

- 1.0 Preface
- 1.1 Introduction Importance of the Subject
- 2.1 Exactly what the Theory is
- 3.01 Theory a Relic from Attitudes of a Bygone Era of Thought
- 3.02 Wellhausen's views Preserved Mainly Unchanged by present-day scholars
- 3.11 Skepticism about ancient facts and writings
- 3.12 Wolf and his followers
- 3.13 Attitude toward Troy and Mycenae
- 3.14 Attacks on Cicero's orations
- 3.15 Allegre and the Gospels
- 3.16 Wellhausen on unhistorical nature of Moses, Abraham, etc.
- 3.17 Far-reaching change as a result of archaeology
- 3.18 Schliemann at Troy
- 3.19 Egypt and Mesopotamia
- 3.20 Old Testament History
- 3.21 Historicism - writings as merely expressing the spirit of the age. Evolution
- 3.26 Ballads
- 3.29 Evolutionary historicism discredited. Reaction against historicism
- 3.31 Source hunting in general
- 3.41 Situation in the study of Homer
- 3.42 Historical truth and error preserved in Homer
- 3.45 Homer destroyed in thought a few years ago, now largely reestablished
- 3.50 Effect of work of Milton Parry
- ~~3.501 Historical accuracy in Homer~~
- ~~3.502 Historical error in Homer~~
- 3.51 Nibelungenlied, ^{3.52} Beowulf, ^{3.53} Piers Plowman
- 3.61 The Indian epics
- 3.65 Persian Literature
- 3.71 Beaumont and Fletcher
- 3.72 Chaucer
- 3.73 DOCTOR FAUSTUS Christopher Marlowe

- 4.1 Current dogmatism of supporters of critical theory
- 4.5 Absurdly minute dissection that is advanced
Fragmentation
- 5.1 Claim that theory is result of 60 to 200 years of research
- 5.7 Wellhausen's theory of development now generally abandoned or ignored
- 6.1 Claim that theory represents consensus of opinion of all trained scholars
- 6.2 Critical scholars differ, no two scholarly books agree exactly
- 6.4 Scandinavian scholars rejection of theory
- 6.5 Many scholars express doubt or uncertainty
- 6.7 Pfeiffer's S, Elssfeldt's L, Morganstern's K
- 7. Argument from Divine Names
- 9. Argument from Continuous, Complete Document
- 10. Argument from Parallels and Repetitions
- 10.5 The so-called two creation accounts
- 10.95 Alleged discrepancies
- 11.2 The Flood
- 12.1 Style- Importance of the Argument. Gunkel on sources of Genesis
- 12.3 Similarity of styles in J and E. Disagreement over division between.
- 12.6 Claim that style of P is completely different . *Date of P*
- 12.62 Critics admit that purpose in writing affects selection of material used
- 12.7 Entire theory built on assumption of ability to distinguish styles
- 13. Book of Deuteronomy
- 14. Argument from Development
- 17. Erosion of Wellhausenism
- 17.10 Higher critical presuppositions admitted to be wrong but conclusions "right"!
- 19. Our Attitude toward the Pentateuch
Mosaic Authorship
- 19.5 Christ's Attitude

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT

Most of those who look into this book are apt to fall into one of three groupings.

1. People who are convinced that the Old Testament is a true revelation from God, consider that its first five books were written by Moses, and see little point in learning about the theories of the "Higher Criticism" regarding the J, E, D and P documents.

2. Those who believe that scholarship has proven that the first books of the Bible came into existence through the combining of documents J, E, D and P, and think that the matter is so definitely proven that there is little point in examining arguments against it.

3. Those who do not know anything about the matter.

It is the conviction of the present writer that he has a considerable amount of material to present that should be of great interest and importance for each of these three classes of people. I would like, therefore, to present reasons why each group ought to be interested in learning about this subject.

First, I would like to discuss the matter from the viewpoint of those who see no reason why they should bother about the theories of the "Higher Criticism." Such persons are doubtless unaware of the tremendous dissemination that is being given to these theories in recent years. Seventy-five years ago the "Higher Criticism" was practically unknown except for the studies of a few scholars. During the succeeding years, however, the teaching has been spread more and more widely until today is a force that must be reckoned with by anyone who deals with the Bible. If a person himself is not interested he is sure to have contact with others who are interested, and with whom it is

- 3.96 Study in Oral Transmission
- 3.97 Situation out of which the Creation, Fall, and Flood stories arose; the documents in which they are placed; date and purpose of composition
- 4.1 Wellhausen Theory Substantially Held Today
- 4.3 Great Dogmatism of its Supporters
- 4.5 Absurdly minute dissection that is advanced
- 5.1 Claim that it is the result of 200 years of research
- 5.7 Development Theory Generally Abandoned or Ignored
- 6.1 Claim that it represents the consensus of opinion of all trained scholars
- 6.2 Critical Scholars do not all agree
- 6.4 Scandinavian Scholars
- 6.5 Critics Express Doubt
- 6.7 Pfeiffers S; Eissfeldt's L
- 7.01 Documents Distinguished by Divine Names of God Used
- 9.01 Alleged Continuous Documents
- 10.01 Parallels and Repetitions
- 10.5 Creation
- 10.95 Alleged Discrepancies

"However, the conservatives complain that the critics arbitrarily rule out as interpolations or late comments passages which are unfavorable to their hypotheses. The advocates of tradition also charge the opposite school with being swayed by purely subjective fancies, and in the case of the more advanced criticism, by philosophico-religious prejudices. Moreover, they assert that such a piece-meal formation of a book by successive strata, as is alleged for many parts of the O.T. is without analogy in the history of literature."

-- by Geo. J. Reid, S.T.L., Prof. of Sacred
Scripture and Hebrew, The St. Paul
Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

- See 3.31 Altick, Richard D., The Art of Literary Research p. 181, 182 ; pp. 63-4
- See 3.41 Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, Vol. I, p. 179
Reaction against mythological interpretation of heroic stories
- See 5.7 Wright, G. Ernest, The Old Testament Against Its Environment (1950)
pp. 15, 61
- See 6.5 Deuel, Leo, Testaments of Time (1965), p. 223 Wellhausen's arguments
lost ground with appearance of Tell el Amarna tablets
- See 3.21 Wellek, Rene, Concepts of Criticism, (1963) p. 37
"Fifty and sixty years ago the concept of evolution dominated literary
history; today, at least in the West, it seems to have disappeared almost
completely. Histories of literature and of literary genres are being
written without any allusions to the problem and apparently with no
awareness of it." p.37
"In Europe, especially since the first World War, there has been a
revolt against the methods of literary study as practiced in the second
half of the nineteenth century . . . "
- See 3.51 Chambers, R.W., Man's Unconquerable Mind
Beowulf pp.63-4 "Half a dozen motor-bikes cannot be combined to make a
Piers Plowman p. 109, 169 /Rolls-Royce car."
Shakespeare p. 216
Beowulf, p. 62 (separate sheet) "But most students have long ago abandoned
the attempt, and have come to agree that 'the Christian elements are,
almost without exception, so deeply ingrained in the very fabric of the
poem that they cannot be explained away as the work of a reviser or later
interpolator."
- See 3.51 Ker, W. P., Epic and Romance on Medieval Literature. re Beowulf
- See 3.51 Chambers, R.W., Beowulf
- See 3.61 Drekmeier, Kingship and Community in Early India. On Mahabharata (Hopkins)
- See 3.31 Geden, Alfred S., Outlines of Intro. to the Heb. Bible 1909
- See 3.31 Homer, A Collection of Critical Essays ed. by Geo. Steiner. "In the
late nineteenth century, dismemberment was all the rage . . . Today, the
wheel has come full turn." (p.2)
- See 3.39 A Companion to Homer, edited by Wace and Stubbings p.263
- 3.41 Jaeger, Werner, Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture p. 421 on the
tendency to abandon analysis of the Homeric poems
- See 3.31 Guerard, Albert, Preface to World Literature , pp. 72-3
- See 3.41 Scott, John A., The Unity of Homer
- 3.21 Literary Scholarship, Its Aims and Methods by N. Foerster, J. C. McGilliard,
Rene Wellek, Austin Warren, W. L. Schramm (1941)
17. Hooke, S.H. in Peake's 205(173-c)
- 3.41 Whitman, Cedric, Homer and The Homeric Tradition

See 3.41 Davidson, J. A., "The Homeric Question" p. 257 in A Companion to Homer ed. by Wace and Stubbings, 1962

See Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization 1100-650B.C. 1961

See 3.81 Hyman, Stanley Edgar, The Armed Vision

See 3.21 Biblical and Other Studies, chapter "The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text" by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein

See 3.45 Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture, by Werner Jaeger
(trans. by Gilbert Highet) 1945 p.421

p. 59 Questions of authenticity and attribution may be even more important, and their solution may require elaborate stylistic and historical investigations.²⁶

26 Giles Dawson, "Authenticity and Attribution of Written Matter," English Institute Annual, 1942, New York, 1943, pp. 77-100; G. E. Bentley, "Authenticity and Attribution of the Jacobean and Caroline Drama," *ibid.*, pp. 101-118; cf. E. H. C. Oliphant, "Problems of Authorship in Elizabethan Dramatic Literature," Modern Philology, VIII (1911), pp. 411-59.

We are certain of the authorship of most works in modern literature. But there is a large ~~mass~~ pseudonymous and anonymous literature which sometimes yields its secret, even if that secret is nothing else than a name unassociated with any biographical information and hence no more illuminating than the pseudonym or anonym itself.

60

(The Shakespeare Canon, 4 parts, London 1922-32; An Introduction to the Study of the Shakespeare Canon, London, 1924; E. K. Chambers, "The Disintegration of Shakespeare", 1925)

p. 59, Recently, J. M. Robertson has been the most outstanding proponent of the "disintegration of Shakespeare," a view which would leave Shakespeare with little more than the authorship of a few scenes in the best-known plays. According to this school of thought, even Julius Caesar and The Merchant of Venice are supposed to be nothing but a hotchpotch of passages by Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Kyd, and several other playwrights of the time.²⁸ Robertson's method consists largely in tracing little verbal tags, discovering inconsistencies and literary parallels. The method is extremely uncertain and willful. It seems based on a false assumption and a vicious circle: we know what is Shakespeare's work from certain contemporary testimony (the inclusion in the Folio, the entries under his name in the Stationer's Register, etc.); but Robertson, by an arbitrary act of aesthetic judgment, selects only certain purple passages as Shakespeare's and denies his authorship of anything that falls below that standard or that shows similarities to the practice of contemporary dramatists. Yet there is no reason why Shakespeare could not have written poorly or carelessly or why he could not have written in various styles imitating his contemporaries. On the other hand, the older premise that every word in the Folio is Shakespeare's cannot be upheld in its entirety.

3,81

3,01

p. 60 No wholly definitive conclusion can be reached on some of these points, since Elizabethan drama was a communal art in which close collaboration was a very real practice. The individual authors were frequently scarcely differentiable by their styles. Two authors might well themselves have been unable to distinguish between their shares. Collaboration sometimes poses almost hopeless tasks to the literary detective.²⁹ Even in the case of Beaumont and Fletcher, in which we have the advantage of having work definitely only by Fletcher, ~~in which we have the advantage of having work definitely~~ written after the death of Beaumont, the division between their shares is not established beyond controversy; and the case is completely lost with The Revenger's Tragedy, which has been assigned to Webster, Tourneur, Middleton, and Marston alternatively or in various combinations.³⁰

3,01

G. Udry Yule, The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary, Cambridge, 1944 - has used very complex mathematical methods to study the vocabulary of writers like Thomas a Kempis in order to establish the common authorship of several manuscripts. Stylistic methods, if patiently developed, can supply evidence which, though falling short of complete certainty, makes identification highly probable.

See 3.31-19³

3.01-4
(2, 81)

Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature, (1942, 1949)

"Recently, J. M. Robertson has been the most outstanding proponent of the 'disintegration of Shakespeare,' a view which would leave Shakespeare with little more than the authorship of a few scenes in the best-known plays. According to this school of thought, even Julius Caesar and The Merchant of Venice are supposed to be nothing but a hotchpotch of passages by Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Kyd, and several other playwrights of the time. Robertson's method consists largely in tracing little verbal tags, discovering inconsistencies and literary parallels. The method is extremely uncertain and willful. It seems based on a false assumption and a vicious circle: we know what is Shakespeare's work ^{certain} from contemporary testimony (the inclusion in the Folio, the entries under his name in the Stationer's Register, etc.); but Robertson, by an arbitrary act of aesthetic judgment, selects only certain purple passages as Shakespeare's and denies his authorship of anything that falls below that standard or that shows similarities to the practice of contemporary dramatists. Yet there is no reason why Shakespeare could not have written poorly or carelessly or why he could not have written in various styles imitating his contemporaries. On the other hand, the older premise that every word in the Folio is Shakespeare's cannot be upheld in its entirety.

"No wholly definitive conclusion can be reached on some of these points, since Elizabethan drama was a communal art in which close collaboration was a very real practice. The individual authors were frequently scarcely differentiable by their styles. Two authors might well themselves have been unable to distinguish between their shares. Collaboration sometimes poses almost hopeless tasks to the literary detective. Even in the case of Beaumont and Fletcher, in which we have the advantage of having work definitely only by Fletcher written after the death of Beaumont, the division between their shares is not established beyond controversy; and the case is completely lost with The Revenger's Tragedy, which has been assigned to Webster, Tourneur, Middleton, and Marston alternatively or in various combinations." (pages 59 and 60)

(3.21)

Page 27

Literature was increasingly studied in the context of its environment. Individuality cannot be comprehended and described except in the context of or in contrast to some environment. In the 17th century more and more attention was paid to the climatic and geographical conditions of literature, and increasingly literature was seen in terms of social conditions and intellectual atmosphere. People began to discuss the influence of social stability, peace and war, liberty, and despotism on literature. The concept of a national character as a determining factor in literary creation was slowly taking shape.

Page 38

Most of Voltaire's principles can thus be studied only in his concrete pronouncements, but these are fortunately so numerous and cover so many authors that a general view emerges with astonishing consistency. Voltaire adheres to the classical tradition of decorum, bienséance, convenance. "Perfection consists in knowing how to adjust one's style to the matter one treats."²⁸ Style, form, way of expression are always decisive for critical judgment. "As far as making the passions speak, all men have almost the same ideas; but the way of expressing them distinguishes the man of wit from the man who has none."²⁹ Voltaire restates the ancient doctrine of the three levels of style: each subject has its level, "natural," "tempered," or "elevated."

Pages 124-125

The emphasis on environment became especially significant when the "manners" which determine a work of art were analyzed in detail. At first the most remote explanation was the most widely favored. Sir William Temple's theory about the connection between the variable English weather and the odd humor of Englishmen⁶⁵ was one of the earliest instances of the explanation of literature by climatic conditions. Later the older idea that poetry--especially highly imaginative poetry--flourished best in the South received

a rude shock from the "discovery" of the northerner Ossian. Gray admitted that "imagination dwelt many hundred years ago in all her pomp on the cold and barren mountains of Scotland" and thus could not be the result of heat.⁶⁶ But Hume and Kames became quite skeptical of the whole business of explaining poetry by climatic conditions.⁶⁷

The climate theory becomes much more acceptable when it is reinterpreted to include geographical conditions. Bishop Lowth's De sacra poesi Hebraeorum tried to explain the particular character of Hebrew poetry by the influence of the surrounding objects of nature: he traces Palestinian landscape in the imagery of the Bible. Robert Wood traveled in the Near East and, in An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer (1769), studied the topography of the site of Troy, concluding that Homer was "the most constant and faithful copier after nature."⁶⁸

Page 126

What is most striking to a modern observer is the complete confusion about the states of society supposed to be primitive. The early stages of Greek civilization, the society depicted in the Old Testament, contemporary Arabian society, the feudal Middle Ages, and the dim time in which Ossian was supposed to have lived are all considered the same. This sociological simplification is matched by the crudity of the 18th-century dichotomy between natural poetry and art poetry. This contrast dates back to the Renaissance, but only in the 18th century was natural poetry identified with a universal folk poetry in which everything which deviates from the Latin-French tradition was lumped together: the Bible, Homer, Ossian, the Welsh bards, the few Lapland and Indian songs known at the time, the Scottish ballads, and even chivalric romances. Thomas Percy seems to have been the first to entertain the explicit conception of primitive poetry as a whole. He planned a collection ... His translations from the Chinese and from Runic poetry, his paraphrase of the Song of

Songs as a "sample of Hebrew poetry," his Reliques of Ancient English Poetry (1765) which contains not only ballads but many Elizabethan lyrics and scenes from Shakespeare, his specimens of "Moorish" romances, his transcriptions of chivalric romances, and the planned edition of Surrey⁷⁴ --all point to this conception of a substantial identity of primitive poetry.

Page 152

In a different situation and in different terms we are apt to share this compromise today. Our historicism, which countenances the most diverse kinds of art, from prehistoric cave paintings to Picasso, from Homer to Eliot, from plain chant to Stravinsky, is an all-embracing eclecticism. It has the same implications of sterility which we feel in the antiquarian critics of the 18th century. Today they rightly elicit great sympathy and interest, for they represent the beginnings of an attitude which seems to have become almost universal in the academic world of our time.

Page 182

Besides, Herder constantly rewrote what he had written: the second edition of the Fragmente differs profoundly from the first, and materials are often moved from one book to another. The exclamatory style, the shifting terminology, the fragmentariness of the arguments, the constant oscillation and flitting from one topic to another are extremely irritating and justify Saintsbury's charge of "fearful wooliness,"⁴⁴ but they do not justify a neglect of Herder.

He has been considered a forerunner of Taine in his stress on milieu. There is in Herder much about climate (hot, cold, and temperate),¹⁰⁹ landscape, race (nations), customs, and even political conditions such as Athenian democracy in their relations to literature. One of his prize essays, called Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst auf die Sitten der Völker in alten und neuen Zeiten (1778), is a survey of the history of literature with stress on its educative and civilizing function. But Herder rarely analyzes the environmental factors and never brings them into close relationship with the actual literature. He constantly argues in a circle: i.e., he explains a work of literature by history and then utilizes the work to throw light on history. In the case of Ossian, for instance, since there exist no early documents about ancient Scottish history, Herder derived all the information about ^{the} social setting from the poems, and that was extremely vague and baffling. He uses such criteria as climate and landscape very loosely, and even the racial point of view amounts to little more than the old contrast between North and South, the Germanic and the Latin nations. In a paper on Homer and Ossian, Herder tries to derive the poetic differences between the two from differences in climate and national stock.¹¹⁰

Gordis, Robert, The Book of God and Man (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press) 1965

page 15

In sum, what is generally proposed as a solution to the enigma of Job substitutes an even greater mystery. The assumption is made that a conglomeration of separate documents, unrelated and at times even opposed to one another, were either haphazardly or deliberately manipulated to produce a masterpiece.

This tendency to atomize the book belongs to the "age of analysis" in biblical scholarship. It reached its apogee in the years before World War I in the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, particularly in the Documentary Hypothesis of the Graf-Wellhausen School.

page 16

In the period following World War I a marked shift of emphasis and approach took place in the field of biblical scholarship. This shift was induced by a variety of factors, not the least of which was a reaction against the hyper-critical analysis of sources, which had previously been carried to extremes.

p. 22 *narrative*

The process by which the various traditions and individual codes were combined and ultimately united in the Five Books of Moses was highly complex and may never be reconstructed in all its details. Undoubtedly, the creation of the Torah took place at an earlier period and was less complicated than the Higher Criticism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries maintained. Recent scholarship now recognizes that the concept of "the Torah of Moses" is not a figment of the imagination and surely not a "pious fraud" perpetrated by later scribes. Contemporary research makes it increasingly clear that there is a central and significant core of Mosaic material in the Pentateuch, even though it is difficult to reach a consensus as to its exact extent and contents.

p. 73

It is characteristic of Semitic literary usage that the writer keeps his traditional sources intact, even if there are obvious discrepancies between them. Thus, where modern practice would relegate to a footnote one or another of two contradictory sources, Hebrew and Arab writers did not hesitate to retain the variants cheek by jowl in the main narrative, without attempting to harmonize all the details. Instances of this literary procedure are common in oriental literature.

|| 23

Footnote 42, p. 326 Thus, in the narrative of the prophet Balaam (Num. chaps. 22-24), he is granted permission by God before he leaves home (22.20) to answer the call of Balak. On his way, however, his life is threatened by an invisible angel with a sword (22.31). His life is saved by the prescience of his ass, and only after the angel is revealed to him is he granted permission to proceed. It is clear that two variant traditions (differing over when the divine permission was granted) have been placed in succession here.

In the Book of Samuel, David comes to the attention of King Saul and is brought to court because of his skill with the harp, which relieves Saul's melancholy (1 Sam.16.22). In the very next chapter, however, after David slays Goliath, neither the king nor Abner, his general, recognize the lad (1 Sam.17.55ff.), and only thereafter is David taken to the royal court. In the Arab chronicle Kitab Al'aghani, in the life story of a poet named Kais, the author informs us that because Kais contracted a marriage opposed by his parents he never saw them again. The very next line reads, "When Kais visited his parents."

|| 23

Gordis, Robert, The Book of God and Man (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965)

page 106

Before embarking on a detailed investigation of the evidence, we may note the growing disfavor in which the atomization of ancient literary documents is viewed by contemporary scholarship. Increasingly, the study of ancient literatures, like that of the Homeric epics, has been focusing attention on the unity and meaning of the whole work rather than upon the disparity of the constituent elements. That the indiscriminate (and even accidental) lumping together of scattered literary fragments by an obtuse redactor, who often did not understand the material he was working with, could produce a masterpiece - that naive faith of nineteenth-century literary critics is no longer widely shared today.

It is self-evident that this change of intellectual climate will, of itself, not suffice to reverse the view of the inauthenticity of the Elihu chapters, still widely held among scholars. The impressive arguments in favor of this position need to be analyzed and evaluated.

Footnote 7, page 333. See the trenchant observation of E. D. F. Kitto, The Greeks (Harmondsworth, 1951), p. 63

A similar change has taken place in the study of Dante's Divine Comedy. As Marc Slonim points out: "Critics in the 19th century saw the work as composed of dualisms . . . The same critics either rejected Dante, the faithful son of the church, and extolled the great creator of images and characters - or the other way around. . . . Modern critics and scholars reject the theory of antinomies in the 'Commedia' and speak of its structural unity and harmonious proportions reflecting the perfect integration of its varied components." ("The Miracle of Dante," in the New York Times Book Review, Aug. 29, 1965, p.6.)

page 107

It is principally the proportions that have shifted, not the usages.

With regard to the argument concerning language, it should be noted that the alleged variations are relative rather than absolute. This is true of the divine names, the pronouns, and the prepositional forms, all of which occur throughout the book. Any literary composition, particularly a short one, may turn up words lacking in another composition by the same author. The fact that Elihu cites arguments from the preceding speeches, far from being an argument against his authenticity, is a point in his favor.

page 110

Finally, Pfeiffer begins with the critical assumption, frequently made in the past, that heterodox ideas were subjected to extensive interpolation to make them palatable to the orthodox. This once-popular assumption is highly questionable. As we have demonstrated elsewhere, this hypothesis is both unnecessary and erroneous with regard to the Book of Ecclesiastes.²² In ancient times, a far more effective device was available for countering unorthodox doctrine: since manuscripts of any given work were few, it was easy to suppress the material completely. If copies of the book in question were consigned to the Genizah, the storehouse of abandoned documents, the work would be withdrawn from circulation and thus condemned to oblivion.

Gordis, Robert, The Book of God and Man (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press) 1965

page 110

Virtually all the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works of the Second Temple period, which were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, emanated from groups which differed in greater or lesser degree with normative or pharisaic Judaism in doctrine, practice, or both. The leaders of the dominant group in Judaism subjected these books, not to critical interpolation, but to total neglect. As a result the originals were lost and only translations into Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, and other languages have survived. These versions were safeguarded, not by the Synagogue, but by the Church, which found them congenial to its outlook and useful in its work.

That ancient readers would employ large-scale interpolations to counter the main thrust of literary works to which they were opposed is a theory of doubtful validity and should be invoked only as a last resort.

page 110-111

The history of literature can point to many instances in which a writer's style grows increasingly complex and difficult with his advancing years. A classic example is afforded by Shakespeare's Tempest and by other plays of his last period. The later poems of William Butler Yeats, and James Joyce's last novel, Finnegans Wake, on which the novelist worked twenty years, reveal the same trait.

page 111

An even more instructive parallel is Goethe's Faust. The Urfaust goes back to the poet's Sturm und Drang period, the third decade of his life; the first part of Faust did not appear until more than thirty years later, in 1808; and the second part was completed shortly before his death in 1832. In the sixty year gestation period of the work, Goethe's conception of his theme and of the characters, as well as his poetic style and vocabulary, underwent a profound transformation. Every reader notices at once the change from the epigrammatic style of Part I to the involved, complicated mode of expression characteristic of Part II. The radical differences in subject matter are summarized by J. G. Robertson in these words: "The Second Part is far removed from the impressive realism of the Urfaust or even the classicism of the First Part. It is a phantasmagory; a drama, the actors in which are not creatures of flesh and blood but shadows in an unreal world of allegory. The lover of Gretchen had, as far as poetic continuity is concerned, disappeared with the close of the first part. In the second part, it is virtually a new Faust who, accompanied by a new Mephistopheles, goes out into a world that is not ours. Yet behind the elusive allegories . . . there lies a philosophy of life, a ripe wisdom born of experience, such as no other modern European poet has given us."²³

Footnote 23, page 335. Encyclopedia Britannica (14th ed.), X, 473b.

page 123

Many critics have sought to delete the sections on Behemot and Leviathan.⁹ Several arguments concerning style have been adduced in this connection, some readers maintaining that the second speech is inferior to the first as literature. This is a highly subjective point of view which I do not share. . . . There is, however, no reason for assuming that the poet would monotonously employ a single rhetorical form throughout four long chapters (chaps. 38-41). On the contrary, as a gifted poet he would be far more likely to vary his style.

page 157

The profundity of Job is matched by its literary greatness. The author is generally included among the half-dozen transcendent literary geniuses of all time, along with Homer, the Greek dramatists, Dante, Shakespeare, and Goethe.

page 159

Each reading discloses new beauties in Job, even if the book is read in a language other than Hebrew. The wonder is that so much has been successfully captured in translation, particularly in the magnificent King James Version. The reasons for its success are several. The Committee of Translators of 1611 possessed native literary gifts of the highest order and an ear for the cadence and sound of words second to none. Moreover, it was their good fortune to live at the flood tide of the Elizabethan era, when English possessed a richness and plasticity never attained before or since. Finally, the translators made themselves willing captives of the Hebrew original, even when it meant creating new English idioms out of Semitic turns of phrases. These ultimately became integral to the English language because of the sway held by the Authorized Version over the English-speaking peoples.

page 169

One of the most common problems confronting readers of the Bible is the occurrence of passages that appear out of place in the context, either in mood or in thought. The ideas expounded may seem irrelevant and even contradictory to the theme of the passage in which they are imbedded; or the emotion expressed may seem radically different from the spirit of the surrounding verses. To meet this difficulty scholars have adopted three basic procedures. In some instances they have rearranged the text, placing the offending passages in what they regard as a more "logical order." In other cases they have analyzed or atomized the literary document, on the theory that the present text is a collection of originally independent writings put together none too skillfully by one or more editors. Finally, and most frequently, they delete stichs, verses, and even entire sections of the received text on the ground that they are later, unauthentic additions. Often the additional assumption is made that these alleged interpolations were added by readers and scribes opposed to the views of the original writers, which they sought to counteract by these insertions into the text.

page 169-170

During the heyday of biblical hypercriticism, and even today, scholars rarely stopped to note that these radical solutions were almost completely subjective and arbitrary and therefore methodologically unsound. Underlying them all was a basic error - the failure to recognize the wide disparity in time, space, and culture pattern between the modern Western mind and that of an ancient oriental poet. The canons of logic and aesthetics congenial to a modern Western writer cannot be mechanically applied to a literary composition of the ancient East.

page 170

To force the biblical writer into the Procrustean bed of Western logic and aesthetics is to maim him beyond recognition. To "reconstruct" the text to suit alien conceptions of proper logical sequence and seemly emotional expression is to distort the work beyond recovery. Humility is more than a moral virtue; it is indispensable to the genuine scientific spirit. The exegete must seek to follow the lead of the author, to penetrate to his spirit and to do justice to the text before him, not to revise and improve upon it.

These a priori objections to the widespread use of transpositions, divisions, or deletions of the accepted text are supported by the fact that there is no objective evidence in favor of these drastic manipulations of the text.

page 170

The extant Hebrew manuscripts and the Ancient Versions, including the Septuagint, the oldest witness, nearly always reproduce the contents and order of our received text, including the allegedly interpolated passages.²

page 170

Equally unsatisfactory is the proposed explanation that later readers were opposed to the contents of the original text and therefore added their contradictory views in rebuttal. The question of why readers should have taken the trouble to add so much additional material, when

page 171

a far easier procedure was available to them, was not raised, let alone answered. All that was necessary was to destroy the manuscript or consign it to some Genizah or storage room of discarded texts, and thus effectively remove it from circulation. A striking case in point is afforded by the entire corpus of apocryphal literature, which was not admitted to the canon of Hebrew scriptures because of legal, doctrinal, or other divergences from normative Judaism. As a result, the Hebrew originals of books like Jubilees, the Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, and many other works of quality and importance, disappeared. Only translations of these books were preserved, and then only because of the interest manifested by the early Church. . . .

Moreover, the sheer extent of these alleged "additions" should have raised serious doubts about their deletion. Thus in the case of Ecclesiastes, Jastrow finds over 120 interpolations in a book of 222 verses. Barton, less extreme, claims that a pious glossator is responsible for 15 important additions and that a "Wisdom" interpolator is the author of 30 more (in addition to many other, lesser changes). Volz eliminates an equal number of passages, which do not, however, coincide with Barton's. The "analysis of sources" was applied by Siegfried to Ecclesiastes. He finds nine distinct major sources for this small book and assigns each verse, with enviable omniscience, to its author. Eissfeldt protests vigorously against this assumption of composite authorship and assumes only nine pious additions in the body of the book. However, he saves the authenticity of the text only by assuming that Koheleth contains no clear-cut, integrated philosophy, but consists merely of a series of rambling reflections that often contradict one another.⁴

In wielding the seapel with such confidence, scholars did not always stop to notice the fragments left behind after the surgical process was completed. Thus in Job, chapter 12, which contains 25 verses, Grill and Siegfried eliminate 22 verses, Driver and Gray delete nine, Jastrow omits 12, in whole or in part, while Volz retains only five verses of the total.⁵ . . .

page 172

Over two decades ago, my researches in Wisdom literature, and Ecclesiastes in particular, led me to reject this procedure of wholesale deletion, not only because it does violence to the integrity of the biblical text, but also because it destroys the content and timbre of the book. It is gratifying to note that the formerly widespread theory of interpolation by uncomprehending or hostile readers is losing ground increasingly among contemporary scholars.⁸ Thus Aage Bentzen observes: "The separation of sources is sometimes driven to a caricature, as in Ecclesiastes and Job. The British pun 'Is the Pentateuch Mosaic or a mosaic?' is not only characteristic for the sentiment among opponents of literary criticism, but also among the younger generation of scholars as a whole."⁹

Footnote 9, page 348. A. Bentzen, Introduction to the O.T. I, 13 (1948)

An Outline of the History of Christian Thought Since Kant, Edward Caldwell
London: Duckworth & Co., 1912.

p. 3,4 One of these principles is, for example, that of dealing in true critical fashion with problems of history and literature. Long before the end of the age of rationalism, this principle had been applied to literature and history, other than those called sacred. This thorough-going application of this scientific method to the literatures and history of the Old and New Testaments is almost wholly an achievement of the nineteenth century. It has completely altered the view of revelation and inspiration. The altered view of the nature of the documents of revelation has had immeasurable consequences for dogma.

p. 12, 13 We shall have then, secondly, to note the historical and critical movement. It is the effort to apply consistently and without fear the maxims of historical and literary criticism to the documents of the Old and New Testaments.

Peerlkamp, Petrus Hofman

(1786-1865)

Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed

;
 Founder of the subjective method of textual criticism, which consisted in rejecting
 in a classical scholar whatever failed to come up to the standard of what that
 author, in the critic's opinion, ought to have written. His ingenuity in this
 direction, in which he went much farther than Bentley, was chiefly exercised
 on the Odes of Horace (the greater part of which he declared spurious), and the

34

Aeneid of Virgil. He also edited the Ars poetica and Satires of Horace, the
 Agricola of Tacitus, the romance of Xenophon of Ephesus, and was the author of
 a history of the Latin poets of the Netherlands.

3.01-16

(3.61)

Charles Drekmeier, Kingship and Community in Early India, Stanford University Press, 196

(Page 132)

"Hopkins many years ago concluded that the original narrative core of the epic is impossible to isolate from the later mythical and moralistic accretions, and few present-day students of the Mahabharata would question this judgment."

Literary Criticism

Robert Lowth in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., Vol. 17, p. 78, 79,
--- his Prælectiones, translated in 1787 by G. Gregory as Lectures on the
Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, exercised a great influence both in England
and on the continent. "Their chief importance lay in the idea of looking
at the sacred poetry as poetry, and examining it by the ordinary
standards of literary criticism.

" * * * the work of Dover Wilson more legitimately belongs to 'higher criticism.'

'Wilson makes very large claims for the method: 'We can at times creep into the compositor's skin and catch glimpses of the MS through his eyes. The door of Shakespeare's workshop stands ajar.' No doubt, the 'bibliographers' have thrown some light on the composition of Elizabethan plays and have suggested, and possibly proved, many traces of revision and alteration. But many of Dover Wilson's hypotheses seem fanciful constructions for which evidence seems very slight or even completely lacking. Thus, Dover Wilson has constructed the genesis of The Tempest. He claims that the long exposition scene points to the existence of an earlier version in which the pre-history of the plot has been told as a loosely constructed drama in the style of The Winter's Tale. But the slight inconsistencies and irregularities in line arrangement, etc., cannot yield even presumptive evidence for such farfetched and needless fancies." (page 55)

801 Literary Scholarship, Its Aims and Methods by Norman Foerster, John C. McGalliard,
L712 Rene Wellek, Austin Warren, Wilbur L. Schramm. Chapel Hill, The University of
North Carolina Press. 1941

3.01

Chapter 1, "The Study of Letters" by Norman Foerster. pp 9-

p. 9 " . . . Meanwhile F. A. Wolf assured the development of a new Hellenism. If Bentley had founded historical philology, it was the author of the Prolegomena to Homer who now established the scientific type of scholarship represented by the term Altertumswissenschaft, thanks to ^{which} the nineteenth century became "a second Renaissance of Greek studies, destined perhaps to be as important as the first." (R. W. Livingstone, Greek Ideals and Modern Life, 1935, p. 25)

3.21

3.21

"The great age of science had now arrived, an age of exploration of the natural and human past by geology and paleontology, an age dominated by the idea of change through evolution, an age of realistic and naturalistic philosophy and literature, of methodical and meticulous objectivity in the historical study of literature and its backgrounds. In the 1860's came the brilliant effort of Taine to apply naturalistic concepts and scientific methods to a national literature. His Histoire de la litterature anglaise opens with the words, "History has been transformed, within a hundred years in Germany, within sixty years in France, and that by the study of their literatures" as transcripts of past states of feeling and thought. Literary works were to be regarded as documents, by means of which the scholar could reconstruct the mental structure of an author and establish the causal relationships that explain literary phenomena, literary phenomena being essentially like natural phenomena. Making similarly dangerous assumptions, Brunetiere, in L'Evolution des genres dans l'histoire de la litterature, attempted to apply the phenomena of literature a formal classification based on the Darwinian theory. Whatever their shortcomings, it is worthy of note that men like Taine and Brunetiere were cast in a larger mould than most of the cautious and tireless specialists who followed them. . . .

p. 11 " . . . There was need of the exacting discipline which Germany had formulated and exemplified, and which at length attained its American culmination in the early twentieth century under the inspiring leadership of such men as Gildersleeve, and Grandgent, and Hohlfeld, and Manly, and Kittredge.

"By the second quarter of the new century the triumph of scientific literary scholarship in America was impressive. But with triumph came a flagging of excitement, a loss of vision, a tendency to mechanical expertness, a sense of diminishing rewards, even though these symptoms of inadequacy were disguised by the opening up to scholarly exploration the most recent periods of literary history. No serious efforts were made to alter or enlarge the pattern of what was more and more called research. While European scholarship was seeking to renew its vitality by fresh purposes and methods, American scholarship persistently confined itself to the accumulation of Materialien for the description of historical phenomena."

3.01

p. 219 ⁹In Germany, the nineteenth-century pattern had gone out of favor in the first decade of the twentieth century. After the positivistic school represented by Scherer came the geisteswissenschaftliche school associated especially with Dilthey; Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung, 1906, marks the change of approach. This reversal of emphasis from the analytical to the synthetic was not repeated in American scholarship. - Certain attempts at renewal of vitality in other European countries are indicated by Rene Wellek in Chapter III

the energy and the command of languages to enable him to read them. We must necessarily base our judgment upon what we know and what we can reasonably hope to know. Our philosophy is what life has taught us; our principles of literature are those that our literary experience has taught us. We cannot expect to establish a code of literary laws for others; we ought not to hope that others will make a code of literary laws for us. Our worth as literary critics largely depends upon our ability to free our minds from cant, obsolete psychology, unexamined contradictions, docile acceptance of fashion and insolent defiance of fashion, words masquerading as ideas and metaphors masquerading as thoughts, a sense of superiority to the past and a sense of the inferiority of the present. If these are our aims, the absence of definable 'standards' (whether ethical or aesthetic) becomes less disturbing. Each of us can have increasing confidence in his own standards because they are related to his expanding literary experience. This is very far from a naïve acceptance of subjective or relativistic or casually impressionistic judgments. On the contrary it accepts the principles of literary criticism as, though time-bound and error-bound, the object of eager and anxious exploration by all who delight in literature.

GENERAL: G. Saintsbury, *A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe* (3 vols, 1900-04; a pioneer work, somewhat erratic in judgment, but still of great value); J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* (2 vols, 1934); *English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase* (1943); . . . *The Renaissance* (1947). . . . *17th and 18th Centuries* (1951; careful accounts of the critical writings of the periods, but rather weak in dealing with ideas); E. E. Sikes, *The Greek View of Poetry* (1931); C. S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic to 1400* (1928); J. E. Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (1899); G. Tillotson, *Criticism and the 19th Century* (1951).—LITERARY THEORY: R. Wellek and A. Warren, *Theory of Literature* (1949; a survey of all the problems, with valuable biblio.).—COLLECTIONS: G. Saintsbury, *Loes Critici* (1903); W. Allen, *Writers on Writing* (1948); G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (2 vols, 1904); J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the 17th Century* (3 vols, 1908-09); E. D. Jones, *English Critical Essays: 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries*, and . . . *19th Century* (2 vols, 1922, 1916); R. W. Stallman, *Critiques and Essays in Criticism 1920-48* (1949; valuable, including some important American work). See also TASTE. T.S.

Cuaderna Vía, also called *Mester de Clerecía*. Spanish metre, combining 4

14-syllable lines (occasionally 16-syllable) in one stanza with a single rhyme. There is a caesura in the middle of each line.

E.M.W.

Cycles, Literary, a group of poems or other compositions round a central theme, hero, family, object or event. It is an extension of the term 'epic cycle' (ἐπικός κύκλος), first used by the Alexandrine grammarians with reference, it is now thought, to a large group of epic poems which by the 8th century B.C. had grown round the battle for Troy (q.v.). It comprised: the 11 lost books called by the mysterious name of *Cypria* and relating the antecedents of the Trojan war; the 24 books of the *Iliad*; the 11 lost books of the *Little Iliad* (Ἰλιάς μικρά) which carried the story to the destruction of Troy, incorporating the lost *Amazona*, *Aethiopia* and *Iliupersis*; finally the *Nostoi* (Returning of the Heroes) of which only the 24 books of the *Odyssey* remain, whilst the sequel, the *Telegonia*, relating the adventures of Telegonos, son of Odysseus and Circe, is lost. The individual epics were in some cases originally 'short' (or ballads); they were expanded and merged with others of varying length to form an epic cycle—probably long before the time of Pisis-tratus and Solon, to whom the Alexandrines attributed the rearrangement.

The origins of the literary (particularly epic) cycle are to be found in the narrative technique of the Greek rhapsode. It was at the courts of rulers, at banquets in the presence of assembled warriors, that he was called upon. His starting point had to be an event or a hero known to his hearers; he needed to be able to relate what had happened before or after the known event, or a previously unknown exploit of a known hero.

Many civilizations produced cycles of much the same kind. Scholars now generally assume that the Old Testament stories up to the monarchy were originally separate; they were drawn together later into cycles (the cycle of the Yahvist, of the Elohist, and the so-called Priestly Code which appears as a more or less homogeneous story), which influenced one another without ever becoming completely fused. Grouped tales, such as those of the Moses cycle, themselves contain some small and some larger units; the main theme of the Mosaic cycle (the departure from Egypt and the conquest of Palestine) may even be a late addition to the separate stories (of the Jews in the wilderness of Kadesh, of the promises made to the

Reto. N. S. 1907
 of Jones.

patriarchs, of the revelation on Sinai). Further additions were new and independent stories: the infancy of Moses, the plagues, the episodes of the conquest, the worship of Baal amongst the Israelites. The various stories were interlocked as the stories of the Pentateuch, their central theme being God's furtherance of his chosen people Israel. This whole process began during the period of oral tradition. In the same way there arose a cycle dealing with Abraham and Lot, with which the cycles of Jacob and Esau, and of Joseph and his brethren, became associated: all came to be linked in major cycles. In a restricted sense the four versions of the Gospel, the Acts of the Apostles and the apocryphal books may also be considered a literary cycle. So it is too with the tales of Buddha: the older tales collected under the name *Himayāna*, the younger tales of the *Lalitā Vistara*, and particularly the *Mahāvastu* which includes beside Buddha legends many *Jātakas* (devout and didactic tales); add the more recent *Mahāvastu-sūtras* and finally the *Svayambhū Purāna* (in dialogue form; this work is Brahman in spirit). The *Avadānas* again are tales both about Buddha and about great rulers, chief amongst whom is the 'Buddhist Constantine', emperor Aśoka (273-232 B.C.). Many Christian lives of saints, such as the *Little Flowers of St Francis*, show a similar cyclical arrangement.

Indian epics too, both the *Rāmāyana* and more particularly the *Mahābhārata* (qq.v.), were probably originally short epics cyclically arranged. The former preserves the appearance of a uniform work, despite its many more or less independent episodes and intercalated legends, but the monumental *Mahābhārata* is a loose agglomeration of stories and events about the struggle of *Bhārata's* descendants. Though the later 'literary' epic of Kālidāsa and his successors harks back to the two great epics and draws on their themes and stories, it does not form a cycle with them: the relationship approximates rather to that between the Roman literary epic of Virgil, Statius, Lucan and the epic cycle of the Greeks.

There are cycles of tales in early Japanese literature, known to us, however, merely through the artificially historical versions in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* (qq.v.) of the 8th century A.D., when the compilers forced the myths into a uniform mould.

Old Irish epic poetry shows typical cyclical structure. There are two main central themes: the struggle of king Conchobor of Ulster and his heroes

Cuchulainn, Conall Cernach and Fergus mac Roich against Ailill, king of Connaught, and queen Medb his wife; and the tales dealing with king Cormac mac Airt, Finn mac Cumhaill and his son Oisinn (Ossian) and their retinue. There is a cycle about king Eochaid Mugmedon and his family; and many more. Welsh literature does not lack cycles; the most famous, however—the Arthurian cycle of the *Mabinogion* (q.v.)—was probably first formed in the brilliant, imaginative history (c. 1135) of Geoffrey of Monmouth and given its highest literary expression in the courtly romances of Chrétien de Troyes. The influence of other cycles on at least the French literary versions of the Arthurian stories (q.v.) is clear: these are the native French romances on themes from classical antiquity (*Roman de Thèbes*, *Roman de Troie* and *Roman d'Enéas*) and cycles centring around Charlemagne, both of which groups, like the Arthurian romances, spread from France to other European literature. The central theme of the Charlemagne cycle (q.v.) is the battle fought by the emperor and his paladins against the whole of heathendom. This imperial cycle gave rise in the 12th century to imitations: to the various feudal (or vassal) cycles, of which the epics concerning Guillaume d'Orange and his nephews, who distinguished themselves in combat with the internal and external enemies of the empire, are the most distinguished.

The heroic enterprises of warrior communities—ranging from the clan to the national or religious community—are the central theme in the epic cycles of classical antiquity and of Irish and French literature. In the Arthurian cycles the individual hero comes to the fore, whilst the community to which he belongs, the Round Table, is not warlike: it is the point of departure as well as the final goal to which the individual hero returns as a perfect knight after a series of adventures. Germanic epic cycles hold an intermediate position. In *Waltharius* (the Latin variant of the Anglo-Saxon *Waldere*) and the *Hildebrandslied* the exploit of the hero seems to be either a central or a peripheral episode in some more general enterprise. Such too appears to be the position of the hero in Burgundian, Ostrogothic and Frankish cycles which are partly preserved in the Old Norse *Edda* (a cycle), and in the later epics (which were developed under the influence of the courtly romance): *Nibelungenlied* and *Wolfdietrich*. To explain the origin of these longer epics we must take into consideration the possibility

Hillway, Tyrus, Introduction to Research Second edition. (Houghton Mifflin Co.: Boston) 1964, 1956 (Tyrus Hillway - Colorado State College)

p. 102 Some years ago a German literary scholar tried ingeniously to prove that John Milton, the great English poet, had borrowed some of his ideas and language from an earlier writer. He attempted this by showing that certain identical words could be found in paragraphs chosen from the works of the two authors, and he proposed the principle of comparing "word clusters" in the writings of two different literary men to discover whether one had borrowed from the other. This principle, however, has been rejected by modern scholars because it conflicts with a known fact in literature; namely that two authors writing about the same subject are very likely to ^{simply} ~~employ~~ many of the same words in describing it. Thus, critical interpretation with conclusions based upon the rejected principle of "word clusters" would today be regarded as fallacious and unacceptable.

Hillway, Tyrus, Introduction to Research (Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston) 1964, 1956 (Second edition)

p. 121 During the eighteenth century Lamarck proposed the theory of "the true inheritance of acquired characteristics" to explain how new species may be formed in biological evolution. He contended that an organism which has been changed by its environment may transmit the change to its offspring. According to this belief, it should be possible to produce a race of short-tailed dogs by cutting off the tails of one generation of the species. The theory, widely accepted in its day, was challenged in 1883 by Weismann and is no longer credited by modern biologists anywhere except in the Soviet Union. . . .

At the beginning of the twentieth century De Vries advanced the "mutation theory" to account for the changes which occur from time to time in various species. He contended that such changes are taking place constantly in the world of nature through a kind of spontaneous mutation. If the change proves advantageous to the individual organism, it helps the organism to survive and is passed along to the offspring. If disadvantageous, it is likely to disappear through the process of natural selection. According to the De Vries theory, a change of this type takes place within the organism and is not caused by outside factors, as Lamarck supposed.

. . . Yet Lamarck's ideas now generally have been discarded, and those of De Vries require much more evidence before scientists of the present day will consider them as firmly established.

p. 123 A few years ago a well-known literary scholar advanced the hypothesis in a biographical study that the rather disagreeable and proud hero of Hawthorne's tale, "Ethan Brand," was intended as a portrait of Hawthorne's friend and neighbor, Herman Melville. The scholar based this hypothesis upon his analysis of Melville's person-
p.124
ality and upon the fact that "Ethan Brand" was published not long after Hawthorne and Melville met. But other scholars quickly pointed out an essential bit of evidence which the hypothesis had overlooked. In Hawthorne's notebooks there appeared a plan for the tale of "Ethan Brand" which had been written down long before Hawthorne knew Melville, and thus the author of Moby-Dick hardly could have served as the model for its chief character. This hypothesis clearly was proved wrong.

Hillway, Tyrus, Introduction to Research (Houghton Mifflin Co.: Boston) 1964, 1956
(Second editions)

p. 155 Ideas and phrases (as well as contemporaneous references) easily comprehended by the people of one century may be unintelligible to those of the next. In Chaucer's day - to give one illustration - such terms as twenty, fifty, and similar round numbers were apparently used freely to indicate merely a large number. Thus, when Chaucer spoke of owning "twenty books," we can interpret this to mean not that he had made an exact count but that he owned a substantial library. Today we still use a term like a thousand and one when we wish to represent a large but indeterminate number.

p. 158 Because it seems unreasonable that one with little formal education could become England's greatest literary figure, some scholars believe that Francis Bacon or Christopher Marlowe or some other university-educated person must have written the Shakespearean plays. The evidence adduced, however, is chiefly negative. As one of the most prominent recent editors of Shakespeare points out, in each case "the arguer has constructed a thesis or hypothesis, and has gone out and searched for matter which can be reconciled with that hypothesis. His whole case is thus built up within itself. Such arguments have no controls, and, as Bacon says, the fact that a system of thought is consistent with itself is no proof of the truth of that system. A true hypothesis is one supported by proof independent of the presuppositions of that hypothesis."⁵

Footnote 5 Hardin Craig, An Interpretation of Shakespeare (New York: The Dryden Press, 1948), pp. 4-5.

Emil Kraeling, THE OLD TESTAMENT SINCE THE REFORMATION, 1955

Page 89

"Orthodox biblicism was deeply entrenched once more and it seemed unlikely that biblical criticism of the sort being carried on in Germany could find admission there. But it was overlooked that biblical criticism had arisen on the Continent in emulation of the critical method developed in the study of the Greek and Roman classics. Homeric criticism found a hearing in England and thus paved the way for the application of similar principles to the biblical literature. A series of incidents now occurred which, through the publicity they received, helped to bring about a change."

Wellhausen's Views Preserved Mainly Unchanged Today

See 4.1 Wellhausen Theory Substantially held today

The History of The Higher Criticism of the New Testament, Henry S. Nash, New York, 1900

p. 79 Schleiermacher, when a mere boy in his twelfth year, was tortured by the suspicion that all the ancient records, both sacred and profane, might turn out to be forgeries.² Historic doubt was widespread.

Footnote ² Life (tr. by Rowan), I, p. 4. "My twelfth year . . . I conceived the idea that all the ancient authors, and with them the whole of ancient history, were supposititious." Cf. Descartes' resolution to begin his mental life by doubting everything.

Historic doubt made Niebuhr possible.³

p. 80 Footnote ³ It is something better than a mere coincidence that the 2nd edition of De Beaufort's Diss. sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire romaine appeared in 1750, nearly synchronous with the beginning of Semler's Bible-work. This reference is taken from Fuchta, Institutionen (6e Aufl., 1865), I, p. 101, n. Flint, Phil. of H., pp. 253-261. Beaufort's Dissertation suggests Niebuhr, although widely different in spirit; it indicates the fact that the mind of Western Europe had entered a "critical climate." The first parts of Niebuhr's Roman History issued in 1811-1812. If the term "epoch-making" had not been rendered useless by overuse, we should call it "epoch-making" in the fullest sense. See Stanley's Life of Arnold for the profound impression it made.

p. 80 The consciousness of facts standing outside all existing knowledge and casting suspicion upon the established framework of knowledge, was its chief characteristic [i. e. of the 18th Century]

It was in this century that criticism was born.

See 3.01 Peetkamp, Petrus Hofman (1786-1865) Encycl. Brit., 11th ed.

See 3.31 Myres, John L., Homer and His Critics Wilamowitz Wolf's theory. Lachmann.

17. Harrison, V., p. 90

To The History of Israel, 3rd ed.,
Wellhausen's Prolegomena, p. 331

"From the patriarchal narratives it is impossible to obtain any historical information with regard to the Patriarchs. We can only learn something about the time in which the stories about them were first told by the Israelite people. This late period, with all its essential and superficial characteristics was unintentionally projected backward into hoary antiquity and is reflected there like a transfigured mirage." (Cited by J. P. Free, Bib Sac, Jan., 1957, p.32)

and greatest epics in any European language, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Nothing whatever is known of his life, save that his technical skill shows that he was a professional poet; and certain linguistic and other evidences point to his having composed in Ionia, not in Greece proper. His surviving biographies are mere collections of folklore, centuries later than any possible date for him, and are of no historical value whatever. Even the meaning of his name (Greek names regularly have a meaning) is unknown; its identity in sound with the word for hostage probably is accidental. The tradition that he was blind comes from one of the *Hymns* which, along with various other works, were attributed to him in antiquity but now, on the basis of evidence collected by the best critics, ancient and modern, are known to be later. In one of these, the *Hymn to Apollo*, the author bids the singers tell anyone asking who their best poet is that he is "a blind man, and dwells in craggy Chios." This assertion of blindness is contradicted by the many instances of keen visual observation in the epics. His date is variously estimated, the arguments being based on probabilities rather than certainties; the most reasonable datings put him not earlier than the 10th nor later than the 8th century B.C.

For a long while, especially from 1795, when Friedrich August Wolf (1759-1824, q.v.) published his *Prolegomena ad Homerum*, it was held by many excellent and industrious scholars that the epics as we have them could not have been composed by one man (the theory still survives in places, especially in Continental Europe). The fundamental reasons for it were advanced by Wolf, who stated (1) that writing was unknown to the Greeks of "Homer's" day and (2) that without writing no one could compose such long works. Both these propositions are now known to be false. Therefore, the arguments based consciously or unconsciously on them are futile. Writing of a kind was known at least to some Greeks centuries before any likely date for Homer, and professional poets in illiterate societies are capable of remembering a prodigious amount of poetry, their own or another's. The search for the shorter poems supposedly put together to make the epics led to curious analyses of the epics and the supposed discovery of all manner of inconsistencies, "later" additions, and so on, as well as to the finding of something that is really there: older and newer forms of words. These, however, are distributed fairly evenly throughout the poems and fail entirely to coincide with the "earlier" and "later" portions. The inconsistencies are few and slight, and very few of the supposed additions still appear to be such when the structure of the poems as wholes and the ancient manner of telling a long story are duly considered. The assembling of the supposed shorter pieces was commonly ascribed to Pisistratus (d. 527 B.C.), tyrant of Athens, on late and slender evidence. The truth seems to be that, in his time, regulations were made for the public recital of the poems in their proper order, not of random selections made by the reciters to suit their own tastes or capabilities.

A modification of the ballad theory, as it may be called, was upheld by the historian George Grote (1794-1871) among others. This was to the effect that the *Iliad* grew out of successive additions, by unknown hands, to a shorter epic, about half the length of the poem as we have it. This, too, is backed by no really cogent arguments; and

all these theories tend to lose sight of the fact that Homer did not live in a primitive community, but in one that still retained memories of the brilliant Mycenaean civilization and, furthermore, was on the fringes of, and in at least occasional contact with, great cultures—Oriental and Egyptian—given to the composition of long and elaborate poems and other works and to their preservation in writing.

The only problem which is really alive today is the old one (it goes back to the Alexandrian critics) of whether Homer—meaning by that the author of the *Iliad*—also composed the *Odyssey*. Though differences in language and tone do exist, it cannot be said that the arguments for separate authorship are cogent, for these may be reasonably accounted for by the difference in subject: the *Iliad* describes an important episode in a long war, and the *Odyssey* the adventures of a man trying, under great difficulties, to return home, being mostly concerned with conditions of peace, or at least not with open and regular warfare.

All this does not mean that the poems have come down to us precisely as Homer composed them. Apart from modernizations of language here and there, certain passages, mostly quite short, may be additions made by reciters for one reason or another. Nor does it mean that Homer made no use of, or did not quote from, earlier poems that are lost to us. On the contrary, his frequent use of stock epithets, recurrent descriptions of natural phenomena, such as sunrise, formulas introducing a speech, and the like, make it clear that he inherited not only a vocabulary but a supply of ready-made metrical tags which he had no hesitation in using whenever it suited him; probably his hearers would have been surprised and disappointed if he had not done so.

The high poetical quality of his work is vouched for by the consensus of the best literary criticism, ancient and modern. See also *ILIAD*; *ODYSSEY*.

Bibliography.—The writings on Homer literally fill whole libraries. For a summary of the controversy on single versus multiple authorship, consult Herbert J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature*, 4th ed., pp. 30-47 (London 1951), and works cited there; a fuller list is in John A. Nairn, *Classical Hand-list*, 3d ed., pp. 34-39 (Oxford 1953). For ancient literary criticism, consult especially Aristotle, *Poetics*, chaps. 8, 23, 24, 25; and "Longinus," *On the Sublime*. For modern literary criticism, consult Matthew Arnold, *On Translating Homer*, 2 vols. (London 1861-62; reprinted, 1 vol., London 1905).

HERBERT J. ROSE,
Emeritus Professor of Greek, United College of
St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews,
Scotland.

HOMER, Louise (nee Louise Dilworth Beatty), American operatic contralto: b. Pittsburgh, Pa., April 30, 1871; d. Winter Park, Fla., May 6, 1947. Educated in Minneapolis and West Chester, Pa., she went to Boston in 1894 to study voice with William L. Whitney and theory with Sidney Homer (q.v.), whom she married in 1895. In the following year, she accompanied her husband to Paris, where, after two years of study, she made her first appearance at a concert under the baton of Vincent d'Indy. In 1898 she made her operatic debut as Leonora in *La favorita* at Vichy. From 1900 to 1919, she sang with the Metropolitan Opera Company in New York City, and for three seasons thereafter with the Chicago Civic Opera Company. She was noted for the beauty and purity of her voice, her mastery and breadth of style, and the dignity of her artistry.

3.12-1
E-15-1
9.326
Vol. 14, p. 338
1966 ed.
Encyclopedia Americana
"Homer"

patriarchs, of the revelation on Sinai). Further additions were new and independent stories: the infancy of Moses, the plagues, the episodes of the conquest, the worship of Baal amongst the Israelites. The various stories were interlocked as the stories of the Pentateuch, their central theme being God's furtherance of his chosen people Israel. This whole process began during the period of oral tradition. In the same way there arose a cycle dealing with Abraham and Lot, with which the cycles of Jacob and Esau, and of Joseph and his brethren, became associated: all came to be linked in major cycles. In a restricted sense the four versions of the Gospel, the Acts of the Apostles and the apocryphal books may also be considered a literary cycle. So it is too with the tales of Buddha: the older tales collected under the name *Himayāna*, the younger tales of the *Lalita Vistara*, and particularly the *Mahāvastu* which includes beside Buddha legends many *Jātaka*s (devout and didactic tales); add the more recent *Mahāyāna-sūtras* and finally the *Svayambhūti Purāna* (in dialogue form; this work is Brahman in spirit). The *Avadāna*s again are tales both about Buddha and about great rulers, chief amongst whom is the 'Buddhist Constantine', emperor Aśoka (273-232 B.C.). Many Christian lives of saints, such as the *Little Flowers of St Francis*, show a similar cyclical arrangement.

Indian epics too, both the *Rāmāyana* and more particularly the *Mahābhārata* (qq.v.), were probably originally short epics cyclically arranged. The former preserves the appearance of a uniform work, despite its many more or less independent episodes and intercalated legends, but the monumental *Mahābhārata* is a loose agglomeration of stories and events about the struggle of *Bhārata*'s descendants. Though the later 'literary' epic of Kālidāsa and his successors harks back to the two great epics and draws on their themes and stories, it does not form a cycle with them: the relationship approximates rather to that between the Roman literary epic of Virgil, Statius, Lucan and the epic cycle of the Greeks.

There are cycles of tales in early Japanese literature, known to us, however, merely through the artificially historical versions in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi* (qq.v.) of the 8th century A.D., when the compilers forced the myths into a uniform mould.

Old Irish epic poetry shows typical cyclical structure. There are two main central themes: the struggle of king Chonchobor of Ulster and his heroes

Cuchulainn, Conall Cernach and Fergus mac Roich against Aíll, king of Connaught, and queen Meled his wife; and the tales dealing with king Cormac mac Airt, Finn mac Cumhaill and his son Oisinn (Ossian) and their retinue. There is a cycle about king Eochaid Mugmedon and his family; and many more. Welsh literature does not lack cycles; the most famous, however—the Arthurian cycle of the *Mabinogion* (q.v.)—was probably first formed in the brilliant, imaginative history (c. 1135) of Geoffrey of Monmouth and given its highest literary expression in the courtly romances of Chrétien de Troyes. The influence of other cycles on at least the French literary versions of the Arthurian stories (q.v.) is clear: these are the native French romances on themes from classical antiquity (*Roman de Thèbes*, *Roman de Troie* and *Roman d'Enéas*) and cycles centring around Charlemagne, both of which groups, like the Arthurian romances, spread from France to other European literature. The central theme of the Charlemagne cycle (q.v.) is the battle fought by the emperor and his paladins against the whole of heathendom. This imperial cycle gave rise in the 12th century to imitations: to the various feudal (or vassal) cycles, of which the epics concerning Guillaume d'Orange and his nephews, who distinguished themselves in combat with the internal and external enemies of the empire, are the most distinguished.

The heroic enterprises of warrior communities—ranging from the clan to the national or religious community—are the central theme in the epic cycles of classical antiquity and of Irish and French literature. In the Arthurian cycles the individual hero comes to the fore, whilst the Round Table, is not warlike: it is the point of departure as well as the final goal to which the individual hero returns as a perfect knight after a series of adventures. Germanic epic cycles hold an intermediate position. In *Waltharius* (the Latin variant of the Anglo-Saxon *Waldere*) and the *Hildebrandslied* the exploit of the hero seems to be either a central or a peripheral episode in some more general enterprise. Such too appears to be the position of the hero in Burgundian, Ostrogothic and Frankish cycles which are partly preserved in the Old Norse *Edda* (a cycle), and in the later epics (which were developed under the influence of the courtly romance): *Nibelungenlied* and *Wolfdietrich*. To explain the origin of these longer epics we must take into consideration the possibility

Note: Waltharius of the Anglo-Saxon Waldere

On the "unhistoric" character of Abraham, Moses, etc.

p. 7 In regard to P, Wellhausen writes: It is historical only in form; the history serves merely as a framework on which to arrange the legislative material, or as a mask to disguise it.

p. 141 In the Jehovistic legislation there is no word of priests (Exod. 20-23,34) . . .

p. 313 The original dwelling-place of the Terahites is, according to Q, not the Mesopotamian Haran(Carrhae), as is JE(12.1; 24.4), but Ur Casdim, which can only mean Ur of the Chaldees. From there Terah, the father of Abraham, Nahor, and Haran, is said to have emigrated with Abraham and Lot, the son of Haran, who was already dead. If this was so, Nahor must have stayed at Ur Casdim, and Haran must have died there. But neither of these assumptions is consistent with the indications of the narrative. The different aspirates notwithstanding, it is scarcely allowable to separate the man Haran from the town Haran and to make him die elsewhere. It is equally impossible to regard Ur in Chaldaeae as the residence of Nahor, whether the grandfather or the grandson of the same name matters nothing; for it is obviously not without relation to real facts that the place, which in any case must be in Syria, where the Nahorides Laban and Rebecca dwell, is called in J the town of Nahor, and in E Haran. Even in Q though Nahor stays in Ur, Laban and Rebecca do not live in Chaldaeae, but in Padan Aram, i.e., in Mesopotamian Syria. What helps to show that Ur Casdim does not belong to the original form of the tradition, is that even in Serug the father of Nahor, we are far away from Babylon towards the West. Serug is the name of a district which borders Haran on the North; how can the son of Serug all at once leap back to Ur Casdim?

p.318-19 It is true, we ^{to} attain no historical knowledge of the patriarchs, but only of the time when the stories about them arose in the Israelite people; this later age is here unconsciously projected, in its inner and its outward features, into hoar antiquity, and is reflected there like a glorified mirage.

p. 320 In the patriarchal legend, however, the ethnographic element is always predominant. Abraham alone is certainly not the name of a people like Isaac and Lot: he is somewhat difficult to interpret. That is not to say that in such a connection as this we may regard him as a historical person; he might with more likelihood be regarded as a free creation of unconscious art. He is perhaps the youngest figure in the company, and it was probably at a comparatively late period that he was put before his son Isaac.

p. 345 As from the literary point of view, so also from the historical, the Moses of the Jehovist appears more original than the Moses of the Priestly Code. To prove this is, it is true, the aim of the entire present work: . . .

p. 347 In the Priestly Code, the work of Moses lies before us clearly defined and rounded off; one living a thousand years after knows it as well as one who saw it with his eyes. It is detached from its originator and from his age: lifeless itself, it has driven the life out of Moses and out of the people, out of the very Deity. This precipitate of history, appearing as law at the beginning of the history, stifles and kills the history itself.

p. 350 It is less easy to account on the theory of pure fiction for the numerous names sometimes arranged together like a catalogue than for reported circumstances and numbers. There can certainly be no doubt that the forty places which are mentioned in the list of encampments in the wanderings, really existed in the region the Israelites are reported to have traversed. But he who is satisfied with this as evidence that we have before us here a historical document of primitive antiquity, will never be disturbed by criticism. Was it such a difficult matter to find out forty definite stations in the wilderness for the forty years of the wanderings? Even if the elements of the composition are not fictitious, that is far from proving the composition itself to be authentic. And in the case of lists of the names of persons, the elements are often of an extremely doubtful nature; and here it is well to keep in view the principle of Vatke . . . that no confidence is to be placed in subjects devoid of predicates, and that persons are not to be taken for real who have nothing to do.

p. 436 Moses certainly organised no formal state, endowed with specific holiness, upon the basis of the proposition "Jehovah is the God of Israel;" or, at all events, if he did so, the fact had not in the slightest degree any practical consequence or historical significance. The old patriarchal system of families and clans continued as before to be the ordinary constitution, if one can apply such a word as constitution at all to an unorganised conglomeration of homogeneous elements.

Historicism -- writings as merely expressing the spirit of the age

p. 30 Thus the law now under consideration is in harmony with the custom and usage of the first historical period, has its root therein, and gives sanction to it.

p. 51 And therefore the latter code is a growth of the soil that has been prepared by means of the former.

p. 338 In the Jehovist the present age everywhere shines through, he in no way conceals his own age; we are told that Babylon is the great world-city, that the Assyrian Empire is in existence, with the cities of Niniveh and Calah and Resen; that the Canaanites had once dwelt in Palestine, but had long been absorbed in the Israelites. The writer of the Priestly Code is very careful not to do anything like this.

p. 447 It was natural enough that the Hebrews should also appropriate the divinity worshipped by the Canaanite peasants as the giver of their corn, wine, and oil, the Baal whom the Greeks identified with Dionysus. The apostasy to Baal, on the part of the first generation which had quitted the wilderness and adopted a settled agricultural life, is attested alike by historical and prophetic tradition. Doubtless Baal, as the god of the land of Canaan, and Jehovah, as the God of the nation of Israel, were in the first instance co-ordinated. But it was not to be expected that the divinity of the land should permanently be different from the God of the dominant people.

Wellhausen, History of Israel

p. 29 It may be taken for granted that in some way or other these have their roots in history, and do not merely hang in the air, quite away from or above the solid ground of actuality.

p. 35 It is the basis and indispensable foundation, without which all else would merely float in the air: first must the seat of the Divine Presence on earth be given before the sacred community can come into life and the cultus into force.

p. 39 Thus (so to speak) it holds itself up in the air by its own waistband.

p. 167 For the position of the Levites is the Achilles heel of the Priestly Code.

History of Israel. p. 320

Abraham alone is certainly not the name of a people like Isaac and Lot; he is somewhat difficult to interpret. That is not to say that in such a connection as this we may regard him as a historical person; he might with more likelihood be regarded as a free creation of unconscious art. He is perhaps the youngest figure in the company, and it was probably at a comparatively late period that he was put before his son Isaac.

Wellhausen on The Tabernacle

The temple, the focus to which the worship was concentrated, and which in reality was not built until Solomon's time, is by this document [P] regarded as so indispensable, even for the troubled days of the wanderings before the settlement, that it is made portable, and in the form of a tabernacle set up in the very beginning of things. For the truth is, that the tabernacle is the copy, not the prototype, of the temple at Jerusalem.

See 17 Erosion of Wellhausenism

Stalker, D. M. G., Peake's Commentary, p. 208
 Harrelson, W., pp. 93, 96, 97, 31, 90

Wellhausen, Hist. of Israel, p. 39, 331?

Stalker, "Exodus" in Peake's, p. 233

Abba, Raymond, "Priests and Levites", Interp. Dict. of the Bible, 226 f.

Albright, W. F., File XI-12

Hooke, S.H., in Peake's Com., p. 169

Cross, Frank M., "The Priestly Tabernacle" in The Biblical Archaeologist Reader

Kaufmann, Yehezkel, The Religion of Israel, reviewed by D. N. Freedman in JBL, June '62, p. 185-190

Hooke, S. H. in Peake's Com., p. 205 (173c e)

W. F. Albright, New Horizons in Biblical Research, OUP, London, 1966

Page 13

"The Mosaic period also has been considerably illuminated by archaeology. Of course, no reference to Moses has been found in any excavated document; it would be extremely surprising if one ever were found. Only a tiny proportion of all the important Egyptians and Semites living in Egypt during the thirteenth century B.C. are mentioned in any documentary source. And Moses is particularly unlikely to be mentioned, because his importance is not related in any way to Egypt but solely to the future Israel. He was the founder of Israel, including its religion, law, culture, statehood. Israel had to have a founder. Nowhere in history is there an example of such unique institutions growing up out of nothing by a process that cannot be defined, because of supposed lack of documentary attestation."

See also 3.31 Ibid. pp. 14, 15

W. F. Albright, New Horizons in Biblical Research, OUP, London, 1966

p. 18 Footnote 1: Thorlief Boman: Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek, London, 1960.

p. 21

"Benjamin Lee Whorf was a brilliant American engineer who wrote on a wide range of subjects. In particular he published a series of articles on linguistic psychology which soon became classics. His ideas were in fact highly original, and convinced many. However, they were almost entirely wrong."

p. 23-4

"We must look more closely at this primitive logic. The man of the ancient Near East developed a rigorously logical approach to many everyday occupations, to ordinary law and social practice, as well as to the arts and crafts. Thousands of years ago man had already invented innumerable devices and gadgets, processes and uses of materials--many of which were subsequently lost and often remain so today. Others have been rediscovered after decades of effort on the part of modern technicians. Many chemists, ceramists, and archaeologists have spent a large part of their lives trying to make Attic black-figured or red-figured glaze. Only now are we beginning to rediscover some of the inventions of ancient men."

p. 27 Footnote 1

"See especially a discussion of the factors involved in the Greek intellectual revolution in my forthcoming Experience on the Road to Reason, to be published by McGraw-Hill."

3.17-3

W. F. Albright, New Horizons in Biblical Research, OUP, London, 1966

Page 9

"The rest of Genesis contains traditions of historical character, though still of course going back to oral tradition. The significance of the latter is that oral material takes on certain fixed forms designed to ensure the preservation of features which might otherwise drop out. There were also aids to memory which were interspersed through oral compositions to draw attention to the meaningful content of words and names, and to associate a given tradition with the correct persons and places; such mnemonic aids are called aetiological." ←

Page 11 - Footnote 1

"On the early patriarchal age, cf. especially Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 163 (1961), pp. 36-54, and also the writer's The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra, Harper Torch Book (New York, 1963), pp. 1 ff. There will be further material in the author's forthcoming Jordan Lectures (University of London) for 1965 (Canaan, Phoenicia and Israel) to be published by McGraw-Hill. Recent attempts to telescope the patriarchal and Mosaic periods, dating Abraham about 1400 and the Exodus about 1200, are quite unnecessary. Ancient and modern Arab genealogies, together with similar examples from Rhodesia, Hawaii, as well as from many other places, usually start with the putative ancestors of the clan. After several generations there are long gaps, followed by the latest ten generations or so--the generations in between are omitted without explanation. Historical analogy suggests that the same may be true of the Biblical genealogies, and that in fact, as all our other evidence indicates, there was an interval of several centuries between the earliest patriarchal period and the time of Moses."

Biblical and Other Studies, edited by Alexander Altmann (Harvard University Press
Cambridge, Mass., 1963)

"Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery"
by Cyrus H. Gordon

p. 4 There is a relationship between the patriarchal narratives and the Conquest, for the Conquest is justified as the fulfillment of the Divine Promise to the Fathers, and in keeping with the treaties and land purchases contracted by the Fathers in Genesis. The Conquest thus corresponds to the Return of the Heraclids in Greek tradition. This might suggest that the patriarchal narratives are the fictional creation of a later age - a view that still has adherents. If we judge the case by the tendentious elements in the Genesis narratives, this view might seem reasonable enough. But the internal evidence of the Genesis text is confirmed by cuneiform documents at so many points, and along so many different lines, that we are obliged to consider the patriarchal narratives as an authentic reflex of the second millennium, specifically of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, for the reasons given below.

p. 5 If the study of antiquity teaches us anything, it is to avoid the assumption of "dark ages" during which nothing happened. Such dark ages sooner or later vanish like mirage.

p. 6 The institutions of the patriarchal narratives are not an invention of later Israelite authors, but have been transmitted accurately from the Amarna Age. If they had been invented by later authors, they would reflect later Hebrew law and custom.

p. 9 Of more direct value for the study of the Patriarchs are the administrative texts from Ugarit that mention merchants supplied with troops.¹⁴ Abraham with his three hundred and eighteen warriors (Genesis 14.14) is not fanciful embroidery; the incident was rather typical of his times in Canaan, as we learn from the most prosaic kind of document: administrative records.

Biblical and Other Studies, edited by Alexander Altmann (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.) 1963

"Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery"
by Cyrus H. Gordon

p.10 In spite of the evidence, the presence of the riding camel in the Genesis narratives has been branded anachronistic by many Biblical scholars,¹⁷ who disregard the Walters Art Gallery seal and also the mention of food for camels in the Alalakh tablets of the Mari Age.¹⁸ Camels that are fed can only be domesticated. So, far from being an anachronism, the mention of domesticated camels in the patriarchal narratives is supported by a contemporary seal and textually in the still earlier Mari Age.

The patriarchal narratives deal with a world that we now know to have been highly literate. Canaan of the Amarna Age was the hub of a sophisticated, international order. Abraham's travels sum up the spirit of the age. He started out in Aran-Naharaim, traveled to Canaan, visited Egypt, bought real estate from Hittites, had dealings with Philistines, contracted military alliances with Amorites, and waged war against a coalition of kings who came from as far off as Elam. It is surprising in retrospect that the Patriarchs could ever have been considered unsophisticated nomadic sheikhs. Canaanite literacy during the Amarna Age is best exemplified by Ugarit, which has yielded inscriptions in many languages and scripts. One school text is a vocabulary in which words are given in Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hurrian as well as in the native Ugaritic. A school system which trains students to correlate four languages belonging to three unrelated families, and recorded in two totally different scripts, can hardly be a function of primitive or provincial society.

17. For a recent, albeit brief, discussion of the date of the domestication of the camel, see Sabatino Moscati, Rivista degli Studi Orientali 35:116 (1960)

18. No. 269:59, published in D. J. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets (London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953); cf. A. Goetze, "Remarks on the Ration Lists from Alalakh, VII," Journal of Cuneiform Studies 13:34-38 (1959).

Biblical and Other Studies, edited by Alexander Altmann (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.) 1963

"Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery"
by Cyrus H. Gordon

p. 13 In discussing Hebrew origins in the light of recent discovery, we have constantly kept in mind the text that records the mainstream of the tradition. One might object that a tradition need have little if any historical basis. But in the case of the Bible - and indeed of Homeric epic, too - modern discovery makes it quite clear that the milieu is genuine, not invented. There is reason to believe that the lives of the Patriarchs fit into a historic framework which may be confirmed by future discoveries more specifically than is now possible. After reviewing the evidence from Nuzu, Ugarit, and Hattusas, can we despair of discovering historic texts mentioning one or more of the nine kings in Genesis 14? Cuneiform texts of the Hittite enclave around Hebron may be awaiting the excavator's spade. We cannot predict that Abraham's deed for the purchase of the real estate in Genesis 23 will be found on a clay tablet. But we can say that such a tablet was the normal medium for recording such transactions in Abraham's milieu. Abimelech, King of Gerar, with whom Abraham and Isaac had dealings, probably presided over a literate court whose records may some day be found.

p.14

Biblical and Other Studies, edited by Alexander Altmann (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.) 1963.

"Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery"
by Cyrus H. Gordon

p. 3 Footnote 3. For a statement of some of the pros and cons, see Martin Noth, The History of Israel, 2nd English ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), pp. 123-124. Cf. also G. Ernest Wright, "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs," reprinted from The Expository Times (July 1960), pp. 3-7.

p. 5. Footnote 5. See my New Horizons in Old Testament Literature (Ventnor, N.J. Publishers, 1960), p. 13, for this and for some other chronological data that are not repeated here.

p. 6 Footnote 6. For a comprehensive account with documentation, see my "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets," Biblical Archaeologist 3:1-12 (February 1940).

p. 9 In the Amarna Age, a composition that enjoyed popularity in the outposts of the cuneiform world was the Epic of the King of Battle, dealing with the theme of merchants abroad, receiving military aid from their king.¹³

Footnote 13. The most accessible publication of this text is S. A. B. Mercer, The Tell el-Amarna Tablets, II (Toronto: Macmillan, 1939), 808-815.

p. 3 Footnote 1. We may term Hebrew history prior to the establishment of the United Monarchy as the "Heroic Age," characterized by movement, dislocation, and instability. Such conditions tend to evoke a heroic literature, and the Hebrew records describing the Heroic Age reflect a strong epic component. For such general considerations I refer the reader to my The World of the Old Testament (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1958).

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge) 1966

p. 11 As early as the 1830's and 1840's, Egyptology became an organized discipline, and during the next three decades, Assyriology rapidly caught up with it and even outstripped it in significance for biblical research.^{p. 12} By the 1930's our new knowledge of the ancient Near East, matrix of the Bible, had become so precise and extensive that it began to revolutionize biblical research.

p. 12 As recently as 1925 there was almost no light which archaeology in the narrow sense could throw directly on the Old Testament.

p. 13 Accordingly, I shall use the term "biblical archaeology" here to refer to all Bible Lands - from India to Spain, and from southern Russia to South Arabia - and to the whole history of those lands from about 10,000 B.C., or even earlier, to the present time.

p. 15 From the 1870's through the 1890's a brilliant German Semitist, Julius Wellhausen, applied the Hegelian dialectic to biblical history. He tried, by means of Hegelian analogy with pre-Islamic and Islamic Arabia, to build a system for the development of Israel's history, religion, and literature which would fit his critical analysis.

p. 15 ((Albright says that both the view of the conservatives that the Hebrew Pentateuch went back with virtually no change to the time of Moses, c. 1400 B.C., the date given by these conservatives, and the liberal view that the text was edited and transformed into its present written form nearly 1000 years after Moses, c. 500 B.C., are views that have been found to be equally wrong.)) .

p. 16 The Wellhausen structure, which divided the Pentateuch into a number of different documents and even attempted to split single verses among three or more different sources, has proved to be an exaggerated system against which many protests have been leveled. Historians of law, for example, have been shocked at the arbitrary treatment of legal material by men who had never been trained as lawyers or as students of the history of law and legal processes.

Albright, W.F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge) 1966

p. 17 M. Parrot, curator of Western Asiatic remains at the Louvre, while excavating at Mari, wrote me once that he had not yet found any direct evidence of Abraham himself -- but almost. I think I can now prove that Abraham flourished in the late nineteenth century, i.e., in the century before the Mari tablets. ((Albright says we have at least 25,000 tablets from both Mari and Nuzi, dating from the 18 and 15th-14th centuries B.C., respectively and these have thrown a flood of light on Patriarchal backgrounds))

p. 18 It is difficult today to imagine the bewilderment of Old Testament scholars when the first reports on the Amarna letters began to appear at the end of the eighties. Julius Wellhausen solved the problem by never referring to them. As late as 1932 a standard two-volume history of Israel appeared in print with scarcely a trace of having been influenced by the Amarna finds. Here then there has been a lag of about half a century.

p. 18-19 ((Albright says that the excavations of Ugarit(Ras Shamra), begun in 1929 by C.F.A. Schaeffer and still continuing, illuminate the previously little-known civilization of Canaan and the Canaanite alphabet texts discovered there have enabled linguists to reconstruct the forgotten grammar and verse style of pre-Mosaic times.

p. 20 ((Scrolls from Qumran dating from the early 3rd cent. B.C., to the sixties of the first cent. A.D. Contain all of Isaiah, substantial parts of Lev., I and II Sam, Psalms, Hab, etc. Contain many thousands of fragments from virtually all the other books of the O.T. In all we have fragments of some 150 biblical manuscripts, at a conservative estimate. Average c. 1000 years older than any Heb. biblical text of more than a few lines known to exist anywhere in 1947.))

p.22 The stories of the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are told in the Book of Genesis, and date in their extant written form to the tenth-seventh centuries B.C.

p. 44 In the absence of clear-cut differences in wording and ^{p. 45} / structured formulas, it is impossible to classify literary sources on the basis of content alone. ((In context Albright is reconstructing Samuel's role in history))

p. 31 In the first place, there is a whole series of settlements of the period, with the same type of house construction and the same indications of seasonal planting, along the old caravan routes in north-central Sinai. Rothenberg, Aharoni, and others found Middle Bronze I pottery even in the heart of this arid desert along the main caravan routes to Egypt. No other pottery at all from any period was found - only pottery of the middle twentieth-nineteenth century B. C! How can this strange situation be explained?

When Beno Rothenberg's book The Wilderness of God appeared in 1961, describing his explorations in Sinai with illustrations of the pottery and with descriptions and plans of the sites where it was found, I realized that the anomalous situation could be explained only by donkey caravan trade. Desert donkeys need water every two or three days, whereas unspoiled desert camels can last a week or longer without water.

p. 41 Albright has this footnote:

See also my forthcoming volume of Jordan Lectures on Canaan, Phoenicia and Israel, Chapter II.

p. 42 My point of view was first presented as the Goldenson Lecture for 1961, entitled Samuel and the Beginning of the Prophetic Movement (Cincinnati, 1961). It was not until early the same year that I read William Sargant's brilliant book, The Battle for the Mind (New York, 1957) in its 1961 Penguin edition.

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition
(Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge) 1966

p. 44 Modern scholars, beginning especially with Julius Wellhausen, have tried to distribute the narratives of Samuel among different documentary sources. In Genesis this can be done to a certain extent, thanks to the two divine names, Yahweh and Elohim. However, in the Book of Samuel there are no such concrete criteria of form, so that scholars who try to use the divergent traditions about Samuel's role as a means of differentiating documentary sources are soon reduced to speculation. In the absence of clear-cut differences in wording and / ^{p. 45} structured formulas, it is impossible to classify literary sources on the basis of content alone

p. 45 The analysis of the Hebrew recensions of I and II Samuel by Frank M. Cross, Jr., as they appear among the sheepskin fragments of Cave IV at Qumran, is at last providing us with a textual basis for the study of Samuel's career.² . . . In other words, the original text of Samuel was longer than any derived recensions, and naturally longer than all modern translations. Where the Greek and Hebrew differ, most apparent recensional variants were already found in the earlier text. Since we find similar indications of a fuller original text in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges, we may be sure that all these books share in the tendency to reduce the original text through copyists' errors, instead of expanding it by editorial glosses. Therefore, it is impossible to carry out any of those close analyses / ^{p.46} of the Hebrew text which became so popular in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The text of the Hebrew Bible was not fixed at such an early date as supposed by most critical scholars, a fact which means that the Massoretic text cannot be used as a basis for the kind of analysis which sometimes divided a single verse among three different sources.

2 See F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Study (New York, 1958), especially pages 31 ff. and 133 ff.

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition
(Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge) 1966

p. 46 The text of the Hebrew Bible was not fixed at such an early date as supposed by most critical scholars, a fact which means that the Masoretic text cannot be used as a basis for the kind of analysis which sometimes divided a single verse among three different sources.

Just what this means in terms of textual criticism is easy to see. Most losses are the result of the repetitive style of oral transmission, where we have statements as to what will occur or instructions about what is to be done, followed by narratives in which the events are narrated as having happened or the instructions are said to have been carried out in detail. In Canaanite (Ugaritic) prospective and narrative epic texts we have similar scribal omissions, which must be restored to their places in both doublets in order to understand the text. In most cases, both in the epics and the Bible, scribal omissions are caused by remembering parallels and omitting words because the scribe was under the impression that he had already written something which he had, in fact, only remembered.

p. 48 Footnote # 4

Thanks to the Hebrew text of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), discovered by S. Schechter in the Cairo Geniza, and published since 1897, we now have the text of this book in its original form. That the Hebrew of the Geniza is indeed original and not a retranslation into Hebrew in medieval times, has been proved by Y. Yadin's discovery of a manuscript of the book in his excavation of Masada (found in 1964, published in 1965). This manuscript had been written in the early first century B.C., a century or so after the first composition of the book!

p. 49 In the second place, was Samuel judge of all Israel or only a little-known diviner? We actually have good reason to think that he was both judge and a man of the charismatic gifts associated in Israel with divining. As patron of the ecstatic prophets, to whom I shall turn later, he was a member of their circle, which was intimately bound up with such charismatic functions as divination. When he is called rô'eh or "seer" it does not mean that he was a diviner in the Babylonian or even in the Canaanite sense. In other words, he was not like Balaam, a professional diviner with long training in the complicated "sciences" of divination.

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition
(Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge) 1966

p. 49 (cont'd) Instead, he was associated with the nôzîm who gave oracles through visions, or in some other simple way accepted by the Israelites. As we have said, he was closely connected with the ecstatic prophets, who were also oracular diviners. Furthermore, he was "a man of God," a prophet (a nâbî, which means, as we know now, "one called to a vocation").⁵

Footnote 5. Both in Old Babylon and in early Northwest Semitic - the linguistic group to which the Patriarchs belonged - we find the same verb used of "calling," "naming," and "giving of a commission (to a man by a god)." nâbî does not mean "speaker," for Moses was nâbî, but not a speaker (in which capacity Aaron took his place). The nâbî was specially called by God; he was not necessarily a prophet or diviner. p. 50

p. 50

Footnote 6 In 1922 and 1933 I directed the excavation of the Philistine fortress at Gibeon (Tell el Ful) from the late eleventh century B.C., and M. Dothan has recently cleared the site of a fortress of the same type at Kadesn Barnea. Other such fortresses seem to be known.

p. 51 Finally, what was the attitude of Samuel toward the monarchy? In retrospect it seems strange that no one has quite recognized the actual situation.⁷ Titularies were very important in antiquity, just as they are in some countries today. In those days titles meant more than they do today even in title-minded countries, because ^{now} people/are a little freer from the tyranny of words than were most people of the ancient Near East. It is therefore important to note that Saul, the first king of Israel - using the usual English designation - was, according to the formula used three times in 1 Samuel,^{p. 52} anointed not as melek, or king, but as nâgîd. In other words, he was not anointed as king at all. David is explicitly said to have been anointed four times as nâgîd, but he is never said to have been anointed as melek, although the term is elsewhere applied to him. We are told in one passage that Solomon was anointed as nâgîd. But the term melek early became conventional in the southern kingdom, which had become an hereditary monarchy. However, the northern kingdom remained a quasi-elective monarchy much of the time on a traditionally charismatic basis, as has often been pointed out, and the official term nâgîd continued there at least until the time of Baasha.

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition (1966)

p. 52 (cont'd) The word nāgîd meant "military leader." Scholars have forgotten that in Aramaic dialects of post-Christian times the cognate words negîdâ and nâgôdâ both meant "leader, commander." In one of the Aramaic treaties from Sefireh in northern Syria, dating from the middle of the eighth century B.C., the king of Arpad mentions successively, "one of my sons (bny), one of my commanders (ngdy),^{or} one of my officials (pgdy)," so it is quite clear that the term had the same meaning as in later Aramaic dialects. Nevertheless, even such a great scholar as Albrecht Alt tried to explain the term differently. Others have also offered various explanations, such as "a person who announces," Hebrew higgîd, "to announce." Here I should simply observe that quite unnecessary confusion is introduced by trying to explain words by etymology instead of from actual usage.

p. 62 Only sung or chanted poetry can survive the vicissitudes of oral transmission. Whether we turn to Greece or Rome; to ancient Arabia, Canaan, Egypt, or Babylonia; to early Romance, Germanic, Slavic, Indian or Chinese literatures, we find that poetry came first, with only apparent exceptions. Israel would accordingly be the only known exception in the old World, which would be hard to believe for anyone not impervious to rational arguments. And yet, of course, we cannot prove a case like this by a single historical model, even though the model may seem to be valid in all comparable cases.

Fortunately, there is entirely independent evidence. As a result of the discoveries at Ras Shamra (Ugarit), we know the immediate background of early Hebrew poetic language and style (see above, Chapter I). And it is precisely the Mosaic and early post-Mosaic poems of the Bible that almost invariably exhibit style and grammar approaching most closely to corresponding characteristics of such Canaanite mythological poems as "Baal," "Aqhat" (Danel), "Keret," etc., all of which were first put into writing not later than the fourteenth ^{p. 63} century B.C. In the Song of Miriam (Exodus 15), which describes the Exodus in the early thirteenth century B.C., we find the closest resemblances in style and language. It is quite impossible

Albright, W.F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition (1966)

p. 63 (cont'd) to maintain seriously today that the Song of Miriam is post-exilic or even post-Solomonic. Employing sequence dating, we may proceed from Canaanite to the earliest Israelite style of the thirteenth century, then to the manner of the twelfth and eleventh centuries and finally to the style of the tenth-eighth centuries.¹²

The chronological shift reminds one of the changing poetic styles of early Rome, or of Anglo-Saxon literature, which develops from Beowulf to Chaucer with a changing style which makes it possible to date poems within comparatively short periods by style and language alone. So there is confirmation of the historical analogy by the convergence of stylistic criteria and content of the poems.

Footnote 12 For a detailed account see Chapter I of my Jordan Lectures on Canaan, Phoenicia and Israel.

p.28. Gerar was a city at the northern edge of the desert southeast of Gaza, and is identified with modern Tell Abu Hureirah, which contains the remains of a town that covered a considerable area, whose floruit dates precisely to the period between 2000 and 1500 B.C. ; the only possible explanation for such a large city at this location is that it served as a caravan base at the northern edge of the desert.

p. 54 Footnote 8. Following the lead of Albrecht Alt and especially of his pupil Martin Noth, most scholars now term Israel an amphictyonic confederation, using the Greek word amphictyonia, applied to tribes or towns that belonged to a league formed around a central sanctuary. There were many of these leagues in Greece, western Asia Minor, and Italy; they formed a remarkably close historical analogy to the amphictyonic confederation of Israel. According to the Wellhausen point of view, there was no central sanctuary before post-exilic times, when the Temple in Jerusalem became the only sanctuary accepted by true Jews. Yet there were many such central sanctuaries in the ancient Near East, and it would be rather strange if early Israel were an exception. Not only were there central sanctuaries, but there were also high priests all over the Near East, again unknown to Wellhausen.

p. 56 Footnote 10 As emphasized by O. Eissfeldt; see his Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tubingen, 1956), 271 f.,

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition(1966)

p. 58 Today we have a much clearer neuro-psychological understanding of this phenomenon, such as is presented in the illuminating analysis by William Sargant in Battle for the Mind. Being himself an eminent neuropsychologist, completely opposed to Freudian and other forms of mythopoeic psychoanalysis as well as to the "analytical psychology" of C.G. Jung, he is able to examine their methods, as well as the methods of brainwashing successfully employed by Communists. For our purpose the most instructive part of the book is its survey of the history of revival movements among Protestant bodies, and the technique of individual conversion. Being himself a Wesleyan Methodist, Sargant is in sympathy with what he calls the "spiritual capital" built up / ^{p. 59} by early ecstatic religious movements. And here again I want to illustrate the application of historical analogy.

p. 61 In 1958 Otto Eissfeldt published a monograph in which he contended that the majestic poem in Deuteronomy 32 goes back to Samuel's time.¹¹ At first I was not unnaturally skeptical. In my book From the Stone Age to Christianity(1940) I had held to the usual critical date in the seventh century B.C., though in later editions (1946 on) I changed the date of the poem to the tenth century. But after reconsidering the evolution of poetic style in early Israel, I came to the conclusion that Eissfeldt is correct about the date. On the other hand I cannot agree with his idea that the religion of Samuel was semi-pagan. The exact opposite must be true - that Samuel's religion was ultra-monotheistic, like Deuteronomy 32.

O. Eissfeldt; see his Einleitung in das Alte Testament(Tubingen,1956)
271 f.

Williams, R. J. (Professor of Near Eastern Studies, University College, University of Toronto), "Inscriptions", Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible (Abingdon, 1962) Vol. 2, pp. 706-712

p. 707

Egyptian

Much important information may be derived from the topographical lists, cataloguing the conquests of Thut-mose III (ca. 1490-1436) of the Eighteenth Dynasty, inscribed in the temple of Amon at Karnak. Together with his "Annals" recorded on the same building, these lists serve to document the history of the Palestinian city-states such as Megiddo, Gezer, Taanach, Aijalon, etc. during the expansion of the Egyptian Empire.

p. 708

Sumerian and Akkadian

The Sumerian King List, compiled ca. 2065, records the reigns of the earliest rulers in Mesopotamia and indicates that the line was interrupted by a memorable flood. The eight antediluvian kings are given reigns totaling 241,000 years (the last ruling 18,600!). A late form of the list preserved by Berossus (281-261) enumerates ten such kings, with a total of 432,000 years. Such astronomical figures recall the OT record of the longevity of the ten patriarchs from Adam to Noah (Gen. 5).

See also 12.1 Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, p. 494
12.6

See also 17 - Critics admit early elements in P
Enumerative style of P, very early

Buck, Harry M., People of the Lord (The Macmillan Co., New York) 1966

p. 125 The source separation between J and E is complex in Exodus. E gives prominence to Moses, while priestly editors play up the role of Aaron, the prototype of the priest. Nowhere does the Book of Exodus claim Mosaic authorship. It is, instead, the skillful redaction of living tradition, a compendium of Israel's sacred heritage. Even its component parts, such as J and E, are not separate documents but the later literary transmission of older memories.

p. 127 Although the historicity of Moses and the Exodus cannot be doubted, their actuality is difficult to reconstruct.

p. 131 The first nineteen chapters of the Book of Exodus are saga rather than history. Of course, the narrative preserves some facts, but faith has transformed the record into the reality itself, preserving the sense of wonder and amazement that attended the actual journey out of Egypt.

p. 138 The Moses of history is different, and more difficult to reconstruct. In the final analysis, we have no access to him, because although it would be foolish to deny his existence, it is equally fallacious to assume that anything preserved about him is objectively historical. All older memories have been washed out by richer tradition.

Tent and Tabernacle

14.3 p. 141 This tent (Heb. 'ohel mo'edh) is not the same as the priestly conception of the tabernacle (Heb. mishkan), although the King James Version fails to distinguish between the two. This tent is the private oracle place for Moses. It is the tent where YHWH "used to speak to Moses face to face, as a man speaks to his friend" (Exod. 33.11). The tabernacle is the priestly retrojection of Solomon's Temple as a portable cathedral in the wilderness. The ark, also supposed by later editors to be a part of the wilderness worship of Israel, emphasized the nearness of God; the tent, pitched outside the camp and accessible only to Moses, God's transcendence.

Albright, W. F., New Horizons in Biblical Research (London: Oxford) 1966

p. 39

"The best known representatives of the two positions today are perhaps Rudolf Bultmann,¹ who emphasizes the Greek elements at the expense of the Jewish, and Frederick Grant,² who insists on the Jewishness of the New Testament."

1. "The best all-round picture of Bultmann's thought in this connexion is to be found in his Theology of the New Testament, London, 1952

2. Cf. F. C. Grant, The Gospels, New York, 1959

p. 41 Footnote 1

"Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, New York, 1960

p. 42

"New Testament studies of the late 1940's and of subsequent years among the followers of Bultmann, like the critical views of twenty, thirty, and forty years ago, have been characterized by evolutionary historicism. This scheme spreads the New Testament books over a period of eighty to one hundred years, very roughly between 50 and 150 A.D., depending on the scholar and the amount of up-to-date evidence that he will accept. Within such a period there is plenty of room for the development of ideas, but it proceeds according to an arbitrary, unilinear system of evolution."

p. 45

"An important new Aramaic targum of the Pentateuch has come to light in the Vatican Library, more recent than some of the Aramaic translations of the Bible among the Dead Sea Scrolls, but two or three centuries older than any previously known targum. In it the 'Word' of God appears as a surrogate for the name of God, Yahweh."

See 3.01 Foerster, Norman, Literary Scholarship, Its Aims and Methods

3.91 Types of criticism

5.7-2 *albright*

*No Evolution from
God of Nature to God of ethics*

W. F. Albright, New Horizons in Biblical Research, OUP, London, 1966

p. 31

The empirical logic of the Hebrew Bible also appears in Israel's religion. In Bronze Age Palestine and Syria there was a continual fluctuation of sex, function, and identity among the gods, as we know from the rich literature now at our disposal. The principle of contradiction is flouted at every turn. It is quite inappropriate to ask: how did the God of nature become the God of ethics in Israel?--because the god of nature was also lord of ethics from remote pre-Israelite times. In Assyria and Babylonia the sun-god was also patron of justice, and there was a similar relation in the case of all high gods. Proto-logical polytheisms did not make a logical distinction between nature and ethics.

809
Insp
9th
1963

Literary History and Literary Criticism ACTA of the Ninth Congress
International Federation for Modern Language & Literature, Leon Edel,
Editor. Kenneth McKee and William M. Bibson, Co-editors, New York University
Press, 1965

"Literary History and Literary Criticism" by Douglas Bush, Harvard University

p. 3

To speak roughly, from about 1880 to about 1916 there was virtually a single movement in literary scholarship, that is the writing of literary history according to the genetic method, a method derived from European science and the literary stress on milieu. This meant the tracing of literary sources and literary influences, and during most of this long period the material was predominantly medieval literature, which lent itself most readily to such investigations and which had such illustrious European explorers as Gaston Paris. The aim and method, however, were extended over later literature as well, and continued to flourish through the 1930's, after rival aims and methods had appeared. The total result, whether in rounded works or small fragments, was a learned, comprehensive, and solidly detailed body of literary history from which we have all profited. Its chief shortcoming was that its historical preoccupations slighted criticism and critical values, so that it remained largely an external record of purely literary relationships. One book which may be called at once a culmination and a distinguished exception was John Livingston Lowes's The Road to Xanadu (1927).

While this useful if limited approach to literature is still practiced to some degree (and in recent years has been rehabilitated by a more critical historicism), it gave way to a succession of movements which sought to get closer to the inner significance and artistic value of literature.

p.4, 5

Some other approaches to literature may be mentioned . . . They range from a mainly social view . . . to the aims and scientific methods of technical bibliography. . . . Another and less scientific approach - . . . - has come from the psychology of Freud and others. . . . Then there is the neo-Aristotelian school, centered in the University of Chicago, which has put critical emphasis on structure . . . There are the structural linguists, who have become a considerable army, but whose work I am not qualified to assess. . . . To add a last topic to this overcrowded paragraph, from the New Critics onward there has been an inclination to deny biography a place in or near criticism . . .

p. 5

In this country perhaps the most fashionable critical mode of the past decade or more has been the myth-and-symbol doctrine. Like the New Criticism, it began in England but has flourished chiefly in America. It may be said to have started with Maud Bodkin's Archetypal Patterns in Poetry (1934); its authoritative bible is the fresh, acute, learned, and lively Anatomy of Criticism (1957) by Northrop Frye.

p. 10

Since criticism is not a science and cannot be made one by any amount of theorizing . . .

Albright, W. F., History, Archaeology and Christian Humanism (McGraw-Hill Book Company: New York) 1959

p. 139 Since 1921 there have been increasingly frequent attempts to shake off the yoke of a rigid Wellhausenism, but it cannot be said that any has succeeded, though there have been numerous partial successes and many correct observations. However, voices are more and more often heard decrying the artificiality of most modern /^{p. 140} theories of the religious evolution of Israel. The important and influential school of Albrecht Alt has performed exceedingly valuable services for Israelite history as a whole, but it is clear that it is weak in the sphere of religious history. The crisis of religious faith in Central Europe which heralded the victory of National Socialism in Germany, brought with it a violent reaction against historicism (Historismus) in all its manifestations, a reaction almost as pronounced among foes of the movement as among its friends. The Swiss scholar, Walter Eichrodt, expresses my own conviction in emphatic words: "It is high time that the tyranny of historicism in Old Testament studies was broken and the proper approach to our task rediscovered. This is no new problem, certainly, but it is one that needs to be solved anew in every epoch of knowledge - the problem of how to understand the realm of Old Testament belief in its structural unity."²²

²² W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. I, trans. J. Baker, 1961, p. 31 (first published in 1933), with underlining omitted.

801
T482ce

The Critical Moment, Essays on the Nature of Literature. Pub. by Faber and Faber, London. The Times Publ Co. Ltd., 1963, 1964

"Some Principles of Criticism", Rene Welleck

evol.

p. 43 In several of my theoretical papers, recently collected as Concepts of Criticism (Yale University Press, 1963), I have tried to re-examine the main historiographical tools of the literary scholar: the concept of evolution, which seems to have disappeared from recent practice completely; the concept of period, which

✓ p. 45 Thus, we ought not to succumb to the lure of 'historicism' which spread from Germany and nowadays is still the almost official creed of many eminent scholars. 'Historicism' of this kind is only relativism and scepticism, an abdication before the task of criticism as judgment. The view that we must judge merely by the criteria of the past, that there is an unending multiplicity of irreconcilable standards - not only the poetry of Pope and the poetry of Wordsworth, but every poet's distinct and unique value - would, if carried through consistently, lead to an end of all literary appreciation, to complete anarchy, to the victory of the old vicious maxim, De gustibus non est disputandum.

Historicism

Encyclopedia Britannica, 1956 Edition, Vol. 20, p. 59 in article "Scepticism" under heading "The 19th Century"

- The Reign of Law
- Psychologism
- * Historicism
- Pragmatism

States that historicism is sometimes treated as if it were identical with naturalism. "The underlying assumptions are too plain to require comment."
 ". . . in its sceptical drift, historicism . . . implies that . . . all opinions . . . can be shown to have been bemused by hopeless diversity of judgment. In particular, thinkers who profess to decide fundamentals exhibit irremediable contradictions. It is absurd, therefore, to claim that ultimates are capable of settlement. This view involves a negative dogma, by denying the possibility of progressive insight - hypothesis can never rise to theory. The process of phenomena, each member its own witness, hides aught that may lie behind.

or not 'the rules of Aristotle' were exemplified in it. Feelings of humility towards the great classical achievements were somewhat diminished as the Greco-Roman civilization ceased to be the only great culture that was known. From China to Peru information about literatures became available in England. Gray translated from Icelandic and Welsh; Percy offered poetry from Greenland, Lapland and South America; and William Jones began to make available the treasures of oriental poetry. When Gray wrote his ode *The Progress of Poesy* (pub. 1757) he envisaged the Muse as holding sway practically from pole to pole.

The wider and deeper knowledge which became available in the 18th century applied equally to English literature. The beginnings of serious literary history became possible, based upon newly published texts of the older writers and upon manuscript material investigated in libraries. Older English literature was studied not merely in an antiquarian spirit but with increasing understanding of the principles on which it was written and with sympathy and enthusiasm for the 'manners' of former times. This wider experience of diverse literatures did not always decrease respect and admiration for Greek and Latin literature. But inevitably the actual experience of quite different literatures, which were obviously good, made people less willing to accept principles of criticism based solely upon Greek and Latin. The conclusion was simple: since mankind was not always the same, created once and for all in a definite mould, then the principles of literature could not be expected to be always the same. The 'rules' could not be discovered once and for all. Each age must endeavour to establish its own rules. Each age must write as it can. It can only write as it must.

The historical method has defects when applied to the criticism of literature. It sometimes shirks the problem of value or fallaciously assumes that what is historically important is aesthetically valuable. It sometimes awards high praise to what is historically explicable or representative or expressive; and belittles the idiosyncratic writer who does not seem to express the significant currents of feeling in his age. On the other hand it sometimes elevates idiosyncrasy (individuality or originality) as the prime virtue. Yet there is no doubt that a sense of history is one of the dominant ideas in the modern criticism of literature and linked with it is the special

significance we give to such words and phrases as 'imagination' and 'imaginative powers', 'artistic creation' and 'creative writer'.

IMAGINATION AND CREATION.—That art is an imitation of nature was an idea that had for long a dominant influence upon the way literature was analysed and justified. Aristotle's notion of *mimesis* hardly includes any activity of the imagination, which for him was only a weak kind of sensation or perception, such as is involved in remembering or anticipating. Even for Longinus, the most imaginative of Greek critics, *phantasia* is no more than 'vividness of representation', which makes you feel as if you were seeing or hearing what the poet describes. In the Renaissance, owing to the high reputation of Aristotle as a literary critic, 'imitation' was the normal description of the poetic activity. The poet's relation to the external world was summarized in Ronsard's declaration that the poet should 'imitate, invent and represent the things which are, or which can be, or which the ancients believed to be, true'. This obviously gives little indication of the modern idea of the poet's 'creativity'.

But there were a few heretics who were prepared to maintain that only God and the poet deserved the name of creator. Sir Philip Sidney in *An Apology for Poetry* made a tentative claim for the poet as a creator in a fuller sense than could be given (he supposed) to any other intellectual activity. The historian, the lawyer, the logician and the rest are dependent upon nature for their materials.

'Only the poet, disclaiming to be tied to any such subjection, lifted up with the vigour of his own invention, doth grow in effect into another Nature, in making things either better than Nature bringeth forth, or, quite anew, forms such as never were in Nature.'

We have become thoroughly familiar with the idea that an imaginative writer is 'creating a world'; so familiar indeed, that we easily overlook the implications of the great change from the modest Greek notion of 'imitation' or representation. The phrase 'creative writer' carried with it ideas which were at first very difficult to formulate or to apprehend. But this beginning of a new philosophical interpretation of the poet's creativity is the background to Shakespeare's remarkable comments upon the poet:

as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name.

The notion of the imagination as the prime literary activity was, however, little developed in the 17th century. To suppose that the human mind could create anything was entirely antithetical to the mental philosophy of Hobbes and of Locke. For Hobbes 'there is no conception in a man's mind, which hath not at first, totally or by parts, been begotten upon the organs of sense' (*Leviathan* I. i). For Locke the mind was passively receptive; and he belittled imagination, or fancy, as likely to interfere dangerously with the purely rational activity. The mind of the infant (he supposed) is a sheet of white paper upon which experience writes; and however complex the ideas a mind might conceive, they were derived wholly from combining simple ideas derived from experience. This was not a favourable background for any notion of the imagination as an important human faculty; and Locke's point of view, in spite of some protests, had a tyrannical influence upon literary theory for many years. Addison, in his papers on the imagination in *The Spectator* (nos. 411-21), supposed the imaginative power to be that of calling up into the memory images of what had been observed. The primary tests of what was produced by the imaginative faculty was truth to experience or observation. Imagery derived from (for example) the sense of sight was only valid so far as it was visually adequate and consistent. From this point of view such lines as Shakespeare's

Oh, how shall summer's honey breath hold out
Against the wrackful siege of battering days!

were intolerable. Johnson in the 10th chapter of *Rasselas* assumed that all the experience a poet required was to be derived from the external world. It is not even suggested that he should 'look in his heart and write'.

But the 18th century gradually became dissatisfied with this notion. Burke in his *Inquiry into . . . the Sublime and Beautiful* (1756) rejected the notion that language is necessarily based upon visual or any other experience. If language does not imitate nature, then poetry, which is constructed from language, cannot be regarded merely as an imitative art. The poet does not imitate nature; he provides a kind of substitution for it. This was important not because it was really an advance in literary theory, but because it helped to disentangle criticism from the difficulties which are inherent in any theory that literature is an imitation of life.

The new philosophical ideas which were becoming current in the later 18th century were much more favourable than were Locke's to an acceptance of the imagination as a legitimate, reputable and valuable faculty. Kant made the human mind active, instead of passive, in the reception of impressions from the external world. He saw that, although the contents of our consciousness are ultimately derived from the sense-impressions we have received, yet the matter of thinking is intrinsic to the mind. The forms of space and time and the principles of conceptual order (which he called the 'categories') have their origin within the mind. The function of the categories is to bring order and synthesis to the stuff of experience. From this point of view the understanding gives form to what comes to it from the senses. The understanding (in this sense) 'makes' nature, because the categories are universal principles implicit in all our thinking. Thus the mind was back at the centre of the universe; and Kant justifiably described his philosophical achievement as a kind of Copernican revolution.

The impetus given by this new attitude of the creativeness of the human mind was deeply felt by the literary critics of Germany in the later 18th and early 19th centuries; and in England it is well seen in Wordsworth, Coleridge, De Quincey and Shelley. Wordsworth's preface to *Lyrical Ballads* (1800), although best known for his discussion of the language of poetry, is in fact largely concerned with the nature of the poetic mind and its characteristic kind of consciousness. Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* (1817) has had a profound influence on subsequent literary criticism; and whatever its weaknesses may be, that book will always represent the invigorating spectacle of a great mind, possessed of the highest poetical gifts and no mean philosophical ones, dealing with the great problems of literature, often floundering, sometimes wrong, but brilliant and stimulating. To Wordsworth the imagination was a 'power so-called through sad incompetence of human speech', and he discussed rather clumsily and enigmatically the nature of 'the vision and the faculty divine'. But Coleridge endeavoured to give some kind of philosophical definition to the Imagination and the Fancy, using them as technical terms. The Imagination proper is the higher faculty, the *esemplastic* (i.e. 'moulding into a unity') and image-creating faculty, which works the products of Fancy into something more

may be, as if we were always on a voyage of discovery, in search of new knowledge, new beauty, new enlightenment, new intensity of experience. This day, this hour, this moment is life. Unless we fill it with something it is lost. Literature helps us to maintain a keen self-controlled alertness of mind, a responsible consciousness, an unceasing intellectual and sensuous vigilance, by which we can fill time to the brim and enrich life, not waste it nor avoid it. Books are to be valued and assessed in so far as they fulfil this aim.

These are, so far as they go, lucid principles of literary selection, and they are in fact clearly behind the personal and practical assessments we all make as readers of books—unless we are reading merely to while away the time, to pass an examination or to imitate or surpass the culture of our acquaintances. But some of Pater's immediate disciples lacked his scrupulous and intellectual interpretation of his ideas and some of the notorious critical extravagances of the Nineties were unfairly fathered upon Pater. Oscar Wilde's witty preface to *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is a kind of caricature of the critical contribution of the aesthetic movement:

The artist is the creator of beautiful things . . . The critic is he who can translate into another manner or a new material his impressions of beautiful things. . . . No artist has ethical sympathies. An ethical sympathy in an artist is an unpardonable mannerism of style. . . . All art is quite useless.

This exaggeration of Pater's kind of sensibility and the degeneration of his faith in the civilizing influence of 'the love of art for its own sake' into the illogical catch-phrase 'art for art's sake' has perhaps discredited impressionistic criticism. Yet much of the best criticism of the 20th century has been deeply influenced by the increase of sensitivity and alertness which it brought about.

The theories of Benedetto Croce were an advance from the aesthetic movement and in some respects a philosophical clarification of the inheritance. For Croce art is not self-expression but effective communication; our reaction to a work of art is a kind of contemplation (Croce uses the word 'intuition' here in a technical sense, rather unfortunately perhaps, as it is liable to misunderstanding). It is an autonomous activity; that is to say, it exists in its own right, and we are not to seek for explanations of its workings in terms of other human faculties (reason, emotion etc.). It is a mode of knowing, comparable to, but distinct from, other

modes of our awareness of the universe around us and of our human lot. An essential part of our 'intuition' of a poem or other work of art is a consciousness of purpose in its very existence; a human being made it in order to provoke certain definite responses from us, precisely what we experience, in fact, as we read the poem. There is a special and peculiar relation of sympathy with the maker of the work of art. The critic is something more than the connoisseur of 'beautiful appearances' that the aesthetes had supposed him to be. On these principles Croce denies our having any *aesthetic* reactions to natural objects. Our response to a 'beautiful' sunset is different in kind from our response to a 'beautiful' work of art. Croce associated his theory of an autonomous aesthetic activity with a re-interpretation of the historical ideas of his great Neapolitan predecessor Vico; and a good deal of this combination has become absorbed, partly directly and partly by ways which defy analysis, into the critical consciousness of the 20th century. When a critic is endeavouring to judge and interpret a work of literature, he can only resolve those particular problems which it presents to him in his own time. However great a critic's erudition may be in (for example) the history and thought of the Elizabethan period, he can never become an Elizabethan reader of Shakespeare; in spite of the vanity of scholarship he can never really get away from the characteristic ways of thinking and feeling in the 20th century and extricate himself from its own problems and its inevitably prejudiced attitudes. But it is also obvious that every really great work of literature rises superior to the limitations of each age which inherits it; and therefore every great work of literature is an inexhaustible subject for criticism. Judgments and interpretations can never be final. Even the greatest critic can only judge and interpret in a way that is appropriate and inevitable in his own age; and what he says would not have been intelligible to any previous age, nor will it be sufficient for any future age. We are behaving absurdly if we are contemptuous of Pope's estimate of Shakespeare, perplexed by Johnson's treatment of the 'metaphysical poets', or scornful at Matthew Arnold's description of Dryden and Pope as 'classics of our prose'. We must exercise the same kind of imaginative sympathy in dealing with the literary criticism of the past as we do with the literature of the past.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY METHODS AND SOLUTIONS.—In the past, theories of literature have often been deduced from contemporary views of the nature of the human mind. The 18th century saw several treatises on literary criticism based upon the 'mental philosophy' of Locke and David Hartley. The extensive and exciting advances in psychology in the 20th century have had a notable influence on literary criticism. But the severe disadvantage under which such criticism labours is that when the psychological theories have gone the way of the snows of yesteryear, the literary criticism derived from them becomes obsolete, naïve or unintelligible. Time has dealt badly with such serious works as Henry Home's *Elements of Criticism* (1762), Archibald Alison's *Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste* (1790) and E. S. Dallas's *The Gay Science* (1866); and even I. A. Richards's valuable and influential book, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (1924), is beginning in some patches to wear badly. Such are the dangers of the use of psychology in literary criticism. Nevertheless the theory that poetry has a kind of therapeutic value for the reader has been skilfully argued in the 20th century; perhaps it has seemed more convincing than the older idea of poetry as a civilizing influence. It would of course be difficult to suppose that any important external impression can be without effect on our personality; and for some readers experiences from literature are important, intense and stimulating. It has been claimed that the effect of 'genuine' poetry is to reduce the chaos of the mind, to organize its attitudes, to resolve its conflicts and (without, of course, giving us any positive instructions how to behave ourselves) to leave us altogether healthier and saner than we were before. It is perhaps comforting to those who love literature to be thus told how advantageous and salutary it is. Many of us, however, remain sceptical.

The 20th-century interest in psychiatry has likewise led to a good deal of discussion of great artists and writers as 'cases'. Personalities as different as Leonardo da Vinci and Lewis Carroll have been subjected to clinical analysis. Their work provides the evidence from which their mental condition may be diagnosed. It was an old opinion that 'great wits are sure to madness near allied'; and the abnormalities of temperament and conduct exhibited by some men of letters, like other aspects of their personalities, find some reflection in their work and demand

explanation. But on the whole the psychiatric approach to literature, like the purely historical, ignores or (worse still) disguises considerations of value. The poem is a problem from which is sought evidence of the poet's state of mind or of his private history. It may be a concealed wish-fulfilment; it may be the release of a repression or otherwise represent some disguised aspect or impulse of his mind. This kind of treatment of literature must be regarded as biographical rather than critical; and like other investigations into the lives of authors is valuable in a varying degree in each case. Psycho-analytical discussions of the characters created by dramatists and novelists have been less rewarding. There is an inherent fallacy (we suppose) in treating an author's creations as if they were real human beings, with a history outside the play or the novel; this is difficult to prove logically, and it may be conjectured that future critics will have something further to say on this very difficult problem.

Biographical information has for long been regarded as a useful companion to literary criticism, and in many admirable books the two are closely interwoven. Yet it is not always easy to assess the importance of the author's life in our judgment of his work. Facts of biography and environment unquestionably sometimes succeed in illuminating and freshening our impressions from a work of literature; and an enormous amount of research is devoted to the accumulation of such facts, which are assumed to be in some way relevant to literary judgment. The relation of a writer to the world in which he finds himself seems to be of varying importance to his work. It seems impossible to establish general laws to decide what information about a writer and his environment is necessary for a full understanding, interpretation and judgment of one of his writings. Anything may be of importance; much obviously is not. Where are we to draw the line, approving what is on one side as significant fact, and dismissing what is on the other as the product of mere antiquarian curiosity? Presumably it is of no importance to criticism that the exact day of Shakespeare's birth is unknown. It seems, however, to be of some significance to know that Pope had a crooked spine, Carlyle a bad digestion, and Wordsworth an illegitimate daughter by a Frenchwoman. Detailed attention during the last half-century to the theatrical conditions and to the methods of book-production of Shakespeare's time has profoundly affected the

recalcitrant writers from the headquarters of a political party (what Shakespeare called 'art made tongue-tied by authority'). But this is unfair. The 'rules' were sought in the same sceptical and intelligent spirit as was manifested by Descartes, Locke and Newton in their study of the human mind and the physical universe. The best criticism both in France and England was a genuine exploration of the essential nature of literature. It was a hopeful search for absolute standards of judgment.

From the modern point of view, the fallacy in this demand for unalterable laws or rules of literature is that it was entirely unhistorical. It was based upon the assumption that mankind has always been approximately the same. The laws of gravitation undoubtedly applied equally in the time of Homer and the time of Pope. It was likewise commonly assumed that the 'rules' of tragedy (if they could once be discovered) applied equally in the time of Sophocles and in the time of Shakespeare or Corneille. Pope in *An Essay on Criticism* (1711) gave this advice to the critic:

First follow Nature, and your judgment frame
By her just standard, which is still the same;
Unerring NATURE, still divinely bright,
One clear, unchang'd, and universal light.

The history of literary criticism in the 18th century and the major changes of literary theory which took place illustrate the gradual breakdown of this point of view. The great pioneer of the historical approach to literature was G. B. Vico (†1744). Beginning by a devotion to legal studies, Vico sought for absolute principles of justice and law; and observing that there were many varying codes of legislation in existence, both past and present, came to the conclusion that the differences were not due merely to differences of nationality but to the characteristic ways of thinking and feeling in each age. Historical changes in law were due to historical changes in man's way of thinking and feeling; and (Vico proceeded) literature differed in each age for the same reason.

From Vico has derived that historical method which has come to be systematically applied to the development of all human ideas, institutions, and activities. Reason and nature are not immutable and one, and apparent in all ages. The ingrained habits of thought, characteristic of each age, are the result of long historical development, and these distinguish one age from another even more decidedly than changes due to such things as mechanical

inventions. We realize that it would be easy to explain to Dr Johnson our telephone system; but it would be almost impossible to get him to understand our morals.

The notion that the history of literature and the arts reflects inward changes of mentality has become a deeply rooted habit of the modern mind. We know that we are under the sway of both continuity and change, inextricable tradition and irresistible transformation. Each age is an age that is dying and one that is coming to birth. We recognize that the methods and principles of literature in one age are not necessarily applicable to another age and are unlikely to be so, because the mentality of people will have changed. Therefore the literary opinions of Aristotle or Horace, however valuable for the interpretation of Greek and Latin literature, are essentially only relevant to that literature and not necessarily applicable to what is written in another age by another people. 'Historicism' (as it has come to be called) was one of the great revolutions of European thought. Later in the 18th century Herder explicitly expounded the notion that one can write a history of culture: that art, literature etc. are evolved by a kind of natural process, which determines the expression of the intellectual and emotional life of a people. Thus nowadays a great deal of critical ingenuity is expended upon establishing the relation between 20th-century literature and the age which is producing it. It is a common assumption that an age of anxiety will produce a troubled literature. Dilemmas of conscience, dissatisfactions, great social changes will all find their reflection and expression in modern literature; and moreover it is right and proper that they should. Modern poets are generally expected to be in some subtle way the spokesmen of their age. It is enough to express the dilemmas and frustrations of modern life. The writer is not necessarily expected to contribute to the solution or cure.

The steady growth of the historical approach greatly weakened the hold of the 'rules' (based on Greek and Roman precedent) upon ways of thinking about literature and about principles of judgment, and was reinforced by a remarkable expansion in knowledge of literatures and arts which had no connexions whatever with the Greek or Roman tradition and were nevertheless respectable or admirable. When a Chinese tragedy appeared in Europe it was eagerly discussed whether

Pre-face to World Literature, Albert Guerard . Henry Hold & Co., N.Y., 1940

p. 237 We find in many critical and historical books such affirmations as the following: "The first epics took shape from the scattered work of various unknown poets. Through accretion these early episodes were gradually molded into a unified whole and an ordered sequence." This takes for granted the theory of "Unconscious growth," which we have already had the opportunity to challenge. We admit easily enough that no epic ever sprang full-armed from the brains of a single poet, with its whole universe of heroes, events, mythology and traditions. Homer did not create the Homeric world ex nihilo. Every work of art has its roots in the deep humus of reality. But this does not prove that, at the crucial moment, an act of deliberate artistic creation was not indispensable.

We may some day have a definitive masterpiece about Lincoln - whether it be called epic, history or biographical romance is not relevant to our present argument. This supreme Lincoln will have been prepared by innumerable half-successful works, interwoven with Lincoln folklore; but it will certainly not be an automatic agglutination of sayings, anecdotes, detached poems, chapters from earlier historians. A Lincoln hodge-podge will never turn of its own accord into a Lincoln saga. In the same way, no process of accretion could account for the grand unity of theme, development, character, spirit and style which we find in Homer. We might as well imagine that the Parthenon results from the chance conglomeration of ruins and cabins in the course of centuries.

The hypothesis of "gradual moulding" may apply to the rank and truly jungle-like Hindu epic, the Mahabharata, in the huge and loose mass of which incongruous fragments may easily be discerned. It fails to apply to the Iliad, to the Odysey, to the Song of Roland, to the Poema de Mio Cid, in which conscious artistic unity is manifest. In other cases, Genesis, the Ramayana, the Nibelungenlied, even Beowulf, several interpretations are possible. There are discrepancies and even contradictions which prove that, in their present form, these epics are not the finished and unified products of a single author. But they are far removed from

Preface to World Literature, Albert Guerard.

p. 238 chaos. They give the impression, not of spontaneous growth, but of definite and mixed authorship. To resume our comparison: they are not, like an old-world village, a mere conglomeration of huts; they are not, like the Parthenon, or St. Paul's in London, the working out of a single design, definite in structure, refined in every detail with the utmost degree of consciousness; they resemble rather a palace like the chateau of Blois, or like the Louvre, a church like St. John the Divine in New York, revealing the hand of successive architects. We have the literary equivalent of this in the medieval allegory, the Romance of the Rose, begun by Guillaume of Lorris, completed by Jean Clopinel, of Meung; or in the Holy Grail story, Perceval, which Chrétien of Troyes left unfinished, and which was continued by three other poets. These composite monuments in stone or words grew indeed; they never reached the point of complete subordination to a single, final plan; but at no moment was the growth unconscious.¹

Biblical and Other Studies edited by Alexander Altmann (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 1963.

Chapter entitled "The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text" by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein pp. 79-122.

p.89 In order to introduce our point, we may start by looking back at the history of the so-called "Higher Bible Criticism" since Kahle's early days. The theory of evolution was still all-prevading, and it was the aim of

p. 90 scholars, at least unconsciously, always to detect the line of development. Different phenomena were conceived of as stages in a developmental sequence; the question was only: which preceded which and why.³⁸

Whatever our attitude to some extreme contentions of the so-called "oral tradition" school, there is no doubt that during the past quarter of a century it has made scholars aware again of the power of "oral tradition" in Near Eastern cultures. Furthermore, we are much more willing today to acknowledge the existance of traditions side by side, and do not telescope them by force into an evolutionary chain.

20. The discussion of all the details of Kahle's theories on the Tiberian Bible text must be left for Nosah ha-Miqra. For the moment, I would suggest that it is precisely by practically negating the role of oral traditon and by forcing the facts into a developmental Procrustean bed, that Kahle was able to build his hypothesis. Since the Tiberian forms are different ³⁹ from those of other traditions they are more recent,⁴⁰ and since the Hebrew language had long become extinct, the Tiberian Bible text is really no true tradition at all.⁴¹ It is the invention of the Tiberian Masorettes. They

p. 91 invented, "restituted," and changed arbitrarily (see below, Note 49). Their model was horribile dictu, no one else bu the Qoran readers!⁴²

21. It is not my fault if this sounds like a caricature of critical method (see Note 44). In my submission Kahle's theory does not merely start from outdated ideas.⁴³ It is contrary to sound historical criticism. It postulates a textual situation unparalleled in the history of philology, and turns into reckless deceivers generations

Biblical and Other Studies edited by Alexander Altmann (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 1963

"The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text", by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein
p.91(cont'd) of Masoretic scholars who spent their lives to safeguard the "correct tradition" of the Bible, to the very best of their ability.⁴⁴ Even were we to possess what looks like a perfect proof, not just

p. 92 theories, that the Tiberian Masoretes did what Kahle attributes to them - and what has entered since into most handbooks - we should rather disbelieve our "proofs."

38

p. 90

For the general attitude involved see my Text and Language, pp. 157 ff.

39. See above, Note 7. Kahle, whose revolutionary stressing (since 1902!) of

non-Tiberian traditions has made others aware of the problems of dialect traditions in the Transmission of Hebrew, apparently never seriously considered the possibility of a plurality of traditions - none of which is necessarily pre se inferior to any other - side by side with what may all the time have been the mainstream of tradition. For the present writer this way of explaining facts is an attitude basic both to his viewing the Masoretic consonantal text vis-a-vis the Bible Versions, the Dead Sea Scrolls, variants in Rabbinic literature, and so on, and to his estimation of the Tiberian Bible text vis-a-vis other reading traditions. . . .

p. 91

41. . . . In order to prevent any misunderstanding, I should add that becoming aware of the non-Tiberian traditions is of vital importance for understanding the history of Hebrew (see above, 36), but they should not make us turn history upside down. Understanding a problem in historic-comparative linguistics and explaining the history of the Bible text are not necessarily the same thing. Especially with regard to the latter problem Kahle has overplayed his hand and has, besides, ignored any statement to the contrary by specialists. . . .

p. 92

44. . . . Statements like those quoted there are painfully reminiscent of what Paul A. de Lagarde in his weak moments had to say about the "Jewish Masoretes."

It gives some food for thought that the type of Bible criticism prejudiced by evolutionary theory has ended, both in the "Higher" and the "lower" field, by practically turning our only witnesses into deceivers, even if it was only pia fraus. Usurping the attribute "critical" for these theories becomes, of course, a mighty weapon against all "uncritical" dissenters. Cf below, Notes 89 and 96 and 33 and 47.

prescribes erythromycin, will have to be home a few days. "Who will I get to stay with her?" Hilda says; "I can't miss work again." She makes three telephone calls, finds a woman to come the next day.

In bed finally, lights out, Hilda is unhappy, tearful. "This is no way to live," she says; "I'm so rushed. This morning I was impatient, rough with Anneli. Felt bad about it all day, couldn't concentrate. I hurried to buy food, come home, cook, Anneli's sick, you're out late drinking I don't know who with and . . . this is no way to live. I just hate it. I want to have some fun in life." "Things will get better," Edward says; "maybe we can go away." "That's what you always say," Hilda says; "it's not enough. I want something more. I want to be happy." "What's the matter, baby?" "I don't know," Hilda says; "nothing. Everything. We have a good working relationship, and I mean *working*, could go on like this for years, till we drop—get up, go to work, do the job, then home, stove, housework, bed, sleep—but something's missing. You don't talk to me any more, don't really look at me, seem to be listening for something else." He pets her, strokes her hair, shoulders, back.

He lies awake after she is asleep, and when at last he too sleeps something soon disturbs him. Something moving. What is it? He wakes, opens his eyes. The room is dark, outside a sound of wind in trees, the cry of distant foghorns—unnnmm-unh. Hilda is snuggled against him, her breathing deep. Whisky sighs from the hallway rug. Edward closes his eyes, is at the threshold of a deep sleep when he feels it again: a slow movement—unhurried, unhurriable. A door. That's it. The door in which he saw his reflection that afternoon as a stranger. Somewhere inside him a door is swinging open, the noiseless movement coming now to an end; the door is open; there's nothing there.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ON THE HISTORY OF LITERARY CRITICISM

A HISTORY OF MODERN CRITICISM, 1750-1950: VOL. III, THE AGE OF TRANSITION, and VOL. IV, THE LATER NINETEENTH CENTURY, by RENÉ WELLEK, Yale University Press.

A MAJOR problem in writing a history of literary criticism is finding what one is writing about, for literary criticism can mean various things. Professor Wellek is unmistakably clear about what he takes it to mean in his magisterial five-volume work, *A History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950*, of which the present two closely related volumes are the third and fourth in number and also the third and fourth to appear. Literary criticism for him does not mean something incidental or adventitious to literature. Quite the contrary. It is a normal and necessary outgrowth and adjunct of literature, vital, serious, demanding, and in a sense culminating. Literary criticism for Wellek has as its central task "the definition and description of the nature of poetry and literature—poetics, literary theory" (III, xiii). It is "an intellectual discipline, a branch of knowledge, a rational pursuit" (IV, 466). It "aims at a theory of literature, at a formulation of criteria, and standards of description, classification, interpretation, and finally judgment" (IV, 466). But if it is the ultimate arbiter, to which all literature is inevitably subject, it does not exercise its judgment entirely from outside literary works themselves. Literary theory can thrive "only in contact with works of art, which initially at least demand sensitivity, enjoyment, and involvement" (IV, 466). Thus literary theory (and, presumably criticism itself, *a fortiori*) "will remain a humanistic discipline concerned with value which will remain, also, value for oneself" (IV, 466).

Although this is not the only current understanding of literary criticism, it is certainly a legitimate and meaningful understanding. It is also an ambitious understanding. The sweep of the concept on which Mr. Wellek settles calls for all the massive erudition, the powers of reflection and of discrimination, and the interpretive and synthesizing insights with which he is so eminently equipped. It calls, moreover, for his enviable command of languages, for, while it may still be possible to study a national literature fruitfully along

3.21 → 14

Yale Review, Summer 1966

The drive toward an ambitious understanding of literature appears to have been for the moment unimpeded

prescribes erythromycin, will have to be home a few days. "Who will I get to stay with her?" Hilda says; "I can't miss work again." She makes three telephone calls, finds a woman to come the next day.

In bed finally, lights out, Hilda is unhappy, tearful. "This is no way to live," she says; "I'm so rushed. This morning I was impatient, rough with Anneli. Felt bad about it all day, couldn't concentrate. I hurried to buy food, come home, cook, Anneli's sick, you're out late drinking I don't know who with and . . . this is no way to live. I just hate it. I want to have some fun in life." "Things will get better," Edward says; "maybe we can go away." "That's what you always say," Hilda says; "it's not enough. I want something more. I want to be happy." "What's the matter, baby?" "I don't know," Hilda says; "nothing. Everything. We have a good working relationship, and I mean *working*, could go on like this for years, till we drop—get up, go to work, do the job, then home, stove, housework, bed, sleep—but something's missing. You don't talk to me any more, don't really look at me, seem to be listening for something else." He pets her, strokes her hair, shoulders, back.

He lies awake after she is asleep, and when at last he too sleeps something soon disturbs him. Something moving. What is it? He wakes, opens his eyes. The room is dark, outside a sound of wind in trees, the cry of distant foghorns—unnnmm-unh. Hilda is snuggled against him, her breathing deep. Whisky sighs from the hallway rug. Edward closes his eyes, is at the threshold of a deep sleep when he feels it again: a slow movement—unhurried, unhurriable. A door. That's it. The door in which he saw his reflection that afternoon as a stranger. Somewhere inside him a door is swinging open, the noiseless movement coming now to an end; the door is open; there's nothing there.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ON THE HISTORY OF LITERARY CRITICISM

A HISTORY OF MODERN CRITICISM, 1750-1950: VOL. III, THE AGE OF TRANSITION, and VOL. IV, THE LATER NINETEENTH CENTURY, by RENÉ WELLEK, Yale University Press.

A MAJOR problem in writing a history of literary criticism is finding what one is writing about, for literary criticism can mean various things. Professor Wellek is unmistakably clear about what he takes it to mean in his magisterial five-volume work, *A History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950*, of which the present two closely related volumes are the third and fourth in number and also the third and fourth to appear. Literary criticism for him does not mean something incidental or adventitious to literature. Quite the contrary. It is a normal and necessary outgrowth and adjunct of literature, vital, serious, demanding, and in a sense culminating. Literary criticism for Wellek has as its central task "the definition and description of the nature of poetry and literature—poetics, literary theory" (III, xiii). It is "an intellectual discipline, a branch of knowledge, a rational pursuit" (IV, 466). It "aims at a theory of literature, at a formulation of criteria, and standards of description, classification, interpretation, and finally judgment" (IV, 466). But if it is the ultimate arbiter, to which all literature is inevitably subject, it does not exercise its judgment entirely from outside literary works themselves. Literary theory can thrive "only in contact with works of art, which initially at least demand sensitivity, enjoyment, and involvement" (IV, 466). Thus literary theory (and, presumably criticism itself, *a fortiori*) "will remain a humanistic discipline concerned with value which will remain, also, value for oneself" (IV, 466).

Although this is not the only current understanding of literary criticism, it is certainly a legitimate and meaningful understanding. It is also an ambitious understanding. The sweep of the concept on which Mr. Wellek settles calls for all the massive erudition, the powers of reflection and of discrimination, and the interpretive and synthesizing insights with which he is so eminently equipped. It calls, moreover, for his enviable command of languages, for, while it may still be possible to study a national literature fruitfully along

fairly restricted national lines, any adequate study of criticism understood as he understands it in the period here covered demands the simultaneous treatment of literary criticism in France, Italy, England and Scotland, the United States, Germany, and Russia. This Wellek masterfully provides as he ranges through the vast network of nineteenth-century criticism from Sainte-Beuve, Carlyle, Poe, Heine, and Belinsky through Balzac, Flaubert, Taine, De Sanctis, Arnold, Walt Whitman, James Russell Lowell, Baudelaire, Chernyshevsky and Tolstoy to Nietzsche, Pater, Mallarmé, and Dilthey—to name only a selection from among those he deals with.

Wellek's undertaking is made the more difficult by the fact that many—perhaps most—of the authors he has to treat do not always address themselves directly to the questions which he considers properly critical or, if they do, do so with ulterior motives and less than clear vision. Consequently each critic must himself be worked over critically by Mr. Wellek to be given his proper place in this history. Sainte-Beuve is found to be rather distracted by biography and psychology, although his sixty volumes of criticism "in the wide sense of the term" make him in a true sense *the* critic of the mid-nineteenth century. Taine fails to allow for the autonomy of the individual work of literature; his forte is interpretation of the author's own personal world, and his view of literary development is too deterministic. So is the view of Brunetière, who fits literature to the concept of biological evolution. Wellek is particularly telling in his confutation of the recurrent cultural recapitulation theory, which interprets "movements" or whole cultures as though each were an individual human being, who is born, matures, ages, and dies, and he suggests that this popular but queasy and even meaningless analogizing extends beyond literary criticism to the work of Marx, Spengler, and Toynbee, as indeed it does. Anatole France and Lemaitre overcorrect Taine and Brunetière: in their retreat from scientism, they interpret literature too impressionistically. The Dane Georg Brandes and the Russian radical critics reduce literature to political ideology and make it unjustifiably didactic and moral. John Stuart Mill wants the poet to become a philosopher, and Arnold's concept of criticism tends to narrow the concept of beauty to the ethical. Symbolism, particularly in Mallarmé, seems to reduce poetry and language itself to a kind of magic. Dilthey is often clumsy, obscure, and fuzzy rather than intriguingly "dark." And so with scores of others.

But Wellek is never merely negative. For every writer he considers he has ample store of the sympathy requisite for true understanding. If he finds no critic beyond all censure, he also finds even in the very worst at least some little point worth commendation. Macaulay is intolerant, cocksure, and shallow, a loquacious Philistine, but he shows at least expository skill. Even Saintsbury, dilettante, prejudiced, a chatterbox, haphazard, and often simply confused, has to his credit that he defended baroque when others rejected it out of hand. Shaw was narrow, complacent, and shallow, insensitive to man's inner life, but he functioned as a useful literary policeman.

Wellek reserves his greatest praise for Francesco De Sanctis, a critic who is still virtually unknown outside Italy. De Sanctis "fuses Hegelian history with romantic dialectic aesthetics and translates them both into a new context in which the metaphysics are dropped and the new positive and realist spirit has been assimilated" (IV, 124). De Sanctis' *History of Italian Literature* Wellek finds "the finest history of any literature ever written." It combines a broad historical scheme with close criticism and analysis of particular texts and generates its theory in close association with literary practice.

This happy combination of particularity and generalization, in an atmosphere of trust and serenity such as he attributes with obvious sympathy to Henry James, marks Wellek's own thought in these two volumes, as elsewhere. Wellek's own critical theory—for the historian of criticism must seemingly share with the critics themselves the task of generating a theory—has been set forth in his earlier *Theory of Literature*, written with Austin Warren. We read in *Theory of Literature* that literature is distinguished by "organization, personal expression, realization and exploitation of the medium, lack of practical purpose, and, of course, fictionality," but that none of these features alone (or any other designable feature) is satisfactorily characteristic of literature since "a literary work of art is not a simple object but rather a highly complex organization of a stratified character with multiple meanings and relationships." Wellek's theory of literature does not admit of very succinct or indeed of any altogether complete statement, for its full details are still being worked out. In parallel fashion, the present two volumes take criticism itself to be an inchoate something, an "essentially contested concept," one which exists by being debated, and debated in connection with the social, political, philosophical, and theological

But Wellek is never merely negative. For every writer he considers he has ample store of the sympathy requisite for true understanding. If he finds no critic beyond all censure, he also finds even in the very worst at least some little point worth commendation. Macaulay is intolerant, cocksure, and shallow, a loquacious Philistine, but he shows at least expository skill. Even Saintsbury, dilettante, prejudiced, a chatterbox, haphazard, and often simply confused, has to his credit that he defended baroque when others rejected it out of hand. Shaw was narrow, complacent, and shallow, insensitive to man's inner life, but he functioned as a useful literary policeman.

Wellek reserves his greatest praise for Francesco De Sanctis, a critic who is still virtually unknown outside Italy. De Sanctis "fuses Hegelian history with romantic dialectic aesthetics and translates them both into a new context in which the metaphysics are dropped and the new positive and realist spirit has been assimilated" (IV, 124). De Sanctis' *History of Italian Literature* Wellek finds "the finest history of any literature ever written." It combines a broad historical scheme with close criticism and analysis of particular texts and generates its theory in close association with literary practice.

This happy combination of particularity and generalization, in an atmosphere of trust and serenity such as he attributes with obvious sympathy to Henry James, marks Wellek's own thought in these two volumes, as elsewhere. Wellek's own critical theory—for the historian of criticism must seemingly share with the critics themselves the task of generating a theory—has been set forth in his earlier *Theory of Literature*, written with Austin Warren. We read in *Theory of Literature* that literature is distinguished by "organization, personal expression, realization and exploitation of the medium, lack of practical purpose, and, of course, fictionality," but that none of these features alone (or any other designable feature) is satisfactorily characteristic of literature since "a literary work of art is not a simple object but rather a highly complex organization of a stratified character with multiple meanings and relationships." Wellek's theory of literature does not admit of very succinct or indeed of any altogether complete statement, for its full details are still being worked out. In parallel fashion, the present two volumes take criticism itself to be an inchoate something, an "essentially contested concept," one which exists by being debated, and debated in connection with the social, political, philosophical, and theological

fairly restricted national lines, any adequate study of criticism understood as he understands it in the period here covered demands the simultaneous treatment of literary criticism in France, Italy, England and Scotland, the United States, Germany, and Russia. This Wellek masterfully provides as he ranges through the vast network of nineteenth-century criticism from Sainte-Beuve, Carlyle, Poe, Heine, and Belinsky through Balzac, Flaubert, Taine, De Sanctis, Arnold, Walt Whitman, James Russell Lowell, Baudelaire, Chernyshevsky and Tolstoy to Nietzsche, Pater, Mallarmé, and Dilthey—to name only a selection from among those he deals with.

Wellek's undertaking is made the more difficult by the fact that many—perhaps most—of the authors he has to treat do not always address themselves directly to the questions which he considers properly critical or, if they do, do so with ulterior motives and less than clear vision. Consequently each critic must himself be worked over critically by Mr. Wellek to be given his proper place in this history. Sainte-Beuve is found to be rather distracted by biography and psychology, although his sixty volumes of criticism "in the wide sense of the term" make him in a true sense *the* critic of the mid-nineteenth century. Taine fails to allow for the autonomy of the individual work of literature; his forte is interpretation of the author's own personal world, and his view of literary development is too deterministic. So is the view of Brunetière, who fits literature to the concept of biological evolution. Wellek is particularly telling in his confutation of the recurrent cultural recapitulation theory, which interprets "movements" or whole cultures as though each were an individual human being, who is born, matures, ages, and dies, and he suggests that this popular but queasy and even meaningless analogizing extends beyond literary criticism to the work of Marx, Spengler, and Toynbee, as indeed it does. Anatole France and Lemaitre overcorrect Taine and Brunetière: in their retreat from scientism, they interpret literature too impressionistically. The Dane Georg Brandes and the Russian radical critics reduce literature to political ideology and make it unjustifiably didactic and moral. John Stuart Mill wants the poet to become a philosopher, and Arnold's concept of criticism tends to narrow the concept of beauty to the ethical. Symbolism, particularly in Mallarmé, seems to reduce poetry and language itself to a kind of magic. Dilthey is often clumsy, obscure, and fuzzy rather than intriguingly "dark." And so with scores of others.

But Wellek is never merely negative. For every writer he considers he has ample store of the sympathy requisite for true understanding. If he finds no critic beyond all censure, he also finds even in the very worst at least some little point worth commendation. Macaulay is intolerant, cocksure, and shallow, a loquacious Philistine, but he shows at least expository skill. Even Saintsbury, dilettante, prejudiced, a chatterbox, haphazard, and often simply confused, has to his credit that he defended baroque when others rejected it out of hand. Shaw was narrow, complacent, and shallow, insensitive to man's inner life, but he functioned as a useful literary policeman.

Wellek reserves his greatest praise for Francesco De Sanctis, a critic who is still virtually unknown outside Italy. De Sanctis "fuses Hegelian history with romantic dialectic aesthetics and translates them both into a new context in which the metaphysics are dropped and the new positive and realist spirit has been assimilated" (IV, 124). De Sanctis' *History of Italian Literature* Wellek finds "the finest history of any literature ever written." It combines a broad historical scheme with close criticism and analysis of particular texts and generates its theory in close association with literary practice.

This happy combination of particularity and generalization, in an atmosphere of trust and serenity such as he attributes with obvious sympathy to Henry James, marks Wellek's own thought in these two volumes, as elsewhere. Wellek's own critical theory—for the historian of criticism must seemingly share with the critics themselves the task of generating a theory—has been set forth in his earlier *Theory of Literature*, written with Austin Warren. We read in *Theory of Literature* that literature is distinguished by "organization, personal expression, realization and exploitation of the medium, lack of practical purpose, and, of course, fictionality," but that none of these features alone (or any other designable feature) is satisfactorily characteristic of literature since "a literary work of art is not a simple object but rather a highly complex organization of a stratified character with multiple meanings and relationships." Wellek's theory of literature does not admit of very succinct or indeed of any altogether complete statement, for its full details are still being worked out. In parallel fashion, the present two volumes take criticism itself to be an inchoate something, an "essentially contested concept," one which exists by being debated, and debated in connection with the social, political, philosophical, and theological

conditions of a given time, although it is never reducible to such conditions. (The theological state of affairs, incidentally, gets possibly the shortest shrift of all in the account here presented by Professor Wellek, whose handling of intellectual history might on this score be contrasted with that of the late Perry Miller.) Wellek sees the history of literature and of literary criticism in terms neither of relativism nor of absolutism, but in terms of what here and elsewhere he calls "perspectivism," whereby one devises theory through reflection on history and interprets history in terms of flexible theory.

This complex understanding of criticism plus the wealth of detail in the present two volumes makes the over-all drift of thought in the period here covered difficult to summarize, but it might not be far off the mark to say that in Wellek's account the criticism of the mid-nineteenth and late nineteenth century seeks on the whole to move away from a Platonism to an evolutionism, that is from a philosophy of decadence (matters were better "at first" in an ideal world from which everything we experience defects) or of cyclicism (change is tolerable only because it brings us back to where we started) to a philosophy of *ascesis*, of hard-won, forward-moving, change, mysteriously patterned. On the whole, however, although individual literary works are treated with greater and greater knowledge by successive generations of nineteenth-century critics, the drive toward an evolutionary understanding of literature appears to have been for the moment uneventful. The "ideal" remained the generally controlling critical concept through the nineteenth century. Insight into literary development lagged behind insight into social development. What the period needed and lacked was a sense of open-end interaction between social and psychological structures, that is, an open-end phenomenology of communication, particularly as constituted in the verbal (basically oral) world. Despite its growing sensitivity to history, the age still had not brought into its criticism a feeling for the successive organizations of the human life world which constitute the interior dimensions of history. At the same time, critics had not found a fully satisfactory way of dealing with literature as communication—Taine and many others (like Hegel) prefer to see the work of art as a "concrete" universal, as rather exclusively an "object" (which it is only analogously) rather than as also an event in intersubjective life.

No one, of course, is to be blamed for this state of affairs, which

simply registers the stage of knowledge and culture at the time. We can now perceive the lack of fuller evolutionary and intersubjective awarenesses in the age treated by these volumes because such awarenesses emerge to a greater degree in the succeeding age, which is close to or even identical with our own. It will be interesting to read what Professor Wellek will make of this latter day in his fifth and final volume. We can hope that he will generalize, at least tentatively, some further description of the over-all movement which has made criticism today quite a different thing from its equivalent in the late eighteenth century and which has made his own brilliant history of criticism itself possible.

WALTER J. ONG, S.J.

THE RE-EXPLORATION OF AFRICA

THE PENETRATION OF AFRICA: EUROPEAN EXPLORATION IN NORTH AND WEST AFRICA TO 1815, by ROBIN HALLETT, *Frederick A. Praeger*.
 HISTORY OF EAST AFRICA: VOL. II, edited by VINCENT HARLOW, E. M. CHELVER, & ALISON SMITH, *Oxford University Press*.
 PAN-AFRICANISM AND EAST AFRICAN INTEGRATION, by JOSEPH S. NYE, JR., *Harvard University Press*.
 NIGERIA: THE TRIBES, THE NATION, OR THE RACE: THE POLITICS OF INDEPENDENCE, by FREDERICK A. O. SCHWARZ, JR., *M. I. T. Press*.

THE scholarly re-exploration of Africa and of Africa's past continues to gather momentum. These four volumes are representative of some of the more important genres adding momentum to the intellectual scramble. Robin Hallett's is the first volume of what promises to be a masterful survey of European exploration in northern and western Africa through about 1830. Already the editor of the *Records of the African Association, 1788-1831* (1964) and of the *Landers' Niger Journal* (1965), Mr. Hallett has traveled the archival paths and recaptured the contemporary moods of eighteenth-century exploration. His own African experience in the Extra Mural Department of the University of Ibadan has been brought felicitously to bear, and he joins the growing number of established scholars, such as Fage, Hodgkin, and Kimble, whose long service in Africa adds insight and sympathy to the interpretation of historical fact.

The second volume of the *Oxford History of East Africa* illustrates again the mixed value of the multi-author historical surveys of which the leading English universities have been prolific. First suggested at an East Africa Governors' Conference in 1952 and forwarded through the use of Colonial Development and Welfare Funds, the three volumes on East Africa (of which the third is still

simply registers the stage of knowledge and culture at the time. We can now perceive the lack of fuller evolutionary and intersubjective awarenesses in the age treated by these volumes because such awarenesses emerge to a greater degree in the succeeding age, which is close to or even identical with our own. It will be interesting to read what Professor Wellek will make of this latter day in his fifth and final volume. We can hope that he will generalize, at least tentatively, some further description of the over-all movement which has made criticism today quite a different thing from its equivalent in the late eighteenth century and which has made his own brilliant history of criticism itself possible.

WALTER J. ONG, S.J.

THE RE-EXPLORATION OF AFRICA

THE PENETRATION OF AFRICA: EUROPEAN EXPLORATION IN NORTH AND WEST AFRICA TO 1815, by ROBIN HALLETT, *Frederick A. Praeger*.

HISTORY OF EAST AFRICA: VOL. II, edited by VINCENT HARLOW, E. M. CHELVER, & ALBION SMITH, *Oxford University Press*.

PAN-AFRICANISM AND EAST AFRICAN INTEGRATION, by JOSEPH S. NYE, JR., *Harvard University Press*.

NIGERIA: THE TRIBES, THE NATION, OR THE RACE: THE POLITICS OF INDEPENDENCE, by FREDERICK A. O. SCHWARZ, JR., *M. I. T. Press*.

THE scholarly re-exploration of Africa and of Africa's past continues to gather momentum. These four volumes are representative of some of the more important genres adding moment to the intellectual scramble. Robin Hallett's is the first volume of what promises to be a masterful survey of European exploration in northern and western Africa through about 1830. Already the editor of the *Records of the African Association, 1788-1831* (1964) and of the *Landers' Niger Journal* (1965), Mr. Hallett has traveled the archival paths and recaptured the contemporary moods of eighteenth-century exploration. His own African experience in the Extra Mural Department of the University of Ibadan has been brought felicitously to bear, and he joins the growing number of established scholars, such as Fage, Hodgkin, and Kimble, whose long service in Africa adds insight and sympathy to the interpretation of historical fact.

The second volume of the *Oxford History of East Africa* illustrates again the mixed value of the multi-author historical surveys of which the leading English universities have been prolific. First suggested at an East Africa Governors' Conference in 1952 and forwarded through the use of Colonial Development and Welfare Funds, the three volumes on East Africa (of which the third is still

conditions of a given time, although it is never reducible to such conditions. (The theological state of affairs, incidentally, gets possibly the shortest shrift of all in the account here presented by Professor Wellek, whose handling of intellectual history might on this score be contrasted with that of the late Perry Miller.) Wellek sees the history of literature and of literary criticism in terms neither of relativism nor of absolutism, but in terms of what here and elsewhere he calls "perspectivism," whereby one devises theory through reflection on history and interprets history in terms of flexible theory.

This complex understanding of criticism plus the wealth of detail in the present two volumes makes the over-all drift of thought in the period here covered difficult to summarize, but it might not be far off the mark to say that in Wellek's account the criticism of the mid-nineteenth and late nineteenth century seeks on the whole to move away from a Platonism to an evolutionism, that is from a philosophy of decadence (matters were better "at first" in an ideal world from which everything we experience defects) or of cyclicism (change is tolerable only because it brings us back to where we started) to a philosophy of *ascesis*, of hard-won, forward-moving, change, mysteriously patterned. On the whole, however, although individual literary works are treated with greater and greater knowledge by successive generations of nineteenth-century critics, the drive toward an evolutionary understanding of literature appears to have been for the moment uneventful. The "ideal" remained the generally controlling critical concept through the nineteenth century. Insight into literary development lagged behind insight into social development. What the period needed and lacked was a sense of open-end interaction between social and psychological structures, that is, an open-end phenomenology of communication, particularly as constituted in the verbal (basically oral) world. Despite its growing sensitivity to history, the age still had not brought into its criticism a feeling for the successive organizations of the human life world which constitute the interior dimensions of history. At the same time, critics had not found a fully satisfactory way of dealing with literature as communication—Taine and many others (like Hegel) prefer to see the work of art as a "concrete" universal, as rather exclusively an "object" (which it is only analogously) rather than as also an event in intersubjective life.

No one, of course, is to be blamed for this state of affairs, which

simply registers the stage of knowledge and culture at the time. We can now perceive the lack of fuller evolutionary and intersubjective awarenesses in the age treated by these volumes because such awarenesses emerge to a greater degree in the succeeding age, which is close to or even identical with our own. It will be interesting to read what Professor Wellek will make of this latter day in his fifth and final volume. We can hope that he will generalize, at least tentatively, some further description of the over-all movement which has made criticism today quite a different thing from its equivalent in the late eighteenth century and which has made his own brilliant history of criticism itself possible.

WALTER J. ONG, S.J.

THE RE-EXPLORATION OF AFRICA

THE PENETRATION OF AFRICA: EUROPEAN EXPLORATION IN NORTH AND WEST AFRICA TO 1815, by ROBIN HALLETT, *Frederick A. Praeger.*

HISTORY OF EAST AFRICA: VOL. II, edited by VINCENT HARLOW, E. M. CHELVER, & ALISON SMITH, *Oxford University Press.*

PAN-AFRICANISM AND EAST AFRICAN INTEGRATION, by JOSEPH S. NYE, JR., *Harvard University Press.*

NIGERIA: THE TRIBES, THE NATION, OR THE RACE: THE POLITICS OF INDEPENDENCE, by FREDERICK A. O. SCHWARZ, JR., *M. I. T. Press.*

THE scholarly re-exploration of Africa and of Africa's past continues to gather momentum. These four volumes are representative of some of the more important genres adding moment to the intellectual scramble. Robin Hallett's is the first volume of what promises to be a masterful survey of European exploration in northern and western Africa through about 1830. Already the editor of the *Records of the African Association, 1788-1831* (1964) and of the *Landers' Niger Journal* (1965), Mr. Hallett has traveled the archival paths and recaptured the contemporary moods of eighteenth-century exploration. His own African experience in the Extra Mural Department of the University of Ibadan has been brought felicitously to bear, and he joins the growing number of established scholars, such as Fage, Hodgkin, and Kimble, whose long service in Africa adds insight and sympathy to the interpretation of historical fact.

The second volume of the *Oxford History of East Africa* illustrates again the mixed value of the multi-author historical surveys of which the leading English universities have been prolific. First suggested at an East Africa Governors' Conference in 1952 and forwarded through the use of Colonial Development and Welfare Funds, the three volumes on East Africa (of which the third is still

The Critical Moment Literary criticism in the 1960s. Essays from the London Times Literary Supplement.

Rene Wellek, "Some Principles of Criticism" pp. 40-47
 Prof. of Slavic and Comparative Literature at Yale University
 p. 43 In several of my theoretical papers, recently collected as Concepts of Criticism (Yale University Press, 1963). I have tried to re-examine the main historiographical tools of the literary scholar: the concept of evolution, which seems to have disappeared from recent practice completely; the concept of period, which must neither
 page 44
 be reduced to a linguistic label nor exalted to a metaphysical entity, but should be understood as the dominance of a system of literary conventions and norms whose rise and fall we can trace; and, finally, the specific period concepts which have given rise to such endless debates: Baroque, Romanticism, Realism.

page 44
 Analysis, interpretation, evaluation are interconnected stages of a single procedure. Evaluation grows out of understanding. Correct evaluation out of correct understanding. What is correct
 page 45
 interpretation of a specific work of art will, of course, be often a matter of dispute, but it seems impossible to deny that there is this problem of 'correctness' or 'adequacy' of interpretation, of a hierarchy of viewpoints. We might argue about the different concepts of Hamlet propounded by Goethe, Coleridge, A. C. Bradley, Ernest Jones, L. L. Schücking, Dover Wilson, and so on, but we must recognize that there are limits set to the freedom of interpretation: Hamlet is not a woman in disguise, nor is ~~he~~^{he}, as Miss Winstanley proposed, 'Mainly James I'. Just as there is correct interpretation, at least as an ideal, so there is correct judgment, good judgment.

Thus, we ought not to succumb to the lure of 'historicism' which spread from Germany and nowadays is still the almost official creed of many eminent scholars. 'Historicism' of this kind is only relativism and scepticism, an abdication before the task of criticism as judgment. The view that we must judge merely by the criteria of the past, that there is an unending multiplicity of irreconcilable standards - not only the poetry of Pope and the poetry of Wordsworth, but every poet's distinct and unique value - would, if carried through consistently, lead to an end of all literary

The Critical Moment Literary criticism in the 1960s.

Wellek. "Some Principles of Criticism" cont'd

appreciation, to complete anarchy, to the victory of the old vicious maxim,

De gustibus non est disputandum.

Raymond Picard, "Critical Trends in France" p.101-107

Professor in the Faculty of Letters in the University of Lille.

p. 106 One of the most dangerous tendencies to which contemporary criticism is subject is thus to deviate from literature. Against that I have myself always considered that the first duty of the literary critic is to focus all his attention on the literary work, which I regard as an end in itself, complete and absolute. Like many Anglo-Saxons, I believe in studying literature from the inside, concentrating on its intrinsic qualities. Naturally it would be a mistake to neglect the environment or the social conditions: the historical meaning should not be ignored, not that it need necessarily be agreed with. But the critic must always return to the work itself and to the literary universe to which it belongs while still constituting an autonomous and self-justifying unit. For a work, be it poem or novel, is sufficient unto itself, endowed with its own power and containing its own clues. These are to be found simply by examining the text: criticism begins and ends above all as textual elucidation, as explication de texte.

A LITERARY HISTORY AND LITERARY CRITICISM, Acta of the Ninth

Congress, International Federation for Modern Languages and Literature, held at New York University, August 25-31, 1963. ~~Leon Edel, Editor~~ Leon Edel, Editor, New York University Press 1965

Paper No. 3 "Literary History and Literary Criticism", by Douglas Bush, of Harvard University

Discussion of Temple Mario Praz^{x ?} paper by René Wellek, of Yale University
Braz
Page 82 ?

"Relativism is no answer: nor of course is the ancient frozen absolutism. Rather, I have argued many times for a kind ~~of~~ of 'perspectivism,' which tries to see the objects from ~~all~~ all possible sides. Such perspectivism assumes that there is an object, an objective element elephant(?) in spite of all the diverse opinions of the blind men. How can the opinion be justified? If the literary critic is not merely another blind man, seeing the trunk, the tusk, the tail, or the foot of the elephant alone? The only answer is history, and the lesson that grows out of it: a body of doctrines and insights, judgments and theories which are the accumulated wisdom of mankind...."?

Professor Braz(?) , it seems to me, is right (correct) in rejecting extreme historical reconstructionism.

Rene Wellek, A HISTORY OF MODERN CRITICISM: 1750-1950

Volume 4 The Later Nineteenth Century. Yale University Press 1965 (2)

(3.3)

Page 397:

"Pater inherits from German historicism the belief and emphasis on Zeitgeist. The artist is a 'child of his time.'¹⁵³ There is a genius of an age, and art and literature 'must follow the subtle movements of that nimbly shifting Time-Spirit or Zeitgeist.'¹⁵⁴ In every age 'there is a peculiar ensemble of conditions which determines a common character in every product of that age, in business and art, in fashion and speculation, in religion and manners, in men's very faces. . . nothing man has projected from himself is really intelligible except at its own date, and from its proper point of view in the never-resting 'secular process.'¹⁵⁵

No wonder he can say of the historical spirit that 'the scholar is nothing without it.'¹⁵⁶

The Development of American Literary Criticism, Floyd Stovall (edited and with introduction by). University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1955

"Changing Attitudes in Early American Literary Criticism 1800-1840", Harry H. Clark, pp. 15-73

- p. 49 In the early eighteen thirties, however, the way was prepared for such a sympathetic method of criticism by American admiration for Carlyle, who appealed to contemporary taste not only as a disciple of Goethe but in his own right especially by his earnestly moral conviction that the critic should be the interpreter (not the judge) of the writer's anti-rationalistic revelation of the Divine Idea, and that the critic's approach should be biographical
- p. 50 in characterizing the man behind the book. . . . C. A. Bartol, George Bancroft, W. H. Channing, and many others eulogized Carlyle's generally sympathetic criticism,⁵⁸ and it seems apparent that Carlyle's was one of the influences which inaugurated what was then the new criticism.

The Turn to Historical Literary Criticism

p.55 Broadly speaking, historical criticism may stress one of many things: change or growth or progress or the diversitarian as opposed to the changeless or universal or uniformitarian; a turn from the appraisal of the art or ethics of the writing itself to an impersonal attempt to explain its origin in terms of cause and effect and influences, with attention to temporal sequence and a contexture or the conditioning influence of the author's life or of his time, place, and race; a turn to relativity, adaptation to new surroundings, and functionalism, including an encouragement of linguistic innovation, flexibility, and diverse levels of actual usage in a multi-racial democratic society, as opposed to British purism and linguistic standardization.

p. 56 Second, consider the influence of foreign critics. In Herder's "genetic thinking" in Ideen (1784-91) literature was not an isolated, static mechanism but a vital "plant" growing out of a distinctive place, climate, race, and folk spirit, toward a greater "humanity", and to be explained critically in terms of these. A clergyman as well as a historian, Herder applied such criticism in The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, which James Marsh translated in 1833 with an approving introduction; Ripley reviewed this (TA, 89-97) in 1835 as "a treasure of learning, . . . beautiful and winning," of a "pure and noble spirit." This, along with some thirty other⁶⁷ critical essays on Herder in our period, suggested that the same historical methods might be applied fruitfully to books other than the Bible. Translations of Madame de Staël's Influence of Literature upon Society were published in three different American cities in 1813, developing her view that literature depended upon social environment and that it improved in proportion as nations became Christian and politically free;

p. 72 Broadly speaking, there were at least five different varieties of organicism recognized by Americans. . . . Second, the vogue of Herder helped to inspire the beginnings of a literary criticism which stressed the organic mutual relation between literature and its authors' time, place, and race, as we have seen in connection with the rise of historical criticism.

The Development of American Literary Criticism, Floyd Stovall

"Revolt and Revaluation in Criticism 1900-1930", John H. Raleigh

p. 171 In the area of purely literary criticism the great symbol was Springarn's famous lecture "The New Criticism" which - although it seems to have had no palpable effect - was welcomed with enthusiasm because of its iconoclasm. In Springarn's throwing out of all the "rules" of the game, such as history, genres, style, and periods, in his interest in the creative process itself, in his cosmopolitan championing of Croce, and in his slaying of the moral dragon, he embodied the deep-set antagonism of the younger writers to the logic-chopping, the dry academicism, the narrow Anglophilism, and the "moral printer" attitudes that had constituted one of the main strains in American criticism. Mencken himself grudgingly congratulated this college professor, and he bestowed on Springarn his supreme accolade - acknowledgment of belligerency: "Against the whole corps [of critics], moral and esthetic, psychological and algebraic, stands Major J. E. Spingarn, U.S.A."³⁴

(Footnote 34. H. L. Mencken, "Criticism of Criticism of Criticism," Criticism in America, ed. Joel E. Spingarn (New York, 1924), p. 177)

✓ 3.21

Guerard, Prof of Stanford University 3.21-23

Albert Guerard, PREFACE TO WORLD LITERATURE, 1940-1957

See 3.31-16

Page 72

" * * * internal evidence, of a convincing nature, reveals a commanding artistic personality. To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been able to supply."

(34)

Page 75

" * * * the Faust legend and the William Tell saga had survived humbly until the end of the eighteenth century. But it would be a mockery to assert that they automatically assumed definite shape, that they 'got themselves written down,' somehow, by scribes known as Goethe and Schiller."

3,21

See 3.31-16 f

Page 101

"It may be easier for the teacher to cram Milton down Johnny's throat than to take Johnny by the hand, shy, diffident, but secretly proud, into Milton's august presence. The result of the first method is an inveterate Miltonphobia: not a rare disease among college freshmen. The second brings an inestimable enrichment of life."

- ✓ Preface to World Literature, Albert Guerard (Prof. of General and Comparative Literature Stanford University), Henry Holt and Company, N. Y., 1940

3.21 // page 74. "It is not denied that literature uses the same stuff as folklore; but it is claimed that folklore is turned into literature only through an individual act of conscious organization. A book is a piece of work, not an accident.

✓ ^{Unconquerable Mind}
Man's Unconquerable Mind R. W. Chambers. Jonathan Cape, London, 1939

- p. 71 Fortunately, twenty years ago, that great teacher of English, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, gave his answer to the problem:

3.21 // Gentlemen, I would I could persuade you to remember that you are English, and go always for the thing, casting out of your vocabulary all such words as 'tendencies', 'influences', 'revivals', 'revolts'. 'Tendencies' did not write The Canterbury Tales; Geoffrey Chaucer wrote them. 'Influences' did not make The Faerie Queen; Edmund Spenser made it; as a man called Ben Jonson wrote The Alchemist, a man called Sheridan wrote The Rivals . . .

- p. 85 So we hail Wiclif - the Morning Star of the Reformation. But to William Langland, less than justice has been done. He comes immediately before the great upheaval of Wiclif, and people do not know what to make of him. No great figure of English literature has been equally neglected. He has even been divided into four or five authors, and we have been told that Piers Plowman was 'the voice and vision, not of one lonely, despised wanderer, but of many men, who, ~~through~~ though of diverse tempers and gifts, cherished the same enthusiasm for righteousness and hate for evil'.¹ (¹ Cambridge History of English Literature, II, p. 42).

// Here again, let us remember Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch: 'Tendencies did not write The Canterbury Tales; Geoffrey Chaucer wrote them.'

// I hope to satisfy the reader that Tendencies did not write Piers Plowman: that a man called William Langland wrote it.

Quiller-Couch wrote: ✓
Adventures in Criticism, 1896
On the Art of Writing, 1916
On the Art of Reading, 1920
Charles Dickens and other Victorians, 1925
The Poet as Citizen, 1934

Page 27

3.21
 Literature was increasingly studied in the context of its environment. Individuality cannot be comprehended and described except in the context of or in contrast to some environment. In the 17th century more and more attention was paid to the climatic and geographical conditions of literature, and increasingly literature was seen in terms of social conditions and intellectual atmosphere. People began to discuss the influence of social stability, peace and war, liberty, and despotism on literature. The concept of a national character as a determining factor in literary creation was slowly taking shape.

Page 38

Most of Voltaire's principles can thus be studied only in his concrete pronouncements, but these are fortunately so numerous and cover so many authors that a general view emerges with astonishing consistency. Voltaire adheres to the classical tradition of decorum, bienséance, convenance. "Perfection consists in knowing how to adjust one's style to the matter one treats."²⁸ Style, form, way of expression are always decisive for critical judgment. "As far as making the passions speak, all men have almost the same ideas; but the way of expressing them distinguishes the man of wit from the man who has none."²⁹ Voltaire restates the ancient doctrine of the three levels of style: each subject has its level, "natural," "tempered," or "elevated."

Pages 124-125

The emphasis on environment became especially significant when the 'manners' which determine a work of art were analyzed in detail. At first the most remote explanation was the most widely favored. Sir William Temple's theory about the connection between the variable English weather and the odd humor of Englishmen⁶⁵ was one of the earliest instances of the explanation of literature by climatic conditions. Later the older idea that poetry--especially highly imaginative poetry--flourished best in the South received

a rude shock from the "discovery" of the northerner Ossian. Gray admitted that "imagination dwelt many hundred years ago in all her pomp on the cold and barren mountains of Scotland" and thus could not be the result of heat.⁶⁶ But Hume and Kames became quite skeptical of the whole business of explaining poetry by climatic conditions.⁶⁷

The climate theory becomes much more acceptable when it is reinterpreted to include geographical conditions. Bishop Lowth's De sacra poesi Hebraeorum tried to explain the particular character of Hebrew poetry by the influence of the surrounding objects of nature: he traces Palestinian landscape in the imagery of the Bible. Robert Wood traveled in the Near East and, in An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer (1769), studied the topography of the site of Troy, concluding that Homer was "the most constant and faithful copier after nature."⁶⁸

Page 126

What is most striking to a modern observer is the complete confusion about the states of society supposed to be primitive. The early stages of Greek civilization, the society depicted in the Old Testament, contemporary Arabian society, the feudal Middle Ages, and the dim time in which Ossian was supposed to have lived are all considered the same. This sociological simplification is matched by the crudity of the 18th-century dichotomy between natural poetry and art poetry. This contrast dates back to the Renaissance, but only in the 18th century was natural poetry identified with a universal folk poetry in which everything which deviates from the Latin-French tradition was lumped together: the Bible, Homer, Ossian, the Welsh bards, the few Lapland and Indian songs known at the time, the Scottish ballads, and even chivalric romances. Thomas Percy seems to have been the first to entertain the explicit conception of primitive poetry as a whole. He planned a collection His translations from the Chinese and from Runic poetry, his paraphrase of the Song of

Songs as a "sample of Hebrew poetry," his Reliques of Ancient English Poetry (1765) which contains not only ballads but many Elizabethan lyrics and scenes from Shakespeare, his specimens of 'Moorish' romances, his transcriptions of chivalric romances, and the planned edition of Surrey⁷⁴ --all point to this conception of a substantial identity of primitive poetry.

Page 132

In a different situation and in different terms we are apt to share this compromise today. Our historicism, which countenances the most diverse kinds of art, from prehistoric cave paintings to Picasso, from Homer to Eliot, from plain chant to Stravinsky, is an all-embracing eclecticism. It has the same implications of sterility which we feel in the antiquarian critics of the 18th century. Today they rightly elicit great sympathy and interest, for they represent the beginnings of an attitude which seems to have become almost universal in the academic world of our time.

Page 182

Style

Besides, Herder constantly rewrote what he had written: the second edition of the Fragmente differs profoundly from the first, and materials are often moved from one book to another. The exclamatory style, the shifting terminology, the fragmentariness of the arguments, the constant oscillation and flitting from one topic to another are extremely irritating and justify Saintsbury's charge of "fearful wooliness,"⁴⁴ but they do not justify a neglect of Herder.

He has been considered a forerunner of Taine in his stress on milieu. There is in Herder much about climate (hot, cold, and temperate),¹⁰⁹ landscape, race (nations), customs, and even political conditions such as Athenian democracy in their relations to literature. One of his prize essays, called Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst auf die Sitten der Völker in alten und neuen Zeiten (1778), is a survey of the history of literature with stress on its educative and civilizing function. But Herder rarely analyzes the environmental factors and never brings them into close relationship with the actual literature. He constantly argues in a circle: i.e., he explains a work of literature by history and then utilizes the work to throw light on history. In the case of Ossian, for instance, since there exist no early documents about ancient Scottish history, Herder derived all the information about^{the} social setting from the poems, and that was extremely vague and baffling. He uses such criteria as climate and landscape very loosely, and even the racial point of view amounts to little more than the old contrast between North and South, the Germanic and the Latin nations. In a paper on Homer and Ossian, Herder tries to derive the poetic differences between the two from differences in climate and national stock.¹¹⁰

Popper, Karl P., The Poverty of Historicism (Boston: The Beacon Press; 1957)

- p. 3 . . . I mean by 'historicism' an approach to the social sciences which assumes that historical prediction is their principal aim, and which assumes that this aim is attainable by discovering the 'rhythms' or the 'patterns', the 'laws' or the 'trends' that underlie the evolution of history.
- p. 5 Although historicism admits that there are plenty of typical social conditions whose **regular recurrence can be observed**, it denies that the **regularities detectable in social life have the character of the immutable regularities of the physical world.**
- p. 31 **Historicism stresses the importance of change.**
- p. 49 **Historicism fully recognizes that our wishes and thoughts, our dreams and our reasoning, our fears and our knowledge, our interests and our energies, are all forces in the development of society. It does not teach that nothing can be brought about; it only predicts that neither your dreams nor what your reason constructs will ever be brought about according to plan. Only such plans as fit in with the main current of history can be effective.**
- p. 51 **Although it teaches neither inactivity nor real fatalism, historicism teaches the futility of any attempt to alter impending changes; a peculiar variety of fatalism, a fatalism in regard to the trends of history, as it were.**
- p. 106 **Indeed, the recent ~~x~~ vogue of historicism might be regarded as merely part of the vogue of evolutionism - a philosophy that owes its influence largely to the somewhat sensational clash between a brilliant scientific hypothesis concerning the history of the various species of animals and plants on earth, and an older metaphysical theory which, incidentally, happened to be part of an established religious belief.**
- p. 128 **This, we may say, is the central mistake of historicism. Its 'laws of development' turn out to be absolute trends; trends which, like laws, do not depend on initial conditions, and which carry us irresistibly in a certain direction into the future. They are the basis of unconditional prophecies, as opposed to conditional scientific predictions.**

Literary Language & Its Public In Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages, Erich Auerbach. Translated from the German by Ralph Manheim. Bollingen Series LXXIV, Pantheon Books. 1965. *orig. pub. Bern, 1958.*

Erich Auerbach earned a doctorate in law in 1913 and a Ph.D. degree in Romance philology in 1921. Prof. at the University of Marburg from 1929 to 1935 when he was dismissed by order of the Nazi regime. In 1947 he came to U.S. Spent over a year on faculty of Penna. State University and one at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, and joined the faculty of Yale University in 1950. Was appointed Sterling Professor of Romance Philology at Yale in 1956. Died, 1957. Born, 1892.

- 3, 21
Habermas →
- p. 11 In the last few decades influential critics have once again been propounding descriptive or dogmatic categories of judgment for which they claim absolute validity. Of course, no one hopes any longer to equal the clarity and richness of certain of the great "prehistorical" critics who within their own fields classified the existing genres, defined their structure and purpose, and authoritatively pointed out the supreme achievements in each. Nevertheless there is a widespread tendency to reject historical perspectivism tacitly or explicitly; particularly in the field of literary criticism, this tendency is related to a distaste for philology of the nineteenth-century type, which is looked upon as the embodiment par excellence of historicism. Historicism, many believe, results in antiquarian pedantry, in overestimation of biographical detail, in failure to appreciate a work of art as such, and, by doing away with all categories on which one might base value judgments, in eclecticism. These critics forget, first of all, that the historicism of Vico, of Herder and the Romantics, or of Hegel, though underlying philological specialization, is not identical with it. It is true that many scholars, including some to whom we owe a great deal, became so absorbed in specialization that they forgot the purpose of their efforts; but this cannot be taken as an argument against a philosophical outlook which unfortunately they have lost. It is true, too, that preoccupation with biographical details, and above all the endeavor to interpret all literary productions as biographical in the most literal sense, are exceedingly naive and often absurd. But it seems to me that this brand of scholarship has been sufficiently attacked and ridiculed. The simple fact that a man's work stems from his existence and that consequently everything we can find out about his life serves to interpret the work loses none of its relevance because inexperienced scholars have drawn ridiculous inferences from it. The notion, often met with nowadays, that a work should be considered independently of its author is justified only in so far as the work often gives a truer, more integrated picture of its creator than do the sometimes fortuitous and misleading bits of information that we possess concerning his life.
- p. 12

Albright, W. F., Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press) Fourth Edition, 1956

p. 3 We also emphasized the fact that the evolution of historical patterns^m is highly complex and variable; it may move in any direction and it cannot be detected by a priori hypotheses nor can it be explained by any deterministic theory. We also pointed out that this organismic nature of history makes unilinear "historicism" unsuitable as a clue to the complexities of the history of religion.⁸ For this reason Wellhausen's Hegelian method was utterly unsuited to become the master-key with which scholars might enter the sanctuary of Israelite religion and acquire a satisfying understanding of it. That it has been a useful tool for historical research we do not, of course, deny.

Footnote 8 FSAC 49f.; JBL, 1940, pp. 95ff.; Science, Philosophy and Religion, A Symposium (New York, 1941), pp. 296ff.

~~Jerusalem Bible, 1966, p. 7~~

See also 3331 Altick, Richard D., The Art of Literary Research pp. 63-4

Jerusalem Bible, 1966, p. 7

It should be noted that the literary analysis behind this hypothesis ((the JEDP theory)) was allied with an evolutionary theory of the religious development of Israel.

Wellek, Rene, A History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950 2. The Romantic Age
 (New Haven: Yale University Press) 1955

Wellek - Professor of Slavic and Comparative Literature, Sterling Professor of Comparative Literature, Yale University

p. 282 to Jakob Grimm it seems unthinkable that there should ever have been a Homer or an author of the Nibelungen. No civilized nation is able to produce an epic and has never done so, he says. Epics can only compose themselves.

p. 287 In most details the general structure of the Grimms has since crumbled. The reaction against their views has gone far. Much evidence has been accumulated to show that a great deal of what they considered folk literature is the composition of a single author in the Western tradition and not unacquainted with antiquity. The Nibelungen, the Edda, even Beowulf, are neither primitive nor purely Teutonic. The chansons de geste are frequently quite late in origin, traceable even to specific authors and full of the devices and traditions of artificial poetry. Much that is supposedly folk poetry is rather "gesunkenes Kulturgut," i.e. it has descended socially to the "lower classes" and its simplicity and naivete are rather a reduction than an origin. One may still, as Croce does, object to any bifurcation of poetry, to any attempt to break up its unity,²⁵ but the reaction against the Grimm's point of view has clearly run its course. //

²⁵ See Benedetto Croce, Poesia popolare e poesia d'arte, Bari, 1946
~~Granted the exaggeration of their position, there is much in it that is basically sound. Medieval poetry has ultimate roots in folk poetry and folk traditions. Scholars are even coming back to the view that the courtly love lyric has its origins in folk forms.~~

Granted the exaggeration of their position, there is much in it that is basically sound. Medieval poetry has ultimate roots in folk poetry and folk traditions. Scholars are even coming back to the view that the courtly love lyric has its origins in folk forms.²⁶ Myth is almost palpably discernible behind much poetry even of modern times, and the "archetypal patterns" derived from Jung and expounded by Maud Bodkin, do not differ substantially from what the Grimms meant by myth. //

p. 336 Germany, in the later part of the 19th century, lost its leadership in literary theory and criticism completely. //

801 Concepts of Criticism, Rene Wellek. Edited and with an introduction by
W458c Stephen G. Nichols, Jr., New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1963.

pp. 9,10 "Far greater and more difficult issues are raised by those who have genuinely embraced the creed of 'Historicism,' which after a long career in Germany and Italy, after its theoretical formulations by Dilthey, Windelbrand, Rickert, Max Weber, Troeltsch, Meinecke, and Croce, has finally reached the United States and has been embraced by literary scholars almost as a new religion. To give a characteristic recent example, Roy Harvey Pearce, in an article, 'Historicism Once More,' (pub. 1958, pp. 554-91) - strangely enough lauded and endorsed by J. C. Ransom - preaches a new historicism and concludes by quoting a poem by Robert Penn Warren

Warren, hardly an enemy of the New Criticism, is quoted as the key witness for 'Historicism,' though his fine poem has nothing whatever to do with historicism Pearce's historicism is a confused mixture of existentialism and historicism, a string of bombastic assertions about humanity, the possibility of literature, and so on, with the constant polemical refrain that "criticism is a form of historical study" (p. 568)

See pages 11 - 20

p. 15 Only peripherally, in questions which have to do with biography or, say, the reconstruction of the Elizabethan playhouse, does the literary student have to rely on documents.

p. 17 The kind of period relativism recommended as a solution by Auerbach is no way out: it would split up the concept of art and poetry into innumerable fragments.

p. 19 Logic, ethics and, I believe, aesthetics cry aloud against a complete historicism which, one should emphasize, in men such as Auerbach, is still shored up by an inherited ideal of humanism and buttressed methodologically by an unconsciously held conceptual framework of grammatical, stylistic and geistesgeschichtlich categories. In such radical versions as the theory leads to a paralysis of criticism, to a surrender of our primary concern for truth. Ernst Troeltsch struggled more than any other historian with the problem of historicism and came to the conclusion that "historicism" must be superseded. Cf. "Historiography," in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 6(Edinburgh, 1913), 722.

p. 37 "Fifty and sixty years ago the concept of evolution dominated literary history; today, at least in the West, it seems to have disappeared almost completely. Histories of literature and of literary genres are being written without any allusions to the problem and apparently ~~na~~ with no awareness of it.

p. 51 Darwinian or Spencerian evolutionism is false when applied to literature because there are no fixed genres comparable to biological species which can serve as substrate of evolution. There is no inevitable growth and decay, no transformation of one genre into another, no actual struggle for life among genres.

p. 53 footnote. "I know of no history of evolutionism in literature. The treatment of evolutionary concepts in historiography and philosophy in Ernst Troeltsch, Der Historismus und seine Probleme (Tubigen, 1922), is most illuminating. etc.

p. 256 f. "In Europe, especially since the first world war, there has been a revolt against the methods of literary study as practiced in the second half of the nineteenth century: against the mere accumulation of unrelated facts, and against the whole underlying assumption that literature should be explained by the methods of the natural sciences, by causality, by such external determining forces as are formulated in Taine's famous slogan of race, milieu, moment. In Europe, this nineteenth-century scholarship is generally called 'positivism': a convenient label which is, however, somewhat misleading, as by no means all older

3.31 Source
 3.21
 scholars were positivists in the sense of actually believing in the teachings of Comte and Spencer. If we analyze the state of scholarship at the beginning of the twentieth century, we recognize that the reaction since the twenties has been directed against three or four fairly distinct traits of traditional literary studies. There is, first, petty antiquarianism: "research" into the minutest details of the lives and quarrels of authors, parallel hunting, and source digging - in short, the accumulation of isolated facts, usually defended on the vague belief that all these bricks will sometime be used in a great pyramid of learning. It is this characteristic of traditional scholarship that has elicited most derisive criticism, but it is in itself, a harmless and even useful human activity which dates back at least as far as the Alexandrian scholars and the medieval monks. There will always be pedants and antiquaries; and their services, properly sifted, will always be needed. However, a false and pernicious "historicism" is frequently connected with this "factualism": the view that no theory or no criteria are needed in the study of the past and the view that the present age is unworthy of study or is inaccessible to study by scholarly methods. Such an exclusive "historicism" has justified a refusal even to analyze and criticize literature. It has led to a complete resignation in face of all aesthetic problems, to extreme skepticism, and hence to an anarchy of values. The alternative to this historical antiquarianism was late nineteenth-century aestheticism: it stresses the individual experience of the work of art, which is, without doubt, the presupposition of all fruitful literary study, but which in itself can lead only to complete subjectivism. It cannot bring about such a formulation of a systematic body of knowledge as will, necessarily, always remain the aim of literary scholarship. This aim was sought after by nineteenth-century scientism, by the many attempts to transfer the methods of natural science to the study of literature. This was the intellectually most coherent and respectable movement in nineteenth-century scholarship. But also here we have to distinguish several motives: one was the attempt to emulate the general scientific ideals of objectivity, impersonality, and certainty - an attempt, on the whole supporting pre-scientific factualism. Then there was the effort to imitate the methods of natural science by a study of causal antecedents and origins which, in practice, justified the tracing of any kind of relationship as long as it was possible on chronological grounds. Applied more rigidly, scientific causality was used to explain literary phenomena by determining causes in economic, social, and political conditions. Other ~~xxx~~ scholars tried even to introduce the quantitative methods of science: statistics, charts, and graphs. And finally there was a most ambitious group which made a large-scale attempt to use biological concepts in the tracing of the evolution of literature. Ferdinand Brunetiere and John Addington Symonds conceived of the evolution of genres on the analogue of biological species. Thus students of literature became scientists, or rather would-be scientists. As they were late in the field and handled an intractable material, they were usually bad or second-rate scientists who felt apologetic about their subject or only vaguely hopeful about their methods of approach. This is certainly a somewhat oversimplified characterization of the situation of literary scholarship around 1900; but I dare say we all recognize its survivals today, in America and elsewhere.

All of this chapter on "The Revolt Against Positivism in Recent European Literary Scholarship", pp. 256 - 281 should be read.

N.B. the reference on page 264 to "pure antiquarianism, which, with the method of the new "bibliography" (textual and "higher" criticism, mostly of Shakespeare) as practiced by W. W. Greg and Dover Wilson, became very influential in recent decades

- p. 359-60 of the chapter on "Trends of Twentieth Century Criticism "
The New Criticism . . . has, no doubt, reached a point of exhaustion . . .
The historical perspective remains very short. Literary history is neglected.
The relations to modern linguistics are left unexplored with the result that
the study of style, diction, and meter remains often dilettantish. . . .
There seems time for a change.
- p. 360 Myth criticism. . . . whole groups of critics have tried to discover the
original myths of mankind behind all literature: the divine father, the
descent into hell, the sacrificial death of the god, etc. . . . In the U. S.
→ myth criticism can be described as the most successful attempt to replace the
New Criticism. It allows, the discussion of subject matter, of
folklore, of themes and content that were slighted by the New Critics.
(The Method has its dangers . . . and many of the writings of Wilson Knight
. . . are open to such objections)

René Wellek, A HISTORY OF MODERN CRITICISM: 1750-1950

Volume 4 The Later Nineteenth Century. Yale University Press 1965

Page 143:

H. M. Posnett's Comparative Literature (1886), the first book in English expressly devoted to that subject."

"But the main exponent of an evolutionary literary history in Victorian England was John Addington Symonds, whom we shall discuss in detail later."

ff "In Symonds we see naturalism rampant: literary history became a branch of biology. Page 141:

"Historicism radiated mainly from Germany and was felt first in classical philology and most conspicuously in theology.² Its power was strengthened, though its direction and spirit was changed with the victory of Darwinian evolutionism in the sixties."

Footnote 2 - page 535

"2. Cf. Klaus Döckhorn, Der deutsche Historismus in England, Göttingen, 1950"

Page 297:

Whatever the limitations of Hettner's knowledge and sensibility, his Literaturgeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts belongs to the very few great achievements in literary history during the later 19th century: it seems to me superior to Brandes' Main Currents or to Taine's English Literature, though it must yield to De Sanctis' great History of Italian Literature.

Page 301:

"In discussing Faust, Scherer tried to construct an early prose version (a theory refuted later by the discovery of the Urfaust)⁴⁹..."

Footnote 49 - page 584

"49. See Aus Goethes Frühzeit (Strasbourg, 1879), esp. p. 99: "Der prosaische Faust (1772)."

Page 352

"Historicism,' a term devised by Fuerbach in 1835 for the excess of the historical sense, is Nietzsche's particular target and is a problem which is still with us, even in the very different situation of present-day American literary scholarship."

3.21

3.86

3.21

Essays in Criticism, Vol. XVIII, Jan. 1967. Oxford.

Article in The Critical Forum on "Dr. Gardner's Dating of the Songs and Sonets,"
by A. L. French, La Trobe University, Melbourne.

p.118,119

But a brief glance at some known facts about a writer other than Donne will suggest that poets do not always develop continuously from the simple to the complex. Consider what would happen if we tried to date Keats's The Cap and Bells without using external evidence. It would clearly be absurd to assign it to the later months of 1819, because at that time Keats was writing The Fall of Hyperion, and so we have the extraordinary spectacle of a man producing a jeu d'esprit and his most tragic work simultaneously. No: The Cap and Bells must obviously have been written earlier, perhaps in the second half of 1818, before Tom's death and the meeting with Fanny Brawne clouded the poet's temperament. Yet in point of fact we know that Keats did write the two poems at the same time - devoting, according to Charles Armitage Brown, his mornings to the one and his evenings to the other.

//

Evolution

In William S. Knickerbocker, Editor Twentieth Century ENGLISH, New York, 1946

Carl F. Strauch "The **Crisis** in Modern Literature"

"The degradation of man is the now centuries-old and ever deepening conviction that his place in the universe is not so glorious as the Middle Ages had thought; that the universe has for man neither meaning nor purpose; that, indeed, man is an animal, the natural product of a natural world." (pp. 15 and 16)

"A conflict between supernaturalism and naturalism emerged, a conflict between man's hopes for a glorious destiny and the scientific probability that, in sad truth, man's career was as unimportant as the position of the planet he inhabited." (page 16)

"Again had supernaturalism been attacked. The universe was growing cold. Man came into life without knowledge, no better than an idiot; and he was born on a planet that without purpose cut its dreary path through an unimportant segment of a meaningless universe.

"Darwin pushed the degradation further. Man was no longer to be thought of as a special creation to crown God's labors; man was, rather, an animal, the natural product of a natural world. Copernicus, Locke, Darwin -- these among others in the last four centuries have aided us in arriving at the scientific probability about man and the universe he lives in. This scientific probability, however true, is hardly flattering to our self-esteem. How cheerless the view is can be seen in this passage from the most eloquent English of the early twentieth century:

That Man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labours of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of Man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins--all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. (Bertrand Russell, Mysticism and Logic (New York, 1918) pp. 47-48)

"Only the mental life of the mature human being had escaped attack." (p. 17)

In William S. Knickerbocker, Editor Twentieth Century ENGLISH, New York, 1946

Carl F. Strauch "The Crisis in Modern Literature"

"The degradation of man is the now centuries-old and ever deepening conviction that his place in the universe is not so glorious as the Middle Ages had thought; that the universe has for man neither meaning nor purpose; that, indeed, man is an animal, the natural product of a natural world." (pp. 15 and 16)

"A conflict between supernaturalism and naturalism emerged, a conflict between man's hopes for a glorious destiny and the scientific probability that, in sad truth, man's career was as unimportant as the position of the planet he inhabited. (page 16)

"Again had supernaturalism been attacked. The universe was growing cold. Man came into life without knowledge, no better than an idiot; and he was born on a planet that without purpose cut its dreary path through an unimportant segment of a meaningless universe.

"Darwin pushed the degradation further. Man was no longer to be thought of as a special creation to crown God's labors; man was, rather, an animal, the natural product of a natural world. Copernicus, Locke, Darwin -- these among others in the last four centuries have aided us in arriving at the scientific probability about man and the universe he lives in. This scientific probability, however true, is hardly flattering to our self-esteem. How cheerless the view is can be seen in this passage from the most eloquent English of the early twentieth century:

That Man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labours of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of Man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins--all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. (Bertrand Russell, Mysticism and Logic (New York, 1918) pp. 47-48)

"Only the mental life of the mature human being had escaped attack." (p. 17)

In William S. Knickerbocker, Editor Twentieth Century ENGLISH, New York, 1946 (Cont'd)

"Then came Freud, and with his magic wand he transformed the brain into a menagerie of wild and ferocious beasts. The degradation of man was now complete. Supernaturalism was dead. The universe was meaningless. Man was an animal. And his brain was the abiding place of horror and madness." (p. 18)

"It is as though modern writers, turning to those who have revealed the scientific probability, exclaimed, 'Look! These are the grim results in everyday life of the civilization we have inherited from you.'" (p. 18)

"Hemingway's characters took to lusting and drinking and fighting to escape, in the round of animal pleasures, a world that would be too horrible to be confronted by a man whose vision was not blurred by alcohol. It is that horrible world that in Faulkner's novels we confront without consolation, without satisfaction, without drink." (p. 19)

"Beyond this dismal point--enduring a meaningless and savage world--the degradation of man cannot go." (p. 20)

"But who has not been aware that since the beginning of this unhappy century the vigorous, not to say ferocious, enterprise of our civilization has increasingly called forth a literature of attack and indictment?" (p. 20)

In William S. Knickerbocker, Editor Twentieth Century ENGLISH, New York, 1946 (Cont'd)

"Then came Freud, and with his magic wand he transformed the brain into a menagerie of wild and ferocious beasts. The degradation of man was now complete. Supernaturalism was dead. The universe was meaningless. Man was an animal. And his brain was the abiding place of horror and madness." (p. 18)

"It is as though modern writers, turning to those who have revealed the scientific probability, exclaimed, 'Look! These are the grim results in everyday life of the civilization we have inherited from you.'" (p. 18)

"Hemingway's characters took to lusting and drinking and fighting to escape, in the round of animal pleasures, a world that would be too horrible to be confronted by a man whose vision was not blurred by alcohol." It is that horrible world that in Faulkner's novels we confront without consolation, without satisfaction, without drink." (p. 19)

"Beyond this dismal point--enduring a meaningless and savage world--the degradation of man cannot go." (p. 20)

"But who has not been aware that since the beginning of this unhappy century the vigorous, not to say ferocious, enterprise of our civilization has increasingly called forth a literature of attack and indictment?" (p. 20)

801
W719e

Literary Criticism A Short History by William K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Cleanth Brooks. New York, 1957

(Wimsatt and Brooks are both professors of English at Yale University)

The book has no reference to "higher criticism" in the Contents or Index but makes mention of The Historical Method in both.

p. 366

There were strong developments in a kind of antiquarianism which was to have special import for methods of literary scholarship.¹ At the same time, a general broadening and deepening of historical interest worked into more exalted notions about the nature of literature. One early continental source, though during the romantic period it was not influential,² was the New Science of Vico (1725) expounding the patriarchal and monarchic origins of human thought and institutions.³ Similar trains of ideas appear in 18th-century books on Homer,⁴ such as those in English by Thomas Blackwell (1735) and Robert Wood (1769), leading up to Friedrich Wolf's thesis that the Homeric epics are put together from a number of smaller poems handed down by oral recitation.⁵ From the time of Herder on, the appreciation of various folk and Gothic literatures and the comparative study of ancient, eastern, and modern foreign literatures (the criticism of literature by age and race)⁶ were strongly established, . . .

p. 532

The notion of a rigorously historical study of literature had, it is true, a long neo-classic and classic ancestry. Yet this kind of study flourished during the 19th century as never before. It will be sufficient for present aims merely to allude to the union of Bentleian and Wolffian classical philology with Scriptural hermeneutics under the leadership of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Schleiermacher, the further transfer of these methods to modern literature in the Encyklopädie und Methodologie der Philologischen Wissenschaften of August Böckh, the Indo-Germanic philological and folklore triumphs of the brothers Grimm, and somewhat later in France, the resuscitation of the epic cycles and romances by such French scholars as Léon Gautier and Gaston de Paris.

p. 540

3.26

Near the end of a long career as translator and popularizer of classical epic and as custodian of native balladry, Andrew Lang wrote a book on the vexed question about the authenticity of the Border Minstrelsy which Sir Walter Scott had assembled from such authorities as Mrs. Brown of Falkland and James Hogg the Ettrick Shepherd. And what of Sir Walter's own role as a ballad maker? Of one thing Lang was sure.

If it [Auld Maitland] is a bad ballad, such as many people could compose, then it was not by Sir Walter.³

In short, authorship guaranteed quality, and by a legitimate manipulation of the hypothetical syllogism implied, quality was at least a necessary condition for the imputation of authorship. So far as this was a focus on the literary work itself, rather than on external types of information about it, the argument might find its classical analogues. "I wouldn't believe Cicero had written this way," said Bentley, "even if Cicero himself should swear he had."⁴ Cicero might have dreamed he had written that way, or he might simply not have remembered not having done so. So far as the emphasis is on the means of establishing who wrote something, the preference in a given case for internal over external evidence is neither peculiarly classical nor peculiarly post-romantic.⁵

⁵ Cf. Thomas Warton's insistence on the internal and aesthetic evidence against the authenticity of the Rowley poems (An Enquiry into the Authenticity of the Poems Attributed to Thomas Rowley, London, 1782, p. 90).

Literary Criticism A Short History by William K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Cleanth Brooks

p. 540

But it will be noticed that Bentley's statement is a greater hyperbole; it contemplates the extreme of discountenancing the very testimony of the author himself about his own writing. The basic supposition on which Lang and his generation were working was the opposite. Clear, irrefutable external testimony that Sir Walter was the author of a ballad would have elicited from Lang the admission that it was a good ballad. Criticism would be merely the finding of praise in support of the poetic value necessarily entailed by authenticity.

p. 541
542

A sceptical attitude toward scholarship became fashionable in England early in the 20th century and discouraged all but the less reflective kinds of anti-querianism and the whimsical essay in the "art of praise." Within the field of critical writing in English, it has remained indeed for American scholarship during the 20th century to carry some of the anti-critical trends which we are about to describe to their most systematic extremes.

In America during even the first decades of the 20th century, academic literary criticism was less warmly colored by romantic personalism and the art of praising. Although a Bliss Perry, a William Lyon Phelps, and later a Henry Seidel Canby did appear and flourish, American literary study was much more inclined than the British to borrow rigors from the methods of German philology and in general to undertake a respectful emulation of feats being performed in the laboratories of physical science. The literary scientist tried to set up the rules of his experimental procedure with sober and neutral precision. Consider, for instance, Professor L. A. Sherman of the University of Nebraska. In a series of notes appearing in the periodical Science during 1889, he read that conclusions about the average number of words per sentence used by a given author should not be based on a sampling of fewer than many thousands of sentences. Inspired by this conception, he counted the number of words per sentence for all five volumes of Macaulay's History of England and demonstrated a "consistent numerical . . . average," of 23.43 words per sentence.

Here, then, in this 23.43 was the resultant of the forces which had made Macaulay's literary character.¹

In 1876 the Johns Hopkins University had been founded expressly for the purpose of introducing upon the American scene the graduate seminar on the German model. In 1883 was organized the Modern Language Association of America, which in 1927 voted to change the original definition of its purpose, "the study of modern languages and literature," to a phrasing more consonant with what had long before become its actually dominant purpose, the "advancement of research in the modern languages and literatures." (It was only in 1950 that the members of the Association voted to add to their constitutional statement of purpose the word "criticism.") A new era of American literary studies was carried in triumphantly by a massive conflux of motives which might be named separately as (1) respect for German philology, (2) a native American desire for facts and scientific precision, (3)

p. 543

. the romantic German stress on origins and the evaluation of literature as national or racial physiognomy.²

p. 544

But the course of literary scholarship during the past twenty-five years both in America and in England has been remarkable for the variety and mixture of its historical and historico-critical drives. One of the most complicated contributions during this period from the historical side has been an American

Literary Criticism , Wimsatt and Brooks

p. 544 version of Geistesgeschichte,⁷ the new school of the History of Ideas, initiated by Professor A. O. Lovejoy and represented in his numerous essays in the Journal of the History of Ideas which he founded in 1940.

(Footnote 7 Wellek, loc. cit. (i.e. "Literary Scholarship," in American Scholarship in the Twentieth Century, ed. Merle Cutri, Harvard University Press, 1953, ~~xxx~~) p. 119 points out that the form of Geistesgeschichte cultivated in Germany during recent decades was a reaction against positivistic philology. Among the few direct echoes of that movement in America was the hostile Academic Illusions, 1933, by Martin Schütze)

p. 548 There is a passage in the Practical Criticism of I. A. Richards in which he argues that the date when a poem was written "cannot by itself settle its genuineness, in the sense of its sincerity." But it is good "presumptive evidence." A poet may well enough "write an entirely sincere poem in the manner of a different age, but on the whole the probability is strongly against it."

(Footnote 5 Practical Criticism (New York, 1935), p. 77. "It is impossible," writes Victoria Sackville West, "to imagine, even after allowing for changes of diction, a Gray's 'Elegy,' or an 'Ode on Intimations of Immortality,' still less a 'Prelude,' or a 'Paradise Lost,' as the product of the twentieth century I do not believe that even a great poet, were one to arise, could or would move upon the place or breathe the air of Milton and Wordsworth. This is simply another way of saying that sublimity has gone out of fashion" (Tendencies of Modern English Poetry, quoted by H. W. Garrod, Poetry and the Criticism of Life, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, p. 13).

Epilogue

p. 731 The past fifteen years on the critical front have seen several new, or newish, large claims making headway The most academic of the new claims, the most professional, the most scholarly, is that relatively new kind of graduate school study that seeks to substitute for the poem, not the author, as in former more romantic phases of historicism, but precisely and deliberately the audience for which the author may in any sense be proved to have written the poem. If we look back to the mid-18th century and the first clear start of the modern historical method in such documents as Thomas Warton's Observations on the Faerie Queene, Bishop Hurd's Letters on Chivalry and Romance, or even Samuel Johnson's Preface to Shakespeare, we note that their sympathy for the Gothic or the Elizabethan ~~hesitates~~ somewhat between a plea for tolerance of antique authors, . . . , and a plea for appreciation of the inspirational opportunities afforded by those very ages. But the decisive concept ~~of~~ for the time was personal "genius." That is, criticism was on the side of Shakespeare in spite of his handicaps. In the 19th century, there were nationalism, folklorism, and cultural determinism, the race, milieu, and moment of Taine's History. But literary studies still tended to marshal such interests rather squarely behind the author. That is, they were important because they showed the mind of the author, what made him write the way he did. . . . Despite the somewhat contrary cultural massiveness of Courthope's History of English Poetry, it is mainly right to say that English and American literary

Literary Criticism, Wimsatt and Brooks

- p. 732 research continued until fairly recent years to be a pursuit of the author, his whole history, both internal and external, and his habitat. It requires perhaps only a tilt of the mirror to turn the habitat into the author's audience. . . . But to shift the accent of value in academic research . . . was yet another step, and it has been a fairly recent one. Until recently it was the normal aim of academic research to be able to announce: "And thus we prove what the author was trying to say," "thus we prove his learning and accuracy," "thus we prove his sincerity," or "thus we prove his deep feeling." But the new mode, one which is more comprehensive and difficult, and has yet advanced so little as to have perhaps a large and dangerous future, seems to entertain the aim of announcing: "And thus we prove that the author's poem was addressed to the audience of his day, or to the real audience, or to the audience that mattered." "Thus he knew what he was doing, and thus he was a good author."
- p. 733 Here we have the most imposing of the several recent critical trends. Surely the hugest cloudy symbol, the most threatening, of our last ten or fifteen years in criticism is the principle of criticism by myth and ritual origins.
- p. 734 The three main trends of recent criticism which we have just sketched - that toward the audience, that toward gross structure, and that toward myth - have in common a horizontal or folkways alignment (in contrast, for instance, to the vertical and aristocratic alignment of the neoclassic formalism). All three show to some degree the didactic and evangelizing interest which was prepared in the 19th-century socio-real tradition.

WELLEK, RENE, Confrontations studies in the intellectual and literary relations between Germany, England, and the United States during the nineteenth century (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.) 1965

p. 98 "National physiognomy" is a term used by Herder - the great preacher of literary nationalism - who elaborates on the spirit of an age and an epoch.⁴⁵ Nationalism in literary history had been faint and scarcely self-conscious in England, but it began to be voiced strongly at the beginning of the nineteenth century, largely in the context of folk-poetry. But Southey, for instance, objected strongly to Pope's and Thomas Gray's scheme for a history of English literature because they ignored the fact that the English have a "costume and character of their own." He speaks of the "home-growth" of English verse and calls English literature "coloured by the national character, as wine of different soils has its raciness."⁴⁶ Carlyle, in the passage quoted, formulates this ideal of literary history more clearly and more fully than anyone before him in England. This conception for a long time determined the ideals of literary history, in England and elsewhere: it permeates the books of Henry Morley, which tell the history of English literature as a story of national ethics. And even W. J. Courthope's History of English Poetry (1895-1910), though very un-Carlylean in its critical views, is governed by the idea of a history of literature as that of the national ⁹⁹ / mind, which he conceives as most clearly expressed in its political ideas and institutions. There is here no occasion to discuss the obvious dangers of these conceptions of literary history: their stress on nationalism to the exclusion of the common tradition of Western European literature, or the preoccupation with the ideological implications of literature to the exclusion of its artistic function and development. Carlyle only formulated an ideal program which he cannot be said to have attempted to carry out himself on any scale.

44 Schlegel, op. cit., p. xviii.

45 "Nationalphysiognomie" in Herder, Werke, op. cit., XIII, 365; cf. XIX, 148, "Nationalseele," e.g. III, 30. See Lempicki, loc. cit.

WELLEK, RENE, Confrontations (Princeton University Press) 1965

p. 137 In every way, De Quincey's view of Greek religion was unhistorical, as it denied a continuity between religions and the universality of the religious experience. His views on other questions of classical philology were equally anti-romantic, e. g. his attack on the Wolfian / ¹³⁸ theory of the collective authorship of the Homeric epics. There he again depended on ammunition from German scholars: from Voss, Ilgen, and especially Nitzsch. ⁸⁵

⁸⁵ "Homer and the Homercidae" in Masson, VI, 7-95. Most of the arguments seem to come from Gregor Wilhelm Nitzsch's (1790-1861) contributions to the Allgemeine Encyclopädie (see Masson, VI, 16). De Quincey knew also Karl Ilgen's edition of the Homeric hymns (ibid., VI, 30-32). Some account of these scholars is in J. E. Sandys, History of Classical Scholarship (Cambridge, 1908), III, 63-64, 105, etc.

We still have left untouched De Quincey's ideas on social evolution in relation to literature and the necessary passage from a poetry of passion to a literature of manners. Its derivation is very different from the passage on Christian versus Classical poetry. De Quincey's interpretation of the Classical-Christian contrast associates him with conservatism, Christian Romanticism, though some of the anti-Classical arguments seem strongly tinged by rationalism. His scheme of social evolution is, however, merely an echo of eighteenth-century speculations on the development of society and literature. The idea that poetry developed from an age in which it expressed elemental passions to an age in which it reflected society and manners is one of the hoariest commonplaces of eighteenth-century criticism. It is part and parcel of the viewpoint which we are accustomed to label primitivism.

p. 142 What has been called the "organology" of German Romanticism has distinct features which set it off from eighteenth-century ideas of development: its concept of evolution is very different from that of the eighteenth century, or that of positivistic sociology. It is not a complex of complications of psychological processes, but the evolution of individualities and individual totalities which have a ~~single~~ ⁹⁹ single center, the Volksgeist.

WELLEK, RENE, Confrontations (Princeton University Press) 1965

p. 142 Footnote 99.

For German historiography, ideas of development, etc., cf. E. Rothacker, Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften (Tubingen, 1920); E. Troeltsch, Der Historismus und seine Probleme (Tubingen, 1922); and F. Meinecke, Die Entstehung des Historismus, 2 vols (Munich, 1936). Since, see my essay "The Concept of Evolution in Literary History" in Concepts of Criticism (New Haven, 1963) first published in 1956; and J. Kamerbeek, "Legatum Velleianum" in Creative Wedijver (Amsterdam, 1962).

In De Quincey no use is made of these ideas, and whenever he encounters some of their implications, such as the interpretation^{p. 143} of the Homeric epics in Wolfian terms, he rejects them violently. To call any and all interpretation of literature in connection with social development "organic" is a blurring of distinctions which does not serve any good purpose. Nor is the "organic" conception particularly modern and scientific. Its lineal descendant, the German Geistesgeschichte, is open to very grave objections. 100

Footnote 100. Cf. my "Parallelism between Literature and the Fine Arts" in English Institute Annual, 1941 (New York, 1942) pp. 29-63.

De Quincey shows precisely no grasp of organic unity as we get it in Coleridge and, for a certain time, in Carlyle. He is rather echoing schematic, rationalistic formulas of the universal history as it was constructed in the eighteenth century.

p. 153 Footnote 1.

Since this paper was written, Henry A. Pochmann, in his German Culture in America (Madison, Wis., 1957), has accumulated much new material, and Stanley M' Vogel, in German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists (New Haven, 1955), has touched on the problem in a wider context.

p. 155 An actual motive for the study of German thought was supplied only the the New England theologians, who became interested in German Biblical scholarship long before the earliest migrations of American students to German universities after the end of the Napoleonic wars. As early as 1806, the Reverend Joseph Stevens Buckminster, later pastor of the Brattle Street Church at Cambridge, brought a library of some three thousand German books from Europe and started to lecture on Biblical criticism at Harvard College. Buchmister died young and apparently left few traces of his interests.⁶

⁶ The Dictionary of American Biography

WELLEK, RENE, Confrontations (Princeton University Press) 1965

p. 155 (cont'd) But Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature at Andover Theological Seminary, must have been a far more influential figure. In 1812 he encouraged his young friend Edward Everett to translate Herder's Letters on Theology; and in 1814, when Everett went on a trip to New York, Stuart asked him to buy German books. He wanted him especially to get a "copy of Kant's philosophy," whatever that may mean, which "would be a great curiosity."⁷ He used Rosenmüller and de Wette in his classroom and in 1822 translated from the Latin a book called The Elements of Interpretation by the German J. A. Ernesti. In 1825 he underwent investigation for his views by the trustees of his college. The Committee reported that "the unrestrained cultivation of German studies has evidently tended to chill the ardor of piety, to impair belief in the fundamentals of revealed religion, and even to induce for the time, an approach to universal skepticism."⁸ But Stuart continued with his work, and as late as 1841 sent a spirited defense of German Biblical scholarship to the Christian Review. The work done by other figures, such as Dr. Convers Francis and James Walker, both students of German theology, still needs exploring.

Footnote 7. O. W. Long, Literary Pioneers (Cambridge, 1935: hereinafter "Long"), 237, note 6

Footnote 8. Daniel Day Williams, The Andover Liberals (New York, 1941), p. 17 p. 157 Thus, Clergymen who studied German Biblical scholarship and Kant appear to have made the first contact with modern German thought.

The role of the American students who returned from Germany has been, it seems to me, extremely overrated, at least for our question. Edward Everett, who was to procure that copy of Kant's philosophy for Moses Stuart, studied classical philology in Göttingen. Everett was President of Harvard from 1846 to 1849, but no interest /^{p. 158} in German philosophy is recorded in his life except an abortive plan to give an address on "the influence of German thought on the contemporary literature of England and America," in 1837.¹¹

Footnote 11. O. W. Long, Literary Pioneers (Cambridge, 1935), p 75

WELLEK, RENE, Confrontations (Princeton University Press) 1965

p. 170 George Ripley and Theodore Parker present a striking contrast to Alcott in their attitude toward German philosophy. Both were Unitarian clergymen who found in German thought additional support for their liberal religious convictions. Ripley was the more timid and also the more orthodox of the two. His early writings praise Herder and Schleiermacher ³⁸ "the greatest thinker who ever undertook to fathom the philosophy of religion" ³⁹- and his own thought seems to agree in every way with this professed sympathy.

Herder →

Footnote 38 Review of James Marsh's translation of Herder's Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, in the Christian Examiner, XVII (1835), 167-221; "Herder's Theological Opinions and Services," ibid., XIX (1835), 172-204; and "Schleiermacher as a Theologian," ibid., XX (1836), 1-46. Also Ripley's "Letters to a Theological Student" (written in December 1836) in the Dial, I (1840), recommends Herder highly (1.187).

p. 172 Theodore Parker was both a bolder mind and man and a greater scholar than Ripley; but in our context he is nearest to Ripley, though he drifted further from the moorings of the church. Parker early studied German Biblical criticism and theology and translated a two-volume Introduction to the New Testament by de Wette, a liberal German theologian who was a follower of Fries and thus remotely of Kant. Parker's learning in German scholarship, theological, historical and literary, was really imposing, though the long strings of indiscriminately jumbled names in an article in defense of the German literature in the Dial ⁴⁶ arouse some suspicions whether his knowledge, at least at that time, was always so thorough and firsthand as it seems. In this long and able article, which is ostensibly a review of Menzel's History of German Literature, little is said of German philosophy, though Parker calls Menzel's views on Kant "exceedingly unjust" and recognizes the political /bias of his attacks on Hegel. ⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Dial, I (1841), 315-39. Reprinted in Parker's Critical and Miscellaneous Writings, second edition (New York, 1864), pp. 28-60

p. 173 The next year, 1843, Parker went to Germany, called on de Wette in Basel and other theologians, and heard Werder, a Hegelian, lecture on logic in Berlin. The performance seemed to him merely ridiculous, as did Schelling, whom he heard lecture on

WELLEK, RENE, Confrontations (Princeton University Press) 1965

p. 173 (cont'd) the philosophy of revelation.⁴⁸ After his return, Parker became immersed in German theology, jurisprudence, ecclesiastical history, and later, of course, the cause of abolitionism. He thus never returned to German philosophy proper. But in the fine confessions of faith which he wrote to his parishioners from Santa Cruz when on his last voyage to Italy in 1859, he confessed his debt to Kant, "one of the profoundest thinkers in the world, though one of the worst writers, even of Germany."

Footnote 48. H. S. Commager, Theodore Parker (Boston, 1936), pp/ 95-96

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy, and early Biblical Tradition (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge) 1966

n. 7 For a long time, and often with little logical or experimental basis, the theory of evolution was developed simply by drawing analogies through homology. In the late 1920's and early 1930's Russian scientists believed that they had discovered a new kind of radiation originating in cell division, which they termed "mitogenetic radiation."
An international congress was held on the subject in 1935,^{n. 8} but now the theory has been abandoned by all except possibly a few intractable East European scientists. The reason is simple: the theory was developed on the analogy of the fission of physical atoms and molecules, and never had any experimental basis. Earlier, in the world of physics, "N-rays" had been similarly imagined on the analogy of light. Prosper-Rene Blondlot of University of Nancy claimed that he had discovered radiation to which glass was opaque and which passed through substances opaque to light. He further claimed that the diffusion of these "N-rays" was governed by the same laws that govern the diffusion of light. His views were rapidly gaining acceptance when the famous American optical physicist Robert Williams Wood, who was present at one of Blondlot's experiments, removed the lens. The experiment proceeded unaffected and produced the same results. That was the end of N-rays -- the analogy had proved worthless.

An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, A. H. McNeile. 2nd ed.
rev. by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford, 1953

p. 58 It may not be going too far to apply to Form-critical views

mutatis mutandis what John Drinkwater¹ wrote about our ballads:

We need have nothing to do with the fantastic notion that they [the ballads] were by some unexplained process communal productions. A poem must be written by a poet and that is all there is about it. These poems, surviving as they did from generation to generation by oral tradition alone, doubtless underwent many modifications in the process, but that has nothing to do with the question, which with rational people cannot be a question at all.

¹English Poetry, p. 78

See 3.11 Guerard, Albert, Preface to World Literature, 1940-57
3.21-23¹ . . . The Faust legend and the William Tell saga had survived
humbly until the end of the eighteenth century. But it would be a
mockery to assert that they automatically assumed definite shape,
that they 'got themselves written down.' somehow, by scribes known
as Goethe and Schiller."

See 3.12 Encyclopedia Americana, 1966 ed. "Homer"

See 3.41 Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, Vol I p. 133, 179
Historical character of events previously considered mythological

Communal theory of origin of ballad today discredited

"The communal theory, most thoroughly developed by F. B. Gummere . . . held that the ballad was old ("pre-epic"), that it was closely associated with dance and ritual, and that it was composed by improvisation by a dancing, singing, throng, inspired by events in their common experience. George L. Kittredge later modified this theory by the addition of the idea that the improvised ballad was made under the guidance of a leader who exercised control over, and gave direction to, the efforts of the "dancing ^{throng} ~~throng~~." Today the communal theory is generally discredited. We know that the ballad is not primitive; that, being narrative, it had little to do with dance; and that its complicated dramatic structure could never have been arrived at by improvisation.

"Many scholars before and after Gummere have demonstrated that the ballad is the product of individual composers. (Collier's Encyclopedia, 1963; Vol.III, p. 492)

492 BALLAD

strels and were closely related to the romances. But through the nineteenth century, beginning with Jakob Grimm's famous phrase, *das Volk dichtet*, some, especially Continental scholars, came to believe that the folk as a communal group composed the ballads.

The communal theory, most thoroughly developed by F. B. Gummere in such books as *The Beginnings of Poetry*, held that the ballad was old ("pre-epic"), that it was closely associated with dance and ritual, and that it was composed by improvisation by a dancing, singing throng, inspired by events in their common experience. George L. Kittredge later modified this theory by the addition of the idea that the improvised ballad was made under the guidance of a leader who exercised control over, and gave direction to, the efforts of the "dancing throng." Today the communal theory is generally discredited. We know that the ballad is not primitive; that, being narrative, it had little to do with dance; and that its complicated dramatic structure could never have been arrived at by improvisation.

Many scholars before and after Gummere have demonstrated that the ballad is the product of individual composers. Opinions differ as to who these individuals were, but probably no one category of writer, such as the minstrel, was solely responsible. No one (not even the communalists) has ever denied that a number of ballads were composed by the minstrels, or that the later broadsides and stall ballads were composed by hack-writers, poetasters, and the like. To these we would add: churchmen, musicians, professional poets like Henryson, Scott, and Burns, and above all, the folk poets, those individuals found in any folk group who have skill in turning a verse, in making a song, and also in

singing it. The latter not only did much to create but they have also had ballads in their keeping, singing, and handing them down to their successors. An example is the blind singer of "Chevy Chase" who entranced Sir Sidney.

Why then are ballads folk songs if they are made by individuals? The answer is that the folk have their way with them, that in the long period in oral tradition the hands of folk singers have put their stamp upon the original, adding elements, changing, deleting, restyling—in short, making them folk re-creation. The result is that the end product are far removed from the originals, and they have been developed into multiple versions, each reflecting its particular experience in the folk re-creation process.

Subject Matter of the Ballads. The following categories generally cover ballad story: ballads using material from folklore and superstition; historical ballads; pseudo-historical ballads; ballads of the border; Robin Hood and other outlaw ballads; ballads concerned with medieval legends of miscellaneous themes and backgrounds.

A number of the finest ballads use folklore. "Yankee Doodle" is based on a story of a young man taken by the Indians and rescued by a girl who loves him. "Thomas the Rhymer" recounts the visit of a mortal to fairyland. "Kemp and Alison Gros" use the loathly lady theme. Revolutions and ghosts appear in many ballads; notable are "The Gunpowder Plot," "Sweet William's Ghost," and "The Cruel Mother." Talking birds, magic worked by objects like rings, and various plants, such as bent and broom, and many magic charms are common. A ballad particularly rich in many older folk beliefs and rituals is "Johnny Cock."

CECIL SHARP, noted English collector of ballads and folk songs, and his associate Maud Karpeles, shown taking down a song from a singer in the Kentucky mountains. Sharp found some tunes of English origin surviving in America that were undiscoverable in England.



Many events. The Chase, an Eleanor's one would ballad always and the singer. Border stories of border, a Sir Walter These are Noble as Robin Hood's unique in celebrated ballads of Hood in Hood's simple melody. Ro (1377) as exclusive got the stories on re-creation story, per Middle A about meth support a Certain of Robin the early developed exists on hero—out ing woin ing the and there Marian 15 century ballads de beaten in century caught of tales. Fro hero of th A few mes an Bor and have roo pheas sw ballads us and seven Carol' b his birth apocryph Herod' and crow of it.

"Ballad" Encyclopedia Britannica, 1956
 by Geo. Gregory Smith, Prof. of English Literature, Queen's University,
 Belfast, N. Ire., 1909-30. Author of Scottish Literature: Character and
 Influences.

Was not till the beg. of 19th C. that the foundation of study of ballads was truly laid in Great Britain.

Question of Authorship

1. Ballads were transmitted orally
2. Are all anonymous
3. In diction and metre they are separate from all traditional literary expressions.
4. Analogues in foreign literature point to some ancient genre to which tests of literary origin do not apply.

Percy, Ritson, Scott and all the collectors and editors were of opinion that the ballads were work of minstrels and were derived from earlier and more "literary" work. Abridgements of the ancient metrical romances, narrated in a smoother stanza and more modern language.

In 1800 in Germany, A. W. Schlegel held that ballads were not made for the people, but "in a certain manner... by the people as a whole". The brothers Grimm advanced the generalization, with no hint of evidence, that early Folk in its communal strength actually assumes the function of poet.

Prof. Child's Theory never surrendered the individualist and literary position. Was of a communal nature. The most whole-hearted supporter of the communal theory has been Prof. F. B. Gummere who ~~claims~~ ^{views} the ballad as evidence of a co-operative folk-intelligence, first expressing itself in dance and choral song. Andrew Lang sought to strengthen this view. Prof. Kittredge restates the communal arguments. He allows an initial creation by an individual author but holds that "the processes of oral tradition amount to a second act of composition" - "a collective composition" - "of an inextricably complicated character" which is not to be identified with the corruption by scribes and editors of a classical text. He claimed that the composition is not a solitary act but oral improvisation before an audience "in close emotional contact" He describes "the supposedly inconceivable phenomenon of a unanious throng composing poetry with one voice" and so passed ~~Child's~~ Child's theory.

In 1895 W. J. Courthope protested against the "vague idea" that "as the ballad is before all things popular in its character, it was evolved in some mysterious ~~way~~ manner out of the genius and traditions of the people themselves." His view was endorsed by T. F. Henderson who concluded that "the lyric-epic did not originate amongst what is usually termed the folk" but was the concern of high-born folk and in its later history is a tale of decadence with the common people. Prof. G. Gregory Smith calls it "part of the literary debris of the middle ages". Recent opinion is more and more inclined to follow this opinion and to oppose the claims of the folklorists.

The latest attack on the positions held by Profs. Gummere and Kittredge was made in 1921 by Prof. Louise Pound

Communal Verses Individual Authorship. Theory of communal origin fails... In Scotland and Denmark the ballads were the concern of "upper classes". The recital of pieces in the Complaynt of Scotlande excludes all sugges-

3.01

- omu -

can be recognized. Comparison of a traditional version of "Riddles Wisely Expounded" (no. 1 C in the Child collection, taken down from recitation by William Motherwell early in the 19th century) with the 17th-century broadside copy in the collection made by Samuel Pepys (Child no. 1 A) reveals the false notes of supposed elegance and rectitude that the broadside poetaster is responsible for. The bathos of phrasing, the latinate vocabulary, the abstract terms, the moralizing conclusion, the intrusion of the "maker" into the song, all these are marks of an alien influence on traditional verse.

The widespread story of a revenant coming on horseback to seize and carry off his grieving love in a wild ride to his grave exists in English in a broadside form under the title "The Suffolk Miracle." Since it was such a fine ballad in other European tongues, Child included it in his collection in spite of thinking that it might "be classed with the vulgar prodigies printed for hawkers to sell and for Mopsa and Dorcas to buy." This ballad has since Child's time been collected from tradition in variants markedly superior to the earlier known broadside. Whether the oral texts are derived ultimately from the broadside printings of the 17th century is hard to say; Phillips Barry thought that the Scotch-Irish oral tradition of this ballad was independent of the broadside and doubtless older. "The Suffolk Miracle" demonstrates the relations of broadside printing and a tradition of song orally transmitted. Printing has crossed oral tradition, and probably few ballads are free of this helpful crutch to memory and the editing and "improving" that printing has usually entailed. The tale of "The Suffolk Miracle" was turned by Gottfried August Bürger (q.v.) into the famous literary ballad "Lenore," thus illustrating the other contact between the popular ballad and literature. At the end of the 18th century men of letters developed a great interest in folk song. The term "ballad revival" is used to describe this interest, which ranged in time from Percy to Scott. The literary ballad became a fashion with the romantic school in Germany and Great Britain particularly. The language of the common man, the narratives of wonder and superstition, the four-lined stanza, these became hallmarks of a poetic tradition that Herder, Goethe, Scott, Coleridge, Keats and others derived from the ballads.

The Study of Ballads.—The main activity in ballad study since the beginning of the 19th century has been collecting and editing. Collecting may be a separate task, as in field collecting (often with phonograph or tape recorder). The fruits of such collecting increase the holdings of such repositories as the Folk Song archive of the Library of Congress, the libraries of the British Broadcasting corporation and of Cecil Sharp house in London, Das Deutsche Volksliedsarchiv in Freiburg, and Dansk Folke-minde-samling in Copenhagen, to name only a few. The editor is also a collector, however; Grundtvig and Child thought of themselves primarily as collectors, although the first great analytical contributions are also found in their editions. Collections are made in libraries as well as in the field. There have been three main phases in this era of collection. The first extends to the mid-19th century. It is characterized by the gentleman amateur preserving "reliques of antiquity" for a "polished age," atoning for rudeness of style and taking liberties with the text. The second period is the age of emergence of scrupulous editing and scientific scholarship; it is dominated by the work of Grundtvig and Child. In this period the significance of the variant is recognized. The third era results from Sharp's insistence on the music as of equal importance with the text. There has been a comparable scholarly development in other lands, although the Anglo-American, Danish and German ballads are more adequately edited and pre-

with the application of the evolutionary principle of the ballad regarded as the primal protoplasm. There were many attacks on the communalists, the most direct being that by Louise Pound in her *Poetic Origins and the Ballad* (1921). The "ballad war" proved of value primarily because of its by-products: scholars came to understand ballad style and language better, they perceived differences in narrative structure, they documented such stylistic devices as "incremental repetition" and they examined all the external historical evidence available. A balanced position between the communalists and the individualists is that taken by G. H. Gerould, summed up by the phrase "communal re-creation," by which is stressed the shaping effect of oral transmission.

Other major concerns of scholars include cataloguing and classifying of the materials collected and the preparation of bibliographic aids for further study; study of individual ballads and their changes through time; analysis of international connections and the dissemination of ballads. But ballads are not of interest only to the scholar; since the 1930s the general public has been receptive to a growing avalanche of recorded ballad music that bespeaks a 20th-century ballad revival. *Discographies* (lists of recordings) appear in most modern editions of ballads. The new and wide interest in ballads raises new questions of classification and judgment of performance and of the song performed—the authentic as opposed to the commercialized folk song, purism as opposed to eclecticism.

See **FOLK DANCE; FOLKLORE; FOLK MUSIC; see also Index** references under "Ballad" in the Index volume.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—Works mentioned above and the following; *General Collections*: Helen Child Sargent and G. L. Kittredge (eds.), *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (1904, an abridgement of Child's 5 vol.); Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Ballads* (1910); MacEdward Leach (ed.), *The Ballad Book* (1955); Albert B. Friedman (ed.), *The Viking Book of Folk Ballads* (1956). *Bibliographic Aids*: Tristram P. Coffin, *The British Traditional Ballad in North America* (1950); G. Malcolm Laws, *Native American Balladry* (1950); M. Dean-Smith, *A Guide to English Folk-Song Collections, 1822-1952* (1954). *Descriptive handbooks*: F. B. Gummere, *The Popular Ballad* (1907, 1959); G. H. Gerould, *The Ballad of Tradition* (1932); Evelyn K. Wells, *The Ballad Tree* (1950); M. J. C. Hodgart, *The Ballads* (1950); MacEdward Leach and Tristram P. Coffin (eds.), *The Critics and the Ballad* (1961). *Music*: Cecil J. Sharp, *English Folk-Song: Some Conclusions* (1907); Samuel P. Bayard, "Prolegomena to a Study of the Principal Melodic Families of British-American Folk Song," *Journal of American Folklore*, 63:1-44 (1950). *International Connections*: W. J. Entwistle, *European Balladry* (1939); Archer Taylor, 'Edward' and 'Sven i Rosengard' (1931); Holger O. Nygard, *The Ballad of 'Heer Halewijn'* (1958). *Histories of Ballad Scholarship*: S. B. Hustvedt, *Ballad Books and Ballad Men* (1930); Erik Dal, *Nordisk Folkeviseforskning siden 1800* (1956); D. K. Wilgus, *Anglo-American Folksong Scholarship since 1898* (1959); Albert B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival* (1961). (H. O. N.)

BALLADE, a fixed form of verse best exemplified in French literature, allowing considerable variation within precise limits and capable of great complication (*ballade laie; ballade triple; ballade balladant; ballade équivoque, rétrograde et léonine*). Basically it consists of three stanzas and an envoy, the final lines of each stanza and of the envoy being identical (the refrain). The whole poem is constructed on three or four rhymes, masculine and feminine mixed, for preference, recurring in the same order in each stanza, the rhymes of the second part of the stanza being repeated in the envoy. These rules, gradually evolved from Guillaume de Machaut (c. 1300-1377) onward, are set out in Jean Molinet's *Art et Science de Rhétorique* (printed in 1493), where it is further laid down that the length of the stanza is determined by the number of syllables in the refrain. An eight-syllable refrain, for example, requires eight-line stanzas; thus a

ballade, and La
regarder ballades ex
teous jadis" of wh
Dieter
Est Fl
Archip
Qui fu
Echo j
Dessus
Qui be
Mais c

and the envoy:
Prince
Ou ell
Qu'a e
Mais a

The ballade had its
veloped toward its
to reach its most e
and 15th centuries
it flourished and b
cent Ballades occas
shorter line). Eust
the number of lines
Charles d'Orléans f
five-syllable lines).
Pisan and Henri B
doubted master of
Marot, Mme. Ant
Vincent Voiture an
attacked by Moliè
disfavour. It was
Banville, whose Tr
imitators.

In no other lang
form found favour.
were written, with
by English poets, in
surviving ballades,
gate. After the
written in English
were reintroduced.
*Lyrics of Old Fran
vive the ballade in
Prodigals" (1876)*
Swinnburne and Ro
Villon; and by Ed
time ballades were
were even more p
Brander Matthews
20th century G. K

See G. Lote, *Histo*

BALLAD OP
where it originated
in the nature of a
mainly confined to
dialogue, was based
to which new word
from the works of
one of the earliest
satire on content
by John Gay with

3.26-6b
"Ballade"
See Appendix
Encyclopedia Britannica, 1965 -
Vol. III, p. 22

duplicate

BALLADE

commercial presses almost from the time of the earliest printers. From the 16th to the 19th centuries there is a horde of such ephemeral verse, much of it of interest only to the historian and student of popular taste. The printing of traditional ballads on such broadsides preserved copies of songs or variants of songs that might otherwise have been lost. The poetasters on occasion reworked the substance of ballads for printing, and their handiwork can be recognized. Comparison of a traditional version of "Riddles Wisely Expounded" (no. 1 C in the Child collection, taken down from recitation by William Motherwell early in the 19th century) with the 17th-century broadside copy in the collection made by Samuel Pepys (Child no. 1 A) reveals the false notes of supposed elegance and rectitude that the broadside poetaster is responsible for. The bathos of phrasing, the latinate vocabulary, the abstract terms, the moralizing conclusion, the intrusion of the "maker" into the song, all these are marks of an alien influence on traditional verse.

The widespread story of a revenant coming on horseback to seize and carry off his grieving love in a wild ride to his grave exists in English in a broadside form under the title "The Suffolk Miracle." Since it was such a fine ballad in other European tongues, Child included it in his collection in spite of thinking that it might "be classed with the vulgar prodigies printed for hawkers to sell and for Mopsa and Dorcas to buy." This ballad has since Child's time been collected from tradition in variants markedly superior to the earlier known broadside. Whether the oral texts are derived ultimately from the broadside printings of the 17th century is hard to say; Phillips Barry thought that the Scotch-Irish oral tradition of this ballad was independent of the broadside and doubtless older. "The Suffolk Miracle" demonstrates the relations of broadside printing and a tradition of song orally transmitted. Printing has crossed oral tradition, and probably few ballads are free of this helpful crutch to memory and the editing and "improving" that printing has usually entailed. The tale of "The Suffolk Miracle" was turned by Gottfried August Bürger (*q.v.*) into the famous literary ballad "Lenore," thus illustrating the other contact between the popular ballad and literature. At the end of the 18th century men of letters developed a great interest in folk song. The term "ballad revival" is used to describe this interest, which ranged in time from Percy to Scott. The literary ballad became a fashion with the romantic school in Germany and Great Britain particularly. The language of the common man, the narratives of wonder and superstition, the four-lined stanza, these became hallmarks of a poetic tradition that Herder, Goethe, Scott, Coleridge, Keats and others derived from the ballads.

The Study of Ballads.—The main activity in ballad study since the beginning of the 19th century has been collecting and editing. Collecting may be a separate task, as in field collecting (often with phonograph or tape recorder). The fruits of such collecting increase the holdings of such repositories as the Folk Song archive of the Library of Congress, the libraries of the British Broadcasting corporation and of Cecil Sharp house in London, Das Deutsche Volksliedsarchiv in Freiburg, and Dansk Folke-mindesamling in Copenhagen, to name only a few. The editor is also a collector, however; Grundtvig and Child thought of themselves primarily as collectors, although the first great analytical contributions are also found in their editions. Collections are made in libraries as well as in the field. There have been three main phases in this era of collection. The first extends to the mid-19th century. It is characterized by the gentleman amateur preserving "reliques of antiquity" for a "polished age," atoning for rudeness of style and taking liberties with the text. The second period is the age of emergence of scrupulous editing and scientific scholarship; it is dominated by the work of Grundtvig and Child. In this period the significance of the variant is recognized. The third era results from Sharp's insistence on the music as of equal importance with the text. There has been a comparable scholarly development in other lands, although the Anglo-American, Danish and German ballads are more adequately edited and presented for scrutiny than those from elsewhere.

During the early part of the 20th century there took place a fierce scholarly debate, now only of historical interest, on the

origin of ballads. The case for a communal origin of ballad poetry, championed by Gummere, was based on the assumption that ballads represent that variety of spontaneously created poetry that a throng might produce in co-operative dance and ritual observance. His ideas were compounded of too narrow an interpretation of German romantic asseverations like Uhland's *die Völker dichten*, (too literally read by Gummere as "the folk compose"), together with the application of the evolutionary principle to literature with the ballad regarded as the primal protoplasm. There were many attacks on the communalists, the most direct being that by Louise Pound in her *Poetic Origins and the Ballad* (1921). The "ballad war" proved of value primarily because of its by-products: scholars came to understand ballad style and language better, they perceived differences in narrative structure, they documented such stylistic devices as "incremental repetition" and they examined all the external historical evidence available. A balanced position between the communalists and the individualists is that taken by G. H. Gerould, summed up by the phrase "communal re-creation," by which is stressed the shaping effect of oral transmission.

Other major concerns of scholars include cataloguing and classifying of the materials collected and the preparation of bibliographic aids for further study; study of individual ballads and their changes through time; analysis of international connections and the dissemination of ballads. But ballads are not of interest only to the scholar; since the 1930s the general public has been receptive to a growing avalanche of recorded ballad music that bespeaks a 20th-century ballad revival. Discographies (lists of recordings) appear in most modern editions of ballads. The new and wide interest in ballads raises new questions of classification and judgment of performance and of the song performed—the authentic as opposed to the commercialized folk song, purism as opposed to eclecticism.

See FOLK DANCE; FOLKLORE; FOLK MUSIC; see also Index references under "Ballad" in the Index volume.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—Works mentioned above and the following: *General Collections*: Helen Child Sargent and G. L. Kittredge (eds.), *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (1904, an abridgement of Child's 5 vol.); Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Ballads* (1910); MacEdward Leach (ed.), *The Ballad Book* (1955); Albert B. Friedman (ed.), *The Viking Book of Folk Ballads* (1956). *Bibliographic Aids*: Tristram P. Coffin, *The British Traditional Ballad in North America* (1950); G. Malcolm Laws, *Native American Balladry* (1950); M. Dean-Smith, *A Guide to English Folk-Song Collections, 1822-1952* (1954). *Descriptive handbooks*: F. B. Gummere, *The Popular Ballad* (1907, 1959); G. H. Gerould, *The Ballad of Tradition* (1932); Evelyn K. Wells, *The Ballad Tree* (1950); M. J. C. Hodgart, *The Ballads* (1950); MacEdward Leach and Tristram P. Coffin (eds.), *The Critics and the Ballad* (1961). *Music*: Cecil J. Sharp, *English Folk-Song: Some Conclusions* (1907); Samuel P. Bavington, "Prolegomena to a Study of the Principal Melodic Families of British-American Folk Song," *Journal of American Folklore*, 63:1-44 (1950). *International Connections*: W. J. Entwistle, *European Balladry* (1939); Archer Taylor, "Edward" and "Sven i Rosengard" (1931); Holger O. Nygard, *The Ballad of 'Heer Halewijn'* (1958). *Histories of Ballad Scholarship*: S. B. Hustvedt, *Ballad Books and Ballad Men* (1930); Erik Dal, *Nordisk Folkeviseforskning siden 1800* (1956); D. K. Wilgus, *Anglo-American Folksong Scholarship since 1898* (1959); Albert B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival* (1961). (H. O. N.)

BALLADE, a fixed form of verse best exemplified in French literature, allowing considerable variation within precise limits and capable of great complication (*ballade laie; ballade triple; ballade balladant; ballade equivoque, retrograde et leonine*). Basically it consists of three stanzas and an envoy, the final lines of each stanza and of the envoy being identical (the refrain). The whole poem is constructed on three or four rhymes, masculine and feminine mixed, for preference, recurring in the same order in each stanza, the rhymes of the second part of the stanza being repeated in the envoy. These rules, gradually evolved from Guillaume de Machaut (c. 1300-1377) onward, are set out in Jean Molinet's *Art et Science de Rhétorique* (printed in 1493), where it is further laid down that the length of the stanza is determined by the number of syllables in the refrain. An eight-syllable refrain, for example, requires eight-line stanzas; thus a possible four-rhyme pattern for a *huitain* would be *ababcdD* or *ababdcD*. François Villon does not always observe this correspondence between syllables and lines (e.g., in his "Ballade et

Oraison...
both French and
Villon; Chaucer
four to seven line
"La grisse Marce
"Prue" for some
judge. This is
nor always with
doctrine, and
regular ballades
temps jadis" of

and the envoy
Prue
Of the
Of a
Man

The ballade had
veloped toward
to reach its most
and 15th centur
it flourished
cent Ballades
shorter line). E
the number of li
Charles d'Orle
five-syllable li
Pisan and Hen
doubted master
Marot. Mme. An
Vincent Voiture
attacked by M
disfavour. It
Banyville, whose
imitators.

In no other
form found fav
were written, w
by English poet
surviving ballad
gate. After the
written in Eng
were reintrodu
*Lyrics of Old Fra
vive the ballad
Prodigals" (18
Swigburne and
Villon; and by
time ballades
were even im
Brander Matt
20th century
See G. L. Kittred*

BALLAD OPI
where it origina
in the nature
mainly confined
dialogue was
to which now
from the work
one of the
a satire on a
by John Gay
had many im
composed by
uel Arnold, 17

Encyclopaedia Britannica

Vol. III

1965

3,26-7a

P.O.

Songs composed and sung by individuals and songs sung by groups of singers (or "thongs," if you prefer) are to be found in the most primitive of living tribes. That in the earliest stage there was group utterance only, arising from the folk-dance, is fanciful hypothesis. That primitive song is of group composition or collaboration, not individual composition, is quite fanciful.

Pages 154-155

When it is affirmed that improvising folk-thongs created the literary type appearing in the English and Scottish ballads of the Child collection, pieces like The Hunting of the Cheviot, the Robin Hood pieces, Sir Patrick Spens, Lord Randal, etc., the affirmation is pure--and not too plausible--conjecture. We have to do with long finished narratives, obeying regular stanzaic structure, provided with rhyme, and telling a whole story--pretty completely in older versions, more reducedly in the later. To assume that ignorant uneducated people composed these, or their archetypes, having the power to do so just because they were ignorant and uneducated, finds no support in the probabilities. There is strong doubt that a "choral throng, with improvising singers, is not the chance refuge, but rather the certain origin, of the ballad as a poetic form." There is still stronger doubt of the "acknowledged aptitude of the older peasant for improvisation and spontaneous narrative song," or of a statement like this: "There can be no question, then, of the facts. Popular improvisation at the dance has been the source of certain traditional lyric narratives." The following position is somewhat qualified from the preceding but it, too, represents conjecture rather than what is demonstrable: "The characteristic method of ballad authorship is improvisation in the presence of a sympathetic company which may even, at times, participate in the process. Such a description is in general warranted by the evidence though it cannot be proved for any of the English and Scottish popular ballads." The author "belonged to the folk, derived his material from popular sources, made his ballad under the inherited influence of the manner described, and gave it to the folk as soon as he had made it."

52. Gummere, Cambridge History of English Literature, II, p. 456: Old English Ballads, p. 312; The Popular Ballad, p. 25

53. Kittredge, Introduction to English and Scottish Ballads, p. xvii. This view associating the origin of the English and Scottish ballads with the gathered folk-throng and improvisation has many adherents. It is the view to be found in our best known and most accessible books treating the ballads, like Professor Gummere's The Beginnings of Poetry, The Popular Ballad, and Democracy and Poetry, and it appears in the Cambridge History of English Literature and in the Kittredge and Sargent one-volume edition of the Child ballads, and it seems to have been accepted by F. E. Bryant, A History of English Balladry, 1913. Besides the many authors holding it who have been mentioned in preceding pages, it has the support of Professor G. M. Miller, Dramatic Elements in the Popular Ballads, University of Cincinnati Studies in English (1905), and apparently of Professor C. Alphonso Smith, Ballads Surviving in the United States, The Musical Quarterly, II, 116. There are dissenters from it here and there, whose work may be found in special articles. Among them was W. W. Newell, the distinguished folk-lorist (see Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. 13, p. 113). But the theory of communal origin and emergence, with its emphasis on improvisation, retains the strategic position in literary histories and in special school editions of the ballads.

3.26 - 7th

duplicate

Louise Pound, POETIC ORIGINS AND THE BALLAD, 1921, 1948, 1962

Page 25

"Songs composed and sung by individuals and songs sung by groups of singers (or 'thongs,' if you prefer) are to be found in the most primitive of living tribes. That in the earliest stage there was group utterance only, arising from the folk-dance, is fanciful hypothesis. That primitive song is of group composition or collaboration, not individual composition, is quite fanciful."

Pages 154-155

"When it is affirmed that improvising folk-thongs created the literary type appearing in the English and Scottish ballads of the Child collection, pieces like The Hunting of the Cheviot, the Robin Hood pieces, Sir Patrick Spens, Lord Randal, etc., the affirmation is pure--and not too plausible--conjecture. We have to do with long finished narratives, obeying regular stanzaic structure, provided with rhyme, and telling a whole story--pretty completely in older versions, more reducedly in the later. To assume that ignorant uneducated people composed these, or their archetypes, having the power to do so just because they were ignorant and uneducated, finds no support in the probabilities. There is strong doubt that a 'choral throng, with improvising singers, is not the chance refuge, but rather the certain origin, of the ballad as a poetic form.' There is still stronger doubt of the 'acknowledged aptitude of the older peasant for improvisation and spontaneous narrative song,' or of a statement like this; 'There can be no question, then, of the facts. Popular improvisation at the dance has been the source of certain traditional lyric narratives ~~THESE~~ The following position is somewhat qualified from the preceding but it, too, represents conjecture rather than what is demonstrable: 'The characteristic method of ballad authorship is improvisation in the presence of a sympathetic company which may even, at times, participate in the process. Such a description is in general warranted by the evidence though it cannot be proved for any of the English and Scottish popular ballads.' ~~53~~ The author 'belonged to the folk, derived his material from popular sources, made his ballad under the inherited influence of the manner described, and gave it to the folk as soon as he had made it.'"

52. Gummere, Cambridge History of English Literature, II, p. 456; Old English Ballads, p. 312; The Popular Ballad, p. 25

53. Kittredge, Introduction to English and Scottish Ballads, p. xvii. This view associating the origin of the English and Scottish ballads with the gathered folk-throng and improvisation has many adherents. It is the view to be found in our best known and most accessible books treating the ballads, like Professor Gummere's The Beginnings of Poetry, The Popular Ballad, and Democracy and Poetry, and it appears in the Cambridge History of English Literature and in the Kittredge and Sargent one-volume edition of the Child ballads, and it seems to have been accepted by F. E. Bryant, A History of English Balladry, 1913. Besides the many authors holding it who have been mentioned in preceding pages, it has the support of Professor G. M. Miller, Dramatic Elements in the Popular Ballads, University of Cincinnati Studies in English (1905), and apparently of Professor C. Alphonso Smith, Ballads Surviving in the United States, The Musical Quarterly, II, 116. There are dissenters from it here and there, whose work may be found in special articles. Among them was W. W. Newell, the distinguished folk-lorist (see Journal of Americal Folk-Lore, vol. 13, p. 113). But the theory of communal origin and emergence, with its emphasis on improvisation, retains the strategic position in literary histories and in special school editions of the ballads.

Louise Pound, POETIC ORIGINS AND THE BALLAD, 1921, 1948, 1962

Page 236

"This is not very solid ground and it is hardly likely that the next generation of scholars and students will linger upon it. Belief in the origin of the mediaeval ballads by communal improvisation in the dance, and belief in the extinction, with mediaeval conditions, of the ballad as a literary type, seem to the present writer to have emerged from and to belong to a period of criticism which deliberately preferred the vague and the mystical for all problems of literary and linguistic history--mythological explanation of the Beowulf story, multi-handed composition of the Homeric poems, mystical theories of the origin of language. These originate in romance but they readily fade in a literal, anti-romantic period like our own."

Evolutionary Historicism Discredited

See 5.2-29¹⁰,30 Kraeling on Diestel

The Ballad Book, edited by MacEdward Leach (New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., Inc.)

Copyright, 1955, by Harper & Brothers

be

p.29

p. 28 The whole matter is uncertain and probably it will never/fully determined when the type of narrative we know as ballad was first put to music and so became narrative folk song. At any rate, the ballad form as we know it emerged toward the end of the Middle Ages. There is no evidence whatever that would put ballads in English back in the Old English period. Epic lays like the "Battle of Brunanburgh" and the "Battle of Maldon" are not ballads, although some scholars have confused them with this form. There is a strong possibility that the Scottish and English ballad was an import from Denmark. Many of the Danish ballads did drift into Scotland. More "international" ballads are to be found in Scotland than in England, suggesting a general drift from the Continent to Scotland and thence to England.

But enough of speculation. We know that ballads about Robin Hood were being sung in the fourteenth century - if we can trust the references in Piers Plowman. We have texts of Robin Hood ballads from the fifteenth century. A few other ballads were written down in that century, but most of the English ballads - the texts - belong to the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, or even nineteenth centuries. What should be stressed here is that the ballad as a form, as a distinct genre, with the characteristics we have outlined above, emerged in England and in most of western Europe in the late Middle Ages and that in this form the ballad continued to be composed and to exist in diminishing numbers through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. New versions of the oldest ballads are still being found today in America.

Many nineteenth-century scholars, basing their ideas on the fact that the ballad embodies folklore and old folk culture and that it uses techniques of old folk poetry, such as iteration, assumed that it originated in a primitive state of society. As a result, there developed first in Germany the communal theory of ballad origin, the belief that the folk as a group composed ballads as a kind of general group activity and hence that group improvisation is the key to ballad origin.

Today, however, most students of the ballad, realizing that the ballad is by no means primitive but late medieval, believe that it originated pretty much like any other form of art, by creation of individuals. The communal theorists were constantly led astray by lack of precise definition. When they found refrain and iteration in a savage song that asked the local god for rain, they noted that the ballad also had the refrain and iteration and hence they were inclined to see this as a mark of primitivism in ballads, a suggestion that the ballad was a remnant of primitive culture. Basically the difficulty probably stemmed from the fact that most of these theorists were studying the ballads in terms of a romantic philosophy, instead of studying them realistically in the field.

p. 30

The best argument against the communal theory is the body of facts that support individual authorship. We have quantities of analogical evidence of the individual composition of ballads. In sections where ballads are being made today, such as Cape Breton, the southern Appalachian Mountains, the Hebrides, Newfoundland, it is invariably a community singer who made the story-song. We have considerable evidence too of the origin of American ballads, those narrative folk songs that have spread all over the country: "Springfield Mountain," "Young Charlotte," "Casey Jones," and the like. All without exception were composed by individuals and bequeathed by them to the folk. This is what one would expect. Even a primitive community very soon develops the song and story specialist; in the heroic age the making of song and story was firmly in the hands of the most competent individuals.

next page

The Ballad Book, edited by Mac Edward Leach (New York: A.S. Barnes & Co., Inc.)

Copyright, 1955, by Harper and Brothers.

p. 30 The scop creates; the bleeman carries the song; and people receive it. What we have said about Ballad meter, style, subject matter, and treatment should indicate that no group of people could be so skillful, so integrated as to produce such song poetry. One needs only to read "Mary Hamilton" or "The Unquiet Grave" or "Child Waters" or "Sir Patrick Spens" to know that poets and skillful artificers were behind these ballads.

The Author

MacEdward Leach is a graduate of the University of Illinois, and a Pennsylvania Ph.D. He has taught at the University of Pennsylvania since 1921. His major interest for many years has been ballads and folklore. He has done a great deal of the field work, collecting ballads and folklore, in such places as Newfoundland, Cape Breton, the Smoky Mountains, and the Blue Ridge. Since 1940 he has served as secretary of the American Folklore Society. He is author of Amis and Amiloun, Methods of Editing Medieval Texts, and many articles on ballads and folklore.

Ballads

3.29-3

Chambers, E. K., English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages (Oxford at the Clarendon Press) 1945

It must be admitted that most of the collectors of Scottish ballads, who were inspired by the Reliques, were lovers of poetry rather than exact scholars, and did not refrain from completing for themselves pieces which had reached them from singing or recitation in a fragmentary condition. Sometimes, too, they were tempted to 'correct' what they found unintelligible. This is true even of Sir Walter Scott, in his Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border (1802-3), the fruit of ten years' hunting among the farms of Liddesdale. The worst offenders have generally been taken to be Peter Buchan and the blind stroller James Rankin, who supplied him with the material. Mr. Keith has recently done something to rehabilitate the reputation of these worthies. It is fortunate, however, that some of the texts, upon which Scott and others worked, have also been preserved in the form in which they were originally taken down.

An edition of Percy's Reliques was printed at Göttingen in 1767, and led to much German speculation on the distinction already made in the sixteenth century by Montaigne, between popular poetry and the poetry of art. J. G. von Herder translated a number of the ballads, and apparently introduced the term Volkslied. In an essay on Homer he wrote of an age when in the mouths of the people heroic traditions 'of themselves took on poetic form', but was careful to make it clear that by 'the people' he meant the whole of a race and not merely 'the rabble of the streets'. He was followed by A. W. Schlegel, who wrote less cautiously of ballads, 'Deren Dichter gewissermassen das Volk im ganzen war'. And in later German speculation the notion of composition by the folk took on a more mystical form. This was largely due to the activity of the brothers Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm, although the phrase Das Volk dichtet, in which their theory is often summed up, does not appear to have been actually used by either of them. But Jakob Grimm certainly committed himself to the view that 'every epos must compose itself, must make itself, and can be written by no poet'. Later he admitted that the exact process by which the self-composed epic came into existence was not quite clear to him.

Epic poetry is not produced by particular and recognized poets, but rather springs up and spreads a long time among the people themselves, in the mouth of the people--wie man das nun näher fasse.¹

Wilhelm Grimm applied his brother's theory, rather more cautiously, to the ballad. And now Schlegel, in spite of his own earlier utterance, protested. Every poem, he held, implies a poet. Legend and epos and song might well belong to the people as their property; but the making of this verse was never a communal process. Later the controversy was renewed in connexion with the origin of Scandinavian ballads. Ferdinand Wolf insisted that they were made 'von einem dichtenden Subjekt', and not 'von einem nebulösen Dichteraggregat, Volk genannt', but was countered by Svend Grundtvig with

Darum ist das Volks-Individuum als solches, nicht das einfache Menschen-Individuum, als Dichter der Volkspoesie zu betrachten.

And there, for a while, the issue between communalists and individualists may rest.

1. 'However we may interpret this phrase more precisely.'

BALLADS

Chambers, E. K., English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages (Oxford at the Clarendon Press) 1945

Page 179

Professor Entwistle's account of the effect of oral transmission is much the same as Professor Gerould's:

Composed in common form, the ballad becomes at once common property, like a fairy-tale or legend. The author has no copyright, and the ballad only exists by virtue of each successive performance when it is what the performer makes it. It is not that ballads were, as the Romantics insisted, the product of the community working as a creator. Artistic creation under such conditions would be impossible; each ballad has its author and its moment of birth.

Page 174

But the growing interest, during the last half of the nineteenth century, in the 'folk' and its ways of life and thought led to a revival of the old German theory of Das Volk dichtet. A protagonist was Andrew Lang, himself a learned folklorist, who set out his views, with much poetic enthusiasm, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (1875):

Ballads sprang from the very heart of the people, and flit from age to age, from life to life, of shepherds, peasants, nurses, of all that continues nearest to the natural state of man. They make music with the flash of the fisherman's oar, with the hum of the spinning-wheel, and keep time with the step of the ploughman as he drives his team. The whole soul of the peasant class breathes in their burdens, as the great sea resounds in the shells cast up from its shores. Ballads are a voice from secret places, from silent places, and old times long dead. It is natural to conclude that our ballads too were first improvised and circulated in rustic dances.

This is perhaps sufficiently answered by the quiet irony of George Meredith in The Amazing Marriage (1895), where Dame Gossip's 'notion of a ballad is, that it grows like mushrooms from a scuffle of feet on grass overnight'. But in the meantime Lang's enthusiasm had become rather subdued. In his preface to a selection of ballads for Ward's The English Poets (1887) he says no more than:

About the authors of the ballads, and their historical date, we know nothing. Like the Volkslieder of other European countries, the popular poems of England were composed by the people for the people.

And in an article of 1904 he seems to have abandoned his theory of communal origin altogether. But the doctrine which he expounded with such fervour in 1875 and so discreetly let drop, found a congenial home later in democratic America.

The Bible in Modern Scholarship, edited by J. Philip Hyatt (Abingdon Press: Nashville) 1965. Papers read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Dec. 28-30, 1964.

George E. Mendenhall Response to Roland de Vaux's "Method in the Study of Early Hebrew History."

p. 32 On the other hand, biblical history today is in a predicament analogous to that of nuclear physics; our fundamental historical particles of data derived very largely from archaeological excavations are far too ^{numerous} numerous to fit into the received picture of early Hebrew history, either of religious or academic tradition. The nineteenth-century ideas about the evolution of culture are still deeply engrained into the "collective unconscious" of biblical scholars, as are also concepts of cultural change which constitute a very serious handicap to further progress. The sedentarization of nomads, for example, is an historical process appealed to for explanation by both biblical scholars, and ancient orientalist; it illustrates the pitfalls involved in the correlation of biblical with extrabiblical evidence, for if scholars in both fields are working with the same erroneous assumption, there will arise a confidence in results which it may take a century to rectify. The principles which apply to biblical history apply also to the extra-biblical evidence, and method consists first of all in the careful examination of the specific data. Historical generalizations must be derived from the concrete evidence, not imposed upon it. . . .

It is no longer possible to treat early Israel as a primitive, unsophisticated group of cultureless barbarians who gradually became civilized. The historical context of Israel's emergence was not that of outside barbarians inundating the civilized land of Canaan - the very historicity of the patriarchal traditions is the best proof of this.

p. 33 Probably most historians now have a deep distrust of a priori concepts of historical development; but since working hypotheses are inevitable, it is necessary that every aspect of the hypothesis be checked to determine that it is actually a cultural feature of the ancient peoples and their ways of thought and behaviour, not ours.

Albright, W. F., New Horizons in Biblical Research (London: Oxford) 1966

p. 39

"The best known representatives of the two positions today are perhaps Rudolf Bultmann,¹ who emphasizes the Greek elements at the expense of the Jewish, and Frederick Grand,² who insists on the Jewishness of the New Testament."

1. "The best all-round picture of Bultmann's thought in this connexion is to be found in his Theology of the New Testament, London, 1952

2. Cf. F. C. Grant, The Gospels, New York, 1959

p. 41 Footnote 1

Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, New York, 1960

p. 42

New Testament studies of the late 1940's and of subsequent years among the followers of Bultmann, like the critical views of twenty, thirty, and forty years ago, have been characterized by evolutionary historicism. This scheme spreads the New Testament books over a period of eighty to one hundred years, very roughly between 50 and 150 A.D., depending on the scholar and the amount of up-to-date evidence that he will accept. Within such a period there is plenty of room for the development of ideas, but it proceeds according to an arbitrary, unilinear system of evolution."

p. 45

"An important new Aramaic targum of the Pentateuch has come to light in the Vatican Library, more recent than some of the Aramaic translations of the Bible among the Dead Sea Scrolls, but two or three centuries older than any previously known targum. In it the 'Word' of God appears as a surrogate for the name of God, Yahweh."

Albright, W. F., New Horizons in Biblical Research (London: Oxford) 1966

p. 32

"But the Bible has already 'demythologized' its source material by excising myths or by taking certain mythical elements in their corresponding empirical form, and using them in the service of a higher religious vision."

p. 33-34

"It is just as incongruous to say that the New Testament (or rabbinic literature or the Old Testament) is mythological because God and heaven are depicted as being 'up', as it is to say that a person believes in a geocentric universe because he speaks of the sun rising in the east and setting in the west. Nor are contemporary theologians necessarily speaking in mythological terms when they call religion 'the dimension of depth'."

"We should not be justified in supposing, for example, that tehôm, the great deep of Genesis 1, is a monster by that name, as Tihāmtu was in earlier Canaanite mythology. Such allusions no more indicate belief in the reality of the original bearers of the names, than does our use of the word 'cereal' express faith in the goddess Ceres. The Bible uses a number of names of ancient gods and goddesses as common nouns. Astarte has become 'sheep-breeding'; Shulman, the god of healing, has become 'good health'; another deity has given his name to the oak-tree; another to the terebinth; another to wine. These are all instances of demythologizing."

p. 34-35

"~~Marxism~~, which is developed by an ostensibly logical form of Hegelian dialectic reasoning, is based on an artificial structure of postulates and assumptions, many of which would be accepted by few. It is the apparent solidity of the logical superstructure that has convinced a great many of the correctness of conclusions which ultimately derive from thoroughly defective postulates. If we made proper use of empirical logic, that substructure would never be constructed. So it is with most of our modern ideologies."

Page 9

"The rest of Genesis contains traditions of historical character, though still of course going back to oral tradition. The significance of the latter is that oral material takes on certain fixed forms designed to ensure the preservation of features which might otherwise drop out. There were also aids to memory which were interspersed through oral compositions to draw attention to the meaningful content of words and names, and to associate a given tradition with the correct persons and places; such mnemonic aids are called aetiological."

Page 11 - Footnote 1

"On the early patriarchal age, cf. especially Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 163 (1961), pp. 36-54, and also the writer's The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra, Harper Torch Book (New York, 1963), pp. 1 ff. There will be further material in the author's forthcoming Jordan Lectures (University of London) for 1965 (Canaan, Phoenicia and Israel) to be published by McGraw-Hill. Recent attempts to telescope the patriarchal and Mosaic periods, dating Abraham about 1400 and the Exodus about 1200, are quite unnecessary. Ancient and modern Arab genealogies, together with similar examples from Rhodesia, Hawaii, as well as from many other places, usually start with the putative ancestors of the clan. After several generations there are long gaps, followed by the latest ten generations or so--the generations in between are omitted without explanation. Historical analogy suggests that the same may be true of the Biblical genealogies, and that in fact, as all our other evidence indicates, there was an interval of several centuries between the earliest patriarchal period and the time of Moses."

W. F. Albright, New Horizons in Biblical Research, OUP, London, 1966

Page 13

"The Mosaic period also has been considerably illuminated by archaeology. Of course, no reference to Moses has been found in any excavated document; it would be extremely surprising if one ever were found. Only a tiny proportion of all the important Egyptians and Semites living in Egypt during the thirteenth century B.C. are mentioned in any documentary source. And Moses is particularly unlikely to be mentioned, because his importance is not related in any way to Egypt but solely to the future Israel. He was the founder of Israel, including its religion, law, culture, statehood. Israel had to have a founder. Nowhere in history is there an example of such unique institutions growing up out of nothing by a process that cannot be defined, because of supposed lack of documentary attestation."

Albright, W. F., New Horizons in Biblical Research (London: Oxford) 1966

p. 17 Cf. also Chapter 3 of the author's History, Archaeology and Christian Humanism (New York, 1965), pp. 83-100

p. 18 Footnote 1: Thorlief Boman: Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek, London, 1960.

p. 21

"Benjamin Lee Whorf was a brilliant American engineer who wrote on a wide range of subjects. In particular he published a series of articles on linguistic psychology which soon became classics. His ideas were in fact highly original, and convinced many. However, they were almost entirely wrong."

p. 23-4

"We must look more closely at this primitive logic. The man of the ancient Near East developed a rigorously logical approach to many everyday occupations, to ordinary law and social practice, as well as to the arts and crafts. Thousands of years ago man had already invented innumerable devices and gadgets, processes and uses of materials--many of which were subsequently lost and often remain so today. Others have been rediscovered after decades of effort on the part of modern technicians. Many chemists, ceramists, and archaeologists have spent a large part of their lives trying to make Attic black-figured or red-figured glaze. Only now are we beginning to rediscover some of the inventions of ancient men."

p. 27 Footnote 1

"See especially a discussion of the factors involved in the Greek intellectual revolution in my forthcoming Experience on the Road to Reason, to be published by McGraw-Hill."

Slonim, Marc, "The Miracle of Dante" in the N. Y. Times Book Review, Aug. 29, 1965, p. 6.

Certainly the complexity of the "Commedia" is undeniable. It is an encyclopedia of the Middle Ages, a sum total of its wisdom, a vision of the universe, a cosmology. It is also a travelogue of a Christian soul under the guidance of pagan reason and poetry, which ends with final redemption in the bliss of eternal light, of the God-head or that Love which, to use Dante's words, "moves the Sun and other stars." But it is also a hymn to Beatrice, the woman Dante saw three times in his life and who became for him the symbol of Grace, the fount of hope.

Critics in the 19th Century saw the work as composed of dualisms, the subjective and the descriptive, the discursive and the lyrical, the allegorical and the concrete, the intellectual and the passionate. The same critics either rejected Dante, the faithful son of the church, and extolled the great creator of images and characters - or the other way around.

3,01-108

One of the most notable revelations of the 1965 celebration (((the 700th anniversary of the birth of Dante))) is the reversal of the 19th century attitude. Modern critics and scholars reject the theory of ^{antinomies} in the "Commedia" and speak of its structural unity and harmonious proportions reflecting the perfect integration of its varied components. The other evident trend is a serious effort to present Dante in his historical environment and to give a flavor of his times.

Dante still remains the most popular Italian literary figure.

Such Dantists as Auerbach, Garin, Spitzer, Nardi, Falena . . .

"Dante and His Century" by Indro Montanelli, a talented and caustic journalist, has emerged as a best seller and provoked the wrath of the Academy. Montanelli, without following the conventions of scholarship, simply wrote a vivid and highly readable survey of the 13th century in Italy, using only the authenticated facts of Dante's life and ignoring legends and conjectures. What is chiefly wrong with this much-reprinted book is that it leaves aside Dante's poetry.

The World Through Literature, Edited by Charlton Laird (Peter Owen Limited: London) 1959

"Primitive Literature" by Paul Radin, visiting professor at Kenyon College

p. 6 Footnote 4. There are few books on comparative literature which pay much attention to aboriginal peoples. The work of A. S. Mackenzie, The Evolution of Literature (New York, 1911) is rendered useless for my purposes because of the author's acceptance of many of the outworn and completely discredited clichés about the mentality of preliterate peoples. By far the best treatment, although it is incidental to the authors' main interests, is that found in the great work of H. Munroe Chadwick and N. Kershaw Chadwick, The Growth of Literatures (London, 1932-40) 3 vols. The Chadwicks are among the few historians of literature who have clearly understood the significance of the oral literatures of the great historic civilizations and evaluated them properly, thus laying the foundations for obtaining a proper perspective in approaching the study of the oral literatures of aboriginal peoples.

p. 7 Footnote 7. The best general treatment of Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian literatures, although somewhat antiquated, is still Otto Weber, Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer (Leipzig, 1907). For more recent treatment of Sumerian literature, cf. Samuel Nathan Kramer, Sumerian Mythology (Philadelphia, 1944) and the appended bibliography.

p. 38 These last few comments on language and diction bring us to the all-important question of authorship. I think we can safely dismiss all theories of communal authorship.⁷⁹ The evidence at our disposal today proves overwhelmingly that poems and prose narratives are composed by individuals, no matter how communal the setting in which they are composed. Nor is there any reason for believing that at any time in the history of the world it has been otherwise. Nothing, indeed, has caused so much mischief as this assumption and the oft-repeated German dictum das Volk dichtet.

p. 38 Footnote 79 For the classic discussion of this theory cf. Francis Barton ^{Gummery} Gummery, The Beginnings of Poetry (New York, 1901), and the excellent critique of this theory in Louise Pound, Poetic Origins and the Ballad (New York, 1921).

p. 491

Bibliographical Note

The best one-volume bibliography of world literature now available is Hanns

W. Eppelsheimer, Handbuch der Weltliteratur von den Anfängen bis zum Weltkreis (Frankfurt am Main, 1937); as its title suggests, it continues only to the first world war, and it is damaged for readers of English by the bibliography of translations being restricted largely to works in German.

. . . Guide to Comparative Literature, a critical bibliography (to be published c. 1952) . . . will have the advantage of expository and critical comments. It ^{p. 492} will include a general bibliographical intro. with emphasis upon world lit., a selected but extensive bibliography of translations into English from all languages . . .

"Chinese Literature" by Prof. Shao Chang Lee, Head of the Dept. of Foreign Studies and Director of the International Center, Michigan State College.

p. 71 Bibliography on Literary Forms and Styles

Hightower, James Robert, Topics in Chinese Literature: Outlines and Bibliographies, Yenching Institute Studies, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass. 1950)
. . . the book describes and evaluates Chinese theories of literature and the Chinese attitude toward literary composition. . .

"Indian Literature" by Prof. Philo M. Buck, Jr., teacher of world literature at the University of Wisconsin. Died Dec. 9, 1950, while this vol was in press. Proof was read by Mrs. Buck.

p. 130 Bibliography

Fraser, Robert Watson, Literary History of India (New York, 1907)
Gowen, Herbert Henry, History of Indian Literature from Vedic Times to Present Day (London, 1931).
Keith, Arthur Berrledale, Classical Sanscrit Literature (London, 1924)
-----, History of Sanscrit Literature (Oxford, 1928)
Macdonell, Arthur Anthony, History of Sanscrit Literature (London, 1926)

"The Koran" by Prof. Edwin E. Calverley of the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

p. 136 The best introduction in English to the whole of this literature is R. A. Nicholson's Literary History of the Arabs. (Cambridge, Eng., 1930) ((Also recommended are)) The Seven Golden Odes of Pagan Arabia, Known also as the Moallakat (Trans. by Lady Anne Blunt from the original Arabic; done in English verse by Wilfred Scawen Blund, London, 1885), and An Introduction to Ancient Arabian Poetry, by Charles Lyall (London, 1885; reprinted 1927)

p. 170 Browne, E. G., A Literary History of Persia (New York, 1902-24) 4 vols.

"Hebrew Literature: An Evaluation" by Eisig Silberschlag, Dean of the Hebrew Teachers College, Roxbury, Mass.

p. 180 The Sumerian paradise myth of Enki and Ninhursag antedates the biblical story of paradise, and the Code of Hammurabi is older than the Mosaic ^{code} ~~code~~. The Egyptian proverbs of Amenemope resemble the biblical Proverbs, and the ^{love} ~~song~~ songs of the Chester Beatty papyri parallel the Song of Songs. But the biblical story of Paradise, with its psychological and philosophical overtones, is a masterpiece of simplicity and grandeur; the Mosaic code is superior in ethical content to its Babylonian prototype. . . . In the dawn of their nationhood, perhaps in the fourteenth century B.C., the Jews outdistanced their Canaanite neighbors.

p. 180 Unlike the Semitic narratives of Ras Shamra and the Greek epics, the Iliad and the Odyssey, the Hebrew account of a nation, from freedom through slavery to liberation and* conquest, as recorded in the Hexateuch (the Pentateuch and Joshua), and continued in Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, is history.

p. 181 It is no accident that the Bible begins with history - Genesis - and ends with history - Chronicles. For Judaism is a historical religion: . . .

p. 182 If an entire book of the Torah, Leviticus, and sections of Exodus, Numeri, and Deuteronomy deal with laws, these, too, are a part of history, Differentiation between literary genres belongs to later ages. In ancient literatures all genres are one. The historical narrative of the Bible, interrupted by the legal narrative, is resumed with a sudden discontinuity which characterizes the modern literary techniques of a Joyce or a Stein or an Eliot. Editorial changes and emendations may have corrupted the original text of the Bible. Yet it was not written to conform to the theories of Wellhausen on the multiple sources of Hebrew literature but rather to express the ancient awe and wonder of mankind. That is why the same formula "and God said" serves as a legal preamble and an historical introduction. And the same terseness of style characterizes the legal and historical portions of the Bible. The former have been a living influence in Anglo-Saxon law, in Puritan England and America. The latter have won the admiration of the greatest literary masters of modern times, Goethe, Tolstoy, and Thomas Mann.

p. 212 Pfeiffer, R. H., Intro. to the O.T. (N.Y., 1941) An appraisal of Biblical lit. in the light of the present state of higher criticism.

Wright, G. Ernest, The Old Testament Against Its Environment (SCM Press: London) 1950

p. 14 Footnote 9 For an excellent and succinct critique of the evolutionary approach to the Old Testament, see W. Eichrodt's review of H. E. Fosdick, Guide to the Understanding of the Bible in Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXV (1946), pp. 205ff. Many similar references could be given, especially from German scholars, who reacted earlier against the older views than did the scholars of England and America; cf. H. Gressmann, Mose und seine Zeit (Göttingen, 1913). The classic attack on the assumption that the phenomena of religion, composed so largely of the 'non-rational' and the 'numinous,' can be understood merely by intellectual criteria is, of course, the work of Rudolf Otto, referred to in Note 3.

p. 10 Footnote 3 Cf. Rudolf Otto, The Idea of the Holy (London, 1931), pp. 3-4

p. 15 Quotations from Wellhausen and Edward Meyer are given
 Wellhausen: "Why Chemosh or Moab never became the God of righteousness and the Creator of heaven and earth, is a question to which one can give no satisfactory answer."
 E. Meyer: pointed out the futility of seeking an explanation in a theory of Moses' elevation of an old nature deity to a tribal god. The phrase with which the work of Moses is often described, 'Yahweh God of Israel and Israel people of Yahweh,' is a cliché without real content and which mutatis mutandis could also be used for other folk-religions. ¹³

Footnote 13. See Eichrodt, op. cit., pp. 211 f., and Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (Halle, 1906), p. 451, n. 1.

Peyre, Henry, The Failures of Criticism (Cornell University) 1967. Emended edition of Writers and Their Critics: A Study of Misunderstanding (1944)

p. 121 Nevertheless, the strangest misconceptions seem to have been aroused in the public, and in the critics who should have led the public, by their rather innocuous innovations. A clever journalist, Jules Huret, undertook in 1891 to question the leading literary personalities of France on "literary evolution." The answers of those eminent "chers maîtres" arouse our laughter today; they should rather make us pause and think that the same lack of understanding and mental laziness were opposed, at approximately the same time, to the Impressionists in painting and to the music of Debussy, and later on, to the Cubists and the Surrealists. Will our successors remember our flagrant injustice and do better?

3, 29-17
p. 17.

11/5 Much of Christianity and much of Protestantism does not accept the presuppositions of what was called Higher Criticism. New directions in biblical thought can only be understood and followed against the pattern of this uncritical acceptance of the Bible.

Ch. 2 "The Historical Question" by James M. Robinson (associate professor of theology and N.T. at Southern California School of Theology, Claremont, Calif.)

73

74

Wellhausen thus presented such an imposing synthesis of historical-critical method and the modern mind of his day that his construction took the place of the Bible's Heilsgeschichte as the point of departure for scholarship at the turn of the century and for much of the enlightened public even down to the present.

75

However, Hermann Gunkel gave a new and decisive turn to twentieth century scholarship by introducing the study of oral tradition. . . . The net result has been to overthrow the construction of Wellhausen, by tracing the roots of the post-exilic law and of the interpretation of Israel's historical origin in terms of Heilsgeschichte back into the period of Israelite origins itself. This remarkable reversal in Old Testament research can be illustrated from the work of such outstanding modern scholars as Albrecht Alt, Gerhard von Rad, and Martin Noth.

Gunkel

77

If one may state Alt's conclusion in pointed fashion, so as to place it in antithesis to Wellhausen's position, one could say that the most reliable historical fact about Abraham is his faith, and that all we know about the patriarchs is in terms of Heilsgeschichte; in the beginning was the promise, the covenant (Gen. 15). Wellhausen's "Secondary theological interpretation" has become the ~~px~~ primary historical datum.

79

Such form-criticism-critical research in the Old Testament has led to a remarkable reversal of Wellhausen's assumption as to the priority of sober historical narration and the secondary nature of the embellishment which gradually developed into the construction called Heilsgeschichte.

Rene Wellek - Concepts of Criticism - 1963

"The word 'criticism' is so widely used in so many contexts--from the most homely to the most abstract, from the criticism of a word or an action to political, social, historical, musical, art, philosophical, Biblical, higher, and what-not criticism--that we must confine ourselves to literary criticism if we are to arrive at manageable distinctions." (page 21)

3.01 'Fifty and sixty years ago the concept of evolution dominated literary history; today, at least in the West, it seems to have disappeared almost completely." (page 37)

- See ~~3.21~~ 17.10 Albright, W. F., New Horizons in Biblical Research (London:Oxford) 1966
 "Much of the source-analysis . . . based on the erroneous notion that the consonantal text remained completely unchanged"
- See 3.91-2 Gardner, Helen, The Business of Criticism (Oxford) 1959
- See 3.41 Guerard, Albert, Preface to World Literature, 1940-57
 3.21-23' "To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been able to supply."
- See 3.01 Gordis, Robt. L. The Book of God and Man (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965)
 3.01-9-13 Reaction against atomization of ancient literary documents
- See 3.21-31¹⁰ Wellek, Rene, Concepts of Criticism, p .256ff
- See ^{3.21-20} 1 Wellek, A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950 p. 397
- See 3.41 Scott, John A., The Unity of Homer
 Quotation from Van Leeuwen
- See 3.81 Hyman, Stanley Edgar, The Armed Vision
 re Dover Wilson and W. W. Greg

Myres, John L.(Sir), Homer and His Critics. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1958
 Edited by Dorothea Gray

Wolf's theory

- p. 75 Briefly stated, Wolf's theory amounted to this. In the absence of alphabetic writing, the composition of a poem as long as the Iliad or the Odyssey was unthinkable and therefore impossible. Therefore the unity of design which had hitherto been thought to exist in each of the poems resulted, not from pre-meditation or single authorship, but from the ingenuity of compilers and editors, interpreting the vague folk-memory out of which the "sequel of songs and rhapsodies", in Bentley's phrase, had sprung. Even if there had been any primary coherence, in general relation to such folk-memory, it had been for centuries at the mercy of piecemeal recitation by more or less careless professionals. Not all the primitive songs which must be thus presumed are the work of the same composer, or even of the same age; this is inferred from, and accounts for, the minor inconsistencies within the poems as we have them, but it is not possible now to distinguish between original and supplementary work. We can trace the poems to the recension of them by Peisistratus at Athens in the sixth century B.C., but no further back with any certainty.
- p.76
- p. 86 Among the learned, Wolf's Prolegomena had a mixed reception. Heyne, as we have seen, thought that Wolf had stolen his ideas. But it was some while before the real weakness of his interpretation was detected. In the first place, he underestimated the evidence for the antiquity of alphabetic writing in Greece, even as known in his time; and it was not long before his Berlin colleague, August Boeckh, set the Prussian Academy of Sciences to work to investigate this very question by the collection of whatever evidence there was in that Corpus of Greek Inscriptions which bears his name; a work as essential for the sound criticism of Homer, in this respect, as for Boeckh's own special studies in ancient economics and administration. In 1884 Wilamowitz could say that alphabetic writing is not only not so late as Wolf thought, but is in fact as early as Homer.
- p. 88 Wolf's conception, too, of schools of professional reciters with their own repertoire of traditional verse, neither rested on ancient authority . . . nor did it help his other contentions much. If there were such schools, how did it come about that the traditional poetry was in such fragmentary disorder as the theory of a Peisistratid Recension presupposed? And whence did they derive their traditional materials? For Wolf seems to have conceived them rather as clumsy transmitters than as original composers of epic. It was also, among his German colleagues at all events, no small defect in Wolf's presentation of his ideas, that he had evidently not worked them out in detail, with chapter and verse; and further, as time went on, that he had little intention of doing so. His eventual edition of Homer, published in 1804, did not seriously advance the particular aspect of the subject which he was supposed to have made his own. This did not, however, prevent his ideas from having very wide popularity and enduring influence.

Weakness of Wolf Theory

- p. 86 In the first place, he underestimated the evidence for the antiquity of alphabetic writing in Greece, even as known in his time; . . .
- p. 87 In the second place, Wolf's own assumption that in the absence of written record, the transmission of a long poem is not possible, was really refuted in advance by Robert Wood's experiences among the Arabs and among the Greek ballad-mongers; and has been disproved again and again by other travellers in many parts of the world. . . .

Further, Wolf relied on the late and scanty statements about the activity of Peisistratus, which he describes quite inaccurately as supported by the unanimous agreement of antiquity. But even if it were better attested, it would yet prove little as to the previous state of the poems.

- p. 88 Wolf's conception, too, of schools of professional reciters with their own repertoire of traditional verse, neither rested on ancient authority (for even of the so called "sons of Homer" in Chios we know little more than their name) nor did it help his other contentions much. If there were such schools, how did it come about that the traditional poetry was in such fragmentary disorder as the theory of a Peisistratid Recension presupposed? And whence did they derive their traditional materials? For Wolf seems to have conceived them rather as clumsy transmitters than as original composers of epic. It was also, among his German colleagues at all events, no small defect in Wolf's presentation of his ideas, that he had evidently not worked them out in detail, with chapter and verse; and further, as time went on, that he had little intention of doing so. . . . There was, indeed, little controversy over them till after his death. Then Nitzsch raised the objection that the art of writing is proved by extant inscriptions to have been known before the time of Peisistratus and K. O. Miller, while accepting his views on writing, disputed his inferences.

Comment on Wolf's theory gradually took two principal forms

- p. 89 Gottfried Hermann . . . laid the foundation for the scientific study, not of the Homeric hexameter merely, but of Greek metre in general. He faced the perplexing problem of the Homeric dialect . . . He did pioneer work . . . on the poems attributed to Hesiod, on the so-called Homeric Hymns . . . In particular, he made the first systematic and critical analysis of the structure and contents of the two poems (which Wolf does not seem to have attempted), and devoted special attention to . . . the frequent repetition of whole passages, in identical words, even where the context would seem to demand at all events a change of standpoint and interpretation of the facts to be related. This peculiarity gained especial interest when it was realized that it recurred in other bodies of traditional poetry and might be regarded, for some reason yet to be discovered, as an habitual procedure in such compositions. . . .

- p. 90 Hermann, like Aristarchus, admitted as certain a large class of such blemishes, and saw his way to explain how they had come to stand in the text; but he regarded the poems . . . as preserving in essentials the plan and contents of the original composition . . . ; and he saw no reason, in their conception or style, to assign them to different authors. Hermann's . . . standpoint was shared in essentials by . . . Kayser and Immanuel Bekker.

A more drastic line was taken by

- p. 90 Karl Lachmann, . . . It was his contention that contradictions in the subject matter between these lays preclude unity of original conception or authorship of the poems as we have them, but he also found divergencies of spirit between some of them.

Lachmann's Theory

p. 90 His tendency, therefore, is to give less prominence to "one first poet" than Wolf did; Die Einheit der Ilias ist eine gefallene Burg. He had no difficulty in demonstrating that there were anomalies. They had, indeed, been recognized in antiquity, and excused on the ground that the personal Homer sometimes fell short of perfection; quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus. He contended further that the only argument accepted as valid by all Unitarians was the evidence of the tradition. His conclusion that all theories of single authorship, sources or evolution are alike hypothetical is unshaken, and we may wonder if in this we have gone any further since 1874. He failed, however, to note that his own lay theory was equally hypothetical. His "objectivity" is only

p. 91 apparent. It is not that he believed the evidence for a Peisistratid recension to be stronger than the evidence for a single Homer, but that he required the Peisistratid recension to support his lay theory; and the lay theory itself finds no support in Greek literature, but is based on the analogy of the lays he thought he had detected in the Nibelunge-not and Edda. Yet he himself warned his pupil Lehrs of the danger of arguing from analogy with other literatures. . . . His own arguments against the Iliad are valid against his lays; they have no Aristotelian "unity" of composition, neither the epic unity which Aristotle at least thought the Iliad had, nor unity as conceived in a tragedy or a Pindaric Ode. It was left to Wilamowitz to ask how the lays could exist except as fragments of a pre-existing Cycle. Lachmann used historical premisses as hypotheses for a literary conclusion about what must have been the condition of poetry in early times, instead of working inductively from the poems. In fact, he rushed to conclusions in the spirit of the creative romanticism in which he had grown up. He became a great leader; but leaders only achieve their tasks when they are outrun.

p. 92 Of these two interpretations of Wolf, George Grote followed Hermann's rather than Lachmann's. . . The question of writing raised by Wolf has no necessary connexion with the problems of single authorship; it is easier to suppose long memories than long manuscripts. . . The absence of allusions to events and customs of the Peisistratid age is negative evidence in favour of an early date for the poems as a whole . . . The Odysey has a structure so closely compacted that, whatever the materials available when it was composed, it appears to be one man's work and design as it stands. The Iliad is more complex. Grote saw in it an original poem of single design about the Wrath of Achilles, which has been expanded by additions which have no necessary or original connexion with the incident of the Quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon. The parts of the poem in which Achilles is in the picture are coherent and consecutive in themselves, but the interval between the first and the eighth books, nearly a third of the whole poem, is inexplicable except on the supposition that another had been at work. Similarly the ninth book, in which a further attempt is made to propitiate Achilles, is inconsistent with points in the main narrative, and the ~~episode~~ episode of the fortification of the Greek camp makes the tactics in other parts of the action unintelligible. The character of Zeus in the non-Achilleid sections is inconsistent with that assigned to him in the Achilleid. Finally, the last two books, after the death of Hector, are in a style and contain matter perceptibly different from all that precedes and should be regarded as a supplement of later date. . . .

This is the first example of a plausible theory of expansion. What Grote saw was that the Wolfian theory of a piecemeal Homer, patched together by Peisistratus, and still more Lachmann's theory that the minor poems which he detected had once had a separate existence and consequently a literary form and method of composition of their own, failed to explain the strong traces of design in the larger sections even of the Iliad. He conceded, therefore, the gradual accretion of episodes, while insisting that there must have been some nucleus around which they might cohere.

Summary of Geo. Grote's theory of Iliad's history

p. 92 Early in the eighth century "Homer", using earlier lays, composed an Achilleid or Menis (AΘΛ-X ; later critics expelled Θ). It was expanded into the Iliad by the addition of B-ΠIK (later critics make K later still). ΨΩ make a further supplement.

Adolf Kirchhoff

p. 93 He distinguished three stages in the poem's creation, independent poems on the Wanderings and on the Revenge, brought together by a later poet who added the Telemachy. He dated the final stage to about 600 B.C. Kirchhoff performed the inductive work which Lachmann had indicated as necessary but did not do. His concentration on the Odyssey marks a change of emphasis; from now on, it becomes more prominent in controversy. He raised the question whether analysis of the poems is the only way to reach a solution, the alternative being to treat the whole question historically, with the use of external evidence. Aristarchus had denied Homeric epic a past and a sequel, a view which is not yet obsolete. "Homer is only interpreted by himself" is a valuable principle, but not of universal application. From another point of view, "Homer" is the whole Epos, which has a lifetime coming down into historic times and traceable back thence. Wolf's ill-founded corollary to Wood's ill-founded thesis became in turn the foundation of sand for nearly a century of "higher" and "higher" criticism, chiefly in Germany but increasingly copious in England as German notions of scholarship came into vogue from about 1850 onwards; but the generation after Lachmann put the Homeric Question on to an entirely different footing, even from that in which Lachmann left it.

Wilamowitz

p. 154 A characteristic instance of the current reformulation of the Ionian theory is the Homeric Enquiries of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, which was published in 1884, but too late for Heibig's first edition but in ample time to influence his views in the second. In form this book was an examination of the structure of the Odyssey, by the methods of Wilamowitz's own master Kirchhoff. It was dedicated, appropriately and significantly, to Wellhausen, a leading figure in that "higher criticism" of the Hebrew Scriptures which had owned so much in its inception to the Homeric Prolegomena of Wolf.

p. 209 More important, in respect of Wilamowitz's general defence of an evolutionary view of the poems, is the consideration that if, as he contended, there was no Trojan War historically, then someone must have invented it; and the less the traditional ground for such a story, the greater the imaginative genius of its inventor. . . . but if there was no Troy, how is an Iliad to be explained without a personal Homer? Wilamowitz followed Bethe in believing in the wholesale transposition of legends. . . . But bringing them to whom, and contributing them to what story, if there was no Trojan War, and no personal Homer to collect them? Nor was there even, for Wilamowitz, the Peisistratid recension of the Homeri libros confusos antea which had been the alternative adopted by Wolf; for Wilamowitz still insisted that the poems as we have them were essentially of Ionian composition and of pre-Peisistratid antiquity. His insistence . . . that . . . the Iliad, and . . . Odyssey, is a masterpiece of great poetry, was beginning to force him to admit that somewhere . . . a great mind had intervened. . . . and for Wilamowitz that somebody was Ionian, and that sometime was almost at the end of the process.

p. 214 . . . Wilamowitz had still no use for such comparison between Homer and other early literatures as had led astray Lachmann, and before him Wolf. Modern analysis, like the assimilation of epic to folk-poetry, "crumbles" the poems through neglect of the evidence for design. This design, for him as for Mulcaer, can be recovered only by a new kind of analysis, which must begin with the latest additions and not attempt to dissect out an original core or kernel; and he submitted the results of his own analysis, of which it is sufficient to say that there is lacking any demonstration that the whole process was not rapid enough to have been comprised within the working life of a single composer.

Myers, John L. Homer and His Critics (London: Routledge & Kegan

Paul) 1958

A Comparison to Greek Studies edited by Thomas Whitley, 4th ed., Harper Pub. Co. N.Y. London, 1963

3.31

Wolff's Theory

'Separaters' (of χωριζομεν). Aristarchus wrote against this 'paradox,' which never had any vogue in the ancient world.

140. A modern student of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is at once struck with two broad facts about them. (1) Each shows finished poetic art. And Greek literature begins with these masterpieces. We have no samples of the ruder work which must have gone before. There is no parallel for such a phenomenon in the history of any other literature. (2) Each forms, in a large view, an organic and artistic whole. Yet each contains matter which on various grounds has been considered irreconcilable with the belief that one poet composed the entire epic. These two problems have been the basis of 'the Homeric question.'

141. The critical study of the Homeric question began with Abbé d'Aubignac (born in 1604) whose *Conjectures Académiques* was published posthumously in 1705. D'Aubignac attempted to show that Homer never existed and that the *Iliad* was little more than a *corpus* of poems cleverly put together about the time of Lycurgus. More attention was paid to F. A. Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795). Wolf sought to prove four main points. (1) The Homeric poems were composed, about the tenth century B.C., without the aid of writing, which then was either wholly unknown to the Greeks, or not yet in use for literary purposes. The poems were handed down by oral recitation only, and in that process suffered some changes. (2) The poems were for the first time written down about 550 B.C., in the time of Peisistratus. They then underwent some further changes at the hands of 'revisers' (διακελευσται), or learned critics. (3) That artistic unity which belongs to the *Iliad* and (in a yet higher degree) to the *Odyssey* is not mainly due to the original poems, but has been superinduced by artificial treatment in a later age. (4) The original poems, out of which our *Iliad* and our *Odyssey* have been put together, were not all by the same author. But there was one poet, of commanding genius ('Homer'), who made 'the greater part' of the songs afterwards united in the two epics.

Wolf's theories were developed and modified by many scholars in the nineteenth century. The poems were subjected to a close analysis, and the analysis led to conclusions in sharp conflict with one another. Some scholars saw in Homer a primitive poet, author of an original sketch of one or both poems (*Ur-Ilias, Ur-Odyssee*), which formed the stocks on which later poets grafted new material. Others regarded Homer as a compiler, who combined old lays, unwritten and independent of one another, into single poems. There was no agreement in the application of this theory: Köchly, for example, dissected the *Iliad* into sixteen, and Christ into forty such lays.

While there were thus two theories irreconcilable with each other, and the adherents of each arrived at widely different conclusions, a new criterion was derived from the excavations at Troy, Mycenae, and other places. The evidence of archaeology was applied.

Evidence of Archaeology.

Developments of Wolf's theory.

A Companion to Greek Studies edited by James of
Whalley, 4th ed. Harpax Publ. Co. Ltd. London 1963

Some hailed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as 'pure Mycenaean' on the grounds that many of the elements of Mycenaean culture, bronze weapons, Nestor's cup, boar's tusks on a helmet etc., are present in the Homeric poems. But such a position could not be maintained in its entirety, since there are allusions also to things and peoples of later times, geometric ware, Phoenicians. So the poems were analysed in such a way as to make the Mycenaean elements form one stratum, the later elements another. But the attempt failed, the elements were inextricably mingled, and the Homeric poems could not be made a mirror of contemporaneous cultural development. Attempts to correlate the archaeological with the literary analyses made the confusion worse, since the so-called oldest literary strata were often found to contain the latest cultural elements.

142. With such inconclusive results it is not surprising that scholars sought another method of approach to Homer. They assumed the artistic unity of the two poems, and abandoned the attempt to divide them into strata. Some, however (P. Cauer, C. Robert, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, E. Bethe), while professing to reject the conclusions of Wolf, were still impressed by what they regarded as discrepant elements in the poems. They recognised what they regarded as 'accretions,' which they proposed to cut away from what they regarded as the work of the original author. This method again led to divergent results with no generally accepted conclusions.

Modern
opinion.

Other scholars (e.g. F. Blass, J. W. Mackail, C. Rothe), starting from the presumption that each of the poems was the composition of a single poet, argued that the contradictions which had been found in different parts of the epics were no proof of divided authorship. The arguments that the two last books of the *Iliad* (as well as books 11 and x) and the conclusion of the *Odyssey* were later additions have been met (T. W. Allen, A. Shewan, E. Drerup, J. A. Scott). Furthermore, reasons based on linguistic evidence, the supposed ignorance of writing at the time when the poems were composed and the part played by the commission of Peisistratus were discredited. But disciples of unity have for the most part been disposed to allow that interpolations may have taken place, certainly before Aristarchus and probably after. But clearly, unless there is some measure of agreement about the interpolations, we shall be no better off than we were in the morass of the analysts. Some interpolated verses can be identified, but there is a wise reluctance to reject whole books or passages merely on the ground that they do not fit a particular theory. Again some scholars (e.g. G. Finsler, W. Schmied) have regarded Homer as the author of the *Iliad* but not of the *Odyssey*. They show some reasons for supposing that the *Odyssey* was written later than the *Iliad*, but no sufficient reason has been shown why it should not be the work of the same poet at a later period of his life. On the whole, modern opinion tends to accept the view that Homer, who was acquainted with writing, was the author of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* substantially in the form in which they have come down to us.

888
H8.y3C

The Unity of Homer, John A. Scott
U. of Calif. Press (Berkeley, Calif.), 1921
Chapter III The Arguments of Wolf
Chapter V The Contradictions
Chapter VIII The Iliad and the Odyssey

888
43.yM

Homer and His Critics, Sir John L. Myres, edited by Dorothea Gray
Oxford, 1950
Chapter 5 on F. A. Wolf

p. 83 Wolf acceptance, even more literally than in the very tentative and guarded phrases of Robert Wood, of the assumption that before the 7th century at earliest . . . those poems had not been systematically written down at all . . .

3.31

p. 93 Wolf's ill-founded corollary to Wood's ill-founded thesis became in turn the foundation of sand for nearly a century of "higher" and "higher" criticism, chiefly in Germany, but increasingly conscious in England as German notions of scholarship came into vogue about 1850 onwards; but the generation after Lachmann put the Homeric Question on to an entirely different footing, even from that in which Lachmann left it.

p. 293 a Chapter entitled "The Last Decade"

888
n8.yN

Homer and Mycenae, Martin P. Nilsson, 1933

See pages 51-55

883
H752ia

Homer, The Iliad. Translated by S. O. Andrew. Everyman's Library.
With an introduction by John Warrington. Preface by M. J. Oakley.
London J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., N. Y. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1955

Notes taken from the introduction by John Warrington, pp. v-viii

The Iliad and Odyssey, indeed, have undergone treatment not unlike that of the Scripture text

Homer's date has always been, and must remain, a matter of conjecture. According to Eratosthenes of Cyrene, he was contemporary with the main events which he relates, that is, in the 12th century. But in the light of modern archaeological research this date is too early Herodotus favours the 9th century. This view is adopted by most scholars today.

3.31

F. A. Wolf put forward a theory that each of the poems was simply a collection of lays which had been gradually blended and given a semblance of unity in the course of their transmission. His view was favorably received, and has since been developed by a long line of famous scholars. This belief in a multiple origin of the poems rests upon two main arguments: the supposed impossibility for a single person to have composed works of such length without the aid of writing, and the presence of undeniable repetitions and inconsistencies.



3.31

Whatever date we assign to Homer we cannot say for certain that he had not the aid of writing The ~~results~~, moreover, of investigation into the powers of trained memory show the composition of the longest works to be within the limits of possibility. The importance of repetition and inconsistency is lessened when we recall that these poems, like all man's work, are the fruit of fallible intelligence . . . that they were rarely, , , recited in their entirety; and that therefore their hearers would have been as little able to discern such flaws as the author would have been to eliminate them with the unaided function of memory. Repetition and inconsistency demonstrate no more than that the poet used his sources with a degree of critical acumen unworthy of the best modern scholarship. Today, therefore, there is a strong tendency to lay more stress upon those characteristics of the poems which suggest a unity of authorship. In each there is a central figure around whom is formed a closely woven plot and over whom hovers the anger or the favour of a god. In each not only the principal heroes, but even the minor characters, are consistent. In each there is a marked similarity of language throughout, and the recurrent evidence of an individual taste.



The second part of the Homeric problem turns upon the question whether one author was responsible for both epics. Many authorities have held that, even granted the essential unity of each, the poet of the Odyssey was other than the composer of the Iliad. The most serious arguments brought forward in support of this theory are drawn from the notable differences of style and thought; but in spite of these very real difficulties, scholars are returning to the old faith in one author of both works. Pseudo-Longinus may give us a clue to the truth when he remarks that Homer began to fail in the later poem: the objections, indeed, lose force in the light of the bard's advancing years. For altered ideas of life, a new conception of the communion of earth with heaven, are characteristic of Everyman's experience as he draws nearer to the final darkness. . . . Both stories, though so different,

are told with a fundamentally similar technique, in language that has been likened to a whirlwind or the thunder of waves upon a lonely shore.

→ What of Homer's sources? They were, no doubt, folk tales, some dating back maybe to Crete and some maybe beyond. They probably had the form of shorter lays improvised by the bards of a culture of which Homer must be considered the perfect flower. He took them, fused them, and quite transformed them by his unique genius and single inspiration.

"Homer, the traditional epic poem of Greece, of whom no real records exist. Herodotus placed him as living in the ninth century B.C., and modern authorities incline to accept this date" (first page inside cover.)

References to the Homeric Question

- p. 184 Richard Volkmann's Geschichte und Kritik der Wolfschen Prolegomena zu Homer, 354 pp., 1874
- p. 93 Grotfried Hermann (1772-1848) defended the hypothesis of Wolf against the opinion of the most important and most scholarly of its opponents, Nitzsch, who held that Homer composed the Iliad with the aid of older poems, and that he probably also composed the Odyssey, in which he was more original and less indebted to his predecessors. Wolf had held that the weaving of the Homeric web had been carried down to a certain point by the first and chief author of the poem, and had been continued by others. Hermann, improving on this opinion, suggested that the original sketch of our Iliad and our Odyssey had been produced by the first poet, and that the later poets did not carry on the texture, but completed the design within the outline that was already drawn.
- p. 105 While Wolf regards Homer as a primitive bard, who began to weave the web of the Homeric poems, and only carried it down to a certain point, Nitzsch looks upon him as a 'great poetical artist who, coming after the age of the short lays, framed an epic on a larger plan.' (Jebb's Homer, 121) Thus Wolf places Homer at the beginning of the growth of the poems, Nitzsch nearer to the end. Nitzsch regards the Iliad as mainly the work of Homer, but this view does not exclude the introduction of minor interpolations and changes at a later date. The Odyssey he considers to be the work of perhaps the same poet, who (he holds) was more original here than in the Iliad. In the course of the controversy Nitzsch observed that some of the 'Cyclic' poems of the seventh and eighth centuries B.C. presupposed our Iliad and Odyssey in something like their present form, and, further, that the Greek use of writing was probably older than Wolf had assumed.
- p. 130 Quoting from Jebb's Homer, 118f, "Lachmann dissected the Iliad into into eighteen separate lays. He leaves it doubtful whether they are to be ascribed to eighteen distinct authors. But at any rate, he maintains, each lay was originally more or less independent of all the rest. His main test is the inconsistency of detail. A primitive poet, he argued, would have a vivid picture before his mind, and would reproduce it with close consistency. He also affirms that many of the lays are utterly distinct in general spirit."
- p. 167 Georg Friedrich Schomann (1793-1879). For his views on the Homeric question cp. his review of G. W. Nitzsch in Jahrb. f. Phil. lxxix (1854), lf, 129f.
- p. 132 Hermann Kochly (1815-1870), the earliest follower of Lachmann in his theory of lays. "The structure of the Iliad is examined in his seven Zurich dissertations (1850-9), and in a paper on 'Hector's Ransom' (1859); that of the Odyssey in three Zurich dissertations (1862-3). The results of his examination of the Iliad were embodied in a practical form in an edition of sixteen lays published at Leipzig in 1861. Kochly's 'lays' do not correspond to Lachmann's.
- p. 326 H.F.F. Nutzhorn (1834-1866)
327 Nutzhorn compares the consequent condition of Homeric criticism to "A pathless wilderness in which the 'guiding star' might possibly prove a mere will o' the wisp". Dividing his own work into two parts, 'historical evidence', and 'internal criteria', he deals with the former under four heads: - (1) the evidence on the text; (2) the story about Peisistratus; (3) the Homeridae; and (4) the contrast between the earlier apudoi and the later paphsiodoe. He shows (1) that the known variations of reading do not point to more than one ancient redaction; (2) that the evidence as to Peisistratus is late, conflicting, and, in general, unsatisfactory, while Wolf's inference, that the Iliad and Odyssey did not exist in a complete form before the time of Peisistratus,

is disproved by 'Homeric reminiscences' in poets as early as Hesiod, Archilochus, Alcam and Hipponax, and by scenes from the Iliad on the chest of Cypselus. (3) Modern criticism is not justified (he urges) in regarding the Chian clan of the Homeridae as rhapsodes; this chapter is less satisfactory than the rest of the work. (4) The contrast between the leisurely bards of the older age, who sang successive portions of lengthy epic poems at the courts of chieftains, and the rhapsodes of a later time, who hurriedly rehearsed selected passages amid the excitement of a popular festival, suggests that the former is the mode of recitation for which epic poetry was originally intended and shows that, in form as well as substance, the Homeric poems are the creation of a pre-historic age. The rhapsodes were 'an uncongenial and even destruction element', but the mischief done by them was counteracted by statesmen like Solon, and by the more extended use of writing in Greece.

In the second part Nutzhorn criticises the various attempts that had been made to resolve the Iliad into short lays, and contends that the small discrepancies, which had been noticed by modern critics with the printed page before them, would have passed unobserved by the original audience, and did not suffice to ~~prove~~^{show} a difference of authorship. He also discusses Grote's Achillied, pointing out that the lengthy portions of the Iliad, which do not belong to the Achillied, may be regarded as episodes characteristic of the earliest epic poetry, and as serving to help the original audience to realize the long absence of Achilles from the field of battle.

The author is perhaps unduly violent in his invective against the views then prevalent in Northern Germany, and political differences between Denmark and Prussia appear to give keener edge to his controversial temper. But the permanent value of his work is hardly impaired by the patriotic spirit which makes it (for our present purpose) a characteristic product of the scholarship of Denmark.

- p. 372 The Homeric question has been elaborately discussed by G. Mistriones (subsequently professor of Greek at Athens), who maintains the unity of the Iliad and Odyssey and regards Homer as the author of both, and a French treatise on the topography and the strategy of the Iliad was published in Paris in the same year by the Cretan scholar, M. G. Niochaides, while private life in Homer has been ably treated by K. R. Raugoes (1883)
- p. 430 George Grote (1794-1871)
A special importance attaches to his opinions on the 'Homeric Question'; he regards Homer as 'belonging to the second, not the first, stage in the ~~the~~ development of epos, - as the composer of the large epic, not as the primitive bard of the short lays'; but he holds that Homer's original Achilleid has been converted by a later poet or poets into our present Iliad.
- p. 409, F. A. Paley (1816-88)
410 Maintained that the Homeric poems in their present form were not earlier than the age of Alexander, and that it was mainly through oral tradition that they reached the age of Thucydides.
- p. 427, John Stuart Blackie (1809-95)
428 Concludes there is 'a soul of truth in the Wolfian theory, but its operation is to be recognized among the rude materials which Homer used and fused, not among the shapely fragments of the finished work which Pisistratus collected and arranged.'

The Iliad

16 Encyclopedia Britannica (11th ed) says that Lachmann's Betrachtungen über Homers Iliad, first published . . . in 1837 and 1841, in which he sought to show that the Iliad consists of sixteen independent "lays" variously enlarged and interpolated . . . his views are no longer accepted. (1965 ed. same)

18 J. A. Davison writing on "The Homeric Question" in A Companion to Homer (1963, ed. by Wace and Stubbings) says (on page 249) : "In two papers delivered before the Berlin Academy in 1837 and 1841, and published as Betrachtungen über Homers Ilias in 1847 (later editions 1865, 1874), he ((Lachmann)) claimed to have identified eighteen separate and distinct lays, not necessarily by the same author, out of which our Iliad had been composed: of these the last two (our Books Ψ and Ω) were a later addition to the original Iliad, the composer of which was by no means a first-class poet. Thus Lachmann found virtually no place for any poet who could be called 'Homer'.

17 ~~But~~ Sanday's History of Classical Scholarship (1958) on p. 130 quotes from Jebb's Homer, p. 118f, that "Lachmann dissected the Iliad into eighteen separate lays."

The Nibelungenlied

20 The Nibelungenlied trans. by Wm Nanson Lettson with a spec. intro. by Wm. H. Carpenter, Prof. of Germanic Philology in Columbia University, rev. ed., 1901, p. xvii: "According to the Lachmann theory, the poem consists of no less than 20 distinct lays, each differing inherently from the rest, and each, with the exception of the Eighth and Ninth, by different authors.

20 Cassell's Encyclopedia of Literature (1953) p. 380-381 gives K. Lachmann's explanation (1816) of the NL as an arrangement of 20 original lays . . . We now prefer A. Heusler's general theory (indebted to W.P. Kerr) of two main lays, ideally independent in origin, which were expanded from within and progressively fused.

Lachmann (2)

The Iliad

16

H. J. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Literature (Methune and Co., London, 4th ed. 1951, reprinted with minor corrections 1956 and 1961) says, p. 38, that "As a result of much analysis (Lachmann, for example, dissected the Iliad, down to the death of Hektor, into sixteen lays), a modification of Wolf's view began to grow up.

18

Albin Lesky, A History of Greek Literature (1966) says on p. 35 that the Iliad on Lachmann's view was made up of some ~~s~~ixteen separate poems

16 lays | Lachmann's Betrachtungen über Homers Ilias, first published in the Abhandlungen of the Berlin Academy in 1837 and 1841, in which he sought to show that the Iliad consists of 16 independent lays variously enlarged and interpolated, has had considerable influence on modern Homeric criticism, although his views are no longer accepted."

Encyclopedia Britannica, 1965 edition
Vol. 13, p. 577

Albert Guérard, Professor of General and Comparative Literature, Stanford University,
PREFACE TO WORLD LITERATURE New York 1940.

Page 71-72:

"For two hundred years, this philosophy of the unconscious and the subconscious has been advanced, not in literature only, but in many other domains.....

p. 72 "Against this romantic theory of obscure growth, the Individualistic conception has managed to hold its ground, and even to recapture some important positions...the burden of proof is on the side of Wolf and his followers. Not because mankind has believed for so long in the existence of an individual genius named Homer; but because internal evidence, of a convincing nature, reveals a commanding artistic personality. To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been able to supply.

"Although the theory of unconscious growth presents itself with a formidable apparatus of scholarship, it remains, in many cases, a product of the romantic imagination. The evidence it adduces is frequently not actual, but hypothetical.....

p. 73 the Faust legend and the William Tell saga...it would be a mockery to assert that they automatically assumed definite shape, that they 'got themselves written down,' somehow, by scribes known as Goethe and Schiller."

GAYLEY, Charles Mills, and SCOTT, Fred Newton: An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism: the Bases in Aesthetics and Poetics. Boston, Ginn, 1899. 587pp.

GAYLEY, Charles Mills, and KURTZ, B. P.: Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism: Lyric, Epic, and allied forms of Poetry. Boston & New York, Ginn, 1920. 911pp.

SAINTSBURY, George: History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe. Edinburgh & London, W. Blackwood, 1900-1904. 3 vols.

BABBITT, Irving & al. (Van Wyck Brooks, W. C. Brownell, Ernest Boyd, T. S. Eliot, H. L. Mencken, Stuart Sherman, J. E. Spingarn, George E. Woodberry): Criticism in America. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1924. 330pp.

Albert Guérard, Professor of General and Comparative Literature, Stanford University,
PREFACE TO WORLD LITERATURE New York 1940.

Page 71-72:

"For two hundred years, this philosophy of the unconscious and the subconscious has been advanced, not in literature only, but in many other domains.....

"Against this romantic theory of obscure growth, the Individualistic conception has managed to hold its ground, and even to recapture some important positions...the burden of proof is on the side of Wolf and his followers. Not because mankind has believed for so long in the existence of an individual genius named Homer; but because internal evidence, of a convincing nature, reveals a commanding artistic personality. To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been able to supply. 3.41

"Although the theory of unconscious growth presents itself with a formidable apparatus of scholarship, it remains, in many cases, a product of the romantic imagination. The evidence it adduces is frequently not actual, but hypothetical..... 3.91
 the Faust legend and the William Tell saga...it would be a mockery to assert that they automatically assumed definite shape, that they 'got themselves written down,' somehow, by scribes known as Goethe and Schiller."

GAYLEY, Charles Mills, and SCOTT, Fred Newton: An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism: the Bases in Aesthetics and Poetics. Boston, Ginn, 1899. 587pp.

GAYLEY, Charles Mills, and KURTZ, B. P.: Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism: Lyric, Epic, and allied forms of Poetry. Boston & New York, Ginn, 1920. 911pp.

SAINTSBURY, George: History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe.
 Edinburgh & London, W. Blackwood, 1900-1904. 3 vols.

BABBITT, Irving & al. (Van Wyck Brooks, W. C. Brownell, Ernest Boyd, T. S. Eliot, H. L. Mencken, Stuart Sherman, J. E. Spingarn, George E. Woodberry): Criticism in America. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1924. 330pp.

Page 73

Guérard

" * * * the Faust legend and the William Tell saga had survived humbly until the end of the eighteenth century. But it would be a mockery to assert that they automatically assumed definite shape, that they 'got themselves written down.' somehow, by scribes known as Goethe and Schiller." 3, 20

Albert Guerard, Professor of General and Comparative Literature, Stanford University (2)

SAINTSBURY, George, Editor: Periods of European Literature (from the Dark Ages to the end of the Nineteenth Century), 12 volumes. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907

WENDELL, Barrett: The Traditions of European Literature from Homer to Dante.
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920. 669pp.

BRANDES, George: Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature (the testament of bourgeois Liberalism). London, Wm. Heinemann; New York, Macmillan, 1906. 6 vols.

Preface to World Literature, Albert Guerard (Prof. of General and Comparative Literature Stanford University), Henry Holt and Company, N. Y., 1940

page 74. "It is not denied that literature uses the same stuff as folklore; but it is claimed that folklore is turned into literature only through an individual act of conscious organization. A book is a piece of work, not an accident.

Angewandte Moral
Man's Unconquerable Mind R. W. Chambers. Jonathan Cape, London, 1939

p. 71 Fortunately, twenty years ago, that great teacher of English, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, gave his answer to the problem:

Gentlemen, I would I could persuade you to remember that you are English, and go always for the thing, casting out of your vocabulary all such words as 'tendencies', 'influences', 'revivals', 'revolts'. 'Tendencies' did not write The Canterbury Tales; Geoffrey Chaucer wrote them. 'Influences' did not make The Faerie Queen; Edmund Spenser made it; as a man called Ben Jonson wrote The Alchemist, a man called Sheridan wrote The Rivals . . .

p. 85 So we hail Wiclif - the Morning Star of the Reformation. But to William Langland, less than justice has been done. He comes immediately before the great upheaval of Wiclif, and people do not know what to make of him. No great figure of English literature has been equally neglected. He has even been divided into four or five authors, and we have been told that Piers Plowman was 'the voice and vision, not of one lonely, despised wanderer, but of many men, who, ~~through~~ though of diverse tempers and gifts, cherished the same enthusiasm for righteousness and hate for evil'.¹ (¹ Cambridge History of English Literature, II, p. 42).

Here again, let us remember Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch: 'Tendencies did not write The Canterbury Tales; Geoffrey Chaucer wrote them.'

I hope to satisfy the reader that Tendencies did not write Piers Plowman; that a man called William Langland wrote it.

Prof read

The Classical Tradition, by Gilbert Highet. Oxford University Press, New York and London, . 1949.

p. 384. Wolf set out to put the Homeric poems in their correct historical perspective. He undertook to trace the various stages by which they had been transmitted since they were composed. He pointed out that it was impossible to say there was a single fixed text of the two poems - in the same way as a modern printed book represents, in all its many thousand copies, a single text which (barring accidental errors) is what the author wrote.

p. 385 This (Wolf's) type of analysis was to be practiced on most of the classical authors throughout the nineteenth century, and still continues.⁶⁰

Footnote 60 (page 669) Livy's early books were thus dissolved by Niebuhr (see p. 472f), and in the later nineteenth century the same solvent was applied to many poets and philosophers who little needed it. Ribbeck, for example, having grasped the obvious fact that Juvenal's satires grew gentler and more discursive as the poet grew older, wrote Der echte und der unechte Juvenal to prove that the early satires were written by Juvenal and the later satires by an imitator.

It had already been initiated in the criticism of the Bible, by eighteenth-century editions of the New Testament which pointed out the important variations in the text of the gospels and epistles; and during the nineteenth century it issued in the dissolution of the Old Testament, under 'higher criticism', into many fragments, and of the gospels into a number of much-edited narratives.

On scholars this had a stimulating effect. But literary men found Wolf's book discouraging. It was depressing to think that what they had taken for a pair of great epics was really two groups of small-scale poems, and that individual genius counted for nothing in characterization and planning.

✓ Wolf's theory has now been superseded, although his intelligence and his acumen are recognized.⁶¹ It has been proved that it is quite possible for good poetry on the scale of the Iliad and Odyssey to be composed without the aid of writing, and to be transmitted faithfully enough from generation to generation. And although it is clear that poems by many different composers were used in the construction of the Iliad and Odyssey, the work of the poet or poets who built the two epics into their majestic architecture is now called not 'editing' but poetic composition of the highest type.

p. 386 ✓ Goethe was at first encouraged by Wolf's theory. He had felt Homer to be unapproachable; but if there were no Homer, only some smaller talents called 'Homerids', he could endeavour to rival them.⁶² And it was in this mind that he wrote Hermann and Dorothea. Later, however, as he read the Homeric epics with more and more understanding - and also, no doubt, as he attempted other Homeric poems like his Achilleis and continued work on his own large-scale drama, Faust - he realized that behind the epics there stood at least one majestic genius; and at last he published a formal retraction of his belief in Wolf's solution of the Homeric problem.⁶³

cf. 3.41-65⁸

Footnote 63 (page 669) - Goethe expressed his reversion in a little poem, Homer wieder Homer, as well as in various prose utterances. For an account of his varying opinions on the Homeric question, see Bapp (cited in n. 28) c. 4
K. Bapp, Aus Goethes griechischer Gedankenwelt

over →

- p. 487 (Samuel Butler (1835-1902) gave a lecture on The Humour of Homer (1892) and the effect of his approach was to humanize the epics, to break their fame of convention and allow them to be criticized as ancestors of the modern novel.
- p. 488 Although Butler's criticism lacked historical perspective, it carried farther the movement to discredit the theory preached by Wolf and taken up by dozens of German scholars, that the epics were assemblages of "lays". Butler not only made the Odyssey the work of one person, but, from the difficulties and incongruities smelt out by the Wolf-pack, reconstructed a fallible human authoress.
- p. 499 "For brick-making does not produce architects." Said at close of paragraph beginning "The scientific approach, as well as the expansion of knowledge, has also been responsible for the fragmentation of classical study. For several decades the majority of scholars have preferred writing small studies of single authors, of separate aspects of single authors, of tiny areas of social and literary history, of topics obscure and peripheral and unexplored. Meanwhile, much remains to be done on the great central subjects. ~~There has been a widespread belief, not without foundation, that scholars actually chose to write on subjects which were safe because so few people knew anything about them.~~
- p. 500 The scholar has a responsibility to society - not less, but greater, than that of the labourer and the business man. His first duty is to know the truth, and his second is to make it known.
- p. 558 In French, the oldest document is the Oaths of Strasbourg (A.D. 842)
- p. 695 Footnote 50. Housman has a memorable sneer at this, in the preface (p. xxviii) to his edition of Juvenal:
 'The truth is, and the reader has discovered it by this time if he did not know it before hand, that I have no inkling of Ueberlieferungsgeschichte. And to the sister science of Quellenforschung I am equally a stranger: I cannot assure you, as some other writer will assure you before long, that the satires of Juvenal are all copied from the satires of Turnus.* It is a sad fate to be devoid of faculties which cause so much elation to their owners; but I cheer myself by reflecting how large a number of human beings are more fortunate than I. It seems indeed as if a capacity for these two lines of fiction had been bestowed by heaven, as a sort of consolation-prize, upon those who have no capacity for anything else.'
- * Turnus was a satirist who is known to have written not long before Juvenal, but whose work has almost entirely disappeared.
- p. 499 The false parallel with science ~~has~~ caused many more errors and exaggerations in classical study. One odd one was the habit of Quellenforschung, the search for sources, which ~~was~~ began as a legitimate inquiry into the material used by a poet, historian, or philosopher, and was pushed to the absurd point at which it was assumed that everything in a poem, even such a poem as the Aeneid, was derived from earlier writers. It is a typical scientific assumption that everything can be explained by synthesis, but it omits the essential artistic fact of creation.⁵⁰

(Footnote 50 is reproduced in the above paragraphs)

25
not
imp.

p. 69 The determination of authorship requires the gathering and judicious assessment of as much evidence, both internal and external, as can be found. Internal evidence is normally more abundant, but it is also very slippery. (Footnote 29. In Shakespeare's case, the metrical tests were directed primarily toward establishing the order of the plays, although they were also used in the effort to differentiate Shakespeare's work from that of supposed collaborators or revisers. For one trenchant criticism of some of these tests, see H. T. Price, "Towards a Scientific Method of Textual Criticism for the Elizabethan Drama," *JEGP*, XXXVI (1937), 151-67. With other authors, however, the tests of meter and vocabulary have been employed chiefly to determine authorship. The most elaborate of all such exercises is G. Udny Yule's The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary (Cambridge, 1944), an attempt to decide whether Thomas à Kempis or Jean Gerson wrote De Imitatione Christi.)

See
3.01-3⁸

The premise underlying its use is that every author's work has unique idiosyncrasies of style. . . .

Theoretically, this manner of proceeding is legitimate enough, and some of the results thus obtained have won wide acceptance. Many authorship studies, notably in the later nineteenth century and the early twentieth, laid claim to scientific rigor, and were published with an imposing panoply of statistical charts and tables. F. G. Gleay's Shakespeare Manual (1878) is an easily accessible example of such work. (see footnote 29 above)

p.71 Sometimes, too, the styles of several authors, all of whom may have contributed to a work, are so similar that differentiation of their respective portions is impossible. Though we know that half a dozen men (Swift, Arbuthnot, Pope, Gay, Parnell, and the Earl of Oxford) composed the Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus, we cannot positively isolate the contributions of any one of them.

p.80, 81 During the first third of this century, no branch of research brought the academic study of literature into greater disrepute among laymen [than source-study]. Like the mythical scholarly passion for counting the commas in Piers Plowman, the widely publicized, and admittedly all too prevalent, zeal for discovering the obscure places where a poet was alleged to have lifted his material became a symbol, to the world at large, of all that was niggling, pedantic, and futile in scholarship. While some such exercises were of indisputable value, far too many were pretentious wastes of time and misapplications of scholarly diligence. . . . Too often, casual or unremarkable similarities were interpreted as evidence of one writer's dependence on another.

3.31

3.01

p. 84 Of all the devices used by students of literary genetics, the most seductive ~~and most seductive~~ and the most laden with potential fallacy is the parallel passage: . . .

p.59 At the end of the nineteenth century, the techniques that had been developed in Biblical and classical studies began to be applied to English literature, especially to works written before the printing press was invented and, therefore, a number of manuscript copies were made.

The Art of Literary Research, Richard D. Altick

Problems of Authorship

p. 63,64 After I. A. Richards dramatically demonstrated, through the university students' papers quoted in his Practical Criticism (1929), how deeply readers' judgments of a poem are affected by their knowledge of its author, some critics urged that authorship be disregarded altogether and the poem treated as if it were an artifact as anonymous as a primitive statuette from Polynesia. But this extreme view, though it had considerable influence, has lost favor, and rightly so. As human beings we have an ineradicable and perfectly valid desire to know what fellowman created the work of art we admire. Even more important is the fact, once more, that seldom is an artistic work an isolated entity which can be explained and judged solely in terms of itself. It is, on the contrary, one among several or many productions of the same creative intelligence, and sound criticism requires our placing it among the other works which preceded or followed it and using to the full the insights they afford both into it and into the mind that produced them all.

3.21

1

p. 69 The determination of authorship requires the gathering and judicious assessment of as much evidence, both internal and external, as can be found. Internal evidence is normally more abundant, but it is also very slippery.

11

p. 70 Versification and vocabulary used to be the two staple categories of stylistic evidence employed in authorship study. In the 1930's a third was brought into prominence: imagery. . . . Caroline Spurgeon's systematic demonstration, in her Shakespeare's Imagery (1935), that Shakespeare had a marked fondness for specific images, or clusters of related images, which, being used repeatedly in the plays, constitute a hallmark of his style. . . .

p. 70 . . . whatever evidence imagery provides must be treated as at best collateral, never conclusive.

p. 181, 182 There was a time, within the memory of senior professors yet in service, when the chief reproach laid against literary scholarship was that it was sterile, unimaginative, divorced from both life and literature, and preoccupied with absurd trivialities - "the date of Hegator, swan maidens, Celtic cauldrons of plenty, the priority of the A or B versions of the prologue to the Legend of Good Women, medieval lives of Judas Iscariot, Vegetius in English, or Caiaphas as a Palm Sunday prophet."¹

(Footnote 1. This particular indictment dates from 1913 (Stuart Pratt Sherman in The Nation, September 11; reprinted in his Shaping Men and Women (Garden City, 1928), p. 66), but it was echoed for the next thirty years at least. ~~xxxxxx~~ Lately the literary critics seem to have drawn the journalists' fire away from the researchers.)

20

It would be less than candid to assert that present-day scholarship has purged itself in that respect, though the tendency in recent years, for better or worse, has been toward the other extreme - a kind of scholarship, often brilliantly imaginative, that leaves hard facts far behind in its sweep toward broad generalization.

Homer, A Collection of Critical Essays. Edited by Geo. Steiner & Robt. Fagles. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1962

"Introduction: Homer and the Scholars" by Geo. Steiner.

page 2

Yet the stubborn truth remains: today the Homeric Question is not much nearer solution than it was in 1795, when Wolf published his Prolegomena ad Homerum

But, though the problems remain, our methods of approach to them change. And the fascinating aspect is this: in each case — Homer, Christ, Shakespeare — the currents of scholarship and judgment follow the same pattern.

In the late nineteenth century, dismemberment was all the rage. In a single chapter of Luke, textual analysis revealed five distinct levels of authorship and interpolation. The plays attributed to that illiterate actor Shakespeare appeared to have been compiled by a committee which included Bacon, the Earl of Oxford, Marlowe, recusant Catholics, and printers' devils of extraordinary ingenuity. This fine fury of decomposition lasted well into the 1930's. As late as 1934, Gilbert Murray could discover no reputable scholar ready to defend the view that a single poet had written either or both the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Today, the wheel has come full turn. In Homeric, Biblical, and Shakespearean scholarship, unitarianism carries the day. To Professor Whitman of Harvard, the central personal vision and "ineradicable unity" of the Iliad are beyond doubt.

There are material and psychological reasons for this reversal of judgment. We have grown increasingly respectful of the tenacity of the written word. The higher criticism assumed that if a text was very ancient or had been often reproduced, it would necessarily be corrupt. We are no longer so sure. Comparisons between the Dead Sea scrolls and the canonic version of the Bible suggest that ancient literature, where it was regarded in a sacred light, was handed down with great fidelity. In reverence later scribes or scholiasts even reproduced errors or archaic words which they no longer understood.

What is even more important, a post-Freudian age regards the act of

page 3

literary composition as one of extreme complexity. Where the nineteenth century editor saw a lacuna or interpolation, we tend to see the indirections or special logic of the poetic imagination. Our entire image of ^{the} mind has altered. The higher critics, Wilamowitz or Wellhausen, were anatomists; to get at the heart of a thing they took it to pieces. We, like the men of the sixteenth century, incline to regard mental processes as organic and integral. A modern art historian has written of la vie des formes, the implication being that in the life of art, as in that of organic matter, there are complications of design and autonomous energies which cannot be dissected. Wherever possible, we prefer to leave a thing whole.

Moreover, we no longer expect from genius a constant performance. We know that great painters on occasion produce bad pictures. The fact that Titus Andronicus is full of shoddy violence is no proof whatever that Shakespeare did not write it; or, more precisely, it is no proof that he wrote only the good lines. This change in perspective is vital with reference to the Iliad and Odyssey. A hundred years ago, a passage which struck an editor as inferior was confidently bracketed as an interpolation or textual corruption. Today, we simply invoke the fact that poets are not always at their best. Homer can nod.

Does this mean that the Iliad and Odyssey - as distinct from the archaic material in them - were composed orally? Since Milman Parry, it is an established fact that much of Homeric verse is formulaic. It consists of set phrases which fill the natural metrical units of the lines.

The Ionic script, in which the Iliad and Odyssey were handed down, came into official use only in the fifth century B.C. We know scarcely anything of its previous history. This leads Whitman to conclude that the Homeric epics were initially set down in what is known as the Old Attic alphabet and later transliterated (this could account for certain oddities in our present text). The first manuscript might date from the second half of the eighth century, "from the time, if not the hand, of Homer himself." Only thirty years ago, such a theory would have made scholars howl with derision!

The theory that the two epics were memorized and transmitted perfectly by word of mouth until they could be written down in the fifth century simply won't hold.

"Odysseus' Scar" by Erich Auerbach

The genius of the Homeric style becomes even more apparent when it is compared with and equally ancient and equally epic style from a different world of forms. I shall attempt this comparison with the account of the sacrifice of Isaac, a homogeneous narrative produced by the so-called Elohists. The King James version translates the opening as follows (Gen. 22:1): - quote - Even this opening startles us when we come to it from Homer. Where are the two speakers? We are not told. The reader, however, knows that they are not normally to be found together in one place on earth, that one of them, God, in order to speak to Abraham, must come from somewhere, must enter the earthly realm from some unknown heights or depths. Whence does he come, whence does he call to Abraham? We are not told. He does not come, like Zeus or Poseidon, from the Ethiopians, where he has been enjoying a sacrificial feast. Nor are we told anything of his reasons for tempting Abraham so terribly. He has not, like Zeus, discussed them in set speeches with other gods gathered in council; nor have the deliberations in his own heart been presented to us; unexpected and mysterious, he enters the scene from some unknown height or depth and calls: Abraham!

The world of the Scripture stories is not satisfied with claiming to be a historically true reality - it insists that it is the only real world, is destined for autocracy. All other scenes, issues, and ordinances have no right to appear independently of it, and it is promised that all of (the) the history of all mankind, will be given their due place within its frame, will be subordinated to it. The Scripture stories do not, like Homer's, court our favor, they do not flatter us that they may please us and enchant us - they seek to subject us, and if we refuse to be subjected we are rebels.

As a composition, the Old Testament is incomparably less unified than the Homeric poems, it is more obviously pieced together - but the various components all belong to one concept of universal history and its interpretation. If certain elements survived which did not immediately fit in, interpretation took care of them; and so the reader is at every moment aware of the universal religio-historical perspective which gives the individual stories their general meaning and purpose. The greater the separateness and horizontal disconnection of the stories and groups of stories in relation to one another, compared with the Iliad and the Odyssey, the stronger is their general vertical connection, which holds them all together and which is entirely lacking in Homer.

"Homer" by Albert B. Lord

In the ninth century in Palestine the oldest of the documents of the Old Testament seems to have been written, namely, the J Document, and in the following century the E Document came into being. (Footnote to R. H. Pfeiffer, Intro. to O.T., New York 1941; Revised Edition 1951)

Chapter 3, "Literary History" by Rene Wellek pp. 91-130

Cf. Ch. VI of Theory of Literature by Wellek & Warren

3.31
p. 92 "Literary history in a wide sense of the term can be understood to begin with the accumulation and collection of documents, their editing and placing in a chronological scheme. This preliminary work is frequently termed "research" par excellence . . . Nobody will underrate the immense work accomplished in these fields, especially in the last hundred years. We have mapped out the whole realm of literature and literary scholarship with systematic bibliographies . . . we have given answers to innumerable questions of chronology, authenticity, and authorship. A great body of scholarship has been built up, a cooperative enterprise which may be corrected and supplemented by investigators in the future.

p. 93 For these preliminary studies, however well-established, are not stationary today. It is still possible to discover unknown works, even in English literature, like the book of Margery Kempe or Medwall's Fulgens and Lucrece. Legal and historical documents which throw light on the lives of well-worked authors have been discovered in recent years, by Leslie Hotson and others.³ Even in the editing of Shakespeare and his contemporaries great changes have taken place in recent decades. A method which calls itself rather misleadingly "bibliography," sponsored by scholars like Dover Wilson, W. W. Grey, and, more soberly by R. B. McKerrow, has put to use the results of a careful study of the methods of book production, of Elizabethan handwriting, and compositors' practices in order to arrive not only at a new text of Shakespeare, but also at audacious speculations on Shakespeare's methods of work, his revisions and adaptations, his share in plays assigned to several authors.⁴

p. 226 ⁴The methods of the "bibliographical" approach are discussed in the following publications: Dover Wilson's "Textual introduction" to his (and Sir A. Quiller-Couch's) edition of the Tempest (1921); Percy Simpson, "The Bibliographical Study of Shakespeare" in Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications (Vol. I, 1923); R. B. McKerrow's An Introduction to Bibliography (1927) and his Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method (1939).

Ingenious methods have been devised to ascertain the chronology of works for which external evidence is defective, and many questions of authenticity and authorship have been solved by an increasingly subtle study of distinctions of style and a systematic search for the remotest bibliographical and documentary evidence. Organization, sheer dogged industry, but also much ingenuity and brilliant guesswork have had their rewards in results for which every scholar must be grateful. . .

p. 94 No doubt this work will and should continue: there are still many problems unsolved and many important gaps to fill. Important authors are not available in critical and complete editions, as in the case of Layamon, Fulke, Greville, Peele, Middleton, Dryden, Defoe, Johnson, Coleridge, and many others. Much is still obscure in questions of authorship and date, especially in the vexed field of Elizabethan drama. No doubt, similar questions remain unsolved in all other literatures, but there is general agreement today that the task has been accomplished in its main outlines, at least in the great Western literatures. The time has definitely arrived when all this material accumulated and sifted by several generations should be put to some further use. The task of interpretation and coordination, the task of writing literary history, cannot be put forever on the shoulders of the next generation.

Wellek cont'd

3.31
Pp. 94,95 "The only American book which treats of the problems under discussion in a systematic fashion, Andre Morize's Problems and Methods of Literary History (1922), creates the impression that literary history is almost confined to questions of editing and authorship, sources and biography. Towards the end of the book, there is only a brief reference to literary history in connection with the history of ideas and the history of manners. Likewise, most academic teaching stresses the use of tools and the technique of preparing new ones. The usual argument in favor of such limitations upon "research" is the value of the discipline gained by training in these methods. But the results of such training seem overrated, in view of the many fantastic theories propounded by the greatest experts. W. W. Greg - to quote a single instance - made an elaborate attempt to show that the elder Hamlet was not poisoned through the ear, and that the play within the play as well as the ghost made a false accusation.⁵ Erudition and expert knowledge are no guarantees of common sense. However indispensable all this preliminary work, an overemphasis on it results frequently in trivialities and useless pedertries which justly evoke the ridicule of the layman and the anger of the scholar at wasted energy.

"God Stands Behind the Book," Emile Cailliet
Christianity Today, April 9, 1965, p. 709

Surely it makes a big difference whether or not the historical critic approaches the biblical documents with an awareness of the more-than-historical dimensions of the data they attest. If one is going to apply a critical method to the Bible scientifically, he must first try to find out what the Bible is about and then investigate the ways in which it is about this. The fault of much criticism is that it reverses the order. Thus a secularly minded methodology dares condition God and the things that are God's. No wonder its naturalistically inspired ways stick in the throat of evangelicals! Indeed, the conclusions reached by means of such a methodology have all along been implied in its procedure.

The next device invited in the secularized quest for "truth" is likely to be some mechanical contrivance. Indeed, a Church of Scotland minister used computers to show that out of fourteen New Testament epistles currently attributed to Paul, five were by a single author and the rest the work of five different authors. Whereupon a conference on computers and the humanities held at Yale University was told that by applying the minister's very method, one could prove that James Joyce's Ulysses was the work of five authors and that none of these wrote Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. All in all, six authors could be assigned to the two novels. Concluded Dr. Sidney M. Lamb, associate professor of linguistics at Yale, a computer is merely "an instruction-following machine" that does only what it is told, or programmed, to do.

3.31

See also "Paul and the Computer" by Reinier Schippers
Christianity Today, December 4, 1964, p. 7

"With the help of a computer, the Rev. A. C. Morton, a Scot, has calculated that of the thirteen New Testament epistles generally ascribed to Paul, only five - Romans, Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, and Philemon - were written by him. Under the title, "A Computer Challenges the Church," in the London Observer (November 3, 1963), he claims he has proved this in a scientific, unimpeachable manner.

3.31

.....
Morton's work is based on the principle that every writer has his own peculiarities of style that are deeply rooted and always recognizable. These peculiarities no more change in the course of a lifetime than does a man's fingerprint. Among these unchangeable characteristics Morton reckons the number of words that make up a complete sentence. He chiefly counts such phenomena as the repetition of the word "and" and the space between uses of the word; the use of "it" to begin a sentence; the use of the words "but" and "in," of the verb "to be", of the definite article, and of the Greek equivalent of "he," "she," and "it."

Morton investigated the regularity with which these appeared in seven Greek authors. Of these he names Isocrates and Aristotle, and when them his theory holds true. Classical scholars have noted that this can be expected because an orator like Isocrates carefully molded his language. For the rest, scholars would still have to see the figures to be convinced."

Albright, W. F. New Horizons in Biblical Research (London: Oxford) 1966

p. 14 Much of the source-analysis of the modern critical scholarship from the school of Wellhausen on has been based on the erroneous notion that the consonantal text, and often even the vowels of the Pentateuch, remained completely unchanged after a supposed final redaction about the fifth century B. C., perhaps under Ezra. However, we now know that there were many different textual recensions in the following period. Examination of the Dead Sea Scrolls and renewed study of the Septuagint have brought concrete evidence that the Massoretic tradition was only one of a number, and that the consonantal text of the Pentateuch as known in all Hebrew manuscripts up to recent years as well as in all printed Hebrew Bibles, is by no means the same as it was when these documents were originally written and compiled. Consequently the attempt to break a text down into minute units, sometimes sharing a single verse, even a short verse, among three different sources, is quite futile. But although these fundamentalist 'higher critics' are quite wrong in their presuppositions, it does not necessarily follow that the documentary hypothesis in general is wrong. But it does have to be treated with much more critical circumspection than has hitherto been the case.

p. 15

3.17 p. 15 What was Moses' place in history? By comparing the cultic, ritual, and civil legislation of the Pentateuch with earlier and later developments, we can show that it must come in the middle - somewhere between the fourteenth and eleventh centuries B. C. It fits nowhere else. Similarly we can show that the religion of the Pentateuch after Genesis is intermediate between Patriarchal religion on the one hand, and the religion of the Monarchy on the other, and so must be Mosaic in our broad sense.

Hogarth Lectures on Literature The English Renaissance: Fact or Fiction?
E. M. W. Tillyard. The Hogarth Press, London, 1952

- p. 89 Since I have extended the epic category to include prose, you may ask
p. 90 whether Malory's Morte D'Arthur may not fall within it. I believe not,
and especially in view of Vinaver's important conclusions drawn from
the recently discovered manuscript at Winchester on which he has based
his edition. It now appears that what we believed was one long work
is the collected works of Thomas Malory. This discovery both exonerates
Malory from the charge of faulty composition, often and quite rightly
brought against the work as originally conceived of, and removes him
from the small and select class of authors who have staked most of their
reputation on a single great work.

Fletcher, Robert H., The Arthurian Material in the Chronicles (New York) 1966
 Second edition, expanded by a bibliography and critical essay for the period
 1905-1965 by Roger Sherman Loomis. Originally published as Vol X (Harvard)
Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, Vol. X) Boston 1906

A Supplementary Bibliography and Discussion
 by Roger Sherman Loomis

(supplement, pp. 317-335)

p. 317 Fletcher's excellent work on the Arthurian material in the Chronicles, when first published in 1906 as volume 10 of the (Harvard) Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, established itself at once as a sober and reliable work of reference in a field full of interest but confused by antiquated editions, forged data, and baseless speculation. Long out of print, it was republished in 1958 by Curt Franklin, and is now again published with a supplement bringing the discussion and the bibliography up to date. It goes without saying that, in the sixty years that have passed since this book first appeared, the scholarship on the subject has greatly expanded. ((If Fletcher were alive)) he would doubtless feel obligated to revise drastically his chapter on the life and work of Geoffrey of Monmouth in the light of the researches of H. E. Salter, J. Hammer, J. S. P. Tatlock, and R. A. Caldwell.

p. 318 Fletcher's account of Gildas agrees in nearly all respects with later scholarship. . . . The historians Hodgkin and Stenton are less sceptical than Fletcher of Gildas' statement that the first Saxon invasion swept across almost the whole island. Fletcher's reasons for disregarding the failure of Gildas to mention Arthur seem to have been equally cogent for more recent scholars, who without exception regard him as a historical figure.

p. 319 In general, it may be said that scholars have not discredited Fletcher's account of Nennius and his analysis of the Historia Britonum. The state of the manuscripts, however, makes it difficult to arrive at final conclusions.

p.320 Fletcher's over-cautious statement that Arthur may have been a myth after all is offset by the fact that his name is not that of any Celtic divinity but a normal development from the Roman name Artorius, and by Stenton's conclusion (p.31) that "four independent authorities (including Gildas and the Saxon Chronicle) agree in suggesting a single coherent story" of the period.

Fletcher, Robert H., The Arthurian Material in the Chronicles. A Supplementary Bibliography and Discussion by Roger Sherman Loomis (New York) 1966

(Supplement, pp. 317-335)

Geoffrey of Monmouth

p. 322 All recent authorities reject the Gwentian Brut as a forgery of Iolo Morgannwg. Consequently, Fletcher's statement that Geoffrey was an archdeacon of Llandaff and a nephew of Uchtryd, Bishop of that see, has no sound basis. He was probably from at Monmouth of Breton parents, for he referred to himself as Brito (not Wallensis) and showed in the Historia, as Fletcher noted, a contempt for the Welsh in contrast to his admiration for the Bretons. . . . The date of his death was 1155, not 1154.

p. 323 With the exception of Griscom and Windisch, scholars ^{agree} with Fletcher that Geoffrey's alleged source, the liber vetustissimus, brought from Britannia (Brittany), either never existed or else contained only some meagre suggestions. Fletcher was too generous in absolving Geoffrey of intentional fraud, but it was an age when charters, saints' lives, and histories were commonly composed or doctored for ~~some~~ some practical end. Geoffrey's motives in perpetrating the hoax were in part the desire for fame and consequent advancement in the world, and in part a pride in his Breton stock. There is no reason to suppose that any of his patrons were accomplices in the sham.

p.324 The emperor Lucius Hiberus was fabricated by Geoffrey out of a hypothetical Welsh Llwh the Irishman (Hibernus), and his wars with Arthur follow somewhat the same pattern as the cognate stories of the wars of Loth and Lancelot with Arthur.

MERLIN

p. 325 The opinion of Bruce, Faral, and Tatlock that the Welsh poems attributed to Myrddin were composed after Geoffrey had made him famous by the Historia and the Vita Merlini is rejected by Welsh scholars. Jarman believes that the name Myrddin was not that of a historical person but was ~~imply~~ simply due to the mistaken analysis of the name Caerfyrddin (Carmarthen) as a compound meaning "Fortress of Myrddin". . . . Fletcher was doubtless right in attributing to Geoffrey the arbitrary lifting of the story of Vortigern's tower from Nennius and identifying Ambrosius with Merlin.

3,31-29

est force to bear on the weakest point are still valuable, even though unheard of, on the football field; but in battle—no “field” any more—the machine gun and the atom bomb have made “scatteration” instead of concentration the necessity if one is to preserve his integration. Longfellow could feel as certain that Caesar was the hero of Miles Standish as we can that he was the fundamental authority for Fluellen on “the true disciplines of the wars, look you, or the Roman disciplines,” whether either actually ever saw an original or even a translation.

Ovid's book of *Metamorphoses* was equally practical for anyone who pretended to technical literary competence. Significantly, Erasmus does not list Ovid as one of the authors for his perfect grammar school. But he gives *Metamorphoses* its own special and fundamental niche as the source for the rhetorical graces of mythology, etc. As such, it was early beaten in the original into every schoolboy, including Shakspeare. For some, the experience killed neither the recipient nor the received, so that even the erudite as well as the relatively unlearned are to be caught using Golding's translation more or less judiciously. Through Golding's eyes, one could see still further into the mysteries of poesy. And in Golding, there was the further advantage that the stories had been not only morally fumigated as was customary, but were specifically Calvinized in a long introductory summary. In getting rhetorical grace, no one was to go astray morally and religiously—unless indeed, to use the dodge of Erasmus, he already had the seeds of evil flourishing within him. Significantly, “this rather formidable obstacle . . . has been relegated to the end of the book,” by way of sweeping it under the carpet, thus leaving the reader of this volume morally and religiously wholly unprotected. To Golding, Calvin's lucubrations generally, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Caesar's *Commentaries* were all calculated means to the same end of cultured uplift, whether in the service of the pen, the sword, what not. As such, they demanded translation into the vulgar tongue. If one knows what Golding was about, he will see deadly consistency throughout. Golding was not trying to be amusing to anyone, and for one I am not amused by Golding—not even though there is possibility of ancestral connection—and I suspect Golding himself would not be amused by some of the intended praise bestowed upon him. The objective of these men—Golding, Baldwin, etc., particularly Sir Thomas Elyot, even Ascham—must be more fully emphasized, if we are to get any just notion of how the sixteenth century came to be. What we find most interesting was not their fault, even if they did play so fundamental a part in shaping it.

There are some good points in the editor's evaluation of Golding, such as the observation that Pyramus and Thisbe “break into what are really Golding's fourteeners” (p. xxi). The burlesque is of the older style to which Golding's work belongs; but since Ovid is the source of the story, the point is valid, though not conclusive, for “everybody” in Golding's day used fourteeners—as Shakspeare himself has done elsewhere also, mostly for comic purposes.

I am certain I could—I shan't—put together a respectable list of Golding's “boners” (see the happy “large flew” above) to keep company with Marlowe's. No one has yet given Golding the assiduous attention that the poet Marlowe has justly received. There are clever illustrations of Golding's

difficulties in getting frisky Ovid into the lumbering coach of the chosen metrics, where one must admit at least a bit of clumsiness on Golding's part, though, I fear, most of Golding's intended grace is attributed to him as unwitting awkwardness—literary ideas have changed. At least, in most of the illustrations given—I applaud the selections—Golding was using infallible literary devices to improve Ovid. Ovid is the stalking horse, and Golding the whipping boy for quite a disquisition on fine points of metrics—some of it at least sensible, to the best of my belief and opinion. Only, Golding was following faithfully a different set of rules.

Eventually the editor turns to the positive side of Golding's contribution, and finds a great deal to praise justly—Golding per se is most certainly not Ovid. I doubt if anyone who can really read Ovid will care to be troubled with any translator. After I had gone through the classical mill of my day, *Metamorphoses* (Gleason's selections, of course) was the only book of the lot I cared to keep handy for reading. For some years I was obliged to teach Caesar and the rest, but not Ovid; he might have been interesting! It is as an essay on poetics generally, particularly upon metrics, that this introduction may possibly be found to have some value.

On balance, the text is not accurate enough to be useful to the scholar, and the editorial trivia will merely irritate him. Even for its stated purpose, surely an accurate text would have done as well. At any rate, it is a handy and handsome volume, in those respects worthy of the publishing name it bears. A very little scholarly care for accuracy of text, etc., could have made it so much more and nobody the worse.

T. W. BALDWIN

Southern Illinois University

INTERNAL EVIDENCE AND ELIZABETHAN DRAMATIC AUTHORSHIP: AN ESSAY IN LITERARY HISTORY AND METHOD. By S. Schoenbaum. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966. Pp. xx+281. \$7.50.

While the abusers of internal evidence in studies of Elizabethan dramatic authorship are the villains of Professor Schoenbaum's essay, and internal evidence itself is inevitably contaminated thereby, it is my view that he has made out a strong case for the greater value of internal evidence over external evidence. As I see it, Professor Schoenbaum is writing about at least three kinds of scholars: (1) poor scholars misusing good tools, i.e., legitimate internal evidence; (2) good scholars misusing good tools; and (3) good scholars achieving acceptable results with good tools—the order is a descending one in terms of number. When, for example, we read that "the objection to commonplace or unparallel parallels occurs often in *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*. It is a legitimate objection but applies less to a method than to its abuses. For if the parallels are not parallel and the words and phrases are commonplace, the test, in a very real sense, has not been employed" (p. 190), we can agree that this is true of all tests of internal evidence, not solely of the parallels test. What Professor Schoenbaum has done, really, is to give us an entertaining annotated bibliography of attribution studies in the field of Elizabethan drama, a bibliography which records the melancholy fact that most workers in this field have made asses of themselves time after time. The archvillains are

Homer Bibliography

341-0

- E. R. Dodds in Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship (ed. M. Platnauer, 1954)
- Lord, A. B., The Singer of Tales 1960
- Lorimer, H. L. Homer and the Monuments 1950
- Scott, J. S., The Unity of Homer 1920
- Page, D. L., History and the Homeric Iliad 1950 (1963)
- Bowra, C. M., Tradition and Design in the Iliad 1930, (1950, 1958, 1963 reprints from corrected sheets of the first edition)
- Myres, J.L. (ed. D. H. F. Gray), Homer and his Critics 1958
- Bowra, C. M., Landmarks in Greek Literature 1966
- Steiner, George and Robert Fagles editors, Homer, A Collection of Critical Essays, 1962
- Murray, Gilbert , The Rise of the Greek Epic 1907, 1911, 1924 (1960 Galaxy Book)
- Finley, M. I., The World of Odysseys, 1965
- Kirk, G. S., The Language and Background of Homer, 1964
- Kirk, G. S. The Songs of Homer, 1962
- Wace, J. B., and Frank H. Stubbings, A Companion to Homer, 1962
- Webster, T. B. L., From Mycense to Homer 1958
- Page, Denys L., The Homeric Odyssey 1955
- Vermeule, Emily, Greece in the Bronze Age, 1964 "Homer has been rejected as evidence"
says M. I. Finley of Vermeule's book

- 3.41 Situation in the study of Homer
- 3.45 Homer destroyed in thought of a few years ago, now largely reestablished
- 3.50 Effect of work of Milton Parry
- ~~3.501 Historical accuracy in Homer~~
- ~~3.502 Historical error in Homer~~
- 3.51 Nibelungenlied, ^{3.52} Beowulf, ^{3.53} Piers Plowman
 "Half a dozen motor-bikes cannot be combined to make a Rolls-Royce car" RWC
- 3.61 The Indic epics
- 3.65 Persian literature
- 3.71 Beaumont and Fletcher
- 3.72 Chaucer
- 3.73 DOCTOR FAUSTUS Christopher Marlowe
- 3.81 The Disintegration of Shakespeare
- 3.86 Applied to Goethe
- 3.91 General repudiation of "spontaneous growth" ideas and source hunting
Helmut Dardner
- 3.91~~5~~ Disappearance of term "higher criticism"
- 3.93 Romantic Literature
- 3.94 Latin Literature
- 3.95 John Milton's Paradise Lost (Richard Bentley)

Situation in the Study of Homer

See 3.31-16 Guerard, Albert, Preface to World Literature, 1940-57

page 72. " . . . internal evidence, of a convincing nature, reveals a commanding artistic personality. To dissolve Homer into a myth or a committee, much stronger acid would be needed than the Wolfian school has been able to supply."

See also 3.12 Encyclopedia Americana, 1966 ed. "Homer"

See 3.31 A Companion to Greek Studies (duostat print), p. 125

See 3.31 Homer. A Collection of Critical Essays ed. by Geo. Steiner p. 2

See 3.31 Karl Lachmann

See 3.31 Sandy's History of Classical Scholarship

See 3.31 Scott, John, The Unity of Homer

See 3.39 A Companion to Homer edited by Wace and Stubbings, pp. 257, 263

3.50 Notopoulos, J. A., "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry"

See 3.71 Bowra, C. M., Tradition and Design in the Iliad (Oxford) 1930

See 3.41 file on HOMER (truth and error preserved in)

See 3.45 Paideia, by Werner Jaeger trans. by D. Heit (1945) p. 421

See 12.6 under Style of P

The Validity of the Gospel Record, Ernest Findlay Scott. New York, 1938

(Scott - Prof. of N.T. Criticism, Union Theo. Sem., N.Y.)

p. 117, 118 A Warning may here be derived from the history of Homeric criticism, with which, from the time of its inception more than a century ago, the criticism of the Gospels has been curiously linked. The theory was put forward, and for some time was generally accepted, that the Iliad and Odyssey were compounded of a great number of ballads, different in date and authorship and revised by several editors. In this account of the poems there were doubtless some elements of truth; but the main effect was disastrous. Homer was sacrificed in the interests of a theory. His most splendid passages were discarded because they were too good for a primitive ballad or lengthened it out unduly. Sane critics are now agreed that if we are ever to explain these poems we must take them as they are, not as they might have been if they had been made according to our formula.

Emil Kraeling, THE OLD TESTAMENT SINCE THE REFORMATION, 1955

Page 89

"Orthodox biblicism was deeply entrenched once more and it seemed unlikely that biblical criticism of the sort being carried on in Germany could find admission there. But it was overlooked that biblical criticism had arisen on the Continent in emulation of the critical method developed in the study of the Greek and Roman classics. Homeric criticism found a hearing in England and thus paved the way for the application of similar principles to the biblical literature. A series of incidents now occurred which, through the publicity they received, helped to bring about a change."

Bowra, C. M., Landmarks in Greek Literature (Weidenfeld and Nicolson:London) 1966

p. 21 For some two centuries the Iliad and the Odyssey have been the victims of technical controversy on their composition and authorship. The Greeks themselves thought that the poems were the work of a single man called Homer, who lived in Chios and whose poems were preserved and recited after his death by a guild of bards who called themselves the Sons of Homer. At the other extreme some modern critics have argued that the poems are collections of separate lays from many hands put together at Athens in the sixth century B.C. Many of the arguments for this case have been discredited by recent investigations into oral traditions and their ways of working and by our realization that a poet who composes in his head for recitation constructs his tale quite differently from a poet who relies upon writing, that an audience which listens to a recited poem must have events put to it differently from a public which reads books. In our present state of knowledge we may say that the Iliad and the Odyssey may fairly be regarded as the work both of many poets and of a single poet. Behind them lies a long tradition of poets who told tales like theirs and certainly invented a large number of phrases and devices and episodes and characters which appear again in them. They are more directly dependent on this tradition than Shakespeare, for instance, is on North or Holinshed, and their debt is far more general and pervasive. More than this, they are composed in a certain way because this had been evolved and established through many generations for heroic poems. This means that in many respects they are highly conventional, but this in no ways reflects on their worth, for it is in his new use of conventions that a poet shows his strength. Nor can we doubt that behind these long epics lies a large number of short lays, whose technique can be discerned/ⁱⁿ both poems at many points and suggests that individual episodes in them were retold in a manner appropriate to a short song. To this extent the authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey is multiple, but we can in no way assess how many poets have contributed to them in the centuries when their stories and story-telling were fashioned. On the other hand the Greeks believed in a man called Homer, and we must respect their belief.

Bowra, C. M., Landmarks in Greek Literature (Weidenfeld and Nicholson: London) 1966

p. 21 (cont'd) It is true that they attributed to him poems which he is unlikely to have composed if he composed the Iliad and Odyssey. It is also true that we know next to nothing about him, and such attempts as were made in antiquity to write lives of him are flights of fancy compiled from the poets themselves. Yet both the Iliad and the Odyssey are single works of art, each composed on a recognizable pattern, with clearly discernible main movements in a commanding scheme, with a sustained tone and temper to be found in no other oral poetry, with a consistent and elevated style which could hardly have been maintained at such a level if some very uncommon poet had not p.23
/ been in control of it. There are indeed substantial differences of temper and outlook and vocabulary between the two poems, and these have led some scholars to assume the existence of two separate poets, each of whom was responsible for a complete work of art. This is by no means impossible, but the difference may just as well be explained by the hypothesis of a single author who first composed the Iliad and then in his riper years, when some of his first, fiery impetus had abated and he had mastered some new linguistic devices and matured some of his ideas, composed the Odyssey. We shall probably never know the right answer. But in the last resort it does not matter. What matter are the poems, which are the works of art based on a long tradition and themselves composed in the latter part of the eighth century B.C., and it is not improper to speak of Homer and by him to mean the poet or poets who composed the Iliad and the Odyssey.

(Pub. by The University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon)

OLD TESTAMENT POETRY AND HOMERIC EPIC

3.41-6

William Whallon, Michigan State University

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

work attributed to a major prophet will recover his *ipsissima verba*. What the school has failed to give much attention to is the problem, not of transmission, but of composition, where we face the possibility that all poets used the same word pairs—and tended to use many of the same hemistichs and distichs, and even several fairly long passages—more or less as single formulas. Yet most of the Homerists in the English-speaking world today would agree that the analogous possibility, when applied to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, was as close to certainty as theoretical matters can ever come.

The Towneley scholium on the first line of the tenth book of the *Iliad* declares that Homer created this book but not as a part of the epic in which it stands; and a group of nineteenth-century scholars accordingly came to regard the book as somehow dubious. Because of the high degree of repetition in the Homeric corpus it is not surprising that some parts of the book—an example that may or may not have been noticed before is *Il.* 10.292-4 = *Od.* 3.382-4—should also appear in the *Odyssey* but nowhere else in the *Iliad*: from such evidence the book was thought not genuinely Iliadic but a recognizably Odyssean insertion. This was the day of patchwork theories and for most Homerists in the English-speaking world it is past. For there was an inherent flaw that would, had it been given its due attention, have prevented much useless research: in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* together, eighteen hundred different lines occur at least twice, and the pattern of recurrence is so complex as to make comparative dating totally impractical.⁷ None of the old plagiarism arguments any longer seems much more likely than its converse—the tenth book of the *Iliad* could have donated, rather than appropriated, all the lines it shares with the *Odyssey*; and all the lines it shares with the rest of the *Iliad* (except for the second syllable *Il.* 10.402-4=17.76-8) could likewise have been equally well lent as borrowed. The prevailing opinion nowadays appears to be that no repeated passage, line, or phrase was deliberately transcribed from one occurrence into another. The element was instead a commonplace developed in the oral tradition and used by many poets before the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written down. I do not see how this opinion of Homerists can be mistaken, nor why it should not, with very few changes, be held by Hebraists also. We may therefore object to a mass of conclusions about the dependence of Old Testament poets on each other.

⁷ For a list of thirty (outmoded) works on the subject—one of them Dutch and all the others German—see A. Shewan, "Repetition in Homer and Tennyson," *The Classical Weekly*, XVI (1922-23), 155, n. 5. Shewan himself represents the modern attitude, as does George M. Calhoun, "Homeric Repetitions," *Univ. of California Publications in Classical Philology*, XII (1933), 1-26.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

cerned less with originality than with making the best use of all resources that came to mind. Here is our hypothesis: in the vast and continuous oral tradition that existed at one time, a tradition far greater in bulk and scope than we can see from what has survived, poets borrowed from each other until their songs were a great deal alike. There is a considerable amount of repetition in the poetry known to us; there was a *tremendous* amount in the tradition at large (for when the size of the corpus increases arithmetically the proportion of identifiable formulas increases geometrically); and therefore no verse that strikes us as unusually fine is certain to have been created for the context in which it now appears. Quite the contrary: the better a verse, the wider its use. Nor can we establish limits for the size of the formula: Psalm 18 recurs with slight change as II Samuel 22, and many another element of equal length might well have recurred at an earlier day. We may prefer to believe that only the very best and most important part of the poetry ever came to be written down, and that only the best of what came to be written was not allowed to perish. Both possibilities are attractive, but both are far beyond proof. The ordinary practice of dating books with respect to each other, on the basis of the repeated hemistichs and distichs, may in certain rare instances arrive at the exact truth, for when the canon began to take shape lines from one scroll could be copied into another. But as a general theory this idea of composition is incredible. Certain parts of the poetic corpus, the entire Book of Job for one, might never have existed in anything like their present form until the moment they were recorded. These parts might very well, that is to say, have been first created with the advantage of literacy—no matter: they were composed in elements that the authors knew by ear and second nature, not in elements stolen one by one from a room full of documents. What can we deduce about the origins of Old Testament poetry from the evidence of its style? We can at least take from Homeric theory the concept of an ancient and diffuse oral tradition, in which each poet used the work of his predecessors and added his own best inventions to the common fund of phrases available to those that should come after.¹³

¹³ The Isaiah roll is now generally thought to contain works by different authors; so we have to conclude with George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah*, The International Critical Commentary series (Edinburgh, 1912), I, lvii-lviii: "All that can be strictly claimed is that what clearly proceeds from Isaiah is to be regarded as his, all that clearly proceeds from other or later writers is not to be regarded as his, and all that is neither clearly his nor clearly not his must be regarded as uncertain." But our uncertainty is even greater than this threefold tautology implies. For neither the verses that recur elsewhere nor those that do not are more likely to have been created by Isaiah than to have been traditional commonplaces before his day.

Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, Vol VI, edited by J. Coert Rylaarsdam
Williams, Walter G., "Tension and Harmony between Classical Prophecy and Classical
Law" pp. 71-91.

p. 86 We have indicated elsewhere ¹⁷ that II Isaiah never identified in the same
person the functions of servant and messiah. This identification is made first of
all in the New Testament and has been projected back into Deutero-Isaiah.

¹⁷ Walter G. Williams, Prophets, Pioneers to Christianity (Nashville: Abingdon,
1956), pp. 110 ff.

Rose, H. J., A Handbook of Greek Literature (Methuen & Co., London) 1934, 1942, 1948, 1951 (dates of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th editions respectively) Reprinted with minor corrections 1956 and 1961.

See pages 34 - 46 for a thoroughgoing discussion of the "Homeric Question".

P. 36-37

(((F. A. Wolf in his Prolegomena ad Homerum, 1795, denied that any man, without the aid of writing, could compose poems so long and on the whole so admirable constructed as the Iliad and Odyssey; or that if he did, that they could survive in an illiterate age. He never denied the possibility of learning the poems by heart once they were written. But supposing that by some miracle they were constructed and did survive, why did not the authors of the epics learn the art of constructing a poem from them, instead of producing, as we know from Aristotle that they did, works lacking in unity? He concludes, then, that behind the poems as we have them there must lie a number of short pieces, rhapsodies or lays of moderate compass, which were afterwards collected, joined together by a very able editors or diasceusts, and written down in more or less their present form. In support of this he cites a few passages . . . which he holds to show a rather clumsy join between two distinct lays. Moreover, ancient and modern critics have declared unhomeric certain passages essential to the story, or at least highly desirable . . . If important parts of the poem are additions to what the original Homer composed, why not less important ones? The actual putting together was done by, or rather under the direction of Peisistratos, who had at his court several notable poets)))

P. 37 - 38

(((Wolf got a hearing from scholars, especially in Germany. With literary men, and particularly the foremost of his time and country, he found less favour. Schiller attacked him and his theories vigorously; Goethe, at the time when he wrote Hermann und Dorothea, was a declared Wolfian, and went further than Wolf in supposing a number of Homericidai, whose collective efforts had finally led to the genius of the poems. But later, while working at his Achilleis, he became more and more fully convinced of the unity of Homer. Wieland testified from his own experience in writing Oberon that a poet need not lay down a plan beforehand to compose a work having sufficient unity. Why should not Homer have simply been led on by his poetical instinct to compose more and more, until his productions of themselves fell into the framework of unified poems? But the great critic Schlegel strongly supported Wolf, and his own colleagues, the classical specialists, followed the lines he had laid down in a long series of investigations, characterized by greater learning and diligence than insight.)))

Wolff

P. 38 As a result of much analysis (Lachmann, for example, dissected the Iliad, down to the death of Hektor, into sixteen lays), a modification of Wolf's view began to grow up. We may conveniently call it by the name of Grote, the historian of Greece, although he did not actually originate it, since his is the best-known statement of it and aroused interest, not only in England but in Germany.

P. 38-39

(((Grote thought the Odyssey was the work of one poet but that the Iliad showed traces of multiple authorship, notably certain inconsistencies between various sections which he accounted for on the basis of his theory. Kirchhoff further modified this theory especially in its application to the Odyssey. He supposed two poems, with an enlargement forming practically a third, whose combination had made the present work. These had been put together, but not so skillfully as to hide a number of clumsy joins.)))

P. 39 The outstanding characteristic of this theory is its utter impossibility. Wolf and Grote had supposed things to happen which really have taken place in the history of literature. An editor of taste and poetical feeling has put together a selection of ballads into an epic; Lönnrot made the Kalevala in this way.⁵⁷

H. J. Rose, Professor Emeritus of Greek in the University of St. Andrews

P. 39 An original shorter epic has been expanded by additions into a larger one; this is the history of the Chanson de Roland.⁵⁸ What is known to have happened in Finland and France might have done so in Greece. But that any one possessed of tolerable poetic ability, to say nothing of a genius, should have written an epic without an end, like the supposed Return, or without a beginning, like the supposed Vengeance, still more one with neither end nor beginning, like the Telemacheia, is past belief altogether, and most of all past belief when Kirchhoff assigns some of his supposed shorter epics to an age of whose art we know enough to say that the characteristic Greek feeling for form and symmetry was rapidly developing.

P. 40 Apart from such absurdities - I can find no milder word - as these, the objections to the various forms of the separatist theory, Wolfian, Grotian or Kirchhoffian, are of a negative kind: viz. that the arguments used to support it are too weak to be capable of proving anything. They fall under three heads, linguistic, archaeological and literary. For it is plain that if the poems are composite and not all the product of one age, we should be able to detect differences in the accent and syntax between the older and later parts, and also to find in the later allusions to customs, instruments, industries, laws and so forth inconsistent with what the older ones relate. Finally, it is not likely that any longer work could be put together from shorter ones so cunningly as not to show the joins here and there to a careful observer. Hence arguments of all three kinds have been used, ~~but mostly of the third sort.~~ but mostly of the third sort.

(((Rose examines the linguistic argument regarding the digamma and finds that their use does not prove the Iliad and Odyssey were produced from a number of poems of different dates. The argument of archaeology concerning various shapes of shields is also shown to be inconclusive since the two shapes can be shown to have existed side by side. Homer represents his heroes in the equipment of his own day, pretty obviously as mixed as his own dialect.)))

p.39 | ⁵⁸ Briefly, the reason why none of these countries ever had an Iliad is that none of them ever had a Homer.

P. 42 But the chief weapon of the separatist has always been literary criticism, and of this it is not too much to say that such niggling ^{word-} ~~was~~-baiting, such microscopic hunting of minute inconsistencies and flaws^{p.43} in logic, has hardly been seen, outside of the Homeric held, since Rymer and John Dennis died. No long poem and no long novel is ever likely to be without self-contradictions here and there, and indeed many shorter pieces contain them. In Les Femmes savantes, iii,2, / (iv,2), Armande says to her 'et vingt fois . . . j'ai lu des vers de vous.' In Othello, the double timing is well-known. Bianca taxes Cassio with having neglected her for a week, iii,4,173; therefore he has ^{been} in Cyprus for something more than seven days. Yet the preceding scenes occupy the night of the day on which he arrives and the following day, less than forty-eight hours. No one supposes Shakespeare or Moliere to have written these plays in conjunctions with any one else; but when it comes to Homer, such ^{arguments} arguments as the following have been offered, and taken, seriously. (((Three examples follow where passages are attributed to different lays by different authors or put among the late additions to the poem))) Other examples of this kind of thing could be multiplied from the writings of scholars, by no means the worst of their schools, who have dissected the two poems. If they wished to prove multiple authorship by a sound criterion, evidence of the smoothing away of inconsistencies would be more to the point; for ^{p.44} such things are much more clearly evident to readers, especially perhaps to persons who are getting the poem by heart, than to the author.

The fact is that the separatist doctrine sprung from a very pardonable misapprehension, and was later supported by another. Wolf, as we have seen, began by stressing the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of composing or learning such works as the Iliad and Odyssey without the aid of writing. Difficult in the extreme it no doubt would be for a modern, for we generally commit but little verbatim to memory, It was not so in Homer's time To know by heart 15,000 lines or so was probably not a rare accomplishment then, any more than it seems to have been in Finland; ⁷² much more remarkable feats are reported of Arabian story-tellers. ⁷³ But all such speculations are needless, since, as has already been pointed out, writing had been known in that region for long before he or even his people arrived there.

Rose, H. J., A Handbook of Greek Literature (Methune & Co. , London)

p. 44 On top of this misconception came the theory that was for a while prevalent in the nineteenth century, that much literature and art had ^{grown} from up, not from the efforts of individuals, but from the people in general. The truth, as we now see it, is that a people can and do condition an art (there could have been no English poetry but for the English language, the creation of the people at large, and certain generally shared ideas as to what constitutes verse), but that art is always and everywhere the creation of individuals, the so-called popular poems, such as ballads, being simply the works of writers, or other composers, so obscure that their names have remained unknown. Nothing remotely like an epic has ever taken shape without a poet to shape it.

p. 45 Which is likelier, that there should have been one great poet whose two chief, perhaps only, works differed somewhat from each other in choice of plot and consequent minutiae of treatment, or that there were two of about the same age, so like one another that only very close inspection can detect the difference? To the present writer, there can be but one answer; Homer is one, both poems are his, and the changes in manner, such as they are, can be easily explained by supposing the two works to have been written some years apart. Had there been another writer great enough to produce the Odyssey, he would have had a style of his own, differing from Homer's at least as much as that of Sophokles does from Aeschylus.

Having thus rejected separatism in all its forms, we may ask whether any results of value have come from this long aberration of scholarship. This answer is that, like all honest research, that of the separatists has done good to the subject. . . . it has drawn attention to a vast number of details, literary, aesthetic, grammatical, metrical and archaeological, comprehension of which adds greatly to an intelligent reader's enjoyment of these masterpieces. Also, it has given us a far clearer picture than before of the manner in which the epics were composed and published. We have left behind us the picturesque figure of the blind bard, chanting his inspired lays in the childhood or youth of the world. We have instead the more intelligible figure of the Ionian man of literature, probably of letters also, working upon traditional material, taking a legend here, a phrase there, again perhaps a line or two, from the earlier poems with which his

Rose, H. J., Handbook of Greek Literature

p. 45 (cont'd) memory was stored, and possibly also from rolls jealously guarded as the sacred property of his gild. We can picture him reciting, lyre or staff in hand,⁷⁶ before the nobles of his day or at public festivals. We can imagine him instructing pupils to do as he had done. No one is likely to suppose that he sat down^{p.46} and, beginning at Il. i, I, ^{wrote} write steadily on till he reached the end of the Odyssey. Nor does any one imagine that a ne uarietur edition of his words, too sacred to have a single letter altered, passed into the hands of those who came after him. On the contrary, it is highly probably that small alterations and insertions were made here and there,⁷⁷ certain that the language was gradually modernized, as has happened to most English classics, by no means unlikely that one or two details were the work of pupils, not of the master himself. Substantially, we have Homer complete and perfect; in detail, we must count on retouchings and allow for them to the extent of our knowledge and ingenuity in restoration.

⁷⁷ For what they are worth, I record my guesses concerning interpolations, apart from short additions of a line or two. ----- may be from another document; ----- contains a list of river-names largely unknown to Homer and the unhomeric word -----, applied in Hesiodic manner ----- to the heroes of Homer's poems; the rivers also recall a similar list, ----- . I am inclined to excise the whole passage -----, supposing it to be the insertion of an archaeologically minded rhapsode, who wished to explain why there was no trace of the Greek wall left in the Troad. If this is so, he altered 35 slightly to fit his insertion. ----- Needless to say, I am not the first to object to any of these passages, and many of them were suspected in antiquity.

An amusing parallel to the rise and fall of the separatist theories may be given from Middle English philology. In 1902, a theory was put forward and rapidly gained ground to the effect that Piers Plowman was the work of a plurality of authors; see Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. ii, p. 3 sqq. To-day, as my late colleague A. Blyth Webster informed me, scarcely a philologist of any eminence takes it seriously. In the case of Homer, the paradox has had a longer run.

Rose, H. J., A Handbook of Grekk Literature

p. 58 Footnote 4. The fashion, once prevalent, of dissecting the W. D., ((abv. for Works and Days, ?of Hesiod?)), has lost favour even with scholars who still hold the separatist theory of Homer. The only question now seriously debated is whether the 'Days' are not a latter addition to the poem. Small insertions here and there may reasonably be suspected. See, for recent discussion, Sinclair, pp. ix-xvi.

Page 63 (Chapter IV - Homer)

This is the famous Homeric Question which scholars have debated for a century and a half: the reader will not expect it to be settled here. The later Greeks themselves possessed a whole cycle of epics on the Trojan war. Two of these were of surpassing excellence, and were attributed to Homer. This attribution was accepted quite wholeheartedly until modern times when closer investigation showed all sorts of discrepancies of fact, style and language both between the two epics and between various parts of each. The immediate result of this was the minute and confident division of the two poems, but especially of the Iliad, into separate lays of different periods, appropriately called 'strata' by critics who sometimes imperfectly distinguished between artistic and geological composition.

The study of the epic poetry of other races, and of the methods used by poets working in this traditional medium, has done a great deal to restore confidence in the substantial unity of each poem: that is to say, that what we have in each case is not a short poem by one original 'Homer' to which later poets have added more or less indiscriminately, but a poem conceived as a unity by a relatively late 'Homer' who worked over and incorporated much traditional material--though the present Iliad certainly contains some passages which were not parts of 'Homer's' design. Whether the same poet wrote both poems is a point on which opinions differ and probably always will. The difference in tone and in treatment is great.

Longinus, the finest critic of antiquity, observed this, and remarked, 'Homer in the Odyssey is like the setting sun; the grandeur remains, but not the intensity'. It may be the same sun. But a man has a right to an opinion who has immersed himself in Homer to the extent of translating one of the poems. Accordingly, it is interesting to observe that of the two recent English translators, T. E. Lawrence is so certain that the two poets are not the same that he does not even consider the possibility: while Mr. E. V. Rieu says, 'His readers may feel as sure that they are in one man's hands as they do when they turn to As You Like It after reading King John'.

Biblical and Other Studies edited by Alexander Altmann (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 1963.

Chapter entitled "Elihu the Intruder" A Study of the Authenticity of Job (Chapters 32-33) by Robert Gordis pp. 60-78

p. 60 The prose tale (chapters 1-2, 42) raises an entire complex of problems: (a) its relationship to the poetry, (b) the earlier history of the Job tradition, several stages of which can now be constructed, and (c) the inner unity of the prose narrative itself. The Dialogue of Job and his Friends which follows contains three cycles of speeches. While all scholars recognize that all three cycles are original, virtually all are agreed that the third cycle (chapters 22-31) is incomplete and disarranged, but there is no unanimity with regard to a possible reconstruction of the material.

p. 66 The authenticity and relevance of the Elihu speeches have long been subjects of contention in the study of the Book of Job. The Church Father, Gregory the Great (died 604), stigmatized the Elihu chapters as being of little value, a view which has been widely accepted today both with regard to the content and the literary quality of the speeches. It is fair to say that today most critical scholars regard them as a more or less clumsy effort at interpolation by a defender¹⁵ or by several defenders¹⁶ of the orthodox religion of the time. Only a relatively few scholars have defended the authenticity of the Elihu speeches,¹⁷ though often on contradictory or unconvincing grounds.

Before embarking on a detailed investigation of the evidence, it is well to note the growing disfavor in which the atomization of ancient literary documents is viewed by contemporary scholarship. Increasingly, the study of ancient literatures, like that of the Homeric epics, has been focusing attention upon the unity and meaning of the whole work rather than upon the disparity of the parts. That the indiscriminate, and even accidental, lumping together of scattered literary fragments by an obtuse redactor, who often did not understand the material he was working with, will produce a masterpiece - that naive faith of nineteenth-century literary critics is no longer widely shared today.¹⁸

3.41-14³

¹⁸ Cf. the trenchant observations of H.D.F. Kitto, The Greeks (Harmondsworth, 1951), p.63. "This attribution [of the Iliad and the Odyssey to Homer] was accepted quite wholeheartedly until modern times, when closer investigation showed all sorts of discrepancies of fact, style and language both between the two epics and between various parts of each. The immediate result of this was the minute and confident division of the two poems, but especially of the Iliad, into separate layers of different periods, appropriately called 'strata' by critics who . . . imperfectly distinguished between artistic and geological composition. The study of the epic poetry of other races, and of the methods used by poets working in this traditional medium has done a great deal to restore confidence in the substantial unity of each poem: that is to say, that what we have in each case is not a short poem by one original 'Homer' to which later poets have added more or less indiscriminately, but a poem conceived as a unity by a relatively later 'Homer' who worked over and incorporated much traditional material - though the present Iliad certainly contains some passages which were not parts of 'Homer's' design."

p. 67 It is self-evident that this change of intellectual climate will not suffice to reverse the present widely held views on the inauthenticity of the Elihu chapters. The impressive arguments in favor of this view need to be analyzed and evaluated.

Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization 1100-650 B.C. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf) 1961

3.01 Chester G. Starr, Professor of History, University of Illinois

14. 5.7 p. viii As will be suggested at various points in the text, I have been driven to feel that the common historical view on this matter is faulty. It is time we gave over interpreting human development as a slow evolution of Darwinian type; great changes often occur in veritable jumps, two of which will appear before us in the following story.

p. 46 To fill out our knowledge of the Mycenaean kings and of their world generally, modern scholars have tended to turn to the Homeric epics; particularly in recent years the weight of opinion, it is safe to say, has equated Homeric and Mycenaean eras to a remarkable degree. This tendency I find overbold in its assumptions, shaky in its logic, and historically misleading to a dangerous extent. Nowhere dare we rely upon the Iliad and the Odyssey as independent evidence for conditions in the second millennium. Between the thirteenth century and the eighth century, in which the ^epics assumed their present shape, lay virtual aeons of unrest and even chaos; and, as I shall try to show later, the basic spirit of the Homeric poems accords chiefly with the closing stages of the Dark ages.

Beyond this point, which will be justified at its proper place, there are other serious grounds for rejecting Homeric and mythological evidence for the Late Bronze age. The root of both epic and myth may go back to this era - names later used for Trojan heroes and for mythical figures appear in the Mycenaean tablets as the names of men - but the historian has no valid tool by which to separate folk memory from later elaboration. In these circumstances, though it may be fascinating to ransack the riches of myth and epic to enliven an otherwise nameless account based on broken pots and crumbling stones, the procedure is utterly unsound historically. For later eras we have at times a legend and also happen to know the historical situation from which it rose - e.g. the Nibelungenlied (which concerns the Burgundian court of the

Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization (1961)

p. 47 fifth century after Christ); and here we can determine that, while a major event may long be remembered, its details and even its true shape are distorted in poetic transmission.

The common inclination to assume that Homer and myth may be taken as reflecting Mycenaean conditions unless the contrary be proved has much against it. Those scholars who have tried to re-create a detailed historical reality out of this traditional material have wound up with the most gossamer constructions and stand in hopeless disagreement among themselves. Very rarely can Homeric descriptions even of concrete objects be linked to Mycenaean prototypes. Nor, to return to the matter at hand, do the epic references to wide-ruling Agamemnon and other Zeus-born lords fit our knowledge of kingship in the Late Bronze age as well as might appear at first sight. Spiritually the cattle-reaving barons of the Homeric poems are at home in the Dark ages, not the wide world of Mycenaean days; the epic tradition cannot safely be said to show more than a vague memory of Mycenaean political geography.

p.64 If the absolute dates suggested above for these styles are valid, then Pylos was sacked about 1200, but the citadel of Mycenae endured to about 1150.

p. 66 The fall of Troy VI has been put about 1300, that of Troy VII.A about 1250 (or before the fall of Pylos), by Blegen

p. 67 Sober historical judgment must discard the ancient chronological schemes in toto; they are nothing more than elaborate harmonizations of the myths and legends which were known in later times and have no independent value whatever for historical purposes. Not until the fifth century B.C. did the historic Greek world come to date even contemporary events on a coherent scheme. . . .

While the calculations were sometimes ingenious, they often were simply guesses; Duris of Samos assumed that Troy fell in 1334 in order to place the event a thousand years before Alexander crossed into Asia. The often striking differences in dates

Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization (1961)

p. 68 assigned to early events are not incidental flaws in a generally solid tradition but reveal the fundamental weaknesses of the underlying principles. The Greeks believed their legends were historically true, and eventually, as they arranged their own times in sequences, they constructed elegant schemes for the past as well. We, however, need not follow them far. Since writing was used from at least the late eighth century B.C. onward, we can trust that major events and persons of the seventh and sixth centuries are approximately in the right sequence, though such figures as Pheidon of Argos float in a void; but so apparently reliable an absolute date as Solon's archonship of 594 - perhaps the first solid point in Greek history - has been seriously questioned.

Before the eighth century, on the other hand, no traditional date deserves credence in itself, and belief even in traditional events is largely a matter of faith. At the most, the historian can only hope that the main line of folk memory and genealogical tradition preserve the most outstanding developments in the right sequence; . . .

p 157 The main articles of my own belief are that the Homeric epic and myth cannot safely be used to restore a specific picture of events for any epoch, Mycenaean or otherwise; that they, nevertheless, do throw general light on the main characteristics of the Greek outlook, and for this end are among our most precious sources; that the evidence of the epic, in particular, bears best on the early eighth century. Like Ripe Geometric pottery, the Iliad represents a culmination of native evolution through the Dark ages. . . .

p. 158 The Iliad stands alone, save for its mighty sibling, the Odyssey; scholars have placed it by persuasive arguments anywhere from the twelfth to the sixth century B.C. . . . historically speaking, we can feel reasonably sure only that the Iliad had assumed its enduring form before 700 B.C.

Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization (1961)

14
5.7

pp. 160-70 In general, Homer was no freer to invent absolutely afresh^a than were the Geometric potters of Athens, and the story he cast in its final shape was undoubtedly long in creation. But for neither the Iliad nor the Odyssey can we hope to dissect levels of development of the story and of characterizations solely on the basis of internal evidence, even if logically we may assume that such development did underlie their present form. Those flaws of composition and the inconsistencies which modern students use toward the end of determining layers of accretion are highly subjective discoveries, if not at times the fruit of modern over-subtlety. Comparative studies of the Greek and other, more modern epic techniques throw some light on the probable mode of evolution of the Homeric oral style; but I think that one may gain as much illumination on the epic use of stock phrases and on its verse forms from examining the stiff principles of composition in Geometric vases. That a man could take inherited motifs and group them suddenly in a masterpiece has already been shown in the great Attic amphora CC200.

p. 163 Any assertion that the epic and myth reflect first the spirit of the early eighth century and then, more generally, the pattern of life in the Dark ages must cope with the very frequent efforts to assign this material to Mycenaean origins or to Oriental roots. On the former point, we simply do not know to what extent Greek myth was derived from Mycenaean sources. Enthusiastic efforts have been made to discover representations of Europa on the bull and of other mythical figures on Mycenaean seals, jewels, and vases, but more sober analysts have had little trouble in disproving any equations which have been offered.⁵

⁵ Mycenaean myth: Nilsson, Minoan-Mycenaean Religion, 34-40, and The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology (Berkeley, 1932); Persson, New Tombs at Dendra; Webster, From Mycenae to Homer, 43-63, 114-27. Skepticism: Luisa Banti, "Myth in Preclassical Art," AJA, LVIII (1954), 307-10; Doro Levi, "La Dea micenea a cavallo," Studies to D. M. Robinson, I, 108-25, on the so-called Europa; Emily Townsend Vermeule, "Mythology in Mycenaean Art," Classical Journal, LIV (1954), 97-108. Mycenaean chariot craters (see Plate 4a): . . .

Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization (1961)

p. 164 In recent years, as interest in Mycenaean development has risen greatly, Homeric scholars have asserted an extensive Mycenaean survival in the epic tradition. While one may sympathize with their efforts to gallop down a fresh path, the results are not very convincing. With respect to physical objects mentioned in the epic poems, a few can be shown to have been Mycenaean, though these are far fewer than is often suggested - and the possibility of transmission of ^{heirlooms} her~~o~~looms must not be forgotten.

Footnote 6 (page 47) One of the most commonly cited parallels has been discarded by S. N. Marinatos, "Der 'Westerbecher' aus dem IV. Schachtgrab von Mykenai," Neue Beiträge zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft (Festschrift B. Schweitzer) (Stuttgart, 1954), 11-18, and Arne Furumark, "Nestor's Cup and the Mycenaean Dove Goblet," Eranos, XLIV (1946), 41-53. Other observations are made by A. Heubeck, Gnomon, XXIX (1957), 38-44; D. H. F. Gray, "Metal-Working in Homer," JHS, LXXIV (1954), 1-15, and in J. L. Myers, Homer and His Critics (London, 1958), 247-48, 268, 288; H. L. Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments (London, 1950), passim. . . . The most judicious effort to connect Homeric and Mycenaean evidence remains that of M. P. Nilsson, Homer and Mycenae (London, 1933). Among the most recent studies, T.B.L. Webster, From Mycenae to Homer (London, 1958), is shaky in logic and semantics and rash in historical judgment; Page, History and the Homeric Iliad, is more reserved on several important points.

p. 164 The Homeric basileus, for instance, was not a Mycenaean wanax. . . .

p. 164-5 All in all, I should be much disinclined to postulate for the Iliad any marked inheritance from as far back as the Mycenaean era either in substance of plot (save for the basic memory of an attack launched across the Aegean to Troy) or in epic spirit. What did survive perhaps from Mycenaean days was far more the aspect of techniques - i.e., the creation of the epic dialect, of the hexameter, or of stock formulas. Even here the age of invasions and the Dark ages probably caused changes the dimensions of which we cannot measure.

p. 265 The Odyssey was thus later than the Iliad and not composed by the same poet, though it arose by a similar process out of ancestral materials treated in the same fashion of oral poetry. If we set the Iliad before 750, then the Odyssey will fall about 740-720. Much ingenuity has been exercised by Homeric scholars to prove (or occasionally to disprove) its junior relationship on technical grounds such as

Starr, Chester, G., The Origins of Greek Civilization (1961)

p. 265

such as differences in vocabulary, in the handling of the hexameter, in the use or absence of similes, and in epic technique generally. Old words and verb forms, to give an example, which are common in the Iliad are absent from the Odyssey, which in turn has more abstract nouns. Such quasi-mathematical proofs can never quite hit their mark. Both epics have later, interpolated passages, and the Odyssey contains its share of old strata - though no student of Homer can convince his peers just which lines in either epic fall into these categories. Much of the poetic contrast, moreover, is not of chronological origin. The two poems tell diverse kinds of tales; they may have been composed in widely separated areas, though not necessarily so; the younger poet may even not have known the specific formulation of the old tale of Achilles in the Iliad.

Pocock, L.G., Odyssean Essays (Oxford: Basil Blackwell) 1965
 (Formerly Professor of Classics University of Canterbury, N.Z.)

p. vii I have to thank the editors of the various journals in which these articles have appeared for printing them in the first place . . . I believe that in the end their contents will prove to be not less important than they are at present unorthodox - not for egoistical reasons, but because I believe myself to have been the first, since recorded scholarship began, to use the keys to a new understanding of the poem written into it deliberately by the poet himself.

p. 6 The site of Scheria, I think it can be shown is not in Fairyland, but in north-western Sicily, where any Homeric scholar may go and see it - a real and clearly recognizable place under a fictitious name.

p. 7 As Miss Lorimer remarks (although I cannot agree with her belief that the poem is of Anatolian origin and Eumaeus's birthplace the land of Syria in Asia Minor), the poet belongs to the realistic school of fiction. Indeed, so far as our records go, he is the very founder of that school; and he is still in several respects without a rival in that art - as he is also in the realm of fantasy.

p. 34 Whether the remains of the Catalogues that have come down to us are fragments also of the authentic work of Hesiod, must remain a matter of opinion. My opinion is that some of them certainly are. I refer particularly to those that involve points of topography which tally with the topography of the Odyssey, and which, according to my findings, may similarly be described as pre-scholastic. . . .

. . . It now becomes evident that the poet of our Odyssey is far more heavily indebted to Hesiod than had been realized by anyone: and that Hesiod, as well as the poet of the Odyssey, owes the better part of his inspiration far more definitely to the western half of the Mediterranean than the eastern, and to the Straits of Gibraltar in particular. There, in both poets, and not in the outer sea, is the abode of 'Ocean', and thence his waters flow - in various directions. There the Argonauts are said to have passed: and there the scenes of the last three labours of Hercules

p.34 are to be located within real and restricted geographical limits. There the House of Styx and the House of Hades, one above the other, both in Hesiod and in the Iliad, are to be pinpointed with exactitude - a fact of which neither poet is likely to have been aware: and there was the meeting place of Mycenaean Greeks and Phoenicians, and their myths and deities, since before the beginning of the last millennium before our era. The geographical interest in the old Greek epic shifts to the western seas.

p. 49 . . . I feel sure it would still remain true that Hesiod would never be shown to have been acquainted with our Odyssey; whereas to refute the argument that our poet knew and used Hesiod would still remain impossible. . .

p. 50 It seems to me that a new understanding of the Odyssey has shed a new and fascinating light on Hesiod, and to some extent upon the Iliad also. It shows that the poet is indeed using traditional materials to a more positive extent than had been realized; but it shows also his own creative imagination constantly at work in doing so. I would conclude by reiterating my conviction, already stated in RAO, that so far from being charming nonsense by a senile Homer or a somewhat slap-dash and haphazard compilation by many generations of unlettered minstrels, there is no work in European literature, from the Aeneid to Hamlet and Twelfth Night, that bears more unmistakably than the Odyssey the stamp of its author's own unrepeatable individuality and humour - whatever his indebtedness to others may have been.

p.71 In Hesiod and the Odyssey it has been shown that whereas Hesiod has no knowledge of our version of the Odyssey, our poet has followed Hesiod (up to a point very closely) especially in matters connected with the Straits of Gibraltar. There in both poets it is the place of sunset, death, and darkness, the beginning and the ends of earth and sea, the abode of deep-eddying Ocean.

p. 74 Evidence from Homer, Hesiod, and the Odyssey for placing the abode of Ocean in the Straits, and the abodes of Styx and Hades (with Tartarus down below) in the caves of the Rock of Gibraltar, and for defining the River of Ocean as the east-going Atlantic current in the Mediterranean, has now been presented in RAO, Ch. 5 above and the present discussion.

p. 75 . . . Since Merry's day and since 1947 - and 1949 when the Oxford Classical Dictionary appeared - the Odyssey has been one of the happiest of hunting grounds for classical scholarship, largely no doubt because of its seemingly safe and unrealistic nature. But no intrinsic advance in its study has been made, or could be made, so long as it was based on the assumption that the Odyssey was a poem of beautiful nonsense and the poet a delirious geographical nincompoop. Good scholarship, like good poetry, can never be the result of running away from reality and truth. In this case scholarship simply did not know these qualities were there, residing deep in the poet's very nature. It is sad to think however of the nonsense about the best of poems that is going to be inflicted on the minds of school-boys and schoolgirls and undergraduates . . . no doubt for some time yet to come.

3.31-184
p.76 Samuel Butler's discovery, so obvious in retrospect, that 'Drepane, sacred home of the Phaeacians' was Drepane or Trapani in N. W. Sicily, has led to the discovery, step by step, of other obvious facts; which consign a number of fashionable doctrines about the Odyssey to the waste-paper basket, along with the doctrines that the world began in ~~4000~~⁴⁰⁰⁴ B.C. and that flint handaxes fell from heaven. The defences of faith in long-accepted error are akwats stybbirb. But Scheria-Trapani can hardly fail, after a decent interval of time, to be recognized as the pons asinorum to the proper study of the Odyssey. Any one crossing it will at once find himself in fresh woods and pastures new, the quality of which will be proved in the first few nibbles. Mistakes no doubt there may be in the arguments but there is much about which no mistake is possible.

p. 78 With the caverns of Gibraltar, however, identified as the abodes of Styx and Hades, I think a quite plausible probability presents itself that Gilgamesh, like some prehistoric Kilroy, may have been there too.

p. 79 One other point of interest is that the epic of Gilgamesh (or part of it) was committed to writing (which may still be read), we are told in the third millennium B. C. - as other ^{poems} ~~poems~~ were at Ras Shamra also, in very ancient times.

3.50

p. 79 This I think should be pondered carefully by those who make such a cult of the work of Milman Parry that they regard it almost as an accepted law of scholarship that the Odyssey; for example, could not possibly have been written down by the poet who composed it for his serial recitations in the seventh century B.C. One would certainly not deny that the conventions of orally transmitted and largely improvised recitation were maintained in the epic art; and we can add that the mere convention might account for much. But it stands to reason that in an age when writing was well known, writing and reading might also have been used for composition, and transmission. There would surely be nothing to prevent the best of poets from composing or preparing their recitations in advance and writing them down beforehand, or afterwards, for future reference. The Phoenician script from which the Greek alphabet was derived must have been current in the Aegean, we are told, 'certainly by the eighth century B.C. and probably much earlier'.

p. 80 The possibility then cannot be denied that some of these Gibraltar tales may have also reached the Aegean Greeks, by word of mouth or otherwise, from Babylonian or Semitic poetry written down and recorded many hundreds of years before.

p. 80 . . . the evidence that the 'glorious abode' of Styx in Hesiod and Homer was the Hall of St. Michael in the Rock of Gibraltar, and her water a stream falling from a high rocky point within it, is conclusive.

p. 84 In one way and another it seems to me that the case for the Straits of Gibraltar as the scene for the episodes in the ancient epic that have been here ascribed to them proves itself beyond any reasonable doubt whatever. I think it should no longer be ignored.⁴⁷ (Footnote 47, p.90 The Straits are not mentioned at all in the new Companion to Homer. Their existence, in fact, so far as 'the world of the epic' is concerned, is expressly denied on p. 284.

p.84 The fairly obvious fact that the 'river of Ocean' in the Odyssey was the Atlantic current flowing eastward from the Straits, and that the Leucas Petre of xxiv.11, in consequence, would be Pliny's Album Promonturium, and the 'Gateway of the Sun' the Pillars of Hercules, as viewed from sea-level with the sun setting in the sea beyond them, was pointed out in The Landfalls of Odysseys, published early in 1955. In no notice, however, of that pamphlet, in any classical periodical, nor of the two books that followed it in 1957 and 1959 respectively, has the 'river of Ocean', or the 'Gateway of the Sun', or the Leucas Petre, even been mentioned. In The Singer of Tales (Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 184, Professor A. B. Lord, still taking Leucas Petre to be the northerly point of the island of Leucas in the Ionian Sea, writes as follows: 'With all that has been written about Leucas (see the article on Leucas in Pauly-Wissowa xxiv(1925), 2218-2257, I cannot understand Page's rhetorical question: "Who ever heard, before or since, of a Rock Leucas, or While Rock, near the entrance to Hades, across the river Oceanus?" (Denys Page, pp. 117-118). The river Oceanus is where you want it to be, it seems to me, and if you are in Ithaca, or anywhere else in Greece, it is not far away, unless you want it to be of course (Pauly-Wissowa, xxxiv(1937), 2308-2361).'

There is much in Pauly-Wissowa, it seems to me, and in Liddell and Scott, and elsewhere, which stands in urgent need of correction.

p. 89 Footnote 29 In all matters that concern the Straits the impression given, I think, is strong that Hesiod and Homer were just about contemporary - as tradition held.

p. 98 It is now generally agreed that the Catalogue of Ships in Book ii of the Iliad is an earlier composition than the rest of the poem, into which it has been introduced verbatim, regardless of its incompatibilities with the Iliadic story.

p. 122 Professor Page in The Homeric Odyssey has argued fiercely against the Continuation (as he terms it) as an authentic part of the Odyssey, very largely on linguistic grounds; and I expect he may be right. But I do not feel quite so certain about it in some respects. He holds the poem itself to be the result of slow growth, and the work of a number of different hands. I have given my reasons (not 'accepted' as yet but certainly not disproved) for thinking it - as we have it and barring perhaps the end - the work of a poet of Phocian-Elymian descent, skilled and practised though he was in the Ionic language of eastern epic convention. I also think, as many others have thought, that the date of our Odyssey is pretty late in the seventh century.

p. 123 To use such clues as the name of Nausicaa for example; to describe with a Mediterranean pilot's instinctive accuracy the coastal and island scenes embodied under fictitious names in his poem, and above all to use (with a smile to himself no doubt) the features of Trapani and its environs in similar disguise for 'Ithaca', all this was, when you come to think of it, the poet's least obtrusive and most enduring method of signing the Odyssey as his own, and claiming the credit for it, in the fulness of time, both for himself and his native land . . .

There appears moreover to have been in antiquity a certain convention of anonymity, imposed perhaps by the rhapsodes . . . And this poem's chances of 'acceptation', perhaps, in the seventh century, were very much better, if its provenance might be ascribed to some great poet of the old eastern establishment. And so good it was, we may guess, that it came to be ascribed to the great Homer himself - than whose work it was in fact much less archaic in almost every way; and even when misunderstood, much wider in human interest, and in consequence even greater.

p. 96 We shall not look on his like . . . and wit again. . . And what is more he was no more Homer (in my opinion) than I am Martin Luther. Let us at all long last . . . give him back to the Ireland of the Mediterranean, to which his poem rightfully belongs.

See 3.41-60

Davidson, J. A., "The Homeric Question" p. 257 in A Companion to Homer ed. by Wace and Stubbings, 1962

No one, that I know of, now believes that the Iliad or the Odyssey was created by joining together "loose songs" into "a sequel of Songs and rhapsodies" in such a way that the original components could be simply uncoupled from one another and resume an independent existence. All the researches into the relative chronology of the various elements in the poems show the "older" and "younger" elements (whether archaeological, linguistic or social) interlock (perhaps the best example is the occurrence of the unquestionably ancient boar's tusk helmet in K, a book in which the language is characteristically modern and even "post-Odyssean"). We may therefore deny that the Iliad and Odyssey were created directly out of lays in the Lachmannian sense; but we cannot deny that there are blocks which seem to be closely inter-connected, and may have originally formed parts of separate οἶμαί (or even κλέα ἀνδρῶν), as for example Γ-Ε, Η-Θ, -Κ and Λ-μ.

3.01

Feder, Lillian, Crowell's Handbook of Classical Literature (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.) 1964 (Feder - Associate Professor, Queens College)

p. 174 Homer

Wolf himself has been justly called "the founder, not merely of the school which disintegrated Homer into the work of many hands, but of all modern Homeric scholarship" (Cedric Whitman, Homer and the Heroic Tradition [Harvard University Press, 1958], p.3) In 1832 Gottfried Hermann proposed that the original Iliad dealt merely with the wrath of Achilles and that gradually the poets added to this nucleus until the poem grew in size and scope. This theory was accepted and developed by George Grote in his History of Greece (1846-1856). According to E. R. Dodds, who summarizes the Homeric question in three brief and excellent essays Grote's viewpoint "held the field at the turn of the century, and is still today the most widely accepted alternative to unitarianism." A significant variation of the theory was developed by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in Die Ilias und Homer (Wiedmann, 1916). His position is that Homer took up the work of earlier poets, added to it, and adapted it to his own purposes; then his poem was treated similarly by his successors.

Early in the 20th century the analytic school was severely criticized by scholars who returned to the view that a single poet had written the Iliad and the Odyssey.

p. 175 The study of sources and interpolations has thus led most scholars back to acceptance of a single poet who shaped and revitalized traditional material . . . The best-known unitarians are T. W. Allen, C. M. Bowra, Cedric Whitman, W. T. Wadsworth, W. J. Woodhouse, Rhys Carpenter, and Denys Page. Whitman, who regards the idea that Pisistratus is responsible for the first collection of the "scattered remains of Homer's poetry" as pure "legend" (pp. 66-67), says that the Iliad is a "profoundly personal creation" (p.9). C. M. Bowra also bases his conclusion that the Iliad is primarily the work of one poet on the poem's "unity of character and style, its dramatic impetus and high imaginative life." (p. 270).

Commentators on the Odyssey who belong to the unitarian group, yet emphasize Homer's dependence on earlier sources and the inclusion of later material in the poems, are Woodhouse, Carpenter, and Page.

p. 431 Troy

Moreover, Troy VIIa has been established as the city ruled by Priam. According to Blegen the Trojan War took place around 1240 B.C., over 50 years earlier than the traditional date. [See Blegen's Troy and the Trojans, Praeger, 1963] Troy VIIa had a brief life; though scholars cannot determine its length, some believe it lasted only as long as one generation of men and others that it remained for a century.

Excavation has yielded evidence of the Troy Homer describes: its walls, fortresses, terraces around the walls, and a great many remains of horses' bones which suggest the accuracy of Homer's "horse-taming Trojans." There is also archaeological evidence that Troy VIIa was destroyed by warfare during the period generally accepted as that of the Trojan War. However, the hot and cold springs that Homer depicts no longer exist, and the two rivers, the Scamander and the Simois, follow courses different from those Homer describes.

Chadwick, E. Munro and N. Kerstead Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, Vol. I
(Cambridge at the University Press), 1932

p. 133 There is no doubt that many of the persons and events celebrated in stories of the Teutonic, British and Irish Heroic Ages are historical. Their existence is proved by contemporary documents or monuments. But there are many other cases where no such evidence is available. The greater part of the Irish Heroic Age is prehistoric; and the same is true of the whole of the Greek Heroic Age. Even in the Teutonic and the British Heroic Ages the great majority of the persons and events are not mentioned in contemporary records. As to the historicity of these much difference of opinion exists. Half a century ago it was generally believed that heroic poetry and saga were derived from mythology; and consequently there was a tendency to regard as mythological all persons and events which could not be identified from historical records. Now opinion has greatly changed; but widely divergent views are still held.

p. 179 Owing partly to the archaeological evidence and the evidence as to political conditions and partly to the general reaction against mythological interpretation of heroic stories which prevailed last century, a marked change of opinion on this subject has taken place during the last twenty or thirty years. Many scholars formerly regarded Cormac mac Airt as a mythological character; but we believe he is now usually held to have been a real man. We have no doubt that this change of opinion is fully justified. But at the same time it is to be noted that the characters in regard to whom opinion has changed are those whose stories are of the heroic Type C (i.e. more of less didactic) or non-heroic. It is to stories of the heroic Type A, i.e. to stories composed solely or chiefly for the purpose of entertainment, that we would rather call attention.

p. 552 The last quarter of a century has seen a noteworthy change of opinion with regard to the composition of the Homeric poems and of Beowulf. In place of the elaborate and often conflicting theories which had long prevailed among the majority of scholars, the view has been gaining ground that each of the epics is the work of a single author, who wrote his poem much as a modern poet would do. On the question whether both the Iliad and the Odyssey are the work of the same poet there is less tendency to agreement; but this is, comparatively, a minor question.

Chadwick, H. Munro and N. Kerstead Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, Vol. I
(Cambridge at the University Press), 1932

p. 552 This view is attractive from its simplicity. It puts an end to a large amount of speculation which has led to no definite conclusions. In the case of the Homeric poems it has the sanction of ancient opinion. In the case of Beowulf no opinion earlier than last century is recorded. Possibly an Englishman of the eleventh century, if questioned, would have expressed a similar belief; but this is quite uncertain.

We regret that we are unable to subscribe to this view. It appears to us to involve the assumption of modern conditions in times for which we have no warrant for believing that they existed. . . . We doubt the existence of a written Beowulf in the first half of the eighth century (A.D.) Yet few scholars will propose later dates than these for the composition of the poems.

. . . Beowulf preserves record of an event which is known to have taken place about two centuries before the time assigned to the composition of the poem, and of many princes, living about the same date, whose historical existence cannot reasonably be questioned (cf. p. 135ff). For the persons and events recorded in the Homeric poems contemporary evidence is wanting; but we have seen (p. 181ff.) that there is good reason for believing that they also contain a large historical element.

p. 553 . . . With the Homeric poems the case is different. We do not know of any "lays" - or indeed of oral poems of any kind - dealing with contemporary events, which run to such a length. Our view is that they were greatly expanded in the course of time - a process for which a certain analogy is to be found in the Mahabharata. This expansion was due largely, we think, to the desire to provide consecutive entertainment for festivals which extended over a number of days. We see no reason for believing that a written text was involved. The effort of memorisation involved would doubtless be beyond our powers.

Chadwick, H. Munro and W. Kerstead Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, Vol I (Cambridge at the University Press), 1932

p. 554 Expansion may take place either from within, by fuller treatment, or from without by adding new matter or joining one poem to another. There is a widespread impression that the 'lay' was essentially a short poem, in which the action moved rapidly; and the fragmentary poem Finn is often cited as the solitary survivor in Anglo-Saxon of this class of poetry.

'Separaters' (of *χωριστες*). Aristarchus wrote against this 'paradox,' which never had any vogue in the ancient world.

140. A modern student of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is at once struck with two broad facts about them. (1) Each shows finished poetic art. And Greek literature begins with these masterpieces. We have no samples of the ruder work which must have gone before. There is no parallel for such a phenomenon in the history of any other literature. (2) Each forms, in a large view, an organic and artistic whole. Yet each contains matter which on various grounds has been considered irreconcilable with the belief that one poet composed the entire epic. These two problems have been the basis of 'the Homeric question.'

141. The critical study of the Homeric question began with Abbé d'Aubignac (born in 1604) whose *Conjectures Académiques* was published posthumously in 1705. D'Aubignac attempted to show that Homer never existed and that the *Iliad* was little more than a *corpus* of poems cleverly put together about the time of Lycurgus. More attention was paid to F. A. Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795). Wolf sought to prove four main points. (1) The Homeric poems were composed, about the tenth century B.C., without the aid of writing, which then was either wholly unknown to the Greeks, or not yet in use for literary purposes. The poems were handed down by oral recitation only, and in that process suffered some changes. (2) The poems were for the first time written down about 550 B.C., in the time of Peisistratus. They then underwent some further changes at the hands of 'revisers' (*διορθωταί*), or learned critics. (3) That artistic unity which belongs to the *Iliad* and (in a yet higher degree) to the *Odyssey* is not mainly due to the original poems, but has been superinduced by artificial treatment in a later age. (4) The original poems, out of which our *Iliad* and our *Odyssey* have been put together, were not all by the same author. But there was one poet, of commanding genius ('Homer'), who made 'the greater part' of the songs afterwards united in the two epics.

Wolf's theories were developed and modified by many scholars in the nineteenth century. The poems were subjected to a close analysis, and the analysis led to conclusions in sharp conflict with one another. Some scholars saw in Homer a primitive poet, author of an original sketch of one or both poems (*Ur-Iliad, Ur-Odyssey*), which formed the stocks on which later poets grafted new material. Others regarded Homer as a compiler, who combined old lays, unwritten and independent of one another, into single poems. There was no agreement in the application of this theory: Kochly, for example, dissected the *Iliad* into sixteen, and Christ into forty such lays.

While there were thus two theories irreconcilable with each other, and the adherents of each arrived at widely different conclusions, a new criterion was derived from the excavations at Troy, Mycenae, and other places. The evidence of archaeology was applied.

Developments
of Wolf's
theory.

Evidence of
Archaeology.

Some hailed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as 'pure Mycenaean' on the grounds that many of the elements of Mycenaean culture, bronze weapons, Nestor's cup, boar's tusks on a helmet etc., are present in the Homeric poems. But such a position could not be maintained in its entirety, since there are allusions also to things and peoples of later times, geometric ware, Phoenicians. So the poems were analysed in such a way as to make the Mycenaean elements form one stratum, the later elements another. But the attempt failed; the elements were inextricably mingled, and the Homeric poems could not be made a mirror of contemporaneous cultural development. Attempts to correlate the archaeological with the literary analyses made the confusion worse, since the so-called oldest literary strata were often found to contain the latest cultural elements.

142. With such inconclusive results it is not surprising that scholars sought another method of approach to Homer. They assumed the artistic unity of the two poems, and abandoned the attempt to divide them into strata. Some, however (P. Cauer, C. Robert, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, E. Bethe), while professing to reject the conclusions of Wolf, were still impressed by what they regarded as discrepant elements in the poems. They recognised what they regarded as 'accretions,' which they proposed to cut away from what they regarded as the work of the original author. This method again led to divergent results with no generally accepted conclusions.

Other scholars (e.g. F. Blass, J. W. Mackail, C. Rothe), starting from the presumption that each of the poems was the composition of a single poet, argued that the contradictions which had been found in different parts of the epics were no proof of divided authorship. The arguments that the two last books of the *Iliad* (as well as books II and X) and the conclusion of the *Odyssey* were later additions have been met (T. W. Allen, A. Shewan, E. Drerup, J. A. Scott). Furthermore, reasons based on linguistic evidence, the supposed ignorance of writing at the time when the poems were composed and the part played by the commission of Peisistratus were discredited. But disciples of unity have for the most part been disposed to allow that interpolations may have taken place, certainly before Aristarchus and probably after. But clearly, unless there is some measure of agreement about the interpolations, we shall be no better off than we were in the morass of the analysts. Some interpolated verses can be identified, but there is a wise reluctance to reject whole books or passages merely on the ground that they do not fit a particular theory. Again some scholars (e.g. G. Finsler, W. Schmid) have regarded Homer as the author of the *Iliad* but not of the *Odyssey*. They show some reasons for supposing that the *Odyssey* was written later than the *Iliad*, but no sufficient reason has been shown why it should not be the work of the same poet at a later period of his life. On the whole, modern opinion tends to accept the view that Homer, who was acquainted with writing, was the author of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* substantially in the form in which they have come down to us.

Modern
opinion.

341-33

31

31

341

Some hailed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as 'pure Mycenaean' on the grounds that many of the elements of Mycenaean culture, bronze weapons, Nestor's cup, boar's tusks on a helmet etc., are present in the Homeric poems. But such a position could not be maintained in its entirety, since there are allusions also to things and peoples of later times, geometric ware, Phoenicians. So the poems were analysed in such a way as to make the Mycenaean elements form one stratum, the later elements another. But the attempt failed; the elements were inextricably mingled, and the Homeric poems could not be made a mirror of contemporaneous cultural development. Attempts to correlate the archaeological with the literary analyses made the confusion worse, since the so-called oldest literary strata were often found to contain the latest cultural elements.

142. With such inconclusive results it is not surprising that scholars sought another method of approach to Homer. They assumed the artistic unity of the two poems, and abandoned the attempt to divide them into strata. Some, however (P. Cauer, C. Robert, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, E. Bethe), while professing to reject the conclusions of Wolf, were still impressed by what they regarded as discrepant elements in the poems. They recognised what they regarded as 'accretions,' which they proposed to cut away from what they regarded as the work of the original author. This method again led to divergent results with no generally accepted conclusions.

Modern
opinion.

Other scholars (e.g. F. Blass, J. W. Mackail, C. Rothe), starting from the presumption that each of the poems was the composition of a single poet, argued that the contradictions which had been found in different parts of the epics were no proof of divided authorship. The arguments that the two last books of the *Iliad* (as well as books II and X) and the conclusion of the *Odyssey* were later additions have been met (T. W. Allen, A. Shewan, E. Drerup, J. A. Scott). Furthermore, reasons based on linguistic evidence, the supposed ignorance of writing at the time when the poems were composed and the part played by the commission of Peisistratus were discredited. But disciples of unity have for the most part been disposed to allow that interpolations may have taken place, certainly before Aristarchus and probably after. But clearly, unless there is some measure of agreement about the interpolations, we shall be no better off than we were in the morass of the analysts. Some interpolated verses can be identified, but there is a wise reluctance to reject whole books or passages merely on the ground that they do not fit a particular theory. Again some scholars (e.g. G. Finsler, W. Schmid) have regarded Homer as the author of the *Iliad* but not of the *Odyssey*. They show some reasons for supposing that the *Odyssey* was written later than the *Iliad*, but no sufficient reason has been shown why it should not be the work of the same poet at a later period of his life. On the whole, modern opinion tends to accept the view that Homer, who was acquainted with writing, was the author of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* substantially in the form in which they have come down to us.

Lesky, Albin, A History of Greek Literature (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.)
Methuene & Co, 1966. Trans. by James Willis and Cornelis de Heer.

The Homeric Epic

p. 34 These few examples show the problems that are raised if individual passages are subjected to logical scrutiny. This kind of criticism began with the Alexandrians, but did not go so far as to take the poems to pieces. The analytical movement had only one precursor in modern times³ - the abbé François Hédelin d'Aubignac, whose motive was to defend Homer against the depreciation which was fashionable in the France of his day. The poetical value of the Iliad, he suggested, lay in individual passages, which some unknown hand put together into a whole. This view was expressed in 1664,

but not printed until 1715, as Conjectures académiques ou dissertation sur l'Iliade.

It has been validly urged against Friedrich August Wolf that he made no due acknowledgment to this study. It is beyond dispute, however, that the whole subsequent development of the Homeric question stems from Wolf's Prolegomena ad Homerum (1795). His main theses, that writing was unknown in the Homeric age, that the poems had a long oral tradition, and that the Pisistratean recension was of great importance for the text, long remained central pillars of Homeric studies. The profound effect of this theory on the world of scholarship was not matched by its effect on contemporary literature. Goethe's attitude was typical of most: he acknowledged the force of the criticism, but sometimes deplored the subjective element in the constantly varying theories.

p. 35 It has been supposed that the poem was planned as a unity, and that around an original Iliad of moderate compass gradual accretion took place which eventually brought the poem to its present form. This 'expansion theory', long the arena of fierce conflict, claimed Gottfried Hermann (1772-1848) as one of its first exponents. Contemporary with this great critic and linguist was Karl Lachmann, who had previously worked on the Nibelungenlied: he propounded the 'lays' theory, the Iliad, on this view, being made up of some sixteen separate poems. Learned criticism here went hand in hand with romantic notions of the 'national spirit' at work in poetry, causing the

Lesky, Albin, A History of Greek Literature Methuene & Co., 1966.

p. 35 cont'd -the gradual organic growth of the epic. Victor Hehn's lecture on Homer¹ gave exaggerated expression to this view. The 'lay'theory was made less tenable as Germanist scholars² stressed the difference between lays and epic episodes. In consequence an attempt was made to separate out as constituents of the Iliad not lays, but small-scale epics of varying extent and merit - the 'compilation' theory. This conception grew out of the analysis of the Odyssey in the hands of such men as A. Kirchhoff; but in course of time it became the fashionable theory for the Iliad as well. It became fused with the expansion theory, according as one took this, that or the other epyllion as the kernel round which the others accrued.

As regards the critical tools employed by the analysts, it must be admitted that some turned in the operators' hands. Logical inconsistencies became less and less cogent as the unitarians were able to point to many such discrepancies in modern literary works whose unitary authorship no one denies. Attempts to achieve a satisfactory dismemberment on the basis of linguistic and cultural levels entirely failed, for reasons which we shall see in the relevant sections. All that remained was stylistic differences; and the danger of subjectivity in using such criteria cannot be over-emphasized. This is not to say that such differences do not exist, only that their interpretation is a problem in itself.

The situation had become one to which Goethe's rather over-confident words in his Annals in 1821 now fully applied: 'It would need a revolution in all our notions of the world to set the old views on their feet again.' It was not until after the first world war that growing dissatisfaction with experiments in analysis made it possible again to regard the Homeric epics as a unity.³

¹ K. Deichgräber, Aus Victor Hehns Nachlass. Akad. Mainz. Geistes- u. sozialwiss. Kl. 1951/9, 814.

² A. Heusler, Lied und Epos in der germ. Sagedichtung. Dortmund 1905.

³ C. M. Bowra, Tradition and Design in the Iliad. Oxf. 1930

Lesky, Albin, A History of Greek Literature Methuane & Co., 1966

p. 35 cont'd The time was ripe for the Iliasstudien of Wolfgang Schadewaldt (Leipzig 1938), in which the old types of analysis were given some very hard knocks.⁴ From the very beginning the unitarians had defended the general unity of the Iliad's plot: now the structure of the poem was defended in detail. A study rivaling in minuteness those of the analysts sought to establish numerous correlations, references p.36) back and forth, economy of narrative or deliberate slowing up of the action, as indications of the conscious design of a single creative artist. This artist may be our old Homer again, although Schadewaldt supposes as the author of our Iliad not an individual creating the whole scheme according to his fancy, but a man using a rich stock of precedents and a tradition going far back into antiquity.

As Willy Theiler expressed it in the Festschrift für Tièche (1947), for a long time it seemed as if 'the enormous influence of Schadewaldt's book in Germany had brought a century and a half of analytical scholarship down in ruins'. But appearances were deceptive: in late years Homeric analysis has vigorously claimed attention in almost all the old forms.¹

¹ An expansion theory, for example, is defended by P. Mazon in his useful Introduction a l'Iliade. Paris 1942. W. Theiler, 'Die Dichter der Ilias'. Festschrift f. E. Tièche. Berne 1947, 125; 'Noch einmal die Dichter der Ilias'. Thesaurismata. Festschr. I. Kapp. Munich 1954, 118, supposes an original Iliad overlaid with various additional strata. Jachmann (op. cit. p. 33, n.3) applies the lay theory particularly to the battle scenes. P. Von Der Mühl, Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias. Schweiz. Beitr. z. Altertumswiss. 4, Basel 1952, distinguishes an original menis-cycle composed by Homer from later additions; cf. J. Th. Kakridis, Gnom. 28, 1956, 401. More recently W. H. Friedrich, Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias. Abh. Ak. Gött. Phil.-hist. Kl. 3. Folge, 38, 1956, has drawn analytical conclusions from his study of the material. D. L. Page's book History and the Homeric Iliad (v. p. 38, n. 1) has an appendix Multiple Authorship in the Iliad, in which the analysts' case is supported from the embassy and the building of the wall. An extreme view is taken by G. Jachmann (v. p. 33, n.3), who reckons the compiler of our Iliad to be a clumsy botcher: on this see J. Th. Kakridis, Gnom. 32, 1960, 393. The almost simultaneous appearance of two important discussions of the problem brings out clearly the unbridgeable gulf between the opposing positions. W. Theiler's article 'Ilias und Odyssee in der Verflechtung ihres Entstehens'. Mus. Helv. 19, 1962, I, lives up to its title, and is full of confidence in what analysis can do. The unselfish labour of Uvo Hölscher has put into our hands K. Reinhardt's book 'Die Ilias und ihr Dichter'. Göttingen 1961, carefully put together from the unfinished manuscript. The title is no less challenging than Theiler's. We can do no more than refer in general terms to this study as the most determined unitarian defence of the Iliad since Schadewaldt's Ilias studien of 1938, and an attempt to reconcile all the different aspects of the epic within the conception of an individual Homer.

p. 39 To justify this hope at all, we must part company with simple-minded unitarians who imagine Homer creating in a vacuum and with those analysts who show no understanding of the nature and laws of the genre, and who ply their scapels in an endless vivisection of the living body of the Iliad.

p. 40 It should be added that the view here outlined does not exclude the possibility of later insertions. We no longer reckon among these the Catalogue of Ships,¹ but follow Dieuchidas and many modern writers in supposing Attic interpolations (e.g. 2.558). The tenth book, containing the Doloneia,² is so unconnected with the main narrative that it serves by contrast to emphasize the unity of the rest, and suggests a late interpolation.

Now that we can once again think of the poet of the Iliad as an historical person, and that 'Homer' as a proper name, not as a description (= 'hostage'), we cannot help wishing to know something of his life.³

¹ V. Burr, . . . ; see A. Heubeck in Gnom. 21, 1949, 197; 29, 1957, 40; 33, 1961, 116. He denies any historical Mycenaean background, and in the last-named review especially assails D. L. Page, History and the Homeric Iliad (v. p. 20, n.1) 118, who shares with Webster, From Mycenae to Homer (v. p. 18, n. 1) 132 and 175 the view that the Catalogue of Ships might go back to Mycenaean times. At the other extreme G. Jachmann (v. p. 34, n.1) reckons it as a late interpolation. Further bibliography in Heubeck, Gymn. 66, 1959, 397.

p. 56 Against features coming from the poet's time we may set others derived from Mycenaean, or even Cretan, civilization. There are not very many, and not all are certain. It was reasonable to hope for much in this connection from the decipherment of Linear B. This hope has been disappointed, and not merely because the new texts are concerned with the economic records of the seat of government. Rather, it is because the knowledge thus gained of social and economic structure tends to widen the gap between the Homeric and Mycenaean worlds. Rodenwaldt's conclusion,¹ that Homer has many historical, but no archaeological links with Mycenaean culture, has been confirmed in its second part, but weakened in its first. The connections between the Mycenaean world and the civilizations of the Near East seem to be multiplying, but this does not imply that Homer's links with it cannot be traced any more.

¹ Tiryns 2, 1912, 204

Shields

p. 57 Since W. Reichel published his book on Homeric weapons¹ it has been widely believed that, of the two kinds of shield appearing in Homer, the long one protecting the whole body is Mycenaean, while the small round one belongs to Homer's own time. This view has recently been called in question, and geometric vases have been brought to light in which the small round shield and the large 'figure-of-eight' shield appear side by side. In fact the long shield appears in two shapes in the carved dagger-handle from the fourth shaft-grave at Mycenae: as well as the figure of eight there is the 'fire-screen' type without any narrowing at the waist. . . .

We have seen that not all the alleged Mycenaean features in Homer can be claimed as certain; but beyond doubt there are some.

¹ Die Homerischen Waffen Vienna 1894, 2nd ed. 1901. . . .

Lesky, Albin, A History of Greek Literature Berne: A. Franke 1957/58; Methune & Co. 1966

p. 61 Attempts have recently been made to separate out different levels of Homeric language chronologically - Mycenaean, Pre-migration and Post-migration diction.² But these elaborate studies have served to show how hard it is in a thorough mixture like this to sort out linguistic levels, let alone to date individual passages and sections by them. In the perpetual flux of epic language new formulae were being invented even at a late date, and old formulae were still being pressed into the poet's service. In this way epic language developed its peculiar richness: much that was old remained amid the inrush of the new, and forms of widely diverse age and origin were used side by side. It is obvious that such a rich variety of forms was very welcome to the bards who extemporized heroic lays, while for later poets it made the mastery of the hexameter much easier to attain. The coexistence of different linguistic periods is well illustrated by the varying use of the later definite article. The same may be said of the optional use of the digamma, a discovery which we owe to the genius of Bentley. In both epics we find this sound regarded or disregarded at will in prosody. The degree to which it was sounded in Greek at the time no doubt varied, and thus the poet was allowed to be inconsistent.³

² T. B. L. Webster, 'Early and Late in Homeric Diction'. Eranos 54, 1956, 34. G. S. Kirk, 'Objective Dating Criteria in Homer'. Mus. Helv. 17, 1960, 198. Great vigour and confidence is displayed by D. L. Page, History and the Homeric Iliad. Sather Class. Lect. 31, Univ. of Calif. Press 1959, especially c. 6., in identifying Mycenaean elements in Homeric language.

p. 63 In so saying we have already committed ourselves in regard to a question which has become more important lately. Those who reckon the Homeric poems as pure 'oral composition' have drawn the conclusion that the use of formulaic elements is to be explained on purely technical grounds, and that interpretations which appeal to literary judgment are an illegitimate application of modern standards.² As the author does not accept the view that the Homeric poems had a purely oral composition, he rejects this interpretation. We must never forget how much free and original poetry there is in both the Iliad and the Odyssey, apart from traditional formulae. It is where his creation is relatively free of the traditional that we most catch the tones of his voice; as in the first and last books of the Iliad, and where his similes give us pictures of his own world.³ To evaluate the finds of Parry and his school it is high time (page 64) that we considered not only what we have learned about the formulaic element in Homer, but also those parts which are outside the sphere of the formula.

² ~~T. B. L. Webster, 'Early and Late in Homeric Diction', Erasmus 54, 1956.~~

A vigorous exponent of this view is F. M. Combellack, 'Milman Parry and artistry'. Comparative Literature II, 1959, 193. For a different view: R. Spieker, Die Nachrufe in der Ilias. Diss. Münster 1958. Both he and C. E. Whitman (sup. p. 53, n.2), go too far in detecting artistry and symbolism. Both extremes should be avoided.

³ In this connection the researches of G.P. Shipp (Studies in the Language of Homer. Cambridge 1953) deserves attention.

p. 73 We share with most scholars the view that the composition of the two epics presupposes writing. In Homer's time this must have been a recent invention. Even if he was not the first epic poet to use writing, the peculiarities of his manner and the number of oral elements support such a view. But it would be wrong to regard this use of writing as initiating a written transmission, tied wholly to books. Rather, it was for a long time in the hands of rhapsodes, who were organized into guilds (often, no doubt, on a family basis).

Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture By Werner Jaeger

Translated from the Second German Edition by Gilbert Highet

Volume I - Second Edition - New York - Oxford University Press - 1945

Page 16

"Today, the real problem is this: are we to confine our historical analysis to an examination of the Iliad and Odyssey as a whole (which would be equivalent to abandoning the investigation), or are we to extend it to the inevitably hypothetical attempt to distinguish within the epics strata of different ages and characters?⁴ This problem does not affect the justifiable and still unsatisfied claim that the poems should be judged above all as an artistic whole."

"Naturally, I cannot produce my own analysis of the poems in this book. However, I believe I have proved satisfactorily that the first book of the Odyssey (which critics since Kirchhoff have regarded as one of the latest insertions in the poem) was considered to be the work of Homer, not only by Solon, but very probably by the Greeks of the age before Solon's archonship (594). That is, it was held to be Homeric in the seventh century at least.⁶ In his latest work on the subject Wilamowitz was forced to the belief that the great intellectual movements of the seventh and sixth centuries had no influence on the Odyssey."

Note 6 from pages 421/22

"6. See my essay Solons Eunomie (Sitz. Berl. Akad. 1926), 73 ff. There I have demonstrated, as I think beyond all doubt, that Solon in his elegy *Ἡμετέρῃ δὲ Πόλιν* reflects the speech of Zeus in the assembly of the gods in the first book of the Odyssey. (See also p. 143.) This elegy of Solon's was connected with the social unrest in Athens which he attempted to settle by his reforms (594 B.C.). It must be referred to the period preceding them, and therefore represents a most valuable clue

to the form of our Odyssey about the turn of the seventh century. Thus the Odyssey known in Solon's age contained the parts of the epic which a critic like Adolf Kirchhoff has distinguished as the most recent: the Telemachia and with it the first book. Kirchhoff's analysis of the Odyssey seemed logically so conclusive to modern scholars like Wilamowitz and Schwartz that they based their own analytical efforts largely on his results. They supposed that the first book of the Odyssey belonged to a much later time than it would now appear from its imitation in Solon's elegy. Their conclusions must be revised in the light of the facts mentioned above, as has been promptly recognized by Rudolf Pfeiffer in his penetrating review of the books of Wilamowitz and Schwartz on the Odyssey in Deutsche Literaturzeitung 1928, pp. 2364 and 2366. F. Jacoby, in Die Antike IX, 160, adds reasons for believing in an even earlier terminus ante quem for the Odyssey."

Note 2 from page 421

"2. This controversy started on a large scale with the publication of F. A. Wolf's famous Prolegomena ad Homerum in 1795. This work followed almost immediately upon the rediscovery of the ancient Alexandrian theories of the epos and the later critical tradition that has come down to modern times through the scholia found in the oldest Venice manuscripts of Homer, first published by the Marquis de Villoison in 1788."

Note 3 from page 421

"3. All the contributions to the Homeric problem made by Wilamowitz, from his early book Homerische Untersuchungen to his great work Homer und die Ilias and the late monograph Die Heimkehr des Odysseus, show this new historical trend. He tried throughout to compare the development of the epic to the archaeological monuments and to what little we know about the historical background of early Greek poetry. See also his lecture Das homerische Epos' in Reden und Vortraege, Bd. I. The books on Homer by E. Bethe and Ed. Schwartz follow the same path. But the same tendency prevailed also among contemporary

archaeologists, Schliemann, Doerpfeld, Evans, and their successors, who tried to throw light on the problem of the epic through the new evidence afforded by the excavations."

Note 4 from page 421

"4. A distinct tendency to abandon analysis of the Homeric poems is shown in such modern works as Domseiff's Archaische Mythenerzahlung (Berlin 1933), and Jacoby's Die geistige Physiognomie der Odyssee (in Die Antike IX, 159). Among the scholars of the English-speaking world this tendency has always been very strong. It has been more recently represented by the Americans J. A. Scott and S. E. Bassett, whose well-known books in the Sather Classical Series oppose on principle the analytical spirit of the Homeric scholarship of the last century. The articles of G. M. Calhoun must also be added to them."

Note 17 from page 428

"17. We may refer briefly to some of the outstanding modern books on the Homeric problem, such as U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Die Ilias und Homer (Berlin 1916) Erich Bethe, Homer, Dichtung und Sage (2 vols., Leipzig 1914), Gilbert Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic (2nd ed., Oxford 1911). Of unitarian writers we quote J. A. Scott, The Unity of Homer (Berkeley 1921), S. E. Bassett, The Poetry of Homer (Berkeley 1938). Sir Richard Jebb gives an introduction to the Homeric question and its development in the nineteenth century in his book Homer (1st ed., 1886). Georg Finsler, Homer (2. Aufl., Leipzig 1914-18), contains a good chapter on the history of the problem. On the analysis of the Odyssey see the books listed in note 54 of the previous chapter of this book. See also C. M. Bowra, Tradition and Design in the Iliad (Oxford 1930)."

Note 25 from page 429

"25. Roland Herkenrath, Der ethische Aufbau der Ilias und Odyssee (Paderborn 1928), has given a full analysis of both poems from the ethical point of view, which he thinks is the approach most fitted for a true appreciation of their unified composition and art. The book contains much valuable observation, but has carried its thesis too far, overrating its importance for the question of the origin of the epic."

Note 20 from page 432

"20. This was the title of Adolf Kirchhoff's noted book (Hesiodos' Mahnlieder an Perses, Berlin 1889) in which he applied the same method to the work of Hesiod as in his analytical treatment of the Odyssey mentioned before."

Pages 49-51

"The work of Homer is throughout inspired by a comprehensive philosophy of human nature and of the eternal laws of the world-process, a philosophy which has seen and judged every essential factor in man's life. He contemplates every event and every character in the light of his universal knowledge of the underlying and eternal truth. The love of Greek poetry for gnomic utterances, its tendency to measure each event by a general standard and to reason from the general to the particular, and its frequent use of traditional examples as universal types and ideals--all these tendencies originate with Homer. The finest expression of the epic view of human life is the pictures on the shield of Achilles, which are fully described in Book XVIII (478 ff.) of the Iliad.

"On the shield Hephaestus wrought the earth, and heaven, and the sea, and the tireless sun, and the moon at its full, and all the signs which crown the sky. And he made two cities of men, beautiful to see. In one, there were marriage-rites and feasting: a bridal procession was marching through the city by the light of torches, while many a marriage-song rose up, and dancing-boys whirled among them to the music of flute and lyre; and the women stood at their doors admiring it all. The citizens were assembled in the market-place, where a quarrel was afoot between two men, about the blood-price to be paid for a man who had been killed. The elders were sitting upon polished stone seats in a sacred circle, each holding a herald's staff of office: and they stood up in turn to give their verdicts.

"The other city was besieged by two armies, gleaming in armour. They were in two minds whether to destroy the city or to plunder it. But the citizens had not yet submitted, but marched out to an ambush, leaving their wives and their children, along with the old men, to guard the city wall. And when they came to the place for the ambuscade--it was by a river, at the watering-place of cattle--they took their posts,

and attacked a herd which was driven down to the river. Then the enemy rushed up, and a battle broke out along the river banks. Spears flew back and forward: Eris and Kydoimos, the demons of War, moved among them as they fought, while Kér, the spirit of Death, in blood-stained garments, dragged the dead and wounded men by the feet through the mêlée.

"And Hephaestus made a field, where ploughmen drove their teams up and down: at the field's edge where they turned a man came up and gave them a cup of wine. And he made a manor at reaping time. The reapers plied their sickles, while the trusses fell behind them and were bound into sheaves by the binders; the king who owned the manor stood watching in silent joy; and his squires prepared a meal under an oak tree beyond. Hephaestus made a vineyard too, with a gay vintage dance; a herd of horned cattle, with drivers and dogs; a pasture ground in a beautiful valley, with sheep, and shepherds, and sheepfolds; and a dancing place, where young men and maidens were dancing, holding one another by the hand, while a divine minstrel sang to his lyre--all these completed the vast picture of all the activities of human life. Round the rim of the shield flowed the Ocean, embracing the whole world.

"That deep sense of the harmony between man and nature, which inspires the description of Achilles' shield, is dominant in Homer's conception of the world. One great rhythm penetrates the moving whole. No day is so full of human striving that the poet forget to tell how the sun rises and sinks above the turmoil, how the toil and battle of the day is succeeded by repose, and how the night which loosens men's limbs in sleep embraces all mortals, Homer is neither a naturalist nor a moralist. He is neither swept away without foothold in the chaotic waves of life, nor standing, a serene observer, on the shore. Physical and spiritual forces are equally real for him. He has a keen and objective insight into human passions. He knows their elemental violence, which overpowers man himself and whirls him away in their grip. But though that force may often seem to overswell its banks, it is always controlled by strong barriers beyond.

For Homer, and for the Greeks in general, the ultimate ethical boundaries are not mere rules of moral obligation, but fundamental laws of Being.³⁰ It is to this sense of ultimate reality, this deeper knowledge of the meaning of the world, beside which all mere 'realism' seems thin and partial, that the Homeric epic owes its overpowering effect.

'Homer sees life as governed by universal laws; and for that reason he is a supreme artist in the craft of motivation. He does not passively accept tradition: he does not relate a simple succession of events. He presents a plot which develops by its own compulsion from state to stage, governed by an unbreakable connexion of cause and effect. With the first line, the dramatic narrative of each epic begins to unfold without interruption towards its logical end. 'Muse, sing of the anger of Achilles and his strife with Atreus' son Agamemnon. Which of the gods set them to strive with each other?' The question flies straight as an arrow to the goal. Upon it follows the tale of Apollo's wrath, a tale which gives only the essential factors which cause the tragedy: it is set at the head of the epic like the aetiology of the Peloponnesian War at the beginning of Thucydides' history. And the plot does not develop in a loose chronological sequence. It is ruled throughout by the principle of sufficient reason. Every action has its roots in character.

"But Homer does not, like modern authors, see every action from within, as a phenomenon of human consciousness. In his world, nothing great happens without the aid of a divine power. The poet who tells a story is necessarily omniscient. Our authors must speak of the most secret emotions of each character as if they themselves had entered his mind. Homer, on the other hand, presents all human action as guided by the gods. It is not always easy to draw the line beyond which this narrative method becomes simply a poetic device; but it is certainly mistaken to hold that the intervention of the gods is never more than a trick of the epic style. For Homer does not inhabit a rationalized world, full of the banal and the commonplace, and disguised only by the painted scenery of poetic illusion. If we study the instances of divine intervention in the epics, we

3.41-58

Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture

By Werner Jaeger

(8)

can trace a development from the occasional external interference of the gods (a motif which must belong to a very early stage of the epic style) to the constant spiritual guidance of a great man by a divinity, as Odysseus is guided by the perpetual inspiration of Athena.³¹

A Companion to Homer, edited by Alan J. B. Wace and Frank H. Stubbings (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1962)

Wace, Alan J. B. "The History of Homeric Archaeology" Chapter 11

p. 328 One difficulty is that much of the evidence is unfortunately negative, and this is unsatisfactory. The lack of archaeological illustration of an object in the epics does not necessarily mean that such an object never existed . . . We should not strike out as interpolation any passage in Homer because the mention or description of an object does not agree with our assumptions of what it should be or with the object to which the name was applied in classical times.

p. 329 There have, it is true, been some scholars who have endeavored to use archaeological evidence in support of a disruptive criticism of Homer, rejecting some passages as archaeologically impossible, or as late in date, and therefore interpolated. But the general effect of archaeology can be best seen in the contrast between the generally 'separatist' tendency of mid-nineteenth-century Homeric criticism, before Schliemann, with the present tendency, which is in the main unitarian.

A Companion to Homer, edited by Alan J. B Wace and Frank H. Stubbings (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1962)

See 3.41-28

Davidson, J.A., "The Homeric Question" Chapter 7, p. 257

No one, that I know of, now believes that the Iliad or the Odyssey was created by joining together 'loose songs' into 'a sequel of songs and rhapsodies' in such a way that the original components could be simply uncoupled from one another and resume an independent existence. All the researches into the relative chronology of the various elements in the poems show the 'older' and 'younger' elements (whether archaeological, linguistic or social) interlock (perhaps the best example is the occurrence of the unquestionably ancient boar's tusk helmet in K., a book in which the language is characteristically modern and even 'post-Odyssean'). We may therefore deny that the Iliad and Odyssey were created directly out of lays in the Lachmannian sense; but we cannot deny that there are blocks which seem to be closely inter-connected, and may have originally formed parts of separate $\sigma\mu\delta\alpha\iota$ (or even $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\alpha$ $\alpha\nu\sigma\mu\omega\nu$), as for example Γ -E, H-, Θ -, K and i- μ .

Footnote 53. p. 263 The tide began to turn against the destructive analysts in 1929 with the publication of W. Schmid's Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, i; his account of Homer (83-195) strongly emphasized the artistic unity and importance of the poems. In 1930 it was followed by C. M. Bowra's Tradition and Design in the Iliad (a pioneer work of first class importance),

821.03
85f

The Fortunes of Epic Poetry, A Study in English and American Criticism 1750-1950, Donald M. Foerster. The Catholic University of America Press, 1962.

p. 60 Often obscured since the Renaissance by moralistic and rationalistic interpretations of literature, it had even received occasional expression during the Age of Reason. But just before 1800, just at the moment when criticism was rapidly becoming emotionalistic of its own accord, along came the surprising and shocking theories of the German scholars, Heyne and Wolf. A man named Homer had never existed; the Iliad was originally a group of separate heroic ballads composed by a host of rhapsodists; the poem was eventually assembled by Pisistratus. Thus, in 1798 Charles J. Fox takes issue with Wolf, saying that he sees no reason to dissect Homer's poems and to assign the detached pieces to different ages. . . . In conversation, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey discussed the German theories - how thoroughly it is impossible to say -- and all three "leaned to the Wolfian, or as my brother (Hartley Coleridge) calls it, Wolfish and Heribous hypothesis."

As we shall see later, belief in this hypothesis was often damaging to the reputation of Homer. But Englishmen usually appear to have rejected Wolf's idea of multiple authorship and to have accepted other ideas of his. The result was that real impetus was given to primitivistic appraisals of Homer, to the view that the Iliad and Odyssey were the genuine, sincere effusions of a child of nature rather than the lucubrations of a craftsman.

p.72 Antagonism towards Homer was far milder but was perhaps a good deal more persistent. Needless to say, the adverse criticism was basically the result of the major shifts in literary theory which we have already discussed. A more specific factor, however, was the speculation about Homeric origins that stemmed ultimately from eighteenth century conjectural studies of history and more directly from the writings of Wolf. Though the German hypotheses were often said to be absurd, and though they might prompt one to visualize the Iliad and Odyssey as highly emotionalistic and therefore highly "poetic," they also contained certain implications detrimental to the prestige of Homer. Could he be admired as a real person? Was he the great and original genius he had been supposed, a "blazing star," as Lord Kames had described him, generating light from within and illuminating a dark and barbaric age? Whether or not one believed implicitly in everything that Wolf had said, it was obviously hard to disregard some of his contentions. Wordsworth was not alone in believing that Homer had written the Iliad but not the Odyssey. Others questioned the very existence of the poet.

p. 73 In yet another way did Wolf's theories tarnish the glory of Homer; they threw suspicion upon the completeness and inner consistency of both his epics. While it is true that narrative, unified and well-rounded narrative, no longer seemed indispensable in higher types of poetry, it became an almost habitual practice during the Romantic period to point to passages in which Homer was presumed to have nodded and to look for possible expungings and interpolations of the text. William Taylor decided that inconsistencies in the fables proved Homer was "not the polished artist" people had supposed,⁶⁷ Henry Hallman said

p. 74 that "the Iliad wants completeness,"⁶⁸ and even Henry N. Coleridge, a Homeric zealot, could not detect the "exquisite-ness of artifice" of which critics had so insistently spoken.⁶⁹ In one of his essays, De Quincey made facetious reference to a man who, by amazing stroke of genius, had discovered that Ulysses had attended three "dinner parties" on the same evening.⁷⁰ And S. T. Coleridge declared that many books of the Iliad "might change places without any injury to the thread of the story. Indeed, I doubt the original existence of the Iliad as one poem."⁷¹ On the whole, it is perhaps small wonder that some literary men began to be alarmed for Homer; for, as one of them protested, scholars and critics had tried to take from him "his best parts, his affecting episodes, his battles, his shield, or his games," had distributed them among "forgotten troubadours," and had "put, as it were, they very genius of Homer into commission."⁷⁵

p. 121 According to William Smith, an historian writing in the 1850's, no literary theorist of the day was immune to the insidious hypotheses of Wolf and the other so-called "separatists": "even those who were the most opposed to his views have had their own opinions to some extent modified by the arguments which he brought forward, and no one has been able to establish the old doctrine in its original integrity."¹¹ Though one is impelled to take Smith's statement cum grano salis, the Victorians were certainly more excited about the German theories than the Romantics had been, and not a few of them came to regard the traditional "unitarian" view as completely unrealistic. . . . Considerably better known but somewhat along the same lines were the speculations of George Grote, whose history of Greece first appeared in 1846 and was still being reprinted after 1900. Grote endeavors to seem impartial in his judgments: he opposes Lachmann's view (Kliedieder-Theorie) that at least sixteen poets were contributors to the Iliad, and he censures the supposition that all passages betokening real artistry are "decidedly post-Homeric."

p. 122 Of all the champions of Wolf in Victorian Britain, Thomas Carlyle was clearly the most important. Lecturing in the 1830's on the history of literature, he declared that the Iliad is comprised of what he called "ballad delineations" of historical events and that "one may cut out two or three books without making any alteration in its unity."¹⁶

68. Literature of Europe, III, 473

69. Greek Classic Poets, p. 79

70. Historical and Critical Essays (Boston, 1856), I, 266

71. Miscellaneous Criticism, pp. 160-161

75. T. J. Mathias, Observations on the Writings and on the Character of Mr. Gray (London, 1815), p. 78

11. A History of Greece, Amer. ed. (Boston, 1855), p. 42.

16. Lectures on the History of Literature, ed. J. Reay Greene (London, 1892), pp. 16, 19.

p. 123 That there was little support for separatism or for the progressive and primitivist estimates admirably attuned to it around 1800 becomes apparent if we turn for a moment to the caustic comments that were now being made about Wolf and his followers. Never before had the Germans been subjected to so much indignation. William Mure, usually hailed as the great champion of Homer in Victorian England, spoke of the separatists as indulging in a "tasteless course of hypercritical subtlety," and he asked the skeptics why Homer could not have composed both the Iliad and the Odyssey if it was generally agreed, as it seemed to be, that a single author had written plays so dissimilar as Macbeth and the Merry Wives of Windsor.²³

Reminders on the similarity were far more evident in their language → In 1850 one of them declared that among the Germans "eccentricity has long been the standard substitute for genius. Accordingly they worked each after his fashion for nearly fifty years with most pertinacious alacrity - one cutting and slashing - another pruning and paring - score upon score mumbling and nibbling."²⁴ In another issue a writer dams Lachmann's "imbecile deductions," his "micro-criticism," his "crazy theories like a Neapolitan gig on a festa."²⁵ Nor did Blackwood's hesitate to join in the chorus of anathemas when it railed at the Germans as "those charlatans, impostors, knaves, idiots, heretics, schismatics, atheists."²⁶ The Homeric scholar J. S. Blackie was not particularly given to the launching of imprecations, but in his chief work, Homer and the Iliad, he described the separatists as lawyers, "supersubtle, curious, captious, and impracticable. They are like men, if we may imagine such, with microscopic eyes, who see the mites crawling so gigantically through the mass, that they lose all stomach for the cheese."²⁷ It is, in fact, with some feeling of relief that one comes across the rather flippant verses by Elizabeth Barrett Browning:

Wolf's an atheist,
 And if the Iliad fell out as he says,
 By mere fortuitous concurrence of old songs,
 We'll guess as much for the universe.²⁸

**** 23. A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece (London, 1854), I, 199-200; II, 130

24. LXXXVI, 237. (Amer. ed.).

25. LXXXI, 409, 413.

26. LXXXII, 181-182.

27. Homer and the Iliad (Edinburg, 1866), I, 244.

28. Quoted by Blackie, Homer and the Iliad, I, 245.

Trevelyan, Humphrey, Goethe and the Greeks. Cambridge, 1941, pp. 229-231

"Full Classicism: 1788-1805 - Crisis and Failure"

The problem which Wolf's Prolegomena had raised three years before was evidently of great importance to Goethe in deciding how to handle the Achilleis. His attitude to the Homeric controversy in fact gives the clue to some of his more hidden thoughts in the crisis that the Achilleis brought about. When the Prolegomena came out in May 1795, Goethe's first reaction was one of disapproval.³ But a few weeks later he met Wolf, and was filled at once with respect and admiration for his mind and personality.¹ The result was a change of his attitude to Wolf's theories. He came to accept Wolf's basic contention, that Homer, even if there had once been such a person, could not have been the sole, nor even the chief, author of the Iliad and Odyssey; but that these poems were the result of a long process of development in which innumerable poets and editors over a period of many centuries had all played a part.² Goethe gave up the idea of a personal Homer without difficulty; but he strongly opposed any tendency to tear the poems in pieces and show that they had no artistic unity.³ The more he studied the Iliad, the more clearly he saw that it had poetic unity in the highest sense, so that "it is impossible either to add to it or take away from it".⁴

Goethe conceived the origin and growth of the Homeric poems thus: nameless bards (δοιοιοι) had made up and sung innumerable ballads of the deeds of the Trojan heroes; these had been handed on and added to by the rhapsodists; in time this vast but formless "ocean of poetry" had tended insensibly, without the aid of any great poetic genius, to coalesce around two major themes, the wrath of Achilles, and the return of Odysseus; what could not be related to these, dropped out of use and was forgotten; later ages continued to work at these at first loosely-organised complexes, the tendency being rather to cut out what was irrelevant than to add new material; this process continued down to the days of the grammarians of Alexander.⁵ The Homeric poems could therefore be regarded as an anonymous product of the whole Greek race. At the same time this unconscious process had created poems that had every appearance of being the most finished

products of conscious art. Here was a mystery before which Goethe's mind stood still in wonder. Then as he gazed on it, a thought, a hope, rose up in him. These poems were such perfect representatives of epic poetry,¹ because the individuality of every poet who had worked on them had been obliterated by the work of all the rest. The element of caprice (das Willkürliche) which the individuality of even the greatest artist introduces into his work, was wholly absent from the Iliad and Odyssey. . . . Might it not be possible for him also to sink his individuality in the mighty tradition of the Greek epic, to let the idea of epic poetry merely blow through him as it had blow through those scores of nameless singers? This was his struggle in those days of May: first to identify himself so completely with the Homeric world, that in studying it he would be raised above the limits of a subjective judgment;³ to suppress every objection that his individual nature might make to what he saw;⁴ then having attained this state of super-personal receptiveness, to let his Achilleis grow of itself, as the seed sown broadcast on the well-tilled earth grows through the will of God.⁵ . . . No man alive, nor any that ever should be born, he wrote to Schiller, was capable of judging the Iliad.

"~~Goethe~~" Last Years: 1805-1832" p. 267-268

Between 1817 and 1823 he [Goethe] not only finished and published two essays on ancient art, Myrons Kuh and Philostrats Gemälde,⁴ which he had begun some years before; he also followed closely the controversy between Hermann and Creuzer on Greek mythology;⁵ and in 1820 and 1821 he revised and published the digest of the Iliad which he had made for his own use in 1798. In connexion with this work he returned with delight to Homer's world, and revived his long-dormant interest in the Homeric question.⁷ With obvious relief he came back to a belief in a personal Homer, and arch-editor of genius, and greeted the work of the younger critics who opposed the Wolfian heresy, in these lines: [translation given] "You have in your clever way freed us from all reverence; and we asserted too glibly that the Iliad was only a patchwork. Let no one take offence if we change our mind, for young men have been able to fire us to think of him rather as a whole, to feel him joyfully as a whole." Homer wieder Homer, WA.3, p. 159

331-182

JK

Whitman, Cedric H., Homer and The Heroic Tradition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 1958

p. vii Though the Old World largely maintains its scepticism, America has become the home of a new and firmly based theory of Homeric unity, which it is the purpose of this book to reveal and develop.

p. ix Least of all does Chapter II, dealing with Mycenaean history, lay claim to finality. Here well-known fact, controversial hypothesis, and pure guesswork are mingled in the attempt, by no means unprecedented, to adjust the quasi-mythical traditions of antiquity to archaeological, historical, and other scientific knowledge. Whether it will ever be possible to reach agreement in such matters seems dubious at best; and it is only to be expected that archaeologists (though I hope I have done their differences justice in my notes) and folklorists alike will object to my formulation. It is not my hope to enlighten either.

p. x Clearly, my chief points of departure are the works of Milman Parry, Albert Lord, and James Notopoulos, the men who have done the most, by far, for the all-important doctrine of oral composition.

p. 1 Happily, the smoke of battle between the "analyst" and "unitarian" schools schools has cleared away, and a new spirit of humility and careful research has succeeded the vituperations and positivism of

p. 2 the last century. In retrospect, it is not always easy to do justice to the efforts of those Homerists, by reason of both the ~~Quantity~~^{Quantity} and the waywardness of their opinions. The unitarian, like every fundamentalist, tended to reject reason, and the analyst erred in overuse of it. If the analyst group was the more learned, on the whole, it was also the more deficient in literary feeling. For Wilamowitz, the Iliad as it stands was a "wretched patchwork." Deeply as one may deplore such a judgment, it is difficult to see how any better one could arise from the kind of rationalistic literary approach which the so-called Higher Criticism regularly employed.

3.01

The fixed notion that repeated lines, or echoing phrases, offer evidence of tamperings and interpolations was simply out of place in dealing with Homer. More serious was the tacit assumption that poetry and prose have a similar logic, so that superficial failures of consistency in Homer could provide scientific criteria sufficient to prove the multiplicity - and the incompetence - of the compilers of the epics. . . .

p. 3 The unitarian position today rests upon a number of careful, specialized studies. It is no longer necessary to refute one by one the contentions of the old school, partly because in the long run the analysts, each with his own theoretical breakdown of the poems and ~~perennially~~^{perennially} failing of agreement, argued the matter to rags,

3.01

Whitman, Cedric H. Homer and The Heroic Tradition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 1958

page 3(cont'd)

and eventually caused the whole method to die of its own ingenuity.

page 4

Objectors to Wolf must prove either that writing was as old as Homer, or that the human memory could do incredible feats, and for the time neither course seemed possible. Hence, for over a century, scholars faced the problem bravely, trying to distinguish the layers of composition, the older from the younger, the work of "original" poets from that of compilers, interpolations of various ages, contradictions, anachronisms, and expurgations. By the time of Leaf's large edition of the Iliad, the chaos of Homeric scholarship made the Ptolemaic universe look simple. By creating an ever increasing confusion, the method had shown itself a failure, yet almost no one dared to return to a unitarian view. Indeed, in 1934, in the preface to the fourth edition of the Rise of the Greek Epic, Gilbert Murray wrote with some satisfaction that he could find "no unitarians left except Drerup."

page 5

In his two French theses, in his various articles, and above all in his great recorded collection of Serbian oral epics, only now being published by his colleague and continuator, A. B. Lord, Parry reverted directly to Wolf's original question, answered it anew, and outmoded with one lightning stroke a whole century of scholarship.³ Homer did not have to write in order to compose the epics.

page 9-10

In the years since 1934, when Murray could find "no unitarians left except Drerup," there has been, in America at least, a considerable increase in the ranks of unitarianism. It has been called a change in fashion, but it is more like a confession of renewed uncertainty, after the failure of the last century's methods to produce a clear doctrine. It marks a resurgence of literary intuition about two highly polished works of art, in which flaws of consistency and relevance, by which the activity of many hands might be detected, are hard to find and impossible to prove. Large epics, the product of literary agglutination from many sources, do exist, the Mahabharata, for instance; but the latter's fame rests upon its parts, the tale of Nala and Dayayanti, or the Bhagavad-Gita. The Kalevala is equally an artificial assemblage, made in the

Whitman, Cedric H., Homer and the Heroic Tradition (1958)

eighteenth century, of early oral Finnish ^{poetry} ~~poetry~~, and Dr. Lönnrot, who made it, showed remarkable skill in the arrangement of the cantos which he collected. But these works are nothing like Homer, whose poems, traditional as they are, exhibit a structural unity and finesse comparable only to the most sophisticated and carefully devised works of literature. . . .

. . . The secret of Homeric structure, of the Iliad at least, lies, as we shall see, in the adjustment of oral technique to the psychology underlying the Geometric symmetry of the late eighth century B.C. Its units are the typological scenes and motifs which are the stock in trade of oral poets, and Homer's finished design is far too authoritative to suffer seriously from the small logical inconsistencies which have sometimes been so fiercely denounced.

Logical inconsistencies in Homer fall into two classes, real and imagined. To take an example of the latter first, it has been said that the season shifts irresponsibly between winter and spring in the later books of the Odyssey, but this is untrue.

page 13

If the analyst school of higher criticism wrought confusion by trying to find "Homer" in certain parts of the epics and not in others, the theorists of oral composition have yet to distinguish him from the traditional medium in which he worked.

page 63

A minor degree of corruption may have taken place. But it is poor method to assume a corruption if the text as it stands can be explained. To assume that the Ionic of Homer is of an Attic and not of a colonial variety, is only consistent with the archaeological and anthropological evidence and with the historical and legendary tradition. The doctrine that Homer had been modernized in the sixth century and later, partly for political reasons and partly by accident, was once perhaps, the only recourse. Now that the role of Attica in preserving the traditions of the Achaeans can be adumbrated with such probability, it becomes far more natural to conclude that Attic phenomena in the text, whether dialectal or involving subject matter, are old and genuine and do not postdate the time of Homer himself.

The Pisistratean theory, first formulated in modern times by Wolf in 1795, was documented by him from ancient sources, which, though they conflicted greatly, all pointed to Pisistratus' having done something to Homer. Believing as he did that Homer lived long before writing was invented, Wolf could find no other way to explain the survival of the epics in written form. We now know, through the energetic field-work of Parry and others, that oral poetry does not behave according to his suppositions, and that the operations of Pisistratus are not only unnecessary, but even impossible. But the Pisistratean theory still enjoys wide popular currency.

.....

The other, even more popular story, that Pisistratus first collected the scattered remains of Homer's poetry and arranged them in writing, rests principally upon an amalgam of the testimony of Cicero (nearly half a millennium after the event), Flavius Josephus, (p. 67) the historian of the Jews, Pausanias, and an epigram in the Greek Anthology, of uncertain date, no authority, and clearly tendentious import. Some illustrious names in scholarship can be found subscribing to this belief. Its inherent difficulties, which have been well analyzed by Wilamowitz, scarcely need repetition, since it flies so vehemently in the face of both oral theory and the real aesthetics of the Homeric poems. Like the story of Hipparchus, it is a legend, and its growth as such has recently been clearly spelled out.

But even those who reject all other forms of the Pisistratean theory generally admit that Pisistratus interpolated the poems to a degree. The ancient testimony for this belief is more respectable than the rest, but it affects only a very few passages, notably those dealing with Athens, which are supposed to have been added for nationalistic reasons.

In the sense that he is at once the climax of the oral tradition and the beginning of written literature, Homer is a transitional figure. There is not much that is still primitive in Homer, but whether his refinement and sophistication point to the effects of writing is a dubious matter. Homer's mode of composition seems to be, from beginning

Whitman, Cedric H., Homer and the Heroic Tradition (1958)

to end, strictly that of the oral poet. To assume that he simply took a pen and wrote what he had often sung is to assume a change which has not yet been observed by any who have ever studied oral poets at first hand; hence the suggestion that Homer dictated to a scribe. This seems the most likely possibility, though at least one example does exist of a man who, from total illiteracy, became an eminent writer, the Greek revolutionary general Makriyannis. Yet Makriyannis did not write what he had sung while illiterate, he had practiced oral verse-making, but when he learned to write, he wrote prose memoirs. He does not provide the full example which is desired, therefore, of an oral poet transferring his efforts to paper, but he does prompt one or two suggestions about the motivation underlying the writing of the epic.

p. 82 Indeed, Mozart with his extraordinary gift for composing long works in his head and then writing them down whole with scarcely a correction later, offers what may not be the worst analogy to Homeric methods of composition.

p. 83 Scholars have often assumed earlier Iliads than ours, and surely they are to be assumed. But they must have all been by Homer, for the Iliad is a profoundly personal creation. He must have sung it many times before the work was committed to writing, for the benefit of the Homerids, the poet's performers.

p. 83 The idea of an official state text of Pisistratus is, as we have seen, inconsistent with the facts and alien to the times. Homer's original dictated text was official enough, in one sense, but precisely how soon it became official for the ancient Greeks is a problem.

Fifty years of Classical Scholarship
Edited by Maurice Platnauer
Basil Blackwell, Oxford

1954 CHAPTER I

HOMER

i. Homer and the Analysts

BY E. R. DODDS

IN the second volume of his *Geschichte des Altertums*, published in 1893, the great historian Eduard Meyer summed up the results achieved by the intensive study of the Homeric poems during the nineteenth century. It could, he said, be considered as scientifically proved that they were neither the work of an individual nor yet a conglomerate of 'lays', but the outcome of an activity of minstrel-poets which had extended over centuries; and he added that the stratification within each poem could be determined with an adequate measure of confidence. This was the general opinion of the time, in England as well as in Germany; the same verdict had been given, if in rather more cautious terms, by Sir Richard Jebb in his *Homer: an Introduction* (1887),¹ and by Walter Leaf in his *Companion to the Iliad* (1892). Unitarianism was not indeed dead (despite frequent announcements of its demise), but it was a heretical minority view, at least among professional scholars;² its chief public upholders were isolated figures like Andrew Lang³ in England — a brilliant scholar who enjoyed amateur status — and Carl Rothe⁴ in Germany. On the other hand, Lachmann's fantastic 'lay-theory' had been abandoned for good, although it continues to figure in the popular imagination (and in the books of some unitarians) as the typical outcome of Homeric analysis. With one possible exception, no serious analyst has maintained within living memory that the *Iliad* can be resolved into a conglomeration of short independent poems which an 'editor' has joined together by placing them end to end, as Dr. Lönnrot produced the Finnish pseudo-epic known as the *Kalevala*.⁵ That both the Homeric poems have in their present form a carefully conceived design and a basic structural unity has long been recognized by analysts as well as unitarians: e.g. Jebb wrote that 'each of the poems forms an organic and artistic whole', while adding that certain parts 'appear to disturb the plan or to betray inferior workmanship'.⁶ And on the whole the tendency of modern

3.41-71

analysis has been to place increasing emphasis on the element of design at all stages in the assumed development of the poems; we hear much less of the 'bungling redactor', that *diabolus ex machina* whom early analysts invoked to explain every blemish that seemed to mar the faultless perfection of the 'genuine' Homeric poetry.

Hermann

The view of the *Iliad* which held the field at the turn of the century, and is still today the most widely accepted alternative to unitarianism, maintains that its central subject was from the first the theme announced in the proem, the Wrath of Achilles, but that the poem has been gradually enlarged by the accretion of other material round this central nucleus. Such a view was naturally suggested by the peculiar structure of the *Iliad*, which has been described as 'a drama with retardations'; it was a natural guess that the drama formed a nucleus to which more and more retardations had in the course of time been added. Originally propounded in 1832 by one of the greatest of all Greek scholars, Gottfried Hermann, it had been developed and popularized in England by George Grote in the second volume of his *History of Greece* (1846-56). In the two generations which followed Grote it was accepted, in one form or another, by most of the leading German and English scholars — by Theodor Bergk, Wilhelm Christ, Eduard Meyer, Paul Cauer, Carl Robert, Erich Bethe, by Sir Richard Jebb, Walter Leaf, J. B. Bury, and Gilbert Murray, to name only a few. Later it was for a time eclipsed by the rival theory of Wilamowitz (see below) and by the sudden growth of unitarianism; but it has been revived in several recent analyses of the *Iliad* — in the admirable *Introduction à l'Iliade* by Mazon, Chantraine, and others (the analysis is Mazon's), and in two works by distinguished Swiss scholars, W. Theiler's essay 'Die Dichter der Ilias', and the *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* lately published by the veteran Peter Von der Mühl. By most of these writers the author of the original Wrath-poem is identified, either firmly or tentatively, with the historical bearer of the personal name 'Homer'; the old view which saw in 'Homer' a mere personification of the genius of epic poetry, or the mythical eponymous ancestor of the Homeridae, has been generally (and rightly) abandoned.

Wilamowitz

There is thus more agreement in principle among modern analysts than might be supposed by an unwary reader of unitarian polemics. But when it comes to defining the limits of the Wrath-

poem, or determining the successive stages of the later expansion, agreement seems more remote today than it did fifty years ago. The *minimum* content of the Wrath-poem must have included at least the Quarrel of the Chiefs (Book I), the Greek defeat in Book XI, the Patrocleia (Book XVI, with the end of XV), and the death of Hector (Book XXII), together with connecting pieces which are no longer recoverable in their original form. But how much more it included remains, and seems likely to remain, a matter of dispute. Did it, for example, end with the dragging of Hector's body (Leaf)? Or with Andromache's lament at the close of Book XXII (Von der Mühl)? Or did it go on to tell of Achilles' own death, so often predicted in our *Iliad* (Robert, Wilamowitz)? Or did the tale of the Wrath always end as it does now, not with the death of Hector or of Achilles, but with the death of the Wrath itself and the ransoming of Hector's body (Mazon)? To many readers the last will seem the most reasonable assumption, despite the many signs which appear to indicate that the final book of the *Iliad* is in its present form relatively late work.* Again, is it certain that the original poem included no 'retardations' at all? The older analysts tended to assume this, apparently because they felt that 'Homer's' work must have had the sort of strict organic unity that Aristotle expected of a tragedy. But Homer had not had the advantage of reading Aristotle, and it may be that, like Shakespeare, he cared less about organic unity than about pleasing his audience. May he not, to that end, have included in his poem further battle-pieces which gratified the pride of Greek listeners by describing Achaean victories, and enabled traditional heroes like Diomedes and Ajax to show their paces? Considerations of this kind account for the widely varying estimates of the length of the Wrath-poem, ranging between the extreme views of Bethe,¹⁰ who cut it down to some 1500 lines, and of Mazon, who is willing to attribute to the original poet fourteen books of the present *Iliad* (Books I, XI to XVIII, and XX to XXIV). Such differences indicate the limited usefulness of the nucleus-theory, though they do not, of course, disprove its correctness. They were in fact foreseen by the founder of the German analytic school, F. A. Wolf, who wrote in a moment of pessimistic foresight 'forsitan ne probabiliter quidem demonstrari poterit, a quibus locis potissimum nova subtemina et limbi procedant'.¹¹

3.41-72

There is hardly less disagreement about the 'stratification' of the expansions and the manner in which they were brought about. Leaf imagined a gradual process of growth, in which it was possible to distinguish two main strata: an earlier, consisting mainly of 'aristeiai' of different heroes, which had the effect of transforming the Wrath-poem into an *Iliad*, a general picture of the Trojan War; and a later, consisting of freely invented short poems, some of them of the highest quality, which reflects the humanity and the psychological interest of a later age. Bethe, on the other hand, postulated a second great individual poet (situated, rather unconvincingly, at Athens in the sixth century) who transformed the Wrath-poem at a single stroke into our *Iliad* by incorporating in it a large number of short pieces which had grown up round it in the interval. Others again, like Theiler, assume a much more complicated process of development, involving five or six different strata, but dispensing with the assumption of independent short poems. It is, however, untrue to suggest that *no* generally agreed conclusions have emerged.

3.41 { There are at least a few specific problems on which there is an approach to unanimity. For example, all analysts (and many unitarians) are agreed that the Doloncia (Book X) is a late addition to the poem.¹² It is, again, agreed by most analysts (and some unitarians) that the Embassy (Book IX), and the battle in Book VIII which was invented to lead up to it,¹³ formed no part of the original Wrath-poem; and that certain subordinate figures — Nestor, Glaucus and Sarpedon, Aeneas — owe their prominence in the *Iliad* to later poets who introduced them to gratify local interests.

The nucleus-theory, in its traditional form, places its 'Homer' at the *beginning* of the long poetic development which produced our *Iliad*. To this it has been objected (*a*) that the language and style of the *Iliad*, even in its 'oldest' parts, is far from being 'primitive', but has a technical perfection which presupposes a long tradition of epic poetry; (*b*) that the matter of many parts of the *Iliad* seems to be saga-stuff, which presumably was current long before the tale of the Wrath was invented. To meet these and other difficulties, Wilamowitz devised the novel view which he presented in *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1916). Wilamowitz's Homer comes in the *middle* of the development: living at Chios in the eighth century, he took over, combined, and

in some cases remodelled, the work of various pre-Homeric poets; his own work was in turn enlarged, and in places remodelled, by a succession of post-Homeric poets. Homer's *Iliad*, according to Wilamowitz, included the main substance of Books I to VII, XI to XVII, and XXI to XXIII as far as the burial of Patroclus; the original ending is lost, and the connecting links between XVII and XXI largely obliterated by later work. But in most of this Homer was building on earlier compositions. Much of the detailed analysis fails to carry conviction: it is not easy to think that Hector's visit to Troy in Book VI is lifted from a pre-existent *Hectoreis*, and it is harder still to believe that an independent *Patrocleia* ever existed apart from the Wrath-poem. Nevertheless, *Die Ilias und Homer* is one of the great books on Homer. It is inspired throughout by a deep and true feeling for Homeric poetry, and is full of fresh and delicate observations on the many variations of style to be found in the *Iliad* — style-analysis being for Wilamowitz quite as important as structural analysis. It also marked an important advance in the understanding of the genesis of the poem. Its influence is apparent not only in the later analyses of Mazon and Von der Mühl, both of whom recognize that our *Iliad* incorporates much 'pre-Homeric' material, but in the recent work of continental unitarians on 'Homer's sources' (see below, §ii). It is not the least of Wilamowitz's services that he built in this way an undesigned bridge between the two warring schools.

Wilamowitz's date for Homer is also now widely accepted, by unitarians as well as analysts. Fifty years ago a much earlier dating was fashionable: Leaf, Jebb, Bury, Ridgeway, all dated back the older parts of the *Iliad* to the eleventh century or thereabouts. This was due in part to a misunderstanding of Homer's silence on such matters as the Dorian migration and the colonization of Asiatic Greece, in part to the discoveries of Schliemann and the recognition of 'Mycenaean' elements in Homer (see below, §v). But the evidence of the similes points clearly to Ionian authorship;¹⁴ and it is now seen that both Homer's silences and the survival in the poems of Mycenaean elements can be explained by the conservatism of an epic tradition and, in particular, by the conservative influence of a formulaic diction. The archaeological evidence makes it difficult to maintain that anything resembling our *Iliad* existed much before the eighth century; and a *terminus ante quem* is furnished by Callinus' reference

3.41-73

to Homer (as the author of a *Thebais!*), as well as by seventh-century allusions, imitations, and graphic representations (see below, §v) which seem to presuppose an *Iliad* (though not necessarily just the *Iliad* that we read today). But the dating of the various 'posthomerica' and 'antehomerica' incorporated in the *Iliad* still presents many unresolved problems.¹⁵

English writers since Leaf have contributed much less to the structural analysis of the *Iliad* than to the elucidation of its historical and cultural background. But this is perhaps the place to mention two well-known and justly admired books in English which approach the latter question, or group of questions, from the general standpoint of the analytical school — Gilbert Murray's *Rise of the Greek Epic* (Clar. Press, 1907, 4th ed., 1934), and Martin Nilsson's *Homer and Mycenae* (London, Methuen, 1933). Murray's book is nearing its half-century, and inevitably wears in places an old-fashioned air: certain of its hypotheses are outmoded and perhaps unlikely to return to favour, such as the theory which sees in a large number of Homeric heroes faded gods or 'year spirits'.¹⁶ But it will, and should, continue to be read, not only for its characteristically vivid portrayal of the conditions of life in the Submycenaean Age, but more especially for its inquiry into the nature of 'traditional books' and its interpretation of the growth of the *Iliad* in the light of that inquiry (we now have reason to believe that the Homeric poems are in fact oral compositions, but many of the illuminating things that Murray has to say about the traditional book are equally applicable to an oral tradition). Nilsson's book is predominantly concerned with the historical and archaeological questions which are discussed below (§v); but it includes also sound and valuable chapters on the principles at issue between analysts and unitarians, on Homeric language and style, on the origin and transmission of epic poetry, and on Homeric mythology (a subject on which its author is probably the greatest living expert). There is no book on Homer which the present writer would more willingly place in the hands of the intelligent inquirer, whether sixth-form boy, undergraduate, or general reader, if only because its author has the rare virtue of not claiming that his arguments prove more than they do.

The *Odyssey* is a very different kind of poem from the *Iliad*,¹⁷ and is thought by most analysts (and some unitarians) to have had a different authorship and a rather different history. Among other

differences, it has a much closer structural unity and lends itself less easily to a theory of gradual accretion round a nucleus. Nevertheless it reveals some striking structural inconsistencies, and the range of variation in style is perhaps wider than in the *Iliad*. Many of the problems which it poses were already seen and stated by Kirchhoff (*Die homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung*, 1859); his observations were brilliantly exploited and developed, with much more feeling for the poetry and understanding of the historical background, in Wilamowitz's remarkable early book, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (1884; near the end of his long life he revised some of its conclusions in *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, 1927). In our own time, besides many minor critical contributions, important analyses of the *Odyssey* have been published by Bethe, Schwartz, Bérard, Von der Mühl, and two scholars of a younger generation, Friedrich Focke and Reinhold Merkelbach.¹⁸ All these, save Bérard's, are in German; the only book in English which covers this line of country is W. J. Woodhouse's ingenious and charmingly written *Composition of Homer's Odyssey* (Clar. Press, 1930). Woodhouse's standpoint was unitarian: the author of our *Odyssey* was for him 'Homer'. But he utilized many of the discoveries of the German analysts as a means of getting back to what he regarded as 'Homer's sources'. His main originality lay in his recognition of the numerous folklore themes which are among the ingredients of the *Odyssey*.¹⁹

Limitations of space forbid any description of the results arrived at by individual analysts. While there is virtual unanimity on certain points, such as the lateness of Book XXIV²⁰ and of some parts of the *Nekyia*²¹ (both already recognized by Aristarchus), there is, as might be expected, more divergence of opinion about the growth of the poem than there is among *Iliad*-analysts, most of whom have at least the nucleus-theory in common. But certain general probabilities may be said to have emerged from the long debate. (i) Whereas the *Iliad* grew out of a Wrath-poem, 'the *Odyssey*', as Von der Mühl has put it, 'was always an *Odyssey*'; from the first it told a connected tale of Odysseus' homeward voyage and his vengeance on the suitors. But there were different versions of the story, which have been combined in our poem but not quite perfectly harmonized.²² There were longer and shorter accounts of the hero's wanderings, which freely borrowed incidents and motifs from older tales of

travel, including the Argonaut-story.²³ And there were rival versions of the Vengeance, whose imperfect harmonization is responsible for a number of obscurities, in particular the curious behaviour ascribed to Penelope in Books XVIII and XIX.²⁴ (ii) The 'Telemachy' (i.e. approximately Books I to IV, with XV, XVI, and the beginning of XVII) formed no part of the older *Odyssey*. But it is very doubtful if it ever existed as an independent poem. On this point Focke seems to the present writer to have reason on his side (against the opinion of most of the earlier analysts²⁵). The simplest view seems to be that the whole Telemachus sub-plot was invented by the same poet who gave the *Odyssey* its present shape by combining all the best features of the older versions and adding some further expansions in his own characteristic manner (e.g. the extra day which Odysseus is allowed to spend with the Phaeacians²⁶). It has often been remarked, even by analysts,²⁷ that the *Odyssey* for all its discrepancies bears, much more than the *Iliad*, the impress of a single mind; also that it makes as a whole an impression of relative modernity. This is perhaps best explained by the assumption that the poem was enlarged and reconstructed in the seventh century²⁸ by a single poet, who allowed himself a much freer hand than any of those who made their contributions to the *Iliad*.

In conclusion, it may be suggested that what is most needed now is not further analyses of either poem, which at the present time would, one fears, have even less prospect of general acceptance than had their predecessors, but rather a careful review of the traditional analytic arguments and methods, in the light both of unitarian criticisms and of Milman Parry's proof that the poems are oral compositions.

ii. Homer and the Unitarians

BY E. R. DODDS

It is now more than thirty years since the old logical game of discovering inconsistencies in Homer was replaced in public esteem by the new and equally enjoyable aesthetic game of explaining them away. The exhilarating conviction that for several generations the best scholars in Europe had been playing the wrong game dawned on the public mind with surprising

suddenness shortly after the First World War. It may be surmised that the reasons for so abrupt a change lay in part outside the field of Homeric scholarship. There is evidence²⁹ that in some quarters resentments left behind by the war were not without influence; Homeric analysis was in the main a German achievement, and the arrogance of some of its exponents was felt to be typical of the German mind. But the basic causes certainly lay deeper. Parallel changes occurred about the same time in New Testament criticism, where the confident claims of nineteenth-century analysts were similarly called in question; and in textual criticism proper, where the old arrogant disregard for manuscript tradition began to be replaced in many quarters by an almost superstitious reverence for it. And something not altogether dissimilar happened in philosophy, where the whole speculative structure reared by nineteenth-century idealism was swept away within a few years. All these developments can be regarded as necessary processes of disinfection — a cutting out of unsound wood. And in the case of Homer the reckless proliferation of hypotheses in the preceding half-century certainly called for a drastic pruning operation. But that was not all. The notion of a monolithic Homer, a supreme poetic genius whose work it was sacrilege to analyse, undoubtedly corresponded to certain tendencies of the time — a distrust of cold logic, a yearning to follow 'the dictates of the heart', and, more specifically, a widespread rejection of the intellectual approach to poetry.³⁰

The unitarian reaction was thus to some extent a manifestation of the *Zeitgeist*. It was announced almost simultaneously by J. A. Scott in America, by Sheppard in England, and by Drerup in Germany. Drerup³¹ was the most learned and systematic of the three; in particular, he adduced much interesting evidence from other early literatures (which, however, has seemed to analysts to prove the opposite of what Drerup thought it proved). Sheppard³² represented the aesthetic wing; he contented himself with discovering 'patterns' in the *Iliad* which seemed to him to establish its unity of design and therefore its unity of authorship (but is not the inference from the former to the latter a question-begging *non sequitur*?). It was, however, Scott's book, *The Unity of Homer* (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1921), which made the deepest impression, at least on the English-speaking public. A skilful if unscrupulous controversialist, he succeeded by a

Scott

careful choice of examples in conveying the suggestion that the greatest scholars of Germany were not only pedants but fools. He devoted pages to *minutiae* such as the trivial oversight about Pylaemenes³² — killed in *Iliad* Book V, resurrected in Book XIII to attend his father's funeral — which no modern analyst thinks important, while saying nothing at all about the Embassy problem, about the Διάπειρα problem, or about the apparent doublets in the *Odyssey*. The reader was left with the impression that the analysts' case was founded on trivialities.³⁴ The part of Scott's work which has been most generally accepted as important by scholars is the series of painstaking statistical arguments by which he tried to show that there are no significant linguistic differences between the two poems. He certainly revealed the inaccuracy of some earlier statistics; but it may be questioned whether in matters of vocabulary and grammar a statistical approach is the right one. The most significant differences, being qualitative, often escape the net of the statistician.³⁵

A feature common to Scott, Drerup, and many later unitarians is their passionate insistence on Homer's 'originality'. This led Drerup into an extreme anti-historicism: everything in Homer was poetic invention, and most of it was his own invention. Certainly, the English historical school has been guilty at times of fantastic exaggerations through treating Homer, in Wilamowitz's phrase, 'as if he were a war-correspondent'. One of its members has even professed to know the exact date of Hector's death: it occurred on August 28th, 1185 B.C.!³⁶ In the present writer's opinion it is permissible to doubt whether the debate about the identity of the Phaeacians, or even the debate about the identity of Homer's Ithaca, is a discussion about anything real. But it is much more difficult to doubt, with Drerup and Carpenter,³⁷ that the Trojan War took place (see below, §v). Scott did not go so far; but he put up a plausible case, which has recently been supported on different grounds by Schadewaldt and Wade-Gery,³⁸ for regarding Hector, and with him the whole Wrath-story, as a poetic invention. It must be said, however, that in the light of our present awareness of 'antehomerica' to equate 'poetic invention' with 'Homer's invention' is to beg a very large question. And in any case the unitarian emphasis on originality appears somewhat misplaced. As Nilsson has reminded us, 'ancient poets, and epic poets especially, did not think that

3.21 ✓

Phys Carpenter →

the greatest possible independence of previous writers increases a poet's glory'.³⁹ Nor, for that matter, did Shakespeare.

The 'naive unitarians', of whom Scott, Drerup, and Sheppard are representative, held a fundamentalist faith in the integrity of the Homeric Scriptures; their religion forbade them to make any concession whatever to the infidel, although it compelled them at times to fall back on arguments as unconvincing as the worst efforts of the analysts. But the purity of the original faith soon declined. Old difficulties were rediscovered, heresies arose, and breaches appeared in the monolithic structure. In his *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission* (Clar. Press, 1924) T. W. Allen, the most learned and formidable of English unitarians, admitted in principle that the poems contain both 'posthomeric' and 'antehomeric'. With the Alexandrine scholars, he recognized that the end of the *Odyssey* is an 'interpolation'; he also held that Homer worked on the basis of a pre-existent verse chronicle, and that the Catalogue of Ships, which was certainly not composed for our *Iliad*, is the oldest piece of Greek verse we possess. On the last point his view appears to be substantially confirmed by recent research, and is accepted in principle by Bowra, Miss Lorimer and Wade-Gery.⁴⁰ But there is much in his book which cannot be accepted, in particular his opinion that Homer 'sang the language he spoke' (see p. 35, n. 19), and his extraordinary reliance on the Greco-Roman romances of Dictys and Dares as preserving an authentic tradition of the Trojan War.

Further bits of the monolith have been discarded by subsequent unitarians. Schadewaldt, Miss Lorimer, Wade-Gery, and recently Bowra have rejected the Doloneia; Miss Lorimer rejects also *Iliad* VIII (though *Iliad* IX must be Homer's, since its removal 'would lower the value of the poem'⁴¹), together with the Supplicatio in Book VI, the Shifting of the Arms in the *Odyssey*, and some other things. There has also been a revival of 'separatism': unitarian scholars like Reinhardt,⁴² Miss Lorimer, and Wade-Gery have not concealed their opinion that there are two monoliths and not one. In short, 'naive' unitarianism is slowly⁴³ being replaced by a 'critical' unitarianism which does not despise analytical methods and is prepared to adopt some part of the analysts' conclusions. While the analysts have gradually advanced to a fuller appreciation of the over-all design, their opponents are moving from angry assertion of the design to a closer study of the

sometimes jarring parts. One may even feel that between the more moderate spokesmen of the two schools the difference is now largely one of terminology: what the analysts call nuclei or prototypes, the unitarians call sources; what the analysts call expansions, the unitarians call interpolations. Nevertheless, the schizophrenia which has so long afflicted Homeric studies has not been completely overcome. Analysts and unitarians are slow to learn from each other, and sometimes give the impression of not having troubled to read each other's works.

Apart from general studies of the economy and cultural background of the poems, such as Bowra's well-known and very useful book, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* (Clar. Press, 1930), or the more recent *Homère* of A. Scveryns (3 small vols., Brussels, Office de Publicité, 1943-48), and from Wade-Gery's interesting but highly speculative attempt to establish the personality and date of Homer (*The Poet of the Iliad*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1952), the main positive work of the unitarians in recent years has been directed towards the exploration of 'Homer's sources'. This is really the old analytic game in a new form, which is felt to be compatible with a proper recognition of the essential unity of each of the poems. One example, Woodhouse's book on the *Odyssey*, has already been mentioned. Others are Reinhardt's penetrating and original study of the sources of Odysseus' travels; 'Kakridis' convincing proof that the Meleager-story in *Iliad* IX is abbreviated from an older poem on the Wrath of Meleager; ' and the thesis recently developed by Pestalozzi, Howald and Schadewaldt, ' according to which a whole series of motifs in the *Iliad* were borrowed from an older poem, the 'Cyclic' *Aethiopis* (or its predecessor), which recounted the slaying of Memnon by Achilles and Achilles' own death at the hands of Paris. As to this last contention, certain of the motifs in question do look as if they had been invented for the Memnon story, but others, like the Funeral Games and the avenging of a friend, may well have been drawn by both poets from a dateless traditional stock; and in an oral tradition it is perfectly possible for two poems which belonged to the repertory of the same reciters to have influenced each other reciprocally, and to have continued to influence each other over a long period. '7

It may be thought, finally, that the unitarians, no less than their rivals, ought to re-examine the validity of some of their own arguments. They have let a salutary breath of fresh air into the

stale den of the Homeric specialist; but as a recent critic has said, there is a real danger of their movement developing 'internal excesses rather distressingly like those which contributed so much to the collapse of the analysts'.⁴⁸ In particular, we should beware of importing modern psychological subtleties into Homer;⁴⁹ and should also remember that in poems designed for piecemeal oral recitation there is a limit to the amount of deliberate cross-reference ('Fernverbindung') which it is reasonable to postulate.⁵⁰

iii. Homer as Oral Poetry

BY E. R. DODDS

We have still to consider what is perhaps the most important single discovery about Homer made during the past half-century, the decisive proof that the poems are oral compositions. This is mainly if not entirely⁵¹ due to a gifted American scholar, Milman Parry. The essentials of his proof are contained in his Paris thesis, *L'épithète traditionnelle chez Homère* (Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres', 1928); but the English reader can form a good idea of his work from the two long papers which he published in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vols. 41 (1930) and 43 (1932).⁵² His argument was cumulative, but his main point was that the peculiar technique of the poems, with their recurrent epithets, recurrent formulaic phrases, recurrent descriptions of scenes and situations, must have been devised as a safeguard against a possible breakdown in improvisation. He showed, for example, that for each of 37 leading characters in the two poems the poet has a stock descriptive phrase of exactly the same length, extending from the caesura to the end of the line, and normally only one such phrase for each (on the principle of 'epic economy'). And he argued that the purpose of this provision lay in its enabling the poet to apply any statement he wishes to any of his characters without risk of metrical breakdown, provided he lets the statement end at the caesura; he has then only to select from stock the appropriate descriptive phrase to complete safely and simultaneously his line and his sentence. Parry supplied a negative check on this by showing that no such system of metrically controlled epithets is to be found in pen-poets like Apollonius Rhodius. On the other hand he showed (and it has been independently shown by the Chadwicks)

3,50

Parry

that techniques broadly similar to Homer's, though less elaborate, have been developed for a similar purpose in the oral poetry of other societies.

That the Homeric poems are oral compositions is of course no new idea. It was put forward by Robert Wood in 1767, and developed (as regards the original state of the poems) by Wolf in 1795. But before Milman Parry it was open to any one to deny the assertion, and many scholars dismissed it as out of the question. This seems to be no longer possible; and some current theses, both analytic and unitarian, may need considerable readjustment in consequence. Parry unfortunately died young, before he had worked out the implications of his own discovery, and, strangely enough, these have not yet been adequately discussed. His work was received with hostility by the aesthetic school (this was not their notion of how great poetry is produced), and it appears to be still largely unknown in Central Europe;⁵³ its importance was recognized, however, by Nilsson,⁵⁴ and is today generally acknowledged by English and French scholars.

If the poems were composed without the use of writing, the question when they were first written down is of vital consequence. For if they passed through even a short period of oral transmission, it becomes impossible to claim that what we read today is the *ipsisima verba* of the individual poet Homer. Oral transmission can preserve the substance of a long poetic narrative, often with remarkable fidelity; but it would be a miracle if it preserved it *verbatim*. To escape this embarrassing conclusion, it has lately been suggested that Homer did indeed compose his poems orally, but subsequently wrote them down, having learned to write in the meantime.⁵⁵ It may be doubted whether this convenient explanation will win wide acceptance. For one thing, the separatists, who are now probably in the majority, will have to imagine two different oral poets at two different dates each acquiring in the nick of time the means of preserving his exact words for posterity. Even less probable is the view that Homer was a pen-poet using an inherited oral technique.⁵⁶ For it appears incredible that a pen-poet would fall into the unmetrical or strikingly inappropriate use of formulae which we find at times in the poems. As Parry pointed out,⁵⁷ these are the characteristic marks of oral composition. Further, devaluation of formulae by inappropriate use seems to be much commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*,⁵⁸ and is especially

noticeable in parts which analysts consider late. This looks less like the carelessness of Homer misapplying his own formulae than like the carelessness of a later oral poet: it suggests that parts of the *Odyssey* date from a period of declining oral technique.

The art of writing was certainly known in the latter part of the eighth century. But it does not follow that the oral poets were literate — literacy seems to kill the oral technique, and some of them, like the author of the *Hymn to Apollo*,⁵⁹ were blind men — or that, if they were, they wrote down poems as long as the *Iliad*. One may ask, with Bethe,⁶⁰ whether such a feat was technically possible in the eighth century, and, with Carpenter,⁶¹ whether either the poets or their audience had a sufficient motive for attempting it. As the latter puts it, 'in a community where oral literature flourishes, there must be some special occasion or incentive to justify the otherwise pointless expenditure of energy involved in manuscript notation'. Like Cauer, Wackernagel,⁶² and others, he sees the special occasion in the institution of recitations at the Panathenaea, where the poems had to be recited ἐξ ὑποβολῆς, each rhapsode beginning where his predecessor left off. This would account for the legend of the Peisistratean recension, which 'assembled' the 'scattered' poems of Homer, hitherto orally preserved.⁶³ That legend, which had played a great part in the theories of Wolf and other early analysts, was for a time wholly discredited by the criticisms of Lehrs, Wilamowitz, and Allen.⁶⁴ But several recent writers⁶⁵ have urged that it contains at least a kernel of truth: we can accept it as fairly certain (a) that in the fourth-century dispute between Athenians and Megarians about interpolations in Homer both parties knew or believed that a written redaction of Homer had been made at Athens in the sixth century; (b) that at the time of the dispute no other redaction was available for comparison. Taken together these two facts may be held to support the assumption that the poems were first written down at Athens, though they plainly do not prove it.

Whatever be the truth about the 'Peisistratean recension', the supposition that the poems have passed through a period of oral transmission can be used to explain a number of their characteristics. It will account for the concertina-like structure of the *Iliad*: when time was no object, the oral poet could recite the poem at full length and perhaps insert (as oral reciters do⁶⁶) fresh episodes of his own composition; when his audience was in a hurry,

3.4/1-71

he could leave out anything up to two-thirds of it without making more structural changes than a skilled reciter could improvise, and he would still have 'sung the Wrath of Achilles'. It will also account for what looks like conflation of variants, as in the *Diapira*, or duplication of incidents, as at several points in the *Odyssey*: the oral poet, piously anxious to preserve and utilize whatever seems to him best in the work of his predecessors, will at times fuse together features derived from different local versions, and at others duplicate an incident rather than sacrifice either version of it.⁴⁷ Again, it will explain the presence of a few seemingly seventh-century elements in a substantially eighth-century poem: such things as the allusions to hoplite equipment which appear sporadically in the *Iliad* (see §v) might well be thoughtlessly slipped in by a reciter in the course of improvisation, but are less easily understood as deliberate yet apparently motiveless 'interpolations' in a written text. And finally, it will explain why, while Hesiod's *Theogony* evidently presupposes Homer, the Homeric poems appear in places to imitate the *Theogony*; for we know that reciters transfer passages from one poem in their repertory to another, just as actors transfer lines from one play to another.

It seems clear that the comparative study of oral poetry—full of pitfalls as all comparative study is—must in future be a matter of serious concern to Homeric scholars. The material for it exists in abundance, particularly in the three stately volumes of the Chadwicks' great work, *The Growth of Literature* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1932-40), and in Parry's still unpublished collections of Jugo-Slav oral poetry at Harvard. Some of the questions which it raises for the Homeric scholar are discussed in Bowra's new book, *Heroic Poetry* (London, Macmillan, 1952); but much remains to be done. It will also be necessary, if the view taken above is correct, to adjust many traditional positions and arguments to the consequences that flow from Parry's work. Obviously, on this view, 'naive' unitarianism will cease to be tenable (if it ever was); but scholars will also have to abandon finally the sort of 'naive' analysis which claims to recover older poems from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by a process of simple subtraction,⁴⁸ since in oral transmission successive poets not only incorporate but as a rule remodel earlier work. Analysts, again, will have to be more cautious in using arguments from contradiction, since in this matter oral poetry is naturally more

tolerant than are written compositions; but this principle of 'oral tolerance' has limits, which can only be settled, if at all, by comparative studies. So too with arguments from repetition. We know now that most of the recurrent elements are formulaic, and are drawn from an ancient traditional stock; every poet uses them as often as he needs them. But it will still be open to the analyst to point to cases where lines evidently composed for a specific situation are elsewhere misapplied to a different situation, and to ask whether the original poet is likely to have so misused his own invention. In these respects as in others the Homeric Question is far from being *chose jugée*.

iv. Homer and the Philologists

BY L. R. PALMER

The progress of philological research into the Homeric language may conveniently be reviewed in 1954, since 1953 saw the completion of the first full-scale grammar of the Homeric language¹ since Monro² and van Leeuwen.³ While grammatical work is necessarily concerned largely with minutiae, a brief survey⁴ must confine itself to generalities.

It has become increasingly clear that many of the forms presented in the manuscripts of Homer are orthographical errors which occurred early in the tradition. Meillet^{4a} has summarized the problems of reconstituting the *Urtext* with his customary lucidity. False division of words is responsible for certain strange forms such as *νήδυμος* (B 2 and K 187), a metrically convenient form which was then generalized (e.g. *ν* 79). The adjective *δκρυόεις* had a similar origin (see below). Leumann⁵ has given other instances of this phenomenon.

It is well known, too, that the original text of Homer did not distinguish between long and short *ε* and *ο* respectively. The transcription of *ē* and *ō* into the conventions of the reformed alphabet offered difficulties in the case of words no longer current in the spoken language: hence *ΚΑΙΡΟΣΕΟΝ* was rendered as *καιροσέων* instead of *καιρουσσέων*, *ΘΕΟΜΕΝ* as *θείομεν* instead of *θήομεν*, etc. Meillet also believed that double vowels in hiatus were written only singly in the original text. Thus *κλέ(φ)ε' άνδρῶν* was written *ΚΛΕΑΝΔΡΟΝ* and this accounts for the

phrases, rarely in short descriptive passages, the geometric more frequently in the way that the poets tell the story or in similes. Though some things in the *Odyssey* are as old as anything in the *Iliad*, and some things in the *Iliad* as young as anything in the *Odyssey*, the Mycenaean content of the *Odyssey* is much smaller. So far as archaeology is concerned, this could be caused by difference of subject or of author or of date. In both poems the post-geometric element is small, and since our knowledge of geometric Greece, and still more of geometric Ionia, is defective, even the things listed are doubtful. The type of Odysseus' brooch (but not its design) is fairly securely dated in the seventh century, but a new and interesting form of brooch was likely to find its way into the poems where a striking token was needed for identification. The couplet describing the Gorgoneion seems to be an alternative devised to please a generation used to blazons. The *presentation of the robe* and the *moving of the arms* cannot be dated as post-geometric with certainty on archaeological grounds; the argument rests rather on their uneasy adjustment to their contexts and the accumulation of unusual features. Nothing which can be shown to be post-geometric is organically incorporated in the poems. Some post-Mycenaean elements obviously continued into the seventh century and later (e.g. the use of iron), but it is noticeable that the undoubtedly geometric custom of using two spears with a parry-shield slung on a telamon is not misunderstood as it is on seventh-century 'archaising' vases.¹² It seems established that the epic tradition admitted innovations freely until some date not far removed from 700 B.C. and then ceased to do so; opinions differ as to whether this could have happened if the poems were transmitted orally down to the middle of the sixth century.

Almost all the scholars mentioned in §§i-iii above took account of the archaeological evidence available when they wrote and thought that it supported, or at least could be reconciled with, their divergent theories. There are questions which archaeology cannot pretend to answer. The mass of evidence from Egypt to Scythia and from the Atlantic to the Euphrates with a range of dates over a millennium, and the disagreement of archaeologists on its interpretation, make it easy to concentrate on one group of facts or on one interpretation to the exclusion of others. The paucity of evidence from all countries from the decline of Mycenae until the late eighth century, and from some countries, notably

the west coast of Asia Minor, in all periods, casts just suspicion on the *argumentum ex silentio*, and this suspicion is easily transferred to periods in which a solid body of positive evidence gives the negative argument real significance. For the Mycenaean period this has been increased by the discovery of isolated exceptions to some accepted generalizations, until some critics come perilously near to arguing that an object must have existed *because* it has not been found. By using these arguments, and by assigning all that is common to the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age to one of them, it is possible to reduce the contribution to the poems made by the other. But neither period can be eliminated, and such a combination of features of widely different date can be explained only by a tradition of oral poetry lasting for centuries and ceasing to develop at about the time when inscriptions in the Phoenician alphabet first appear. By establishing this, archaeology has largely contributed to the measure of agreement which has been reached.

I—III

¹ Jebb's book includes a useful sketch of the history of the Homeric question down to his time. For the period 1887-1923 there is a full critical bibliography in G. Finsler's *Homer*, third edition, Leipzig, Teubner, 1924. The developments of the next ten years are described by Nilsson in *Homer and Mycenae*, and by Delatte and Severyns in *L'Ant. class.* 2 (1933) 379ff; while A. Lesky's *Die Homersforschung in der Gegenwart* (Vienna, Sxsl, 1952) gives an invaluable survey of recent work.

² By 1865 Mark Pattison could write 'We may safely say that no scholar will again find himself able to embrace the unitarian hypothesis' (*Essays*, 1.382). But in England, at least, a good many men of classical education continued, like Gladstone and Matthew Arnold, to cherish unitarian views.

³ *Homer and the Epic* (1893); *Homer and his Age* (1906); *The World of Homer* (1910). Lang wrote with wit and elegance; but his interpretation of the culture described by Homer as belonging to a single 'age of transition' can no longer be sustained.

⁴ *Die Bedeutung der Wiederholungen für die homerische Frage* (1890); *Die Bedeutung der Widersprüche für die homerische Frage* (1894); *Die Ilias als Dichtung* (1910); *Die Odyssee als Dichtung* (1914).

⁵ Something not unlike the 'lay-theory' has recently been put forward by G. Jachmann ('Homerische Einzeliieder', in the Festschrift for J. Kroll, *Symbola Coloniaensia*, Köln, 1949), for whom the *Iliad* is a 'Corpus' or 'conglutination' without any real architecture; but such views are nowadays exceptional. On the genesis of the *Kalerala* see Comparetti's edition, and his *Traditional Poetry of the Finns* (Eng. trans., London 1898).

⁶ *Homer: an Introduction*, 104. Cf. Murray, *C.R.* 36 (1922) 75: 'we all believe in the unity of Homer: it is only when we try to explain what that unity is and how it has come about, that the Homeric Question begins'.

⁷ *Introduction à l'Iliade*, par Paul Mazon avec la collaboration de Pierre Chantraine, Paul Collart et René Langumier (Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres', 1942); Theiler in *Festschrift Tücher* (Bern, Lang, 1947); P. Von der Mühl, *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Basel, Reinhardt, 1952).

⁸ But it remains possible that the name belongs to some much earlier poet, to whom all the best epics were indiscriminately ascribed in Callinus' day (and down to the

3.41
Jachmann

fifth century). E. Rickel, in a book modestly entitled *Homer: die Lösung der homerischen Frage* (Bonn, Scheur, 1919), supposes Homer to be the man who invented the hexameter c. 1000 B.C. On the whole question of the name see Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, chap. 18, and E. Schwartz, 'Der Name Homeros', *Hermes* 1940.

¹ For the evidence see now Von der Mühl, *op. cit.*, 369ff.

¹⁰ Erich Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Saga*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914).

¹¹ *Praefatio ad Iliadem* xxviii.

¹² On the lateness of the Doloneia the observations of P. Chantraine (*Mélanges Desrousseaux*, 1937, 59ff), H. Heusinger (*Stilistische Untersuchungen zur Dolonie*, diss. Leipzig, 1939), and F. Klingner (*Hermes* 1940) appear decisive against Shewan's defence (*The Lay of Dolon*, London, Macmillan, 1911).

¹³ Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, chap. 2. Schadewaldt's elaborate defence of Book VIII (*Iliastudien*, Abh. Sachs. Akad. 1938, chap. 4) has not convinced the present writer that Wilamowitz was wrong.

¹⁴ That the similes are the work of Ionian, not 'Achaean', poets was proved by Arthur Platt in an article in the *Journal of Philology*, 24 (1896) 28ff, which is still worth consulting. See also below, §iv.

¹⁵ Sir Arthur Evans thought that the roots not only of Greek mythology but of the Greek epic went back to Mycenaean times (*J.H.S.* 32, 1912, 277ff). This speculation, which has been revived by Severyns (*Homère II*), will gain greatly in probability if it is finally established that the language of the Mycenaean was Greek.

¹⁶ For a criticism of the 'faded gods' hypothesis see Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1921), chap. xi. Among Homeric figures Helen seems to be the only really convincing instance. The fantastic speculations of Charles Autran (*Homère et les origines sacerdotales de l'épopée grecque*, 3 vols., Paris, Denoel, 1938-44) have done nothing to enhance the probability of this type of view. The present writer can only regret its reappearance in a book whose first chapter makes an original and important contribution to the understanding of Homeric religion, Fernand Robert's *Homère* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1950).

¹⁷ I quote the characteristically incisive judgement of Wilamowitz: 'any one who in regard to language or religion or manners throws *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into one pot can no longer claim to be seriously considered' (*Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, 171).

¹⁸ E. Bethe, *op. cit.* n10, vol. II (1922); E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* (München, Hueber, 1924); V. Bérard, *Introduction à l'Odyssee* (3 vols., Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres', 1924-25); P. Von der Mühl, art. 'Odyssee' in *R.E.* (1939); F. Focke, *Die Odyssee* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1943); R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (München, Beck, 1951).

¹⁹ On folklore in the *Odyssey* see also L. Radermacher, *Sitzb. Wien 178* (1915) 1, and K. Reinhardt, 'Die Abenteuer der Odyssee', in his book *Von Werken und Formen* (Godesberg, Kupper, 1948). Rhys Carpenter's attractive book, *Folktale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics* (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1946), contains some valuable chapters, but suffers from an excessive preoccupation with bears.

²⁰ On the date of Book XXIV, or rather of XXIII.297 to the end, the English reader may consult Allen's *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission*, 218ff, and Mackail's essay in *Greek Poetry and Life, Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, 1ff (1936). As the latter points out, the 'Second Nekyia' is strikingly different in style from the rest; and there is something to be said for Schwartz's view that it was taken over by the Continuator from an older source.

²¹ Consultation of a spirit seems to have been an element in the original folktale of the Wanderer's Return; but the abrupt changes in style, treatment, and scenery make it difficult to regard the present Nekyia as an imaginative unity.

²² Von der Mühl has tried in the interest of simplicity to dispense with this assumption; but it may be doubted whether his analysis does full justice to the complexity of the evidence.

²³ See K. Meuli's brilliant essay, *Odyssee und Argonautika* (diss. Basel, 1921).

²⁴ Cf. Woodhouse, chaps. 8-16 (mainly from Wilamowitz).

²⁵ That the 'Telemachy' must have been composed as an expansion of the *Odyssey*, not as an independent poem, was already seen by Niese in 1882; but the authority of Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz has led analysts generally to accept the other view.

²⁶ See Schwartz, *op. cit.* (n18), 22ff.

¹⁷ Cf. Leaf's judgement: 'the *Odyssey*, whatever the original materials on which it was based, is in its present form at least a poem due to a single poet', whereas 'the *Iliad* is a growth from a single poem'.

¹⁸ Some of the reasons for attributing the present form of the *Odyssey* to the seventh century are stated by Carpenter, *op. cit.* (n19), chap. 5.

¹⁹ See the introduction to Allen's *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission*.

²⁰ The classical statement of this point of view is the Abbé Bremond's *La poésie pure* (1925); but it was already widely held in France and England some years earlier.

²¹ Engelbert Drerup, *Das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart* (Würzburg, Becker, 1921). He had already published in 1913 *Das fünfte Buch der Ilias, Grundlagen einer homerischen Poetik*.

²² J. T. Sheppard (Sir John Sheppard), *The Pattern of the Iliad* (London, Methuen, 1922). Other unitarian writers with a mainly aesthetic approach are S. E. Bassett (*The Poetry of Homer*, Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1938) and E. T. Owen (*The Story of the Iliad*, New York, O.U.P., 1947) both of whom have made good observations on Homeric technique.

²³ The oversight has been convincingly explained by A. B. Lord, *T.A.P.A.* 69 (1938) 445, as due to the influence of a conventional motif – the aged father mourning his warrior son. Pylæmenes continues to be the favourite Aunt Sally of unitarians: both Bowra (*Tradition and Design* 97ff, *Heroic Poetry* 300ff) and Fernand Robert (*Homère* 287) make great play with him, while passing in silence over more serious structural discrepancies.

²⁴ Readers should also be warned that, whether from an imperfect knowledge of German or from the carelessness engendered by apostolic fervour, Scott (*op. cit.* 76) actually attributed to Wilamowitz the view which the latter set out to refute, that the *Iliad* is 'a miserable piece of patchwork' (*Die Ilias und Homer* 322). The libel is unfortunately repeated in Bowra's *Tradition and Design*, p. 9.

²⁵ Examples are the dropping in the *Odyssey* of old cult-epithets whose meaning had long been forgotten, and of obsolete forms like the pronoun τῶν; and the outcropping of significantly new words like θεοσένης, 'godfearing'. There is still need for a systematic and disinterested study of variations in vocabulary, grammar, and metre throughout the two poems, a study for which the new *Lexicon to Homer, Hesiod and the Older Epic*, now in preparation at Hamburg, ought to provide a secure foundation. Meanwhile, Leumann's exploration of semantic shifts within the poems (see below, §iv) points to conclusions which support the analysts.

²⁶ Sir Philip Macdonell, *C.R.* 55 (1941) 16. Hyperhistoricism of another sort pervades the singular book of Emile Mireaux, *Les poèmes homériques et l'histoire grecque* (2 vols., Paris, Michel, 1948-49). While tracing back the Trojan Cycle not to the Trojan War but to 'collective rites', he holds that both poems 'have well-defined political aims' in relation to the commercial ambitions of rival Greek states in the eighth and seventh centuries.

²⁷ Drerup, *Homerproblem* 273ff; Carpenter, *op. cit.* (n19), chap. 3. Among analysts, Bethe was equally sceptical; but the theory of displacement ('Sagenverschiebung') by which he accounted for the origin of the Trojan Cycle was severely (and justly) criticised by Drerup.

²⁸ W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, second (enlarged) edition, Stuttgart, Koehler, 1952, 177; H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the Iliad*, 7. Wade-Gery suggests that the invention is datable *a parte ante*, Homer's Hector being named after an historical Hector who once ruled in Chios (he thinks c. 800 B.C.). But the reverse relationship, assumed by Wilamowitz and Schadewaldt, seems at least equally probable; and if Ventris proves to be right in deciphering the name Hector on a Mycenaean tablet, the foundation of the argument will vanish.

²⁹ Nilsson, *op. cit.*, 33.

³⁰ Against the view of Leaf and Jacoby (*Sitzb. Berl.* 1933, 682ff) that the Catalogue is a late interpolation, V. Burr (ΝΕΩΝ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ, *Klio* Beiheft 39, 1944) thinks that Homer composed the Catalogue himself on the basis of a Mycenaean document; but it seems much likelier that it was transmitted in the tradition of heroic poetry (and subjected to some working over). See Bowra, *Tradition and Design* 70ff, and Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, Appendix A.

³¹ H. L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* 480. Both Miss Lorimer and Von der

Mühl (op. cit. n7, 159f) think that the Embassy was composed by Homer as an after-thought and was worked into the *Iliad* by the later and inferior poet who concocted Book VIII. This curious theory seems to rest on little more than the assumption that whatever is best in the *Iliad* must be 'Homer's'. But if Athens could within half a century give birth to three poets of genius, may not Ionia have produced more than one?

⁴³ 'Tradition und Geist im homerischen Epos', *Studium Generale* 4 (1951) 334ff.

⁴⁴ There are still last ditches occupied by Old Believers. The latest editor of the *Odyssey* (2 vols., London, Macmillan, 1947-48), W. B. Stanford, rejects virtually nothing, not even the Continuation (which Homer may have composed when he was 'aging or tired').

⁴⁵ See n19. It is hoped that Reinhardt will publish a book on Homer in English.

⁴⁶ J. T. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund, Gleerup, 1949; written in English). The author's further speculations concerning the influence of the Meleager-poem on the *Iliad* may be thought less convincing.

⁴⁷ H. Pestalozzi, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Zürich, Rentsch, 1945); E. Howald, *Der Dichter der Ilias* (ibid., 1946); W. Schadewaldt, 'Einblick in die Erfindung der Ilias', op. cit. (n38), 155ff.

⁴⁸ One may fairly contrast the effective use of an *Aethiopia*-motif at *Iliad* XXII.208ff with the clumsy adaptation at VIII.80ff. On the possibility of reciprocal borrowing see Murray, *Rise of the Greek Epic*, 177ff, and §iii below.

⁴⁹ F. M. Combellack, *A.J.P.*, 71 (1950), 340. Milman Parry had uttered a similar warning, *Harvard Studies*, 1930, 75.

⁵⁰ A recent example is the suggestion that Penelope behaves so oddly in *Odyssey* XIX because she has correctly divined the stranger's identity, although by a 'subtle artistry' on the poet's part her discovery is never mentioned (P. W. Harsh, *A.J.P.*, 71, 1950, 1ff).

⁵¹ For a criticism of the 'Fernverbindungen', of which Schadewaldt in particular has made a great deal, see Jachmann, op. cit. (n5).

⁵² Parry acknowledged his debt to various predecessors, notably H. Düntzer in regard to the formulaic style and M. Murko in the comparative study of oral epic. Cf. also §iv below, on the work of Witte and Meister.

⁵³ Other important articles by Parry will be found in *T.A.P.A.*, 59 (1928), 233ff, and 64 (1933), 30ff.

⁵⁴ E.g. Richard Harder could say in 1942 that 'no one any longer doubts that Homer could write, and wrote his poetry down' (*Das Neue Bild der Antike*, ed. Berve, p. 102).

⁵⁵ See Nilsson's summary of Parry's work, *Homer and Mycenae*, 179ff, and his inferences regarding the development of Greek epic poetry, *ibid.*, 205ff; also Hermann Fränkel's inferences, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York, A.P.A., 1951), 7ff.

⁵⁶ Bowra, *Heroic Poetry*, 241.

⁵⁷ Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the Iliad*, 39f.

⁵⁸ Parry, *Harvard Studies*, 1930, 137ff. On the unmetrical use of formulae see his *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère* (Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres', 1928); on their inappropriate use, *L'épithète trad.*, 146-81.

⁵⁹ This was noticed by Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (third ed., 2 vols., Leipzig, Hirzel, 1921-23), 45f. Striking *Odyssean* examples are 1.29 εὔρομος Ἀγλασίοιο; 1.70 ἀντίθεον Πόλλυρημον; 14.18 ἀντιθεοὶ μνηστήρες; 14.22 etc. συμβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἄνδρῶν; and the misuse of *Iliadic* formulae at 14.419, 22.296, 308, and elsewhere (see *Monro's* edition of *Odyssey* XIII-XXIV, p. 328ff).

⁶⁰ *H. Apoll.*, 172. Cf. *Homer's Demodocus*.

⁶¹ *Bethe, Buch und Bild im Altertum* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1945) 16, 110. Cf. *Birt, Antike Buchwesen*, 277, and Collart in *Mazon's Introduction à l'Iliade*, 70f.

⁶² Carpenter, op. cit. (n19), 14. Cf. early Scandinavian poetry, which 'must have lived orally in Iceland for many generations before it was written down', although the runic script was available (G. Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature*, O.U.P., 1953, 7, 74).

⁶³ Cauer, op. cit. (n58), I.5; J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (see below, §iv).

⁶³ Most of the ancient evidence is collected in Allen's *Origins and Transmission*, 226ff. That until then the poems were orally transmitted is specifically stated by Josephus, *c. Apion.* 1. 2. 12 (omitted by Allen).

⁶⁴ Lehrs, *Rh. Mus.* 17 (1862); Wilamowitz, *Hom. Untersuchungen* 235ff; Allen, *op. cit.* 239ff.

⁶⁵ See especially R. Merkelbach, *Rh. Mus.*, 1952, 23ff; also G. Thomson, *The Prehistoric Aegean* (London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1949) 568ff, and Carpenter, *loc. cit.*

⁶⁶ We hear of Greek rhapsodes doing this, schol. Pindar, *Nem.* 2.1. For expansion and compression in modern oral recitation cf. Chadwick and Chadwick, *Growth of Literature* II, 146, 250, and Fränkel, *op. cit.* (n54), 27.

⁶⁷ For the rapid growth of variants cf. e.g. Chadwick and Chadwick, *op. cit.*, II, 413ff; for examples of their conflation, *ibid.*, III, 163-70.

⁶⁸ As the Germans express it, 'Schichtenanalyse' will have to give way to 'Elementen-analyse'. The older analysts were misled by the analogy of excavation, in which it is often possible to expose untouched layers of earlier material. In a traditional oral poem we can never hope to find untouched layers.

IV

¹ P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, i. Phonétique et morphologie, 1942. ii. Syntaxe, 1953, Paris (Klincksieck). For word-formation we have an exhaustive survey in E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin, 1937. Etymologies of a number of obscure Homeric words were contributed by F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer*, Halle, 1914.

² D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, 2nd edn., Oxford, 1891.

³ J. van Lecuwen, *Enchiridium dictionis epicae*, Leyden, 1894.

⁴ Useful surveys of linguistic work on Homer are given by P. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, c. vi, 3rd edn., Leipzig, 1921; M. P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*, c. iv, London, 1933; P. Chantraine in P. Mazon, *Introduction à l'Iliade*, c. iv, Paris, 1942; A. Meillet in *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, 3rd edn., Paris, 1930.

^{5a} *Rev. Et. Gr.*, 31, 1918, p. 277ff.

^{5b} M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, Basel, 1950, p. 36ff.

⁶ E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, München, 1939, p. 102f.

⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁸ *Introduction*, p. 90.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

¹⁰ *Introduction*, p. 90f; *Grammaire*, I, p. 75ff.

¹¹ *Bezenberger's Beiträge* 4, 1880, 25ff, and *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, p. 66ff.

¹² *Gr. Gram.* I, p. 104.

¹³ A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* I, 6 *Sprache*, 3rd edn., Leipzig, 1923, p. 93.

¹⁴ E. Hermann, *Z. f. vergl. Sprachforsch.* 46, 1914, p. 241ff.

¹⁵ Listed in Schwyzer, *Gr. Gram.*, p. 106ff.

¹⁶ E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* I, 1892, p. 132. More recently upheld by G. H. Mahlow, *Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung*, Berlin, 1926, p. 260ff.

¹⁷ J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, Göttingen, 1916.

¹⁸ M. Nilsson, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

¹⁹ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Sb. Berlin. Akad. Wiss.*, 1906, p. 61f., 'Ueber die ionische Wanderung'; T. W. Allen, 'Homer sang the language he spoke' (see section ii, p. 11).

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

²¹ F. Bechtel, *Die Vocalcontraktion bei Homer*, Halle, 1908, in which the author repented of his earlier construction of a primitive Aeolic Iliad (in E. Robert, *Studien zur Ilias*, Berlin, 1901.)

²² 'Was Homer a Chian?', *Cambridge Philol. Soc. Proceed.*, 1915, p. 7ff.

²³ Witte summed up his researches in Pauly-Wissowa *RE* VIII, 2213ff.

²⁴ K. Meister, *Homerische Kunstsprache*, Leipzig, 1921.

²⁵ See P. Chantraine, *Grammaire* I, p. 116ff.

²⁶ *Introduction*, p. 104.

Occasion and Early Use

Sir M. Bowra in A Companion to Homer

p. 59 It has been suggested that the Iliad and the Odyssey were composed for performance at some great festival like the Panionia at Mycale, when the bard would have far more time at his disposal than he would normally have at a feast in the household of such kings as Odysseus and Alcinous. After the middle of the sixth century the poems were recited at the Panathenaea at Athens.

A. B. Lord in A Companion to Homer

p. 195 While it is pleasant to think of the Iliad being performed from beginning to end as we have it at one of the festivals of ancient

Date of Homer

Starr, Chester G., The Origins of Greek Civilization 1100-650 B.C. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf) 1961 (Starr is Prof. of History at University of Illinois.

p. 158 scholars have placed it ((the Iliad)) by persuasive arguments anywhere from the twelfth to the sixth century B.C. . . . historically speaking, we can feel reasonably sure only that the Iliad had assumed its enduring form before 700 B.C.

p. 265 If we set the Iliad before 750, then the Odyssey will fall about 740-720.

The Oxford Classical Dictionary (1949) article by C. M. Bowra on Homer

p. 434 The Greeks, with significant exceptions, believed that both the Iliad and the Odyssey were composed by Homer, but they had no certain or accepted facts about his life. His date was variously given, as contemporary with the Trojan War (Tzet. Chil. 12. 183), soon after it ([Plut.] Vit. Hom. A.5), at the time of the Return of the Heraclidae (? Crates Theb. ap. Tatianum Ad Gr. 31), at the time of the Ionian wandering (Philostr. p. ^{194.9} ~~194.9~~), in the middle of the ninth century (Hdt. 2.53), and 500 years after the Trojan War (Theopomp. Hist. Ap. Clem. Al. Strom 1.117). This great divergence indicates that external evidence was lacking and that the Greeks knew little more than we do . . . Archaeology . . . forbids an early date, since the sitting statue of Il. 6.302-3 cannot be earlier than the 8th century, the shield of Agamemnon in Il. 11.19ff. may be even later, and the use of the phalanx in warfare Il. 13.131ff. may be still later . . . The Iliad . . . certainly does not describe the culture of the Mycenaean age as a contemporary document should. Literary evidence gives at least a terminus ad quem in the 7th century, when Terpander is said to have recited Homer at Sparta and echoes of him are to be seen in Tyrtaeus . . . We may then perhaps place the date of Homer before 700 B.C. though we admit that there is always a possibility of his text having been altered and the indications of date being additions.

Dates re Homer

Sir M. Bowra on "Composition" in A Companion to Homer (ed by Wace and Stubbings)
 p. 40 Though Homer is a real name, nothing at all is known about the man who held it. Even if we dismiss those Greek antiquarians who made him a contemporary of the Trojan War, his date remains without external authority, since Herodotus (ii.53.2) puts him in the ninth century, and Theopomus in the seventh(fr. 203 Jacoby)
 Though his name was known to Xenophanes . . and Heraclitus . . . , yet it was not associated with either the Iliad or the Odyssey, while Simonides . . . and Pindar . . . regard him as the author of ~~the~~ other poems not known to us.

p. 41 a few facts emerge. First, the poet or poets of the Iliad and the Odyssey were connected with Ionia . . . Secondly, the main body of the poems may have reached something like its present state c. 700 B.C. . . . Thirdly, it is significant that the poems were after all ascribed by name to Homer. It is not customary to ascribe an oral poem to anyone

p. 45 ((the poems)) seem to have been written down c. 700 b.C. After being written down they were subjected to serious alterations and accretions.

The New Century Classical Handbook (Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962)

p. 574 According to Herodotus, Homer lived c. 850 B.C. Others give a later date, and some^a date as early as 1200 B.C.

Whatmough, Joshua, Poetic, Scientific and other Forms of Discourse A New Approach to Greek and Latin Literature. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956

p. 81, 82 From composite dialect such as "Homer's", Composite composition must follow; authorship is not the word. Even a sixth-century Iliad has no "author," but many contributors, and so has even a reconstituted text, as near as we can hope to come to "Homer" (whatever is meant by that word); what went before it is beyond our horizon and likely to stay there.

p. 83, 84 The literate "Homer" of a later date did not use a syllabary, but he was not the composer of our Iliad, but the compiler. If, as Wade-Gery has ably argued,¹⁴ this "Homer" could and did write, then he used an alphabet composed of what I should call graphemes, i.e. στοιχεῖα or elementa, the strictly limited number of which, with their limited permutations and combinations, are statistically determined.¹⁵ But it is hard to believe that literate and the Iliad came at the same date; otherwise I do not find the differences of opinion so great.

p. 84 In the first place I am no "separatist" - that is, I have no confidence in the attempts to analyze (on either literary or linguistic grounds) the Homeric poems into a number of distinct compositions. I have no interest whatever in any such undertaking, which I regard as unnecessary and bound to be unsuccessful. It is not useful to ask, or to know, who wrote what among the many contributors to the multiple tradition (for I am no "unitarian" either), "Homer" being the work not of one but of many, the creation of centuries, no longer presented solely in oral, but also in visual shape. In fact, the deciphering method (of Ventris) may be applied to any visually presented code. A frequency count of Etruscan phonemes would be a necessary first step toward interpretation of Etruscan documents that, so far as I know, has never been taken.

p. 89 Let me say at the outset that the matter, whether "Homer" is one or many, is not of earth-shaking importance; but that, if it were, it would have to be conducted with the same kind of scientific precision as that with which engineers conduct their affairs, . . .

p. 90 Not that literary critics are all on the "unitarian" side. The recent works of Merkelbach and Jachmann, sustained by Wackernagel's earlier linguistic discussion, are able defenses of multiple authorship.¹⁶ But there is often a deplorable misapprehension of the linguistic facts on the part of advocates of "unitary authorship," who seem capable of any distortion in striving to gain a point. . . . Either a phoneme exists or it does not; there is no "in between" or "transition" stage. Only the assumption of different dialects . . . , different authors . . . , and different ages can account for the observed facts, as every tyro in linguistics knows. An editor who does not know this is, in my judgment, and in the judgment of all who know the history of Greek, or of any language, simply incompetent to edit Homer, and a corrupter of youth whom he is educating in the misuse of evidence, evidence of the clearest and most convincing kind.

Whatmough, Joshua, Poetic, Scientific and other Forms of Discourse. U. of Calif., Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956.

- p. 91 The contributions of archaeology to the solution of any literary or linguistic problem are not primary except in the recovery of new written documents. Opinions of the archaeologists themselves on the question of authorship, for example, fluctuate too widely and too often to inspire confidence. Their criteria seem to be inapplicable to this particular question save in so far, which is not very far, as they may furnish support
- p. 92 to linguistic criteria and judgments, which after all are, and must be, paramount when the evidence of any written document is summoned: "words not shreds." It may be noted, however, that a recent archaeological pronouncement, that of Miss Lorimer in her Homer and the Monuments (London 1951), is on the side of multiple authorship. . . . I have previously indicated . . . my opinion that a unitary force played a leading part, about the eighth to the sixth century B.C., in shaping the Homeric poems as we now have them, whether a "great poet" (as Professor MacKay believes) or merely an "editor" of unusual talent, as I suggested. But we agree to this extent, that one man enters the picture at this stage, and my view is not really very different from that expressed by some other Homeric scholars on this point as well (p. 84 above) as on "separatism."
- p. 93 It is obvious that we have further proof of multiple authorship. The passages Il. 3.205-206, 11.139-141, and 24.234-235 were composed by three different singers. Not that it makes much immediate difference. But attention may be directed to Leumann's chapter vi on the appearance of "poetic" words not in poetry, but in prose, in inscriptions, or post-Homeric writers, and in non-Attic Greek, or in the grammarians, which should crack some ironclad illusions about the nature of poetic discourse in general, and of Homeric usage in particular.

Postscript

- p. 279 (1) Professor MacKay (CP 51, 1956, 88-89) suggests that essentialist and existentialist better describe the two schools of thought about "Homer" than Unitarian and separatist, which no longer correspond to their actual views. I agree.

Yale Classical Studies edited for the Department of Classics by G. S. Kirk and Adam Parry. Vol. 20 | Homeric Studies (New Haven & London: Yale University Press) 1966

p. 215 What we can conclude with some certainty is that the analogy which Lord assumes between conditions in twentieth-century Yugoslavia and eight-century B.C. Ionia is very shaky, and that his statements about the effect of writing on improvising poets cannot be applied in any simple way to the composer of the Iliad. The corollary to this is that the notion explored by Lesky, Whitman, Wade-Gery, and Bowra,⁶¹ that Homer himself knew the art of writing, is in fact

p. 216 not ruled out by modern research into the processes of oral poetry, as Lord and Dow would have it.

The two principles which Lord has articulated concerning composition and transmission of poetry in the improvising style are, we remember, that (1) an orally composed poem cannot be handed on by the tradition of oral song without fundamental change and (2) "the [oral] poet's powers are destroyed if he learns to read and write." Kirk has rightly felt that it is all too easy for such principles, supported by the dubious analogy of Yugoslav and ancient Greek poetry, to become standard belief. But Kirk's attack on the first principle has not been successful. The second principle, which Kirk accepts, seems in fact the weak point of Lord's argument, for it rests on the weakest part of the Yugoslav-Homeric analogy.

If Lord's first principle is correct, as I believe it is, the Iliad will somehow have been put into writing at the time of its composition. Lord has insisted on dictation as the only way this could have been done because of his (as I believe) mistaken notion of the impossibility of a bard who can write. If the man who, on this hypothesis, put the poems into writing was more an amanuensis than a recording scholar in the manner of Parry and Lord, then perhaps the difference between this sort of dictation and actually writing by hand would not be enormous.

In either case, we have the striking coincidence that in the Iliad and the Odyssey we have poems far longer than improvised heroic poems are likely to be, longer than the usual conditions of improvised singing (as we learn from the Iliad and the Odyssey as well as from comparative studies) would suggest or allow; and that in this very same period, the use of writing becomes available. It seems difficult not to see in the use of writing both the means and the occasion for the composition, in the improvising style, of poems which must have transcended their own tradition in profundity as well as length, just as that tradition itself surpassed all subsequent traditions of heroic song.

Lord, A. B., "Homer and Other Epic Poetry" (in A Companion to Homer ed. by Wace and Stubbings, New York: Macmillan Co., 1963)

p.179 The Chadwicks, especially in The Growth of Literature, and C. M. Bowra in Heroic Poetry have brought enlarged vistas of epic to our view of Homer and in doing so have taken the camera from the hands of the separatists; for we now realize that to compare Homer with other epic songs does not necessarily entail the theory of multiple authorship.