

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](#)



Busolt's *Greek History Griechische Geschichte*. Dr Georg Von Busolt. Band III. Teil I.: Die Pentekontaetie. Pp. xxii + 592. M. 10. 1897. Teil II.: Der Peloponnesische Krieg. Pp. xxxv + 1049. M. 18. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1904.

Ranald M. Burrows

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 02 / March 1905, pp 128 - 131
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0099173X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0099173X

How to cite this article:

Ranald M. Burrows (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 128-131 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0099173X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in Orientius. That is Mr. Ellis' doing. His edition of the poet, issued in the Vienna Corpus in 1888, first called modern attention to him. More recently M. Bellanger, professor at the Lycée of Auch, has taken up the study of the ancient bishop of that town, and round his volume quite a little literature has arisen. It is indeed a most excellent volume, not so much (perhaps) in matters of textual criticism, for here Mr. Ellis naturally left little to be done, but in general explanation and collection of material which might elucidate the *Commoni-*

torium and the poet's life. I do not desire to criticize it in detail. That has been adequately done by reviewers in England and Ireland and France and Germany. I will only add my praise to theirs. For the rest, I fear that my view of Orientius differs too widely from that of M. Bellanger and indeed of Mr. Ellis. They regard Orientius as interesting for what he says. To me, as I have tried to explain, the chief interest of his poem lies in what he omits.

F. HAVERFIELD.

BUSOLT'S GREEK HISTORY.

Griechische Geschichte. Von Dr. GEORG BUSOLT. Band III. Teil I.: Die Pentekontaetie. Pp. xxii+592. M. 10. 1897. Teil II.: Der Peloponnesische Krieg. Pp. xxxv+1049. M. 18. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1904.

THE first part of Dr. Busolt's third volume has already been incidentally alluded to in these pages; by the present writer, for instance, in his notice of Hill's Sources for Greek History (*C.R.* 1898, p. 451). Indeed, although it has only now come to hand for reviewing, in company with the second part, it must long ago have become familiar to English scholars, and praise and blame are alike belated. Let us turn to the second part, which tells in continuous narrative the whole story of the Peloponnesian war. It is needless to say that the book is a valuable commentary on Thucydides, and that on the whole its author's judgments are sound and weighty. The 167 pages specially devoted to Sources, and the references given in foot notes throughout the book, form the best Bibliography of the subject that exists, and should be in the hands of all who deal with it. Dr. Busolt is at his best in dealing with Chronology and Statistics, and we notice full and excellent discussions on such points as the strength of the Athenian forces (p. 878 *seq.*), and the exact limits of harvest time as determining the Peloponnesian invasions (p. 907 *seq.*). None the less the book does not wholly satisfy. It would be unfair indeed to criticize it for want of life and vividness. Dr. Busolt has meant it to be a record of facts, and nothing more. In this connection I should only suggest in passing

that the printing of particularly important sentences in the body of the narrative in much bolder type than the rest is out of keeping with the dry light in which the narrative is presented to us. When after three pages of ordinary type, for instance, we suddenly are confronted with *Das Scheitern der Verhandlungen war wesentlich Kleons Werk*, we get an impression of theatricality and sensationalism which is of course not at all what the author meant, but is none the less somewhat comical. One is reminded of that unfortunate death-scene in Daudet's *Jack*, which—for indeed there is no accounting for tastes—gave Georges Sands such a 'serrement de cœur' that she was unable to work for three days. 'Jack—c'est moi—Je suis là.' Pas un mouvement. La mère eut un cri d'épouvante. 'Mort?'—'Non'—dit le vieux Rivals d'une voix farouche 'Non . . . Délivré!!' It would be less suggestive of la voix farouche if paragraph-headings, or some such simple device, could be adopted instead.

This is by the way. A book can only be fairly judged from the standpoint of the object which it sets out to achieve. Dr. Busolt's History is meant to be thorough, exhaustive, exact. Does it from this point of view come up to the highest standard?

Modern researches into even such a limited period as that of the Peloponnesian war are, it is needless to say, voluminous. To go into full detail over every small point discussed in the controversies of recent years would have demanded even more than the thousand pages which Dr. Busolt has given us. Grote devoted two and a half volumes to this part of the subject, and,

taking into account the size of the page, that means only a little less than is given us here. Granted that much new material has come to light since Grote's time, and that to say that Busolt does not go into matters as fully as Grote did, merely means that he has written on a smaller scale, not that there is a want of proportion between his treatment of various sections of the work, we have still to face this question. If a history aims at being exhaustive, and sacrifices to that aim all literary style and interest, ought it to be on a smaller scale than Grote? Ought it to omit? One naturally turns for a comparison to a book that deals with another subject that has grown with recent years, Dr. Frazer's *Pausanias*. It cannot be said that Dr. Busolt's work gives the same impression of massiveness, of his having got to the bottom of every controversy and understood every suggestion. That this is a high standard goes without saying. Yet it is one by which I think Dr. Busolt would have us judge him.

Let us take a few instances. No notice is taken of the interesting side lights which were thrown by the investigations of the members of the British School at Athens on the Athenian attack on Melos. Milchhöfer is quoted (p. 1147) as giving certain views on the Battle of Delium. These views may have been formed independently of Frazer, but the latter (vol. v. p. 76) published two years earlier, and should have been quoted. More important is the absence of any reference to Frazer's account of the walls of Plataea, though attention might easily have been called to it by Dr. Grundy's short answer in the *Classical Review* (vol. xii. p. 162). It is however in regard to Pylos and Sphaacteria that Dr. Busolt's shortcomings are most startling. It is hard to avoid the belief that some distinguished German scholars find it irksome to follow a long piece of consecutive English. Grote has been translated into German, and so, we notice, has the third volume of Freeman's *History of Sicily*. Apart from writers who have extorted attention to this extent, the output of English work on ancient history is not nearly so great as that of German. We have partly ourselves to blame, then, if a German historian does not take it for granted that he has thoroughly to master all that has been written in English on his subject. On Pylos and Sphaacteria, unfortunately, at least three-fourths of all that is important on the subject is written in English, from Leake's day to our own. To

judge from Monsieur Fougères' *Appendice* to the new edition of the *Guide Joanne* to Greece, French scholars, set on the track by Dr. Frazer's *Pausanias*,¹ are familiar with the fact. I have not seen the latest German edition of Baedeker's *Greece*, but some German historians at least are not yet alive to it.

Dr. Busolt indeed has not fallen so heavily as Eduard Meyer. In the fourth volume of the latter's history, published in 1901, when all the various articles that had appeared in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* and the *Classical Review* on Pylos were already published, Eduard Meyer gives us his views on the matter in a short paragraph of twenty-three lines (p. 382). The first statement that caught my eye was one that naturally caused me concern, as coming from a historian of distinction 'The views of Burrows (*J.H.S.* xvi, cp. the controversy in the *Classical Review* x, xi) differing as they do in some points from those of Grundy appear to me not tenable.' I was relieved, though somewhat astonished, to find, a few lines above, that the view which had attracted Meyer, and appealed to him as the centre point of Dr. Grundy's position and the key to the difficulties of the narrative, was the identification of Thucydides' two entrances to the harbour with the bay of Boidia Koilia and the Sikia Channel. Now it is true that this view was put forward by Dr. Grundy in his original Article (*J.H.S.* xvi.), but, though superficially attractive, it was the weakest part in his whole argument, and was at once recognised by him as such and withdrawn. In a note he had printed as an appendix to the special copies of his article he definitely withdrew it, and the matter never formed part of our 'controversy' at all. The fact that he had retracted the view in question was clearly stated both by him and me in one of the very volumes of the *Classical Review* (xi. pp. 8 and 158) to which Meyer refers. It is hard to find words to characterise an historian who is in the first place carried away by a theory so unsound that a month after publication it is retracted by its author, then takes so little interest in the matter that he never discovers the retraction, and finally quotes, as if he had read them, the articles in which that retraction appeared!

Dr. Busolt has at least taken some pains to understand the main points of Dr. Grundy's revised theory as to the blocking of the channels. The unfortunate thing is that having grappled with Dr. Grundy's theories

¹ See Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. v. pp. 608-613.

only to reject them, he seems to have sunk back exhausted from his study of English texts. He does indeed give an excellent Bibliography of the various articles on the subject, but there is no evidence that he has studied them. It is possible that Dr. Busolt thought my views so similar to his own, as indeed on many points they are, that it was unnecessary to go fully into them. It is possible that he rejected some details, or thought others too unimportant for him to allude to in the space at his disposal. Professor Bury for instance, in the admirable account he has given of the whole incident in his history of Greece (school edition, pp. 430 to 438), has naturally exercised a discrimination in the matter. He would indeed be a foolish researcher who would expect other scholars to agree with him on every point, and to attach the same relative importance to every detail. Yet he would be almost as foolish who could not distinguish the man who had studied his views and sifted them from the man who had never taken the trouble to study them at all. If it were merely that the only hint of any identification of particular points in the topography, such as Brasidas' rocks, or of any remains of fortifications on Pylos or Sphacteria, is contained in a foot note reference to 'Photographieen bei R. M. Burrows ebenda,' one might assume conscious rejection or omission. It is more difficult however to adopt this attitude to Dr. Busolt's incidental remarks about the fortifications of Pylos. He could hardly have remarked without comment (p. 1087) that Pylos only needed to be fortified against land attacks on the North-east if he had known that the reasons which I gave for placing Demosthenes' wall on the North-west had at least the *primâ facie* support of being directly approved by one writer whose article is mentioned in his Bibliography (H. Awdry *J.H.S.* xx. p. 19), and indirectly by both of those whose independent visits to the site resulted in the taking of the 'Photographieen' (R. C. Bosanquet and A. Lindsay, *J.H.S.* xviii. pp. 147 *seq.*). Much the same applies to Dr. Busolt's unquestioning identification (p. 1091 = 1089 n. 2) of the wall facing the mainland (Thucydides iv. 9. 2) with the wall on the side of the harbour (iv. 13. 2). If Dr. Busolt had come to the conclusion that I had not after all succeeded in proving my point that, so far from these walls being the same, Thucydides could not be understood unless one of them was placed on the North-west of Pylos, and the other on the South-east,

it was strange that he should refrain from refuting an argument that had clearly proved itself capable of deceiving others.¹

It might be urged that these are points on which Dr. Grundy and I disagreed, and that our controversy was so tedious that any one might be forgiven for refusing to decide between us. There is a good deal to be said for this! It is difficult, however, to suggest excuses for positive misstatements that seem to have arisen from not reading us on points where we *are* agreed. Whether for instance an historian accepts my view of the last struggle on Sphacteria or that of Dr. Grundy, he would be obliged to regard as meaningless the statement (pp. 1108, 1109) that the Spartans defended themselves in the fort on the north peak (Nordspitze), till the Messenians 'climbed the steep ascent, and seized a higher peak (eine höhere Bergspitze) in their rear.' On my theory the point the Messenians climbed was the cliff at the top of the gorge, which could scarcely be described as a peak, and was considerably lower, not higher, than the north peak. On Dr. Grundy's theory they climbed the actual north peak, and the words 'höhere Bergspitze' are equally inappropriate, as the Spartans on that supposition were not on another peak at all, but on the slopes of the same peak.

More far-reaching is a mistake that Dr. Busolt has made in regard to the entrances to the harbour. He rejects Dr. Grundy's view, as I have said, and is convinced that the two channels to which Thucydides refers must be the Sikia channel and the broad entrance which now separates the south of Sphacteria from the fort of Neo-Kastro. Misled, however, by the assumption that the Spartans, though they did not in fact on his own showing block the entrances, must have seriously meant to do so, and ignorant or regardless of my suggestion that Thucydides' under-estimate of the breadth of the southern channel arose from a natural though mistaken combination of an Athenian fact with a Spartan excuse, Dr. Busolt falls back on the old theory that the southern entrance was probably much narrower in ancient times (pp. 626 and 1090 = 1089, note 2). Such a view is absolutely out of the question. If there is one point on which Dr. Grundy and I are in solid agreement, and on which from first to last we have spoken clearly

¹ See the discussion in *J.H.S.* xviii. Besides the three papers in that volume (pp. 147, 232, and 345) and the two papers in *J.H.S.* xvi. (pp. 1 and 55), see also *Classical Review*, x. (p. 371) and xi. (pp. 1 and 155). See also Mr. Awdry's article in *J.H.S.* xx. (p. 14).

and decisively it is this (*J.H.S.* xvi, pp. 3, 72, 73). Error does indeed die hard.

I have no wish to exaggerate the significance of these shortcomings, nor to suggest that they could be found to occur in other parts of Dr. Busolt's work. He has won a high reputation, and there is no reason to think that he has not deserved it. It cannot be denied, however, that the incident of Pylos and Sphacteria has been raised to importance in the world's history by the fact

that the greatest of the world's historians thought it worth his while to put some of his best work into describing it. It is at least a pity that on such a matter two of the leading historians of Germany would be less able to give an account of themselves to the ghost of Demosthenes than the ordinary English schoolboy who had read his Bury.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

DILL'S ROMAN SOCIETY.

Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.

By SAMUEL DILL, M.A. Macmillan. Pp. xxii + 639. Price 15s. net.

It will be seen from the title of this important work that it does not, in point of time, quite join on to Dr. Dill's earlier study of Roman affairs, his *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. There is room for an intermediate volume, and we hope that some day Dr. Dill will give it to us.

In the meanwhile, what is the plan of his present work? This is divided into four books. It is not altogether easy to make out what links bind the four together, or bind the contents of some of the books singly; but, so far as we can see, Books I, II deal with Social Life; III with the Philo-sophic Director; and IV with the Revival of Paganism. Books I and II differ in that I handles 'the worst of [Roman] society, whether crushed by the tyranny of the Caesars or corrupted and vulgarized by sudden elevation from ignominious poverty to wealth and luxury,' while Book II 'will reveal a different life' because 'there were great numbers, both among the nobles and the masses, who maintained the traditions of old Roman soberness and virtue.'

The chapters of the First Book deal with The Aristocracy under the Terror, The World of the Satirist, and The Society of the Freedmen. The Second Book, looking most at the happier days inaugurated by Nerva, takes up The Circle of the Younger Pliny—that is to say, well-to-do and cultivated men, who lived now in Rome, now on their estates—Municipal Life, with its cultivated or uncultivated freedmen, its petty ambitions, its generous gifts to fellow-citizens; and Plebeian Life in many parts

of the Roman world, under which head we find much to read about *collegia*, whether they were for social, religious, or business purposes.

To Books III and IV we shall return presently. It must be clear from the headings of chapters already quoted that these studies might be made to mean or cover either much or little. Dr. Dill makes them mean much, and the chapters deal very fully with their respective subjects, and even contain in many cases more than they directly promise. The work is as thorough and solid as readers would expect who know the companion volume. But the arrangement of the books and chapters is not perhaps quite an ideal one, and it leads to some overlapping. Book I. c. 3 and Book II. c. 3 are not very sharply distinguishable in topic; and even within the limits of one chapter cases of overlapping or repetition may be found, as on p. 2 compared with p. 6, or on p. 597 compared with p. 604.

Apart from this drawback, one which is hard to exclude where wide and far-reaching matters are concerned, the author's style is agreeable, smooth, and yet unmonotonous and well fitted to keep up the attention of his readers. This stout volume is not exactly one which will, like the Stoic books known to Horace, lie about on ladies' sofas or dressing-tables; but it is as readable as such topics can be made. The literature and history of long-dead peoples can never be studied without an effort; but the effort is here made an easy one. The treatment is not repellent: we see always where we are going, and very soon learn confidence in our guide. A large part of the book too is taken up by what we may call essays on the views and surroundings of the authors of the age: each comes up in turn; and this