PREFACE

These lectures ask a question—*Who were the Greeks?*—and attempt some sort of answer. It is a question which every historian must ask, sooner or later, about the subject of his studies, and every statesman about the object of his endeavors. And it is a kind of answer, in which history has more chance of becoming an applied science, as well as a graphic art, than in most of its tasks. Some day it will be permissible to ask, and possible to answer the question, “Who were the Americans?” At present what concern us more are the twin questions,—“Who are the Americans?” and “What are they in process of coming to be?” And the Greeks of classical times asked those questions too about themselves.

In attempting an answer, therefore, a method of enquiry is sketched, with illustrations of its use, selected from those parts of a large subject where it seemed, in the spring of 1927, most needful to restate an old problem in view of recent advances of knowledge; sometimes in the hope that a solution has at last been found; more often with the conviction that until this or that piece of exploration has been put in hand, no solution is possible. It is some gain to have even an obstacle defined. But even where certainty seems to have been achieved, it is at best a vantage-ground for reconnaissance of what looms up beyond. And the fighting line in a campaign of this kind is a ragged one. Far too much has depended in the past on chance occasions, capricious hindrances and interruptions, individual preferences, and other irrelevant considerations, in the choice of the next thing to do. Our knowledge of many parts of the subject is fragmentary, not so much by reason of physical or political hindrances—though these, in Greek lands, have been serious—but because enquiry has been spasmodic and unco-ordinated.

Excavation is always expensive, and when funds are scarce, work is curtailed or suspended. Failure to make sensational “discoveries,” and the supposed need to make them, divert attention from scientific to sentimental objectives. All this makes

PREFACE

exploration more expensive still, by restricting the prospect of results. There was, of course, a time when it seemed better to dig about anywhere than not to dig at all: the unknown was so vast. But those days are over. We begin to know not only what to seek next, but how and where to look for it, efficiently and economically. This, like any other kind of strategy, presumes both knowledge and imagination, as well as patient persistence; qualities the combination of which means most to those best able to take long views and make comprehensive plans, in their own affairs, as in pure science.

So I have been careful to note, in the course of this argument, the points at which we are at present balked by lack of information, easily obtained at the cost of seeking for it. If this survey of a large question as a whole should initiate even a few of the pieces of research which if done next will rectify omissions, and connect outlying ends and corners of our knowledge, it will have been well worth while.

Fragmentary however as our information is, discursive and diagrammatic as discussion of it must be, it will be found to permit a reconstruction of prehistoric times in the Greek cradle-land, on objective naturalistic lines, as a standard by which to test the statements which the Greeks themselves have left us about their origin. Even in the third and sixth chapters the Greeks' own stories about themselves are presented as part of the circumstantial evidence. Only in Chapter VIII, where circumstantial evidence must be supplemented by literary, does the subjective aspect of the question begin to appear; and at that point this enquiry may reasonably end. How the Greeks of the Homeric and Hesiodic age, and their successors, looked at their own problem of "living well," I have discussed already in lectures on the George Slocum Bennett Foundation on *The Political Ideals of the Greeks* (New York and London, 1927). The connection between the two themes is obvious, and is anticipated there in the sections on "Greek Lands," on "Geographical Distributions of the Greek City-states," on the "Origin of the *Polis*," and on the "Special Case of Attica," where an attempt is made to trace the debt of historical Greek communities to their Mycenaean predecessors, in respect of institutions and customs.

PREFACE

These aspects of the treatment here adopted must serve to explain certain wide variations of scale, and changes of standpoint, in the course of the argument; and also the total omission of much controversial matter. For the same reason the names of earlier workers, and acknowledgment of their contributions, will be found in the notes, not in the text. It would have been easy to double the length of this book by recapitulating always the stages by which present knowledge has been won; to fill a second volume with references to the pioneer-work of the past, old guesses, the mere refutation of which was a step forward through the new facts established; half-truths the significance of which has only been perceived by degrees. But to the reader it matters very much more what has been done, than who did it.

To keep the main argument clear and concise, only such facts have been cited as seem essential to the proof; and for easier verification of these, reference has been restricted usually to a few well-known textbooks and museum catalogues. As these include bibliographies and full references to original publications, it is hoped that much space has been saved without loss of efficiency. Though the Sather Lectures at Berkeley were fully illustrated, there has been no attempt to reproduce those pictures; all the more important objects having been repeatedly published elsewhere. But I have to thank Dr. Chas. Blinkenberg for permission to copy typical specimens from his *Fibules Grecques et Orientales* (Copenhagen, 1926), which supersedes all earlier discussions, and makes possible my own interpretation of the first safety-pins, in Chapter VII. They were carefully redrawn for me by Miss Amice M. Calverley.

The sketch-maps are due to the skilful draughtmanship of Mrs. O. M. Washburn. As each gives the geographical distribution of one class of data only, they must be compared with one another, and supplemented by the use of a large-scale map showing those physical features which so largely determine such distributions.

Though what is printed here is rather longer than what was spoken in March and April, 1927, there has been no serious change in the argument; the passages omitted in the lecture-room being for the most part such as did not admit of effective illustration.

PREFACE

For the same reason, it has only been possible to take account in the notes, or by occasional phrases in the text, of the numerous important works which appeared after the lectures were delivered. It is an encouragement to find that in Chapter IV I am in general accord with the views of Dr. Martin Nilsson in *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* (Lund, 1827), which appeared after the lectures were delivered.

For much help in revising proofs and verifying references, I have to thank Mr. W. F. Jackson Knight, and some of his pupils at Bloxham School, especially P. A. Schofield. Miss H. L. Lorimer, Fellow of Somerville College, Oxford, and Mr. Stanley Casson, Fellow of New College, have also read the whole, and called attention to slips and obscurities. I am especially indebted to W. W. A. Heurtley, Assistant Director of the British School of Archaeology at Athens, for allowing me to refer to unpublished results of recent excavations in Macedonia.

New College, Oxford.

JOHN L. MYRES.