

blind, we presume, not altogether unfit for the office of rhapsodising.

Wolf further maintained that the original fragmentary songs, which were subsequently composed into an Iliad and Odyssey, were *singly* recited by the Rhapsodists; and yet, in the very teeth of this theory, he derives the name from *ῥάπτειν ὁδόν*—"heroica carmina modo et ordine publicæ recitationi apto connectere." If the Rhapsodists recited these "heroica carmina" *singly*, how comes it that they derive their name from *uniting* poems? Once admit that the Homeric Poems existed originally as wholes, then it becomes sufficiently intelligible why they were called connectors of songs—connecting the single parts of those wholes for public recital. Wolf argued against the single authorship of the Iliad from the incongruities, inequalities, gaps, and contradictions observable therein. His heaviest artillery is brought to bear upon the six last Books of the Iliad and the Catalogue of Ships in the Second Book. In his view, the closing songs of the Iliad have nothing in common with the avowed object of the Poem—the wrath of Achilles; and some statements in the Catalogue are, he considers, at variance with the succeeding songs. What then becomes of the Catalogue, if we withdraw it from the Homeric unity, to save its consistency? It becomes an integer without meaning, without poetical interest or organic connection: if we look at it as a list of men and cities, actors in the grand drama before the walls of Troy, it will appear, as it is, a fundamental and constitutive portion of a long heroic poem. In answer to the first objection, we will quote the language of Bæumlein: * "Vidimus argu-

* Commentatio de Homero, sect. 14.