

Reviews of Books

De Lycurgo in facultate litterarum Parisiensi ad doctoris gradum promotus disseruit H. BAZIN. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1885.)

It is almost superfluous to say that this dissertation adds nothing to our knowledge of the history of Lycurgus. The veil in which that legislator is shrouded will probably never be lifted. Bazin's treatise is an attempt to reconcile the conflicting accounts which we possess as to Lycurgus' date and legislation; but his arguments rest on little more than conjecture, and some of his conjectures are inconsistent.

A writer on Lycurgus is confronted on the very threshold of his investigation with the question, 'Did Lycurgus ever exist?' Two modern students of history, Gilbert¹ and Gelzer,² writing about the same time, have each independently and on various grounds denied his personality. We are told by Strabo³ that Hellanicus entirely ignored Lycurgus (*Λυκούργου μηδαμῶς μνησθαι*) and attributed the Spartan constitution to Eurysthenes and Procles; and we can hardly believe that Hellanicus could have suppressed so great a name either wilfully or from ignorance. The extraordinary variety of dates assigned to his life and legislation—they range from 1100 to 820—and the apparently symbolical meaning of many names connected with him in the legends, have been cited as additional reasons for doubting his existence. It cannot be said that Bazin has met these difficulties. The sole argument which he adduces is that the singularity of the Spartan institutions can only be explained on the supposition that they were founded by one man. But although this may be used as *prima facie* evidence, it will hardly outweigh the silence of Hellanicus; and Busolt⁴ has recently explained the peculiar character of the Spartan and Cretan institutions as due at least in some degree to the instinct of self-preservation engendered in conquerors of Dorian race when they had to maintain themselves against hostile masses of subject peoples.

Assuming, however, that Lycurgus did exist, we are at once met by chronological difficulties. Not to mention later and less important authorities, Herodotus (i. 65) and Xenophon (Rep. Laced. 10. 8) assign as his date the period just after the Dorian invasion, i.e. (presumably) circ. 1100 B.C. Thucydides (though without naming Lycurgus) seems to place

¹ *Studien zur altspartanischen Geschichte*, 1872.

² In the *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. xxviii. p. 1 foll. 1873.

³ viii. 366.

⁴ *Griechische Geschichte*, p. 191.

him shortly before 800 B.C.; while Aristotle, on the strength of the quoit of Iphitus, on which the name *Λυκούργος* was inscribed, assigns him to the year 884 or 776, according as Iphitus is regarded as having originally founded or as having only reorganised the Olympic festival. Bazin endeavours to reconcile Herodotus and Thucydides by placing the Dorian immigration as late as the tenth century; he claims to have thus swept away at a stroke two of the darkest centuries of Greek history. No doubt (as Grote remarks) the lists of Spartan kings previously to the first Olympiad are to a great extent fictitious, and Bazin expresses himself to the same effect; but it is somewhat inconsistent, after rejecting these lists as untrustworthy, to proceed to build on them a new calculation as to the date of the Dorian invasion. This Bazin does, when he assigns twenty-three years—the average duration of the reigns of nine historical kings of Sparta—to each king in the Spartan lists from Alcamenas back to Eurysthenes; the result is that the Dorian invasion happened in the tenth century. It is not accurate to say, as Bazin does, that Grote entertained this view; Grote merely declares himself⁵ unable to separate what is historical from what is not in the Spartan lists, and in another chapter (part i. c. 18) he expressly says that a long interval must have elapsed between the Dorian immigration and the dawn of history, since ‘the obscure and barren centuries which immediately precede the first recorded Olympiad form the natural separation between the legendary return of the Herakleids and the historical wars of Sparta against Messene.’ The united voice of ancient tradition assigns the Dorian immigration to the twelfth or beginning of the eleventh century; and some such early date is also fixed by the fact that the Homeric poems (whose development cannot be placed later than the ninth century⁶) undoubtedly imply that the various races have already occupied their historical sites. And if Busolt is right in assigning, as he has recently done, the fortifications of Mycenæ to Dorian chiefs of the eleventh century, we are bound to place the Dorian invasion in the twelfth and Lycurgus (if we follow Herodotus and Xenophon) not later than the eleventh century.

On the whole we must allow that the existence of Lycurgus has not yet been proved; there is something to be said in favour of viewing him as a form of Apollo. We may believe this without accepting Gilbert's conclusion that the Lycurgus-myth did not grow up before the seventh century, when Terpander's reforms were ascribed to Lycurgus as one of the forms of Apollo. We know that the Dorians worshipped Apollo from the earliest times (v. Busolt, p. 472). Gilbert argues that *Λυκούργος* : *Λύκιος* :: *Ἐκάργος* : *Ἐκατός*, and Gelzer interprets the name as ‘the light-bringer;’ the last writer also quotes many authorities to show that in very early times Lycurgus was worshipped as a god at Sparta and had a temple (*ἱεὺρ, ναός*—not merely a *ἱερῶν*) and priests. If some traces could be found of the cult of *Ἀπόλλων Λυκούργος* either in Sparta or in other Dorian states, Gilbert's argument would be greatly strengthened; but even as it is, the verses⁷ in which the Pythian prophetess saluted

⁵ *Hist. of Greece*, part ii. c. 4.

⁶ Busolt, p. 86, and Professor Percy Gardner's article in *Macmillan's Magazine* for September 1886.

⁷ *Hdt.* i. 65.

Lycurgus as he entered her shrine sum up not inaptly the present state of the controversy :

δίξω ἢ σε θεὸν μαρτύρομαι ἢ ἄνθρωπον.
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον θεὸν ἔλπομαι, ὃ Λυκόργε.

J. ADAM.

The Fall of Constantinople, being the Story of the Fourth Crusade.

By EDWIN PEARS, LL.B. (London: Longmans & Co. 1885.)

Quatrième Croisade; la Diversion sur Zara et Constantinople. Par J.

TESSIER. (Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1885.)

THE Latin conquest of Constantinople does not lie on one of the unexplored bypaths of history, but it so happened that no monograph dealing with it existed in English, and Mr. Pears has done well in attempting to fill the gap. His volume appears at the same time as M. Tessier's pamphlet, which covers a small portion of the same ground, being devoted to the discussion of the causes which turned aside the crusaders of 1204 from their original course towards Egypt and Syria into an attack on Constantinople. The two works may therefore be taken into consideration at the same time.

The main thesis of Mr. Pears' book is that the irruption of the Ottoman Turks into Eastern Europe was entirely due to the crushing blow inflicted on the Byzantine empire by the fourth crusade, all other causes which led up to that irruption being of very secondary importance. Further, he subjoins a statement—in which M. Tessier agrees with him—that the attack on Constantinople was not due to any sudden inspiration of the moment, but had been long before projected by the Venetians, and probably also by Boniface of Montferrat.

Both these points are worth discussion, and we must confess that on each of them our own opinion would lead us to an opposite conclusion to that at which Mr. Pears has arrived.

The view which maintains that the Byzantine empire, if it weathered the storm of 1204, would have been unassailable by the Turk, is eminently controvertible. It rests, in Mr. Pears' case, on the idea that the power wielded by Alexius Angelus was practically the same as that which Basil II had possessed some two centuries before. Although he does not state this notion in so many words, it is plainly visible in his account of Constantinople, whose commerce, wealth, and resources he describes as they existed in A.D. 1000, not in A.D. 1200. In fact, the reaction against Gibbon's views on the eastern empire—a reaction started by Finlay and popularised by Professor Freeman's essays—has gone so far with the present generation of historians, that there is some danger of our growing into a belief that the Byzantines, far from being invariably weak and incapable, were always strong and energetic. The one view is as false as the other. The empire of the Angeli was not powerless merely because its rulers were cowardly and apathetic. It was in itself a mere hollow shell, whose inner strength had been already eaten out. Looking at it from the military point of view, we should say that the Byzantine empire was never its old self after the fatal battle of Manzikert (1071 A.D.) That defeat shattered not only a single army, but the whole Byzantine