

On the homeric epithets:

δαΐφρων, ἰππόδαμος.

Among the numerous epithets which we find familiarly applied to heroes of all classes and characters throughout both Iliad and Odyssee, not the least frequent is that of *δαΐφρων*. It is used 36 times in the former, and 21 in the latter poem, and in such a manner, that although (as we trust to be able to shew) its real signification can be accurately enough defined by reference to these numerous examples, it can but rarely, from the promiscuous way in which it is distributed, be considered as conveying in individual cases any more personal or peculiar trait of character than *ἀνύμων, ἀντίθεος, δῖος*, and other titles which are in a great measure the common property of the race of heroes, and in so far class themselves under that most important and extensive head of the poets style, its routine or commonplace. The ambiguity in which, on a superficial view, the precise sense of the term is involved, is increased by that of its etymology, which may, on a similarly superficial view, be traced with equal apparent plausibility either to *δαΐς* battle, or to *δαίω* to divide or discriminate, and consequently may imply an allusion to either of the essential characteristics of a hero, his valour, or his discretion. — The present generation of critics and lexicographers have pronounced in favor of the former of these interpretations in the case of the Iliad of the latter in the case of the Odyssee, and have followed up this verdict by a very natural inference as to the different origin of the two works in which so broadly marked a difference of

idiom displays itself. Our present object is to shew, by arguments derived as well from the etymology as from the use of the term, that this distinction is altogether groundless, and that the latter of the above significations, that namely of discreet or prudent, is the only one which can fairly be attached to it throughout the text of either poem.

A declaration of adherence to the old, and as it may now almost be styled, exploded belief, in the substantial unity of the source to which we owe the two standard productions of greek epic genius, may not perhaps, with the public of the present day, be the best passport to a favorable reception for an essay on any speculative point of homeric criticism. Were we to add that this conviction is in our own case the result of a many years close study and collation of the text of the two poems, directed more especially towards this very point, and undertaken upon a plan, which either in regard to extent or impartiality, does not seem yet to have been followed out in any other quarter, — we should doubtless appear to be merely repeating one of those prefatory commonplaces, by which every author is at liberty to recommend his labours, and which are more likely to convince his readers of the good opinion he entertains of himself, than of the validity of those he may entertain upon any other subject. We must therefore be content for the present to allow the merits of the general question to rest upon their own basis, without despairing of being enabled on some more fitting occasion, to place our own view of it in a plausible light. It must however at least be matter of satisfaction with every enlightened critic, whatever his own opinions, that the sources from whence all sound conclusions must ultimately be derived should be preserved pure, or where necessary freed from corruption. An article therefore upon this familiar and significant homeric epithet, contained in a work of such great and well

merited influence on the whole circle of homeric interpretation as the Lexilogus of Buttmann ¹⁾, and involving a series of sweeping and fallacious inferences, which upon so high authority have been very generally acquiesced in, will we trust be sufficient excuse for obtruding upon public attention what might otherwise appear a diffuse dissertation upon a comparatively insignificant matter.

In the first place it may be observed, that of the three most expressive of the various terms which the subtle invention of the greek race had from the earliest epochs introduced into popular use, to specify the corresponding varieties of the spiritual element of our nature: φρήν — θυμός — νόος — the former is that which more peculiarly denotes its intellectual — rational — or discriminating faculty; the second is more immediately expressive of passion or feeling; — the third of simple thought or volition. This distinction it is true is far from being closely adhered to, even in that early stage of the greek tongue at which we first become familiar with it, where the confusion that in vulgar usage naturally takes place between the representatives of such nearly cognate ideas is already very perceptible. Still however a very cursory review of the occasions on which the terms are employed, in a simple or in a compound state, in Homer or in the language at large, will suffice to shew, in the case of each respectively, a large preponderance of the signification just pointed out as originally peculiar to it; and the distinction has accordingly been adopted as a general rule in the articles assigned them in the best vocabularies. The following line of Aeschylus, descriptive of the ascendancy of reason over passion, will perhaps serve to place this distinction in a clearer light than pages of grammatical disquisition (Pers. 757):

φρένες γὰρ αὐτοῦ θυμὸν ἠακοστροφοῦν.

1) In v. δαίφρων I p. 200; cf. Passow: Lex. in v.

The composition therefore of *φρῆν*, at least in the primitive state of the language, with another element denoting the exercise of the intellectual powers, is in itself more natural than with one expressive of such a passion or impulse as warlike ardour. The correctness of this view of the signification of this epithet is still more effectually born out by the etymological analysis of its first, than of its second element. *Δαίς*, from whence it has been proposed to derive it in the case of the Iliad, bears indeed the signification war or battle, not however with reference to the valour or prowess, but exclusively to the discord or hostile feelings of the combatants. Apart from any closer appeal to the remote origin of the term (which may however safely be referred to the same source as its homophone *δαίς* a banquet, the one denoting division in the sense of discord, the other in that of partition), the justice of this interpretation is evinced by the circumstance that hostility, not courage or prowess, is the fundamental idea conveyed by every other derivative of the root, wherein a specific allusion to any modification of the general idea war is perceptible, such as *δηΐος* — *δηϊότης* — *δηιόω* (to assault, make war upon, or ravage; not to fight, or wage war). Even therefore were we justified in assigning to the compound *δαΐφρων* by reference to its first element a pathetic rather than ethic power, it would signify not valorously, but hostilely disposed, a sense which would be highly inapplicable, or even preposterous, in all or most of the passages in which it occurs. Admitting however that in this particular case the term *δαίς* might possibly have carried along with into composition the signification of valiant, we have still farther evidence that this was not the case in the fact, that in every other modification, derivative or compound of the primitive common root ΔΔ Division, where its martial sense is in the ascendant, the first syllable is

long; as for ex. δῆϊος (δαΐος), δῆϊουῆς, Δῆϊφοβος etc. 2) Now the first syllable of δαΐφρων is as invariably short. On the other hand it will be remarked that the quantity of this syllable in every ascertained derivative of the same simple root in its sense of discriminate, is short, as it is in δαΐφρων; as for example in δαῖναι — δαίμων — δαΐζω 3); the latter of which terms is invested by Homer with the same power of discriminating or arranging our thoughts, in order to arrive at a correct judgement, which we have here pointed out to be inherent in δαΐφρων. 4)

The grammatical anomalies therefore to which we must reconcile ourselves, before we can fasten upon this epithet any other signification than one connected with the exercise of the intellectual faculty, are of such a nature, that nothing but the most indisputable evidence of the poets own text can justify the opinion of their having received any countenance from his usage. But an impartial analysis of the passages in which it occurs will suffice to deliver us from any such dilemma. In the Iliad it is applied to 21 individuals of various ranks and characters. Among the Greeks to the following leading warriors: Achilles 5), Diomed 6), Ulysses 7), Ajax 8), Idomeneus 9), Antilochus 10); together with 3 others of lesser note: Meriones 11), Penc-

2) δαΐκταμένοιο (as the words are usually written) is no more a compound than ἱφι κταμένοιο, Ἀρηῖ κταμένῳ, or other similar juxtapositions.

3) The single exception in the case of this word, (Jl. λ, 497) in the arsis of the first foot of a verse, is obviously of a metrical, not an etymological nature.

4) Jl. ξ, 20. 23, where the very association of ideas embodied in the compound δαΐφρων seems to be herited at by mutual reference of the terms δαΐζόμενος and φρονιόντι to each other:

ὧς δὲ γέρον ἄρμινε δαΐζόμενος κατὰ θυμόν

ἴδμε δέ σι φρονέοντι δούασσι κέρδιον εἶναι.

5) β, 875. κ, 402 λ, 791. ρ, 76. 654. σ, 30.

6) ε, 181, 184. 277. ψ, 405.

7) λ, 482.

9) δ, 252.

11) ν, 164.

8) ξ, 459. ρ, 123.

10) ν, 418.

leus¹²⁾ and Cebriones¹³⁾; and to the deceased or absent heroes, Peleus¹⁴⁾, Atreus¹⁵⁾, Tydeus¹⁶⁾ and Bellerophon.¹⁷⁾ On the trojan side it is given to Priam¹⁸⁾, Aeneas¹⁹⁾, Pandar²⁰⁾, the herald Idaeus²¹⁾, and four other little known or insignificant personages: Antimachus²²⁾, Socus²³⁾ and his father Hippasus²⁴⁾, and Phorcys.²⁵⁾ As, owing to the peculiar nature of the subject of the Iliad, the persons to whom this title is applied are almost exclusively warriors, and as its application takes place, in many cases, in passages descriptive of military exploit or adventure, the signification martial or valiant, but for the objections already urged, might on a first view appear plausible enough. Still however there are not a few cases where this rendering would be as palpably improper as the other is appropriate. Bellerophon is a hero whose whole history as given by the poet is one continued exemplification of his good sense and high moral principle, and who, although the bravest of warriors on occasion of necessity, may upon the authority of the same narrative be characterised as by nature rather of a peaceful than a warlike turn. When therefore we find him assigned this title on two out of the five occasions that his name is mentioned, when we observe farther that one of these passages bears special allusion to his discreet character, and that neither of them contains the remotest hint at his military attributes, one can hardly expect that an epithet of peculiarly martial import would have been so expressly selected for him, even assuming it to be used in a mere commonplace sense. In the former of these texts, after the description of the seductive proposals of the wife of Proetus, it is added Il. ξ , 161:

12) ξ , 487.15) β , 23. 60.17) ζ , 162. 197.19) ν , 267.21) ω , 325.23) λ , 456.13) π , 727.16) δ , 370.18) ι , 647. λ , 197. σ , 239.20) δ , 93.22) λ , 123.24) λ , 450.14) σ , 18.25) ρ , 312.

ἀλλὰ τὸν οὕτι

παῖθ' ἀγαθὰ φρονέοντα δαΐφρονα Βελλεροφόντην.

The other passage is descriptive of his domestic prosperity
Il. ζ, 199:

ἧ δ' ἔτεκε τρία τέκνα δαΐφρονι Βελλεροφόντη.

Add to this, that on the two other occasions in which his name is introduced in connexion with any epithet, the one selected is ἀμύμων, also expressive of moral worth rather than of military prowess, and we shall be naturally led to the inference that both designations are in this case really and emphatically significant of that modesty, discretion and high sense of honor which form the peculiar attributes of this noble minded hero.

Diomed to whom the title is applied four times, is in one place addressed as καρτερόθυμε δαΐφρον. 26) If the latter epithet here signify valiant, we have an unnecessary tautology. If on the other hand it be rendered discreet, we have a pithy and expressive summary of that just combination of courage and conduct by which this héros character was distinguished, as well as another apt illustration of the specific difference between the powers of the two cognate terms θυμός and φρόνη.

To Priam the epithet is applied three times. It is true that although we are no where expressly told, that Priam was distinguished for military exploit in his youth, we have no reason to doubt the fact. The character however, under which he is so admirably portrayed to us in the Iliad, is that of the mild and benevolent old sovereign, the fond and over-indulgent parent; and as it is to the characters of his heroes as exemplified in his poem that Homers epithets ought, and (in all cases where they admit an emphatic construction) strictly do apply, it were a solecism of which we have no right to suspect him, to have allotted thus fre-

26) Il. ε, 277.

quently to the kindhearted old priæce an epithet of such dire import, which has never once been given to his own son Hector, the very type of the ferocity and martial ardour of the nation. Prudence however and judgement are not only in the abstract the familiar characteristics of age and experience, but are qualities in which Priam with all his faults was no way deficient. Here then again the epithet, whether in a specific or a conventional application, were as appropriate in the one sense as improper in the other.

Another trojan elder for whom it is selected as the distinctive title, on the only two occasions on which his name is mentioned, is Antimachus, of whose military qualities either in youth or old age we hear nothing. He may indeed have been a very valiant hero for aught we know to the contrary, but certainly the account given of his conduct in the only transactions in which he is mentioned as distinguishing himself, leads to a very opposite inference, in as-much as treachery, avarice and cruelty, although qualities not uncongenial with cunning and worldly wisdom, are proverbially not the most compatible with valour or heroïsm. The passages are the following: Jl. λ, 123:

Ἀντιμάχοιο δαΐφρονος, ὅς ῥα μάλιστα
 χρυσὸν Ἀλεξάνδροιο δεδεγμένος ἀγλαὰ δῶρα,
 οὐκ εἴασχ' Ἑλένην δόμεναι ξανθοῖ Μενελάω.

Ibid. 138:

. . . Ἀντιμάχοιο δαΐφρονος . . .
 ὅς ποτ' ἐνὶ Τρώων ἀγορῇ Μενέλαον ἄνωγεν,
 ἀγγελίην ἐλθόντα σὺν ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆϊ,
 αὐθι κατακτεῖναι.

These notices however, and the first more especially, lead to the belief that his judgement had a very considerable sway in the trojan councils, and consequently favor the inference that in this case the term as the more pointedly significant of intellectual capacity.

Socus, a trojan warrior, after an unsuccessful attack upon Ulysses, observing that hero advancing to take his revenge, turns and flies, and as he is running is pierced through the middle of the back between the shoulder blades by the spear of his adversary. 27) As this was just the most disgraceful wound that a warrior could receive, and as it is received by Socus in the commission of the most dastardly act of which a warrior could be guilty, when we find him in the immediate sequel styled δαΐφρων, the interpretation valorous, unless in an ironical sense of which there is no trace here, would certainly be most inappropriate; and even in that sense the signification prudent would perhaps be more to the purpose.

Pandarus is a person whose conduct, especially on the occasion where the epithet is applied to him 28), is an apt commentary on the characteristic „τοξότα λωβητήρ“, by which the poet elsewhere stigmatises the class of warriors to which he belongs, and consequently intitles him far better to the epithet of cunning or prudent than of valorous. In this sense also it is admitted by Buttmann to be most appropriate as applied to the herald Idaeus.

On a variety of other occasions it is connected with the names of antient heroes dead or living, fathers or ancestors of the warriors actually engaged. Among these, besides Bellerophon, Atreus, Tydeus and Peleus, personages distinguished no doubt for valour as well as talent, we also find several obscure and insignificant individuals, such as Hippasus the father of Socus above mentioned, and Antimachus whose base policy we have also had occasion to notice. And this circumstance, taken in connexion with its threefold occurrence in the case of Priam, certainly justifies us in referring it to the age and experience of these veterans rather than to their military attributes.

27) JI. λ, 446 sqq.

28) JI. δ, 93.

In the *Odyssee* as was to be expected, amid the wide difference of the subject, the illustrations of the true power of the epithet are both more numerous and more pointed. In ten out of the 22 times that it occurs²⁹⁾, it is applied to the protagonist himself; and in 5 out of these cases it is enhanced by that of *ποικιλομήτης*, with which it is also combined when given tho the same hero in the *Iliad*; and distinguished as this hero is for valour in all its various shapes, yet the essential attributes of his character are prudence and discretion. On four other occasions it is given to Alcinous king of Scheria³⁰⁾, where consistently with the comic and satirical spirit of the *Odyssee* at large, and more especially of this portion of it, one might be disposed to take it in an ironical sense, that monarch being as little remarkable for valour as for discretion, — were it not for the probability that it may be here, as we have already seen in the *Iliad*, a mere euphemistic commonplace for age and authority.³¹⁾ The latter view is farther confirmed by a similar application of it to Polybus and Anchialus,³²⁾ fathers of Mentis and Eurymachus, personages otherwise unknown, and to Orsilochus³³⁾ the venerable sovereign of Pherae. That in one case it is given to the mother of Ulysses seems conclusive as to its power at least in this example. It is once also given to Telemachus³⁴⁾, once to a phaeacian artisan³⁵⁾ and lastly in the battle with the suitors to one of their number called Polybus³⁶⁾, on which occasion, but for the mass of evidence to the contrary, the context might seem to favor its application to the bravery rather than the good sense of the person alluded to.

In passing in review the above series of texts, which we

29) α, 48. 83. γ, 163. η, 168. θ, 18. φ, 223. 379. χ, 115. 202. 281.

31) ο, 519.

33) φ, 16.

35) θ, 373.

30) ζ, 256. θ, 8. 13. 56.

32) α, 180. 418.

34) δ, 687.

36) χ, 243.

must consider as, decisive of the precise etymology, as well as the precise signification of this term, the judicious student of Homer will be led, if not to discover in this constancy and harmony in the use of so delicate an epithet, an evidence of the unity of the genius that dictated the composition of the two works, at least to admire how aptly the usage of the one illustrates that of the other, and how valuable a critical aid the difference of subject — (the most important consideration indeed as regards this whole question and the most generally overlooked) thus becomes, in correcting the false or confirming the right impressions which might be produced by their separate perusal. Almost all the events or actors of the Iliad, as already observed, are warlike, and hence our first impression is, naturally enough, that a title of so frequent occurrence in connexion with such adventures requires a martial interpretation. But the ascendancy of a contrary power in the Odyssey, as connected with a widely different class of adventures, aided by the evidence of a considerable number of analogous cases even in the former poem, effectually preserves us from any such erroneous conclusion. When therefore we find several of the most learned and acute of modern commentators, as the result of an elaborate analysis of the text of each poem, arriving at the conclusions: that δαΐφρων in the Iliad as derived from δαΐς battle signifies valiant; — that in the Odyssey as derived from δαΐω to discriminate it signifies prudent; — that by consequence the two works where the same phrase is so systematically employed with two opposite powers cannot be by the same author; — nay, that the last book of the Iliad where Idæus the herald is allowed to have deserved it in his intellectual capacity, cannot be by the author of the rest of the poem, — and when we find these sweeping doctrines applauded and promulgated, with we believe scarcely a dissentient voice, throughout the

subordinate channels of the stream of homeric learning, it is difficult not to perceive what a serious influence, here as in too many other cases, the partiality of the present school of criticism for its own favorite theories is apt to exercise on the judgement of its professors. — We shall now however bestow a few moments attention on one or two of the arguments on the other side, either as curious in themselves or as leading to some farther illustrations of other interesting points of homeric usage.

Among the evidences adduced by Buttmann of the propriety or rather the necessity of the interpretation warlike in the text of the Iliad, is the case of Socus, who strange to say is held up for the purpose of this argument as a model of heroic valour: „Und eben diess gilt, wenn der sonst ganz unbekante Socos in der wohl ausgeführten Rolle eines muthigen, obgleich unglücklichen Kriegers dieses Beywort hat.“ This decision we must presume after all to be founded on Falstaffs principle that: „The better part of valour is discretion“, and that flight in the moment of danger is the imperative duty of a discreet soldier, a doctrine with which wa are familiar, as embodied in the classic lines of Hudibras:

He that fights and reens away
 May live to fight another day,
 But he that is in battle slain
 Will never live to fight again.

Upon this principle the conduct of Socus may indeed appear to render him preeminently worthy of the epithet even in the sense the critic has assigned it.

Besides the want of attention to difference of subject, another frequent source of error in questions of this nature is the neglect of a no less vital distinction, which has also frequently been alluded to in the previous pages, that namely between the more emphatic, and the more general or

conventional power of Homers epithets; whether as pointedly referring in particular cases to the personal conduct or attributes of individuals, or as mere euphemistic qualifications of the heroic character at large. In the latter case there can be no doubt that their selection, even as regards those names with which they are most frequently combined, often depends far more on metrical or musical euphony, or other causes of a similarly incidental nature, than on the personal merits of the proprietor of the name itself. That this is a distinction of essential importance to a right understanding of every portion of the poets text might be shown by a number of perhaps still more pointed examples, did our limits permit. That *δαΐφρων* itself, at least in a large number of cases, must be considered as falling under this head of usage, seems to result from the very vagueness, which, whatever sense be assigned it, must still in some measure pervade its employment.

It is therefore to an equal neglect of both these distinctions, that we owe Buttmanns so confident appeal to the occasional application of this epithet to Achilles and Diomed, persons preeminently distinguished for valour, as one of the strong evidences of its exclusively martial signification in the Iliad: „Aber wenn diese beyden Helden, in einem Zusammenhange, der keinen eigentlichen Bezug auf den Verstand hat, ein einziges Beywort als festes haben, so fühlt jeder, dass diess kein anderes seyn kann, als eines, das sich auf ihre Tapferkeit bezieht.“ The applicability in the present case of this twofold characteristic *einzig* and *fest* we confess ourselves at a loss to apprehend, as the number of occasions on which this pair of warriors between them are honoured with this title is absolutely trifling in comparison with those where their heroic character is enhanced by other epithets. But what becomes of the converse of the position which forms the pith of the foregoing decision?

What becomes of the number, the great majority of examples in which the epithet occurs even in the Iliad „without the slightest reference to military prowess? “ Not tho mention those of Priam, Bellerophon, Antimachus, Hippiasus, in 5 out of the 6 cases in which it is assigned to Achilles no such reference can be detected. Nay were we disposed to subtilise, it might perhaps be maintained that in several of them it conveys rather an allusion to the heros intellectual qualities. 37) What becomes of the facts that, while out of the vast number of cases in which the name of the valorous Diomed is introduced, he is honoured but 4 times with this epithet, that, while the ferocious Hector is denied it altogether, the mild and benevolent old Priam out of the comparatively limited number of occasions on which he is brought on the stage receives it no less than thrice?

Another argument has been grounded on the occasional combination of the two epithets *δαΐφρων* and *ἰππόδαμος*. This latter phrase is also assumed to be a sort of military commonplace, similar to the modern word chivalrous; and like it equally applicable to any hero remarkable for courage or activity in the field of battle; and the two are thus understood in their juxtaposition *δαΐφρωνος ἰππόδαμοιο* to be mutually corroborative of each other. We shall endeavour to shew that this inference is based on a no less extensive misunderstanding of the real value of the epithet *ἰππόδαμος* than that, which has been already pointed out with respect to its companion.

This phrase then it must be observed partakes in no degree of the conventional or universal character above alluded to as attaching to *δαΐφρων*, but is the special and proper characteristic of certain individuals, families, or even nations, distinguished not so much, it would seem, for their boldness or skill in the management of the noblest of do-

37) Especially λ, 791.

mestic animals, as for the pleasure they took, or the science they displayed, in nearing and training it, or for the number or value of the breed they possessed. This will at once appear from the citation of the passages in which it occurs. They are in all 48; 45 in the Iliad 3 in the Odyssey. In no less than 24 it is the eponyme distinction of the Trojans; 38) whose claim to it may be farther illustrated by reference to Jl. ε, 222 sqq. 265. ϑ, 105, ψ, 221. It is also given once tho their neighbours the Phrygians. 39) The Greeks collectively never receive it. The number of living heroes to whom it is allotted is no more than six; and of these as might be expected the largest portion are Trojans: Hector 40), Antenor 41), Hyperenor 42), and Hippasus 43), father of Socus above mentioned. Among the Greek warriors it is confined to Diomed, and Thrasymedes the son of Nestor. To Diomed 44) it is assigned no less than 7 times. His own personal claims to it are established by reference to his constant use of the chariot in battle, to his often expressed fondness for the animal itself, and to his victory in the chariot race; and as it is also twice given to his father Tydeus 45), we may assume it to have been a family distinction. The same inferenc is justified in the case of Thrasymedes 46) by his fathers almost inseparable title of ἰππότα, and by various other incidental allusions to the partiality of the Neleid family for the animal; with which doubtless is connected their especial devotion to the worship of Neptune 47), also repeatedly noticed in both poems. The only other personages styled ἰππόδαμοι in the Iliad are Atreus 48) — the lord of Αργος

38) β, 230. γ, 127. 131. 251. 343. δ, 80. 333. 352. 355. 509. ζ, 461. η, 361. ϑ, 71. 110. 516. 525. κ, 424. λ, 567. μ, 440. ρ, 418. 230. τ, 237. 318. υ, 180.

39) κ, 431.

40) η, 48. π, 717. ω, 804.

41) ζ, 299. ξ, 473.

42) ρ, 24

43) λ, 450.

44) ε, 415. 781. 849. η, 404. ϑ, 194. ι, 51. 707.

45) δ, 370. ψ, 472.

46) ξ, 10.

47) Jl. ν, 554. ψ, 307. Od. γ, 5. λ, 253 sqq.

48) β, 23. 60.

ἵππόβοτον — and Castor⁴⁹⁾, the eponyme hero of the equestrian art. In the *Odyssee* amid the total difference of subject and localities the epithet occurs but three times, and, again observe with what singular harmony — once as a title of Castor,⁵⁰⁾ once of Diomed,⁵¹⁾ once of Nestor⁵²⁾ himself. Here than one cannot fail to admire the consistent propriety of the poets employment of such expletives, wherever the subject required that they should convey any specific meaning, amid the apparent licence in their distribution as epic commonplaces. Observe too the following additional illustration which the foregoing analyses suggests of unity of design, even in the minor links of historical connexion between the two poems. In the *Odyssee* our attention is expressly called to the fact, that the dominions of Ulysses were unfavorable to the breeding or use of horses, and that the royal family by consequence had no taste for equestrian pursuit. Hence Telemachus declines the present of a noble pair offered him by Menelaus, and in the catalogue so proudly given by the faithful Eumaeus⁵³⁾ of the vast wealth of his royal master, amid numerous herds of oxen, sheep, goats, swine, there is not a word of horses. Most consistently then is this title never connected with the name of any cephalenian hero in either poem. Ulysses who distinguishes himself in various other athletic exercises around the tomb of Patroclus takes no part in the chariot race; and it would appear from the notices relative to his exploits in the *Iliad*, that he invariably fought on foot. We can recollect at least no distinct allusion to either chariot or charioteer. — Nor must we omit even as regards the *Iliad* in its single capacity a similar instance of the same delicate interconnexion which even the minor details of its text every where display. Nestor and his family it would appear, merited, at least with

49) *γ*, 237.52) *γ*, 17.50) *Od. λ*, 299.53) *Od. ξ*, 100.51) *γ*, 181.

Homer, their characteristic designation of Horsemen, rather from their zeal for equestrian pursuit, fostered no doubt by the local peculiarities of their native Pylos, than by their successful cultivation of the art itself, or by the excellence of the race they possessed. How are we led to this inference? By the circumstance that in the very same poems in which the character of horsemen is so pointedly ascribed to them, their stock of horses, and even the skill of their charioteers, is very lightly spoken of in sufficiently express terms upon several occasions. At v. 104 of *Jl. 9*, Diomed, on occasion of the sudden panic spread through the greek ranks, urges the old pylian chief to abandon his own equipage and take the place of Sthenelus by his side, in the following terms :

*ἤπεδανός δέ νύ τοι θεράπων βραδέες δέ τοι ἵπποι,
ἀλλ' ἄγ', ἐμῶν ὀχέων ἐπιβήσῃο*

And although we were just before told that Nestors spare horse, hampered by a wound, had been the occasion of the momentary obstacle to his retreat, yet it is clear from the general terms of Diomedes address that no allusion is intended to that circumstance; and the justice of the stigma is accordingly confirmed by the old hero himself in his instructions to his son Antilochus when about to engage in the chariot race (*ψ*, 309) :

*. . . . ἀλλά τοι ἵπποι
βάρδιστοι θεΐειν, τῷ τ' οἴω λοίγι' ἔσσοθαι,
τῶν δ' ἵπποι μὲν ἔασιν ἀφάρτεροι*

The sincerity of this confession will be found to be justified by the description of the race.

Skill in the management of the horse was therefore far from being so essential an attribute of military excellence in the heroic age of Greece, as in our own age of Chivalry; and the reason is simple enough. The equestrian warrior fought not from the back of the horse but in a chariot. The opportunities therefore for personal display of chival-

rous prowess were far more limited. The use of the chariot by reference to the whole text of the Iliad was rather locomotive than combative. The warriors of highest rank, in cases of single combat, or wherever a steady hostile collision takes place between the two lines, prefer engaging on foot, and several of them appear seldom or ever to have fought in any other way. The duties of cavalier, in battle, were not properly speaking their own, but those of their charioteers, a class of persons of secondary importance in a military point of view; and the value of whose services, as of the vehicle own which they presided, is perhaps more largely exemplified in cases of flight or retreat after discomfiture, than of successful attack on the enemy. The justice of this view seems indeed to be effectually born out by reference to the poets more general distribution of the epithet. It certainly could not be his object to distinguish the Trojans, who receive it 24 times, as collectively more warlike than his own countrymen to whom it is carefully denied; or to mark out Antenor, Hippiasus, Hyperenor, or even Hector himself as more valiant than Achilles or Ajax, who also never receive it. If indeed it could be assumed, as a general characteristic, to convey a military qualification of any kind, we should be disposed to take it in an unfavorable rather than a laudatory sense, as contrasting a fugitive or skirmishing mode of warfare with the *σταδίη ὑσμίνη*, the steady assault of the man at arms. Indeed the very line in which the chivalrous propensities of the Trojans are familiarly mentioned by the poet:

Τρώων θ' ἰπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
 might almost seem as if meant to place this distinction between their favorite mode of warfare and that of his own countrymen in a light certainly not intended as complimentary to the former; a suspicion justified perhaps by reference to other passages⁵⁴), conveying in similarly indirect, though more insulting terms the same unfavorable comparison.

Col. Mure.

54) Il. γ, 2 sqq. 8 sqq. δ, 423 sqq. 433 sqq.