Biterature.

ne prompt mention in our list of "Books of will be considered by us an equivalent to lishers for all volumes received. The i-our readers will guide us in the selection for further notice.] interests of

DR. SCHLIEMANN'S TROJA.*

The latest result of Dr. Schliemann's admirable labors with the spade, and of the digging of his literary and archeological friends among the libraries and museums, deserves quite as warm libraries and museums, deserves quite as we a welcome as that which his previous works His Troja is to be received, valued and or the same weighty reasons and upon

ceived. His Troja is to be received, valued and judged for the same weighty reasons and upon the same sound principles as its predecessors. More particularly the work, in all its aspects, is strictly supplemental to his "lilos," which appeared late in 1890. In body, notes, preface and appendixes, it is strictly supplemental. It teems with necessary references to "lilos," both for letter-press matter and for pictorial illustrations. The labors and toprocupacy which it tions. The labors and journeyings which it records, the theories and views put forth, its spirit and sympathies, and even the motive which the author assigns for his recent diggings which the author assigns for his recent diggings and writings, are all supplemental. He had thought that, by his excavations on the hill of Hissarlik in 1879, he had "settled the Trojan question forever"; but he became skeptical as to the extent of the city of Troy, and he undertook the work of 1882 in order to settle that doubt. Accordingly his apprehensel, which apprehensel, which are the control of the city of the control of the city of the ci doubt. Accordingly, his supplemental result, as the author himself views it, is that on the plain of Troy there was "a large city, destroyed of old by a fearful catastrophe, which had on the hill of Hissarlik only its Acropolis, with its temples and a few other large edifices."

With this general canalysism and the legit

and a few other large edifices."
With this general conclusion and its legitimate consequences probably few will dissent who consider that the author has settled the main point of the site of Troy. That point once granted, the other conclusion might follow, almost without any excavation to prove it, since, in the presence of historical testimony, the question of a city of great extent about an according would not depend upon the existence. acropolis would not depend upon the existence or non-existence of abundant remains—especially -especially of an inferior wall of great circumference and

The grand idea which all along has moved Dr. Schliemann to his wondrous works and discov-Schliemann to his wondrous works and discoveries, and to the bringing out of so much good to the common brotherhood of carnest investigators, has been his search for the remains of Troy; and it would be ernel to hint at the existence of skeptics regarding his main point, or to repeat the frequent observation that Dr. Schliemann's actual discoveries and indirect services to general archeology and history are of far more value than his own discussions of them. That is true, however, in a sense that is flattering to him, and which he himself would probably be one of the first to admit. Doubtless, also, on his main point, he carries with him a unifority of the popular vote, not to say a portion of the learned world that is respectable in quality and numbers, and that does not diminish as time goes on.

Troja proper contains, first, a brief nur-

diminish as time goes on.

Troja proper contains, first, a brief narrative of the explorations at Hissarilk and in the Troad in 1882, which is interesting and particular, but leaving many items to be picked up in the following chapters. The remainder of the work discusses the alleged seven successive offices on the site explored, of which the sup-posed second was the Troy of Homer, and the seventh the Ilium of the later Greek and Roman writers. Next comes a discussion of the conical mounds called Heroic Tumuli, and of the other recent explorations in the Troad. Notes, and six Appendixes, with the Index, complete the writers. Next comes a discussion of the conical

volume.

In general, the discussions throughout the volume, as already stated, are theroughly supplemental to (rarely corrective of) the conclusions adopted and the positions taken in Dr. Schliemann's former works, especially "Hios"; and they everywhere exhibit partiality to the author's own views—whether main or subsidiary—and to people who sustain him. The author's own views—whether main or subsidiary—and to people who sustain him. The scholar will not be troubled at that, but will thank the author for his carcial descriptions and beautiful illustrations, glad even to learn now and then from the subtle remarks of a practical excavator and eve-witness. now and then from the subtle remarks of a practical excavator and eye-witness, and equally as much in the way of references to books not always at command in his own library. Yet he will be unable to see the pertinence of citing authorities to prove points of common notoriety, or of citing authorities of inferior weight in order to prove a less obvious point, when for better subtorities less obvious point, when far better authorities are at hand. Neither will be wonder (seeing that certain professed archwologists keep Dr. Schliemann company herein) that objects (e. g.,

whorls and hand-made pottery and querns) representing a number of arts and practices in common use to-day are classed as indubitable evidences of the pre-historic. Nor will he be surprised that Dr. Schliemann even finds a "probable" copy of the genuine Palladium. The only criticism that the scholar will feel bound to pass upon Dr. Schliemann is that he has allowed himself, in a few instances, to speak of his critics, especially Prof. R. C. Jobb, of Chasgow, in terms scarcely worthy of himself, and of course harmless to the subjects of his remark. A man, who, like Professor Jobb, has been knighted by the King of Greece (in Dr. Schliemann's opinion a very sound archwological authority) for his work in Greek lore and archwology, is not to be put down or disgraced by epithets. epithets.

On these points, however, Dr. Schliemann is carcely less contentious, while he is less vitu-erative than some of the language in Appendix scarcely less V, by Professor Mahaffy, on the site and antiquity of the Hellenic Ilion, and in the Preface, by Professor Sayce. Neither of these gentlemen either needs or can well afford such weapons; nor is the contest one where they have a proper place. The Appendix in question is a reprint, with added notes of a reply to Professor Jebb's article on "Hos" in the Edinburgh Review. The Preface is in large measure a reiteration of positions taken by its author in an appendix to "Ilios," with some added assertions about his hypothetical "Asianic Syllabary," in which exanos, with some attice assertions about his hypothetical "Asianic Syllabary," in which experts, who are at least his peers, will scarcely agree with him, either as to facts or theory, the whole intermingled with a deal of fact and brilliant writing, which generally smuses and sometimes profits. It may have been natural, in the dash of a preface to Dr. Schliemann's book, to find fault with the critic's warning that a strict distinction should be made between the theories Dr. Schliemann has put forward and the facts he has discovered; but it was rather rash to say that "it is the critics themselves who have been guilty of propounding theories which have no fact to support them." The "disheartening signs" which are seen by the author of the Preface, "in the criticisms passed upon 'Ilios' in respectable English publications," are described with brilliancy and feeling; but the description is by iliancy and feeling; but the description is by no means ascorrect as a cool head and impartial pon would have laid down. Those who differ from Professor Sayce in opinion are not generfrom Professor Sayce in opinion are not generally—especially those at whom he aims are not—any the less to be regarded than he, nor greatly to be harmed by the rapid statements in which he undervalues their acquisitions or misappreciates the depth of their learning. Writing in less haste, Professor Sayce would, perhaps, have invited a more prudent judgment than that of "the reader who does not pretend to a knowledge of archæology," except as he is invited "to examine the wood-cuts so lavishly distributed through the pages of 'Hios.'"

The Appendixes of Rudolph Virchow and Kurl Blind deal mostly with the bones found by Dr.

Blind deal mostly with the bones found by Dr. Schliemann in the Troad. Blind's Appendix IV., on the "Teutonic Kinship of Trojans and Thrakians," is a curiosity in the specific, but not in the generic manner of luxuriant theorizing.

As a whole, there is no reason to reverse, greatly to modify, the general scholarly esti

greatly to modify, the general scholarly estimate of Dr. Schliemann's books, nor to abdicate sound positions in archeological matters because of any vehement writing on the part of his learned assistants and contributors. The defining of positions may be done—or overdone—by vigorous language, but the battles of sober and tugging science are not fought in that way. An English critic once said that Dr. Schliemann had need to pray to be saved from his friends; but even if that were literally true, his brilliant discoveries, no less than the means and qualities which led to them, place him beyond the reach of the missiles of his focs—if he has any, or of the recoil of his too ardent friends artillery. any, or o artillery.

^{*} Froja. Results of the Latest Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Homen's Troy and in the Heroic Tumuli and other Sites made in the tear 1882, and a narrative of a Journey in the Troad in 1881. By Dr. Herry Schliemann.

Preface by Prof. A. H. Savez. With 10 Woodcutg and 4 Maje and Plads. New York: Herrer& Brothers, 8vo, Dp. 21, 424.