

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](#)



**Muller's Handbook of Classical Antiquities *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*,
herausgegeben von Dr. Iwan Müller. 4te Band, 2te
Abtheilung. 'Die römischen Staats- Kriegs- und
Privatalterthümer,' von Dr. Hermann Schiller und Dr.
Moritz Voigt. Zweite umgearbeitete und vermehrte
Auflage. München: Beck. 1893. Pp.478. 8 Mk.**

E. G. Hardy

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 06 / June 1893, pp 275 - 276

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00198014, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00198014

How to cite this article:

E. G. Hardy (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 275-276 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00198014

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Both Constantine and Diocletian had to consider the eastern as well as the northern danger. P. 161, note. The statement that Atharidus the Gothic ruler mentioned in the Acts of St. Sabas 'is probably, though not certainly, the same person as Athanaric,' is hardly consistent with the note on p. 180 where it is said that Atharidus 'may be, as Dahn and many other scholars suppose, the same as Athanaric; but to me this seems extremely doubtful.' P. 14 and 618. It is stated definitely that Diocletian divided the Empire into *four* Prefectures. But of this, as far as I can discover, we have no evidence. Diocletian introduced the system of dioceses and provinces, the provincial governors being under the control of the diocesan governors, who were called *vicarii*, as being representatives of the praetorian prefects. But were there, under Diocletian, more than two praetorian prefects—one the minister of Maximian in the west, the other of Diocletian in the east? Had the Caesars Constantius and Galerius praetorian prefects at their disposal, as well as the Augusti? I should be inclined to guess that they had

not, and that the *vicarii*, for example, of Gaul and Britain were responsible directly to Constantius, and not either to Maximian's praetorian prefect or to a praetorian prefect appointed by Constantius himself. The only direct evidence we have is that of Zosimus, who attributes to Constantine the division into four prefectures. This arrangement of Constantine was probably made in connexion with the division of the Empire among his sons. But the four prefectures do not seem to have become an unalterable institution until late in the fourth century; for we find only three in the year 365. See Ammianus xxvi. 5, 5, where Mamertinus is prefect of 'Italiæ cum Africa et Inlyrico'; where Illyricum clearly does not mean the diocese but the 'prefecture' including Macedonia and Dacia (see Mr. Hodgkin's map, I. 185) as the enumeration is exhaustive. II. p. 242. It might have been mentioned that the Proconsul of Achaia held the same independent position as the Proconsul of Africa. P. 243, l. 7. For 'cause' read 'course'?

J. B. BURY.

MULLER'S HANDBOOK OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES.

Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Dr. IWAN MÜLLER. 4te Band, 2te Abtheilung. 'Die römischen Staats- Kriegs- und Privatalterthümer,' von Dr. HERMANN SCHILLER und Dr. MORITZ VOIGT. Zweite umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. München: Beck. 1893. Pp. 478. 8 Mk.

THE first edition of this volume of Dr. Müller's *Handbuch* appeared in 1887 and was noticed in the *Classical Review*, Vol. II. pp. 201 foll. Very few alterations have been made in the second edition. The number of pages indeed has been increased by twenty-eight, but of these thirteen are accounted for by the Index, while the additions to the Bibliographies at the end of the various sections would probably amount to several more. It is true that no important fresh evidence for Roman antiquities has come to light like the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* for Greek, but nevertheless the publication of Mommsen's volume in the *Staatsrecht* on the Senate and the Citizen-body, and of Herzog's second volume of the

Geschichte und System are no unimportant contributions to the subject, and it is certainly somewhat surprising that the sections dealing with the 'Senat' and 'Bürgerschaft' have not been to some extent rewritten or at any rate enlarged. A comparison of the Table of Contents in Mommsen's volume on the 'Bürgerschaft' with the sections on the same subject in the *Handbuch* will show that many points have been left untouched which have received full treatment in the former work. The alterations actually made are of a comparatively trivial character, e.g. in accordance with Mommsen's exposition a distinction is now made in the section on the procedure in the senate between the 'Beantwortung der Umfrage' (*sententiam dicere*) and the 'Abstimmung' (*censere*) p. 126: it is noted that magistrates in office lost for the time their right of voting, p. 126: one or two sentences are added on the civil jurisdiction of the senate (p. 132) suggested by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. pp. 1063-4: the statement that *libertus* was originally the freedman, *libertinus* his son

born after his emancipation, is made much less positively than before (p. 139): a short paragraph is added on the 'Constitutio Antonina' of 212 A.D. A few trifling alterations of a similar kind I have noticed in the division on the 'Kriegsalterthümer,' which as well as the 'Staatsalterthümer' is the work of Dr. Schiller. It was noticeable in the first edition that little or no use had been made of Mommsen's articles in *Hermes* on the 'Conscriptionsordnung der römischen Kaiserzeit,' and the new edition is unaltered in this respect. Indeed the whole subject of the Roman military system is treated on a very small scale (40 pp. as against 105 pp. devoted to the military system of the Greeks) and does not, I think, compare altogether favourably with Mr. Purser's very careful article in the new *Dictionary of Antiquities*.

Dr. Voigt's work on the 'Privatalterthümer,' though increased by a few more pages, is still in all essential respects unaltered. But it deserves notice, and the editor himself calls attention to the point,

that the very awkward and complicated system of double references by letters and figures which was adopted in the first edition is now replaced by a simpler one in which the references in each section are consecutively numbered. There is one addition in the volume before us for which every student who consults it will certainly be grateful, viz. two Indices, one to Dr. Schiller's contribution and one to Dr. Voigt's. Neither of these can be described as very complete—the latter is more so than the former—but hitherto the volumes of the *Handbuch* have been entirely without Indices of any kind, and the promise of an 'alphabetische Sachregister über das ganze Werk' is not altogether reassuring, since to be of much practical value this must assume colossal proportions. How is it that, in spite of the number and industry of German scholars, year after year important books come out provided either with poor and meagre indices or with none at all?

E. G. HARDY.

SCHULTEN ON THE PROVINCIAL CONVENTUS.

De Conventibus Civium Romanorum. Script ADOLFUS SCHULTEN, Ph. Doc. Wiedemann: Berlin. 4 Mks.

THAT it should be possible to produce a monograph of 132 pages on a subject closely connected with the Roman municipal institutions, which nevertheless is hardly touched on either in Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* or in Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung*, may seem surprising, but is nevertheless a feat which has been performed by Dr. Schulten, while curiously enough a second book dealing with almost exactly the same subject, 'de civibus Romanis in provinciis imperii consistentibus,' has appeared nearly simultaneously, written by E. Kornemann under the auspices of Dr. Hirschfeld. The latter book, which came out first by a few months, I have not had the opportunity of seeing, but from Dr. Schulten's criticisms it seems to deal with the same material, epigraphical and literary, from a somewhat different point of view and to result in somewhat diverse conclusions. The subject treated is one of considerable interest, and perhaps justifies this expenditure of labour, and my only complaints against Dr.

Schulten are that his material is not conveyed in a form which makes it easy to summarize his conclusions: page frequently follows page entirely unbroken by interval or paragraph; fresh headings of a subject often begin in the middle of a line; full stops are never followed by capital letters; references instead of appearing at the bottom of a page are wedged into the text by a system of brackets; while, to add to these material difficulties, the Latinity is far from lucid, and many sentences have to be read over two or three times before they are intelligible.

The subject of Dr. Schulten's treatise is the juristic position of those *cives Romani* who, as we have long since known both from authors and inscriptions, were congregated usually for purposes of trade and commerce throughout the provinces, sometimes in towns of non-Roman constitution, sometimes in mere *vici*, sometimes in the *canabae* or trade settlements which sprang up round the great legionary camps. Inscriptions have testified to *curatores c. R.* both in connexion with the *canabae* and elsewhere: we know of *c. R. qui negotiantur Salonae*—*c. R. qui Mascululae*