

ders of men ; notwithstanding, men would not thinke it impossible, that the love which waxeth cold and dyeth in the most part, yet may revive and kindle in some men's hearts ; and that there may be found some that may neglect their ease and profit to doe the church good and God service, out of a sincere love and affection to God's honour and the church's good. Or if, in the world's infancy, men out of an ambitious humour, or at present for private advantages and expectation of gaine, thrust themselves out from their own dwellings into parts farre remote from their native soyle ; why should not we conceive, that, if they doe this for a corruptible croune, that the desire and expectation of an incorruptible (the reward of such as deny themselves for the service of God and his Church) may as strongly allure such as by patient continuance in well-doing seeke immortalitie and life ? And yet the favourable conceits that men entertaine of such as follow, in all their actions, the wages of their private gaine, and the jealousies that they are apt to entertaine of such as pretend onely the advancement of the Gospell, manifestly argue that the generall opinion of the world is, that some may be true to themselves and the advancement of their owne private estates, but hardly any to God and his Church. I should be very unwilling to thinke, they cherish this suspition upon that ground, that moved that sensuall Emperor to beleeve that no man was cleane or chaste in any part of his body, because himselfe was defiled and uncleane in all. This is then the first favour that is desired, of such as consider this action, to beleve that it is neither impossible nor unlikely, that these men's intentions are truly and really such as they pretend, and not colours and cloakes for secret dangerous purposes which they closely harbour in their breasts, especially when all apparent circumstances concurre to justifie the contrary." — pp. 79, 80.

ART. VII. — *Geschichte der Hellenischen Dichtkunst*, von Dr. GEORG HEINRICH BODE, Assessor der philosophischen Facultät zu Göttingen. — *Erster Band. Geschichte der Epischen Dichtkunst der Hellenen bis auf Alexandros den Grossen.* — *Zweiter Band. Geschichte der Lyrischen Dichtkunst der Hellenen bis auf Alexandros den Grossen.* *Erster Theil. Ionische Lyrik, nebst Abhandlungen über*

die ältesten Kultus- und Volkslieder, und über die Tonkunst der Hellenen. Leipzig. 1838. 8vo. pp. 524, 395.

History of Grecian Poetry, by DR. GEORGE HENRY BODE, Assessor of the Philosophical Faculty at Göttingen. — *Vol. I. History of the Epic Poetry of the Greeks, down to Alexander the Great.* — *Vol. II. History of the Lyric Poetry of the Greeks, down to Alexander the Great. Part First. Ionic Lyric Poetry, together with Essays upon the most Ancient Religious and Popular Songs, and upon the Music of the Greeks.*

DR. BODE is not unknown to scholars in the United States. A residence of several years, as Greek Instructor in the Northampton School, brought him into personal relations with the principal men of letters among us. His Essay on the Orphic Poetry also, written at a very early period of his life, was introduced to American scholars through the pages of this Journal,* and gave a most favorable impression of his abilities and learning. Soon after his return to Germany, he published an elaborate edition of several ancient mythographers, which confirmed the high opinion already formed of his literary attainments. The present work on the history of Greek poetical literature will place his name still higher among the scholars of the age, and will be an acceptable offering to the lovers of classical learning, wherever the German language is cultivated.

To undertake the history of Greek poetry is a very ambitious literary enterprise. Undoubtedly, the intellect of Greece was unfolded with wonderful symmetry. One life seems to have run through every form it assumed, whether in poetry, rhetoric, art, or philosophy. With all their diversities, the Greek people were singularly homogeneous, both physically and mentally. Their national existence, and their intellectual activity, were rounded off so as to be complete. Yet within the limits of this completeness, what diversities of intellectual habits, moral tendencies, and political views! How strangely the Spartan soldier contrasted with the Athenian gentleman, the *καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς* of the ancient writers! How widely the legislation of Solon departed from that of Lycurgus! And how the short, sharp, pithy conversational style of the Lacedæmonians, where wit and wisdom, repartee, sarcasm, and truth were blended, and formed a weapon,

* See *North American Review*, Vol. XXI. p. 388.

the edge of which nothing could resist, — how curiously this compares with the fluent politeness, the “O most wonderful,” “O most dear,” and the graceful irony, and boundless versatility, of the smoothly winding Attic dialogue. And then, how strange the contrast between Greece united against the Persian invader, the Lacedæmonian and Athenian fighting and falling side by side ; — and the same Greece broken into struggling parties, — the Spartan armies ravaging the Attic fields, and the Attic fleets wasting the Lacedæmonian shores, and each inflicting on the other all the horrors of the long-protracted Peloponnesian war ! How furious were the conflicts of opposite political principles ; democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy ! How violent the contrasts of philosophical opinions and systems ! And yet all these contrasts were bound together by a subtile, all-pervading national feeling, which made them a part and parcel of the one and only Greek character. This Greek character was perfectly stamped on Greek literature and art ; and a history of Greek literature cannot be severed from the history of art, nor from the political history of the country. For all these together form an organic whole, and are as intimately united as the limbs of an animated body. When they are sundered, life vanishes under the anatomist’s fingers.

The permanency of this Greek spirit is not the least surprising phenomenon in the history of the world. It has endured, from the first glimmering of historic light, down to the present day, and the analogies between recent events and those of former times are at once striking and instructive. Between three and four thousand years ago, a royal government was established in Athens, by a foreign prince, who hushed the quarrels of warring tribes, established or renewed the forms of civil life, and built on the Acropolis a stronghold against invaders. And it was but yesterday, that the same city, and the same Acropolis, with the old Pelasgic wall, which outdates Theseus and Cecrops, still standing, were entered by a foreign prince, and made the seat of a new Hellenic kingdom ; the centre of a civil power, which has already reduced the wild mountain tribes under a government of laws. Three thousand years ago the exploits of Grecian heroes, during a nine years’ warfare against the dwellers on the Asiatic shore, were chanted by the singers of the Grecian isles ; and singers of the same Grecian isles are even now celebrating the deeds of heroes in a nine

years' warfare with the swarthy hordes from the same Asiatic shore ; and a modern Odysseus, of Ithaca, stands among the highest heroic names. The bards have taken up again the broken harp of Greece ; and, though its compass is narrowed, and its strings are fewer than of old, still, tones of the old Hellenic spirit are drawn from it once more. Twenty-four or five centuries ago, Herodotus related the long train of slaughter and conflagrations that attended the Persian invasion, with the final overthrow of the turbaned Asiatics ; five or six years ago, Sourmeles sent out from the press of Ægina, a like history of a like invasion of turbaned Asiatics, which has gained for its author the appellation of the modern Thucydides. The assassination of Hipparchus, and the death of the assassin, were acted over again in the fate of Count Capo d'Istria. The piracies, mentioned by Homer, and described by Thucydides, have all been repeated, in modern times, among the islands of the Grecian seas. The superstitions of the Greek mythology are preserved, under slightly altered forms, among the songs of the Klephtic mountaineers. "They are the same *canaille*," remarked a French merchant in Athens, "that they were in the days of Themistocles." They have undergone innumerable revolutions and reverses ; they have been ground to the earth by successive tyrants, who have, one after another, been swept away ; but they have always cherished their national recollections, and their ancient Hellenic pride ; they have written and spoken substantially the language of their great ancestors ; they have ever refused to mingle with their barbarian oppressors ; among their mountain fastnesses, a portion of them have preserved their Grecian liberty, as well as their Grecian spirit, unextinguished. Some have engaged in commerce, and acquired wealth ; others have frequented the Universities of Western Europe, and returned thence, laden with the treasures of science and literature. Under all these circumstances they have never lost the consciousness of national existence, nor the mighty memories of the past ; and they bear, to this day, in their features, indelible marks of their descent from those ancients, whose perfect forms are immortalized in the marble. They are the same *ελλικωπιες Ἀχαιοί*, the same bright-eyed Achæans, of whom Homer sung "three thousand years ago."

The political history of the Greeks has been handled in various ways by modern writers. The English, whose po-

litical experience and practical liberty give them great advantages for understanding the spirit of foreign and ancient history, have devoted much attention to the Grecian States. But the value of their labors has been materially diminished by the fact, that their ablest historical writers have permitted the prejudices and partialities of modern political divisions to sway their judgments upon the events and characters of remote antiquity ; so that what is gained on the one hand, is, perhaps, more than lost on the other. Mitford's "History of Greece," though, in many respects, a work of considerable ability, is notoriously false in historical coloring. All the most important events of Grecian history are distorted, and all the most illustrious characters of antiquity, are blackened, merely to gratify a rancorous hatred against every form of popular liberty. A proceeding of this kind, conducted on such a prodigious scale, can never be too severely stigmatized. On the other hand, Bulwer's flashy History of Athens, is a work too thoroughly fictitious, perhaps, to be subjected to the principles of historical criticism ; yet, as it passes for a real history, and makes no ordinary pretensions to scholarship, and is called a history by its author, it will probably be so received by what affects to be the reading public. What the value of this pretender's historical judgments may be, is sufficiently shown by his defence of that monstrous institution of the Athenian democracy, the *ostracism*.!!! We are not going too far, when we say, that, considered as histories, both these works are worse than worthless ; for they are written on principles radically wrong. They are false, beginning, middle, and end. Considered as works of fiction, some people may find them entertaining. They are certainly full of invention.

Still less has been done towards illustrating the literary history of Greece by English scholars. In fact, no profound and comprehensive view of Greek literature has ever been attempted in the English language. Classical learning has, it is true, been always one of the leading objects of British education ; and there have always been, at the British Universities, men of distinguished classical attainments. Their contributions, however, to the stores of classical learning, for the use of the whole literary world, have been comparatively unimportant. The great Bentley was a man of astonishing reach of mind and vigor of reasoning ; but his attempts upon the text of ancient authors may be estimated, and fairly esti-

mated, by his conjectural emendations of Milton's "Paradise Lost." Porson was an eminent scholar; but he did very little, indeed, for the promotion of classical learning; and even that little, particularly in the department of metre, is of no great value at present. It is very curious to observe, how mechanical and slavish English scholarship has been since; and with what reverence the *dicta* of a few distinguished men have been almost universally received and regarded. For example, if an expression is found in a Greek tragedian, which defies the canons of the great masters, the commentator remarks, "This expression *violates* the canon of Dawes," or "This line cannot be reconciled with the principle of Porson," or "Porson says it must be so and so;" as if the canon of Dawes and the principles of Porson were the first authorities to be consulted, and the ancient author himself really had but little to do with settling the question; and the chances are, that the genuine text will be mutilated, to make it correspond with the rule so mechanically laid down. Elmsley's ludicrous fanaticism against anapæsts in Tragic Iambic verse is a fair example of the epidemic pedantry among the older English scholars. Blomfield's *Æschylus*, a work, upon the whole, of creditable learning, offers readings which the poet-soldier, if he could rise from his grave, would look upon with wonder, if not with indignation. It is impossible to conceive a more atrocious piece of literary quackery, than cutting and slashing the lines of an ancient poet, to enable the modern reader to count off the syllables at his fingers' ends. Poetical rhythm is to be judged more by the musical sense, than by the *tum-ti* systems of learned gentlemen, who have deadened their perceptions of nature by the thousand-fold subtleties of mere verbal criticism. A better spirit has been recently shown among the Hellenists of England. Mitchell's edition of a part of the Comedies is an honor to British scholarship; and the same may be said of Arnold's *Thucydides*. Thirlwall's "History of Greece," also, is entitled to very high praise.

In Germany, on the contrary, the study of classical antiquity has been prosecuted with boundless industry and learning. The German scholars, apart from the concerns of practical and political life, have created, in regions of science, letters, and art, a career of intellectual activity, which they have followed up with a zeal and enthusiasm elsewhere unequalled. The two languages of classical antiquity have been explored by them with the most minute and searching care; they have

been illustrated from every conceivable source ; and if their full import has not been perfectly brought to light, it is because of the impossibility of restoring all the meaning and variety of languages, which have ceased to be used in the living intercourse of men. The best grammars of the Latin and Greek languages have been written by Germans ; except the immortal work of Forcellini (the "Totius Latinitatis Lexicon"), incomparably the best dictionaries of the Latin and Greek languages have been written by Germans ; the most learned, comprehensive, and thorough works on the arts and antiquities of the Greeks and Romans have been written by Germans ; so that the classical scholar, who is ignorant of what the Germans have done, in every department of ancient learning, must be content to remain far behind the scholarship of the age.

But the peculiar circumstances, in which the German literati are placed, have led them as a body, into faults of a grave character, which the American student must sedulously guard himself against. They are much inclined to paradoxical opinions for the sake of their novelty ; their theoretical views are not sufficiently tempered down by common sense and the experience of daily life ; they are apt to lose themselves in the airy regions of abstruse speculation ; they often reject old views for no better reason than that they are old, and supply their place by new ones, which are supported by the slenderest possible proofs ; they elevate a single fact, or a mere hint, by itself of little or no consequence, into an unwarranted dignity, by making it the basis of a theory, or a leading idea of some startling and paradoxical system ; and it must be confessed, they are fond of abusing their privilege of being mystical and obscure in their style, to a degree unheard of among other nations. All these remarks are supported, also, by the admissions of some of their most sensible writers. Thus it happens, that, while we may regard the German scholars as admirable models of patient research, and conscientious industry, and while we must resort to the treasures which they have accumulated, if we would investigate any department of learning to the best advantage, still we must enter a protest against taking them, as a general rule, for models of arrangement, style, and reasoning. The perfect ideal of a scholar would be one, who should unite the labor and learning of the German, the practical sense of the Eng-

lishman, and the transparent clearness and admirable method of the Frenchman.

But it is time to return to the work, whose title is placed at the head of this article. It is marked, both by the excellences and defects, which belong to its German origin. In learning, it is minute, extensive, and profound. Scarcely a fact, in the history of those branches of Greek literature, which are taken up in the volumes already published, has escaped the author's vigilant eye. Every topic, both of fact and speculation, every question, both of ancient and modern criticism, every view, that has heretofore been presented on the contested points of Greek learning, is dealt with according to the author's judgment of its importance. But this truly German method has led him into an excessive detail, which grows occasionally tedious, even to the most conscientious reader. Amidst such a multiplicity of particulars, we fail to arrive at distinct, general views. We lose our way in the labyrinth of minute discussions, and look about us in vain for some Ariadne's thread to guide us out into the clear light of day. The author fails, too often, to gather up the separated lines of his learned inquiries, and draw them all into a single, irresistible conclusion. The work is not a well-proportioned edifice. Some parts are dwelt upon altogether too long, and are raised to an importance wholly out of proportion to their general bearing upon the rest. But he frequently presents illustrations of his views, drawn from the world of ancient art, that are at once beautiful and instructive; and we do not know a writer, who has more successfully availed himself of this abundant source of tasteful analogies and convincing argument. Besides excessive details, it seems to us, that the learned author has erred on the side of excessive divisions and subdivisions of his subject-matter. It may, perhaps, be a question, whether the literature of any nation can be adequately set forth, upon any other plan than that of taking up its several branches, and completing the history of each by itself. But we are inclined to think, that a history which should present all the literary phenomena, as they arose, giving to each its proper place and its just weight, and blending the political fortunes of the nation, so far as would be necessary to present a complete, well-proportioned, and harmonious picture of the collective intellect of the people, would be more satisfactory, than the

most elaborate and able work, which represents the literary achievements of a people, as it were, by piecemeal. This remark is particularly true, when we apply it to the literature of the Greeks, on account of the extraordinary homogeneity of all their intellectual achievements, as we have before observed. A work upon the other principle, especially if its author sees fit to publish it by single volumes, almost necessarily loses the interest of a completed whole, and fails to give the pleasing impression of correct proportions. Now these two things are the leading characteristics of all the productions of Grecian genius, and ought to characterize every work devoted to the exposition of the intellectual life of the Greeks. We cannot affirm, that Dr. Bode's work fulfills this condition.

The first volume is devoted to the history of epic poetry, and we quote from the Introduction the following passage, for the sake of letting the author express the principles by which he has been guided, in his own way.

“The poetry of the Greeks was unfolded from the very midst of the whole nation, like an intellectual power; it was not propagated under a stiff and contracted form, by artificial and toilsome care, as the heir-loom of particular classes. It may be set forth under two principal historical bearings. We may consider it as a complete whole, though its inward connexion is often made out only from uncertain fragmentary accounts; in the frequently recurring voids, the connexion can, for the most part, be divined only by analogies drawn from free combinations, and can rarely be ascertained with clearness. Then the history of it must endeavour to grasp the intellectual spirit and purport of the national life, so far as they have been expressed under the forms of poetry, and to follow them out, through all the steps of culture, and in all their phenomena. By this psychological method, our investigation brings us to a clear perception of the interior course of poetry, and might furnish no small contribution towards the history of man, if, at the same time, it should point out the close connexion, which was kept up, with ever increasing importance, between the poetical activity of the Greeks and all their political relations, however modified by considerations of morality and religion, from the earliest beginnings of their national existence, to the period when their political and intellectual powers were completely unfolded. The delineation will, therefore, dwell longer upon the most eminent minds, because by their creations we are most exactly acquainted with every step in the progress of the national mind,

and because they have at the same time given the most powerful impulse to new careers of activity. Regarding these, then, as the main pillars, on which the whole structure is supported, we shall find it easy to point out by analogy the symmetrical proportions of the single parts to the whole, which whole consists in what may be called an intellectual unity, even with regard to the connecting links which have been lost; for all the forms of Grecian poetry have been unfolded by a growth so perfectly natural and regular, that each makes a whole of itself, and is guarded against all intermixture with other species, by a definite type and outline, within which the same conformity to law prevails. Such a representation of Grecian poetry from within, however, and the treatment of its external history, which is the other point of view from which it may be delineated, are by no means to be divided, if all the peculiarities and phenomena, embraced by the comprehensive province of poetical activity, are to be historically recorded, and brought under a general view coextensive with the purpose to be accomplished.

“A distribution of the whole into definite portions and classes is the more necessary here, since a mere record of all the monuments of poetry, without classification, would only have the appearance of an unorganized mass. But, while making such an external disposition of the parts, we must be careful never to lose sight of the collective culture of the nation, so far as this has been taken up into the poetical literature, and made a portion of its conscious existence. It forms what may be called the frame-work to the proper picture of the poetry, referring, as it does, to the personal relations of the several poets after the received accounts of the ancients, defining the peculiarities of their art, according to their works, or to fragments of their works, and seeking to give a fair view of their poetical import, according to settled principles of criticism. By this method, we can easily take the several species of poetry from the great affluence of the literary phenomena and trace them out by themselves. These various kinds of poetry have exercised the powers of genius in very different gradations, sometimes freely and nobly; at others, under a contracted form, and merely by accident. Besides, as long as the separated races of the collective Hellenic nation existed free and independent, the different species of poetry also were freely and independently unfolded, and their peculiar tendencies may, therefore, be easily detected, and arranged under the given classes. But the literary historian must not make this specification of classes his final aim; on the contrary, it must be subordinated to the higher laws of the inner repre-

sentation, which endeavours to grasp the fixed and organic connexion of the entire poetical efforts of the age, that are recorded by outward history only one by one or in homogeneous masses, and to bring them into a united whole, wherever this can be done. But to facilitate the general survey, even with regard to the interior history, it is necessary to adhere to definite epochs, although they may break up the unobstructed course of poetry. But clearness of view in the general representation demands this sacrifice, although we often have to take up together those phenomena of a new epoch, the roots of which run into a preceding period; which owe to its fruitful soil, not only their existence, but their most efficient nutriment, and which are lost again among the variegated multitude of intellectual tendencies, so that it remains doubtful under what division of time they may most suitably be placed. According to this view, therefore, the entire extent of Greek poetry, down to the time of Alexander the Great, should first be laid off into the three leading species, the Epic, the Lyric, and the Dramatic, after we have taken a preliminary survey of the indefinite period of mythical antiquity.

“When, therefore, we proceed to the division by epochs, we must make the first or preliminary period extend from the earliest dawn of poetical activity to the time of Homer, representing particularly the Orphic age. The second period, from Homer down to the Persian wars, Ol. 72, 3, or 490 before Christ, embraces the range of Greek national poetry, according to the threefold division into Ionic, Æolic, and Doric. It includes the historical progress of the Epic, the Ionic Lyric, particularly of Elegiac and Iambic poetry, of the Lesbian and Æolian *melos*, and of the Doric choral odes, tracing them through all their manifold appearances and directions, and thus prepares for the third period, which extends to the time of Alexander, Ol. 111, 1, or 336 years before Christ, embracing the entire literature of the Drama, according to the three divisions of Tragic, Satyric, and Comic. It is called the Attic period also, and it united within its limits the most complete creations of epic and lyric poetry, and moulded them into magnificent works of art for theatrical representation. The long interval between the age of Alexander and the capture of Constantinople in 1453, contains nothing but repetitions and variations of the earlier kinds of poetry. These were no longer the natural and necessary growth of organic culture. They were single and disconnected attempts, which were raised to beauty of form, at the beginning, by the toilsome efforts of Alexandrian scholarship, on the basis of classical poetry. After the establishment of the Roman Universal Empire, which took place 30 years before

Christ, they branched out anew into sophistic subtilities. They sunk lower and lower, however, through the merely literary pursuits, which were the prevailing objects of the times, and finally, after Justinian, A. D. 529, degenerated into the unnatural distortions of the Byzantine Christian, or Middle Greek, style." — Vol. I. pp. 3–6.

It has been common among writers to set aside the inquiries of the Greeks themselves into their own antiquities of literature and art. This has been too hastily done. But it is true, that, with regard to some points, the Greek inquirers indulged too freely in merely fanciful speculations; that they amused themselves with etymological whims, which the sounder views of modern scholarship have rejected. Still, it must be admitted, that some of the Greek philosophers at least were men of careful industry, patient research, calm and cool judgment, as well as of brilliant imagination and splendid eloquence; and to set aside the opinions of such men, considering too the vast abundance of the materials which they had and we have not, is the very height of literary arrogance. The traditions of Orpheus, and the poetry which passed under his name, were an early object of investigation to the lively and curious-minded Greek. The dim legends concerning the roaming life of Homer were a fascinating theme of speculation and inquiry; and other epic bards and lyric poets were by no means neglected. The hints that are scattered here and there over the works of Aristotle, with regard to the early history of Greek poetry, are invaluable guides to inquirers at the present day. He wrote a treatise on the poets, consisting of three books, and another of equal length on the art of poetry, out of which an incoherent abridgment was afterwards made, confined principally to epic and dramatic poetry, which, in spite of its fragmentary state, contains the best exposition of the Hellenic theory of art. Besides this, he wrote independent treatises on some of the most distinguished poets, such as Homer and Euripides; six books of Homeric inquiries, and essays upon the Olympic and Pythian victors, upon the Dionysiac contests, and upon Tragedies, and tragic instruction. This branch of study was zealously followed up by his disciples, and to a certain extent by the elder Platonists. Works on the poets were also written by Phanius of Eresus, and Hieronymus of Rhodes; and the celebrated Heracledes of Pontus was the author of an important work on

poetry and the poets. Glaucus of Rhegium wrote upon the elder poets and musicians; and numerous other names of more or less note have been handed down to us from antiquity, in connexion with this line of inquiry. The view which Dr. Bode presents, of what the Greeks themselves accomplished for the history of poetry, is at once learned and interesting, condensed and comprehensive.

We translate the following remarks on the Greek philosophy of art.

“It cannot be exactly ascertained, at how early a period the art of the Greeks was made a particular theme of speculation. Here and there a few hints on its nature, aim, laws, and effects, occur in the oldest poems of the Greeks themselves. But worthy as these are to be examined by the expounder of the theory of art, properly so called, still they afford no certain insight into the philosophical view and the development of art among the ancients. With respect to the latter, we have only to consider the demands which the speculation of the philosopher makes upon the works of the artist. We have nothing to do with the plastic impulse, which is present clearly to the poet's soul at the moment of creation, and from which the work of art proceeds. This impulse, however, is not required to unfold the laws upon which the work of art is constructed and completed. A poem, on the contrary, which exhibits most clearly to the philosophic eye its own conformity to law, is the more noble and complete the fewer outward marks it bears of antecedent reflection upon the principles of art involved in its structure. We should not, therefore, draw a conclusion too hastily from the excellence of the creations of Hellenic art, as to a high point of completeness of the Greek theory, at least so far as it was expressed in written works.

But still, the philosophers of the most ancient times, when art was yet in the full vigor of its active powers, began to turn their attention to the establishing of those laws, which modify its character and limit its extent. The theoretical views of music, which was always inseparable from poetry, were indeed completed earlier in the general theory of Greek art, and were first set forth by Pythagoras and his disciples upon mathematical principles. Philolaus seems to have investigated this subject most earnestly. Like most of the Pythagoreans, he founded his theory on the observance of a relation of quantity between the higher and lower tones, and endeavoured to define this relation by abstract reason, without taking the intimations of the senses at all into the account. This is what constitutes the calming and purifying power which the Pythagoreans attributed to music; and for

this reason, and in perfect accordance with the mathematical and speculative intellectual tendencies in general, they approved only of such harmonies as produce the abovementioned effect. Yet the elder Pythagoreans appear not to have left behind them any special treatises upon music in itself considered, and apart from their philosophical system. The oldest work on music known to antiquity, was written by Lasus, the instructor of Pindar ; but to what extent the author carried his idea of music, and particularly whether he discussed also what is properly called poetry, is unknown. Democritus, an early contemporary of Socrates, and a thinker of strong powers and various culture, occupied himself upon these studies in a wider range. No less than ten musical works are mentioned as his. These embraced nearly every part of the theory of art, particularly poetry, rhythm, and harmony, the beauty of the epic, the harsh or agreeable sounds of the letters, Homer, orthoepy, song, diction, together with an onomasticon, painting, and perspective. But, as Suidas acknowledges but two works of Democritus as genuine, it is probable that most of the abovementioned treatises were written by other authors bearing the same name. For example, Diogenes mentions a musician, called Democritus of Chios, who must have been a contemporary of the philosopher of Abdera, and who certainly instituted special inquiries into many subjects of his art, as some still-existing fragments of his writings indicate. But the great Abderite was one of the first who expressed the opinion, with regard to the essence of poetry, that it was not so much a work of art as of an indwelling divine power of inspiration, an unconscious mastery of genius, a nobler kind of madness. By these strong and bold expressions, which Democritus used elsewhere in his representations, he certainly intended merely to oppose the view of those, who regarded poetry as a faculty that might be acquired by effort and practice, like logic and rhetoric. But that such a view existed at that time, and was frequently discussed, may besides be inferred from the flourishing state of the sophistic art, to which Democritus must have felt as great an aversion as Socrates. And it is worthy of remark, that the Platonic Socrates also shares this opinion with Democritus, that poetry is an original and mighty power springing from the inmost regions of the soul, which can only lend a greater vigor to the poet's genius, and that it consists in a kind of possession. 'For,' says he, 'the third species of madness comes from the Muses. It seizes upon pure and tender souls, urges them to pour out their divine delirium in songs of every kind, and moulds the coming times, by embellishing the numberless great deeds of the past. But he who, without the madness of the Muses, draws

nigh the portals of poesy, supposing that art alone can make him a poet, remains unsuccessful, and fails to enter the sanctuary. He, and the poetry of the self-possessed, are nothing in comparison with the poetry of the mad.' This view, which was received with equal favor both by the poets and philosophers, because the Hellenic faith derived it from an ancient tradition, furnished every thinking mind with the most appropriate symbol for his lofty musings upon the essence of creative art, which appears to most men incomprehensible and divine, and, according to the expression of the sagacious Pindar, cannot be acquired. Such a divinely-inspired sense Democritus attributed to Homer, who often places himself figuratively under the immediate influence of a higher power, to whose control he submits; he said of Homer at the same time, 'He built the structure of the varied verse.' When speaking of other poets, Homer generally derives the impulse to song from Apollo and the Muses, and calls them at the same time, *self-taught*; whence it is clear, that, when he himself composed, he was fully conscious of his own activity, and could not really have believed that the self-acting mind was overmastered by a divine power coming from abroad; a fact which is likewise shown by the quiet clearness of his poetry. Democritus, therefore, spoke only poetically of the inborn power of the poet, somewhat as Homer himself speaks, but by no means as the comic poets affirmed more in jest than in earnest, that the poet could draw genuine inspiration only from the wine-cup, and that the state of intoxication was the best fitted for the production of poetic works of art.

"There is but little information to be drawn from Plato, and scarcely any thing from later authors, upon the mode in which the elder sophists were accustomed to handle the theory of poetry, or at least to put on the appearance of being able to speak upon it with scientific precision. According to Plato, they treated the old poets like sophists in disguise, and had the art of proving out of them the most contradictory propositions. Still they threw out, here and there, some acute expressions, by which they often showed a just idea of the nature of art, without being able to subject the conception to a precise philosophical analysis, especially the conception of the beautiful as the highest aim of art. But contemporaneously with them, Socrates, in his unceasing effort to pierce through outside appearances, and to make the moral essence of all the labors and creations of man an immediate subject of knowledge, applied his severe method of criticism to poetry.* This was more

* We are not quite sure, that we have here given the precise meaning of our author. German speculators, in criticism as well as philosophy, some-

completely carried out by Plato, and, from his point of view, was elevated to the rank of a scientific theory.

"The views of Socrates are expressed with greater fidelity by Xenophon than by Plato, who often makes his master unfold opinions that are purely Platonic, and that are not a little inconsistent with the accounts of Xenophon. Socrates himself, as it appears, held the good and the beautiful to be identical, and defined both according to the usefulness for this or that end, to which they were designed originally to correspond. This conception he applied both to spiritual and material beauty, but the reporter engages in no proper analysis of the conception; he affirms, however, that Socrates was the inventor of that well-known theory of art, according to which a beautiful piece of sculpture is to be formed by combining the single beauties that are scattered over nature. This was really the method adopted by the sculptors of that age, among whom Socrates himself was once numbered, and consequently was able to speak upon the subject with accuracy."—Vol. 1. pp. 23, 28.

This general outline is followed by an essay on Plato's philosophy of art. This great writer was the first who reduced all the phenomena of art under the general head of imitation. He regards not only the forms of the external materials, but also the mental images of the ideal world, which art loves to embody, as imitations. According to his theory, the poet can have no free exercise of will, creative fancy can enjoy no independent action, but the highest problem of poetry is to apprehend and set forth things as they actually exist. It must be added, to give a fair exhibition of his views, that the Greeks considered the world of ideas, as something existing by itself, and placed far above the ever-recurring changes of human opinions, and that they had a peculiar power of incorporating thought, and of setting forth these ideas under established types. This facility of giving to ideas a sensible representation naturally produced among the reflecting Greeks the opinion, that the artist had nothing to do but to imitate or

times hide their meaning under so many coatings of metaphysical phraseology, that it is next to impossible to find it. The dubious part of the sentence is as follows; — "im unablässigen Streben, den wahren ethischen Gehalt alles menschlichen Schaffens und Treibens, aus der Tiefe der Erscheinungen zur objectiven Erkenntniss zu bringen," literally, "in the unceasing effort to bring the true ethical import (or intrinsic worth) of all the creation and business of man, from the depth of phenomena to objective recognition." The passion for words that look profound, diminishes materially the value of many otherwise excellent and learned works by the German scholars.

set forth the intellectual images existing in his own soul, and is by no means to be regarded as himself the creator of those ideas. This is the fundamental principle of poetic imitation, which forms the starting-point of Plato's speculations, and differs essentially from the modern theory of the mere imitation of nature. To form a correct opinion of Plato's judgment upon the relative value of poetry, we must place ourselves upon the same height of speculation, from which he surveyed all the creations of art. But he regards the unchangeable harmony of the world of ideas as "the very head and front" of his philosophy, and adopts the hypothesis of a former state of existence, where men lived in the immediate contemplation of the true and eternal beauty of ideas. All knowledge to which man can again arrive, consists according to him, only in reminiscences; but memory itself flows from everlasting being, and thus assures us of the immortality of the soul. Now, when the creative impulse is begun, and the memory of the idea stands clearly before us, then begins the act of imitation, or of bodying forth the idea. The very first intuition of the idea changes the ordinary condition of the soul, and begets that enthusiasm which creates from memory, and in which the real essence of things is brought to light. Regarded as a special favor of the deity, this state of mind, which even Plato calls madness, is by no means inconsistent with the possession of reason and understanding, but must be considered as the source of the highest blessings. Still madness and rationality, which this condition would seem to unite, stand in the sharpest contradiction to each other; a contradiction which Plato reconciles, by drawing a distinction between the madness which springs from human infirmity, and that which springs from a divine exaltation of the ordinary state of the soul. But, as he believes the divine madness to be something wholly different from a common disorder of the mind, so is the rationality, which guides the divine madness to imitative activity, something wholly different from the perishing reason, whereby the ordinary man regulates mere external affairs, but can never move in the higher region of the divine. The more noble and philosophical reason, according to Plato, stands at a higher point, and begins to act only where common sense sees its final end and aim. It recog-

nises the reality of divine things, and constantly endeavours to accompany the enthusiasm, that is, the inspiration of the divine power, to discover the true nature of things in the memory, and to find out and secure the immortal element in the mortal, and devotes its whole existence to the love of philosophical investigation. But now, mere human reason, without the divine inspiration, undertook to exercise itself upon art. Art, however, within this earthly circle, only implies a faculty or talent, and is again opposed to the inspiration of the Muses. That only, which man produces under this creative impulse and enthusiasm, belongs to genuine art, and is by no means to be confounded with the results of mere technical ability; but Plato thinks creative impulse can hardly be called art with propriety, because it is not produced by the application of scientific knowledge, does not move within circles drawn by itself, nor can be extended at will. It is an inborn power of the mind, excited by an impulse from within, but guided and carried forward by reason. Considered from this point of view, Plato's noble disquisitions upon poetical inspiration, as the opposite of an acquired accomplishment, and of the poetry of the understanding, appear in a wholly different light from that in which they are usually regarded. It is called without qualification a divine gift, and is beautifully compared to a magnet, which not only shows its inward power by attraction, but also imparts it to objects with which it is brought into contact. For, according to him, the Muse first inspires the poets, and these communicate some part of their inspiration to other men, such as the rhapsodists.

These are some of the leading views of Plato, which Dr. Bode has carried out to a great length of detail, and with a thorough mastery of the subject. We have no very coherent statements of the theoretical opinions held by the other disciples of Socrates, and by the elder disciples of Plato. Although art, and beauty, which is the aim of art, were the most favorite subjects of philosophical speculation, yet no deeper views of its nature and essence seem to have been presented by them. The Cynic philosophers, Antisthenes in particular, refused to acknowledge any thing as beautiful, which was not shown to be good at the same time. They would have nothing to do with beautiful appearance, and waged war upon the whole circle of the Hellenic *μουσική*. Of the Socratic philoso-

phers, who occupied themselves more expressly upon the conception of art, the names of three are handed down; Crito, who wrote on poetry and the beautiful; Simmias the Theban, who investigated poetry, the beautiful, and other kindred subjects; and Simon the Athenian, whose works on poetry, music, and the beautiful, show that investigations of this sort were then very zealously carried on. Aristotle, who assumed the idea of imitation as the starting-point of his inquiries, by a more careful development of the idea of imitation considered in itself, arrived at a result wholly different from Plato's. Far from rejecting poetry, and particularly dramatic, because it rests upon the principle of imitation, he finds precisely in this its highest perfection; for he assumes, that it contains not a mere feeble copy of the idea, but by imitation embodies the idea itself, and thus appears an independent and absolute power, which brings its works to light by the same necessity and under the same laws as nature, without being an imitation of nature.

“ Nature, as the principle of motion, changes, by what is called the *ἐπιτέλεια*, the idea of being into being itself; and the aim of this change is the form which the material puts on. Every species of poetry, every subdivision of the single species of poetry, nay, every single work of art, carries, therefore, in itself its own law, and its inward truth. But the poet's imitation, according to Aristotle, consists in the representation of an idea, or a thing, according to its inward necessity and truth. At the same time there are two kinds of imitation, distinct from each other. In a stricter sense, the poet imitates, when he takes the part of another, that is, when he represents foreign characters and not himself. But when he relates in his own person concerning others, or makes himself the object of poetry, there is no imitation, strictly speaking. So, also, that part of music only is called imitative, which represents on the stage the passion of the player. In a broader sense, however, Aristotle calls poetry and music, in their whole extent, imitative, so far as they aim to set forth the truth of their own indwelling idea. For the delight we take in art springs not from the idea of the beautiful, but partly from the essence of imitation (as every imitator takes pleasure in his own activity, and the impulse to learn and to imitate is implanted in man by nature,) and partly from the truth of the object represented to its own laws, whether it be beautiful or deformed. On this fundamental view, the further development of the idea of each of

the fine arts, and of their various branches, rests; and no Greek philosopher has endeavoured to define the nature and essence with so much impartiality, and depth of investigation, as Aristotle." — Vol. I. pp. 53, 54.

The author proceeds to a careful statement and examination of Aristotle's theoretical principles, and does his work in the thorough and *exhaustive* manner, which belongs to German inquirers, by right of birth. This is followed by an account of the Stoic and Epicurean theories, and those of Plutarch and the rhetoricians, and the Introduction is closed by an essay on the classification of poetry.

Dr. Bode introduces his long and detailed discussion of the Orphic age with the following very just observations.

"Among all the nations of the earth, the Greeks had the most brilliant mythical antiquity, out of which the flower of epic poetry sprang as naturally, as afterwards the flower of lyric poetry sprang from the clearly ascertained period of history. When the mythical age passed away, the circle of epic poetry, too, was in itself completed. This finished form has been happily preserved and handed down in the Homeric poems, which must, therefore, have come into existence about the close of the mythical period, and must, at the same time, mark the line where the historical existence of the Greeks begins. The *mythi*, which Homer relates, are not, however, his own invention, but, on the contrary, strike their roots into the historical soil, which has, by no means, been hidden from our sight by the oral traditions, through which they were brought down to after times. Now the formation of *mythi*, wherein real events assume a nobler form, and rise to a higher point of moral dignity, presupposes the actual existence of a great poetical power among the nation; a power no longer limited to the narrow range of individual feeling and experience, but raised, within certain definite limitations of space, to a broader perception of things in their more general external relations.* The richer and the more finished, therefore, is the mythical history of a nation, the earlier, also, must their poetical activity have

* This is another specimen of a philosophical sentence. The German of the last part is, — "welche nicht mehr auf der untersten Stufe subjectiver Beschränktheit steht, sondern sich bereits zu einer allgemeineren objectiven Erkenntniss in bestimmten räumlichen Verhältnissen erhoben hat." Literally, "which stands no more upon the lowest step of subjective limitation, but has already raised itself to a more general objective cognition in definite relations of space."

been moulded upon the established principle. Unhappily, the first beginnings of poetry, among all original nations, have disappeared at the same time with the earliest unfolding of the mythical age which produced them. The Greeks themselves, at least in the age of historical investigation, had by no means come to a settled conviction, that the Homeric *epos* was the oldest among all the monuments of poetry they had received from former times. What had been composed before Homer, must have gone down amidst the splendor of this epic sun. But, from the long ante-Homeric period, nothing has been preserved, but the memory of a few celebrated names, which are not, however, all mentioned by the oldest poetical records, and which, for this or some other reason, were often the subjects of doubt and uncertainty, even among the ancients. The most conspicuous among these was Orpheus, whom the Greeks, by reason of an ancient tradition, were accustomed to regard as the representative of the mythical age of poetry." — Vol. 1. pp. 87, 88.

There is no doubt, that the earliest form, in which the genius of Greece manifested itself, was the poetical; and the earliest poetry was devoted to religious and moral themes. The mythologies, theogonies, and cosmogonies of the ancient world were arranged and embellished by the poets. Indeed, the higher we ascend into the regions of antiquity, the closer is the connexion between poetry and every subject of human thought. Philosophy uttered her earliest precepts and laws in poetical numbers. The poets were the first to invent and describe the forms of the gods and heroes. Phidias borrowed his conception of the Olympian Jupiter, from the noble description of Homer; and, again, the tragic and lyric poets transferred to their works the painted and sculptured deities, with which every Grecian city was peopled. The names only, as Dr. Bode observes, of some of the oldest religious poets, such as Orpheus, Musæus, Linus, Pamphus, and Olen, have been preserved. These poets sustained the threefold character of singers, priests, and prophets. Ministers of religion, they composed the hymns and prayers which were chanted in the sacred ceremonies; and the people regarded them as the friends and favorites of the gods, from whom they were supposed to have received a knowledge of futurity. The names of these poets, and all the traditions concerning them, point to a northern source, whence all the streams of religion and poetry flowed. Olym-

pus, Helicon, Parnassus, and Pindus were the ancient seats of their primeval culture. It is truly remarked, by a late learned writer ;

“ In Thessaly and Bœotia, afterwards so barren in men of genius, there is not a spring, a river, a hill, or a forest, with which poetry has not associated some delightful recollection. There flowed the Peneus ; there was the vale of Tempe ; in Thessaly, Apollo, banished from heaven, lived as a shepherd amidst a happy people ; there the Titans warred against the gods. In a word, poetry, with which the civilization of Greece commenced, came to her from the North, and to Thessaly may be applied the fine verses of an English poet.

“ A different sort
From the high neighbouring hills, which was their seat,
Down to the plain descended ; by their guise
Just men they seemed, and all their study bent
To worship God aright, and know his works,
Not hid, nor those things lost, which might preserve
Freedom and peace to man.’ ” *

But very few facts are known of any of these poets. Linus of Chalcis was represented as the son of Apollo, and one of the Muses. His memory was honored with a festival at Thebes ; but his works have wholly perished, unless we admit the genuineness of a few lines, ascribed to him by Stobæus, on the celebrated proposition of the Eleatic philosophers ; *Ἐκ παντός διὰ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐκ πάντων πᾶν ἐστίν*. “ From the whole are all things sprung, and from all things the whole ; ” a proposition worthy of the genius of the profoundest among certain philosophers of the present day. Pamphus of Athens was said to be the disciple of Linus, and to have composed hymns for the hereditary priesthood of Eleusis ; those in honor of Love, the Graces, and Neptune, are particularly mentioned. Olen, commonly designated as the Hyperborean, led a priestly colony from the North, which settled in the island of Delos, where he introduced the worship of Apollo, and celebrated in songs the birth of the god. His poems were publicly chanted, accompanied by solemn processions and dances. Olympus of Mysia was the inventor of the *nome*, a species of music for the flute. Eumolpus, a Thracian, established the Eleusinian mysteries, and

* Schoell, *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*. Tom. I. pp. 30, 31.

from him the Eleusinian priests derived the name of Eumolpidæ. Melampus was at once a poet, musician, prophet, and physician. He is said to have introduced the worship of Bacchus from Thebes to Argolis. Philammon, of Delphi, first established the chorusses of maidens, who belonged to the temple of Apollo. Thamyris, his son, is mentioned in the Iliad, and is celebrated for having challenged the Muses to a poetical combat. But, as has already been stated, the most renowned of all these poets, was Orpheus, who seems to have been the author of a system of mysterious rites, the aim of which was to soften the rude manners of the people, and to carry forward the rising civilization of Greece, by the means of poetry, music, and religion. These rites were secret, and were preceded by formal ceremonies of initiation. The history of Orpheus is interwoven with such a tissue of fable, that the most ingenious antiquary finds it impossible to disentangle the truth, and his very existence has been doubted by many. His poetry is supposed to have related to the mysteries of this secret society, and its real purport and bearing were expounded only to the initiated. The mystery, in which this poetry was shrouded, naturally led to such alterations and corruptions, that nothing of unquestionable genuineness remained, even in the times of Plato and Aristotle. The works attributed to these poets bore the names of *Cosmogonies*, *Oracles*, *Initiations*, *Purifications*, *Expiations*, *Hymns*, *Remedies of Disease*, and *Onomastics*, or books of the names of the gods. Orpheus is supposed to have been born in Thrace, about the fourteenth century before the Christian era. He is mentioned as having taken part in the Argonautic expedition, which he celebrated; and he is supposed to have applied the various knowledge, acquired by travel and study, to the improvement of religious doctrine, and the purification of life and manners. Among other things, the invention of the lyre is ascribed to him; and its wondrous powers, when touched by his hand, are a familiar subject of poetical and classical allusion. He is said to have abolished the bloody rite of human sacrifices, and to have instituted a mode of expiation, which put an end to the disastrous hereditary feuds, which had hitherto prevailed. The works, ascribed to Orpheus, under the abovementioned titles, though adulterated at

a very early period, expressed, perhaps, the substance of his religious doctrines ; but the poems, which now exist under his name, have long been proved, both by external and internal evidence, to be forgeries, of a much later date ; and it is doubtful whether they contain the slightest reflection of his poetry or opinions.

But, whatever doubt may attach to every individual fact, recorded of those Northern bards, enough remains to show, that the earliest culture of the Greek nation sprang from the regions of the North. We may amuse our imaginations, by endeavouring to draw a distinct picture of those dim, shadowy times ; but it will be a mere fancy picture, if we attempt to pass beyond the faintest general view. Dr. Bode has gone into the subject with infinite zeal, and applied all the apparatus of his learning to its elucidation ; but, though his speculations are ingenious, and some of them very interesting, we feel compelled to say, that they occupy a space wholly out of proportion to their comparative importance. Historical and literary inquiries, with so few well-ascertained facts to proceed upon, however ably conducted, are mere tissues of gossamer, which the first breath of skepticism sweeps away.

But the case is entirely changed, when we come down to the heroic age. The inimitable delineations, contained in the Homeric poetry, present us a most lively picture of those simple, but by no means uncultivated times. A variety of natural, but peculiar, circumstances contributed to make that poetry the clearest possible mirror of the feelings and spirit, the manners, customs, and political institutions of the heroic age. We have only to look into this mirror, to see that age brought up before our eyes with all the distinctness of living reality. Dr. Bode traces out the relations it bore to the preceding period ; he investigates the circles of legends, traditions, and historical facts ; examines the state of domestic life, and points out the influence of that distinguishing and most honorable characteristic of the Greek heroic age, the respect that was paid to women, and the sacredness of the marriage relation ; he shows the condition of slaves, and investigates the knowledge of the sciences and arts, that had already been gained. He then proceeds to investigate the ideas of the gods, and to trace their progress, from their earliest conception, to the order and system first introduced by the poets.

The state, rank, character, and powers of the singers are also investigated; and, upon all these topics of the discussion, we cannot help applauding the learning and ingenuity of our author. The legendary cycle of the war of Troy next occupies his attention; and the origin, character, growth, and preservation of the Homeric poetry, are treated in a comprehensive view and with minuteness of detail. The following passage will show, that Dr. Bode takes strong ground against the theory of Wolf, which, by the way, seems to be losing credit among the German scholars generally.

“ There is another more important question, which was first raised in modern times, and has been argued with great zeal. It turns principally upon what was the oldest form of the Iliad and Odyssey. We know certainly, that they were not, at least before the Alexandrian age, divided into two series of twenty-four cantos each. This investigation has a very close connexion with the idea of the *Epopœia*, which the philosophers and critics of art, since Aristotle, have constructed or analyzed, constantly comparing it with the completed tragedy. But how old the denomination of the Iliad is, is unknown. The earlier writers, particularly the poets, who allude to the Homeric poems, cite only the name of the author, without mentioning the title of the work. Thus Simonides, and Pindar, and perhaps even Hesiod. The title of the Iliad occurs first in Herodotus. In the later statements of the introduction of Homer into Greece proper, mention is made only of the Homeric poetry in general. The name of the Odyssey, which also first occurs in Herodotus, and then particularly in the writers after the age of the Attic orators, is better chosen, and certainly is older and more correct, than that of the Iliad, which neither the *procœmium*, nor the idea of the entire *epos*, can justify.

“ The *procœmium* announces the wrath of Achilles, as the subject-matter of the whole; and the twenty-four cantos, as they now lie before us, easily adapt themselves to a unity which corresponds perfectly to this first announcement, and to the plan. It is true, that many portions may be taken away, without breaking up the connexion of the whole. The Alexandrian critics were unable to perceive the necessity of the tenth book, which bears the name of *Doloneia*, and, on this account, excluded it from the original Iliad, as an unessential addition. Hence, a more recent opinion, after separating this book, supposes that there are three parts of the Iliad, each of which

may be considered as a whole by itself, and as standing only in an external connexion with the other two. According to this, the wrath of Achilles forms the subject only of the first nine books, which rest on the basis of an ancient hymn to Apollo, embracing about the first four hundred lines of the first book. The nine books, following the tenth, according to this view, set forth the gradual reconciliation of the angry hero, and the last five, it is said, exalt Achilles, now reconciled, by the glory of victory. Now, if we assume, that the words, 'Sing, O Goddess, the wrath,' was a favorite introductory formula of the most ancient epic bards, by which the whole was merely heralded in, but which was not designed to express the fundamental thought, then we cannot possibly look for the idea of the whole Iliad in the wrath of Achilles. But still we must adhere to the wrath of Achilles as the leading subject, or as constituting the poetic unity of the whole epic. We must consider its delineation as the gradual progress of the original idea, according to the three abovementioned springs of action, which already existed in the original plan of Homer; for, in the first book, Achilles expresses the wish, that Jupiter may grant aid to the Trojans and the glory of victory, and turn the Greeks to flight, that Agamemnon may perceive his wrong. Thetis also utters the same wish to Jupiter, but with the express addition, that she 'may see her son honored, and exalted with honor.' The latter is promised by Jupiter, and the action is now extended over the fifteenth book, where we find a spring of action that accounts satisfactorily for all the rest. When Achilles declares, furthermore, that he will take no part in the conflict, until Hector shall threaten the ships of the Myrmidons with fire, and shall venture to attack him in his own tent (which, however, he considers impossible, and seems to treat with scorn), the progress of the action to the sixteenth book, where Hector actually hurls fire among the ships, is made out as necessarily as any portion of the first part of the Iliad. Nay, we find in the second part, both a reference to the promises, which Jupiter had given to Thetis in the first canto, namely, to honor Achilles, and also hints that point to the end of the Iliad; so that a general connexion of the three above parts may be made out with no great difficulty, and it is impossible, that three different poets should have been their authors." — Vol. i. pp. 295–298.

The author follows out this train of thought still further, and arrives at this conclusion;

"The same poet, who, in the first book, represented the sublime image of the king of the gods making the heights of

Olympus tremble by his nod, when he pledged his promise to Thetis, embracing his knees in supplication, already had the conclusion of the *epos* in his eye, where Achilles, distracted with sorrow and the passion for revenge, though Jupiter has granted him the promised honor and satisfaction, sees the supplicating Priam before him in the dust. What there is between these two points, embraces the achievements of the Grecian and Trojan heroes, while Achilles indulges his wrath, in inactive repose, among the ships, until he is finally roused to vengeance by the death of his friend. The greatest deed, which Achilles performed in the Trojan war, was, according to the legend, the victory over Hector; and this the poet very properly made the end of his poetical effort, although, elsewhere, he introduces the hero whom he wished to celebrate, as inactive, and therefore could not call the poem by his name." — Vol. 1. pp. 301, 302.

Dr. Bode admits the extreme probability, that, in the course of ages, and under the hands of innumerable editors, collectors, and copyists, a great deal of foreign matter was foisted into the genuine songs of Homer, and that the recitation of the Homeric poetry, by so many rhapsodists, may have introduced important modifications and additions; but he maintains, that, whatever additions may have been made from the works of other bards, and however much its original plan may have been enlarged, under the hands of the Homericidæ and the Rhapsodists, in the course of time, still its original and essential unity remained uninjured; and these remarks apply, with still greater force, to the *Odyssey*. We do not fully coincide with these conclusions. We do not think the preconceived unity of the *Iliad* especially, can be established. But to unfold, fully, our views upon this point, would carry us far beyond the limits of the present paper. We must, however, admit, that Dr. Bode has made out a very strong case.

The remainder of the volume is taken up with the *epic cyclus*, and a statement of all that has been handed down to us concerning every branch of epic poetry, including the works of Hesiod. The discussion of these matters is exceedingly full and satisfactory.

The second volume, the first part of which only has reached us, contains the history of lyric poetry. But the space we have already occupied, forbids our doing more,

than indicating, in a general way, the manner in which Dr. Bode has handled this part of his subject. He first considers the nature and the age of lyric poetry, which he traces back to the ante-Homeric period. He illustrates the history of the Pæan, its application to the worship of Apollo, and describes the musical accompaniments. From this, he proceeds to take up, one after another, the successive species of lyric poetry, the different kinds of music which were appropriated to them, the occasions on which they were composed and recited, along with very ably drawn sketches of the lives, characters, and poetical value of the several inventors and authors. The discussions, in this part, conclude with some exceedingly curious details upon the musical principles of the Greeks. But this is a subject too large and difficult to be undertaken at the end of an article. When the other volumes arrive, we may, perhaps, resume our remarks, and consider the peculiarities of Greek lyric poetry at some length.

ART. VIII.—*The Poetical Works of THOMAS CAMPBELL.*
A New Edition. London. 1836.

Too much, we think, is generally attributed to the influence of the prevailing spirit of the times, in determining the character of poetry. Those, from whose writings that character is inferred, are few in number, and, not unfrequently, in a position as far as possible beyond the reach of such an influence. Take, for example, Burns and Cowper; who have been referred to with the view of showing, that the reforming energy, which manifested itself, near the close of the last century, in politics and various forms of literature, was communicated to poetry by the same deep impulse. It would not be easy to name two individuals, of any literary eminence, who were more removed, by circumstances, from the interests and passions, which swayed the living mass around them. When Burns, in the solitude of his lowly cottage at Mossgiel, was pouring the full tide of song from the depths of his proud and manly heart, he was as much sequestered from the great world and its sympathies, as if