

with 'glass.' The error appears in both the first and the latest editions of the poet.

Professor Gilbert Davies' inaugural address on the Utility of Greek (Maclehose, University Press Glasgow) is well worth reading. The new professor of Greek dwells upon the mental training which Greek and Latin furnish in what may be called the higher regions and takes as a test the 'ability to handle abstract and general terms with understanding and accuracy'—a capacity which modern languages do not bring out in anything like the same degree. He draws attention to some advantages of Greek which are often overlooked—the instructiveness of its subtle logical development and its special importance to the student of what in this

country is the much neglected study of comparative Philology. Mr. Davies is no advocate of compulsion.

It is worth remarking that the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique* is now entering upon its fiftieth year. The aim set forth in the first number was to keep clear of party politics, and to keep in view only the intellectual interest of writers and readers. The subjects dealt with include classical and modern literature, history and geography, mathematics and science, and all other branches of secondary instruction, with the study of method. Its non-political character has been faithfully kept. To readers of the *Revue* it must seem strange that England has no corresponding paper.

CORRESPONDENCE

HOMER AND HIS AGE.

MR. ALLEN, in his more than generous review of my *Homer and His Age*, says that, as to Knossian and Mycenaean archaeology 'an expert, I understand, has been retained to curse.' If Mr. Burrows be that expert, he has not, like the Archbishop in *The Mort Arthur*, 'done the curse in the best manner and the most orguilous,' and I thank him for correcting some misprinted numerals, while I look forward with pleasure to his promised work on Cretan discoveries. Mr. Evans's *Prehistoric Tombs at Knossos* appeared too late for my purpose, and I have been unaware of its publication.

Mr. Burrows cursed not, but I think his criticism is 'perhaps a little gay.' He says that, in my book, 'Highlanders illustrate most things, and not least that the Laird of Runraurie used imported swords but home-made spades at the Battle of Killiecrankie.' I do not understand! I said nothing of the sort. If the Laird did anything at the battle, he viewed it from his drawing room window. He used no swords or spades, home-made or made in Germany; and it is

NO. CLXXXIV. VOL. XXI.

doubtful whether the spades which dug the shelter trenches on the hill were those of Claverhouse, or of Lord George Murray in 1746. I said nothing about them. I said nothing at all about the Laird, except that, on his home farm, remote from any town, he had a smithy, in 1689; and that probably a Homeric chief, far from towns, had also *his* smithy; so that his ploughman and shepherd would not need 'to forge their own tools,' as Mr. Leaf supposed to be indicated in *Iliad* xxiii. 835. The historic Highlanders illustrate, I think, *two* other points of custom in my book—not 'most things.' The burden of illustrating the evolution of defensive armour is borne, successfully, I hope, by other peoples, Egyptian, mediaeval, Red Indian, and so forth. Not to know or care about military evolution, outside of the Homeric area, has been the fault, or the misfortune, of Reichel and his allies.

Is it by my own fault, or through the gaiety of Mr. Burrows that he has misunderstood me on a point of essential importance? After interesting remarks on the overlapping

E

of bronze and iron weapons (of which I also gave examples) in Cretan graves, he argues that the indifferent use of both metals at once 'throws light on that twice repeated phrase in the *Odyssey*' (*αἰτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος*), 'which is inexplicable on the theory that the swords and spears of 'the moment' were all of bronze, and that Homer always 'means what he says.'

Now, in my opinion, that phrase is hardly explicable, if at all, on any theory except that, at the 'moment' when it was composed, 'iron' was synonymous with 'weapon,' as in Shakespeare's 'I can wink and hold out my iron.' But iron could not become synonymous with 'weapon' (I suggest), while bronze was equally in use, and if I am right 'the moment' of the composition of the verse (a popular gnomic saying), must be long posterior to the chalko-sideric age of these Cretan tombs. (Cf. *Homer and His Age*, p. 193, where this opinion is stated.) Mr. Burrows then gives Mr. Ridgeway's view, and adds, 'Mr. Lang on the other hand—How are the mighty fallen—takes shelter in the host of Athetizers, and rejects the two lines as "a very late addition"' (pp. 193, 203).

Did Mr. Burrows not read the context of the words which he quotes? I say (p. 193) 'the line in the *Odyssey* must be a very late addition . . .,' and here I own that for 'must be' I should have written, 'may be regarded as a very late addition.' But surely my next sentence makes my meaning clear. 'If, on the other hand, the line be as old as the oldest parts of the poem, the author for once forgets his usual antiquarian precision.' That is, the author, or authors, who, by the hypothesis of their archaizing, have uniformly, through two epics, adhered to bronze as the metal for weapons, suddenly let out, in one line, that iron and weapon are synonymous. On pp. 203, 204, I speak of the same line, and again offer these alternative explanations, 'if the line is genuine,' 'if the line reveals the true state of things.' This being so, how can I be said to athetize the line? We should never athetize a line because it contradicts a theory of ours, though I am far from denying that some lines, as in Mr. Allen's opinion, 'were of the nature of gag,' thrown in by a rhapsode. My bias

leads me to prefer, for my own part, the theory that a solitary line, when it contradicts the uniform tenure of two epics, is a very late addition. It implies that, when it was composed, the predominance of iron had given rise to a popular saying in which iron is synonymous with weapon.

It is as if, in the Early English epic of *Beowulf* (in which iron is the only metal for weapons), *bronze*, in a single line, appeared as a synonym for weapon. That line, if genuine, would be a survival in *Beowulf* of a very much earlier age than *Beowulf* as it stands; and I suggest that the Odyssean line may be 'gag' of a much later age than the *Odyssey* in general. I trust Mr. Burrows will believe me when I say that I did not athetize the line; but offered alternative solutions, twice.

Mr. Burrows, speaking of the hypothetical 'younger poets' of the age when bronze and iron, for weapons, overlapped, says 'they constantly introduced the arms and weapons of their own age.' If so, iron would be nearly as common for swords, as bronze in the poems, or more common. Yet it appears in only one line, and then as a synonym for weapon. How could this happen? Because every man of the younger poets, except one, in one line, was, so far, a careful archaizer? Is that probable? The question I leave to the reader. Mr. Burrows regards the poems as full of anachronisms,—or at least as containing several anachronisms, left standing into the early iron age, conceivably out of ancient poems whose very language is unknown. Of these survivals he names the Palace of Alcinous and the Shield of Achilles. Now I cannot tell when the palaces of Mycenae and Tiryns fell; nor, when they had fallen, how long their afterglow lingered in the poetic sky. But, as to the Shield of Achilles, it is of metal, though I presume that the 'five folds' (*Iliad* xviii. 480), may perhaps indicate the usual Homeric substrata of leather. Now have we a trace of a metal cover for a shield in the Mycenaean epoch to which Mr. Burrows seems to refer the Shield of Achilles?

I understand Mr. Burrows to date the Shield long before the time of the 'twelfth or eleventh century bard,' 'who cheerfully

attached his metal greaves to the old-world description of Achilles' armour.' But had the 'old-world' Mycenaean warriors metal plating to their shields? If Mr. Burrows has found proofs of this, verily he may 'do the curse' against me, whose ignorance has found none. I have even argued that, as against stone arrow-heads, used in the Mycenaean prime, no metal plating for shields was needed. Starting from these two supposed anachronistic survivals—old things among new—namely, the palace of Alcinous, and the metal-plated and richly adorned Shield of Achilles,—Mr. Burrows gives, as a parallel case, Shakespeare's anachronisms, which are new things among old. 'It is just so with Shakespeare when he writes *Julius Caesar* with North's *Plutarch* in front of him.'

Let us take Shakespeare when he writes *Troilus and Cressida* with Homer's (or Chapman's) *Iliad* in front of him. His knowledge of *Iliad* iii.—vii. is interesting, and he skilfully uses the situation in Troy and the Greek camp after the duel of Paris and Menelaus (*Iliad* iii.) and before the passage of arms between Hector and Aias (*Iliad* vii., *Troilus and Cressida*, Act I).

In the first act Shakespeare introduces the following list of anachronisms: (1) 'Friday, Saturday'; (2) Negroes; (3) India; (4) The cuckold's 'horn' of Menelaus (not that of Paris); (5) Pounds, as a measure of weight; (6) The rack, as an engine of torture; (7) The Devil; (8) Glass; (9) Coins; (10) The Mint; (11) A battering ram; (12) Angels; (13) 'Taking a trumpet' (to invite a parley); (14) The challenge to any Greek knight to combat for the honour of his lady. I dare say there are other anachronisms: fourteen in one Act, and fourteen so portentous, are good enough. Of course Mr. Burrows cannot produce in Homer any parallel to these wild anachronisms. My book is a criticism of alleged Homeric anachronisms. From the upper chambers of the girls to the grave-clothes of Hector, from corslets to the costume of the hastily clad heroes in the *Doloneia* (apparently

alluded to in *Troilus and Cressida*), from the 'man of many lots' to the Bride Price, I have examined all the alleged anachronisms which I could find noted by critics, and have argued that not one of them is an anachronism. I may be confuted—Mr. Burrows has not attempted the task—but his analogy of the Shakespearian anachronisms is manifestly not to the purpose.

As for the *unus color* of the Book of Common Prayer, the Book, in language, has the *unus color* of the English language from 1540 to 1552; but, as regards dogma and ritual, the various Books of Edward VI. have not *unus color*. The Book and the Epics are not analogous.

Mr. Burrows thinks 'several great poets more probable than one great poet, and evolution more probable than creation by a single act.' This faith, he says, is harder for poets than the belief in one great poet. All poets, except Coleridge, have found the evolutionary creed too hard for them, in a matter of their own business. Is it not possible that these experts may be right? They are not, like other experts, all at odds among themselves! In any case the Darwinian doctrine of evolution had to produce its proofs, and show the processes. I have a right to ask to be shown at least one instance in which evolution has produced anything essentially resembling the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Lönnrot and the *Kalewala* were offered as analogous by critics who knew nothing of the matter. Comparetti took the immense trouble needed for the purpose of pulverizing their false analogy.

By the way I am familiar with 'the regular masonry of the Palaces at Knossos and Phaestos,' which is also shown in a gem representing the Lions of the Mycenae gateway, *with their heads on!* The date of this gem (in the Ashmolean Museum) is a puzzle far beyond me, but I doubt if 'the regular masonry' was, at Mycenae, contemporary with the Lion Gate.

A. LANG.