SCHILLER'S HISTORY OF THE EMPIRE.

Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit. By Prof. SCHILLER. Band II. Gotha. 1887. 9 Mk.

No one who reads Prof. Schiller's history will be inclined to underestimate either his learning, or the amount of conscientious study which he has devoted to his subject. But he has no mercy on his readers, and we fear that for all but the strongest digestions this volume, like that which preceded it, will prove too tough a morsel. The truth is that he has produced not so much a history, as a collection of the materials for a history. The value of his work lies in the mass of facts which he has brought together and in the fulness of his references, alike to the ancient authorities and to the modern literature, while it is in the selection and grouping of his facts that he fails. Too often we cannot see the wood for the trees, and the general outlines and distinctive features of the period are constantly obscured by the mass of details. These defects are the more unfortunate because the period with which this volume deals, that from Diocletian to Theodosius, is at once one of the most important, and the most difficult of comprehension in ancient history. It more-over stands in great need of a historian. Tillemont, laborious and learned as he was, worked with inadequate materials, and with a very imperfect grasp of the chief problems of the time, while Gibbon's treatment of this period is on the whole the least satisfactory part of his great work. Since Gibbon wrote, although much has been done in special departments—and notably in all that concerns the movements of the barbarian peoples—there has been, if we except the necessarily brief sketch in Ranke's *Weltgeschichte*, and the rather superficial account given by Duruy, no serious attempt made at a history of the time as a whole, and this want Prof. Schiller has only partially supplied.

The volume opens, rightly enough, with a section on the authorities—which in itself affords a good illustration of Prof. Schiller's strong and weak points. As a catalogue it leaves little to be desired, but its value for the student would have been trebled, had the list of names been supplemented by something more in the way of a critical estimate of the importance and relation to each other of the different writers; we should also have welcomed, what Prof.

Schiller is undoubtedly competent to give, some account of the mass of evidence from inscriptions, coins and monuments which recent research has accumulated, and of its general bearing on the literary tradition.

Roughly speaking, it may be said that the three points on which the attention of the historian should be fastened during this period are, first, the development and working of the elaborate administrative machinery, by means of which Diocletian and his successors hoped to compensate for the decay of internal strength and spontaneous energy; secondly, the growth of the Christian Church and its relations with the imperial government on the one hand, and the barbarians on the other; thirdly, the movements of the barbarian peoples themselves. To the first of these Prof. Schiller devotes about a hundred pages, closely packed with solid matter, and it is here perhaps that his want of constructive skill will be most keenly felt. Emperor and senate, the civil and financial administration, the court and the army are all separately dealt with, their functions and position stated, but though we are shown in turn each part of the machinery, we get no clear impression of its actual working and effects. Thus the section on the civil administration (pp. 44–68) would have been all the better for the omission of some of the less important details as to the duties of the various officials, and the insertion of a few of those graphic illustrations from the actual history which are necessary to give life and meaning to the most careful analysis. Apart from this excessively anatomical treatment and an occasional want of sequence in the arrangement (e.g. the account of the mode of succession to the imperial purple, and of the system of joint rule, is interposed between the paragraphs dealing with the names borne by the emperors and those dealing with their titles), there is little in this part of the book to call for special criticism in a brief review like the present. A few points however may be noticed. Prof. Schiller leaves us in some doubt as to his view of the 'nomina' borne by Diocletian and Maximian. We do not quite understand whether he thinks that Diocletian assumed both Aurelius and Valerius on his accession, or whether he considers that 'Valerius,' as is just possible, previously belonged to him. As regards Maximian, he was surely 'ein

Aurelier' only because, as Prof. Schiller elsewhere implies, he assumed or was granted the two names 'Aurelius Valerius' on being associated with Diocletian in the government. The Oriental pomp with which the emperors of this period surrounded themselves is rightly traced further back than Diocletian, but the statement that its introduction was due to the 'Verlegung des Schwerpunktes des Römerreichs nach Osten' (pp. 33, 34) is hardly adequate as an explanation. Prof. Schiller comes nearer to one at least of the reasons for this, when on p. 122, note 1, he calls attention to the direct imitation of Sassanid practice by Diocletian. In other words this orientalising tendency, for which strange to say two such vigorous and soldierlike emperors as Aurelian and Diocletian are mainly responsible, was the result partly of a desire to surround the Roman emperor with as much visible majesty as his only rivals in the East, the Sassanid kings; partly of a hope that, if thus fenced round by ceremonial and dignified by outward splendour, he might be rendered less accessible to attack from his own subjects. It was, in fact, like the practice of adoption, one of several methods intended to remedy the two weakest points in the imperial system, the want of a legitimate origin, and of an established order of succession. The section on the civil administration, though cast in too statistical a form, is accurate and fairly complete. The author correctly points out that this later administrative system is distinguished from the earlier by its exact division of labour, and the substitution for the old type of magistrates with their ill-defined prerogatives and conflicting jurisdiction of the 'Berufsbeamte' und 'Berufsoffizier' (p. 44). He does not, however, call attention to the fact that this newer type of official is from the first characteristic of the imperial service, as distinct from that of the state, and that its gradual spread marks the progressive extension of that service over the whole area of the empire to the exclusion of the other. In the section on finance, we cannot help regretting that Prof. Schiller has not given a fuller and clearer account of the imperial census itself. The subject is no doubt full of difficulties, but considering its importance the space allotted to it is certainly small. We should also have welcomed a more detailed discussion of the origin and position of the 'coloni,' the class of free labourers bound to the soil, who fill so large a place in the legislation of the period, and on whom a vast amount of

ingenious speculation has been expended. We may note in passing that the conjecture (p. 78) as to the wide extent of the 'agri fiscales' in Italy is to some extent confirmed by the evidence of Cassiodorus. There is lastly a little inconvenience in the arrangement by which the account of the actual working and results of the system are relegated to a chapter at the end of the volume. Thus the part played by guilds such as that of the 'navicularii,' and the influence of financial necessities on the development of the colonate, are treated of apart from the general tendency to stereotype the machinery of society, which is so marked a characteristic of the Later Empire, but for an account of which the reader must turn to p. 444. Numismatic questions have evidently a special attraction for Prof. Schiller, and not the least valuable parts of his book are his account of Diocletian's reform of the coinage (pp. 147 *sqq.*), and such discussions of the evidence derived from coins, as that in the chapter (pp. 204 *sqq.*) on the attitude of Constantine towards the Christian Church. On the other hand, Prof. Schiller leaves the problem of the real meaning of Diocletian's famous edict 'de pretiis rerum venalium' very much where it was.

The relations between the Church and the Empire the author has treated with as much care and completeness as his limited space allowed. The chief interest of his work here lies in his endeavour to trace the gradual change in the imperial policy from one of friendly neutrality to one of declared partisanship, a change which elevated the Church to a position which was incompatible with the 'staatliche Omnipotenz' of the emperor (p. 415), 'damit war ein höhere Gewalt über dem absoluten Kaiser anerkannt' (p. 436). Thus while fully allowing the influence of the Church in saving Roman civilisation and even the Roman state from extinction, he places it side by side with the inroads of the barbarians as one of the forces hostile to the imperial system in the fourth century.

The barbarian advance is not so satisfactorily handled. In the fifth and last chapter Prof. Schiller indeed notices briefly the barbarising, as it is called, of the empire, by the wholesale settlements of barbarian captives in the provinces, the increasing use of them in the imperial army, and the frequent elevation of barbarians to high posts in the imperial service. He lays stress also on the fact that to the lower classes within the empire the barbarians not seldom

brought relief from intolerable burdens (p. 440). But we miss any chapters such as those on the ecclesiastical policy of Constantine, or of Gratian and Theodosius, dealing with the question as a whole, and

even so critical a moment as that of the admission of the Goths by Valens is treated in far too incidental a fashion.

H. F. PELHAM.

STUDIA BIBLICA.

(Continued from p. 197.)

THE essay of Bishop Wordsworth above referred to is 'On the Corbey MS. of St. James,' an old Latin MS. (ff.) now in St. Petersburg; and Prof. Sanday has supplied 'Further Remarks' on the same MS. The hypothesis of Bishop Wordsworth is that the original language was Aramaic, and that the Corbey version is not derived from our present Greek text but from a different translation. Amongst the passages which he thinks this hypothesis helps to explain are: ii. 7, 'blasphemant in bono nomine,' v. 2, 'res [for vestes] vestrae tiniaverunt' where the confusion of 'res' and 'vestes,' impossible in Greek, might occur from the double sense of the Aramaic *mdu*. However, he also quotes Dr. Hort's suggestion that *ues* has been lost before *res vestrae*. In confirmation of his hypothesis of an Aramaic original, he shows by an analysis of the vocabulary that the writer 'must have had a rather wide range of classical reading.' It seems to us that the rare words found in the Epistle do not suffice to prove this. They may have been familiar colloquially and locally. The word *περπερεύεσθαι* in 1 Cor. xiii. 4 is found, we believe, only once in any other Greek writer, and that much later than St. Paul. But the compound *ἐμπερπερεύεσθαι* is used by Cicero (*ad Att.* i. 14) in a way which makes it probable that it was a familiar word. And such words as *ἀνεμίζω*, *δαμονιώδης*, *χρυσοδακτύλιος*, may well have been colloquially used; *ἀνεμίζω* is given by Hesychius as an explanation of another word (*ἀναψύξαι*): *χρυσοδακτύλιος* is also used by him in explanation of another word. Both it and *δαμονιώδης* occur in Greek Scholiasts. Such facts are indications of popular use.

Prof. Sanday in his essay on the same Corbey MS. compares it minutely with the Vulgate, Jerome's quotations and the so-called *Speculum* of St. Augustine, and concludes (differing herein from the Bishop), that the Corbey MS. and the Vulgate do not proceed from fundamentally different stocks, whereas the text of the *Speculum* does pro-

ceed from a different source. He thinks that the Vulgate text in this Epistle owes extremely little to Jerome, and that the peculiarities in the Corbey text are due to a definite local recension. Some words of Lagarde go to the root of the question, Whence arose the marked differences? Replying to Hartel (who said that the scribe of the Verona MS. seemed like a grammarian teaching boys how to vary their expressions, preferring for no probable reason *pacificis* to *pacatis*; *nefaria* to *nefanda*, etc.) Lagarde observes that 'the probable cause was that in the learned or popular speech of the district for which the MS. was intended the one word was not in use, and therefore had to be replaced by another.'

With reference to the old Latin texts generally, Prof. Sanday concludes from his examination of the first two Gospels that there were two parent stocks and not more, the African and European. The Vulgate of St. James is mainly European, but with a peculiar element, not necessarily African. However, in *Old Latin Texts*, p. cclv, he withdraws this expression of opinion as to the fundamental separation between the two families of texts, thinking that the time for a definite conclusion had not yet come.

Mr. Gwilliam examines a Syriac Biblical MS. of the fifth century (*Brit. Mus. Add.* 14459, fol. 1—66), containing the first two Gospels. The text does not differ in any essential particular from that of Widmanstadt, and such differences as exist affect but very slightly the relation of the Syriac version to the original Greek text. We give a few instances:—

Matt. xvii. 21 not omitted (om. *S* B.*)

xix. 17 agrees with Text. Rec.

xxiv. 36 has not οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός.

xxvii. 35 = Rec.

Mk. vi. 11; ix. 44, 46. xv. 28 = Rec.

The last verses of St. Mark are given without any note of doubtfulness. In Matt. xxviii. 18 it adds (with the printed Peshito), 'and as my Father sent me I send you.'