after its destruction by Fimbria in 85 b.c. (2) A city which, like the former, extended beyond the mound of Hissarlik (its acropolis) over the adjacent plain. This corresponds with the Greek Ilium of the Macedonian age, as embellished and enlarged by Lysimachus, *c*. 300 B.C. (3) A smaller city, probably confined to the mound. Here we may recognize the Greek Ilium as it existed before the Macedonian age. It was a small and poor place, as appears from the known incidents of its history in the 5th and 4th centuries B.c., owing its chief importance to the shrine of Athene Ilias. (4) A petty town or village, confined to the mound, and poorly built. The evidence of architecture fails to decide whether it was Hellenic or not ; if Hellenic, it might represent the primitive settlement of the Æolic colonists, perhaps *c*. 700 B.c. It was a small house in this village that Dr Schliemann at first identified with Priam’s palace. The ground-plan shows four rooms, of which the largest measured 24 feet 4 inches by 12 feet. (5) A large town, to which the mound was only acropolis, and which extended to some distance south and south-east over the plain. These remains are unquestionably prehistoric. (6) A few remains of a small settlement which, if indeed distinct from No. 5, preceded it. The reason for distinguishing 6 from 5 is that some of the acropolis buildings of 5 are above those of 6, and seem to have been built on carefully levelled ground. Apart from architectural evidence, objects found in the excavations prove that the remains of the historical age extend much below 6 feet. One of these was a terra-cotta disk, stamped with the head of a warrior, in an advanced style of workmanship, found at 26 feet 3 inches below the surface (*Troy,* p. 294). Another is a terra­cotta ball, found at 26 feet, which cannot be older than *c.* 360 B.c. Then, at 20 feet, was found another terra-cotta, marked with the Greek letter P. A piece of ivory, belong­ing to a seven-stringed lyre, and therefore not older than *c.* 660 B.c., was found at 26 feet. Thus we have at His­sarlik the remains of the Greek Ilium in three successive phases,—Roman, Macedonian, and Æolic, and below these the remains of at least one prehistoric settlement, the age and origin of which are unknown.

We can no longer either prove or disprove that these prehistoric remains are those of a town which was once taken after a siege, and which originally gave rise to the legend of Troy. But most certainly it is not the “ lofty ” Troy of which the Homeric poet was thinking when he embodied the legend in the *Iliad.* The conception of Troy which dominates the *Iliad* is based on the site at Bunárbashi, and suits no other. The sole phrase in the epic which favours Hissarlik occurs in book xx. (216 *sq*.), where Dardania is said to have been built on the spurs of Ida, when Ilios “ had not yet been built in the plain and this phrase occurs in a passage which, as the best recent critics agree, is one of the latest interpolations in the *Iliad,* having been composed after the Greek Ilium had actually arisen “ in the plain.” Its purpose was the same as that which appears in the Hymn to Aphrodite, viz., to glorify reputed descendants of Æneas, and it probably belongs to the same age, the 7th century b.c. The tactical data of the *Iliad—*those derived from the incidents of the war—can­not be treated with such rigour as if the poem were a military history. But Nikolaides has shown that they can at least be brought into general agreement with the site at Bunárbashi, while they are hopelessly incompatible with Hissarlik. The *Iliad* makes it clear that the general description of the Trojan plain was founded on accurate knowledge. At this day all the essential Homeric features can be recognized. And it is probable that the poet who created the Troy of the *Iliad* knew, personally or by description, a strong town on the Bali Dagh above Bunár- bashi. The legend of the siege may or may not have arisen from an older town at Hissarlik, which had then disappeared. The poet might naturally place his Troy in a position like that of the existing strong city on the Bali Dagh, giving it a “beetling” acropolis and handsome buildings, while he also reproduced the general course of the rivers and that striking feature,—an indelible mark of the locality,—the natural springs at the foot of the hill, just beyond the city gates on the north-west. But, while he thus imagined his Troy in the general likeness of the town on the Bali Dagh, he would retain the privilege of a poet who was adorning an ancient legend, and whose theme was a city that had long ago vanished. Instead of feeling bound to observe a rigorous accuracy of local detail, he would rather feel impelled to avoid it ; he would use his liberty to introduce some traits borrowed from other scenes known to him, or even from imagination. To this extent, and in this sense, his topography would be eclectic. Such a consideration might suffice to explain the fact, well known to those who have studied this question on the spot, that neither Bunárbashi nor any other one site can be harmonized with every detail of the poem. The re­commendations of Bunárbashi are, first, that it satisfies the capital and essential conditions, while no other site does so, and secondly, that the particular difficulties which it leaves unsolved are relatively slight and few. This character of Homeric topography becomes still easier to understand, if, as most critics would now concede, our *Iliad* contains work of various hands and ages. Few questions, perhaps, of equal literary interest have been so much confused by inattention to the firδt conditions of the problem. The tale of Troy, as the *Iliad* gives it, is essentially a poetical creation ; and we have no evidence other than the *Iliad.* That is, our sole data are (1) of the mythical class, (2) of inadequate precision, and (3) of un­certain origin. But they show a general knowledge of the ground ; and the question is how far particular features of the ground can be recognized in the poem. It may be doubted whether the case admits of any solution more definite than that which has been indicated above.

*Bibliography.—*1. Works dealing with the Troad generally,— Strabo, bk. xiii. ch. 1, is the principal source for the ancient Troad. Of books by modern travellers in Asia Minor the following may be mentioned :—Philip Barker Webb, in the Italian *Biblioteca Acerbi,* June and July, 1821, whose studies are better known through the French edition, *Topographie de la Troade,* 1844 ; W. Μ. Leake, *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor,* London, 1824 ; P. de Tchihatchef, *Asie* *Mineure,* &c., Paris, 1853-69; R. Virchow, “Beiträge zur Landeskunde der Troas,” in *Trans.* of Berlin Acad., 1879 ; H. F. Tozer, *The Highlands of Turkey,* 1869; H. Schliemann, *Reise der Troas in Mai,* 1881 ; Joseph T. Clarke, *Report on the Investigations at Assos,* Boston, U.S.A., and London, 1882, including “Notes on the Geology and Topography of the Troad ” by J. S. Diller, and on “ Bunàrbashi,” &c., by W. C. Lawton and C. H. Walker. J. T. Clarke’s “Notes on Greek Shores,” in the *Report* of the Archaeo­logical Institute of America for 1880, are also valuable.

2. For the question as to the site of Troy, see — Lechevalier, *Voyage de la Troade,* Paris, 1802 ; Gustave D’Éichthal, *Le Site de Troie selon Lechevalier, &c.,* Paris, 1875 ; H. Schliemann’s *Troy* (1875), *Ilios* (1880), *Troja* (1884), which contain many good plans and illustrations ; E. Brentano, *Zur Losung der troianischen Frage,* Heilbronn, 1881, and *Troia und Neu-Iion, ibid.,* 1882 ; R. C. Jebb, “ Schliemann’s Ilios,” in *Edinb. Rev.,* No. cccxiv., April, 1881 ; Id., “Homeric and Hellenic Ilium,” *in Jοurn. of Hellenic Studies,* vol. ii. pp. 7-43,1881 ; Id., “ The Ruins at Hissarlik,” *ibid.,* iii. 185-217, 1882 ; Id., “Homeric Troy,” in *Fortnightly Review,* April, 1884 ; G. Nikolaides, 'Ιλιάδos Στρατηγική Διασκεvή, Athens, 1883 ; P. W. Forchhammer, *Erklärung der Ilias, auf Grund der in der beigege­benen Original-Karte von Spratt and Forchhammer dargestellten topischen und physischen Eigenthümlichkeiten der Troischen Ebene,* Kiel, 1884 ; and W. J. Stillman, “Les Découvertes de Schliemann,” in the journal *L'Homme,* Paris, October, 1884. (R. C. J.)

Legend of Troy.

According to Greek legend, the oldest town in the Troad was that founded by Teucer, who was a son of the river Scamander and the nymph Idæa. Tzetzes says