

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Philip and Alexander of Macedon. Two Essays in Biography. By
DAVID G. HOGARTH, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xiv, 312.)

It is safe to say that no school-boy or college student ever reads the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes without mental reservations in favor of Catiline and Philip. The oratory is more or less dimly felt to disguise the truth. Neither of the great victims of the oratory can now get his side of the case fairly before us, because literary and historical tradition are so exclusively hostile. This is especially true in the case of Philip of Macedon. Leaving out of view the tantalizing fragments of Theopompus, we are compelled to see Philip through Athenian, or at least philo-Athenian, eyes. And Chæroneia drowned the voices of all Athenian Philippizers, even those of Isocrates and Phocion, so that Athenian eyes look only hatred. In Philip's case, then, the task of the biographer is to rescue character and career from the distortions of a tradition which is at best scanty, and which is prevailingly hostile. Even the outlines of portions of Philip's career must be conjecture, and the reasonably sure outlines of other periods must be filled in by cautious inference and combination. Correction of material given and supplementary suggestion where material of tradition fails must both characterize a good biography of Philip of Macedon, but constructive criticism must be more largely employed.

Far different is the task of the biographer of Alexander of Macedon, so different as to call for an entirely new balance of powers. Tradition, in the case of Alexander, has an overwhelming magnitude and scope. It is also, in the main, adulatory. Romantic invention has multiplied details which were before superabundant. There is little call, then, for supplementary conjecture in giving detail to meagre outlines, or in furnishing the outlines themselves. The colossal figure of the world-conqueror must rather be stripped of nebulous accretions and restored to something like human proportions. The miracles of his career must be rationalized. For this task destructive rather than constructive criticism must be more largely employed.

It would be only natural that a historian who attempted both these tasks should perform them unevenly. Mr. Hogarth's *Philip* is far superior to his *Alexander*, and meets a want more keenly felt. "Philip," as the author says, "supplies the central figure to no extant biography; Alexander has inspired a whole literature." Philip was great not merely "for what it was given him to do," but also for what he was. He crushed Greek autonomy, but substituted for the degenerate city-state the

grander ideal of a national power. "Reading the lesson of his times, and marking the proved inferiority of citizen militia to standing forces, and of the capricious rule of the many to an imperial system under a single head, he evolved the first European Power in the modern sense of the word—an armed nation with a common ideal" (p. 3). This thesis Mr. Hogarth admirably sustains. Of course, the anachronistic conceptions of the Athens which opposed Philip have to be corrected, and here the boldness and vigor of the author's views especially appear. It is no easy thing for the critical historian to make headway against the unreasoning and indiscriminate exaltation of everything Greek, because Greek, which the enthusiasm of a cultured age, conscious of its enormous indebtedness to Greece, has long fostered. "As it had been given to Thucydides to exalt a series of raids into a great national war, so the transcendent oratory of Demosthenes has led historians to invest his opposition to Philip with an importance of which assuredly Philip was not aware" (p. 82). This sentence is one of many showing how sturdily the author has cast aside the perverting influence of an incomparable literature on the historical judgment. The political and military decay of Athens at the time of her conflict with Philip is strongly portrayed. The tenderness which Philip evinced towards Athens, "exalting her as the one inviolate queen of civilization" (p. 100), was not due to fear. "Rather to Philip's honor let it be recorded, as to the honor of any warrior-statesman, that sword in hand he paid homage to the arts of peace. And not less be it recorded to the honor of Athens that she did not accept his homage" (ib.). Occasionally the author does less than justice to the dilatory city-state. It is a cruelty to brave citizen-soldiers to sum up their conduct on a battle-field where three thousand of them were killed or taken, with the contemptuous words: "The Athenians ran, Demosthenes with the rest, and the supreme effort of Greece was spent" (p. 129). But such injustice is rare, and usually rhetorical. Sometimes too much weight is given to an unsupported statement of Plutarch or a late compiler; sometimes, when "the fact itself is more worthy of credit than the authority for it," too much confidence is felt in constructed details, but in general the handling of sources is scientific and scholarly. It would be easy to speak of many striking features of the essay, such as the clear apprehension of the relation of slavery to the different materials for an army afforded by Athens and Macedon (pp. 18, 151); the sharp differentiation of the Theban character with its oriental traits (pp. 28 ff., 34), but space will not allow.

Mr. Hogarth's *Alexander*, while filling no such gap in biography as his *Philip*, brings into clearer light than ever before the son's inheritance from the father, the son's gradual emancipation of himself from all Macedonian inheritances, as soon as they were felt to be restrictions, and his rational and logical assumption of Oriental imperialism. No decadence or depreciation in the powers of the conqueror during the last years of his life is to be granted, but rather an enlargement of ideas, consequent upon the enlargement of his task, which necessarily brought with it emanci-

pating conflicts with all the old Macedonian limitations. These were necessarily cruel, but "the conquest of Persia had been forgotten in the conquest of the Earth." On the whole the biography is defensive of Alexander, but it strikes the happy mean between the fulsomeness of earlier histories and the severities of reactionary criticism. The conqueror and destroyer was yet a far-sighted builder. "To Alexander commerce and Hellenism were means, not ends, means indeed far from clearly grasped or understood; but in so far as he did grasp and understand them, his is the glory to all time of having applied on a great scale for whatever end the greatest influences for peace in the world of his day" (p. 192). Fresh and vigorous is the treatment of Alexander's visit to the oracle of Ammon. It was not the inception of a great policy, but was designed to "test a romantic belief which he owed to Homer, and in diverse ways to both his parents" (p. 198). But the founder of the Macedonian Empire did not seriously think of his own divinity. His empire was an achievement of human genius, the genius of one incomparable man. The universal empire which followed his was a "system independent of the life of an individual."

The death of Hephæstion left the great soul of Alexander "in such a solitude as has seldom been the doom even of kings." Alexander did not live long enough to have his grief assuaged, or to resume with the old ardor his plans for universal conquest and order. "Having the greatest powers, he set up the greatest aims consistent with his day, and pursued them greatly. Philip lives hardly outside the world of scholars. The son is still a master to all masters in war, and his type has been chosen by Art for the Hero" (p. 282).

Mr. Hogarth's book is admirably printed, beautifully illustrated, and well indexed. An appendix discusses ably certain chronological questions of Alexander's reign, and the author's familiarity with the technical questions of Alexander's military organization is shown throughout the book.

B. PERRIN.

Domesday Book and Beyond. Three Essays in the Early History of England. By FREDERICK WILLIAM MAITLAND, LL.D. (Cambridge: University Press; Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1897. Pp. xiii, 527.)

THE world of scholars has long since learned to greet a new book from Professor Maitland's pen as marking an epoch in the subject of which it treats, and the work before us only serves to confirm and deepen the impression already made. Although *Domesday Book and Beyond* was planned as a first volume to *The History of English Law*, its publication has been deferred for various reasons. But the delay has not been without its advantages, for it has enabled the author to make use of Mr. Round's discoveries in *Domesday Book* and of Dr. Meitzen's conclusions regarding early Teutonic settlements; and the reader who by this time