

treason to Medize before there was a Greece, and the Greece that came out of the Persian war was a very different thing from the cantons that ranged themselves on this side and on that of a quarrel which, we may be sure, bore another aspect to those who stood aloof from it than it wears in the eyes of moderns, who have all learned to be Hellenic patriots. *A little experience of a losing side might aid historical vision.* That Pindar should have had an intense admiration of the New Greece, should have felt the impulse of the grand period that followed Salamis and Plataia, should have appreciated the woe that would have come on Greece had the Persians been successful, and should have seen the finger of God in the new evolution of Hellas—all this is not incompatible with an attitude during the Persian war that those who see the end and do not understand the beginning may not consider respectable."

We have not space even to enumerate the various topics which Professor Gildersleeve treats in his introductory essay. We can notice only one or two points. Under the heading "Approach to Pindar," he sketches the manner in which he thinks the artistic study of an ode should be prosecuted. He apparently agrees with the recommendation of Rauchenstein to commence with the "easier odes," but asks (p. lxiii):

"Which are the easier odes? The fact is, a man who has read himself into Pindar is a poor judge of the relative difficulty of the odes unless he has made actual trial in the classroom, and the experience of most lovers of Pindar has of necessity been limited, as Pindar has seldom been read in our colleges."

We suspect that were it not for his experience in the class-room, Professor Gildersleeve would be a poor judge of the relative difficulty of different portions of the works of almost any of the Greek classical writers. His study of Greek has been so wide and so deep, so minute, we might say so microscopic, that the language has become interwoven with his intellectual constitution; all intelligible passages are to him equally easy, and a passage which is obscure or unintelligible to him, we have little doubt would have been equally obscure or unintelligible to an educated Athenian of the 80th Olympiad. He points out, however, the order in which he thinks it best to study the odes, and then the manner in which they should be studied. "The first thing to be mastered, not theoretically, but practically, is the form"; and before any attempt is made to get at its meaning, it must be read over and over aloud until the student has become perfect in the rhythmical recitation of the ode. To enable the student to do this our editor has not only given with each ode Schmidt's schemes of the metres, but he has placed dots under those syllables of the Greek text upon which the stress falls. Having mastered the rhythmical recitation of the ode, much as if it were a piece of instrumental music to be played with the voice, the next thing is to master the meaning, and here, of course, the commentary will come in. "Finally," what to many will seem a little odd—"the introduction by way of review" is to be studied. We do not think it a matter of vital importance whether the student first masters the form or the meaning so far as either can be comprehended without the other, provided he really masters both in the end; and as to the special introduction to each ode, we are quite sure that, whether for better or worse, it will be the first thing that every student will read.

As noticed above, Professor Gildersleeve has been enabled to lay before his readers the very latest results of the profound investigations of Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt, according to whom Pindar uses three fundamental forms of metre, corresponding to the 2:4 or duple, the 3:8 or triple, and the 5:8 or quintuple time of writers on music. We have no space to enter into the details of protraction, corruption, and other points. We shall confine our remarks to the last species, reminding the reader that the difference between music

in 5:4 and in 5:8 time is merely one of notation, and that any given piece in the one kind of time can equally well be written in the other without changing its character in any respect whatever. For a large part of the first half of the present century it was supposed that many of the peasant dances in the Palatinate and Bohemia were genuine examples of music in 5:4 or quintuple time, and many of them were so printed. But subsequent investigations have shown that this was a mistake, and that the music is really a combination of duple and triple time. Indeed, while there is no doubt that a few pieces in quintuple time have been written by modern composers, yet it is extremely doubtful whether any such music ever grew. An error is never fully comprehended or susceptible of complete refutation till its origin is discovered. The origin of the error of supposing that these peasant dances were in quintuple (5:4) time is easily pointed out. Any strain of music which consists of alternate bars of duple (2:4) and triple (3:4) time, or *vice versa*, can, without any essential change of its character, be converted into quintuple (5:4) time by simply omitting the alternate cross-bars. The first specimens of these dances that were reduced to writing were of this kind. Why this was the case is also clear. Out of the multitude of these dances, all equally accessible, those which were apparently in quintuple (5:4) time were the only ones the rhythm of which was intelligible to those who endeavored to reduce them to writing. But investigations of living musicians have shown that the dances which can be reduced to quintuple (5:4) time form but a small fraction of the whole number. Louis Köhler, in his collection of national dances ('Volkstänze aller Nationen der Erde,' Collection Litolf, vol. 514), has published a considerable number of these peasant dances (*Bauerntänze*). They are all marked with the double-time signature 3:4 2:4, and, unless we have made some mistake in our examination of them, there is only one in the whole number which can be reduced to quintuple (5:4) time. In all cases each section or strain is repeated. In most cases the strain commences with an anacrusis and ends with an imperfect bar, which, together with the anacrusis, when the strain is repeated, or with the anacrusis of the succeeding strain when we pass to it after repeating the preceding strain, just forms a complete bar.

It may be a matter of interest to metrical students who are acquainted with the elements of music if we give the metrical schemes of one of these dances. It can be easily done in the same manner as Schmidt's Pindaric schemes. Commencing with the first complete bar, and considering the last bar as complete for the reason mentioned above, the scheme of the first strain of No. 21 of Köhler's collection is this: 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3. Here each figure represents a bar and the number of quarter-notes or their equivalent contained in it. It will be observed that by combining two bars in one these eight bars of complex (2:4 3:4) time can be reduced to 4 of quintuple (5:4) time, so that the scheme would be: 5 5 5 5. But there is an insuperable objection to this. When so combined there would be nothing to indicate to the player whether the secondary accent should fall on the third or the fourth quarter-note, and unless the secondary accent of the quintuple bar were marked with the same clearness as the primary, the dancers would not know how to regulate the figures of the dance; that is if they counted their steps, as learners do, they would not know whether to count them 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, or 1, 2, 3, 1, 2. In other words, if the music were written in quintuple (5:4) time, both the player and the dancers would inevitably convert it into one of the forms of complex-time, either 2:4 3:4 or 3:4 2:4.

There is no definite limit to the number of

ways in which duple and triple time may be combined, and perhaps the time will come when in all the Greek metres we shall be able to return to the prosodial principle, recognized for more than twenty centuries, that the only Greek syllables are shorts and longs, standing to each other in the simple ratio of 1 to 2. At any rate we feel that, although Professor Gildersleeve has given us the latest, he has not given us the last word on Greek metre and rhythm.

We will conclude with the expression of a hope, which is that the sale of this volume of the Olympian and Pythian odes may be sufficient to induce Professor Gildersleeve to prepare, and to warrant his publishers in issuing, a second volume on the same plan, containing the Nemean and Isthmian odes and all the fragments, not merely a selection. His introductory essay is in all respects adapted to a complete edition of Pindar's works. The references in those parts which treat of the dialect and syntax of Pindar are quite as numerous to the lacking portions as their comparative bulk demands. In many cases they are more numerous than the references to the odes contained in this volume; for example, under the suffix *-dev* he gives one reference to a Pythian ode, while there are two to Nemean and two to Isthmian odes. Should our hope be realized, we should have an edition of Pindar which for completeness and usefulness would long remain unsurpassed; and it would serve as a specimen of American learning and scholarship of which we should all be proud.

*The Campaigns of Stuart's Cavalry.* By H. B. McClellan. Richmond: J. W. Randolph & English; Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1885.

THIS volume fills, and fills well, a gap in the literature connected with the civil war. Though called on the title-page, 'The Life and Campaigns of Major-General J. E. B. Stuart,' it is really a history of the cavalry of the army of Northern Virginia while under his command, but a small space being devoted to the personal history of General Stuart apart from his military career in the Confederate army. In the many narratives, more or less valuable, which have been written of the campaigns in Virginia, the operations of the cavalry have been described in a fragmentary and often in a very meagre and inadequate way. For the first time we now have a history of these operations (so far as conducted by Stuart) which gives a connected view of them as a whole. This has been done, too, by one who, as Adjutant-General of the cavalry corps, not only knows what he is talking about, but who has evidently spared no pains and labor to get at all the facts about transactions in regard to which the official reports are imperfect, or misleading, or altogether wanting. The tone of Major McClellan's book deserves unqualified praise as the frank, manly, straightforward story of a soldier who is more anxious to be just than to glorify his own side, and who can see and admire the gallant deeds of his foes as readily as those of his comrades.

But this is only one of the excellences of the book. While the style is perfectly simple, unpretending, we may say unadorned, it is admirable for its lucidness and ease. Cavalry operations are often complicated and confused, and the battles of large bodies of horsemen, scattered as they usually are over a great extent of country, are matters not easy of description. But Major McClellan is not excelled by any writer we know in the clearness with which he sets forth the movements of troops before battle, and the well-defined, perfectly comprehensible picture he presents of battles themselves. The story of Stuart's raids is admirably told, and the great cavalry

fight, for instance, between Stuart and Pleasanton, on June 9, 1863, which opened the Gettysburg campaign, is so well set forth that, with the aid of the map, it is perfectly easy to follow the varied and intricate movements of the day without confusion and without fatigue. Major McClellan possesses the happy faculty of not overburdening his narrative with too much detail, while he yet retains enough to secure vividness. He thus describes the opening of the struggle for Fleetwood Hill, the centre and key to Stuart's position on June 9, and which, from the supineness of General Robertson, had almost fallen into General Gregg's possession before Stuart knew that he was near:

"My first courier found General Stuart as incredulous concerning the presence of the enemy in his rear as I had been at the first report of the North Carolina scout. Major Hart states that Stuart turned to him and ordered him to 'ride back there and see what all that foolishness is about.' But simultaneous with my second message came the sound of the cannonading, and there was no longer room for doubt. The nearest point from which a regiment could be sent was Jones's position, one and a half miles distant from Fleetwood. The Twelfth Virginia, Col. A. W. Harman, and the Thirty-fifth Battalion, Lieut.-Col. E. V. White, were immediately withdrawn from his line, and ordered to meet this new danger. But minutes expanded seemingly into hours to those anxious watchers on the hill, who feared lest, after all, help *could* not arrive in time. But it *did* come. The emergency was so pressing that Colonel Harman had no time to form his regiment into squadrons, or even in platoons. He reached the top of the hill as Lt. Carter was retiring his gun after having fired his very last cartridge. Not fifty yards below, Col. Percy Wyndham was advancing the First New Jersey Cavalry in magnificent order, in column of squadrons, with flags and guidons flying. A hard gallop had enabled only the leading files of the Twelfth Virginia to reach the top of the hill, the rest of the regiment stretching out behind in columns of fours. It was a trying position both to the pride and courage of this regiment to be put into action in such manner that a successful charge seemed hopeless; but with the true spirit of a forlorn hope, Colonel Harman and the few men about him dashed at the advancing Federals. Stuart reached the hill a few moments later.

"And now the first contest was for the possession of the Fleetwood Hill; and so stubbornly was this fought on either side, and for so long a time, that all of Jones's regiments and all of Hampton's participated in the charges and countercharges which swept across its face.

"Colonel Harman was severely wounded in a personal encounter with the officer leading the Federal cavalry. Lieutenant-Colonel White, having reformed the two squadrons of his battalion, swept around the west side of the hill and charged the three guns which had been advanced to its foot. The cavalry which supported these guns was driven away. Not so, however, with the gallant gunners of the Sixth New York Battery. They had already distinguished themselves at Chancellorsville on the 2d of May under General Pleasanton, and on this occasion they stood by their guns with the most determined courage. Lieutenant-Colonel White says in his report: 'There was no demand for a surrender, nor offer to do so, until nearly all the men, with many of their horses, were either killed or wounded.'

Major McClellan is perhaps over-careful to defend the fame of his chief against the military criticisms which have been often made on some of his operations. Stuart was one of the great cavalry leaders of the war. On the Southern side, he divides with Forrest the palm for skill, daring, and genius, and his achievements entitle him to rank among the great commanders of horse. His judgment was cool and good, his military intuitions of a very high order, his daring proverbial, his skill in handling men very great, while his physical energy and endurance had few parallels. The author has well explained the difficulties which had to be overcome in the equipment and maintenance of the Confederate cavalry, growing out of the insufficient supply of horses and arms to be had. Yet Stuart maintained an easy superiority over the Federal cavalry opposed to him during the first two

years of the war. An immense improvement, however, took place in the Federal cavalry in the spring of 1863, and from this time forward the struggle was far more desperate and uncertain. Stuart was confronted by foemen worthy of his steel, and the failing resources of the Confederacy made his task increasingly arduous.

But his ability was too great, and his achievements too solid, to make it necessary to defend him from every charge of error. The saying is trite but deserves to be remembered: "The man who has made no mistakes has never fought any battles." The achievement which first gave Stuart great reputation was his daring raid around McClellan's army on the Chickahominy, and he showed ever after a *penchant* for similar operations. This first raid not only was a brilliant feat, but it conduced in the highest degree to the success of Lee's plan of campaign against McClellan. Indeed, that campaign may be said to have been based upon the information that Stuart brought. But no such importance, either in design or result, attached to the Chambersburg raid; and while the skill and boldness with which it was conducted were creditable in the highest degree, the exhaustion due to it probably counterbalanced the advantages secured.

One of Stuart's great days was that on which he commanded Jackson's Corps at Chancellorsville, and, after a fierce and sanguinary struggle, wrested victory from Hooker. Arriving on the field at midnight, when the operations of the corps had been for some hours paralyzed by the fall of Jackson, he showed immense energy in acquainting himself with the condition of the field and the disposition of the troops, and deserves great credit for the vigor and skill of his attack next morning. He fought out the battle according to his own conceptions of the situation, instead of attempting to carry out Jackson's ideas. In this he was right; but it does not follow that, had Jackson been permitted to complete his own movement of the night before, even more striking results might not have been obtained.

In regard to Stuart's movements before Gettysburg, Major McClellan has said well what can be said in behalf of his chief, and he has not hesitated to criticize him—mildly, it is true—for sacrificing time of inestimable value for the sake of saving a train of captured wagons or paroling a few hundred prisoners. There can be no question but that General Lee's instructions allowed Stuart great latitude in consonance with the confidence which Lee reposed in the indefatigable commander of his horse, but it is just as certain that his prolonged absence was unexpected and severely felt by Lee, and that to this absence the battle of Gettysburg, at least as to manner and place, was due.

The brief sketch of Stuart's life before the war, the account of his participation in the capture of John Brown, and the glimpses given of his personal character and habits, add much to the charm of this interesting book; and we can only wish that the author had dwelt more on the personality of a soldier not more renowned for his brave deeds than for his singularly pure and lovable character. No deed of cruelty to citizen, no outrage upon woman, has ever been laid to his charge. Courteous as brave, running over with a joyous gayety which nothing could depress, he was hardly less earnest in his religious convictions than Stonewall Jackson himself.

The oversights are few. On page 88 Morse's Neck should be Moss Neck, and on page 386 Hanover Junction is once printed when Warrenton Junction is meant. Rosser and the horse artillery hardly receive the credit they deserve for their part in the fight at the Boonsboro' gap, September 14, 1862. On page 129 it is not accurate to speak of Starke's division as reinforcing

Lawton, as both were engaged at the same time and on different parts of the line. The book has been well got up by the publishers, and the maps are unusually good.

*Königliche Museen zu Berlin: Die Gipsabgüsse, etc.* [*Royal Museums of Berlin: The Plaster Casts of Ancient Sculpture explained in Historical Sequence. Materials for the History of Greek and Roman Plastic Art.* By Carl Friedrichs. Revised by Paul Wolters.] Berlin: Spemann. 1885. Pp. x, 850.—Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium. [Description of the Collection of Vases in the Antiquarium.] By Adolph Furtwängler. 1 vol. in 2 parts, pp. xxx, 1165, 7 plates. Berlin: Spemann. 1885.

THE Museum of Berlin (to class as one the many royal or national collections of the Prussian capital) is rich in vases and painted terracottas; and this collection may even be considered as peculiarly good for purposes of study and comparison, although it cannot be put in the first rank for the number and importance of its separate pieces of peculiar value and rarity. Large and very judicious purchases have been made during the past few years: in 1880, for instance, the collection of six hundred votive tablets from Corinth was obtained in one transaction, and not long before had been procured the extraordinary painted frieze from Athens; while remarkable single pieces, notably some with decoration partly in gold, have been added within a very few months. They are not very well displayed for the purposes of the ordinary student, who must look at them through the glass of the cases. Nearly all departments of the Berlin Museum are crowded.

The great cast collection, especially, is so much too large for its halls and corridors that it is really impossible to get far enough away from its most important pieces to see them properly. But there it is, filling ten halls of different sizes, besides landings of stairs and small passages; not very rich in Mediæval and Renaissance specimens, and much too purely German in the former department, but in classic sculpture by far the largest gathering in Europe. In fact, as has already been set forth in these columns, what with the few original pieces of value in the old collections—the Pergamon originals—the Olympia casts, which have their headquarters in Berlin, and are housed by themselves not far off, and the general collection housed in the "New Museum" building, Berlin may be said to have all the important classical sculptures that exist above ground, for the delectation of its students. The cast collection alone, including the Olympia finds, and as given in the book before us, contains 2,371 numbers of classical sculpture only.

The two books under consideration are excellent companions to the study of these collections, and so discharge their first duty as catalogues, but not in this capacity would they claim much attention from stay-at-home students. They are also excellent companions in the study, and nobly make up for the shortcomings of the professed histories and handbooks. For what is the fault of the histories and handbooks?—that they explain and discuss and draw general conclusions without giving examples enough to help the reader make up his own mind. Take the history of Greek sculpture, of which we have several good examples of late, and see what pages of disquisition have only two or three examples cited as the ground for these conclusions and convictions. The reader longs for more: he wants to know how many such reliefs or statues there are above ground; he would like to help the author reach his decisions, and asks for material to work upon. This the "history" cannot give, but the mere catalogue, "in historischer Folge erklärt,"