

The prompt mention in our list of "Books of the Week" will be considered by us an equivalent to their publishers for all volumes received. The interests of our readers will guide us in the selection of works for further notice.]

MYTHOLOGY AND MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT ATHENS.*

It is a reasonably good sign that interest in Greek studies is not waning that two such books as this and Haigh's "Attic Theatre" should appear within the same year. Both fill an important gap in our handbooks of antiquities. For knowledge of the Attic theater students have for many years been obliged to get what they could from the long antiquated work of Donaldson. On the topography and monuments of Athens, excellent as is the work of Leake and of Dyer, so rapidly is the best description of Athens made antiquated by the busy work in archeological inquiry that a field was laid open here demanding a work which should give English readers Athens as it is understood in the light of the latest archeological discoveries and discussions.

Since the appearance of her "Introductory Studies in Greek Art," Miss Harrison has broadened and deepened her knowledge in many directions, and the present volume grows out of long and loving labor in Athens. But with all due deference to her powers as a student, it would have been impossible for her to produce a work that would have commanded anything like the attention which the present work commands, unless she had had at her side a mentor in the person of Dr. Dörpfeld, the director of the German Archaeological Institute, in Athens, who, tho not so old in the field of Athenian topography as most of the "authorities," has lately been made, by tacit consent, king in the archeological circles of Athens. One always wishes to hear his verdict, and does not lightly dissent from it.

Since he has not yet published in connected and orderly form his views on Athenian topography, which are known to differ in some respects quite widely from those hitherto current, this book has a unique interest, as containing, for the most part, where nothing is stated to the contrary, the views of Dr. Dörpfeld. No man has ever been more magnanimous than he, in allowing his material to be used by others. Miss Harrison has not been ungrateful nor tried to conceal her indebtedness to the man whose name comes to honor by most conspicuous frequency of mention in her pages.

Some of Dr. Dörpfeld's views, which still meet with opposition, but are here confidently promulgated, are the location of the Agora, the river Eridanos, the Limnæ, the Eleusinion, and the Euneakrounos.

The Agora has been kicked about considerably, until one hardly knows what to call the prevailing belief in regard to its situation. Here it is at least robbed of all form and comeliness. We read (p. 17):

"Instead of considering it as a neat, oblong space, drawn out with a measuring line, we have to regard it as a long, irregular tract, more like a straggling road, widening out here and there—the first part winding round the northeast corner of the 'Theseian' hill, being mostly commercial, of indeterminate width; the second part secluded by a gate, and more devoted to politics and religion, winding round the northwest corner of the Areopagus up to the Acropolis."

The river Eridanos is transferred from the south of the Ilissos to the north of the Acropolis, and its bed found in what was formerly supposed to be a cloaca, with an exit from the city wall near the Dipylon gate.

The Limnæ, the ancient precinct of Dionysos, are now found near the Dipylon instead of in the region south of the Acropolis.

The Eleusinion is transferred from the

east end of the Acropolis to the south slope of the Areopagus with the phrase, *ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκροπόλει*, of Clement of Alexandria, treated somewhat elastically. The Euneakrounos, with the rape of Oreithyia, is no longer sought in the famous Kallirhoe by the Ilissos, but near the Eleusinion at the foot of the Areopagus, where Boreas had more chance to show his power.

Dr. Dörpfeld's views as to the old Athene temple on the Acropolis are adopted and most warmly defended. This temple, the precursor of the Parthenon, built, or at least enlarged by Peisistratos, was forgotten until its foundations were discovered in 1886. Since then it has become customary to refer to this as "Dörpfeld's temple." He not only elucidated the remains in a masterly manner and restored the temple with great ingenuity, but maintained that immediately after the Persian War this temple was rebuilt without its peristyle, and stood in its place all through the period of classical antiquity; that Pausanias saw it, and described it in a lacuna; that the architect of the new Erechtheion had to build his Caryatid porch right over the basis of the ancient peristyle-wall of this temple, and almost up against the standing wall of the naos, in the hope, of course, that this old temple would be removed, now that the Parthenon was completed—a hope that was not realized. It is hard for scholars to believe in the curious accident of a lacuna in Pausanias just where this temple was described. Miss Harrison adopts the lacuna idea, but finds the lacuna in a different part of Pausanias's narrative from that in which Dr. Dörpfeld finds it. The view that the architect of the Erechtheion ever allowed his glorious maidens to stand with their faces almost touching a wall, is also repugnant to many.

Dr. Dörpfeld's view, here adopted, of the theater of Dionysos is that down to the time of Lykurgos or about 330 B.C. there was no stage; that the actors as well as the chorus appeared in a simple orchestra circle, traces of which he finds underneath the various walls of later dates. On this point, also, the smoke of battle has not yet been cleared away.

In the midst of much that is unsettling and downright revolutionary in the new topography, it is gratifying to find the Pnyx restored to its time-honored location from which it was removed half a century ago by German scholars to become a football of discussion.

It would be no small merit of the present work if it simply set before English readers some of the finer work done by Dr. Dörpfeld, work that will abide when many of his speculative and tentative notions will have been refuted or recanted. As examples of this may be adduced his resurrection of the old Athene temple already mentioned and, as the crowning example, his discovery, from an examination of the remains of the Propylæa, not only of what Mnesikles actually executed, but the original plan which Mnesikles never was able to execute. This is finely reported here, pp. 350 ff.

But while this book will attract more attention on account of its discussions of topography and monuments than any other feature, yet the author has, as the title indicates, endeavored to make a substantial contribution to the elucidation of Athenian mythology. In an introductory essay of about 150 pages, she has treated in a thorough and elaborate way, even if not always clearly and convincingly, the development of the more prominent local myths of Athens. Perhaps vase paintings were never more carefully used as mythological documents.

It would be very strange if a book treating so large a subject did not show weaknesses somewhere. While it will be made a constant companion of all careful English-speaking tourists in Athens for years to come, as well as a text-book in our colleges where Greek archeology is taught, it will rouse dissent all along the line in the minds of those who use it most intelligently. Yet no one will feel disposed to demand a wholesale recantation. He who sees how little of really

ancient Athens remains outside of the Acropolis will always expect in books of this kind, surmises and counter-surmises rather than any great body of incontrovertible statements.

A short enumeration of things that seem faulty in the present work, some of which may be corrected in a second edition, may be here justifiable.

One feature which promises, most is found to be most disappointing. The numerous cuts (there are 251 of them) are sometimes so indistinct as to make one smile at the phrases, "the cut will make it clear," etc. Examples of poor cuts may be noticed on pp. 283, 284, 286, 295, 300, 301, 387, 416, 441, 449, 494. Many of these would convey nothing to one who had not already seen the object.

One who uses the book much will have just ground of complaint that he must waste a good deal of time in turning over pages to find the references to authorities. If these references were all collected at the end of the volume and provided each with a cross reference to the page of the text, the reader would be spared a good deal of useless labor. Mrs. Mitchell's "History of Ancient Sculpture" is a model in this respect.

By the way, it is a little strange that Miss Harrison does not make a single reference to Mrs. Mitchell, whose work is still new, and whose name is mentioned with honor among German workers. Opportunities for such mention were not wanting.

To one who is on the lookout for cases of "woman's reasoning" there is perhaps one phrase on p. 89 that may be marked as such. The author speaks of her impressions as having "slowly grown together into what is for me personally, not a demonstration, but that surer thing, a conviction."

Some will see in her supposing (p. 434) that the central group of the east pediment of the Parthenon represented Athene actually springing from the head of Zeus, an instance of extravagances that might oftener appear but for the controlling influence of her Mentor.

Sometimes contradictions occur. We read: (p. 301) That "This wall is the actual boundary" (i. e., of the precinct of Asclepius) "is fortunately established beyond dispute by the inscription on one of the stones." On the next page we read: "Topographically it" (i. e., the inscription) "helps to fix the extent of the precinct. An attempt has been made to limit the precinct by the wall. Obviously, as the inscribed stone lies beyond this wall, such a limitation is impossible." The argument of the latter passage is, in itself, unintelligible; but if it means anything, it seems to contradict the former passage.

On p. 79: "As Pausanias says nothing about these later sacrilegious additions" (i. e., statues of Brutus and Cassius) "it is probable they had been removed by some Roman governor or emperor to whom their presence may have been politically offensive," reads as if the author did not recognize Pausanias's habit of shutting his eyes to later monuments, e. g., that of Agrippa, or rather of looking at things through Polemon's eyes; and yet, on p. 350, she recognizes this habit.

P. 538: "The columns of the ancient temple of Athene were built into the new wall," is in contradiction with p. 467, where it is correctly stated that these drums of columns belong to the unfinished temple of Kimon. In the latter passage it is, however, implied that the *metopes* built into the Acropolis wall are of poros stone, whereas they are of marble.

Sometimes clearness would be gained by the relegation of matter irrelevant to the main point under discussion to a footnote, e. g., the remark on p. 91, explaining who Hippocrates is.

The habit of speaking of the books of the Iliad and Odyssey as if each book were an Iliad or Odyssey, e. g., "sixth Iliad" (p. 259), is reprehensible, no matter how often it has been done in English. There is only one Iliad.

Of positive errors needing correction in a revised edition, the following may be noted; The name of Lolling is given

everywhere with wonderful persistency, dozens of times, in the form "Lölling."

The Greek name Dysaulas, is interpreted (p. 96) as meaning "double-furrow." But "dys" cannot have anything to do with "double." If the name has any reference to plowing, it would mean the man who has a hard time of it with his plowing. *Λυσίθεος* is curiously translated (p. 246) as "son of Lysitheidēs."

The habit of mixing the points of the compass is very annoying, as "south and east" for "south and west" (p. 301), "southwest front" for "west front" (p. 360). The cut of the Nike Temple (p. 362) is designated as "from southeast." It is actually from northeast. So in the cut on p. 512 we read: "Southwest corner of the Pandroseion." What is actually shown is the southeast corner.

"Built by the Persians" (p. 466) for "burnt by the Persians," looks as odd as "about 12 inches (for meters) distant from the basis of the Parthenon at the eastern end, and somewhat nearer at the west." "Goddess of love and war, Aphrodite" (p. 366) seems venturesome.

On p. 162 for "Polygnotos" (three times) read "Mikon." On p. 234 for "Plut., Alc. I," read "Plut., Themist. I." On p. 299 for "Beulé read "Ross." On p. 414 for "Ulrich" read "Ulrichs." On p. 537 for "Pausanias" read "Thucydides." On p. 606 for "Robert" read "Wilamowitz."

The cut of the Tower of the Winds (p. 201) is described incorrectly on p. 203. We read: "In the woodcut, Kalkias and Apeliotes are full in sight, and Euros is half in sight to the right hand." The figures actually appearing in the cut are Skiron, Boreas and Kalkias.

A very curious error is seen (p. 426) in a translation from Aristophanes: "Oh yes, that's all old-fashioned and Diipolia-like, and full of grasshoppers, and of *kekydes*, and of the Boupbonia." Who would ever suspect that the name of the old dithyrambic poet *Kekeides* was hidden in the word "*kekydes*."

On p. 499, a divisor is spoken of as "five metres" (5 m.). On p. 500 "architrave fragments are spoken of as having "triglyphs and a cornice." What amendment is intended to be suggested by the phrase (p. 82): "The sword-hilt in the right hand must be taken away and a drawn sword substituted?"

On p. 337 "Wiener Vorleseblätter" is perhaps only one of the printer's errors. An enumeration of these would be tedious.

* MYTHOLOGY AND MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT ATHENS: BEING A TRANSLATION OF A PORTION OF THE "ATTICA" OF PAUSANIAS. BY MARGARET DE G. VERBALL, with Introductory Essays and Archeological Commentary by JANE E. HARRISON. Macmillan & Co. 1900. Price, \$4.50, pp. clvi, 653.