conventional closure. The remainder of the book is concerned with the Aufklärung heralded by the sophists and brought to its zenith by Plato. A good chapter on Socrates and the Socratics deals separately with the historical and the Platonic Socrates. The presentation of Plato's own teaching rests of course on Prof. Campbell's well-known theories about the chronological order of the dialogues. He truly observes that in the later writings Plato's ethical conviction assumes more and more the nature of a religious confidence, while retaining unshaken its essentially metaphysical foundation. 'For once in the history of Greek thought religion, philosophy, and ethics are interfused' (p. 350). Here is the culminating point for the historian of Greek religion. But justice is done to the genius of Plato's great rival. 'Religion is not the word that first occurs to one in thinking of Aristotle. Yet in steadily regarding him one is aware of an elevation and a colossal greatness which is not dissociated from religion in the truest sense. The very keystone of his philosophy consists in a conception of the divine life, and of the divine nature, which is really sublime. The description of the philosophic life in *Ethics* x, if more calm, is hardly less impressive than the speech of Diotima in the *Symposium*; and the account of God in *Metaphysics* xii is in a similar strain.' A few pages are added on the religious opinions of the post-Aristotelian schools and such 'cultivated persons' as

Pausanias, Plutarch, and Lucian. Finally, an interesting estimate is made of those elements in Greek thought which may be looked upon as a permanent contribution to the religious inheritance of the world.

A significant feature of Prof. Campbell's work is the extensive use that it makes of archaeological evidence. Inscriptions are frequently cited, including the mystic gold tablets lately found in Greek tombs of S. Italy, Sicily, and Crete. Architecture, sculpture, painting and the minor arts are all pressed into the service, and often point a moral fitly enough. Some peccadillos, however, should be corrected. The allusion on p. 234 to 'the temple of Aphrodite Pandemos, said to have been founded by Phaedra during her passion for Hippolytus,' assumes that the temple of Aphrodite Pandemos was identical with the sanctuary of Aphrodite ἐφ' Ἱππολύτῳ—an identification which has been rightly called in question: see Harrison and Verrall, *Myth. and Mon.*, p. 333 f., Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. ii., p. 243 f. 'The string-course of marble pigeons' mentioned on p. 235 belonged not to 'this Troezenian goddess' but to Aphrodite Pandemos: Frazer, *ibid.*, p. 245 f. Again, it is dubious whether the figure of Arcesilaus, king of Cyrene, on the famous vase that depicts the weighing of silphium-bales (Baumeister *Denkm.* iii., 1664) is 'a manifest caricature': Welcker thought so, but Jahn disagreed with him. In any case it does not amount to 'a proof of the unpopularity of one of the kings' (p. 157). On p. 186 the statement that 'Xerxes, in Herodotus, is led onwards by a spiteful deity' might have been illustrated by the Darius-vase at Naples (*Handbuch: Atlas zur Arch. d. Kunst*, Taf. xiv., D), in some ways the most remarkable vase in existence: it shows the sinister figure of ἈΓΓΑΥ sent down from the presence of Zeus to delude the monarch in his council-chamber.

On the other hand Prof. Campbell is sensible of a certain danger attaching to one department of archaeology. 'Recent researches,' he says, 'into the culture of prehistoric times have tended rather to obscure the abiding interest of the age of classical literature in Greece' (p. v.). This warning is not indeed uncalled for at the present day. One of the most subtle and seductive forms of disproportionate study is certainly that which interests a man in the investigation of origins to such an extent that he omits to trace subsequent growth and ultimate decay. But intent upon avoiding this peril the author goes too far in the

opposite direction and somewhat underrates the importance of primitive customs and cults in the general development of Greek religion. They are, he contends, 'the leaf-mould out of which it springs, whose quality is indicated by the weeds that grow upon it; but they have little to do either with the deeper roots or the spreading branches' (p. 14). The fact is that primeval sentiment and superstition were so persistent in Greek life as to form an appreciable element in the highest thoughts of speculative philosophy. It might, for instance, be argued that Plato's deification of the natural kinds is but the last term of a series whose starting-point was the animal-worship of the Mycenaean age. And if the metaphysician himself was not wholly free from such traditions, the religious attitude of the people at large is often unintelligible without them. We demur then to statements of the following kind: 'To suppose . . . that any light can be thrown upon the spirit and meaning of Euripides by connecting the action of the *Bacchae* with some ritual of which the traces remain, say, amongst the Russian peasantry—though the process may be ingenious, and some such far-off connection may have a real existence—is a mode of commentary which confuses more than it enlightens' (p. 14). The allusion is presumably to Mr. Bather's able article on 'The Problem of the *Bacchae*' in the *J.H.S.* xiv. 244—263. But the choice of this example is an unfortunate one; for it might well be maintained that the primitive character of the cult portrayed in the *Bacchae* throws a most valuable light upon the spirit and meaning of Euripides. May not part of the poet's purpose have been to recall men's minds from latter-day subtleties to fundamental instincts and to advocate a form of religion which, as distinguished from most Greek cults, drew largely upon the emotions of its devotees, rousing and raising them to an enthusiastic elevation otherwise unattainable? Some such purpose is indeed half suspected by Prof. Campbell when he comes to consider the play more closely (pp. 309—311). Again, we are told that Xenophon's picture of Ischomachus training his young wife, 'idealised though it may be, teaches us more about Attic religion than the information that the person thus instructed had danced the bear-dance at ten years old, or had carried the sacred basket in honour of Athena at fourteen' (p. 339). It does teach us more about Attic religion, if by that we mean the motives and aspirations of the

Attic moralist: but it may be surmised that in the mind of Ischomachus' wife the bear-dance and the basket-carrying bulked larger than the protreptics of her husband.

This failure to appreciate the part played by primitive and popular modes of thought here and there betrays the author into a positive misinterpretation of facts. Looking backwards from a civilised to a semi-civilised age he falls occasionally into the error of explaining early customs from a later standpoint. He tells us, for example, that the priests of Zeus at Dodona 'still in Homer's time lay upon the ground, no doubt watching over the life of the tree, *not taking time even to wash their feet*'! (p. 38). The real meaning of this singular practice is obscure, and it may be questioned whether Dr. Leaf and Mr. Bayfield have got to the bottom of the matter when they assert (on *Il.* xvi. 233) that 'the Helloi sleep on the ground and do not wash their feet, as preserving the habits of a more primitive time, with the conservatism which marks all cults.' Dr. Jevons (*Introd. Hist. Rel.*, p. 78 f.) shows that at an early stage of social development holy persons are frequently forbidden to wash, perhaps lest the taboo-infection should be conveyed by the water to others. He compares (*ibid.* p. 63) the ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες of Dodona with the priest and priestess of Artemis Ὑμνία, whose washings were not like those of common folk (Paus. viii. 13, 1), and also (*ibid.* p. 365) with the Eleusinian Demeter who abstained from washing for nine days (*h. hom.* v. 50 f.). The epithet χαμαῖεῖναι is best explained by the oracular powers ascribed to the Earth. To sleep on it was to be in close contact with its peculiar virtues and ensured true dreams, &c. Gaia was honoured at Dodona in connexion with Zeus (Paus. x. 12, 10), and Drexler in Roscher, *Lex.* I. ii. 1572, 54, thinks that this was no accidental association, but due to her character as 'wahrsagende Gottheit.' An analogous case is that of the Flamen Dialis, the feet of whose bedstead were smeared with fine mud (Gell. x. 15), perhaps—so Mr. Frazer suggested in the *Class. Rev.* ii. 322—as a substitute for sleeping on the ground. It was of importance that he too should receive oracles in dreams; hence possibly the further restriction which forbade him to touch or even name beans (Gell. x. 15, cp. Plut. *quaest. conviv.* viii. 10, 1). Again, we must get back to naïve and unsophisticated notions if we are to understand why, when the horse of Achilles breaks into human speech, it is the Erinyes who check his utterance

(*Il.* xix. 418). It will not do to say that the Erinyes 'seem here to personify a law of nature' (p. 70): Homer was not Sophocles. We must recollect that the Greek mind in its infancy imagined beasts as well as men to be capable of doing or suffering wrong. This is only a particular application of the general principle that savages regard the souls of animals as human (Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, i. 467, ii. 230), and it certainly survived among the Greeks into historic times. Animals were actually tried for murder at the Prytaneum (Aristot. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 57, cp. Plat. *Legg.* 873 D). A moral lesson is drawn from animal life in the fable of Hesiod, *O.D.* 203 ff. Archilochus, *frag.* 88, Bgk., says of Zeus, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων | ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει. Aeschylus, *Ag.* 59, makes Apollo or Pan or Zeus send the Erinyes to avenge the outraged vultures. There was even a proverb εἰσι καὶ κυνῶν Ἐρινύες (*Paroem. Gr.* i. 397). The Erinyes, then, were the punishers of wrong-doing amongst animals as much as amongst men. And here the horse Xanthus, who had just foretold that Achilles should fall θεῶ τε καὶ ἀνέρι, was about to reveal too much: he is therefore stopped in the act by the Erinyes. Prof. Campbell is entrapped into a similar anachronism when he states (p. 214 f.) that in the cult of Artemis 'the rite of initiation, by which young girls were consecrated to her service, was fancifully associated with her Arcadian favourite, the bear,' and recalls Lobeck's suggestion 'that ἀρκτος as applied to one of these young catechumens may have been originally derived from ἀρχεσθαι, "to begin." The word once chosen would soon,' he urges, 'come to be identified with the animal whom the goddess loved.' But this is to forget that the ἀρκτεία does not stand alone. The πελειάδες at Dodona, the μέλισσαι and ἐσσηνες at Delphi and Ephesus, have indeed been assailed by the rationalist: but what of the ταῦροι of Poseidon at Ephesus (Athen. x. 425 C.) and the ἵπποι of the Iobaccheia (Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa, II. i. 1171, 53)? Can they all be explained away by means of popular etymology? Besides, Prof. Campbell himself admits that 'the worship of animals and the strange rites attending it . . . left undoubted traces on Greek culture' (p. 8). Is not the ἀρκτεία precisely one of these traces? On p. 63 Poseidon's powers as an earth-shaker are attributed to 'a natural association between the raging billows and the earthquake by which, as in the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, the earth is rolled in surges to and fro.' This conception

of seismic waves is perhaps too advanced for primitive reflection; yet, it is true, there was in Arcadia an oak-forest with waving foliage which went by the name of Πέλαγος (Paus. viii. 11, 1, 5, 10). Less probable is Riddell's conjecture, adopted on p. 90, that black bulls were offered to Poseidon (*Od.* iii. 6) because of 'the darkness of the deep, the ἔρεβος ὑφάλων of Sophocles.' Black victims were regularly sacrificed to the powers of the underworld; a black ewe to Ge (*Il.* iii. 103 f.) and to Teiresias (*Od.* xi. 32 f.), a black bull to Achilles (Philostr. *Heroica* xx. 25) and to the Greeks who fell at Plataea (Plut. *Aristid.* 21), black rams to heroes (Paus. i. 34, 5; v. 13, 2; ix. 39, 6; Strab. vi. 284) and to Typhos (Ar. *Ran.* 848), a black lamb to Hiems (Verg. *aen.* iii. 120), Nox and Tellus (*ibid.* vi. 249 f.). The chthonian character of Poseidon sufficiently accounts for both his earthquakes and his black victims. That Delos should have been chosen as the birth-place of the sun-god because 'some pious soul, perhaps a pirate withal, may have seen some glory of sunrise on the rocky cliff and wondered' (p. 117) is hardly to be inferred from *h. hom.* i. 135 ff. It savours too much of the old picturesque interpretations of ποδοδάκτυλος and εἰδείελος. Lastly, Mr. Frazer has made it probable (*Golden Bough*, ii. 213 ff., 233 f.; *Pausanias*, vol. iii. p. 341 f.) that the Spartan διαμαστίγιωσις was in its origin not merely an endurance test (p. 39) but a primitive religious purification.

Another pitfall in the path of a writer on this intricate subject is the exaggeration of foreign elements. Egyptian influence on Greek life was in the main external and, apart from a few legends (Io, Epaphus, Danaus, &c.), had little to do with religion. Prof. Campbell may, however, be right in holding that Orphism 'had a root in some imperfect knowledge of Egyptian rites' (pp. 191, 247—250), though he admits that 'the chief doctrine of the Orphics, the immortality of the soul, combined with metempsychosis, and with the hope of ultimate deliverance from the body, is essentially different from the Egyptian belief in the Ka.' The Egyptian element in Pythagoreanism, which he is inclined to credit (pp. 191, 248 f.), is also probable enough (Jevons, *Introd. Hist. Rel.*, pp. 320—324), but requires further proof. Abstinence from beans at least does not spell Egypt; see Lenormant in *Dar.-Sagl. Dict. Ant.* II. ii. 947; Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iv., p. 240 f. On the other hand, Foucart's Egyptising hypotheses as to the origin of Demeter-worship should have been

more decisively rejected. And Egyptian traits in the cult of the Argolic Hera (p. 239) and of Dionysus (p. 269)—unless by Dionysus is meant Zagreus—need substantiating. That the Gorgoneion of Greek art originated in the Arabian Besa (p. 49) is a highly precarious hypothesis. J. Six, *de Gorgone*, p. 94, has discredited it, and Furtwängler, once a believer, has now recanted (Roscher, *Lex.* I. ii. 1705, 55). Babylonian elements are rightly relegated to the background (pp. 9 f., 14 f., 45, 107 f., 142, 163); and no stress is laid on Aeschylus' possible acquaintance with Persian learning (p. 280) or the indebtedness of Plato to Zoroastrianism (p. 349). Adolph Holm remarks (*Hist. Gr.* i. 101) that 'of late a decided reaction has set in against the popular theory of the great influence exercised by the Phoenicians on Greece.' Prof. Campbell cannot be reckoned among the reactionaries. He finds Phoenician traits not only in Heracles (pp. 137 f., 159 f., 190), Aphrodite (pp. 159, 189, 234), and Cadmus (p. 35, *alib.*), but also in Demeter Achaia (p. 190), Poseidon at Onchestus and Corinth (pp. 111, 159 f., 189), Athena Onca at Thebes (p. 189), Despoina at Lycosura (p. 189), Dionysus (pp. 160, 189, 269), the Cabiri in Samothrace (p. 159), the Dioscuri (pp. 159 f., 189) and Helen (p. 189), Minos (p. 35, *alib.*) and Daedalus (p. 35). He even leans to Bérard's view that Zeus Lycaeus was a Phoenician Baal (p. 37); Farnell, *Cults*, i. 41 f., and Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iv., p. 385 f., are content to recognise here a wolf-god; and the latter explains the two pillars that stood in front of his altar as perhaps columns for determining solstices and equinoxes. On p. 35 the Phoenician settlement at Thebes is well defended against the current objection that Thebes was too far inland for so maritime a folk by the analogous occupation of Tamasus in Cyprus. The suggestion is also made that Semitic influence in early Greece would account for 'the readiness with which, in later times, oriental symbolism and magic obtained so wide a hold on the Hellenic mind' (p. 35). Phrygian contact is admitted in the case of Rhea (p. 239), the Ephesian Artemis (pp. 39, 191), and Dionysus (pp. 243, 251). On pp. 194, 286 f., attention is drawn to the curious fact that 'Attic tragedy from the first revolved continually about the legends of Thebes and Argos.' This is usually explained by the large part that both traditions had played in epic poetry: but here two further explanations are offered; (1) that the birth of tragedy coincided with the reign of Pisistratus, who

allied himself with Argos and probably with Thebes; (2) that Argive (= Tantalid = Phrygian) and Theban (= Cadmean = Phoenician) stories fascinated the cultured Athenian by the contrast which they presented to Hellenic moderation and reflection.

In an undertaking of such wide compass there are bound to be gaps and omissions. One of the most noticeable of these is Aristophanes, to whom no separate treatment is accorded. Xenophanes, too, is dismissed with less than a page, though from a religious point of view he is a significant figure. Hesiod's so-called 'Delphic' phraseology deserves at least a mention (see *Class. Rev.* viii. 381 ff.); and the same may be said of Bacchylides' misuse of religious epithets (*ibid.* xii. 343 ff.). Indeed, the importance of cult-epithets in general is hardly realised. Bruchmann's *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur* is in itself a store-house of religious beliefs; and one of the most pressing needs of modern archaeologists is a similar collection for the prose-writers. Hades is κλυτόπωλος in Homer, not ταχύπωλος as is implied on p. 70. That Hermes' epithet Ἀργειφόντης 'dimly alludes to another part of his legend, not mentioned in the Iliad' (p. 63) is the view of a minority now-a-days: see Pauly-Wissowa II. i. 703, 51 ff. And that Athena Alea 'in accordance with her title . . . gave shelter to the fugitive and even to the criminal' (p. 143), if true at all, is not the whole truth: see *ibid.* II. ii. 1974, 21 ff. The reason of Hephaestus' lameness (κυλλοποδιών) is left undetermined on p. 65, where Prof. Ridgeway's theory deserves a place. He points out that the divine smith (Hephaestus in the south, Völundr or Wieland in the north) is lame simply because the human smith was lame; the lame man in a primitive community was useless as a warrior and was therefore left behind to forge weapons for the rest.

Some questionable statements of a miscellaneous sort may be noticed here. The equation 'Uranus = Varuna' (p. 44) is probably but not quite certainly correct: see Schröder-Jevons, *Prehist. Ant.*, pp. 130, 412, 417, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 28. What evidence has been adduced for the identification of Athena Onca with the armed Aphrodite (p. 142)? The latter was undoubtedly of Eastern origin (Farnell *Cults*, ii. 653 f.), but whether the former was Phoenician or not is a moot point (Farnell *ibid.* i. 300; Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. v., p. 49; Dümmler in Pauly-Wissowa, II. ii. 1949, 23 ff.). That in early times 'the chief anxiety of the living was to prevent

the spirits of the dead from coming back again' (p. 228) is a statement needing qualification: see the important article on the funeral law of Iulis by Dr. Jevons in the *Class. Rev.* ix. 247 ff. On p. 280 it is said 'that in Aeschylean tragedy the dead, even when deified, are never spoken of as blessed' surely *Pers.* 633 μακαρίτας ἰσοδαίμων βασιλεύς sufficiently disproves the dictum. Why should we trace Spartan influence in the crown of wild olive awarded at Olympia (p. 153)? The prize was in all likelihood determined on religious, not economical grounds: cp. Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iii., pp. 484, 573. Prof. Campbell doubts the view 'which refers peculiarities of Spartan marriage customs to a survival from savage life, before the family had become a settled institution' (p. 150), but offers no definite alternative. He thinks (p. 270) that Dionysiac festivals were first instituted by 'the wise tolerance of some Greek ruler, who allowed his subjects once a year to give vent to the exuberance of their animal nature, thereby at once indulging and regulating emotions that could not be suppressed. This homoeopathic hypothesis seems to be based on the legend that, when the Proetides were seized with madness because they would not accept Dionysiac rites, Melampus cured them by chasing them μετ' ἀλαλαγμοῦ καὶ τινος ἐνθέου χορείας from the mountains to Sicyon (Apollod. ii. 2, 2). But the interpretation of the whole myth and of others like it (Minyades, Pentheus) is far too uncertain to warrant any such inferences: see Voigt in Roscher, *Lex.* I. i. 1054, 10-36, Bather in *J.H.S.* xiv. 260 f., Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. v., p. 382 f. That Zeus Teleios had a priest of the family of Buzugae at Athens (p. 211) is an isolated and meaningless fact unless *C.I.A.* iii. 294 be supplemented by *Plut. conjug. praec.* 42, as is done by Toepffer in Pauly-Wissowa, III. i. 1095, 19 ff. On p. 112 Theognis is said to have given the first clear utterance to that strain of pessimism which so often appears in Greek literature: but in *Il.* xxiv. 527 f. the store-house of Zeus has two jars of evil to one of good (unless indeed the text preserved by Plato, *Rep.* 379 D is correct), and the fixed epic phrase δαίλοισι βροτοῖσιν points in the same direction; on pessimism in Hesiod see Warr, *The Greek Epic*, p. 234. That Thales' philosophy in some sense found an echo in contemporary minds is scarcely to be inferred from the Pindaric proverb ἀριστον μὲν ὕδωρ κ.τ.λ. (p. 165): see W. Christ and Fennell on *Ol.* i. 1. Finally, can it be maintained that Epicurus and his

followers combined the atomism of Democritus with the *hedonism of Aristippus* (p. 340)? The pleasure sought by the Cyrenaics was the enjoyment of the moment *ἡδονάθρα μόνόχρονος* (Aristipp. *ap.* Athen. xii. 544 A), positive in character, and mainly physical. The object of the Epicureans was *ἡ τοῦ ὄλου βίον μακαριότης* (Diog. x. 148) resulting from a rational computation of pleasures and pains; it was *ἀταραξία καὶ ἀπονία* (Diog. x. 136) negative rather than positive; and, though they admitted that the body was the source of all pleasure, yet since memory and anticipation accumulate feeling they aimed at securing mental rather than physical ease (Diog. x. 137): see Ritter and Preller,⁷ p. 386 f., Usener, *Epicurea*, p. 293 f.; Zeller, *Stoics*, etc., p. 474 ff.

Among the happier novelties incidentally offered by the book is the suggestion (p. 116) that Mimnermus in dwelling on the transient character of human life foreshadows the philosophy of change propounded by Heraclitus. On pp. 234, 326 Socrates' dying words 'We owe a cock to Asclepius' are well explained: 'the god of health is regarded as the author of Euthanasia, or painless death May not Socrates have prayed for this as Cassandra did, or rather, had he not prayed for it in *Phaëdo*, 117 B, C; and would not Crito receive comfort from the assurance that the prayer was heard?' Ingenious is also the attempt on p. 286 to account for some peculiarities of tragic diction, *e.g.* the use of *τύρανος* with no disparaging association, by the hypothesis that Sophocles wrote not for Athens only but for all Ionia, where despotic government had long been tolerated.

In conclusion, a word or two about externals. Prof. Campbell's style throughout is piquant and full of those felicities of phrase which charm us in his editions of Plato. What could be neater than Solon's 'glorified common sense,' or 'the all-searching humanity' of Sophocles, or the description of the Homeric poems as 'preserving some relics of an immemorial past like flies in amber, while bearing on their surface all the gloss of novelty,' or the statement that 'in the white light of Socrates the several rays which coloured later ethics are combined'? At the same time the general absence of references to authorities, inevitable in a lecture but culpable in a serious book, and the inconsistent use of notes, sometimes incorporated in the text (*e.g.* pp. 156, 293) and sometimes printed at the foot of the page, give the work a slovenly and

unscholarly appearance which by no means corresponds to its character. Misprints are not frequent, but 'Gulf of Lions' (p. 43) should be corrected, and three mistakes in the Byron couplet quoted on p. 303 rectified: presumably too 'henceforward' should be inserted after 'nothing is' on p. 114 (16 lines from the bottom) and 'premetaphysical' read for 'metaphysical' on p. 383. The rather grotesque paraphrase of *h. hom.* vii. 45 ff. 'A bear breaks out amidships, and sits up with threats' (p. 121) might be improved.

If the points to which I have taken exception appear numerous, it must be borne in mind that many of them are details which do not detract from the main lines of argument, while some might be fairly regarded as matters of opinion. In so wide a field a few weeds and barren patches may well be excused, especially as this precise plot has not been fenced in and tilled by British hands before. Prof. Campbell, who in a prefatory epigram modestly describes himself as *καυῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ σοφίας*, has given us a book containing the results of wide reading and (so far as his subject proper is concerned) of considerable insight. But he would probably be the first to allow that the final work, if finality on such a theme is conceivable, still remains to be written.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

MACDONALD'S HUNTERIAN CATALOGUE.

Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection. Vol. I.: Italy, Sicily, Macedon, Thrace and Thessaly. By GEORGE MACDONALD. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1899. Pp. lxvi, 496; 30 plates. £3 3s. net.

THE celebrated, yet practically little known, collection of coins and medals bequeathed by William Hunter to the University of Glasgow consists of some 30,000 specimens, of which about 12,000 are Greek and 12,000 Roman. It was Hunter's intention to issue, with the aid of various scholars, a scientific catalogue in seven volumes, but only one volume, dealing with a portion of the Greek series, was ever published. This was the well-known *Descriptio* by Hunter's friend and numismatic adviser Charles Combe. The work appeared at the end of 1782, a few months before Hunter's death,