

Short Notices

WE have several times been glad to express our appreciation of the enterprise of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in bringing out their series of *Helps for Students of History* and *Texts for Students* at an extremely cheap price, and almost all of them the work of well-qualified scholars. Both series have now been largely extended, and we are sorry that the limits of our space preclude us from noticing them except very briefly. In the *Helps*, the *Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission* are described by Mr. R. A. Roberts, who writes with the intimate knowledge of a former secretary to the commission. He furnishes a guide, which will be very useful to the beginner, to help him to find his way through the labyrinth of the *Reports*, and then surveys their principal contents of interest to students of English history, omitting those on ecclesiastical, collegiate, and municipal collections. The *Guide to the History of Education* by Professor J. W. Adamson contains good matter, but is carelessly written. In so small a work repetitions should have been avoided. The list of books at the end is wanting in proportion, and some titles look as though they were merely copied from library catalogues. Mr W. F. Reddaway's *Introduction to the Study of Russian History* is the work of a competent scholar, but it is necessarily a mere sketch. Its arrangement might be improved, for the later sections often overlap one another.

The *Texts for Students* include *The Code of Hammurabi* and *Selections from the Tell el-Amarna Letters*, by Mr. P. Handcock, the one based on the translation by R. F. Harper, the other on that by J. A. Knudtzon; the Greek text of *The Epistle of Barnabas* and of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, from Lightfoot's edition, by Dr. T. W. Crafer; *Selections from the Historia Rerum Anglicarum of William of Neuburgh*, by Mr. C. Johnson; and *Select Passages illustrating commercial and diplomatic Relations between England and Russia*, by Mr. A. Weiner. This last work contains a list of books for reference, many of which are not worth recommending. Q.

A careful study of a very interesting subject, submitted for the degree of doctor in philosophy at the university of Wisconsin, is Dr. Richard Orlando Jolliffe's *Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the Last Half-century of the Roman Republic* (Menasha, Wisconsin: Banta, 1919). It covers only that short period at the end of the republic in which we have sufficient evidence to feel sure of our footing. Even there, as any one knows who has become really familiar with Cicero, sureness of foot is not inevitable; and the fact that Dr. Jolliffe is conscious of this and declares it

honestly in his preface, is greatly to his credit. He tells us that in reading the sources with the idea of collecting evidence there is a tendency to become unduly suspicious of corruption where, possibly, none existed. Cicero, he truly says, abounds in general statements, and one often has to mistrust his plurals. Yet there are sufficient data in particular cases to establish the substantial truth of these general statements. This is quite true and well put; but we must always remember that our habit of suspicion may harden as the result of inability to cross-examine the witnesses. The footing is indeed uncertain; but Dr. Jolliffe is quite right in saying that certain particular cases practically establish the truth of general statements, and he might have added a list of such cases for the independent investigation of each student. Dr. Jolliffe has laid out his field of operations well; in four chapters, each divided into several sections, he treats of corruption in the army, navy, and among the client princes, finishing with corruption in the personnel of embassies, both those sent from Rome, and those introduced by the consuls to the senate in the month of February in each year. Perhaps the chapter on the navy, in which the evidence comes almost entirely from the *Verrines*, will be the least familiar part of the subject to English university students. Those who have been educated to find evidence of corruption chiefly in Cicero's letters may possibly find here new hunting-grounds. Perhaps the most interesting chapter is that about the client princes; here the evidence is mainly from letters of Cicero written during his Cilician government. The famous case of the indebtedness to Pompey of Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia seems to be well handled. Dr. Jolliffe thinks that the king's debt to Pompey, if not to Brutus, was for moneys promised him for his support in the senate. He also thinks that Pompey put forward the guileless, upright Cicero as the king's sponsor in the senate, and adds a conjecture that is certainly worth consideration, viz. that 'the magnitude of the sum involved was what dictated Cicero's appointment as governor of Cilicia and as "tutor" to the royal debtor'. Dr. Jolliffe is to be congratulated on the clearness of his English and his method of paragrapping.

W. W. F.

In a dissertation on *The History of the Title Imperator under the Roman Empire* (Chicago: University Press, s.a.) Mr. D. McFadyen undertakes a radical criticism of the tradition of Suetonius and Dio with regard to the origin of the *praenomen Imperatoris* in the lifetime of Julius Caesar and its hereditary character, and is successful in showing that the perfunctory acceptance of these statements by many modern historians, and even the subtler interpretations of them which we owe to Mommsen and Rosenberg, are without justification. As he remarks, the designation of Caesar in the *Fasti Consulares* and *Acta Triumphalia* is fatal to the theory of the hereditary *praenomen*. He seeks, however, to prove too much in denying that Caesar used the title 'Imperator' except in accordance with strict republican usage.¹ That usage, it is almost certain, was

¹ Mr. McFadyen thinks that Caesar was saluted *Imperator* in Gaul 'before his invasion of Italy in January, 49 B.C.' Has he considered the superscription of *Cic. Fam.* 7. 5 (54 B.C.)?