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](#)

Gilbert's *Greek Constitutional Antiquities The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens*, by Dr. Gustav Gilbert, translated by E. J. Brooks, M.A. and T. Nicklin, M. A., with an introductory note by J. E. Sandys, Litt.D. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1895. 10s. 6d.

Reginald W. Macan

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 04 / May 1896, pp 197 - 202
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203879, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203879

How to cite this article:

Reginald W. Macan (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 197-202 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203879

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GILBERT'S GREEK CONSTITUTIONAL ANTIQUITIES.

The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, by Dr. GUSTAV GILBERT, translated by E. J. BROOKS, M.A. and T. NICKLIN, M.A., with an introductory note by J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1895. 10s. 6d.

THE merits of Dr. Gustav Gilbert's 'Manual of Greek Constitutional Antiquities' (*Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer*) have long been known to scholars. The first instalment of the work, originally published in 1881, at once took rank as a masterpiece of its kind. Admirable in method, fully competent in knowledge, and by no means devoid of original suggestions, the book quickly proved to be of high service to Hellenists, *inter alia* as a canon for the purpose of regulating and directing their studies in the political antiquities of Greece. The complete work comprises two volumes, the first dealing with the institutions of Sparta and Athens; the second (published in 1885) containing an inventory of knowledge for the other all too numerous and lesser known city-states of Hellas. From the nature of the case and from the condition of the evidences the second volume was inevitably destined to a less complete success than its precursor. In dealing with Greek states other than Sparta and Athens the scant and fragmentary evidences do not afford materials for an adequate characteristic or history, even in such notable instances as Thebes and Corinth, Elis and Corcyra, to say nothing of the infinity of Greek constitutions throughout the *diaspora*, from Mas-salia to Poseideion, from Olbia to Cyrene. In all that region we are constantly baffled by the failure of evidence, while the generalized history and system of the Greek City State, which take the place of fuller and more exact knowledge of particular city-states, are but a poor consolation to the historian a-hungering for realities. Even in regard to Sparta how much is left to be desired! Thucydides could believe that for upwards of four centuries there had been no constitutional movement or history in Sparta. Laconian secretiveness had dried up the inner sources of Laconian fame, even for the predecessors of Aristotle. Police regulations and other reserves seem to have made the description of contemporary institutions in Sparta a difficult and inconclusive task. The happier fortune, the more gener-

ous self-advertisement of Athens have enriched posterity with more copious vision and rewarded Athens with an imperishable crown. Even in the first edition of Gilbert's first volume three-quarters of the whole was devoted to Athens. Since then the constantly growing wealth of epigraphic material, and the epoch-making discovery of the lost Aristotelian tract on the *Athenian Polity*, have further aggrandized Athens, as by a new transfer to her of the common fund. Athens is become for the time more than ever the centre of Hellenic interests. In the second edition of Gilbert's first volume (1893) Athens absorbs four-fifths of the text, without reckoning the *Introduction* on 'Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*.' It is from this second edition that the translation now under review has been made. The translation was a work well worth doing, and it has been, upon the whole, well done. Barring an unfortunate negative in the third line of the Author's Preface I have observed nothing much to mislead and very little to displease a scholarly reader. The translation is indeed a good illustration of the advantage of work done by properly trained hands. The translators obviously not merely possess a good knowledge of German, but have brought all the advantages of a classical training to bear upon their work. As a result the *Handbook* is readable in its English form. The extremely business-like character of the original dispenses, indeed, with ornament, and in this respect the English version very properly follows suit: but it has the great merit of rendering the German as a rule into the English idiom. The scholarly character of the work is further guaranteed by the scrupulous fidelity with which Gilbert's notes, including all quotations and references, have been reproduced. One could have desired that the translators had adhered to the stricter purism of the German original in the transliteration of Greek words and names. A work of this kind offered a good opportunity for striking a blow against the desperate anarchy of our English practices in this particular. A correctness which was acceptable to Robert Browning in his poetic workshop should not be too pedantic for the Cambridge Senate House, or for the Oxford Schools. I venture to repeat a protest against the version of κληροῦν *et cog.* by 'to choose by lot.' The

words 'choice' 'choose,' were better reserved for *αἵρεσις*, *αἵρεῖσθαι* et *cog.*, and this protest applies to rendering Gilbert's word *erlost* into 'chosen by lot' (e.g. *E.T.* p. 139), much more, into 'chosen' *simpliciter* (*ib.* p. 391). The use of these technical terms is extremely precise in the Greek and is observed by Gilbert in his German; nothing is gained for accurate knowledge by substituting in English phrases which only avoid inconsequence by being deprived of concrete significance. I had noted two or three expressions which the translators might perhaps better from the point of view of our idiom: 'military artists' may carry a false suggestion to this or that English reader, nor is it quite equivalent to the German *Kriegskünstler* [or to the Greek *τεχνῖται τῶν πολεμικῶν*]. The description of Solon starting on his travels 'in perfect self-denial' (p. 141) has a slightly droll solemnity about it, which is not justified by the German *unternahm voller Selbstverleugnung eine laengere Reise*. A few such objections in so large a labour but accentuate our commendation. The chief secret of the translators' success is doubtless that they have been genuinely interested in the subject of the work, and the Public Orator in the University of Cambridge, who has written the *Introductory Note*, is to be congratulated, if he can count among his pupils any large number of scholars competent to undertake and perform so well such services to the cause of Hellenic studies under his inspiration.

This paper has been somewhat retarded by circumstances, and I have thought to make some amends to the distinguished author, and his English editors, by subjoining two or three notes on particular points, where the views maintained in the *Handbook* may be open to question, or revision. This course may also commend itself to readers of the *Classical Review*, few, if any, of whom can require to be told at any length that Gilbert's book, in the original or in this serviceable translation, is indispensable now to every scholar's library. I take three corn-stalks out of my sheaf, on which to practise a critical experiment: (1) Gilbert's general estimate of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία: (2) Gilbert's theory concerning the age for the enrolment of the Athenian citizen: (3) A point in regard to the constitution of the Athenian *dikasteria*, in which Gilbert argues against a result which was established by Fraenkel in 1877 to the general satisfaction of those qualified to judge. The following remarks are not to

be regarded as conveying any general censure upon Gilbert's work. I can conceive no better way of paying homage to the labours of a scholar, than by taking the trouble to discuss relatively small points in a whole, for which one has nothing but commendation and gratitude to express.

(1) *Gilbert's estimate of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία.*

It was natural enough for the author, in view of the publication of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία in 1891, to explain, as he has done in the *Introduction* to the new edition of his work, his own exact relation to the recovered authority. It must, however, be observed that, valuable as the *Introduction* may in itself be, it has a disturbing effect upon the economy of the *Handbook* as a whole. A somewhat exaggerated value has, perhaps, temporarily accrued to the text of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία owing to the circumstances of its long eclipse and late recovery. When the critique of the new authority shall have been more nearly than at present accomplished, it will not be necessary for a writer upon the Institutions of Athens to select this one source for special discussion to the exclusion of the rest. In the next edition of his *Handbook* Dr. Gilbert will, perhaps, convert the *Introduction* into a more general and critical survey of the sources at large, or else relegate the expression of his personal views upon the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία to the *Preface*, or to a foot-note. In regard to the authority of the new text Dr. Gilbert appears to me to have surrendered too easily. For all he says, the newly discovered text might be not merely a fragmentary and inaccurate transcript by various hands of a copy of a treatise ascribed, more or less uncritically, to Aristotle, but a veritable autograph from the pen of that philosopher himself! Naturally Dr. Gilbert feels inclined to bow down before such an authority, and seriously defends the more transparently rationalistic passages of domestic history, such as the accounts of Themistokles and Aristeides, the seventeen years of Areiopagite regimen after the Persian wars, the curious remark on the incompetence of the Strategoi in the days before the introduction of mercenary soldiers, and so on. Dr. Gilbert regards even the account of the Drakonian constitution as 'valuable information founded on documentary evidence which we are not justified in rejecting in favour of conjectures of our own,' (p. xxxix.). It would take too long here to apologize for 'conjectures of our own,' nor are we always bound to substitute a modern for an ancient

hypothesis on rejecting the latter: but how a critical historian can treat the passages on Drakon as genuine history, or tradition, remains to me somewhat of a mystery. It may be observed, in addition, that Dr. Gilbert's *obiter dicta* on Herodotus and Thucydides in their relation to the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία are not always quite convincing. His remark (*Introduction* p. xxvii.) that 'in Herodotus' day the prevalent opinion at Athens was that the Alcmeonidai established themselves at Delphi, won over the Pythia by bribery,' etc. etc., is based on Hdt. 5, 62, 63. But, even if we ignore Schweighaeuser's plausible conjecture of Λακεδαιμόνιοι for Ἀθηναῖοι in c. 63, it does not follow that the prevalent opinion in Athens at any time was what is there recorded. Again, is it not a little rash to describe the *πρωτάνεις τῶν ναυκράων* in Hdt. 5, 71 as 'an invention of Herodotus' (*E.T.* p. 122 n. *eine Erfindung Herodots* in the original)? And does not the remark, that the temple-building at Delphi mentioned in Hdt. 5, 62 cannot be the same as that mentioned in Hdt. 2, 180 (*E.T.* p. 145 n.), seem to miss the point of the preposition in *ἐξοικοδομήσαι*? The rebuilding might have been begun in the reign of Amasis even if it was not completed until the time of Kleisthenes. It is, perhaps, paying Thucydides' account of the family relations of the Peisistratidai too high a compliment to describe it as 'resting on the evidence of inscriptions' (*Introduction* p. xxxviii.), even though Thucydides quotes two inscriptions to the point and might doubtless have quoted others; and in this connexion one misses in the *Introduction* a reference to Beloch's theory that the two exiles of Peisistratos are a product of false inference and combination, the earliest effects of which appear in Herodotus—an ingenious theory which, if accepted, will furnish a good example of the substitution of 'a conjecture of our own' for 'a conclusion of Aristotle's' (cp. p. xxxviii.)—not unattended with advantage.

(2) *Gilbert's theory on the age of enrolment* (ἡ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐγγραφή), or of legal majority at Athens.

This case is especially interesting for the present purpose because here, for once, Dr. Gilbert undertakes to correct an explicit statement in the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, and in the stronger part of it, to wit, the second part, which deals with Athenian institutions as they were in the writer's own day. It should be a very convincing argument to lead us in such a case to substitute 'a conjecture of our own' for 'a conclusion of

Aristotle's.' Now, what is the state of this case?

The text in question runs: ἐγγράφονται δ' εἰς τοὺς δημότας ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονότες c. 42.

These words can only mean: 'citizens are inscribed on the demotic lists when they are eighteen years of age.' The context shows that great pains were taken to prevent premature enrolment.

Yet Gilbert maintains (*E.T.* p. 197) that the words mean, not when they are 18 (i.e. in the 19th year of age), but 'upon the completion of the 17th year,' i.e. in the course of their 18th year, or in other words, before they are fully 18 years of age.

He bases this interpretation upon the case of the orator Demosthenes, in regard to whose majority we have some apparently precise information.

As, however, the Greek text quoted can only bear one clear meaning, if the case of Demosthenes proves that the orator attained his majority before he was 18 years of age, the following dilemma will arise: either the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία is in error, or the enrolment of Demosthenes was premature and illegal. Both alternatives are equally improbable. I hope to show that the case of Demosthenes is not adverse to the statement in the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, and that other evidence goes to support that statement.

The case of Demosthenes may be exhibited as follows after Gilbert (*E.T.* p. 197):—

(i.) Demosthenes was seven years old when his father died. Dem. 27, 4.

(ii.) Demosthenes was ten years and a few days under guardianship. *Ib.* 6.

(iii.) Demosthenes then came of age, i.e. was enrolled on the *ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον*.

In regard to (i.), the words in point are: οὐμὸς πατὴρ...κατέλειπεν...ἐμὲ...ἔπτ' ἐτῶν ὄντα... Are these words to be taken as meaning *exactly seven years to a day*? That is not very likely. The words may well mean: *not yet eight years of age*. (On the analogy of Gilbert's rendering of ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονώς the words here in question should mean *not yet seven full years old*: which would prove too much for his argument!)

In regard to (ii.), the words are: δέκα ἔτη ἡμῶς ἐπιτροπεύσαντες. There is nothing in the text about 'a few days' extra. These 'few days' are apparently due to an inference, in itself plausible enough. But if 'a few days' may be added to the ten years here, why not to the seven years above?

There are frequent references to the δέκα ἔτη throughout the speech, and oddly enough § 69 concludes, Ἀφοβον δὲ μηδ' ἦν ἔλαβε προῦκ' ἐθέλοντα ἀποδοῦναι καὶ ταῦτ' ἔτει δεκάτῳ, which strictly interpreted should mean only 'after nine years.'

In regard to (iii.), it must be observed that there is nothing in the speech, exact or definite, about the date of the orator's enrolment, or coming of age. The words in § 5, τοσούτον χρόνον ἕως ἐγὼ ἀνὴρ εἶναι δοκιμασθῆναι, leave the period an open question, even if they are to be interpreted as referring to the ἐγγραφή εἰς τοὺς δημότας. But, even if the examination (δοκιμασία) is here practically identical with the registration (ἐγγραφή), the question of the exact age of Demosthenes at the time is still left open.

Another passage, however, throws light on the point. In 30, 15 Demosthenes states that he brought the action against his guardian in the Archonship of Polyzelos, in the month Skirophorion, in which month also his δοκιμασία had taken place.

In the same passage he reckons a period of 'two years' between the Skirophorion of Polyzelos and the Poseideon of Timokrates.

The list of Archons is as follows:—

Polyzelos,	Ol. 103.2 = 367-6 B.C.
Kephisodoros,	Ol. 103.3 = 366-5 B.C.
Chion,	Ol. 103.4 = 365-4 B.C.
Timokrates,	Ol. 104.1 = 364-3 B.C.

The Skirophorion of Polyzelos coincides, roughly speaking, with June 366 B.C. The Poseideon of Timokrates coincides similarly with December 364 B.C., and the 'two years' equals therefore two years and six months. On this analogy, 'ten years' might stand for ten years and six months, and 'seven years' might stand for seven years and six months, more or less: and in any case it is obvious that an exact argument for the interpretation, or refutation, of the text in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία cannot be based on the data in Demosthenes, and that, to all appearance, Demosthenes may have been fully eighteen years of age before he brought his action, or was inscribed on the roll of his Deme, and presumably was so old.

But that is not all. Gilbert appears to have overlooked in this connexion the bearing of the list of *Eponymoi* upon the problem of the ephebic majority.

It is, by the way, a curious fact that Gilbert still thinks the 42 *Eponymoi* of the Hoplites (ἐπώνυμοι τῶν ἡλικίων) identical with the Archons of a man's years of service

(*E.T.* p. 315). The true interpretation of Ἀθην. πολ. 53, 4 we owe to Mr. Kenyon, and it appeared already in his *editio princeps* of 1891. But whether the 42 *Eponymoi* were Archons, as Gilbert still thinks, or Heroes, as Kenyon then showed, the facts remain that the 42 names marked 42 years of service, and that the last year of service was the 60th year of a man's age, during which he served as a *Diaitetes*. But, if the 42nd *Eponymos* corresponds to the 60th year of a man's age, the first *Eponymos* must correspond to the 19th year of a man's age: Q. E. D.

It is, therefore, obvious now that Gilbert's interpretation of Ἀθην. πολ. 42, 1 is unacceptable; that the case of Demosthenes is not an instance against the correct interpretation; and that the correct interpretation is completely borne out by the use of the 42 *Eponymoi*. The legal age for the enrolment or registration (ἐγγραφή) was on the completion of the 18th year, i.e. in the course of the 19th year, precisely as stated in the passage in question.

The Ephebic training lasted two years: a citizen would not join the mass, 'be with the rest' (μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων), until he had completed his 20th year. As everybody in Athens born in one year was not born on the same day of the year, the legal regulations did not work out with precisely the same coincidence in all cases, but this point needs not to be pursued further at present. It will here suffice to have vindicated the true interpretation of the passage in question from the gloss which Gilbert has put upon it.

(3) *Gilbert's view of the composition of the grand Jury (album iudicum)*: Were there ever 6,000 *dikasts* in Athens?

On this point there is more room for dispute, and I cannot expect to carry all suffrages in favour of the view to be here propounded. The case presents a test for the critique of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, as well as an important problem in the constitutional history of Athens. If Dr. Gilbert is right, the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία has determined a controversy concerning the number and composition of what we may, perhaps, call the great, or grand, Jury at Athens, and has demonstrated a remarkable change or reform in this matter, affording a fresh contrast between the conditions of the fifth and of the fourth centuries B.C. I hope now to show good reason for disqualifying the authority of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία in this regard, and for denying the supposed contrast in this particular.

It was a received opinion twenty years ago that year by year in old Athens a great jury of 6,000 dikasts used to be impanelled by lot, out of which great panel particular juries were constituted by a further sortition as occasion demanded. This theory, however, was not two centuries old. It was devised by Valesius (Henri de Valois), and developed by Matthiae and Schoemann. It was the result of ingenious inference and combination, starting from the lines in Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 661, 2:—

ἀπὸ τούτων νυν κατὰθες μισθὸν τοῖσι δικασταῖς
ἐνιαυτοῦ,
ἐξ χιλιάσιν, κοῦπω πλείους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ
κατένασθεν...

and the complete confutation of this modern theory was among the most certain results of Max Fraenkel's brilliant monograph, *Die attischen Geschworenengerichte*, Berlin, 1877. But lo! here comes the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία back from the dead, bringing the 6,000 dikasts with it! There they are, as large as life, in chapter 24, among the 'twenty thousand men and more,' supported and paid from the public funds of Athens in the fifth century B.C.

συνέβαιναν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν φόρων καὶ τῶν τελῶν
καὶ τῶν συμμάχων πλείους ἢ δισμυρίους ἄνδρας
τρέφεσθαι. δικασταὶ μὲν γὰρ ᾤσαν
ἐξ ἑκακισχίλιοι κ.τ.λ.

True, there is not a word about this figure 6,000 for the dikasts in the second part of the treatise, where the annual composition of the great panel, as well as the diurnal sortition of particular juries, is somewhat minutely displayed. True, the description of the dikastic institutions as they were in the days of Demosthenes and Aristotle, for which the second part of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία is a first-rate authority, completely vindicates Max Fraenkel's brilliant critique. But the express text above quoted is too much for Dr. Gilbert, with his generous estimate of 'Aristotle's' authority for the history of Athenian institutions. Accordingly Gilbert—while of necessity abandoning the position for the fourth century—positively retains, or, to speak more accurately, revives the exploded theory of Valesius, with the further developments of Matthiae (*de iudiciis Atheniensium*), and of Schoemann (*de sortitione iudicum apud Athenienses*), as valid for the fifth century B.C. (See *Eng. Trans.* pp. 391, 392, 394.)

There is thus set up a notable contrast between the *album iudicum* of the fifth century and that of the fourth, but it is an absolutely unnecessary and untenable contrast. Every argument against the 6,000 remains exactly where it was before the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία came to light. There is not space here to recapitulate or to enforce those arguments, I must be content to say that if they are valid against the contemporary authority of Aristophanes in the fifth century, they are valid against the fourth century writer—even assuming the complete authenticity of the given passage in the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. The figures in this passage are obviously round numbers—the 500 φρουροὶ νεωρίων, the 700 ἀρχαὶ ἐνδημοὶ and so forth—and the 6,000 dikasts cannot be seriously treated as a fixed and absolute total obtained, year by year, by some method not specified or even suggested anywhere in the treatise. Nor is the figure adduced in order to elucidate the composition of the *album iudicum*, or of the special juries; it is given simply as an item in the grand total of state-paid Athenians, 'upwards of 20,000,' in all. And where can we suppose the author to have got these figures from? Where did he find the 6,000 dikasts? He found the 6,000 dikasts where Valesius found them, to wit, in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes. He found them where he himself found the 20,000 citizens—it is a mercy that he has spared us the 1,000 tributary cities!

εἰσὶν γε πόλεις χίλαιοι, αἱ νῦν τὸν φόρον ἡμῖν
ἀπάγουσιν
τούτων εἴκοσιν ἄνδρας βόσκειν εἴ τις προσέταξεν
ἐκάστη,
δύο μυριάδες τῶν δημοτικῶν ἔζων ἐν πᾶσι
λαγῶσις...

Wasps 707-9.

If 'the φόροι and the σύμμαχοι' can support 20,000 Athenians, you have but to add the τέλη to support the more!

The case is fairly clear. We are in the presence of one of those inferences and combinations of which the first part of the 'Αθην. πολ. is full; we are not in the presence of an official document, or a genuine tradition. Some of these inferences are good, and some of them are bad, and some in either kind have been independently made by modern scholars, before the discovery of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. The 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία has appeared to verify the modern conjectures: but the apparent verification is not above criticism. Luge-

bil's theory on the position of the Polemarch at Marathon is a good case in point. Every one now accepts this theory, on the strength of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία, yet the theory was fully established, for those who could estimate historic evidence, long before the recovery of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία.¹ But this other case—the apparent verification of the hypothesis of Valesius in the text of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία—only proves, when critically examined, that a bad inference made in the seventeenth century of our era had been anticipated in the

¹ On this point I venture to refer to the note in my edition of Herodotus iv., v., vi. Vol. i. p. 365.

fourth century before our era. It is a subject for regret that Dr. Gilbert has allowed himself to be overborne by the authority of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία in this matter; and I trust he will reconsider his position before the next edition of his *Handbuch* makes its appearance. The classical perfection which he has attained in the treatment of the Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens makes any lapse on his part the more distressing to those who, like the present writer, gratefully acknowledge a large debt to his labours.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

RAMSAY'S *ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER AND THE ROMAN CITIZEN*.

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, by PROFESSOR RAMSAY. 1895. 10s. 6d.

THE record of St. Paul's Christian life in the Acts ranges from his conversion to his Roman imprisonment: but his active career as apostle to the Gentiles (omitting the unrecorded years at Tarsus, and his last years of which mere glimpses are given in the Pastoral Epistles) began with his arrival at Antioch and ended with his arrest at Jerusalem. Other periods of his life are rich in personal and spiritual interest: but these were the years in which he took the lead in church extension. His rapid success claims the attention of the philosophic historian as well as the Christian: within fifteen years he planted churches throughout Asiatic and European Greece which lived, and took root, and grew into a permanent kingdom of Christ. This was evidently due to certain elements in his Greek environment which rendered it possible for him to make Greek culture and Roman organization valuable handmaids of the Church. These elements may with advantage be considered in connexion with his many-sided character, and his wonderful combination in his own person of the various forces that made up the complex civilization around him. He was by birth and education at once Jew Greek and Roman before he became a Christian apostle. The union of Jew and Greek was specially important: for by opening to him the synagogues of the Dispersion it enabled him, in spite of the Jewish opposition which his doctrine

provoked, to win the ear of those godfearing Gentiles who offered the most fruitful field for conversion. His Roman citizenship also had its value, as Prof. Ramsay urges in his recent work on *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, not only as a shield from outward danger, but also in the wide outlook it gave him over the Empire, and a greater sympathy with Imperial organization than was possessed by mere provincials.

For, as the author points out, the civilization of Greece and Western Asia was Graeco-Roman. Greeks had of old studded the seaboard with colonies, which found in the ordered freedom of city life the most effectual means of commercial enterprise and of protection against oriental despotism. Greek monarchs had further developed this municipal system as the surest support of their throne against the reactionary forces of Eastern feudalism and superstition, besides adding to the cities a large Jewish population. The Caesars, inheriting a like policy from the Roman Senate, fostered the growth of commercial cities and established new colonies along the main lines of communication.

This Graeco-Roman civilization has found few more able exponents than Prof. Ramsay. By local research, by study of its geography and its monuments, by investigation of its political changes and its history, he has made himself well acquainted with the religious and social life of Asia Minor during the first two centuries. His history of *The Church in the Roman Empire* in-