

STACK  
ANNEX

PA  
4037  
Z5B6  
1880

A

0  
0  
0  
1  
3  
4  
9  
7  
9  
4



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



Henry W. Lefz.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation





# THE ORIGIN OF THE HOMERIC POEMS

A Lecture

BY

DR. HERMANN BONITZ

*TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION*

BY LEWIS R. PACKARD



NEW YORK

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS

FRANKLIN SQUARE

1880

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1879, by  
HARPER & BROTHERS,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.



STACK  
ANNEX  
PA  
4037  
2586  
1880

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

---

THE following lecture was delivered in 1860 in Vienna, and has passed through four editions in Germany. It has been recognized by many scholars as presenting in brief space and with fairness the points involved in the discussion, and the progress which has been made towards a solution of the problem. I have been led to translate it mainly by the fact, as I suppose it to be, that there is no work in English which gives any just idea of the difficulties in the way of accepting the Homeric poems as the production of one poet, unless it be the large and expensive work of Mure, which defends the unity of authorship. It seemed desirable that there should be accessible in English a partial statement of the reasons which have led so many German scholars to doubt the unity of authorship of the poems. Besides, the notes contain a very valuable, though not of course a complete,

bibliography of the subject, which would be of great service to one taking up the study of the Homeric question.

I have translated the lecture in full; but in the notes I have taken the liberty of omitting and condensing, so far as could be done without detracting from their value. The references I have verified so far as was within my power.

LEWIS R. PACKARD.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE HOMERIC POEMS.

---

ON the threshold of Greek literature, as its earliest known work, not to us only, but to the Greeks themselves at the height of their historical development,<sup>1</sup> stand two majestic poems, to which few other works of profane literature can be compared, either for manifold influence on the intellectual life of their own nation, or for admiring recognition among all peoples of high culture, even after the lapse of twenty-five centuries—the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer. It seemed even to the ancients that the imperishable works of Greek literature, especially in poetry, were but the variously unfolded flowers of a tree whose root and trunk were the Homeric poems.<sup>2</sup> The Greek epic poetry was at first an echo, in later times a conscious imitation, of Homer. The founder of Greek tragedy in its classic grandeur, the mighty Aeschylus, declared himself that his poems were but fragments fallen

from the rich table of Homer;<sup>3</sup> and the choicest praise of Sophokles—that master-poet whose dramas, even in modern times, in feeble reproductions, without the glory of festive representation, without the rhythmic dance of the chorus, without the inimitable flavor of the original language, yet fascinate their hearers—was that his tragedies eminently displayed a Homeric character.<sup>4</sup> The Greek historians based their work on Homer, at first in unquestioning reception of his legends and involuntary imitation of his narrative style, afterwards in critical explanation of the subject-matter of his poems.<sup>5</sup> The Greek philosophy, although, in its effort to solve by the intellect the highest problems of humanity, it gradually came into most decided conflict with the popular faith and with the Homeric poems, the most sacred representative of that faith,<sup>6</sup> yet, at the same time, sought eagerly to find in those poems the foundation of its convictions.<sup>7</sup> From Homer, from certain particular verses of the *Iliad*, Pheidias, in the highest bloom of Greek sculpture, derived the idea of the Zeus which he set forth at Olympia for the veneration of the people.<sup>8</sup> At Athens, the intellectual centre of Greece,

the systematic reading of the Homeric poems was made, by an institution of Solon's, an important part of the greatest national festival from the beginning of the sixth century before Christ.<sup>9</sup> From the time that reading and writing were introduced as a constant element into the education of the Athenian youth, the poems of Homer, especially the Iliad, formed the primary and necessary material for training in these matters, as well as in memorizing and in reading aloud;<sup>10</sup> and when, in the fifth century B.C., a young Athenian of noble family boasts in company that he still knows by heart the whole Iliad and Odyssey, no one finds anything incredible in the statement.<sup>11</sup> Whatever Greek classic, in poetry or prose, we read,<sup>12</sup> whatever branch of Greek culture we study, an intimate acquaintance with Homer is an indispensable condition of a thorough understanding of it, for the literature and all the intellectual life of the Hellenic people are bound by a thousand threads to the poems of Homer.

To this universality of influence among his own people,<sup>13</sup> of which the instances above given are only hints, corresponds the range of extension abroad of

these poems. They have gone far beyond the limits which are ordinarily set for the greatest works of genius by the lapse of time, the divergencies of national character, and the growth of new civilizations. Since the leading modern nations have definitely recognized the connection of their own culture with that of the classical nations of antiquity, and have found for this conviction an expression, necessarily varying in different times, in the form they have given to the higher education, the Homeric poems have taken a prominent place in the training of all whose early years give them an opportunity to study Greek. Although the learning of that language is in some cases made much too laborious, so that in after-years one looks back upon the time spent in it as so much fruitless waste, yet commonly the reading of Homer forms a bright spot on the dark background. For so soon as the first struggle with the discouraging abundance of forms and words is over, the fresh immortal youth in the poetry affects the student with a resistless charm. And though the delicate bloom of the original is destroyed by the loss of the sounds themselves in a translation, yet there remains a

vigorous material of true poetry so indestructible that all the cultivated peoples of modern times regard a successful translation of Homer as a real gain to their own national literature.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the effect upon our own German literature of the appearance of Voss's translation is still manifest from the letters and memories of that most active period of our literary history; and it will continue to be marked in its influence upon our poetry when those recollections shall have long lost their freshness. The poetry of Homer in the version of Voss became a common inheritance of all cultivated persons, in which every one felt it his duty to claim a share. It cannot, indeed, be compared with the original in exquisite effects of language, in the natural flow of the rhythm, in life-like richness of significance, in picturesqueness of epithets; but its true and faithful reproduction of many characteristics of the poems widened the circle of those who could advance from vague admiration to distinct knowledge of the name and poetry of Homer. The sharp clearness of sensual perceptions and the poet's self-abandonment to them, the power of natural passion, the vividness of presentation of out-

ward events or inward emotion, and all this controlled by a judicious moderation which seems to have been the happy endowment of the Greek intellect—these characteristics of Homer became, as it were, a standard of truth to nature, to which every descriptive poem must conform.<sup>15</sup> For, to use Goethe's words, "Homer presents realities, we mostly effects; he paints the terrible, we the terror; he the charming, we the charm."<sup>16</sup> When Lessing compares poetry, as to the power of representation, with the plastic arts, and draws with conclusive criticism the fixed boundaries of the two fields, it is in Homer especially, whose truth to nature he trusts as if it were Nature herself, that he finds the norm for poetry. No poet of our time and of our people approaches so nearly to Homer's objectiveness as Goethe himself, who so sharply contrasted him with modern poets in the words above quoted, and it was Goethe who gave up *Nausikaa* as a theme after it had fascinated him and he had already sketched a plan of treatment, on the ground that no one could safely venture into such rivalry with Homer.<sup>17</sup>

When we consider thus the power of these



poems, we understand how their author was thought worthy by his own people of heroic, almost of divine, honors,<sup>18</sup> and was referred to by them as “the poet,” without further definition. What the admiration of his people expressed in this way has been confirmed in its true significance by the testimony of succeeding generations.

But the almost divine honor of this hero-poet in his own nation, and the undisputed recognition he obtained through more than two thousand years, could not protect him from the sudden uprising of doubts, one may say, as to his very existence, and of a theory of the most opposite character as to the origin of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. We may state the new views somewhat as follows :

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which we call the poems of Homer, are not the work of a single poet ; but each of them—certainly, at least, of the older of the two, the *Iliad*, this may be confidently said—is made up of the separate songs of different poets. For hundreds of years there were in circulation among the Greek tribes heroic songs about the incidents of the Trojan legend, each one of moderate length, each containing only a single transaction,

designed to be sung with the accompaniment of the lyre, and to be heard by a company who, after a banquet at any festival occasion, would enjoy recalling the achievements of their ancestors. In course of time these separate songs were combined according to the order of the story, at first into large groups and then into the complete wholes, pretty much as we now have them, and were then, at last, made permanent in written form by the orders of Peisistratos, in the sixth century before Christ. It is, then, not the work of a single man, but the poetic product of a long period, which we find incorporated into the Iliad.

These are some of the principal ideas which F. A. Wolf, the founder of philological science as now understood, set forth near the close of the last century in his *Prolegomena to the Homeric poems*.<sup>19</sup> As the veneration for the name of Homer, then freshly intensified by the recent publication of Voss's translation, had not been confined to the narrow circle of professional Greek scholars, so the excitement produced by Wolf's book extended far beyond that limited range.<sup>20</sup> The philosopher Fichte declared, out of lively sympathy, that he

himself had reached, on *a priori* grounds, the same result that Wolf had attained through historical research, an expression of approval to which Wolf replied with humorous irony. Of more weight was the entire assent to his views of the acute scholar W. von Humboldt. On the other hand, Schiller, who maintained with Humboldt a lively and fruitful exchange of thought on æsthetic questions, declared it absolutely barbarous to think of dismembering the Iliad or of its having ever been put together from originally separate songs.<sup>21</sup> Lest we should suppose this the unanimous verdict of true poets on the theories of philologists, let us hear at once Goethe's enthusiastic assent to Wolf's views<sup>22</sup>—

“Erst die Gesundheit des Mannes, der, endlich vom Namen Homeros

Kühn uns befreiend, uns auch ruft in die vollere Bahn!

Denn wer wagte mit Göttern den Kampf, und wer mit dem Einen?

Doch Homeride zu sein, auch nur als letzter, ist schön.”

Still the same Goethe, in his old age, withdrew his assent to Wolf's revolutionary view, and preferred

to believe in, and gladly open his mind to, Homer as an individual, his poems as a whole.<sup>23</sup>

We cannot here trace out further the sketch of these various and varying impressions made by Wolf's views. It must be enough to have given the principal facts in connection with the leading names, which may serve as a type of what went on in the educated world at large. The waves of discussion would soon have subsided, and peaceful acquiescence in the traditional views have returned, had nothing but a troublesome paradox been thrown out to the world in Wolf's book. The merit of the book, that which makes it a notable and fruitful event in the field of historical science, is not the boldness of its attack upon a generally received opinion, but the conscientiousness of its method. For nearly twenty years Wolf silently entertained and examined the ideas which are unfolded in his *Prolegomena*.<sup>24</sup> All that could be detected by an eye steadily fixed on the subject in the laboriously gathered traditions of antiquity, in the poems themselves, in the general progress of culture—all this he considered with the strictest conscientiousness before he finally, with unmistakable reluctance,<sup>25</sup> re-

solved to break loose from a belief which had been no less warmly cherished by him than by others, and which only the pitiless force of reasoning compelled the earnest investigator to abandon. This merit of his book no one has remarked more justly than F. Schlegel, a man to whom certainly cannot be ascribed any pleasure in the overthrow or weakening of an old and settled state of things. "Wolf's book," says he, "by the thirst for knowledge and love of truth which inspire it, and by its firm grasp and close linking-together of so long a series of thoughts and observations in such a field, is a thorough model of the investigation of a point in ancient history, and yet its defenders comprehended it almost as little, to say nothing of using it, as its assailants did." The want which Schlegel saw in Wolf's contemporaries was made good in time; the following generation, no longer bewildered by the novelty of his theory, gave his investigations their true value by developing fully the various lines of research first opened by him. The thorough study of the poems in regard to their internal consistency and their linguistic and metrical form, the examination of all the statements

of ancient writers bearing upon Homer and the Homeric poems, the combination of these researches with a study of the general course of culture among the Greeks, and the comparison of their results with kindred phenomena in other nations—all these points must be separately and fully weighed before a settled conclusion can be attained. To one scholar, K. Lachmann,<sup>26</sup> the acute investigator in the field of the early German poetry, belongs indisputably the special merit of having given, in his minute and exhaustive study of one single point—the self-consistency of the Iliad—a model for such examinations, and an important contribution to the solving of the problem. He does not, however, stand alone; for in this field, as in the others, each of which must be separately worked, other scholars have brought further support to the view proposed by Wolf. And, at the same time, with no less acuteness and zeal for the truth, has everything been used which could support the traditional belief in the original unity of each poem, and in Homer as their author.<sup>27</sup> The great importance of the Homeric poems, not only in relation to Greek history and literature, but also to all epic poetry, has

brought it about that the "Homeric question," to use the common phrase, in all the course of the discussion as well as at its beginning, has secured the attention of learned men even outside of the circle of specialists. But for such lookers-on it is difficult, almost impossible, to find their way through the labyrinth of separate investigations of all kinds, which form by this time an extensive literature in themselves.<sup>28</sup> The fatigue of this confused discussion is producing now an effect somewhat similar to that which the novelty of the theory at first produced. Sympathies and antipathies, convictions which, however well-founded, have nothing to do with the question, have more weight than real study of the subject. Opprobrious epithets occasionally take the place of arguments. A foolish timidity suspects in this attack upon the traditions of two thousand years—for that seems, at first, the tendency of Wolf's ideas—a connection with other tendencies of the time, tendencies with which pure historical research has nothing to do. An æsthetic dogmatism which, as we have seen, can shelter itself behind the names of Schiller and Goethe despises the barbarous pedantry which cuts up great

poetic creations into fragments; and a frivolity which is not ashamed to put on airs of scientific omniscience looks with pity on the long-since refuted paradoxes of Wolf. It is impossible, in a single lecture of popular character, to go through such an involved discussion, and it would be unseemly to urge in such a form one's personal views on disputed points. But it may be possible to show on what grounds the whole question as to the origin of the Homeric poems is justified—what are the means for its solution, and within what narrow limits the matters still in dispute between the opposed parties have been restricted. These are the questions which will now occupy us.

“He who doubts that the Iliad and Odyssey, essentially in their present form, are the work of one poet, and that poet Homer, each originally a single mental product, is in conflict with the unanimous conviction of all antiquity. How can any one, separated by thousands of years from the period of the poems, possessing only scanty remains of so abundant a literature, be so foolish or so daring as to contradict the unanimous testimony of Homer's own nation?” †



This idea, expressed in manifold forms, excludes from the start all question as to the origin of the Homeric poems as unwarranted and inadmissible. It would have great weight if only it were quite true. Such a Homer, however, the author of these two poems, belonging, as any actual person must, to a definite time and a definite place, though he has gradually won a position in manuals of history, yet is not directly attested by any real historic document. Let us see what is the real content of tradition as to the principal points in regard to Homer and the Homeric poems.<sup>29</sup>

The ancient Greeks possessed, besides the Iliad and Odyssey, a number of other epic poems of some extent connected with the Trojan myths,<sup>30</sup> which were concerned with parts of the legend preceding and following these two poems. The existence of this body of epic poetry can be traced back to a considerable distance beyond the beginning of the Greek national life.<sup>31</sup> Of it all we possess now but a few fragments, with some summaries of the narratives and other notices; yet there are enough data not only to bring before us the great extent of the epic poetry on the Trojan theme, but also to enable us

to recognize the fact that these other poems, though related to the Iliad and Odyssey, are distinguished from them by characteristic differences.<sup>32</sup> In regard to every one of these outlying Trojan epics, there exists a tradition uniform as to the place of origination, and uniform, or in some cases varying between two names, as to the name of the author.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, the time of composition belongs to a period not far removed from the light of historic knowledge. In spite of all this, these poems, together with the Iliad and Odyssey, are sometimes ascribed to Homer. Homer is regarded as the author not only of the Iliad and Odyssey, but, besides, of the other Trojan epics, either of most of them or of all; or even of all these and of the so-called Homeric hymns to the gods besides. This comprehensive meaning is given to the name of Homer not only by those who were little in sympathy with the intellectual spirit and literature of the Greek people, but also by men whose statement is to us unquestioned authority.<sup>34</sup> The idea of limiting Homer's authorship to the Iliad and Odyssey alone is held by only an individual here and there in the classical time; it does not become an established

belief until, in the third century before Christ, Alexandria becomes the centre of Greek learning and culture.<sup>35</sup> This belief is therefore the result of study, which did not reach definite conclusion until some five hundred years had passed since the Iliad was a completed work. On the other hand, the direct historical testimony of the classical period ascribes to Homer works of such extent and such widely differing character that even the boldest fancy might well hesitate to attribute them to a single man.

When, then, and where did this incomparable genius live? It is a well-known story, embalmed in several Greek epigrams,<sup>36</sup> that seven cities contended for the honor of having been Homer's birthplace. Another Greek epigram gives the happy poetical solution of the puzzle, that no spot on earth, but heaven itself, is his true fatherland;<sup>37</sup> but the historical solution of the difficulty is not at all furthered by this ingenious suggestion. For the numerous birthplaces of Homer are not merely poetic fancy, but in sober prose we find a still greater number of claimants; among them Smyrna, Kolophon, and Miletus on the coast of Asia

Minor; Athens in Greece proper; Ios, Chios, Kypros, and Krete among the islands. And always, no matter how late in time the statement is made,<sup>38</sup> some unexceptionable ancient authority is given for it, so that we have absolutely no right to rank the claim of one place clearly above that of another. Moreover, as to most of the places which claimed to be his birthplace, we find the further statement that there was a school there for the cultivation of epic poetry, associated by the tradition of art from generation to generation into a sort of family.<sup>39</sup> The tradition of such schools of poets exists, also, in the case of other places, as to which the statement that Homer was born or resided there may perhaps be only accidentally lost to us.<sup>40</sup> And when did Homer live? We should not be surprised to find in so unhistorical a period an uncertainty of some fifty or a hundred years; but when the statements as to the time of his life range from the period of the Greek migrations to Asia Minor—that is, about the middle of the eleventh century—down to the last third of the seventh century before Christ, and when all the statements fixing different points in this long period go back to authorities

among which we cannot give any decided preference to one over another,<sup>41</sup> then we recognize that we have to do with something more than the mere chronological inaccuracy of an early age. - According to these accounts, Homer's life falls anywhere within a period of more than four hundred years, and that during a time marked by the most extensive changes in the social condition of the Greeks on both sides of the Aegean Sea. For this variation in regard to the place and the time of Homer's life,<sup>42</sup> the real historical significance has been determined by a recent investigation, in which one can hardly tell whether to admire most the self-evident simplicity of the main idea, or the merciless rigor of the historical argument.<sup>43</sup> It is this: Every statement as to time belongs to the tradition of a particular locality. Thus the birth of Homer, according to the tradition of Smyrna, falls in the middle of the eleventh century; according to that of Chios, about two generations later, or the beginning of the tenth century; according to that of Samos, in the ninth century; and so on. Also to the ninth century belonged, according to Samian tradition and to Herodotus,<sup>44</sup> the residence of Homer at Samos and the

founding of the school of poets there; whereas the latter event at Chios, according to Chian tradition, fell at the beginning of the tenth century. If, now, the name Homer, as has been shown, is made to bear all the epic poetry of the Trojan circle of myths; if this Homer is reported as born at different points in the Greek world during a period of more than four centuries; if in each instance there is connected with his birth or residence in a given locality the story of the rise of a school of epic poetry in the same locality, then for any one who does not allow himself to accept or to reject any of these facts by itself the conclusion is irresistible. The statements as to Homer's birth at different places and at different times are really statements as to the beginning of epic poetry in the several localities. The sequence of dates and places yields a history of the spread of such poetry over the western coast of Asia Minor and among the islands. The order in which Smyrna, Chios, Kolophon, and so on to the remote Kypros and Krete, arrange themselves according to the succession of the respective traditions of time, corresponds to the geographical position or the political relations of the

several places, and so furnishes an unsought confirmation of this theory.<sup>45</sup>

To these historical data in regard to the person of Homer let us now add the facts which are established as to the poems, without reference to the name of their author.

The Iliad and Odyssey were not originally committed to writing, but orally delivered. All the attacks made upon this proposition since Wolf first proved it have only served to establish its truth more firmly.<sup>46</sup> The poems themselves, by their form and contents, make it probable. Nowhere do we find in the narrative of the poems or in the numerous similes the slightest hint of the existence of the art of writing, not even where there was natural occasion for mention of it.<sup>47</sup> The language also, in its power of adapting itself to the metre by lengthening and shortening, separating and contracting, the vowels, shows a flexibility that is incomparably more natural for the spoken word than for the word fixed in a given form by writing.<sup>48</sup> But the supposition that is thus made highly probable becomes certain from other considerations. In the eighth century before Christ, the Ili-

ad was already a completed work, as appears from the fact that other epics composed at that time by the limitations of their own subject-matter recognize the limits of that of the Iliad as already settled.<sup>49</sup> It is not until a full century later that we find the first beginnings of the use among the Greeks of the art of writing, and then it is for the recording of laws.<sup>50</sup> But from the use of writing to record the brief formulas of ancient laws to the use of it for long poems is a progress involving so many indispensable steps as to require a very long time. Poems so long as the Iliad and the Odyssey—one 16,000, the other 12,000 lines—are not written down, so long as the habit of hearing them recited is universal and there is no hope of their finding readers. The preservation of these poems, by oral tradition only, for a couple of centuries, which in itself is not without a parallel in the history of epic poetry,<sup>51</sup> is in this case the less surprising by reason of the historical fact that there were schools of poets who made it their business to cultivate epic poetry, and to recite and transmit the heroic songs of their ancestors.

The earliest well-authenticated case of the com-



mission of the Iliad and Odyssey to writing occurred at Athens in the latter half of the sixth century before Christ, when the work was done by a committee organized by Peisistratos.<sup>52</sup> That this was the first time that the whole of the poems was written down may be clearly inferred from the form and character of the numerous statements in regard to it. If it had been only a combination and connection of written copies previously existing, it would never have been, as it now is, celebrated as an important event, as the accomplishment of a difficult task. And surely the ordinance of Solon, before the time of Peisistratos, directing the succession in the delivery of the Homeric songs at the great Panathenaic festival at Athens would have taken a different form if he could have referred to existing written copies.

After Peisistratos, and more especially after the end of the fifth century before Christ, when the love of reading became more general, copies of the Iliad were multiplied.<sup>53</sup> Certain cities had their own copies, which were probably the local test of the accuracy of the festival declamations. Alexander the Great held his copy in great honor, and

set apart a jewelled casket from his Persian booty to keep it in. The form given to the poems under Peisistratos, when corrected of some errors that had subsequently crept in, was what the Alexandrian scholars of the third century before Christ aimed to restore,<sup>54</sup> and our modern editions strive to reproduce, as nearly as possible, the text as they determined it.<sup>55</sup>

Now let us take together in one view the points thus historically settled. The Iliad and Odyssey were orally circulated for two centuries before they were put into written form. The prevalent opinion among the Greeks in the classical time made Homer the author not only of the Iliad and Odyssey, but the originator of all their epic poetry, or at least all that pertained to the Trojan circle of myths. The traditions in regard to his life give no story of an individual existence connected with a definite time and place, but assume the shape of items as to the gradual spread of epic poetry among those Greek cities and tribes which chiefly cultivated it. The question whether the Iliad and Odyssey proceeded from the spontaneous conception of a single poet, or were formed by putting

together the separate songs of one or of several poets, is not touched at all by these traditions, for either supposition is reconcilable with the historical facts yielded by them. There is, however, one result gained by examining them, and that is, that the answer to this question is shown to be entirely apart from any supposed historical evidence. If any one is constrained, by arguments of another kind, to hold that the Homeric poems are not original units, but combinations of separate songs or enlargements of simpler poems, no one can charge him with defying the testimony of a sure and well-defined tradition. The answer to the question between original unity and subsequent combination can be sought only in the poems themselves.

*In the poems themselves.*<sup>56</sup> That sounds very well as a theory, but in practical application it may be very likely to amount to leaving the decision to personal temperament and subjective inclination. We have just seen how men of the most cultivated judgment in the sphere of poetry; who undoubtedly formed their opinion solely from the poems themselves, came to the most opposite conclusions. And, indeed, may it not be impossible to determine,

in regard to poems of so remote an age, what degree of self-consistency they ought to have in order to prove their original unity?<sup>57</sup> Such considerations must certainly inspire us with caution, but the fact of differences of opinion ought not to make us despair of reaching a satisfactory conclusion by going to the bottom of the subject; and, on the other hand, in the case of poems as long as the Iliad and Odyssey, a comparison of their several parts as to subject and form furnishes a standard of consistency which restricts very narrowly the caprices of individual judgments. It will be my endeavor to show that, in virtue of these things, a tenable opinion can be formed, and has been in part already settled. Let us look first at the Iliad.

The series of transactions and incidents which the Iliad presents to our imagination is so connected together as to be easily embraced in one view. It is the tenth year of the siege, and the Achaean army is still striving to overthrow Troy in revenge for the outrage committed by Paris. Then it happens that their bravest hero, Achilles, is wounded in his honor by Agamemnon, the leader of the host, and resolves to avenge himself for

the insult by keeping aloof from the battle-field. His goddess-mother, Thetis, asks and obtains from Zeus the promise that the Achæan army shall have disasters until Agamemnon repents and atones for the wrong he has done. For a time the valor of the other Achæan chiefs maintains the balance against the Trojans, but presently they are at such a disadvantage that Agamemnon sends an embassy of the noblest chiefs to beg forgiveness of Achilles and offer him full compensation. But his thirst for revenge is not yet satisfied; the woes of the Greeks must be yet greater; the Trojans must force their way into the camp, begin to burn the ships, and thus threaten them with complete destruction, ere he will lay aside his wrath and come forth from his retirement. The very next day brings matters to this extremity. The bravest of the Achæan leaders are wounded and forced to leave the field. Hektor breaks through the wall of the Greek camp, and the resistance of the mighty Ajax cannot prevent his setting fire to one of the ships. Then Patroklos, the trusty companion-in-arms of Achilles, beseeches him in this crisis of need, if he will not go out himself, at least to allow

him and the host of the Myrmidons to take part in the battle. This only he consents to do. By the successes that attend his unexpected appearance on the field, Patroklos is so carried away that he forgets the strict command of Achilles, and lets himself be drawn on from defence of the camp to an attack upon the Trojan army. In pressing the attack he is slain, and it is only with great effort that his body, stripped of its armor, is rescued from the eager foe. At the dreadful news of his friend's death, Achilles, late on that day, comes forth, and by his mere presence checks the renewed onset of the Trojans. The next morning Agamemnon gives Achilles a full compensation for the wrong done him, and Achilles, burning with desire to avenge the death of his beloved friend, dismisses his anger at Agamemnon. In the now renewed conflict he takes his revenge. Many Trojans fall before him, and, last of all, Hektor, who alone dared to meet his attack, and who alone was the hope of the Trojan cause. The burial of Patroklos, the funeral games in his honor, the return of the body of Hektor to his aged father, and the lament of the Trojans over it, bring the poem to a close.

This hasty sketch will suffice to recall to any one acquainted with the Iliad the main outline of the poem. One cannot thus bring it up to mind without being impressed with the manifest interlinking of the parts, the restriction of the story within well-chosen limits, the grouping of the whole around a common centre. But in recent times the admiration of this poem has gone a step farther, and made the discovery that the whole Iliad is guided and controlled by one fundamental thought, one leading idea,<sup>58</sup> which is thus stated:

“The wrath of Achilles is fully justified and right, and the supreme Governor of the world himself assures to it its satisfaction; but then the man’s passion pushes his wrath, right as it is in itself, to an undue excess. When he rejects the offered reconciliation, Achilles makes himself liable to punishment, and by the death of his dearest friend pays the penalty of his excessive wrath.”

Who would deny that the succession of actions and events presented in the Iliad is perfectly adapted to convey this sound ethical doctrine? Who could fail to recognize that a sort of national instinct made due moderation a necessary condition,

in the view of the Greeks in all ages, of the highest moral goodness and nobleness? But the question is a very different one, whether in the *Iliad* as we have it and the ancients had it, be it one poem or a combination of originally diverse elements—whether in this *Iliad* we find this idea set forth as the controlling idea, or anything to justify us in reading it between the lines? To this question we must certainly answer, No. It is not from the consideration of justice that Zeus promises the fullest satisfaction to the wrath of Achilles, but he owes gratitude to Thetis for previous benefits, and Thetis makes these benefits tell so as to secure the assent of Zeus to her request.<sup>59</sup> The rejection by Achilles of the offers of friendship does not constitute a turning-point in the action of the poem. There is no subsequent reference to it, even where there is the strongest reason for one;<sup>60</sup> and Zeus, without the slightest hint of disapproval of the implacability of Achilles, maintains unaltered his promise to avenge him by the increasing woes of the Greeks.<sup>61</sup> In the death of Patroklos, no one of gods or men detects a penalty for the excessive wrath of Achilles. He falls by the attack of a deity



friendly to the Trojans, and because he transgressed the strict command of Achilles as to the limits of his taking part in the contest. Thus we see that at every important point of the action not only do we fail to find that motive suggested which we ought to find on this theory, but another motive, essentially different and irreconcilable with that, is employed. In truth, one has to get away from the Iliad, and strive to forget what is really contained in it, before he can venture to impose upon the poem *as it is* a thought which *might* be the ruling thought of the whole.

But, again, the most serious difficulties arise as to the mere continuity of connection in the narrative so soon as we descend from general outlines to particular details. So far as these depend on variation of tone and style, it is useless to try to give an idea of them.<sup>62</sup> They do not appear in the German translation, which, excellent as it is, spreads a uniform tone over the whole. So, also, of other grounds of suspicion, although as depending on the subject-matter they must appear in any version, yet one can hardly give an idea of their number and the way they are inwrought in the whole

structure of the poem without going minutely through the whole. Still, perhaps, in some examples the kind of doubt they raise may be so far indicated as to show whether they are such as to justify positive inferences. Such cases as this, that the same warrior is killed on different days by different foes, may be regarded as of little consequence.<sup>63</sup> They occur only in regard to inferior persons, and such contradictions in a long poem may be explained by failure of memory, even on the supposition of single authorship. But other things go deeper into the course of the main incidents. The larger part of the Iliad is taken up with the particular narrative of the events of three days of conflict. The first, favorable throughout to the Greek army without the help of Achilles, extends from the second book nearly to the end of the seventh; the second day, which contains the extreme peril of the Greeks, the exploits and death of Patroklos, and finally the sudden appearance of Achilles on the field, begins in the eleventh and ends in the eighteenth book; the third, containing the vengeance of Achilles and the death of Hektor, covers books xx, xxi, and xxii. If now we

undertake to make clear to ourselves the incidents of the second and most important day, we stumble at every step against the greatest difficulties. The narrative goes quickly over the beginning of the conflict. After only eighty lines we are told that so long as the sun was ascending the fortune of the battle was undecided, but that from mid-day on the scale was turned. And then, after we have followed through five books the most varied shiftings of the contest, and have been told of incidents requiring considerable time—the battle about the wall of the Greek camp, and the storming of its gate against vigorous defence; the help given by Poseidon to the Greeks; Hera's preparations for a trick upon Zeus, and her success in beguiling him to sleep, in order that Poseidon may work on uninterrupted; the awakening of Zeus, and the help he sends to the Trojans; the turning of their retreat into an attack; the struggle around the ship of Ajax; the appeal of Patroklos to Achilles for leave to rescue the Greeks; the arming of Patroklos and the Myrmidons, and a large part of the exploits of Patroklos—after all this has been told, in more than 4000 lines, then we hear again that it is

mid-day and the sun standing high in heaven.<sup>64</sup> We may, if we please, cut out ever so much of what lies between these two statements, as being a subsequent enlargement of a skilfully constructed original narrative. But we gain nothing by that; for, in any case, the development of the struggle which causes the appearance of Patroklos, and a great part of his achievements, have no time allowed for them, for they occur between two distinct indications of the same hour. In another point of view, there is a difficulty as to the appearance of Patroklos on the field. When the battle is turning against the Greeks in the eleventh book, Patroklos is sent out by Achilles to learn the name of a wounded man whom they see Nestor carrying away in his chariot. Patroklos is in such a hurry to perform the command of his impatient chief that he refuses to sit down in Nestor's tent. But this haste is forgotten; for while the Greek wall is stormed by Hektor, and while the fortunes of war are changing back and forth through four long books, Patroklos remains seated in quiet conversation in the tent of a Greek chieftain.<sup>65</sup> Nay, more than this, when he finally, in the sixteenth book, re-

turns to Achilles, not a word is said of an answer to the question of Achilles, nor, indeed, of his having been sent on the errand.<sup>66</sup> Similar discrepancies we find in the course of the whole narrative, lively and vivid as it is in the details. In closely connected passages we find different representations of the condition of the battle, of its form, of its locality.<sup>67</sup> The entrance of the same person, Poseidon, at the same time into the conflict is twice described, and in ways irreconcilable with each other.<sup>68</sup> Zeus utters on the same day two incompatible prophecies of the immediate future.<sup>69</sup> As to the death of one hero, Patroklos, we receive two inconsistent accounts in close connection.<sup>70</sup> As we read, we are carried along by the naturalness and vigor of the successive pictures, but the effort to hold one continuous thread through them, to grasp a unity in the narrative, such as it must have even if only recited, so that the hearers should understand and see the incidents in imagination—this effort fails utterly. We find ourselves in a mighty concourse of tumultuous waves, where it is impossible to stand firmly.<sup>71</sup>

Very different is the impression made by the

story of the first day of conflict in books ii-vii. There, with very slight exceptions, we enjoy the clear light of a transparent narrative. What reader of the Iliad would not recall with lively admiration the charming passage of the view from the walls of Troy, with its happy delineations of Helen, Priam, and the Greek heroes; the exquisite description of the shooting of the arrow of Pandaros, the beauty of which Lessing has so clearly analyzed;<sup>72</sup> the splendid story of the exploits of Diomedes, and then the peaceful episode between him and Glaukos, who meet as foes, but recognize each other as connected by hereditary ties of hospitality, and separate with mutual gifts; finally, the parting of Hektor and Andromache, a scene often imitated, but not easily surpassed in the touching power of its simple naturalness? But the beauty of these separate scenes, which makes it hard to tell which one is the most delightful, is quite equalled by the difficulty of combining them into one story.<sup>73</sup> The mass of the incidents threatens at the very outset to overwhelm us, when we recollect that they are to be supposed to occur within a single day; and then we find it, in almost

every case, impossible to discover the internal link between any two of them. We have a stately picture of the arming of the Greek host, and then a roster of the whole Greek force down to the minor chiefs, occupying some 400 lines. Everything indicates the beginning of a grand general conflict, and then follows—a truce, and a single combat between Paris and Menelaos.<sup>74</sup> The agreement, sanctioned by a sacrifice and solemnly sealed by oaths, that if Menelaos is victor in this duel, Helen and the treasure taken with her shall be given up, is wantonly broken by the Trojans; and on the same day, with the slightest possible reference to that former duel, Hektor challenges any of the Greek chiefs to a second one, without proposing that it shall decide so much. Still the Greeks accept his challenge, and utter no reproaches over the former breach of faith. Moreover, on the very day on which the previous duel has resulted in favor of their champion, and on which, too, the general contest has brought the Trojans into extreme distress, the bravest Greek chiefs dread to enter this single combat, and have to be aroused from their consternation by Nestor's reproaches.<sup>75</sup> Even Diomedes,

who on that very day has undertaken and triumphantly carried on a combat with Ares himself, is now among the terror-stricken. It is true, his courage has already before this, in some unexplained way, abandoned him. Immediately after he has, with valor inspired by Athene, vanquished and driven from the field Aphrodite and Ares, we find him meeting Glaukos, whom he does not know, and asking with pious anxiety whether it may not be a god who confronts him, for with gods a mortal must not venture to contend.<sup>76</sup>

But I will not go on with the list of such contradictions, tempting as is the abundance of material. It is impossible to fairly present here the number of difficulties which arise in the two parts of the Iliad of which I have spoken, which make up about a half of the whole poem. My only purpose has been to bring to your view, by some easily presented examples, the character and importance of them. Whoever wishes a confirmation from without of the gravity of these inconsistencies should seek it, not in the writings of those who have convincingly set them forth,<sup>77</sup> but rather in those of their adversaries, who, in order to maintain the



nity of the Iliad, labor to invalidate the grounds of suspicion.<sup>78</sup> The devices of interpretation and involved hypotheses by which they seek to seem to reconcile irreconcilable contradictions,<sup>79</sup> form the strongest proof of the reasonableness of the doubts as to the original unity of the poem, and justify the simple inference drawn from them. When a poem like the Iliad presents, sometimes through two hundred lines, and sometimes through nearly a thousand, one scene and set of characters with strict consistency, even in the minutest details of the vivid delineations, and then in the very next lines passes on to the assumption of a different scene and a different disposition in the actors—when this kind of inconsistency, varying in degree, runs through the whole poem, and everywhere shows itself, not within single narrations, but only in the combination of these into one whole;<sup>80</sup> in such a case we find ourselves compelled to conclude that those single narratives were originally separate, and that the combining of them was a subsequent process. The narrative of Diomedes' conversation with Glaukos is, in its way, as admirable as that of his exploits in war, but as a continu-

ation of these it cannot have belonged to the original conception and composition of the poem. Hektor's challenge to a single combat, the dread of the Greek chiefs to engage with him, the bravest of the Trojans, Nestor's reproaches and exhortations—all this is very well told; but as a scene of the same day on which the Greeks had been cheated out of the stakes of another single combat (a day, too, in which they are everywhere successful in battle), such a representation is impossible.

Facts of this kind speak so plainly that we cannot be deaf to them, and attention to them has already brought about agreement on certain points between the two parties to this discussion. No one who really understands the questions at issue believes any longer in the original independent existence of a poet, called Homer, if you please, who wrought up the myths of his people into the *Iliad*.<sup>81</sup> It is admitted by the most decided and most prominent champions of the theory of single authorship that the composer of the *Iliad* had before him separate songs of earlier origin, that he took them up into his comprehensive poem without material alterations, and that the contradictions—or, to use a

milder term, inequalities—which we discover proceed from this adoption and combination of earlier songs.<sup>82</sup> The difference of opinion is limited now substantially to these points: that the defenders of the unity of the Iliad assert the impossibility of separating it into the originally independent parts;<sup>83</sup> that they restrict as much as they can the amount of such incorporations in proportion to the rest of the Iliad; and that they find the true value of the Iliad to lie, not in the poetic beauty of single lays, but in the majestic composition of the whole poem. As to the first point, there is hardly room for much dispute; for the real question is not whether it is possible in all, or even in a few, cases to mark off the originally separate songs, but whether the present form of the poem has grown out of such elements without essential alteration of them; and on this point there is agreement within certain limits. As to the relative extent of the incorporated elements and of the new independently composed Iliad, the field of controversy will be narrowed by the further investigation of particular cases. The third question, whether the value and significance of the Iliad is to be seen in the poetry of single

scenes or in the grand composition of the whole, might be left untouched so far as it is not answered in what has already been said. But it may be allowable, without undue influence from one's personal opinions, to suggest two considerations which may prepare the way for a decision. The composition of extended and elaborately constructed epic poems, in contrast with single songs containing each the story of a single adventure, marks unquestionably a great progress in poetic literature.<sup>64</sup> If, now, the *Iliad* was, as seems most probable, the earliest composition of such extent in the Greek epic poetry, then, even if it is almost wholly a mere patchwork of previously existing separate materials, still a high position in the development of the Greek epic is due to such a work of compilation. But it is a very different question whether in this poem, as we now have it, the chief value lies in the original elements or in the architectural skill which has made them into one whole. On this question let one simple fact be considered. The contradictions in the *Iliad* are so manifest and so absolute that when once pointed out they cannot be ignored, however one may strive to make them appear tri-

fling. But if thousands of readers, from antiquity to the present time, have felt the elevating and inspiring influence of the Homeric poems without noticing the contradictions, it would surely be a great mistake to ascribe this surprising fact to a universal carelessness in reading. We should rather explain it by the overpowering charm of the separate pictures, which draw off the attention from their connection with one another. Goethe's praises of Homer, Lessing's luminous deductions from him, all have reference to the separate narratives, and remain true—yes, even gain in truth, when we believe that we have not one continuous narrative, but some eighteen or twenty separate epic songs arranged together according to the general course of the incidents.

We have thus far turned our attention exclusively to the Iliad; let us now in brief space consider the Odyssey. We might grant that the Odyssey must be recognized as originating in a single poetic conception, excluding altogether the supposition that it was made up of originally separate materials, without thereby casting a doubt upon what has been more or less certainly deter-

mined with regard to the origin of the Iliad. It is quite possible that the two poems which now are inseparably united in our eyes, and which all antiquity, too, referred to the one all-including name of Homer, may have differed essentially in their real origin. Whether this is really the case is a question on which the conflict of opinion is not at present narrowed down to so small a field as in regard to the Iliad. The examination of the Odyssey from this point of view began later than that of the Iliad,<sup>85</sup> and so we find within the last few decades scholars who decidedly rejected the belief in the single authorship of the Iliad and yet as decidedly maintained a belief in that of the Odyssey.<sup>86</sup> The investigations which questioned or disproved the original unity of the Odyssey were mainly confined for a long time to single parts of the poem, and were conducted on the silent assumption that the process of construction in the two poems was essentially the same.<sup>87</sup> Under these circumstances, it is easy to see that one cannot, in the case of the Odyssey, mark out with the same prospect of assent the limits within which opinions are now agreed, and I may be excused if I

confine myself to a statement of a few principal points of view.

The arguments for original unity of authorship in the *Odyssey* are not only the well-judged limitation of the material and the grouping of its manifold incidents about a single central point, but also the skilful complication of the story. The abundance and variety of the stories of Odysseus' adventures on the return from Troy, and in conflict with the foes in his own home, are constantly focused upon one thing—the character of the hero. His courage and his cautious judgment are not to be broken down by the dangers of the long voyage, nor yet by the terrors of conflicts with giants and with supernatural powers. Neither the allurements of comfort, nor the charms of beautiful goddesses, nor the loveliness of the maiden who saves his life, can overpower his longing for home and faithful affection for his wife. And a like spirit in that wife, joined with courage and cunning, has meanwhile, in conflict with hardly less dangerous enemies, kept safe the home into which, after all his toils and struggles, he is to enter for a new lease of happiness. The copious details which fill

up this outline are not recited in simple chronological order; but the opening of the poem shows us the wanderings of Odysseus nearly at their end, while the previous incidents, instead of being told by the poet, are, far more effectively, put into the mouth of the hero himself at the time when he, welcomed and entertained by the Phaeakians, is thereby assured of a return to his home. Two, or rather three, threads of narrative—the occurrences in the house of Odysseus, the journey of Telemachos to visit his father's companions-in-arms, and the wanderings of Odysseus—are carried on at first independently side by side, and then are united when the father and son, almost at the same moment, return to Ithaka, and win their victory over the enemy at home. That this skilful arrangement is the result of matured reflection, and marks by its complication a higher stage of art in construction than the straightforward course of the *Iliad*, must be admitted without hesitation; but this by no means decides—does not, in fact, even touch—the question whether the *Odyssey*, in its present form, was originally conceived as a single poem, or is either a careful combination of ele-



ments not originally designed for such union, or the expansion of a nucleus originally much simpler. But against the supposition of original unity of conception in the *Odyssey* as we have it, insuperable objections arise. In the first place, in order to find in the particulars above mentioned a proof of the original unity of the poem, it is necessary to apply them in the most general and abstract way to the actual details of our *Odyssey*.<sup>88</sup> The alleged connection of all the numerous incidents with the one person *Odysseus* cannot, surely, be held strictly true of those in the third and fourth books; for the real subject of those books is the adventures of other heroes on the return from *Troy*, which have no natural connection with his.<sup>89</sup> The character of *Odysseus* certainly might be so presented throughout the whole poem as it has been sketched above; but, in fact, we find this true only in the first half of the poem, while in the second half it is exaggerated on both sides almost to the point of caricature. On the one hand, the wise self-control of the hero degenerates, when he appears in his own house cunningly disguised as a beggar, almost to vulgar buffoonery;<sup>90</sup> and, on the

other, such valor as enables him alone to engage with more than a hundred able-bodied men, skilled in war, without even the help of a deity to make it credible, oversteps the limit of moderation which is observed in the earlier part of the narrative.<sup>91</sup> An artful complication of different threads of narrative is certainly characteristic of the *Odyssey*; but not less characteristic is it that just this peculiarity of construction involves us in unexplained, indeed for the most part inexplicable, difficulties. The incidents of the return of *Odysseus* are, indeed, interwoven with those of the voyage of *Telemachos*; but, on closer study, admiration of this plot is more than shaken. For the journey of *Telemachos* is not only altogether without influence on the main action, but is undertaken in the beginning without motive and prolonged without reason.<sup>92</sup> One cannot avoid the thought that it is introduced only in order to attach to the adventures of *Odysseus* a sketch of those of some other heroes. And, more than all, the very points of contact of the combined narratives, those places on which the defence of original unity must lay special stress, bring us every time into undeniable inconsisten-

cies. In passing from the Telemachos story to the Odysseus story, at the beginning of the fifth book, we find a council of the gods which is irreconcilable in the subject of its dealing with that of the first book; and the lines in which it is described are plainly a clumsy patchwork, made up from other passages of the poem.<sup>93</sup> Again, when we return, in the fifteenth book, from the story of Odysseus' arrival in Ithaka to that of Telemachos, the goddess Athene comes in to help out the transition. Athene has been aiding Odysseus by word and deed since his arrival on the island, and she goes to Lakedaemon to stir up Telemachos to return home. But she leaves Odysseus long after daybreak, and arrives in Lakedaemon on the same day before dawn! Both marks of time are clearly given, and each is essential to the whole course of the narrative in which it stands, so that the contradiction is plain and admitted.<sup>94</sup> Such an inconsistency is not conceivable in an original creation; but we understand it when we recognize here an artificial union of poems which, as already familiar and cherished, were brought into their new relation with the least possible change.

The supposition of original unity in the poem is upset, in the second place, by the consideration that there is want of harmony between different parts of the *Odyssey* as to certain fundamental matters which must have been fully present to the consciousness of the poet. For example, as to the deity to whose wrath the extraordinary woes of *Odysseus* are to be ascribed;<sup>95</sup> as to the proximate number of the suitors of *Penelope*<sup>96</sup> and the time during which their wild doings had gone on;<sup>97</sup> as to their offering or not offering the customary marriage presents;<sup>98</sup> as to the personal appearance of the hero himself;<sup>99</sup> as to the age of *Telemachos*;<sup>100</sup> as to the design against his life formed by the suitors;<sup>101</sup> as to the name of a person in the household of *Odysseus* who was of no little consequence to the action of the story<sup>102</sup>—in these and other points we find unmistakable contradictions which cannot be smoothed over or eliminated.

Thirdly and finally, we observe in the tone and poetic quality of the narrative a variation which cannot escape notice even in the disguise of a translation. Let one read in immediate sequence the sixth book, for example (the meeting with

Nausikaa), and the twentieth (the incidents preceding the fatal catastrophe), and he may safely offer a reward for any person who shall be able to attribute to the same poet the transparent clearness of the former and the helpless confusion of the latter.<sup>103</sup> There is, moreover, one peculiarity of the *Odyssey* which makes it very difficult to decide how far the poem is made up of originally independent constituents, and how far it has merely been expanded by additions to an original whole, and that peculiarity is the repetition of essentially the same mythical matter in various forms, or what may be called twin narratives—a peculiarity which can hardly be paralleled from the *Iliad*, but is a characteristic feature of the last two thirds of the *Odyssey*. Thus we find in the adventures of Odysseus the two solitary divinities, Kirke and Kalyпсо; the two mysterious helpers of his voyage, Aiolos and Alkinoos; the two similar prophecies from Kirke and Teiresias; the fatal sleep of Odysseus twice repeated.<sup>104</sup> And so it is constantly after the arrival of Odysseus in Ithaka. The story of his coming into his own house unrecognized, in the disguise of a beggar, and having a bone or a foot-

stool thrown at him by the revellers who are eating up his substance, striking enough once, is repeated three times with slight variations; <sup>105</sup> four times the sagacity of the dogs is impressed upon us; <sup>106</sup> four times we have fictitious accounts of himself and his history given by Odysseus, similar to one another, and yet not the same even in the principal features, although some of the same persons are present to hear them. <sup>107</sup> The quiet slumbers of Penélope in the upper room at all times in the day, <sup>108</sup> the inexhaustible capacity of Odysseus for eating and begging, <sup>109</sup> the accumulation of similar omens, <sup>110</sup> as if all Olympos were incessantly busy about the house of Odysseus—in a word, the multitude of difficulties, no single one of which can be satisfactorily cleared up unless all are, is so great as to discourage even an indefatigable student. <sup>111</sup> To have undertaken the investigation in its full scope, and to have carried it on with a keenness of judgment and a rigorous acceptance of truth which enabled him to reach as positive results for an understanding of the formation of the Odyssey as Lachmann did for the Iliad—this is the undisputed honor of A. Kirchhoff. <sup>112</sup> It would perhaps

be premature to indicate now, in regard to the *Odyssey* as in regard to the *Iliad*, within what limits the traditional assumption of original unity must confine its opposition to these views; but still one may be allowed to point out some things which seem to be settled with entire certainty by Kirchhoff's investigations. The idea of original unity of construction in the *Odyssey* as we have it is not merely disturbed, but so completely set aside that scarcely the shadow of it can maintain itself. On the contrary, the poem has been systematically worked over by an editor with intelligent design and some degree of poetic power, who incorporated into the originally more simple nucleus borrowed matter of kindred mythical tenor and additions of his composition. And even that original nucleus which we must assume, the earliest narrative of the adventures and return of *Odysseus*, is not a simple song like those which we assume as making up the *Iliad*, but belongs to the period in which the epic poem as a form of art was being developed. But the expanded edition of its present form belongs to the time when the decay of the Greek epic had already begun, when mean-

ingless breadth of narration, conveyed in the traditional forms of language and metre, served as a substitute for the freshness and vivid reality of true poetry. If, indeed, we lose anything of real value when we are obliged to give up the fond belief in a divine singer who gave forth the Iliad in his youth and the Odyssey in his old age, still we have gained something of much more importance in its stead; for these two poems have become for us, without suffering thereby harm or loss in their intrinsic value, reliable witnesses to the progressive growth of Greek epic poetry. The comparison to the rising and setting sun with which antiquity glorified the individual Homer as author of these two poems, we may adopt in an altered sense and apply to the poems themselves as representatives of the stages of that poetic development.

I have now endeavored to fulfil the task which I proposed to myself in the beginning, to set forth the reasonableness of raising the question as to the origin of the Homeric poems, to suggest the means for its solution, and to indicate the limits within which the points in dispute are by this time re-



stricted. It may justly be demanded that I should bring together the positive conclusions, less manifest in themselves, which result from these negative considerations, and thereby present a view in outline of the history of the formation of these two poems. To such an attempt a few words may be devoted in closing.<sup>113</sup>

As in the case of all peoples where it is possible to trace the course of poetic development up to its beginnings,<sup>114</sup> so in the Greek tribes, epic song appears as the earliest form of poetry. Its subject-matter is the legendary lore of the tribe and the people. Legend differs from history, not merely in being less certain and trustworthy because it depends solely on oral tradition, but also in that it gives a prominence to particular events and personages as the most perfect expression of the character of the people and shining types of what it wishes to be and to do.<sup>115</sup> Even written history does not exclude the growing-up of legend concerning the very same time—*e. g.*, as to Charlemagne, as to the Crusades—if certain characters and events take hold of and inspire a whole people in its inmost being. Such a subject of uplifting and glo-

rious remembrance the Greek tribes had in the long contest which they carried on against kindred tribes on the coast of Asia Minor, the Trojan war. The heroic deeds of that conflict, the adventures of the heroes on their return, every one would wish to have recalled to memory on festival occasions in the happy enjoyment of quiet days.<sup>116</sup> Therefore the palace of a prince in the heroic time could not do without the bard to recite in verse, accompanied by the simple chords of the lyre, the fame of those heroes. High in honor at home and abroad was the man on whom the gods had bestowed the gift of song.<sup>117</sup> Mneme, Melete, Aoide—that is, Memory, Meditation, Song—are the characteristic names, dating from the earliest time, of the muses from whom this gift came.<sup>118</sup> For the singer's merit did not consist in his creative originality, but people wanted to hear from him that which they already knew, and they wanted to hear it because they knew it and delighted in it. "The individual poet," to use the happy language of an honored scholar of our own time,<sup>119</sup> "influences the natural growth of legend in much the same way as a skilful gardener regulates and guides the nat-

ural growth of his plants." The bard brings the legendary heroes clearly before our perception, and that in rhythmical form, which is grateful to the hearers and at the same time aids his own memory. There is no marked difference between delivering songs which he himself has first put into shape and repeating those of other poets which have won the applause of their hearers. The song contains a single event which is limited within moderate compass and so can be taken in at one view. Such is the representation which the Homeric poems themselves give us of the bard in the period to which their story refers. The lay of Ares and Aphrodite, which is put in the *Odyssey* into the mouth of the Phaeakian bard, takes up no more than a hundred lines. It would be rash to seek to determine the average length of the earliest epic lays from this example,<sup>120</sup> which, by the way, is beyond question an interpolation, but that each song covered but one single incident—*e. g.*, the building of the wooden horse—and was of limited extent, is proved by the other instances of heroic songs and by the manner of their use; for the listening to the bard is only one of several

social pleasures during or after a feast, and is alternated with other amusements. The bard had no need of long introductions to make the special narrative intelligible to his audience; they were already familiar with the legend at every point.

The period of the emigration of the Aeolic and Ionic tribes to Asia Minor was especially fitted to stimulate recollection of the heroic deeds of the Trojan war, for then a similar conflict had to be carried on in the same or neighboring localities, and so the remembrance of the past acted as an encouragement for the present. It is therefore significant that the earliest date<sup>121</sup> assigned for the lifetime of Homer makes him contemporary with the Ionic migration. In the Ionian colonies, which soon succeeded in establishing themselves, poetry was cultivated by schools of bards, and, as a probable consequence of the rise of these schools at intervals during the next four centuries, we find different dates given for the birth of Homer in different cities. The existence of these schools of poetry explains the preservation of heroic songs when once composed, and it also furnished the

natural transition to the next stage in the development of epic poetry.

The prosperous growth of individual Greek cities of Asia Minor and their active intercourse with one another gave opportunity for regularly recurring festivals, at which great assemblies of people gave themselves up for considerable time to refined enjoyments at their leisure. One important element of the festivities was the delivery of epic songs, and that no longer by a single poet or rhapsode, but by several in succession in mutual rivalry.<sup>122</sup> What, then, could be more natural than that, when longer time was given for the recital, and the demands of the audiences gradually became more exacting, the single songs should be arranged together in the order which their subjects indicated? Such combination would be facilitated by the fact that the legends naturally grew up around certain fixed central points of myth, and the already settled popularity of the old songs would insure their being taken up into the new connection with as little change as possible. That the change of a few lines and the addition of a few would be enough to combine these originally inde-

pendent elements, the separate hero-songs, into a long epic, seems proved by the successful attempt of a modern German poet to unite into such a form a part of the detached folk-songs of the Serbians,<sup>123</sup> as well as by the combination into a single epic of the Finnish folk-songs, which still exist separately, side by side with the epic, and number more than 22,000 lines. It is evident, too, that in the historical development of epic poetry this process has actually occurred several times, for, even if the method of formation of the German national epic, the *Nibelungenlied*, is still an open question, there is an undoubted instance in the old French poem of the battle of Roncesvalles.<sup>124</sup> Now, in what progressive steps this combination, by re-writing some lines and adding others, took place in the case of the Greek heroic songs of the wrath of Achilles and the return of Odysseus, can hardly be ascertained with complete definiteness; but the poems themselves, as we have them, show us not only that some such process took place, but also that there is a marked difference between the two poems in the elements which may be recognized in them, in the method of their development, and

in the time when they were completed. The *Iliad*, in most of its extent, enables us to recognize the separate lays, sometimes united by mere juxtaposition, sometimes more skilfully dovetailed into one another, and then it brings its subject to a close with poetry of a later date which already shows signs of decay in freshness and vigor.<sup>125</sup> In the *Odyssey*, the simplest element, recognizable as such by the style itself, belongs to an age in which epic poetry was entering upon more comprehensive composition; the continuation of it and the editor's work which expands, dilutes, and rounds off the story, belong to the time of the decline of epic poetry. It is not necessary to suppose that the earlier songs disappeared at once when this combining or final editing work was done; furthermore, it is quite probable, in the nature of things, that frequently single passages of the composite epic were separately recited, for only in extraordinary festivals would there be time for the delivery of the whole.<sup>126</sup> When Solon fixed by law the order of the recitation of the Homeric poems for the great Athenian festival,<sup>127</sup> he took the first step in the preservation of the completed form.

The arrangements of Peisistratos for committing them to writing were the second step, and to that we owe their preservation to our time.

This which I have given is but an outline of the history of the origin of the Homeric poems, a mere sketch which needs to be filled out at numerous points. Some points must always remain not filled out; others the progress of investigation will supply, and so gradually circumscribe the region of the unknown, provided the same principles be observed which prevail in the philological science of to-day. These principles are, first, a conscientious upholding of the real tradition of antiquity—for the Homeric investigations since Wolf's day have not abandoned the traditions of antiquity, but rather have at last re-established a consistent connection with them; second, an indefatigable investigation of the most isolated and minute particulars, for it is just as true of philology as it is of physical science, that no matter of investigation can be called trifling, but everything may be important in its relations; third, an extension of one's view over the entire literature of the nation immediately concerned, and over kindred phenom-



ena in other nations.<sup>128</sup> These are the means by which the philology of to-day endeavors to present to our mental view classical antiquity in its true form, and in the Homeric investigations we may clearly recognize the application of these means. Whatever near approach to historic truth has been attained in the field of the Homeric question has been due, not to the accident of happy suggestions, but to rigorous method, to unwearied investigation, to absolute devotion to the subject.

*Wrd. wj., June 28, 1882.*  
*Lipsie.*

---



## NOTES.

---

<sup>1</sup> Herod. II. 53. Further instances in Bernhardt, Griechische Literatur-Geschichte, 2d ed. I. p. 251; Sengebusch, *Homeric dissertatio* I. p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Numerous comparisons of this kind in Lauer, *Gesch. der Hom. Poesie*, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Athen. VIII. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Sengebusch, *Hom. diss.* I. p. 171.

<sup>5</sup> Sengebusch, I. pp. 139-166. For the principles on which Thucydides used the Homeric poems for inferences as to the historical facts of the earliest times, see Roscher, *Leben, Werk u. Zeitalter des Thukydides*, p. 132 sqq.

<sup>6</sup> So Xenophanes in *Sext. Emp. adv. Math.* IX. 193; I. 289; *Plat. Rep.* II. 377 D sqq.

<sup>7</sup> E. g., *Plat. Theaet.* 180 D; *Arist. de an.* III. 427 a, 25, with Trendelenburg's note, p. 449.

<sup>8</sup> *Val. Max.* 3, 7. Cf. Lessing's *Laokoon*, XXII.

<sup>9</sup> *Lycurg. adv. Leocr.* § 102; *Diog. Laert.* I. 57. On the latter passage, Sengebusch, *Hom. diss.* II. p. 107 sq.; *Lehrs, Rhein. Mus. N: F.* XVII. p. 491 sqq.

<sup>10</sup> *Plat. Protag.* 325 E; *Isoc. Paneg.* § 159; Hermann, *Griech. Antiq.* III. § 35, 6 sq.

<sup>11</sup> *Xen. Conv.* 3, 5.

<sup>12</sup> As to Plato, for example, see the proof in Sengebusch, I. p. 121 sqq. The long list of Homeric lines quoted or re-

ferred to in the writings of Aristotle and those attributed to him is given in the Index Aristotelicus under "*Ὅμηρος*." Those of the *Odyssey* are not half so numerous as those of the *Iliad*. It would be interesting to determine in the whole range of Greek literature the number of references to the *Iliad* and to the *Odyssey* respectively.

<sup>13</sup> On this whole subject of the influence of Homer on the Greeks, see Lehrs, *De Arist. stud. Hom.* pp. 200–229; Lauer, *Gesch. der Hom. Poesie*, pp. 5–58; the greater part of Sengebusch, *Hom. diss. I.*; Bergk, *Griech. Lit. I.* pp. 874–882.

<sup>14</sup> Information as to the principal translations into Latin, French, Italian, English, and German, is given in Bernhardt, *Griech. Lit. 2d ed. II. 1*, p. 175 sq.

<sup>15</sup> Scarcely any book has done so much to further a real insight into the character and special excellence of the Homeric poetry as Lessing's *Laokoon*. A large part of the numerous subsequent treatises on the subject is based on his clear and simple remarks. One among these, W. Wackernagel's "*Die Epische Poesie*" (*Schweiz. Museum für histor. Wissenschaften*, vol. i. and ii.), deserves special mention for breadth of view, thoughtful penetration, and masterly clearness.

<sup>16</sup> *Italienische Reise*, II. [I am so doubtful of the translation here that I subjoin the original.—Tr.]: "Homer stellt die Existenz dar, wir gewöhnlich den Effect: er schildert das Fürechterliche, wir fürchterlich, er das Angenehme, wir angenehm."

<sup>17</sup> *Briefwechsel mit Schiller*, No. 424.

<sup>18</sup> Instances in Lauer, *Gesch. der Hom. Poesie*, p. 59 sq.

<sup>19</sup> *Prolegomena ad Homerum, sive de operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma variisque mutationibus et*

probabili ratione emendandi—Scripsit Fried. Aug. Wolfius, vol. i. (no second volume was published), 1795. New edition, 1859. For earlier suggestions of the idea which Wolf was the first to establish by proof, see Bernhardy, Griech. Lit. II. p. 98 sq.; Volkman, Gesch. und Kritik der Wolf'schen Prolegomena zu Homer, pp. 1-35.

<sup>20</sup> For the influence of Wolf's Prolegomena beyond the circle of scholars, see Friedländer, Die Homerische Kritik von Wolf bis Grote (1853), pp. 1-6; Bernhardy, Griech. Lit. II. 1, pp. 99-103, and especially the section on this topic in Volkman's book just cited, pp. 71-181.

<sup>21</sup> Briefwechsel mit Goethe, No. 459.

<sup>22</sup> Hermann und Dorothea. [The short poem in elegiac metre, not the well-known long one in hexameters.—TR.]

"Here's to the health of the man who has opened us all a new field  
Where we may roam, by breaking down Homer's great name!  
For who to the gods, or who to 'the poet,' refuses to yield?  
But to be ranked as a Homerid, even as youngest, is fame."

<sup>23</sup> Goethe, Works, oct. ed. of 1827, vol. iii. p. 156. A similar utterance of his from a much earlier time, scarcely eighteen months after the expression of the liveliest assent to Wolf's views, in a letter to Schiller of May 16th, 1798, is given below in note 57. Compare Volkman as above, p. 75.

<sup>24</sup> Körte, Leben Wolf's, pp. 64 sq., 73 sq., 265; Volkman, pp. 35-48.

<sup>25</sup> Preface to edition of the Iliad, Leipzig, 1804, pp. xxi.-xxiv.

<sup>26</sup> Lachmann, Betrachtungen über die Ilias, mit Zusätzen von Moritz Haupt (Berlin, 1847). Earlier than the first part (1837) of Lachmann's Betrachtungen appeared the valuable treatise of G. Hermann, "De interpolationibus Homeri"

(1832); *Opuscula*, vol. v. pp. 52-77. How decidedly Lachmann's work made an epoch in the discussion is clear from the fact that the whole of the extensive literature upon the unity of the *Iliad* (the most important works of which are mentioned below in notes 58-82) consists of assent to, opposition to, or modification of, his researches.

<sup>27</sup> As a comprehensive statement of the arguments on this side, G. W. Nitzsch's work, *Die Sagenpoesie der Griechen kritisch dargestellt* (1852), deserves prominent mention (see also Schömann's searching criticism of it in *Jahn's Jahrbücher*, vol. lxxix., and in his treatise "*De reticentia Homeri*" (1853), *Opusc.* vol. iii.). That Nitzsch, however, in spite of his absolutely rejecting and indefatigably assailing Lachmann's investigations, in some essential points comes very nearly to the same results, is shown below in note 82. Both tendencies, the opposition to Lachmann and the substantial agreement with his results, appear in his posthumous work, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Epischen Poesie der Griechen* (1862): it was criticised by J. La Roche in the *Zeitschrift für das österreichische Gymnasialwesen*, 1863. On the same side with Nitzsch are several thorough essays by W. Bäumlein: *Kritik der Lachmann'schen Schrift* in the *Zeitschrift f. d. A. W.*, 1848 and 1850; *Commentatio de compositione Il. et Odysseae* (Maulbronn, 1847); *Preface to the Tauchnitz edition of the Iliad*; in *Philologus*, vols. vii. and xi.; and in *Jahn's Jahrb.*, vol. lxxv. Two essays in Düntzer's *Homerische Abhandlungen* (1872), pp. 28 and 101, oppose Lachmann's views in almost every particular. Düntzer's own view as to the unity of the two poems is mentioned below in note 82. Friedländer's essay in defence of Grote's theory of the *Iliad*, *Die Homerische Kritik von Wolf bis Grote* (1853), may

also be regarded as a polemic against the main points of Lachmann's theory. It was attacked by W. Ribbeck, in *Philologus*, vol. viii.; "Prüfung neuerer Ansichten über die Ilias." Opposed to both these parties at once—to the party of Lachmann as well as to that of Nitzsch—is the "new hypothesis" advanced by J. Minckwitz in his *Vorschule zum Homer* (1863). As to its relation to the two parties, see note 82. A recent addition to the list of books in defence of the theory of original unity is F. Nutzhorn's *Die Entstehungsweise der Homerischen Gedichte—Untersuchungen über die Berechtigung der auflösenden Homer-Kritik*, with a preface by J. N. Madvig. In his preface Madvig denies to the agency of Peisistratos that importance in the work of compiling the Homeric poems which Wolf and Lachmann have ascribed to it; and supposes—very nearly as Nitzsch does (see note 82)—that unity of conception and the appropriation of earlier songs were combined in the production of the poems: "But he who conceived the grand poetic thought could easily, in a time when the ideas of literary reputation and property did not yet exist, take up into his poem with little alteration passages which others had composed in the same metre, or his shaping of one passage or another might be so far determined by the influence of earlier lays that certain characteristic traits and even turns of expression might be reproduced in his poem. The Homeric poems are not a patchwork of songs, but were composed as independent wholes under the stimulus and control of earlier songs" (p. xi). Nutzhorn, in the first part of his book ("The Historical Evidence," pp. 1-98), strives to set aside as untrustworthy the statements which are used to disprove the original unity of the poems. In the second part ("The

Internal Evidence," pp. 100-268) he discusses some of the contradictions which have been pointed out in the Iliad, and explains them away or ascribes little importance to them, in the hope of thus establishing the original unity of conception of the poems against attack from any quarter. We may recognize the fervor of enthusiasm for the poet, for which Madvig praises the author (p. xi.), but the work itself can hardly be thought to contribute much to the Homeric discussion, since it touches no point connected with the real question which had not been more calmly and more thoroughly treated in previous works.

Bergk, in the first volume of his *Griechische Literatur-Geschichte* (Berlin, 1872) — which is mainly occupied with the subject of Homer — takes a position in defence of the original unity of the Iliad against Lachmann, but in a very different sense from the writers hitherto named. In order to avoid possible inaccuracies, I will confine myself, in attempting to state Bergk's view of the origin of the Iliad, so far as possible to his own words, even where the usual quotation marks do not appear. The Iliad, as well as the Odyssey, was originally "a single poem, composed on a definite plan," and written down by the poet himself, to whom we may reasonably assign the name Homer. In the present form of the Iliad "we detect three essentially different elements: the original poem, additions in the form of continuations, and the work of a final reviser. The primitive Iliad was a poem of moderate length, though it is impossible now, since parts of it are lost, to tell exactly how long it was; of the present poem the greater part consists of later additions. It was also simple in structure." "The genuine portions of the Iliad have an incomparable beauty and dignity. If it were possible to detach



them wholly from the later additions and modifications, our enjoyment and admiration of them would be greatly intensified." Still we must not "set up too high a standard for the work of a poet who made the first attempt to construct an epic poem; such a work could be brought to perfection only by slow degrees." "This gradual building-up of the poem is the sufficient explanation of many contradictions and many variations in the poetic style." "Still the difference of the various parts [of what we actually have], the amount of the disturbing element, is too great to allow the opinion that the Iliad in its present form proceeded from a single hand." This "suggests the agency of several persons in the expansion of the original poem. The work of the great master was at once carried on by younger poets, whom we must suppose to have lived in close connection with him, and whom we may call Homeridae. But others, too, who were not born into this family circle, took part in the work, as one addition gave rise to another." The "self-restraint and moderation which distinguished those poets were unfortunately lacking in the editor who undertook to combine these later songs with the primitive Iliad, and, at the same time, to continue the work of the younger poets. Thus he not only worked over the original nucleus and its outgrowths, but added longer or shorter passages of his own production. These additions of the reviser exceed in length and audacity all that his predecessors had done in this direction. But the chief injury done by him to the poems consists in his having wholly suppressed important parts of them, substituting his own work in their place, or so modified them that it is hardly possible to recognize the original any more, and that not only where his additions

involved such changes, but also arbitrarily and needlessly. It has been the principal task of the present critical analysis of the Iliad to indicate the work of this audacious reviser, for, although he impressed a distinct character on all that passed through his hands, the real facts of the matter have never, up to this time, been suspected by scholars." "This reviser gave to the Iliad essentially the form it now has. After him but few considerable additions—such as the Catalogue of the Ships and the last two books—were made. Even these additions were made before the beginning of the Olympiads, so that Arktinos and the other cyclic poets had the poem before them in completed form." [Here follows Bergk's analysis of the Iliad, which is omitted on account of its length.—TR.] When I try to estimate—so far as Bergk's language makes it possible—the amount of the several elements of our present Iliad on the basis of his analysis, I find that of the (about) 16,000 lines of the poem he recognizes some 1400 as genuine, that is, as belonging to the original Iliad, and some 5800 as half genuine, that is, as original lines, but so modified by the reviser that it is no longer possible to distinguish clearly the original element from the modification. The probability of such a thorough change of form, consisting not merely in additions and expansions, but also in omissions, substitutions, etc., seems greatly embarrassed by Bergk's supposition that the Iliad was originally committed to writing by its author. Bergk anticipates this objection, and says: "It is precisely oral tradition that best preserves the details. A poem that passes from mouth to mouth is handed down more nearly as it is received, or, if changed at all, is completely changed; whereas putting it in writing brings with it its own evils.

Every rhapsode who wrote down the poem for himself could easily change the text at his pleasure, and the longer poems gave opportunity for partial changes, arbitrary additions, and new combinations of parts. The earlier epic poetry was in the highest degree fluid in substance, and the use of writing put no check upon its variation; indeed, we may say that writing facilitated the production of a corrupt and defective text." For answer to this, if any answer is needed, one may see the remarks of W. Hartel in his review of Bergk's *Literatur-Geschichte* in the *Zeitschrift für d. österr. Gym.*, 1873, p. 357. To estimate the reality of these changes, and judge as to the assignment of particular passages to these different hands, would require more room than Bergk's analysis itself occupies, and is made more difficult by special peculiarities. In spite of no lack of confidence on his part, we find so frequently expressions implying uncertainty—"probably," "may be," "would seem," etc.—that it is hardly less difficult to draw a clear line between what he considers proved and what he indicates as mere opinion, than between the genuine and the ungentine in the *Iliad*. And for what he puts forward as certain there is either no reason given, or the reason is either a presupposition as to the contents of the original mythical matter (e. g. that every mention of Idomeneus is due to the reviser), which implies knowledge which is not and perhaps never can be attained, or an æsthetic judgment (as in his high opinion of the river-battle in XXI.) which will hardly command general assent. Bergk says indignantly of Lachmann: "It goes beyond all reasonable credibility when the modern criticism expects us to recognize a mere compilation of loosely connected songs in those two poems, which not

only the simple, natural, popular feeling, but the unanimous verdict of acknowledged masters in poetry and philosophy has for centuries regarded as an indivisible whole." That this "unanimous verdict," imposing as it sounds, is no reality, I have endeavored above (p. 18 sqq.) to show; but when Bergk invokes it against Lachmann, it is hard to see how he can deny that it bears with just the same force against himself. Aeschylos and Sophokles, Plato and Aristotle, we know had the Iliad in the same form—apart from inconsiderable variations of the text—in which we read it; and what they admired was the Iliad as a whole and as the work of one poet; of the ravages of the audacious reviser they had as little suspicion as had modern criticism before Bergk. What really surpasses "all reasonable credibility" is that Bergk expects us to recognize, of the poem which he himself describes as above, only one tenth as the untouched work of that creator of the epic, a much larger part as the off-hand production of the light-minded reviser, and more than half of the whole as a confused mixture of successive deposits of poetry.

<sup>28</sup> Even for professional scholars there have appeared in recent times several statements of the present condition of the Homeric question, e. g. by K. A. J. Hoffmann, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Untersuchungen über die Einheit der Ilias" (Allg. Monatschrift für Wissensch. und Literatur, 1852); G. Curtius, "Andeutungen über den gegenw. Stand der Homerischen Frage" (Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym., 1854); Hiecke, Der gegenw. Stand der Hom. Frage (Stralsund, 1856). An article by J. La Roche ("Ueber die Entstehung der Hom. Gedichte" in the last-mentioned journal for 1863) is an attempt to determine with

the aid of the labors of previous scholars the definite marks of interpolations and points of juncture through the whole of the two poems. It contains also a brief statement of the author's opinions as to the general process of growth of the Iliad and Odyssey, and an attempt to indicate the several original lays which can still be recognized in it.

<sup>29</sup> In this section I have endeavored to present briefly some of the principal results of the pregnant discussions by M. Sengebusch (*Homerica dissertatio prior et posterior*) referred to above in the early notes.

<sup>30</sup> The Hesiodic epic and the cyclic poems not connected with the Trojan myths have been purposely left unmentioned to simplify the discussion, inasmuch as they do not throw light directly upon the point of view under which the question is here discussed.

<sup>31</sup> A sketch of the several epics belonging to the Trojan myth, made up by combination of scattered notices and scanty fragments, is given by Welcker in *Der Epische Cyclus oder die Homerischen Dichter*. This book, like all his similar works, has great value from his profound knowledge of all the remains of ancient Greek literature and art; but it oversteps the limits that are set to our knowledge by the fragmentary condition of its sources. The section on the post-Homeric epic poets in Nitzsch's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Epischen Poesie* goes still further in this direction.

<sup>32</sup> Welcker, as above, pp. 1-82. A modification of Welcker's view is implied in Kirchoff's investigations on the composition of the Odyssey, see p. 56 sqq. of the lecture and the accompanying notes.

<sup>33</sup> Sengebusch, *Diss. II.* pp. 23-25.

<sup>34</sup> Sengebusch, Diss. II. p. 14, gives a view of the amount of the epic poetry which is assigned to Homer by Pindar, Simonides, Aeschylus, Sophokles, Aristophanes, and Thucydides; the proof of his statements is given in the corresponding passage of Diss. I.

<sup>35</sup> Sengebusch, Diss. II. p. 15.

<sup>36</sup> Brought together in Sengebusch, Diss. II. p. 13.

<sup>37</sup> Anthol. Pal. II. pp. 715, 295 sq. (in Jacob's *Delectus Epigramm. Graecorum*, IV. 6).

<sup>38</sup> As to the time of composition of the lives of Homer that have come down to us, see Sengebusch, Diss. I. pp. 1-13, and the authorities quoted in them, p. 19 sq. The whole of diss. I. treats of their value.

<sup>39</sup> Sengebusch, Diss. II. pp. 47-69.

<sup>40</sup> Sengebusch, Diss. II. p. 70.

<sup>41</sup> A view of the several dates, with the authorities for them, is given by Sengebusch in Jahn's *Jahrbücher*, 67, p. 611 sqq., and Diss. II. p. 78. Röth (*Geschichte der abendl. Philosophie*, II. p. 38), with noteworthy naïveté quotes the date given by Herodotus as if it were the only one ever suggested. By such a method it is certainly easy to triumph over the whole Homeric discussion set on foot by Wolf as "a long since exploded paradox," which "proceeded from half-knowledge of history." I mention this because such lofty language actually imposes upon readers who are not in a position to investigate the matter themselves; and also because recently (*Literar. Centralblatt*, 1860, No. 7) philology was reproached with having kept a significant silence about Röth's book. The groundlessness of this reproach can be seen by a glance at the second edition of Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen*. But such a method as that just mentioned in regard to

the period of Homer needs no criticism but to be left to bring on its own judgment.

<sup>42</sup> Those statements are excluded, in both cases, which depend not on actual tradition, but merely on the conjectures and computations of learned men.—Sengebusch, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 67, p. 609 sqq.; *Diss.* II. p. 69.

<sup>43</sup> Sengebusch, first in his review of Lauer's *Gesch. der Hom. Poesie*, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 67; then in *Diss.* II. The chronological principles followed in these discussions are attacked by J. Brandis, *De temporum antiquiss. Graecorum rationibus*, *Index lect.* (Bonna, 1857-58). Compare the review of this essay by A. von Gutschmid, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 83. An unqualified condemnation of Sengebusch's investigations is expressed by Bergk (*Griech. Literatur-Gesch.* I. p. 463): "This hypothesis has been praised as not only ingenious but well-supported; yet any one who takes the pains to examine it thoroughly will find it hollow and worm-eaten all through." This thorough examination Bergk does not offer us directly nor enable us to gain indirectly from his own treatment of the subject. For, among the statements as to the place of Homer, he accepts one and condemns all the rest without reason given; and, as to the time of Homer, he rejects all traditions as pure fiction, and puts his confidence solely in general combinations. Such a proceeding is, in truth, very simple and convenient, but it wholly neglects to explain the real and unique multiplicity of statements, and gives one no right to condemn at a blow every attempt to explain it. See Hartel, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1873; and, as to the pseudo-Herodotean life of Homer, which Bergk adopts, J. Schmidt, *De Herodotea quae fertur vita Homeri* (Halle, 1875).

<sup>44</sup> Herod. II. 53; Sengebusch, Jahn's Jahrb. 67, p. 373 sqq.

<sup>45</sup> Sengebusch, Jahn's Jahrb. 67, p. 614. Against this, Volkmann, *Gesch. und Kritik der Wolf'schen Prolegomena*, p. 358 (cf. p. 275 sqq.): "We have no tradition of the work or of the existence of Homeridae or of any school of epic poetry outside of Chios. The assumption of their existence is a purely arbitrary assumption."

<sup>46</sup> Wolf, *Prolegomena*, pp. 40-94; Sengebusch, *Diss. II.* p. 41 sqq. I have left the statement in the lecture unchanged, although Bergk (*Griech. Lit. I.* pp. 185-214), and after him Volkmann (*Gesch. etc.*, pp. 181-232), have endeavored to prove that even before the Trojan War the art of writing was in use among the Greeks. The earliest instance of writing yet discovered, of determinable date, is the cutting of their names by Greek mercenaries on the Nubian colossus (Kirchhoff, *Griech. Alphabet*, 2d ed. p. 31 sqq.). If we assume as probable the earlier of the possible dates for this inscription, it proves that the art of writing was widely diffused among the Greeks about 620 B.C.; and, of course, this wide diffusion implies the existence and practice of it for a considerable time before that date. These facts agree fully with the development of Greek literature in prose and poetry. But to carry back the use of writing more than five hundred years before that date is in no way justified by the existence of this inscription. Bergk himself frankly admits this as applying to Homer, whose period he puts fully two centuries after the Trojan War: "It is impossible to decide, on historical evidence, whether these poems were, in the first instance, committed to writing. . . . We are, therefore, left to depend upon combinations." As to the value of



the most important of these combinations, see Hartel, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1873, p. 350 sqq., 1874, p. 822 sqq. While I express, at the beginning of my discussion of the origin of the poems, the conviction that they were not originally committed to writing, and therein follow the historical course of the investigation, I feel myself obliged, in opposition to Bergk and especially to Volkman, to deny that this conviction includes the central point, or even a clearly decisive element of the answer to the question as to the origin of the poems. On the contrary, this question is to be decided only by arguments drawn from the poems themselves. If the study of the poems constrains us to the conclusions stated on p. 59 sqq., we must hold fast those conclusions whether an original use of writing in this case is proved on other grounds or not, although it cannot be overlooked that they agree best with the latter supposition.

<sup>47</sup> Röth, it is true, says (*Abendl. Philos.* II. p. 41): "Homer himself mentions the art of writing, and that, too, as practised in the heroic age;" and, certainly, in his translation of *Il.* 6: 169 there is mention of it. But that there is no such mention of it in the words of Homer is so familiar a fact that it is hardly necessary to refer a reader of Homer to *Lehrs, De Aristarcho*, p. 103; *Sengebusch, Diss.* II. p. 42 sqq. Bergk says on this passage: "The well-known passage in the *Iliad*, where Proteus intrusts to Bellerophon the fateful missive, is explained, not necessarily, but very probably, as referring to a system of secret writing. This, however, by no means excludes, but rather presupposes the knowledge and use of the ordinary writing." The reason given by Bergk for the absence in Homer of any mention of the arts of reading and writing,

though they were known before the Trojan War, viz., "because they seemed inconsistent with his ideal picture of a primitive state of society," is one that I cannot criticise, because I do not understand it. Homer finds it consistent with his "picture of primitive society" to mention a high degree of art in weaving, in the working of metal, ivory, wood, not as produced by gods only, but by men also, on whom Athene and Hephaestos have bestowed such gifts. How would the art of writing, if in use before the heroic age of the Iliad, as a gift of Hermes perhaps, differ from these so as to disturb the picture of primitive society? But, possibly, for it is not easy to follow out his analysis of the poem, all those references to other arts of civilization are inventions of the "audacious reviser."

<sup>48</sup> Bekker, Hom. Blätter, I. p. 136: "This [Homeric] language, developed in the course of a great migration, under the unceasing influences of the meetings, the frictions, the interminglings of kindred tribes, and controlled only by song and the lyre, attained indeed to a great wealth of euphonious forms, but seems to have gone through the stage of trying all possible combinations, and to have had no fixed, unchanging, exclusive system of forms, such as came in later by the general spread of writing. *Litera scripta manet.*" On the other hand, Bergk, Griech. Lit. I. p. 200: "As the peculiar orthography of the poems is a conclusive proof of their great age, so the remarkably regular and transparent form of the language shows the wide diffusion in early times of the art of writing. The rare purity in which the Greek language was preserved is scarcely credible without constant use of that art, which is not only the foundation of all higher cultivation, but gives to language its settled form and its power to pro-

teet itself against corrupting influences." Compare on this Hartel, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1873, p. 352.

<sup>49</sup> The *Αἰθιοπία* and *Ἰλίου πέρσις* of the Milesian Arktinos, Welcker, *Epische Cycl.* II. For the settling of the date 775 B.C. as the *ἀκμή* of Arktinos, see Sengebusch, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 67.—Kirchhoff in his essay, *Quaestionum Hom. particula* (Berlin, 1845), proves that the *Κύπρια* of Stasinos, written about 660 B.C., recognized several books of the *Iliad* in the form and connection in which we have them.

<sup>50</sup> The laws of Zaleukos, about 664 B.C. Cf. Wolf, *Proleg.* p. 66 sqq.

<sup>51</sup> Sengebusch, *Diss.* II. p. 45.

<sup>52</sup> The authorities for this important fact are given in Sengebusch, *Diss.* II. pp. 27-41; Düntzer, *Homerische Abhandlungen*, pp. 1-27. The historic credibility of the statements about Peisistratos is criticised by Nutzhorn (n. 27), pp. 16-66, and Volkmann.

<sup>53</sup> Sengebusch, *Diss.* I. pp. 193-197.

<sup>54</sup> Sengebusch, *Diss.* I. pp. 71 sq., 186, 200 sqq.

<sup>55</sup> The principles of text-criticism in regard to the Homeric poems which have been accepted since Wolf's time are concisely stated by L. Friedländer, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 79. The relation of Wolf's text to those of previous editions and to Villoison's edition of the MS. Ven. 454 is stated by Bekker, *Hom. Blätter*, pp. 232, 296. A material part of the principles on which Bekker's text-edition of 1843 is based will be found in his criticism of Wolf's edition, *Hom. Blätter*, p. 29. Bekker's text (1843) is the foundation of the editions which have since appeared, with the exception of Dindorf's in the Teubner series, as to which cf. J. La Roche, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1863. How far Bekker's principles were modified in his second edition of 1858 is stated

in the preface to that edition, and further explanations are to be found in the *Hom. Blätter*. This second edition was reviewed by W. C. Kayser, *Philologus*, vols. xvii. and xviii.; Friedländer, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 79; Rumpf, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 81; J. La Roche, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1860. As to the most recent text-editions with critical apparatus of the *Odyssey* by J. La Roche, Leipzig, 1867, and A. Nauck, Berlin, 1874, see A. Ludwich, *Wissensch. Monatsblätter*, 1873; *Jahn's Jahrb.* 109; and Eickholt, *Zeitschrift für d. Gymnasialwesen*, 1868.

<sup>56</sup> These words mark the limits within which all the following discussion is confined; it contains no conclusions to which the two Homeric poems, as they now lie before us, do not lead by reasonable inference. It is, for instance, possible that one might be led, by comparison of the development of epic poetry in other nations or by general reasonings, to hold that, before the existence of epic lays of moderate compass and limited to single incidents of the myth, such as the *Iliad* implies, there must be assumed as existing epic poems of equally moderate extent but covering the main substance of the whole myth with less detail. The reasonableness of such or similar assumptions is not here discussed, because that would involve abandonment of the ground on which all our conclusions are based, viz., the facts presented to us in Greek literature.

<sup>57</sup> Goethe, correspondence with Schiller, No. 472: "I am more than ever convinced of the unity and indivisibility of the poem, and there is no man living, nor will there ever be, who can settle the question. I, at least, find myself every moment coming back to a mere subjective opinion; so has it been with others before us, and so will it be with others after us."

<sup>58</sup> Nitzsch, *Sagenpoesie*, p. 89, and this idea is carried out at length in pp. 184-273. Cf. Bäumlein, *Commentatio de Homero ejusque carminibus* (prefixed to the *Iliad* in the Tauchnitz series), pp. xx.-xxvii., particularly p. xxiii.: "Nor will any one doubt that a single, and, as Nitzsch has shown, a tragical idea runs through the whole *Iliad*," and again in *Philol.* II. p. 417. Against such a single fundamental idea in the *Iliad*, see Düntzer, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 83, and *Supplementband 2* (*Hom. Abhandlungen*, pp. 236, 410).

<sup>59</sup> Schömann, *De reticentia Homeri*, *Opusc.* III. p. 12 sq., and *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69.

<sup>60</sup> Grote, *History of Greece*, Am. ed. II. p. 179 sqq. As to the method in which Nitzsch tries to bring the important passages II. 11 : 609 sq.; 16 : 72 sqq. into harmony with the ninth book, see Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69, and *De reticentia Hom.*, *Opusc.* III. p. 15. Franke's revision of Faesi's *Iliad*, in the note on the former passage and at the beginning of the ninth book, frankly acknowledges the inconsistency. The silence of La Roche as to the difficulty in both the passages quoted is a neglect of the function of an explanatory edition. Faesi's note on the passage in the sixteenth book, where Achilles, when Patroklos begs his permission to go into the battle, answers that the Trojans would be in disgraceful flight instead of triumphant, *εἰ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων ἦπια εἶδείη*, "if Agamemnon were well disposed to me," is as follows: "The haughty Achilles is not yet willing to confess that the chief blame for the calamity lies on him, and refuses to remember that Agamemnon, in the ninth book, has done all in his power to appease him. He will not be put in the wrong." The fact, that is, that the here inevitable reference to the ninth book is lacking, is twisted into a delicate touch of psychological portraiture, but Faesi

could hardly deny that for such a purpose the poet ought to use and would have used other means. This interpretation really substitutes something else for the text. The approving reference in Franke's *Faesi* to the exclusion by the early critics of 11 : 767–785 seems hardly justified. The essential reason on the part of the early critics (see *Schol. Ven.*) for the exclusion of these lines was their want of harmony with the ninth book, a point of view which this editor cannot adopt; and the assumption of an interpolation is reasonable only when some occasion for the insertion of it can be shown.

<sup>61</sup> Il. 15 : 63, 593. Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69.

<sup>62</sup> Lachmann has warned us (*Friedländer, Die Hom. Kritik*, p. vii.) how uncertain the result is if such considerations are allowed much weight. Rash conclusions from the *ὑπαξ εἰρημένα* and from the differences of vocabulary between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are discouraged by the statistics of L. Friedländer, *Die kritische Benutzung der ὑπαξ εἰρημένα*, *Philol.* 6, and *Dissertatio de vocabulis Hom., quae in alterutro carmine non inveniuntur I.–III.* (*Universitäts-Schriften, Königsberg*, 1858–59). This, however, diminishes in no degree the value of careful and thorough investigations in this direction, such as C. A. J. Hoffmann's *Quaestiones Homericae* (Clausthal, 1848); J. La Roche's *Homerische Studien* (Wien, 1861), especially p. vii. sq.; L. Friedländer's *Die Gärten des Alkinous und der Gebrauch des Präsens bei Homer*, *Philol.* 6; or of special observations, like those of Liesegang, *Zwei Eigenthümlichkeiten des 16. und 17. Buches der Ilias*, *Philol.* 6 (against which see Nitzsch, *Die Apostrophe in Ilias und Odyssee*, *Philol.* 16); and Koch, *Ueber das Vorkommen gewisser Formeln in manchen Theilen der Ilias, anderer für dieselbe Sache in anderen Theilen*, *Philol.* 7.

We may confidently expect that the thorough investigation of the Homeric poems in regard to matters of syntax and vocabulary which is now just started will contribute to the correction or confirmation of the conclusions which have been reached hitherto mainly on other lines of evidence. A recent example of most comprehensive, keensighted, and conscientious investigation of this kind is W. Hartel's *Beiträge zur Homerischen Prosodie und Metrik*, in his *Homerische Studien, Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Classe der Wiener Akademie*, I. vol. 68. (second edition, Berlin, 1873), II. vol. 76, III. vol. 78.

<sup>63</sup> A number of these little points are brought together in Faesi's *Iliad*, *Introd.* p. vii., with references to the notes, where the attempt is made to reduce the contradictions as much as possible; in Franke's revision (*Introd.* p. v.) the notes are free from the endeavor to disguise and explain away the extent of the contradictions.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. *Il.* 16 : 777 with 11 : 86. Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69, p. 18, considers Nitzsch's attempt to reconcile the passages. Faesi's attempt to diminish the inconsistency does violence to the language, and is in conflict with his own note on 8 : 66. Franke (*Introd.* p. xxxii. and note on 11 : 86) and La Roche (notes on the two passages) recognize the contradiction without trying to smooth it away. The essay by A. Kiner, *Die Chronologie der Ilias*, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 83, constructs a complete table of the days in the action of the *Iliad*, without paying any attention to such little matters as these.

<sup>65</sup> Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69, p. 19. On this point, which every discussion of the subject touches, I refer to Schömann's article, because it includes a consideration of Nitzsch's argument in defence of the unity.

<sup>66</sup> Faesi himself admits, at the beginning of the sixteenth book, that this and the following book contain few points of connection with the four that precede them, and that they were originally planned as an independent poem. Yet his translation, in the note on 16 : 2, of *παρίστατο*, unsupported by any other case in the Iliad, and impossible here, by reason of *τὸν δὲ ἰδών*, in 16 : 5, and his supposition that the first meeting of Achilles and Patroklos is already passed without mention, can have no other object than to explain away the omission of the information which Patroklos was to bring. La Roche's silence does not solve the difficulty.

<sup>67</sup> Different positions of the battle, in immediately connected narratives, may be seen by comparison of 11 : 824 with 12 : 35-39. See Lachmann, *Betrachtungen*, p. 45. Franke's Faesi states here the simple fact that "the twelfth book brings at length the battle which has been in prospect since the end of the seventh book." For the cases of variation in locality, see Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69, *De reticentia Hom.*, *Opusc.* III. p. 21 sq., notes 8, 9.

<sup>68</sup> Il. 13 : 345-360, compared with 13 : 10-39. See A. Jacob, *Ueber die Entstehung der Ilias und Odyssee*, p. 270 sq. Faesi (on 13 : 352) strives to hide the inconsistency in the narrative by an impossible translation of *λάθρη ὑπέξαναδύς*, which he retains in his third edition, although he has added to the note on 345 the admission (from Nitzsch, *Sagenpoesie*, p. 264) that perhaps lines 345-360 may not have originally belonged in this place. La Roche, contrary to his custom, touches on this difficulty, and seems to try to solve it *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον* (see note 79), for he remarks, on 352, "that Poseidon had in the meantime returned into the sea is left unmentioned by the poet ; in 239 it is said *αὐτίς ἔβη*



θεὸς ἂμ πόνον ἀνδρῶν." Bergk (Gr. Lit. I. p. 607) denies the existence of any inconsistency.

<sup>69</sup> See the instances in full in A. Jacob, as above, p. 284 sqq.; Lachmann, *Betrachtungen*, p. 35. On the attempts to minimize the contradictions by interpretation, or to remove them by exclusion of lines, as by Faesi on 11 : 193, see Friedländer, *Die Hom. Kritik*, p. 35 sq. Franke's Faesi, on 11 : 193, openly states the difficulty and the different possible solutions. La Roche says nothing about it.

<sup>70</sup> Il. 16 : 793-815, compared with 17 : 13, 16, 125, 187, 205. Faesi's note on 17 : 13 misses the real point of the matter. It is true that "the poet could not assume that Apollo had taken the arms of the slain hero away with him;" but the difficulty is, that after Patroklos was γυμνός (16 : 815), and the gods had taken his armor from his shoulders (16 : 846), there is no propriety in the statements that others stripped him of them (17 : 125, 187, 205). As to the combination of different narratives in this part of the poem, see Schütz, *De Patrocleae compositione* (Anclam, 1845).

<sup>71</sup> On the general character of the narrative in books XI.-XVIII. of the *Iliad*, see the frank statement of Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69. For the methods of bringing order out of this confusion, see Nitzsch, *Sagenpoesie*, pp. 240 sqq., 274 sqq. Among these methods is the discovery that certain sections of the poem are to be regarded as containing incidents concurrent in time, where, however, the poet has unfortunately neglected to indicate the concurrence. This very useful theory of narratives parallel in time is accepted by Bergk in another connection, *Gr. Lit.* I. p. 657, 704. Cf. W. Hartel, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1873. As to the contradictions in this portion of the poem, there is general agreement in the discussions by G. Hermann (work cited

in note 26), Lachmann (same note), E. Cauer (Ueber die Urforn einiger Rhapsodien der Ilias, Berlin, 1850), W. Ribbeck (Philol. 8), A. Jacob (note 68); but the hypotheses as to the parts of which it is probably composed differ considerably.

<sup>72</sup> Lessing, Laokoon, XVI.

<sup>73</sup> By the combination of separate narratives as an occasion of difficulty, I refer, in the examples in the text, always to connection in subject-matter, not to the words which form the transition from one narrative to another. The difference between the two is plainly seen in the case of the first and second books, where both come into consideration, but in different ways. The case itself is interesting, on account of the devices employed to solve the difficulty. That the second book cannot be regarded as a proper continuation of the first in subject-matter was convincingly shown by G. Hermann (Opusc. v. p. 57). Since he pointed out the difficulties, no one has been able to pass them over in silence. To meet his arguments, Nitzsch (Sagenpoesie) takes refuge in "the condition of the myth," thus tacitly admitting the impossibility of an explanation. Nägelsbach (Anmerk. zur Il. 2. Aufl.) declares the second book necessary for the purpose of the poet, "to bring before us the feeling in the army, the attitude of the chiefs towards Agamemnon;" and that the dream does not turn out destructive (*οὐλοε*), "does not," says he, "disturb us in the least; the decision of Zeus, to give victory to the Trojans, finds a serious obstacle in the valor of the Greeks, which hinders its execution." But, however true it is that the feeling of the army is vividly brought before us in the second book, still this ought not, if the second book is a continuation of the first in the original composition, to be done under cir-

cumstances which do not agree with the first book. This point, which is the only one really in question, is not touched by that explanation of the poet's purpose. And if the fulfilment of the decree of Zeus was hindered by the valor of the Greeks, would not, and ought not, a poem conceived by a single mind to have given us a hint that *ὑπὲρ αἴσαν Ἀχαιοὶ φέρτεροι ἦσαν*? Bäumlein (Philol. 7), instead of proving the unity of the two books in subject, offers only the assertion that there is such a unity, quoting as proof certain lines in the second book which refer to the first. These lines, which no one has overlooked in the discussion of the inner connection of the two books, prove nothing but the intention to adapt one to the other. Bäumlein further describes the conduct of Agamemnon, in the council and the assembly of the second book, as "intelligible on psychological principles from the events of the first book;" and therein suggests an idea, which is expanded with all confidence in an essay by A. Göbel (Mützell's G. Z., 1854). In that essay we have the gap between the two narratives completely filled by imagination, so as to make the connection seem all right. These capricious fancies (of which an example is given in note 79) Faesi regards as well-founded reasoning, and bases on them his unhesitating statement at the beginning of the second book, that it "stands in close connection with the first book, and assumes precisely the same situation of affairs and state of feeling that we see at its end." This untenable assertion Franke displaces by the more moderate remark, "the second book narrates the first step taken by Zeus towards the fulfilment of his promise to Thetis." A very different question is the one as to the words which form the connecting link between the first and second books. Lachmann, in the introduction to his Betrachtun-

gen, mentions, as a striking illustration of the fact that between two successive sections of the Iliad it seems often to be implied in the language that one song ends and another begins, the lines 1 : 609 sqq. and 2 : 1 sq. "Neither is the antithesis complete, as if it were 'All went to bed and slept, but Zeus slept not,' instead of which we have 'The gods went to bed, and also Zeus slept. The other gods and men slept, but Zeus did not;' nor, on the other hand, if the statement was to follow at once, 'Zeus slept not, but summoned the dream-god,' was there any object in first mentioning that by him lay golden-throned Hera, who, however, was not to know of the sending of the dream." This puts a very awkward obstacle in the way of interpretation, and to remove it one of two means must be employed; either *καθεῦθε* (1 : 611) does not mean "he slept," or *οὐκ ἔχε νῆδνμος ὑπνος* (2 : 2) does not mean "he slept not." Both means have actually been employed. *καθεῦθε* is translated "he lay down to sleep" by Gross (*Vindiciae Hom. I.*), with quotation of *Od.* 4 : 304 ; 6 : 1 ; 7 : 344 ; 8 : 313 ; 20 : 141 ; "he went to sleep," by Döderlein (on *Il.* 1 : 611), who quotes the same passages ; "he lay in bed," by Ameis (on *Od.* 15 : 5). The passages in *Od.* 8 : 313, 337, 342 are out of the question, for there *εὔδειν* is a mere euphemism for *φιλότῃτι μιγῆναι*. The other quoted passages, where it is indifferent which sense, "to sleep" or "to fall asleep," is given to the word, or where the latter is admissible, can prove nothing for a passage where a positive preference for one meaning is essential to the interpretation. Moreover, this view ignores the weight which the secondary meaning of the word ought to have in determining its original sense. These considerations, perhaps, influenced Nägelsbach, in the second edition of his commentary, to speak of this translation as "a

wide-spread error." He tries the other method, explaining *Δία δ' οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος*, "Zeus was not chained in sleep the whole night, but after a time he awoke, and meditated how to fulfil his promise to Thetis." So also La Roche. But this is not in the words, for *οὐκ ἔχε* and *ὅ γε μερμήριζε* are put together as coincident in time, and it is not said that he awoke from sleep, as it is in *Od.* 15 : 8, though Nägelsbach quotes that passage as sustaining his view. The other passage which he quotes, *Il.* 9 : 713 and 10 : 1-4, is simply another instance of inconsistency between the end of one lay and the beginning of another. Both of these means are combined by Döderlein (on *Il.* 5 : 2), and by Faesi in his notes; but Franke, in his edition of Faesi, rejects all such artifices (*Introd.* p. v., note, and on 2 : 2). This instance illustrates the difference between difficulties in the phrases of transition and those in the continuity of the subject-matter, to which latter class all our examples belong. It may also show how, in almost every case, the conflict of the conservatives and radicals has had a long history.

<sup>74</sup> Instead of the expositions of the startling want of sequence here (e. g. G. Hermann, *De interpol. Hom., Opusc.* v.), it may be well to read the enthusiastic praise of the passage by Nitzsch (*Sagenpoesie*). Faesi's remarks, in the Introduction, p. xxi., and in the note on *Il.* 3 : 15, can hardly be reconciled. Franke substitutes for the former the simple statement that "the often announced and anticipated battle of the two armies is still postponed."

<sup>75</sup> Lachmann, *Betrachtungen*, p. 22; A. Jacob, *Ueber die Entstehung*, etc., p. 215.

<sup>76</sup> A. Jacob, as above, p. 209.

<sup>77</sup> Of these works perhaps the best for the unprofessional

reader is that by A. Jacob, which states the inconsistencies minutely and gives the principal passages in German.

<sup>78</sup> See this point developed in A. Köchly's *De Iliadis carminibus diss.* III. p. 6 sqq.

<sup>79</sup> Among these harmonizing devices, the most prominent is the supposition that the poet omits to mention, and leaves the reader to supply, some particular which is essential to the understanding of the narrative. To what an extreme Nitzsch carries the use of this device, *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον*, is shown by Schömann (*De ret. Hom.*) and Köchly (*De Il. carn. diss.* III.). It is used also by Faesi, for instance, in the notes on Il. 3 : 249, 259 (where also Ameis, La Roche, and Franke do the same), on Il. 5 : 510 (where Franke recognizes its inadequacy), and elsewhere. The use of it by Ameis and La Roche on Il. 5 : 133 surely needs no refutation (see Franke's note on the passage). What may be done by a free use of this time-honored device may be seen from an instance in A. Göbel's treatise, mentioned in note 73. The line Il. 1 : 487 is usually supposed to contain nothing more than the simple fact of a dispersion of the men to their tents and ships, as in other similar lines (e. g. Il. 19 : 277 ; 23 : 3 ; 24 : 2). But Göbel finds in it "they scattered themselves hurriedly among the ships and tents, as if a guilty conscience hunted them away, or, rather, as if a mysterious storm-cloud was hovering over the Greek camp." On such fancies, which any sound principles of interpretation condemn, is built up the psychological explanation of the connection between the first two books of the Iliad. A very successful contrivance for removing contradictions is the assumption of an interpolation. That many such would creep into an epic poem which was long preserved only by oral tradition is certain ; but there is no just ground for holding that a given passage

is interpolated in the fact that it disturbs the continuity of the poem as a whole. Nitzsch's effort by this means to bring the speech of Achilles, II. 16 : 49-91, into harmony with the ninth book (*Sagenpoesie*, p. 180 sqq.) is especially characteristic in this respect, and is thoroughly examined by Schömann, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69, *De ret. Hom.* pp. 13-15. The only conditions under which the assumption of an interpolation is justifiable are laid down distinctly and decisively by Kirchhoff, *Die Composition der Odyssee*, p. 201 (*Philol.* 19). Friedländer's idea (*Die Hom. Kritik*), that these discrepancies are, in most cases, to be regarded as "lingering traces of a long separation" of the parts of a poem originally one, is applied far too freely in interpretation.

<sup>80</sup> The fact that these contradictions run through the whole extent of the poem is a serious objection to Grote's intermediate hypothesis (*History of Greece*, Am. ed. II. p. 175 sqq.), that our *Iliad* is made up of two long poems, an *Achilleid*, consisting of books I., VIII., XI.-XXII., and an *Iliad*, consisting of books II.-VII., with perhaps IX. and X. This theory Friedländer (*Die Hom. Kritik*, etc.) endeavors to establish with additional arguments. It is attacked, as preserving the unity of the poems too much, by W. Ribbeck (*Philol.* 8), and as sacrificing the unity, by Bäumlein (*Philol.* 11). [See, also, *Transactions of the Am. Philological Association*, 1876. A new form of Grote's theory, advanced by W. D. Geddes, *Problem of the Homeric Poems* (London, 1878), is open to the objection mentioned above. The chief novelty of this theory is, that it tries to show by internal arguments that the portion of the *Iliad* regarded by Grote as an addition to the original *Achilleid* (with a few scattered passages) was composed by the author of the *Odyssey*, and that to him, an Asiatic Greek, belong the name

Homer and the traditions connected with that name.—Tr.] Essentially the same position was taken, before the publication of Grote's theory, by Düntzer, *Jahn's Jahrb.*, Suppl. 2 (also in his *Hom. Abhandlungen*).

<sup>81</sup> Röth, indeed (*Abendl. Philos.* II.), regards Homer as the poet who *wrote* the Iliad, the Odyssey, the Thebaid, and several other great epics, each by a single effort of independent creative power; but he, with all his other learning, has not grasped the real point of the Homeric question, as was shown in note 41.

<sup>82</sup> That the composer of the Iliad as a single poem took up into his work earlier songs, largely or entirely unaltered, is repeatedly affirmed by Nitzsch (*Sagenpoesie*, pp. 109, 123, 126, etc.) and Bäumlein (essay prefixed to the Tauchnitz edition, p. xx. etc.). How slightly the view here adopted by Nitzsch differs from that which he opposes is shown by Schömann (*De ret. Hom.*) and Köchly (*De Il. carm. diss.* III.). Bergk (*Gr. Lit.* I. p. 523) remarks against this view: "The style of those earlier lays would not fit into the new form of art; therefore they cannot have been incorporated bodily into the new poems, but can only have served, like rough sketches of a picture, to stimulate and inspire the creative genius who laid the foundation of Greek epic poetry." Düntzer disposes of a portion of those passages in which Lachmann found his evidence of inconsistency as arbitrary insertions by the rhapsodes (on which see note 112). As to the remaining genuine body of the poems, he says (*Hom. Abhandl.* p. xii.): "That each of the two great poems was originally a single whole we dare not assume; for neither does the action, in its main features, constitute a single unity, nor does the same poetic spirit animate the whole." In this place may be mentioned the "new hypoth-



esis" of J. Minckwitz (see note 27), according to which a bard of the people, by name Homer, living at the time of the Trojan war, having acquired unwonted facility of expression by long practice from early youth in the production of lyric and short epic poems, composed a number of detached lays upon the heroic deeds of the Trojan war and the fortunes of the Greek chiefs on their return home, which were received with great applause by those who heard them. These detached lays, connected only in subject-matter, and varying in style from the very beginning, were handed down orally for centuries by the rhapsodes, until, in a somewhat mutilated and time-worn shape, they were collected together by Peisistratos. The apparent unity of the Iliad and Odyssey is due to editorial revision, which pieced them together, as well as might be, with all possible fidelity to the existing form of each portion. The one important feature of this "new hypothesis," that which puts it in opposition to Lachmann on one side and to Nitzsch on the other, the supposition of a single poet for many separate lays, may be found in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1844, N. 126-129 (cf. Curtius, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1854). This theory does not touch the most essential points, the original existence of independent lays, not designed to form one story, and the combination of them as a subsequent stage of their history. The impossibilities it contains, along with much that is true and generally admitted, cannot be discussed here.

<sup>83</sup> Nitzsch, *Sagenpoesie*, p. 281 sq. A conjectural analysis of the Iliad into its original songs is offered by Köchly, *Iliadis carmina XVI*. (Leipzig, 1866). The reasons for his analysis are given in a series of monographs ("De Iliadis carminibus dissertationes" in the Zurich University pro-

grammes from 1850 on, and "Hektor's Lösung," in the *Gratulations-Schrift der Zür. Univ. an Welcker*, 1858). His views are assailed or modified in many particulars by W. Ribbeck, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 85, and by J. La Roche, *Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1862.

<sup>84</sup> See the admirable development of this point by W. Wackernagel, in the essay mentioned in note 15 (II. p. 76 sqq.).

<sup>85</sup> The only exception to this remark is, that the close of the *Odyssey*, from 23:297 on, which Aristarchus long ago rejected, was subjected, not long after the appearance of Wolf's *Prolegomena*, to thorough examination by F. A. W. Spohn, *Commentatio de extrema Odysseae parte*, etc. (1816).

<sup>86</sup> This opinion is expressed not only by Nitzsch, Bäumlein, Grote (II. p. 164 sqq., Am. edition), Friedländer (*Die Hom. Kritik*), but also by Schömann, in the often-mentioned review, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 69. "To regard the *Odyssey* as a patchwork of originally independent lays seems to me rank absurdity, although it is certain that it contains interpolations, some of them of considerable extent, which, however, can be positively recognized as such. But the poem as a whole is the noble conception of a lofty genius, who had in this kind of poetry no model, and, so far as we can judge, no worthy imitator." On this Sengebusch (*Hom. diss.* II.) remarks that he fears Schömann will some day seem to himself to have decided with more force than truth. Bernhardt (*Gr. Lit.* 2d ed. II. p. 119) says of the *Odyssey*: "Here we find the epic conception to have advanced not only to the having one person as a moral centre, but also to unity of artistic construction; the action proceeds in strictly natural sequence, the plot is far more compact than that of the *Iliad*, and all its parts work together to one end. With a

fully developed art, the poet of the *Odyssey* groups the elements of his scheme, and makes them easily co-operate in a sphere of sober thought combined with serene wisdom. His poem, which is the earliest example of the organized artistic epic style, constitutes a chief part of the present *Odyssey*, and to his original shaping of the plot is due the precise interaction of the incidents, and the regular progressive advance through them to the catastrophe." On the other hand, Bekker, at the close of his criticism of the opening lines of the *Odyssey* (*Hom. Blätter*, p. 107), says: "It would not be much to the credit of the Greek intellect if Wolf's statement (*Proleg.* p. cxviii.) were true, that the admirable plan and structure of the *Odyssey* is to be regarded as the noblest monument of Greek genius." [To the same effect Steinthal, *Zeitschr. für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, 7, 1871.—Tr.]

<sup>87</sup> Apart from the unimportant book by Heerklotz, *Betrachtungen über die Odyssee*, Trier, 1854 (see Friedländer, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 79), and the valuable remarks in A. Jacob's work mentioned in note 68, most of the discussions bearing on the origin of the *Odyssey* have been confined to separate parts of the poem, e. g. on the opening lines by Bekker (*Hom. Blätter*); on the *Telemachie* by Hennings (1858; cf. Friedländer, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 79; Bäumlein, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 81); on the opening lines of the fifth book by Schmitt (*De secundo in Od. deorum concilio*, Friburg, 1852); on the gardens of Alkinous by L. Friedländer (*Philol.* 6); on the eleventh book by Lauer (*De Od. libri XI. forma genuina et patria*, Berlin, 1843); on the first thirteen books by Köchly (*Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1862; reprinted, with notes and a statement as to the separate lays in the latter half of the poem, in the *Verhandlungen der 21. Versammlung deut-*

scher Philologen, etc., Leipzig, 1863); on the XIII.-XIX. books by R. Volkmann (*Quaestiones epicae*, Leipzig, 1854); Rhode (*Schulprogramme*, Dresden, 1848, Brandenburg, 1858; cf. Friedländer, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 79); Meister (*Philol.* 8); on the twentieth book by Bekker (*Hom. Blätter*); on the portion from 23 : 297 through by Liesegang (*De extrema Od. parte*, Bielefeld, 1855).

<sup>88</sup> This point in regard to the *Odyssey* is stated with praiseworthy frankness, and proved by conclusive instances, in Faesi's introduction to his *Odyssey*, 4th ed. pp. 37-44.

<sup>89</sup> Kirchhoff, *Die Hom. Odyssee*, p. viii.

<sup>90</sup> A. Jacob, as above (note 68), p. 475 sq. See also note 109.

<sup>91</sup> A. Jacob, pp. 508-514.

<sup>92</sup> A. Jacob, p. 363 sqq.; Faesi, p. 39. As to the confused advice which Athene gives Telemachos in the first book, see Kirchhoff, *Die Composition der Odyssee*, I.; Friedländer, *Analecta Homerica*, *Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl.* 3; Kammer, *Die Einheit der Odyssee*. Friedländer (*Hom. Kritik*, and so after him Nitzsch, *Epische Poesie*) seeks to remove the difficulty as to the unexplained prolongation of the stay of Telemachos at Sparta as follows: "This delay is undeniably in conflict with his original design. But the freedom which the poet here allows himself is the less surprising, because he might reasonably assume that no one of his hearers would notice it. The really wonderful thing is, that this is the only instance worth mention of such poetic license in the whole poem; for the few other inconsistencies are much more probably to be ascribed to defective preservation than to careless composition of the poem." The examples given in the text may perhaps show that this is not the "only

instance worth mention of such license," and also that the inconsistencies run too deep into the structure of the poem to be ascribed to "defective preservation."

<sup>93</sup> Schmitt, in the work mentioned in note 87; Faesi, p. 37; A. Jacob, p. 387. Nitzsch gets over this difficulty easily by the very convenient phrase, "parallel narratives" (Philol. 17, pp. 1-28); cf. note 71.

<sup>94</sup> Faesi on Od. 15 : 1. Still, even in this case, it is possible to find an apparent solution. One is given in detail by Nitzsch (Epische Poesie, p. 128 sq.), which it is worth while to read through, and then ask yourself if it is intelligible.

<sup>95</sup> A. Jacob, p. 421. Most of the passages in which the woes of Odysseus are said to be caused by Poseidon's wrath, Düntzer (Hom. Abh. p. 409) regards as interpolations.

<sup>96</sup> Faesi, p. 41; A. Jacob, p. 369, 481; Kern, Bemerkungen über die Freier in der Odyssee, Progr. des Gym. zu Ulm, 1861; Hartel, Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym., 1871.

<sup>97</sup> Faesi, p. 40 sq. Cf. the attempt of Ameis (on 11 : 116) to explain away the present *κατέδουσι*.

<sup>98</sup> A. Jacob, p. 481.

<sup>99</sup> Od. 13 : 399; 16 : 176. Faesi, in this case, contrary to his usual practice in regard to the Odyssey, tries to establish harmony by the meaning he gives to *κνάνεος*. Ameis (Anhang on 16 : 176) avails himself of physiological science. See, on the other hand, the plain statements of A. Jacob, p. 463; Kirchhoff, Composition der Od., VI.

<sup>100</sup> Faesi, p. 41.

<sup>101</sup> A. Jacob, pp. 462, 471 sq., 507.

<sup>102</sup> Eurykleia and Eurynome; Faesi, p. 41; A. Jacob, p. 477. Faesi gives several other instances of this kind.

<sup>103</sup> See Bekker's pregnant essay on the twentieth book (Hom. Blätter).

<sup>104</sup> A. Jacob, pp. 430, 433 sq.

<sup>105</sup> Od. 17 : 360-491; 18 : 346-428; 20 : 284-344. See Meister (Philol. 8).

<sup>106</sup> Od. 14 : 29 sqq.; 16 : 4 sq., 162; 17 : 291 sqq.

<sup>107</sup> Od. 13 : 257-286; 14 : 199-359; 17 : 419-444; 19 : 172-248. There is still another in 24 : 303-314. Cf. A. Jacob, p. 453 sqq.; Faesi, p. 43.

<sup>108</sup> Od. 4 : 793; 16 : 450; 18 : 188; 20 : 54; 21 : 357-23 : 5. A. Jacob, p. 480.

<sup>109</sup> Od. 7 : 215; 17 : 503; 18 : 118, and cf. 15 : 344; 17 : 286; 18 : 53. That the *λαιμαργία* and *γαστριμαργία* of Odysseus were astounding to readers in ancient times appears from the combinations and comments in Athenaeos X. 412 b.

<sup>110</sup> Od. 15 : 160-165, 525-528; 17 : 160, 541; 19 : 535 sqq.; 20 : 103, 345 sqq.; 21 : 411-413; 22 : 240.

<sup>111</sup> The cases given in the text by no means exhaust the list of strange repetitions and accumulations, e. g. the two-fold direction given to Odysseus as to the way to the palace of Alkinous, Od. 6 : 300; 7 : 20 (A. Jacob, p. 348); the repeated presentation of gifts to him by the Phaeacians, Od. 8 : 385; 11 : 335; 13 : 10; the references by Penelope, Od. 19 : 518 sqq.; 20 : 65 sqq., to the myth of Pandareos, with different conceptions of the myth (Bekker, Hom. Blätter, p. 125); Odysseus complains *ad nauseam* of the ruinous effect of his stomach's resistless demands, Od. 7 : 216; 15 : 344; 17 : 286-289; 18 : 53; he tests repeatedly the faithfulness of his servants, Od. 14 : 459; 15 : 304; 16 : 305 (A. Jacob, p. 465), etc. As to the poetic value of the second half of the Odyssey, see especially Kirchhoff, *Composition der Odyssee*, p. 209.

<sup>112</sup> Kirchhoff, in his book *Die Homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung* (1859), has given the result of several years

of study in such form as to show to the eye his theory, printing separately the several successive layers of which the poem consists. He is very far from thinking that he can draw an exact line between the original and the added portions, but chooses the above as the simplest way of giving his conclusions definitely. The prefixed explanations do not undertake to give the reasons for his analysis, but simply to supplement the unavoidable deficiencies of this method of stating it. "The *Odyssey*, as we have it, is neither the single creation of one poet, only disfigured by interpolations here and there, nor a collection of independent poems from different authors and dates, strung together in the order of events, but a systematic enlargement and remodelling in a later age of an originally simpler nucleus. This nucleus, which I call 'the earlier revision,' in which form the poem was known until about 660 B.C., is not itself simple, but consists of an earlier and a later part, which belong to different times, different authors, and different points on the coast of Asia Minor. The first and earliest part of the whole poem, 'the Return of *Odysseus*,' is an original unit which cannot be further analyzed. It formed, without the addition of the second part, a complete independent whole. It is not, however, a popular epic in the usual sense of the term, but belongs to the period when the artistic epic was being developed." This "Return of *Odysseus*" consisted of *Od.* 1 : 1-87 ; 5 : 43-7 : 17 ; 7 : 84-102, 132-184, 233-242 ; then followed so much of the narrative of the adventures of *Odysseus* as remains in a tolerable state of preservation in *Od.* 9 : 16-564 ; then (according to essay IV. in his other book, to be presently mentioned) the original part of the *νέκυν* in *Od.* 11 ; then *Od.* 7 : 251-297 ; 11 : 333-353 ; 13 : 7-9, 13-184. The second part of "the earlier

revision" consisted of nearly the whole of Od. 13 : 185-23 : 296, excluding all passages which in any way directly or indirectly presuppose the Telemachia, and a few others for other reasons. This part was added before the first Olympiad, with special knowledge of and reference to the former, apart from which it never existed, and to which it is decidedly inferior in poetic quality. "Between 660 and 580 B.C. this 'earlier revision' was subjected to a thorough reworking by some person unknown, whereby the length of the poem was increased by more than one half, the text much changed, and here and there gaps left in it. This reworking was occasioned by the desire, on the one hand, to complete the Odyssey by incorporating into it the contents of certain earlier poems of the same circle of myths, and, on the other, to give to the whole a conclusion more in accordance with the taste of the time." This later revision became then the foundation of the work of the editorial commission of Peisistratos, and had a few interpolations made in it by them.—The reasonings on which a part of these conclusions were based are stated in seven essays, which appeared first in different periodicals and afterwards without change in *Die Composition der Odyssee, gesammelte Aufsätze von Kirchhoff*. (Berlin, 1869). (Essay I. will be found in *Rhein. Mus.* 15; II. in *Philol.* 15; III. in *Monatsberichte der Kön. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1861; IV. in *Philol.* 15; V. in *Rhein. Mus.* 15; VI. in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1865; VII. in *Philol.* 19.) The first essay shows, with a conclusiveness rare in such matters, that the part of the first book from line 88 on is a distorted and clumsy reproduction of the corresponding passage in the second book. The establishment of this point not only shuts out the possibility of maintaining original unity of



conception for the *Odyssey*, but also settles that "the passage referred to of the second book, with all that can be shown to stand in original and organic connection with it, proceeds from a different and an earlier poet than the corresponding part of the first book with its belongings; the poet of the latter knew the passage in the second book and used it (in part in its precise words) in his own way and to his own ends." His object plainly was to connect the narrative of the journey of *Telemachos* with that of the return of *Odysseus*.—In the fifth essay *Kirchhoff* undertakes to show, starting out from a remark of *Aristarchus* in reference to *Od.* 12 : 374–390, that the passage in the narrative of *Odysseus* extending from 9 : 565 to 12 : 446 (with the exception of the original part of the *véxvta*—see essay fourth) was originally composed in the third person as told by the poet, and then rewritten in the first person as told by *Odysseus* himself. Thus we have in the present narrative an original nucleus and a subsequent addition. The *véxvta* incorporated into this addition is shown in the fourth essay to belong to the original nucleus. In the latter part of the third essay it is shown that several features borrowed from the myth of the *Argonauts* have been taken up into this subsequent addition.—In the first part of the third essay he points out in *Od.* 7 : 240–259 the place at which came originally the simpler, not yet enlarged, narrative of the wanderings of *Odysseus*, in answer to the question addressed to him on his entrance into the palace of the *Phaakian* king.—The sixth essay brings out the fact that the incident in the story which is minutely detailed in the thirteenth and elaborately made use of in the sixteenth book, the transformation of *Odysseus* by the wand of *Athene*, is not referred to at the critical point of his recognition by

Penelope, where it could not but have been remembered, yet where only such change in his appearance is assumed as time and trials would bring about. This serious inconsistency in the twenty-third book is disguised by an interpolation, the occasion of which is easily explained and its disturbing influence on the context manifest.—The seventh essay begins with a discussion of the two passages, Od. 16 : 281–298 and 19 : 3–52, concerning the concealment of the arms, and shows that, contrary to the hitherto universal opinion that the former is an interpolation, the latter is really an awkward imitation of the former, and was introduced, together with the line Od. 22 : 141, in order to connect the topic of 16 : 281–298 with the narrative of the killing of the suitors which otherwise does not recognize it.—In all these discussions of the inner structure of the Odyssey it is characteristic of the writer's method that he does not content himself with pointing out contradictions and irreconcilable assumptions in the different parts of the poem, but rather demonstrates in every case the earlier and later strata of the work, and the intelligible purpose of the reviser in his changes. To determine approximately the time of these strata can be possible only by combination with other dates in the history of the growth of the Greek epic, and such combinations are made in the second, third, and fourth essays. The cyclic "Nostoi" (essay IV.), which belong to about 700 B.C., show knowledge of the third and fourth books of the Odyssey and of the original "Return of Odysseus" in the ninth book (including as above part of the *νέκνια*), but decidedly none of the enlarged version of his adventures contained in books X.–XII. From this it is certain that at that date the poem on the journey of Telemachos and the original "Return of Odysseus" were

in existence, and also that the later additions to the latter had not yet been incorporated with it; it is also probable that these additions did not yet exist even as an independent poem. This latter point is raised from probability to certainty by a consideration from another source (essay III.). The later additions show a connection in the localities mentioned with a form of the Argonaut myth which cannot be earlier than the colonization of Kyzikos; it follows that "the origin of the poem which forms the basis of books X.-XII. of the *Odyssey* falls at the earliest towards the end of the period 750-680 B.C., and its revision in the present form—that is, the final shaping of the first half of our *Odyssey*—not much before 660 B.C." On the other hand (essay II.), the *Eoai*, which belong between 620 and 580 B.C., recognize the contents of the *Odyssey* as we have it in such a way as to warrant the inference that the final revision of the poem was somewhat generally known by 580 B.C.

But little has been done as yet in the way of thorough and unprejudiced examination of this closely connected chain of reasoning. The notices of the earlier work (*Die Hom. Odyssee*, etc.), by W. Ribbeck and L. Friedländer, in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 79, may be left out of account, since they were written before the essays were published. Friedländer's review, in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 83, of the four earlier essays, expresses agreement in most points with Kirchhoff's views, though as to the origin of the confusion in the first book of the *Odyssey* he still maintains his own idea (*Anal. Hom.* p. 476) of a threefold revision; an idea which, by its unnecessary artificialness, rather helps to make Kirchhoff's simpler theory more acceptable. W. Hartel's "*Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der Odyssee*" (*Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1864,

1865) ranks before all others for logical and keen-sighted penetration into Kirchoff's course of thought. This leads him to supply omissions in some of the essays, and to oppose some of the statements and reasonings, especially as to the recognition by the cyclic "Nostoi" of the Telemachia and the original "Return of Odysseus;" as to the shifting of the later additions from the third into the first person (against which see Nitzsch, Jahn's Jahrb. 81); and as to the point in the poem at which the original brief narrative of the wanderings of Odysseus is supposed to have stood. As to Steinthal's criticism of Kirchoff's views (in the article mentioned in note 86), see the remarks of W. Hartel in a review of Müllenhoff's *Deutsche Alterthumskunde* (*Zeitschrift für d. österr. Gym.*, 1871). A criticism of this whole theory of Kirchoff's, hostile in all particulars, is to be found in Düntzer's *Kirchoff, Köchly, und die Odyssee* (Köln, 1872). The method of refutation is essentially the same throughout, that those passages on which Kirchoff bases his conclusions are set aside as interpolations, to which he adds that other passages, to the connection of which Kirchoff makes no objection, contain as much material for such criticism as those in which he finds evidence of growth by successive modifications. As to the former point, Kirchoff lays down the principle (*Compos. der Od.* p. 201): "To declare a passage in any text an interpolation, without being able to assign an occasion for or design in its being inserted, is a thoroughly unscientific proceeding, by which investigations such as that into the origin of the Homeric poems cannot be furthered, but only hindered." This principle Düntzer repeatedly and emphatically rejects, c. g. p. 19: "Kirchoff plainly carries much too far his principle that the assertion of an interpolation cannot be scientifically justified unless

the reason for it can be pointed out. Since no manifest incongruity, breaking the pure, smooth flow of the poem, can have proceeded from the poet, any such blemish must be set aside as a clumsy addition, which we shall continue to ascribe to some improvising rhapsode until we get evidence of the existence in the flesh of Kirchhoff's later reviser. For most interpolations one can imagine a reason, which, however, has nothing more than a greater or less degree of probability in its favor; but the interpolation is an objective fact, and when we consider the arbitrary caprice, obeying only the sudden and often strange suggestion of the moment, manifest in the additions of the rhapsodes, we see the unreasonableness of requiring an explanation of them in every case." It is plain from these and similar expressions, that only those can agree with Düntzer's criticisms who can be satisfied with "arbitrary caprice" and "strange suggestions of the moment." He finds the safeguard for right decision, in case of interpolations for which an occasion or motive cannot be found, in a full entrance into the spirit of the poet, such as results from a loving but critical following in his steps from sentence to sentence, from speech to speech, from incident to incident; when this is done, the spurious element excludes itself. This describes quite rightly the origin of the tact and feeling for inequality of character by which the spurious may be detected, but in order to lift this feeling above the dangers which belong to its subjective nature, and to be able to convince others of the truth of its decisions, it is necessary to support it by definite arguments. Düntzer himself has only to recall his own variations in the passages he has proposed to exclude to see the justice of this demand. (Düntzer's answer to these criticisms may

be found in his last book, *Die Homerische Frage*, Leipzig, 1874.)

With Hartel's essay, mentioned above (*Untersuchungen*, etc.), we may associate Heimreich's "*Die Telemachie und der jüngere Nostos*" (*Progr. des Gym. zu Flensburg*, 1871), inasmuch as it likewise accepts Kirchhoff's principles, but is led by them to somewhat different results, and so to a modification of his theory. The principal points of divergence are as follows: To remove all obscurity and confusion from the first book, Heimreich would exclude the supposed interpolations, leaving thus lines 89 sq., 96, 102-269, 295-324 (with probably 421-427 as a transition passage), which form an unobjectionable introduction to the journey of Telemachos; and are the work of the same poet who composed the next three books. The *Telemachia* never existed as a separate poem, but the same poet who composed it inserted it (or the greater part of it) between *Od.* 1 : 87 and 5 : 29 in the process of enlarging the *Odyssey* from its simpler original. As to the peculiarities of the *Kirke-Episode*, Heimreich makes some valuable remarks. His theory, in brief, is as follows: "There was originally a shorter poem on the return of *Odysseus* (in substance the same with Kirchhoff's original '*Return*,' but with the addition of the myths of *Aeolos* and of the *Laestrygoni*); this was expanded before the time of the '*Nostoi*' of *Agias* (that is, probably before 700 B.C.), by a second poet, to the compass of our *Odyssey*, with the exception, of course, of a few late interpolations." These criticisms of Heimreich's touch in part the points for which Kirchhoff has not yet published a statement of his reasons; such as the discrimination of the "later additions" from the original "*Return of Odysseus*," and the independence of the *Telemachia*.

An indirect attack upon Kirchhoff's investigations is contained in the section on the *Odyssey* in Bergk's *Griech. Literatur-Geschichte*, I. pp. 654-726, in which, though there is, as usual, no mention of the labors of other scholars, the reference is plain to those who know the literature of the subject. The development of the present form of the poem out of the original *Odyssey*, which he ascribes to a different poet from that of the original *Iliad*, is explained by Bergk in essentially the same way as in the case of the *Iliad* (see note 27). But in this case he admits that the intruded matter is not so extensive as to suppress, so completely as in the *Iliad*, the original, nor to disturb the structure so thoroughly. While some books, as the sixth, are almost free from interpolations, in others, as the eighth, only a moderate portion of the original poem remains, and in general the first half of the poem has suffered less at the hands of the reviser than the second. (On Bergk's treatment of the *Odyssey*, see W. Hartel's review, mentioned in note 27.) Bergk's attitude towards Kirchhoff's investigations may be most clearly seen in the case of the first book of the *Odyssey*. He regards the conversation of Athene with Telemachos as an essential pre-condition of the narrative of the three following books, but as so confused and blind that it cannot be ascribed to the original poet. "It is probable that the speech of Athene was lost in careless transmission; then he who gave the *Odyssey* its present form endeavored to fill up as best he could the serious gap, using, with no great skill, the hints to be found in the second book." The introduction of the name of Mentos, also, is an addition, so that "but little of the original poem is to be found in the first book." Here the result of Kirchhoff's investigation is reproduced; but whereas that inves-

tigation confined itself to reasonable inferences from the actual form of the *Odyssey*, here we have added the hypothesis, unproved and hardly capable of proof, that the poor work of the reviser replaces the accidentally lost good work of the original poet.

A minute criticism of Kirchlhoff's whole theory will be found in Ed. Kammer's *Die Einheit der Odyssee, nach Widerlegung der Ansichten von Lachmann-Steinthal, Köchly, Hennings, und Kirchlhoff, dargestellt von Dr. Ed. Kammer in Königsberg.*—Anhang: *Homerische Blätter* von K. Lehrs (Leipzig, 1873). The first part of the book is occupied with the refutation announced in the title; in the second part the author goes through the *Odyssey*, throwing out the lines he regards as interpolated, and presenting thus the poem in its pristine unity. But the criticism of those essays of Kirchlhoff's which have to do with passages in the latter half of the *Odyssey* is to be found in this second part in connection with the author's statement of his own views. He conceives the poet of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* as developing a profound ethical theme in a series of scenes or situations, in each of which, in turn, his fancy is actively at work, and his effort is to enchain his hearers by holding and busily occupying their imaginative vision. As he advanced in his work, we may suppose that his path teemed with ideas more richly, and so it came about that of the fresh details that flowed in upon his mind some were in conflict with what had gone before, a fact which neither poet nor hearers could be expected to observe, as neither had the whole before the mind at once. Even when the theme was fully worked out, the poem did not assume a fixed form, but remained in a certain fluid state, ever renewed by the remarkable faculty of improvisation which



constant practice developed. Then it passed through the hands of a host of lesser poets, who amplified and varied it greatly. Kammer distinguishes (pp. 758-761) five different groups of such additions and changes. His refutation of Kirchoff is naturally facilitated by the fact that he, even more decidedly than Düntzer, rejects Kirchoff's principle as to the cases in which one may assume the existence of an interpolation. Two brief notices (Schade's *Wissensch. Monatsblätter*, 1874; *Altpreussische Monatsschrift*, 1873) by Lehrs, whose disciple on this question Kammer avows himself to be, warmly commend this book, and another, by H. Weil (*Revue Critique*, 1874), expresses agreement with its principles. The reviewer in the *Göttinger Gelehrter Anzeiger* (1874) indicates by judicious extracts the treatment of the question in it, and shows by examples that the contents do not justify the assumption of infallibility on the part of the author. Similarly A. Bischoff, in *Philol. Anzeiger* (1875), and in *Philologus*, 34. Hennings replies, in *Jahn's Jahrb.* (1874), to the criticism of his views, so far as applies to the first three books of the *Odyssey*. A careful account of Kammer's critical treatment of the first twelve books of the *Odyssey* is given by Dr. Lange, in the *Zeitschrift für d. Gym.*, 1875, *Philol. Jahresbericht*.

<sup>113</sup> In Löbell's *Weltgeschichte in Umrissen* (1846), I. p. 600 sqq., is a statement of the order and relation in which Ritschl placed the incidents of the growth of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: "I. Period. Existence of certain heroic lays, celebrating the Trojan war, immediately after its occurrence, at first among the Achaeans in Greece, and then among the colonies of Asia Minor. II. Period, perhaps 900-800 B.C. The unadulterated poetry of Homer and the Homeridae, still unwritten, with the digamma pronounced. Out of a

rich abundance of epic lays the pre-eminent genius of Homer selects a number; and combines them, fused together with his own productions, into an artistic unity, having for its central point, to which all parts have reference, a moral truth. This process is something far higher than mere compilation; it is the first creation of a great organized whole. Thus fully developed, the genuine Iliad and Odyssey are transmitted by the members of close guilds or schools of poets, while at the same time the detached songs, out of which they sprang, still survive. III. Period, 800-700 B.C. Circulation of the Homeric poems, still unwritten, but with gradual disappearance of the digamma and separation of the lays from one another by the rhapsodes, whose art is no longer in the hands of the Homeridae exclusively. The poems are also expanded by insertions. IV. Period, 700-600 B.C., in two divisions. (1) First commission of the poems to writing, without the digamma (for the Alexandrian scholars found no trace of it remaining); continued separation of the lays by the rhapsodes, but no further additions to the poems, as may be inferred from the fact that Peisistratos finds them in existence as if handed down from antiquity. (2) The collection of separate parts to form larger units. Oral tradition continues, and arbitrary separation and combination of the lays; but, also, care is taken (e. g. by Solon) to prevent falsification of the traditional text by having standard written copies of single lays. V. Period, 600-200 B.C. Peisistratos, by having a copy of the poems written out in the original order, so far as it could be recovered, puts an end at once to the corruption of the text, and to the separation and arbitrary linking together of individual lays. The ordinance of Hipparchos secures for a long time the practice of connected declama-

tion of the poems. At the same time copies are multiplied of the entire poems, they begin to be the subject of learned discussion among their admirers (*ἐπαινέται*), and are transcribed into the new alphabet. VI. Period. That of the Alexandrian critics." A considerable part of the statements here made as to the first four periods lies beyond the region of proof; and another part of them may fairly be called untenable, in view of the foregoing exposition of the subject, and the investigations on which it is based.

<sup>114</sup> See W. Wackernagel's essay (I. p. 341 sqq.), mentioned in note 15.

<sup>115</sup> As to the relation between legend and history, see Lauer, *Geschichte der Hom. Poesie*, p. 163.

<sup>116</sup> I have let these two sentences, which recognize a nucleus of historical fact in the Trojan myths, stand as they were originally delivered, although I am far from being willing to maintain that view now. On the history of the development of epic poems on these myths, so far as it is sketched in the succeeding pages, no direct influence is exerted by one's opinion as to the origin of the myths themselves; and I do not find myself in a position to reach a decision, by independent examination, upon the ingenious combinations by which a solution of the latter question is sought. See Curtius, *Griech. Geschichte*, I. p. 113 sqq. (Am. edition, I. p. 145 sqq.), and the comprehensive and minute investigations of Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Alterthumskunde*, I. pp. 5-73. The admirable summary of these investigations in a review by W. Hartel (*Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gym.*, 1871) shows incidentally, in regard to the *Odyssey*, how Müllenhoff's investigations confirm, from a totally different point of view, Kirchhoff's ideas.

<sup>117</sup> On the bards, see Welcker, *Ep. Cycl.* I. p. 340.

<sup>118</sup> This inference from the names is in Wackernagel's essay, above referred to, I. p. 343.

<sup>119</sup> Welcker, *Ep. Cycl.* II. p. 11.

<sup>120</sup> The opposite inference from this same case, namely, that the songs of Demodokos "contain evident traces of a great connected epic poem," is made by Welcker, *Ep. Cycl.* I. p. 348; Bäumlein, *Jahn's Jahrb.* 75 and 81; and Nitzsch, *Ep. Poesie*, p. 197 sqq.

<sup>121</sup> Of course, in this statement only those dates are included which are positively or probably based on actual tradition. Of those based only on combinations, at least one carries Homer back to the time of the Trojan war (see note 42).

<sup>122</sup> For the authorities as to competitive chanting of epic songs, see Bernhardt, *Griech. Lit.* I. p. 252 (2d ed.). For the difference between bards and rhapsodes, see Welcker, *Ep. Cycl.* I. pp. 358-406. The distinction is ignored in the text, not because it is questioned at all, but only because it is comparatively unimportant in this connection.

<sup>123</sup> Lazar der Serbencar, nach serbischen Sagen und Heldengesängen, von Siegf. Kapper, 1851. This example and the following one are cited by Miklosich, *Verhandlungen der achtzehnten Versammlung deutscher Philologen*, p. 3.

<sup>124</sup> Wackernagel, as above, II. p. 81. A recent study of this subject by C. d'Héricault, *Essai sur l'Origine de l'Épopée Française* (Paris, 1859), I know only by quotations.

<sup>125</sup> Compare the poetic style of books I.-X. with that of XI.-XVIII., and then with that of XIX.-XXIV.

<sup>126</sup> It is interesting to note the opinion on this point indirectly expressed by Aristotle, when, in speaking of the prop-

er length of an epic, he does not mention the Homeric poems as a model, as he does in all other respects, but, instead, lays down the rule that, in order that the whole may admit of being taken in at one view, it should be shorter than the Homeric poems, and not exceed in length the (three or four) tragedies adapted to be performed together. Arist. Poet. 24, 1459 b 17. Cf. Vahlen, Beiträge zu Arist. Poetik, III. pp. 287 sq., 334 sq. (Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. vol. 56).

<sup>127</sup> "The object of the Athenian statesman in this measure was the only one intelligible and natural in his time, to encourage competition. He aimed to introduce the most difficult form of contest, in which only the ablest rhapsodes would succeed. To introduce the memorizing of the whole poems, as a novelty, into the system of the rhapsode's art, was surely a matter having no kind of connection with his domain." Lehrs, Zur Hom. Interpolation, Rhein. Mus. N. F. 17, p. 491.

<sup>128</sup> On this last point Mor. Haupt speaks with convincing arguments and well-earned authority in his "Festrede über den Gewinn den die deutsche Philologie der classischen Philologie gewährt," Ber. über die Verhandlungen der Kön.-sächsisch. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften, 2d vol., 1848, pp. 90 sqq., 100.













UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 000 134 979 4

