



The Roman Assemblies by G. W. Botsford
The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 30 (1910), pp. 180-181
Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/624288>
Accessed: 31/12/2014 19:35

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

chapter gives an admirable historical survey of the subject, summing up the main results of the foregoing discussions. The work closes with adequate indexes and a list, occupying no less than 82 pages, of the inscriptions and papyri cited: each of these is provided with a key-number, by which it is referred to throughout the book, a system whereby an immense economy of space is effected. The work is not, indeed, perfect: that a number of minor errors and inconsistencies should escape the author's notice was perhaps inevitable in a book of this kind and does not seriously detract from its value. Nor is it absolutely complete: the interesting thiasos-law, for example, published in the British School Annual xiii. 328 ff., could not be taken into account. But Dr. Poland may be heartily congratulated on the result of his labours and Hellenists on the possession of a work which throws so much light on what was so important and characteristic a side of Greek life.

Die Verfügungsbeschränkungen des Verpfänders besonders in den Papyri. Mit einem Anhang: Eine unveröffentlichte Basler Papyrusurkunde. Von ERNST RABEL. (Festgabe zur Fünfhundertjahrfeier der Universität Leipzig, dargebracht von der Universität Basel.) Pp. 116. Leipzig: Veit & Co., 1909. 4 M.

This monograph is somewhat of a novelty among books dealing with ancient law in that it utilizes also the law of the Teutonic peoples. It is an investigation of the noteworthy clause in papyri relating to pledges in security (*ὑποθήκαι*) by which the pledger is forbidden in any way to dispose of the property pledged before repayment of the debt. Beginning with an examination of ancient Greek law with a view to discovering whether it affords analogies, the author collects the papyrus material, and then briefly discusses certain theories in regard to the similar provision in German law. After this he proceeds to a consideration of the origin and justification of the clause, suggesting certain explanations. It cannot be said that any definite conclusion is reached. Most of the evidence is extremely precarious and incomplete, and certainty is at present hardly attainable; but the book is useful as a statement of the problem. At the end is published a *ἑποθήκη* contained in the Basle Public Library. It is pleasant to hear that an edition of all the papyri in this collection may be expected. The volume contains an index of sources.

Études sur l'ancienne Alexandrie. Par ALEXANDRE MAX DE ZOGHEB. Pp. 242. 2 Plates and 1 Map. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1909. 4 fr.

M. de Zogheb's book contains a few summary sketches of the history of Alexandria under the Ptolemies and the Roman Emperors and also in Christian and Mohamedan times, and a few lectures and essays on Alexandrian topography, in which subject his chief guides are Neroutsos Bey and Mahmoud Bey el Falaki. The author, who is more confident than critical in his statements and judgments, is convinced that the present mosque of the prophet Daniel, below which are some ancient vaults now inaccessible, occupies the site of the *Sema* or tomb of Alexander the Great, his only doubt being whether the body of the king is still there; and he maintains with equal insistence that Antony and Cleopatra were buried not in the tomb which Cleopatra had constructed near the temple of Isis, but in the *Sema* alongside all the Ptolemies.

The Roman Assemblies. By G. W. BOTSFORD. Pp. x+521. New York: Macmillan Co. 1909. 17s. net.

It is clear that this book is the result of much patient care. The author tells us that he has consulted practically all the modern authorities; and this means not only the standard works on Roman constitutional history but numberless articles in the various

periodicals of all countries. The book is therefore of great value as a work of reference, a value which is much increased by the full bibliography appended to each chapter and by the copious references given in the notes. But it is more than a work of reference. The author warns us that we shall find views not previously expressed, and begs us not to reject an interpretation because it seems new but to examine carefully the grounds on which it is given. The most prominent of the new views is the treatment of the tribal assemblies. Prof. Botsford begins with the definition of Laelius Felix: 'he who orders not the whole people but some part of it to be present ought to proclaim not comitia but a concilium.' He shows that this distinction is not recognised by Cicero, Livy, and the other ancient writers, and so refuses to allow concilium plebis as a technical title in opposition to comitia tributa populi: the plebeian assembly could equally be comitia, and both tribal assemblies were comitia tributa. But in his desire to emphasize this identification of title, he is led into an arrangement which is very confusing. He recognizes only three kinds of comitia, the curiata, the centuriata, and the tributa. Under the last heading come both tribal assemblies, not separated as two distinct bodies, but treated as the same assembly in slightly different forms. This is unwise from the author's own standpoint: he professes to deal fully and individually with the Roman assemblies, and the identification of title does not alter the fact that there is an essential difference between the two assemblies of the tribes, and the comitia tributa populi requires separate treatment. This confusion lessens the value of the work for purposes of reference: information about the popular assembly can only be extracted from the full account of the plebeian by constant use of the index, and here too the index, which is otherwise excellent, is correspondingly unsatisfactory. Thus in the chapters dealing with the legislative activity of the comitia, leges and plebiscita are given side by side with little emphasis laid on the distinction, although one main object of the account is to trace the development of the struggle between the orders. Again in the discussion of the judicial powers of the comitia tributa no mention is made of the jurisdiction of the comitia populi. Apart from this subject Prof. Botsford shows a judicial spirit in discussing the conflicting views of earlier scholars. The references throughout are very full and accurate.

The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic. (The Thirlwall Prize Essay, 1906.) By P. C. SANDS. Pp. xi+242. Cambridge, 1908. 4s. 6d.

Mr. Sands has spent much energy on the collection of evidence bearing on his subject, and the material he has gathered gives a value to his Essay. But his results are very disappointing. Some of his main conclusions seem to us to be erroneous and to show a defective appreciation of Roman principles and methods, while the absence of any serious attempt to estimate the part played, for good and for evil, by the system of protectorates in Roman policy and politics indicates a limited historical outlook. The bulk of the essay deals with 'the acts and functions of the Clientship' (Part II.), to which is prefixed a discussion of the technical position which the princes occupied by treaty with Rome (Part I.). The introductory survey opens with a definition of clientship, which is irrelevant: for, though 'Client Princes' is a convenient title, the relation of these princes to Rome was not based on the conception of *clientela* and was not so designated. A similar faulty method, pregnant with consequences, marks the opening of Part I. Finding that the kings are styled *reges socii* or *socii et amici*, he bases his discussion on a definition of 'alliance' applicable no doubt to the Triple Alliance but not to any *societas* entered into by Rome from the time that she became a paramount power in Italy. An exhaustive examination of ancient authorities brings out clearly the fact that the title (*rex*) *amicus* applied in the earlier period to kings in treaty relationship with Rome is replaced in and after the second century B.C. by the title *amicus et socius* or *socius atque amicus*, sometimes shortened to *socius* simply or even *amicus*. Now,