notion. According to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary it comprises: (1) the process of bringing up (young persons); (2) the systematic instruction, schooling or training given to the young (and, by extension, to adults) in preparation for the work of life; also the whole course of scholastic instruction which a person has received; (3) culture or development of powers, formation of character. It is these points of view from which the present work has been written. The period 450-350 B.C. has been chosen, because in this particular period a number of thinkers have realized what the best paideia of the (Athenian) citizen was. As the essence of the Greek paideia covers the same wide field as the Anglo-Saxon idea of education, the author is completely justified in considering ancient spiritual life from the point of view of education.

Many a Dutchman, however, would have tackled this problem in quite a different way, as the Dutch have no exact equivalent for the word "education" as used in Anglo-Saxon countries. In the Dutch language there is a clear distinction between "upbringing" and "cultivation", a distinction which is also made in the German language between "Erziehung" and "Bildung". Many Dutch authors would definitely dissociate "upbringing" from the field of education. Upbringing is a guided process: the adult guides the young to full age by exercising authority, i.e. by personifying certain values. In the very field of education every culture goes its own way and, considered from this point of view, every culture receives a signature of its own. If the author had applied this criterion, the typical figure of the παίδευσις would have stood out much more clearly.

As the above distinction has not been made, the book is, at least in my opinion, for the greater part an exposition of how certain thinkers have consciously tried to shape Athenian spiritual life. In this respect, and thanks to the systematic lay-out and the ample number of quotations from ancient literature, the author has been very successful, although the book does not impart as many new ideas as is being suggested.
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This is a most complicated book on a most complicated subject. The Greeks had a distinct aversion to levying direct taxes on the free population. There was one exception: the eisphora, an extra-
ordinary direct tax, levied irregularly on the citizen’s property in case of emergency. Th. gives an extensive discussion of previous theories on the eisphora-system (1-37), followed by an accurate description of what he believes to have been the structure of the system in its various stages. Leaving aside Th.’s chapter on the origin of the eisphora (p. 119-146) I concentrate upon his main and novel theories. Thuc. III 10,1 says that in 428/7 B.C. the Athenians paid an eisphora of 200 talents. Thomsen assumes (a) that the Athenians continued to pay this amount until the middle of the 4th century and (b) that a mysterious passage in Pollux VII 129 (saying that the pentakosiomedimnoi “paid one talent into the treasury, the hippeis half a talent, the zeugitai 10 minae and the thetes nothing”) reveals the principles of the system. Both assumptions are unwarranted. Are we really to suppose that in 428/7 B.C. the Athenians were so stupid as to bind themselves to the payment of a fixed eisphora-amount? Emergency-cases never are the same; prosperity is not a constant! As to Pollux, Th. combines this passage with Kleidemos FGH fr. 8, which mentions 100 symmories. Jacoby dated Kleidemos’ Althis to the middle of the 4th century B.C., but Th. prefers, on hardly satisfactory grounds, the last part of the 5th century. He interprets Pollux’ words as meaning that the Solonian census-classes paid different amounts in their symmories: \( 100 \times (1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6}) = 166 \frac{2}{3} \) talents; the remaining 33\( \frac{1}{3} \) talents were supplied by the metics. The various passages concerning to \( \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \tau \omega \nu \) which metics had to pay, are interpreted as meaning that the metics as a group paid one sixth of the total tax-amount of 200 talents. This fits well, in fact too well. From Dem. 22, 61 it is most natural to infer that the individual metic paid one sixth of whatever amount may be meant; the re-dating of Kleidemos is most uncertain; finally Philochoros says that the Athenians were for the first time divided into symmories in 378 B.C. Now πρώτον (or πρώτοι) is lacking in some MSS., but even if it has to be deleted, Philochoros’ text as it stands suggests that the dividing into symmories was quite an innovation in itself in 378/7 B.C.; but there is more: it seems improbable that the Solonian classes, which were based on income, have been used for fiscal purposes; if so, we have to face the remarkable fact that a skilled labourer, earning \( 1-\frac{1}{2} \) drachma a day (cf. A. H. M. Jones, Athenian Democracy, 135, note 1), should have belonged to the hippeis, which is inconceivable; the relevance of the Solonian classes in 5th-4th century social life in Athens certainly is a problem which deserves further research.

Th. further suggests that each class, though based on income,