

theory buttressed by a prodigy of scholarship in several complicated areas of Greek culture, a "Cambridge" or "ritual" approach became generally available. Within a few years, its application to Greek studies had been enormously widened: . . . . .

The first application of the theory outside Greek studies was Murray's 1914 Shakespeare Lecture, "Hamlet and Orestes," a brilliant comparative study on the common ritual origins of Shakespeare and Greek drama. In 1920 appeared . . .

p.283 In the thirties, S. H. Hooke edited two important symposia, Myth and Ritual (1933) and The Labyrinth(1935), in which a number of prominent scholars studied the relationships of myth and ritual in the ancient Near East; . . . . .

By the forties, old subjects could be gone back over with greatly augmented information. . . . Rhys Carpenter amplified Murray's earlier treatment of Homer in Folk Tale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics(1946)

p. 284 So far in the fifties half a dozen new territories have been explored . . . Theodor H. Gaster's Thespis (1950) generalized a ritual origin for the whole body of Near East sacred literature; . . .

p. 285 . . . the ritual approach to myth and literature . . . . can cohabit happily with a great many other approaches.

p. 289 If the fallacy of historicity is still with us, the fallacy of etiology may finally be on its way out. In Themis, as far back as 1912, Harrison wrote:

✓ The myth is not at first aetiological, it does not arise to give a reason; it is representative, another form of utterance, of expression. When the emotion that started the ritual has died down and the ritual ~~through~~ though hallowed by tradition seems unmeaning, a reason is sought in the myth and it is regarded as aetiological.