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](#)

Botsford's *History of Greece* A *History of Greece*. By G. W. Botsford, Ph.D., Instructor in the History of Greece and Rome in Harvard University. The Macmillan Company. 1899. Pp. 396. 6s. 6d.

M. Alford

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 01 / February 1900, pp 73 - 75
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080379, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080379

How to cite this article:

M. Alford (1900). Review of Donna Lee, Ian Taylor, and Paul D. Williams 'The New Multilateralism in South African Diplomacy' The Classical Review, 14, pp 73-75
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080379

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

vant: that *quandoque . . . veniet* 13, 24 is now rightly accepted by other editors as a verse-quotation: and that 'we do not read of the delivery' is a very doubtful rendering of *ut neque . . . dictus legatur* in 38, 15.

A word of praise should be added for the way in which the publishers have done their

work: the book forms an admirable addition to the attractive series of Latin authors which is being issued by Messrs. Allyn and Bacon.

W. PETERSON.

McGill University, Montreal.

BOTSFORD'S HISTORY OF GREECE.

A History of Greece. By G. W. BOTSFORD, Ph.D., Instructor in the History of Greece and Rome in Harvard University. The Macmillan Company. 1899. Pp. 396. 6s. 6d.

THE history of Greece is a subject on which we want as many good books as possible, short as well as long, and Dr. Botsford has produced a valuable addition to the rather small stock of short histories in English. It does not supersede Oman's useful work, but supplements it. In the first place Dr. Botsford tells us that Oman's account of the Epic Age is antiquated, and in this matter and others he himself gives the more modern views and discoveries. "By the name 'Homer,'" he says, "we mean any one of the minstrels who helped to make either the Iliad or the Odyssey." The new material supplied by the 'Αθ. πολιτεία is utilised. (But the favourable view of the great Trimmer, Theramenes, is not adopted.) Aristedeis is a thorough democrat. Lykourgos is a god. And Tyrtaios has ceased to be a lame schoolmaster and an Athenian, though not transported into the fifth century, where Dr. Verrall would have him. But more important than any differences of detail is the difference from Oman's history in plan and aim. The new book is an outline, intended as an introduction to wider reading, and regarded in this light, it appears admirably adapted to rouse intelligent interest and also to supply a framework of knowledge. Details of campaigns, ins and outs of "interstate" politics, are designedly omitted. But the general march of events, the main directions of movement, are presented in a rational and interesting form; the most important points are as a rule marked with excellent precision; and an impression of the spacious spirit of the Greeks is conveyed within small compass. The progress and changes of philosophy, art, literature, and their close connection

with political change and progress, are outlined with especial care and skill. The individual figures of statesmen, generals, orators, to whom brief paragraphs are devoted, stand out really individual, and their several contributions to history or art are clearly indicated. The value of the work is enhanced by the illustrations, a large proportion of which are admirable. Kresilas' bust of Perikles, the metope from the Parthenon, the Euripides, and the view of Sparta may be mentioned as a few among many.

At the end of each chapter is a list of authorities ancient and modern, and at the end of the book a list of "studies," in which it is assumed that the student will work with Thucydides, Grote, Holm, Plutarch, about him. Thus we see that if we find but a meagre outline of the great tragedy of the Sicilian Expedition, it is because we are intended to read the tragedy itself in Thucydides. Again, Dr. Botsford makes large, sometimes perhaps excessive, allowance, for the prejudices of writers belonging to the "better class." Not only is Kleon represented as a highly respectable person, with "a remarkable talent for finance," but "there is no reason for doubting that" Hyperbolos "was a man of integrity and fair ability." But we must remember that this is to be diluted with large draughts of Thucydides and Aristophanes.

Once or twice we feel as if Dr. Botsford were writing about members of the Anglo-American race who had somehow become possessed of eccentric superstitions, as when Zaleukos is said to have "pretended to receive laws from Athena in dreams" (p. 32) or we are told that the "especial fault" of Pythagoras "was attaching to numbers a mystical power unknown to true science" (p. 95). But as a rule persons or states are not blamed for not being quite other than they were, but are discussed from the point of view of principles and aims possible

to them. It is even admitted that the Spartans were probably sincere in that scruple concerning the phases of the moon which kept them from Marathon.

The student of Dr. Botsford's history will not be troubled much with tribal names and migrations, and the Pelasgians are mentioned only once in a note. On the other hand he will learn how Thebes, Athens and Sparta owed their position as foremost powers to their success in welding comparatively large territories into single states. Especially the union of Attika and the union of Lakonia, and the difference between the two, are clearly characterised: "in the former the country had as many rights as the city, and was in fact taken into the city organisation; in the latter the country remained subject to the city" (p. 29). The account of the development of the Athenian constitution is particularly good. We observe that the Council of the Areopagites is regarded as the old council of kingly times; the Ephetai are apparently instituted by Drakon; the extension of the franchise to the heavy-armed is put before Drakon, as also the Council of 401, changed by Solon to a Council of 400.

The Dorian Migration is entirely rejected. The Dorians are said to have been in the Peloponnese "from the earliest times" (p. 28). But apart from tradition and from vexed questions of Mykenian civilisation, this leaves unexplained the existence of Doris and the close connexion of Sparta with the northward-looking Delphic Amphiktyony. The position of the Arcadians, too, relatively to Argos, Sparta and Messene is strongly suggestive of an earlier population thrust back into the mountains.

Occasionally Dr. Botsford seems to represent as suddenly created an institution which we know to belong to wide tracts of time and space. For instance, when he says that "Nausithous grouped kindred families into a brotherhood (phratry); several of these brotherhoods into a tribe . . ." (p. 21). The idea formed by the student will probably be that these groups were an arrangement brought in by Nausithous and other founders of cities. This doubtless is not what the author means; but the natural tendency is to regard such phenomena as isolated and sudden if the opposite view is not emphasised, and though artificial tribes and phratries may often have been formed, this is not so important as the existence of the ancient kinship groups, which were imitated in the artificial product. Again, it is said that about 280 B.C. "some

Achaean cities, too, began to form a league modelled apparently after that of Aetolia." Would it not be more correct to say that the ancient Achaean League was revived and remodelled? The old tendency to federation, seen especially in the more backward states, at last in this period came to its full birth. Connected with this tendency is the somewhat vague sense of unity, becoming a reality only in time of pressing danger, which appears in Thessaly recurrently, and appears also in the relation between Athens and Sparta in the period between 500 and 462 B.C. Dr. Botsford has recourse to the view that the Athenians entered the Peloponnesian League (p. 86 and elsewhere), though he grants them an exceptional position. But the other explanation seems better to fit the facts. The recognition by Athens of Sparta's leadership occurs only in connection with the Persian danger (first in 491, when the Aiginetans have given earth and water to Dareios) and the language addressed by Athens to Sparta points to nothing less than all Hellas as the ideal whole of which Sparta is considered the head, e.g., Herod., 6, 49: *κατηγόρεον Αἰγινητέων τὰ πεποιήκοιεν προδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα* and ch. 106.

The scholarly accuracy of the book is as remarkable as its liveliness. Of misprints and small mistakes I have detected none, except in the maps. "Helicon," in the map on p. 179, must, I think, have taken the place of "Hymettos." Anthely (p. 128), Cynassea (p. 236), Camarinia (p. 243), and a good many more names need correction. With regard to the spelling of Greek names in the text I cannot resist a protest. An occasional "K" and "ai" has found its way into the maps, otherwise the spelling is Latin, except in two points: "ei" is usually kept (but "Pisistratus"), and Gelon, Hieron, Theron are allowed their final "n" (the Athenian legislator, however, is "Draco"). Even "dikasterion" is disguised as "dicasterium" (p. 173), though "nomos" on the next page is not transformed into "nomus." No doubt almost any way of spelling Greek names is a compromise, and it must be so until we can write "Thoukydides" without being pedants (even then such words as "Korinth" and "Korinthian" may present difficulties) or till—but the other alternative is, I hope, impossible. By the present time, however, we have moved further than this on the path of advance. Dr. Botsford certainly does not get his Greek history through Latin. Why try to make it look as if he did? And he does not even avoid compromise, since

"Laureium" and "Hieron" are not Latin. "Laureium" is neither Greek nor Latin. The history is so good and so Greek that it

ought to be relieved of names that are Latin or not even Latin.

M. ALFORD.

P. RIBBECK'S *SENATORES ROMANI*.

Senatores Romani qui fuerint Idibus Martiis A.U.C. 710. By P. RIBBECK. Pp. 97. (Berlin, 1899). 2 m.

IN his book entitled *Le Sénat de la République Romaine*, Willems reconstructed, so far as it was possible to do so, the lists of Roman senators for the years 179 B.C. and 55 B.C. The author of this 'dissertatio inauguralis' has, by continuing the investigations of Willems, performed a laborious and useful service. But where his work and that of Willems run parallel to one another, his information is less full, and his plan in some respects is less convenient. In the case, for instance, of the *consulares*, only the dates of quaestorship and consulship are usually given, though the former of the two dates is very often conjectural, and is inferred from the definitely recorded date of some higher office. As a result of this plan, the passages quoted from ancient authors in reference to the quaestorship have often only an indirect application to that magistracy, and it is necessary to verify the passages in order to ascertain whether their application is direct or indirect. The dissertation is somewhat disfigured by misprints; no uncommon thing in these 'dissertationes inaugurales,' whose authors have for the most part had little experience in correcting for the Press. More serious are the inaccuracies in the matter, not often important in themselves, but numerous enough to diminish the usefulness of the work. The senator who is No. 40 on the author's list is A. Manlius A. f. A. n. Torquatus, praetor in 52, well known as one of the interlocutors in Cicero's *De Finibus*. A reference is given

to No. 66 in Willems' list for the year 55; but the senator who figures there is the father of this Torquatus. Of No. 52 the author writes: 'M. Acilius [M. f.] Caninus, Caninis (*sic*) vel Caninianus appellatus Caes. b.c. III., 39, 1 in melioribus codicibus.' One would expect from this to find in the codices the name written as M. Acilius Caninius or Caninianus, whereas the *praenomen* and *nomen* are absent. In dealing with P. Cornelius P. f. Scipio Pomponianus Salvitto (No. 78) the author gives reasons for holding that the Scipio who adopted him was descended from the elder Africanus, rather than from his brother Asiagenus, as Mommsen supposed. Not one of the reasons is sound. (1) Plutarch Caes. 52 says this man was οἰκίας τῆς Ἀφρικάνων. The language is vague, which would hardly have been the case had Plutarch supposed him to be the representative, in the direct line, of the great Africani; nor would Dio and Suetonius have refrained from indicating his lineage, had they known of it. Plutarch might well speak of a descendant of the brother of Africanus the elder, as belonging to the family of the Africani. (2) It is urged that Plin. 38, 5 *dedecore* (so the author wishes to read, not *dedecori*) *inrepentes Scipionum nomini*, supports the view taken. But when the context of these words is examined, it is seen that the passage tells the other way, and loses its meaning if the adopted father of Salvitto was descended from Africanus. (3) The fact that Salvitto was consul in 38 seems to be regarded as bearing somehow on the point in dispute, which it cannot in reality affect.

J. S. R.