

told that when the sun was ascending the battle stood undecided, and after five books of shifting narrative requiring considerable time for incidents such as the battle at the Greek camp—the storming of the gate—the help of Poseidon to the Greeks—Hera's trick in beguiling Zeus to sleep—Zeus aiding the Trojans—the retreat of the Trojans—their renewal of the attack—and numerous other incidents, we are still told that the sun is high in the heavens (Il. xi. 86, cf. Il. xvi. 777). We also find the description in battle in Il. xi. 824 inconsistent with that recorded in xii. 35-39; Poseidon enters the conflict in two ways irreconcilable (Il. xiii. 10-39, cf. Il. xiii. 345-360); the two prayers of Zeus are incompatible with the immediate future (Il. xi. 193). We have two different accounts of the death of Patroclus (Il. xvi. 793-815, cf. Il. xvii. 13, 16, 125, 189, 204). Many other examples might be adduced of contradictions. When we turn to the accounts of the first day's conflict we find this occupied with the details of the prowess of individual heroes. The conflict of Paris and Menelaus—the exploits of Diomedes and Glaucus—the interview of Hector and Andromache are all evidently separate lays. While Diomedes wounds Ares, he himself is wounded by an obscure enemy. All these facts go to prove that the composer of the Iliad had separate songs of early origin—that he blended them into his own poem without any material alteration, that these seeming contradictions arose from this combination of earlier lays. However the very fact of a great poem being formed from such lays shews a high development of the Greek Epic.

The Odyssey may have originated in a single poetic conception, although made up of separate materials. The argument of original authorship is mainly derived from the fact that all the incidents are grouped around one central figure. An examination however reveals the fact that there are two or three threads of the story ingeniously interwoven. The journey of Telemachus—the wanderings of Ulysses—the occurrences in Ithaca, form the whole poem. In regard to

the first part we have two minor *voortol* namely those of Nestor and Menelaus related in Odyssey iii.-iv. We also find the character of the hero completely changed, and in the later books Ulysses plays rather the part of a buffoon than a hero. The style is altogether different in the later books as compared with the first. Many minor points of difference might be mentioned did space permit. These are the chief arguments of Dr. Bonitz. Some of these points have been anticipated, and while as we have already said, this lecture by no means puts at rest the vexed question of the authorship of the Homeric poems, we still recommend its careful perusal to our readers assured that such perusal will well repay them for their time spent.

---

SHAKESPEARE'S KING JOHN. Edited by W. J. Rolfe. New York: Harper & Brothers; Toronto: Willing & Williamson.

WE have had occasion in previous issues of this magazine to notice the other plays of this series. While recommending the book as excellent for the general reader, it seems to us that there is too much in vogue a custom of interlarding our English classics with useless notes. We have laid before us a great deal of this man's and that man's opinion about Shakespeare, and we are apt to make this the chief point of study while we leave the real Shakespeare in the background. However valuable the notes and commentaries of different editors may be, English literature ceases to be valuable as a factor in education if it is confined to these. The tendency of examinations fosters this abnormal method of studying literature, and we were sorry to find in the last Matriculation Examination at Toronto University, papers set which practically ignored the authors prescribed. As examinations are now conducted by our examiners we know of no better books than those of Rolfe. They are excellent for getting up *points that will be asked*. For the real purposes of education however we must recommend the Clarendon Press Series.