

DAVIS' A FRIEND OF CAESAR.

A Friend of Caesar: a Tale of the Fall of the Roman Republic. By WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS. New York: the Macmillan Company, 1900.

“He was delighted to find scribbled on the wall, “Artemisia to her Agias: you are real mean.”” (p. 142) ‘If this book,’ says the preface, ‘serves to show that Classical Life presented many phases akin to our own, it will not have been written in vain.’ It is apparently not written for the scholar, whose temper will be tried by fussy footnotes, which inform him that Baiae was a famous watering-place, or that *pulcherrima* means ‘most beautiful.’ The lay reader, for whom it is intended, will have three facts impressed on his memory, that the Romans spoke the language of the modern melodrama, garnished with occasional *pols* and *hems* to preserve the local colour, that Julius Caesar when not ranting was engaged in twaddling, and that the best Greek wine in Rome was to be obtained at ‘the Big Eagle restaurant down on the Vicus Jugarius.’ The language and sentiments of the characters, partly historical and partly imaginary, are about as much like those of Cicero’s contemporaries, as the language and sentiments of Rasselas are like those of Abyssinians of the eighteenth century. Here is a specimen of Caesar’s after-dinner conversation:

“Therefore while we love we do indeed dwell in the Islands of the Blessed: but when the vision

fades away, its sweet memory remains to cheer us in our life below, and teach us that where the cold intellect may not go, there is indeed some way, on through the mists of the future, which leads we know not whither; but which leads to things purer and fairer than those which in our most ambitious moments we crave.” The voice of the conqueror of Gaul and German sank with a half tremor; his eye was moist, his lips continued moving after his words had ceased to flow.’ (p. 214)

But best of all is the thrilling scene at the Rubicon—transpontine indeed, but fortunately too long to quote. Indeed Mr. Davis has a fine turn of eloquence. The following soars far beyond us:

‘The azure above glowed with living brightness, and by night the stars and planets burned and twinkled down from a crystalline void, through which the unfettered soul might soar and soar, swimming onward through the sweet darkness of the infinite’ (p. 242).

To give Mr. Davis his due, the archaeology is fairly correct, though we may doubt whether the Latin for storehouses is *horreae*, or whether Gallic horses were called *mammi*, or whether Chrysippus was born 180 B.C. What are we to make of this sentence: ‘*Vina Opimia* is the best’? What was the *ius osculii*? Where is the town of Coma? Who is Calverly? and who Ichomachus? What authority is there for the black shoes of the Equites? or for the quotation ‘that majesty that doth hedge about a king’? or for the grammar of ‘whom she was sure was in the house’?

J. H. VINCE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE EARLY AGE OF GREECE.

PROF. P. GARDNER in the English Historical Review (1901, pp. 743-6) framed some strictures upon my ‘Early Age of Greece’ which I have hitherto had no opportunity of answering. I should have dealt with them in a postscript to my reply to Mr. Myres in the last number of the *Classical Review* had space allowed.

Dr. Gardner says that I call ‘the Achaean theory (of the origin of ‘Mycenean’ culture) as much out of date as the geocentric scheme

of astronomy.’ In dealing with Dr. Gardner’s belief in the Achaean theory I said: ‘Dr. Gardner comforts himself with the reflection that most archaeologists have held the Achaean theory, but he forgets that there was a time when the majority of astronomers believed that the sun revolved round the earth.’ This does not assert that the Achaean theory is out of date, but it shows that the fact that the theory is held by Perrot and the majority of archaeologists

(the only grounds put forward for his belief by Dr. Gardner) is no evidence of its truth.

Against Dr. Gardner and the majority of archaeologists I maintained that the Mycenaean culture was not that of the Homeric Achaeans, but of a section of the indigenous Mediterranean race, and I further hold that the Achaeans of Homer had come down from central Europe in the early Iron Age. Dr. Gardner has now come over to me, for he now says that the recent discoveries in Crete 'prove that in Crete at least the race of the Mycenaean civilization was not Hellenic,' but, when he states that the 'character of the palace at Cnossus' &c. 'all seem to point to a culture in relations with those of Egypt and Babylon, a cousin perhaps of the Canaanite civilization, but having no relation whatever to anything Greek,' he does not face my arguments to show that the full growth of the Mycenaean art in Crete is to be ascribed to influences from continental Greece (p. 202) confirmed by Mr. Evans' discoveries there cited. Further, if there was a non-Aryan people in Crete, they would have been the Eteocretans, but Bosanquet's excavations at Praesus, a chief city of that race, have shown that it certainly was not a cradle of the full Mycenaean culture.

He says that I 'hopelessly confuse the question of race and the question of the character of civilization.' Yet my words (p. 74) 'that the same primitive culture was spread over the whole of the Mediterranean and even central Europe' show that I do no such thing.

He says that my proposition that 'the race that produced the Mycenaean culture was a Greek-speaking race called by the historians Pelasgi' is 'baseless and extravagant,' and he says that my 'way of citing and trusting ancient writers is one which is generally supposed to have been extinct among scholars since the days of Niebuhr.' It is enough to refer him to my replies (C.R. pp. 82 col. 2 and p. 83 col. 2) to similar charges by Mr. Myres (C.R. p. 71 col. 2 and p. 75 col. 2). Dr. Gardner blames me for using Homer and Aeschylus, yet he himself (*Man. Gr. Antiq.* p. 152) cites Callimachus to prove that 'the Pelasgians planted in Dotian territory near Lake Boebeis in Thessaly a grove in honour of Demeter.'

Dr. Gardner 'welcomes' my chapter on the

Homeric age, but he does not tell the reader that it proves that the Mycenaean culture was that of the Pre-Achaean Pelasgi, while that of the Homeric Achaeans is that of the full Iron Age which I identify with the culture of the early Iron Age of central Europe. He would thus appear to have given up his old belief that the Achaeans had created the Mycenaean culture! I hold that the Achaeans were a large fair-haired people who came from central Europe. Dr. Gardner now admits 'that the Achaeans were a fair-haired race, and that they came down into Greece from the north.' 'But' (says he) 'why should the Achaeans be Celts rather than Germans, if they are not to be (what seems after all most natural) Hellenic?' But he might have seen on my page 369 that I, like the ancients, include Germans in the term Celts. Over two dozen reviewers have noticed this and I have dealt with the point in my reply to Mr. Myres *supr.* p. 88 col. 1. Dr. Gardner in suggesting that the Achaeans are Hellenic is only again adopting my doctrine (*Early Age*, 112-3). Thus Dr. Gardner is another of my converts. Yet in the face of these admissions he calls my theory 'baseless and extravagant.'

He says that 'the best authorities' will not accept my dates for Hallstatt. 'The best authorities' are dealt with in my reply to Mr. Myres (C.R. 89). Dr. Gardner objects to my arguments from philology (1) pointing out that I do not suggest a Celtic derivation for Achilles, and (2) saying in reference to certain labialized forms in Greek (*e.g.* ἴππος, πέρρατες) that he 'has asked the highest authorities to whom he has access and their reply is adverse to giving any weight to Mr. Ridgeway's view.' Unluckily for my critic Mr. J. H. Moulton (*Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1902) has pointed out in support of my view that Fick (*Personennamen*) has already identified Ἀχιλλεύς with *Agilulfs*. Dr. Gardner's reliance on authority has proved unfortunate for him in the case of the Achaeans, and the date of Hallstatt; equally so is his trust in his philologist friends, for they evidently did not know Fick's derivation of Achilles. Can Dr. Gardner's 'best authorities' show that ἴππος is a true Greek form, or can they meet my arguments based on the Arcadian dialect?

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.