

Author(s): John Peradotto

Reviewed work(s):

Myth in Indo-European Antiquity by Gerald James Larson ; C. Scott Littleton ; Jaan Puhvel

Source: *The Classical World*, Vol. 69, No. 7 (Apr. - May, 1976), pp. 453-455

Published by: Classical Association of the Atlantic States

historian, the classicist, or the theologian. It is handsomely produced and moves across a range of material that transcends most specialties. What it accomplishes in putting this material together is admirable.

Should the book require a second edition I would suggest some modifications, to include expansion and some correction in the introductions to each of the passages. These follow a format of (1) short biographical and editorial comment, (2) a few bibliographical references, and (3) comment on the translation used. Each of these elements should be expanded if the book is to be used by the general instructor, with alternate translations suggested here rather than in the bibliography at the end of the book.

It is probable that the choice of translations used depended much on the problem of copyright and availability, but it is unfortunate to see the Bohn Library so often represented, and Pitt's undistinguished rhyming translation of the *Aeneid* when so many exciting translations have been produced recently (on p. 65 n. 8, Thompson actually notes the weakness of the translation). Perhaps nowhere does the Bohn problem appear more distinctly than in Yonge's translation of the *Tusculan Disputations*, where mid-nineteenth century punctuation and diction are sometimes confusing and unattractive even to the modern ear seeking to hear the Ciceronian complexities (cf., e.g. p. 23). The Tacitus is also unfortunate.

Throughout it would be useful to insert paragraph numbers in all the translations. Some notes might be modified. On p. xvii, n. 5 Cardinal Mai's palimpsest discovery of perhaps a quarter of the *de re publica* might be noted. Cicero's revisiting of Greece "for further study" in 51 B.C. (p. 18) is misunderstood unless put into the context of his proconsulship (indeed Thompson may be referring to the exile of 58-57). On p. 42, in the introduction to Mommsen's comments on Caesar's achievements, a more extensive comment on changes of attitudes among historians since Mommsen's time is certainly called for. Note 1 on p. 59 needs a more sophisticated statement on the archaeology of early Rome than is provided in the quotation from Father Brinkman, which may mislead the general student or teacher. There is a *non-sequitur* in the introduction to Tacitus on p. 79 between paragraphs one and two, and the paragraph on speeches in Tacitus should be considerably expanded.

Thompson's book is a stimulating one. It will be helpful to the generalist and to some extent to the specialist on Rome by extending the Roman horizon into the medieval and Renaissance where few classicists tend to move comfortably. Most of its weaknesses are venial, or may be required by copyright costs. It should be considered carefully by teachers of humanities and classical civilization courses.

Ohio State University

Charles L. Babcock

---

Gerald James Larson (ed.), C. Scott Littleton and Jaan Puhvel (coedd.). *Myth in Indo-European Antiquity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1974. Pp. vii, 197 (no price listed).

The present volume appears to be the first in a series of publications by the Institute of Religious Studies of the University of California at Santa Barbara. The essays in it are the result of a 1971 symposium on comparative Indo-European mythology sponsored conjointly by the Institute, the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology (U.C.L.A.), the Forschungskreis für Symbolik

(Heidelberg University), and the Wenner-Gren Foundation of New York. In its general scope, this book is strongly reminiscent of another recent University of California publication, *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans* (1970). Not surprisingly for such a demanding field, five of the twelve essayists represented here appeared in the earlier volume.

Gerald Larson's introduction sets these essays in the larger framework of research in myth by presenting a brief history of major perspectives from the mid-nineteenth century to the present, from the now discredited celestial theories of F. Max Müller and Adelbert Kuhn, through Bachofen, Durkheim, Freud and Jung, the ritual theorists, to the work of Cassirer, Eliade, Lévi-Strauss, and Dumézil. But the methodological bias is quite understandably for Dumézil's approach, which is essentially comparative and historical, supplemented by insights from sociology, anthropology, and philology, and which purports to reconstruct the common ideological system of Proto-Indo-European culture by examining the various extant Indo-European mythologies. This ideological system, briefly stated, shows an unparalleled tripartite conception of society based upon the interrelation of three functions: (1) *sovereignty*, including both magico-religious and contractual or juridical aspects; (2) *force*, primarily but not exclusively military; and (3) *economic productivity*. Each of these functions is the domain of a special kind of divinity, for example, at Rome: (1) Jupiter and Dius Fidius, (2) Mars, (3) Quirinus; among the Scandinavians: (1) Odin and Týr, (2) Thor, (3) Njördr-Freyr and the goddess Freyja.

The success of the method depends, to my mind, on a proper sense for what constitutes the limits of an acceptable analogy. The exemplary caution with which Dumézil himself employs it is evident in his contribution to the present volume, where he again tackles a problem that has exercised him off and on for thirty-two years — the appearance in several Indo-European traditions of one-eyed and one-handed figures whose mutilations, in cause and effect, offer close parallels: Scandinavian Odin/Týr, Roman Horatius Cocles/Mutius Scaevola, Irish Nuada, and (perhaps) Iranian Jamshid.

Besides this concrete demonstration of the method at its best, there are several essays which address themselves more discursively to methodology. In Udo Strutynski's defence of Dumézil against the criticism of Einar Haugen, the blend of diachronic and synchronic approaches in Dumézil is properly appraised. But, perhaps more importantly, a careful distinction is drawn between Dumézil's empirical "structuralism," which relies more heavily on comparative philology and which aims at understanding the nature of the Indo-Europeans more than the nature of language or myth as such, and the ahistorical and *a priori* "structuralism" of the Prague linguists and of Lévi-Strauss (and Haugen), which aims at elucidating the nature of myth as such, or for that matter of any product of the human mind, irrespective of historical setting. Edgar Polomé's "Approaches to Germanic Mythology," besides providing an excellent summary and evaluation of the sources for the subject, suggests that Dumézil's (and Lévi-Strauss') approach is more adequate to the fragmentary state of the data than an exclusively historical and inductive approach such as Karl Helm's. Classicists may find special interest in his discussion of the Germanic mother goddess Nerthus as described by Tacitus (*Germania* 40); and of the Germanic, Italic, and Hittite parallel patterns of encounter between Indo-European and non-Indo-European cultures. C. Scott Littleton discusses the criteria governing choice of conceptual *models* in approaching the explanation of cross-cultural parallels. Such models are misunderstood if they are thought of as providing in themselves *causal* explanations; rather, they are analytical frameworks, compressed similes meant to compare the relationship between certain

selected data and the relationship between selected elements of a logical construct. More specifically, Littleton argues the efficacy of Dumézil's revival of the *genetic model* used by the nineteenth-century historical linguists and solar mythologists ("Each member of a given set of cross-cultural parallels bears independent witness to a common prototype that existed in what may be termed a parent culture"), as opposed to other models traditionally used by anthropologists, i.e., the *independent-invention model* ("Common response to common conditions") and various *diffusion models* (Features invented in one culture are borrowed by other cultures). Matthias Vereno suggests a variety of further enquiries arising out of the relations between Dumézil's approach and the History of Religions in general. Among them are (1) the manner in which the sacred/secular distinction sharpens in proportion to the transfer of sovereignty from the first to the second of the tripartite functions; (2) the fate of the tripartite structures under the influence of Zarathustrian and Buddhist religious reforms and of the demythologizing tendencies of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam in the West and of Confucianism and Taoism in the East; (3) the survival of tripartite structures through the development of metaphysical and cosmological principles out of myth.

The other seven essays are devoted to more specific problems in various mythological traditions. Jaan Puhvel with consummate skill continues to lay to rest the flawed assumptions of most of the scholarship on Baltic religion and culture. Patrick Ford finds in the Irish tradition of the wells of Nechtan and the Iranian myth of Apam Napāt a common concept of "fire in water" as the source of inspired poetic wisdom. Marija Gimbutas refines the scholarly understanding of a Lithuanian god, Velnias, and Stephen E. Greenebaum discusses the relation between Indian Vrtrahan and Iranian Vərəθragna. The continuity of the notion of the outlaw as werewolf from Hittite law to medieval Germanic law and literature is the subject of Mary Gerstein's essay. Jeannine Talley tries to establish a connection between the folklore of the mandrake (Germ. *Alraun*), beliefs about runes, and the myth of Odin's voluntary sacrifice on the gallows at Yggdrasil. Closer to the interests of Hellenists is David Evans' long essay, "Dodona, Dodola, and Daedala," which struggles to make a coherent whole out of (among other things) myths of sacred oak, heroes with maimed or unsandaled feet, the Roman Nudipedalia, the imagery of *Aeneid* 6, and stockings hung for Santa Claus!

State University of New York, Buffalo

John Peradotto

---

*Kurt von Fritz*. The Relevance of Ancient Social and Political Philosophy for our Times. A Short Introduction to the Problem. Berlin and New York, 1974. Pp. iv, 57. DM 9.80 (paper).

The author of this concentrated study, well-known as a teacher and scholar both in Europe and in USA, deals with the relevance of Greek political and social thought for the understanding and handling of the crisis of our century, as a reply to those who, not without the help of misguided teaching and research in the classical field, in increasing numbers have presented the Classics as *Wissenschaft des Nicht-wissenswerten*. Von Fritz prepared this publication, part of a forthcoming book, as material for discussion at the Madrid Congress of Classical Studies in 1974. Against the background of an excellent presentation of the growth, aspects, and problems of the situation in both the liberal-capitalist and the socialist brand of society, he emphasizes the description and analysis of most of the essential issues of the condition, potentialities, and limitations of man and society in the two unsurpassed and never outdated masterpieces of Aristotelian thought, the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the