The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Province of Asia *De Communi Asiae Provinciae*. Thesim proponebat Paulus Monceaux. Paris. Thorin. 1886. f. 3.50.

W. M. Ramsay

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 04 / April 1889, pp 174 - 179
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194612, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194612

How to cite this article:

W. M. Ramsay (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 174-179 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194612

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

accentuation of *o*- and *a*-stems. For one class of these, the *mo*- and *ma*-stems, Dr. Brugmann already recognizes the principle which Osthoff discovered (see *Morphologische Untersuchungen*. iv. 127ff.); Dr. Brugmann's words are (p. 160): 'Seeing that low and high grades' (i.e. of root-vowel) 'plentifully appear in the same word, e.g. Gr. λίμνός, λοῖμνός; Skt. *dhū-mās*, O.H.G. *tou-m*; Gr. χῦμός, Skt. *hō-mās*; Skt. *idh-mās*, Av. *aes-ma*, original gradation within the same paradigm may be inferred.' But gradation of root-vowels implies gradation of accents, originally if not in fully-developed Indo-European; and Osthoff has proved, not only for the *mo-ma*-stems, but for all disyllabic stems in *o* and *a*, that the same formation constantly shows both low and high root-vowel, both oxytone and paroxytone accent (as proved by Verner's law, apart from the Greek and Sanskrit accent), without distinction of meaning. If the 'agent and action' rule had not stood in the way, surely Dr. Brugmann would have joined in Osthoff's suggested conclusion (it is quite true that Osthoff does not state it *totidem verbis* except for the *mo-ma*-stems) that the last I.-E. form of declension was nom. *lōigos*, but gen. *līgē-sio* or *līgēos*,

acc. *lōigom* loc. *līgē-i*, and so on. How words of more than two syllables were treated I cannot conjecture; but in any case I cannot think that the Wackernagel-Wheelerian principles are valid outside Greek and the Asiatic languages.

One or two interesting points may be noticed. The Greek *-as* stems (κρέας, &c.) are identified with the Skt. *-is* stems (p. 398), as I.-E. *es*-stems, which possibly may ultimately be *es*-stems with a weaker grade of the suffix. De Saussure is followed (p. 344) in identifying Ἀγαμέμνων and θρασυμέμνων as *-μεν-μον-* 'spirited,' ποδαπός and *longinquus* are explained as compounds, with the same second number as the Skt. stems *ūd-añch-* 'directed upwards' and *ny-añch-* 'directed downwards' (p. 461). νικάω is the source, not a derivative, of νίκη, and means 'I make low,' from an I.-E. adjective stem *nī-go-*, Skt. *nī-cha-* 'low,' derived from the preposition-adverb *nī*, *nī* (p. 241). (But it seems strange to separate νίκη from νείκος). The Greek adverbs in ξ are nominatives of adjectives in -κος, which have changed their inflexion and become consonant-stems, *μουννακος, *περικος, *ὀδατ-κος, &c. (p. 241).

T. C. SNOW.

THE PROVINCE OF ASIA.

De Communi Asiae Provinciae. Thesim proponebat PAULUS MONCEAUX. Paris. Thorin. 1886. f. 3.50.

THIS work deals with a subject both interesting and important, which is closely connected with many problems of political and religious history, and which has never yet been treated in a systematic way. By an intelligent arrangement of the facts and a logical estimate of their value, M. Monceaux reaches several important conclusions, and makes a decided advance in our knowledge: but his work contains several errors in details, and the new views which he advocates in regard to the meetings and officials of the *Koinon*, though approximating to the truth, seem to me to miss it, while the whole third part, so far as it is novel, is, I think, mistaken. In all that relates to the difficult question of the High Priests and the Asiarchs, M. Monceaux traverses the same ground which the Bishop of Durham at the very same time was discussing in his *Ignatius and Polycarp*. I have not access to the latter work while

writing, but, so far as I recollect, its conclusions are founded on a fuller examination of the authorities, and seem to me to be in all respects correct. It must of course be remembered that M. Monceaux's work is the *thesis* of a young student finishing his course of training, and required of him by the rules of the university: looked at in this character it deserves unstinted praise as a most creditable and scholarly production. The investigation is conducted with admirable honesty and clearness, and a perusal of the work fills us with bitter regret that such a method of testing students is not more practised in England. We should be glad to see some such *thesis* required from all 'First Class' men. But the most real praise to give to M. Monceaux's work is to subject it to a rigorous examination: and in a subject which is so remote from the studies of most, it may not be impertinent that one who has been forced to study the antiquities of Roman Asia should offer some criticism on a work that deals with them.

The union of the whole province of Asia

in the worship of Rome and Augustus was founded by Augustus, to supply for the Roman province that religious bond which, according to ancient feeling, must exist in order to hold together any association or political body. The earliest recorded act of the *Koinon* was the foundation in 19 B.C. at Pergamum of a temple to Rome and Augustus: coins struck in this year exist with the legend *Com. Asiae*. M. Monceaux in one point misstates the facts about these coins: as they fall under a heading in Cohen's list, *Méd. d'Or et d'Argent*, he says that they exist in both gold and silver. Cohen and Eckhel mention only examples in silver.

The discussion of the titles *νεωκόρος*, *δισ νεωκόρος*, etc. is very good. The neocorate—which was granted by formal decree of the Roman senate to certain cities of Asia—related to local cults of emperors or imperial families, and had no connection with the worship of Rome and Augustus which was maintained by the entire province as united in the *Κοινὸν Ἀσίας*. A single neocorate implied a single temple to an emperor or an imperial family, such as the Julii or Flavii; a second and third neocorate implied two or three temples to different emperors or imperial families. This point is a discovery of M. Monceaux's, and he has advanced reasons for it which make it at least highly probable. One further argument which he has not observed raises his theory almost to certainty. In the proconsulship of T. Aurelius Fulvius Antoninus, placed by Waddington A.D. 135, there is still only one temple in Ephesus of the *Koinon* (*C. I. G.* 2965), and the second temple of the *Koinon* in Ephesus was probably not older than Antoninus Pius: whereas the second neocorate with a second Ephesian temple was granted under Hadrian.

On p. 22 M. Monceaux quotes Eckhel as his authority for the statement that both second and third neocorates were granted to Smyrna and to Sardis under Severus. The statement is true about Sardis, but Eckhel expressly says that the second neocorate of Smyrna is mentioned on a coin of Commodus; and he adds that an inscription records the second neocorate to have been granted to Smyrna under Hadrian. M. Monceaux on his preceding page quotes this very inscription: he gives it only on the authority of Eckhel, apparently unaware that it is in *C. I. G.* no 3148.

The games held by the *Koinon*, called *Κοινὰ Ἀσίας*, and celebrated in turn in different seats of the joint cultus, were pentatetic. It is remarkable that three different scholars independently arrived at the same

conclusion, and published it in the same year (1885): M. Monceaux, the Bishop of Durham in his *Ignatius and Polycarp*, and myself in a note in the *Papers of American School*, I. 103. Previous writers, Marquardt, Mommsen (*die Provinzen des Reichs*), etc., all accept the games as annual.

The Asiarch who presided at the games also bore the title of Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας. This once disputed point is now probably universally accepted. It implies a rather looser use of terms than would be probable in Greece proper, but such a loose use is characteristic of the Greek of Asia.

The distinction between the titles—

(1) Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας in the fullest sense, i.e. Ἀστιάρχης, which denotes the supreme functionary of the *Koinon*;

(2) Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας *ναῶν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ, Σμύρνῃ*, etc., which denotes the officials who directed the cultus in Pergamum, Smyrna, etc.; and

(3) Ἀρχιερεὺς in some local cultus, who was unconnected with the *Koinon*—

is clearly drawn, and is of course known to all accurate writers. I feel however unable to agree with the opinion that the Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας was an annual officer, and that only every fourth Ἀρχιερεὺς was also an Ἀστιάρχης. The writer correctly observes that the Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας is not fully equivalent to Ἀστιάρχης, but is of wider application; but I think he is wrong in his view that the difference lay in the fact that three out of four Ἀρχιερεῖς were not Ἀστιάρχαι, and that only the Ἀρχιερεὺς who celebrated the pentatetic games was also Ἀστιάρχης. The difference seems to me to lie in the use of Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας as a title of courtesy, in abbreviation for the full Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας *ναῶν τῶν ἐν κ.τ.λ.* Strictly only the Ἀστιάρχης, an official for four years, was also Ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας, but loosely and through courtesy the latter title was applied even to the subordinate *Archiereis* of Smyrna, etc., and at last this loose style was carried so far that we hear of an *Asiarcha templorum splendidissimae civitatis Ephesinae* (*C. I. L.* III. 296-7). I expressed this opinion in the *Academy*, Aug. 11, 1883. An inscription, which M. Monceaux has misunderstood, seems to show that the Ephesian High Priest was a pentatetic official: it contains the phrase *Τιβ. Ίουλ. Πηγείνου Ἀστιάρχου β' ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς φιλ' πεντατηρίδος*.¹ This shows that Rhegeinos was

¹ By a misprint M. Monceaux, p. 57, reads *φιζ'*. I may add that the reading *φ* can surely not be correct; the 517th pentateteris means a lapse of 2065 years: should we not read *πιζ'*? *φ* is sometimes mistaken for *ρ*, yet *φιζ'* occurs twice (Wood, vi.

Ephesian Asiarch (obviously equivalent to ἀρχ. Ἀσίας τῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ) for a *pentacteric*. Yet M. Monceaux, on the authority of this inscription, gives Rhegeinos as Asiarch proper. The analogy of a pentaeteric Ephesian Asiarch may safely be extended to the Asiarch proper. The date of Rhegeinos is unknown.

It is greatly to be regretted that M. Monceaux did not, while so industriously collecting the material, compile a list of Ἀρχιεῖς Ἀσίας as well as a list of Ἀσιάρχαι. This would have added much to the value of his work, and he would confer a further benefit on students by publishing such a list.¹

Asia Provincia was divided by Sulla into 144 *regiones* or *civitates*: sometimes several *populi* were united in one *regio* (p. 28). This is a most happy generalisation. It involves an alteration of the text of Cassiodorus from XLIV. to CXLIV. (Mommson, *die Chronik des Cass. Sen.* 622²), but some such change seems absolutely necessary. I may add that these *regiones* can be traced even as late as the sixth century, by which time they had certainly been considerably increased in number.

On p. 63 he says that *per longum tempus apud Ephesios solos videntur celebrati esse communes provinciae ludi*, and hence we hear of 'Asiarchs of Ephesus,' but never of Asiarchs of any other city. Yet on p. 74 he declares inconsistently but correctly that at first the games were held only in a very small number of cities, and Pergamum is known to have been among this small number from an inscription which he calls *antiquus ille titulus*.

We find on p. 94 an extraordinary error: a coin of Tarsus is quoted with the legend Κωνὸς (ἀγών) τῶν τριῶν ἐπαρχῶν, and the three ἐπαρχίαι are explained in the words of Eckhel as *Isauria Ciliciae, Caria Asiae, Lycaonia Cappadociae*. Any one who is acquainted with the recent investigations into either the coinage or the epigraphy or the organisation of the Anatolian provinces of Rome knows that the three *Eparchiae* which are so frequently mentioned are Cilicia, Isauria and Lycaonia, united in the later empire under one governor. To speak of 'Lycaonia Cappadociae' is just as accurate

as to use the phrase 'Northumberland of the Lothians.' Such a mistake was pardonable in Eckel, but is not allowable now.

The statement on p. 49 is too loosely expressed, that the Asiarchate, an office which, as M. Monceaux points out, could be only held by a man of great wealth, was especially bestowed on soldiers after *honesta missio*. The other qualifications enumerated—priesthood of local cults, rank as *Eques Romanus*, etc.—enter into the question merely because they also imply rank and wealth, and therefore Asiarchs were likely to have been taken from their number. It is altogether misleading to use the expression *cursus honorum* in reference to the Asiarchs. A *cursus honorum* implies a definite official routine, such as formed the course of training for Roman administrators and governors. There was nothing of the kind in the case of the Asiarchs. Again M. Monceaux has not succeeded in his attempt to prove that there was a connection between: (1) the neocorate, (2) the coining of *cistophori*, (3) the meeting of *conventus*, (4) the meeting of the *Koinon* of Asia, (5) the title of *metropolis*, beyond the general fact that such honours were naturally accorded only to cities which were eminent in wealth and importance. The comparative tables which he gives to prove the connexion are vitiated by several errors accepted on Marquardt's authority.

(1) He makes Philadelphia and Tralles seats of *conventus* in the first century. This is inaccurate, for Philadelphia was in the time of Pliny included in the *conventus* of Sardis, as is obvious from a glance at Pliny v. 29–31, combined with the map and lists of *conventus* given in my *Cit. and Bish.*, part II. (*Jour. Hell. Stud.* 1887, p. 469). Probably it had become the seat of a *conventus* before the time of Aristides, but the change is not likely to have taken place till Hadrian's time. Marquardt indeed is inclined to reject the testimony of Pliny, but this involves giving up Pliny's whole lists, which are our one authority. Pliny mentions towns south and east of Philadelphia in his list of the Sardinian *conventus*, and the mere omission of the name Philadelphia out of that list would still leave the surrounding country in the *conventus* of Sardis. There are only two alternatives: to give up Pliny's lists as utterly untrustworthy, though it was so easy for him to obtain true lists; or to accept the opinion which I have elsewhere tried to render probable—that the *conventus* were subdivided after the first century. Similar remarks apply to Tralles.

(2) He makes Philomelium a mint for

8 and 18). If correct it must refer to a mythical foundation of Ephesus as era.

¹ A list was published I think by C. Babington in *Num. Chron.* many years ago; but it is now incomplete and not generally accessible.

² In such a reference M. Monceaux would confer a boon on all who do not possess the *auszug* by adding the further description *Abhandl. Sächs. Gesellsch.* 1861.

cistophori. The error is Marquardt's, who thought to correct an omission in Pinder's list of *cistophori* by quoting an old paper of Borrell's (*Num. Chron.* viii. 32): Pinder however mentions the coin in question, and corrects Borrell's false reading (ΦΙ for [Ε]ΦΕ): see his paper *über die Cistophoren*, p. 560 in *Berl. Abhandl.* 1855.¹

(3) He accepts the customary error of the numismatic classification, and puts Nysa in Caria. I need not enter on the discussion of such a point, and since Head's *Historia Numorum* has given Nysa under Lydia, it is to be hoped that the old fashion will pass out of use.

He always gives Eumenia as a *conventus*. Marquardt gives it as uncertain; Monceaux follows him, but omits generally his mark of interrogation. It is certainly quite impossible, but I need not enter into the reasons: any one who reads Pliny and looks at the lists I have given of the *conventus* will see them for himself.

(4) Tralles, Synnada and Lampsacus are assumed without any evidence on grounds of general probability as places where the *Koinon* met: this assumption is used on p. 38, with marks of interrogation, to give some show of plausibility to the comparative table. Then on p. 41 the assumption is made the ground for a new inference, to the effect that they must have possessed High Priests of the cultus, inasmuch as they were meeting-places of the *Koinon*.

For Tralles M. Monceaux might have appealed as an authority to Strabo, p. 649: but the passage merely proves that citizens of Tralles were frequently Asiarchs, which is natural in such a wealthy city. He does appeal to Lebas-Wadd., no 609: but this fragmentary inscription merely records a list of victories gained in the [2]11th Olympiad (according to M. Waddington's restoration) in various Greek and Asiatic games. The inscription has since been published more correctly by Prof. J. R. S. Sterrett in *Papers of the Amer. School of Athens*, I. p. 106, where however we should read in line 1 [Κλ(ανδια-νός) Δά]μας, a person well known from other Trallian inscriptions, and at the end [ῥην va] δλυμνιάδα], which gives the exact date 133 A.D., as I have there shown (p. 103): the date is by Trallian Olympiads.

At the same time it is most probable that such a wealthy city as Tralles, and so con-

veniently situated, was a meeting-place of the *Koinon*, and two inscriptions which have since come to light may be cited in confirmation. One has been published, after the copy of a Greek, by Prof. Sterrett,² with a false restoration which loses all the meaning of the inscription. I copied it in 1884: [ῥ]᾿Ασία καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ π[ερὶ Δ]ιόνυσον τεχνῖται ἐτί-μ[ησαν ᾿Α]πολλώνιον Δημητρίον Δ[. . . τ]ὸν προαναγγελέντα τῆς συν[όδου] ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕ[]/1. The last word stands alone in the middle of the last line: I do not understand it, unless ἀρχιεράν was the original reading; this form of the accusative is not uncommon in later Greek, and especially in Asia Minor. The other inscription, published by Sterrett (*l.c.*) after the copy of the same Greek, is an honorary decree of οἱ ἐν τῇ ᾿Ασίᾳ δῆμοι. These inscriptions do not absolutely prove that the meetings of the *Koinon* which granted these honours were held at Tralles, but they strengthen an antecedent probability, and if we could read in 3-4 an ethnic such as Δ[ωρην]όν, the proof would be complete: if however a personal name such as Δ[οργί]ον ought to be inserted, the proof is by no means sufficiently strong.

To justify the insertion of Synnada in the list, M. Monceaux quotes Aristides (*Or.* xxvi. p. 344, εἰς Φρυγίαν ἀνω). In these words I think that the reference in all probability is to Laodicea. If Apameia, one of the richest cities of Asia, certainly the richest city of Phrygia except perhaps Laodicea, was not a meeting-place of the *Koinon* (though it was the seat of a *conventus*), there is not much probability that a small town (οὐ μεγάλη πόλις, Strabo, p. 577) like Synnada was so. The reason why Apameia was not a meeting-place was probably its remoteness: and the reason is stronger by fifty miles for Synnada. In regard to Lampsacus M. Monceaux quotes no authority.

It appears then that the assumption of these three cities as meeting-places of the *Koinon* could be justified only on one of two grounds: either because they appear in the other columns, and probably therefore should appear in the first column also, which assumes the point sought to be proved; or because they were rich and important cities, which, as I contend, is the only reason for any correspondence between the different columns of the comparative table.

Where these conjectural names are removed from the comparative lists, any

¹ I owe the reference to Mr. Head: M. Monceaux quotes Pinder's article from the *Abhandl.* 1856 instead of 1855. Marquardt says 'Pinder hat diesen Cistophorus übersehen,' an example of the danger of correcting a specialist in his own subject.

² Papers of *Amer. School at Athens*, ii. p. 333: also published with a different but equally false restoration in *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1886, p. 455.

appearance of mutual connexion vanishes. The lists then prove: (1) that the honours in question were given to certain of the richest and most important cities without any apparent plan; (2) that even in the three centuries over which the tables extend a considerable variation occurred in the importance and comparative rank of the various cities; (3) that the eastern cities of the province were, relatively to the western or coast cities, more important in the third century after than in the first century before Christ: this confirms many other indications of the steady growth in civilisation and prosperity that took place in the central districts of Asia Minor under the Roman Empire.

(5) Again he tries, in Part III. p. 100 ff., to establish a connexion between the title *metropolis*, given to various cities of Asia in the second and still more in the third century, and the division of the Roman Province into seven provinces which was completed at some disputed time before or after 300 A.D. His view is that the old ethnic division into Lydia, Caria, Phrygia, etc. survived as a powerful idea under the Empire and gradually pulled asunder the Roman Province into the separate nations, and he sees in the *metropoleis* the capitals of these various nations. He argues that before Diocletian's time the Province had fallen apart into its constituent *ἔθνη*. He has however not succeeded in proving more than the commonplace that the title *metropolis* was given to certain very important cities in different districts of the Province, while the facts seem to show that the districts had no strict connexion with the later provinces. We find two *metropoleis* in Hellespontus, Cyzicus and Lampsacus; four in Asia (in the narrow later sense of the term Asia), Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum and Miletus (he says '*titulus brevi ereptus esse videtur*': but there is no proof that the statement is true); two in Lydia, Sardis and Thyatira (he says '*Thyatira cujus in locum Sept. Severus Sardes in Lydia subrogavit*'; this statement also cannot be proved); in Phrygia Prima no *metropolis*, in Caria none, in the *Insulae* none. In this criticism I do not of course dispute that the recollection of the old countries, Phrygia, Lydia, etc. remained throughout the empire. I only dispute the assertion that the emperors in granting the title *metropolis* paid any regard to the old nations and selected a *metropolis* for each.

He puts Synnada in the list of *metropoleis* in the third century: but on p. 100 he remarks that it is uncertain when it received the title; and M. Perrot (*Rev. Archéol.* 1876,

I., p. 196) takes the probably correct view that Synnada received the title *metropolis* only after the redistribution of the provinces had been effected. Aphrodisias must have become *metropolis* of Caria at the same time.

On p. 101 he says, with reference to a rescript of Antonius Pius, '*distinguuntur in illo rescripto civitatum Asiae tria genera, scilicet minores (τὰς ἐλάττους πόλεις) et conventuum capita et μητροπόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν*'. This requires correction. The rescript distinguishes only αἱ ἐλάττους, αἱ μείζους and αἱ μέγισται πόλεις: it is Modestinus who in his commentary suggests the explanation: *μητροπόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἔχουσαι ἀγορὰς δικῶν* and αἱ ἄλλαι. This brings down the date of the important phrase *μητροπόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν* a whole century later.

On p. 97 he quite misunderstands a coin of Laodicea. In reality the type shows Laodicea standing between Caria and Phrygia, symbolising the position of the city on the borders of the two countries. It is variously assigned to Caria and to Phrygia.

Part III. as a whole is not equal to the rest of the book. On p. 118 he says quite truly, but with no novelty, that many things in the constitution of the Christian Church must be referred to the second or third century: and he adds two examples which are, the first erroneous, and the second valueless. In the first place, he argues that twenty-five bishops who met at the Council of Laodicea in the fourth century (he omits to mention that this Council, which is mentioned in an inscription, is the one placed doubtfully by Mansi in A.D. 320) are bishops of the twenty-five cities which used to meet in the *conventus* of Laodicea, i.e. Cibyra (Plin. v. 29). This is impossible. (1) A meeting of bishops of a *conventus* would not obtain the importance of this Council. (2) The *conventus* had disappeared from existence long before this time. (3) I believe that xxv. in Pliny is a false reading, and xv. or xvii. is a more correct reading (*Cities and Bishoprics*, II. p. 469). (4) Everything points to the conclusion that the twenty-five bishops came to Laodicea from the surrounding districts of Asia Minor, or at least from the whole of central and southern Phrygia. If they had come only from the Cibyratic *conventus* there would not have been any representative from the districts where the conflict against Montanism raged most keenly. In the second place, the list which is given to prove a connexion between the holding of Councils of the Church and the meeting of of the *Koinon* proves nothing whatsoever. Naturally Christian Councils, after Roman

Asia had been divided into seven provinces, each with its own metropolis, met in the metropolis of a province. Hence the fact that Ephesus, Sardis, Laodicea and Cyzicus appear in both columns proves nothing. Synnada and Lampsacus appear in the second column and conjecturally in the first, but I have just shown that they have no right to appear in the first. Hierapolis appears as the seat of a Council A.D. 173, but it was not a meeting-place of the *Koinon* nor seat of a *conventus* nor a *metropolis* (until the time of Justinian), nor did it strike *cistophori*; it was simply an early important centre of the Church, and hence a Council assembled there in 173. There remain only Pergamum and Sardis, which appear in all columns of all M. Monceaux's lists—two cities of the first rank throughout the Roman Empire, contending with Smyrna for the title *πρώτη Ἀσίας*: what can be more natural than that a Council should meet there, quite apart from its being a meeting-place of the *Koinon*?

That the Church organisation was modelled after the political organisation is practically certain: but the new arguments advanced by M. Monceaux and the development from the older to the later provincial system which they postulate seem to me to be founded entirely on the misconception I have combated, viz. that the Roman Province was broken up through the persistence of the old

ἔθνη. Though I do not believe that this was the cause of the break up, yet I think he might have brought more arguments to prove the vitality of the old *ἔθνη*, e.g. from Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* But the subject cannot here be touched.

But after so much destructive criticism one word must be added in the opposite direction. I think that the development between the earlier and the later provincial system will be found to lie in another line, viz. in subdivision of the Roman *conventus* (*Cit. and Bish.* II. p. 470); though at present I know no proof of this view. It has however in its favour the natural presumption that the changes in the constitution of a Roman province took place through a gradual modification of the Roman official division: whereas M. Monceaux's theory means that the Roman division was swept away by the recovering strength of the pre-Roman system.

In conclusion I can only repeat that the work makes a real addition to our knowledge of the constitution of Roman Asia. The mistakes of detail show that the writer has not gained perfect mastery of the antiquities of Asia, and the progress of research will show whether his general views given in Part III. are right or (as I have argued) wrong: I have however shown at least that he has not proved them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

A Companion to School Classics. By JAMES GOW, M.A., Litt.D. Second edition revised. London: Macmillan and Co. 1889. 6s.

THE rapidity with which Dr. Gow's useful handbook has passed into a second edition has not prevented him from giving it a very thorough revision. There are no long or very material additions, but numerous corrections, often consisting of the more precise wording of a sentence too strongly or somewhat ambiguously expressed. In several instances paragraphs have been rewritten, always to their improvement. Except in the chapters on the Drama and Philosophy, it is hardly possible to find two consecutive pages anywhere without traces of the reviser's hand. In subsequent editions the book may with profit be expanded; it can scarcely be more accurate or trustworthy. I can say so after comparing every page of this issue with those of the former edition.

A. S. W.

A Brief History of Greek Philosophy. By B. C. BURR, M.A., formerly Fellow, and Fellow by courtesy, in the Johns Hopkins University. Boston. Ginn & Company. 1889. \$1.25.

THIS little manual of Greek philosophy is based largely upon the translations published by Mr. Bohn and others. It is strange that any one in the present day should compose under these conditions. t

NO. XXIII. VOL. III.

the evidence seems conclusive and Mr. Burt is perfectly honest in the matter. What other inference can be drawn for instance from the astonishing note prefixed to his sketch of Aristotle's Politics—'The following outline follows the translation of the Politics made by J. E. C. Welldon, M. A. (1883)'? With these words before us we know pretty well what meaning to give to the remark at the beginning of his account of Plato, that the student must accept as authentic all or nearly all the dialogues 'that appear in the collection known as Professor Jowett's translation.' Of course it is not to be assumed that Mr. Burt has no acquaintance with the Greek of Plato and other writers, but he seems to have been content to help himself very extensively by the use of translations; and, though a man may get a wide and fairly correct notion of Greek philosophy in this way, it hardly qualifies him to write a book on the subject. It is perhaps a slight indication of the author's scholarship that he at least three times gives us the remarkable word 'Mytelene.' He has on the whole made a good use of his English and German materials, though no translation, I think, can be responsible for the following statement about Aristotle—'He compares the manner in which the universal unconsciously grows out of the particular of sense to the way in which soldiers in battle are caused to fly by the perception of one, and then another, and so on, fleeing.' But even the English books to which he refers seem to be imperfectly

N