

Prosopographia Sybaritica; but it is difficult to see what good it all does to either author or reader. Professor Callaway appears to have no idea of the critical use either of literary authorities, especially the late authorities on whom he must chiefly rely, such as Athenaeus, or of archaeological evidence. Even so he might have got together a pleasant collection of commonplaces and tales of Sybaris to demonstrate the place this fabulous city occupied in the minds of later generations, if his arrangement and discussion of the sources had been less naïve, humourless, and uncritical, and his tendency to excessive divagation had been in some measure checked. Does he speak of dogs? Then he must bring in a wholly gratuitous list of names from the François Vase. The Sybarites liked dwarfs, we are told, so it must be pointed out that Augustus did not. The Sybarites invented the *dimis*. Is this luxury? Not a bit of it. 'The Sybarites were developing a consciousness of a standard of living, as will appear . . . from this and other innovations.' Need more be said?

R. J. HOPPER

University of Sheffield

JOHANNES IRMSCHER: *Götterzorn bei Homer*. Pp. viii+96. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1950. Paper.

THIS is a shortened and partly revised version of a dissertation submitted to the University of Berlin in 1947. Dr. Irmischer collected the material during war service and after his return to civil life prepared the dissertation under the supervision of Professor Schadewaldt, whose views about the author-

ship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* he appears to accept unquestioningly.

A short introduction ('Die Aufgabe und der Weg', pp. 1-3) is followed by an investigation of the words for anger used in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (3-26; Irmischer calls this 'Die Wörter für den Götterzorn', but he considers the anger of men as well as that of gods, and he includes unexpected words such as *ἀγαμαι*). The third section (26-39) is headed 'Erscheinungsformen des Götterzorns'; here again Irmischer deals with men as well as gods, defending his procedure by reminding us that 'die Götter Homers sind auf eine höhere für eben projizierte Menschen'. The next three sections (39-52, 52-65, and 66-77) deal respectively with 'Götterzorn und Iliashandlung', 'Götterzorn im Odysseusnostos' (the *Urodissee* which, it seems, is all that Professor Schadewaldt is prepared to ascribe to the author of the *Iliad*) and 'Odysseeüberarbeitung und Götterzorn'. A seventh section is devoted to 'Der Zorn des Zeus' (77-86), and the monograph ends with a 'Zusammenfassung' (86-90), from which Irmischer's main thesis appears to be that from the *Iliad* to the final version of the *Odyssey* there is a tendency for the gulf dividing gods and men to widen, and for increased emphasis to be laid on man's responsibility for his actions (and so for incurring Heaven's wrath). There are indexes of passages quoted and of 'Namen und Sachen'.

The subject is really too big for so summary a treatment, but Irmischer's collection of the material is valuable and his comments, though not particularly original, seem sensible.

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the Classical Review

Dear Sirs,

IT is not surprising that your reviewer (*C.R.* 1952, 16-17) found little good to say of Bolling's attempt, in his *Ilias Atheniensium*, to reconstruct the Peisistratæan edition of the *Iliad*. As another reviewer has indicated, 'About it there will be two, and only two, opinions. Old dogs unwilling to learn new tricks will reject it out of hand. Those who accept it, must accept it *in principle* in its entirety. Bolling himself would be the last to claim no possibility of correction'. (Whatmough in *The Classical Weekly*, xlv. 41.) Since your reviewer, even before his study of Van der Valk's book (see *C.R.* 1950, 54-55), 'had already come to the conclusion that the vulgate text must be our stand-by and that nothing can

usefully or logically be said about Homer if the possibility of large-scale variation between the "Homeric" and Byzantine texts is admitted', one hardly needed to ask him his opinion of a text which shortens the vulgate Iliad by some one thousand lines.

What is objectionable is that in attempting, quite gratuitously, to justify his opinion, your reviewer has criticized Bolling's book for failing to do things which it does not claim to do, while at the same time, and in a most invidious distinction, he has praised Bolling's sponsors and publishers for what he imagines to be the lavish scale of the production. That is, even the little good he has to say is false. On these minor points, then, I trust you will agree that your review needs some correction from one who, as editor for the American Philological Association, was in charge of the publication.

The fact is that the resources of the two learned societies which undertook to publish the book were (and are) very limited, so that every effort had to be made to hold down the costs of production. This was achieved by adapting the technique of lithoprinting to a master copy made up by much intricate cutting and pasting from various printed materials, some old (the Oxford text, by permission) and some newly set in type. (For details of the process see H. M. Silver in *The ACLS Newsletter*, ii. 6-9, May 1951.) If the resulting pages are 'unattractive to the eye'—and it is true that the printing is not always so evenly black or so perfectly aligned as in good letterpress work—then the fault is mine and that of the process used, not Bolling's; but it should also be added that the total costs were about a third of what a conventional book of the same size (524 pages) would have come to.

Your reviewer also complains that Bolling's apparatus omits some references to atheteses or omissions by the Alexandrian editors, and fails to give detailed references in other places where they would have been useful to the reader in judging the correctness of Bolling's procedure. So it does; but to have attempted to give the evidence in full on every passage (the only sound alternative) would have meant an edition on the scale of Leaf's *Iliad*, which, however desirable, was out of the question. Besides, Bolling had already collected and discussed the evidence in his two preceding books, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford, 1925) and *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* (Baltimore, 1944). Since, as Bolling carefully points out in his Introduction (12), both books follow the order of the text, no further reference than 'om. (see *External Evidence*)' or 'ath. (see *Athetized Lines*)' was needed. If your reviewer, or any other reader, will consult these books, he will find there all the references he desires, and many of the original texts besides.

On the other hand, your reviewer does your readers a real disservice in failing to call attention to the many changes Bolling has made (with adequate references in his second apparatus) in the wording of the lines and even the form of the words, thus recording for non-specialists the sound results of two generations of linguistic scholarship.

To sum up, Bolling's purpose in this book was modest enough: 'to print "for the use of scholars"', as he says in *Athetized Lines*, 42, 'an edition in which the text should be my reconstruction of *II* (the Peisistratean edition), with the "plus" verses—plus verses in reference to this text—relegated to the critical apparatus. Whether that would be a "better" poem I would leave to the judgment of those who lecture on the appreciation of literature. But those who wish to analyse the composition of the poem, or to handle it as a document

testifying to the speech and life of its time, would find such an edition, I am convinced, a firmer basis for their investigations than any other.'

Yours very sincerely,

Urbana, Illinois

JOHN L. HELLER

Professor J. A. Davison writes:

Professor Heller's indictment seems to contain six main counts: (1) that I am 'unwilling to learn new tricks'; (2) that having made clear in advance my opinion on the question of principle raised by Bolling's book, I not only (a) wrote an unnecessary review but (b) 'gratuitously' attempted to justify my unfavourable opinion; (3) that I criticized Bolling unfairly, complaining that his first apparatus (a) did not mention all the known omissions by Alexandrine scholars and (b) failed to give references to most of his statements about omissions and atheteses; (4) that I did not mention that Bolling's introduction referred readers to his two earlier books; (5) that I praised Bolling's publishers and sponsors for what I imagined to be the lavish scale of the production; (6) that I failed to call attention to the changes in wording or word-forms proposed in the second apparatus.

My answers are: (1) that I do not believe Bolling's 'tricks' to be new or logically defensible; (2) (a) that in my opinion (as, it seems, in Bolling's, cf. his review of Van der Valk in *A.J.P.* lxxi, 1950, 306-11) one has both a right and a duty to review books with which one disagrees fundamentally, and (b) that in such cases it is essential to give the fullest possible justification for one's disagreement; (3) (a) that, whatever Bolling claimed to do, he was in fact bound to make his first apparatus as complete in this respect as possible (binding me to point out that he had not done so), and (b) that Bolling could easily have given the single reference needed in each case, either to the ancient source (where the facts are clear) or to one or other of his books (in more complex cases); (4) that it is unfair to expect the reader to be perpetually referring to other books, especially when one of them (*The Athetized Lines in the Iliad*) is hardly known in this country; (5) that the context of my references to the technical ingenuity, hard work, paper, and money expended on the enterprise shows that I was far from praising anyone for 'the lavish scale of the production' (a phrase which I neither used nor meant to imply); (6) that limitations of space forced me to confine my discussion of Bolling's book to those aspects of it on which I felt that I could properly and usefully express an opinion.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLVII. I: JANUARY 1952

W. H. Alexander, *The Enquête on Seneca's Treason*: as he admitted, Seneca sent the message reported by Natalis, but purely as a complimentary formula: our own times make the treasonable construction put upon

it easier to understand. J. A. O. Larsen, *Cyrene and the Panhellenion*: from the inscription published by Fraser in *J.R.S.* xl. 77 concludes that Cyrene was a member of the Panhellenion, that members might be not cities but Koina (like Crete), and that the members had varying numbers of representatives and votes. B. M. W. Knox, *The*