
All who reflect on the subject will acknowledge that there is a single human nature common to all men, a nature made evident by the ultimate unity of human aspiration. But if they are wise they will qualify this statement by pointing out that the common nature is expressed in diverse ways and with different degrees of success by the various peoples who dwell on earth, and that this diversity is, historically, very strongly rooted. In other words, the single *phusis* is embodied in a great diversity of *nomoi*.

Accordingly, the political implications of the unity of mankind are perplexed. Should the autonomy of the polis be respected, or should the polis be abolished in favour of the cosmopolis? Is it just to exercise imperial sway? And if so, how should the subject races be administered? Under what laws should they be governed, in what system of education should they be nurtured, to what religion should they be habituated?

Such questions as these are perennial. Yesterday the issues concerned British rule over India. Today the theme focuses on national sovereignties set over against the E.E.C., the United Nations, and the World Council of Churches; and again on problems of collaboration and partition in multi-racial and multi-national countries.

Those who have to bear responsibility in the modern scene may profit by studying ancient models. The Greeks were precipitated into the dilemmas of the cosmopolis by the conquests of Alexander — a subject examined by Professor Baldry in his *Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*. But the Greek experiment was merely a prelude. We must look to the long experience of Rome in its growth to empire if we are to see these matters in their full amplitude. Some forty years ago, Haarhoff, concerned with the conflicting loyalties of Afrikaners and British in South Africa, wrote two valuable (and all too little known) works, *Vergil in the Experience of South Africa* and *The Stranger at the Gate*, drawing extensively on the lessons of the Roman-Greek rapprochement. He came to the conclusion that the solution lies in recogniz-
ing a hierarchy of loyalties, a hierarchy in which the proximate allegiances are not extinguished, but are given new meaning and tone by the infusion from a higher level of more universal citizenship.

Now Signora Mazzolani takes up the matter from a slightly different angle. She traces the evolving concept of Rome the City from the early fortress to the imperial unity of the pax romana and on to the spiritual perspectives of the Church Fathers. 'Like Janus', she writes (p. 13), 'the Empire faced both ways from its earliest beginnings: on the one hand dutifully preserving the active moral features of the Republic which were so dear to the ruling class of Rome, but on the other accepting the spiritual influences that flowed westward from the eastern half of the Empire. Unable to hold back these religious, cultural and social forces, the Empire assimilated them, and began to find its own moral driving force in them. Augustus paid conspicuous, devout reverence to the spiritual values of the Republic, and decisively rejected the Utopian dreams of the East; yet at the same time he managed to gain control of those dreams, to add them to the mainstream of Roman tradition, to convert them into an instrument of power. They were cosmopolitan ideals, foreign to the ancient spirit of the City; and yet their union with the older tradition was the source of the new legend of Rome.'

This is a learned work. The author draws extensively on the poets, historians, philosophers and polemical writers to unfold her theme. As we would expect, Alexander and Cato, Caesar and Antony and Augustus receive close attention. For they represent the struggle of the two partial moral orders—the parochial and the universal—and, with Augustus, the resolution of that struggle. The author's general conclusion, though nowhere succinctly stated, seems to be not markedly different from Haarhoff's.

Mrs. Mazzolani writes from the heart as well as from the head. This is refreshing, but sometimes we get the impression that she has allowed the head to fall into second place. Thus the writing is inclined to be diffuse and repetitive; at times too much is read into sources; in the last chapter, that on St. Augustine, the tendency to cloudy profundity is distressing. It seems that the author's weakness is of a philosophical order: she approaches the point time and again
but each time she veers off.

These strictures, however, should not deter the reader. The work, in its conception and matter, if not its style, is of a high order, and its study will provide starting points for many lines of reflection on human affairs, past and present. The book, ably translated from the Italian, is furnished with notes, bibliography and index.

G. W. R. Ardley.