

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## The New Edition of Busolt's *Griechische Geschichte* G. Busolt: *Griechische Geschichte*, Band ii. Die aeltere attische Geschichte und die Perserkriege. Zweite vermehrte u. völlig umgearbeitete Auflage. 1895. Large 8vo. pp. xviii. 814. 13 Mk.

Reginald W. Macan

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 09 / December 1896, pp 432 - 436

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205088, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00205088](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205088)

### How to cite this article:

Reginald W. Macan (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 432-436 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205088

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

end of the fourth foot by position,<sup>1</sup> unless it forms a monosyllabic word. There are no doubt a few exceptions in Homer but so few and so doubtful that they afford no support for importing another. Thus in the phrase βῶπις or βῶπι πότνια Ἥρη the ι is certainly long and we should perhaps accent βῶπις ποτνία. At Φ 126 we should read, I now think, μελαίνῃ φρίχ(ι) ὑπαίξει.

<sup>1</sup> Unless of course the consonant or consonants lengthening it are part of the same word.

The rule was observed throughout the whole course of Greek epic verse. Indeed in the late highly polished school of hexameter writers it is still more stringent, for they decline to lengthen even a monosyllable *in thesi* at this part of the verse, at any rate generally speaking.

I believe that the only two exceptions to the Homeric rule in the Hymns are xxxii. 6 and xxxiv. 18, a precious pair of lines.

ARTHUR PLATT.

### THE NEW EDITION OF BUSOLT'S *GRIECHISCHE GESCHICHTE*.

G. BUSOLT: *Griechische Geschichte*, Band ii. *Die ältere attische Geschichte und die Perserkriege*. Zweite vermehrte u. völlig umgearbeitete Auflage. 1895. Large 8vo. pp. xviii. 814. 13 Mk.

The second edition of Professor Busolt's chief work is all, and more than all, it professes to be, an enlarged and thoroughly revised version of the first (1885-1888). It is virtually a new and in every way a bigger book. It is also a better book, an observation not necessarily consequent on the preceding. The improvement arises not so much from any change in the author's method, as from the notable additions to our resources which have been made during the last ten years, since the first and second 'Parts,' which have now grown into the first and second 'Volumes' of this *History*, saw the light. From two different quarters Greek history has received large endowments, by the Mykenaeen renaissance—it must still for convenience be called Mykenaeen—and by the discovery of the Aristotelian *Polity of Athens*. These original additions have naturally been attended by a huge and rapid output of treatises and articles, a formidable increment in the bibliography of our subject. It is enough to make less capable or more distracted students well nigh despair to see with what apparent ease Professor Busolt not merely utilises the additions to our original sources, but also digests the masses of accumulating exegesis, down to the last German monograph, before going to press. His exemplary diligence in this respect would make his work indispensable to all students of Greek history, quite apart from the value of his own contribution to the discussion raised by the new material, and by the literature

arising out of it. This growth of materials has led the author not merely to enlarge his volumes, but to re-distribute his chapters and paragraphs, and, indeed, to renumber and to rename them. The effect here is all for the better, and fully bears out the author's prefatory claim to exhibit a more thorough-going analysis of the original sources, and a more convenient synthesis of results than in the first edition. Yet, here I venture to suggest *argumenti causa* that the new first chapter (*Die mykenische epoche* i.<sup>2</sup> 3-126), useful and interesting as it is in itself, somewhat disturbs the symmetry and even the method observable in the *Handbuch* as a whole. This chapter is in the first place an inventory and description of the material remains of the so-called Mykenaeen period. It is in the second place a survey of the geographical distribution of those remains, and a discussion of the antecedents and origin of the Mykenaeen culture, with results probably not all acceptable, even now, to our leading archaeologists. It is not, and indeed it could not be, a history of the Mykenaeen period; the time is not yet come for that. This first chapter is preceded by three pages on the sources and recent bibliography (*Quellen und Literatur*): but the description of the archaeological evidences is here the description of the real *Quellen*, the most authentic, the most primitive. The second chapter deals with the origin of the historical complex of Greek states (*Die Entstehung der geschichtlichen Staatenwelt*): but the 'Mykenaeen' states are becoming more real than some of their successors: they had their constitutions, their cults, their economy, their politics, as well as their arts, and arms, all which can hardly be relegated permanently to the 'præhistoric' limbo. In truth, Busolt's

present arrangement can be but transitional. We may hope to see in the third, or in the fourth edition of the same work from the same learned pen, a further stage reached in the thorough-going analysis of evidences, and in the convenient synthesis of results. Meanwhile the book in its present form may safely be taken to exhibit more fully and fairly than any similar work the position of the whole argument down to the date of its publication (1893): and we can trust the indefatigable author, when the time comes for a retraction of the problems discussed in his first and second chapters, to place his readers once again fully abreast of the ever-growing argument.

The large amount of space devoted to the first volume to the Mykenaeen question, and the discovery meanwhile of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* entailed the transfer of *Early Attic history* to the second volume, with which indeed we are here more directly concerned: nor merely the transfer, but a wholesale reconsideration, only some few degrees less far-reaching and novel than the results of that Mykenaeen renaissance before recorded. In dealing with the new text, a source, or at least a 'channel,' (to borrow a distinction from v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff), of a class with which a scholarly historian is of course well qualified to deal, Professor Busolt naturally moves with even more authority than among the ruins and relics of Mykenai. We have all tried our hands, with more or less success, on the text, or on the contents, of the recovered treatise: and for a while the English contribution to the new debate was both prompt and ample. It must now be confessed that with the works of Kaibel and of Blass, of Wilamowitz and of Busolt before us—to name only the more considerable representatives—Germany is leaving us behind. It was bound to be so. What chance has a lecturer in Oxford—or, for aught I know, in Dublin or in Cambridge—of getting an audience together, out of our 'Mods.' ridden, 'Greats' ridden, Tripos ridden, Civil Service haunted first-classes, to stand such a course of deliberate and exemplary analysis, as we see deposited in *Aristoteles und Athen*, even assuming the genius and learning among us to essay it? There may be better times in store for those now condemned, or permitted, 'to bow themselves in the house of Rimmon'—our examinations-idol—but meanwhile his votaries are fain for the most part to serve this false god with dainties condensed from the works of those German prophets. But to return:—it is no matter for regret that

Professor Busolt had printed the first two hundred pages of his second volume before the appearance of *Aristoteles und Athen*, and has only been able to use that brilliant and suggestive work for the history from Drakon onwards, and, for that, only after having worked out his own results. We have thus in the volume before us, and especially in the forty pages devoted to the discussion of the new authority on its own merits, a more independent, or perhaps a less polemical, appreciation of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* than is possible to any one now, at least until he has accepted, or refuted, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Thus it will count for something with those, who may not be able to form an independent judgment, that Busolt, like v. Wilamowitz, regards the *Polity* as Aristotle's. It would save a deal of trouble, no doubt, even in the matter of mere citation, to be convinced that we might quote the treatise as Aristotle's, *sans phrase*. But even the ingenious manner in which v. Wilamowitz dovetails the composition of the *Politics*—or of the various courses of lectures which that work may represent—into the composition of the *Polity*, is rather suggestive than convincing. Perhaps those who doubt the strict Aristotelian authorship of the *Polity* may have been expecting too much from the historical excursions of the father of Logic: but 'very Aristotle' will still seem to many an hypothesis unnecessary to explain any of the data, and well-nigh irreconcilable with some of them. Apart from the traditional ascription of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* (plus 157 similar tracts) to Aristotle, would any scholar have identified the author of the Br. Mus. Papyrus cxxxi. with the author of the *Politics*? Well, yes, perhaps the brilliant writer of *Aristoteles und Athen*, who has convinced himself, and Professor Busolt too, that the author of the oligarchic party-pamphlet, which we all recognize among the sources of the *Polity*, was Theramenes, son of Hagnon, of Steiria, and none other. This identification adds not merely a fresh fame to Theramenes, but a new name to the list of Greek authors: for, it was not previously proved that Theramenes had published anything, no, not even his own speeches (*A. u. A. i.* 167). But it was, we are now told, from this lost and forgotten work of Theramenes that Aristotle derived, at the eleventh hour, after writing the well-known passage in the *Politics* on Drakon (2, 12, 1274b), that later account of the Drakontic Constitution, which formed one of the surprises of the new-found *Ἀθηναίων*

πολιτεία. Busolt may have done well in cancelling his acceptance of the hypothesis that Kritias indited the said brochure: but the tempting ascription to Theramenes is unprovable. If an authentic work by Theramenes had just come into 'Aristotle's' hands, and he was borrowing largely from it things new and old, it is a little unfortunate that no reference, however remote, to the literary activity of Theramenes occurs in the text. The praise of him by name in association with Nikias and Thukydides [son of Melesias] makes nothing for his authority as a writer, but rather the reverse, especially as it occurs in a context, for which Theramenes cannot have been 'Aristotle's' authority. It is one thing to suppose that the writer of the *Polity* had a more or less authentic report of a speech, or of speeches, of Theramenes in 404 B.C., or in 412-1 B.C., and used them in writing his accounts of the Revolution of the Four Hundred and of the Régime of the Thirty; it is another thing to name Theramenes as author of a never-cited tract, in which the Drakontic Constitution was set out, with much more to the same effect. But even if the description of the Drakontic Constitution in 'Aθ. πολ. 4' were demonstrably traced to the pen of Theramenes, that would leave its historical character as dubious, nay, as discreditable, as ever. Busolt has not been beguiled into accepting von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's verdict on the historical value of this passage, and Busolt's opinion on this matter is the more valuable, as he was originally prepared to reconstruct the constitutional history of Athens, upon the supposition that the Drakontic Constitution was a distinct and authentic stage in the order of events. The argument of *Aristoteles und Athen* helps to vindicate the passage as a genuine part of the original text, and plausibly nominates an ultimate authority for this novel and inconsequent chapter in Athenian history; but it has done very little (in my opinion) to render the passage acceptable as a real addition to our knowledge of the state of Prae-Solonian Athens, and for this conclusion it is pleasant to be able to cite the authority of Busolt's second thoughts.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> To avoid misunderstanding, it may be well to note that the sceptic is not bound to deny the restriction of the franchise, in Drakon's time, to the citizens who carried arms, and themselves provided the arms they carried (οἱ τὰ ὅπλα παρεχόμενοι). But the crucial question is whether Drakon was the author of a new Constitution, and of a new Constitution which is fairly described in 'Aθ. πολ. 4'. Is the authority or the argument of the *Polity* enough to carry that conclusion? I trow not.

Concerning still more primitive times and institutions, and their treatment by Busolt, and other German authorities, I can but allow myself here one general remark. Undoubtedly something may be recovered in regard to the character of 'ancient law,' from texts and inscriptions of the fourth and subsequent centuries, and a historian is bound in the first instance to make the most of the direct evidences, so far as they go. It seems, however, a shortcoming that recent investigation in Germany ignores, or even deliberately rejects, the assistance of analogies furnished by the comparative and anthropological methods to Hellenic *origines*. The primitive, or relatively primitive, condition of society, of government, of domestic and religious institutions within the area of later Hellenism will never be fully understood, without recourse to anthropology. We have the best precedent for the position, for there is hardly a method employed by anthropology to-day which is not potentially used by Thucydides in his immortal proem, on the beginnings of Greek history. From this point of view an English reader may be struck by the amount in Busolt's section on the *Beginnings of the Athenian State* (§ 15), which is valid or verifiable only for post-Eukleidean Athens. Aristotle, in the *Politics*, fell into the mistake of supposing that the analysis of the domestic institutions of Athens in the fourth century supplied the clue to the historic origin of the city-state. He formulated the parent idea which Sir Henry Maine, twenty-two centuries later, represented as 'The Patriarchal theory.' The name may be a mis-nomer, but we cannot get rid of it now, the rather, as it has provoked the not less objectionable term 'matriarchate,' to describe that condition of society, in which kinship is traced through females chiefly or exclusively, and institutions conform, in a greater or less degree, to this uncivilised precedent. For German Hellenists I will not say the works of McLennan, but the works of their own savant, A. H. Post, apparently do not exist. (Those writers are both gathered to their fathers, and can be named without fear or favour). To take one instance; the importance of the *Avunculate*, or mother's brother's right, in early Hellenic, or apparently Hellenic, society, is hardly to be explained save by analogies, of which anthropologists can supply any number. Some curious points in Athenian law, e.g. the legality, under certain circumstances, of marriage between children of one father, may be in part explicable as survivals of

'matriarchal' rights. Again, no one acquainted with the literature of this subject is likely to acquiesce (with Busolt, p. 114) in the interpretation of *ὁμογάλακτες* (Milk-brothers?) as originally 'the descendants of a common *Father*.' We shall never get to the bottom of the problems touching the nature and origin of tribes and phratries, or understand the revolution, or evolution, which passed over society in Attica and elsewhere, in the beginnings of history, by the mere analysis and description of society as it was in the fourth, or even in the fifth and sixth centuries, within the strictly Hellenic city-states.

It is not possible here to discuss the mass of details upon which issue might be taken with the learned author of this large yet closely packed volume, but I may note a few of the points specially interesting to myself. (1) Busolt rejects Beloch's suggestion that the stories of the two expulsions of Peisistratos are duplicates in disguise; but I do not find his refutation (p. 320) quite conclusive. On this point v. Wilamowitz agrees with Busolt: but v. Wilamowitz himself detects a *doublette* in the Herodotean stories of the Atheno-Aiginetan wars, and it is doubtful if the greater chronological consistency of the Peisistratid tradition, can rescue the stories in detail. (2) Busolt (pp. 167, 583) retains the view that at Athens in 490 B.C. the supreme command circulated day by day within the strategic college. I have elsewhere (I trust) made it more probable that at Marathon the Strategi were still Colonels of the phyleic regiments, and the 'War-Lord' still in supreme command. (3) Busolt (p. 528), accepts the story of the conduct of Miltiades at the Danube, the incredibility of which Thirlwall long ago pointed out, and the origin of which I have elsewhere tried to explain. (4) Busolt retains his former chronology for the Ionian revolt, by which the siege of Miletus is made out to have lasted three years: objections and alternatives to this chronology I have urged elsewhere at sufficient length.

It is natural that in undertaking to digest not merely all the ancient authorities but nearly all the immense literature of the present day upon our subject, Professor Busolt should now and then make himself responsible for discrepant utterances. Thus (on p. 650) the anecdote about Themistokles and the increase of the Athenian fleet told in the *Ἀθ. πολ.* is dismissed as 'highly improbable in itself, and a contradiction of the older sources,' while on the next page an element of truth is conceded to it. If

Prof. Busolt had happened to recall, in this connexion, the statement of Herodotus concerning Kleinias son of Alkibiades and his own trireme (Hdt. 8, 17), he might have found the contradiction less absolute, and the element of truth somewhat more probable. In dealing with the stories of the Persian wars, which form the second theme of this volume, the author could not exhibit such an advance on the previous edition of his work as in the earlier chapters, for there has been little fresh evidence to consider. His duty has been of necessity confined to a report on the ever growing bibliography, and a revision of his own previous positions in view of more recent discussions. It is to be regretted that the author cannot have seen Mr. G. B. Grundy's map of the battle field of Plataea, with accompanying paper, published by the R. G. S. in 1894, as that sound bit of work has completely antiquated previous surveys. Among recent studies H. Delbrück's brilliant monograph appears to have exercised some influence on Busolt's treatment of the Persian wars, and he has gone the length of accepting the *Visions-hypothese* as the true explanation of the celebrated Shield-episode at Marathon: but he reacts freely, as might be expected, against the exaggerated scepticism of H. Welzhofer, who is a veritable *advocatus diaboli* in regard to the canonisation of Herodotus.

This second edition does not reach the point at which the first edition ended: the history of the *Pentekontaetia* is relegated to the third volume, for which probably we shall not now have long to wait. Whether that third volume will carry us down to the end of the fourth century remains to be seen: but those who know the *Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte* (1880), and remember that Dr. Georg Busolt made his début with a substantial monograph on 'The Second Athenian League' (1874), are looking forward with the liveliest interest to the remaining volumes of this *History*. On the scale now ruling the work the third volume, which was originally intended to reach the battle of Chaironeia, can scarcely go lower than the archonship of Eukleides: but it may be hoped that a fourth and final volume will appear before a new edition of the earlier volumes is demanded. This hope may look rather like a left-handed compliment, but it is expressed in the interests of the author and of his subject. The later volumes will fill a gap left by the abrupt close of Duncker's great *History*. Busolt's work is dedicated to Duncker, that is now

to his memory. It is becoming the fashion in some quarters to dismiss Duncker as the modern Ephoros, who bedizened the native simplicity of the historic Muse with his rationalism and his rhetoric: but whatever may have been the value of the Egyptian and Oriental portions of his work, in regard to which Duncker could not himself control the native sources, his contribution to the discussion of the problems of Greek history is not to be despised, and its sudden cesser with the second year of the Peloponnesian war was a real misfortune. That misfortune Busolt's forthcoming volumes will more than compensate, but the loss will not be in every respect covered. Busolt's work

is a monument of learning, and of scientific exposition: he has deliberately sacrificed upon that altar the charms of literary art. His work is conscientiously devoid of rhetorical merit, and it is no mere pastime to read it from cover to cover. Very full tables of contents facilitate the use of the volumes as books of reference, but I note with eager approval the author's pledge that his work shall not close without a copious index (*einen ausführlichen Register*). This promise constitutes an additional reason to wish the distinguished author well and quickly through the remainder of his laborious task.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

## BLAYDES' *ADVERSARIA*. PART II.

*Adversaria in Comitorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, scripsit et collegit F. H. M. BLAYDES, LL.D. Pars II. secundum ed. Kockianiam. Halle, 1896. Pp. 360. M. 7.

DR. KOCK's edition of the *Fragments of Attic Comedy* has given the study of them a new stimulus; to be welcomed, not only because they are interesting in themselves, but because of their influence upon the later Greek literature—and, of course, upon the Roman. I am not thinking only of mere centos, Epistles of Alciphron and Aristaenetos; but Lucian, for instance, the romance-writers, sophists, moralists, epigrammatists—Comedy was for these what Homer was for the tragedians. Comedy—especially the middle and the new—was the abundant spring that supplied them with themes and types and phrases.

This may be illustrated by a new example. In a tirade against women [Lucian] *Amor.* 42 ii. 443 (a sophistic σύγκρισις): τίς οὖν ὁ μετὰ τὴν τοσαύτην παρασκευὴν βίος; εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἔξοδοι, καὶ πᾶς θεὸς ἐπιτρέβων τοὺς γεγαμηκότας, ὧν ἐνίων οἱ κακοδαίμονες ἄνδρες οὐδὲ αὐτὰ ἴσασιν τὰ ὀνόματα—Κωλιάδας,<sup>1</sup> εἰ τύχοι, καὶ Γενετυλλίδας, ἣ τὴν Φρυγίαν<sup>2</sup> δαίμονα καὶ τὸν δυσέρωτα κορμὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ποιμένι. τελεταὶ δὲ ἀπόρρητοι καὶ χωρὶς ἀνδρῶν ὑποπτα μυστήρια καὶ—τί γὰρ δεῖ περιπλέκειν;—διαφθορὰ ψυχῆς. Sommerbrodt, the latest editor, places an asterisk against πᾶς θεὸς and remarks 'π. θεατῆς ΩΓ Harl. Obscura haec neque ullo modo adhuc

illustrata. Hoc solum constat interiisse haud pauca ante ὧν ἐνίων.' There is no omission, nor should the meaning be in doubt. The complaint is of the luxury of women and their addiction to orgiastic forms of worship (Ar. *Lys.* 387—396); the γυνὴ φιλέσδοος makes every imaginable obscure divinity (Scholl. on *Lys.* 1 and 389) an excuse for going abroad. The phrase is from Menand. 601 (quoted by Strabo 297):

ἐπιτρέβουσιν ἡμᾶς οἱ θεοὶ  
μάλιστα τοὺς γήμαντας· αἶψά γάρ τινα  
ἄγειν ἑορτὴν ἔστ' ἀνάγκη.

and (as I have indicated) more from the same source is probably embedded in the passage. The *shepherd* is Attys (Theocr. xx. 40) or Adonis (iii. 46, xx. 35), to whom the MS. κῶμον is inapplicable: I have therefore emended it. (Cf. Lucian i. 233, iii. 646 of Attys: of the *Adonia*, iii. 454, Ar. *Lys.* 396, Dioscor. *A.P.* v. 53, Plut. *Alcib.* 18, *Nic.* 13, Bion i. 81.)

English scholars, since the days of Porson and Elmsley and Dobree, seem to have done little in this region—Dr. Blaydes records conjectures by Prof. Ellis, Prof. Palmer, a few of my own—but every student of pure literature should be familiar with these remains and with what can be gathered from the Roman adaptations of Plautus and Terence.

Like all Dr. Blaydes' work, this volume might with advantage have been many times less in bulk, so full is it of repetition and unprofitable remarks. Readings, conjectures, comments, are needlessly tran-

<sup>1</sup> Ar. *Lys.* 2, *Nub.* 52 Blaydes.

<sup>2</sup> Pollux iii 11, Diog. Laert. vi. 1, 1.