

Reviews of Books

Griechische Geschichte. Von Dr. GEORG BUSOLT. I. Theil, 1885 :
II. Theil, 1888. (Gotha : F. A. Perthes.)

It is with considerable interest and pleasure that we welcome the appearance of a new history of Greece. Its author, Professor Busolt, is an historian of no small experience : he has published, among other works, a monograph on 'Die Lakedaimonier und ihre Bundesgenossen' and an elaborate article in 'Philologus' xli. on 'Der Phoros der athenischen Bündner.' He is now engaged in writing a general Greek history, which is to be continued down to the battle of Chæronea, and in the two volumes already issued he treats of the period extending from the earliest times to the events following immediately upon the thirty years' truce of 445 B.C.

So much good work has recently been done in the comparatively new spheres of archæological and philological research, that no new author need apologise for intruding upon ground hitherto occupied by historians so famous as Thirlwall, Grote, and E. Curtius. Professor Busolt, however, does not propose to supersede the works of his predecessors, but writes with a slightly different object in view. His book is one of a series of manuals of ancient history in general. Thus, while it aims to give a clear and succinct account of Greek history, embodying all the most recent discoveries and theories, it is evidently meant to serve not so much as a mere narrative of the facts themselves, as a compendious guide to the enormous literature which has little by little grown up around every detail of Greek life and thought. From this point of view one of the most useful features in Professor Busolt's book is the admirable survey of materials and authorities, both ancient and modern, which is prefixed to every chapter and to almost every section. Nor do these surveys contain mere lists of names and references, but in them the comparative worth of different kinds of evidence is carefully weighed and criticised ; and in the case of the later Greek writers, more especially of Plutarch, many ingenious attempts are made to trace the sources from which their materials must have been derived. The results of these attempts, however, we would venture to suggest, are generally too uncertain to admit of so many references to writers so little known as *e.g.* Ephorus and Theopompus, in the form of 'Ephorus (Diod. xi. 69)'¹ or 'Plutarch, Pericles, 9 (Theopompus).'² For when we actually refer to such passages in Diodorus or Plutarch, as often as not, we look in vain for any indication of their source sufficiently plain to justify such a method of

¹ Vol. ii. 75.

² Vol. ii. 459.

quotation. Still, though we may complain of Professor Busolt's practice, there can be no doubt that he is right in his theory, that the statements of such comprehensive compilers as Diodorus and Plutarch are of very various value; so that if we would get at their true worth, we must as far as possible discover the real basis on which they rest in each particular case.

These general surveys are supplemented by lengthy footnotes appended to every page, which refer us again not only to all the received authorities, ancient and modern, but to an enormous number of essays and articles in German, English, French, and Italian periodicals. The reader is thus enabled to see at a glance the whole bibliography of any given subject; so that, should he wish to differ from the conclusions drawn by Dr. Busolt, he is put in a position easily to find out for himself all that can be said on the other side.

A very large portion of these notes is devoted to questions of chronology; for the learned professor is above all things a chronologist. He does not take a single date for granted, but subjects each one in its place to the minutest investigation, showing both how it has been arrived at and how far it is trustworthy. Thus even in the case of so well established a date as 480 B.C., the year of Xerxes' expedition against Greece, he is able to explain away an old difficulty with the help of fresh evidence. For Herodotus (ix. 10) mentions an eclipse of the sun as occurring at the time; until quite lately, however, astronomers only knew of an annular eclipse in the year 478 B.C. But Dr. Busolt cites from Hoffman's more recently (1884) calculated tables an eclipse on 2 Oct. 480, thus confirming both the ordinarily received date and the narrative of the ancient historian. Valuable, however, as these chronological notes are in themselves, we cannot help thinking that a great deal of space and needless repetition might have been saved, if the extremely diffuse discussions upon these various dates, which are scattered up and down the book, sometimes in the notes and sometimes in the text, had all been collected together and relegated to an appendix; or, still better, had appeared as a separate volume in the form of chronological tables. In their present shape they tend to confuse the reader, and the arguments are so ill arranged that they make it almost impossible for him to understand on what principles the dates finally arrived at are obtained.

Similarly in vol. i. pp. 852-860 Dr. Busolt puts in the text an elaborate discussion of the comparative weights and values of the Æginetan, Eubœic, and other standards of coinage, and upon their various relations to the Babylonian and Phœnician systems. In these pages he gives us such a multitude of figures and such a mass of details strung together without any apparent method, that their general effect is quite bewildering; whereas, if only a few comparative tables had been inserted, all would have been—at least comparatively—clear and simple.

The same want of method and arrangement is seen in the general structure of the book. Thus in vol. i. § 10, under the heading 'The Pisistratidæ, the Lacedæmonian Hegemony and Clisthenes,' there occur no less than twenty-six pages about the Lydian monarchy and its relations to the Asiatic Greeks, and about the commercial and intellectual progress of the Greek colonies not only in Ionia, but all round the Black Sea and even in

Egypt. Again, in vol. i. 182-222, after apparently on page 183 acquiescing in the usually received view as to the successive order of the Greek migrations eastwards to Asia Minor, he reverses this order without further note or comment, and proceeds *per simplicem enumerationem* through the Dorian, Ionian, and Æolian states, working upwards from south to north.

Professor Busolt apologises, it is true, in the preface to his second volume for these strange confusions, and has accordingly made in his later volume some considerable improvement in his method of dividing and subdividing his subjects; yet even here chapters are to be found three hundred pages long, and sections running to nearly one hundred pages. In fact it is not too much to say that much of Dr. Busolt's best work loses half its value through these faults of style. His second chapter, for example, is a perfect mine of information on points of Greek trade, commerce, and colonisation; but its method, at least from a literary point of view, is a return to that of the logographers before Herodotus. 'By them,' says the old critic, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 'the history of each nation or city, Greek or barbarian, was taken up separately, with little or no connexion between the affairs of one and those of the other; the object of each writer being, apparently, but to place the materials collected by him in the form in which he had received them, without addition or curtailment, before his public.' Dr. Busolt seems indeed to be himself conscious that his manual is in many parts little more than a deep mine out of which some future historian may dig his raw material; for in his second preface he tries to console the reader, coming weary from his first volume, with the half apologetic, perhaps half sarcastic remark, *dass meine griechische Geschichte als ein Handbuch mehr zum lernen als zum lesen geschrieben ist*.

To turn, however, from the form to the matter of the book, we have looked with greatest interest at those more obscure or more disputed parts of Greek history on which recent research and criticism might have been expected to throw most light, and here Professor Busolt does not disappoint us. He gives us an admirable sketch of the Homeric question, stating concisely and temperately what may fairly be called the results of this long-protracted discussion. He does his best to unravel the contradictory accounts found in ancient authors of early races and tribes like the Pelasgians, Carians, Leleges, and Cadmeans. He brings together the latest philological evidence to show how little justifiable is the usual threefold division of the Hellenic dialects into Ionian, Dorian, and Æolian. He traces carefully the twofold stream of Dorian migration into the Peloponnesus, and suggests an explanation as to how it became known as the return of the Heraclidæ. He gives a full and detailed description of the great discoveries at Mycenæ, but refuses to believe them to be of prehistoric antiquity; in fact he would date them as subsequent to the Dorian invasion, and the rich and powerful kings of Mycenæ he would regard as Dorian princes of the twelfth or eleventh century B.C.

Concerning the Spartan constitution Dr. Busolt has little new to tell us, at least in his text: even the old problem of the origin of the dual monarchy he is content to leave with the modest suggestion that it may have sprung from the rivalry of two mighty houses. But in the notes

he states and in general discusses all the modern and mostly wild theories on the origin and nature of various Lacedæmonian institutions. In a few words he shows the basis of such theories, if they have any, and with equal brevity he states the most cogent reasons for disbelieving them.

In treating of the Athenian constitution Dr. Busolt is hardly so cautious. His sketch of the early state of Attica, of the divisions of the people into the four Ionic tribes and into Eupatridæ, Geomori, and Demiurgi, and of the gradual disappearance of the monarchy before the growth of the aristocracy, leaves little to be desired; but it is surprising to find admitted into the text of a work generally so sceptical Lange's highly ingenious but unsubstantiated theory of the constitution of the Athenian council or senate. Because the fifty-one ephetæ who decided cases of homicide together with the nine archons make up the round number of sixty, which can be divided by four, and because the senators were judges in cases of homicide at Sparta, it scarcely seems to follow, in the absence of other evidence, that each of the four Ionic tribes must have elected fifteen members to the senate thus constituted, and that out of the sixty so elected nine were chosen as executive magistrates and called archons. Indeed, still less probable does the hypothesis appear, when we remember that it was the custom of Athenian law courts in later times always to have an odd number of judges, *e.g.* 501, to prevent an equality of votes. Why should we not rather emphasise the passage in Aristotle's 'Politics' (ii. 12) where the Areopagus is apparently spoken of as a pre existing βουλή? or failing that, what need is there, after the complicated συνοικισις that took place in Attica, of supposing an Homeric βουλή to have existed at all?

Professor Busolt's account of Solon's reforms in the constitution is very careful and suggestive. In the main it follows the lines laid down by Schömann and Curtius in opposition to Grote. Especially noticeable among the many good points in it, is the highly ingenious and at the same time satisfactory explanation of Androtion's statement that the famous *seisachtheia* was only a depreciation of the coinage, such that the mina, which before went but for seventy-three drachmæ, now went for a hundred. What Solon must really have done, Dr. Busolt points out, was to change from the Æginetan standard, which was followed by Ægina and Megara, the enemies of Athens, to the Eubœic standard, which was twenty-seven per cent. lower. Thus Solon was enabled not only to relieve the debtor, but to form a closer connexion with the friendly states of Chalcis and Corinth, which both followed the latter standard, except that Corinth had adopted a threefold division of the stater peculiar to herself.

The information derived from the Berlin fragment of Aristotle's 'Politics,' that after the archonship and exile of a certain Damasias the citizens elected four of the nine archons from the Eupatridæ, three from the peasants (ἄποικοι?), and two from the artisans, Dr. Busolt considers to belong to 586-585 B.C., the year of the archonship of the second Damasias, known to history, and not, as many commentators have held, to 621 B.C., the year of office of the first Damasias. The method of election described he would explain as a compromise effected by the Eupatridæ, after they

had tried to regain once more their old supremacy in the state by an attempt to overthrow the Solonian constitution.

In dealing with the internal changes made by Clisthenes, Aristides, and Pericles, Professor Busolt in his general outlines differs nowhere very widely from ordinarily received views. He has, however, collected for the first time in an accessible shape a large mass of details more or less new about the offices and functions of the various Athenian magistrates, especially the ten generals, the origin and increase of whose powers he treats with especial care and fullness. But it is in his account of the development of the Athenian fleet and maritime empire that Professor Busolt has most that is new to tell us, though here again his method of treatment is specially chargeable with the same faults of confusion and diffusiveness. Of these new points we will now proceed to notice some of the most striking.

Herodotus' account (vii. 144) of Themistocles' famous proposal, whereby the Athenians were induced to build a fleet of 200 vessels with the revenues derived from the mines of Laurium, and thus to lay the foundation of their naval power, Professor Busolt, following Duncker and others, brings into connexion with a passage in Polyænus (Strat. i. 80. 60), which, until the discovery of the Berlin fragment of Aristotle's 'Politics' referring to the same event, had been allowed to pass almost unnoticed. By a comparison of Aristotle and Polyænus he is enabled to explain and perhaps even to correct Herodotus. For Themistocles, it would appear, brought forward a scheme rather more elaborate than Herodotus would lead us to suppose, containing the germs of the later trierarchic system: he proposed not only that the people should forego the usual distribution of the revenues from the mines of Laurium, but that out of this money 100 talents should be assigned to the 100 richest men in the state, one talent to each, with which each should build a trireme; that each trireme, when built, should be publicly tested, and that if it were not approved, then the money should be refunded. The Athenians already possessed 70 ships, and in this way 100 more were built (not 200, as Herodotus states) in time for the war against Ægina, which seems to have broken out again about 482 B.C. After its conclusion the Athenians still continued to build new ships with great vigour, and thus were able in 480 B.C. to bring a fleet of 200 vessels against the Persians at Artemisium. Again, after the repulse of Xerxes' invasion, Themistocles seems to have passed a second law (which must not be confused with his first), which provided for the annual building of a certain number of new triremes, and for the first organisation of the trierarchic system, whereby the expenses of the fleet were met year by year.

The formation of the Delian confederacy Professor Busolt assigns to the year 476 B.C.; but the account of its original institutions occurring in the text of Thucydides (i. 96) he considers, with Kirchhoff and Classen, to be an interpolation. He argues that the *πρῶτος φόρος*, mentioned in the passage, could not possibly have amounted to 460 talents, because of the five districts—the Island, Hellespontine, Ionian, Carian, and Thracian—into which the confederacy was divided soon after 446 B.C., only the first three could have been included at that time within the boundaries of the league; and because these three districts, as it would

appear from the inscriptions recording the quota of one-sixtieth dedicated to the goddess Athena out of the sums paid by the allies, which begin in the year 454 B.C., seem never to have contributed, at any rate subsequently to that date, more than 300 talents. But is there sufficient evidence to warrant such a conclusion? In the first place there is nothing to show that most of the Thracian and Carian states, which on this hypothesis are supposed to have entered the confederacy somewhat later—the former after the successful expeditions of Cimon against the Persian garrisons in Thrace, the latter after his great victory at the Eurymedon in 467 B.C.—did not belong to it from its foundation. Rhodes indeed, far the most important state of the later Carian district, was already a member; ³ and if Rhodes, why not many of the other Carian towns in the more immediate neighbourhood of the island? In the second place absolutely nothing is known either of the assessment of the tribute or of the amount actually paid between 476 and 454 B.C. In the absence of any evidence, therefore, any reasoning backwards from the later state of things, such as Dr. Busolt's conclusion implies, is quite inadmissible. Finally, it might be asked, is 460 talents such a very large sum after all? It is doubtless true that many of the allied states, which at first sent contingents of ships, afterwards contributed money in their place. This change might indeed lead us to expect a larger sum total in the later years of the confederacy. But at the same time it must be remembered that the war against Persia was never afterwards prosecuted with such vigour as then; that every trireme, kept constantly afloat, must have cost some six or seven talents a year; and that 200 ships, most of them certainly Athenian, would appear to have been the normal number which Cimon took with him on his expeditions.

Professor Busolt traces with great ingenuity the varying rise and fall of the tribute between the years 454 and 425 B.C., showing how it depended on the various fortunes of the Athenian arms. Thus immediately after the destruction of the 250 Athenian ships in Egypt, the tribute was increased, doubtless in order to build new vessels, with which to replace the old. But in 450, when the new ships were mostly completed, the quota lists exhibit an average decrease of some ten per cent. So again in 446 after the cessation of the war with Persia, and the disastrous defeat of Coronea, the tribute was in many cases lowered: several states seem to have withdrawn from the confederacy altogether, thus still further lowering the sum total paid, while the assessment of the island of Thasos was for special reasons suddenly raised tenfold, from 3 to 30 talents. By 439 B.C. so many of the Carian towns had withdrawn that henceforth Caria disappears as a separate district of the Athenian empire, and the few Carian states still remaining faithful appear in the lists as incorporated with the Ionian district. At the same time the payments of many of the Thracian, Hellespontine, and even of the Ionian towns became very uncertain. Thus to meet these various defalcations the Athenians found themselves obliged to exact larger sums individually from a considerably diminished number of states. The quota lists show us that this was effected either by actually increasing the existing assessment, or by separately assessing many of the smaller states, which had

³ Cf. Plut. *Them.* 21.

previously paid together as *συντελεῖς*, or in some few cases by demanding an *ἐπιφορά* or additional payment. The sum total, however, seems to have remained at much the same figure, about 460 talents. How, then, is this to be reconciled with Thucydides' statement that Pericles in 481 B.C. estimated the annual tribute at 600 talents? Professor Busolt can only suggest that Pericles must have included the yearly payments of the war indemnity, which was imposed upon the Samians after their revolt in 440-438 B.C., and which, considering the length of the siege, can very well have amounted to as much as 140 talents *per annum*. Finally it would appear from a note on p. 352 that Dr. Busolt believes that the evidence furnished by the inscriptions tends to confirm the statement of the orators, that about 425 B.C. the tribute was doubled; but for his arguments we must await the publication of his third volume.

The method of assessing and collecting the tribute seems to have been as follows. A new assessment was made as a general rule once every four years, dating in the earlier period from the great Panathenæa in the third Olympic year, but after the beginning of the Peloponnesian war from the year following. The amount was fixed by the Athenian senate in accordance with the reports of the *rakrai* or commissioners appointed, two for each district of the empire, to survey the resources of the subject states and to assess the tribute proportionately. But if the subject states were dissatisfied with the assessment of these commissioners, it was open to them to make their own wishes known, either by themselves proposing a counter-assessment or by inducing some private Athenian citizen to name on their behalf a sum more consistent with their means. Finally, if the senate refused to listen to their representations, they might appeal from its decision to the Heliastic courts. The allies themselves brought the tribute to Athens every spring at the time of the Great Dionysia, and paid it over to the Hellenotamiæ, who, after disbursing such sums as were necessary to meet the current expenses of the confederacy, deposited the surplus in the opisthodomus of the Parthenon, where it gradually accumulated into a large reserve fund. If any states delayed payment without sufficient cause, the Athenians sent out certain officials called *ἐκλογεῖς* to collect the sums in arrear, and their demands were, if necessary, backed up by ships of war.

Equally interesting is Dr. Busolt's account of the measures which Athens adopted to secure her empire. Thucydides makes the general statement that she encouraged democracies in the subject states: the inscriptions in two or three instances enable us to see how this was done. In the case of Erythræ in Ionia the task of remodelling the constitution on a more democratical basis was entrusted by decree of the assembly to certain *episcopi* and a *phrurarchus* or commandant. Similarly five special commissioners were appointed to reorganise affairs at Chalcis after the reduction of Eubœa in 445 B.C.; and it would appear from another fragmentary inscription¹ that five commissioners were sent to Miletus to execute a similar task. Athenian commandants, sometimes with civil in addition to their military functions, were stationed at the head of Athenian garrisons in many of the allied states. To still further strengthen the empire and prevent the spread of disaffection, military colonies

¹ C. I. A. iv. 22a.

(κληρουχίαι) were established in the islands, and here and there upon the coasts of the Ægean. Thus Pericles sent out such colonies to the Thracian Chersonese in 447 B.C., to Eubœa in 446, and to Naxos and Andros about the same time.

Nor did the interference of Athens stop here: she also took measures to limit the judicial powers of the dependent states, though whether she did so systematically is extremely doubtful. Indeed, on this subject it is almost impossible to make any general statements, as the evidence is very scanty and imperfect, and must be interpreted as true only of the particular states to which it applies; for in all probability the amount of interference varied in different cases. Naturally all offences against the empire, such as high treason, rebellion, or refusal to pay tribute, were tried in the Athenian courts. But that these were not the only kind of offences to be so dealt with, appears from an inscription⁵ which records that the Chalcidians of Eubœa were bound to refer all serious charges, such as involved the penalties of death, exile, or disfranchisement, for settlement to the Athenian dicasts. Similarly all civil suits, in which sums of money above a certain amount were in dispute, were, at any rate in many cases, to be dealt with by the same authorities. On the other hand, Dr. Busolt argues, and with considerable force, that the *ἐνυβόλαιαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐνυμμάχους δίκαι*, in which the Athenian orator states in Thucydides (i. 77) that his fellow citizens allowed themselves to be worsted, must mean *suits relating to private contracts*, which in accordance with separate treaties concluded between Athens and the various allied states were tried not necessarily in Athens, but in the city to which the party accused belonged. In support of this theory Dr. Busolt brings together a considerable mass of evidence from Aristotle, the orators, and inscriptions; and such an interpretation, compared with others, certainly gives additional point to the claims of forbearance advanced by the Athenian orator.

Enough, however, has been already said, without entering into any further details, to show what an immense amount of hitherto almost inaccessible information Dr. Busolt has made practically available for the ordinary student of Greek history. Some indeed may be tempted to complain that he has thrown little or no new light upon many of the more notorious *questiones vexatæ*, like e.g. the institution of the lot at Athens, or of the Nomothetæ, Nomophylaces, and Graphè Paranomôn. But surely such complaint is unreasonable; such problems in the absence of fresh evidence admit of no definite solution, and in these cases no such evidence is forthcoming. In most cases Dr. Busolt has dealt with them with due caution and scepticism, and is especially to be praised for the self-restraint which has kept him from the beguiling employment of framing new theories of his own, destined only to fall before the onslaught of the next and newest critic. In a word, Dr. Busolt has, to our mind, a twofold claim upon our gratitude: in the first place he has collected within a tolerably reasonable compass a whole mass of very heterogeneous materials, which have never been put together before; and in the second place he has produced out of this chaos something like order. His 'Handbuch der griechischen Geschichte' is therefore to be regarded, as we have said before, not so much as a finished

⁵ C. I. A. iv. 27.

history as a foundation on which he himself or some future historian may build hereafter. From this point of view we look forward with increased interest to the publication of his third volume, for in it he will have to deal with a period for which, the further it extends, the more abundant become the materials furnished by the different departments of recent archaeological research. Thus, although in his first two volumes Dr. Busolt has done much to enlarge and correct our notions of Greek history, he has before him an opportunity of doing still more in the volumes which are yet to follow.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias. Edited with Introduction and Notes by John Gilmore, M.A. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.)

IN re-editing the fragments of the *Persika*, Mr. Gilmore doubtless felt himself justified by the inaccessibility of the existing edition of Müller; and in so far as he has collected all that can be recovered of his author into a concise and comparatively inexpensive form he has done a service to the student. But it may be questioned whether Müller's method of printing the fragments as a sequel to Herodotus, and leaving them in the main to speak for themselves, has been at all improved upon by the elaborately annotated volume of Mr. Gilmore, whose comments, especially in the earlier part, might have been greatly curtailed with advantage to the reader, who, wishing only to see the parallel passages from other ancient authorities, could well spare second-hand disquisitions on Assyrian mythology, and long quotations from well-known books like Rawlinson's Herodotus. In the case of an author who exists only in epitome and second-hand fragments, the diffuse commentator may easily find himself beating the air.

But waiving the question of proportion, Mr. Gilmore has at any rate embodied in his notes all parallels and comments of importance. Some modern scholars, who, while reverencing Herodotus, still believe that Ctesias had better opportunities of learning the facts of Eastern history, and that his *mala fides* yet remains to be proved, will object to the editor's distinctly hostile attitude towards his author. As soon as we reach firm ground, and have satisfactory literary evidence to compare with Ctesias, as at the period of the Persian expeditions to Greece, he differs so little from that evidence, and where he does, so often improves obviously upon it (as in his reduction of the numbers of Xerxes' army to 160,000 and of the Athenian navy at Salamis to 110 ships), that it is difficult to understand why the other and less assured portions of his history should be so constantly depreciated. For example, it is surely prejudging him to assume, as Mr. Gilmore does in the introduction (p. 14), that his history of the Assyrian empire is pure invention, because, had he drawn from Persian sources, he would have left us an account similar to the poetic fictions of Firdusi. In small points which can be checked, such as the interpretation of names, the Cnidian physician shows himself a faithful witness; e.g. in the cases of Mount Bagistan and of Oebares; and of the reigns of Cambyses and Darius, his account is both possible and probable in itself, and on the whole accords singularly well with monumental evidence,—itself in the nature of things not above suspicion. In according so high