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his model) is certainly the best. Of the current types, the German combines the extreme of ugliness with the extreme of illegibility: the English is fairly legible, though it is too regular by far, but it is smug to a degree, a Chadband among types. The Germans have made a new attempt in their reprints of papyri, but this is like the Indian Dak Bungalow fowl.

W. H. D. ROUSE.


The central idea of this book, as expressed in the ‘Foreword,’ is not a new one: that the Roman State was modelled on the ancient Gens or ancient Family, and that its theory (principle would be a better word) of government was founded upon the relations existing between kinsmen; and that these again were determined by religious notions which later became transformed through developments within the City and external influences. It is substantially the idea of the famous book of Fustel de Coulanges, and Mr. Launspach is perhaps too strongly influenced by a work which he has evidently studied with great care, adding a wide knowledge of many recent writers on Roman law, continental as well as British. It is however as well to remember that the story told in La Cité antique is in the main a true one as regards Rome, though it was too complete and symmetrical in all its parts, and hinged too entirely on the doctrine of the worship of ancestors. It finds useful illustration in this volume. The earlier chapters are indeed somewhat behind the time; the origin of the Romans, the religious basis of Roman society, the nature of the Gentes, of the early Kingship, etc., are subjects which just now one may well be shy of, seeing that archaeologists, anthropologists, ethnologists, and philologists, are all at work on them, and cannot for a long time to come be expected to formulate any definite or quite satisfactory conclusions. A glance, for example, at Binder's recently published volume on the Plebs, and at the nature of his material as visible in his notes, will illustrate what is here meant. When we find Mr. Launspach quoting Livy's first book with complete confidence (as against Soltau, see p. 90) for the election of the kings by the citizen body, and apparently regarding Tullus Hostilius and Ancus Martius as historical personages, we cannot but feel that he is insufficiently equipped for this part of his work. He nowhere refers to the articles on Curia, Comitia, etc., in the Pauly-Wissowa Real-encyclopadie, which sum up the views of the most trustworthy scholars of recent times. But in the last three chapters, on marriage, patria potestas, and succession, he is on firmer ground; here the main thesis is well illustrated from the ius civile. These chapters comprise at least half the book, which may therefore be of considerable value to students. The last chapter, on succession, is perhaps the most interesting for those who keep in mind the central idea of the book. In this the decay of the gens (or better, the loosening of the gentile bond by City association, see p. 254), and the results of this disintegration on society in general, are well explained and illustrated from the history of the devolution of property. It is pleasant to find Mr. Launspach taking a more reasonable view of the religion of the old Romans than is generally to be found in English books touching on the subject. On p. 47 he says with truth, ‘The utmost that we can expect from a primitive religion is that it shall clarify and not distort, fortify and not corrupt, such primordial social instincts as are already operative.’ When in the next sentence he claims that ‘with the Romans religion had struck the deeper note of human life,’ he only means that it sanctioned their best social instincts,—and so far he is probably right.

W. W. F.

THE HASTA DONATICA.


Dr. HELBIG has turned aside from the preparation of a new edition of his well known
work on Homeric antiquities to deal with a topic of Roman archaeology, which is not, however, without connexion with his special studies. Among the *dona militaria*, about which Steiner not long ago published a valuable monograph in the *Bonner Jahrbücher* (1906, pp. 1-98), was the gift known as *hasta pura*, or, sometimes, as *hasta donatica*. A special discussion of this particular mark of military distinction, which figures along with phalerae, armillae, coronae, etc., is welcome; for the very expression *hasta pura* (as in Virgil's *'Ille vides pura juvenis qui nititur hasta,'* *Aen.* vi. 760) has been diversely interpreted. The usual explanation that it was a wooden spear deprived of its iron tip is set aside by Steiner in favour of a *virgin* spear, as distinguished from one that had been actually used in battle. Helbig takes the word *pura* to mean 'all of a piece,' or, rather, 'all of a single material,' whether wood, iron or other metal.

The view that Helbig now puts forth is as follows: The *hasta pura* or *donatica* was the earliest form of the military donum. Originally, it was not an offensive weapon at all, but a kind of sceptre—the symbol of *imperium*—bestowed by the king and roughly reproducing the king's *'scipio eburneus.'* At first, this 'hasta' was of wood, then of metal—bronze, iron, or even gold or silver. Some time before the Imperial age this 'sceptre-hasta' became assimilated to a spear, and finally, when 'hasta' had come in general usage to signify chiefly a weapon of war, and when the primitive significance of the *sceptre-hasta* had been forgotten, an actual spear was the donum bestowed for military prowess.

Helbig supports his views as to the original character of the *hasta donatica* by various considerations, and, in particular, he finds a representation of it (or rather of two hastae) on a terra sigillata bowl from Chieti described on page 8 of this monograph. The objects thereon represented are two sceptre-like objects, and though there seems to be no absolutely decisive proof—such as an accompanying inscription—for their identification, the fact that they appear on this monument in conjunction with various *dona militaria* renders it probable that they are hastae donaticae. With these 'hastae,' Helbig compares an enigmatic object found on Roman Republican bronze and silver coins of the third century B.C.—a kind of sceptre furnished with a knob at each end. With regard to this object as it appears on the coins described by Helbig and figured in his plate, I may remark—that this does not affect the question of identification—that it is not an integral part of the 'type,' but a 'symbol,' which, in the case of the bronze money, is often interchanged with many varying symbols of a totally different kind. No doubt all these symbols are the private signets of monetary magistrates.

Helbig's paper further contains much interesting matter regarding the use of the *hasta* in primitive times, and he discusses its position in ritual (the *βάσων* of the Salii, for instance), and refers to the well-known case of sales 'under the hammer,' as we say, or as the Romans called them 'sub hasta,' *i.e.* (according to Helbig) under the auspices of the old sceptre-hasta, which originally signified *justum dominium and imperium*.

As Dr. Helbig has been careful to bring together a good deal of the numismatic evidence about *hasta* and *dona militaria*, I may add a further reference to an instructive type that often occurs on the bronze coins issued by the Bosporanic kings under the Roman Empire. This type displays the marks of honour (identified as such by the inscription *TEIMAI*) presented by the Emperors to the Kings of Bosporus—a spear and shield, a helmet, an ivory throne, a sceptre and other objects. (See the British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins, *Pontus*, etc., pp. 53, 58, etc.)

**Warwick Wroth.**


An interesting book: even the severe classicist, whose knowledge of post-Augustan Latin is limited to Persius, Juvenal, and Tacitus, will find some useful remarks, *e.g.* on Pers. 3. 27 sqq. (p. 37), and on such