UM Libraries Depository

103274909008

This thesis is subject to
reserved book regulations

A CRITICISM OF KELLER'S

HOMERIC SOCIETY.

b y

HELEN MAR KRABIEL, A. B.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the

GRADUATE DEPARTMENT
(COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE)

of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

1908.

The sociological study of the Iliad and Odyssey entitled "Homeric Society", and compiled by Albert Galloway Keller, instructor in social science at Yale University, offers much interesting reading, much matter for careful thought, and no small opportunity for criticism. It is the purpose of this paper to offer that criticism.

Mr. Keller says in his introduction that his "treatment of social factors and tendencies has been first of all, systematic". This is true with regard to certain portions of the work, but it certainly is not its distinguishing characteristic, and it would be difficult to find a greater lack of systematic and logical arrangement than is shown in the chapter entitled "Religious Ideas and Usages".

A general difficulty offered by Mr. Keller's book is the fact that he does not put all his references in proof of a certain statement in a group by themselves, but places the references to a large number of statements together, thus causing his reader much trouble in determining to which statement a particular citation from the text refers.

The most frequent errors on the author's part are reading too much into Homer's text, misinterpreting the meaning of the text, drawing general conclusions from particular instances in the poems, lack of logical arrangement, lack of coherence of subjects, grouping of subjects under a wrong heading, and inaccuracies such as making statements which he himself contradicts in a subsequent part of his work.

While in our criticism of his book, we have relied mainly on the Teubner text of the Iliad and Odyssey, we have also had recourse to Lang, Leaf, and Myer's translation of the Iliad, Palmer's translation of the Odyssey, Leaf's annotated edition of the Iliad, Merry and Riddell's and Monro's annotated editions of the Odyssey, Seymour's Life in the Homeric Age, Smith's Dictionary of Greek Antiquities, Buchholz's Homerische Realen, Harper's Classical Dictionary, Mure's History of Greek Literature, Herodotus, Ebdling's Homeric Dictionary, and Gardner and Jevon's Manual of Greek Antiquities.

Before entering into the discussion of Homeric Society itself, Mr. Keller gives us an opening chapter on the influences brought to bear upon Homeric people by other tribes. He calls this a discussion of "Ethnic Environment" and before we can competently judge of what he has to say, we must have an accurate understanding of the meaning of his title. Quite naturally we take it to mean the influence upon a people by actual and direct contact with other peoples, an interpretation with which Mr. Keller evidently agrees when he says "it seems impossible to do justice to the relations of the Homeric Greek with his ethnic environment without first calling attention to the general character of the peoples by whom he was surrounded." (1).

In developing this first chapter the author has divided into two classes the people who influenced the Greeks, viz. the Eastern empires whose civilization was in advance of the Homeric and "those remoter tribes in comparison with whom the Homeric Greeks felt themselves superior in culture and the arts." (2). Under the latter head he classes the Hippomolgoi, Abioi, Cimmerians, Laestrigonians, the inlanders who do not know the sight of oar or taste of salt, Phaeacians, robber tribes of Thrace and Thessaly, Cyclopes, Gigantes and Aethiopes. (3). But his own position with regard to the actual influence upon the Greeks of these peoples is vague, for he

(1). Keller p. 1. (2). Keller p. 1. (3). Keller pp. 3, 4.

says, "evidence in the poems goes to show an acquaintance by actual contact or thru rumor with several peoples whose character bears the stamp of crudeness and barbarism." (1).

Not only is he uncertain with regard to the influence of these peoples, but, what is even more startling, he puts them in as factors in Homeric environment when he actually confesses that he doesn't know whether some of them existed or not. To show his position, or rather lack of position we will quote a few passages from his discussion of this question. He says that "the vagueness of the location of these peoples suggests that they existed in Homer's mind only as he had heard of them thru rumor," (2) and that confused geographical rumors led also to the conception of the Laestrigonians." (3) Again, he says it was from the Phoenicians that Homer gained his vague knowledge of exterior geography and his scarcely more accurate ideas concerning the great Eastern civilization, that he peoples the regions beyond his actual experience with gods and men who often bear an unmistakably Oriental stamp, citing for examples the Phaeacians and the Egyptian Proteus, (4) and adding that "Homer could scarcely have gotten the material for his imagination to work upon elsewhere than from the Phoenicians." (5).

This then we would call Mr. Keller's first error -- the fact that he proposes to treat as environmental the influences

(1). Keller p. 2.

(3). Keller p. 8.

(2). Keller 3.

(4). Keller p. 25.

(5). Keller p. 27.

of peoples who were known vaguely and conceived of thru rumor or the imagination.

The consensus of opinion, if we may accept the views of those who are generally regarded as authorities on such questions, seems to imply that these so-called barbarous tribes were, for the most part, mythical, and that, if any of them were historical, the Homeric Greeks knew of them only thru hearsay.

According to Leaf (1) the Hippomiolgoi were the nomadic Scythian tribes north of the Danube, information of whom probably reached Greece along the primeval trade route by which the amber of the Baltic came to the Mediterranean; while the Abioi were perhaps connected with Herodotus' legend of the Ἀγριππῆες (2), who abstained from all war and enjoyed a kind of sanctity.

With regard to the Cimmerians it is clearly understood that the tribe mentioned by Homer was mythical and was in no way connected with the historical people by that name who dwelt on the Sea of Azov, in the Tauric Chersonesus, and in Asiatic Dalmatia. (3). "The mythological Cimmerians", say Merry and Riddell, (4) "may in a way be symbolical of the long, dark winter of the north. This may have suggested the reading *Χερμερίους* of which possibly *Κιμμερίους* is only a slightly altered form."

(1). Leaf, Iliad XIII. 5.

(2). Herod. IV. 25.

(3). Harp. Class. Dict;
Herod. I. 15.

(4). Mer. & Rid. Od. XI. 14.

The Laestrigonians were a mythological race of savage cannibals thought of by the Greeks as dwelling on the east coast of Sicily. Later the Roman poets who thought that the promontory Circeium was the home of Circe, peopled the south coast of Latium near Formiae with Laestrigonians and hence we have Horace speaking of "Laestrigonia Bacchus in amphora," and Ovid calling Formiae "Laestrigonis Lami urbs" (1).

Merry and Riddell explain the tradition of the inlanders who know not sight of oar or taste of salt, by saying that this merely means to imply that Odysseus went as far inland as possible on the continent nearest to Ithaca, and that we need not trouble ourselves to speculate whether any particular people is intended by this description. (2).

As to the Phaeacians, Mure, commenting on the similarity of this name with Phoenician, thinks that it is some colony of these Oriental adventurers in some part of the Western Mediterranean which here forms the butt of Homer's playful satire. (3). What Mr. Keller means by saying that the Phaeacians were contrasted with the Gigantes (4), cannot be ascertained from Homer. Indeed Alcinous, in addressing his countrymen in the presence of Odysseus, remarked that the Phaeacians were near to the gods as were the Cyclopes and and wild tribes of Gigantes, (5) and moreover the two peoples

(1). Harp. Class. Diet.

(4). Keller p. 3.

(2). Mer. & Rid. Od. XI. 122.

(5). Od. VII. 205.

(3). Mure's Gr. Lit. Vol. I. ap. E.

were related in Homer's mythology, for Nausithous, king of the Phaeacians, was the son of Poseidon and Periboea who was daughter of Eurimedon, at one time ruler over the Gigantes (1). It is true that the Phaeacians are said to be ἀγχιθρόοι (2) and φίλοι ἀθανάτοισιν (3), but there is nothing to prove the author's statement that they sacrificed "at all times" (4). The narrative simply states that when Nausithous had been driven with his people from Hypereia because of the unendurable conduct and greater power of the Cyclopes, he moved to Scheria where he ran a wall around the town, built houses, made temples for the gods, and laid out farms (5).

With reference to the tribes of Thrace and Thessaly, Homer says nothing that could substantiate Mr. Keller's idea that there were "robber tribes", (6) and in the story of Proteus we may suppose that we have the poet's adaptation of some well known sailors' yarn (7) instead of agreeing with the author that he was a "symbolic skipper". (8).

The first instance of the author's frequent tendency to generalize from a particular incident is found in his attributing to the Cyclopes as a race, facts that apply only to Polyphemus, who was an exceptional Cyclops. In his description

(1). Od. VII. 59.

(2). Od. V. 35.

(3). Od. VI. 203.

(4). Keller p. 26.

(5). Od. VI. 8.

(6). Keller p. 3.

(7). Mer. & Rid. Od. IV. 385.

(8). Keller p. 26.

of the race Mr. Keller says they were "tremendous in stature" (1), while Homer indicates that Polyphemus was the only Cyclops who had this unusual stature, (2) and further states that his was the greatest strength among all the Cyclopes (3). The statement that "they are like not so much to men as to Gigantes" (4) refers not to the Cyclopes at all, but to the Laestrigonians (5).

In discussing the live stock of the Cyclopes, Mr. Keller says " they had no horned cattle -- merely sheep " (6). It is true that cattle are not mentioned in the poems as being possessed by the Cyclopes, but neither is the lack of them mentioned, so that we have no right to make any absolute statement with regard to the matter. But it is specifically stated that both Polyphemus and his race had not only sheep, but goats also. (7).

Homer says nothing that could authorize Mr. Keller to believe that " the Egyptians had accomplishments which the Greeks attributed to supernatural powers " (8). The narrative tells of the many drugs and physicians in Egypt (9).

(1). Keller p. 4.

(2). Od. IX. 190.

(3). Od. I. 71.

(4). Keller p. 4.

(5). Od. X. 120.

(6). Keller p. 4

(7). Od. IX. 167; IX. 220.

(8). Keller p. 8.

(9). Od. IV. 229.

Merry and Riddell (1) explain away even the unusualness of this by comparing what Herodotus (2) says of the number of physicians in Egypt and the system on which every Egyptian physiced himself three days in each month. "A stranger," they say, "would naturally acquire the idea that in Egypt every man was a physician when he saw all the people about him dosing themselves. It would seem like a nation of doctors."

There is one instance in Homer where Greeks were taken prisoners by Egyptians, namely in the fabricated story of Odysseus in beggar's guise. (3). But there is no basis in the poems for Mr. Keller's general statement that "the Greeks spent years of captivity in Egypt" (4) or that "Egypt was to Homer a land of dense population." (5). This latter statement is certainly not justified by the account referred to above in which it is related that "the people (of Egypt) hearing the shouts, came forth at early dawn and all the plain was filled with infantry and cavalry and with the gleam of bronze." (6).

The author's idea that the fact of Menelaus' erecting a cenotaph for his brother in Egypt indicated that Greek affairs were of some repute there, (7) is clearly without foun-

(1). Mer. & Rid. Od. IV. 231.

(5). Keller p. 8.

(2). Herod. II. 77, 84.

(6). Od. XIV. 267.

(3). Od. XIV. 267

(7). Keller p. 8.

(4). Keller p. 21.

dation for Menelaus would have erected it in honor of his brother, according to Greek burial customs, in any land at which he happened to be stopping at the time he learned of his brother's death, even if a Greek had never before been seen or heard of in that land.

The poems themselves easily refute the author's statement that "the Homeric Greeks had practically nothing of the arts and of luxury." (1). Telemachus, on seeing the house of Menelaus, cried out, "O son of Nestor, notice the blaze of bronze thruout the echoing halls, the gold, the amber, silver, and ivory ! The court of Olympian Zeus within must be like this. What wealth untold is here ! I am amazed to see." (2). During the same visit of Telemachus in Sparta, the poet enumerates some of the possessions of Menelaus and Helen. Among these were a carved chair, a silver basket, a golden distaff, two silver bath-tubs, a pair of kettles, and ten talents of gold. (3). Surely this one Greek palace, at any rate, was luxuriously built and furnished.

In speaking of the nearness of far-away tribes to the gods, Mr. Keller says, "the Aethiopes are often hosts of the gods." (4). Had he been accurate he would have said that according to the Homeric account, the Aethiopes were twice visited by the gods, -- once by Zeus and all the gods, (5)

(1). Keller p. 6.

(4). Keller p. 2

(2). Od. IV. 71.

(5). Il. I. 425.

(3). Od. IV. 121.

and a second time by Poseidon. (1). Both of these visits can be explained upon the same basis as that of Athena to Pylos where she went "to meet the sacrifice" (2) offered her by Nestor and his people.

The remainder of the chapter has to do with the Oriental tribes, and consists mainly of a long dissertation upon the Phoenicians based, for the most part, upon "Die Phönizier" by F. C. Movers.

1. Od. I. 22.

2. Od. III. 435.

The second chapter which deals with "Industrial Organization", discusses under this head six topics, -- hunting and fishing, cattle-raising, agriculture, food and its preparation, manufactures and trade.

Our first criticism is that hunting should have no place under the head of industrial organization as there is absolutely no evidence in the poems of animals being killed to sell for their own value as meat, or for the value of their hides.

The author's belief that there was a powerful breed of dogs (1), that men hunted for hides (2), and there were professional hunters (3) may have led him to assume that hunting was an industry, but the fact that he is mistaken in all three points mentioned and that hunting was carried on only for protection to flocks (4), for food when supplies had given out (5), and for pleasure (6) takes away the few frail props which he had for the maintenance of his standpoint.

It is true that dogs often accompanied the men on their hunting expeditions, but the only dog mentioned as especially

-
1. Keller p. 29
 2. Keller p. 29.
 3. Keller pp. 29, 30.
 4. Il. XI. 551; V. 554; XXI. 573.
 5. Od. X. 156; IX. 154.
 6. Od. XI. 457; XVII. 294; XI. 572; Il. X. 380.

skilled in the hunt was Argus who belonged to Odysseus, and who was a favorite of the young hunters (1).

The hides of animals were worn (2), but the hunt was not engaged in for the purpose of obtaining them. Even in the case of Meleager's boar hunt, where the hide and head of the slain animal served as prizes, the purpose of the hunt was to rid the country of the boar and not to obtain the animal's hide (3).

Mr. Keller could not rightly assume that men were professional hunters because they were taught by and under the guardianship of Artemis (4) any more than he could call *aretē*-serving maids professional weavers because Athene gave them skill in this art (5).

The author, however, is right in saying that hunters were "leaders of dogs" (6), tho they are so-called in only one place in the poems (7).

The usual word for hunters is *θηρῶντες* (8), or *ἐπακτῶντες* (9). As for his statement that "the Greeks had a

1. Od. XVII. 294.

2. Il. X. 23, 177, 334.

3. Il. IX. 548.

4. Keller p. 30; Il. V. 51.

5. Od. VII. 110.

6. Keller p. 29.

7. Od. IX. 120.

8. Il. XXI. 252; XXIV. 316; V. 51; XI. 292; XVII. 726; XII. 170; XXI. 574.

9. Il. XVII. 135; Od. XIX. 435.

strikingly accurate knowledge of wild beasts and their characteristic actions" (1), he has attributed to the people as a whole that knowledge and keen observation of animals which the poets had and to which they give evidence by telling how the hare or doe runs screaming before the hounds (2), how the boar whets his tusks between his crooked jaws (3), how he bristles his back, flashes his eyes (4), and wounds his assailant by a side-thrust of his tusk (5), and how the lion draws down his brows over his eyes (6).

The boar hunt in which Odysseus participated with his uncles, the sons of Autolycus, will serve as an example of the way in which men hunted. The poet relates (7) that "when dawn appeared they started on the hunt; the dogs and men went forth. They climbed the steep and wood-clad mountain of Parnassus and soon they reached its windy ridges. And now to a glen the pricklers came. Before them, following the tracks, the hounds ran on, the sons of Autolycus hastening after. With the sons went royal Odysseus, close on the hounds, wielding his outstretched spear. In a dense thicket here a huge boar lay. Here round the boar there came the tramp of men and dogs

1. Keller p. 50.
2. Il. X. 561.
3. Il. XI. 416.
4. Il. XIX. 445.
5. Il. XIX. 449.
6. Il. XVII. 136.
7. Od. XIX. 428.

as the pricklers pushed along. Facing them from his lair, with bristling back, fire flashing in his eyes, the bear stood close at bay. Odysseus first sprang forward, raising the long spear in his sinewy hand, eager to give the blow; but the bear was quick and struck him on the knee, and by a side-thrust of the tusk tore the flesh deep, but reached no bone. And now Odysseus by a downward blow, struck the right shoulder of the bear; clean thru it the spear-point passed. Down in the dust he fell with a moan, and his life flew away".

A list of animals hunted and weapons used, which Mr. Keller omits and without which no discussion of hunting would be complete, follows. Accounts are given of men hunting deer (1), goats (2), fawns (3), hares (4), boars (5), lions (6), wild ibex (7), and leopards (8). The instruments of attack or defense against beasts were spears (9), bows and arrows (10), bronze clubs (11), and fire-brands (12).

-
1. Od. X. 158; XVI. 295; XI. 475.
 2. Od. IX. 155; XVII. 295.
 3. Od. XIX. 228; II. XVII. 295.
 4. Od. XVII. 295; II. XXII. 189.
 5. Od. XIX. 437; II. XI. 293; XVII. 21.
 6. II. V. 554; XI. 293; XI. 548; XVII. 20; 133.
 7. II. IV. 106.
 8. II. XVII. 20; XXI. 573.
 9. Od. X. 162; IX. 156; XIX. 438; II. XXI. 577.
 10. Od. IX. 156; II. XI. 476; XI. 553.
 11. Od. XI. 575.
 12. II. XI. 554.

With regard to fishing, the poems are not quite so explicit, but even granting that it was an industry, it certainly was not organized. The author says "it was less popular than hunting and was carried on chiefly by the common people among whom fishing, together with passenger carrying by boat, constituted a regular trade". (1). It may have been less popular, at least there are fewer references made to it than are made to hunting, but that it was carried on by the common people to the exclusion of all others, is hardly probable as it is so often alluded to in a general way, e.g. in similes. Scylla snatching the companions of Odysseus from the ship, is likened to a fishermen who "on a jutting rock with long rod throws a bait to lure the little fishes, casting into the deep the horn of stall-fed ox; then, catching a fish, flings it ashore writhing." (2). After the Laestrigonians had killed a number of Odysseus' men who had landed at their harbor, they made a meal of them, gathering them in "as men spear fish". (3). The suitors slain by Odysseus were all "laid low in blood and dust and in such numbers as the fish which fishermen draw to the shelving shore out of the foamy sea in meshy nets; these all, sick for the salt sea wave, lie heaped upon the sands while the sun takes life away". (4). Iris sent by Zeus with a message for Thetes, sprang into the sea and "sped to the

1. Keller p. 30.

2. Od. XII. 251.

3. Od. X. 124.

4. Od. XXII. 383.

bottom like a weight of lead that mounted on horn of field ox goes down bearing death to ravenous fishes". (1). From such references as these we infer that fishing must have been pretty widely engaged in by all classes. The two instances where fishermen were called upon to perform any duties that might come under the head of "passenger carrying" are where Eury-machus, upon the return of Telemachus from Pylos, says to the suitors, "Let us launch the best black ship we have and get together fishermen for rowers, quickly to carry tidings to our friends and bid them sail for home with all the speed they may"; (2) and where, after Odysseus had slaughtered all the suitors, it is recorded that "Out of the house they each brought forth his dead and buried them; and all that came from other towns they gave to fishermen to carry home on their swift ships" (3). We feel that we have to stretch our imagination considerably in order to term the bearing of tidings or dead bodies "passenger carrying". These were both instances of dire need and the fishermen were quite naturally called upon at such times to perform such duties. That there was a passenger-carrying business, however, is certain in at least one case. Mention is made of this where the poet relates that "a third now joined them (the suitors) Philoetius, and brought them a barren cow and fatted goats. The ferrymen brought them over, they who bring people too whenever anybody comes their

1. Il. XXIV. 80.
2. Od. XVI. 548.
3. Od. XXIV. 419.

way (1). This ferry seems to have run between Ithaca and Cephallenia, for Philoetius says to Odysseus, disguised as a beggar, with regard to Odysseus, his former master, "But if he is already dead and in the house of Hades, then woe is me for good Odysseus who gave me charge of cattle when I was but a boy in the land of the Cephallenians." (2). It seems logical to conclude that Philoetius still had charge of Odysseus' flocks in that place and that it was thence he brought the cattle by ferry for the suitors.

Mr. Keller's idea that "fishing was resorted to by the more fastidious classes only when all other provision failed" (3) seems to be prevalent among some other writers also. Among these are Merry and Riddell who say that "however much a fish diet might have been admired in later days, (4) fish generally formed no part of human food in heroic times, except under pressure of hunger" (5). There are instances in which men go fishing when all other sources of supply are denied them. For example, when Odysseus and his men were forced by unfavorable winds to stay on the Island of the Sun, "the stores were spent, and they sought for game -- for fish, for fowl, for what might come to hand, caught by their crooked hooks" (6). But this does not justify the statement that the Homeric Greeks ate fish only under pressure of hunger, especially in view of the many references to fishing in the poems (7),

-
1. Od. XX. 185.	4. Athenaeus bb. 7, 8.
2. Od. XX. 208.	5. Mer. & Rid. Od. III. 177.
3. Keller p. 30.	6. Od. XII. 327; cf. Od. IV. 368.
7. Od. X. 124; XII. 251; XIX. 108; II. V. 487; XXIV. 80;
XVI. 745.	

and moreover the poet includes them among the blessings of life when he makes Odysseus say, (1) "For a blameless king the dark earth produces wheat and barley, trees bend low with fruit, the flock has constant issue, and the sea yields fish, under his righteous sway".

The implements used in fishing were the rod with bait and horn of ox, (2) crooked hooks, (3) hooks of bronze, (4) spears, (5) weight of lead on ox-horn, (6) and nets, (7). Oysters were obtained by diving. (8).

In comparing hunting and fishing with cattle-raising, Mr. Keller says the former were only "occasional pursuits" while the latter was a "business in which a man of any importance was always interested." (9). Previous to this statement he has given us his discussion of hunting and fishing as organized industries, a position which we have proved to be incorrect,

-
1. Od. XIX. 111.
 2. Od. XI. 251.
 3. Od. XII. 329; VI. 369.
 4. Il. XVI. 408.
 5. Od. X. 124.
 6. Il. XXIV. 80.
 7. Od. XXII. 383.
 8. Il. XVI. 745.
 9. Keller p. 50.

while now he takes the saner view and calls them occasional pursuits, which latter classification of them alone is justified by evidence in the poems.

There was no public barter for meat, but every man raised and slaughtered his own stock, so that, although the statement that "cattle raising was a business in which a man of any importance was always interested" is true it does not justify the listing of cattle raising among the organized industries.

Every landed proprietor had his stock which played as important a part in his wealth as did the farming of his land, the production of crops, etc. The cattle, besides being a sign of wealth to the owner were used as a unit of value (1), as was the case in the early history of our own race, our word "fee" originally meaning "cow" (2). The armor of Diomedes was worth nine while that of Glaucus was valued at one thousand cattle (3); a tripod which Achilles offered as a prize at the funeral games of Patroclus was worth twelve cattle (4); and Athene's aegis was adorned with one hundred gold tassels, each one of which was worth one hundred oxen (5).

Thus, in the main, we agree with Mr. Keller's discussion of cattle and their importance to the Homeric Greek. We might

1. Buch. Hom. Real. vol. II. part 1, § 26.

2. Cf. Germ. Vieh.

3. Il. VI. 234.

4. Il. XXIII. 702.

5. Il. II. 448.

pause to say that the ox was not the only animal used in sacrifice, sheep sometimes serving this purpose also. (1). Yet we can scarcely dispute the author when he says the ox was the "regular sacrifice" (2).

But Mr. Keller has not chosen a fitting heading for this portion of his chapter on "Industrial Organization", or else he has failed to set forth his facts in that "systematic classification and sequence" which he has promised us in his introduction, (3) for under the head of "cattle raising" he discusses sheep, goats, swine, horses, mules, dogs, and domestic fowl as well as cattle. However, we shall follow Mr. Keller's order as nearly as possible.

Taking up first his discussion of the cotes where animals were kept, we agree with him that "the cotes were sometimes situated at a distance from dwellings (4); and that they were exposed to the inroads of wild beasts, we have shown in our discussion of hunting (5). But he clearly misinterprets when he infers from the use of the word *κοπρός* in connection with cattle that the cow-pens were "never cleaned" (6). The passage cited (7) likens the joy of Odysseus' men at this

1. Od. X. 524; XI. 32.

2. Keller p. 33.

3. Keller intro. p. V.

4. Keller p. 33.

5. page 10

6. Keller p. 33.

7. Od. X. 410.

return from the house of Circe, to that of "stalled calves which skip round a drove of cows returning to the barnyard (κοπρός) when satisfied with grazing". The sense of the passage demands that we give to κοπρός its secondary meaning of "cow-pen" and not the refuse of the pen, and this interpretation is supported by Mr. Ebeling (1). But even if the meaning here were that of ordure, there would still be nothing to justify the author's statement that the pens were never cleaned.

The following names are found for the cotes, σταθμός (2) αὐλή (3), and κλίσιον (4). Stathmos has the epithets "lonely" (ὀλοπόλος) (5) and "pertaining to a flock" (ποινής) (6). Aule has the epithets "high" (ὑψηλός) (7), "beautiful" (καλός) (8), "large" (μέγας) (9), "with space around" (περίδρομος) (10), "very beautiful" (περικαλής) (11), and "well fenced" (εὐερκής) (12).

-
1. Ebeling Hom. Lex.
 2. Il. V. 140.
 3. Il. X. 183.
 4. Il. XIX. 377.
 5. Il. XIX. 376.
 6. Il. II. 470.
 7. Od. XIV. 6.
 8. Od. XIV. 5.
 9. Od. XIV. 5.
 10. Od. XIV. 5.
 11. Od. I. 425.
 12. Il. IX. 472.

Buchholz says that $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ may signify a permanent shelter, while $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ means a portable enclosure. $\alpha\upsilon\lambda\eta'$ carries with it the idea that the shelter or enclosure was built near a dwelling. $\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ implies a rural or country steading or shed. (1). In the case of Laertes' country place this $\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ran around the house on every side and in it ate, sat, and slept the slaves who did his pleasure. (2).

The shepherds, as Mr. Keller states, lived in the cotes during pasturing season (3). As a rule they took excellent care of their flocks and although there is an instance of robber wolves falling on the lambs and kids when they are scattered on the hills, by the witlessness of the shepherds, (4) this is the exception and not the rule. The very references which Mr. Keller cites (5) to prove that "swine were less cared for than sheep" and that "they were allowed to sleep in the lee of a convenient rock" (6), proves on the contrary that they were tended with extreme care, for Eumaens, the old swineherd put on his storm-coat, and, armed with sword and spear, left his dwelling in the night and went away to rest where lay the white-toothed swine under a hollow rock, sheltered from

-
1. Buch. Hom. Real. vol. II. part 1, § 28.
 2. Od. XXIV. 208.
 3. Keller p. 32.
 4. Il. XVI. 352.
 5. Od. XIV. 533.
 6. Keller pp. 32, 33.

Boreas (1). This rock was hollow underneath, thus forming a cave where the swine had protection so good that even the herdsman could spend the night in its shelter.

Moreover, Mr. Keller is mistaken when he says that "swine were sent to the mountains to be fattened returning in the winter", (2) for the reference he cites (3) does not so much as mention the fattening of swine. It is the passage in which Achilles in his struggle with the river Scamandrios likens his imminent death to that of a swine-herd boy whom a torrent sweeps down as he tries to cross it.

The most general term for the herdsman is ποιμήν, which either stands alone or has the epithet ἀγρᾶνλος (4). While ποιμήν is sometimes used with regard to the master or owner (ἀναξ) (5) of an estate, it may also be applied to leaders or princes who are metaphorically called "shepherds", -- e.g. Agamemnon (6), Nestor (7), Atreus (8), and Thrasymedes (9). These metaphorical uses of the word prove that the position and business of a herdsman were altogether honorable.

Mr. Keller's discussion of the Homeric horse and mule is very interesting, but, as usual, inaccurate. In the first place the statement that the horse was "more than human" (10),

1. Od. XIV. 533.

2. Keller p. 32.

3. Il. XXI. 282.

4. Il. IV. 455; XVIII. 162.

5. Od. IV. 87.

6. Il. II. 254.

7. Il. X. 37.

8. Il. II. 105.

9. Il. IX. 81.

10. Keller p. 35.

has no proof. "The horses of Achilles that were apart from the battle wept when first they were aware that their chariot-
eer, Patroclus, had fallen in the dust beneath the hands of Hector ", (1) and Achilles' horse, Xanthus, was given power of speech by Hera that he might say to Achilles, "Yea verily for this hour we will still bear thee safe, yet is thy death-day nigh at hand, neither shall we be cause thereof, but a mighty god and forceful fate ". (2). But in these respects the horses were human, not more than human, and further, these statements are not to be taken literally.

There is no instance of the horse's "serving as ornament", and no evidence of horse back riding's being "common in everyday life ".(3).

That riding on horseback was not wholly unknown might be supposed, but the few examples of it are insufficient to prove the custom of horse-back riding against the weight of negative evidence (4). On their return from a midnight expedition to the Trojan camp, Odysseus and Diomed rode the horses of Rhesus which they had captured (5). At one time when the Achaeans were hard pressed by the Trojans, Ajax is said to have gone with long strides over the decks of the ships "like a man well skilled in horsemanship, who couples four horses out of many, and hurrying them from the plain towards a great city, drives along the public way, and firmly he leaps, and

1. Il. XVII. 427.

4. Cf. Sey. L.H.A. ch. 13.

2. Il. XIX. 404.

5. Il. X. 513.

3. Keller pp. 34, 36.

changes his stand from horse to horse "; (1) and Odysseus mounted a beam of his wrecked raft as if he were riding a steed (2).

The evidence with regard to the four-span of horses supports Mr. Keller's belief that it was unusual (3). Mr. Leaf says that Il. VIII. 185 has been condemned for the very good reason that the use of four horses in a chariot is post-Homeric. The names of the horses in this passage are all taken from other passages (4). A four-horse chariot is alluded to only in similes (5), and perhaps in one other instance where we are told that "to Neleus was a great debt owing in goodly Elis, four horses, winners of prizes, with their chariots had gone to the games and were to run for a tripod" (6). According to Seymour (7), the chariot was in general drawn by two horses, tho Hector had four (8), and the Phaeacian ship that carried Odysseus home is likened to four stallions rushing over the plain under the blows of the whip (9).

Horses were represented as born of Boreas and mortal mares (10) as well as of the wind-god Zephyrus and the harpy Podarge (fleet-foot), as stated by Mr. Keller (11). The ἀρπυία or storm gust (lit. snatcher) appears here (12) only in the

-
1. Il. XV. 680.	7. Sey. L.H.A. ch. 13.
2. Od. Y. 371.	8. Il. VIII. 185.
3. Keller p. 36.	9. Od. XIII. 81.
4. Il. XVI. 149; XXIII. 295;
Od. XXIII. 246.	10. Il. XX. 223.
5. Il. XV. 680; Od. XIII. 81.	11. Keller p. 34.
6. Il. XI. 699.	12. Il. XVI. 150.

Iliad. In the Odyssey⁽¹⁾ it is less distinctly personified. A comparison of Odyssey XX. 77 with XX. 66 shows that the ἄρπυιαι are identical with the θετέλλαι. This tracing of horses to the wind-gods is probably only a mythological way of accounting for their speed.

There is only one instance to substantiate Mr. Keller's general statement that a mule was "hard to break", (2) and that is the case of a six year old mule, which naturally, if left untamed until that age, would be hard to break.

Mr. Keller was not satisfied with misstating in his discussion of hunting (3) that there was "a powerful breed of dogs", but repeats this idea twice under cattle-raising (4), and also states that there were "all varieties of dogs found in Homer" and that "table dogs were kept in the house of Priam" (5). Three kinds of dogs are spoken of in Homer, -- those which accompany men in the hunt (6), those that guard cattle (7), sheep (8), and swine (9), and table dogs kept for show (10), tho it is not mentioned that Priam had this latter class of dogs in his palace.

As for domestic fowl, it is true that Homer does not give instances of many. Penelope had a flock of white geese

-
1. Od. I. 241; XIV. 371; XX. 77.	6. Il. III. 23; VIII. 338; XV. 579.
2. Keller p. 37.	7. Il. XVIII. 578; XI. 549.
3. Keller p. 29.	8. Il. X. 183.
4. Keller pp. 32, 38.	9. Od. IV. 21.
5. Keller p. 38.	10. Od. XVII. 315.

in her court-yard, but why Mr. Keller should assume that they were "only for ornament" (1) is not obvious unless he got his idea from the statement that Penelope amused herself with watching them (2). But geese are also referred to as "tame fowl from the yard", (3) and as "fattened in the house", (4) so in all probability they were kept and fattened for a more useful purpose than that of ornamentation.

On the whole, cattle-raising together with agriculture was the essential material basis for the organization of the state. But of all property, the possession of land was the most important. "Favored by a genial climate, agriculture was carried on almost everywhere with a zeal to which the wants of a dense population added their stimulus. That it was regarded as the very groundwork of social life is shown by the fact that Demeter, its guardian goddess, presided also over wedlock and law." (5).

People who, like the Cyclopes, did not possess and cultivate land, lacked all political bonds. Perhaps Odysseus' description of the Cyclopes' land (6) would lead us to assume not so much that it was a "painful sight" as Mr. Keller suggests (7), to see this land uncultivated, but that this is a very striking instance of a Greek's keen observation of the agricultural possibilities of a land. Odysseus calls it a

1. Keller p. 39.

2. Od. XIX. 536.

3. Od. XV. 161.

4. Od. XV. 174.

5. Harp. Clas. Diet.

6. Od. IX. 130.

7. Keller p. 40.

" spot not worthless but one that would bear all things duly. for here are meadows on the banks of the gray sea, moist, with soft soil; here vines could never die; here is a smooth ploughing land; a very heavy crop, and always well in season, might be reaped for the under soil is rich " (1).

Laertes' personal care for his garden (2) is a striking example of the fact that nobles and princes were not above such duties. But we may agree with Mr. Keller that the heaviest and most disagreeable of this work fell to slaves and hired laborers (3).

In speaking of the products of the soil, Mr. Keller says that flax is not mentioned (4), wholly ignoring the fact that the word $\lambda\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ is used very many times in the poems. With regard to this matter, Seymour says, (5) " Flax was of less importance in the Homeric age since garments, rugs, and some bed clothes were made of wool. It is true the flax plant is not mentioned, but since the Homeric Greeks used linen for garments, for bed clothing (6), for burial shrouds (7), for tunics in war (8), for fish lines (9), and for nets (10), to doubt the cultivation of the plant would be unnecessary. The word $\chi\iota\tau\acute{o}\nu$ is supposed to have been borrowed from the Phoenician " kitonet " (linen) and indicates that the Greeks

1. Od. IX. 130.

2. Od. XXIV. 227.

3. Keller p. 45.

4. Keller p. 40.

5. Sey. L.H.A. ch. 12.

6. Od. XIII. 73, 118.

7. Il. XXIII. 254

8. Il. II. 529.

9. Il. XVI. 408.

10. Il. V. 487.

received their knowledge of linen from the Phoenicians, but if the Achaeans procured their linen from the Phoenicians, Homer certainly does not tell of this. The Homeric word for linen (λίνον) is cognate with the English "linen" and the German "Leinen". The thread spun by the Fates was of linen (1), the Phaeacian women wove and spun linen (2), oil was used in the finish of linen (3), and the ropes of the ships were ordinarily of tow or some kind of hemp -- tho possibly they were of rushes at times.

Mr. Keller again is guilty of misinterpretation when he states that "a child's careful raising was compared with the care expended upon an olive shoot". (4). In the first reference he gives as authority for this statement, Thetis says, "Zeus gave me a son to bear and nourish -- and he shot up like a young branch", (5) and in the second Panthous, son of Euphorbus, "lay dead upon the earth as an olive sapling lies broken by a hurricane" (6). Here it is plain that there is no comparison between the care of children and that of trees, but their growth, form, and stature are the points of similarity. Another example of likening the form of a young person to a tree is the simile in which Odysseus compared Nausicea to a young palm tree (7).

-
1. Il. XX. 128; XXIV. 210;	5. Il. XVIII. 438.
Od. VIII. 198.	6. Il. XVII. 53.
2. Od. VII. 107.	7. Od. VI. 132.
3. Od. VII. 107; Il. XVIII. 595.	
4. Keller p. 42.	

A further instance of his lack of appreciation of the real significance of a passage is seen in his notion that "young children were early encouraged to take interest in the raising of fruit " (1). His sole foundation for this idea is a little incident connected with the return of Odysseus to Ithaca from his long wanderings (2). On his making himself known to Laertes, his father, he is asked for some sign by which the aged may know that this is indeed his own son. To satisfy Laertes, Odysseus says, " Come and let me tell the trees in the well-ordered vineyard which once you gave when I, being still a child, begged you for this and that, as I followed you about the garden." This incident carries with it positively no idea of encouraging young children to care for fruit, but is merely a picture of the way in which an indulgent father humored a dearly loved child.

When he says that it was a "high honor for a country to be vine-clad " (3), the author is drawing conclusions that are unwarranted by the Greek. The terms "vine-clad" or "rich in vines" are often used as epithets (4) of a land just the same as "breeder of horses" is used as an epithet of Ilium (5), and there is no especial honor connected with the term.

1. Keller p. 42.

2. Od. XXIV. 336.

3. Keller p. 42.

4. Il. II. 507; 537; 561; Il. IX. 152; 577;
Il. III. 184.

5. Il. V. 551.

Following his discussion of the soil and its products, Mr. Keller treats the question of food and its preparation. He states, and correctly, that the Homeric Greeks drew a regular supply of meat from their flocks and herds and that this was their chief article of diet (1). What bread they had was made of barley- or wheat-flour (2). Thus their diet was very simple, as Plato remarks in his "Republic" calling attention to the fact that the Homeric warriors before Troy had no sweets, relishes, or fish tho they were encamped on the shores of the fishy Hellespont. Bread, roast-beef, mutton, goat's flesh, and pork are the only dishes mentioned in the Iliad with the exception of a single onion served with a sort of drink (3). This is the only vegetable mentioned in the poems beside the lotus plant and there is no foundation for the author's statement that "relishes or combinations, probably of a vegetable variety were prepared" (4). The Greek which he cites as authority makes no mention of vegetables, but in one case, Phoenix says to Achilles "With none other wouldst thou go unto the feast, neither take meat in the hall, till I had set thee upon my knees and stayed thee with the savory morsel out for thee" (5), and in the other Nestor's housekeeper put into Telemachus' chariot "wine and dainties" (6). The fact that the "savory morsel" was cut for Achilles

1. Keller p. 45.

2. Keller pp. 45, 46.

3. Il. XI. 630.

4. Keller p. 46.

5. Il. IX. 489.

6. Od. III. 479

seems to indicate that it was some sort of meat, if we are to make any conjecture at all as to its nature, while the "dainties" ($\delta\psi a$), according to Merry and Riddell (1), means "fresh meat", properly that which is cooked ($\delta\pi\tau\acute{o}s$), whereas $\eta\acute{a}$ (2) is "bread".

The author adds, as another of his many generalizations from one particular instance, the assertion that "the legend of the Lotus eater seems to point to the listlessness and lack of energy due to a food entirely vegetable" (3). This lotus was just one species of vegetable and a very unusual one at that, so that it is sheer folly to attribute to all vegetables the properties which lotus had for making a person listless or lacking in energy. Of course it is understood that this lotus (4) is not to be confused with the grass of that name. (5) Modern travellers state that in Africa, both inland and on the coast, this food is still used and is called jujuba (6).

It seems doubtful whether, as Mr. Keller believes, the fact that inlanders did not use salt, proves that those who did use it had an "acquired taste" for it (7). It seems more logical to believe that the fact that those inland peoples whom Odysseus was commanded to visit after his return to Ithaca, did not eat food mixed with salt (8), implies not only

1. Mer. & Rid. Od. III. 430.

2. Cf. Od. v. 538.

3. Keller p. 46.

4. Od. IX. 94.

5. Il. II. 775; Od. IV. 602;

Il. XIV. 348

6. Mer. & Rid. Od. IX. 94.

7. Keller p. 47.

8. Od. XI. 123.

that Homeric salt was gained from sea-water, but also that the Greek by the sea-shore was naturally accustomed to use it with his food (1). As an example of the use of salt on food we cite the instance in which Patroclus, preparing a meal for the embassy to Achilles, sprinkled the meat with salt before cooking it (2).

Mr. Keller is correct in saying that "salt was a symbol of cheapness"(3) This is the natural inference from a passage in the Odyssey where the beggar reproves a suitor for not giving him some food, by saying, "From your own house you would not give a suppliant salt, if sitting at another's table you will not take and give me bread" (4). But that it had the epithet "divine" (θεῖος) (5) once applied to it, does not signify anything. Mr. Leaf (6) argues that perhaps salt was called θεῖος because it was used on account of its purifying quality, to render sacrifices fit for the gods, as is customary in the Jewish ritual. But he hastens to add that no such usage is mentioned in Homer, and indeed salt is mentioned but few times in the poems (7). The epithet "divine" or "sacred" (θεῖος) is used so frequently and is applied to so many persons and things, that in most instances it has become colorless and without significance. So when Mr. Keller says that

1. Sey. L.H.A. ch. 7.

2. Il. IX. 214.

3. Keller p. 47.

4. Od. XVII. 455.

5. Il. IX. 214.

6. Leaf. Il. IX. 214.

7. Od. XI. 125; XVII. 455; XXIII. 270.

" fish must have been an old food, because the epithet 'sacred' was applied to it " (1) he has no doubt exaggerated the importance of the epithet.

In the life depicted in the poems, milk does not seem to be much used as a food, with which fact Mr. Keller agrees (2). Mr. Seymour, in trying to explain this, says (3), " The warriors perhaps could hardly be expected to drink largely of milk after wine had been introduced. But a large part of the Homeric Greek's wealth consisted in flocks and herds; and what the dairyman calls "milk products" must have been more important in ordinary life than appears in the poems. Milk, curds, and cheese are among the chief foods in Modern Greece, being indefinitely more important than flesh ". Milk is mentioned only four times in the Iliad and each time in a comparison (4). In the Odyssey, however, Polyphemus drinks milk and also whey (5). The latter is sarcastically suggested by Melanthius, the goat-head, as food upon which Odysseus, disguised as a beggar, might subsist as a watchman at his farm and a cleaner of his stables (6). But the fact that it is suggested in this one place as fitting food for a man of low estate, does not at all prove that it was the food of all poor slaves in Greece, as Mr. Keller would have us believe(7).

1. Keller p. 48.

5. Od. IX. 248.

2. Keller p. 47.

6. Od. XVII. 225.

3. Sey. L.H.A. on. 7.

7. Keller p. 48.

4. Il. II. 471; IV. 434; V. 902; XVI. 641.

Mr. Keller is also wrong in stating that only goat's milk is found in the poems (1). The very reference (2) he gives disproves his statement. It likens the confused shout of the Trojans as they advance to battle, to the bleating of the countless sheep a-milking in the farmyard of a rich man. Polyphemus too, milked ewes as well as goats (3). Cow's milk is not mentioned at all in the poems.

In speaking of the abundance of flocks and milk in Lybia "where three times a year the flocks bear young, where no prince or peasant lacks cheese, meat or sweet milk, and the ewes always give their milk ($\theta\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$) the whole year round (4), Mr. Keller makes the very astonishing statement that "it is strange that the verb $\theta\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is used " (5). It is, rather, very strange that he should draw such a conclusion, for from the facts, it is the most natural thing in the world that with such an abundance of milk there should be plenty for the young animals, and hence that the verb $\theta\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ should be used.

If when Mr. Keller says that "milk was given to the dead in Hades" (6) he means it was given to them as a food, he is mistaken. Presuming, as Ebeling suggests, that honey mixture ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$) contained milk, it was not fed to the dead, but formed a part of the libation to the dead, which was poured on the ground around the edges of a pit! (7) What

1. Keller p. 47.

2. Il. IV. 434.

3. Od. IX. 244.

4. Od. IV. 85.

5. Keller p. 47.

6. Keller p. 47.

7. Od. XI. 23.

the dead actually drank or tasted was the blood of victims which had been caught in the pit for this purpose (1). But even this could not be termed a food for the dead.

In stating that "wine was the staple drink and water is not mentioned as used by itself as a drink", (2) Mr. Keller is correct, but he goes too far in saying that "ships were rarely provisioned with water" (2). We know that wine, before being used, was diluted with water (3). The very vessel in which wine was prepared for drinking was called "mixing-bowl" ($\kappa\rho\eta\tau\eta\rho$) (4), and we know that the Ismarian wine which Odysseus gave to Polyphemos was mixed to the proportion of twenty parts water to one part wine (5). There are many instances where wine forms a part of the ship's provisions (6), and water must have been taken along to mix with the wine. Ships frequently stopped at some favorable landing place to draw fresh water (7), and the raft of Odysseus, upon leaving Calypso's island, carried, among other provisions, a skin of water. (8)

1. Od. XI. 98.

2. Keller p. 48.

3. Od. IX. 209.

4. Od. IX. 390; III. 390; IV. 615; XV. 115; VII. 179; XIII. 80; XIII. 109.

5. Od. IX. 207.

6. Od. II. 349; V. 265; XII. 320.

7. Od. IV. 359; IX. 85; XII. 306; XIII. 109.

8. Od. V. 266.

the dead actually drank or tasted was the blood of victims which had been caught in the pit for this purpose (1). But even this could not be termed a food for the dead.

In stating that "wine was the staple drink and water is not mentioned as used by itself as a drink", (2) Mr. Keller is correct, but he goes too far in saying that "ships were rarely provisioned with water" (2). We know that wine, before being used, was diluted with water (3). The very vessel in which wine was prepared for drinking was called "mixing-bowl" ($\kappa\rho\eta\tau\eta\rho$) (4), and we know that the Ismarian wine which Odysseus gave to Polyphemus was mixed to the proportion of twenty parts water to one part wine (5). There are many instances where wine forms a part of the ship's provisions (6), and water must have been taken along to mix with the wine. Ships frequently stopped at some favorable landing place to draw fresh water (7), and the raft of Odysseus, upon leaving Calypso's island, carried, among other provisions, a skin of water. (8)

-
1. Od. XI. 98.
 2. Keller p. 48.
 3. Od. IX. 209.
 4. Od. IX. 390; III. 390; IV. 615; XV. 115; VII. 179; XIII. 50.
 5. Od. IX. 207.
 6. Od. II. 349; V. 265; XII. 320.
 7. Od. IV. 359; IX. 85; XII. 306; XIII. 109.
 8. Od. V. 266.

Although Mr. Keller would have us believe that a mixture of Pramneian wine with grated cheese, honey, and barley meal was very popular (1), we find but three instances of its use. Circe gave it mixed with a drug to Odysseus' men when she wished to turn them into swine (2); Hecamede gave it to Nestor and Machaon in the hut of Nestor (3), and Aphrodite brought up the daughters of Pandareus on it (4).

From the use of the epithet $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\eta\delta\eta's$ in connection with wine, Mr. Keller judges that "wines were sweet perhaps because often mixed with honey" (5).

Honey was sweet, perhaps the sweetest material the Greeks knew. It was natural, therefore, that when they wished to characterize anything as sweet, they should compare it to honey, or say that it was honey-sweet ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\eta\delta\eta's$). That they did this is shown by many instances in the Homeric poems. Achilles characterized wrath as that which "far sweeter than trickling honey, waxeth like smoke in the breasts of men" (6). Again Nestor is described as he "from whose tongue flowed discourse sweeter than honey" (7).

Wine is of itself sweet, some kinds being sweeter than others according to the kind of grapes from which it is made; but all that $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\eta\delta\eta's$, as applied to wine, means is that wine is sweeter as honey, and not that it is sweet by the

1. Keller p. 49.

2. Od. X. 234.

3. Il. XI. 638.

4. Od. XX. 69.

5. Keller p. 48.

6. Il. XVIII. 109.

7. Il. I. 249.

admixture of honey. In fact there is no evidence to show that wine was mixed with honey. Wine was mixed with water and there are abundant proofs of that; if therefore, it was made sweet by the admixture of honey, there must have been some mention of this fact among the many instances in the poems when wine was used, for there is no reason why the ingredient water should be mentioned so frequently and honey not mentioned at all. The word $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\gamma\delta\eta's$, therefore, does mean sweet, but when it is applied as an epithet to wine or to any other word, it is not a correct inference that the quality of sweetness is due to the admixture of honey. If so, then the sweetness of fruit (1), wheat (2), lotus (3), grass (4), and even of sleep (5) and of the soul (6), is due to the admixture of honey, for this epithet ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\gamma\delta\eta's$) is applied to all of them.

Mr. Keller does not mention fruits tho apples, pomegranates, figs, pears, olives, and grapes are spoken of in the poems. All of these fruits grew in the orchard of Alcinous where were "tall thrifty trees on which fruit never fails; it is not gone in winter or in summer, but lasts thruout the year"(7).

When Odysseus went to his father's farm after his return to Ithaca, he addressed his father as follows, "Old man,

1. Il. XVIII. 568.	5. Od. XIX. 551.
2. Il. X. 569.	6. Od. XI. 203; Il. X. 495.
3. Od. IX. 94.	7. Od. VII. 112 ff.
4. Od. VI. 90.	

nothing is here -- shrub, fig-tree, vine, olive, or pear, or bed of earth -- in all the field uncared for " (1). Grapes with wine in their heavy clusters grew in the land of the Cyclops where the people "plant with their hands no plant, nor ever plough, but all things spring unsown and without plowing" (2). Pomegranates and figs are mentioned as hanging over the head of Tantalus in Hades (3).

From food and its preparation, Mr. Keller turns to the question of Manufactures, under which head he treats a number of subjects far outside the sphere of manufactory. It is quite proper for him to discuss metals and woods and the weapons made from these materials, but when he gets into a weighty discussion as to the relative position and merits of the bow and sling, and whether a warrior fought first with his sword or his spear, his dissertation is not in place under the main heading of Manufactures.

The remainder of this section of chapter two, deals with the following subjects,-- utensils; ships, housebuilding, a description of the house, furniture, clothing, unguents and perfumes, colors, miscellanies, (such as fat, wax, pitch, sponges, sulphur, papyrus, and salt,) collective undertakings (fortifications, dikes and dams, roads, and settlements), the specialization of work (as done by smiths, builders, stonemasons, workers in leather, pottery, basket-weaving etc. merchants, and sailors), and lastly, the social footing of these

1. Od. XXIV. 244 ff. 2. Od. IX. 115. 3. Od. XI. 589.

craftsmen. All this classified under Manufactures !

His description of metals, seven pages in length (1). is good and shows common sense and good judgement. The only absolute mistake is in the assertion that lead is mentioned but once (2). It is twice spoken of, in the first place as a sinker of a fish line (3), as Mr. Keller notes (4) and in the second place as a standard for what is pliant and yielding (5).

Seymour (6) believes that metal must have been considered as a treasure, for three men, Adrestos (7), Dolon (8), and the sons of Antimachus (9) are quoted as saying - "Many treasures lie in my father's house -- copper, and gold, and well-wrought iron". No one can say where gold and silver came from as no mines are mentioned in the poems. But at Athene's visit to Ithaca in the guise of Mentos (10) she tells him that she is carrying iron to Temesa to trade it for copper. Iron is found in the island Meganisi near Acarnania which Dr. Doerpfeld is disposed to identify with the Homeric Taphos. Sidon is called "rich in bronze" (11), but this may be a general expression of wealth.

-
1. Keller pp. 50-57.	7. Il. VI. 47.
2. Keller p. 57.	8. Il. X. 379.
3. Il. XXIV. 80.	9. Il. XI. 133.
4. Keller p. 57.	10. Od. I. 184.
5. Il. XI. 237.	11. Od. XV. 425.
6. Seymour Ch. 8.	

Buchholz (1) and Monro (2) both are of the opinion that ἡλεκτρον is amber and is quite different from ἡλεκτρος which they say is a mixture of gold and silver, but which Keller says maybe this or may be taken to mean a jewel or precious stone " (3).

Cyanus, according to Seymour (4) was an imitation of "lapis lazuli" - a kind of blue paste used for cornice decorations in the great hall of Alcinoüs (5), for the adornment of Agamemnon's cuirass and shield (6), and the shield of Achilles (7). Mr. Keller practically agrees with this view when he says (8) it was one of the imported Egyptian enamels mentioned by Maspero. The adjective formed from this word is used freely for "dark" being applied not only to clouds (9) and ships (10), but also to the brows of Zeus (11), and the hair of Poseidon (12).

As to the meaning of χαλκός, Mr. Buchholz (13) agrees with Mr. Keller (14) that it must mean copper, while Mr.

1. Buch. Hom. Real. Vol. II. part 1. §43	
2. Monro Od. XV. 460.	
3. Kel. p. 54.	9. Il. XXIII. 188.
4. Sey. Ch. 10.	10. Od. III. 299.
5. Od. VII. 87.	11. Il. I. 528.
6. Il. XI. 24, 35.	12. Il. XIII. 563;
7. Il. XVIII. 564.	Od. III. 6.
8. Kel. p. 53.	13. Buch. Hom. Real. II.
	1, 44.
14. Keller p. 51.	

Seymour (1) takes no absolute stand upon the subject, but says it may be either copper or bronze.

The first misstatement in the discussion of weapons is that "Orion carried a wooden club" (2), while the Greek says that Orion carried a club of solid bronze that never can be broken (3). Further, there is no foundation for Mr. Keller's idea that the sling was once a noble weapon which had sunk to the use of the common soldier, and that no hero carried one (4). Mr. Leaf has probably given us the correct explanation of the position of the sling as a weapon when he says that the word occurs in what is beyond doubt a late interpolation where a post-Homeric mode of warfare is mentioned (5).

Of the bow, Mr. Keller says, "the fact that the best archers were almost always those who dwelt near the sea, in districts open to foreign influence, would point to a foreign origin of the bow" (6). To this he adds the following statements, - "The bow was an old weapon, gradually growing obsolete" (7); "Hera expressed contempt for Artemis' bow, and the bow of Paris was held in contempt" (8); "the bow was relegated to hunting and games, and appears to have been going out of use for purposes of war" (8); and "Odysseus got poisoned arrows from a Phoenician neighborhood" (8).

It is a mere conjecture to say that the bow was of foreign

1. Sey. L.H.A. ch. 10.

2. Keller p. 58.

3. Od. XI. 575.

4. Keller p. 59.

5. Leaf, Il. XIII. 716.

6. Keller p. 59.

7. Keller p. 59.

8. Keller p. 60.

origin, and a very unscientific conclusion to draw that the bow was rapidly growing obsolete and was used not so much in war as in hunting and games, when there are many instances of its use in war (1) and only two where it is used in games (2). Hera taunted Artemis saying, "Hard were it for thee to match my might, bow-bearer tho thou art," but she expressed no contempt for her weapon (3); and just because Paris was not by any means a hero in war (4), for that reason his weapon, the bow, was not necessarily looked down upon. Odysseus obtained poisoned arrows from Taphos (Meganisi) which is not at all in a Phoenician neighborhood. (5).

Mr. Keller's lack of skill in interpreting is shown in the following statements with regard to the chariot, - "The heroes fought regularly from a two-horse war chariot" (6); "the chariot had a seemingly springy floor" (6); and "the horses were confined in a somewhat complicated harness" (6).

Tho Diomed aided by Athene, fought from the chariot (7), this was not the regular way. The fighting was generally done on foot and the chariots were stationed near at hand to be in readiness in case of flight. Agamemnon left his horses and chariot; and his squire, Eurymedon, kept apart the snorting steeds; and he straitly charged him to have them at hand whenever weariness should come upon his limbs with marshalling so

1. Il. V. 171; 245; XV. 465; VIII. 329; XI. 375; XIII. 583; X. 500; IV. 206; Od. XXII. 11.

2. Il. XXIII. 871; Od. XXIV. 172.

5. Od. I. 261.

3. Il. XXI. 481.

6. Keller p. 61.

4. Il. III. 30.

7. Il. V. 836.

many; and thus on foot ranged he thru the ranks of warriors. (1)

Mr. Keller must have gotten his idea that the chariot had a springy floor from the description of Hera's chariot. (2) The statement in the poems is that the chariot-body was plaited tight with gold and silver thongs. It is much more natural to assume that this is a description of the sides, and not the floor of the chariot. No warrior could have stood firm on such a floor and fought with the unerring accuracy of Diomed (3). The straps were attached to the rim at the top of the sides of the car.

The harness, instead of being complicated, was simple in the extreme. The fullest description given tells how the sons of Priam "brought forth the mule chariot and bound the body on the frame, and from its peg they took down the mule yoke of boxwood with knob well fitted with guiding rings; and they brought forth the yoke-band of nine cubits with the yoke. The yoke they set firmly on the polished pole on the rest at the end thereof and slipped the ring over the upright pin, which with three turns of the hand they lashed to the knob and then laid it close around the pole and turned the tongue there - under " (4).

As to utensils, Mr. Keller concludes that copper jars were in common use (5) from the myth concerning the imprisonment of Ares in a copper vessel (*Κεραμειος*) (6). Mr. Leaf

1. Il. IV. 226.

2. Il. V. 727.

3. Il. V. 836.

4. Il. XXIV. 206.

5. Keller p. 63.

6. Il. V. 387.

says that this *κέραμος* reminds him of the enormous jars, quite large enough to hold a man, comfortably, found by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik. He says (1), "These jars are of course of earthenware. The epithet *χάλκεος* is added in accordance with the usual practice of describing the utensils of the gods as made of the more valuable metals, while men used baser materials ". It is also probable that the myth has Ares bound in a copper jar to indicate the impossibility of his escape.

"Oil-can" is a most crude, prosaic, and misleading term for Mr. Keller to use (2) in speaking of the *λήκυθος* or flask in which oil was kept for anointing the body after the bath (3). The translation "oil-can" conveys to the mind of the modern reader the idea that the *λήκυθος* was made of tin, whereas it was of earthenware.

Mr. Keller's discussion of the house, which is in its details, entirely out of place in this part of his work, contains some statements worth considering or disproving. In the first place, what he means by saying that "the Homeric house was distinctly of the Southern type " (4) is hard to conjecture. He is treading on dangerous ground when he describes the roof as composed of "converging extensions from the side walls which were supported by pillars, and left an opening in the center " (5), as the construction of the roof is a matter of mere conjecture since there are no remains of

1. Leaf, II. V. 387.

2. Keller p. 64.

3. Od. VI. 79.

4. Keller p. 66.

5. Keller pp. 66, 67.

roofs to give us any idea of how they were built.

That "the house was augmented by the addition of small chambers, built by the sons for their wives " (1) is highly improbable. It is true there is a description of a bed built stationary in a room constructed by Odysseus (2), but there is no reason to believe that this room was built at some time subsequent to the completion of the palace.

Mr. Keller is wrong when he says that "flocks were kept in the court and cattle and sheep were tethered at the fore-hall " (3). Animals were not kept in the court in front of a house, but were driven there from their pens to await slaughter just before a feast. The aithousa ran entirely around the aule or court and it was, in all probability, to the pillars of one of the side portions of the aithousa that animals were tied and not at the portion directly in front of the house, which was used as a sleeping apartment (4).

The floor of the megaron was cleaned after the slaughter of the suitors, by scraping it with a shovel (5); it was not dug up as Mr. Keller's use of the word "hoeing" (6), would suggest.

There may have been a treasure room "to which there was a descent " as Mr. Keller believes (7), but the evidence for it rests almost solely upon the interpretation of *κατά* as

1. Keller p. 68.

5. Od. XXII. 455.

2. Od. XXIII. 178

6. Keller p. 69.

3. Keller p. 68.

7. Keller pp. 69, 70.

4. Od. III. 399; IV. 297; XX. 1.

meaning "down", which is not at all certain. At any rate the treasure room in the palace of Odysseus where the bow was kept, was upstairs as shown by the passage where Penelope is represented as going to get it. "She mounted the long stairway of her house and hastened to a far-off room where her lord's treasure lay, bronze, gold, and well-wrought steel" (1).

To prove that the Homeric house was strongly constructed, Mr. Keller says, "The suitors made no attempt to break thru the walls" (2). It is a puzzling statement to be sure, and one has difficulty in understanding just why he is surprised that the suitors made no such foolish attempts. In the description of the slaughter of the suitors, the poet says, "they sprang from their seats, and hurrying thru the hall, peered at the massive walls on every side" (3). Of course they were looking for some weapon or piece of armor, and not for a place where the wall might be broken thru.

The sons of Priam had their rooms in the aithousa around the aule (4), and not behind the megaron as Mr. Keller's term "long-house" (5) would suggest.

While some of the chairs may have been heavy and perhaps stationary, as Mr. Keller suggests (6), there are others which seem to have been lighter and easily moved; e.g. the chair which Telemachus drew up for himself after he had seated

1. Od. XXI. 6.

2. Keller p. 70.

3. Od. XXII. 24.

4. Il. VI. 242.

5. Keller p. 70.

6. Keller p. 71.

Athene (1), the one which Adraste placed for Helen (2), and the one which was placed near the hearth for Penelope (3).

Mr. Keller is right in saying that beds were regularly laid in the forehall or portico, but is mistaken in his idea that the megaron was used for a sleeping apartment (4). Odysseus and Eumaeus slept in the main room of the latter's lodge (5), but this was a κλισίη and probably had but one room. There are no instances of sleeping in the megaron of a palace.

With regard to the women's garments Mr. Keller is not clear. If when he says "the women wore a short, close-fitting tunic next the body" (6), he means that they wore this under a longer garment, he is wrong, for the Homeric women wore but one garment. If he means that this was the only garment they wore, he is still wrong and contradicts a later statement of his own that "the women's garments were sweeping" (7). He has doubtless confused the Homeric dress with that of classic times. Homeric women wore the πέπλος (8), φάρος, (9) or ἔανος (10), and are termed "long robed" (τάνυπέπλος) (11), or "trailing-robed", ἑλκεσίπεπλος (12).

-
1. Od. I. 132.	9. Od. V. 230; X. 543.
2. Od. IV. 123.	10. Il. XVIII. 178; XVI. 9;
Od. XXI. 507.
3. Od. XIX. 55.	11. Il. III. 228; XVIII. 385; 424.
4. Keller p. 72.	12. Il. VI. 442; VII. 297
XXII. 105.
5. Od. XIV. 518.	
6. Keller p. 74.	
7. Keller p. 74.	
8. Il. XXIV. 229; V. 315; 734.	

The ὀθόνη which Mr. Keller translates "veil" (1) was more properly a head covering and was held over the face only in modesty in the presence of men. There are three other words in the Greek meaning head covering, which Mr. Keller does not mention as a part of a woman's wearing apparel. These are κρήδεμνον (2), καλύπτρη (3), and κάλυμμα (4). The meaning of ὀθόνη is doubtful. In Lang, Leaf, and Meyer's translation of the Iliad it is rendered "linen", while Seymour says that ὀθόνη (5) as well as εἶδος seems originally to have been a general word for clothing. They were the same probably as the linen πέπλος (6).

There may be several explanations for the expression "deep girdled". Mr. Keller says "it refers to extra quantity in dress" (7). Another interpretation is that of sinking deep into the body, which theory is confirmed by vase paintings of the earliest period.

It is true that "clothing was washed by stamping upon it" as Mr. Keller states (8), but it was not washed in rivers and springs but in troughs built near a river or spring (9). "They seem to have been tanks dug at the side of a river, having a free communication therewith above and below, so that the water was continuously passing in and out of them" (10).

1. Keller p. 74.

6. Sey. L.H.A. p. 166.

2. Od. I. 334; V. 346; II. XIV. 184.

7. Keller p. 74.

3. Od. X. 545; II. XXII. 406.

8. Keller p. 75.

4. II. XXIV. 94.

9. Od. VI. 92; II. XXII. 153.

5. II. III. 141; XVIII. 595.

10. Mer. & Rid. Od. VI. 88.

Sandals were always bound on the feet when one left the house, be it for a long or short, a rough or smooth journey; they were not used only on stony ground as Mr. Keller would have us believe (1).

The discussion of settlements, the selection of sites, and the comparative wealth of these (2) is hardly in place here. This is also true of the paragraph dealing with merchants and sailors (3), and with the social footing of craftsmen (4), which paragraph would be more fitting in the succeeding section of this chapter dealing with "Trade".

The main discussion in this section has to do with trade by sea. The author dwells first upon the dangers offered to this primitive navigation, due both to the fact that the ships were small, low, and scantily decked, and to ignorance of the operation of sailing into the wind (5). Mr. Seymour agrees (6) with Mr. Keller's idea that "Journeys by sea were not made by night except in great exigencies" (7) for he says, "Odysseus is thought cruel by his companions because he bids them not to land at evening at the Island of the Sun (8). The ships were only open boats, with no hold and no cabin, with no berths or hammocks, and thus with no arrangements of any sort for cooking or for sleeping. No one can wonder then that Odysseus' comrades, in spite of his warnings of danger on landing, desired

1. Keller p. 75.

2. Keller pp. 79, 80.

3. Keller p. 83.

4. Keller p. 84.

5. Keller pp. 86, 87.

6. Sey. L.H.A. p. 305.

7. Keller p. 86.

8. Od. XII. 274.

to spend the night as usual on shore. The only night voyages which are willingly undertaken are those of Telemachus to Pylus and return (1) in which he desires to escape notice, and the convoy of Odysseus by the Phaeacians (2), where again it was of the highest importance that his arrival should be unobserved".

There are passages in the poems which mention night sailing when there is no reason to suppose that there was a great necessity for hurried or unobserved setting out, for example the voyage of Odysseus from Calypso's island when he steered his ship by the aid of the stars, sailing thus seventeen days (3), yet in the majority of cases, the favored time for setting sail seems to have been in the early morning. It was dawn when Odysseus left the land of the Ciconians (4), when he left the Cyclopes' land (5), when he set out on his journey to Hades (6), and when for the second time, he left the island of Circe (7).

The marriage contract, mentioned by Mr. Keller, between a man of Phthia and a woman of Sparta, does not prove that the remotest parts of Greece were closely in communication (8), for the contract was made by the fathers of the young people while the former were at Troy (9).

1. Od. II. 434; XV. 296.

2. Od. XIII. 29.

3. Od. V. 270.

4. Od. IX. 75.

5. Od. IX. 536.

6. Od. XI. 10.

7. Od. XII. 143.

8. Keller p. 89.

9. Od. IV. 5.

With regard to the art of writing, Mr. Keller states that "the genuine Greeks were ignorant of writing" (1). In this connection Mr. Seymour says (2), "The art of writing was known in Greek lands long before Homer's day, but only once (3) does he refer to it. There the reference is distinct enough. The poet does not avoid the mention of an art of writing. The art was known, but how much was it used except for records and commercial purposes? No one can tell. That no letter was sent from Troy to Greece or from Greece to Troy need excite no more surprise than the failure to send a messenger, since there was no postal service. No scholar would now set the Trojan war before the age of the palace at Cnosus in which thousands of written documents are found. The art of writing was known then not merely in the poet's own age, but also in that of his warriors and his warrior's grand - fathers".

The passage to which Mr. Seymour refers as the one time when writing is mentioned in the poems, tells of the sending of Bellerophon by Proetus to Lycia. Proetus "gave him tokens of woe, graving in a folded tablet many deadly things, and bade him show these to Anteia's father, that he might be slain" (4). Commenting on this passage, Leaf says, "It seems impossible to deny that these famous lines imply a knowledge of writing in Homeric times. Writing has been traced back to a period which probably coincides with the composition

1. Keller p. 94.

2. Il. VI. 169

3. Sey. L.H.A. 169.

4. Il. VI. 169.

of the later parts of the poem at least." The weight of such authority as this seems sufficient to disprove the statement in question.

It is doubtful just what Mr. Keller means when he says, " Guest-friendship made the host his guests banker " (1), or in what sense the term " banker " is used, as there was no money in Homeric times. While a fictitious Odysseus was gone to Dodona to consult the oracle, the king at whose palace he had been visiting kept his treasures until his return (2), but this could hardly be called a process of banking.

Mr. Keller contradicts his own statement that " debt was confined to lack of reparation for a raid " (3), when he says, " It is probable that other debts were owed to men by members of a near tribe with whom they had had business relations " (3).

1. Keller p. 97.

3. Keller p. 99.

2. Od. XIV. 320.

Previous to this chapter on Religious Ideas and Usages we have made the general criticism that Mr. Keller puts much incongruous material in a chapter which has a certain definite heading. This is also true of the chapter in that portion where he leaves the main topic to discuss the greatness of the Homeric poems and their value as literature.⁽¹⁾ Much more glaring than this fault, and in addition to the many incorrect statements within the chapter is the absolute lack of any coherence in the arrangement of his material, and the resulting impossibility of dividing the chapter into any convenient sub-heads and divisions.

The first few pages (2) which serve as a sort of introduction to the chapter, are without this defect and are easily outlined into the following subheads, -- religion of Homer in general, death, the soul, the spirit-world, and the gods. But nothing less than a reading of the remainder of the chapter, written under the heading of "Cult", can give any adequate idea of the conglomeration of material and the lack of form or method in its presentation. For example, the harm that may come to the soul after death is mentioned on page 118, and the same topic is again taken up on page 129 after several intervening pages devoted to the discussion of sacrifices. The term "old foods" is used on pages 132, 140 and 171, and in none of these places does the author explain what he means by this peculiar expression or what significance it has in a discussion of religion. A somewhat detailed account

1. Keller pp. 184, 185.

2. Keller pp. 101-111.

of beliefs concerning the dead, sacrifices to them, and the condition of their spirits is given on page 118. The threads of this topic are left dangling loosely for a time, and then are suddenly taken up again on page 168. The "older gods" are spoken of on pages 130 and 179 without the slightest effort to make clear who they were or what is the significance of the term as it is used in these places. These are but a few instances of the poor arrangement and general weakness of the chapter.

The Homeric terms for "soul" are, as Mr. Keller states (1), the words derived from "breath" or "wind", viz. *ψυχή* and *θυμός*. Mr. Seymour limits the translation "soul" to the word *ψυχή* rendering *θυμός* as "heart" and saying that the latter is connected with the body and not with the mind (2). He contends that "the soul has its seat in no particular part of the human body, but is rather a man's second self, the invisible counterpart of his body". This view of the subject differs decidedly from that expressed by Mr. Keller who says (3), "the soul was connected with various parts of the body, -- the diaphragm, heart, head, pupil of the eye, and the blood." These opposing views may be reconciled by explaining that the *θυμός* was the seat of the passions or feelings, and that the expression of these feelings made itself felt, as modern psychologists assert, in the various parts of the body. The two passages (4), however,

1. Keller p. 102.

2. Sey. L.H.A. p. 434.

3. Keller. . . p. 102.

4. Od. XVII. 469;
XVIII. 352.

in which the seat of the *θυμός* is mentioned as being the breast, must not be overlooked. In both cases this fact is expressed in the opening words of a speech, thus - "Let me tell you what my heart within my breast bids".

Grief (1), pain (2), fear (3), and love (4) are the feelings experienced within the *θυμός*. That a physical expression might result from such feelings is proved in the remark of Telemachus to the suitors, -- "You do not conceal in your *θυμός* that you have eaten and drunk" (5).

The word which means "midriff" or "diaphragm" is used seldom in an anatomical sense, but when it is so used, refers to the muscle which separates the chest and the abdomen. When Odysseus was casting about for some plan by which he might kill Polyphemus, he once "found the plan within his daring heart of closing on him, drawing his sword, and stabbing him in the breast where the midriff holds the liver" (6). Again, Patroclus struck with a javelin Sarpedon, hitting him "where the midriff clasps the beating heart" (7).

More often the diaphragm forms a sort of complement to the *θυμός* and is affected by wine (8), pain (9), grief (10), and joy (11), and is receptive of ideas (12). When Eurycleia

1. Od. XVIII. 203; 274;
XIX. 210.

2. Od. XIX. 117.

3. Od. XVIII. 390.

4. Od. XVIII. 212.

5. Od. XVIII. 406.

6. Od. IX. 301.

7. Il. XVI. 481.

8. Od. XVIII. 391; XIX. 122.

9. Od. XVII. 470.

10. Od. XVII. 470; XIX. 471.

11. Od. XIX. 471.

12. Od. XIX. 10.

recognized the scar on Odysseus' leg "joy and grief together siezed her breast " (1); Telemachus in explaining to the suitors why he had put the armor away, says, "Some god put a grave fear in my $\phi\rho\eta'$ " (2); and the beggar at Odysseus' door remarked that "a man feels no smart or indignation in his $\phi\rho\eta'$ if struck while fighting for his own possessions" (3).

The heart ($\kappa\eta\rho$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\delta\iota\eta$) is the seat of anger and of grief. Agamemnon's "heart within him was greatly filled with anger and his eyes were like flashing fire " because Calchas advised him to give up Chryseis his prize of war (4); and bitter vexation pierced the heart of Penelope because of the conduct of the suitors (5).

Apart from the drinking of the sacrificial blood by the souls of the dead (6), there is no reason to suppose that the soul was connected in any way with blood.

Mr. Keller has clearly misinterpreted when he says "the souls in Hades were huddling and clinging together like bats" (7), and that "a case of their suffering is shown by their fleeing like birds because they were a mark for the archer Heracles " (8). The statement in the poems is that "they gibber as bats gibber when they are tumbled from the rock out of the cluster as they cling together " (9), and "around

1. Od. XIX. 471.

6. Od. XI. 147.

2. Od. XIX. 10.

7. Keller p. 104.

3. Od. XVII. 470.

8. Keller p. 106.

4. Il. 103; Cf. Od. XVIII. 387.

9. Od. XXIV. 5.

5. Od. XVIII. 274; Cf. XVIII. 348.

Heracles rose a clamor of the dead like that of birds fleeing all ways in terror " (1). There is no proof that the dead were a mark for Heracles and the only likeness between birds and the dead is in regard to their shrill cries, and not to any huddling or fleeing.

When Mr. Keller states that " the dead are forgetful of all " (2), he overlooks the fact that Anticleia related to her son the affairs of Ithaca (3), that Heracles remembered the tasks he had performed while living (4), and that Ajax would not draw near Odysseus because of the grudge he still bore him on account of the armor of Achilles (5).

A somewhat unique interpretation is given by Mr. Keller to the word ἀμβροσίη when he states that " the gods ate and drank immortality " (6). This excludes nectar which was the drink of the gods, while ambrosia was the food. The relation between ambrosia and immortality does not seem to be clear, - whether the substance itself was immortal or whether it rendered so those who ate of it. It appears as a food only in the Odyssey (7), while in the Iliad it is mentioned as fodder for Ares' horses (8) and as an ointment (9).

Mr. Keller's discussion of the word Σάμω is somewhat unsatisfactory. He connects the word with an evil power or

1. Od. XI. 605.

2. Keller p. 104.

3. Od. XI. 181.

4. Od. XI. 617.

5. Od. XI. 543.

6. Keller p. 103.

7. Od. XII. 63; V. 93;
V. 199; IX. 359.

8. Il. V. 777.

9. Il. XVIII. 170;
XVI. 670.

divinity (1), when it is used just as often with regard to a divinity who is a bringer of good. Theoclymeneus approached the ship of Telemachus at Pylos, and finding Telemachus sacrificing, entreated him "by the offerings and the *Σαῖμω*" to tell who he was (2); Agamemnon told Odysseus that he would take an oath and that he would not forswear himself before god (*Σαῖμω*) (3); Patroclus advanced in battle like a *Σαῖμω* (4); and Odysseus, warning the suitors said, "May some *Σαῖμω* conduct you to your homes, and may you not encounter Odysseus when he returns" (5). In these examples there is no indication whether the divinity was a good or evil one, but certainly the inference would be that it was in every way equivalent to *Θεός*.

Cult Mr. Keller divides into two main forms, - the banishing and compelling, and the propitiative. Under the former head he mentions as examples the banning effects of fire and water (6). According to the poems there was a barrier of water (7) which had to be passed between the earth and Hades' abode, but there is no passage referring to a barrier of fire. In this same connection he states that "entrance was impossible to Hades' home until one had had his share of the fire" (8). The passage he quotes as authority relates the incident of Patroclus' appearing to Achilles at night and saying,

1. Keller pp. 109, 110.

2. Od. XV. 281.

3. Il. XIX. 188.

4. Il. XVI. 705.

5. Od. XVIII. 146.

6. Keller p. 112.

7. Od. X. 513.

8. Keller p. 112.

"Bury me with all speed that I pass the gates of Hades. Far off the spirits banish me, the phantoms of men outworn, nor suffer me to mingle with them beyond the River, but vainly I wander along the wide-gated dwelling of Hades. Now give me I pray thee, thy hand, for never more shall I come back from Hades when you have given me my share of fire"(1).

This passage shows clearly that it is not the share of fire which makes entrance into Hades' home possible, but it is the burying of the body; the only effect of the fire is to prevent subsequent return to earth.

It is of interest to note here two examples of souls being within the realm of the dead when as yet their bodies were unburied. The one instance is related by Odysseus in his story of his trip to Hades (2). He says, "First ($\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$) came the spirit of my man Elpenor. He had not yet been buried under the broad earth; for we left his body at the hall of Circe, unwept, unburied, since other tasks were urgent. I wept to see him and said ' Elpenor how came you ($\pi\omega\varsigma\ \gamma\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma$) in this murky gloom (3)? Faster you came on foot than I in my black ship.' With a groan Elpenor answered, 'Odysseus, cruel doom and excess of wine destroyed me. I fell from the roof of Circe's house, my neck was broken, and my soul came down to the house of Hades ". The other instance refers to the summoning of the spirits of the suitors whom Odysseus slew (3). These spirits are reported as "conversing together

1. Il. XXIII. 69.

3. Od. XXIV. 1 ff.

2. Od. XI. 51.

where they stood within the house of Hades " (1), before their bodies were brought from the court of Odysseus' palace and buried (2).

With regard to the Elpenor incident, Merry and Riddell believe that Elpenor's ghost was within the gates of Hades with the rest of the dead, and that is why Odysseus saw him first (3), but an equally good argument for the use of $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta$ is that Elpenor had died but the day before and so was the first to be observed by Odysseus. In discussing the incident of the meeting of Elpenor and Odysseus in Hades, Mr. Keller says, "As Odysseus asked him how he died, it is hardly supposable that neglect was intentional " (4). There seem to be three possible interpretations of Odysseus' question $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma$, -- "by what road did you come?" "how did you come so quickly?" or "by what death did you come?" Merry and Riddell⁽⁵⁾ uphold Mr. Keller's opinion that it meant "by what death did you come", and give as reason for this standpoint the fact that Elpenor's answer implies that he understood the question to apply to the circumstances of his death. However, this seems a very foolish question for Odysseus to ask since he knew the facts in the case, and it seems much more reasonable to suppose that he referred to the swiftness with which Elpenor reached Hades. In the latter case, neglect of burial could not be excused as unintentional as Mr. Keller states (6).

1. Od. XXIV. 203.

2. Od. XXIV. 417.

3. Mer. & Rid. Od. XI. 51.

4. Keller p. 122.

5. Mer. & Rid. Od. XI. 50.

6. Keller p. 122.

Mr. Keller is correct in stating that "water was in common use for purification" (1), as especially indicated in the washing of hands and bathing. Tho in the majority of cases the hands were washed even after the whole body had been cleansed in the bath, thus indicating that there was more of the ceremonial of purification connected with the hand washing, there are two passages which mention bathing and donning of clean raiment as the only necessary purification before prayer. When Penelope learned of the departure of Telemachus for Pylos, she "bathed, and putting on fresh garments, went to her upper chamber with the maids, took barley in a basket, and prayed to Athene (2). Upon the return of Telemachus she went thru the same process, except that this time she vowed hecatombs to Zeus (3).

Mr. Keller says that the terrorizing effect of the aegis was in the tassels and that they were shaken to frighten away evil spirits (4). There is no reason for assuming that the shaking of these tassels caused fright, and when the aegis was used, it was not to inspire fear in spirits, but in the enemy against whom the wearer was contending (5).

Death by drowning or far away from friends was pitiful and inglorious, as Mr. Keller states (6), but not "because the soul entered the next life without possessions of any kind".

The thing that made this manner of death undesirable was lack

1. Keller p. 112.

2. Od. IV. 759.

3. Od. XVII. 58.

4. Keller p. 112.

5. Il. XV. 318.

6. Keller p. 117.

of burial with funeral rites and due honors. When Odysseus was on his raft on a stormy sea he bewailed the fate that threatened him and said, "Would I had died in Troy. Then had I found a burial and the Achaeans had borne my name afar" (1).

Maltreatment of dead bodies could not harm the soul in any way as Mr. Keller would have us believe (2), for the soul left the body as soon as death came, being breathed out thru the mouth or coming from a wound (3). Therefore this could not be the cause of the fights over dead bodies (4), which were desired by the enemy chiefly for the armor they wore, and by the fellow soldiers, either for the armor, or more probably to give them burial honors.

What Mr. Keller means by a "follower" in the person of a man's slayer or by his term "otherworldiness" (4) is hard to conjecture. There is no evidence in the poems to justify these terms.

In speaking of the feeling exhibited in Homeric times against dishonoring dead bodies, Mr. Keller uses a peculiar translation of $\kappa\omega\phi\eta\gamma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$, rendering it "the dull earth" (5). The expression occurs in the speech of Apollo to the gods in which he is angry at the way in which Achilles was treating Hector's senseless clay ($\kappa\omega\phi\eta\gamma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$) (6).

Homer does not call human sacrifice an "evil deed" as Mr. Keller would render the words $\kappa\alpha\kappa\grave{\alpha} \epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$ in the passage describing the funeral pyre of Patroclus. It relates

1. Od. V. 308.

2. Keller p. 118.

3. Il. IX. 409; XIV. 518;

XVI. 504.

4. Keller p. 118

5. Keller p. 119.

6. Il. XXIV. 53.

how Achilles slew twelve valiant sons of great-hearted Trojans, for he devised *κακὰ ἔργα* in his heart (1). These words have rather the meaning "grim work", in substantiation of which rendition, reference may be made to the struggle of Achilles with the River Xanthus where he devised grim work and smote as he turned about in every direction (2).

With regard to the length of funeral rites, Mr. Keller says those of Patroclus lasted only a few days, while those of Hector took eleven days and were supplemented with dirges and choruses (3). As a matter of fact, the funeral of Patroclus lasted but one day (4), and that of Hector lasted eleven days including, not supplemented by, dirges and choruses (5).

There were no gifts given to the unburied dead (6). The only reference Mr. Keller gives to authorize his statement tells of the mounds heaped up and funeral rites accomplished (7), and of the robes of Hector burned by Andromache who knew that these would be of no profit to her husband as he would never lie in them. She burned them merely in token of the honor in which she held him (8).

One of the most peculiar statements that Mr. Keller makes is that "swine were used in taking oaths by the older gods or by those which had to do with the lower world, and were sometimes sacrificed by the poor. Something the same may be

1. Il. XXIII. 176.

2. Il. XXI. 17.

3. Keller p. 120.

4. Il. XIX. 227.

5. Il. XXIV. 656 ff.

6. Keller p. 121.

7. Od. I. 289.

8. Il. XXII. 509.

said of sheep"(1). In the first place the poems make no distinction between the older and younger gods. Then the reference he cites about swine being sacrificed by the poor, tells about the preparation of a meal at the lodge of Eumaeus and, as he was the swineherd and had no other animals to slaughter, it is quite natural that he should have prepared a meal of pork. The sacrifice connected with this meal was merely incidental -- a setting aside of a certain portion for Hermes and the nymphs (2). A hog was sacrificed before a prayer to Zeus, Earth, Sun, and Erinyes (3), and Teiresias directed Odysseus to offer a hog together with a bull and a ram, to Poseidon (4). Rams and lambs were sacrificed to Apollo (5), and rams to Erechtheus (6), Zeus (7), and Teiresias (8).

The author takes a peculiar view when he says that "oxen and cows were ungoaded and unbroken in order to preserve them from the altar" (9). The gods required unblemished animals in sacrifice (10), and, if the oxen were cared for, it was to make them worthy of the altar and not keep them from it.

In connection with this question of sacrifice, Mr. Keller remarks that "a survival of the primitive appetite for blood is displayed in the ceremonial tasting of the vitals of an animal slain in sacrifice" (11). But these vitals were always

1. Keller p. 130.

7. Il. III. 103.

2. Od. XIV. 414.

8. Od. X. 524.

3. Il. XIX. 250.

9. Keller p. 131.

4. Od. XI. 131.

10. Il. VI. 309.

5. Il. IV. 120; XXIII. 873.

11. Keller p. 134

6. Il. II. 550.

roasted before tasting and were not necessarily more bloody than any other part of the animal.

The statement that "sacrifice differed but little from mere eating" (1) is probably misconstrued from the fact that they often accompanied each other. As a rule, after the thigh pieces had been burnt for the god to whom sacrifice was being made, the people made a feast from the rest of the victim; also in preparing a meal, prayer was sometimes offered and a part of the food set aside for some god. But sacrifice was a religious ceremony and as such, naturally differed very much from the mere satiation of hunger.

If we take the sacrificial ceremonies as performed at Pylos (2), as a type, we can safely dispute Mr. Keller's idea that women were of no account in sacrificial proceedings (1). For there the wife and daughters, and the daughters-in-law of Nestor all hold an important part in the rites -- that of raising the cry at the slaughter of the animal and thus, as some believe, calling the gods' attention to the honor about to be paid him, or, as Merry and Riddell suggest, indicating their joy and satisfaction (3).

A story is once told in the poems of how Pheidon kept in his house the treasure of Odysseus while the latter went to Dodona to learn the will of Zeus about the homeward journey, (4) and it is upon this one single instance that Mr. Keller bases his statement that "it was a common thing to learn the will

1. Keller p. 135.

2. Od. III. 450

3. Mer. & Rid. Od. III. 450.

4. Od. XIV. 327.

of Zeus from the tall oak of Dodona" (1). This is but another case of his frequent generalizations from a single incident.

Homer tells us "there were two gates for dreams, one made of horn and one of ivory. The dreams that pass thru the carved ivory delude and bring us tales that turn to naught, those that come thru polished horn accomplish real things" (2). But there is no proof in the poems for Mr. Keller's statement that "it was well known at what period of sleep dreams were wont to come" and that "a person was then said to be in the dream gates" (3). From the passage cited above it is clear that it was the dreams, not the people who experienced them, that were in, or rather, passed thru the dream gates.

With regard to Mr. Keller's statement that there was "a sort of fetichism in number and that 3 and 9 were the sacred numbers" (4), there is little, if anything, in the poems that he might use to support his argument. The passages where these numbers are mentioned seem to offer nothing in substantiation of his theory -- with the possible exception of Od. III. 7 which describes a sacrifice to Poseidon at Pylos. The people were divided into nine groups and each group was sacrificing nine bulls, but Merry and Riddell (5) say in this connection that the number nine corresponds with the number of the Pylian cities. Antiphus who was slain by

1. Keller p. 145.

2. Od. XIX. 562.

3. Keller p. 151.

4. Keller p. 171.

5. Mer. & Rid. Od. III. 7.

Polyphemus, had three brothers (1), Alcinous had three sons (2), Menelaus chose his three best comrades when he went to question the old man of the sea (3), there were nine appointed umpires at the Phaeacian games (4), when Odysseus and his men went hunting on the Cyclopes' island there fell to each ship nine goats, (5) and Tityus in Hades lay stretched across nine furlongs of ground (6). In none of these instances or in the few others (7) where these two numbers are mentioned, does it seem possible to conclude that the numbers 3 and 9 were sacred. In commenting on the nine muses as given in Od. XXIV. 60, which is probably a late interpolation, Mr. Monro says that nine was a "favorite" number with Homer, but implies nothing as to its sacredness.

-
1. Od. II. 21.	6. Od. XI. 577.
2. Od. VIII. 118.	7. Od. VI. 63; V. 484;
3. Od. IV. 409.	XX. 163; XVII. 515;
4. Od. VIII. 258.	XI. 311; XIV. 248;
5. Od. IX. 160.	XXIV. 60.

Unlike the preceding chapters, this fourth one on "Property" merits only favorable criticism. While the reader has a feeling that some of the detailed discussions of wealth in the form of herds, flocks, and lands given in the chapter on "Industrial Organization" would more properly have had a place under the heading of property, yet this, if it be a criticism, relates to the second chapter rather than to this one.

It is especially refreshing to turn from the almost fruitless efforts to bring form out of the chaos in the chapter on "Religious Ideas and Usages", to this discussion of property, concise, well written, and correct in its contents. It may be conveniently divided into discussions of property in general, moveable property, slaves, land, inheritance customs, and property rights.

Mr. Keller's belief that there is no certainty as to whether Homeric property was held in common or not (1), is upheld by Mr. Seymour who says (2), "The contention that land in Greece was not held in severalty by common men has not been proved. Certainly the chief men and not the princes only, had homes of their own, and the ownership of a house in primitive times almost necessarily implied the ownership of land. But the land of a family was under strict entail and could not be sold or otherwise alienated.

Tho Mr. Keller's statement that "the guarantee of Homeric property was force alone" (3) is somewhat too strong, yet

1. Keller p. 198.

3. Keller p. 198.

2. Sey. L.H.A. pp. 235-6.

he has exactly the right conception of the state of affairs when he says, "A king appears to have held his *temenos* and office in undisputed right as long as he was really the most powerful man in the state; when he was no longer that, revolution became in a measure justified" (1). It is true that strength was the main requisite and that kings ceased to be kings before their death since, when weariness and old age overtook them, they abdicated in favor of a younger and stronger man. Examples of this fact are found in the cases of Peleus and Laertes. While conversing with Odysseus in Hades, Achilles, son of Peleus said, --"Tell me what you know of gallant Peleus, whether he still has honor in the cities of the Myrmidons, or do they slight him now in Hellas and in Phthia because old age has touched his hands and feet" (2). Laertes, overcome by old age, left matters of rule in the care of Odysseus and went to his farm to spend the rest of his days in the quiet pursuit of gardening and vine husbanding (3).

"In general", says Mr. Keller, "what a man could get and hold was his property" (4). This statement applies principally to the flocks and herds gotten on booty raids, which form of property acquirement is discussed more at length in a following treatment of justice and law.

Movable property in Homeric times consisted almost entirely of live stock, woven stuffs, and metals in the form of armor, household utensils, and ornaments for the house or person

1. Keller p. 196.

3. Od. XI. 188.

2. Od. XI. 493.

4. Keller p. 190.

"Property in persons was", as Mr. Keller says, "as rational to the Homeric Greek as property in things; and, in so far as he was able, each householder provided himself with slaves" (1).

The great majority of slaves were women who were captured in war. Eumaeus (2) is perhaps the most noted example of those male slaves who were bought when young and trained to acquiescence and fidelity (3).

Mr. Keller closes his discussion of property by saying that "The social system of Homer has been found to be in many ways a transitional one and so it appears to be here. The Homeric property-system may be regarded, as far as the question of land tenure is concerned, as approaching, thru a quasi-feudal system, the stage of private holdings" (4).

1. Keller pp. 190, 191.

2. Od. XV. 403 ff.

3. Keller p. 191.

4. Keller p. 199.

The fifth chapter, that on "Marriage and the Family", divides itself into the following topics,- the patriarchate and traces of descent thru females, relation of sexes, the preliminaries of marriage and marriage, position of woman, and the family under which latter head are discussed the position of children and succession of property.

After a brief introduction on marriage in general and its effects upon the economic basis of society, Mr. Keller speaks almost immediately of the patriarchate and matriarchate in Homeric or pre-Homeric times. He says, "If the patriarchate was weak in some respects, it was the weakness of decline (1), for it was the real moulding force of Homeric marriage forms, arising as it did, where the economic effectiveness of man is relatively superior to that of woman" (2).

Of the matriarchate he says, "The field is à-priori far from promising to the searcher after survivals of the mother family and the female line of descent" (3). The truth of this statement is challenged not only by evidence in the poems, but also by subsequent statements of Mr. Keller himself. As examples of the latter may be cited his admission that such a system existed among the Phoenicians (4), but he hesitates to add that such evidence is merely cumulative. But a stronger admission is found in the following sentence,- "Other instances witness strongly to the importance of the female line of descent among the Greeks themselves" (4).

1. Keller p. 201.

2. Keller p. 207.

3. Keller p. 201

4. Keller p. 202.

Again he says, "A brother by the same mother is evidently regarded as the closest fraternal relation" (1); and further, in speaking of the Lycaon incident, while insisting that the evidence does not go to prove the superiority of the female line, he says, "But this passage (Il. XXI. 95) does emphasize the importance of the female line of descent, and in so far at least, witnesses to a survival of pre-patriarchal ideas " (2).

Turning now to the evidence in the poems themselves, we cite the following passages to show that the closest relationship was that thru the mother, which relationship must be a relic of the matriarchate, since in Homeric times the matriarchate no longer existed. The following passages from Homer seem to prove the existence of these relics of mother rule, - Briseis, in speaking of her husband, said "I beheld him before our city mangled with the keen spear, and my three brothers whom my own mother bore, my near and dear (brothers)"(3); Helen told Priam she could see all the other Achaeans but Castor and Polydeuces, her own brethern whom her own mother bore (4); Lycaon pleading for his life, begged Achilles not to slay him for he was not of the same mother (*ὁμογάστρου*) as Hector who slew Achilles comrade, Patroclus (5); and in the council of the gods, Apollo, complaining at the treatment of Hector and the enduring anger felt by Achilles for

1. Keller p. 206.

2. Keller p. 207.

3. Il. XIX. 293.

4. Il. III. 238.

5. Il. XXI. 95.

the loss of Patroclus, argued that "many a man might lose even some dearer one than was this, a brother of the same mother (*ὁμογάστριος*) or perchance a son" (1).

Mr. Leaf also throws the weight of his authority in favor of the existence in Homer's time of relics of the matriarchate, arguing that the word *ὁμογάστριος* shows a trace of the ancient way of reckoning kinship thru the mother, and that although the foundation for such influence is slight, yet in a polygamous household, the families of different mothers would naturally feel a closer tie among themselves than with the half-brothers and sisters (2).

Among the Lycians too, descent thru the mother was recognized as we learn from Herodotus (3), who says, "The Lycians have one singular custom in which they differ from every other nation in the world. They take the mother's and not the father's name. Ask a Lycian who he is and he answers by giving his own name and that of his mother, and so on in the female line". Mr. Leaf in commenting on Il. VI. 206, points out that Sarpedon as son of the daughter of Bellerophon inherited the Lycian kingdom instead of Glaucus, son of Hippolochus who was Sarpedon's mother's brother.

In view of these definite and clear instances of the importance of descent thru the mother, one is hardly justified in the statement that the field is far from promising to the searcher after survivals of the mother-family

1. Il. XXIV. 45.

3. Herod. I. 173.

2. Leaf, Il. XXI. 95.

and the female line of descent.

A striking incident of the author's inability to interpret Homer is shown (1), when in discussing the patriarchate and matriarchate, he cites as an evidence of uncertainty of fatherhood, the passage in which Telemachus, in reply to Menestes' question as to whether he were the son of Odysseus, says, - "My mother says I am his child; I myself do not know, for no one ever yet knew his own parentage" (1). Commenting on this passage he says, "The proverb 'no one knows his own birth', may point to an uncertainty of fatherhood which would be somewhat remarkable under the patriarchate" (2). The passage of course proves nothing as to uncertainty of parentage and would be as applicable today as then, since it merely indicates that everybody is dependent on others for information as to his parentage.

In discussing the relation of the sexes, Mr. Keller touches upon that custom which seems so out of harmony with the usual conduct of the Homeric people, - namely the custom of having the women of the household bathe the male guests (3). He takes the literal view of this subject which is clearly the one indicated by the poems, tho others, notably Mr. Seymour, would have us believe that the women merely made the preparations for the bathing (4). And yet even he must acknowledge the seeming contradiction made by Odysseus when he tells how Circe's maid seated him in the bath and bathed him

1. Od. I. 216.

2. Keller p. 206.

3. Keller p. 210.

4. Sey. L.H.A. p. 136.

from a kettle about the head and shoulders, tempering the water well (1). This task was assigned sometimes to servants (2), and sometimes to women of the house (3), in one case being performed by Nestor's youngest daughter (4). Such facts as these make it almost, if not quite, impossible for us to give any but the literal interpretation to this phase of sex relation.

Equally interesting if not more so than the question of the matriarchate, is that of the manner in which a man obtained his bride. Mr. Keller calls it wife purchase (5). In emphasizing this position he says, - "A wife was regularly sought with gifts, that is, was bought in a more formal and distinctive way (than a concubine)" (6), "the gifts to the bride's father were usually cattle, and the woman went to the highest bidder" (6); "in Homer the distinction between wife and concubine is, in general, that one is honorably bought and the other is captured, - at all events the wife was bought and taken possession of with ceremonies" (7), being bought, in Homer, was about as important to the wife as it was later to be endowed" (8), and "the conditions and preliminaries of marriage were, for the most part, variations

1. Od. X. 362.

2. Od. IV. 48; VI. 210;
X. 360; XVII. 88;
XXIII. 154; XXIV. 365;
XIX. 320.

3. Od. IV. 252; X. 450;
II. V. 905.

4. Od. III. 464.

5. Keller p. 212.

6. Keller p. 212.

7. Keller p. 213.

8. Keller pp. 213, 214.

of a contract of sale " (1).

Mr. Keller is not alone in maintaining this view of the matter, for Herodotus tells us that "Among the Thracians brides are purchased of their parents for large sums of money" (2), and Aristotle, in arguing that the ancient laws were too simple and barbarous, cites, in proof of this, the fact that "the Greeks used to buy their wives of each other" (3).

Further, under the discussion of Matrimonium in Smith's Dictionary of Greek Antiquities, it is stated that a low state of society is suggested by the fact that the Homeric chiefs bought their wives instead of receiving a dowry with them, in addition to which we have the following from Gardner and Jevons, - "In the Homeric state, marriage by purchase (in place of capture) was becoming customary" (4).

Mr. Leaf too, says we have proof that marriage was a bargain, in the passage (Il. XI. 243) which, commenting on the death of Iphidamas, tells how he "slept a sleep of bronze far from his wedded wife of whom he had had no joy and much had he given for her" (5).

On the other hand we have Mr. Seymour's arguments that "the position of women in general forbids us to believe that she was bought and sold in marriage, tho her father received gifts from the suitors. For example no one can believe that Nausicaa was to be given to the highest bidder and that Arete

1. Keller p. 216.

2. Herod. V. 6.

3. Aristotle, Politics II. 8.

4. Gard. & Jev. Man

Gr. Antiq. p. 404.

5. Leaf. Il. XI. 243.

and Nausicaa herself were to have no voice in the decision" (1). With regard to the passage (2) in which Penelope is told to marry "the man who is bravest and offers the most gifts", Seymour argues that the question was not merely who would pay the largest price, for in that event, the auction would soon be over; but at the end Penelope demanded no gifts at all, but promised to marry the man who should prove strong and skilled enough to string the bow of Odysseus and shoot the arrow thru the axe-heads (3).

To take a radical stand for either of these two phases of the question is almost impossible, for even the evidence obtained from the poems is confusing. For example, that the negotiations savored of the elements of sale is indicated by the fact that parents often had the only say-so with regard to the disposal of their daughters. While yet in Troy, Menelaus promised that his daughter should marry the son of Achilles (4); Ctimene was sent by her parents to wed a man in Samos and her parents obtained large wedding gifts (5); Agamemnon promised any one of his daughters to Achilles if he would return to the war;⁽⁶⁾ Cassandra was promised to Idomeneus by Priam (7); and even Telemachus was advised to send his mother to her father's home that the latter might give her to whomsoever he wished (8).

1. Sey. L.H.A. p. 129.

2. Od. XVI. 77.

3. Sey. L.H.A. p. 130.

4. Od. IV. 5.

5. Od. XV. 367.

6. Il. IX. 145.

7. Il. XIII. 368.

8. Od. II. 53.

Moreover when such an epithet as "cattle-bringing" (1) is applied to maidens, it points to something very akin to purchase, if not to purchase itself. Also the fact that Idomeneus was permitted to marry one of Priam's daughters without giving $\epsilon\delta\upsilon\alpha$ (2), shows that this must have been contrary to the regular custom.

On the other hand, if the property that was given over to the bride's father is considered only as a "gift", the size of this gift had a great influence on the parents and was considered of much importance. We find Penelope's father and brothers pressing her to marry Eurymachus, because he excelled all the suitors in his gifts and overtopped their dowry (3); Hector led Andromache from the house of Eltion after he had given bride-gifts untold ($\mu\upsilon\sigma\gamma\iota\alpha \epsilon\delta\upsilon\alpha$) (4); and Menesthius wedded Polydora after giving countless gifts of wooing ($\alpha\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\alpha \epsilon\delta\upsilon\alpha$) (5). But to the wish that Penelope marry the man who gives her most ($\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha \pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\iota$), is added "and comes with fate to favor" (6). Here another consideration beside the amount of gifts comes in; but it seems hardly just to place too much stress upon conditions influencing the marriage of Penelope, as she was a (supposed) widow and her wooing took place under extraordinary circumstances.

It seems probable in the face of these conflicting notions

1. Il. XVIII. 593.

2. Il. XIII. 365.

3. Od. XV. 17.

4. Il. XXII. 472.

5. Il. XVI. 178.

6. Od. XXI. 161.

as to whether the wife was obtained by purchase pure and simple, or only by gift giving, that the Homeric time was one of transition, in which the older custom of purchase keeps coming to the surface, while only here and there are hints of a more progressive and liberal state of affairs in which the girl's feelings in the matter were to some degree consulted, and the suitor gave gifts, not perforce, but because it was customary and might have some influence in his favor.

In discussing the wedding celebration, Mr. Keller says, "The wedding day was celebrated with feasts provided by the groom in the house of the bride's father, and the groom, if he lived far away, might not be present or might be present by proxy" (1). We know that a feast did take place in the event of a wedding; for Athene, in the guise of Mentos, asked Telemachus what sort of a company that was gathered at his house -- whether it were a drinking-bout or a wedding (2), and when Telemachus went to Sparta in search of tidings of his father, he found Menelaus holding a wedding-feast in honor of his son and daughter (3). Neither here, therefore, nor anywhere else in the poems, do we find an instance when a wedding-feast was provided by the groom. Penelope once, in indignation at the conduct of the suitors, said, "This never was the way with suitors heretofore; they who will woo a lady of rank, a rich man's daughter, rivalling one another, bring oxen and sturdy sheep to feast the maiden's friends, and

1. Keller p. 217.

3. Od. IV. 5.

2. Od. I. 226.

give rich gifts besides" (1). But this, as is readily seen, has no reference at all to a wedding-feast, but shows that it was customary for a suitor, during his courtship, to give feasts to the friends of the maiden he was wooing.

Wedding festivities did take place when the groom was not present, as we see from the *same* incident in Menelaus' house mentioned above (2), for Menelaus' daughter was to be sent to Phthia, there to wed the son of Achilles. But Mr. Keller cites no case in which the groom was present by proxy and there is no evidence in Homer to support such a statement.

"The position of woman", says Mr. Keller, "was typical of the patriarchate. Her part in life, with few exceptions, did not extend beyond the house, tho her liberty of going and coming was not restricted in what we are wont to call the Oriental manner" (3). And yet, he adds that "in going about, a princess was usually veiled and accompanied by maids" (4). From this latter statement we are led to suspect that Mr. Keller pictures the *κρηῖς τε μύδιον* as a face covering or protection in the modern sense. This suspicion is borne out by a previous statement of the author's that the *κρηῖς τε μύδιον* was worn by a bride (5). That the *κρηῖς τε μύδιον* was not of this nature, but was a sort of shawl-like garment, which could be thrown over the shoulders or over the head at will, seems evident from the way in which it is spoken of in the poems. The

1. Od. XVIII. 275.

2. Od. IV. 3.

3. Keller p. 221.

4. Keller p. 221.

5. Keller p. 217.

strongest evidence, perhaps, in favor of this view is the way in which Penelope wore her *κρηδεμνον*. If it had been a veil, she would have put it on over her face in her room before descending to where the suitors were; but instead of this, as soon as she reached the threshold of the megaron, she held her *κρηδεμνον* before her face (1). From this fact, we naturally conclude that this was not the usual function of the *κρηδεμνον*, but that it was so held by Penelope through a sense of modesty. Another instance where the *κρηδεμνον* could scarcely be conceived of in the sense of a veil is that of Nausicaa and her maids throwing off their *κρηδεμνα* after they had finished washing the clothes (2). The maids were alone, far from town, and there could have been no necessity for these so-called veils being worn on this occasion. So we naturally come to the conclusion that "veil" is not the best term to use in translating *κρηδεμνον*, as it does not give the proper idea of the shawl-like quality of this garment, and that therefore the fact that a princess wore a *κρηδεμνον* does not show that she went about "veiled". This view is supported by Mr. Seymour who says, "That Helen wraps herself closely in her mantle-like veil (3) and that, in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, the goddess, in her grief, hides her face in her veil (4), no more indicate this to be the usual office of this garment than the similar act of Odysseus drawing his mantle over his head (5) shows the ordinary use of this cloak"(6).

1. Od. I. 334; XVI. 416;

XVIII. 210.

2. Od. VI. 100.

3. Il. III. 419.

4. Hom. Hymn. V. 197.

5. Od. VIII. 84.

6. Sey. L.H.A. 167.

With regard to the *κρητήσεμνον* being worn by a bride, the author draws this conclusion from the fact that Aphrodite gave one to Andromache as a wedding gift (1). There is no reason for looking upon this therefore as a part of a bride's apparel at the wedding, any more than any other gift in the form of clothing or ornament.

In discussing further the position of women, Mr. Keller says, "Occasionally women discharged a really important function; there is one case of a priestess of Athene, and the number of women in the *Nekuia* shows that woman was an important factor in society -- but on the whole her sphere was the home" (2). In the first place Mr. Keller's statement is weak in that he cites no proof whatever that there was a priestess of Athene, tho the poems tell us that Theano, wife of Antenor had been elected to this position by the Trojans (3). The list of women named in the *Nekuia* (4) is nothing more than a genealogy of women, most of whom figured only in mythological accounts and the mere number of these women does not prove that woman was an important social factor.

But woman was a factor in society thru her high position in the home. Notable examples of such women are Arete, wife of Alcinous, Helen, and Penelope.

It is doubtful whether Mr. Keller has the correct conception of Penelope's position with reference to the control of the property in Odysseus' absence, when he says, "A newly-

1. Il. XXII. 470.

2. Keller n. 222.

3. Il. VI. 297.

4. Od. XI. 225 ff.

married wife was left alone with a young son and aged father-in-law, as regent over a large property " (1). It is true that when Odysseus went to Troy, he told Penelope, as she relates in Od. XVIII. 267, that on her must rest the care of all things there. But this must be interpreted in connection with other passages bearing on the same subject. In Od. II. 225 the property was certainly entrusted to Mentor to whom Odysseus, "on going with the ships, gave charge of all his house, that they should heed their elder and keep all things secure", and we have a similar instance in the case of Clytemnestra's being entrusted by Agamemnon to a bard when he went to Troy (2). Further, the words of the departing Odysseus seem to indicate that by "care of all things here" he meant, "Be mindful of my father and my mother here at home, as you are now, and even more when I am gone" (3). It would seem then in the light of these facts, that she was to take care of his parents and have general supervision over the house rather than be regent over a large property as Mr. Keller asserts.

A case of inaccuracy on Mr. Keller's part is found in the statement that "only one stepmother is mentioned in the poems" (4). There is another case besides this one of Aloeus' wife (5), -- that of Eriopis, wife of Oeleus and stepmother to Medon. Mention is twice made of this latter case (6).

1. Keller p. 222.

2. Od. III. 268.

3. Od. XVIII. 267.

4. Keller p. 227.

5. II. V. 389.

6. II. XIII. 697; XV. 336.

In discussing children, Mr. Keller mentions that "infanticide appears in but one case, and that among the gods, where a deformed child was devoted to death by its mother" (1). He fails to cite any passage that contains the incident referred to, but cites two passages which show that Hephaestus was lame and that he was born so. In one passage Hephaestus is represented as saying that his mother wished to "conceal" ($\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\psi\alpha\iota$) him because he was lame (2). It is inferred from the context, but not stated, that he was thrown from Olympus. Even if $\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\psi\alpha\iota$ means "to kill", the context shows that his mother did not succeed in her design, for Thetis and Eurynome received him. Mr. Keller therefore falls very far short of proving his one case of infanticide. In connection with this subject, reference may be made to the instance where Hephaestus said to his mother, "Once ere this, when I was fain to save thee, he (Zeus) caught me by the foot and hurled me from the heavenly threshold; all day I flew and at the setting of the sun I fell in Lemnos, and little life was in me" (3). This event clearly took place after Hephaestus was no longer a small child, as the fall was a result of his taking his mother's part against Zeus.

The majority of cases in which children are mentioned prove beyond doubt that children were well cared for, loved, and cherished in the family. In proof of this Mr. Keller says, "It was a great sorrow to lose a son especially if he

1. Keller p. 233.

3. Il. I. 591.

2. Il. XVIII. 394.

were about to marry" (1). The latter part of this statement contains a small inaccuracy, for the Greek tells us that this is not said of a son about to be married, but of a "new-married son whose death is woe to hopeless parents" (2). This is a small point, but serves to illustrate the inaccuracy of the author.

Another passage showing the care and love a man had both for his father and his son, is one misinterpreted by the author. In commenting on the questions asked of Odysseus by Achilles in Hades (3), Mr. Keller says, "The first question of an absent hero was concerning the integrity of his possessions" (4). The keenest desire of Achilles was to know, not about the integrity of his possessions, so much as about his father Peleus and the treatment that was being accorded him in his old age. Then after he had questioned Odysseus carefully on this point, he showed pleasure on hearing the Ithacan tell of his son's prowess in the army.

The children of good or highly cultured parents could naturally be told by conduct or intelligence, but we cannot understand why Mr. Keller should say that the progeny of a "lucky" marriage was easily recognizable; from such a statement as the following made by Menelaus to Telemachus, - "You have said just what a man of understanding might say and do, -- for sprung from such a father you too talk with understanding"(5). Neither this, nor any other evidence in the

1. Keller p. 236.

2. Il. XXIII. 222.

3. Od. XI. 492.

4. Keller p. 236.

5. Od. IV. 207.

poems explains in what respect a "lucky marriage" was easily recognizable (1) or what Mr. Keller means to imply by this statement. Again we find an instance of Mr. Keller's tendency to generalize from one particular incident. The statement referred to is this, - "It must be recognized that the bonds of real kinship were extremely strong, so much so that one got no chance to adopt a son except in the person of an outcast from his own kin" (2). The incidents he cites to prove this statement are two, - The receiving by Achilles' father of Phoenix, when he fled his country (3), and of Patroclus when the latter's father took him out of his own country because of a murder he had committed (4). In either case the fugitive was well cared for and made an attendant to Achilles, the son of the house. But there is no hint of adoption, and even if there were, it would not be fair to say from these two isolated instances, that "no one got a chance to adopt a son except in the person of an outcast from his own kin".

One of the most beautiful scenes portrayed in all the Iliad is that little family scene in Ilium when Hector is taking leave of his wife and child before going to battle. He laughs at the child's fear of his helmet-crest and holds him tenderly in his arms while he prays to Zeus for the little one's renown when he grows to manhood (5). There are few such instances in the poems, but this one surely corroborates

1. Keller p. 238.

4. Il. XXIII. 85.

2. Keller p. 238.

5. Il. VI. 474.

3. Il. IX. 478.

Mr. Keller's belief that "the relations of parents and children were very close and affectionate" (1).

There is no direct statement as to any preference for male children, and yet, as Mr. Keller says, "they must have been indispensable from standpoints of property inheritance, dynasty, and religion" (2).

When Odysseus in beggar's guise was telling Eumæus his supposed history, he says he was the son of a rich man by a slave mother, and tho he was given equal honor with the legitimate sons, yet at his father's death, when the sons divided the living by casting lots, they assigned to him a very meagre share(3). This would indicate that Mr. Keller is right in saying that the children of the chief wife were the ones who regularly inherited their father's property (4).

As for woman, she was but part of man's property, and so of course such a thing as female inheritance was out of the question (5).

1. Keller p. 234.

4. Keller p. 237.

2. Keller p. 236.

5. Keller p. 243.

3. Od. XIV. 200.

In treating the first subject of the chapter on Government, Classes, and Justice, Mr. Keller begins logically with the origin of the State, which was, he says, largely a product of war and which kept on existing as an enforced place between conquered and conquerors. (1). Thus early in his discussion, he touches on that important fact in Homeric government - the fact that power or strength was the ruling element and was a main qualification for a ruler. He says further that the Homeric Greeks were in a state of transition from the family system to that of the tribe or nation and that the evolution of the patriarchate into the state turns upon the extension of the peace-bond (2). Then he elaborates on that fact hinted at in his opening paragraph -- the absolute necessity of strength in the ruler, - by arguing that "in an age of violence, power regularly falls into the strong hands" (3), that "the value of a king to the people was the value of strength and discipline in times of violence" (4), and that the king owed his tenure to his ability to conquer without and to keep peace within the group" (5).

In treating of monarchy, the author is doubtless right in saying that the Homeric king was preeminently a war chief (6), but he has clearly misconstrued the evidence when he states that "military glory was so much worshipped that a successful fighter gained a certain claim to the throne" (6).

1. Keller p. 248.

2. Keller p. 248.

3. Keller p. 251.

4. Keller p. 254.

5. Keller 255.

6. Keller p. 252.

He draws this conclusion from the words of Sarpedon to Glaucus,- "Glaucus wherefore have we two the chiefest honor and hold great demesne ? Therefore it now behoves us to take our stand in the first ranks of the Lycians " (1). These men felt that they must display valor, because they were kings, and not that they might have a better chance to become kings, as Mr. Keller would seem to imply.

In elaborating on this office of war chief as held by the king, Mr. Keller shows a tendency to attribute duties and powers to the king that were not his as such, but rather belonged to him in the capacity of commander-in-chief of the army. For example, there is no proof for the statement that the people were "given over" to the king (2), as Mr. Keller concludes from the words of the dream sent by Zeus to Agamemnon,- "Sleepest thou, son of Atreus ? To sleep all night thru beseemeth not one that is a counselor to whom people are entrusted and so many cares belong" (3). These words were addressed to Agamemnon as commander-in-chief, to whom, of course, his soldiers had entrusted themselves when they came on this expedition with him. Upon the king, as Mr. Keller states later (4), the success of the confederated arms must largely rest and he must by physical exertion and good strategy promote the common aims; in short, he must be both king and warrior.

The king was generally good and fatherly toward his

1. II. XII. 313.

3. II. II. 25.

2. Keller p. 253.

4. Keller p. 257.

people, as is shown by the words of Athene in the guise of Mentor, - "Never again let sceptred king in all sincerity be kind and gentle, nor let him in his mind heed righteousness"(1), and also by the fact that he is so often designated as the "shepherd of the people" (2). The sceptre was the badge of his office (3) and he was called $\sigma\kappa\eta\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ (4). The sceptre however was not confined to the king, but was used by heralds (5), priests (6), judges (7), and seers (8). The functions of the king were somewhat diverse, as he presided over the $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta^{(9)}$ and $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\eta'$ (10), was judge (11), commander-in-chief of the army (12), conducted public sacrifice (13), and managed religious festivals (14).

With regard to the power of the king, it seems to have been, if not absolute, at least very great. For example, Proetus banished Bellerophon from his country (15) and Menelaus said that if Odysseus had come home from the war, he (Menelaus) would have cleared out one of his towns of its inhabitants and given it over to Odysseus (16). These instances

-
1. Od. II. 234.	9. Il. II. 53.
2. Od. XVII. 109; Il. X. 73;
II. 254; IX. 81.	10. Od. VIII. 5; Il. IX. 2.
3. Il. I. 234; II. 265; III. 218.	11. Od. XI. 186; XIX. 111.
4. Od. II. 231; V. 9; IV. 63;
VIII. 41; Il. II. 86.	12. Il. I. 16.
5. Il. VII. 274.	13. Od. XIII. 181;
Il. III. 271.
6. Il. I. 15.	14. Il. IX. 545.
7. Od. XI. 569.	15. Il. VI. 158.
8. Od. XI. 90.	16. Od. IV. 176.

show a very high degree of authority. But the evidence is not so clear in proof of the author's statement that the king had in war time power of life and death and that Agamemnon possessed this power over the whole of the common soldiery (1). His basis for these statements lies in the words, not of Agamemnon, but of Nestor, - "Son of Atreus, do thou still keep steadfast purpose and lead the Argives amid the violent fray, and for these, let them perish, the one or two Achaeans that take secret counsel to depart to Argos first" (2). And in the same speech the old counsellor says, - "If any man is desirous overmuch to depart homewards, let him lay his hand on his decked black ship that before all men he may encounter death and fate" (3). These words do not give conclusive enough evidence that this death was to come about by command of Agamemnon. Nestor may have meant that the gods would destroy them for being cowards, or that if they left before the war was completed, they would be shipwrecked. In fact, it seems that, in Homeric times, murder was not an offence against society in general, but a private matter between the slayer and the friends or relatives of the slain; so that any man, kings and common folk alike, could kill a man if he were willing to meet the anger of his victim's avengers (4).

Another right granted by Mr. Keller to Agamemnon as head of the army was that of giving trading privileges in return for which he received substantial gifts from the

1. Keller p. 256.

2. IL. II. 346.

3. IL. II. 357.

4. IL. XV. 116; XVII. 34;
IX. 633.

merchants (1). Euenus, Jason's son, sent to Troy many ships laden with wine and along with these a special freight for Agamemnon and Menelaus (2). There is no mention here of any trading privileges granted in return for which this gift of wine was made, but it seems entirely natural that in a cargo of goods there should be a special portion set aside for the commander-in-chief. The other reference (3) quoted by Mr. Keller in substantiation of his statement, has to do with a cup which Achilles made one of the prizes in the funeral games of Patroclus. This cup had been brought across the sea by Phoenicians and given to Thoas. Later Euenus gave it to Patroclus as a ransom for Lycaon. Here again is no mention made of trading privileges and we fail to see in what way the reference applies to the subject under discussion.

Mr. Keller does not give us the whole truth when he says that Agamemnon was addressed with titles of respect, even when the speaker was very angry (4). Tho Achilles does address him as "Most noble son of Atreus", in the same breath he adds, "of all men most covetous", (5) and at another time calls him "thou clothed in shamelessness", "thou of crafty mind", and "thou dog-face" (6) -- rather strong language to be qualified as respectful.

This freedom of speech was exercised generally in the agore where the king expressed his wishes and, in turn,

1. Keller p. 258.

4. Keller p. 258.

2. Il. VII. 470.

5. Il. I. 122.

3. Il. XXIII. 741.

6. Il. I. 148 ff.

listened to the advice of the people. The agore, (ἀγορῇ), the absence of which, Mr. Keller remarks, was a proof of anarchy (1) "seems to have had little or no power of initiative but was merely for the approving or discouraging of the king's projects" (2).

Mr. Keller is right in stating that the βουλή, which was composed of the king and elders, or the king's immediate helpers "in general preceded the popular assembly, and prepared the matter which was to come before it" (3).

In obedience to the behest of the Dream, Agamemnon called together first a βουλή of the elders and told them the words of the dream and the plan he has formed for making trial of the soldiers. After the βουλή was adjourned, the people were called together in the agore and Agamemnon's plan carried out -- not discussed -- among them (5). On the other hand there is one instance in which the ἀγορῇ was called first and after it was adjourned, the βουλή was held (6). In this instance Agamemnon called the agore at a time when he was discouraged and counselled the immediate setting sail for home; shortly after he gathered the counsellors together in the hut and they advised the appeasing of Achilles, as a way out of their difficulties and discouragements, in place of the ignominious flight proposed by Agamemnon to the agore.

The βουλή was composed of King and the so called

1. Keller p. 259.

2. Keller p. 261

3. Keller p. 262.

5. Il. II. 54 ff.

6. Il. IX. 9 and 89.

"elders", ($\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$), tho most of the men in Agamemnon's $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ were young, yet they keep this title of $\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.

These men were privileged in being asked to dine with the king (1) and, in fact, it seems to have been the king's duty to entertain them, for Nestor says to Agamemnon, "Spread thou a feast for the counsellors; that is thy place and seemly for thee. In the gathering of many shalt thou listen to him that deviseth the most excellent council" (2). Even in the $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\eta}$, it was these counsellors who did most of the talking, for tho the people had the right to speak, they did not often do so. The $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\eta}$ was generally convened by heralds (3), tho in time of need and haste the king assisted in summoning the men (4). In one instance (5) Achilles called a meeting of the assembly to plan some way to turn aside the wrath of the archer-god who was devastating their camp. The assembly was held for the discussion of matters of public interest (6), to decide disputes (7), and in war, to discuss matters pertaining to the campaign (8). The speaker generally stood while talking (9), and a herald gave him the sceptre when he wished to speak (10).

The assemblies seem to have been regularly convened

1. Od. XIII. 8; XV. 468.

2. Il. IX. 70.

3. Od. II. 7; Il. IX. 11.

4. Il. IX. 11.

5. Il. I. 54.

6. Od. II. 26.

7. Od. III. 137.

8. Il. IX. 11.

9. Il. IX. 11; Od. III. 137; Il. I. 54.

10. Od. II. 80; Il. II. 101.

early in the morning (1), as Mr. Keller states (2), but there are three instances where an assembly was held at evening (3).

Mr. Keller closes his discussion of Homeric Government by reemphasizing his statement that "the rule of the king was a matter of force and its perpetuation a matter of the maintenance of real power", and that the "council and assembly were means of assuring such predominance" (4).

The classes in the Homeric state, Mr. Keller divides into five,- Kings, nobility composed of counsellors or elders ($\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$), the $\epsilon\tau\alpha\rho\omicron\iota$ or class intermediate between nobles and people, the people ($\delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$), and slaves. The first of these classes has already been fully treated under "Government" and the author merely adds here that the royal house was in reality only the strongest of number of noble houses (5). But when he says that the kings held a $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ from the people, he should specify that this was in times of war only, when, after a city was pillaged, a gift of honor was always set aside for the King. Achilles in his complaint to Agamemnon says,- "Thou threatenest to take my prize of honor, for which I worked much and the sons of the Achaeans gave it to me. Never do I win meed like unto thine when the Achaeans sack any populous city of Trojan men" (6). The $\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ were the privileged class which was in close touch

-
1. Od. II. 7; I. 372;	4. Keller p. 268.
VIII. 5; II. II. 48.	5. Keller p. 268.
2. Keller p. 260.	6. II. I. 163.
3. II. VII. 345; I. 11;	
Od. III. 137.	

with the king, was present at his feasts (1), and composed his *βούλη* (2). Mr. Keller dismisses the subject of the origin of the nobility by saying that "when we approach the question of how the nobility arose, we find ourselves referred for an explanation, to some far off conquest where victors imposed upon subject elements their rule and that of their families (3). This is probably the correct theory for it bears out the idea so often referred to, that strength was the main requisite for the ruling person or class.

The men who were *ἑταῖροι* or comrades to the war chiefs, as Phoenix and Patroclus were to Achilles, seem scarcely numerous or important enough to compose a class or stratum of society all by themselves. They were merely the friends and attendants or "squires" of the chiefs in the army and seem to have been held in higher esteem than the common soldiery. Agamemnon had squires to serve him (4), men who, after the counsellors, were in all probability in closest touch with the king -- his lieutenants so to speak. The friendship of Achilles for Patroclus, who was his *ἑταῖρος*, is one of the beautiful things handed down to us in literature, and after Patroclus, Automedon and Alcimus, squires of Achilles, came next in his affection (5).

Mr. Keller also calls these men *θεράποντες* and says that their function was often an important one (6). This may

1. Il. IX. 73.

2. Il. II. 54.

3. Keller p. 270.

4. Il. XIX. 143.

5. Il. XXIV. 572.

6. Keller p. 273.

be true in the sense of their being the body-servants of the chiefs, but the poems recount no very important service performed by them, unless the bearing of gifts from Agamemnon's ship to Achilles' hut (1), and the preparing of meals for guests (2) be important functions.

We would suggest that these men be omitted as a class, and instead the fourth class which Mr. Keller discusses - the people - be subdivided into two heads, -- people of high class and people of low class. Under the former we would group the *Συμροεργοί*, including artisans, prophets, physicians, builders, and bards (3), and also heralds; and under the latter, hired laborers, sojourners, and beggars.

Of prophets and priests, Mr. Keller says, the "prophets might be noble, and the few priests were of high birth, neither however, forming a caste" (4). It is evident that prophets might be noble, for Helenus, son of Priam, was doubtless so (5) and Ennomus the Mysian leader (6) and Merops (7), in the Trojanwar, were very probably of noble family, simply because of the fact that they were leaders of contingents in the great army of Agamemnon. But as for the priests, no statement is made in the poems to the effect that they were of high birth, either in the mention of Chryses (8), Maron (9),

1. Il. XIX. 143.

2. Il. XIX. 316; XXIV. 625.

3. Od. XVII. 383.

4. Keller p. 274.

5. Il. VI. 76.

6. Il. II. 858.

7. Il. II. 831.

8. Il. I. 14.

9. Il. IX. 200.

or Onetor (1). The adjective ἀμύμων is used in connection with Dares, priest of Hephaestus (2), and θεός with the son of Dolopion, priest of the Scamander (3). But the first of these adjectives is translated by Liddell and Scott to mean "blameless", "noble" or "excellent", in the sense of an honorary epithet like our "honorable", or "excellency," while the second proves nothing as to divineness or nobility as we have shown in a previous discussion of that word (4).

The last part of Mr. Keller's statement -- that neither class, prophets or priests, formed a caste seems to be proved by the absence of any mention of such in the poems.

Mr. Keller again reads more than he should into the word θεός, when he says that heralds whom he also places in this third class, were called "divine" (5). The epithet here as almost everywhere can have no such significance, as it is applied so many times and to such varied things, e.g. names of towns (6), air (7), the sea (8), dawn (9), the earth (10), and Odysseus' swineherd (11).

The author does not explain what he means by saying that the "heralds were easily recognizable" (12). There is no

1. Il. XVI. 604.	8. Il. I. 141; XIV. 76;
2. Il. V. 10.	Od. VIII. 34.
3. Il. V. 77.	9. Il. IX. 240; XI. 723.
4. Page -32	10. Il. XIV. 347.
5. Keller p. 275.	11. Od. XIV. 48.
6. Il. II. 836; XXI. 43.	12. Keller p. 275.
7. Il. XVI. 365; Od. XIX. 540.	

statement to this effect in Homer, but Mr. Keller may infer this idea from the fact that sometimes the heralds are spoken of as carrying staves or probably sceptres (1), by which they were recognized as heralds.

Mr. Keller says of the "people" that they were less brave and able, and were sternly made to feel their place (2). This is surely the case when Odysseus was trying to restrain the soldiers from returning home before the war was finished. It is related that "whenever he found a man of mark, he stood by his side and refrained him with gentle words" (3), but whatever man of the people he saw and found him shouting, him he drove with his sceptre and chid him with loud words" (4).

Hired laborers, sojourners, and beggars, while free people, are classed by Mr. Keller as a shade lower than the ordinary man of the demos (5).

"Slaves", the last and lowest of the five strata of society, "were primarily won in war, tho often bought from traders", and Mr. Keller adds that "the slaves who were bought were mostly women and children for they were most easily kidnapped for subsequent sale; the men slaves of Homer were often persons who had been bought when young and trained for their later position by their master" (6). So far his statements are carried out by evidence in the poems, but when he adds that "a distinction is felt, perhaps, between Greeks

1. Il. VII. 277.

2. Keller p. 270.

3. Il. II. 188.

4. Il. II. 198.

5. Keller p. 275.

6. Keller p. 277.

and peoples of an older and more stable organization", and that Egyptians could capture strong enemies and hold them in bondage", (1) his meaning is obscure even in the light of the reference he cites (2) to prove his statement. The passage is part of a story made up by Odysseus and told to Eumaeus. He said that with nine ships and a force of men he went to Egypt. On landing, he commanded his men to guard the ships while he sent scouts inland. These men, instead of guarding the ships, began to pillage the fields, carry off the women and children, and kill the men. The Egyptians rallied and fought to protect their people. They were the stronger, and carried the defeated Greeks into bondage. This was the natural result of any battle and does not show any distinction between Greeks and peoples of an older civilization.

The tasks of women slaves are given as spinning, weaving, cleaning the house, grinding meal, washing clothes, caring for children, etc. (3). Mr. Keller adds that "in the absence of the mistress, the female slave might become sole manager of the domestic economy" (4). He cites no proof whatever for this statement and the poems offer no instance of its occurrence.

The treatment of slaves was usually mild, except in cases of unfaithfulness, or opposition to the master, as Mr. Keller states (5). That "they ate the same food as the

1. Keller p. 277.

2. Od. XIV. 245 ff.

3. Keller p. 280.

4. Keller p. 280.

5. Keller p. 281.

master and were sufficiently clad" is evident, but there is no support for the author's idea that they were "luxuriously clad" (1). The case of Eumaeus may serve as an example of the condition of slaves. In one place he said, "My lady dressed me in coat and tunic, goodly garments, and gave me sandals for my feet" (2). To Odysseus he said, "You shall not lack for clothes nor anything else -- at least for now, -- tomorrow you shall wrap yourself in your own rags. There are not many extra coats and tunics here to wear, but simply one apiece" (3). In the face of such statements as these, which Mr. Keller cites, we could hardly say that slaves were more than sufficiently clad.

Mr. Keller sums up his discussion of the classes by saying that "the stratum of the servile class was coming to be reformed from exterior sources in Homer's time, later to assume a wide development and growth" (4).

The third section of this sixth chapter has to do with Justice and Law and treats this subject under the subdivisions of murder and theft and their punishments, oaths and promises, dike and themis, inter-state relations, war and guest-friendship. With regard to these topics we would make two general criticisms, first that the discussion of war (5) be omitted as out of place in a treatise on Justice and Law, and second that the paragraph on Dike and Themis (6) which takes up

1. Keller p. 281.

2. Od. XV. 386.

3. Od. XIV. 513.

4. Keller p. 282.

5. Keller p. 295.

6. Keller p. 289.

the origin of justice should open this section of chapter six. We will therefore discuss this topic first.

The author calls these ($\delta\iota\kappa\eta'$ and $\theta\epsilon\mu\iota\varsigma$) two forces in Homeric civilization differing chiefly in name, derived from the past, and clothed with all the sanction of ancestor reverence and religion. In attempting to differentiate between the two terms, Mr. Keller defines $\delta\iota\kappa\eta'$ as what has been "pointed out" and $\theta\epsilon\mu\iota\varsigma$ as what has been "established", and while they are both equivalent to "hereditary custom" or "right", in a social sense $\theta\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ were most commonly "hereditary precedents of procedure which covered the whole of social existence" (1) and were therefore very powerful.

That there were certain men whose duty it was to dispense justice is proved by the words of Achilles in his oath "by the staff which the Achaeans that exercise judgement bear in their hands, even they that watch over the traditions" (2). Judgements sometimes took place in the assembly, for the roar of the Trojan horses as they ran is compared to the roar of a tempest "on an autumn day when Zeus pours forth rain most vehemently, being in wrath against men who judge crooked judgements forcefully in the assembly" (3). This reference also proves that men were supposed to give honest judgments and if they did not, that they were liable to the anger of Zeus. Another case in which judgment took place in the assembly is that in which two men quarrelling about the blood-price of a man slain, go to the assembly for settlement of

1. Keller pp. 289, 290.

2. Il. I. 238.

3. Il. XVI. 387.

the question (1). There were also cases in which one man acted as judge, for Odysseus tells us that Charybdis disgorged the timbers of his ship at the hour when "one rises from the assembly for his supper, after deciding many quarrels of contentious men" (2), and we have Minos represented in Hades dispensing justice (3), doubtless following the avocation he had on earth.

In connection with the question of *δική* and *θέμις*, Mr. Keller has obviously misinterpreted in his conclusion that the reign of law had not yet begun, from the fact that two men are portrayed as quarrelling over the location of their boundary stones and that an orphan's boundary stones might be torn up (4). The fact that such a quarrel or such unfair treatment of an orphan took place does not imply that there was no law by which these matters might be settled.

In discussing murder, Mr. Keller points out that, on the whole, there was very little blame attached to it (5) and amply proves this statement by mentioning the fact that fugitives from punishment for murder were kindly used and often attached to a royal house as retainers (6), as in the case of Patroclus who had to flee from his country "by reason of a grievous man-slaying, on the day when he slew Amphidamas' son, not willing it, in childish wrath over the dice. Then the knight Peleus took him into his house, reared him kindly and named him Achilles' squire" (7). Another

1. Il. XVIII. 500.

2. Od. XII. 439.

3. Od. XI. 569.

4. Keller p. 287.

5. Keller p. 286.

6. Keller p. 286.

7. Il. XXIII. 85.

instance which shows the kind treatment accorded to murderers is that in which Telemachus welcomed to his ship Theodymeneus, who "was far from home because he had killed a kinsman" (1). Telemachus took him to Ithaca, and because he had to go to the swineherd's hut and things would have been dreary for Theoclymeneus at the palace, he gave him over to his friend Peiraeus to entertain (2). But immediately upon his arrival at the city, he went in search of his guest, even before he would tell his mother about the journey from which he had just returned (3).

So that a murderer, tho generally obliged to flee even if as in the case of Patroclus, the killing was not intentional, was not branded as a criminal.

Even seers were not exempt from the necessity of flight in order to escape punishment for murder for, as Mr. Keller mentions (4), "the seer Tleptolemus killed a relative and fled before the threats of the blood-kin of the victim" (5).

In speaking of the murder committed by Orestes in vengeance of his father's death, Mr. Keller says, "The deed of Orestes who slew the murderers of his father, tho one of them was his own mother, received the greatest praise" (6). He clearly overlooks the fact that in the Homeric version of this story, Arestes slays Aegistheus only, and no mention

1. Od. XV. 272.

2. Od. XV. 511.

3. Od. XVII. 46.

4. Keller p. 284.

5. Il. II. 661.

6. Keller p. 284.

is made of the slaying of Clytemnestra (1).

With regard to the punishment for murder, there seem to be three distinct stages in the poems. At first, as Mr. Keller points out, the treatment of homicide lay in direct reprisal -- blood for blood (2). This method was the one commonly used in war and a soldier was always very desirous of slaying one of the enemy to avenge a fallen comrade (3). It is in this connection that Mr. Keller says, "The dead man was supplied with an escort to the spirit-world in the person of a foe, if possible" (4). He cites no reference to prove this idea and we can think of but two passages that may have led him to this false conclusion. One of these tells of the burning of twelve Trojan youths on the funeral pyre of Patroclus (5), but these were sacrificed not that they might serve as escorts, but merely as a token of honor and by way of vengeance of the dead warrior. The other is in the boast of Deiphobus over the body of Hypsenor whom he slew in vengeance of Asios. He says, "Verily, not unavenged lies Asios and I think even on his road to Hades he will rejoice at heart since I have sent him escort for the way" (6). Mr. Keller puts the emphasis wrongly upon the word *πομπήν* while it doubtless belongs on the idea of the rejoicing of Asios at the fact that one of his foemen was slain in vengeance for him and must travel the same road to Hades. But even if escort is the prominent feature here, this

1. Od. XI. 422.

2. Keller p. 283.

3. Il. XXIII. 181.

3. Il. XV. 116; XVI. 398.

4. Keller p. 283.

6. Il. XIII. 414.

is only one instance and that too in war, and does not justify Mr. Keller in drawing the general conclusion that he does.

The second stage in the development of punishment for murder is that of commutation in the form of a property indemnity (1). As evidence of this may be cited the passage in which Ajax, in anger at Achilles for his stubbornness, rebuked him saying, "Yet doth a man accept recompense of his brother's murderer or for his dead son; and so the man-slayer for a great price remains in his own land and the kinsman's heart is appeased when he has taken the recompense" (2).

The third stage, which Mr. Keller does not recognize, has to do with the interference of the people and elders in the settlement made between slayer and avenger. For our understanding of this third stage, we have to depend almost entirely upon one instance (3) in the poems.

The scene is one of those portrayed on the shield of Achilles and describes "the folk gathered in the assembly place; for there a strife had arisen, two men striving about the blood price of a man slain; the one claimed to pay full atonement, expounding to the people, but the other denied him and would take naught, and both were fain to receive atonement at the hand of a daysman ($\delta\iota\sigma\tau\omega\rho$). And the folk were cheering both as they took part on either side. And heralds kept order among the folk, while the elders on polished stones were sitting in the sacred circle, and holding in their hands staves

1. Keller p. 284.

3. Il. XVIII. 497.

2. Il. IX. 633.

from the loud voiced heralds. Then before the people they rose up and gave judgment each in turn. And in the midst lay two talents of gold to be given unto him who should give among them the straightest judgment". This passage shows that when private parties could not agree upon a matter, they referred it to an arbiter or to the elders in the presence of the people. It also shows the presence of an arbiter ($\delta\sigma\tau\omega\rho$) in the regular assembly of elders and people. As to the matter in dispute there is a difference of opinion. This question is involved in the words $\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\delta\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau'\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\omicron\delta\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota$ and $\delta\delta'\alpha\upsilon\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Mr. Keller interprets this as meaning "The one claimed to have paid all, while the other denied having received", for he says, "The question before the gerontes and people was whether payment of a fine had taken place" (1). On the other hand Lang, Leaf and Myers interpret this to mean, "The one claimed to pay full atonement, but the other denied him and would take nothing", thus making the question before the gerontes and people whether the offender should be allowed to pay a fine instead of going into exile. Either translation is permissible from the aorist infinitives $\sigma\omicron\delta\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, the main point of difference lying in the proper rendition of $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$. Mr. Leaf says (2) the rendition "deny" is possible but is certainly not supported by the Homeric use of $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ which regularly means to "repudiate" an offer, or, as in two other cases (3), to

1. Keller p. 286.

2. Leaf. Il. XVIII. 500.

3. Il. IX. 113;

Od. XIV. 149.

repudiate an idea. Liddell and Scott, on the other hand, render this passage, - "He said no, he had received nothing". Thus there seems to be excellent authority for both renditions, and whichever one we accept, the fact remains that the passage is introducing a third stage of development in the treatment of murder -- a stage where the assembly takes a hand in a heretofore private affair. In discussing the whole passage Mr. Leaf divides it into two scenes as follows, - "Scene I., The slayer tenders the blood price of the slain man; the nearest of kin refuses to accept it. Both agree that the decision is to be laid before a judge; each is attended by his partisans. Scene II., The question has been laid (by the judges) before the council of elders who debate whether the community shall enforce acceptance of the blood price or shall impose the full penalty of exile. The appearance of each party with his retainers in the agore in itself implies that the question is not a private one, but public, so that the appeal to the $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\rho$ is a merely formal one" (1). This seems the most satisfactory way of explaining the function of the $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\rho$, for otherwise we get into trouble from the fact that the question seems at first to be entirely in his hands, while later we find that the final decision was given by the elders. That $\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\rho$ is a referee is clearly shown in the only other passage in the poems in which the word is used (2). This is the instance in which Idomeneus and Ajax make a bet as to which horses are in the lead in the chariot race that took place

1. Leaf. II. XVIII. 497.

2. II. XXIII. 486.

during the games in honor of Patroclus, and make Agamemnon their ἵσταται or umpire. The only difference between the two passages in reference to the ἵσταται is that in one case he seems to have final authority, while in the other he only decides whether the matter should be referred to the elders or else appeal is taken from his decision to the elders.

It is true, as Mr. Keller says, that "theft was not morally reprehensible" and that "Autolyous had a great reputation for skilful thieving and was quite respected for his dexterity" (1). Perhaps a stronger proof that theft was not reprehensible, is the fact that men often asked a newly arrived guest if he were a robber. Nestor greeted Telemachus and his men by asking, "Strangers who are you? Are you upon some business? Or do you rove at random, as the pirates roam the seas, risking their lives and bringing ill to strangers?" (2). The same questions were asked of Odysseus and his men by the Cyclops (3).

However, men tried to get recompense for stolen goods. When Nestor on a booty raid, drove many herds of cattle from the land of the Eleians, his father took from the spoils a herd of kine, a flock of sheep, and the shepherds with them. This was by way of recompense for "a great debt which was owing him in goodly Elis: four horses, with their chariots had gone to the games, and were to run for a tripod; but these did Augeas, king of men, hold in bond in that place" (4).

1. Keller p. 287; Od. XIX. 396. 3. Od. IX. 254.

2. Od. III. 73.

4. Il. XI. 686 ff.

The author has overlooked a fine point when he adds that, "petty theft, such as sheep-stealing, was regarded as a mean business" (1). The incident referred to is that in which Priam, venting his wrath at Hector's death on his remaining sons, calls them "plunderers of their own people's sheep and kids" (2). It is not the fact that they were stealing sheep, but that they were stealing them from their own people that was "a mean business".

Mr. Keller's list of punishments (3) includes a fine which Eurymachus, one of the suitors, told Halitherses, the prophet, he would have to pay if he attempted to aid the adherents of Telemachus (4). He also mentions the fact that dismemberment was a punishment for unfaithful slaves, referring to the passage in which Odysseus in reply to the insults of a servant said, "I go and tell Telemachus what words you use and he shall tear you limb from limb upon the spot" (5). In punishment for shameful deeds in the house of Peirithous, the Centaur was dragged from the house and shorn of ears and nose (6). Hector rebuking Paris for all the evils he had wrought, said that the Trojans were very cowards, or else they would have stoned Paris (7). When Zeus was once rebuking Hera for deceiving him, he threatened to beat her with stripes and reminded her of the time when he hung her on high and suspended two anvils from her feet and tied her hands (8). This

1. Keller p. 287.

2. Il. XXIV. 262.

3. Keller p. 288.

4. Od. II. 192.

5. Od. XVIII. 339.

6. Od. XXI. 298.

7. Il. III. 57.

8. Il. XV. 18.

was doubtless one of the modes of punishment employed by men, as they were wont to apply to the gods those customs which they themselves had. When Apollo and Poseidon had fulfilled their part of a contract with Laomedon, and applied for their pay, he refused them and threatened to bind their feet and hand and sell them into far-off isles and cut off their ears (1). It will be noted that in all these instances there was no court judgment, but these punishments were meted out or threatened as private vengeance.

From Mr. Keller's list we would eliminate the punishment of Tityus in Hades, which does not apply to the punishments meted out upon men by men, and also the statement that a lying beggar might be thrown from a cliff. This latter is not mentioned in the poems as a punishment usually meted out to lying beggars, but is part of a wager. Odysseus, disguised as a beggar, wanted to make a bargain with Eumaeus. If Odysseus should return home as the beggar said he would, then Eumaeus should give him goodly garments, but if Odysseus did not come home, Eumaeus was to hurl the beggar from a cliff (2). An additional proof that this was not considered a seemly or usual punishment for lying beggars is found in the speech of Eumaeus in which he very forcefully refuses even to make such a wager. He says, "Stranger, fine fame and fortune would be mine among mankind, both now and evermore, if, after I had brought you to the lodge and given you welcome, I turned about and slew you and took away your life"⁽³⁾!

1. Il. XXI. 452.

2. Od. XIV. 399.

3. Od. XIV. 400.

Mr. Keller gives us only very meagre information about the nature of oaths and promises, merely stating that "For special occasions oaths were taken, the supernatural was invoked and religious fear generally led to oath-keeping" (1). In taking oaths different gods or things were sworn by. Achilles swore by Apollo that no one should lay violent hands upon Calchas (2), and again he swore by the sceptre which he held in assembly that longing for him would come upon the sons of the Achaeans when he had withdrawn from battle (3). Odysseus, in beggar's guise, swore by Zeus, the hospitable table, and the hearth of Odysseus that Odysseus was already in his native land (4). But the greatest of all oaths and the one generally used by the gods was "by the water of Styx, the greatest oath and most terrible to the blessed gods" (5). In bringing about the truce for the burial of the dead, Agamemnon merely lifted up his sceptre and said to the Trojan herald "and for the oaths, let Zeus be witness" (6). Before the single combat between Menelaus and Paris to determine whether the Trojans should give back Helen and all her possessions and pay recompense to the Argives, or whether Paris should keep Helen and the possessions, very elaborate ceremonies accompanied the taking of oaths. Animals were slaughtered, and wine poured to the gods who were invoked thus, "Zeus, most glorious, most great, and all ye immortal gods,

1. Keller p. 288.

2. Il. I. 86.

3. Il. I. 234.

4. Od. XVII. 155; Cf. Od. XIV. 158.

5. Il. XV. 38; Od. V. 135.

6. Il. VII. 411.

whichever folk be first to sin against the oaths, may their brains be so poured out -- theirs and their childrens', and let their wives be made subject unto strangers" (1). This instance seems to show the sacredness of the oaths and the severe punishment that might attend the breaking of them. This very oath, however, was broken by the Trojans when Pandarus wounded Menelaus (2), but the blame seems to have been attached to the gods, and not to Pandarus, for in Hector's speech to the Greeks, he said, "Our oaths of truce Cronus' son enthroned on high accomplished not; but evil is his intent and ordinance for both our hosts" (3). But as a clearer proof than this, we have the episode in which Athene entered the throng of Trojans and persuaded Pandarus saying, "Wilt thou now hearken to me, thou wise son of Lycaon ? Then wouldst thou take heart to shoot a swift arrow at Menelaus, and wouldst win favor and glory before all the Trojans. Shoot at glorious Menelaus, and vow to Apollo, the lord of archery to sacrifice a goodly hecatomb of firstling lambs when thou art returned to thy home" (4).

From the examples cited we observe that oaths were given to strengthen promises, to vouch for one's word, to establish cessation of hostilities, and to ratify certain agreements with regard to the outcome of a military engagement.

Not only is Mr. Keller's information concerning oaths very meagre, but it is out of place in the discussion of

1. Il. III. 300.

3. Il. VII. 69.

2. Il. IV. 121; 158; 270.

4. Il. IV. 85 ff.

punishments, as is also the statement that one's goods were not safe unless carefully guarded (1). Moreover this latter statement is incorrect as a conclusion drawn from the fact that Odysseus on his landing at Ithaca, was unwilling to leave his goods lying on the roadside while he made his way to the town. Of course a passerby would have picked up so valuable a find if he discovered it lying out in the woods or somewhere by the road. But this fact does not at all prove that goods had to be carefully guarded in order to prevent them from being stolen.

"In early ages", as Mr. Keller points out, "war with strangers was the first condition of any external contact" (2). Naturally then the motives accompanying war will give us the clearest ideas with regard to the development of inter-state relations. The author further shows that desire for booty was the greatest war motive and that "cattle-lifting" was the commonest form of this mode of warfare (3). Besides this desire for raiding the flocks of neighboring tribes, there was the love for human booty or slaves. Booty of this kind was confined almost wholly to women and children, as the men were usually slain. Next in order of importance Mr. Keller mentions the desire for treasure such as the armor of a foeman; which his slayer always stripped from the body if he could, and other treasures taken from the pillaged city itself.

1. Keller p. 288.

3. Keller p. 293.

2. Keller p. 292.

Thus far his discussion of war bears directly upon the question of interstate relations. But his discussion of the details of war, such as the manner of fighting, tactical arrangements, camp-fortification, guards, signal-fires, etc. (1) can logically have no place in this part of his work. His observation with regard to these points is, however, correct. For example he is right in saying that "cowardice was a shame, and death was the penalty for dessertion" (2), for Hector rebuked Polydamus thus (3), "Why dost thou fear war and battle ? For if all the rest of us be slain by the ships of the Argives, yet needst thou not fear to perish, for thy heart is not warlike, nor enduring in battle. But if thou dost hold aloof from the fight, or winnest any other with thy words to turn him from the war, straightway by my spear shalt thou be smitten, and lose thy life". The order of battle was, as arranged by Agamemnon, first the horsemen, with horses and chariots, behind them the many brave footmen, a bulwark of battle, and in the midst the cowards, since every man of necessity must fight. (4).

Mr. Keller points out (5) that "the usual expedients of camp-fortifications (6), guards (7), signal-fires (8),

1. Keller pp. 295-7.

2. Keller p. 295.

3. Il. XII. 248.

4. Il. IV. 293.

5. Keller p. 296.

6. Il. VII. 433.

7. Il. VII. 371.

8. Il. XVIII. 208.

watch-fires (1), lookouts (2), duels of champions (3), spies (4), etc. were in common use. Ambushes (5) were usual and the wounded were regularly rescued and carried from the field" (6).

Following this Mr. Keller gives at some length a discussion of guest-friendship (7). The account is accurate and contains all the details of this interesting phase of Homeric life. We have nothing in our social life today that exactly corresponds with this custom by which a stranger -- any and every stranger -- who came to a man's house became at once his guest under the protection of Zeus, and from a guest, became a friend of his host -- this friendship being handed down and observed religiously by the succeeding generations of the two original parties. The very best of entertainment was accorded such strangers, no questions were asked them until after they had partaken of some refreshment, and at their departure, valuable gifts were presented to them. Agamemnon had a breastplate which Kinyras of Cyprus gave him as a guest gift (8); Maron, priest of Apollo at Ismarus gave Odysseus a skin of wine, seven talents of gold, and a mixing bowl of silver (9); Arete bade the Phaeacians not to be in haste to dismiss their guest, Odysseus, not to stint their

1. Il. VIII. 509.

2. Il. XIV. 8.

3. Il. III. 16.

4. Il. X. 342.

5. Il. I. 227; XIII. 277.

6. Il. V. 663.

7. Keller p. 299.

8. Il. XI. 20.

9. Od. IX. 201.

gifts (1), and Odysseus was not a bit backward or modest about the matter for he said, "Might Alcinous, renowned of all, if you should bid me stay a year and then should send me forth, giving me splendid gifts, that is what I should choose; for much more profit would it be with fuller hands to reach my native land" (2). These gifts to Odysseus from the Phaeacians included bronze and gold and woven stuffs (3). The feelings of both giver and recipient were very frank and open. Telemachus begged Athene in the form of Mentes to stay and receive from him a "gift of value, very beautiful, to be a keepsake, even such a thing as dear friends give to friends". But Mentes answered, "Do not detain me longer now, when I am anxious for my journey. And any gift your heart may bid you give, give when I come again, for me to carry home. Choose one exceeding beautiful; it shall be matched in the exchange" (4). Menelaus offered Telemachus three horses and a polished car, but Telemachus refused them saying, "As for the gift that you would give, pray let it be some keepsake. Horses I will not take to Ithaca where there are no open runs or meadows. Not one of the islands is a place to drive a horse -- Ithaca least of all" (5). When Telemachus and the son of Nestor stood at the door of Menelaus' palace, Eteoneus, the squire of Menelaus, did not admit them at once, but went first to ask his master if he should unharness the

1. Od. XI. 339.

4. Od. I. 314.

2. Od. XI. 357.

5. Od. IV. 589.

3. Od. XIII. 135.

strangers' horses or send them elsewhere for entertainment. For his discourtesy to guests Menelaus severely rebuked his squire saying, "You were no fool Eteoneus, before this time, but now you chatter folly like a child ! Only because as guests we often had our food of strangers, are we here; and we must look to Zeus henceforth to keep us safe from harm. Take the harness from the strangers' horses and bring the men themselves within to share our feast" (1). Then when it was time for Telemachus to return home, and he expressed to Menelaus his desire to bring his stay to a close, his host answered, "Telemachus I will not keep you longer if you desire to go. I blame a host if overkind or over-rude. It is an equal fault to thrust away the guest who does not care to go, and to detain the impatient. Best make the stranger welcome while he stays, and speed him when he wishes" (2).

The feeling towards guests is summed up in the words of Alcinous (3), "For the worthy stranger's sake all things are ready now, escort and friendly gifts which we grant heartily. Even as a brother is the stranger and the suppliant treated by any man who feels a touch of wisdom".

One of the reasons -- in fact the main reason -- why Paris was held in such contempt by the Greeks, was the fact that he had betrayed the common trust between host and guest (4). The act of Heracles who slew a guest, was considered a

1. Od. IV. 31.

2. Od. XV. 68.

3. Od. VIII. 543.

4. Il. III. 351; XIII. 623.

monstrous crime (1).

Glaucus and Diomed, enemies on the battle-field, discovering that some of their fore-fathers had been guest-friends, clasped hands, pledged their faith, and exchanged armour by way of guest-gifts (2).

The advantages of this guest-friend relation Mr. Keller points out (3). The greatest service was to the traveller who found thus free hospitality, kind treatment, and a host who acted as defender, food provider, banker, sponsor, and escort. The safeguarding of the integrity of this relation involved public and private and probably local and national interests (4).

Summing up, Mr. Keller says, "Guest-friendship thus reached out into all phases of social life" (5), and it was so powerful a factor that because its laws were once violated, the Greek confederation of eleven thousand ships and about one hundred thousand men was mustered in its defense (6).

1. Od. XXI. 27.

2. Il. VI. 232.

3. Keller p. 307.

4. Keller p. 308.

5. Keller p. 311.

6. Keller p. 309.

3787M71
XK85

010-100742332

RECEIVED
NOV 29 1908
UNIV. OF MO.

~~This thesis is never to leave this room.~~

~~Neither is it to be checked out overnight.~~