

changes be safely found. However, the general result reveals movements which would have that effect upon existing culture which previously, though erroneously, had been associated with the Israelite invasion. These vicissitudes moreover belong to a period which is a mysterious gap to the Biblical student, although henceforth there is clearly an unbroken continuity to the Hellenic age, and the Samaritanism and Judaism of subsequent days must find a common foundation in this period, even as the Hellenic culture has grown out of the two or three centuries which had immediately preceded.

Palestinian archaeology has already done valuable service in helping us to visualise the conditions of ancient life, although it must be admitted that the historical perspective is not so clear as could be wished. As the evidence continues to accumulate from Gezer and from Dr. Sellin's work at Jericho, and as our general knowledge of Western Asia continues to increase, the historical outline will doubtless be more firmly traced. As in every highly complex study, false steps and mistakes are unavoidable, and Father Vincent's valuable work should do much to prevent a too one-sided attitude towards the numerous problems which are constantly assuming new forms. Palestinian archaeology itself depends upon many other departments of research, and the significance of the results of excavation in their bearing upon the history is often involved with questions which are sometimes not fully appreciated, or which must sometimes be held in suspense. Such criticisms as we have offered however concern those problems which are under dispute, and it must be recognised that they do not affect the painstaking scholarship of a book which is one of the very few of real importance which have marked recent years.

STANLEY A. COOK.

*The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle.* By E. BARKER, M.A.  
(London: Methuen. 1908.)

MR. BARKER'S book deals mainly with the theories of Plato in the *Republic* and the *Laws* and of Aristotle in the *Politics*. He explains that his original purpose was to write an introduction to the *Politics*, that his design was extended when he realised the necessity of explaining the political views of Plato, as the master of Aristotle, and a similar necessity of tracing the influence of Socrates on Plato, and of setting forth the views of the Sophists, whom Plato attacked. The genesis of the book accounts for the gradually increasing scale on which the different sections are planned, for while the Pre-Socratics, Socrates, and the Minor Socratics are dismissed in about forty pages, and the different dialogues of Plato in a hundred and forty, the *Politics* have little less than three hundred pages allotted to them.

We cannot fail to be grateful to a writer who devotes so much care and labour to the investigation of Greek thought as applied to the science of politics. Mr. Barker has obviously studied the texts of Plato and Aristotle and the works of modern writers with the greatest diligence. He acknowledges fully, and perhaps with an excess of modesty, his indebtedness to the works of Nettleship, Bradley, Eucken, Shute, and Mr. W. L. Newman, and his book bears full evidence of his knowledge of the

other literature bearing on the subject. In some instances Mr. Barker seems to place too implicit a trust in other writers, whose theories are stated as if they were absolute and uncontroverted facts. Thus Dümmler's ingenious reconstruction of a lost pamphlet, as the source of certain passages in the *Supplikes* and *Phoenissas* of Euripides, is used to justify a reference to 'the political treatise versified by Euripides.' Similarly the theory, which is generally held, that Aristotle, in the *Constitution of Athens*, betrays the influence of some anti-democratic writer or writers leads Mr. Barker to talk of 'yet another pamphlet on the Athenian constitution, attributed to Theramenes,' and to describe its contents in terms which might imply to an unwary reader that such a work is actually in existence.

The study of the political philosophy of the Greek writers needs the application of the historical method, not only to trace the gradual development of political ideas in the earlier writers, but to show the connexion of these ideas with the political institutions of the Greek states. In both these respects Mr. Barker's treatment seems to me inadequate. The origins of political theory are treated very briefly, and not fully illustrated by the texts. There is a good summary of the influence of the Sophists, and the description of the study of politics before Plato as 'partly historical, partly ideal, and with Socrates a testimony and a gospel,' shows a happy power of generalisation. But the Sophists are dismissed too briefly, and the work of non-philosophic writers, such as Thucydides, Xenophon, and Isocrates, deserves and would repay a fuller treatment. The early and anonymous work on the Athenian constitution (which is cited once in a quotation from Gompers) is an admirable statement, in an ironic vein, of democratic theory. From this work and from Thucydides Mr. Barker might have illustrated the classification of states by the ends at which they aim. The distinction between the rulers who govern for their own advantage and those who seek justice in the end occurs in [Xenophon] *De Rep. Ath.* i. 18, and in Thucydides i. 17 and iii. 82, and these writers thus anticipate Plato and Aristotle. Xenophon's work on the Spartan constitution is not, I think, quoted. This idealisation of Spartan institutions throws considerable light on the ideal state of the *Republic*. Mr. Barker does not attach sufficient weight to the parallel of the Spartan state. Xenophon's reference to polyandry and the still more explicit account in a fragment of Polybius tend to show that there was a more real historical basis for the community of women and children than we should gather from these pages. In his survey of Athenian democracy Mr. Barker is content to rely on Gilbert, and his treatment of this subject, which is important for his argument, is superficial and unconvincing. Some incidental references to matters of history raise points which seem doubtful. In assuming 'the want of any principle of cohesion for larger units than the city' Mr. Barker seems to ignore systems of which the Boeotian league is an example, which served to give a unity, more or less permanent, to a number of cities in combination. It is a doubtful hypothesis that the Helots were 'homogeneous in race' with their Spartan conquerors, and Antiphon can scarcely be cited as a champion of middle-class democracy.

The historical matter is however only an inconsiderable part of Mr. Barker's book. The bulk of it is given up to an analysis and

running commentary on the *Republic* and the *Politics*. The existence of the works of Mr. Newman and others, to which Mr. Barker acknowledges his debt, makes this section in great part superfluous. Mr. Newman's introduction does so admirably what Mr. Barker sets out to do that it is difficult to see for what readers the present book is intended. The analysis is full and careful; it suffers grievously however from the lack of systematic references, and partly from this cause it is often difficult to distinguish between the summary of the arguments in Plato and Aristotle and the reflexions of the commentator. The comment is lengthy and not always illuminating, and there are many instances in which the necessity to say something has led the author into the track of the commonplace. From the methods of treatment adopted, and from the close reliance on his predecessors, Mr. Barker's book scarcely professes to be a contribution to learning. On the other hand it is not suited for readers who approach the subject for the first time. The analysis is too diffuse, it does not sufficiently disengage what is really essential, no attempt is made to summarise the main conclusions, and the constant succession of details leaves an impression that everything is of equal value. The book would have been more useful if it had in this respect done much less; if, with a survey of the development of political speculation, the most important contributions of Plato and Aristotle to political theory had been disengaged from the rest of their argument and presented, with proper references, more in summary than in abstract.

LEONARD WHIBLEY.

*Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus.* Von W. WEBER. (Leipzig: Teubner. 1907.)

In this work Dr. Weber, a pupil of Domaszewski, whose inspiration is clearly traceable in many parts of it, devotes much learning and ingenuity to the elucidation of problems connected with the reign of Hadrian. His first essay deals with the vexed question of Hadrian's adoption, and ends with a confession of ignorance, although Dr. Weber evidently inclines to the view that the adoption was a fiction due to Plotina. In his use of monumental evidence he follows closely in the steps of Domaszewski. Thus he rightly interprets the well-known panel from the Arch of Beneventum as representing the submission of Mesopotamia, and further suggests—with very great probability—that the figure nearest to the emperor is the *praefectus praetorio*, Acilius Attianus. He is wrong however in explaining (after Domaszewski) the attitude of this figure and that of Hadrian as indicating opposition to Trajan. They are merely drawing the emperor's attention (after a scheme familiar to Roman sculptors) to the figure which personifies the conquered territory. On the other hand the figure on the extreme left, representing the army, is recommending Hadrian to Trajan's favour, and this fact, coupled with the similar scene in the corresponding panel of the opposite face (fig. 5), where Roma likewise places her hand on Hadrian's shoulder, may be treated as evidence for attributing the execution of the sculptures to Hadrian's reign.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Weber, again, follows Domaszewski in his interpretation

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it might be urged that, while the portraits of Trajan on the arch are excellent, those of Hadrian are far from successful, and suggest that his features were not at the time familiar.