



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries
and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

100

REMARKS
ON
PROF. MAHAFFY'S ACCOUNT OF THE
RISE AND PROGRESS OF EPIC
POETRY,
IN HIS
HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE.

BY F. A. PALEY, M.A.,
AUTHOR OF "POST-EPIC OR IMITATIVE WORDS IN HOMER," ETC. ETC. ; EXAMINER IN
CLASSICS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

LONDON:
GEORGE BELL AND SONS,
YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1881.

[*Price 1s. 6d.*]

Monro 2. $\frac{311}{5}$

CHISWICK PRESS:—C. WHITTINGHAM AND CO. TOOKS COURT,
CHANCERY LANE.

REMARKS, ETC.

THE reviews and literary notices of my several pamphlets on the probably late date of a large portion of the Homeric texts, and on the different "Homer" of the age of Pericles, have brought out one fact but too clearly,—that these are questions to which not many at the present day devote an amount of serious and unbiased attention at all in proportion to their importance in relation to classical learning. It is pretty evident, indeed, that there are some—I will not say scholars—who would strangle the inquiry by laughing it down. There seem to be many who cannot, and not a few who will not comprehend the gravity of the points at issue. They have persuaded themselves that a few verses interpolated here and there by rhapsodists will account for all or any anomalies in the Homeric language and versification, a very serious error in itself. Some appear even to have thought that I regarded the Iliad and the Odyssey as *composed* only a little before the age of Plato, whereas I have always said *compiled*, meaning, of course, adapted, rearranged from older materials, and epitomized, leaving it an open question, as it must be, how much is really genuine, and how much altered or added. Most seem content to think that Colonel Mure, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Grote have settled the question in favour of the great antiquity of Homer, more or less nearly as we now have it. It is considered that these authors speak with peculiar authority on a subject which they have made especially their own, and that it is little better than impertinence in any one to presume to call in question their conclusions.

Mr. Mahaffy, too, in his recent "History of Classical Greek Literature," follows, in the main, Mr. Grote's view of the early date of our texts. But there is one point which is very apt to escape notice—viz., that no *mere* literary information about the supposed early history of these texts is of any avail, without, first, a critical examination of the Homeric vocabulary, not based on the *assumption* of great antiquity; and without, secondly, a thorough investigation of what the poets and artists of and before the age of Pericles seem to have regarded as their Homer. These two points have been entirely out of the province of the distinguished writers in question. Strange to say, Wolf, Welcker (in his work on the Epic Cycle), and Buttmann made this no part of their inquiry, nor has Professor C. G. Cobet in his very important *Homerica*.¹ Sengebusch, in his very learned *Homerica Dissertatio*, i. and ii., has dealt with the latter question only, and I think somewhat imperfectly. Consequently, the conclusions of all these have been one-sided—that is, they have all been biased in favour of a genuine epic antiquity; and my strong contention is, that they are not borne out by the result of further research on the above two heads. Professor Sayce has done good service, for which all scholars will feel grateful, in calling attention to the artificial and often even incorrect vocabulary of our Homeric texts, in his appendix to Professor Mahaffy's history. In this treatise he has largely appropriated the opinions which I had expressed on the subject in one of my pamphlets.²

Many, without doubt, like the sentiment, and some cling to the supposed orthodoxy of the belief, that the Iliad and the Odyssey have come down to us in some wonderful manner, if not from B.C. 850, at least from the times of Solon and Peisistratus. The question, whether such opinions are really *true*, is not entertained at all, nor, probably, much cared for. Love of truth *for its own sake* is evidently a

¹ In *Miscell. Crit.* p. 225 seqq.

² *Post-Epic or Imitative Words in Homer* (F. Norgate).

rare characteristic. Against such a belief, for which not a particle of proof can be adduced, it is contended, that although the Homeric poems are unquestionably very ancient in their general subject-matter, they are only so in the sense in which the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, and the so-called *Posthomericæ* of Q. Smyrnaeus are ancient; in a word, that our two great epics show the work, each of them, of an unknown compiler with a definite object before him, but availing himself freely of episodes and accretions of a comparatively late age. The possibility of working up such discordant materials into a tolerably consistent and harmonious whole cannot reasonably be denied to an age in which recitation was a profession, and pen-and-ink writing, if known at all, had certainly not become a custom. But it is far more likely that our Homer is the product and result of a much later age of Bibliography. Now there is absolute *proof* (or, at least, cumulative evidence of the strongest kind) that the "Homer" of the age of Pericles was very different indeed from our Homer; and there is the strongest possible *presumption*, that epics known and believed at that period to be non-Homeric and inferior, would not have been so exclusively followed by such great Master-poets as Pindar, Aeschylus, and many others, who took them as their themes.

This position is not indeed altogether new, except in its logical results. Most persons, following the well-known remark of Aristotle in the *Poetic*, are aware, in a kind of vague way, that the Greek tragedies do not in general represent our Homer. Nevertheless, as tradition seems persistently to say that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are the only genuine and original works of the Divine Homer, they persuade themselves—and both Dr. Hayman and Mr. Mahaffy¹ insist on the view which I, for one, utterly reject—that the greatest poets in the greatest age of Greek literary genius were content to follow inferiors, because they had a kind of awe of trespassing on the compositions of the master-mind!

¹ He calls it (*Hist. Lit.* i. p. 58) "the conscious abstaining of later Greek art from touching these great masterpieces."

These "inferiors," as everyone knows, are classed as post-Homeric and "Cyclic," of which more anon. It seems to me that the time has come when this question must be dealt with on its own merits alone, apart from the educational prejudices with which it is so thickly beset and surrounded.

§ I.

ON THE COMMONLY RECEIVED OPINIONS ABOUT THE AGE OF HOMER.

MR. GROTE says,¹ "To place the Iliad and Odyssey at some periods between 850 B.C. and 776 B.C., appears to me more probable than any other date, anterior or posterior."

Professor Mahaffy² thinks the Homeric poems were written down as early as B.C. 700, and so were handed down orally "only for a very short time."

Dr. Hayman³ says much the same thing, that "the habit (of reciting in a certain succession of events) from which a written text was first formed, grew up at Athens in the two centuries preceding Solon—viz., the 7th and 8th before Christ, and by the time of Solon, who closes the 7th century, the text was complete in its constituent elements, although probably these were in great disorder, and were charged with much adventitious matter."

Mr. Gladstone⁴ believes that a real poet of this name,

¹ *Hist. of Greece*, vol. ii. p. 135.

² *Hist. Cl. Lit.* i. p. 27. I do not think the author has appreciated, or fully considered, the cumulative weight of the arguments collected by me, for he very briefly dismisses them, as if hardly worthy of any serious discussion. His belief in the remote antiquity of Greek bibliography, on which his view is in great measure founded, seems to me a pure assumption, contrary to all the evidence we possess.

³ Preface to the *Odyssey*, vol. i. p. xiv.

⁴ *Primer on Homer*, p. 15. Colonel Mure also is "the most determined advocate of the unity of authorship of the whole Iliad and the

the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey, "flourished between the siege of Troy and the Dorian Revolution."

Mr. Jebb¹ also places the composition of these poems at B.C. 850, or even earlier.

All these statements, which may be said to represent the ordinary and ancient opinion,² are founded on the well-known assertion of Herodotus,³ that "Homer and Hesiod lived 400 years before him, and not more."

They are statements confirmed by no other evidence of the least value. They are, in a word, put forward, as far as the theory of an early written text is concerned, to account for the otherwise almost impossible preservation of poems of great length, unmixed with the other matter which, as I have said, we know to have existed and to have been accepted as Homer before the age of Plato.

On the other side, *i.e.*, that of a much more recent origin, it must be said—and the remark is an extremely important one—that whereas poems now lost existed in the Periclean age which were widely current as Homer, on the other hand a very large part of our poems appears to have been quite unknown in those times, so far as we can judge from the absolute silence about it, both in the poetry and the art of the period. And this fact is particularly remarkable, not only in contrast with the incessant repetition of the other "Homeric" topics of the tragedies, but because it is the best and most admired episodes in our poems that are whole Odyssey." (Mahaffy, p. 53, who adds that the attitude of these two scholars is "not only behind Wolf; it is distinctly behind Aristarchus and Zenodotus.") *Unity of authorship* may be conceded without the great antiquity Colonel Mure attaches to it.

¹ *Primer of Greek Literature*, pp. 19, 37.

² See Proclus, Chrestom. i. 2, p. 232, ed. Westphal. The dates anciently assigned to Homer are given by Sengebusch, Dissert. Prior, pp. 16, 32, 96, and Diss. ii. pp. 77, 85.

³ ii. 53. The very fact of making Homer and Hesiod *contemporaries* in B.C. 850 proves the worthlessness of the guess. There are reasons, as I shall show, for believing that Herodotus, though he mentions the "Iliad," and doubts the genuineness of the "Cypria," yet included a great deal more in the term "Homer" than our extant texts.

completely ignored by the literature and art preceding the age of Plato. No one who is able to grasp the whole question can rest satisfied with the theory that such abstention from the works of the true Homer was voluntary and intentional.

Add to this, if it can be shown that the language of our Homer is largely artificial, imitative, and replete with late Atticisms and other modernisms, many of them showing a false analogy, the case against a written Iliad and Odyssey of B.C. 700, the same, or nearly so, as ours, is completely established. For the genuine and living epic, not spurious and artificial forms of it, must certainly have existed at that early period.

The truth evidently is, that until two poems so called became *accepted as literary texts*, "Homer" was very much what bards and rhapsodists in every city chose to make him. They were patchers of Homeric stories, and novelty, or at least, new combination and arrangement, was their object, not the preservation of any one traditional text. Such were the ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων ἀοιδοὶ of Pindar, Nem. ii. 2, a phrase which is incapable of any other meaning.

It becomes therefore vastly important to ascertain, if possible, at what period written texts of Greek authors were circulated. On this topic, again, we have plenty of confident assertion, but nothing of close, careful, and scholarly investigation of facts, beyond the views put forth on the subject by F. A. Wolf, in his *Prolegomena*, which incline—unduly, as I venture to think—to the side of antiquity.

Our poems, from my point of view, are the small residue of a vast epic literature, which was current in the age of Plato and Xenophon, but till then, *in all probability*, had not been recorded in writing, or at least had been but partially copied out, and as it were "in scraps." They are made up of perpetual hints and references to the longer and more genuine poems. Some few of the episodes in our texts were known, but with variations, to the tragics; but we

have no reason whatever for believing that the greater part of what now passes as "Homer" was known to them at all.

The age in which a literary written Homer—a work meant to attract readers, and not, as hitherto, hearers only—may fairly be fixed, is about B.C. 400. This was a period at which "political interest sank for a generation into a secondary place, and in which intellectual and moral culture came into the foreground."¹ And we know historically of two "editors of Homer" who lived about this time or a little earlier, Antimachus of Colophon, and one Euripides, probably a relation of the tragic poet.²

§ II.

ON THE NAME AND PERSONALITY OF "HOMER."

WHETHER such a *person* really ever lived, it is needless now to inquire. We can only take a widely prevalent and ancient tradition in evidence of the fact. The *name* has been variously interpreted to mean "fitter", or "composer" (like the term "rhapsodist"), or "blind" (Hesychius), or "hostage," or "flowing in harmonious numbers,"³ another form of *Thamyris*. It *may* have been a pure invention to account for the name of Ὀμηρίδαι given to a local guild of bards, so named from being pledged to sing on the same martial theme (ὁμηρεῖν).

Herodotus and Thucydides mention Homer more than once. We find the name also in Pindar and Simonides,⁴

¹ Mahaffy, *Hist. Gr. Lit.* ii. p. 135.

² Sengebusch, *Diss. Prior*, pp. 181-186.

³ φωνῇ ὁμηρεῖσαι, Hesiod, *Theog.* 39. Mr. Mahaffy discusses the various meanings, *Hist. Gr. Lit.* i. p. 23. Prof. Sayce (Appendix A, p. 521, to that work) quotes the opinion of G. Curtius, that ὁμηροί was first applied to a clan or guild of united bards. Sengebusch, *Diss.* ii. pp. 89-100, goes into the inquiry very fully.

⁴ *Frag.* 53, Bergk, where a story about Meleager is attributed to Homer, quite different from that in *Il.* ix.

but not in any of the Greek tragedies, though it was very familiar to the comic poets, including Aristophanes. Other poets, as Orpheus and Musaeus, and even Hesiod, were thought, in very ancient times, when there was no true history, to have been contemporaries if not predecessors of Homer, and other anonymous poets are more than once alluded to by Thucydides as οἱ ποιηταὶ or οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν ποιητῶν,¹ whom he appears to distinguish from "Ὅμηρος."² Both Thucydides and other writers attribute to "Homer" Hymns and other poems besides the Iliad and the Odyssey.

In the age of Pericles, no one knew who Homer was, what poems were or were not his, and when they were composed. It was reserved for later times to assume the existence of a Homer as the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey.

§ III.

ON THE VAGUE MEANING OF THE TERM "HOMER."

BY "Homer," then, as I have said, it is perfectly certain that a very different idea was conveyed in the ante-Platonic age from that of the authorship of the Iliad and the Odyssey. "Down to the Alexandrian epoch," writes Mr. Mahaffy, i. p. 67, "there is only one (Plato) who seems to hold that the Iliad and Odyssey, *and these alone*, were the work of a single Homer." And in ii. p. 208 he says, Plato is "the first Greek author who confines the name of Homer to the Iliad and Odyssey." We cannot trace even the titles

¹ i. 5 and 13, vi. 2. See also Herod. ii. 23 and 53. Aelian, Var. Hist. xi. 2, ὅτι ἦν Ὀροιβαντίου Τροιζηνίου ἔπη πρὸς Ὅμηρον, ὡς φασιν οἱ Τροιζηνιοὶ λόγοι. Καὶ τὸν Φρύγιον δὲ Δάρητα, οὗ Φρυγίαν Ἰλιάδα ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἀποσωζομένην οἶδα, πρὸς Ὅμηρον καὶ τοῦτον γενέσθαι λέγουσι. *Ibid.* xiv. 21, "Ὅτι Εὐαγρὸς τις ἐγένετο ποιητὴς μετ' Ὀρφέα καὶ Μουσαῖον, ὃς λέγεται τὸν Τρωικὸν πόλεμον πρῶτος ᾄσαι.

² He may refer to Peisander, Panyasis, or Creophylus. Poppo, however, supposes the author was referring to Homer.

of these poems earlier than Herodotus ; and it is impossible to say what they then included. The paintings on extant Greek vases of early date utterly fail to supply any evidence in favour of the commonly received opinion, that "Homer" (*i.e.* our Homer) exercised an influence over all subsequent Greek literature and art. The scant allusions in the tragedies (extant and lost) of Aeschylus and Sophocles to any scenes in the *Iliad* seem at least to indicate a recension differing considerably from the text which we now possess. This is confirmed by the celebrity in those early times of many heroes who are either not at all, or barely mentioned in our texts, Memnon, Telephus, Palamedes, Troilus, Lycomedes, Protesilaus, of all of whom long stories were told, and about whom tragedies were written, and who must have been prominent characters in the Homer of the period. We have an allusion at the very beginning of Theognis to a temple dedicated by Agamemnon to Artemis, ὅτ' ἐς Τροίαν ἔπλεε ναυσὶ θοαῖς. And if there is any truth at all in the story that Peisistratus collected the poems of Homer,¹ it cannot be shown that only the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were meant. The Homer of Peisistratus would necessarily be the much more comprehensive Homer recognized as such in the age of Pericles. The story itself is of small literary value ; but it is truly surprising that it should always have been used for establishing the antiquity of *our*, *i.e.* the Platonic and Alexandrian texts. Mr. Mahaffy (i. p. 26-30) avows his belief in this "commission of Peisistratus," and calls it "the earliest literary criticism on *the Iliad and Odyssey*." The enormous assumption made on such a supposition is quite evident. He admits, however, that all the (cyclic) epics then attributed to Homer were comprised in the criticism (p. 30 note), without perceiving that, if so many volumes *could* have been written in the clumsy βουστροφηδὸν of the period, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* could then, if they existed separately, have had no pre-eminence whatever.

¹ Aelian, Var. Hist. viii. 2. Plat. Hipparch. p. 228 B.

§ IV.

ON THE TITLES OF THE POEMS "ILIAD" AND "ODYSSEY."

(1.)

THE name *Iliad*, meaning a song about Ilium, is wholly inappropriate to our poem, which is the merest fragment of the much larger Trojan tale, ἡ Τρωικὴ πραγματεία, being, in fact, an expansion of an incident in the so-called Κύπρια ἔπη—viz., the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon,¹ diversified by a great number of episodes, some ancient, some comparatively modern. The title itself is doubtless old; but it more properly belonged to, or was one general term for, that large and comprehensive mass of traditional and unwritten ballad-literature about Troy, which, as distinct from the tale of Thebes, the Thebaid, also popularly attributed to Homer, took the characteristic name of Ἰλιάς. The more comprehensive story about Troy and the heroes who fought there, since it was followed by Pindar and the Tragics (who entirely ignore, as I have said, by far the larger part of our present poems), must in fairness be presumed to be the older and more authentic "Homer." A considerable and very important part of the narrative, not included in the present Iliad, was called, by way of distinction in post-Platonic times, the "Little Iliad;" from which it must be inferred, that the title "Iliad," ἡ Ἰλιάς, had already been appropriated for that which had become the *textus receptus* of Homer—viz., more or less nearly our present poem. It is certain, however, that the subject-matter of the "Little Iliad" was much more familiar to the Tragics and

¹ Ἀχιλλεὺς ὕστερος κληθεὶς διαφέρεται πρὸς Ἀγαμέμνονα. (Proclus, ed. Westphal, p. 236). On this incident, and the counsel of Zeus in keeping Achilles from helping the Greeks in order to assist the Trojans, also in the *Cypria* (Proclus, *ibid.*), the present Iliad was built up. The words Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή (Il. i. 5) we know to have been in the *Cypria*. Clearly, then, the Iliad was based on the *Cypria*, not the *Cypria* on the Iliad.

the contemporary vase-painters than the *Iliad* as we have it; and the disparaging title *ἡ μικρὰ* must be later than their age. It is impossible that relative merit and authenticity can have been represented by these two terms in the best period of Greek literature.

The separation of this and the other poems which we are accustomed to call "Cyclic," necessarily implies great editorial changes long subsequent to the times of Solon or Peisistratus, in which we are told by Mr. Grote that our poems existed in a written form. "There must have been definite individuals to whom the arrangement and grouping of this traditional matter was due, to whom, in fact, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the *Thebais* and the *Kypria*, the Lesser *Iliad* and the other specimens of epic literature, as separate poems, owed their origin."¹

(2.) The *Odyssey* was also, without doubt, an ancient poem in some of its parts; but it is probable that the marvellous adventures of Odysseus existed for long only in the form of detached rhapsodies, which gradually became a *corpus* with a title distinguishing it from the *Iliad*.²

But many incidents in our *Odyssey* were undoubtedly adapted from longer and older epics, *e.g.* the storm in the return from Troy, the murder of Agamemnon by Aegisthus, the Wooden Horse, the deaths of Memnon, Antilochus, Ajax, the lament of Thetis and the nine Muses for the death of Achilles, &c. The present poem turns mainly on the suitors of Penelope and their punishment; but it is very significant, that these suitors are nowhere alluded to in Pindar or in the Tragics.³ It is likely enough that this

¹ Prof. Sayce, in Appendix A, to Mr. Mahaffy's *Hist. Gk. Lit.* p. 519.

² On this theory alone we can account for the mention of the oxen of the sun and the Cyclops, as perfectly familiar subjects, at the very beginning of the *Odyssey*! Such an anticipation would be impossible in any well-constructed *original* poem.

³ Orestes 588 is perhaps an exception; but the passage, containing an illogical argument, has been with good reason regarded as interpolated.

part of the story was a variation from, or a *replica* of, the older tale of the Suitors of Helen; just as the *Calypso* seems a repetition of the *Circe*,¹ and the cannibal *Antiphates* of the *Cyclops*. It was, however, known to Polygnotus the painter (Pausan. ix. 4) in the time of Pericles, if the work described was really his.

We have the titles of two lost tragedies, the *Penelope* of Aeschylus and the *Nausicaa* of Sophocles, which bear on episodes in our *Odyssey*; and these may well have been taken from the detached rhapsodies above alluded to.² Our poem, however, appears to have been largely supplemented from the ancient *Argonautica*, which were not only well known to, and often alluded to by, Herodotus (iv. 145, 179; vii. 193), Pindar, and the Tragics, but are definitely referred to in the *Odyssey* itself.³ From these the characters of Alcinous and his queen Aretè, of Calypso, Circe (who is called *Aíaiη* in both poems), Scylla, the Sirens, and the cruel King Echetus, with the oxen of the sun, the moving rocks, Charybdis, and Aeolus the king of the winds, appear to have been introduced;⁴ and from the *Argonautica*, which he cer-

¹ The following lines clearly indicate a patchwork in combining both stories:—

ἡ μὲν μ' αὐτόθ' ἔρυκε Καλυψὼ δῖα θεάων
ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι·
ὥς δ' αὖτως Κίρκη κατερήτυεν ἐν μεγάροιςιν
Αἰαίη δολόεσσα, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.

Od. ix. 29.

² A sculpture of two girls driving a mule-car on the chest of Cypselus was *thought to be* Nausicaa and her maid. (Pausan. v. 19 fin.)

³ The *Ὀσολόγοι* of Aeschylus, a satyric drama, did not, as Dr. Hayman supposes, refer to the Suitors, for Athenaeus (i. p. 17, c) expressly refers it to a drunken bout of the Greeks, probably in camp. He would hardly call the suitors of Helen τοὺς Ἑλλήνας; he would have said, τοὺς μνηστῆρας. Besides, the Schol. on Lycophron, quoted by Dindorf on Aesch. frag. 166, distinctly says the subject of the play was οὐ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ.

⁴ Ap. Rhod. iv. 1070, 1093; *ib.* 965, 894, 922-924, 575, 561, 765, &c.

tainly knew,¹ rather than from the *Odyssey*, Aeschylus appears to have derived his reference to the monster Scylla in *Agam.* 1233. It is to be inferred, from his very different treatment of the murder of Agamemnon, that he had not before him the story of it given in the *Odyssey*.

One thing is absolutely certain: the characters above mentioned, being common to two ancient poems, must either have been adapted to both from a common source, or been copied from one into the other. If the latter was the case, the balance of evidence is in favour of the superior antiquity of the *Argonautica*, of which Pindar has treated at length in the 4th Pythian ode in terms exactly agreeing with the Alexandrine compilation by Apollonius Rhodius. And if the ship *Argo* is expressly mentioned in our *Odyssey*, it follows that the story about it must be older than the allusion:

οἷη δὴ κείνη γε παρέπλω ποντοπόρος νηῦς
'Αργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα παρ' Αἰήταο πλέουσα.

Od. xii. 69.

We have no right whatever to get rid of such evidences, any more than we have those of violated digammas, by assuming the "interpolations of rhapsodists."

¹ The allusion to *Phineus* in *Eum.* 50 conclusively proves this, even if other proofs were wanting. The compilation of the *Odyssey*, generally indicating *western* scenery and geography, with the peculiarity of much of the diction, points to Magna Graecia or Sicily as its birth-place. "*Odysseam in Italia inferiore originem habuisse recte docere videtur Paleius.*" (Dr. Oberdick, *Quaest. Aeschyl.* 1878, p. 13.) This is the reason why the Ionic poem of the *Iliad* is nowhere alluded to in the *Odyssey*. The theory accounts for the semi-latin *εἶρερος*, *servitus*, *Od.* viii. 529, and the confusion of *νέποδες* (iv. 404) with *nepotes*.

§ V.

ON THE EPIC DIALECT.

THE epic, or what we may call for convenience the Homeric, language was a dialect of a peculiar kind, originating in times long prehistoric, and preserved for many ages through the exigencies of metre, at first by its own vitality and creative energy, afterwards (like the Latin of the middle ages) by a kind of literary pedantry or conservatism which we may call *epic tradition*, founded on more or less incorrect imitation, in which condition it survived till at least three centuries after the Christian era, if indeed it ever became really extinct. During the whole period of about a thousand years the use (with more or less frequent and flagrant violations) of the digamma, and a large number of very archaic phrases are found, combined with frequent, and apparently even quite late, Atticisms, and many forms and inflexions which, from their evidently false analogy, may fitly be described as “pseudo-archaic.”¹

Of course, these violations of strict usage form part of the evidence of comparatively modern reproduction of our Homeric texts. No argument is so superficial and so deceptive as the assumption of a remote antiquity for our poems merely because the style and matter seem pretty uniformly to wear a very archaic complexion. That was a necessary condition of their being accepted at all as a part of the ancient epos. The story of Pandarus and his bow is very prettily told, and the account of Thersites is very graphic and clever. Yet the former seems to be unknown to any writer earlier than Plato (p. 408, A), and the account of

¹ Such a phrase as *ὀψείοντες ἀντῆς*, “having a taste for war,” a desiderative from *ὄψον*, is a good example of imitative pedantry. I regard *εὖ ἀκῆδεσεν* in *Il. xiv. 427*, as a rhapsodist’s figment “after the antique.”

Thersites abounds with words¹ that indicate a late recension. We know, too, from the title of a tragedy,² Ἀχιλλεύς Θερσιτοκτόνος, as well as from the account in Q. Smyrnaeus, i. 722, seqq., that a more savage, and probably older, story represented Thersites as killed on the spot by Achilles, just as Sophocles³ made the living Hector dragged round the walls of Troy by Achilles, and so tortured to death.

The *matter* of *all* the extant epic poems alike is *strictly archaic*. None of them allude to contemporary arts, and the absence of all reference to coined money, the art of writing, laws, and contemporary history, is an essential characteristic of the epic style of composition. Here and there only a late poet may be caught tripping. There *seems*, in Od. vii. 81, to be an allusion to the Erechtheum just completed (B.C. 430) at Athens,⁴ and in Il. xii. 260, to the hasty building of the walls of Athens in the manner and with the materials described by Thucydides, i. 93. The mention of στῆλαι in both passages is significant. Allusions to the destruction of Mycenae in 468, and to the offering of the peplos to Athena in the Trojan Acropolis, and the comparison (ii. 479) of a warrior with a type of sculpture representing the school of Pheidias, are also indications of lateness.⁵ The references to Delphi and the Aegyptian Thebes do not suggest a very remote antiquity in a Greek poet. Like a large portion of the Homeric language, they seem rather to represent the age of Herodotus. On all these points, however, nothing certain can be affirmed. The armour of the heroes is that which we know from vase-paintings to have prevailed in the fifth century B.C., while the anatomical terms and the medical appliances generally suggest the science of Hippocrates and the Ionic school.

¹ Especially the form συνοχωκότε, ii. 218.

² By Chaeremon. See Stobaeus, Ecl. i. 6.

³ Ajax, 1031.

⁴ The old one had been burnt by Xerxes (Herod. viii. 55). The superior workmanship of the new one, made of closely fitting stones, seems described by Homer's πυκινὸς δόμος.

⁵ See Mr. Westropp's pamphlet, "Homeric Doubts."

There is nothing in the language of our Homeric texts to prove conclusively any great antiquity. There is, of course, a generally archaic character; but this, as has been said, is (with important distinctions) common to all the Greek epos, of whatever age.

The mythology of Homer is not seriously affected by the later form in which the poems may have come down to us. But the same cannot safely be said of any details of domestic or camp life. These were probably the creations of fancy, in general unison with the traditions that had been preserved. But accounts of palaces and goblets and other works of art must not be supposed to record the state of things existing B.C. 850. We know they do not in the least represent the state of art in the old town or towns excavated by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik.

Whenever, and by whomsoever composed or compiled, the *Iliad* must be taken as essentially the creation of one mind, because it always keeps in view, and often refers to, the *μῆνις*, which was a theme in the ancient Cypria, and the prayer of Thetis to Zeus, which, in the older story, as followed by Pindar (probably, also, as told in the Cypria), had a very different object and import from that developed in the *Iliad*.¹ But round these themes were clustered events that had been much more fully detailed in the older poems, including even the *Thebais*, from which not a few passages have been imported into our Homer.

§ VI.

ON THE REPRODUCTION OF ANCIENT EPICS IN A LATER FORM.

THIS is a most important and interesting subject; and it may be doubted if sufficient attention has ever been given to it.

The whole theory of "pseudo-archaism" is unknown

¹ See inf. § ix. Pind. Ol. ii. 80.

to most, who assume without any inquiry that a thing must be ancient because it has the external appearance of being so. People forget that if an ancient vocabulary was used, the verses composed from it *must* bear an antique character; just as a stained window would still look old if it were rearranged from a cart-load of old fragments with many new patches. The cases, unless I am greatly mistaken, are perfectly parallel.

So far from the bards of old having had any jealous care to preserve inviolate a particular text, or to distinguish critically Homeric from non-Homeric subjects, we have every reason to suppose that what they aimed at was to *amuse by novelty*;

τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι
ἥτις ἀκούοντεςσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται.

Od. i. 851.

The legends or adventures were strictly adhered to, but the treatment of them, at least till the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* became a written literature, was varied indefinitely. It was quite natural, not to say quite essential, to the very existence of rival spouters of Homeric verse, that this should have been the case. Moreover, it is implied in the very etymology of the word *ῥαψῳδός*.

How far any existing epic has a *genuine* antiquity, beyond the material of it—*i.e.*, how far it is interpolated with pseudo-archaic verses and episodes—cannot now with certainty be ascertained. There can be little doubt that the rhapsodes of Pericles' time could throw off thousands of "Homeric" verses almost or quite improvised. It was a habit with them, and just as easy as a "sensational" speech or sermon is to a modern orator. We see this not only in the oracles of *χρησμολόγοι*, but in the frequent parodies and imitations of Homeric verses in Greek comedy. All that can be fairly said has been briefly and well said by Professor Sayce:¹ "Guilds of professional poets received from their

¹ Appendix A to Mahaffy's *Hist. Gr. Lit.* i. p. 512.

predecessors a series of stock subjects, a stock mode of treating them, and a body of traditional words and phrases." These were the ἀφορμὴ, the stock in trade, from which anything "Homeric" could be made to order. Two examples prove incontestably that very ancient epics *were* re-written and re-arranged in late times, and that this was quite compatible with retaining the original subject, in its main outline at least, if not in all its details, with the strictest accuracy. There are (1) The *Argonautica* of Apollonius, which has a close resemblance to the long narrative in the fourth Pythian ode; and (2) The *Posthomericæ* of Quintus Smyrnaeus, who, though he wrote in the fourth century A.D., has preserved far more of the tragic incidents, and even of Virgil's narrative, than we obtain from our Homeric texts. Short epics on the Trojan tale are extant by Coluthus and Tryphiodorus, and a great deal has been preserved by the late Byzantine grammarian, Tzetzes.

So far from the Iliad and the Odyssey being the sole originals, and other epics on Troy being mere imitations, it is the Iliad and the Odyssey which, like Pindar's odes and the Tragedies, are made up of hints and allusions from these. When the bulk of the old epos had dropped out of notice through the superior literary importance of these two works, they were, by some unknown hand, and at an unknown period (perhaps by Zenodotus), preserved from oblivion by being made parts of the great encyclopædia of the ancient epos, known to us as the Κύκλος.

From all this it follows, and it is not to be doubted, whatever Mr. Grote or Mr. Mahaffy may say against it, that the rhapsodists and poets in and long after the age of Pericles did habitually reconstruct, alter, and enlarge, retaining the general characteristics of ancient poems about the tale of Troy and Thebes. In whatever form any of these poems, or parts of them, were recited (and from the detached ancient "parts" the titles of the books have descended),¹ they were

¹ The fanciful and strained interpretations of the phrase ἐξ ὑποβολῆς, to mean "from a written text," adopted by Mr. Grote and Mr. Ma-

alike called *Homer*, no critical discrimination whatever having existed. The titles given to the different "cyclic" poems, as well as the names of their alleged authors, come to us on no real authority. The only genuine poem of antiquity, *i.e.* older than Aristotle, which has any claim to be distinct, is the "Cypria," which was known as possibly non-Homeric to Herodotus,¹ and was very largely followed by Aeschylus and the tragic poets generally. It is quite evident that the *Cypria* enjoyed a popularity, and possessed an authority with the Attic and Doric poets and artists in the time of Pericles, far beyond the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. In fact, the *Cypria* to Aeschylus and Pindar was what the *Iliad* was to Plato. To all of them alike these poems appeared the authentic Homer. And when we are told by Athenaeus (viii. 39) that Aeschylus copied "Homer," and that Sophocles was fond of the "Cyclus" (vii. 5), both must be interpreted of the old and large epos, *not* of the literary compilations we possess,—the *Cyclus* being in their time unknown as a distinctive name. It is simply *certain* that our poems cannot, *in their present form*, claim anything approaching to the antiquity of B.C. 850! "A close examination of the language of Homer shows that it is a mosaic, in which words belonging to different ages and three different dialects—Aeolic, Ionic, and Attic—are mixed together in such a way as to prove it to be *an artificial dialect*, never really spoken by the people, but slowly elaborated by successive generations of poets for the needs of epic composition."² Again, "The use of the digamma shows that a large part of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is composed in quite as artifi-

haffy (i. p. 29), instead of the simple and natural meaning, "in successive parts," seems to me very misleading. One of the parts, the *Διομήδεος ἀριστεία*, has a different place in our *Iliad* from what it had in the time of Herodotus (ii. 116). See on this Sengebusch, *Diss. Pr.* p. 149, and *Diss.* ii. p. 107.

¹ Yet Pindar, according to Aelian (*Var. Hist.* ix. 15) considered the *Cypria* to be a work of Homer's.

² Prof. Sayce, Appendix A, p. 494.

cial a language as the epics of Apollonius Rhodius, or Q. Smyrnaeus."¹ "The Homeric poems must have passed through Attic hands, and undergone an Attic recension."²

Between the best tragic age and the composition of Plato's Dialogues, a period of thirty or forty years may be fairly assumed, during which a growing love for literature had come in with the greater facilities for, and the more frequent practice of, writing and copying books. All we can say with certainty is, that whereas Plato uniformly quotes the Iliad and the Odyssey as Homer,³ the tragics (even up to 400 B.C.) and Pindar almost as uniformly cite from the much wider range of the epos on Thebes and Troy. Therefore, however "absurd" it may appear to Mr. Mahaffy,⁴ it must be conceded that the poems, as they came into Plato's hands, had been so arranged and epitomized, not very long before, by some (perhaps Attic) editor whose name has not definitely come down to us. I hold to this opinion with the utmost confidence; and, to my mind, the alternative proposition is infinitely more "absurd," viz., that the tragics knew our Homer, but "consciously abstained from touching these great masterpieces."⁵ For my own part, I am unwilling to give them the discredit of being so exceedingly foolish! They "abstained from" the Iliad and the Odyssey simply because these poems had then no special prominence, if they had any isolated existence. Their "Homer" was a very different, and very much larger, and in their view a

¹ Prof. Sayce, Appendix A, p. 499.

² *Ibid.* p. 511.

³ Sengebusch, Diss. Pr. p. 127, "Memorable autem visum, apud Platonem neque ex Iliade petitum neque ex Odyssea reperiri ne unum quidem versum, qui hodie in contextu quem dicunt Homeri non legatur." I have remarked elsewhere that Plato quotes the Iliad 120 times and the Odyssey 50.

⁴ *Hist. Gr. Lit.* i. p. 58. It is a mere quibble to object, what everybody knows, that Sophocles and Euripides in their old age were contemporaries with young Plato.

⁵ *Ibid.* Aristotle's reason, in chap. 23 of the Poetics, is not much more likely—that the Cyclics presented more subjects for the drama than the Iliad.

more genuine work; and for that reason alone they took their themes from it, occasionally, as might be expected, touching on subjects which happen to have been embodied in the Platonic Homer.

That the very few fragments which we have from the "Cyclics" appear inferior in versification, only shows that the matter of them, equally, if not more ancient, was put into shape by less skilful poets. The "Cyclic" verses we have may be little better than an Alexandrine coinage.

When Polygnotus, the famous painter, in the time of Pericles, decorated the Λέσχη at Delphi, it is equally certain that he also followed the older Homer. The remark, therefore, of Pausanias (p. 861), that "he must have read the poem of Lesches" (the Ἰλίου πέρσις), is quite worthless, if we take a right view of the real Homer of antiquity.¹ The still older "Chest of Cypselus," likewise described by Pausanias, has only here and there the barest allusions to subjects in our Homer. I wish all who are really interested in the Homeric question would read with more minute care the long account of these works in Pausanias;² for I observe a "spasmodic effort" in some to show that they represent our Homer, which assuredly they do not.

§ VII.

ON THE PROBABLE NATURE AND OBJECT OF THE EPIC CYCLUS.

WE must conclude then that the Cyclus, a compilation of Alexandrine times, was due to an attempt to collect and edit those numerous other poems on Troy and Thebes (or at least, the legends contained in them) which

¹ May not this very name, *Lesches*, have come from the non-Homeric paintings in the Lesche at Delphi?

² Lib. v. 17, p. 419, to 19, p. 426, and lib. x. 25, p. 859, to 31, p. 867. I am rather surprised that Sengebusch is silent on this important subject.

had been very celebrated up to the time of Plato, or thereabouts, but had gradually become less popular as the written Iliad and Odyssey had taken precedence.

This is the natural course in the development of a national poetry. It is thus that ten persons now read Mr. Tennyson's works where one reads Byron, Shelley, or Pope.

And as the two great poems began to be attributed exclusively to Homer, it followed that names must be found for the other poems of the Cyclus, and for the authors of them, different from "Homer."

It is a circumstance of the highest significance, that not one of these names—Stasinus, Arctinus, Lesches, Agias, &c.—is ever mentioned by any early author! They come to us solely on quite late authority. Now, if the poems we call "Cyclic" were in their subject-matter so old and so popular that the Greek dramatists far preferred them to the Iliad and the Odyssey (supposing they knew these epics distinctively as such), and moreover, if they were then known to have been the works of other authors, this silence about them is utterly inexplicable. Something would have been said about *pretenders*—authors of what Plato calls ἀπόθετα ἔπη, or "rejected verses"—who had succeeded in obtaining so extraordinary and so long-enduring a popularity. But, if the ancients did *not* know they were composed by other authors than Homer, what is the value of *modern* testimony, so evidently given with an object in view? Surely, this is a most important consideration.

Mr. Mahaffy is clearly wrong in saying¹ that "the later epic poets who were called Cyclical, and whose laboured accounts of the wars of gods and giants and by-gone men roused the ire and fed the satire of Xenophanes,² were a mere exercise and amusement for the student and for the learned audiences." We know the subjects of which they

¹ *Hist. Gr. Lit.* i. p. 3.

² Here, I think, he is mistaken. The "silli" or satires of Xenophanes were directed against what he thought were Homeric subjects. See Sengebusch, *Diss. Pr.* pp. 129-133.

treated, and we know, I repeat, that those subjects formed the themes of Pindar and the tragics to a degree very far exceeding the influence of our Homer, which is so often, and so very falsely, called "the Bible of the Greeks."

When, then, the "non-Homeric" poems had been arranged by the Alexandrine scholars so as to form a continuous narrative of the wars of Troy and Thebes, names were assigned to the supposed authors of the different poems, and the whole work, or series of events, which included the Iliad and the Odyssey, as well as the Thebais, was called the *Κύκλος*, from a fancied resemblance to the succession of the seasons in a year. It is nearly certain that such an adaptation never could have been made without extensive arbitrary alterations in all these poems, amounting in fact almost to a re-writing of them.

According to Mr. Mahaffy,¹ everything was "Homer" till "a more critical taste separated the chaff from the wheat, and acknowledged the two great poems only." And he would have us believe that Aeschylus, Sophocles, and all the great masters of art in the greatest period of Athens, *deliberately* preferred the chaff to the wheat, well knowing which was the chaff and which was the wheat, but possessed with the idea that "the wheat" was something too sacred for them to touch!

I cannot persuade myself that such Homeric theories as this will long retain their hold with intellectual men.

Were then the great themes of the sacrifice of Iphigenia, the death of Achilles, the burning of Troy, the achievements of Memnon,² the madness of Ajax, the long details of the rape of Helen by Paris, the embassy to regain her, the building of the fleets and of the Wooden Horse, the

¹ *Hist. Gr. Lit.* i. p. 28.

² *Agamemnon* seems to be the same name, with a prefix implying "valour." May not the word, *mem-non*, have imitated the sound of the Egyptian statue, *dimidio magicæ resonant ubi Memnone chordæ*? The fact of the sound is greatly confirmed by our recent knowledge of the "Photophone."

marriage of Peleus and Thetis, the Judgment of Paris—all of them quite hackneyed subjects of the tragedies, but only just touched upon, and barely alluded to in our Homer—were all these taken from the chaff-heap? The very allusions to them, scanty as they are, to say nothing of many bare *hints* at stories now known to us accidentally from other sources,¹ prove that our Iliad is only a particular version of the old *Troica*, very limited in its subject and very partial in its treatment, containing the narrative of events of but a few days, and some of these in a perverted order.²

Mr. Mahaffy³ follows the account of the grammarian Proclus, who, living in the second century after Christ, can be of no real authority for the opinions about Homer which prevailed in the age of Pericles. "Let it be remembered," he says, "that some of the Cyclic epics, then commonly attributed to Homer, were composed by known poets, and within historical times." This is taking for granted that the account given by Proclus is historically true. Besides, how are we to account for such an anomaly—poems composed by *known authors* being persistently attributed to Homer? Again, he argues (p. 26) that the widespread reputation early gained by the Homeric poems is partly proved "by the consistent avoidance of Homer's subjects in the Cyclic poems." Were this strictly true, which a careful perusal of the "Post-Homerica" of Q. Smyrnaeus would show that it is not, it would only prove, what no one doubts, that the "Cyclius"

¹ As the reference to τὸ κῆτος in Il. xx. 147. Strabo, xiii. p. 615 fin., ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον μέμνηται μόνον τῆς ἱστορίας ταύτης, ἀλλ' οἷον τὸν Τηλεφίδην κατενῆρατο χαλκῷ ἥρω Εὐρύπυλον (Od. xi. 519), αἶνιγμα τιθεὶς ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἢ λέγων τι σαφές. But we happen to know from Q. Smyrnaeus, lib. vi., that the whole story of Eurypylus and his defeat by Neoptolemus was given in the fuller *Troica*.

² In Thuc. i. 11, we read that the Greek camp was made on the *first arrival* of the Greeks at the Troad. In our Iliad it occurs in vii. 436 *seqq.*

³ i. p. 66. Prof. Jebb ("Primer," § 25) defines the *Cyclica* as "a mass of songs and legends about Troy which the two great epics left untouched." He dates them B.C. 776 to 550.

was edited and arranged with reference to our Homeric poems and to a certain degree made to harmonize with them.

The disparagement of the "Cyclics" in later times was a necessary result of the celebrity which the Iliad and the Odyssey had attained as literary compositions in the time of Plato. It is very likely, too, that very inferior hands were employed to epitomize the old Troica, and that, by comparison with the Cyclic fragments, the Iliad seems to us the more genuine poem. But we cannot get rid of the positive evidence we have, that the old Homer was *not* our Iliad. When once the "non-Homeric" poems came to be regarded as detached compositions, separate names for them were found, or invented, as well as names for their supposed authors—the Cypria of Stasinus, the Aethiopis of Arctinus, the Little Iliad of Lesches, &c. Of course the term "Little Iliad" implies the pre-existence of a greater poem of that name. I have already remarked (§ iv.) that the so-called Little Iliad is probably the older and more authentic poem of the two.¹

Not a single passage in the extant plays of Aeschylus can be cited to show that he had "our Homer" before him. The Agamemnon is made up of legends from the *Κύπρια*, the *Νόστοι*, and the *Ἰλίου πέρις*. The consultation of Zeus and Themis, and the allusion to the birth of a mighty son from Thetis in the Prometheus,² to the stag killed in hunting by Agamemnon in the Electra of Sophocles,³ to the sacrifice of Iphigenia and the pretended marriage with Achilles, the carrying off of Helen and the prophecies of Cassandra, and to the marriage of Helen with Paris celebrated at Troy (Agam. 687),—all these topics are *known* to be from the

¹ Dr. Oberdick (*Quæstiones Aeschyleæ*, 1878, p. 13) assents to this view. "Ex epici cycli carminibus *Ἰλιάδα μικράν*, quam Aristoteles de poet. 23 ab Homérico carmine seiungendam esse docuit, priorem fuisse existimo cuius ad exemplum qui nostram confecit Iliadem carmini suo adsumpserit titulum, cum id, ut recte monuit Paleius, *Ἀχάλλης* potius quam *Ἰλιάς* inscribendum fuisset."

² v. 787.

³ v. 568.

Cypria. The *Ajax* and the *Philoctetes*, the *Andromache*, *Troades*, *Hecuba*, *Electra*, *Orestes* of Euripides, with the *Orestea* of Aeschylus, are taken from the "Little Iliad," the "Capture of Troy," and the "Return of the Heroes."

The "Post-Homerica" of Quintus Smyrnaeus, in fourteen books, already alluded to, is a continuation of the *Iliad*, and stands intermediate between it and the *Odyssey*. It embodies a great deal of matter familiarly known to and used by Aeschylus and Sophocles, as well as by Virgil. Yet, though the subject-matter is incontestably ancient, the versification betrays its late composition. The same is true of our Homeric texts, though they are so much earlier in date as to show fewer of the most flagrant "neoterisms."

§ VIII.

ON THE "HOMER" OF HERODOTUS.

THE *Iliad*, though it has certainly undergone a very extensive Attic recension, is in the main an Ionic and Asiatic composition. The "Catalogue," on the face of it, is the work of some Pierian or Boeotian bard who knew, from his professional visits, the towns and cities of upper Hellas. We know from Proclus that the *Cypria* contained *κατάλογον τῶν τοῖς Τρωσὶ συμμαχουσάντων*,¹ and it is exceedingly probable that an early *Ἰλιάς* or *Ἀχιλλήϊς* supplied this part of our great epic—for all early poems and histories, too, seem to have included lists of allies or adventurers. We have the same in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Apollonius Rhodius. The *Odyssey*, in all probability, is a Doric development of the Epos, originating in Magna Graecia, as already said.

¹ P. 236, ed. Westphal. The Trojan list in our *Il.* ii. 816 seqq. is meagre, and doubtless much abridged, in order to place the Greek forces in the higher estimation.

Herodotus, writing later than B.C. 450, may have known both, and, in fact, he mentions by name an *Iliad* (and an *Odyssey*¹). He doubts if the *Cypria* and the *Epigoni* were really (*i.e.* as was then commonly supposed) the work of "Homer." Nevertheless, it is clear that portions of the *Cypria* and other poems of the later *Cyclus* formed part of the *Troica*, which he regarded as Homeric.

When he says (ii. 53) that Homer and Hesiod "composed a theogony for the Greeks,"² and also that "Homer in the *Iliad* composed the wandering of Alexander (Paris)," he appears to have confused the *Iliad* with the *Cypria*. For whereas this wandering (*πλάνος*) is *not* in the *Iliad*, we know from the epitome of the *Cypria* given by Proclus that it *was* contained in that poem.³ We know, too, for certain, that the *Cypria* was anciently attributed to Homer.⁴ And while there is nothing whatever in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* even approaching to the nature of a "Theogony" (like Hesiod's poem, which the historian combines with Homer), it is perfectly clear from the extant fragments of the *Cypria* that that poem did treat, among other subjects, of the birth and origin of the gods. The Epic Cycle commenced with the union of Sky and Earth, and went on with *τὰ ἄλλως περὶ θεῶν τοῖς Ἑλλησι μυθολογούμενα*.⁵ Clearly, this refers either

¹ The reference to the *Odyssey* (in ii. 116) is generally allowed to be spurious.

² Mr. Mahaffy (i. p. 17) says this statement is "apparently true and full of import." If Herodotus really referred to our Homer, I should say, on the contrary, that such a statement was wholly unwarrantable and incorrect.

³ P. 234, ed. Westphal. The journey of Paris is just touched upon in *Iliad* vi. 290, but, like so many other points, merely in reference to the fuller and older stories.

⁴ οἱ μέντοι γε ἀρχαῖοι καὶ τὸν Κύκλον ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς αὐτόν, *ibid.* p. 233. And p. 242, οἱ μὲν ταῦτα (τὰ Κύπρια) εἰς Στασῖνον ἀναφέρουσι Κύπριον, οἱ δὲ Ὅμηρον κτλ.

⁵ Proclus, p. 233, Westphal. Sengebusch (*Diss. Prior.* p. 151) shows that the allusion in Herod. ii. 120 fin. is to the *Cypria*. He might have added, that the beginning of the same chapter has in view the lost Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις.

to the *Cypria* or to some introduction preceding it ; and to it Herodotus must really refer as a *Theogonia*.

Like a large part of Pindar and the Tragedies, a considerable portion of the *Iliad* itself is based on the *Cypria*. The marriage of Peleus and Thetis, the Judgment of Paris, the anger of Achilles against Agamemnon, his raids in the Troad,¹ his capture of Lycaon, Il. xxi. 35, the portent of the snake and the sparrows at Aulis, ii. 307, the assigning of Briseis to Achilles, and of Chryseis to Agamemnon, the demand for the restoration of Helen, were all themes of the *Cypria*, from which they are epitomized as incidents in our *Iliad*. I say *epitomized*, for to suppose that a casual and quite incidental mention of a story is older and more genuine than the full and detailed account of it—in other words, that the “Cyclics” were mere expansions of Homeric hints—is contrary to all probability, and is therefore a perverse mode of reasoning.

When Herodotus tells us (v. 67) that Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon, stopped the rhapsodes from reciting “the verses of Homer” because “they were full of the praises of Argos and the Argives,” Dean Blakesley observes on the passage that “the author’s remark is quite inapplicable to the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*,” and, on iv. 32, he gives reasons for thinking the *Thebais* is really meant, which was commonly attributed to Homer. The mention of “Ὅμηρος ὁ ἐποποιὸς” in vii. 161, as having praised some Athenian as ἄριστον τάξαι καὶ διακοσμήσαι στρατόν, seems to refer to Menestheus in Il. ii. 552-4, and there can be no doubt that *Iliad* ii. embodies much that is really ancient.²

The Homeric verse quoted by Syagrus in Herod. vii. 159, ἧ κε μέγ’ οἰμώζειεν ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων, which is

¹ Proclus, p. 236, κἄπειτα ἀπελαύνει (Ἀχιλλεύς) τὰς Αἰνείου βόας, καὶ Λύρνησον καὶ Πήδασον πορθεῖ καὶ συγχρᾶς τῶν περιοικίδων πόλεων. Compare with this Il. xx. 92, and Thuc. i. 11.

² On Il. ii. 126, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἐς δεκάδας διακοσμηθεῖμεν Ἀχαιοί, it may be remarked that the military division into δεκάδες, the Roman *decuriae*, was a custom of the age of Xenophon.

commonly regarded as a parody on Il. vii. 125, ἡ κε μέγ' οἰμῶξε γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς, is just as likely to be the older and more genuine verse, the λ in Πελοπίδης being pronounced double, like παῖ τοῦ Φρυγίου Τελεύαντος, in Soph. Aj. 210. Indeed, the aorist οἰμῶξαι, which occurs many times in the Iliad, seems itself a word of the Attic dialect of the Periclean age, though, of course, many will "see no reason why it should not have been in use B.C. 850."

Sengebusch, in his "Homeric Dissertation Prior" (pp. 139-154) has made an exhaustive examination of all the passages in Thucydides and Herodotus bearing upon the *Troica*. I say, *the Troica*, where he says "Homer," because I do not, of course, concede that mere allusions to the Trojan expedition, or to Agamemnon, Menelaus, or Helen are any proof in themselves that Herodotus had our text before him any more than Pindar and the Tragics had. The passages in i. 3, and v. 94 fin. certainly refer, not to our Iliad, but to a lost rhapsody on Ἑλένης ἀρπαγῇ, the subject of a play of Sophocles. The reference to Ἀθηναίῃ Ἰλιάς in the Πριάμου Πέργαμον, as visited by Xerxes (vii. 43), pertains to the temple mentioned in Il. vi. 270, where the allusion to the *peplos* seems to indicate an Attic recension of not very early times. The learned author constructs an argument from the allusion to ὤκεανός in Her. ii. 23 and Il. xxi. 194 seqq., not observing that a verse which violates the digamma, Ἀχελῷος ἰσοφαρίζει, must be of doubtful genuineness.¹ Nothing is gained by showing from ancient testimonies that Thucydides and Herodotus were considered Ὀμηρικοί. It was a necessary condition of early prose that it should contain many phrases from epic poetry. The idea of Thucydides "consulting MSS. of Homer" (p. 141) is, as I have elsewhere said, a statement resting on no testimony whatever.

¹ Ἀχελῷος *ἰσοφαρίζει* or (Curtius, Et. Gr. 381) *ἰσσοφαρίζει*, is equally liable to the suspicion of an Attic contraction. However, the ι might = our y.

§ IX.

ON THE "HOMER" OF PINDAR.

THE evidence of Pindar is, of course, most important; ¹ for not only does he thrice quote Homer by name in the Odes, and five times in the Fragments, and refer once (Nem. ii. 1) to the *Homeridae*, but he expressly cites subjects of the *Troica* about fifty times. The great majority of the allusions, as we find in the case in Aeschylus, are to that ancient and famed poem which we, with Herodotus, agree to distinguish as the *Cypria*. Such are the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, Ol. iii. 87, Isthm. vii. 28, Nem. iii. 35, iv. 65, v. 25; the prayer of Thetis to Zeus (a different one from that in Il. i. fin.), Ol. ii. 80; the birth of a son superior to his father (also alluded to, and in nearly the very same words, in Aesch. Prom. 942), Isthm. vii. 34; the building of Troy by Apollo and Poseidon, Ol. viii. 31; the first capture of the city by Hercules and Telamon, Isthm. iv. 38, v. 30, and Nem. iii. 37, iv. 25; the education of Achilles by the centaur Cheiron, Ol. vi. 22, Nem. iii. 45; the legends about Tantalus, Pelops, and Ganymede, Ol. i. 36, 44, 70, xi. 105, and ix. 10; ² the departure of Patroclus to Troy, and the

¹ Sengebusch, Diss. Pr. p. 166, does not seem to have gone sufficiently fully into this question. He remarks, "Argumenta narrata in Iliade, Odyssea, reliquis carminibus Homero adscriptis saepissime tetigit Pindarus." It is something to concede that Pindar's Homer was not the same as ours. He makes the same concession, somewhat reluctantly, about Aeschylus, p. 170, "necesse est adducamur eo ut Aeschylum non solas Iliadem et Odysseam Homeri credidisse poemata statuamus, sed omnia fere quae vulgo illi adscribebantur."

² Not all, though most of these subjects, are expressly recorded by Proclus as included in the *Cypria*. There were doubtless other early epics on the *Troica*, giving an account of the birth and exposure of the infant Paris, the invasion of Troy by Hercules, the oaths of the suitors, &c. &c. The account which we have of the *Cypria* is so brief that it must have comprised many more details than are given by Proclus.

fight with Telephus, Ol. ix. 70 ; Isthm. iv. 41 ; vii. 50 ; the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis, Pyth. xi. 22 ; Cycnus killed by Achilles, Ol. ii. 82 ; Isthm. iv. 39 ; the story of Idas and Lynceus, Nem. x. 110 ; the fleet brought to the shores of Troy by the Zephyr (Aesch. Ag. 674), Nem. vii. 29 ; the hero Protesilaus, Isthm. i. 58 ; the lameness of Philoctetes, Pyth. i. 54 ; the mention of Peleus and Telamon together with Achilles, in Pyth. viii. 100 ; probably also the allusion to Nestor in Pyth. iii. 112. Most of these subjects we know, from Proclus, were contained in the *Cypria* ; and we know, from Aelian, that Pindar himself believed the *Cypria* to have been Homer's work.

The *Aethiopis*, attributed by Proclus to Arctinus, contained the contests of Achilles and Antilochus with Memnon, Pyth. v. 32, Nem. vi. 58, *ibid.* iii. 63, Isthm. vii. 54, Ol. ii. 83, Pyth. vi. 32 ; the death of Achilles by the hand of Paris, Pyth. iii. 101, Isthm. vii. 38, the lamentation of Thetis with the Muses,¹ Isthm. vii. 58, and her removal of the body to λευκὴ ἄκτῇ, Nem. iv. 50 ; the dispute (στάσις) between Ajax and Ulysses for the arms of the dead hero was told in the *Aethiopis* ; see Nem. viii. 23-6, Isthm. iii. 53, together with the prowess of Ajax in defending the body of Achilles, Nem. viii. 30.

line of
Phaethon

In the *Little Iliad*, attributed to Lesches of Mytilene, the contest of Ajax and Ulysses for the arms, and the madness and suicide of the former were described ; see Nem. vii. 26, viii. 23. This, with the story of the wooden horse, both so briefly touched upon in the *Odyssey*, were among the most celebrated Homeric episodes of antiquity.² The allusion in the *Odyssey* (xi. 520) to the death of Eurypylus,

¹ The narrative in Od. xxiv. *init.* is taken from this, but is a later form of the legend, since the *nine* Muses are mentioned in v. 60. So the story of Thersites in Il. ii. 212, alluded to in Soph. Phil. 442, was in all probability adapted from the older story of his being killed by Achilles.

² ἵππου νεοσσός, ἀσπίδηφόρος λεώς, in Aesch. Ag. 825, must refer to it. The subject is common in the vase-paintings.

son of Telephus, by the hand of Neoptolemus, is also taken from the "Little Iliad." The capture of Ilium by Neoptolemus, Nem. vii. 35, was related in this poem; the hero's return to Epirus, and probably also his death through the jealousy of Orestes at Delphi, Nem. vii. 38-42, were subjects of the *Nóστοι*, as also the murder of Agamemnon and Cassandra by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, Ol. xi. 20, Pyth. xi. 20, and the revenge taken by Orestes and Pylades, Pyth. xi. 37. From this older poem the narrative appears to have been epitomized in the opening of the *Odyssey*.

Are there then *no* references in Pindar—as there appear to be none in Aeschylus—to the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*? It is not safe to speak decisively on this subject. A well-known passage in Nem. vii. 20,¹ proves nothing whatever, since the Homer of the Periclean age was full of the adventures of this hero. The reference to Ajax as praised by Homer in Isthm. iii. 55² is in precisely the same position, except that we know, from the allusion to fraudulent voting in the contest for the arms, Nem. viii. 26,³ that Pindar had *not* the same account of the contest for the arms as the brief narrative in our *Odyssey*, xi. 545, seqq.

The proverb cited as Homer's in Pyth. iv. 277⁴ has some faint, though very faint, resemblance to the verse, ἐσθλὸν γὰρ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἰδῆ, Il. xv. 207, which, perhaps, is another version of the same maxim.⁵ The reference to Glaucus and Bellerophon in Ol. xiii. 60, is

¹ ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι λόγον Ὀδυσσεύς ἢ πάθεν διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῇ γενέσθ' Ὀμηρον.

² ἀλλ' Ὀμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, δς αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.

³ κρυφαῖσί γὰρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῇ Δαναοὶ θεράπευσαν. Sengebusch (p. 167) thinks there is here a general reference to the deeds of Ajax in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

⁴ τὸν δ' Ὀμήρου καὶ τόδε συνθέμενος ῥῆμα πόρσυν', ἄγγελον ἐσθλὸν ἔφα τιμὰν μεγίσταν πράγματι παντὶ φέρειν.

⁵ Sengebusch (p. 168) thinks that Pindar is certainly *not* referring to the verse in question.

virtually the same, or nearly so,¹ as that in Il. vi. 145, seqq., but the context in Pindar shows that Glaucus told his story to disarm the fears of the Danaï on his first arrival. The mention of Nestor and the Lycian Sarpedon, in connection with the rhapsodists and the "loudly recited epics," in Pyth. iii. 12, refers to narratives the same as or resembling those of our Iliad. Lastly, the legend of the conflict between Hercules, Poseidon, Phoebus, and Hades, at Pylos, Ol. ix. 31, has some resemblance to Il. v. 395, *τλῆ δ' Ἀΐδης κτλ.* And the words *ἐν Τρωίᾳ μὲν Ἑκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν*, Nem. ii. 14, seem to allude to the *μονομαχία* in Il. vii.

A few Pindaric passages remain to be noticed, which we may call "unattached," as referring to legends not preserved to us. These are, Hector's glory at the Scamander and the Helorus, Nem. ix. 39, the wealth of Cinyras,² at Cyprus, Nem. viii. 18, Pyth. ii. 15, Teucer at Cyprus,³ Nem. iv. 46; the arrival of the sons of Antenor,⁴ at Cyrene with Helen, after the burning of Troy, Pyth. v. 85; the invulnerable bodies of Ajax and Achilles, Isthm. iii. 18, Diomed made immortal by Pallas, Nem. x. 7, Hector and Meleager, Isthm. vi. 32, the widely-spread fame of Peleus and Ajax, Isthm. v. 25; the departure of Peisander and Orestes from Amyclae; the thanks given to Achilles by Patroclus, Ol. xi. 19.

Every difficulty vanishes if we accept the view that the Homer of Pindar, like that of the Tragics, was very much more extensive than that which has come down to our times.

¹ Pindar makes Glaucus the son of Bellerophon, while in Il. vi. 119, 206, he is the grandson, his father being Hippolochus. The allusion to the wealth of the Rhodians in Il. ii. 670, has been compared with Ol. vii. 34 and 49, but the Homeric verse was rejected by some as spurious.

² He is referred to in Il. xi. 20—one of the many hints in our texts to older and fuller accounts.

³ Hor. Od. i. 7, 21, "Teucer Salamina patremque cum fugeret," &c.

⁴ The *Ἀντηνορίδαι* of Sophocles probably referred to the same legend.

§ X.

ON THE LOST GREEK DRAMAS COMPOSED FROM NON-HOMERIC THEMES.¹

(1.)

THE celebrity of the two great epic subjects, the *Troica* and the *Thebaica*—both of them, as I have often said, anciently attributed in their bulk and their entirety to Homer, before they were split up into minor poems to distinguish them from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—was so great, that about a hundred titles of tragedies (including Satyric plays) are known to us on the “Tale of Troy alone.” The following are ascribed to Aeschylus:—

Γλαῦκος πόντιος.	Ὅστολόγοι.
Ἑκτορος λύτρα or Φρύγες.	Παλαμήδης.
Θρῆσσαι.	Πηνελόπη.
Ἰφιγένεια.	Πρωτεύς.
Κίρκη.	Σαλαμίνιαι.
Μυρμιδόνες.	Τήλεφος.
Μυσοί.	Φιλοκτήτης.
Ὀπλων Κρίσις.	Ψυχαστασία.

From the hand of Sophocles we have a still longer list—excluding, with the *Orestea* of Aeschylus, his three plays *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Philoctetes*. These six extant plays, though closely related to subjects in the *Iliad* and the

¹ I have not seen Welcker, *De Graecis tragoediis* (Bonn, 1839), referred to by Sengebusch, p. 166, but my own long and independent study of the tragedies in connection with the Homeric question may be an apology for the present chapter, whatever be thought of the value of the argument. Sengebusch's general statement about the Tragic seems to me rather feeble (p. 171): “Sermo tragicorum differt sane ab Homericorum carminum nativo et sincero colore; sunt tamen, sive vocabulorum usum spectes sive constructionem verborum, sunt multa indicia, quae summam tragicos in imitando Homero collocasse operam patefaciant.”

Odyssey, nevertheless were not, as I have elsewhere proved, directly taken from our Homer.

Αἴας Λοκρός.	Νίπτρα ἢ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκαν-
Αἰχμαλωτίδες.	θοπλήξ.
Ἀλέξανδρος.	Ξοανηφόροι.
Ἀντηνορίδαι.	Ὀδυσσεὺς Μαινόμενος.
Ἀχαιῶν Σύλλογος.	Παλαμήδης.
Ἀχιλλέως Ἔρασταί.	Πηλεύς.
Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή.	Ποιμένες.
Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις.	Πολυξένη.
Ἑλένης γάμος.	Πρίαμος.
Ἑρμιόνη.	Σκύριαι.
Εὐρύαλος.	Τεῦκρος.
Ἰφιγένεια.	Τήλεφος.
Ἰοβάτης.	Τρώϊλος.
Κρίσις (of Goddesses).	Τυνδάρεως.
Κλυταιμνήστρα.	Φθιωτίδες.
Λάκαιναι.	Φιλοκτήτης ἐν Τροίᾳ.
Λαοκόων.	Φοῖνιξ.
Ναύπλιος.	Φρύγες.
Μέμνων.	Χρύσης.
Μυσοί.	Φαίακες.
Ναυσικάα.	

Euripides, besides the extant *Andromache*, *Cyclops*, *Electra*, *Hecuba*, *Helena*, two *Iphigenias*, *Orestes*, and *Rhesus*, also composed on the theme of the *Troica*

Ἀλέξανδρος.	Σκύριαι.
Παλαμήδης.	Τήλεφος.
Πηλεύς.	Φιλοκτήτης.
Πλεισθένης.	Φοῖνιξ.
Πρωτεσίλαος.	

To the above must be added the titles of plays which Aristotle (Poet. § 23 fin.) gives, without naming the authors, as taken directly from the "Little Iliad":—

“Οπλων κρίσις (that of Aeschylus, perhaps).	Λάκαιναι (Sophoclis?).
Φιλοκτήτης (Sophoclis?).	Ἰλίου πέρσις.
Νεοπτόλεμος.	Ἰλίου ἀπόπλους.
Εὐρύπυλος.	Σίνων.
Πτωχία (sc. Ulyssis).	Τρωάδες (Euripidis?)

Diogenes Laertius (vi. 12, 80) enumerates the Ἑλένη, the Θυέστης, Ἀχιλλεύς, Χρύσιππος, all evidently taken from the non-Homeric *Troica*, and attributed to Diogenes the Cynic. We know also (sup. p. 17) of the Ἀχιλλεύς of Chaeremon.

(2.) The evidence of Greek Comedy, extending as it did in full vigour from the age of Pericles till beyond that of Alexander the Great, or for nearly two centuries, is of the utmost importance to this question. “Si lustrare pergerem” (says Sengebusch¹) “Homericos” (he should rather have added, “vel non-Homericos”) “comicorum locos, parodias, glossas, argumenta, justus liber nasceretur De Comicorum studiis Homericis inscribendus. Sed ea de re ut liber justus scribatur valde optandum est; neque enim ullo alio modo melius doceri poterit quam accuratam, si non omnes Graeci, certe Athenienses, Homeri habuerint notitiam, quantique fecerint eam.”

From the index of known Greek Comedies given in Meineke's *Fragmenta* (vol. i. p. 569, seqq.), the following list is taken of plays bearing on the *Troica*:²

Ἀγχίσης (two plays).	Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή.
Ἀλθαία.	Ἑλένης μνηστήρες.
Ἀχιλλεύς (two plays).	Καλυψώ.
Βελλεροφόντης.	Κένταυρος (seven plays).
Γλαῦκος (three plays).	Κίρκη (two plays).
Ἑλένη (four plays).	

¹ Dissert. Prior. p. 181.

² Most of these are enumerated by Sengebusch, Dissert. Prior. pp. 174-176. For the sake of brevity the mere titles are here set down without the names of the authors or the school of comedy to which they belonged.

Κύκλωψ.	Ὀρέστης.
Κύκλωπες.	Παλαμήδης.
Κύκνος (two plays).	Πέλοψ.
Μελέαγρος (two plays).	Πηνελόπη.
Μενέλεως.	Πλύντριοι ἢ Ναυσικάα.
Μυρμιδόνες (two plays).	Πρωτεσίλαος.
Μυσοί.	Σειρήνες (two plays).
Ναυσικάα (two plays).	Τρῶες.
Νηρεύς (two plays).	Τρώϊλος.
Νηρηίδες.	Τυνδάρεως.
Ὀδυσσεύς (six plays).	Φιλοκτήτης (two plays).
Ὀδυσσεύς.	Χείρων.
Οἰνόμαος ἢ Πέλοψ (two plays).	

It is an important remark,¹ that whereas the old comedy took very few subjects from our Homer, the middle comedy, and that alone, shows familiarity with our texts. “Frequentasse certe Homericæ argumenta solam mediam comœdiam apparet.” This falls in exactly with the theory I have been advocating, that an Attic edition of Homer first used as *the* Homer by Plato, and on Plato’s authority taken as the authorized Homer by Aristarchus, *superseded* the older and essentially different “Homer” of Pindar and Aeschylus. I feel certain that this statement is strictly true. In earlier times, Tantalus, Pelops, Tyndareus, Ganymede, Atreus, and Thyestes were the main topics, with love-stories about Helen and Paris.² If not the *Cypria*, some similar epics passed as *Homer* B.C. 450. There can be no doubt at all about that.

Now it is not, of course, contended that *none* of the above plays have anything in common with our Homeric texts. Dr. Hayman indeed has taken great pains to establish the contrary proposition. But the main argument is not in the least affected by the success or failure of the attempt;

¹ See Sengebusch, Diss. Pr. p. 176.

² πολύαρνι Θυέστη in B. 106 refers to the oft-told story in Euripides (*e.g.* El. 705) about the golden lamb.

and the same remark applies equally to the paintings of Trojan subjects on the earlier Greek vases, which are all but exclusively non-Homeric. I have myself examined the immense collections of these in the Louvre and the British Museum (not to mention several minor ones, *e.g.* that in the Fitzwilliam at Cambridge), and I know of but two or three among the earlier kind which can fairly be referred to any episode in our Homeric texts.¹ With regard to the plays, it is at once granted that the subjects of the *Ἑκτορος λύτρα*, *Κίρκη*, *Πηνελόπη*, *Φιλοκτήτης*, *Ναυσικάα*, possibly *Φοῖνιξ* and *Φαίακες*, and one or two others, are touched upon or contained in our Homer, as are the extant *Cyclops* and *Rhesus*. But this need not surprise us, because, if our texts were worked up and rearranged from the older and more extensive materials, it could hardly happen but that some episodes would be retained nearly or quite in the same form. No sound reasoner can draw the conclusion, that because some few episodes in the *Iliad* were known to the Tragicists, therefore the *Iliad* existed as we have it, much less that it was *the* Homer to which everything else was secondary. What is contended for is simply this—that as the great bulk of the Tragedies on Troy are certainly non-Homeric, therefore *our* Homer could not have had any special celebrity, authority, or precedence, if it had a definite existence.

The deeds of prowess of Ajax, Ulysses, Diomedes, and Hector were, without much doubt, narrated in the time of Pericles in various and arbitrary combinations; indeed, until there was a written *Iliad*, and a settled and authorized literary text, there *could* have been no fixity in the subjects, since the known amount of epics on the *Troica* was so very great that the stories *must* have been perpetually blended and interlaced. The recitals of the rhapsodists were simply to amuse;² and it is self-evident that local heroes would naturally have precedence given them.

¹ For numerous vase-paintings exist exhibiting the Homeric heroes under many different aspects.

² See *sup.* § 6.

How superficially Mr. Mahaffy has treated this great question of the tragic Homer, or the Homer of Tragedy, is shown by the following passage:¹ "As regards the tragic poets, not only did Aeschylus profess his tragedies to be morsels (τρεμάχην) from the mighty banquets of Homer, but Sophocles copied the *Odyssey* in many dramas (!), and his vulgar admirers were wont to call him *the tragic Homer*. Passing on to satyric and comic poetry, we have still the *Cyclops* of Euripides, many titles of satyric dramas from Aeschylus and the rest, and indeed the *Margites* is named in the *Poetics* as the direct forerunner of comedy."

Allusions to the *Cyclops*, which was clearly a very popular story (and its distinctly solar character² indicates that in some form it was a very ancient one) are not in themselves sufficient to prove the existence of our *Odyssey*, which is so largely made up of allusions to other "Cyclic" subjects. There were doubtless poems on the adventures of Ulysses,³ not only well known to the Tragic poets, but referred to by Herodotus and Thucydides (iv. 24, vi. 2), in which the solar-legends of Circe, the oxen of the Sun, and the Descent into Hades, were described. No one can doubt this; nevertheless, the poem as we have it is beyond doubt a literary edition and compilation of very much later times than those of Solon or Peisistratus.

¹ Vol. i. p. 32.

² The extinction of the circular orb in the forehead of the sky. Ulysses himself seems a type of the westering sun; indeed, the name *Odysseus* may well be connected with *δύεσθαι*. Similarly *Καλυψώ* is the "Coverer," and *Κίρκη* is the she-kite that snatches the hero away. In a very interesting and important passage of Euripides, *Troas*. 435 seqq., we have an epitome of the adventures of Ulysses as they were current in the time of that poet. The escape of the hero under the belly of a ram, on which there is a joke in *Ar. Vesp.* 180, is depicted on a rather early vase in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. On the general question, how far the vase-painters did or did not follow our Homeric texts, an important essay by H. Luckenbach has just come into my hands (Leipzig, 1880).

³ See sup. § 4.

§ XI.

ON THE REPETITIONS AND VARIATIONS OF THE HOMERIC STORIES.¹

THIS is a curious and important subject of inquiry; and it is one on which an argument may be founded for two different conclusions. We may say, for example, as most persons do say, that the account of the Arms of Achilles in the 18th book of the Iliad, and the bearing of the body of Sarpedon through the air by Sleep and Death in II. xvi. are the original stories, and the "Scutum" attributed to Hesiod, which has some phrases identical, and the bearing of the body of Memnon by Eos, which is depicted on early vases, are mere copies of it. On the other hand, it may be maintained (and, as I think, with much greater probability), that there were many versions of these and similar stories, and that not only are there several of these which have been combined in our poems, but the earlier stories, some of which are mentioned in the Tragics, have given place to the later versions in our poems.

It is worth while briefly to consider the evidence for this.

The divine armour, as a description of ideal and supernatural art, was a very favourite subject. Not only were divine arms given by the gods to Peleus on his marriage, of which we have a description in Eur. Elect. 444, but in another account of the same poet (Iph. Aul. 1072), Thetis is said to have presented arms to her son, made by Hephaestos, which he *brought with him* to Troy. But Memnon also had a *ἡφαιστότευκτον πανοπλίαν*, as Proclus tells us² was narrated in the *Aethiopis*; and we have a very long and graphic account of the shield of Eurypylus in Q. Smyrnaeus (lib. vi.), and another of that of Achilles (vii. 195). Again, it is by the direct intervention of Apollo

¹ See sup. § 4 (2).

² P. 237, Westphal.

that both Patroclus and Hector are killed in the Iliad, and precisely the same was told of the death of Achilles in the Aethiopis—ὑπὸ Πάριδος ἀναιρεῖται καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος.¹ Both Ajax and Achilles were represented as ἄτρωτοι, “invulnerable;” both Helen and Penelope had a host of suitors; both Circe and Calypso were sorceresses, who detained Ulysses against his will; both Antiphates and the Cyclops were cannibal giants, who ate the companions of Ulysses, and pelted his ship with rocks; both Glaucus (vi. 150) and Aeneas (xx. 213) address their adversary with the same couplet.

These are merely examples of a marked feature in our Homeric texts. Any impartial inquirer will easily multiply instances of the same tale differently told, having found its way into both the Iliad and the Odyssey. The only reasonable inference is that these poems are not the originals, but made up by editors and διορθωταὶ from the earlier and more genuine compositions of the ἀοιδοί.

§ XII.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.

IF the views put forward in this pamphlet have any truth in them—and they are the well-matured convictions of many years of study and thought—it follows that the ordinarily received opinions about Homer and the Cyclic poets are almost completely erroneous. For, I repeat, so far from the Iliad and the Odyssey being the original works, of which the epic poems, known as “Cyclic,” were imitations and amplifications, the material or subject-matter, though not the actual versification, of the Cyclics represented the older and more authentic version of the tale of Troy; and the Iliad and the Odyssey are little more than reproductions of,

¹ P. 238, Westphal.

and compilations from them. A large portion of the Homeric vocabulary seems to me so palpably spurious and imitative, that I wonder more and more at its general acceptance as the language of B.C. 850. This view I first put forward in a pamphlet, written, with a hope of attracting the attention of European scholars, in Latin.¹ The very few who, in this country, took the trouble to open it, no doubt laid it down as "absurd." For my own part, I still say I can find no escape from the conclusions to which the facts I have brought forward seem to lead. And it is partly because Mr. Mahaffy has done little more than re-state Mr. Grote's view of the Homeric controversy, that I have again pressed the reconsideration of the matter on the attention of the learned.

¹ "Homeri quae nunc exstant an reliquis Cycli carminibus antiquiora jure habita sint." (Norgate.)

THE END.

