

Paphos, hallowed, divine, gentle; in Chios, marching; at Salamis, observer; in Cyprus, all-bounteous; in Chalcidice, holy; . . .'). Mr. van Groningen's comment on l. 95 ἐν . . . Πύργῳ Ἑλλάδα, ἀγαθὴν, where he thinks Ἑλλάδα to be some form of the Semitic *al-ilāt*, the goddess, does not seem to be very satisfactory, for if among the Persians (l. 104) Isis could be venerated as *Latina*, she might well have the style of *Greece* at Pyrgos, and other identifications with purely Semitic deities in this long list seem to be absent.

The whole is a careful piece of work, and deserves the attention of those who investigate the Eastern religions which seemed for a time likely to be the rivals of Christianity.

S. G.

*Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* By JANE ELLEN HARRISON, Hon. D.Litt., etc. Cambridge, 1921.

THIS little book of forty pages is for the most part a summary of the theories and suggestions with which the readers of Miss Harrison's earlier works are familiar, and as such it does not call for a long review. As regards the religion of Greece it contains little or nothing fresh, and the reader will find that Miss Harrison is quite impenitent in regard to some of her earlier suggestions, which seem to be highly disputable; but the convenience and interest of such a summary is obvious, and scholars may well be grateful to Miss Harrison for the

frankness with which she explains what are partly the conclusions of her work, but partly (one may suspect) the pre-suppositions of it.

It is nearly ten years since the publication of *Themis*. The soil from which that volume sprang was in a great measure provided by the writings of Durkheim, in the light of which many of the records of Greek religion were interpreted. This soil has now received a top-dressing, compounded mainly of the psychology of Freud and Jung, and the writings of Solovióv; and the writer's theory of the general nature of religion, and especially of theistic religion, has been somewhat amplified, or at least re-expressed, accordingly; but the criticism of this theory, which (to the reviewer) appears to leave out of account some of the most important aspects of the religious life, whether ancient or modern, is not a task which falls within the scope of the *Classical Review*. It is sufficient to say that Miss Harrison still writes with all the charm and all the provocativeness which have always characterised her work, and that she succeeds in putting into a few pages a theory which it would take many pages to discuss adequately.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE HOMERIC CATALOGUE, 852-5.

I APPEAR to have set a booby-trap for Mr. Leaf (*C.R.*, 1922, 52 ff.). Not intentionally, but a booby-trap. My Apparatus Criticus on B 852 ff. has got into print with several errors.<sup>1</sup> The words '852-5 non legerunt Eratosthenes et Apollodorus' should read '853-5' and stand at line 853; 'κρωβιάλον κρώμναν τε καὶ ἰλήεντα κύτωρον Apollodorus ap. Strab.' should read 'κρωβιάλον κρώμναν τε καὶ ἰλήεντα κύτωρον Apollonius ipse l.c.';<sup>2</sup> 'κρώμαν Zen. Eu. 147.28' should read 'κρώμαν Zonar. 147.28.' Therefore Mr. Leaf's observations from 'But Mr Allen' p. 55 to the end of his article go out, and if he wishes to contest my argument (set out without clerical error on pp. 156-9 of my book) that his idea of there having been

commerce in the heroic age between the Aegean and the Euxine by a sea-route is fiddle-de-dee, he must begin again.

I regret that I omitted to quote Mr. Leaf's 'J' ('my Bm4') for κρώμαν. The note in my forthcoming edition goes 'κρώμαν Bm4 P1 Zonar. 147.28 κρωμάν W3' I hope I have done right. Should I have added 'teste Leaf'? Of the same MS. J (Bm4) Mr. Leaf asserted (*Journal of Philology*, 1892, p. 242) that it read *τερυχηός* at P748; he imposed on Ludwich and on me in the first Oxford edition. He omitted the statement in his own second edition. So between Mr. Leaf in the article and Mr. Leaf in the edition the reader was at sea. This is unimportant, but it shows that the Genius of Error inspires the just as well as the unjust.

T. W. ALLEN.

<sup>1</sup> There are errata in other places too: v. 520 *dele* 'VI V5'; v. 523 read 'Ptol. Pamphil.'; v. 711 after 'cf. 734' read 713, the number of the next line.

<sup>2</sup> The readings stand correctly in the third Oxford edition (1919).

### HYMN. HERM. 109-14.

MR. H. P. CHOLMELEY'S note (*C.R.*, 1922, p. 14) is not helpful. He has quite overlooked one fundamental fact. The marvellous infant