THE

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,

BY

AMOS DEAN, LL.D.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

ALBANY, N. Y.:
JOEL MUNSELL.
1869.

CONTENTS.

			Page.
Chap. I.	Greece —	Its Description and History, -	1
II.	"	Its Industry, - - - - -	70
III.	"	Its Religion, - - - - -	78
IV.	"	Its Element of Society, - -	165
V.	"	Its Government, - - -	238
VI.	"	Its Philosophy, - - -	297
VII.	"	Its Art, - - - - -	407

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER I.

GREECE—ITS DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY.

The traveler whose journeyings have led him through a wilderness dubious and uncertain in his course, with here and there a few hamlets or scattered habitations, feels an inward joy as he approaches the populous city. So also the student of civilization, after he has traced its uncertain course along the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates, and up that of the bountiful Nile, and along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, feels gladsome and joyous as he finds himself under the arch of Grecian skies. There is hardly a thought in the human mind, or an emotion or passion in the human soul, that cannot awake in Greece a kindred echo. Great and glorious in her heroic achievements, deep and diversified in her varied philosophy, bright and beautiful in her creations of art, she challenges the admiration of mankind, and stands forth the paragon of ancient time. It has, until quite recently, been mainly her torch that has shed a somewhat feeble light along the valleys of the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Nile, and along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and well, therefore, may it burn with a fadeless lustre as its light glances over its own hills and valleys, and ascends into the clear azure of its own beautiful skies.

Greece proper was bounded north by the Cambunian mountains which separate it from Macedonia;[1] on the east

[1] *Taylor*, 81.

by the Ægean, on the south by the Mediterranean, and on the west by the Ionian seas. Its extent from north to south was about two hundred and twenty geographical miles, and from east to west one hundred and sixty. Its superficial area was about 34,000 square miles.

Whoever, therefore, expects to find in Greece an extent of country at all corresponding to the greatness of her achievements, or to the largeness of her contributions to civilization, will be much disappointed. But no one can look at her position, or contemplate her physical circumstances, without being struck with their many peculiarities.

Greece extends farther south than any other part of the European continent. Considering the ancient Iberia, the present Spanish peninsula, as the farthest land west that was known to the ancients, and Serica, as that the farthest east, we should find Greece almost directly in the centre of the most cultivated countries of the three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa. It was surrounded by sea, except on the north where it was walled in by mountains.

A short sea passage only divided it from Italy. On the east lay the Ægean studded with islands which brought it near to Asia Minor and Phœnicia.

The voyage to Egypt was neither long nor difficult. Its entire line of coast was indented with innumerable bays and harbors, offering every natural facility for navigation. Hill so interchanged with valley, and mountain with plain, as to throw an agreeable diversity over the features of the country; and a most delightful climate was superadded to complete its physical perfection.

Nature herself marked out three grand divisions designating them by natural boundaries. First the Peloponnesus or southern part was separated,[1] or nearly so, from Hellas or the northern part, by the Saronic and Corinthian gulfs.[2] Hellas again was divided into two nearly equal portions, northern and southern, by the chain

[1] *Taylor*, 81. [2] *Heeren's Politics of Ancient Greece*, 16.

of Mount Œta traversing it obliquely, and separating Thessaly and Epirus from central Hellas.

Greece anciently consisted of several different provinces, some of which were separated from each other by natural boundaries, others only by those which were political.[1] Of these Thessaly was the largest, consisting of an extensive table land surrounded on three sides by mountains, and on the other by the Ægean sea. It was emphatically the land of the Peneus its only river of any size, which rising in Mount Pindus poured its waters eastward into the Ægean, the lofty peaks of Ossa and Olympus rearing themselves each side of it as it discharges its waters into the sea. The summit of the latter was the fabled dwelling place of the gods. An ancient tradition relates that an earthquake once separated these mountains from each other, and thus enabled the Peneus,[2] through the beautiful vale of Tempe, to drain off the waters which had made Thessaly a vast inland sea.

Next in size to Thessaly was the province of Epirus, which was the poorest cultivated of all Greece.[3] The interior is traversed by wild mountains. Its most celebrated productions were oxen, horses and dogs.

Central Greece, or Hellas, contained nine provinces, some very small, none of them large, and a few much celebrated as having performed important parts in Grecian history and civilization.[4] These nine provinces were Attica, Megaris, Bœotia, Phocis, Eastern Locris, Western Locris, Doris, Ætolia, and Acarnania.

The celebrated *Attica*, the home of the Athenians, is a neck of land or peninsula extending in a south-easterly direction about sixty-three miles into the Ægean sea.[5] At its base, where it is connected with the main land, it is about twenty-five miles in width, whence it continues gradually to taper until it terminates in the high cape of Sunium, on the summit of which was reared the temple of Minerva.

[1] *Heeren's Politics*, 35-7. [2] *Idem*, 36. [3] *Taylor*, 81, 82. [4] *Idem*, 82. [5] *Politics*, 26.

This was never a fertile country, not even producing sufficient corn for the consumption of its inhabitants. It had rich silver mines in Mount Laurium, excellent marble quarries in the Pentelic mountains, and the honey made by the bees of Mount Hymettus was much celebrated. The country was mountainous; the mountains, rising only to a moderate height, stony and without forests,[1] but presenting outlines of beauty, and covered with aromatic plants. Where the mountains open, plains of moderate extent often occur,[2] which are covered with forests of olive trees. No large rivers are to be found, the principal being those of the Ilissus and Cephisus. The waters of its streams and brooks were ever clear, and delicious to the taste, while the purity of its air is perhaps unequaled by that of any other country.

West of Attica and close to the Corinthian isthmus lay *Megaris*, the smallest of the Grecian territories.

To the north-west of Attica, and exhibiting, in almost every respect, a different character, lay the ancient *Bœotia*, with its marshy soil, and its cloudy atmosphere. It is a large plain almost wholly surrounded by mountains,[3] being shut in on the west by the chain of Helicon and Parnassus, sacred to the muses, separated from Attica by Mount Cithæron, and from the sea by Mount Ptoas. It is well watered, the Cephisus being the most important river.[4] The soil of Bœotia is among the most fruitful of Greece, and this territory was, in ancient times, the most densely peopled of any part of Greece. The fate of Greece was often decided on the battle fields of Bœotia. Her freedom was won at Platæa, and lost at Chæronea. The Spartans conquered at Tanagra, and at Leuctra their power was crushed forever.

Phocis, a country of moderate size and unequal shape, contained several important mountain passes between northern and southern Greece. Here were the fountains Aganippe and Hippocrene.[5] Here were the temple and

---

[1] *Politics*, 26. [2] *Idem*, 27. [3] *Idem*, 32. [4] *Idem*, 32. [5] *Taylor*, 82.

oracle of Delphi, which imparted a sacredness to the soil of Phocis. Delphi, the residence of the oracle, was situated on the south side of Parnassus, and was overshadowed by its double peak. Above the city was the magnificent temple of Apollo, where, under the patronage of the god, were collected the master pieces of Grecian art. Here assembled the amphictyonic council, in which were discussed and matured the first maxims of the law of nations. Here were celebrated the Pythian games, next in importance to the Olympic; and here at the Castalian fountain, the songs of the poets resounded in solemn rivalship.[1] Of all these no vestiges now remain, except the character they served to impress upon Greece, and through Greece upon the world.

East Locris extends along the Euripus, the long strait dividing Eubœa from Bœotia. There is found the celebrated pass of Thermopylæ, the gate of Greece, at its narrowest point hardly affording room between the mountain and the sea for a single carriage to pass.[2] This was immortalized by Leonidas and his Spartan band.

Western Locris was separated by Phocis from the eastern province. It joined the bay of Corinth.

Between the southern ridge of Œta and the northern extremity of Mount Parnassus, lay the mountainous district of *Doris*,[3] a territory of small extent but the parent of powerful states. From this issued the Doric race.

The rough *Ætolia*, and woody *Acarnania*, forming the western parts of Hellas, are districts of large extent, both situated on the Achelous,[4] which is the largest of the Grecian rivers, and flows between them. Both these were inhabited by descendants of the Hellenes; both were once celebrated for heroes; in both, nature exhibits herself in sublime and munificent attire, and yet the people of both remained barbarians after the Athenians had become the instructors of the world. How extremely difficult it is to understand on what depend the culture and civilization of nations.

[1] *Politics*, 33, 34. [2] *Idem*, 34. [3] *Taylor*, 83. [4] *Politics*, 35.

Southern Greece is called the Peloponnesus or peninsula of Pelops, who, according to tradition, introduced there, from Phrygia, the arts of peace. It is now called Morea,[1] from its resemblance to a mulberry leaf,[2] which that word signifies. Its principal geographical feature presents us in the centre with a high ridge of hills which sends out several branches, some as far as the sea. Between these are fruitful plains, watered by an abundance of streams, which pour from the mountains in almost every direction. This high inland district, which nowhere borders upon the sea, presents us the far famed poetical *Arcadia*, the land of shepherds and herdsmen. This is the Switzerland of Greece, and the resemblance obtains not only in regard to the two countries, but extends also to the inhabitants—the Arcadians, in many respects, resembling the Swiss. Both alike have been remarked for their love of freedom, and their love of money. Vegetation here was ever rich and magnificent. There was about it a freshness and a coolness arising from its elevated situation,[3] and from the innumerable brooks coursing their way down from the mountains. The inhabitants were principally shepherds, not wandering nomades, but possessed of stationary dwellings. They preferred, however, living in the open country rather than to dwell in cities. This reminds one, although on a small scale, of the great central plateau in Asia, the dwellers upon which, unlike the Arcadians, are wandering nomades without a fixed habitation or home. This has been by many supposed to have been the cradle of the Pelasgic race, and it certainly was retained by that people long after the Hellenes had occupied every other part of Greece.[4]

Around Arcadia lay seven territories or provinces, all of them mostly watered by streams descending from its highlands.

To the south lay *Laconia*,[5] rough and mountainous, but anciently densely peopled with a race of hardy heroes. It

---

[1] *Taylor*, 83. [2] *Politics*, 16. [3] *Idem*, 17. [4] *Taylor*, 83. [5] *Politics*, 18.

is said to have contained nearly one hundred towns and villages. Its principal, and only river of any importance was the Eurotas,[1] rising in the Arcadian mountains, and flowing through Laconia the clearest and purest of Grecian rivers. On the west and north Laconia was surrounded by the Taygetus range of mountains which separated it from *Messenia*, which lay at the west of Laconia, and was much the most level and fruitful. This province was early subjugated by Sparta, and held in debasing servitude. On its reduction under Spartan dominion, many of the inhabitants of Messene fled to the island of Sicily, where they founded a new Messene, which, with a very slight alteration, retains its name to this day.[2]

In a south-easterly direction from Arcadia lies an interesting territory, from Argos, its capital city, called *Argolis*. It stretches on the south side of the Saronic gulf directly opposite to Attica, and is somewhat like it in form extending fifty-four miles into the Ægean sea,[3] and terminating in the promontory of Scillæum. There are few, if any, of the Grecian territories that furnish so many spots intimately associated with the early heroic age of Greece,[4] than Argolis. Here lay the ancient Tiryns from which Hercules started on the commencement of his labors. Its Cyclopean ruins are still visible.[5] Here also was Mycenæ, the country of Agamemnon, who was immortalized by Homer.[6] Nemea was also here where the Nemean games were celebrated in honor of Neptune. But the early greatness and glory of this people seem not to have animated their descendants. During the historical period of Grecian history, the Argives seldom appear, and, in fact, are but little known.[7]

On the western side of the Peloponnesus, nearly opposite to Argolis, and lying along the Ionian sea, lay the peaceful land of *Elis*, which was the holy land of Greece. Its greatest length from north to south was fifty-four miles,

[1] *Politics*, 18. [2] *Taylor*, 83, 84. [3] *Idem*, 84. [4] *Politics*, 19. [5] See *Dodwell's Pelasgic Remains*. [6] *Politics*, 19. [7] *Idem*, 19.

and its greatest breadth about twenty-seven. Its principal river was the Alpheus, which is one of the largest of the Grecian rivers. It heads in the Arcadian mountains near the source of the Eurotas,[1] the latter of which flowed southward through a land of war, while the Alpheus coursed westward through a land of peace. Such emphatically was the country of Elis. It offers no bloody battle fields to the historian. It was ever safe from the din of arms. Hostile armies might, indeed, pass over its sacred soil, but on their very entrance upon it they were required to give up their arms, receiving them again when they came to leave it. Here in Olympia, near the city of Pisa, were long celebrated the Olympian games. Here on the banks of the Alpheus stood the sacred grove called Altis,[2] in the centre of which was erected the great national temple of the Hellenes, that of Olympian Jove, in which was the colossal statue of Jupiter, the masterpiece of Phidias. This is reputed to have been the first work of art in all antiquity, and perhaps the first in the world. Here were also other choice specimens of Grecian art. The whole grove was filled with monuments and statues, erected in honor of gods, heroes and conquerors. More than two hundred and thirty statues have been enumerated.

Proceeding north from Elis we enter a narrow maritime district of land, lying along the Corinthian gulf and forming the north-western portion of the Peloponnesus.[3] This is *Achaia*, once termed Ionia from the fact that it was inhabited by Ionians. In the confusion produced by the Dorian emigration, it exchanged its ancient inhabitants for Achæans, and then took the name of Achaia. It is well watered by a great number of mountain streams that descend from the high ridges of Arcadia. Its inhabitants were a peaceful and industrious people, with no lofty aspirations, and distinguished, especially in early periods of Grecian history, neither by warlike achievements, nor by a successful cultivation of art or science. Here twelve cities

[1] *Politics*, 20. [2] *Idem*, 21, 22. [3] *Idem*, 23.

independent of each other in the management of their internal affairs, and having each a small territory attached to it, formed a confederacy, called the Achæan league,[1] which could trace back its origin to a remote antiquity. The fundamental principle which served as the basis of their confederacy was a perfect equality.

To the east of Achaia lay the small territory of *Sicyona*, frequently regarded as a part of Achaia.[2] It was chiefly remarkable for the city Sicyon, which was said to be the oldest city in Greece, having been founded more than two thousand years before the Christian era. Farther east still was *Corinthia*, the isthmus of which, lying between the Saronic and Corinthian gulfs, connected Peloponnesus with Hellas. This was, on many accounts, an important locality. Here were celebrated the Isthmian games in honor of Neptune. Here, in the midst of a grove of fir trees, stood the national temple of that god. Here a stand has frequently been made in defense of the liberties of Greece,[3] the narrowness of the isthmus admitting of its being fortified.

At the south of the isthmus stood the wealthy city of Corinth,[4] which was about four miles in extent. It lay at the foot of a steep and elevated hill, the Acrocorinthus, on which stood its citadel.[5] This was one of the strongest fortresses in all Greece. The view from this citadel in the period of Grecian glory was perhaps unsurpassed by any in the world. Immediately beneath and around it lay the city and its territory, with its temples, theatres, and aqueducts. Its two harbors, one on the eastern, and one on the western bay, both filled with ships, as also the isthmus stretching between the two bays, were all in full view. The peaks of Helicon and Parnassus might be seen looming up in the distance, and, in a clear day, a strong eye could discern afar off the Athenian Acropolis.

Such were the territorial divisions of ancient Greece. Some of its cities have a peculiar distinction in Grecian history. Besides those already mentioned, Thebes with its

[1] *Taylor*, 24. [2] *Idem*, 84. [3] *Idem*, 84. [4] *Idem*, 84. [5] *Politics*, 24, 25.

seven gates, and its claim to stand at the head of the Bœotian cities, will be found to come in for a considerable share of consideration. The two cities, however, that cluster around them the greatest number of interesting associations are Sparta and Athens.

Sparta was the mistress of Laconia, seated on the banks of the Eurotas,[1] without walls or gates, relying solely upon the patriotism and valor of its own citizens for its defense. It was one of the largest of Grecian cities, and although it had a market place, theatre, and various temples, it was nevertheless by no means the most splendid. Its principal ornaments were the monuments of fallen heroes. But these have now perished; and so completely has the grand destroyer, time, done his work among the ruins of this ancient city, that the very spot on which it stood is now a matter of dispute.

Athens, the mistress of Attica, has been more fortunate. The zone of light by which she encircled herself, and the remains she bequeathed to posterity, have dispelled all doubt in relation to her location.

Athens lay in a plain, extending in the south-west direction about four miles towards the sea and the harbors, but on the other side enclosed by mountains.[2] The plain is not continuous, being interrupted by several rocky eminences of varying heights. On the largest and highest of these was erected the citadel, called the Acropolis, from Cecrops, the name of its founder. Around this the city lay spread out, extending particularly in the direction towards the sea.

On the summit of this hill was a level space about eight hundred feet long and four hundred broad, seemingly prepared by nature for the erection of those masterpieces of architecture, which constituted the glory of Athens, and which proclaimed that glory to the far-off traveler, as he beheld in the distance the Acropolis of Athens, lifting its head above the surrounding plain.

[1] *Politics*, 18. [2] *Idem*, 28.

Here was the Propylæa, with its two wings, the temple of Victory, and another temple ornamented with the pictures of Polygnotus. Here were also the temples of the guardian deities of Athens. On the left was that of Pallas,[1] with the column which fell from heaven, and the sacred olive tree; and also the temple of Neptune. On the right, rising above everything else, and possessing the colossal statue of Minerva, by Phidias, was the Parthenon, the pride of Athens.

There were also other rocky eminences besides the Acropolis, that are immortalized in Athenian history.[2] On the west of it is a second hill, of irregular form, and considerably lower, called Mars hill, on which the areopagus, or supreme judicial tribunal of Athens, held its sessions. On its south-west is a valley, open at the north-west and south-east. Here was the agora, or public place of Athens. Above it, to the south-west, rises another hill, formed of hard and rugged limestone. This is the Pnyx, the hill on which the popular assemblies of Athens were held. Here are still to be seen the very steps once ascended by Pericles and Demosthenes, and the bema, or identical spot on which they stood when they harangued the people. To the south of this is still a fourth hill, of similar kind, known as the Museum. Thus Athens lies upon four hills. On the north and south side of the city flows a small stream, that on the south the Ilissus, that on the north the Cephisus.

The two harbors, the Piræus and Phalerum, were connected with the city by a double wall, called the northern and southern, enclosing between them the road which was about five miles long.

The harbor, in fact, formed a city by itself, having its own public squares, temples, and market places, and its busy crowd enlivening it with their various pursuits, mostly of a commercial character.

The undertaking would be useless to enumerate the many works of art which constituted the glory and the pride

[1] *Politics*, 29. [2] *Wordsworth's Greece*, 133.

of Athens.[1] These have not all passed away. On the Acropolis are still to be seen the ruins of the temple of Victory, of the Erectheum and the majestic Parthenon. Some stone steps remain of the theatre where the dramas of Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides were represented, and also some walls and columns of the Propylæa. A few fragments of the long walls connecting Athens with the Piræus and Phalerum, and which were built by Themistocles, are yet visible.

The plain on which Athens was situated, was surrounded on three sides by mountains.[2] From the summit of the Parthenon, erected on the Acropolis, was presented a most splendid prospect. On the east could be seen the peaks of the Hymettus. On the north, that of the Pentelius with its quarries of marble. To the north-west in the far distance, was to be seen Mount Cithæron, and to the south-east, almost at the end of the peninsula, lay Mount Laurium, rich in silver mines. Towards the south-west the range was undisturbed, extending over the harbors and the Saronic bay, with the islands of Salamis and Ægina, as far as the elevated citadel of Corinth.

All Greece was originally inhabited by many small tribes, but the two principal ones, those that have been altogether the most important, were the Pelasgi and the Hellenes.[3] They both probably came originally from Asia, but the difference in language, manners and habits, very clearly distinguish them as different tribes.[4] The Pelasgi were the elder and ruling tribe in Greece. Their language seems to have been the mother tongue of the different Grecian dialects.[5]

Their first settlement was in the Peloponnesus. Inachus was their first leader, and he was contemporary with Abraham. They erected the ancient city of Sicyon, B. C. 2000, and Argos, B. C. 1800. Their settlements extending northward soon embraced Attica. They also extended to

[1] *Wordsworth*, 130. [2] *Politics*, 30, 31. [3] *Taylor*, 89. [4] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 119. [5] *Prichard's Physical Researches*, 496, 497.

and embraced a considerable part of Thessaly. The Pelasgi were a strong race of men. To them are attributed the Cyclopean monuments, consisting principally of the ruins of ancient cities, that are found in different parts of Greece, particularly in Thessaly, Attica, and the Peloponnesus. Such, for instance, as the ruins of Lycosura in Arcadia, which Pausanias, the great Grecian topographer of the second century, says, "was the most ancient city in the world, the first that the sun ever illuminated with his rays," and that "from these venerable walls men learned how to build other cities."[1] Such also are the ruins still remaining of the ancient city of Tiryns, and of Mycenæ, Orchomenus, Chæronea, Gortys, Thoricus, and several others. It is to be remarked that, with rarely an exception, these ancient cities have each an acropolis, or strongly fortified citadel, seated sometimes upon a rock, or hill top in or near the city, the object of which is to serve as a means of defense.

There are reckoned some three or four styles of this early architecture, but in the earliest, the fortification was composed of rude masses of rocks of varying dimensions piled upon each other,[2] the intervals between them being filled with smaller stones to complete the work. The walls were generally some seven or eight feet in thickness, and of different heights. These Pelasgic remains are not confined to Greece. They are also found in Italy, particularly in the ancient Latium. The Pelasgi continued to flourish in Thessaly for nearly two centuries from B. C. 1700 to 1500, where they learned to apply themselves to agriculture, and some of the peaceful arts.[3]

The other principal tribe, the Hellenes, so called from Hellen, one of their leaders, were a milder race of men, and first appeared in Phocis, from around Mount Parnassus,[4] under their leader, Deucalion. Being driven out of their original seats by a deluge,[5] they migrated to Thessaly

[1] *Dodwell's Pelasgic Remains*, 1. [2] *Taylor*, 89. [3] *Idem*, 89. [4] *Idem*, 89. [5] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 120.

about B. C. 1550, and from thence expelled the Pelasgi. Following up their success, the Hellenes soon became the ruling tribe throughout Greece, driving out the Pelasgi, until all that remained to them were the mountainous parts of Arcadia and the land of Dodona.

It was, therefore, from the Hellenic stock that the Grecians were principally derived. That soon became divided into four great branches;[1] the Æolians, Ionians, Dorians and Achæans, who subsequently became distinguished from each other by many peculiarities, having reference principally to language,[2] society and government, and extending also to philosophy and art.

Hellen, the son of Deucalion, gave his name to the Hellenic race.[3] He had three sons, Æolus, Dorus and Xuthus.[4] From the first came the Æolians. These spread themselves over western Greece, Acarnania, Ætolia, Phocis, Locris and Elis in the Peloponnesus, and also in the western islands.

From the second came the Dorians, who originally spread themselves over Macedonia and Crete. A part of the tribe returning, crossed Mount Œta, and settled in Doris, where they remained until they accompanied the Heraclidæ to take possession of the Peloponnesus.

Xuthus, with his wife, Creusa, the daughter of Erechtheus, wandered to Athens.[5] Their two sons were Ion and Achæus, whence came the Ionians and Achæans. Although this, as a personal history, seems entitled to little confidence, yet it is valuable as expounding and symbolizing the first fraternal aggregation of Hellenic men, together with their territorial distribution and the institutions which they collectively venerated.[6]

The Ionians first inhabited Attica and Ægialus, the ancient name of Achaia.[7] From the latter territory they were expelled by the Achæans at the time of the Dorian migration, and the name was changed to Achaia.

[1] *Taylor*, 89. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 120. [3] *Taylor*, 90. [4] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 121. [5] *Taylor*, 90. [6] *Grote*, I, 100. [7] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 122.

The Achæans retained the possession of Argolis and Laconia, until expelled thence by the Dorians, under the Heraclidæ, when they established themselves in Achaia.

Besides these primitive stocks, there were, during the two centuries intervening between the years B. C. 1600 and 1400, several colonizations of different parts of Greece from Egypt, Phœnicia and Phrygia, countries of an elder, and, at that time, a more advanced civilization. It was the influence exerted by these different colonies, that no doubt largely contributed to set successfully in motion, the elements of Grecian civilization.

Cecrops from the ancient city of Sais in Egypt, led an Egyptian colony into Attica about the year B. C. 1550. He introduced into Attica the first elements of civilization. Even the institution of marriage is referred to Cecrops.

Danaus, a little earlier, about B. C. 1500, led also a colony from lower Egypt, and founded Argos.

About the period of Cecrops, or B. C. 1550, Cadmus led a Phœnician colony into Bœotia, and founded the city of Thebes. He first introduced the use of letters into Greece.

Pelops, with a Phrygian colony, came into Peloponnesus about the year B. C. 1400. His descendants, by various means, but principally by intermarriages with the royal families of Argos and Lacedæmon, came to acquire so much influence throughout the peninsula, that it finally took its name from him and was called the Peloponnesus.

The names of Cecrops, Cadmus, and Pelops, together with the facts that they were successively the leaders of colonies into Greece, are familiar to the minds of every student of Grecian history, and yet their several advents lie at a great remove beyond that period in Grecian history which we term historic. As no contemporary writer not only, but none probably within the reach of tradition, has existed, or at least survived to us, to furnish evidence of their existence, Mr. Grote, and others who have followed his lead, have denied the existence of those men, or their alleged colonizations. They, however, admit the strong probability that there were early colonizations from the

east, especially from Egypt and Phœnicia. The fact of the existence of these colonizations is much more important than the names of those by whom they were led. The dates, although generally agreed upon among historians, yet cannot be relied upon with any degree of certainty, but the facts that such men as Cecrops, Cadmus, and Pelops once existed, and that they performed no unimportant parts in Grecian history, are attested not only by tradition, but also by the fact that their names have been respectively perpetuated in the *Acropolis* of Athens, the *Cecropeia* or portion of Attica, and in the *Cadmeia* or citadel of Thebes, and in the *Pelopion* or plain of Pelops, and the *Peloponnesus* of Greece.

In early periods, before Greece started on the career of civilization, her long line of coasts rendered her particularly exposed to the piratical excursions of the Phœnicians, Carians and inhabitants of the Ægean isles.[1] At the north she was open to the Thracians, Amazons and other barbarous tribes. Greece, like Europe in the middle ages, was infested by bands of robbers, who made plunder their profession, and often exercised the most horrid cruelties. These led to two results, both of which were of great importance in the development of Grecian civilization. The first was, that early attempts at union were made among the Greeks. They learnt that in union lay their strength. Their institutions of government were in great measure based upon that fact. The celebrated amphyctionic league was early originated, called into being by the necessities of the country.

The second was the creation of the heroic age of Greece, in which great heroes arose, who signalized themselves by difficult achievements. Among these were Perseus, Hercules, Bellerophon, Theseus, and Castor and Pollux. The exploits of these heroes, in slaying the robbers, destroying ferocious wild beasts, and ridding the country of such hindrances to its progress, borne on the wings of tradition,

[1] *Taylor*, 91.

were brought down to succeeding times, tinging the heroic age with something of romance as well as reality; furnishing subjects to the Grecian artist, and themes to the Grecian poet; contributing even to her mythology, and affording to her future sons examples of heroism which they were loudly called upon to imitate. The spirit of the heroic age more or less transfused itself into the succeeding one, in which occur many important events which history somewhat doubtfully records. These are 1. The Argonautic expedition. 2. The two Theban wars. 3. The siege and sack of Troy. 4. The return of the Heraclidæ. 5. The consequent migration of the Ionian and Æolian colonies into Asia Minor.

I have said that these events were somewhat *doubtfully* recorded by history. I ought to add that the claim of Mr. Grote, and others of his school, is — that there is nothing in Greece that can be called historical beyond the year B. C. 776; that all that precedes that year, including all the events just stated, are mythical, and belong entirely to the empire of legend, and not of history. It must probably be admitted that all evidence strictly historical, limiting that to contemporary records, ascends no higher than that period. There are previous inscriptions and records, but they lack the evidence that they were made contemporaneously with the events they profess to record. It is true that the events above stated, when extended to embrace all their details, include much that can only be classified among the mythical, fabulous, and legendary; and yet that which is admittedly historical in Greece is either connected with, grows out of, or is so powerfully influenced by, those so-called events, that it seems difficult to banish them all to the region of fable. Nor ought the testimony of tradition to be disregarded. Although its light be dim and uncertain, yet where no other exists it is entitled to a fair consideration. The early writers of Grecian history are very unanimous in stating these historical events, and, believing that they have some foundation in history, I shall briefly state them as they are thus given.

I. The Argonautic expedition was undertaken about the year B. C. 1250,[1] by a Thessalian prince named Jason. He led the young chivalry of Greece in an expedition, partly commercial and partly piratical, to the eastern shores of the Euxine sea. They sailed in a ship named Argo, and were called Argonauts. They planted a colony in Colchis. Although the nature and object of the expedition are unknown, it no doubt produced the result of infusing into the Greeks a bold and daring spirit, that told strongly upon their subsequent history.

II. The two Theban wars, the first of which arose between Eteocles and Polynices, sons of Œdipus, who was one of the descendants of Cadmus, the Phœnician. They agreed to reign alternately. Eteocles refused to perform his part of the agreement. Polynices, joined by six Grecian generals, waged what is called the war of "the seven against Thebes." This was B. C. 1225. The two brothers fell by mutual wounds. The successor, Creon, routed the confederate forces, five of the leaders being slain. After the lapse of ten years occurred the second Theban war, in which the sons of the allied princes, called the Epigoni, by way of avenging the death of their fathers, marched against the Thebans, routed them, and besieged, and took the city of Thebes, about B. C. 1215.

III. The Trojan war, an event which gave occasion to the first great epic the world ever saw, the Iliad of Homer. This took place about the year B. C. 1194. A brief reference to the occasion of the siege, and the result of it was made, while on the subject of Troy as one of the countries of Asia Minor. It was attended by several important results:

1. It was the cause of many troubles that subsequently occurred in Greece. The Grecian leaders on their return after a ten years' absence, found that great changes had taken place in their respective governments.[2] In some their thrones had other occupants. In others their wives

[1] *Taylor*, 91. [2] *Idem*, 92.

had other husbands. Many severe trials awaited them, and many fierce wars and intestine commotions grew out of these troubles and difficulties.

2. A second result was that the Greeks failed not to learn from it the important secret that union among themselves was the greatest element of strength and power. It tended to give them a greater nationality of character; to enable them to act in concert, and thus led the way to their successful resistance of the Persian invasion at a subsequent period.

IV. Return of the Heraclidæ.

The extension of the family of Pelops over the Peloponnesus excluded the more ancient inhabitants.[1] The most powerful of these were the Perseidæ, the descendants of Perseus, embracing such heroes as Bellerophon and Hercules. A great branch of the Perseidæ consisted of the Heraclidæ or descendants of Hercules, who were driven into exile by the Pelopid sovereigns. After meeting with a hospitable reception by the Athenians, they retired into the mountainous district of Doris, of which they made themselves masters. But those who had enjoyed the fertile plains of the Peloponnesus could not be expected to take delight in the Dorian mountains. Accordingly when the consequences, or results produced by the Trojan war had filled all Greece with confusion, they availed themselves of the opportunity to reassert, and, if possible, to regain their rights.[2] Twice they attempted the invasion by land, but were both times repulsed at the Corinthian isthmus. The third effort was made by sea. A party of Ætolians and several Dorian tribes joined them. They gained a party in Lacedæmon. A favorable gale conveyed them to the eastern coast of the Peloponnesus. Laconia was betrayed into their hands. Argolis, Messenia, Elis and Corinth submitted. All that remained to the Pelopidæ was the mountainous region of Arcadia, and the coast province of Achaia. The revolution was not accompanied with much

[1] *Taylor*, 92, 93. [2] *Idem*, 93.

bloodshed. The victors distributed the provinces by lot. The Pelopidæ either emigrated or were reduced to slavery.

The commander of the Pelopid forces at the isthmus invaded Achaia, then called Ægialus, and expelled thence the Ionians, B. C. 1104. The province was then called Achaia. Many of the expelled Ionians sought a refuge in Attica and were hospitably entertained by the Athenians. By far the greater number passed into Asia Minor, and founded the colonies of Ionia, Æolia and Caria.

V. The migration. About eighty-eight years after the taking of Troy, two of the Pelopidæ crossed the Hellespont and established themselves on what was formerly the Trojan coast.[1] They extended their colonization from Cylicus to the mouth of the Hermus. This delightful region they called Æolia. A body of Athenians including some of the younger sons of Codrus, their last king, and a few Ionians also crossed the sea and established themselves along the coast from the Hermus to the promontory of Posidarion. This, together with the islands of Chios and Samos, constituted Ionia.

Subsequent hostilities between the Athenians and Dorians led to the third emigration, B. C. 994.[2] The Dorians having been driven from Megara, a part of them settled in the islands of Crete and Rhodes. The remainder colonized the peninsula of Caria, which they called Doris.

To sum up the effects of these invasions and migratory movements.[3] The territories of Argos, Sparta, Messene and Corinth came under the dominion of the Dorian invaders. The Ætolians who accompanied them became possessed of the territory of Elis. The Achaians drove the Ionians out of Achaia and took themselves the possession of it. The Ionians were received by the Athenians, their old kindred tribe. These migratory movements led, as above stated, to the colonization of a part of Asia Minor, and to the foundation there of Ætolia, Ionia, and subse-

[1] *Taylor*, 93, 94. [2] *Idem*, 94. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 128.

quently of Doris. Thus with, perhaps, the single exception of Arcadia, the entire Peloponnesus was revolutionized. This, no doubt, produced results of no small importance in their bearing upon Grecian culture. It was mingling the rude, rough spirit of the mountain Dorians with the more polished and civilized forms of life found in the Peloponnesian cities.[1] It bore some resemblance to the waves of barbarian population that long subsequently, on the downfall of the Roman empire, rolled over the delightful regions of France and Italy. The rougher virtues of mountain birth and nurture became more efficient and powerful when subjected to the milder and civilizing influences of city life and manners. One striking effect produced in the element of government may here be mentioned. Both the tribes that migrated, and those which they expelled, were all at first under the government of their chieftains. During the next two centuries succeeding the emigration, from B. C. 1100 to 900, there sprung up in almost all the Grecian territories, republican forms of government, and these, although subject to many changes, long continued. This was, no doubt, very much owing to the influence which city life, and general civil improvement, exerted among the tribes that had newly emigrated. Each city served as a nucleus around which clustered its own peculiar interests, and generally each, at that time, formed its own internal constitution, and hence there were almost as many free states as there were cities with their territories.

From the Trojan war, about B. C. 1200 to the burning of Sardis, which led to the commencement of the Persian wars about B. C. 500, is an intervening period of 700 years. Of these, the first one hundred were principally occupied in the return and establishment of the Heraclidæ, and the readjustment of things consequent upon the changes then introduced, including the emigrations and planting of new colonies before referred to. The other six hundred years were variously occupied, in part by the wars carried on by

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 129.

the different states of Greece among themselves, and also by the successive changes in the state constitutions, or general principles, upon which the government was administered in the leading states. To the first alone can be made, in this connection, a brief allusion. It is of little importance considered in itself, but may be useful in showing the spirit or true character of the Grecian states, and also the successive steps by which the leading states acquired their supremacy.

The student of Grecian history and civilization finds that his attention is to be mainly directed to two races into which the Greeks very early resolved themselves, or which decidedly take the lead of every other, in the events of Grecian history and the great facts of Grecian culture. These were the Dorian and Ionian. The great features that characterized these races were almost the antipodes of each other.

The Dorian was sedate, grave, apparently thoughtful, reserved, sober, serious and taciturn. He never uttered a word unless he had something to say, and always stopped speaking the minute he had got through. In his conversation or speech there was no grace in the enunciation, no wit in the ideas, no life in the sentiment. He uttered nothing but for some purpose, and enacted nothing but for some effect. He possessed, or at least manifested, a profound indifference to literature and to the higher beauties of art. He was apparently void of passion, always exercising an indomitable self-control. He valued little any philosophy that was not based upon pure utilitarian principles, regarding everything through its utility or some other medium equally as cold. There was about him a fixedness in his habits, an indisposition to change, an unalterable firmness and persistency in adhering to purposes and designs once deliberately formed and entered upon. He was unyielding in disposition; brave, beyond all others in battle; ever manifesting great respect for age, and a deep reverence for immemorial custom. Such was the Dorian or Spartan.

The Ionian was of a character almost completely the reverse. Lively, versatile, buoyant, he was fond of every species of pleasure, and extremely eager in its pursuit. Upon him habits, even of considerable standing, sat loosely; he had little fixedness of purpose, little persistency in any given line of action. He was excessively fond of literary pursuits, much given to philosophical speculations, and wrought up to ecstacy in contemplating the glorious creations of art. Mind and body seemed possessed of a tireless activity. The mind was ever in hot pursuit of something new and pleasing. Little respect was entertained for age or reverence for custom, unless it came hallowed by the sanction of religion. He appeared ever ready for a change if it promised anything agreeable, and seemed always disposed to make the very utmost of the world, and of things. Such was the Ionian or Athenian. If we were to look in modern times for types of these two different races, we should find an approximation to the first in the English, and to the second in the French.

The Dorian conquerors of Laconia became there a ruling caste; depriving the inhabitants of most of their political rights, and reducing many to a state of complete vassalage or slavery.[1] For about two centuries the Spartans were engaged in carrying on wars with the Argives, their own state being at the same time severely agitated by domestic broils.

In the year B. C. 743, occurred the commencement of the first great war waged between the Spartans and Messenians. This continued for about twenty-one years,[2] and, after a series of sanguinary engagements, resulted in the success of the Spartans, the Messenians being compelled to give up to them one-half their entire revenues.

The Spartan army, consisting of the greater part of the citizens, had, on setting out to commence hostilities, bound themselves by oath not to return until they had subdued their enemies.[3] Their continued absence of more than

[1] *Taylor*, 95, 96. [2] *Idem*, 96. [3] *Idem*, 96.

twenty years filled the senate with fears that the Spartan race itself would become extinct. The young men were permitted to have promiscuous intercourse with the wives of the absent soldiers. The result was a class of men called Partheniæ, having no certain father, and not entitled to any inheritance. Finding themselves in a despised condition, they, together with the Helots, conspired against the state. The conspiracy was detected, and the Partheniæ banished to southern Italy, where they founded the city of Tarentum.

Spartan oppression drove the Messenians into a revolt, leading to the second Messenian war. They were led by Aristomenes, a descendant of the Messenian kings,[1] under whose prudent management the war was protracted more than ten years. Messene was finally taken by treachery, and the whole country subdued, but Sparta was much weakened, and left in a low state. By means, however, of this conquest she acquired a marked ascendancy in all the affairs of the Peloponnesus.

Athens, during this period, presents nothing attractive in its outward history. Its internal history, that of its government or civil polity, and the changes which there took place, belong to the element of government. The situation of Attica, its unproductive soil, rendered it less an object of attraction to the surrounding hordes; and the Athenians, in the early period of their history, being less frequently required to resist hostile invasions, possessed more and greater means and opportunities for internal improvement and for separating and developing the elements of humanity.[2]

The general history of the other states of Greece, down to the period of the Persian invasion, is possessed of little interest to the student of civilization.

A very interesting feature in Grecian history during this period is its colonizations. These were more extensive than those of any other people of the ancient world. The

[1] *Taylor*, 97. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 137.

Phœnician colonizations properly came under their development of industry, for the reason that they were almost invariably established for commercial purposes. The Grecian colonizations were of more complicated origin. The reasons upon which they were originally founded were very frequently political,[1] their direction also being sometimes indicated by the response of an oracle. Their object was sometimes commercial, and this was more particularly the case with colonizations made by the colonies themselves. Almost all the Grecian colonies became, in fact, commercial cities, whatever had been the design originally entertained in their foundation.[2] The progress of Grecian culture, the history of ancient commerce, the political relations then and subsequently arising between nations, have all some dependence upon Grecian colonization. Colonies were planted in the most fertile regions of the earth, and where the greatest natural facilities could be afforded for navigation and commerce.[3] Each colony became a centre, commercial and political, where new ideas originated and obtained currency and circulation. In each the Grecian mind was brought into new relations, and this, of itself, could never fail to elicit new ideas.

The relation existing between the colony and the mother country was generally defined by the cause of the settlement. When that cause was political, and the colonists consisted of discontented or exiled emigrants, little or no dependence existed between it and the mother country. When the cause was commercial the dependence was weak, and never very permanent. Whatever might have been the degree of dependence, there can be no doubt but the great diffusion of Grecian mind, and the great mass of ideas that by means of it were put into circulation, were strongly conducive in advancing Grecian culture, and elemental development.

The direction of Grecian colonization was principally east and west.[4] On the east were the coasts of Asia Minor,

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 158. [2] *Idem*, 159. [3] *Idem*, 159. [4] *Idem*, 158.

Thrace, and the countries bordering on the Euxine. On the west, southern Italy and Sicily. The earliest colonization was probably the ancient Pelasgi passing from Greece into Italy, and there, in Latium, leaving their Cyclopean remains.

The earliest and perhaps most important colonization of the Hellenic race was along the western coast of Asia Minor. These were important for commerce, and also for the large contributions made to Grecian civilization. They have already been alluded to.

The Æolian colonies were founded about B. C. 1124.[1] They occupied a part of Mysia and Caria, thence called Æolis or Æolia. The islands of Lesbos and Tenedos were also included. They built twelve cities in Asia, of which Cyme and Smyrna were the principal, and inhabited five cities on the island of Lesbos, the largest of which was Mitylene. All these were independent cities, each having its own constitution, or succession of constitutions and revolutions.

The Ionian colonies were of later date, about the year B. C. 1044. They erected twelve cities, ten on the western coasts of Asia Minor, and two on the islands Samos and Chios. They all had a common sanctuary, the temple of Neptune, on the promontory of Mycale, where they solemnized their festivals, and consulted together in regard to their common affairs.[2] Each city nevertheless preserved its independence. Of the twelve cities, Ephesus, Phocæa and Miletus were the largest. The latter was a great commercial city.[3] During the period of its greatest prosperity, for the two hundred years between B. C. 700 and 500, it was next to Tyre, and Carthage, the greatest commercial city of the old world. It had four harbors, could furnish fleets of eighty or one hundred vessels of war, and is said by some to have founded more than one hundred colonies.

The Dorians were still later than the Ionians.[4] They spread themselves gradually over the islands of the Archi-

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 160. [2] *Idem*, 161. [3] *Idem*, 162. [4] *Idem*, 164.

pelago, until they reached the western coasts of Asia Minor, where they built the two cities of Cnidus and Halicarnassus.[1] Like the Ionians they had a common sanctuary, the temple of Apollo Triopius, where their festivals were solemnized and their deliberations held.[2]

During the period of time intervening between B. C. 800 and 600, the coasts of the Propontis, of the Black sea, and the Palus Mæotis were studded with Grecian colonies. These were mostly from the single city of Miletus, and were several of them flourishing commercial cities. They commanded the entire navigation of the Black sea, and extended their commerce over the south of Russia and eastward to the countries lying east of the Caspian sea.[3] On the Propontis were the cities of Lampsacus, Citycus, Byzantium and Chalcedon.[4] The flourishing Sinope was on the southern coast of the Black sea. On the eastern were the cities of Phasis and Dioscurias, which were the principal markets of the slave trade. On the northern coast was the city of Tanais at the mouth of the river Tanais, and the city of Olbia at the mouth of the Borysthenes, both important for their inland trade.

The coasts of Thrace and Macedonia, along the Ægean, were settled by Grecian colonies derived principally from Corinth and Athens, particularly the latter.

Colonization was later in extending itself west of Greece than east, unless we include the Pelasgi, whose settlements in Italy date at a very early period. Most of the colonization westward by the Hellenic race occurred in the century intervening between B. C. 750 and 650. This was a period when republican forms of government obtained in most of the Grecian cities; when internal commotions were not unfrequent; when the causes of emigration were greatly multiplied—and these were principally of a political nature. These, therefore, occurred not only at a period of great political activity among the Greeks, but also after Grecian civilization had made greater progress, and this may, per-

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 164. [2] *Idem*, 164. [3] *Idem*, 165. [4] *Idem*, 167.

haps, account for the fact that the western colonies not only equaled the eastern in riches, but many times surpassed them in power, and distinguished themselves by wise and permanent codes of laws.[1] So strongly tinctured were the colonists with the political ideas at the time prevalent in the mother country, that the Achaian and Ionic and the Doric were distinguishable from each other in the character of the governments they instituted.[2] Those of Doric descent were more inclined to aristocracy; those of Ionic and Achaian, to democracy.

One of the earliest of these colonizations was Tarentum, founded B. C. 707, by the Partheniæ, from Sparta. It became a rich and powerful maritime city.[3]

Croton soon followed, founded by the Achaians, B. C. 710. Its form of government was a limited democracy.[4]

Sybaris was also founded by the Achaians, B. C. 720. It soon became a great, wealthy and luxurious city, to such an extent that its luxury passed into a proverb.[5] Its government is supposed also to have been a limited democracy until the usurpation of Telys, B. C. 510. The same year the Sybarites were defeated, and the city taken and destroyed by the Crotonians.

Thurii was founded by the Athenians in the year B. C. 446. They were conquered by the Lucani, B. C. 390.

Rhegium was founded from Chalcis in B. C. 668. Its government was aristocratic. Cumæ also from Chalcis was founded B. C. 1030.[6] This early obtained a high degree of power and prosperity. Its constitution was a limited aristocracy.

Sicily was extensively colonized from Greece. These were principally planted on its eastern and southern coasts.[7] They were partly Dorian and in part Ionian. The Dorian were Messana and Tyndaris from Messene, Syracuse from Corinth, Hybla and Thapsus from Megara;[8] Segeste from Thessaly. The Ionian were Naxos from Chalcis, Zande

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 167. [2] *Idem*, 167. [3] *Idem*, 168. [4] *Idem*, 169. [5] *Idem*, 170. [6] *Idem*, 172. [7] *Idem*, 172. [8] *Idem*, 173.

from Cumæ. Of all these by far the most important was Syracuse. She was for a long time the mistress of Sicily. Her position was well selected either for the prosecution of wars or the arts of peace, or the pursuits of commerce. She became rich, flourishing and prosperous. Few, if any, cities or nations have been more diversified in their political concerns. In her varied existence she was under different forms of government; she, in succession, had experience of the republican, democratic and despotic forms. At times she possessed and exercised great power. She makes no mean or contemptible figure in Grecian, Carthaginian, and Roman history. Only a brief allusion can be here made to the different forms of government she passed through.

Syracuse was a republic from its foundation, B. C. 735, till the time of Gelon, B. C. 484, a period of 251 years, during which she does not seem to have gained but little.[1] The kingly government commenced with Gelon, B. C. 484, who laid the foundation of Syracusian greatness, rendering that city more powerful both by land and sea, than any one of the states of Greece itself.[2] This form of government continued to Thrasybulus, who was expelled for his cruelties, B. C. 466.

Next succeeded a democratic republican form of government which continued from the period of its establishment on the expulsion of Thrasybulus, B. C. 466, to the elevation of Dionysius the elder, B. C. 405. She was subjected to a severe despotism under Dionysius the elder and younger.[3] This continued until B. C. 343, when Timoleon expelled the younger Dionysius, and restored the republic. This continued until about B. C. 317, when the despotism was again restored in the person of Agathocles. After many changes of fortune, victories and reverses, the Romans finally took Syracuse after a long siege, and notwithstanding the inventions of Archimedes, in the year B. C. 212. Thus terminated its eventful history. No city or state

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 173. [2] *Idem*, 174. [3] *Idem*, 175–7.

probably ever existed that passed through such a varied experience.

Next to Syracuse, Agrigentum was the first city of Sicily, and was founded in B. C. 582. It was once one of the richest, most luxurious and splendid cities in the world.[1] Its time of greatest prosperity was during the period intervening between the year B. C. 470 and 405. On the Spanish coast was Saguntum, which became rich by commerce, and was destroyed by Hannibal, B. C. 219.[2] On the African coast was Cyrene, founded B. C. 631, which, like Syracuse, had a varied fortune, experiencing both kingly and republican forms of government.

Thus extensive and varied was the system of colonization adopted and carried out by Greece. By means of it she became herself greatly extended. At short, but varying intervals, all along the course of the Black sea, the Propontis, and the Mediterranean, were diffused Grecian thoughts, feelings, ideas, manners, forms of social intercourse, learning, religion, forms of government, and creations of art. This constitutes one of the reasons why the Greek attained such a supremacy, and almost universality, in his industry, religion, society, forms of government, speculations in philosophy, and creations in art. Every colonial settlement was a point from which radiated a power and influence strictly Grecian in its character. It should not, therefore, surprise us that Grecian civilization attained to great heights, extended over a great surface, and exerted a prodigious influence over the progress and destiny of the race.

Greece has been hitherto considered in the states of which she was composed, and the numerous colonies to which she had given birth. Her interest never had extended beyond herself and her colonies. There, beneath the shelter of her rocks, on her plains, and in the bosom of her valleys, had been gradually nurturing the germs of a civilization, that was destined to be world-wide in its

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 179. [2] *Idem*, 181, 182.

extent, and time-lasting in its consequences. The energy and power of this civilization, with the resources it could command, was now to be brought to the test of a bloody arbitrament.

The Persian invasion was the first event that brought Greece upon the theatre of the world, directly under the eye of general history. She was now to resist the first systematically concerted attempt of Asia to subjugate Europe. On her was devolved a high destiny, that of saving Europe from Asiatic despotism. More than this, she was charged with the task of defending the new civilization against the aggressive assaults of the old. This was, in fact, the first great warfare in which man had an interest. It was of little consequence to the race what despotism flourished or fell upon the plains of Asia. But calculation can never estimate what would have been the calamitous consequences had the torch of Grecian civilization been here extinguished. Greece had been long training to meet this issue. Her principal states had passed through various internal revolutions; had made trial of different systems of government; until they had pretty uniformly settled down upon republican forms, some with the aristocratic, others with the democratic element predominating. The blessings conferred by a free government had been actually realized. The strength of her principal states had been tested, but not exhausted, as it came to be subsequently, by harassing wars carried on between each other. While in the enjoyment of youth, and full of high hopes and anticipations of the future, she was called upon to resist the aggressions of the then dominant despotism of Asia.

At the time of the Persian invasion, the Greeks were divided into a number of small states, or territories, some of them very small, slightly, if at all, connected with each other, and some few actually in a state of hostility.[1] Some one great cause seemed to be required to force upon them

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 185.

the necessity of acting in concert, to lead them to an union of effort; and to prevent them from destroying each other. This was supplied by the Persian invasion. This invasion laid the true foundation of Grecian greatness, and brought distinctly into view some of the larger states, which subsequently occupy a very prominent place in Grecian history.

The Persian invasion originated in the transactions that were connected with the revolt of the Ionians. These being originally Greek colonies, and of a race kindred to the Athenians, applied to them for assistance.[1] The Athenians sent twenty ships, with the aid of which the Ionians took and plundered Sardis, the wealthy capital of Lydia. This occurred about the year B. C. 500. The Ionian revolt was afterwards suppressed, and the city of Miletus taken and destroyed. The Persian king Darius was enraged beyond measure at this act of the Athenians, and that he might be kept in mind of it, he caused a crier every day when he sat down at the table to proclaim aloud: "Great sovereign, remember the Athenians."[2] About the same time Hippias, the exiled tyrant of Athens, having retired to the court of Persia, stimulated the Persian monarch to engage in the war with Greece. Before, however, taking any effective steps, as was the usual custom with the Persians, he sent his heralds into the different states of Greece to demand earth and water as tokens of submission. The Athenians and Spartans were provoked at this demand into a violation of the law of nations, throwing one of them into a ditch, and the other into a well. All the insular and continental states of Greece, except Athens and Sparta, proffered their submission to the Persian.

The first armament fitted out by Darius for the subjugation of Greece, was entrusted to his son-in-law Mardonius. The fleet, while doubling Mount Athos was shattered by a violent storm, three hundred vessels being dashed against the rocks, and 20,000 men perished in the waves.[3]

[1] *Taylor*, 108. [2] *Tytler*, I, 128. [3] *Taylor*, 109.

Another and much more powerful armament was fitted out by Darius, B. C. 490, and placed under the command of Datis a Mede, and Artaphernes a Persian. This immense armament, which has been variously estimated in reference to its numbers, arrived safely at the island of Eubœa, then crossed the Euripus, and poured down upon Attica its seemingly resistless force of armed men. By the advice of Hippias, the Persian army encamped on the plains of Marathon, about twenty-two miles from Athens.[1]

The Athenians were at first divided in opinion as to whether they should allow the Persians to invest the city, or march out and give battle in the open field.[2] Under the advice of Aristides and Miltiades they decided on the latter.

The battle of Marathon was fought in the month of September, B. C. 490. A more particular account of it may, perhaps, be given under the element of art. It resulted in the utter discomfiture and defeat of the entire Persian host. Hippias was slain. The Persians fled to their ships, and knowing that Athens must be nearly defenseless, they thought they could sail around the promontory of Sunium, and make themselves masters of the city before the victorious army under Miltiades could return for its defense.[3] In this, however, they were mistaken, and finding Miltiades had arrived and secured the ports, they returned to Asia. In the presumptuous assurance of success, the Persians had brought with them from Asia marble to erect a triumphal monument after subjugating Greece. This falling into the hands of the Athenians, they caused their great sculptor Phidias to form out of it a statue of Nemesis, the goddess of vengeance, and on the tablets were recorded the names of the heroes who had fallen in the fight.[4]

The same Miltiades who achieved the victory of Marathon, being subsequently unsuccessful in a descent upon the island of Paros where he was severely wounded,[5] was,

[1] *Wordsworth's Greece*, 109. [2] *Taylor*, 109. [3] *Idem*, 110. [4] *Tytler*, I, 130. [5] *Taylor*, 110.

on his return, accused of receiving a bribe, convicted on doubtful evidence, sentenced to pay a heavy fine, and not having the ability to do it, was thrown into prison, where he died of his wounds.

The history of a democratic state is little more than the history of its great men, who control, more or less, its internal and external developments. Such is the fact with Athens. From the victory of Miltiades down to the time of Demosthenes,[1] its history mainly resolves itself into that of its great men, who, as generals or demagogues, had the chief direction of affairs. After the death of Miltiades, the power which he had exercised in the state was shared between Themistocles and Aristides. The first was an astute politician, a successful general, and an able statesman. The second, surnamed the Just, was prudent in counsel, and a most incorruptible patriot. The first was placed at the head of the Athenian fleet, and successfully executed the plan of Miltiades against the islands, while to the last was committed the administration of public affairs at home. On the return of the first the rivalry which for some time had existed between them, broke out into an open rupture,[2] and Aristides was banished by the ostracism. This left Themistocles at the head of affairs without a rival. He immediately commenced the execution of his design to render Athens a naval power. He induced the Athenians to appropriate the revenues they were receiving from their silver mines, to the purposes of a navy. This, in the end, proved of the highest importance to Athens, and indirectly to all Greece. Its great importance did not present itself until the next war with Persia and invasion under Xerxes.

Nine years after the battle of Marathon, Xerxes, the son and successor of Darius, collected together the most numerous army that probably the world has ever seen, and, at its head, invaded Greece in person. In order to pass from Asia to Europe, he directed a bridge of boats

---

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 186 [2] *Idem*, 187.

to be constructed between Sestos and Abydos,[1] a distance of only seven-eighths of a mile. This was demolished by a tempest, which so inflamed the wrath of the great king that he ordered those who had done the work to be beheaded; and, having thrown a pair of iron fetters into the outrageous element, he had three hundred lashes bestowed upon the water by way of punishment. A new bridge of boats was then constructed, over which the main body of the army passed, occupying the space of seven days and nights in passing.

The first interruption from a hostile foe experienced by this moving mass of men, was at the celebrated pass of Thermopylæ. This narrow strait, at one point so narrow as not to afford room for one chariot to pass another, was justly regarded as the gate of Greece. Here it was resolved to make the first stand, and here was posted Leonidas, one of the Spartan kings, with a body of 6,000 men, including 300 Spartans, who, with their king at their head, had, just previous to their departure from Sparta, celebrated their own funeral games in the sight of their wives and mothers. After taking up their position in the defile, and inviting the great king if he wished their arms to come and take them, they were assailed by 20,000 Medes, who were repulsed with dreadful slaughter. Next a chosen body of Persians, styled the immortals, charged and met with the same fate.[2] At length through treachery, a track was pointed out to Xerxes, by which the army could pass over in the night to the opposite plain. The defense of the straits being now useless, all were dismissed except the three hundred Spartans, and a few Thesbians and Thebans who held out to the last extremity, being all cut off but one man, who survived, and carried the news to Sparta. This occurred on the 6th July, B. C. 480.[3] The example here set contributed very much to the greatness of Greece.

The Persian army, in pursuing its onward route, ravaged the territory of Phocis, and a detachment was sent to

[1] *Tytler*, I, 131. [2] *Idem*, 133. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 188.

plunder and destroy the temple at Delphi. Here they were attacked by a violent storm, and by rocks rolling down on them from the summits of the precipices. And these, aided by the attacks of the Delphians, drove back the Persians in great consternation.

The mighty host of the Persians moved on towards Attica. The great object was the destruction of Athens. Thespiæ and Platæa were taken and destroyed, and the whole Persian host now moved upon Athens.

Under this perilous state of things, the Athenians, by the advice of Themistocles,[1] having sheltered their aged men and wives and children in the islands of Salamis and Ægina, took to their ships,[2] and abandoned their cherished Athens to the mercy of the Persian foe.[3] The deserted city was taken by Xerxes, and burnt on the 20th July, B. C. 480.

The next event of importance was the sea fight near Salamis. The naval forces of both the Persians and Grecians were here concentrated.[4] The one had consisted originally of 1,200 ships of war, and the other now consisted of 380, of which 180 belonged to the Athenians. Aristides and the banished Athenians were recalled. The engagement was really owing to the management of Themistocles, without which it is very doubtful whether it would have occurred. The allied fleet of the Grecians was under the immediate command of Eurybiades, the Spartan. Themistocles had strongly advised the fight, but fearing the backwardness of the commanders,[5] he had secretly conveyed intelligence to Xerxes that the Greeks were intending to disperse, and then the attempt of the Persians to blockade the harbor of Salamis was seized hold of to bring on a general engagement. The Greeks were altogether superior to the Persians as sailors, and on this occasion their superiority was made abundantly manifest. Xerxes, from a rocky eminence on the coast of Attica, was enabled to witness the whole engagement. It resulted in

[1] *Tytler*, I, 134. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 188. [3] *Taylor*, 111. [4] *Tytler*, I, 131. [5] *Taylor*, 111.

the almost total annihilation of the Persian navy, and the complete triumph of the Greeks. Xerxes became alarmed for his personal safety. His navy being destroyed, he feared lest the Greeks should also destroy his bridge of boats, and thus cut off his return to Asia. Leaving Mardonius at the head of 300,000 men to prosecute the war,[1] he made a hasty retreat, and on reaching the Hellespont and finding his bridge of boats broken down, was forced to cross the strait in a common fishing boat.

Mardonius wintered in Thessaly, and, on the opening of the next campaign, endeavored to seduce the Athenians from the Greek confederacy. In this he entirely failed. The allied forces were under the command of Pausanias the Spartan, and of Aristides, who commanded the Athenians.[2] After some previous skirmishing, in which the Greeks had the advantage, a general battle was fought near the city of Platæa. This ended in the total defeat of the Persians, and the annihilation of their army, except about 40,000, who, under Artabazus, effected their escape to the Hellespont. Some 200,000 fell in battle, and the plunder of the camp was immense. On the same day, September 25, B. C. 479, occurred the naval battle at Mycale, and the burning of the Persian fleet,[3] both which had the effect to free Greece, and that forever, from invasion by the Persians.

The war still continued, but its character was changed. Instead of being conducted by the Greeks on the defensive, it became aggressive. They now aimed to liberate their brethren of Asia Minor from the yoke of Persia. Athens, notwithstanding the obstructions thrown in the way by the Spartans, was rebuilt, and its walls completed, under the management of Themistocles, in the year B.C. 488. The harbor of Piræus was strongly fortified, and joined to Athens by what were called the long walls.

Pausanias, the Spartan, at the head of the allied Greeks, still continued the war with Persia, and took and plun-

[1] *Taylor*, 111. [2] *Idem*, 111. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 188.

dered Byzantium, the ancient site of Constantinople.[1] Being inflated with pride, he entertained the design, through the aid of the Persians, of becoming supreme master of Greece. Being recalled, a letter of his was intercepted, which disclosed his treasons, and he fled for refuge to the temple of Minerva. While all appeared in doubt as to what course to pursue, his mother walked to the gate of the temple, and laying down a stone before the threshold, silently retired.[2] Her example was immediately followed. A wall was upreared around the temple, and the traitor within was left to perish with cold and hunger.

This conduct of Pausanias, together with the want of popularity of the Spartans, caused a change in the general affairs of Greece. The chief command was transferred from the Spartans to the Athenians. Aristides was appointed treasurer. Themistocles, who had been previously banished by the ostracism, was sought to be implicated in the treason of Pausanias. He fled for protection to the Persian court, and there, after living for some time in splendor, ended his days by poison. About the same period full of years and honors, died Aristides the Just, who had for a long time administered the public finances with so little personal benefit, that he did not leave behind him sufficient to defray the expenses of his funeral. To these two individuals, Athens and all Greece were greatly indebted, but more to the former than the latter.

The transfer of the chief command to Athens was attended with highly important results. It tended to increase the jealousy between Athens and Sparta. Athens knew much better how to profit by it than Sparta had done.[3] A league was formed principally by the Grecian states without the Peloponnesus, the object of which was the continuance of the Persian war, and the liberation of the Grecian states in Asia Minor from Persian rule. To

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 112. [2] *Tytler*, I, 138. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 189.

accomplish this, a yearly tribute was fixed upon, the treasury being at Delphos, but Athens having the administration of it. The consequences were: 1. That what had been mere military precedence with Sparta, became, with Athens, political direction, and soon degenerated into supremacy. 2. The oppression, either supposed or real, soon produced discontent and opposition on the part of the allies. 3. There gradually sprung up an opposite alliance, at the head of which was Sparta, already the dominant power in the Peloponnesus.[1]

Upon the death of Aristides, Cimon, the son of Miltiades, became the leader and great man of Athens.[2] He continued with great success the war against Persia, reducing their cities and forts, in Europe, on the islands, and on the coast of Asia. He succeeded in destroying the whole Persian navy off the coast of Cyprus, B. C. 470, and then dressing his soldiers in the vestures and arms of the prisoners taken, on the very same day surprised the Persian camp at the mouth of the river Eurymedon, and before they could recover, completed their destruction. The war continued twenty-one years, during which the naval power and commercial wealth of Athens were continually increasing. The entire continuance of the war, computing the time from the burning of Sardis, was fifty-one years. Peace was at last concluded, B. C. 449. The principal terms were: 1. The independence of the Greek cities in lower Asia. 2. No Persian vessel was to appear between the northern extremity of the Thracian Bosphorus and the southern promontory of Lycia. 3. No Persian army was to come within three days' journey of the sea-coast. 4. The Athenians were to withdraw their fleets and armies from Cyprus.

During the continuance of the war, Laconia was devastated by an earthquake, destroying 120,000 of the inhabitants, and overwhelming the city of Sparta, B. C. 469.[3] This led to the third Messenian war waged by the

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 190. [2] *Taylor*, 113. [3] *Idem*, 113.

helots and remnant of the Messenians, to regain their liberty. They proved at one time quite formidable, but were finally subdued, and driven into exile.

Cimon becoming obnoxious to the democratic party, was banished by ostracism, B. C. 461. This brought Pericles at the head of the Athenian state.[1] He was a true representative of democracy.[2] Without ever having held the office of archon, or being a member of the areopagus, he governed Athens for forty years to the time of his death. He was less a general than a statesman, although he possessed some good qualities as a commander.

The forty years intervening between the year B. C. 470 to 430, was an era of the greatest splendor in Athens. The unrivalled taste and princely expenditure that marked the public buildings, and the style of embellishment adopted, rendered Athens the most splendid city in the world.[3] About the commencement of the administration of Pericles, the common treasury of Greece was removed from Delos to Athens, and the amount of the contributions was increased.[4] The Athenian presidency degenerated into a supremacy of command, some being merely allies, and others subjects.

Troubles of a domestic nature soon arose in Greece. No sooner was the pressure of a foreign war removed, than the intense activity of the Grecian spirit must display itself in broils at home. No less than three Peloponnesian wars followed in succession. In all these, the two leading powers were Athens and Sparta. The first arose from difficulties between Thebes and the other Bœotian cities.[5] Sparta took the part of Thebes, and Athens of the other cities of Bœotia.[6] The Athenians were at first repulsed at Tanagra, but the next year, B. C. 457, they were victorious on the same ground. Their fleet also ravaged the coast of the Peloponnesus, and even threatened Sparta. Cimon was recalled from banishment. A truce was finally

[1] *Taylor*, 113. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 192, 193. [3] *Idem*, 190, 191. [4] *Idem*, 193, 194. [5] *Taylor*, 113, 114. [6] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 193-6.

agreed upon for five years. Soon after, hostilities were recommenced, which were soon concluded by a peace, or truce, which was concluded for thirty years, but which continued only for fourteen. Thucydides, who was at the head of the aristocratic party at Athens, was banished B. C. 444, which left democracy triumphant, and Pericles without a rival.

The first Peloponnesian war was declared by Sparta against Athens, B. C. 431.[1] It was a war of twenty-seven years continuance, excited and prosecuted mainly through jealousy of the prosperity of the Athenians. It was a war rather of races than of nations. It was the Dorian against the Ionian race. It was a war of principles — the Spartan representing the aristocratic, and the Athenian, the democratic principle. These two states differed from each other, not only in their elements of character, in the principle of their government, but also in the sources of their power, and their relations to their allies.[2] Athens, by means of her navy, was mistress of the sea; Sparta of the land. The first, therefore, was brought into relations, more with the insular and maritime states; the last with those which were interior and continental. The allies of the Athenians, were the islands of Chios, Samos, Lesbos. All those of the Archipelago, except Thera and Melos, Corcyra, Zacynthus, the Grecian colonies of Asia Minor, the cities of Naupactus and Platæa, and those in Acarnania. Those of the Spartans were all in Peloponnesus, except Argos and Achaia, which were neutral, Megara, Locris, Phocis, Bœotia, the cities of Ambracia and Anactorium, and the island Leucasia.

The allies of the Athenians were chiefly insular and maritime, who paid, or were compelled to pay, a reluctant tribute.[3] The allies of the Spartans were chiefly continental states who had voluntarily, and free from tribute, attached themselves to the fortunes of Sparta. These relations enabled Sparta to lay claim to be considered the liberators of Greece from the Athenian yoke.

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 197. [2] *Idem*, 197. [3] *Idem*, 197.

Each party, as might naturally be expected, at first carried on the war on its own element.[1] A Spartan army ravaged Attica. An Athenian fleet plundered the coasts of the Peloponnesus. The Spartans were recalled to protect their country. The Athenians invade Megaris, and desolate its territory. The Spartans in the next campaign invade Attica. Athens was, at the same time, invaded by a more terrible enemy — the plague — which, owing to the crowded state of the city, caused by the approach of the Spartan army, proved dreadfully destructive. Pericles himself fell one of its victims.

The war continued to be prosecuted with various success.[2] Potidæa surrendered to the Athenians, who banished the inhabitants, and supplied their place with fresh colonists. Platæa, after a defense of five years, surrendered to the Spartans, who massacred the whole garrison. The Athenian people soon after decreed the same fate to the defenders of Lesbos; but on reflection reversed their decree, and sent out a fast sailing vessel, which arrived in time to prevent the massacre.

On the death of Pericles, Athens was left for the next seven years to all the consequences of an unrestrained democracy.[3] The tanner Cleon pushed forward to occupy the place of Pericles.

A sanguinary clash occurred between the aristocratic and democratic elements in Corcyra. The wildest excesses were witnessed. The democratic element finally triumphed, and its triumph was attended by the extermination of its opponents.[4]

An Athenian fleet landed in the harbor of Pylos and there erected fortifications within fifty miles of Sparta. The Spartans sent a fleet and army to besiege Pylos and garrison the island of Sphacteria. The Spartan fleet was defeated by the Athenians. The Spartans now solicit a peace, but the Athenians under the advice of Cleon, refuse.[5]

[1] *Taylor*, 116. [2] *Idem*, 116. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 199. [4] *Taylor*, 117. [5] *Idem*, 117.

He offered, if made general, to take Sphacteria in twenty days. The Athenians, always ready for a joke, took him at his word. By a fire accidentally occurring and destroying the Spartan fortifications, he was enabled to do it. The island of Cytheria was also captured, and the harbor of Nicæa and other seaports on the coast of the Peloponnesus were destroyed.

While these successes were attending the Athenians in one part of Greece, they were counterbalanced by their defeat at Delium,[1] by the revolt of their northern colonies, and the commencement of hostilities against them by Perdiccas, king of Macedon. Brasidas, the ablest of the Spartan generals, was sent north to aid the revolted colonies. Cleon, at the head of the Athenian army, was sent against him. A battle was fought in which Brasidas and Cleon were both slain.

Both parties had become about equally tired of the war, and desirous of its termination. A peace was therefore concluded, or rather a truce, for fifty years,[2] the basis of it being a mutual restitution, which, on the part of Sparta, amounted to a sacrifice of the interests of her allies.

The peace, or truce, was not of long continuance. The allies on both sides were dissatisfied. Alcibiades, the nephew of Pericles, young,[3] handsome, vain, ambitious, cunning, talented, and unscrupulous, obtained the ascendency at Athens,[4] fully possessed with the idea that his own consequence could only be established by war.

The second Peloponnesian war was commenced between the Argives and Spartans. The Athenians instigated the Argives to commence it, trusting that, by their union with Argos, they might secure their preponderance in the Peloponnesus.[5] This was defeated by the result of the battle near Mantinea. The Athenians attacked the Dorian island of Melos,[6] and, having taken it, massacred the inhabitants. At the instigation of Alcibiades they fit out an expedition

[1] *Taylor*, 117-18. [2] *Idem*, 118. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 200. [4] *Taylor*, 118. [5] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 200. [6] *Taylor*, 118.

against Syracuse, the forces being placed under the command of himself, Nicias and Lamachus. The last mentioned died. The first being ordered home to be tried for his life, on a charge of impiety and sacrilege, fled to Sparta. The result of the expedition was in the extremest degree disastrous.[1] After suffering a series of defeats, all the forces were compelled to surrender at discretion; the generals were put to death, and the common soldiers sold as slaves. This calamity most effectually crippled the power of Athens.

The Spartans, under the advice of Alcibiades, strongly fortified and garrisoned Deceleia, a town about fifteen miles from Athens, and commanding its richest lands.[2] This subjected the Athenians to be harassed by a continual war instead of annual incursions. The Spartans, also, by means of the gold they obtained from Persia, were enabled to fit out a large fleet and send it into the Ægean sea.

Notwithstanding their reverses, the Athenians maintained their courage, rose superior to their calamities, and prepared to meet the crisis with enthusiasm. The same Alcibiades, who was really at the foundation of their disasters, now became the cause of their temporary triumph. Being driven from Sparta, by his vices, he commenced negotiations for the benefit of the Athenians with Tissaphernes the Persian satrap.[3] He was at length recalled, but being desirous of signalizing his return by some remarkable exploit, he hastened with a small squadron to aid the Athenian fleet, the moment it had joined battle with the Spartans. This timely reenforcement gave the Athenians the victory. Not content with this, he persuaded the Athenians to attack the Spartans in the harbor of Cyzicus, and, by his prudent arrangements, the whole hostile fleet was either taken or destroyed. This was followed by the reestablishment of the Athenian ascendency in the Thracian Chersonesus. He now returned home,

[1] *Taylor*, 119. [2] *Idem*, 119. [3] *Idem*, 120.

was welcomed with great enthusiasm, and created commander-in-chief of the Athenian forces by sea and land.

The affairs of Sparta were retrieved by Lysander, a man of great duplicity and cunning, who, obtaining funds from Cyrus, the governor of lower Asia, was enabled to increase the pay of the sailors, and by that means to deprive the Athenians of their most experienced mariners.[1] A large navy was thus got on foot, and, during the absence of Alcibiades, his lieutenant Antiochus, contrary to his instructions, having risked a naval engagement with Lysander, was defeated with the loss of fifteen ships.[2] Alcibiades, being suspected of treachery, was again deposed and banished, and fled to his fortress in Thrace.

Callicratidas, the successor of Lysander in the command of the allied fleet, was defeated by the Athenians off the islands of Arginusæ. The war languished until the reappointment of Lysander. He attacked, unexpectedly to them, the Athenian fleet at the mouth of Ægos Potamos (goats river), and totally destroyed it, with the exception of eight galleys which were saved by the prudence of Conon.[3] 3,000 prisoners were taken, and inhumanly butchered. The principal maritime states in alliance with Athens were now reduced, and the importation of grain into the devoted city of Athens was prevented. He now blockaded the harbor of Athens with a fleet of one hundred and fifty sail, while Agis, the Spartan king, attacked the city by land. The Athenians made a vigorous defense, but were finally compelled to surrender, B. C. 404. The conditions of their submission were, that their democratic form of government should be abolished, all power to be intrusted to thirty individuals to be named by Sparta.[4] All their ships but twelve to be surrendered; their walls to be demolished; their foreign possessions to be resigned, and they to follow the Spartan standard in war. Soon after this, Alcibiades was slain in a Phrygian village by assassins sent for that purpose by Pharnabazus the Persian satrap.

[1] *Taylor*, 120. [2] *Idem*, 120. [3] *Idem*, 121. [4] *Idem*, 121.

The second Peloponnesian war destroyed the supremacy of Athens in the affairs of Greece, and gave the preeminence to Sparta. The confederates soon found that they had lost by the change.[1] Sparta imposed upon them a yoke more severe and galling than they had ever before experienced.[2] She laid aside her poverty, and decreed "that the state might possess a treasure." The party of Lysander, both at Sparta and among the confederates, were particularly noted for their cruelty and rapacity. They established at Athens a detested oligarchy of thirty tyrants. The Athenian Acropolis contained a Spartan garrison to enforce the decrees of this oligarchy. The most dreadful outbursts of passion, cruelty and rapacity were everywhere practiced. There were, in fact, but two classes of inhabitants. The one consisted of the oppressors and their instruments, to the number of some three thousand. The other consisted of the victims who were unarmed, who were mercilessly plundered, and, if at all suspected, were either slain or driven into exile. The walls were demolished, the dockyards dismantled, and even the bema, or pulpit on the Pnyx, from which the Athenian orators addressed the assemblies of the people, was turned to the land side,[3] that glorious recollections might not be awakened by the view of the sea. Oligarchies, similar to that of Athens, were established in other Grecian cities, who were everywhere creatures of Sparta, and guilty of similar acts of cruelty, rapacity and oppression.

At length human endurance could go no further. Even Thebes, formerly the most inveterate enemy of Athens, began to sympathize with the distresses of the subverted city. The exiled Athenians there assembled under Thrasybulus. Their first attempt in which they were successful, was to seize Phyle, a strong fortress on the frontiers of Attica and Bœotia. The thirty tyrants and their adherents flew to arms; but they could do little against the strong moral force of the community. They were defeated

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 203, 204. [2] *Taylor*, 121, 122. [3] *Taylor*, 122.

while Thrasybulus seized upon the Piræus. Lysander quickly came to the aid of the thirty, and blockaded the Piræus. But a strong party was formed against him even in Sparta, and Pausanias, a popular Spartan king, hastily marched with a second army to frustrate his plans. Under his auspices the tyrants were stripped of their power; the Spartan garrison withdrawn from the Acropolis, and the ancient constitution of Athens restored.[1] Some of the tyrants were degraded and put to death. Others retired to Eleusis, and a general act of amnesty was passed.

The restoration of Athens was almost immediately signalized by a singular exhibition of that remarkable people. This was the condemnation and death of Socrates on the frivolous charge of impiety, B.C. 400.

Just about this period the Greeks became again embroiled with Persia.[2] Cyrus, the governor of lower Asia, revolted against his brother Artaxerxes Mnemon, and with an army of one hundred thousand men, and thirteen thousand Greeks, principally Spartans, he invaded the provinces of Upper Asia. In the province of Babylonia, a great battle was fought, which resulted in the death of Cyrus, and the defeat of his army. This was followed by the memorable retreat of the ten thousand Greeks, under the command of Xenophon the historian. They fought their way back about one thousand miles through a hostile country, and after undergoing innumerable fatigues, arrived safely in Greece. This is justly accounted one of the striking events of history.

This led to a war between the Greeks and Persians. Agesilaus, who had been raised to the Spartan throne, was sent with an army into Asia to carry on the war. He defeated the Persians in several engagements, and even began to threaten the subversion of the empire,[3] when he was recalled home by the Ephori. This was rendered necessary by the occurrence of the third Peloponnesian war. Sparta was here the aggressor. A Spartan army

[1] *Taylor*, 122. [2] *Idem*, 123. [3] *Idem*, 123.

under Lysander and Pausanias, under the most frivolous pretenses, invaded the Theban territories. The former was slain, and the Spartans under him defeated, while forming the siege of Haliartus, B.C. 394. The latter evacuated Bœotia and returned to Sparta. A league was immediately formed against Sparta, consisting of Argos, Thebes, Athens, and Corinth, most of the colonies in Thrace and Macedon, also acceding. This led to the recall of Agesilaus from Asia. He returned reluctantly from the career of conquest upon which he had started,[1] leaving his fleet and a portion of his army under the command of his kinsman Pisander.

Conon, the Athenian, by the aid he received from Persia, fitted out a fleet with which he engaged the Spartans off the harbor of Cnidus, gained over them a decisive victory, and annihilated the Spartan navy. This had the effect to destroy the empire of Sparta over the maritime states, and to restore the supremacy of Athens, in the Ægean sea. Shortly after this occurred the battle of Corneia between the Theban army and the Spartan, under Agesilaus.[2] The Spartan was victorious, but with a severe loss, Agesilaus himself being wounded. These were the only important engagements that occurred during the continuance of this war, which lasted during eight years.

At length the peace of Antalcidas was concluded, by which the liberty of the Greek cities was sacrificed, and the independence of all the minor republics proclaimed.[3] This was designed to prevent Athens from asserting her superiority over the maritime states, and Thebes from becoming mistress of the Bœotian cities. It was a disgraceful peace concocted between Sparta and Persia, in which unworthy jealousy and selfish policy were too decidedly prominent. The Persian monarch and the Spartan republic took upon themselves the enforcement of its provisions.

About the year B. C. 383, the Spartan general Phœbidus, in a time of peace, seized upon the Cadmeia or citadel of

[1] *Taylor*, 124. [2] *Idem*, 124. [3] *Idem*, 125.

Thebes, placing therein a Spartan garrison, establishing an oligarchy, thus dooming the devoted city to the same miseries that Athens had undergone under the dominion of the thirty tyrants. Many of the Theban patriots fled as exiles to Athens, where they were kindly received. Among these was Pelopidas,[1] who concerted with a friend at Thebes, a plan for liberating the city, which was carried out with such success that many of the tyrants were slain, and the remainder driven from Thebes.

Now commences the ascendency of Thebes, and her rivalship with Sparta. Her greatness was essentially the work of two men, with whom she rose and fell. These were Pelopidas and Epaminondas.[2] The duumvirate was, perhaps, the most remarkable of any with which history makes us acquainted.

After the liberation of Thebes by Pelopidas and his associates, Cleombrotus was sent with a Spartan army into Bœotia. Pelopidas was chosen general by his grateful countrymen, and achieved two splendid victories, one at Tanagra, and one at Tegyra. The Athenians were, in the meantime, sweeping the Spartan navy from the seas, and infesting the coasts of the Peloponnesus. The maritime states renewed their confederacy under the supremacy of Athens.

Cleombrotus again invaded Bœotia with a powerful army. The two armies met on the memorable field of Leuctra, where the Theban, under the command of Epaminondas, adopting a new system of tactics, and attacking the long lines of the Spartans with his massy columns, won a decisive victory in which Cleombrotus was slain.[3]

This success aroused the hopes of the Peloponnesian states that had long bowed under the dominion of Sparta. These sent pressing messages into Bœotia for aid. Epaminondas and Pelopidas were sent into the Peloponnesus at the head of a powerful army. They advanced into Laconia, where no enemy had dared to make his appearance

[1] *Taylor*, 125. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 206. [3] *Taylor*, 126.

for five centuries. The whole country was laid desolate. They rebuilt the ancient city of Messene, protected its citadel by a Theban garrison, and called back the wrecks of the Messenian nation.[1]

The Athenians now grew jealous of the Thebans, made an alliance with the Spartans, and sent an army to their aid under the command of Iphicrates. Upon learning this, the Theban army returned home laden with plunder.

The Peloponnesian war continued during the six following years.[2] The Spartans were long occupied in Laconia in subduing their revolted subjects, while the Thebans were engaged at the north, in a war with Alexander, tyrant of Phere. Thither Pelopidas was sent with an army. He forced Alexander to submit, and restored Perdiccas, the lawful heir, to the throne of Macedon. On his return he was treacherously seized by the tyrant Alexander, and thrown into prison. He was liberated by Epaminondas, who came with an army for that purpose. He was afterwards sent as embassador to Persia, where he induced the Persian monarch Artaxerxes to break off his alliance with Sparta, and to conclude a league with Thebes. He afterwards fell in a battle with the tyrant Alexander, where he was triumphant.

The greater number of the Grecian states refused to ratify the union formed between Persia and Thebes, in part from hostility to Persia, and in part from jealousy of Thebes. Epaminondas, at the head of a Theban army, again marched into Laconia. By a forced march he appeared before Sparta itself, and made a vigorous attack upon it in the absence of the Spartan army. The attack was repelled by Archidamus, the son of Agesilaus, and the Theban army retreated. An attempt was then made to seize the city of Mantinæa, which failed in consequence of the accidental arrival of a squadron of Athenian cavalry a little before the appearance of the Theban army. These things determined Epaminondas to hazard a pitched

[1] *Taylor*, 126. [2] *Idem*, 127.

battle which was fought in the neighborhood of Mantinæa, and was the most sanguinary conflict in which the Greeks had ever yet engaged. The Theban triumphed, but the Theban hero was slain.

The glory of Thebes perished with Epaminondas.[1] A peace was concluded on the single condition that each republic should retain its respective possessions.

The result of this war seems to have been to destroy the supremacy of any single power in Greece.[2] Sparta was enfeebled by her efforts and the loss of Messene, and Thebes by that of its leaders. An equality is brought about among the states of Greece, but this was the result rather of debility than of strength.

About the year B. C. 356 commenced the sacred war, which continued for ten years. This was occasioned by a decree of the amphyctionic council, which subjected the Phocians to a fine for cultivating some lands consecrated to Apollo, and also imposed a penalty on the Spartans for treacherously seizing and occupying the Cadmeia of Thebes. The Phocians refused compliance, and, under their leader Philomelus, stormed and took the city of Delphi, and seized its treasures by which they were enabled to raise a mercenary army. The Thebans and Locrians undertook to avenge the insult thus offered to religion, and continued to carry on the war chiefly by petty skirmishes,[3] avoiding great battles. It was conducted in a very sanguinary spirit on both sides, the captives taken being generally slain. Philomelus being defeated, and having destroyed himself by leaping from a precipice, was succeeded by his brother Onomarchus, who continued the war. Philip, king of Macedon, being finally applied to by the Thebans,[4] and, having been long desirous of an opportunity to intermeddle in the affairs of Greece, appeared with an army in Thessaly, routed the Phocians and slew their leader Onomarchus. The second time he passed the straits of Thermopylæ,

[1] *Taylor*, 128. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 209, 210. [3] *Taylor*, 129.
[4] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 210, 211.

dismantled the Phocian cities, desolated their country, and caused their vote in the amphictyonic council to be transferred to the king of Macedon.

A new sacred war was occasioned by the refusal of the Locrians of Amphissa to yield obedience to a decree of the amphictyons,[1] procured by Æschines, who was in the interests of Philip. The conducting of it was entrusted to the king of Macedon. He took Amphissa by storm, and seized and fortified Elateia, the capital of Phocis. The Athenians and Thebans now took the alarm. The power of Demosthenean oratory once more aroused the slumbering energies of Athens and of Greece. But it was only to make one last and expiring effort. The hostile armies met at Chæronea. The Athenians and Thebans met with a total defeat.[2] The independence of the Grecian states was totally destroyed. In a general convention of the amphictyonic states held at Corinth, B. C. 337, Philip was chosen captain-general of confederate Greece, and appointed to lead the allied forces against the Persian empire. This brings the Grecian states under the dominion of another power, that of the Macedonian, and leads us to the consideration of that power.

Macedonia was separated from the rest of Europe on the north by the Hæmus range of mountains,[3] and from Greece on the south by the Cambunian chain. It extended to the Ægean sea on the east, and to the Adriatic on the west. Its soil on the sea coast was fruitful, and many of its mountains were rich in mineral treasures. It was anciently said to contain one hundred and fifty different nations, but in making this enumeration each of its cities and towns was regarded as an independent state.

An Argive colony under Caranus, B.C. 813, laid the foundation of the Macedonian kingdom. It is little known for three hundred years, when it became tributary to the Persians, B.C. 513. It regained its independence by the battle of Platæa, B.C. 479.

[1] *Taylor*, 130. [2] *Idem*, 130. [3] *Idem*, 131.

Archelaus, B.C. 413, erected walls and fortresses, and introduced civilization and the arts of life.[1] He made his court the seat of literature, patronizing learning and learned men. His death was succeeded by an unquiet period. The law of succession not being definitely fixed, several pretenders to the crown appeared, each finding support in some neighboring nation or Grecian republic.

The three sons of Amyntas II, Alexander, Perdiccas and Philip, successively occupied the throne; the two first, however, amid great disturbances. On the death of the second,[2] Philip, then a hostage at Thebes, was chosen king in preference to his nephew, then an infant.

The twenty-four years' reign of Philip was very eventful and instructive to the student of history. It is rendered interesting by his somewhat singular policy. Although his more than questionable morality[3] exhibits unfavorably the pupil of Epaminondas, yet he lost not his courage at an almost desperate beginning, and was not deserted by prudence in his highest prosperity.

He found the kingdom assailed by no less than four formidable armies, and distracted by the claims of two rival competitors for the crown, one of whom was supported by the Athenians. He, however, displayed valor and wisdom adequate to the crisis. Purchasing the forbearance of the Illyrians, Pæonians and Thracians, he marched with his whole force against Argæus and his Athenian auxiliaries, whom he defeated, slaying their leader. He succeeded in less than two years, in restoring tranquillity to his kingdom.

Having constructed the Macedonian phalanx, from a hint taken from the tactics of Epaminondas,[4] he was not long in testing its superiority. Being forced to war by the Pæonians, he subdued their country, and rendered it a Macedonian province. He overthrew the Illyrians, and compelled them to sue for peace.

[1] *Taylor*, 132. [2] *Idem*, 133. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 216. [4] *Taylor*, 133.

The great and early object of Philip was to acquire influence and control in the affairs of Greece. The only Grecian state that made an early opposition to this was Athens. During the first sacred war with the Phocians he attempted to seize Thermopylæ, the key of Greece, but was repulsed by the Athenians.[1] The great Demosthenes expended the energies of his life mainly in opposing the designs of Philip. Although Philip was generally successful, yet his troops were driven from the island of Eubœa, by Phocion, the last and most incorruptible of the Athenian generals and statesmen.

The policy of Philip was to lull the Athenians, or keep them engaged in idle discussions by means of the employment of venal orators, whom he kept in pay in Athens for that purpose, while he was steadily engaged in the one great object of acquiring supremacy in Greece.[2] While the Athenians were thus amused, he succeeded in obtaining, by means of treachery, the city of Olynthus, the ally of Athens, the walls and buildings of which he leveled with the ground, dragging its inhabitants into captivity. This was followed by his conquest of the Chalcidian peninsula, with its valuable commercial marts and sea ports. He terminated the sacred war by the destruction of the Phocians, and acquired a commanding influence in the Peloponnesus, by completing the humiliation of the Spartans.[3]

After subduing the commercial cities in the Thracian Chersonese, and on the shores of the Propontis, and after terminating the third sacred war by the destruction of Amphissa, he threw off the mask, took and fortified Elateia, thus giving the Grecian states clearly to understand that he designed to become their master. Thebes and Athens took the alarm, and aroused in defense of Grecian liberty.[4] But it was too late. The counsels and admonitions of Demosthenes had been too long disregarded. On the plains of Chæronea they were totally defeated, and an end put to Grecian independence. The Thebans were

[1] *Taylor*, 133, 134. [2] *Idem*, 134. [3] *Idem*, 134. [4] *Idem*, 134.

treated with severity, but the Athenians with forbearance and kindness. Soon after, at a convention of the states held at Corinth, they resolved to commence an aggressive war against Persia, and appointed Philip captain general of the confederate forces. While making preparations for this great enterprise, Philip was stabbed to the heart by Pausanias, a Macedonian nobleman, B.C. 336.

Philip's policy was a crafty and crooked one. He accomplished much by bribery. It was said that he opened the cities of his enemy with a golden key.[1] But he had more than one method. He borrowed as well as bestowed. It is remarked that he rarely, if ever, made use of the same means twice. He was ever methodical and consistent even in carousal and crime, and seldom, if ever reappeared in the same form.

His power in Macedonia might be said to be unlimited. His nobility were his life guards;[2] his court, his general staff; and the nation became, under him, transformed from a shepherd people to a race of warriors.

Alexander the Great was the son of Philip and Olympias, a woman equally remarkable for her crimes and her misfortunes. She was the daughter, mother, sister and wife of kings. The reign of Alexander was remarkable, both from the extent of the revolution he occasioned, from its continuance and its consequences. He is strictly an historical personage, his acts and exploits being well attested, and all within the range of history.

The way had been gradually preparing for the advent of just such a man as Alexander. He was the son of Philip, and the pupil of Aristotle. The death of his father was the signal for revolt among the Thracians and Illyrians.[3] They were soon subdued. A report having been circulated that he had fallen in Illyria, the states of Greece revolted, Thebes being the leader. In about fourteen days' time he appeared before Thebes, took the city by assault, leveled its walls, and killed and carried into

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 219, 221. [2] *Idem*, 221. [3] *Taylor*, 135.

captivity the inhabitants. A cry of terror rang through Greece.[1] All the states proffered a ready submission. The general confederacy was again renewed, and, in the assembly at Corinth, he was appointed commander-in-chief of the Greeks against the Persians. He left Antipater governor of Macedon and Greece, and with an army of only 5,000 horse and 30,000 foot, crossed the Hellespont without opposition, to invade the great Persian empire, B. C. 334. Memnon advised to lay waste the country, and retreat before the Macedonian army, in order to compel their return from want of subsistence.[2] This prudent counsel was disregarded, and an immense Persian army was collected to dispute the passage of the Granicus, a river running from Mount Ida into the Propontis.

Alexander forded the river at the head of his cavalry, and, having exposed himself to great personal danger, attacked, and with a very trifling loss, defeated the entire Persian host. This was followed by the subjugation of all west of the river Halys, and before the closing of the first campaign, he was the undisputed master of Asia Minor.[3]

The second campaign was commenced by the reduction of Phrygia. He marched through the Syrian gates and reached the bay of Issus. Here, amid the defiles and passes of the mountains, he encountered Darius with an immense army, and totally defeated him. His camp with its immense riches, his mother, wife, daughters and infant son became the prey of the conqueror. The captives were treated with great respect and humanity.

His next object was to subdue the maritime provinces, and thus become master of the sea. He experienced little or no resistance until he came to the city of Tyre. That refused to open its gates to Alexander. After a siege of seven months' continuance, he took it by assault, and massacred or enslaved the inhabitants.[4] The same fate also awaited the resistance of Gaza. He next entered Egypt, where no resistance was offered. Here he laid the

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 222. [2] *Taylor*, 135. [3] *Idem*, 135. [4] *Idem*, 136.

foundations of the city of Alexandria, the site of which was admirably selected for maritime and commercial purposes. The erection of this city affords clear evidence of his far-reaching sagacity, and is itself a monument far more lasting than all his victories.[1]

In the beginning of the fourth campaign he crossed the Euphrates and Tigris, and entered the plains of Assyria. Here was fought another great battle on the plains near Arbela, which decided the fate of the Persian empire, B. C. 331. The result was a complete victory. The Grecians lost about 500 men, while the slain of the Persians amounted to 40,000.[2] This was succeeded by the taking of Babylon, Susa and Persepolis, the last of which was destroyed.

Darius, the last of the Persian monarchs, was first deposed by Bessus, one of his satraps, then thrown into chains, and finally murdered by him or his order. His death was severely avenged by Alexander who subdued all the rebellious satraps of Bactria and Sogdiana,[3] and thus effected the complete conquest of the Persian empire.

He next projected the invasion of India, B. C. 327. His advance was by the route of Kandahar, the same that is still in use by caravans going to and from Persia. He pushed on to the Indus, which he crossed without opposition, and continued his march through the country of the Punjab, or land of the five rivers, until he reached the banks of the Hydaspes. Here he encountered Porus, with an army much more numerous than the Macedonian,[4] and having three hundred war chariots and two hundred elephants. The Indian army was totally defeated, and Porus taken prisoner.

He continued his march eastward as far as the Hyphasis. Here his army unanimously refused to continue their march, and he was reluctantly forced to return. He transported his army in vessels on the Hydaspes to its junction with the Indus, and thence to the ocean. His

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 223. [2] *Taylor*, 136, 137. [3] *Idem*, 137. [4] *Idem*, 138.

general, Nearchus, surveyed the coast from the mouth of the Indus to that of the Euphrates, while he proceeded by land to Persepolis through the solitudes of Gedrosia.[1]

Although he failed in conquering India, yet the connection between Europe and that remarkable country was much his work. He established several colonies on his march which secured the communication by land,[2] while the voyage of his general, Nearchus, between the mouths of the Indus and Euphrates, did much to establish that by the sea.

The next object of Alexander was to consolidate his vast empire. In attempting to do this, he experienced some difficulties.[3] Macedonia was exhausted by the great number of recruits drawn from thence. He had many different nations and even races to govern. He could not expect to keep all these in subjection by Macedonian garrisons. The course he seems to have marked out was to overturn as little as possible; everywhere to respect religion, and established customs and usages; to protect the conquered from oppression;[4] to leave much of the civil government in hands similar to those with whom he found it; and to content himself with entrusting the command of the principal garrisons only to Macedonians.

His plans for the future appear to have been as splendid as had been his heroic achievements. He succeeded in elevating himself above national prejudices.[5] He designed making Babylon the chief city of his empire, and the capital of the world. The union of the east and the west was to be cemented by intermarriages; by a common system of education; by the establishment of business relations; and commercial pursuits. By pursuing these means a vast empire would in time be consolidated, united and bound together by strong if not indissoluble ties, the sceptre of which might be transmitted to his descendants.

[1] *Taylor*, 138. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 225–6. [3] *Idem*, 226. [4] *Idem*, 26. [5] *Idem*, 227.

While in the midst of these splendid schemes he was suddenly cut down in Babylon, B. C. 323, at the age of thirty-three and removed from this scene of his triumph. His sudden death at this time was probably the greatest calamity that could befall mankind. His legal heir, at the time of his death was unborn; he made no provision for a successor;[1] and failed even to appoint a regency. From the Indus to the Nile the world might be said to lay in ruins, a disorganized mass of materials. He had trained up great generals, but there was no one superior mind that could take his place and awe into submission the discordant elements.

For the period of twenty-two years immediately succeeding the death of Alexander, there occurred what might not inaptly be styled the world's great interregnum. There existed an almost complete state of anarchy,[2] confusion and warfare between the generals of Alexander. The wars were principally carried on between Perdiccas, Ptolemy Lagus,[3] Antigonus, Antipater and Craterus, Eumenes, Lysimachus, and Seleucas. The combinations formed, battles fought, and the wars carried on between these generals, each striving for supremacy, were really possessed of little general interest, as they had few important consequences following them.

The battle of Ipsus in Phrygia ended the life and power of Antigonus, and from the occurrence of that event things assumed a more settled form, and the kingdoms that emerged from the ruins of the Macedonian empire became more definite and clearly settled. These kingdoms were: 1. The Syro-Median under the Seleucidæ. 2. Egypt under the Ptolemies. 3. Macedonia and Greece.

The first effect produced in Greece, upon receiving intelligence of the death of Alexander, was that liberty was the universal cry.[4] Demosthenes, although in exile, renewed his active exertions to secure the freedom of Greece. He succeeded in engaging several states to unite with

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 227. [2] *Idem*, 228–238. [3] *Taylor*, 138–144. [4] *Tytler*, I, 201.

Athens, and to equip a fleet of two hundred and forty galleys. Hostilities were immediately commenced against their Macedonian masters.

Antipater, who had been left in charge of Macedon, was at first unsuccessful, but ultimately succeeded in defeating the confederates, and in reducing them again to submission. The democratic form of government was abolished in Athens, and the aristocratic established in its place. The Athenians were compelled to bear the expenses of the war, and to deliver up Demosthenes, who, to escape falling into the hands of his enemies, terminated his life by taking poison. A statue was erected to his memory, in the Prytaneum,[1] with this inscription: "If thy power, O Demosthenes, had been equal to thy wisdom and abilities, the Macedonian wars had never ruled in Greece."

Antipater, at his death, bequeathed Macedon and Greece to Polyperchon, one of the oldest officers of Alexander, instead of preferring to him his own son, Cassander. This led to war growing out of rival claims. Cassander took Athens, and appointed Demetrius Phalerius, governor. He was a descendant of Conon, and was distinguished by his virtue and ability. His administration continued ten years,[2] during which the Athenians were happy under his wise and good government. The revenues were increased, the useful arts encouraged, justice administered, and abuses reformed. The Athenians erected to his honor three hundred statues.

At the expiration of the ten year rule of Phalerius, Demetrius Poliorcetes, son of Antigonus, besieged and took Athens,[3] and restored the democratic constitution. He, in turn, became the idol of the populace, who threw down the statues of Demetrius Phalerius, to render themselves the more acceptable to their new deliverer.

He afterwards became unfortunate, and fled from the battle of Ipsus to Athens; but the Athenians refused to receive him into their city.[4] He afterwards, in some mea-

[1] *Tytler*, 1, 202. [2] *Idem*, 203. [3] *Idem*, 204, 205. [4] *Idem*, 205.

sure, retrieved his fallen fortunes, retook the city, but treated the Athenians with clemency.

For several years next succeeding the death of Alexander, Grecian history exhibits little, if anything, to which any real importance can be attached. Revolutions were of frequent occurrence, but unimportant in themselves or their consequences.[1] Violent transitions are made from one form of government to another. Political changes occur not by reason of the action of the internal spirit or genius of the state, or by any contentions that gave occasion for a display of noble or manly passions, but they were effected by the will of a despot, or a submissive, spiritless, and corrupted people. Yet in a corner of Greece was still preserved a people, till now hardly known, who were fortunate enough to retain their ancient manners,[2] their primitive simplicity, patriotism, and love of country. These were the states of Achaia. They were yet to appear upon the theatre of Grecian action. Greece had had her storms and her severe convulsions, but her sun was yet to descend in an evening of beauty.[3]

Grecian history exhibits the successive triumphs of her different states. We have seen in the ascendant Athens, then Sparta, and finally Thebes. We are now to witness the states of Achaia.

The Achaian republic originally consisted of twelve small republics, or rather of twelve cities, with the demesnes attached to them.[4] Each city or state possessed a democratical form of government, and the principle upon which their league or association was formed was that of perfect equality. Through the convulsions that had shaken Greece, and the Peloponnesian wars, in which almost all the states of Greece had been engaged, they had succeeded in preserving their neutrality.

This league continued from the time of its formation, until the death of Alexander.[5] In the troubled times that

[1] *Tytler*, I, 206. [2] *Idem*, 206. [3] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 286. [4] *Idem*, 146. [5] *Idem*, 286.

succeeded that event, it was temporarily dissolved, especially as after the battle of Ipsus, Demetrius and his son Antigonus made the Peloponnesus the chief seat of their power. Some of these cities they occupied, and in others tyrants sprang up who attained the exercise of the supreme power.

In the year B. C. 281, four of these cities broke free from other associations, and renewed between themselves their ancient league.[1] Within the next succeeding five years, the other cities gradually followed. The league, however, did not become powerful until other states had united with it. Aratus, to whom the revival of the league was principally owing, in the year B. C. 251, liberated Sicyon, which immediately joined the league, and about eight years after, the strong fortress and city of Corinth was added, and also Megara. It was afterwards still further strengthened by the accession of several Grecian states, and among others, of Athens. The principal regulations of the league were: 1. Entire political equality among the members. 2. The preservation of the internal constitution of each city. 3. Two yearly assemblies of the deputies at Ægium, and subsequently at Corinth, for the transaction of business of common interest, where the head of the league, called the strategus, and the chief magistrates called the demiurgi, were elected.

Like the other Grecian states, it owed its elevation and success to its great men, with whose individual histories, its own is, to a great extent, identified.[2] These were Aratus, Philopœmen and Lycortas. The first was the soul of the new league. He was possessed of uncommon endowments, vigilant, enterprising, prompt in decision, and possessed of a ready and forcible eloquence. At the age of twenty he delivered Sicyon from a domestic tyranny, and annexed it to the league.[3] At twenty-eight he was elected prætor of Achaia. During the first year of his magistracy, he expelled the Macedonian garrison from

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 286. [2] *Idem*, 287. [3] *Tytler*, I, 207.

Corinth, which gave the command of the isthmus and the entry into Peloponnesus. One of the consequences of this was, that Megara, Troezene and Epidaurus joined the confederacy.

This league or assemblage of little republics, was not well fitted to support an offensive war, for two reasons: 1. A number of separate, independent states, or republics, can never be expected to act with unanimity. The inevitable consequence is that measures are seldom adopted with celerity or enforced with energy. 2. These confederated states were neither populous nor wealthy, and were incapable of mustering a strong force in the field.[1] Aratus, therefore, directed his chief attention to the adoption of such measures as would secure his country from attack, and from the necessity of going to war. He also endeavored to strengthen the confederacy by adding to it other states.

Sparta was now in the midst of a revolution.[2] Agis IV was endeavoring to restore the ancient laws of Lycurgus which had long since fallen into disuse. But there generally arrives a period in the history of states, when political infirmity has attained such a pitch that recovery is impossible. Sparta had reached that period. The plan of Agis was prematurely disclosed, and he was seized, condemned and executed.

Cleomenes, the son and successor of his colleague, Leonidas, embraced the same noble design that had animated Agis. After preparing the way he assembled the people, proclaimed the abolition of all debts, made a new partition of the lands of the republic,[3] and restored the ancient plan of education, the institution of the public tables, and the regimen of Lycurgus. He was hailed the second founder and father of his country.

This revolution very naturally awakened the fears of the other states of Greece, lest Sparta should once more attain to supremacy and dominion. Achaia entertained this

[1] *Tytler*, I, 207. [2] *Idem*, 208. [3] *Idem*, 209.

jealousy. So far was it carried that she even formed an alliance with Macedon to oppose the ambition of Sparta.

The Macedonians under Antigonus Doson, entered the Peloponnesus with a large army, attacked and defeated the Spartans under Cleomenes, who fled to Egypt, and Sparta falling into the hands of the conqueror, its new constitution and short lived freedom were forever annihilated.[1]

The successor of Antigonus to the Macedonian throne, was Philip II, a prince, young, brave, eloquent and ambitious. He early sought to attain the dominion over all Greece, formed a league with the states of Achaia,[2] and procured the death of Aratus and his son by poison. He also formed a treaty with Hannibal the Carthaginian, by the terms of which he was to furnish a large fleet and army to conquer Italy.

By these means the Romans became introduced into Greece. They resolved to find sufficient employment for Philip at home.[3] They accordingly enlisted against him the Ætolians, the republics of Sparta and Elis, and the king of Pergamus. Philip was supported by the Achaians, the Acarnanians and the Bœotians.

Philip triumphed over the Ætolians, and entered into an alliance with Prusias, king of Bithynia, against Attalus, king of Pergamus.[4] He attacked the Athenians, who made their appeal to Rome. A Roman fleet and army were immediately dispatched, and arrived just in time to save the city.

In the second campaign occurred the fatal battle of Cynoscephalæ, so called from its being fought on a range of low hills resembling dogs' heads.[5] In this battle Philip was entirely defeated by the Romans under the consul Flaminius. This, in effect, put a period to the kingdom of Macedon. Philip, after this, sunk into insignificance. On his death he was succeeded by Perseus, his son,[6] the last

[1] *Tytler*, I, 209. [2] *Idem*, 210. [3] *Taylor*, 169-50. [4] *Idem*, 150. [5] *Idem*, 150. [6] *Tytler*, I, 211.

of the Macedonian kings. He was defeated by the Roman consul Æmilius, in the battle of Pydna. He afterwards surrendered himself up and was led in triumph to Rome.

The triumph of Rome over the Macedonian monarch, in the battle of Cynoscephalæ, paved the way for the introduction into Greece of the Roman supremacy. In the peace, which was concluded after that battle, it was stipulated that Philip[1] should withdraw all his garrisons from all the Grecian states in Europe and Asia; that he should deliver up his whole fleet, and maintain no more than 500 armed men; that he should not carry on any war out of Macedonia, without the previous consent of the Romans; that he should pay one thousand talents, and give up his son Demetrius as an hostage.

The supremacy over Greece having been thus transferred from Macedon to Rome,[2] it was for some little time uncertain what course of policy the latter would adopt. That was to be announced at the next ensuing Isthmian games, when all Greece would be assembled. Then, when all were full of anxiety and conjecture, the trumpet sounded, and a public crier was made to proclaim aloud in substance, that the Romans, having overcome Philip and the Macedonians, would leave all Greece free, ungarrisoned and unburdened with tribute.[3] The magic word, liberty, had an enchanting effect. A wild shout of joy went up to heaven from the assembled masses. The games went on little noticed or heeded. In the overflowing of their tumultuous joy, they pressed upon the Roman consul Flaminius to address, take him by the hand, and cover him with garlands, so strongly that it was almost fatal to him. It was indeed a glorious thing, that a nation should rise up, having the power and disposition to establish once more liberty in Greece.

But the real spirit of liberty had fled, and no effort could recall it. Indeed, the Romans were never probably sincere in this promulgation or profession. The consul immedi-

[1] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 292. [2] *Taylor*, 151. [3] *Idem*, 151.

ately commenced endeavoring to weaken the Achaian league,[1] that being now the source from which the greatest danger was to be apprehended. The league, however, soon became stronger, by the accession to it of Sparta, after the murder of the tyrant Nabis, B. C. 192.

In the war carried on between the Romans and Antiochus, Greece again became the theatre of contention.[2] The Achaians united with the Romans, the Ætolians with Antiochus. After the defeat of the latter, the Ætolians were much humbled by the Romans.

The dignity and power of the Achaian confederacy was for some time preserved by Philopœmen,[3] the last great leader of the Hellenic race. Under him the Achaians took Sparta, and finally abolished the constitution of Lycurgus.[4] After a series of successes he fell in the war between the Achaians and Messenians.[5] His death was amply avenged by Lycostas, his successor, on the taking of Messene.

After the complete conquest of Macedon, the Romans made rapid advances towards attaining the dominion of all Greece. This they accomplished more by their art than their arms. They fostered dissensions between the different republics, and arbitrated differences which they contrived should always terminate in their own favor.[6] Thus a state, confessedly powerful, adopted and pursued the policy of one that was weak.

The policy adopted and pursued by Rome was, after a time, changed, and formal subjection became substituted for dependence.[7] Some arbitrary proceedings on the part of the Romans led the Achaians to insult her embassadors, and this produced a war between them.[8] The Achaians were everywhere defeated;[9] and the Roman consul Mummius finally terminated the controversy by taking and destroying Corinth, in the year B. C. 146.[10] Greece now became reduced to a Roman province under the name of Achaia.

[1] *Taylor*, 151. [2] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 293. [3] *Idem*, 294. [4] *Taylor*, 151. [5] *Idem*, 152. [6] *Tytler*, I, 211. [7] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 297. [8] *Taylor*, 153. [9] *Tytler*, I, 211. [10] *Heeren's Ancient History*, 297, 298.

Rome seems to have shown more favor to Greece than to any other conquered province. For this favor Greece was probably indebted to her eminent attainments in philosophy and in art.[1] Athens, in particular, appears to have been thus regarded. Even the form of democracy was there allowed to be retained, and the administration under it was far more quiet after liberty was extinct than it had been previously.

From this period Grecian history is merged in that of Rome. The candidates for power and place at the latter sometimes made Greece the theatre of their bloody struggles.[2] On the plains of Pharsalia was fought the great battle between Cæsar and Pompey, which gave the dominion of the world to Cæsar. During the five centuries succeeding its subjugation, and until the reign of Constantine the Great, Greece presents little of political interest.

Constantine founded Constantinople on the site of the ancient Byzantium, and removed thither the seat of empire. The empire, termed the Eastern or Greek, was founded by him about A. D. 328.[3] This empire, notwithstanding its inherent weakness, continued in existence over one thousand years until Constantinople was taken by Mahommed II, by assault in 1453.

Greece proper, the Morea, and the Archipelago, from the year 1204 until 1460, were ruled by the French, the Catalans and the Venetians successively. Between 1460 and 1470, the Turks conquered Greece proper, the Morea and Negropont. In 1687, the Venetians recovered the Morea.[4] In 1715, it was again reconquered by the Turks, and the slavery of the Greeks rendered complete. All Greece became now subjected to the Turks, except a few isolated tribes,[5] such as the Mainotes in the Morea, and the Souliotes in Epirus, who preserved their hardy independence, or at best paid but a nominal tribute.

[1] *Tytler*, I, 212. [2] *Bell's Geography*, II, 561. [3] *Idem*, 561, 562. [4] *Idem*, 562, 563. [5] *Idem*, 563.

Between the two races, the Greeks and the Turks, there always existed a natural hostility. The great difference in their religious belief was a constant source of irritation. The severe oppression exercised by the Turks over the Greeks for a long course of years,[1] engendered on the part of the latter an unceasing animosity. All these causes finally led to a revolution in Greece in the year 1820.

The Greeks were at first successful in the Morea, and in the islands. On the 23d September, 1821, they took Tripolizza, the capital of the Morea.[2] On the 4th November, a constitution was published at Missolonghi, for the western continent of Hellas, comprehending Acarnania, Ætolia and Epirus. On the 11th of the same November, a constitution was published at Salona for the eastern continent, comprehending Attica, Bœotia, Eubœa, Phocis, Locris, Doris,[3] and the freed parts of Thessaly and Macedonia. On the 1st of December, was published the constitution for the Peloponnesus. On the 1st January, 1822, was proclaimed the political existence and independence of all Greece.[4] On the 18th January, of the same year, a provisional constitution was published: the same was subsequently adopted by the national assembly at Astro in April, 1823.

The Greeks gained two naval victories, the one at Mitylene, and the other in the Gulf of Patras. On the 16th of December, 1822, Napoli di Romania was taken by capitulation,[5] and the seat of government transferred thither. The campaigns of 1823 and 1824 were also disastrous to the Turks.

In March, 1825, Ibrahim, son of the Egyptian viceroy, took possession of Navarin. With him, as commander of the Turkish forces, the Greeks maintained a bloody struggle for the peninsula. Their battle cry was "freedom or death," and with this they kept up the strife,[6] their num-

[1] *Bell's Geography*, II, 563. [2] *Idem*, 490. [3] *Idem*, 490. [4] *Idem*, 491. [5] *Idem*, 491. [6] *Idem*, 491.

bers all the while constantly diminishing until the sympathies of Europe were aroused in their behalf.

In March, 1829, the French and British embassadors intimated to the grand sultan the intention of their governments to acknowledge and maintain the independence of the Greeks.[1] The result finally was that Greece became entirely separated from Turkey,[2] and was pronounced an independent state to be under a monarchical form of government. The administration of affairs was first placed in the hands of Capo d'Istria,[3] under the title of president, but he became a tyrant, and the government under him extremely despotic in its character.

The crown was offered to Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, who finally declined it. The president, Capo d'Istria was assassinated on the 9th October,[4] 1831. Count Augustine, the brother of Capo d'Istria then assumed the reins of government.[5]

The three powers, Russia, England and France, who had interfered in the affairs of Greece, now elected Prince Otho, son of the king of Bavaria, the king of Greece. Thus Greece, after such a varied history, became a limited monarchy under Prince Otho of Bavaria.[6]

[1] *Bell's Geography*, II, 491. [2] *Idem*, 492. [3] *Idem*, 563. [4] *Idem*, 564, 565. [5] *Idem*, 565. [6] *White's Universal History*, 513.

CHAPTER II.

GREECE—ITS INDUSTRY.

There is nothing very peculiar in the Grecian development of the industrial element. It may be said to have been characterized by the same activity, that, with such restless energy, accompanied the Grecian spirit into the other elements.

The early essays of the Greeks, in the element of industry, are veiled in much obscurity. The first inhabitants of Greece are represented as a race of savages, sunk into the most profound ignorance and barbarism, subsisting upon the spontaneous productions of the country.[1] At a period long anterior to the commencement of authentic history, there is a story that the Titans, a race of strangers from the east, probably from Egypt, established, for a brief period, their sway in Greece, and that under them the industrial arts had their commencement. But their empire was of short duration, and on its extinction the original inhabitants again relapsed into their primitive barbarism.[2]

After a time, new colonies passed into Greece, principally from Egypt and Phœnicia, carrying with them the arts and the divinities of the countries from which they came. The latter, in changing their country, changed also their name, and, in some instances, many of their characteristics. There is little doubt but that many of the first introducers of the useful arts attained the honors of the apotheosis.

For a knowledge of the agricultural art the Greeks claim to have been indebted to Ceres, a queen of Sicily. To her and her pupil Triptolemus, son of Celeres king of Eleusis,[3] the Greeks were supposed to owe the use of the plough,

[1] *Goguet*, II, 173, 174. [2] *Idem*, 174, 175. [3] *Idem*, 176, 177.

the method of breaking oxen and fixing them to the yoke, and the art of sowing grain and grinding it. They also suppose themselves indebted to Ceres for the invention of carts and carriages to carry burdens. Bacchus is also claimed to have introduced the arts of tillage into Greece. The honor of having first reduced these arts to practice is claimed by the Athenians, but this is disputed by the Argives.

The colonizations that were the most effective in reclaiming the Greeks from their state of barbarism were those of Cecrops, who led a colony of Egyptians into Attica, about the year, 1556 B. C., and founded Athens;[1] and Cadmus, who, with a Phœnician colony, founded Thebes about the year 1493 B. C. It was one of the primary objects of those who controlled these colonizations to reclaim their subjects from their custom of rambling upon the seas, and to induce them to regard more favorably the cultivation of the earth.[2]

The species of grain first cultivated by the Greeks is supposed to have been barley, which was raised upon the plains of Rhacia, in Attica.[3] In commemoration of that fact, the cakes used by the Athenians in their sacrifices were, for several generations, made of barley gathered from those plains. The practice of the Greeks, as collected from Homer and Hesiod, was to give three ploughings to the ground. They used two kinds of ploughs, one composed of a single piece of wood;[4] the other consisting of two pieces so contrived, that one composed the body of the plough, while the other served to unite the oxen with it. Both kinds were very simple, having no wheels, nor any iron about them. The animals commonly used for the purpose of tillage were oxen and mules. The use of the harrow was not early introduced into Greece.

The practice of manuring the land was very anciently established in Greece. Its introduction is attributed to Augeas, so celebrated for the number of his flocks.[5] Their

[1] *Goguet*, II, 181. [2] *Idem*, 183. [3] *Idem*, 184. [4] *Idem*, 185. [5] *Idem*, 186.

grain was trodden out by oxen, and the fan made use of much resembled a shovel. The Greeks originally ate their grain green and half roasted, being ignorant of the art of reducing it to meal. They afterwards learned to grind, and acquired by degrees the use of hand mills. During many ages, hand mills alone were used in grinding, and the women principally performed the labor of turning them.[1] Prior to grinding, the grains were steeped in water, then left to dry for a whole month, and afterwards dried by the fire. The art of bread-making was practiced in Greece in very early times, but the period of its first introduction is unknown.

The cultivation of the vine constituted an early industrial pursuit among the Greeks. The Athenians claim to have introduced its cultivation,[2] and the period of its introduction they place as far back as the year B. C. 1463. Some give the honor of it to Eumolpus, but the ancients generally attribute it to Bacchus.

The Greeks had somewhat peculiar methods of making wine. After cutting the grapes they exposed them ten days to the sun and to the coolness of the night.[3] They afterwards placed them in a shade for five days, and on the sixth stamped them.[4] They put their wines into borachios, or leather bags, and often into great vessels of earthenware.

Another industrial occupation of the Greeks was the manufacture of oil from the olive.[5] This was clearly first done in Attica. It was introduced by Cecrops, who led his colony from Sais in Lower Egypt where the olive was extensively cultivated. Its culture was introduced into Attica under the auspices of Minerva. Hence the early and continued worship of this deity by the Athenians. The worship of the gods and the early culture of the arts of life appear in many instances to have been associated with each other,[6] and to have had a common introduction.

[1] *Goguet*, II, 187. [2] *Idem*, 188. [3] *Idem*, 189. [4] *Idem*, 190. [5] *Idem*, 191. [6] *Idem*, 192.

Anterior to the arrival of Cecrops, the inhabitants of Attica, from their proximity to the sea, were much addicted to piracy, and were, therefore, naturally led to regard Neptune as their tutelar deity. Through the influence of Cecrops, the cultivation of the olive and other kindred pursuits of agriculture were substituted in the place of maritime adventure, and thus Minerva became the patron deity of the Athenians. To worship at her shrine was to declare that they would apply themselves to the arts which she was reputed to have invented.

Although the Greeks early practiced the art of making oil, yet they had not for many ages the use of lamps. Their apartments were only lighted by fires,[1] made principally, if not solely, from the burning of wood. The torches spoken of by early writers were pieces of wood split lengthwise, which, having lit at one end, they carried about in the night. The only use they appear to have made of oil in early times was to anoint and rub themselves over.

The culture of fruit trees seems not to have been of very early introduction. Figs, pears and apples were the first cultivated.[2] The art of making cheeses was known at a very early period, the Greeks alleging that they were indebted for that knowledge to Aristeus, king of Arcadia.

In regard to clothing, the first inhabitants of Greece were covered with the skins of beasts which they had killed in the chase.[3] They knew not even in what manner to prepare them, and wore them quite rough with the hair on. Animal sinews served for thread, and thorns for needles and bodkins. We are ignorant at what period the Greeks learned the process of tanning and currying,[4] although it must have been prior to the Trojan war.

The art of weaving relates back probably to the arrival of Cecrops. He must have brought it with him from Egypt, and introduced it into Attica.[5] The materials woven were principally wool and flax. The wool raised

[1] *Goguet*, II, 193. [2] *Idem*, 195. [3] *Idem*, 197. [4] *Idem*, 198. [5] *Idem*, 198.

in Attica was of a very fine quality. The inhabitants of Attica paid great attention to the raising of sheep, going so far as to cover their skins, so as to protect them from the air, and also from dirt.[1] They were at first in the habit of tearing the wool off their sheep, previous to the invention of shears. They at first worked standing, and the fabrics they manufactured were badly done.[2] They had not the art of fulling them. The discovery of this art was attributed to one Nicias of Megara.

Architecture had but a poor beginning among the Greeks. Their houses at first were but simple cabins, built generally of earth and clay, and constructed in a very rude manner.[3] Afterwards the art of making and burning bricks was discovered, and they were used as materials in the building of houses. Eurialus and Hyperbius, two brothers, inhabitants of Attica, are honored as the inventors of brick-making, but the era in which they lived is unknown. To Dædalus has been attributed the plane, the saw, the wimble, the square, and the manner of finding levels by means of a plummet,[4] but it is all so much involved in obscurity and intermingled with fable, as to render it little reliable.

Architecture, as an art, belongs properly to another element. All its beauties were displayed in their temples,[5] theatres and other public edifices. Their private houses were of a different character. They had much less of beauty, grandeur and magnificence than those of the present time. There was not a single palace in all Greece. The rich and powerful had too much good sense to offend the eyes of the common people by the appearance of parade and outward splendor. In their private dwellings the Greeks had a singular practice of making their doors open outward into the street,[6] so that when they had occasion to go out, they first made a noise against the door to give notice to passengers to keep at a distance.

[1] *Goguet*, II, 198, 199. [2] *Idem*, 199. [3] *Idem*, 202. [4] *Idem*, 205. [5] *Idem*, III, 86. [6] *Idem*, II, 212.

The knowledge of metals and the art of working them appear to have been of early introduction into Greece. Gold was among the first metals known.[1] The Greeks attribute the discovery of it to Sol, the son of the Ocean, which has furnished occasion for the supposition that its first introduction was owing to the Titans, who had come by the way of the sea. The discovery of silver was attributed to Ericthonius, who was reputed the son of Vulcan, the inventor of fire, and who was thought by the Greeks to preside at all the operations of metallurgy.[2]

The art of working metals was renewed by Cadmus, when he led a colony of Phœnicians into Greece. He discovered mines of gold in Thrace, and instructed the Greeks how to dig for the metal, and to prepare it. He also made copper known to them, and the art of working it.[3]

It is unknown at what time the art of working silver was introduced into Greece, or by whom.[4] Some attribute to Cadmus the original introduction of it, or its reestablishment.

The knowledge of iron is supposed to have passed from Phrygia into Europe with the Dactyli. This was about the year B. C. 1431. The art of working it seems not to have prevailed very extensively through Greece.[5] The Greeks made use of copper for many things where iron is at present used. At the period of the Trojan war, arms, tools, and instruments of the mechanic arts were of copper.

The Greeks made considerable use of tin in the heroic ages, which they procured by their commercial intercourse with the Phœnicians. The metals, the earliest, the most extensively, and the most generally worked among the Greeks, were gold, silver and copper.[6]

In relation to industrial pursuits, Greece presents a variety, corresponding with the various districts into which she was divided. In the lofty region of Arcadia abounding with its mountains and valleys, its perennial streams

[1] *Goguet*, II, 217. [2] *Idem*, 218. [3] *Idem*, 218, 219. [4] *Idem*, 219. [5] *Idem*, 219–20. [6] *Idem*, 220.

and its rich vegetation, the industry of the shepherd was practiced with great success. In the productive districts of Messenia and Bœotia, the labors of agriculture found an abundant reward. The district of Attica was less favored in possessing the elements of fertility. But as a compensation for that, the rich silver mines of Laurium afforded a medium of exchange to its inhabitants, while its numerous olive plantations furnished an article of export in its olive oil; and its proximity to the sea, and its harbor of the Piræus, offered numerous facilities to commercial enterprise. The wealthy Corinth, with its two harbors, the one on the Corinthian, and the other on the Saronic gulf, possessed great opportunities for the pursuits of commerce.

Notwithstanding the advantageous position of many parts of Greece for commercial exchanges, the custom of trafficking does not appear to have been introduced until some years after the arrival of Cadmus.[1] The primitive manner of buying and selling, or of carrying on the pursuits of commerce among the Greeks, was by a system of exchange or barter. This was in use at the time of the Trojan war.[2] From about that period, metals were introduced into commerce. At first the value was determined by the weight alone. It is not possible to determine with precision the period of time when the use of money was first introduced into Greece. Some attribute its introduction to Erichthonius, fourth king of Athens, B. C. 1513, others to Pheidon, king of Argos, B. C. 890, and others still to Æginetes, without fixing the period.

The first money of the Greeks bore the impression of an ox. This was most probably for the reason,[3] that prior to the introduction of money as a circulating medium, the Greeks made use of oxen as a medium by which they could measure the value of all other commodities. When this office came to be more effectually performed by the use of money, it was natural that they should desire to

[1] *Goguet*, II, 207. [2] *Idem*, 308. [3] *Idem*, 311.

impress upon it the figure of the ox. Pheidon of Argos is said to have been the first who instructed the Greeks in what manner they might give to their coins a regular and agreeable form.

The means by which the Greeks prosecuted their interior commerce were by using beasts of burden to carry goods, and also carts, which were of early introduction,[1] and were attributed to Erichthonius, fourth king of Athens, B. C. 1513. Boats were also early introduced, but the particular period when they were first used is unknown.

There were many obstacles to the early introduction and successful prosecution of interior commerce. Greeks in early times lacked strong cities and flourishing states. Agriculture was languishing, and the mechanic arts little known. Robbers infested the country, and proved extremely dangerous to travelers. Nor was their foreign commerce, or that carried on by the sea, prosecuted with any success during the earlier periods of Grecian history. During its subsequent and later periods, when robbers became exterminated from the land, and pirates from the sea; when the Grecian cities, such as Athens and Corinth, that embarked more especially in commercial pursuits, acquired sufficient to afford protection to their citizens; when order and the supremacy of law became universally established; and when the products of agriculture and manufactures became multiplied, commerce, both interior and foreign, was carried on successfully, and to a great extent, at least compared with that of the nations of antiquity.

There is so little peculiar in the industry of the Greeks that it is hardly worth dwelling upon to any extent. The policy of dwelling lightly upon this will be more abundantly manifest when it is considered how much will be required to be said upon their religion, their society, their government, their philosophy, and their art.

[1] *Goguet*, II, 312.

CHAPTER III.

GREECE — ITS RELIGION.

In approaching the subject of Grecian mythology and theogony, we should feel, that although its investigation is not unattended with doubt and difficulty, yet that on its more prominent features is stamped clearer indications of more certain knowledge than is to be found in the pagan systems of the more eastern nations. Greece herself has furnished the torch in the light of which her gods and goddesses, demi-gods and heroes stand revealed. Their acts, characters, mode and manner of worship, and the myths, and even to some extent, the mysteries connected with them, are discerned through the works of her poets, the speculations of her philosophers, and the relations of her historians. As in our progress onward we bid adieu to the mists of the world's early morning, and advance into a region of sunshine, we feel a buoyancy of spirit and experience, an elasticity of movement, which doubt and uncertainty could never originate.

The importance of obtaining a knowledge of the Grecian mythology and modes of worship is made evident from the fact, that being more or less Grecian creations, they not only reflect the elements of the Grecian character, but also exercise a reflex influence upon that character, and through it upon man in all coming time. The gods of the Greeks must be taken as the embodiments of their ideas of perfection. Their attributes must be the highest excellences that could enter into the conceptions of the Grecian mind. A knowledge of the *beau ideal* of a people, whether in its religion or its art, will at least acquaint us with the ultimate limit of their capacities.

The Grecian religion itself may be said to have a progress and a history. From being dimly shadowed forth

in the creations of her earlier bards, it came to acquire more definiteness as the theme of her later poets, more subtlety and purely intellectual characteristics as it embodied the speculations of her philosophers, and more clearness and consistency of character, as it partook of the general advance of the Grecian mind. The gradual development of Grecian thought and art gave to it an element of constantly increasing perfection.

The element of Grecian religion will be considered:

I. In its theogony; in its gods, goddesses, demi-gods and hero gods, including mythical beings.

II. In its origin and its progress.

III. In its essential character, whether a pantheism, a polytheism, a monytheism; whether real or symbolical.

IV. In its ministers, priests, priestesses.

V. In its altars, places of worship, temples, statues.

VI. In its modes of worship; its sacrifices, festivals, expiations, oaths and public supplications.

VII. In its oracles, divinations, magic, mysteries.

VIII. In the influence it exercised upon the development of Grecian mind and character.

I. The Grecian religion in its theogony, its gods, goddesses, demi-gods and hero-gods.

By the Grecian theogony, is understood the genealogy or descent of their gods. This seems, in early times, to have been confounded with cosmogony, the rise or birth of the world. So intimately were these blended together, that Dr. Burnet observes, that among the ancient writers, they both signified the same thing.[1]

According to the Grecian theogony, the seeds of things first existed in Chaos. Chaos and Night were the ancestors of Nature. From these arose Earth, Erebus and Cupid, the god of love. Night was married to Erebus, its abode, and from them sprang Æther and Day.

[1] *Bell's Pantheon*, II, 277.

The Earth produces out of herself Uranos or the Sky, and afterwards, the Mountains, and Pontus or the Sea. She marries Uranos, and a strong progeny is the result. These were the hundred armed giants, Cothus, Gyges and Briareus, the monstrous Cyclops, Brontes, Steropes and Arges; the enormous Titans, Cœus, Crius, Hyperion and Japetus; old Oceanus; and the mighty Titanides, Thia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Phœbe, and Saturnos or Chronos.[1]

These monstrous productions, however, were not permitted to see the light of day. They were confined in Tartarus. Their strength was feared, if in a state of liberty. But little innovation is yet made upon the empire of Chaos. The earth mourns over the fate of her children, and meditating vengeance, forges a scythe or sickle which she gives to Saturn or Chronos. With this he maims Uranos, his father; from whose blood, falling upon the lap of Earth, arise the Furies, Giants, and Nymphs, who dwell upon the mountains. The prolific power taken from him and cast into the sea, gives rise to Venus, named Aphrodite, the goddess of love and beauty.

The reign of Uranos thus ended, gave place to that of Saturn. In the meantime the children of Uranos and Earth intermarried with each other, and thus the race of God was perpetuated. Cœus married Phœbe, and their children were Latona and Asteria. Hyperion unites with Thia, and the result is the production of Aurora, Helios and Luna. Oceanus and Tethys give birth to Stream and Fountains. Japetus marries Clymene, the daughter of Oceanus, and becomes the parent of the Titans, Atlas, Menœtius, Prometheus and Epimetheus; Crius and Eurybia, a daughter of Pontus, gave birth to the Titans, Astræus, Pallas and Perses.

The reign of Saturn who marries Rhea, now commences; and with it a new series of generations of gods. The dominion of Chaos now becomes invaded by more

[1] *Moritz's Mythology*, 1, 14, 15; *Mergos's Mythology*, 27, 28.

fixed and lasting forms. Saturn, by the Greeks termed Chronos, or Time, perhaps from his being a symbol of it, reigned over his brothers the Titans, and kept the hundred armed giants and Cyclops imprisoned in Tartarus. Having acquired the sovereignty by maiming his father Uranos, he sought to perpetuate it by swallowing his children as soon as they were born, his mother Earth having predicted to him that one of his sons should deprive him of his authority. Rhea mourned over the loss of her children, and previous to the birth of Zeus, or Jupiter, implored her mother Earth and Uranos for his preservation. Those primitive deities of the elder times, although divested of government and influence, could yet prophesy and give counsel. Under their advice the future father of gods and men was, immediately after birth, concealed in the island of Crete; the Curetes, his tutors, making a continual noise with their shields and spears, lest Saturn should hear his infant cries. Instead of the new-born deity, Rhea presents her husband with a stone wrapped up in swaddling clothes, which was swallowed by him in the place of the infant thunderer.

On this secluded island the bodily and mental powers of the god became developed, the goat Amalthea supplying him with milk, doves bringing him nourishment, golden-colored bees conveying him honey, and the wood nymphs acting as his nurses. Five additional children of Saturn and Rhea are saved from destruction, viz: Juno, Neptune, Ceres, Vesta and Pluto. These, together with Jupiter, withdraw themselves from the dominion of Saturn, whose old realm approaches its end. Jupiter sets free the Cyclopean monsters, who, in return, forge and present him the thunderbolt. There is war in the celestial regions. The Titanian hosts, the brethren of Saturn, unite with him; the Cyclops and the hundred-armed giants, also set at liberty by Jupiter, combine with his children. The latter assemble on Mount Olympus, the former on the opposite Mount Othrys. Ten years of desultory warfare is waged, at the end of which occurs a tremendous

battle. The contests of men pale before the battles of the gods. The hundred-armed giants, three in number, hurl at every throw, three hundred rocks. The earth groans; the heavens sigh; Olympus is shaken to its centre; the thunders roll; the woods blaze; the sea rises and boils up, enveloping in mist and hot steam the grim Titans. Jupiter shoots his lightnings with terrific effect, and finally the Titanian brood are vanquished, and hurled headlong down into the gulf of Tartarus.

The new race of gods now divide between themselves the universal empire. Jupiter reserves to himself the government of the heavens; on Neptune is conferred the dominion of the seas; to Pluto is assigned the infernal regions, while Earth, and the events that pass upon earth, are common to the twelve great gods and goddesses, six of each, hereafter mentioned, who together make up the great councils of heaven, and who also have free access to the summit of Olympus.[1] The prison house of the Titans is guarded by the hundred-armed giants.

Although the Titans were vanquished, and effectually subdued, yet according to the fables of the ancients, Saturn escaped to the plains of Latium in Italy, and there, surrounded by high mountains, introduced the *golden age*, or age of perfect equality, in which all things were enjoyed in common. Thus the ancient poets, and authors of the heathen mythology, provided a refuge for the arts of peace, while both earth and the heavens were strewn with battle-fields, on which men and gods contended.

Next after the war with the Titans, according to some, follows the war with the rebel giants, who flung massy oaks and huge rocks towards the heavens, disregarding the fiery shafts of Jupiter.[2]

The power of the new race of gods must be tested by one more severe trial. Earth, still enraged at the imprisonment of her sons, unites with Tartarus, and produces the immense giant Typhon or Typhoeus, a monster having a

[1] *Grote*, I, 3. [2] *Moritz's Mythology*, 19.

hundred dragon heads darting their black tongues and rolling their fiery eyes; its huge serpentine limbs coiled around by serpents; his dragon mouths emitting flames, and uttering howls and roars with an hundred different voices of forest beasts. The dominion of the new race is threatened with subversion, a more formidable foe than any hitherto appearing, lifts his presumptuous form against the gods.

Jupiter seizes his lightnings, and hurls them unceasingly upon the monster, until earth and heaven are blazing in flames, and the universe is so shaken, that Pluto and the Titans begin to tremble. Typhoeus was at length overcome, and crushed under the superincumbent weight of Mount Ætna, where he has ever since continued occasionally to vent his impotent rage in muffled sounds and fiery discharges. The dominion of the new race of gods now became established on an enduring foundation. Their genealogy or descent will be noticed in the brief references made to each.

The ancient deities, although vanquished by their more warlike descendants, and deprived of dominion, continued nevertheless to be objects of veneration. Belonging to the elder time, they are more shrouded in mystery, and have less distinctness in form and attribute than those of more modern date. Among these

Eros, or Love, is by some reckoned as the most ancient, having existed before all degenerations, and first incited Chaos to bring forth Darkness, out of which sprang Æther and Day.[1] This deity was certainly very ancient, and was worshiped among the ancients with great solemnity. Did they understand by it that attractive principle through whose active agency matter unites and moves in masses, thus producing beauty and harmony; and did they ascribe to it reason and will and wisdom to express their conviction that all things were constituted by harmonious laws?

[1] *Moritz's Mythology*, 36.

Nox, or Night, was ranked among the elder deities. According to Hesiod she was the daughter of Chaos, but according to others she was the oldest deity, and Orpheus ascribes to her the generations of gods and men. She was the mother of Madness, Contention, Death, Sleep, and Dreams. She had also by Erebus, Old Age, Labor, Love, Fear, Deceit, Emulation, Misery, Darkness, Complaint, Obstinacy, Disease, War, etc. She is also, according to some, the mother of the Parcæ, of Nemesis, of the Furies and of Charon.

There was something mysterious in darkness of which the ancients and even their gods stood in awe. "When Jupiter was angry at the god of sleep," says Homer, "Night covered him with her veil, and the thunderer restrained his wrath, fearing to offend swift Night."

Night was represented as clothed and covered with a great black veil, attended with stars, and holding in her hand a torch turned towards the earth to extinguish it. She has also been represented as a woman holding in her right hand a white child sleeping, and in her left a black child, also asleep, with both its feet distorted. The two children were to represent Sleep and Death, and the woman Night, the nurse of both.[1]

The Grecian deities have been variously divided by different authors. Some include in one class the ancient deities; in another the modern superior deities; in a third the genii and inferior deities; in a fourth the demi-gods and heroes, and in a fifth mythic fictions. Others make one class of heavenly deities; another of infernal deities; another of terrestrial deities; another of sea deities; and another of demi-gods. Others divide them into the superior gods; the inferior gods; mythical beings and heroes. It does not appear to be very material what classification is adopted, or in what order they are considered, provided correct ideas are entertained of their nature, attributes, and various relationships.

[1] *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 41, 42; *Moritz's Mythology*, 31, 32; *Montfaucon's Antiquities Explained*, vol. I, of supplement, 116.

Among the ancient and infernal deities was included MORS or DEATH, who was born of Night, without a father. He was regarded as the brother of Sleep; his office to take charge of the dying; his representation, the figure of a skeleton enveloped in a black robe bespangled with stars, having black wings, and in his right hand a scythe or scimeter. He was inexorable; far removed beyond prayers or sacrifices; and having, therefore, no temples or priests.[1]

SOMNUS, or SLEEP, was styled by some the twin brother of Death. He was usually represented as a child, in a state of slumber, and holding in his hand a bunch of poppies. By some he was pictured in a state of great indolence, dressed in a white habit over a black one, and having in his hand a horn, out of which he was pouring dreams, and true presages of things to come.[2]

Dreams were the children of Sleep, and presented to the sleeper by their god Morpheus. They were distinguishable into two different kinds, viz: the true ones, or those which exhibited things real; and false ones, or those which were mere illusions. The former were contained in an ordinary horn, the latter in an ivory one; hence the two gates attributed by some to Sleep, the one made of horn, the other of ivory.[3]

There were said to be two gates to the palace of Somnus, the one of horn, the other of ivory, out of which dreams pass and repass, the true through the horn, and the false through the ivory.[4]

The PARCÆ, or FATES: These were the daughters of Night according to some, and according to others the daughters of Necessity. They were three in number, representing the beginning, progress and end of things. Their names were Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos. The duties of the first, who was the youngest, were to preside over the birth of things, and she therefore held the distaff. The

[1] *Mayo*, III, 289. [2] *Montfaucon*, I, supplement, 118. [3] *Mayo*, III, 287, 288.
[4] *Dwight's Mythology*, 59.

second was employed in drawing out the thread, and spinning the events of life. The third, the eldest, held the scissors, and by cutting the thread, brought life, or any series of events to an end.

The Parcæ had temples and statues in Greece, but they were not generally objects of worship, as they were deemed inexorable. They were often represented as three very old women, one holding the distaff, another the spindle, and the third, the scissors. White robes covered their bodies, and they wore chaplets made of large locks of white wool interwoven with flowers of narcissus. Their great age might figure the eternity of the divine decrees, and their crowns represent their absolute power over the universe.

The existence and functions of the Parcæ are undoubtedly derivatives from the philosophic notions of the ancients in reference to necessity, destiny, and fate. The bearing of this on the essential character of the Grecian religion may be hereafter further considered.[1]

The FURIES: These also were three in number, and have been called Erinnys and also Eumenides. By some they are called the daughters of Nox and Acheron; by others, of Terra, or the earth impregnated from the blood of Saturn, and by others still it is asserted that they were formed in the sea from the blood of Cœlus issuing from a wound given him by Saturn. Their names were Alecto, Tisiphone and Megera, the first representing envy, the second, rage, and the third, slaughter.

These were the avenging ministers of the gods, who executed their vengeance upon men, both in the present and future state. They visited with the stings of conscience, and chastised mankind by diseases, wars and other calamities. They were supposed to be constantly hovering about those who had been guilty of any enormous crime. The fear and the dread of them rested upon every mind, so that one dared hardly mention their names, or cast his eyes upon their temples.

[1] *Mayo*, III, 277, *et seq.*; *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 46, *et seq.*

They had temples in several places in Greece, and these were, in general, a secure sanctuary to those who took refuge in them. They were variously represented. While by some they were made to appear as young and beautiful; by others, and the more commonly, they were represented with snakes around their heads instead of hair, and wearing funeral robes fastened with girdles formed of snakes and scorpions. Grasping a flaming torch in one hand and a whip of snakes in the other, they pursue the perpetrators of crime and wickedness, having for their constant attendants, Terror, Rage, Paleness and Death. The licentious theology of the pagans was certainly destined to receive a formidable check in the avenging functions which they attributed to the Furies.[1] Nearly akin to the Furies, was

NEMESIS, who was the daughter of Night, and was reckoned among the ancient deities. She baffled pride and haughtiness, and punished secret vice. She distributed retributive justice, and her vengeance was sure in the end to fall on the offender. She was also said to recompense virtuous actions. She was worshiped at several places in Greece, and particularly at Ramnus in Attica, where was a celebrated statue of her, ten cubits high, the work of Phidias.[2]

On the division of the universe among the children of Saturn after his dethronement, the infernal regions, or the abodes of the dead, fell to the lot of

HADES, or PLUTO, whose reign over the mansions of the dead was undisturbed. These mansions were divided into Elysium and Tartarus; the first being designed to reward the good, and the last to punish the wicked. There was also the field of truth, where judgment was passed upon the souls of the departed.

The entrance to these dominions, was imagined by the Greeks to be near the promontory of Tænaros. The gates were watched by the monster Cerberus, a dog hav-

[1] *Mayo*, III, 368, *et seq.; Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 52; *Bell's Pantheon*, I, 319. [2] *Mayo*, III, 276; *Dwight*, 48.

ing three heads, or according to others, a much greater number.

There were four rivers to cross, viz: Acheron, the sighing river; Styx, a lake rather than a river; the Cocytus, which flows out of Styx; and the Pyriphlegethon, which rolls along slowly its waves of fire.

The ferryman, whose office consists in transporting the souls over these rivers, is Charon, the son of Erebus and Night, who is generally represented as a sordid and morose old man. His bald forehead lined with wrinkles, and his beard long, neglected and gray from age. He always exacted of the soul his fee in advance, and hence the custom so generally prevalent among the Greeks and Romans, of placing a piece of money, called an obolus, under the tongue of the deceased. This practice seems only to have been dispensed with by the Hermonians, who thought themselves so near hell that it was unnecessary to pay anything for their passage thither. If the body were unburied, the soul was doomed to wander on the banks of the Stygia flood for one hundred years before it could be ferried over.

On the arrival of souls within the dominions of Pluto, the first thing that naturally occurred was the trial and judgment passed upon them on the field of truth. For this purpose there were three judges: Æacus, who passed judgment upon those of European descent; Rhadamanthus, who judged the Asiatics; and Minos, who was president of the tribunal, held a golden sceptre, and acted as umpire in very difficult cases. This seems to have been clearly derived from a custom of the ancient Egyptians. Under the reign of Saturn, and in the early part of that of Jupiter, the judgment was passed, and sentence pronounced just previous to death. But this gave princes and men possessed of wealth and power an immense advantage, and led finally to a change in the time; fixing it immediately after, instead of before, death, when all mere worldly influence would become totally valueless.

From the judgment-seat the soul was dispatched to Elysium or to Tartarus. If a life of virtue had been spent on earth the reward was the joys of Elysium. Here were fields of unfailing verdure, every form of beauty exhibited in the delightful garden, the smiling meadows and the enchanting grove made vocal with the sweetest of feathered songsters. Another sun and other stars here illuminate. Here Orpheus tunes his lyre to sweetest harmony, some joining in song and others in the dance. Here the river Eridanus winds between its serpentine banks, which are fringed with laurel. On them dwell the virtuous heroes, pure priests, pious poets, and all whose memories are embalmed in the minds of men for the deeds of goodness done on earth. Here also glides the river Lethe, whose waters bestow on all who drink them the entire forgetfulness of past events. Its banks are crowded with those who, after steeping themselves in forgetfulness by drinking its waters, return again to earth, and become the animating principle of other bodies. Glowing indeed are the descriptions given by the poets of Elysium, but each one describes it after his own fancy, and all its beauties appeal only to the senses, and gratify them to their highest possible capacity for enjoyment.

Adjoining these delightful mansions of the blessed is the prison of Tartarus, the place of punishment for the wicked. Three massy walls with brazen gates surround it, and still around these rolls the river Phlegethon with its torrents of flame, and all surrounded by the miry bogs of Cocytus. Here is the province of the Furies, one of which, Tysiphone, the most hellish and cruel, watches at the gate to prevent the escape of the condemned. Here the miserable victims are lashed with whips of serpents, and the Furies exercise upon their victims their cruel ingenuity. Here in its deepest pit are confined the Titans, driven thither by Jupiter with a stroke of his thunderbolt. Here is Typhus, who, presuming to make love to Latona, was transfixed by Apollo with his arrows, and lies here with a vulture continually preying upon his liver, which

grows again as fast as it is devoured. Here is Ixion, who, boasting that he had received the favors of Juno, is doomed to turn forever upon a wheel encircled with serpents. Here is Tantalus, who, having designed to cheat the gods by serving up for them at table the members of his son Pelops, is condemned to suffer the severest pangs of hunger and thirst, and is tantalized with being continually in the midst of the most delicious food and liquors, which all fly from him the moment he makes an approach towards them. Here the Danaides, as a punishment for murdering their husbands, are condemned eternally to pour water into a cask full of holes. Sisyphus, who revealed the secrets of the gods, rolls a huge stone to the top of a mountain, whence it continually escapes and rolls down again.

Over these mansions was established undisturbed the reign of Hades or Pluto, the son of Saturn and Rhea, the younger brother of Zeus or Jupiter. He is represented as menacing, terrible and inexorable. He is seated upon a throne, with a bifurcated sceptre, or a key, in his hand. There were no temples erected to Pluto. Sacrifices were made to him, but they were those of black sheep and a bull, and they were offered to him in the night. The blood of the victims was not sprinkled upon altars, or even received into vessels as in ordinary sacrifices, but allowed to run into ditches dug in the earth, as if it could penetrate the realms below. The Roman gladiators consecrated themselves to Pluto.

The event of his life, the most celebrated by the Grecian poet and artist, was the forcible seizure and abduction of Proserpine, the daughter of Ceres, by which he acquired a partner on the throne. The force here made use of is said by some to typify the reluctant separation of the soul from the body at death, as she presided over the death of mankind. According to the ancient opinion, no one could die if the goddess herself, or Atropos, her minister, did not cut off one of the hairs from the head. Hence it was often customary to strew some of the hair of the deceased at the door of the house as an offering to the queen of hell.

The entire fiction of Hades, or Pluto, alludes probably to the grave, and hence his palace was supposed to be a narrow mansion, and his empire a silent, void, and desolate one.[1]

CHRONOS, or SATURN. This was one of the ancient gods, the son of Uranos and Zena, or of Heaven and Earth, of the Titan race, and the father of many in the first class of Grecian deities. He was married to Rhea, or Succession, sometimes called Ops. The Greek term *chronos* also meant time, the latin word *saturn* being of Roman origin. The history of Saturn has already been principally detailed. Saturn was generally represented by the figure of an old man, having a scythe or sickle in one hand, and often in the other a serpent with its tail in its mouth, in the form of a circle, being intended to be emblems of time. His worship was not so generally established in Greece, as in Italy and Carthage. Among the Gauls, Pelasgi, inhabitants of Italy and Carthagenians, human sacrifices were offered upon his altar.[2]

RHEA, OPS, CYBELE. The identity of Rhea and Cybele may not, perhaps, be said to be completely established, but they are generally considered the same. To these should also be added the ancient Terra or Earth, and altogether they would compose a goddess worshiped the more generally under the name of Cybele. The worship of this goddess, although under a different name, is supposed to have originated in Egypt; to have extended thence into Syria and Phœnicia; thence into Asia Minor; and then into Greece and Italy. Her worship was, perhaps, the more generally established in Phrygia. She was regarded as the mother of all creatures, gods as well as men. She was worshiped as the great productive power that gives rise to all formations.

She was generally represented as a robust woman, holding keys in her hand to intimate that the earth (which she

[1] *Mayo*, III, 247, 215, *et seq.*; *Moritz's Mythology*, 250; *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 136; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 343.

[2] *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 90; *Mayo*, III, 66; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 335.

represented) locked up the seeds of vegetation during the winter season. She sometimes wore a crown of oak leaves, as a memorial that men in early times fed upon the fruit of that tree. She was frequently crowned with turrets, to represent the cities that lie scattered over the earth. She was represented with many breasts, in allusion to the earth's affording aliment to all living creatures. When sitting, she denoted the stability of the earth; when drawn in a chariot by tame lions, she intimated that the most rude and uncultivated lands can be made fruitful.[1]

At the head of the modern deities stands ZEUS, or JUPITER, the first being his Greek, the latter his Roman name. He was accounted as the sovereign of gods and men. By the philosophers he was taken to represent the more purified air, or ether. So also the poet bids us

> Look up, and view the immense expanse of Heaven,
> The boundless Ether in his genial arms
> Clasping the Earth. Him call thou
> God and Jove.

Ether, or the pure invisible fire of which Zeus was the representative, was regarded as the most subtle, elastic, pervading and expansive of bodies; as the mighty agent everywhere actuating and enlivening the whole visible mass, everywhere keeping up the perpetual round of generation and corruption, thus appearing to be the vegetative soul or vital power of the world. Some things would lead to indulge the supposition that this god originally represented nature, afterwards the ether or superior atmosphere, and finally the supreme existence.

The early history of Jupiter, in part already alluded to, is enveloped in fables. In the early ages of the world, when all the inventions, discoveries and conclusions of the human mind were new, it was usual and common to explain all things by fables, parables, similes, comparisons and allusions. Hence the fables introduced into the

[1] *Mayo*, III, 298, *et seq.*; *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 128.

heathen mythology, and the myths with which it abounds, undoubtedly once had a meaning, which, in many instances, may have been lost in the intervening ages. They are now, very many of them, possessed of little value or interest.

The fabled residence of Jupiter was upon Olympus, a mountain of Thessaly, the calm serenity of whose summit rendered it, in the opinion of the poets, a fitting residence for the gods. Thus the poet:

> High heaven the footstool of his feet he makes,
> And wide beneath him all Olympus shakes,
> He speaks and awful bends his sable brows,
> Shakes his ambrosial curls, and gives the nod,
> The stamp of fate and sanction of a god;
> High heaven, with trembling, the dread signal takes,
> And all Olympus to the centre shakes.

The ancients embodied power as a leading idea in the character of their gods. This is more especially manifested in the representations of the Grecian Zeus. He is usually represented sitting on a throne, his right hand holding a thunderbolt, his left a sceptre, his mighty head bending forward meditating and directing events, and producing, subject to the decrees of fate, the changes and revolutions of things.

The example set by Jupiter, of inconstancy in his matrimonial engagements, must inspire a very unfavorable opinion of the moral ideas of the Grecians, as connected with those matters. He had several wives and many mistresses. Through these a great many gods, demi-gods and heroes claim a descent direct from Jupiter. By his wife Metis, he was the father of the Oceanidi and Minerva; Mnemosyne, of the Muses; Themis, of the Horæ; Eurynome, of the Graces; Latona, of Apollo and Diana; Ceres, of Proserpine; Juno, of Mars. Besides these, he had by Leda, Castor and Pollux, called the Dioscuri; Maia, the god Mercury; Dione, the goddess Venus; Semele, the god Bacchus; Europa, the judges Minos and Rhadaman-

thus; Alcmena, Hercules. And many other similar cases might be mentioned.

Jupiter had various names under which he was worshiped. These sometimes depended upon the place where he was worshiped, as the Idæan, Olympic, Dodonæan. Others upon peculiar features in his character, as thunderer, deliverer, hospitable, punisher of the perjured, etc.

The worship of Jupiter was very universally established over the heathen world. At Olympia in Elis was a splendid temple erected to his honor, in which was a colossal statue of the god, the work of Phidias. So also was he worshiped and gave responses through his oracles from the sandy wastes of Libya, the forest of Dodona, and the cave of Trophonius. The victims generally offered in sacrifice were the she-goat, the ram, the ox, the white bull, whose horns they took great care to gild.

Jupiter was variously represented to suit the various ideas of the ancients. He was more generally represented as a majestic man, bearded, seated on a throne, holding in his right hand the thunderbolt, in his left victory, the upper part of his body naked, the lower part covered, and having an eagle at his feet with wings displayed. All the elements of power, greatness and majesty were designed to be united in the character of Zeus or Jupiter.[1]

Hera, or Juno, was the daughter of Saturn and Rhea, the twin sister and wife of Jupiter. Some claim her birthplace to be Argos, others Samos, while other parts of Greece put in their claims also for the honor.

As Zeus or Jupiter was supposed to represent the ether, so was Hera or Juno the archetype of the atmosphere with which the earth is encompassed. The intermarriage represented the intimate union between the two.

Juno was the personification of sublime beauty united with power. She is called the reigning, the large-eyed,

[1] *Mayo*, III, 11, *et seq.*; *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 97, *et seq.*; *Moritz*, 51; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 339.

the white-armed, showing that respect rather than love was of the essence of her character.

Juno was the mother of Vulcan, and, according to some, also of Hebe, Venus and Lucina. She was greatly characterized by love of power and jealousy. As the great goddess of the pagan world, the queen of gods and men, she possessed much of the former; and the ceaseless amours in which Jupiter was engaged, furnished too much real cause for the latter. Subtle and cunning, her plots and schemes at times nearly proved an overmatch for Jupiter, who, according to the ancients, after the establishment of his throne, seems to have had nothing to dread but fate and Juno. His patience at times forsook him. On one occasion he suspended her on a chain from Olympus into the atmosphere, with an anvil fastened to either foot; an imposing spectacle both to celestials and terrestrials. She is said by some to have been the sole parent of Vulcan in revenge for Jupiter having produced Minerva. She presided over marriage and child-birth, to the former of which her constant wrangling and bickering with her husband must have rendered her peculiarly well qualified.

The swift messenger of Juno was Iris, or the rainbow, formed in the atmosphere by the reflection and refraction of the solar beam in the descending rain. To this the tail of the peacock bears the nearest resemblance, and hence that bird was sacred to Juno, her chariot being generally drawn by peacocks.

Her worship was very universally established through the pagan world. Everywhere through Greece and Italy were temples and chapels erected to her, but at Argos, Samos and Carthage she was more particularly worshiped. Her vindictive character, the pertinacity with which she pushed forward her purposes of revenge for real or fancied slights or injuries, rendered her an object of dread and terror, and tended to establish her worship the more universally. As an instance of this may be cited the award by Paris, the son of Priam, of the golden apple to Venus in preference to the other two competitors, Juno and

Minerva, which resulted in the famous siege of Troy, instigated principally by Juno, which continued for ten years, enlisting on one side or the other both men and gods, requiring all the equanimity and energy of Jupiter to preserve the balance of power and finally ending in the destruction of Troy, and the total obliteration of the race of Priam.

Juno is commonly represented in all her regal splendor, sitting on a throne, or on Jupiter's eagle, holding in one hand a sceptre, and in the other a veil spangled with stars that flows around her head. At her feet is commonly seen the peacock. The hawk, the gosling, and, above all the peacock, were sacred to her.[1]

HELIOS, SOL, PHŒBUS, APOLLO. The Sun was one of the most ancient and grandest objects of worship in the pagan world. We have already seen, that in the east, his worship, under different names and forms, was early established. Among the Grecians he was worshiped under the name of Helios, who was of the Titan race, and one of the ancient original deities. He represented the Sun alone, was surrounded with rays, and gave light both to gods and men. From regarding Apollo as the symbol of the sun, and giving him the office of charioteer, or driver of the chariot of the sun, and from some other attributes assigned to him, he came, at length, by many, to be looked upon as the sun himself. Hence the difficulty, at the present time, of determining whether the sun was really worshiped by the Greeks under the name of Phœbus or Apollo, or under the name of the more ancient deity, Helios or Sol. Although there is considerable confusion on this subject, yet the balance of evidence rather inclines to the belief that there were two deities, each having his own peculiar temples and sacrifices. With Helios or Sol is connected the story of Phæton, his son, who, to show the world the nobleness of his birth, engaged his father by an oath, to

[1] *Mayo*, III, 58; *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 105; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 340; *Moritz's Mythology*, 65.

allow him to drive his chariot for one day, and give the world light. The task was too much. He lost the command of his horses, and driving, sometimes too near, and at others too far from the earth, left the latter exposed now to such extreme heat, and again to such severity of cold, as that finally Jupiter was compelled to strike him to the earth with a thunderbolt. This is all exhibited on ancient monuments.[1]

Apollo was the son of Jupiter and Latona, and was born on the island of Delos, whither she had fled to escape the vengeance of the persecuting Juno.

Few, if any, of the pagan deities were of more diversified gifts and attributes than Apollo. He was esteemed the father and inventor of four things, viz: the art of playing on the harp and the lyre, of medicine, the use of the bow and arrows, and of oracles. Besides these, as the chief of the muses, he should also be styled the father of the sciences. He is represented as a beautiful young man, having with him the symbols of one or more of the arts ascribed to him. He is, perhaps, the more frequently pictured with the lyre, to represent the art of music; sometimes with a serpent, as being the author of medicine; at others with a bow and quiver, as being the god of the silver bow: now a tripod, upon which he gave his oracles; and then with the muses, as being their chief and prince, or leader.

Apollo and Diana were the twin children of Jupiter and Latona. They were considered by many as the twin deities of death, dividing the human race between them, the men falling to Apollo, the women to Diana. Those overcome with old age they killed with a mild arrow.

Although Apollo is occasionally represented in wrath, scattering abroad the seeds of disease and death with his arrows, yet in general, serenity, benevolence and loveliness constitute the chief elements of his character. In the use of the bow and arrow he possessed the greatest skill. By

[1] See *Montfaucon*, I, 74.

means of them, on the spot from which his oracles were to spread over the earth, he killed the serpent or dragon, Python, destroyed the sons of Niobe, and finally put a period to the life of the Cyclops. The last act incensed Jupiter, who banished him from Olympus, and, during his exile, he abode as a shepherd with Admetus, king of Thessaly. Some of the events of his history, and the myths connected with it, were: he beguiled the toil of the laborers with his lyre and songs, when the walls of Troy were building by Neptune; he entered into a musical contest with Marsyas, and having overcome him, flayed him alive; he entertained great love for Daphne, who was transformed into a laurel tree; Clytia entertained great love for him, and was metamorphosed into a sunflower; he entertained a warm friendship for Hyacinthus, who was killed by his inattention, but afterwards changed into a flower of that name; and also for Cyparissus, who was changed into the mournful cypress.

Few gods in the pagan world were more revered than Apollo. His temples through all Greece were numerous. That at Delphi was the most celebrated, next that in Argos. As the god of inspiration and prophecy, he gave oracles in different places, the most celebrated of which was at Delphi. Many festivals were celebrated in his honor. Most of the ceremonies of worship paid him had a reference to the sun, whose symbol he was supposed to be. To him were consecrated the wolf and hawk, on account of their fine piercing eye; and also the crow, the raven and the swan, because they were thought to have by instinct, a faculty of prediction. So also was the cock consecrated, because his crowing heralded the approach of the sun; and the grasshopper, because his chirping honored the god of music.[1]

Artemis, or Diana, the twin sister of Apollo, was the goddess of chastity, the chase and the woods. As Apollo

[1] *Mayo*, III, 87; *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 161; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 344; *Moritz's Mythology*, 67; *Montfaucon*, I, 62.

was represented by the sun, so was Diana by the moon. She has been called Triformis, because three different names and offices have been assigned her. In the heavens she is Luna, or the moon, and enlightens by her rays. On earth she is Artemis or Diana, and she keeps under all wild beasts by her bow and dart. In hell she is styled Hecate or Proserpina, and there keeps all the ghosts and spirits in subjection to her, by her power and authority. She early petitioned for the privilege of living a virgin, and hence was worshiped as the goddess of chastity. All who made the vow of chastity devoted themselves to Diana, who, in a fearful manner, avenged the violation of that vow.

Among the Scythians, Diana was of a frightful form, and the inhabitants of Tauria offered on her altars strangers that were shipwrecked on their coast. The early Lacedæmonians, down to the age of Lycurgus, offered to her yearly human victims. She was the Isis of the Egyptians. Her immense temple at Ephesus was one of the seven wonders of the world. Her representations in that temple were more like the Egyptian Isis than the Grecian Artemis or the Roman Diana.

In Greece, she was the more commonly represented as a young huntress, tall and nimble, with a light, short and often flowing costume, legs bare, feet covered with buskins, with her bow and quiver full of arrows.

Athena, Pallas, Minerva. She was fabled to have sprung from the head of Jupiter, and hence was properly revered as the goddess of wisdom. She was born full grown and in perfect armor, representing the perfection of divine intelligence. She was immediately admitted into the assembly of the gods. She could prolong the life of men, and bestow the gift of prophecy. Although a goddess, she partook nothing of the softness of the sex. All about her was manly greatness; no female tenderness or affection seems ever to have softened, in the slightest degree, her stern and uncompromising nature. She was ever the cold and chaste virgin, delighting in war and

destruction, and also inventing and patronizing the arts of peace. She was the personification of intellect, and, therefore, recognized and adored whenever intellect was required to be exercised. She is purely a Greek conception, and is "the type of composed, majestic and unrelenting force."

The Greeks attributed to her the invention of many arts and sciences. She invented the flute, the art of embroidery and of spinning. She introduced the use of the olive, and various instruments of war.

She was the patron deity of the Athenians, and it is fabled that after Cecrops had built the city, a contest arose between her and Poseidon or Neptune, as to which should give it a name. It was finally decided that the privilege should belong to the one who could produce the most useful thing. That Poseidon produced the horse, and Athena caused the olive to grow. The palm was awarded to the latter, and she bestowed upon it her own name.[1]

As the inventor and patroness of the arts, and all the operations of the intellect, she was universally invoked, and everywhere worshiped. All artists and all warriors united in their worship of the blue-eyed goddess.

She was usually represented clothed in armor, having on her head a helmet, in one hand a spear, and in the other a shield. On her breast was the ægis or breastplate, on which was the head of Medusa the Gorgon.

The palladium, or statue of the goddess, was three cubits high, and was fabled to have fallen from heaven, near the tent of Ilus, while the citadel of Troy was being built. An oracle declared that the city never should be taken whilst the palladium was contained within its walls. Accordingly, before the Grecians could take Troy, Ulysses and Diomedes, having effected a secret entrance, stole it from the city, and conveyed it to the Grecian camp.

Pallas-Athene (her compound Grecian name), interested herself very extensively in the wars and works of men.

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 348; *Dwight's Mythology*, 189, 190.

Hence her worship was very universally established. Her temples were to be found in Egypt, Phœnicia, throughout Greece, in Italy, Gaul and Sicily. It was in Attica that her temples and statues were the most abundant. On the summit of the high cape of Sunium, as it stretched out into the Ægean sea, was a temple erected to this goddess, which announced to the mariner as he ploughed the distant Ægean wave, that he was approaching the land over which she presided.[1]

ARES, or MARS. This was the son of Jupiter and Juno, and the god of war and of battles. He also presided over whatever amusements and exercises were manly and warlike. He was the real embodiment of all that was fearful and terrible on the battle-field. He represented the fierceness of war, and Pallas-Athene its tactics and art. On one occasion while gods and men engaged with each other before the walls of Troy, this god and goddess came into conflict with each other, Mars hurling his spear against her shield, while she deliberately hurled upon his forehead an immense field stone, by which he was precipitated to the earth, covering seven acres of ground.

One remarkable feature in the character of Ares, was his inconstancy. It seemed quite immaterial to him what side he was on, or how frequently he changed sides, provided the bloody contest went fiercely on. This would be a very natural consequence of a love of battle for its own sake. He greatly resembled the northern god, Odin, and was probably the same under another name.

Athough so full of fight and ferocity, he seems to have been susceptible of a softer passion, as his secret intercourse with Venus abundantly testified.

His worship was the most universally established in Thrace, but he had temples and priests in most of the Grecian cities. He was, in general, represented, in full manly vigor, with a strong body, and clad in complete

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 347, 348; *Dwight's Mythology*, 188, *et eq.*; *Mayo's Mythology*, 145, *et seq.*

armor, bearing shield and spear. His chariot is often represented as being driven by the wild Bellona, with a terrific countenance and disheveled hair, while brandishing a bloody whip in her right hand, and shaking a heavy lance with the other.[1]

APHRODITE, or VENUS, the goddess of love and beauty, was represented as adorned with every possible perfection. She was intended to be the personification of loveliness.

A principle, which seems to have been carried very uniformly through the heathen mythology, was to have one deity represent a single quality, or a class of qualities united together by some common tie of affinity. This, if unaccompanied with other qualities, was often productive of evil results. Thus, in Venus, was the personification of love and beauty. This originated desire, which could be only gratified by enjoyment. To the attainment of this alone, everything must be sacrificed. The suggestions of wisdom, the claims of hospitality, the demands of justice, could interpose no effectual obstacle.

This principle was illustrated in the case of Paris and Helen and the Trojan war. Paris, having awarded to Venus the golden apple, was promised by her the most beautiful woman in the world. This happened to be Helen, the wife of Menelaus, king of Sparta. It mattered not that she was the wife of another, and that the seduction must be accomplished while invading the sacred rights of hospitality. It was of just as little consequence that results must follow fatal to one of two nations. Could the Aphrodite goddess have united to her other qualities the cold wisdom of Minerva, or the stern dignity of Themis, the goddess of justice, she would have been incapable of gratifying the wishes of one favorite, at the expense of a whole city or country. But she was the goddess of love and beauty alone, and the qualities of wisdom and justice formed no part of her character.

[1] *Moritz's Mythology*, 76; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 348, 349; *Dwight's Mythology*, 184, *et seq.*

The ancients are not agreed as to her origin. According to many, she was born from the foam of the sea, received by the Horæ, and dressed in divine attire. According to Homer, she was the daughter of Jupiter and Dione. The graces were her companions, the little Cupids her attendants, and her chariot was drawn by doves. She wore a zone, or girdle, which possessed the mysterious power of giving beauty and grace to the wearer, and of inspiring love in every one who beheld it. Whenever Juno wished to inspire Jupiter with affection, she borrowed this magic girdle. Aphrodite was the wife of Hephæstos or Vulcan, but she loved Mars, Mercury and Adonis. She possessed the highest charms imaginable, but in stern dignity and power was much inferior to Pallas-Athene. She did not often engage in war, or in battle; but taking part in the engagement entered into between gods and men before the walls of Troy, she was wounded in the hand by Diomedes, and fled to Olympus, loudly complaining, which gave occasion to the goddess of wisdom to say, "Aphrodite, forsooth, was persuading a handsomely dressed Grecian lady to follow along with her beloved Trojans, and in caressing the fondling, she scratched her delicate hand with the golden clasp which fastened the robe of her favorite." The father of the gods and men smiled, and said, "Warlike work, my love, is nŏt thy business; it is thy sweet care to prepare the joys of the wedding feast; the care of war's wild tumult leave to Ares and Athene." She had clearly mistaken her occupation.

Her worship was very universally established. She is very clearly of eastern origin, being the Astarte of the Phœnicians. The same kind of festival which we have already seen celebrated in Phœnicia, on the occasion furnished by the death of Adonis, was also celebrated in Greece, having been probably transplanted thither by the colonies from Phœnicia. But the character of the eastern goddess was essentially Hellenized by the Greeks. The Grecian sculptors, painters and poets gave her life and loveliness which she never possessed in the east. She was

regarded as one of the greatest divinities of the pagan world. Her temples were often open to prostitution. Amathus, Cythera, Gnidos, Paphos and Idalia were more especially the places where her worship was established. She was variously represented, sometimes as rising out of the sea, but more frequently in a chariot drawn by swans, or by pigeons. She is usually attended by Cupid and sometimes by the graces.[1]

HEPHÆSTOS, or VULCAN. This god was fabled by some to have been indebted to Juno alone for his existence, in order that she might not be outdone by Jupiter from whose brain had proceeded Pallas-Athene. He had the misfortune to be lame, having been kicked out of heaven by Jupiter, and landed upon the island of Lemnos, an island where earthquakes and eruptions of volcanoes were frequently experienced.

He was the artist-god. To him the element of fire was subject. He was regarded as the inventor of all those arts that are connected with the smelting and working of metals by means of fire. He constructed the habitations of the gods, and also their chariots and arms. He also forged armor for distinguished heroes, such as Achilles and Æneas. The Cyclops were his workmen. Mount Ætna was his workshop. So also he had shops at Lemnos and Lipari, one of the Æolian isles. Hence his worship was particularly established at Lemnos and the Vulcanean isles. He had also a temple upon Ætna. His worship is very ancient, having been derived by the Greeks from the Egyptians.

Although a deformed cripple, yet he was married to celestial beauty itself, the goddess of love. Was this designed by the ancients to represent the union between the ugliness of labor and the beautiful creations of plastic art which it produces? As a very natural consequence, he was represented as jealous, and the artificial net he con-

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 349, 350; *Mayo's Mythology*, 169, *et seq.*; *Dwight's Mythology*, 215, *et seq.*; *Moritz's Mythology*, 81, *et seq.*

trived to throw over Mars and Venus, while he called together all the celestials to show them the disgraceful spectacle, and to complain of his misfortune, has been a source of amusement both among gods and men.

The ancient monuments represent him with a beard, his hair neglected, half naked, his habit coming down to his knee only, wearing on his head a round and peaked cap, having his hammer in his right hand, and his tongs in his left.[1]

HERMES, or MERCURY. This was the son of Zeus or Jupiter and Maia. He was born in the morning, at noon invented and played on the lute, and in the evening stole fifty of Apollo's oxen. The Greeks borrowed the worship of this god from the Egyptians, but the Hermes Trismegistus of Egypt was a different being from the Hermes of Greece. The difference between the two illustrates very well the two different national characteristics. The Egyptian Hermes presided over the sciences, over writing, and composed many divine works. He was there the interpreter of the gods. In Greece he had a multiplicity of employments. In fact, he was the embodiment of intense activity, being so much occupied, that, as Lucian remarks, he could never enjoy a moment's repose. He was the god of eloquence, and from his lips dropped the honeyed accents of persuasion. He invented and played the lute in music. He conducted the souls of the departed to the land of shades. He was the swift-winged messenger of the gods, doing their errands and making their negotiations. He was also the god of shepherds and of merchandise. He was famed for cunning, slyness and adroitness of movement. He stole the tongs of Vulcan, the sword of Mars, the girdle of Venus, the trident of Neptune, and the sceptre from Jupiter. He could not only steal, but lie most adroitly, as in the case of Apollo's oxen. He was a great reconciler of differences, and his golden wand, or caduceus,

[1] *Montfaucon*, I, 59; *Dwight's Mythology*, 209, *et seq.*; *Moritz's Mythology*, 90, *et seq.*; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 351.

contained on it two serpents, whose bodies twined around it, and whose heads met over one, and in token of peace and harmony. For this extremely versatile character, Hermes could have been indebted to none other than the Greeks.

His worship was very generally established throughout Greece. He was usually represented as a young man holding in his hand his caduceus, or golden wand, always in motion, either in actual flight or moving rapidly, having on his head a winged hat, and on his feet winged sandals. Sometimes a purse in his hand to represent commerce or gain.

HESTIA, or VESTA. This goddess was called the daughter of Saturn and Rhea. As Vulcan represented the melting and consuming fire, so Vesta was regarded as the emblem of the animating and life-nourishing warmth in nature. She presided over the domestic hearth, and represented civil union and domestic happiness. She is said to have first taught men the use of fire. As she represented that pure element, and was incapable of associating with any other, she made choice of perpetual virginity, and the first share of every offering made to the other gods. Her priestesses were the vestal virgins whose duties and offices were more specially defined under Roman institutions. Her sacred fire must be safely and strongly guarded, and kept from ever being extinguished. Thus the ancients acknowledged the benefit they derived from this essential element by keeping before them an ever present emblem.

To this goddess was ascribed the establishment of family habitations, and hence altars were usually erected to her in the interior or front of houses. She is usually represented bearing in her hand a torch, but her form is covered by a mystical veil.

DEMETER, or CERES. This also was the daughter of Saturn and Rhea, and as Vesta sent her fertilizing warmth throughout nature, so Ceres would call forth the nourishing ear of corn. She was the mother of Proserpine who

was seized by Pluto, and made queen of the infernal regions. Ceres, in her search after her lost daughter, traveled over quite a portion of the globe, diffusing universally a knowledge of agriculture and good morals. She was directly instrumental in sending Triptolemus over the earth to teach husbandry. The fate of Proserpine has been before briefly noticed. In the circumstances attending the history of Proserpine and Ceres, there are probably some truths designed to be darkly shadowed forth. The most celebrated ancient mysteries, the Elusinian, were directly connected with the devotion paid to Ceres.

The most common representation of Ceres, is of holding a sickle in her right hand, and in her left, a torch, which she had lighted at the fire of Ætna, when going to look for her lost daughter.

Dionysus, or Bacchus. Bacchus was the son of Jupiter and Semele. The latter having desired Jupiter to appear to her in his true, divine person, he came with thunder and lightning, which Semele, unable to stand, fell a sacrifice to; but Bacchus was snatched away, and placed in Jupiter's thigh, where he remained until the time of birth. He was after birth committed to the care of the nymphs, and reared up by them.

He was the god of wine, and intended to represent the inward, swelling fullness of nature. Many are the achievements related of this god, and so various that many have supposed that there must have been several of that name. Those who derive the pagan ideas and superstitions from the Hebrew scriptures make Bacchus identical with Moses, and trace between the two many striking coincidences. Others identify him with Nimrod, and others still with Noah.[1]

The worship of Bacchus originated in the east, and was established at a very early period in Greece. Not only was he famed for his military achievements, but also for the advancement of morals, legislation, and commerce, but

[1] *Gale's Court of the Gentiles*, I, b. ii, 28, *et seq.*

more especially for the culture of the vine and the rearing of bees. Festivals were early celebrated in honor of him at Thebes, Nysa, Mount Cithæron, Naxos, and Alea. These soon degenerated into mere bacchanalian orgies, in the celebration of which there was a species of mystery. In these orgies, his attendants were old Silenus, almost always represented drunk, and also a train of satyrs, fauns and bacchanals. They became mere drunken revels, in which sensuality and drunkenness were indulged in to the wildest excess.

The same principle brought to view in the consideration of Aphrodite or Venus, is here again manifested, that is the deifying a single passion, propensity or quality, and carrying that through. Here the wine cup is deified, and all its legitimate results and consequences are to be received and held in veneration. No bacchanalian revel is to be repressed, restrained, or even modified. It forms a part of the worship of the people, and is entitled to be respected. Hence the wildest excesses came to be practiced at the orgies, and sculptors and painters found ample employment in representing all the possible varieties of attitude, motion, and displays of passion, which accompanied and evidenced these excesses. They, at length, became so wild and licentious, that however acceptable they might be to the gods, they could be no longer tolerated among men, and accordingly they were abolished by the Roman senate in the year of the city, 568.

Bacchus was often represented by the poets and artists of antiquity as a handsome, agreeable boy, just on the border of youth. He is crowned with vine and ivy leaves, and bears in his hand the thyrsus, which consisted of a lance, the iron point of which was concealed in a pine cone, and was often twined with wreaths of ivy or bay.[1]

Poseidon, or Neptune, and the sea deities, as the great agents of nature were, by the ancients, very generally

[1] *Dwight's Mythology*, 309; *Manual of Classical Literature*, 354; *Moritz's Mythology*, 103.

exalted to the rank of deities, it is certainly not surprising that the watery element should also have come in for its share.

Among the ancient deities was old Oceanus, a son of Heaven and Earth, who married Tethys, a daughter of Uranos, through whom he produced the rivers and fountains. Like the other ancient deities, these have retired to a great distance, and become almost forgotten. The navigable sea was considered under the dominion of Neptune, while the remote parts, lying beyond where the sun sinks into the sea, constituted the dominions of Oceanus. These were almost too remote for even fancy to dwell upon. Among the daughters of Oceanus were Metis, Eurynome, two of the wives of Jupiter, and Styx, the river of hell. So also the rivers and fountains were the children of Oceanus.

So also Nereus was the personification of the quiet, smooth sea. He could look into coming time, and predict the future. When Neptune became in the ascendant in usurping the realm of Oceanus, Nereus retreated to the Ægean sea, and was worshiped in the maritime towns of Greece. He had many daughters, called Nereides, among whom were Thetis, the mother of Achilles, and Amphitrite, the wife of Neptune, and queen of the sea.

Another sea deity was Proteus, who could assume any form at pleasure, which rendered him difficult of access, and enabled him generally to evade questions by a sudden metamorphosis. He also was endowed with the prophetic gift, but in order for any one to derive any benefit from it, he must hold him through all his metamorphosis until he returned again to his original form. Some have supposed he was designed to represent the various forms and shapes assumed by primitive matter, the substance remaining the same through its variety of changes.

On the division of the universe among the victorious deities after the Titans were vanquished, the dominion of the sea was assigned to Poseidon or Neptune. To him rightfully belonged not only the sea, but also rivers and

fountains, and the earthquake was at his command. He was a favorite god among all the ancient maritime nations, but among those not commercial, like the Egyptians, he was little, if at all, worshiped. The poets tell us he produced the horse by striking the ground with his trident. He obtained his wife Amphitrite, by means of a dolphin, and, in return, placed that fish among the constellations.

Neptune was supposed to be the intelligence which filled the sea, as was Ceres, that which filled the earth. The Greeks seem to have obtained him from the Libyans. In order to succeed in his amours, he had frequent occasion to metamorphose himself, and these metamorphoses are certain allegories under which his intrigues lie concealed.

Although supreme over the watery domain, yet he seems to have been a subordinate deity. During the Trojan war, Iris came to Neptune, delivering to him the threatening message of Jove, that he should beware measuring himself with him, who sways the thunderbolts, and refrain from assisting the sons of Danaus, the Grecians, he at first replied with boldness, "However mighty Jupiter may be, he has spoken very arrogantly! Are we not all three the sons of Saturnus and Rhea? Is not the universe divided among us? He may terrify with such words his sons and daughters, but not me!" Iris reminded him, "The elder brother is protected by the power of the Erynnes," and instantly Neptune complied with the will of the thunderer, speaking to Iris in mild language: "Thou hast wisely spoken, O goddess; it is well if a messenger knows also what is useful."[1]

Neptune rendered assistance to his brother Jupiter against the Titans, built the walls and ramparts of Troy, created and tamed the horse, raised the isle of Delos out of the sea, destroyed Hippolytus by means of a sea monster, and was greatly feared as the author of deluges and earthquakes.

[1] *Homer's Iliad*, xv, 185.

To him were offered in sacrifice, a black bull, rams, and a boar pig. At Rome the gall of victims was offered him, from its resemblance to the salt water in the bitterness of its taste.

He was variously represented by the ancients, but the more commonly under the figure of a man advanced a little beyond the middle period of life, drawn in a shell by two sea horses, holding in one hand his trident, and in the other a dolphin.

The great councils of heaven were made up of six gods and an equal number of goddesses. The gods were Jupiter, Neptune, Mercury, Apollo, Mars and Vulcan; the goddesses Juno, Ceres, Vesta, Minerva, Diana and Venus. These together represented all the supreme powers and agencies of the heavens, the earth and the waters. There were, however, inferior powers and agencies, which were nevertheless superior to men. They owed their existence to the fruitful fancy of the ancients in the creation of so many intermediate agencies between the divine and human. Among these was

AURORA, who was looked upon as the harbinger of the sun and the day. She was the goddess of the day-dawn, and was represented by the poets as a beautiful young woman, whose chariot was drawn by white, or light red horses, and who opened the portals of the sun with rosy fingers.[1]

IRIS, the rainbow, was personified and imagined a goddess. She was the special messenger of Juno, and resided near her throne. She was also occasionally the messenger of other deities. She sometimes performed the office of Proserpine, cutting off the female head the lock of hair, thus effecting dissolution. Her descent from Olympus, as also her ascent thither, was in the path of the rainbow. She was represented with wings, embodying the various colors of the rainbow.

ÆOLUS was the ruler of winds and storms. Zephyrus, Boreas, Notus and Eurus were his servants. He usually

[1] *Manual of Ancient Literature*, 360.

kept them imprisoned in a cave of an island in the Mediterranean sea, and only let them loose when he desired to awaken storms, hurricanes and floods.[1]

PAN was the god of shepherds and herdsmen, of groves and fields, and whatever held relation to rural affairs. His worship was derived from the Egyptians. He resided in the woods and mountains of Arcadia. He was represented with ears sharp-pointed, and standing erect, with short horns, a flat nose, a body covered with hair or spotted, and the feet and legs of a goat.

LATONA was a goddess honored in Lycia, on the island of Delos, at Athens, and in many of the Grecian cities. She was the mother of Apollo and Diana.

THEMIS was the goddess of justice, was the first who uttered oracles, and introduced sacrifices into Greece. She is the source of law and her predictions the source of truth. She is represented as a noble and majestic woman, having her eyes covered with a fillet, and holding in one hand a balance and in the other a sword.[2]

ÆSCULAPIUS was the god of medicine, the son of Apollo, and the nymph Coronis. Hygeia, the goddess of health, was his daughter. The serpent was attached as a symbol to his image, expressing the idea of health, or prudence and foresight.

FORTUNE had temples at Elis, Corinth and Smyrna. To her was ascribed the distribution and superintendence of prosperity and adversity in general. She was represented bearing a horn of plenty, blind-folded, and generally holding in her hand a wheel as the emblem of inconstancy.[3]

FAME was regarded as the author of reports both bad and good. She had a temple at Athens. She was represented as having wings, always awake, and always flying about, accompanied by vain fear, groundless joy, falsehood and credulity.

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 361. [2] *Dwight's Mythology*, 24. [3] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 365.

The hero-gods had generally mortal mothers, but on the father's side claimed the lineage of some god, the most generally of Jupiter. This was occasionally reversed, as in the case of Æneas, the son of Anchises and Venus. They were generally celebrated for one or more extraordinary achievements. Thus:

PERSEUS was the son of Jupiter and Danae. His most celebrated exploit was the destruction of the Gorgon Medusa, whose head he struck off with a sword given to him by Vulcan. The winged horse, Pegasus, sprang from the Gorgon's blood. By means of Medusa's head, he changed king Atlas into a high rock or mountain. By the same means he changed Phineas and Polydectes into stone. To him is ascribed the invention of the discus or quoit. After death he was placed among the constellations.

HERACLES, or HERCULES, was by far the most celebrated of the hero-gods. The son of Jupiter and Alcmena, while a cradled infant, stifled two serpents which Juno sent to destroy him. What are called the twelve labors of Hercules, were so many difficult and dangerous enterprises imposed on him by Eurystheus, king of Mycenæ, to whom he was made subject. These labors were often made the theme of the poets, and are many of them found represented on the monuments. They were to kill the Nemæan lion; to destroy the Lernæan hydra, a many-headed monster, whose heads would grow out again as fast as they were destroyed; to catch alive, the stag with golden horns; to catch the Erymanthean boar; to cleanse the stables of Augeas; to exterminate the birds of Stymphalis; to bring alive the wild bull of Crete; to seize the horses of Diomedes; to obtain the girdle of Hippolyta, queen of the Amazons; to destroy the monster Gorgon; to plunder the garden of Hesperides, which was guarded by a sleepless dragon; and to bring from the infernal world the three-headed dog, Cerberus. Besides these, he slew the robber Cacus; delivered the rock-bound Prometheus from his confinement; killed Busiris and Antœus, and rescued Alcestis from the

infernal world. He also destroyed the centaur Nessus with arrows poisoned with the blood of the hydra; but the blood of the centaur having besmeared a tunic presented him by Dejanira, he was thrown into madness on putting it on, and cast himself into the flames of a funeral pile on Mount Ætna. Thus perished his mortal remains, and his shade, as is said, went down to Orcus, the infernal regions, while he himself rose to Olympus, and was received into the assembly of the immortals. The labors and achievements of Hercules have ever furnished fruitful themes for the artist and poet, and even for the speculations of the philosopher. His twelve labors have been sought to be identified with the annual passage of the sun through the twelve signs of the zodiac, and many real or fancied resemblances have been drawn between these labors and the signs through which the sun successively passes.

His worship was very universally established in Greece. He is usually represented on the monuments as a man in the full vigor of his physical powers, either in the actual performance of some of his achievements, or apparently resting after their performance, having with him his club, and the skin of the Nemæan lion. These two were his almost inseparable companions.[1]

Theseus was another hero, also celebrated for his great achievements. Among these was the destruction of the Minotaur, a terrible monster of Crete, who annually devoured seven male Athenian youth and as many young virgins. Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, furnished him with a clue by which he was enabled to thread the windings of the labyrinth, in which the monster had his abode, and to retrace his steps after slaying the monster, who was half a man and half a bull. He also exterminated a multitude of robbers and assassins that infested Greece, gained a victory over the Amazons, and made a descent into the lower world with his friend Pirithous. He improved the

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 381, 382; *Dwight's Mythology*, 287, *et seq.*; *Moritz's Mythology*, 133, *et seq.*

morals and legislation of Athens and Attica. A superb temple was consecrated to him at Athens.

CASTOR and POLLUX were the twin sons of Jupiter and Leda, and brothers to Helen. They were called the Dioscuri. Castor was distinguished for the management of horses, and Pollux for boxing and wrestling. Castor was slain by Lynceus, who, in turn, was slain by Pollux. The latter obtained from Jupiter the honors of deification and immortality, in conjunction with his brother. Temples were consecrated to them both by the Greeks and Romans. They were invoked in an especial manner by mariners. They both found a place among the constellations, and were represented in the zodiac by the Gemini or Twins.

JASON, the son of Æson, king of Thessaly, was the leader of the Argonautic expedition. This was fitted out for Colchis, to obtain the golden fleece. The most famous of the Grecian heroes, as Hercules, Castor and Pollux, Theseus, etc., united in the expedition. Although attended by many difficulties, the enterprise was finally crowned with success.

BELLEROPHON, having been sent by Prœtus, to Iobates, king of Lycia, was sent by him on a most dangerous enterprise, viz: to attack and destroy the fire-vomiting Chimæra. This monster had the head of a lion, the body of a goat, and the tail of a dragon. The gods were inclined to favor him in the enterprise, and granted him the winged horse Pegasus. After an obstinate resistance, the monster was slain. After meeting with other successes, he finally married the daughter of Iobates, and shared with him the kingdom; but becoming elated with his good fortune, he attempted by means of Pegasus, to ascend to heaven. At this Jupiter was incensed, and sent an insect to sting the steed, by which means the rider was thrown to the earth, where he wandered in solitude until his death.

MELEAGER, the son of Œneas and Althæa, distinguished himself in the hunt of the Calydonian boar. Getting into an affray with the two brothers of his mother, he slew them both. His mother swore revenge. On the day of

his birth, the fates had placed in her possession a piece of wood with the intimation that the new-born child should live as long as it remained unconsumed. She had kept the treasure, and now in the suddenness of her passion, threw it into the blazing fire. Meleager withered away as it was gradually consuming, until he died in convulsive agony. When Althæa learnt the result of her act, she put a period to her own life.

CADMUS was instructed by an oracle to follow a cow, as his guide, and to build a city where she should lie down. He did so, and built the city of Thebes. He afterwards killed a serpent and sowed its teeth, from which a crop of armed men suddenly sprang up, who slew each other, all but five, who assisted in building the city of Thebes.

He afterwards married Harmonia, the daughter of Mars and Venus. He endeavored to civilize the people whom he had collected, and is said to have been the first to introduce into Greece the letters of the alphabet which he had brought from Phœnicia.

ŒDIPUS, being absent from his native country, was warned not to return to it because he would there slay his own father, and marry his own mother. Having unconsciously done the first, he found in the vicinity of Thebes the sphinx, a monster in the shape of a lion, with the head of a maiden, who proposed to all who passed by this riddle: "What animal is it that goes in the morning upon four feet, at noon upon two, and in the evening upon three." All who were unable to interpret it were hurled into the abyss, and hundreds had perished there before the arrival of Œdipus. His reply was "Man, as a child, in the morning of life, creeps upon hands and feet; at the noontide of life, when strength dwells in his members, he goes upright on two feet; and in the evening, when old age has stolen upon him, he needs a staff for his support, and goes as it were, upon three feet." The solution of this riddle caused the death of the sphinx.

He afterwards married Jocasta the queen of Thebes, his own mother, although ignorant of the fact of her being so.

Afterwards discovering it, he put out his eyes, and, led by the hand of his daughter Antigone, wandered about in foreign lands until his death. Jocasta strangled herself.

The hero-gods of Greece existed and performed their great achievements during the fabulous period of Grecian history, a period extending from the deluge of Deucalion to the introduction of the Olympiad into chronology. Their alleged exploits were handed down by tradition, and in most instances created or greatly magnified by the fictions of the poets. These hero-gods were men of superior powers, both of body and mind, and these powers were turned to beneficial purposes in ridding the country of robbers, beasts and monsters, or in improving the condition of the people. Hence the presumption that they were descended from the gods, and had infused into them a portion of divinity. The worship paid to them, however, was, as a general thing, less sacred in its character, and less universal than that paid to the gods. It consisted in an annual commemoration at their tombs, or in their vicinity when offerings and libations were presented to them. No regular priests were ordained, and very seldom were temples erected especially to them.

There is still another species of beings embraced in the ancient mythology. These may be termed mythical beings, creatures of the imagination, into whose history are interwoven the myths of ancient fable. They served as the sport of fancy, and also had their use in the advancement of Grecian art. Among these were the

TRITONS, descendants of Neptune and Amphitrite, represented as half man and half fish, who formed the retinue of Neptune, and announced his approach by blowing the horn, a large conch or sea shell.

The SIRENS, a sort of sea goddesses, usually represented as the upper part virgins, the lower, birds, dwelling upon islands, and captivating and detaining all voyagers by the charms of their music. Even Ulysses, it is said, was compelled to stop the ears of his crew with wax and to order himself to be tied fast, to escape being allured to his de-

struction. This is commonly considered as signifying the dangers of indulgence in pleasure.

The NYMPHS were not considered as immortal, but as living a great length of time. They resided in grottoes or water caves. They had different offices, and were distinguished by various names. Thus the Oreades were nymphs of the mountains; the Naiades, Nereides and Potamides, nymphs of the fountains, seas and rivers; the Dryades and Hamadryades, nymphs of the woods; the Napææ were nymphs of the vales.

The MUSES. These were the daughters of Jupiter and Mnemosyne, and were nine in number. They were described as virgins, and under the instruction and protection of Apollo. They resided at Mount Helicon where was the fountain Hippocrene, and Mount Parnassus where was the Castalian fount. To them also was Mount Pindus and Mount Pieris sacred. Of these nine, Clio was the muse of history, Melpomene of tragedy, Thalia of comedy, Euterpe of music, Terpsichore of the dance, Erato of amatory poetry, Calliope of epic poetry, Urania of astronomy, and Polyhymnia, of eloquence and imitation.

The GRACES were three in number, Aglaia, Thalia and Euphrosyne, the daughters of Jupiter and Eurynome. They were of the retinue of Venus, and were generally represented as beautiful young virgins, without drapery, and commonly in a group, holding each other by the hand.

The HORÆ, or HOURS, were the daughters and servants of Jupiter, the goddesses of time presiding over the seasons and hours of the day.

The HARPIES were the daughters of Neptune and Terra, and are represented as having the faces of virgins, the bodies of vultures, with feet and hands armed with claws. They were sometimes considered as the goddesses of storms.

The DÆMONS, or GENII, were a sort of protecting deities, or spiritual guardians of men. They were supposed to be always present, to direct the conduct of those under their

care, and to control, in a measure, their destiny. There were supposed to be bad dæmons as well as good, and some maintained that each person had one of each class attendant on him.

The MANES were a similar class of beings. They were the more generally considered as guardians of the deceased, who watched over their graves, and prevented any disturbance of their repose. They were held to be subordinate to the authority of Pluto.

The SATYRS and FAUNS. Of these, the first more properly belonged to the Greek, and the last to the Roman mythology. The Satyr was generally represented as having the human form, except that the ears were erect and pointed, and a buck's tail added. The Satyrs, Fauns, Panes and Sileni all belonged to the retinue of Bacchus.

The GORGONS were three imaginary sisters, daughters of Phorcys and Ceta. Their heads had vipers for hair, their teeth were as long as the tusks of the boar, and whoever looked upon them was instantly turned into stone. They had the head, neck and breasts of women, while the rest of the body was in the form of a serpent. Their names were Stheno, Euryale, and Medusa, the last named having been slain by Perseus.

The CENTAURS were the offspring of Ixion and the cloud. They were half men and half horses, and were said to dwell in Thessaly. They made rude attempts upon the women at the marriage of Pirithous and Hippodamia, in consequence of which they had a battle with the Lapithæ, and were driven into Arcadia. They were afterwards principally destroyed by Hercules.

II. The religion of the Greeks was to be considered in its origin and its progress. It is the opinion of many that the gods of Greece were mostly of foreign extraction, that the colonies from Egypt and Phœnicia, led into Greece by Cecrops and Cadmus, brought along with them the gods of those countries. It has been attempted to identify many of the Grecian deities with those worshiped in the

east, particularly in Egypt and Phœnicia. It must be admitted, however, by all such that if the deities are really the same, they have nevertheless been Hellenized or strangely metamorphosed by the Grecian genius, and it will, I suppose, be generally conceded that a genius capable of making so many and such remarkable changes, would also have been adequate to the original creation of them. Besides, it must be obvious that the same causes, viz: the wants and demands of man's spiritual nature, would be equally operative among the early inhabitants of Greece as among those of Egypt and Phœnicia. The principal difference would be—that if left to themselves, those wants and demands would be likely to form creations that would correspond in a more especial manner with their peculiar genius.

Men, all men, everywhere, if deprived of the knowledge of the true God, would seek to find deities either without them, or within them, or both. They would deify the productive powers of nature, or they would go into the moral and intellectual world, and deify the powers and passions of men. The first is the elder worship. It very naturally arises from witnessing the productive powers of the earth, and the various agencies that lend their aid in increasing those powers. Thus the ancient Pelasgi must have kindled up the fires of their devotion at the shrines of Ceres, Vesta, Bacchus, and those other deities that presided over the earth and its productions. A system of nature worship seems to have been everywhere first adopted. Thus the earth was worshiped under the names of Rhea, Tellus, Ops, Cybeli; five under those of Vulcan and Vesta; the water of the sea and rivers under those of Oceanus, Neptune, Nereus, the nereides, nymphs, and naiads; the air and winds under the names of Jupiter and Æolus. So also the woods had their satyrs, fauns and hamadryads, with Pan at their head. Ceres presided over the harvest-fields, and hence hers was an earlier worship.[1]

[1] *Mayo's Mythology*, I, 111, 112.

An important element of this worship must be the peculiar features of the country embracing all its physical characteristics. This no doubt exercised a considerable degree of influence over the Grecian mind. Its elements of activity were in part gathered up from these influences. They were ever-acting because they lay ever around him.

But the Hellenic tribes were not long in discovering that nature and its productive powers, although primarily furnishing to man his subsistence, are by no means the only active agents in the universe. They perceived that in its mighty inventory man also formed an item of value. In the relations existing between him and external nature they discovered a mutuality; that he was as essential to the world as the world was to him. The Greek looked within himself, and found there fountains of thought and emotion welling up from the depths of the human soul. At these he drank deep, and immediately a new era opens in civilization; an era in which man stands prominent on the foreground of action.

One great fact illustrating this truth is, that the Greek invested his very gods with human attributes. He transferred his own nature to his own heavens, and then admired and loved and feared its display in the wisdom of his Pallas, in the loves of his Venus, in the valor of his Mars, in the thunders of his Jupiter. His gods had human forms. They were gods and goddesses. They could be wounded, but not slain. Their blood was ichor; their food, ambrosia; their drink, nectar. They assembled on the summit of Olympus in solemn council. The affairs of men were the matters there debated, and individual and national destinies there determined. They had their feasts, their cup bearers, their messengers. They interested themselves in the affairs of men and of nations, and took different sides in national controversies. They not only protected their own favorites, but sometimes mingled themselves with the terrors of the battle-field.

To link heaven to earth still more effectually, to bring the gods nearer to man, they were invested by the Greek with human foibles and frailties. Jealousy, revenge, and lust found their echoes in the bosoms of the celestials.

It is obvious, therefore, that the Greek availed himself of both the sources formerly mentioned to furnish him with deities; that the powers of nature without, and the powers of man within, were both made the objects of his worship.

So far as progress of the Greek, in his religion, is concerned, little more can be said than that it ever proved a faithful mirror to reflect the operations of his mind and heart in all those things in which they were required to be exercised in reference to that element. The ingenuity and skill of the poet were tasked to the utmost in the invention of fictions and myths, and in throwing over the whole a drapery of fancy that would render them acceptable to the mind.

The painter and sculptor, by rendering their forms models of perfection, united in them a beauty in design, a symmetry in form, a power in expression, and a felicity in execution, which has been the wonder of every succeeding age. When on the subject of Grecian art we shall find its brightest fires kindled at the shrines of the gods, as its noblest specimens were the representations or embodiments of their deities. Nor was philosophy, by any means, an idle spectator in matters of religion. She exerted herself in purifying the religious element; in purging it of gross ideas and superstitions; and in thus rendering it much more acceptable to the higher order of educated mind. By these various means the religion of the Greek of the age of Pericles must have widely differed from that of the ancient Pelasgi, in whose nature worship was united a rude simplicity coupled with a want of that refinement which subsequently encircled the Grecian mind with such a halo of brightness and beauty.

III. The religion of the Greeks was to be considered in its essential character, whether a pantheism, a polytheism,

or monotheism; whether real or symbolical. In regard to unity or plurality there are three different modes of belief. The one identifies deity with the universe, considering the divine essence equally diffused through all parts of the universe, and is hence styled pantheism. Another assigns to several different deities the government of the universe, and is hence styled polytheism. Another still devolves the whole upon one being uncaused, uncreated, existing from eternity to eternity, and this is properly styled monotheism.

The religion of the Greeks is generally considered a polytheism. It had certainly little, if anything, about it of the pantheistic character, unless we can suppose that they regarded the universe as the supreme god, and the several parts of it as his living members; or that they looked upon the material universe as a mirror, or visible image of the invisible deity, and its several parts as so many manifestations of the divine power and providence.

A more difficult undertaking is to decide whether the Greek religion was in reality a polytheism or a monotheism; whether there were many coequal deities, or one great self-existent source of all being and of all events. One thing is very clear and that is, that the Greek theogony itself taught the regular descent of their gods, tracing them in succession to Chaos, which was supposed to contain the seeds of things; Chaos and Night being looked upon as the ancestors of nature. It is therefore the opinion of many that the multiplicity of gods and goddesses were either nothing but several names and notions of one supreme deity, according to its different manifestations, gifts, and effects in the world, personated; or, they were many inferior understanding beings, generated or created by one supreme; so that one unmade, self-existent deity, only was the object of worship by the most intelligent among the Grecians.

That the poets and philosophers entertained the conception of the one supreme being is clear from many of their

works that yet remain. Take for instance the following lines of Euripides:

> The self-sprung being, that dost all enfold,
> And in thine arms heaven's whistling fabric hold!
> Who art encircled with resplendent light,
> And yet liest mantled o'er in shady night,
> About whom the exultant starry fires,
> Dance nimbly round in everlasting gyres.

It is perfectly clear that the gods of the Greeks, were, in many cases, unable to gratify their own desires, to the extent of their wishes, and hence must have lacked that omnipotence which should properly belong to a god. This was perhaps, the most clearly exhibited in that tremendous battle-scene before the walls of Troy, in which the gods took part, contending with men and with each other. The ruler of gods and men was understood to be Jupiter or Olympian Jove, but he is frequently made the dupe of Juno's artifice, which is hardly consistent with the attribute of omniscience. Besides he cannot control the decrees of fate. To illustrate the fact last stated, the following curious circumstance may be related: When Jupiter heard of the death of his son Sarpedon, in the rage of grief he called Mercury, and ordered him to go instantly to the Fates, and bring from them the strong box in which the eternal decrees were laid up. Mercury obeyed, went to the sisters, and omitted nothing that a wise and well instructed minister could say, to make them pacify the will of Jove. The sisters smiled, and told him that the other end of the golden chain, which secured the box with the unalterable decrees, was so fixed to the throne of Jove, that were it to be unfastened, his master's seat itself might tremble. Thus fate or necessity would seem to control even the thunderer. But on the other hand, mind, that is, God, is said by Plato to rule over necessity, because those evils which are occasioned by the necessity of imperfect beings, are overruled by the divine art, wisdom, and providence for good.

On the whole, it is certainly not improbable that although the religion of the Greeks has, to a casual observer, very much the appearance of a polytheism, yet there is a strong probability that the more intelligent actually arose to the conception of the one supreme God, who was really the object of worship, while the others were looked upon as expressive of his several attributes, or as subordinate deities, that perhaps, might intercede with effect, or might aid the more common and less enlightened mind in ascending as by so many stepping stones to the great author of all.

One other question remains under this head, and that is, the real or symbolical character of the Grecian religion. Whether a religion is real or symbolical depends mainly upon the sources from which the deities are derived. Wherever the powers of nature are deified, there will be found a symbolical religion; that is, symbols will be resorted to for the purpose of arresting the attention and turning the full current of thought and feeling upon the agent or power which they were designed to represent. If the active powers and passions of men are made the objects of worship, the representations are real, not symbolical.

The religion of the Egyptians was a fair sample of a symbolical religion. It was vague, shadowy, distant, mysterious, the forms of its deities being so many symbols under which a stately nature-worship was conducted. The religions of the east, except the Jewish, and that to some extent, were mainly symbolical in their character.

Even among the Greeks the earliest religion was that of symbols, because nature and her productive powers were the gods of the ancient Pelasgi. But the Greek mind, although it sympathized strongly with external nature; could never rest satisfied with paying its adoration simply to symbols. It craved something more real and life-like; and, accordingly, when it deified human powers and passions it dropped the symbolical and assumed the real. At the same time the old nature-worship of the Pelasgi was not superseded or discontinued. Ceres, Vesta and Bacchus still continued to be worshiped, but their worship became

more and more involved in mystery, and thus originated the Bacchanalian and Eleusinian mysteries. They consisted of assemblages of symbols through which the mind of the initiated was supposed to be brought into a more intimate acquaintance with the powers they were designed to represent. So far then, the religion continued to be symbolical.

But on the other hand, the deities to whom the heroic age gave birth, partook of reality. They possessed active powers and moral attributes, and could not, therefore, be mere symbols. It has been well remarked that Jupiter could never become symbolical to a people who had once pictured to themselves the nod and the curls of the Jupiter of Homer. With the exception, therefore, of the mysteries, the objects of worship with the Greeks bore a real, not a symbolical character.

IV. The religion of the Greeks considered in its ministers, priests, and priestesses.

In all countries where religious observances have been established, there have been ministers or priests, who have devoted themselves, more or less exclusively, to the services of the altar. In the eastern world generally, particularly in Egypt, we have seen a priest caste established, which possessed a great influence in moulding national character and in giving direction to national energies.

In those countries generally the priest caste contained within itself much, or all, the nation's civilization, and, by a natural or necessary consequence, ruled over its affairs. In this respect a new era in the world's civilization opens in Greece. Here the priest caste disappears, never more to reappear, at least under its ancient forms.

In Greece there seems to have been priests who devoted themselves to the ministrations of religion, but their influence over the people never seems to have been extensive, nor were their services absolutely required at the public solemnities, or the performance of sacred rites in honor of the gods. These seem also to have been done by the kings, leaders and commanders.

In Athens, the king was accustomed to prepare the sacred rites, and when the kingly office was abolished, the second archon was called king because he presided at the public ceremonies of worship. Like the others he was annually appointed, and the election was made by lot. It is true, instances were not wanting where the sacerdotal office was hereditary, but this occurred but seldom. The hierophant of the Eleusinian mysteries, as also three other of the principal priests, were taken exclusively from the family of the Eumolpidæ in Athens. So the priestesses of Dodona seem to have belonged to the family of the Selli. In other instances they were chosen by lot, or elected at a popular election. The regulations in regard to the priesthood were not the same in all parts of Greece. As a general thing the office was filled for a limited time only, and was regarded as a post of honor. Those appointed were taken from the class of active citizens, to which, after the expiration of their term, they again returned. Even while priests they were by no means withdrawn from the regular business of civil life, nor from the duties of war. They never formed, therefore, a distinct order in Greece, and could never come to possess the spirit of a party. They formed no distinct class in society, and had no secret system of instructions confined to themselves alone. Those initiated into the mysteries were not all priests, nor were all priests required to be thus initiated. No one was admitted to the priesthood who was not born in lawful marriage; who was not perfect and sound in all his members; who was not of the proper age; and whose past conduct was not irreproachable. He was required to be chaste and uncontaminated by worldly pleasures, and some drank the juice of the hemlock, to enfeeble their physical powers.

The priests were sometimes married, but the priestesses were mostly virgins. Sometimes they seem to have been elected only to the time of their marrying. Both at Delphi and at Athens, the custody of the sacred fire was committed to the care of widows who were beyond the age of childbearing. At Athens, both priests and priestesses

were required to give an account to certain officers of the manner in which they had discharged their several functions. There was generally a high priest, whose office consisted in superintending the rest, and in executing the more sacred rites and ceremonies of religion.

The attire of the Grecian priests was splendid, without spot or stain, loose, and resembling royal robes. The color depended on the god to whom the sacrifice was offered. If to the celestial gods, the color was purple; if to the infernal, black. The priests were not confined to the care of the altars, but were vested with the sacerdotal dignity generally. They had apartments assigned them near the temples, and a part of the victims was allotted them. They had also a salary, proportioned to the dignity of their functions, and to the rank of the deities whom they served, which was probably paid from the revenue of the temples. This revenue was very considerable, and was derived, in part, from fines levied on individuals for various offenses; in part from the produce of lands belonging to the state, and in part from first fruits which the public officers levied on all lands for the use of the gods. Besides these there was the money and the voluntary contributions which were brought sometimes from parts very remote, and presented to the shrine of the god. At Delos and Eleusis and especially at Delphi, these contributions were enormous. These revenues, however, were neither deposited with the priests, nor expended by them.

The temples of the principal deities had many ministers, and in each presided a chief who had the title of high priest. The number of subaltern priests increased with the rank of the deity, but the priests of one temple were entirely separated from those of another. Each priest was limited to his own temple, and there was no sovereign pontiff presiding over the whole.

The priests as priests were confined entirely to the functions of their office, to the offering sacrifices to the gods, and entreating their acceptance of the adorations of the people. They could neither take cognizance of crimes

committed against the deity, nor punish them. Religious causes fell under the jurisdiction of the Heliastæ.[1]

V. The Grecian religion considered in its altars, places of worship, temples and statues.

1. Its altars. The altar is associated with the earliest idea of worship. That a tribute was due from man to God in the shape of an offering has ever been the practical admission of mankind, and the altar was the place where this offering was made. Among the Greeks the first altars were made of turf, and placed under trees or covered with their boughs. Subsequently stones, brick, marble and metals were made use of as materials in their erection.

The altar was made to vary according to the character of the deity to whom it was dedicated. The celestial gods had their altars raised considerably above the ground. That of Olympian Jove was nearly twenty feet high. The altars raised to the terrestrial gods were not so high. Those appropriated to heroes or demi-gods were one step high. The infernal deities, instead of altars, had ditches or trenches ploughed up to the depth of about a cubit for the purpose of sacrificing. Religious worship was paid to nymphs in caves. The form of the altar was various. That the most common among the Greeks was a perfect cube. Sometimes they were round, at others triangular, octangular, etc. The metallic altars were generally triangular, and those of brick and stone, cubical. On occasions of festivals the altars were decorated with leaves or branches of trees sacred to the gods to whom they were dedicated.

Some altars were intended for sacrifices made by fire; others without fire, and without blood; upon which only cakes, fruits and inanimate things could be offered. On the altars were engraved the names or peculiar characters of the deities to whom they were consecrated. Thus the

[1] *Nuttall's Archæological Dictionary*, article, Priests; *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 199; *Heeren's Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, 69.

inscription on the altar at Athens noticed by St. Paul was: "To the unknown God!"

Some altars were solid, while others were hollow at the top, to receive the libations and blood of the victims. They were generally fixed, but some were portable, to be used in traveling, and upon other occasions. They were to be found in the temples, in the sacred groves, in the open fields, and on the summits of mountains. When consecrated, they often had the privilege of protecting malefactors and debtors who had fled to them for refuge, and laid hold on their horns. Where so fitting a place for the exercise of mercy as the altars on which expiatory sacrifices were offered up to secure the favor and forgiveness of deity?

2. Its places of worship. Anterior to the erection of the temple was the sacred grove, which was one of the earliest places of worship. When found, or furnished, they were always of the thickest kind, dark, sombre, gloomy and impenetrable to the rays of the sun. At first, they possessed neither temple nor altar, but at subsequent periods chapels and temples were built in them, and not unfrequently groves were built around their temples and altars. Not only were these consecrated to the gods, but they also served as places of sanctuary for criminals who fled thither for refuge.

Not only in sacred groves, but also on the summits of high mountains was worship, in a special manner, paid to the gods, and temples erected to them. The summits of high mountains were held sacred to Saturn, or Jupiter, and sometimes to Apollo. They approached nearest to the heavens, the seat of the gods, and hence rendered the gods more accessible to the suppliant.

3. Its temples. These are of great antiquity, although not coeval with worship. It is asserted by many that the tabernacle, which was a portable temple made by Moses in the desert, was the origin of all temple structures, and, in a great measure, the model from which the rest were made. That certainly had its sanctum-sanctorum, and all the pagan temples contain within them a corresponding

sacred place, called the adytum. The erection of temples is supposed to have first taken place in Egypt, and to have passed from thence into Asia. This may be doubtful, but their erection in Greece was undoubtedly derived from Egypt and Phœnicia. The building of the first temple in Greece is ascribed to Deucalion.

All temples had certain things in common which are worthy of notice. The first thing to be mentioned was the porch, or entrance. Here stood the pool in which was contained the holy water designed for the expiation of those who were to enter into the temple. The second was the nave or middle of the temple. The third was the holy place variously called, as penetrale, sacrarium, or adytum, into which no one but the priest was permitted to enter. Lastly, the back temple which was not always present.

Some of the temples had galleries carried quite around them. These were composed of a range of pillars set at a certain distance from the wall, covered with large stones. These temples were called peripteres, that is, winged all around. Again there were temples whose galleries had two ranges of pillars, and these were called dipteres. When pillars formed the portico without a gallery they were called prostyles; and when they had two rows of pillars on the outside, and two also on the inside, the middle being uncovered, after the manner of a cloister, they were termed hypethres.

Some of the temples exhibited very great splendor, but the inner part was the most adorned. Besides the statues of the gods, and sometimes of great men, there were often paintings, gildings and other embellishments of a high order.

The votive offerings in the large temples were very numerous. There were the prows of ships dedicated to the god who was supposed to have rescued from shipwreck the unfortunate mariner. There were the tablets or tabellas for the cure of disease. There were the arms, colors, tripod, bucklers won from an enemy, and hung up as trophies, or dedicated to the god to whom the victory was ascribed as votive offerings.

It was also said that particular gods had their temples of a particular order of architecture. Thus Minerva, Mars, and Hercules had the Doric order, because its plainness best agreed with their valor; Venus, Flora, and Proserpine, the Corinthian, as most agreeable to their delicacy; and Juno, Diana, Bacchus, and other deities of that kind, the Ionic, as holding the mean between the severity of the Doric and the delicacy of the Corinthian.[1]

The form of temples was various — round, square, etc., but those of the Greeks were, with very few exceptions, quadrilateral, the length being one-half greater than the width.

The location of temples seems to have been a matter of some importance. Those of the patron deity of the place were set on places of the greatest eminence so as to overlook the city. The temples of Mercury were in the forum, or market place; those of Apollo and Bacchus near the theatre; those of Hercules near the gymnasium, amphitheatre, or circus; those of Mars without the city in the fields; and those of Venus near the city gates. It was said that the temple of Venus should be without the walls; because if within, it might be the means of debauching the young virgins and the matrons; that of Vulcan also without, that the houses might not be in danger of taking fire; and that of Mars in the same manner without, that there might be no dissensions among the people.[2] If the near proximity of their gods was deemed dangerous, it seems strange they could not have inferred that the further they were removed from them the better.

Wherever the temple stood, if its situation permitted, the windows opened upon the rising sun. The front was toward the west; and the statues and altars being placed at the other end, those who worshiped had their faces toward the east; for it was an ancient custom to worship with their faces toward the east.

One peculiarity of the Grecian temples requires here to be noticed, and that is the right of sanctuary, or asyla,

[1] *Montfaucon's Antiquity Displayed*, II, 33. [2] *Mayo's Mythology*, I, 142.

which they offered to the guilty. This, perhaps, originated in the moral idea that as they supplicated the forgiveness of the gods in the temples, erected to them, so they ought in some degree to merit it by extending forgiveness to those who were supplicating it of them. It seems probable that the first altars that were erected were places of refuge. The first regulation of this principle seems to have been among the Jews, who properly organized their cities of refuge. The example was probably imitated by others.

The custom with the Greeks was very ancient, but the precise date of it cannot be arrived at. Cadmus is said to have granted it to the citadel he erected in Bœotia, and he being from Phœnicia, in the neighborhood of Palestine, may have borrowed it from the Hebrews.

It seems to have been claimed that there were not asyla of all criminals indiscriminately, but for those only who were involutionary offenders. The protection was not in all cases afforded. In some instances the doors of the temples were shut, in order to starve the criminals who had fled thither for refuge. Sometimes malefactors were expelled by fire. In the case of Pausanias, in Sparta, a wall was erected about the place of refuge, and the malefactor thus left to destruction.

It seems also that all temples and sacred places were not indiscriminately asyla, but those only who received that privilege from the manner of their consecration. Some were asyla for all men, while others were appropriated to particular persons and crimes. The temple of Diana at Ephesus was a refuge for debtors, while that of Theseus at Athens afforded one for slaves and those of low condition who fled from severity of treatment.

The sacredness of asyla continued to the reign of Tiberias, when the inconveniences attending them were found to be so great that they were either entirely abolished, or the few that still were suffered to retain the privilege were so greatly reformed, that it ceased to be a leading feature in the character of the temples.

The most celebrated temples in Greece were the temple of Jupiter Olympias at Athens; the temple of Minerva at Athens; the erectheum, or double temple, of Neptune and Minerva at Athens; the temple of Ceres and Proserpine at Eleusis; and that of Apollo at Delphi.

4. Its statues. The first statues of the gods were mere shapeless stones to which a religious worship was paid. Pillars of stone were also objects of veneration and worship. The earliest statues of Hercules and Cupid were nothing but two masses of stone.

As early as the age of Theseus, and of Minos II, Dædalus separated the feet and other parts so as to give them the attitudes of walking and acting. This had the effect of bestowing upon them hands and feet. He also gave them eyes. From that time the improvement in the making of them was very rapid, until the greatest possible perfection was attained, and the masterpieces of Phidias and Praxiteles stood forth, as they have ever since done, the wonder of an admiring world.

In respect to size, there were about four different descriptions of statues. The first were of a size less than the life, and these were made of men, kings, and even gods. The second equaled the life. The third surpassed it once and a half, or twice; while the fourth exceeded the life twice, thrice, or even more, were called colossi, and were made only for the gods. Very few of the gods ever had colossal statues in Greece, except Jupiter and Apollo. The statue of Jupiter Olympus was very large, but the colossus of Rhodes, representing Apollo, was the most extraordinary for size, its height being seventy cubits. Its feet stood upon the two moles which formed the harbor of Rhodes, and ships at full sail passed between its legs. Few persons were able to embrace one of its thumbs. It continued standing for 1,360 years, and was at last thrown down by an earthquake. Its fragments were sufficient to load nine hundred camels. The statue of Jupiter in the temple of Olympian Jove, in Altis, was sixty feet in height, and was the work of Phidias.

These colossal statues were not numerous; far the larger proportion being of the ordinary human size, the gods being some little larger and more robust than the goddesses. The casting of statues in brass, dates back to a very remote antiquity. It seems to have been first practiced among the Greeks. The materials of which statues were made were various. Timber, stone, marble, ivory, and the different metals, as gold, silver, brass, etc., were employed for that purpose. The timber used was box wood, cedar, citron wood, palm tree, olive wood, ebony and cypress. The statues very generally were made of moulded earth, and subsequently they were laid over with different colors, and at last were gilt.

The statue of Jupiter, before mentioned, was composed of gold, ivory, ebony, and precious stones, and these were so artfully blended together, that the effect was so perfectly enchanting that nobody durst try to imitate it.

The number of statues almost exceeded belief. The cities of Athens, Delphos and Rhodes are each said to have had three thousand of them. In Greece they were always represented naked.

They endeavored so to construct the statue as to be in harmony with the character of the god. Thus to Jupiter was given a majestic air; to Minerva, a masculine beauty; to Venus, softness and effeminacy; to Mars, a warlike mien; and to Neptune, a stern and awful look.

The statues usually wore the symbols consecrated to the gods. Thus Jupiter appeared with his thunderbolts; Apollo with his lyre; Neptune with his trident; Bacchus with his grapes; Ceres with ears of corn; Hercules with his club; and Diana with her quiver and arrows. Neptune has his chariot drawn by sea horses, Venus by doves, Juno by peacocks, and Cybele by lions.

The statues of the gods were generally simple, presenting but a single figure; sometimes they were grouped, and contained several figures together.[1]

[1] *Mayo's Mythology*, 125, *et seq.*; *Nuttall's Arch. Dict.*, article, Statues.

VI. The Grecian religion considered in its modes of worship; its sacrifices, festivals, expiations, oaths and public supplications.

1. The modes of worship. These are the outward expression of the sentiment of veneration or reverence. They are always interesting because they are evidence of the manner in which the people suppose they can best commend themselves to the deity. With the Greeks these modes consisted principally in their sacrifices, festivals, expiations, purifications and stated observances.

2. Its sacrifices. The offering up of sacrifices to the gods by way of atoning for sin, or of supplicating the favor of deity, was very universal through the ancient world. It seems to have been a practice which paganism borrowed from true religion. It is one as old as the world.

The first sacrifices among the Greeks were very simple. They consisted only of herbs or fruits. Afterwards animals also were offered, and costly perfumes added, in order to render them more acceptable. Sacred cakes were made a part of the sacrifice, and no oblation was considered acceptable to the gods, unless mixed with salt.

Sacrifices were of two sorts, bloody and unbloody. The first consisted in the immolation of brute animals or of men; the last was an offering of things without life, as of wine, fruits, corn and incense. The last seem to have been the first adopted in Greece. On the altar consecrated to Jupiter most high, at Athens, no living thing was offered, but only simple offerings, without even using wine in the libations. This mode of sacrificing was derived from Cecrops.

It was natural for them to offer to the gods that which they themselves chiefly subsisted on. Hence, when they subsisted on herbs and fruits, these were offered to their gods. When bread came to be substituted for food, it was also for sacrifice. When subsequently they came to feed on the flesh of animals, these, in their turn, were immolated on their altars.

To show the unpopularity which attended the introduction of bloody sacrifices into Athens, it is related that the sacrificer, after having struck the animal that was to be offered up, was obliged to flee. On being pursued he threw away the axe he had made use of, as being guilty of the death of the animal. This, on being apprehended, was gravely proceeded against as the cause of the death.

After the introduction of the bloody sacrifices, the elder forms of offering herbs, salt and meal, were still continued. They threw meal and salt upon the victims, upon the fire, and upon the sacrificing knives.

It seems strange that a people so reluctant to introduce bloody sacrifices could ever have been induced to offer up those that were human. Yet it seems well established that at one period human beings were offered up as sacrifices on the altars of the gods, particularly on that of Saturn. This revolting custom does not appear to have been much resorted to nor of long continuance among the Greeks.

Sacrifices were also either public or private. The first were publicly offered by the pontiffs, priests and other ministers; the last by private persons in their own houses.

Great nicety was required in the selection of the victims. They were required to be clean, without blemish, neither lame nor deformed. When offered to the celestial gods they must be white and of an odd number. When to the infernal, they were black, and of an even number. Almost every god had some peculiar animal. Thus the bull was sacrificed to Jupiter; the heifer to Juno; the bull to Neptune; a black bull to Pluto; a black cow to Proserpine, etc.

Immediately upon the selection of the animal, it was decked with ribbon and fillets. Its horns were gilded, and upon its head was laid the salted cake, fruit and frankincense. Next came the libation of wine, and then the ceremony called litibatur, which consisted in the priest taking some hairs from between the horns of the victim, throwing them into the fire, and then having turned his face towards the east, ordering the sacrificer to slay the victim. When dead the priest plunged the sacrificing

knife into its entrails to see if the sacrifice was auspicious. The victim was then cut in pieces, and a part of it roasted and distributed for the feast. The priests were crowned with a chaplet of the branches or leaves of the tree, which was sacred to the god to whom the sacrifice was offered, as of oak for Jupiter, laurel for Apollo, vine for Bacchus, cypress for Pluto, etc.

The diviners were accustomed to assist at the sacrifices, for the purpose of consulting the entrails of the victim. They also ordered the time, form and matter of the sacrifice.

There were different kinds of sacrifices, such as the holocaust, where the victim was wholly consumed by fire; also the expiatory sacrifice, and the sacrifice of thanksgiving.

The whole animal was not offered to the gods. The thighs were the portion which fell to their share. There were portions also which the priests only had a right to touch, but others were distributed or carried off.

The sacrifices were accompanied with libations. This, in ancient times, was simply an effusion of water. Even the orgies of Bacchus seem to have been once celebrated with this libation. Subsequently wine was introduced.

The sacrifices were made to the celestial gods in the morning; to the terrestrial and infernal in the evening and the night. In the sacrifices to the latter the victims were all black, and a hole dug in the earth received the blood of the victim and the wine of the libation. The entire victim was burnt as in the holocaust, nothing ever offered to the infernal gods being eaten.

The diviners stood ready on the death of the victim to examine its entrails. By these were meant the heart, the liver, the lungs and the spleen. Not only were these to be examined, but also observations were made upon the motion of the tail when the victim was just expiring. If it twisted, it signified a difficult enterprise; if it turned downward, it presaged an overthrow; if it was lifted up, it betokened a triumph. They also drew presages from the manner in which the incense sparkled as it burned, and from the different contortions of the smoke as it ascended.

The occasions on which sacrifices were offered were very numerous and frequent. They were offered by generals before a battle; by those who were about founding a city; by those about commencing a journey; in the common affairs of domestic life; in case any one was afflicted with a disease; after a dream; and when any enterprise of any importance was about to be entered upon.

No violence was resorted to in leading or driving the victim to the altar, and when arrived there, the priest went round it, sprinkling it with meal and holy water. All present joined in a set form of prayer, after which food was placed before the victim, and if it refused to eat, it was rejected as unsound. If the victim happened to escape the stroke, or leaped up after it, or bellowed, or did not fall to the ground; if it died with pain and difficulty, did not bleed freely, or was a long time dying; they were deemed unlucky omens, but their contraries were considered as propitious.

3. Its festivals. The ancients celebrated festivals in honor of their gods in all matters of great public concern. The majority of these derived their names from the objects upon whom these honors were conferred. For instance the Appollonia were instituted in honor of Apollo, the Bacchanalia in honor of Bacchus. Some were so called from the place where they were celebrated, and others from the matter of the offering itself.

The Greeks borrowed some of their festivals from the Egyptians and Phœnicians, and originated several themselves. It would be useless to give a dry list of them. A reference will be made to but few of them.

The ADONIA, in honor of Adonis, lasted two days; the first being spent in howlings and lamentations, the last in rejoicings as if Adonis had returned to life. In some places they lasted eight days, one-half being spent in lamentations and the other in rejoicings. Women only were admitted.

In the ÆMATURIA celebrated in honor of Pelops, the boys whipped themselves until the blood came from their lacerated bodies.

The ANTHESTERIA had the peculiarity, that, during the three days of its continuance, the masters served their slaves at table.

The ATHENÆA were celebrated in honor of Minerva. They were celebrated by all the tribes of Athens.

The DEMETRIA were in honor of Ceres. The votaries of the goddess were accustomed to lash themselves with whips made from the bark of trees.

The DIAMASTIGOSIS was a Spartan festival in honor of Diana. On the occasion of its celebration, boys of the first respectability were whipped before the altar of the goddess. The parents of the children attended, and exhorted them to bear it manfully. These were so severe, that some expired under the lash of the whip. Such were accounted to have attained great honor, and were buried with much solemnity.

The DIONYSIA were celebrated in honor of Bacchus. They were observed at Athens with great splendor, and the years were numbered by their celebration. The festivals of Bacchus were very numerous, and were celebrated with great licentiousness among the Greeks.

The ELEUSINIA were in honor of Ceres and Proserpine, celebrated at Eleusis, in Attica. Its celebration involved the mysteries.

The HERMÆA was a festival in Crete, and also observed at Athens, the principal ceremony of which consisted in masters waiting upon their servants. A great many others were celebrated, too numerous to be mentioned.

4. Its expiations. Expiation was an act for purifying both person and place. It purified the former from guilt, and the latter from defilement. It was not limited to crimes, but was resorted to on various other occasions. The dread of public calamities was a fruitful source of expiatory sacrifices. They were renewed on a great many different occasions, so that many actions in life, both public and private, required them to be made. A general assuming the command of an army; the celebration of games and festivals; the calling an assembly; the initiation into

a mystery; were all occasions where recourse was had to expiatory sacrifices.

In general, public expiations were accompanied with prayers and sacrifices, but the ceremonies were very various. There were several sorts of expiations and peculiar ceremonies for each kind. One of the most solemn was that used upon the appearance of some prodigy.

The number of ceremonies often increased in the same expiation, so that sometimes it became exceedingly burdensome. At first the method of purifying from murder was to wash himself in running water. Afterwards other ceremonies were added. The ceremony of expiation for cities, was one of the most solemn. The army was accustomed to be purified before and after a battle.

The private expiations were more numerous than the public ones. The occasions requiring them were very numerous. They preceded nuptials, funerals and all other matters of importance. It was not always that sacrifices were offered at these. Simple ablutions often sufficed.

5. Its oaths. Oaths are nearly as ancient as the world, having their commencement when men became false and dishonest. The ceremonies practiced on taking the oath were at first very simple, no more being required but holding up the hand. Kings lifted up their sceptres, generals their spears or shields, and soldiers their swords. Afterwards the oath was taken in the temple, the party laying his hand upon the altar. Not unfrequently those who swore dipped their hands in the blood of the sacrificed victim.

The Athenians distinguished oaths into two kinds, the greater and the less. The greater was when the gods swore by the Styx; or men by the gods; or women by the goddesses. The lesser when they swore by a creature. In making a solemn oath they sometimes drew their hands through the fire, or took up red hot iron, from an impression that, if they swore sincerely and honestly, they should receive no harm. Women accused of incontinence used to take a purgation oath, which was written upon a tablet,

and hung round the neck. Thus accoutred they stepped into the water up to the mid-leg. If they were innocent, nothing ensued; but if guilty, the water rose to their necks, and covered the tablet, to prevent the detestible crime of a false oath from being exposed to view.

The ancient Greeks had great respect for oaths. Honor the gods and revere an oath, was the sentiment of Pythagoras. Perjury was regarded as the greatest of crimes.

An oath was required of all those who entered upon the performance of an office, and of those who were to intermeddle in the affairs of government, and the public revenues. It was required of the general when he assumed the command of his army; of the soldier when he enlisted; and of the priest when he entered upon the priesthood. Those who violated their oaths were looked upon as the basest of mortals, as having trampled upon all the sacred ties of religion, and endeavored to impose both upon gods and men.

6. Its public supplications. These consisted either in prayer for favors desired, or in thanksgiving for benefits received. Private supplications consisted in prayers only. Public supplications were offered up on great occasions, such as the raging of the plague, or some destructive disease, or after an unexpected victory, and on other like occasions.

VII. The Grecian religion considered in its oracles, divinations, magic, mysteries.

1. In its oracles. Of all the methods of prying into futurity, as practiced by the ancients, that of consulting the oracles was the most esteemed. Whatever came from them was considered as coming more immediately from the gods. Among the Greeks, oracles consisted essentially in responses of future events, made to the devout inquirers, by means of priests or priestesses, who were supposed to be inspired with extraordinary powers, and to hold familiar converse with the gods. These were consulted in matters both public and private. If a new government was to be

instituted, if war was to be proclaimed, or peace concluded, or particular laws to be enacted, it was common to consult an oracle. So also in matters of private life, when a marriage was contemplated, or a journey to be undertaken, or any business of importance to be entered upon, it was proper first to consult the oracle.

Previously to consulting the gods through one of their oracles it was necessary to offer presents and sacrifices. This requisition deprived the common people of the privilege, and limited it to princes and men of opulence. There was also another regulation that served as a limitation. The gods could not be consulted at all times. At Delphos, Apollo could not at first be consulted but one month in the year. In subsequent times there was one day in each month when the god pronounced his oracles.

The manner in which the oracles were delivered was very various. Sometimes the god himself pronounced the oracle; sometimes the priestess answered for the god. In one place the response of the god was received in their sleep; in another, in letters under seal; and in others still by the casting of lots.

A grave question has been very much discussed in regard to all the oracles, and that is, whether the responses, or predictions, were obtained through the fraudulent contrivance of the priests, or whether they really proceeded from the devil himself. The strong probability is that they were derived directly from the former; but to what extent the devil might have instigated a resort to trick, chicanery and fraudulent contrivance, must remain an open question.

There were several hundreds of these oracles established in different parts of Greece, but it will be necessary to notice specially but very few of them. It seems to have been the general opinion, that Jupiter was the first cause of all sorts of divination, and that he revealed out of the books of fate, whatever he chose, to the inferior dæmons. Apollo had great skill in prediction, and presided over oracles and divinations, but yet he was subordinate to

Jupiter. Of the several oracles to be noticed, we begin with:

a. The oracle of Jupiter at Dodona. This was the oldest in Greece, its origin being attributed to Deucalion, who built the city of Dodona, in Epirus, soon after the deluge. The first priestess was supposed to have come from Thebes, in Egypt. The oracle was originally given by the murmuring of a fountain in the forest of Dodona, which rippled along the foot of an oak. Subsequently other formalities were resorted to. Brazen kettles were suspended in the air near a statue of the same metal also suspended, and which held in its hand a lash. The agitation produced by the wind caused this figure to strike against the kettle that was next to it, and this communicating motion to the rest of the kettles, raised a clattering din which continued for some time; and from this noise their predictions were formed.

There was also another method by which the priestesses obtained responses. Entering the sacred forest they placed themselves near the prophetic tree, and gathered thence from attentive observation of the murmur of the leaves agitated by the zephyrs, or the groanings of the branches as they were beaten by the storm.

Near the temple of Dodona was a sacred grove, full of oaks, in which the fauni, dryades and satyrs were accustomed to dwell. This oracle is supposed to have ceased about the time of Augustus Cæsar.

b. The oracle of Apollo at Delphos. This was the most celebrated in Greece, and was of the longest continuance. Its origin is lost in antiquity.

The city of Delphi was thought to be situated in the middle of Greece, and also in the middle of the earth. Apollo was here worshiped under the name of the Pythian, a title derived from the serpent Python, which he had killed. The Delphic priestess was hence called Pythia, and the games there celebrated, the Pythian.

The original discovery of this oracle is ascribed to some goats that were feeding in the valleys of Parnassus. Hav-

ing come by accident near the mouth of a hole, they commenced capering and frisking in a most remarkable manner, which so astonished the shepherd having them in charge, that he also approached and leaned over the hole. No sooner had he done this, than he was seized with a fit of enthusiasm, under the influence of which, he uttered some extravagant expressions, which were received as prophecies. Other people of the neighborhood were also induced to make the same trial, and with the same result.

This was supposed to proceed from some friendly deity, which soon became an object of worship. The city of Delphi gradually rose around it, and a temple was erected which became one of the most magnificent in the world.

There were several gods, or rather goddesses, who successively had this oracle, as Terra, Themis, Phœbe and finally Apollo. The great celebrity that attached to it was as the oracle of Apollo. Its reputation exceeded that of any, indeed of all others, and Greeks and barbarians flocked from all parts to consult it.

At first a single priestess, called a pythia, was sufficient. At length two were required who alternated with each other. Finally a third was appointed to succeed in case of the sickness or decease of either of the others. At first young women, virgins, were selected for this purpose. They were taken from poor families, where they had lived in obscurity and ignorance. One of the pythia having unfortunately become involved in a love affair, an express law was made that none should be chosen but women above fifty years old.

There were also other ministers of religion, some of whom were called prophets, who superintended the sacrifices, and their inspection. They also performed many other duties. Before any oracle could be delivered sacrifices were to be offered and repeated, until the god expressed himself satisfied. This might consume a whole year. They were careful to have a sufficient number offered before a response from Apollo could be secured.

The pythia also made great preparations for the discharge of her duty. She fasted three days; bathed in the fountain of Castalia; drank some of its waters; and chewed some leaves of the laurel tree. When all was in a state of readiness, Apollo was accustomed to give the signal of his arrival in the temple. The entire fabric shook to its foundations. Then the prophets led the pythia into the sanctuary, and placed her on the tripod, which was an instrument resembling a three-legged stool placed directly over the hole. As soon as the exhalation reached her, her hair stood on end, her mien grew wild and ghastly, her mouth began to foam, and her whole body was suddenly seized with violent trembling. They held her on by force, while her shrieks and howlings made the whole temple resound, filling all around with holy horror. Then it was that she was reputed to be given up to the god, and at certain intervals uttered incoherent words, which were picked up by the prophets and put into the form of verse. This constituted the response of the oracle. She was then taken down from the tripod, and conducted to her cell, where she was accustomed to continue for several days. It was said that speedy death was not unfrequently the result of her enthusiasm.

c. The oracle of Trophonius at Lebadea. This oracle was first discovered by means of a swarm of bees who flew towards the cave afterwards celebrated as the cave of Trophonius. This oracle could not be consulted without the performance of certain ceremonies. The suppliant must pass some days in a chapel dedicated to good Genius and to Fortune. He must be purified by abstinence from all things unlawful. He must sacrifice to Trophonius and all his family, to Jupiter, Saturn and Ceres. Last of all the sacrifices, a ram was offered, through whose entrails it was revealed whether Trophonius was willing he should come down into his cave.

The omens being favorable, he was led to the river Hercyne, where two boys anointed his whole body with oil. Afterwards he was made to drink two sorts of water, the

one that of Lethe, which was the water of forgetfulness; the other that of Mnemosyne, which enabled him to retain whatever he should see in the sacred cave. After going through some other performances, he was led to the cave, the mouth of which was narrow, and the descent into it was by means of a ladder. When arrived at the bottom of this cave, he found another, the entrance to which was very straight. Here he prostrated himself on the ground, carrying a certain composition of honey in either hand, without which he was not admitted to descend. He first put down his feet into the mouth of the cave, and instantly his whole body was forcibly drawn in. Here all were favored with revelations, but not in the same manner. Some were made acquainted with futurity by vision, others by an audible voice. After obtaining their response, he came out the same way he went in, prostrated on the ground and feet foremost. He was then conducted to the chair of Mnemosyne, where he was interrogated as to what he had seen and heard, all which he was afterwards required to write down in a table book, which the priests interpreted in their own way.

d. Some other Grecian oracles. At Claros, a town in Ionia, was an oracle to Apollo, which was very famous and often consulted. So also Jupiter had oracles in Bœotia, in Elis, and at Thebes. The gods not only had their oracles, but also the demi-gods had theirs in great numbers. Even the fountains delivered oracles, such as that of Castalia, at Delphos, and the prophetic fountain in Achaia. That of Limyra gave oracles by means of fishes. Food being presented to them, if they greedily devoured it, it was a favorable omen. If they refused, rejecting it with their tails, it betokened bad success.

The pagan oracles were very numerous. Nearly three hundred have been enumerated, the most of which belonged to Greece. Bœotia seems to have abounded the most in them, its numerous mountains and caverns affording excellent facilities for their establishment. The caves, especially, offered opportunities for secret passages, within

which might be concealed machines and hollow statues, which would enable the priests to carry on more effectually their system of imposture.

The general characteristics of oracles were ambiguity and obscurity. The terms in which they were delivered were generally of such a character as to accommodate themselves to any event that would occur. The case of Crœsus, king of Lydia, may be given in illustration. When he was about to invade the Medes, he consulted the oracle of Delphi, upon the success of that war, and was answered, that by passing the river Halys, he would ruin a great empire. He went on in the full confidence of success, and did ruin a great empire, but unfortunately that empire was his own.

There were various ways in which the oracles were given. In that at Delphos, the priests or prophets interpreted and put into verse what the pythia had pronounced in the time of her fury. We have already seen in what manner the response was given at Dodona, at the cave of Trophonius, and the fountain Limyra.

Responses from the god were often given from the bottom of his statue, the priests probably having conveyed themselves thither by a subterranean passage. In some places the oracles were given by means of letters under a seal. The letter of the applicant was put into the priests' hands, or placed on the altar, and an answer to it received in his sleep.

At Claros the oracle was delivered in a curious manner. The priest required only the number and names of the suppliants. He then retired into a grotto, and having taken water from a secret spring, gave a response in verse, suitable, it was said, to what every one had been thinking upon.

The response of the oracle of Amphiaraus in Attica was given in a dream, the suppliant being obliged to sleep on the skin of a ram recently slain and offered as a sacrifice.

In the oracle of Mercury in Achaia, the suppliant, after many ceremonies, whispered in the ear of the god what he was desirous to know, then stopped his ears with his

hands, left the temple, and the first words he heard upon his coming out, was taken for the response of the god.

The oracles seem to have fallen gradually into disuse on the introduction of Christianity. They appear, however, to have been consulted occasionally as late as the year A. D. 385. Subsequently to that nothing is heard of them.

2. The Grecian religion considered in its divination. By divination was understood the knowledge of future events. It expressed the attempts made by man to pry into the future, and to wrench from it its secrets. It is very ancient, and formed no inconsiderable part of the pagan mythology.

The professed diviners fed principally upon the hearts of crows, vultures and moles, supposing that they thus became partakers of the souls of those animals which naturally followed their bodies, and consequently that they received the influence of the god who accompanied them.

There were three kinds of diviners in Greece. The first possessed prophesying demons, which gave the responses to all such as made inquiries. The second were such as pretended to enthusiasm. The third included all those who were cast into trances or ecstasies, in which they appeared as dead men, and were deprived of all sense and motion, during some days, months or even years. Their relations of strange events were given after their recovery. The Greeks believed that the souls of dying men, when about to separate from the body, could foresee future events.

There were various means or methods of divination, as

a. Divination by dreams; and these were of three sorts: first, when the gods or spirits conversed directly with men in their sleep; the second was a vision, in which the images of things yet to come, are represented in their own proper shape; the third was a dream in which things future were represented by types and figures. This last constituted an allegory, a figure expressing one thing and signifying another. Dreams were supposed to be derived from various sources, as the earth, the infernal

manes, Hecate and the moon; also the god of sleep, who had three attendants: Morpheus, who appeared in the human form; Phobetor or Icelos, who appeared in that of brutes; and Phantasos, who assumed the shape of inanimate creatures. He was supposed to rove through the air to disperse his dreams among men. Delusive dreams were supposed to pass through a gate of ivory, and the true through one of horn. The early part of the morning was the time in which dreams were thought to deserve the most regard.

Those in pursuit of prophetic dreams resorted to the means they deemed the best calculated to secure that end. They were careful of their diet, eating nothing difficult of digestion. Some fasted all one day, and drank no wine for three days. They avoided eating fish, as they were supposed to be difficult of digestion. Many slept in a white garment, and before retiring, sacrificed to Mercury. They procured an interpreter when the dreams were obscure or too ambiguous.

b. Divination by sacrifice. The premises from which conclusions were drawn here were the external parts of the victim, its motions, its entrails, the flame which consumed it, the cakes and flour, the wine and water, and some other things. As the apparent willingness of the victim to be sacrificed was deemed important as a favorable omen, they were accustomed to pour water into its ear, in order that it might, by a nod, consent to the sacrifice. If the entrails were decayed, deficient, irregular, or palpitated, the omen was deemed unfavorable. If the liver was corrupted the whole body was presumed to be, and all further examination was discontinued. Favorable indications were drawn from its redness, from its soundness, from its large head, and the turning in of its lappets; unfavorable, from its dryness, a tie between the parts, the destitution of a lappet, or when it was entirely wanting. So also if it had blisters or ulcers, if it was thin, parched, hard, or discolored, if it had corrupt or vitiated humors, or was any way displaced. Much reliance was placed on the appearance of the liver.

So also if the heart was very little, palpitated much, was wrinkled or lean, misfortune was portended.

Two gall bladders, or one large one very full, portended fierce and bloody, but prosperous battles. Indications were also drawn from the spleen, lungs and intestines, favorable if they were healthy, unfavorable if the contrary.

They also drew indications from the fire that consumed the sacrifice. These were favorable if it readily consumed the victim, if it was bright and pure, if its sparks ascended in the form of a pyramid, and if it continued till all was reduced to ashes. The contrary of these were deemed unfavorable. The result of this species of divination exercised a very great influence and control over the actions of the Greeks. They would desist from enterprises apparently favorable, and undertake such as were doubtful and hazardous, according as the entrails of the victims dissuaded or encouraged them.

c. Hydromancy or divination by water. Of this there were two kinds: first, a basin was filled with water within which was a ring suspended from a string which was held with one finger while he who performed the operation pronounced certain words, and, according as the ring struck against the sides of the basin, he drew from it his predictions; the second was accomplished by conjuring up spirits who appeared at the bottom of the basin. There was also a divination by fountain water which was performed by throwing into it lots, or a kind of dice. When they sank to the bottom it was deemed favorable, but when they remained on the surface it was a bad omen.

d. Pyromancy or divination by fire. One method was to observe the sparkling of the flame, or the light of a lamp. Another method consisted in filling bladders with wine, which were thrown into the fire. The future events were presaged by observing in what manner the wine ran out when the bladder burst. They also threw pitch into the fire, and attended to the manner of its burning, and to the smoke that ascended from it.

e. Divination by birds, insects, etc. Because birds were almost ever on the wing, they were supposed to observe and know the most secret actions of men, and to be acquainted with all events. They were fortunate or unfortunate, either from their own nature, or from the place or manner of their appearance. If a flock of various kinds of birds flew about any person, it was accounted a good omen. If an eagle appeared brisk, clapped his wings, or sported in the air, flying from the right hand to the left, it was reckoned one of the best omens the gods could give. If eagles, vultures, kites, and other birds of prey followed an army, or continued for any considerable time in any place, it was considered as presaging bloodshed and death. The hawk was an unlucky bird, and portended disaster or death if he was seen seizing his prey, unless the prey escaped, and then it denoted deliverance from danger.

The buzzard was an ominous bird. Swallows flying about, and resting upon any place, were an unlucky omen. Owls were ill-omened except at Athens, where, their being sacred to Minerva, changed their character.

The dove was a lucky bird. So also was the swan, especially to mariners. Ravens were much observed, from being the companions of Apollo. When they appeared about an army they were dangerous omens. Their croaking on the right hand was accounted a good omen; on the left, a bad one. The Grecian augurs faced towards the north, having the east on their right hand, and the west on their left. Omens appearing towards the east were accounted fortunate, because from that part of the world, the great principle of light and heat, of motion and life, first diffuses its influence. If they appeared in the west they were deemed unfortunate, because of the sun declining in that part. Some persons professed to understand the language of birds, and therefore to be privy to the most secret transactions.

Ants sometimes foretold good, sometimes evil. Bees were looked upon as an omen of future eloquence. Comets were thought to portend something dreadful.

The true cause of the eclipses of the sun and moon was unknown, and hence they have so terrified the beholders. The course of lightnings was observed. If it appeared on the right hand it was accounted a good omen. Not so if it appeared on the left. The ignes lambens, lambent flame, was a good omen, and presaged future prosperity.

Earthquakes were unfortunate omens. They were supposed to be caused by Neptune. The winds were thought to be prophetical. Thunder was a good or bad omen according to its position. If heard on the right hand it was esteemed lucky; the contrary if on the left.

f. Divination by lots. All lots were sacred to Mercury, who was supposed to preside over this divination. They were commonly black and white beans, little clods of earth, pebbles, dice, and such things as were distinguished by certain characters. These were first cast into a vessel, whence after supplications made to the gods to direct them, they were drawn out, and future events conjectured according to the characters.

Somewhat akin to this was the prophesying by rods. Two sticks were erected, then a certain charm muttered, and according as the sticks fell, whether backwards or forwards, towards the right or left, they gave advice in any matter.

Another method of divination by lots was this. Any person desirous of prying into the future took with him a certain number of lots, distinguished by several characters or inscriptions, and walking in the public road, requested the first boy that met him to draw. If that which was drawn agreed with what he had conceived in his own mind, it was considered an infallible prophecy.

g. Divination by ominous words and things. The Greeks derived omens from a great many sources. They derived them from marks on the body; from sudden mental emotions and perturbations, those especially which seized on men without any visible cause, and which were therefore imputed to the operation of demons. They also derived them from the palpitations of the heart, and the eye,

that of the right eye being accounted a lucky omen, and a ringing in the right ear was an omen of the same character. Sneezing was held sacred, and was most superstitiously observed. It was not always a lucky omen, but varied according to circumstances. Sneezing between midnight and the next succeeding midday was accounted fortunate, but between midday and midnight unfortunate. Sneezing at table while the things were removing was an ill omen. If another happened to sneeze on the left hand it was unlucky, but if on the right, lucky. The sneezing of two men together who were deliberating on business was accounted a favorable omen. Any one sneezing at certain times, or on a particular side, was sufficient to persuade to the undertaking, or to discourage from engaging in business of the greatest importance.

All monstrous or frightful births, sudden and unusual inundations, the unexpected withering or decay of trees and fruits, the noise of beasts, or any accidents that happened to men, or other creatures, contrary to the common course of nature, were thought to be certain signs of the displeasure of the gods. The simple fact of a weasel crossing the road was a sufficient reason for deferring a public assembly for that day.

Certain times were regarded as ominous, some days being accounted fortunate and the cause of success, others unfortunate and the occasion of misfortune. Some days were proper for one kind of business, some for another, and others for none at all.

A bad omen was averted, either by throwing a stone at the thing, or if it were an animal, by killing it. This was done in order that the evil which it foreboded, might fall on its own head. On getting sight at a madman or an epileptic person, it was customary to spit three times into their bosoms. This was done in defiance of the omen, spitting being a sign of the greatest contempt and aversion.

3. The Grecian religion considered in its *magic*. Magic has been defined, the art of producing in nature effects

above the power of man, by the assistance of the gods, upon using certain words and ceremonies.[1] Those who were in the practice of it, were generally acquainted with certain secret powers, properties and affinities of bodies, by which they were enabled to produce surprising effects, and these, although really produced by natural causes, procured them credit in their pretensions to supernatural and miraculous power.

Magic was not originated by the Greeks. It was practiced among the eastern nations, and the knowledge of it was obtained by the Greeks, principally from Persia. Its introduction into Greece is said to have been by Oethanes, who accompanied Xerxes in his expedition.

Although it would seem that in early periods of time, the magicians applied themselves to the study of philosophy, and made strict search into the curious works and mysteries of nature, yet, in subsequent times, the science degenerated; nature was no longer studied; demons were invoked, and mean arts substituted in the place of higher and nobler studies. Little is to be found in Greece under that name, but its incantations, and these are not in kind much unlike the divinations to which reference has already been made.

One species of it was, that in which answers were given by deceased persons. Sometimes a bone or vein of a dead body was used for this purpose. At others, warm blood was poured into the body, with the view of renewing its life, or some other enchantments were resorted to, in order to restore the dead to life. Sometimes the attempt was made, by incantations and ceremonies, to raise the ghosts of the deceased. Thus Orpheus restored to life his wife, Eurydice; and Periander, the tyrant of Corinth, was affrighted by the apparition of his wife, Melissa, whom he had murdered.

There was also a species of magical divination by water, in which they observed the various impressions, changes,

[1] *Mayo's Mythology*, I, 272.

fluxes, refluxes, colors, and images in the water. The future condition of a sick person was foretold by his looking well or ill in a looking-glass dipped into water. Sometimes they cast three stones into the water, and observed the turns made by them in sinking.

Another method was to fill certain round glasses with clear water, and to place about them lighted torches. The demon was then invoked, and the question to be solved proposed. The alterations in the glasses were observed with the greatest care by a chaste boy or a pregnant woman. The demon returned the answer by images in the glasses, which by reflection from the water represented what should come to pass.

There was also a magical incantation performed by polished and enchanted crystals, in which future events were signified by certain marks and figures.

Another species of divination was performed by covering the nails of a chaste boy with oil or soot, which they turned to the sun, believing that by the reflection of his rays, certain images were made to represent the events that should happen.

In order to discover a thief, or other criminal, they fixed an axe or hatchet so exactly upon a round stake that it might be equally poised. They then prayed and repeated over the names of those whom they suspected, and the person at whose name the hatchet moved was deemed guilty.

There was another curious magical incantation performed through the agency of a cock, in the following manner. The twenty-four letters of the alphabet were written in the dust, and on each one was laid a grain of wheat or barley. A cock, magically prepared, was then let loose among them. The letters, out of which he picked the corn, being joined together, were thought to declare whatever was wished to be known.

They also laid a number of straws on a red hot iron, and then observed the figures, curves, and sparkles, which they made in burning.

In the divination by ashes, they wrote the question, to which they desired an answer, in ashes on a board, or something similar to it. They then exposed the board to the open air, where they allowed it to remain for some time. The letters which were found perfect, which were not defaced by the winds or other accidents, were supposed to contain the answer required.

There was also a divination by herbs, in which they wrote their own names, and their questions on leaves, generally of the sage or fig. These leaves they exposed to the wind, and as many of the letters as remained in their own places were taken up, and being joined together contained an answer to the question.

They also melted wax over a vessel of water, dropping it within three certain spaces, at the same time observing the figure, situation, distance, and concretion of the drops.

There were many other sorts of divination, or species of enchantments. There was one performed by certain medicated and enchanted compositions of herbs, minerals, etc. Strange and wonderful effects were said to be produced by them, some taken inwardly causing blindness, madness, love, etc., some infected by a touch; others spread their poison, operating on persons at a great distance.

The eclipse of the moon was thought to be effected by the power of magic, and hence they used drums, kettles, trumpets and hautboys, for the purpose of drowning the voices of the magicians, that their charms might not reach her.

These will serve as sufficient instances of the divination or magical incantations of the Grecians.[1]

4. The Grecian religion considered in its mysteries. We have seen in the east, especially in Egypt, that much was made of mystery, its veil being eagerly sought to conceal the things they considered sacred from the gaze of common men. They probably supposed that respect and reverence for those things would be better secured by

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 270; *Potter's Antiquities of Greece*, 312.

their concealment behind this impenetrable veil. But the Grecian spirit delighted not in mystery. Its course was a bold and a free one, and with silence and secrecy it held small communion.

It would be strange, however, if mystery found no place among the religious observances of Greece. We should at least expect to find some of its remains embracing within their folds the remnants of an earlier faith than that of the Hellenes. We accordingly find the Cabeiria and the Elusinia, the former celebrated on the island of Samothrace, and the latter at Eleusis. The first are little known, the last, by way of eminence, are styled the mysteries.

In what these last really consisted is now but very imperfectly known. I can only state a few things in reference to their introduction and continuance; their officers; their principle of admission; their ceremonies and method of initiation, and the object had in view.

In regard to their introduction, some considered Eumolpus, or Musæus, to be their founder; others claim that they were introduced from Egypt by Erechtheus; while others still attribute them to Demeter or Ceres herself, who while in pursuit of her lost Proserpine, was believed to have come to Attica during the reign of Erechtheus, and having supplied the inhabitants with corn, instituted the mysteries at Eleusis. By whoever introduced they were celebrated in honor of Ceres, and their introduction in all probability, marks an era or period, when the people of Attica were turning their attention to the pursuits of agriculture. They survived the independence of Greece, and although Valentinian made an effort to suppress them, yet they continued down to the time of the elder Theodosius. They lasted in all about eighteen hundred years.

The principal officer was the hierophant, who was a citizen of Athens, and held his office during life. He was obliged to live chaste and single, and to devote himself wholly to the deities. He had three attendants; a torch-bearer who was permitted to marry; a sacred herald; and

one who ministered at the altar. There were besides inferior officers who had their respective duties assigned them.

The initiated into the mysteries were by no means confined to the priests, which goes to show that it was not an exclusively religious festival. Persons of both sexes and of all ages were initiated. The Athenians were admitted to the ceremonies from the most tender age and those who had never participated in them requested to be admitted before they died. The initiation was open to all the Greeks, but an ancient law excluded the people of every other nation. It was even considered a crime of a very heinous nature to neglect the initiation into these mysteries, and this formed a part of the accusation for which Socrates was condemned to death.[1]

The mysteries were divided into the less and the greater. The former in honor of Proserpine were celebrated in November at Agræ near the river Ilissus, the latter in honor of Ceres in August, at Eleusis in Attica. The former was, in fact, but little more than a preparation for the latter, the purification which they then underwent being required for admission into the greater mysteries.

The candidate for initiation into the greater mysteries was compelled to go through the previous rites of fasting and purification. He was afterwards led into the vestibule of the temple, the doors being yet closed. Here the profane being commanded to retire, the worshiper remained alone. Strange sounds fell upon his ear, strange sights upon his vision. Thunder rolled around, lightning flashed through the darkness, light and gloom succeeding each other with startling rapidity. The temple doors being thrown open, the interior appeared lit up with superhuman splendor. The eye was now dazzled with the most vivid and beautiful colors, while the ear was charmed with the most melodious sounds. The initiated was now admitted to behold visions of the creation of the universe, to see the workings of the divine agency by which the machine of

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 293.

the world was regulated and controlled, to contemplate the state of society which prevailed upon the earth before the visit of Ceres to Attica, and to witness the introduction of agriculture, of sound laws, and of gentle manners, which followed the steps of that goddess; to recognize the immortality of the soul, as typified by the concealment of corn sowed in the earth, by its revival in the green blade, and by its full ripeness in the golden harvest; or as the same idea was otherwise expressed, by the abduction of Proserpine to the region of darkness, in order that she might pass six months beneath the earth, and then arise again to spend an equal time in the realms of light and joy. Above all, they were invited to view the spectacle of that happy state in which they themselves, the initiated, were to exist hereafter. These revelations were supposed to contain the greatest happiness to which man could aspire in this life, and to assure him of such a bliss as nothing could exceed or diminish in the next.[1]

It has recently been observed by travelers that the pavement of the sanctuary of the temple at Eleusis is rough and unpolished, and much lower than that of the adjacent portico, rendering it extremely probable that a wooden floor, on a level with the portico, covered the present floor and concealed a vault destined to admit the action of machinery, beneath the sanctuary, for moving the floor. In the soil of an interior vestibule, they observed two deeply indented grooves, or ruts, which they supposed were intended to receive the pulleys which served in the mysteries to raise a heavy body, perhaps a moving floor. They also perceived further on other grooves which might have served as counterbalances to raise the floor. They also detected places for wedges to fix it, immovable at the desired height. There were eight holes bored in blocks of marble and raised above the ground, four on the right and four on the left, adapted to receive pegs of large dimensions.[2]

[1] *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 157, 158. [2] *Philosophy of Magic*, I, 243, 244.

The performances at the celebrations were of various kinds, and required a number of days to complete them. They embraced assembling together; purifying themselves by bathing in the sea; offering sacrifices; making solemn processions; running about with torches; carrying the statue of Inachus from Ceranicus to Eleusis; and engaging in sports in which the victors were rewarded with a measure of barley, that being the first kind of grain reputed to have been sown at Eleusis.[1]

The principal object had in view was the leading a more regular and virtuous life by means of the initiation into the mysteries. It was supposed to recommend them to the peculiar protection of Ceres and Proserpine, and to procure them a more perfect and certain happiness in the other world.

The mysteries very probably concealed the elder forms of nature-worship, which were common to the old Pelasgian prior to the rise of the Hellenic power. They served to keep alive the symbolical meaning, and to preserve the knowledge of the peculiar attributes of those divinities which were incorporated into the popular religion under new forms. While the poets made the gods moral agents, the mysteries regarded them as the symbols of agencies, powers and energies, which were ever at work in the universe around them, producing all the varieties of change with which their senses made them acquainted.

VIII. The Grecian religion considered in the influence it exerted and exercised upon the development of Grecian mind and character.

This presents an important inquiry, and one that for the first time becomes possessed of a very high degree of importance. The religions of the east were connected with the state, and were in a great measure confined within the pale of the priest caste. That of Greece achieved its emancipation from both, and hence becomes

[1] *Dwight's Grecian and Roman Mythology*, 153.

for the first time a legitimate element in the fashioning and moulding of mind and character.

I have had occasion to remark that the elements of humanity are incapable of development while they remain so intimately connected as to be blended together and enveloped within each other. Their successive development is dependent on their successive separation, and hence the inquiry becomes important, among what people this separation first occurs. So far as this element is concerned, we find it taking place in Greece. It would be strange indeed if that freedom which so strongly displays itself in the other elements should be wanting in this. A free spirit once obtaining a foothold among the institutions of a people, will be likely to extend itself through all their varied developments. Even their gods are made to bathe in the same glorious element, and are free from everything except the decrees of fate.

The religion of the Greeks, aside from the teachings of their philosophers, brought but few motives from a future state to have a bearing upon the present. The shades below had but few enjoyments, and those of a frigid and unsubstantial nature. Yet even this feature may have been instrumental in stimulating them to attempt to derive the utmost from this world, while they were clothed with flesh and blood, and before they exchanged the substance for the shadow. Hence may have in part resulted their fullness of life and eagerness for enjoyment.

One great feature noticeable in the Grecian gods is their nearness to the Grecian mind. Their powers, qualities and attributes so nearly resemble those, the most elevated, which may fall to the share of humanity, that they almost seem like familiar acquaintances. The influence they would exert may well be presumed to be the greater in proportion as their nearness became more fully realized. The influence exerted by the Christian religion has been extensive and salutary, because its great Head was touched with the feeling of human infirmity. This principle, therefore, should not be overlooked in calculating

the influence exerted by the Grecian gods upon the Grecian mind.

Another fact presenting also its claims for consideration, is that the Grecian deities, being moral agents, and acting under the influence of motives, everywhere furnish models for imitation, not, it is true, unexceptionable, but such, nevertheless, as profess an elevation above all human standards. Possibly, the feature in which this elevation consisted, was more greatness than goodness, but by means of it, a standard, in some respects, greatly elevated, was presented for imitation.

The Grecian mythology, its gods and goddesses, their relations and acts, its myths, mysteries and fables, and all other things connected with it, presented themes varied and exhaustless, for the Grecian muses. Its influence, therefore, upon the poetry of Greece, must have been elevating and refining. Nor should we forget that the influence here was reciprocal, as no inconsiderable part of the mythology owed its existence, certainly its embellishments, to the creation of poetry.

Nor was the poetic the only art which derived from mythology, its subjects, motives and inspiration. Those of painting and sculpture must rest under obligations, correspondingly deep and extensive. The *chef-d'œuvres* of Grecian art, especially those of the chisel, were the forms of their gods. In them were found the purest, the highest, the noblest models. The most faultless human form idealized, was that around which was poured the splendor of deity. The Grecian artist, in moulding the forms of his gods, assumed the most perfect human form, supplying from his own ideality, whatever it required to render it complete. Thus the Olympian Jupiter and the Apollo Belvidere have challenged the admiration of all ages, for their surpassing beauty and dignity, the paragons of perfection among the works of art.

But there is one other circumstance of great importance in its bearings upon the Grecian mind, and through that, upon the entire destinies of the race. To gather up know-

ledge as a means of exercising power, has, in all ages, stimulated the activity, and employed the energies of certain classes of men. This we have seen in Egypt, and the East was monopolized by the priest caste. But in Greece this caste never existed. Hence the acquisition of knowledge and the cultivation of intellect, were equally open to every inquiring mind. All restraint was removed; every barrier was broken down; and all, no matter what their vocation or calling, were equally entitled to whatever they could acquire, and to all the privileges of thought, of study, of philosophy, of the practice of art. It is this fact that will go far towards accounting for the astonishing progress made by the Grecian mind, in the development of this, and the other elements of humanity.

CHAPTER IV.

GREECE—ITS ELEMENT OF SOCIETY.

The social instinct has many different methods of developing itself; but their number depends much upon the progress of the people in refinement. The Grecians, in this respect, especially the Athenians, exhibit a wide diversity at different times. Very different, indeed, the heroic age from that of Pericles.

The heroic age of Greece was one in which life was rude, simple and frugal. The bull, the ram, the he-goat, the boar, furnished them their food. They had neither spoons, forks, table cloths nor napkins.[1] The luxuries, many of the conveniences and most of the comforts of life were wanting. Throughout the different states of Greece there was neither repose nor security. Robbery and licentiousness reigned, and hence strength of body and indomitable energy and courage were the most prized of nature's gifts. Wisdom, justice, probity, most of the moral virtues, failed even to have names in the earlier Grecian dialects.[2] We may notice presently, under the different heads, the great progress made in manners, customs and modes of life.

Another fact, to which the attention should be early drawn, is that the Greeks were by no means a homogeneous people. They were a collection of little states, mostly republics, sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile to each other. The two that decidedly take the lead in Grecian history, are Sparta and Athens; the one Doric, the other Ionic. In almost all respects the social character, and the manners, customs and modes of life in these two republics were entirely different from each other. The stateliness, taciturnity, and severe gravity of the Spartan,

[1] *Goguet*, II, 380, 381. [2] *Idem*, 392.

contrasted strongly with the versatility, inquiring spirit, and vivacity of the Athenian. Although situated at no great distance from each other, yet the very antipodes could not be more unlike.

The principal points to be considered under this element are the following:

I. The affairs of love. Tokens expressive of it. Potions — means of exciting and allaying it.

II. Marriage. Marriage ceremonies. Divorce.

III. Condition of women; relative position of the sexes.

IV. Treatment of infants. Infanticide. Wills. Descent of property, how regulated.

V. Youth, its privileges and education or training.

VI. Manners and civil life among the Athenians and Spartans.

VII. The dress of the Grecians.

VIII. Their dwellings and furniture.

IX. Their food and drinks.

X. Their baths.

XI. Their times of eating, entertainments, materials of which they consisted; the ceremonies preceding and attending them; their manner of entertaining strangers.

XII. Sickness and death. Ceremonies attending each.

XIII. Funeral ceremonies. Processions. Mourning.

XIV. Manner of interring and burning the dead.

XV. Honors paid to the dead. Sepulchres. Monuments. Cenotaphs.

XVI. Amusements of the Greeks.

XVII. Games that were common to all the Greeks.

I. The affairs of love. Tokens expressive of it. Potions — means of exciting and allaying it.

The natural language of the passions will, among every people, clothe itself in such characters as to be easily and readily understood. Among these that of love holds a distinguished place. The lover found several means of communicating his passion to the beloved. Her name

was inscribed by him on the city's walls, its columns, the plane tree, in its academy and public walks. This refers more especially to the Athenians. Among them the intercourse between the sexes, was, as we shall see, much restricted, while in Sparta almost every restraint was removed.

Another method common among the Athenians was to decorate the doors of those they loved with flowers and garlands. So also the weaving garlands for their hair would indicate the prevalence of the passion.[1] They also made libations before the doors of their mistresses, sprinkling them with wine. When a person's garland was untied, it was considered as a sign of being in love.[2]

They would not readily yield to an apparent want of success. They resorted to various arts to secure a reciprocity of the affections. Sometimes potions were administered, whose operations were violent and dangerous, depriving of their reason those who drank them. There were several curious ingredients which entered into these philters. Among these was a piece of flesh from the forehead of a young colt, resembling a fig, which the mares bite off as soon as they have foaled, or forsake their young if they are prevented from doing so. Hence it was supposed its peculiar qualities resulted. It was taken, reduced to powder, and dissolved in the blood of the lover.[3]

Some herbs were made use of for this purpose, also insects bred from putrid matter; the lamprey, the lizard, the brains of a calf, the hair on the extremity of the wolf's tail, with some of his secret parts, and the bones of the left side of a toad eaten by ants. The bones on the right side were supposed to cause hatred. Besides these, were also used the blood of doves, the bones of snakes, the feathers of screech owls, and bands of wool twisted upon a wheel, more especially such as had been bound about a person that hanged himself.

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, I, 420. [2] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 444. [3] *Idem*, 444.

There were many other strange ingredients used by the enchantress, such as rays, torches and relics. If a nest of young swallows was buried in the earth till they died, and then the vessel opened, those found with their mouths shut were supposed to allay the passion of love, and those with their mouths open, gaping for food, to excite it. The most powerful ingredient was the marrow and dried liver of a boy who had been buried to the chin in the ground, and there left to consume from want. Some tied about the left arm the udder of an hyena, others taking hard olives or barley bran, cast them into the fire. It was also customary to melt wax, by which to mollify the heart of the person whom they desired.[1]

They were also accustomed to imitate all those actions which they wished the person beloved to perform. They made an image of wax, called it after the name of the beloved, and then placed it near a fire, the heat of which as they supposed not only affected the image but also the person represented by it at the same time.

They would occasionally deposit in the ground, underneath the threshold, the pledges of their lover. They also tied three knots of love, the object of which was to unite the affections of the beloved person with their own.

The Greeks also professed to have the means of allaying the passion of love, at least of that species of it which originated from magical incantations. The antidotes were of two kinds. The one consisted of those substances which possessed some natural virtue, to which the production of the effect might be attributed, as the herbs which were supposed enemies to generation. The other included all such as wrought the cure by some occult or mystical power, and by the assistance of demons. As instances of this latter, may be cited the sprinkling of the dust in which a mule had rolled herself, and the confining of toads in the hide of a beast lately slain. Another method of curing love, was to wash in the water of the river Selemnus.[2]

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 445. [2] *Idem*, 447, 448.

II. Marriage. Marriage ceremonies. Divorce. There is some diversity of opinion in reference to the time when the institution of marriage was first introduced into Greece. Many suppose, that prior to the age of Cecrops, there was no institution of this kind among the people of Attica, that they lived in a state of promiscuous intercourse. There is no doubt but that from the time of Cecrops this institution prevailed.

As the strength of states consisted in the number of their inhabitants, it is natural to suppose that the Grecian commonwealths would endeavor, as far as possible, to render marriage honorable, and to encourage it by their laws. The Spartans were particularly severe against those who delayed too long entering into the marriage state. No man could live single beyond the time, without subjecting himself to a number of penalties. One was, that once every winter, he was compelled to run around the public forum, quite naked, and to sing a song exposing himself to ridicule. Another was, they were entirely excluded from those exercises in which young virgins contended naked. A third penalty they were called upon to suffer, was, that upon the celebration of a certain solemnity, they were dragged round the altar by the women, who were all the time beating them with their fists. Besides these indignities, they were deprived of that respect, when advanced in years, which the young at Sparta were ever accustomed to pay to the aged. The Athenians also had a law which required those entrusted with public authority, to be married, to have children, and estates in land, all which were regarded as so many pledges of their good behavior.[1]

The doctrine of polygamy never universally obtained in Greece. The practice never seems to have been common, although there were some instances of it in the early ages. There were also sometimes extraordinary occasions when great numbers of men were swept off by war or some

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 448, 449.

other calamity when this practice was resorted to, but in general we find, in this respect, a more healthy doctrine and practice prevailing in Greece than we have seen throughout the east.

The time at which marriages should take place was deemed of considerable importance, and differed among different Grecian states. At Sparta neither sex was allowed to marry until they had arrived at their full strength, with the view that the children which might be the fruits of it might be strong, healthy and vigorous. What this exact time was, does not precisely appear, but circumstances render it probable that it was thirty in the male and twenty in the female. At one period of time the Athenian citizen was forbidden to marry under thirty-five years of age. According to an old Athenian law the women were permitted to marry at twenty-six.

Marriages were forbidden within certain degrees of consanguinity. It was contrary to law in Sparta to marry any of their kindred either in the line of ascent or descent, but collateral relationship was not regarded as an objection. They allowed marriage between those who had the same mother but different fathers. The Athenians were forbidden to marry sisters by the same mother, but they were permitted to those by the same father.[1]

The season of the year at which marriages the most generally took place among the Athenians was the winter. The month of January was particularly preferred. The time at which there happened to be a conjunction of the sun and moon was seized upon as the most favorable. In most of the Grecian states citizens were only permitted to marry with citizens, the introduction of foreigners or their children to the rights of citizenship being regarded with extreme jealousy.

The consent of both father and mother was necessary to the marriage of a virgin. Even the men were not permitted to marry without consulting their parents. The bro-

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 450.

thers of virgins disposed of them in marriage when they had no fathers. In default of these that duty devolved upon their grandfathers, and, when they were wanting, upon their guardians. Sometimes husbands upon their deathbeds betrothed their wives to other persons.

The persons who were to be married either plighted their faith to each other or to their relations. This was done by kissing each other, or giving their right hands.

In the early ages women had no portions or dowries, being purchased by their husbands. When a greater degree of refinement began to prevail in Greece, the custom was introduced for women to bring portions to their husbands, and this was thought to entitle them to greater respect from their husbands, and to greater freedom with them. Lycurgus, the great Spartan legislator, entirely abolished the custom in Sparta, being apprehensive either that women might rule their husbands, or that men would marry too much for the sake of money.

When there were orphan virgins without any inheritance the next male in blood was obliged either to marry her himself or to give her a portion according to his condition. The state sometimes portioned those virgins whose ancestors had been serviceable to their country, and who had no relations to provide for them. The Greeks were, in general, great lovers of money; and this very universally entered largely into their matrimonial speculations. Whenever the wife brought a dowry it was expected that the husband should make her a corresponding settlement, which should ensure her maintenance in case he should die or obtain a divorce from her.

Before the Athenian virgins were at liberty to marry they were to be presented to Diana. This was to appease the goddess. To her they were considered exclusively to belong, and when they became marriageable, they were in the habit of presenting certain baskets full of little curiosities to her, to obtain permission to leave her train.

So also other gods were consulted, and prayers and sacrifices offered them. The entrails of the victims were care-

fully examined, and if any ill omens appeared, the nuptials were prevented. So also the appearance of any ill-boding omen without the victim had the same effect.

In general, except at Sparta, both the bride and bridegroom were richly adorned, wearing upon their hair garlands of various herbs and flowers. Even the house was decked with garlands, besides being splendidly illuminated.

A pestle was tied upon the door; a maid carried a sieve; and the bride herself an earthern vessel in which barley was parched, the object of all these being to remind her of her obligation to attend to the business of a family.

The time and manner in which the bride was conveyed from her father's to her husband's house was in the evening, in a chariot. They were attended by singers and dancers, and on their arrival home, in some parts of Greece, the axle-tree of the chariot in which they rode was burnt, which was done to denote that the bride was never to return.

A sumptuous entertainment awaited them at the bridegroom's house, to which the relations and friends of the married couple were invited. At this entertainment several ceremonies were frequently observed. One at Athens was the following, which was copied from the festival at which they commemorated their change of diet from acorns to corn: A boy partly covered with branches of hawthorn and oak, appeared with a basket full of bread, and sang a hymn beginning with these words:

I have left the worse, and found the better state.

After the entertainment, the bride and bridegroom were conducted to the bridal chamber by the light of several torches, around one of which the mother of the bride tied her hair-lace, which she had taken from her daughter's hair. When the couple were left alone, they were required by the laws of Athens to eat a quince between them, the object of which was to intimate that their conversation ought to be pleasant and agreeable. During this time young persons of both sexes sang and danced at the door

to drown the maiden's complaints, if she made any, the songs consisting of praises of the bride and bridegroom, with wishes for their mutual happiness. When morning came, they again returned to salute the new married couple with their morning songs. The entire day was spent in receiving the salutations and visits of their friends, and the presents bestowed upon them, the bride and bridegroom also making presents to each other.

The marriage ceremonies of the Spartans differed from those of all the other Greeks. Instead of having a public celebration, everything was there done in as private a manner as possible. When everything had been settled between the parties, the bridegroom at night made a secret visit to his bride at her father's house. Before day he returned to his comrades, at the gymnasia, and never, for a long time, visited his wife except at night and by stealth, as it was accounted a disgrace to be seen coming out of his wife's apartment. They sometimes lived in this clandestine manner for years, not unfrequently having children by their wives before they ever saw their faces by daylight.

In relation to divorce, the different Grecian states had different laws and usages. The Cretans allowed a man to divorce his wife when he was apprehensive of too large a family. The Athenians permitted divorce upon slight occasions, but they required a bill of divorce, stating the reasons upon which it was claimed, first to be presented before the magistrate. The Spartans seldom divorced their wives.

The wives could not so readily obtain a divorce from their husbands, in any of the Grecian states. The Athenians were, perhaps, the most favorable, allowing them to separate from their husbands on just occasions, but they were required to present personally to the archon, a bill of their grievances, before they could get such permission. The union was at liberty to be dissolved by mutual consent, each being, in such case, at liberty to contract a second marriage.

The terms expressing the separation of men and women from each other, were different. The men were said to dismiss their wives; to loose them from their obligations; to cast them out; to send them away; to put them away. If a woman left her husband, it was termed simply to depart from him.

One consequence following divorce was, that the husband obtaining it, was obliged to restore the portion he received with his wife. If he failed to do this, the Athenian laws obliged him to pay a reasonable sum per month, for her support.

III. Condition of women; relative position of the sexes. One of the tests by which the extent of civilization is measured, in any community, is the condition of women; the treatment to which they are subject; and the relative position they hold in society. Among all savage nations man has rendered them his slaves, by means of his larger brain, his stronger arm, and his harder heart. In most portions of the east, where a species of civilization has prevailed, he has collected them together in his harems, where their confinement, exclusion from the world, and deprivation of freedom, has furnished but a poor equivalent for the severe labors of the savage state. It is not, therefore, wonderful that we turn with eagerness to Greece, and inquire what was the agency exerted by woman in enabling her to work out the problem of her social condition.

During the heroic period of Grecian history the condition of women does not seem to have been materially different from that of savage nations. They were charged with almost all the laborious works of the house. They ground the corn, baked the bread, fetched the water, cleaned the apartments, made the beds, and lighted the fire.[1] The more common employments were spinning, weaving, needle-work, especially in the making of different kinds of embroidery. There were often rooms in the house specially appropriated to these employments. The

[1] *Goguet's Origin of Laws*, 388, 389.

management of provisions, and of other household affairs, was often committed to their care. They conducted the men to the bath and to bed, and perfumed, dressed and undressed them.[1]

In the heroic ages the women were under less restraint than at subsequent periods. Still, the intercourse between the sexes was much more restricted than is allowable by modern European usages. There was little of the chivalrous devotion towards the sex which has prevailed more or less extensively in modern Europe, but there was much nature, truth and simplicity, which always furnishes a very reasonable equivalent.

Prior to marriage, young persons of different sexes and families seldom saw each other except in public, and at a considerable distance. They were occasionally brought nearer to each other at festivals, but opportunities for private intercourse were seldom or never enjoyed.[2]

The heroic ages mark a transition state from barbarism to a higher degree of refinement, and the condition of woman was considerably improved. In the time of Cecrops the influence of the Athenian women was very considerable even in matters of politics. The highest respect was paid to the institution of marriage through the period of the heroic ages, but the history of those ages abounds in usurpations, murders and atrocities, in many of which women bear no inconsiderable share.

The Grecian women, excepting the Spartans, seldom appeared in strange company, and were generally confined to the most remote parts of the house. Their lodgings were usually in the highest rooms, which were distinct from those assigned to the men. Those who had no husbands were generally very strictly confined within their lodgings, the apartment of the virgins being usually guarded with locks and bolts. Women recently married were kept in almost as close confinement as virgins.[3]

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 472. [2] *Thirwall's Greece*, I, 87. [3] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 470, 471.

The most enlightened of the Greeks limited the duties of a good wife, housewife and mother, to the following points: 1. That she should be faithful to her husband. 2. That she should go abroad and expose herself to the view of strangers as little as possible. 3. That she should take care of what the husband acquired, and spend it with frugality; and 4. That she should pay maternal attention to the younger children of both sexes, and keep an incessantly watchful eye upon her grown-up daughters.[1]

Women in Greece were subjected to perpetual guardianship. On the death of the father, those who were unmarried fell under the tutelage of the eldest brother, or of their nearest male relative, who exercised the same authority over their sisters and wards as their fathers had possessed.[2] Brothers were obliged to portion their sisters, and, by the laws of Solon, the nearest relatives were obliged to marry destitute orphans, or to give them a dowry.

As the Grecian states acquired riches, and a greater refinement of manners, a corresponding change took place in the relations of the female sex. The Athens of Pericles was altogether a different thing from that of Cecrops, or even of Themistocles or Cimon. Among a people so keenly alive to a sense of beauty, and whose appreciation was so perfect, both of beauty of form and of mind, it cannot be matter of wonder that courtesans, whose aim was to possess both, should meet with great favor among them. Besides, the time had obviously arrived, when social intercourse required the presence and influence of female manners, as an element, to soften the asperities of male education, and to give a more graceful finish to the vigor of manly minds. This might have been wisely accomplished by throwing open the secluded apartments; permitting the women to mingle freely in society; annulling the distance which kept the sexes separate; and rendering the one the equal companion of the other. But

[1] *Meiner's History of the Female Sex*, I, 267, 268. [2] *Idem*, 275.

all this was a very great deal too much for the feelings, prejudices and habits of thought of the Athenians, to sanction or allow. Husbands looked upon their wives as their property, and did not dare to remove the restrictions which they supposed rendered them secure, while young men revolted from the idea of marrying females who had been too much exposed to public view. Thus, instead of elevating the sister, wife, and mother into a position where their social and moral virtues would have been irradiated and rendered tenfold more lovely, by the light beaming from the intellect, they substituted in her place, the courtesan, whose perfection of person and mind might gratify the sense of beauty, but whose lack of the crowning virtue of the sex, must chill the heart at all susceptible to virtuous emotion.

The Athenians, with their lively conceptions and ardent sympathies, no doubt possessed a full knowledge of all the elements that go to form the female character, because they had all those elements among them, but they were strangely distributed. In their wives they expected nothing but the humble household virtues. From the retiracy in which they were born and nurtured, they could expect little else. Their training and opportunities of education were so narrow and limited that their minds would rarely travel out of the circle of every-day life, while their manners would lack the polish which unrestrained intercourse with the world is almost certain to give. But the female mind is well adapted to ready observation, just reflections, keen insight into character, and sometimes to the solution of deep scientific, social, political and moral problems. Where could the Athenian find a place for this species of mind? Strange as it may appear, it was in the courtesan, the woman of pleasure.

It is not improbable but that from the very solemnities of religion, was derived a portion of the importance which is found to have been attached to this class of women. They were looked upon as servants of deity. The Asiatic Greeks originally honored common women as priestesses

of Venus. So also in the luxurious and opulent Corinth, they attained the same consequence and privileges. At all the festivals of the Aphrodite goddess, the people applied to the public courtesans as the most powerful intercessors, and sometimes in the midst of dangers and calamities, they made a vow to devote to her a new priestess. Even Solon, the great Athenian law-giver, thought it advantageous to Athens, to introduce there the worship of the terrestrial Venus, and to invite thither courtesans as her priestesses.[1]

They were not only tolerated, but protected by the laws. The state even derived a profit from them. A tax was levied on them, the collection of which every year was entrusted to those who were best acquainted with them. Thus moral turpitude was sanctioned by law, and on the one hand we behold a class of females possessing every showy attraction and accomplishments, with bodily forms and mental attainments such as would satisfy the most fastidious taste; on the other, one domestic, immured, possessing few of the graces of body or mind, few personal attractions, but displaying the domestic virtues, and especially that crowning virtue of all, modesty. The first was for public shows and pleasures, their use being that of the common sewer, to carry off corruption. The last, it was feared, could not be social without becoming depraved; and could not preserve their virtues without being secluded. In this way it was supposed that men might enjoy the charms of the sex without endangering the chastity of those whose homely virtues they were unwilling to dispense with.

During some of the first generations succeeding the age of Solon, such was the force of public opinion, that the presence of courtesans occasioned no great mischief to the men and morals of Athens. But in the age of Pericles public opinion began to experience a change, which became more and more palpable until the downfall of Grecian

[1] *Meiner's History of the Female Sex*, I, 279.

liberty. This change was probably owing to Aspasia, and the school she established in Athens. This beautiful, accomplished, and highly gifted woman, a native of Miletus, first the mistress and subsequently the wife of Pericles, exercised an influence and a power in Greece very greatly superior to any ever exercised there by any other woman. She was endowed with a mind more beautiful than her beautiful form. Her genius drew around her all those who had a taste for the beautiful, or a desire to cultivate their minds. At her house, eloquence, politics and philosophy were daily discussed, and ladies of the highest rank resorted thither to acquire some of the accomplishments by which she was distinguished. Large concessions must certainly be made to the mind that could be a fit companion for Pericles, and could teach rhetoric to Socrates.

Another, at a subsequent period, still more distinguished for her admirable symmetry of proportion and beauty of form, was Phryne, who served as the model to Praxiteles for his Cnidian Venus, and also to Apelles for his Aphrodite rising from the sea. So immense were the treasures she amassed, that she offered to rebuild the walls of Thebes, after their destruction by Alexander, entirely out of her own resources.

The result of thus polishing vice, and refining and beautifying those agencies whose legitimate operation is to undermine and effect the overthrow of the social fabric, could not be long in displaying itself. The superior perfections of the courtesan, with her thousand attractive arts, was an overmatch for the sober, staid virtues of the wife, with her homely domestic qualities. Hence men of all ranks threw themselves into the arms of the former who undoubtedly were more interesting and accomplished than their own secluded wives and daughters. A very natural result was, that in the ages succeeding that of Pericles and Socrates, the most celebrated generals, statesmen, orators, philosophers, poets and artists, lived in celibacy, keeping courtesans who accompanied them in journeys and in war. During these periods, courtesans amassed great wealth,

were admired for their varied knowledge, and their elegant writing. The Greeks erected to them splendid monuments, and wrote and published their lives and adventures. A golden statue in honor of Phryne was erected at Delphi, the workmanship of Praxiteles, and was placed on a pillar of marble between Archidamus, king of Sparta, and Philip, king of Macedon.

As public prosperity declined, and the arts and sciences disappeared, the Aspasias and the Phrynes, those living models of beauty and perfection, no longer appeared. They vanished with the taste to which they administered gratification. But the vices, although divested of their beautiful drapery, still remained. The number of courtesans remained undiminished, although their mental qualifications had ceased to be attractive. They still retained their rapacity, their intemperance, their debauchery and extravagance. All these continued even to augment and increase with the same rapidity as the moral state and condition of the Greeks sunk into corruption and decay. So true is it, that a permanent national prosperity, can only be based upon great and enduring moral principles.

In the observations hitherto made under this head, no reference has been had to the condition of women in Sparta. Here is, perhaps, to be found, the widest difference between the inhabitants of this republic and the other Grecian states.

We have but little reliable knowledge as to what was the condition of the Spartan women before the age of Lycurgus. If their condition, previously, was similar to what it was in the other Grecian states, the change then effected, proclaims, in a peculiarly strong manner, the influence and the power of that extraordinary man.

The principles upon which females were reared up in Sparta, were the reverse of those adopted in other Grecian states. Instead of being confined, and treated, in some respects, like prisoners, they enjoyed an almost unlimited amount of freedom. The girls, in their education, were treated as if they formed a part of the republic. They

even practiced, like the boys, in the public gymnasiums, all those exercises that are the best calculated to give health, strength and beauty. These exercises were of such a nature, that, in order to be successful competitors, they were required to divest themselves of all their apparel. This they made no difficulty in doing. Their ordinary dress was far less cumbersome, and much less adapted to concealment than that of the other women of Greece. It was so open, as, with the slightest effort, to leave many parts of the body exposed. The effect of this was not to produce indifference on the part of the Spartans, but, on the contrary, to inflame their appetites, and to render them, much more than other Greeks, addicted to women.

The applause or censure of the women had a powerful effect upon the men of Sparta. Young females had a habit of banding together in choirs, and of singing eulogies and satirical songs, which proved one of the strongest incentives to youths and men to stimulate them to great achievements.

The gymnastic exercises in which the girls were trained had the effect of giving to the Spartan women a personal beauty, and a courage, fortitude, and power of endurance much beyond those possessed by any other Grecian women. It was also the effect of these same exercises, combined with some other peculiar practices, to give them a masculine energy, a forward boldness, and an amount of pretensions in every respect extremely unbecoming the sex.

The peculiar practices to which I more especially refer are those authorized by Lycurgus relative to the exchange and lending of wives. He permitted husbands to exchange their wives, the object being to have more perfect children born to the state. Old men might lend their wives to those who were young and vigorous. Men who were distinguished by their valor or personal qualifications might even demand of an husband an interview with his wife. In permitting these extraordinary innovations upon principles which the common sense of mankind hold sacred, Lycurgus sought to furnish good subjects to the state, but

at the hazard of unsettling the bonds of wedlock, and establishing a community of wives.

It is true these practices did not seem productive of bad effects while the institutions of Lycurgus continued in full force. Their poverty, simplicity of manners, and equality or community of property, together with their love of country, amounting almost to an absorbing passion, prevented these practices from producing their legitimate results. But soon after the termination of the Peloponnesian war the barriers erected by Lycurgus began to be thrown down. The victories achieved over foreigners, and the extension of the Spartan power and arms, introduced foreign wealth and luxuries. The poverty and simplicity of the Spartan disappeared. Foreign treasures and foreign vices took their places. Love of country was succeeded by love of self. The motive to self-indulgence became strong. The seeds of corruption which had hitherto lain dormant in the hearts of the women of Sparta now sprung up with a rapidity which it was impossible to check. Females, both married and single, dishonored themselves, their husbands and their fathers, depraved the minds of youth and of their fellow citizens, and rendered a return to the ancient constitution and the virtues of their forefathers difficult or totally impracticable. As early as the age of Plato and Xenophon, and still more in the time of Aristotle, female honor was more rare at Sparta than public virtue, and such was the depravity of the sex, that the Lacedæmonian females were a scandal to all the rest of Greece. The most intelligent observers were of opinion, that the corruption of the women was the principal cause of the decline and overthrow of the Spartan state.[1] There was prevalent almost a perfect community of wives. So wide-spread was this profligacy, that women envied an adulteress the possession of a handsome and valiant paramour. Even during these times, however, Sparta produced females, who, by their courage, would have done honor to the laws of Lycur-

[1] *Meiner's History of the Female Sex*, I, 290, 291.

gus, had they not been disgraced by the irregularities of the rest of their lives. One of these, when reminded of the good fortune of the women of Lacedæmon, replied: "We are worthy to govern men, because we alone bring men into the world."

It was remarked that the more flagrant and outrageous the debaucheries of the Spartan women became, the more immoderate were their pretensions, and the more absolute their authority over their degenerate husbands. They began even to lose the character of wives, and to be treated as mistresses, and to assume the authority usually exercised by the latter over their husbands and lovers. They even became the principal proprietors of property, both real and personal, which increased their arrogance and pretensions. The men who were controlled by women soon ceased to rule over other men, or even to maintain their own independence. The Spartan fame and even name ceased from among the nations.

IV. Treatment of infants. Infanticide. Wills. Descent of property, how regulated. The Grecian mothers were subjected to certain rules prior to the birth of their children. Their food and exercises were regulated either by the laws, or by the manners and customs. In most of the Grecian states they were required to lead a sedentary, inactive, and tranquil life. In Sparta, however, it was directly the reverse. There, women while in that condition were required to be abroad, engaged in their usual athletic recreations, eating and drinking as at any other period of time.

Infants newly born in most of the Grecian states were bathed in cold water. In Sparta a different practice prevailed. They were there bathed in wine, under the impression that, if strong and vigorous, they would acquire by it a greater degree of firmness; but if feeble, it would produce convulsions and death. Swaddling bands were in general use throughout the rest of Greece but not at Sparta.

Considerable importance was attached to the thing on which the infant was first placed on its entrance into the world. Among the Athenians this was on a wrapper adorned with an embroidered figure of the Gorgon's head, which was the device represented on the shield of Athena or Minerva. In other parts of Greece, particularly at Sparta, the child's first bed was a shield.

The Spartan management of children differed in several respects from that of all the other Greeks. They accustomed them early to the use of any sort of meat, and also to endure the want of it. They taught them to have no apprehensions of the dark, nor to be froward and peevish. The Spartan nurses were in great request through all Greece.

On the fifth day after birth the child was introduced into the family, and put under the protection of the household gods. This was celebrated as a festival with expressions of joy at which they received gifts from their friends.

On the seventh day the child was usually named, and this also was honored with festival solemnities. Others named them on the tenth day. Their names were sometimes given from certain actions, from their condition, or from certain personal qualities.

It becomes necessary here to advert to a cruel practice quite common in Greece, that is the subject of infanticide. The destruction of infant life in Sparta was reduced to an organized system. Individuals possessed not the right to preserve or destroy their own offspring. That right belonged exclusively to the state. Every child, soon after its birth, was required by law to be subjected to the inspection of certain officers appointed for that purpose, who determined on its claim for life or death. Those that appeared strong and robust, they decided to live, while those having a weak, sickly appearance they directed to be thrown into the Apothetæ, a deep cavern at the foot of Mount Taygetos. In this there was a double object. The one was to secure to the state perfect physical men and women. The other, to drain off, by this means, their sur-

plus population. Infanticide was also practiced at Athens, but on a different principle. It was the father who was there the arbiter of life and death, and not the state. The means by which their death was accomplished, was generally by exposure. They were placed in jars and exposed in desert places, or in the crowded quarters of the city. It was a practice sometimes resorted to, to tie to the children thus exposed, jewels, rings, necklaces, etc., with the double view of enabling them afterwards to recognize them if they should happen to be preserved, and also to create a motive which might operate upon any one who might find them, either to preserve and bring them up, or at least to buy them.

From this barbarous custom the Thebans formed an honorable exemption. They rendered the murder of infants a capital offense. Those who were born of parents unable to provide for their maintenance were brought up at the public charge, but in return, when grown up, the public had a right to their services until they were adequately compensated for what had been expended in bringing them up.

The children designed to be reared to maturity, the Greeks brought up in their own houses, and the mothers suckled them with their own milk. Women of the highest distinction never disdained this office.

The earliest toy, among the children of Greece, consisted generally of the rattle. To this succeeded balls of many colors, with little chariots. They also amused themselves with puppets, which was an invention of remote antiquity. So also whipping the bembyx or top was among their earliest sports. Sometimes spinning their tops with cord. The hoop also formed one of the playthings of the Hellenic children. What is now termed blindman's-buff was played by them. There were also several other sports and pastimes, such as ball, odd and even, etc., which were substantially the same as are played at present, showing that many of our earliest sports are the same that enlisted in their hearty performance the young limbs of the sons of Grecian heroes.

There were commonly reckoned three sorts of children in Greece. 1. Those born in wedlock. 2. Those who were illegitimate; and 3. Those who became such by adoption. According to the Athenian laws those who had no legitimate sons were obliged to leave their estates to their daughters, who were liable to forfeit their inheritance unless they would consent to marry their nearest relation. All such and their nearest relation could claim marriage of each other, and in case of refusal the injured party had a right of action.

Those having no legitimate issue were allowed to adopt whom they pleased. Those adopted were invested with all the rights and privileges, and subject to all the duties of children born in wedlock. There were very properly provisions against desertion by those who were adopted. By a law of Solon they could not renounce their adoption until after they had children born to bear the name of the person who had adopted them. Having done *that* they might renounce and claim inheritance and kindred in the family they had left. In case those adopted died without issue, the inheritance did not leave the families into which they were adopted, but descended to some relative of that family. If a man after he had adopted a son, married and had one born in wedlock, his estate descended equally to the two. It was an ancient custom for the legitimate sons to divide their fathers' estates by lot, all sharing equally without any reference to priority of birth; and, in case there were any illegitimate, allowing them a small portion. Where there were neither legitimate nor adopted children the inheritance descended to the nearest relatives. In case of death without lawful heirs the inheritance descended to the prince, the commonwealth, or the supreme magistrate as the laws directed.[1]

In relation to the making of last wills and testaments, there was a different doctrine prevailed in different states. In some, men were permitted to dispose of their estates

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 483, 484.

in this manner; in others, they were deprived of that privilege. In Athens, before the age of Solon, all the wealth of deceased persons belonged exclusively to their families. He placed every man's estate at his own disposal, allowing him to bestow it on whom he pleased. He, however, annexed certain conditions to the making of wills, such as: 1. That they must be made by citizens. 2. That the testator must have arrived at the age of twenty years. 3. That he must not have been adopted, or must not attempt thus to dispose of an estate derived through adoption. 4. That he had no male children of his own, for then the inheritance belonged to them. In case he had daughters, those to whom he bequeathed the inheritance, were obliged to marry them. 5. That he should be in the full possession of his senses, what would now be termed of sound, disposing mind and memory. 6. That he should not be under duress, or any species of constraint; and 7. That he should not be seduced into it by any artifice or insinuations of his wife. Wills were usually executed before several witnesses.[1]

The disgrace resulting from men's vices and dishonorable actions, were, to some extent, participated in by the children, and also on the other hand, the descendants of the great men of Greece were not only distinguished by receiving honors and expressions of respect, but in many cases, were made the recipients of more substantial favors. The children, if left without property, were, in many cases, provided for by the state, and even educated at the public expense. The son, daughters, and even granddaughter of Aristides, received from the Athenians such substantial aid as evinced the high regard which they paid to the memory of Aristides. They revered him dead, whom they ostracized while living.

The species of affection which the Greeks warmly cherished was the filial. They believed the disobedience and disrespectful conduct of children to parents subjected them in

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 484, 485.

a very particular manner to the judgment of the gods. The curse denounced by the parent upon his guilty children, the furies and infernal deities were believed to execute in an unrelenting manner. Nor was the punishment left to the gods alone. Solon, the legislator of Athens, ordered that all persons who refused to make due provision for their parents, should be punished with infamy. Those who beat their parents incurred the same penalty. Not only parents but grandfathers, grandmothers and other progenitors, were also within the same line of protection. The Athenian legislator, however, did not forget that there were reciprocal duties, and required that parents should bring up their children to some trade or profession by which they might be enabled to subsist in the world. If they neglected to do this the children were excused from maintaining their parents. Those who were prostituted by their parents were, in like manner, absolved from the duty of maintaining them. Nor were the sons of courtesans under any obligation to relieve their fathers.

The extravagance or disobedience of children might lead to a disinheriting by their parents. This could not, however, be done from passion or prejudice; and in order to provide against that, they were required to appear before certain judges appointed for that purpose. If the children were found deserving so severe a sentence, the public crier was ordered to proclaim that they were disinherited. They might afterwards be reconciled, but if so, they never could be again disinherited. When a parent, through age or infirmity, became unfit to manage his estate, his son was allowed to impeach him before certain magistrates, who were empowered to invest him with the immediate possession of his inheritance.

V. Youth, its privileges and education or training. The attention paid to youth in its education, its training, its occupations, its habits, has ever formed a prominent object in the view of every civilized people. "The child is father of the man," and this fact has been perceived from

a remote antiquity. The Greeks, with their lively intellects, were not slow in acknowledging it, and in adopting systems of education which would implant in the youth the seed of the future man.

The system of education at Sparta was so different from that of other Grecian states, that it will be necessary to leave it out of view for the present, returning to it again after the others have been considered. In Athens no labor that required any application was imposed on children for the first five years. It was wisely considered that all that period of time was demanded to allow the physical organization to acquire sufficient energies at its start in life.

Soon after the young Athenian had attained the age of five years he was taught to swim. With such a maritime people as the Athenians, this was an accomplishment by no means to be overlooked. The Athenians were, to a great extent a maritime people. In the management of ships, and in naval tactics they were the most skillful people in all Greece. It was, therefore, extremely proper that their youth should become familiarized with an element upon which they might afterward be called upon to act.

At the age of seven, at a great festival, it was customary at Athens to have the boys enrolled in the register of the curia, to which their parents belonged. At this age they were usually taken from the parental roof and sent to a public school. This was for the double purpose of enabling them to commence the cultivation of their minds, and also to keep them so occupied as that no time could be allowed for evil thoughts and habits.

The pedagogues or governors to whom the care of instructing youth was confided were very generally slaves, but they were not always necessarily debased in mind and morals. Prisoners of war were then very generally reduced to slavery, and men of virtue and ability were not unfrequently left in this condition by the fortunes of war.

There were not only public schools, but the wealthy and distinguished were accustomed to have private teachers at

their houses. Both boys and girls were instructed at the public schools. The girls were scantily supplied with food in order that they might be of slender make. Even at that early period they had the habit of binding their waists about, so as to compress them, and thus render their forms more elegant.[1]

The schools of the humbler classes were not unfrequently conducted in the portico of a temple, or in some sheltered corner in the street, where, in spite of the din of business and the throng of passengers, the process of learning was in progress. From this fact it has been supposed by some that in Athens there were no school houses. It seems, however, to be well established that in some instances spacious structures were raised for the children of the rich, and that they were furnished with tables, desks, etc., for the accommodation of the scholars.[2]

In the interior of the school house was commonly a kind of oratory, which was adorned with statues of the muses. The apparatus of the school room consisted of mathematical instruments, maps, charts of the heavens, boards upon which to trace geometrical figures, tablets of box wood, fir, or ivory, of a triangular form, skins of parchment and wax for covering the tablets; rulers, reed-pens, pen cases, pen-knives, pencils, and also a rod to preserve order and regularity among the scholars.

These schools seem not to have been state institutions. They were mere private speculations, each instructor graduating his wages according to his own reputation and the fortunes of his pupils. The earliest task undertaken at school was to acquire a knowledge of the Greek characters and the method of writing them with correctness. The practice resorted to, to teach this art, was very similar to that now in use. The teacher first traced the characters on a tablet with a pencil, and the pupil followed, guiding his pen in accordance with the faint lines before him.

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 488. [2] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, I, 177.

Arithmetic was a branch of knowledge which was deemed necessary to be studied at Athens. It was also among the early studies. So also astronomy was among the sciences cultivated and taught at the same place. Music was cultivated for a number of purposes. It was supposed, and no doubt was, well qualified to soothe and mollify the asperity and fierceness of the national character, and to prepare the way for the lessons of the poets. It also enabled the citizens gracefully to perform their part in the amusements of social life, every person being in his turn called upon at entertainments to sing, or play upon the lyre. It was also necessary to enable them to join in the sacred choruses, which were rendered frequent by the piety of the people, and for the performance in old age of many offices of religion. It was required on the field of battle in the chanting of those stirring, impetuous and terrible melodies, called pæans, which ascended up from the embattled hosts just previous to their joining in the fight. For all these reasons the art of music was early cultivated among the Greeks, especially the Athenians. The teachers of it were divided into two classes, the one the Citharistæ, who confined themselves to instrumental music alone. The other the Citharœdi, who combined vocal with instrumental music.

There were also other arts cultivated, especially towards the later ages of the republic. Drawing was taught, and also the elements of art generally. Young men of liberal fortunes were also instructed in philosophy, and for this purpose there were public schools in different parts of Greece.

While these various studies were being pursued, no inconsiderable portion of time was devoted by the Grecian youth, to the invigorating themselves by exercise. This was accomplished by a very artificial system called gymnastics. The gymnasium was regarded as the great agent that dispensed health and strength, and gave to the body its perfection of form.

It was one of the laws of Solon, that every Athenian should be able to read and swim. The tendency of Attic

legislation was to create among the rich and noble a taste for field sports, horsemanship and martial and manly exercise.

Gymnastic exercises prevailed as far back as the age of Homer. They even then constituted one of the principal objects of education. During the entire period of Grecian prosperity these exercises were continued, and held in high estimation. They tended to give men force and agility, a martial bearing, beauty, lightness of form, and along with all these, an ever present cheerfulness. These, therefore, when accompanied with a due degree of intellectual and moral culture, contributed to form a perfect man, because by means of these, his physical nature acquired a grace, beauty and perfection, which few other causes have ever been found adequate to confer.

The Athenians were later than the Spartans in the introduction of these exercises, although they were common in the age of Solon. The age at which boys commenced them is supposed to have been about sixteen. There were three of these gymnasia at Athens, which acquired celebrity. These were the Academy, the Lyceum and Cynosarges. They were spacious edifices surrounded by gardens and a sacred grove. The entrance was by a square court, which was encompassed with porticoes and buildings. Large halls were arranged on three of its sides, which were provided with seats for the philosophers, rhetoricians and sophists, with their pupils. On the fourth side were rooms for bathing and other purposes. From the court, the passage was into a square enclosure, shaded by plane trees. A range of colonnades extended around three of the sides.

The principal parts of the gymnasium were the porticoes, the Ephebeion where the youth exercised; the Palæstra, the place set apart for wrestling; the Sphæristerion, where they played ball; the area, where were performed running, leaping, and pitching the quoit; and the Stadium one-eighth of a mile in length, resembling the section of a cylinder rounded at the ends.

One great object to be secured by subjecting the youth to these exercises was to accustom them early to a power of endurance. Accordingly the first step was to expose them naked during the initiatory exercises, to the fierce rays of the sun, and the cold of winter. The next was to learn the wrestler's art. This was justly regarded as the principal among the gymnastic contests, whether its superior utility was regarded, or the great art and skill which were required in the practice of it. In these exercises the youth were naked, their bodies being anointed with oil. The racing course was performed in the area of the Stadium, which was deeply covered with a soft yielding sand. In addition to this difficulty the youth sometimes ran in armor. Another exercise was leaping, in which they usually sprang from an artificial elevation, and descended upon a soft mould. Sometimes they carried in their hands metalic weights the better to enable them to poise their bodies. Another exercise was pitching the quoit, which was once practiced with large stones or rude masses of iron. Other exercises were shooting with the bow and darting the javelin, sometimes with the naked hand and sometimes with a thong wound about the centre of the weapon.

The wrestling performed was of two kinds. In the first, the wrestlers threw their arms about each others' body, each endeavoring to bring the other to the ground. In the second, the one voluntarily flung himself upon the ground bringing his adversary along with him, and then by pinching, scratching, biting, and other species of annoyance, sought to compel him to yield.

Boxing was occasionally practiced at the gymnasium, sometimes with the naked fist, but more frequently with the cestus, which consisted of a series of thongs bound round the hand and arm up to the elbow, or even higher.

Another branch of gymnastics consisted in the various forms of the dance, which it was considered especially necessary to understand and excel in, whether in reference to the movements and evolutions of war, or to sustaining

a part in the religious choruses, or in regulating the carriage with the proper grace and decorum.

This great variety of exercises was pursued with avidity by the Grecian youth with the double object of securing health and beauty of form, and also of rendering them such perfect adepts in their performance as to enable them to come off victors at the Olympic and other games.[1]

Perhaps the purpose of education, and its adaptation to the formation and completion of national character, are nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the republic of Sparta. We have no reliable knowledge as to what were the methods of culture before the age of Lycurgus. This remarkable man laid the foundations of his civil polity in the education or training to which the youth of Sparta were subjected. That education fitted them not merely to be men, or even Grecians, but to be Spartans. His great purpose, by means of it, was to unfold the bodily powers, to give a perfect physical frame, to instill an indomitable love of country, to inure to hardship and fatigue, and to render valor and personal prowess the most desirable of all qualities. We shall look in vain to Sparta for any lofty exhibitions of mind. The arts which have immortalized Athens, that of oratory, poetry, painting, sculpture, etc., were, in a great degree, unknown to the Spartan. He entered little into speculative philosophy. His questionings in reference to the nature of things were few and feeble. His spiritual, moral, and intellectual natures were but little cultivated. In rearing up bodies to defend the state, the mind and soul were entirely lost sight of, except as to the exercise of some of their earth-born faculties.

The principle which seemed to lie at the foundation of the institutions of Lycurgus was, that every Spartan that came into the world was the exclusive property of the state. Its parents had been simply the instruments of its production, but its ownership was in the state. This ownership, or exclusive jurisdiction, was called into immediate exer-

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, I, 195, *et seq.*

cise in the act of awarding life or death to the new-born infant. It might well be claimed that the condition of sparing its life was, that it should ever after be devoted to the state. The fact that children were state property, receiving little from their parents, and returning little to them, may, in some measure, account for the indifference manifested by the parents, even the mothers, toward their children, and their apparent willingness to have them suffer and even die for the state.

Children were early accustomed to eat indifferently what was placed before them; to manifest no fear in the dark, or when left alone; not to give themselves up to peevishness and ill humor, to crying and bawling; to walk barefoot in order to inure them to fatigue; to lie hard at nights; to wear the same clothes winter and summer, to harden them against cold and heat.

Instead of remaining under the superintendence of their parents, and allowing them to select for them their schools and masters, the Spartan youth were entrusted to the guardianship of a particular magistrate, called a pædonomos. This was bringing them under a species of camp discipline. The power possessed by this dignitary was very great. He could call the boys together whenever he pleased, and inflict whatever chastisement upon them he chose. He was attended by men having whips, who were prompt to exercise them at his bidding. He was, therefore, a kind of despot, whose authority might as well be exercised out of school as within.

The schools at which the Spartan youth received their instruction, were public schools. At these, all the youth attended, even the younger members of the royal family, the heir apparent to the throne being alone exempted.

The youth were restricted to one shirt per annum, and were compelled to lie on pallet beds, made with the tops of reeds, with the addition, in winter, of a quantity of thistle down. They were also reduced to short commons, being restricted, as much as possible, in the quantity of food allowed to them. This was with a view to inure

them to hunger to make them the more perfect soldiers. Besides, health and light spirits were supposed to attend upon an abstemious diet, and also, what was extremely desirable, an agile, clean-limbed, spare warrior. To be fat was an offense at Sparta.

There was one species of theft that was encouraged at Sparta. The youths were taught to enter the gardens and public halls, and steal from thence as adroitly as they could, meat, herbs, and other edibles. If they succeeded in accomplishing such a feat without being discovered, they were commended for their subtlety and cunning. If discovered, they were severely flogged, not for the stealing, but for doing it so bunglingly as to be detected. Their anxiety to escape detection was very great, and in one instance given, a boy suffered a fox he had stolen, and concealed under his robe, to eat into his bowels, and actually to cause his death rather than to reveal his theft. The whole object of this was to train the youth up to great secrecy, slyness of movement, cunning and adroitness—all these being requisite to form the perfect soldier of those times.

Another peculiarity in the training of youth was their hibernation among the mountains. This consisted in sending forth a company, armed for self-protection, on a roving commission, to prowl about the highlands, and less frequented parts of Laconia. It was nominally a hunting excursion, and designed to inure the youth to hardships, and teach them the art of providing for themselves. Instead, however, of relying on game for their subsistence, their more general course was to subsist by plundering the farms and villages of the Helots or slaves. This naturally led to difficulties arising between them, to bloodshed, and in some instances to the massacre of entire villages of Helots. Out of this custom grew the Crypteia or annual massacre of the Helots.

The gymnastic exercises were extensively practiced at Sparta. The young of both sexes spent much of their time at the gymnasium. Girls, like boys, divested entirely

of clothing, contended for mastery at the various gymnastic sports. It is asserted by some that no young man was permitted to marry until he had fairly vanquished his wife in these exercises.

To accustom the Spartan youth to patience, constancy and endurance, they had a cruel custom of whipping several youths at a certain annual festival celebrated in honor of Artemis or Diana. This was practiced in the presence of their parents and of other citizens. The whipping was so severe that the blood ran down on the altar of the cruel goddess, and many actually died under the fearful severity of the infliction. These terrible floggings the youths were expected to bear without a single murmur of complaint, and without suffering so much as a sigh or a groan to escape them. Their fathers were often standing by exhorting them to persevere to the end in their constancy and resolution.

Another exercise somewhat peculiar to the Spartans was the military games conducted under the direction of officers appointed for that purpose. These took place on a little island near the city, and possessing great natural beauty, being encircled by a sheet of clear water, and surrounded by thick and lofty groves of plantain trees. Two companies of youths having first sacrificed to Aries or Mars met on this island face to face, and commenced battle, fighting most furiously with their fists, teeth and limbs. The contests here lacked nothing but arms to render them real battles.

Of a somewhat similar character to the above, were the battles fought between the young men and the three hundred followers of the Hippagretæ. There were three inferior magistrates appointed by the Ephori. They selected each one hundred followers from among the healthiest and bravest of the youthful population. Against this select band all the other young men of the city made war. The contests were sometimes of the fiercest character. Any citizen happening to pass by, could part the combatants, otherwise the fierce boxing matches in which they engaged might

often have terminated fatally. Many of these peculiar institutions were obtained from Crete, where they were generally attributed to Minos.

It must not, however, be supposed that no means of intellectual culture existed at Sparta. The art of writing existed there although it seems never to have been held in very high estimation, and probably was never generally practiced. The Spartans chanted their laws, as well as their songs.

Nor is it supposed that much stress was laid on the ability to read by the Spartans. They never produced an orator. Rhetoric, logic, and other kindred studies were unknown, or at least neglected. They seem, however, to have had some taste for poetry, and even instituted public recitations of Homer.

Dancing was an accomplishment learnt and practiced at Sparta. The most popular dance was the Pyrrhic, which was performed by youths from the age of fifteen or even earlier. They were taught to perform it in arms. The dancers were armed with spear and shield, and went gracefully through a number of movements, wheeling, advancing, giving blows or shunning them as in a real action.

The Spartans, however, did certainly acquire or possess a species of practical philosophy, which gave them a surprising degree of self-control, and enabled them to govern their passions, and subordinate everything to their country and to self. The youth acquired a good deal at the public tables, where it was usual for the masters to instruct the boys by proposing them various questions. They would, for instance, inquire who was the most worthy man in Sparta? or what opinion they would form of such or such an action. To all such questions ready answers were required, and these were given in the tersest possible way, the reason and the proof rendered being in the fewest words. Thus the laconic style was acquired, which consisted in a close and concise way both of speaking and writing.

VI. Manners and civil life among the Athenians and Spartans. There is little that seems to belong peculiarly and exclusively to this head of inquiry. Manners and civil life are made up of all, or nearly all, the elements that enter into the social character of a people. These elements we have embraced under other heads. Some rather general remarks are all that should find a place here.

The Athenian character certainly presents the most remarkable compound of excellences and defects which can anywhere be presented. In it was a high degree of refinement, an ardent and self-sacrificing patriotism, and a great degree of personal bravery. But along with these were to be found great fickleness, an unfailing thirst for novelty, and a severe jealousy and hatred of the most exalted merit. All these different traits are most amply developed in Athenian history.

The Spartan was a different character, almost an antipode to the Athenian. The patriotism and love of country was as much, and probably more, glowing and active in the Spartan than in the Athenian. So also the courage and personal bravery of the Spartan were as great, and probably greater, than the Athenian.

But one great point of difference consisted in the persistency of the Spartan, and the versatility of the Athenian. The first knew no change. He was cast in an iron mould, the mould of Lycurgus. Over his struggling energies was thrown a net of iron. From his cradle to his grave he was made the subject of a severe, an unrelenting discipline. Sparta was called a republic, but it is apprehended that no despotism ever yet existed on earth of a severer character than that embodied in the laws of Lycurgus. Not only every act of the citizen, but as far as possible, every thought and feeling of the man, must be according to law. There was much to justify the remark of Alcibiades who, when they boasted the contempt which the Spartans showed for death, replied: "I do not wonder at it; it is the only means they have of freeing themselves of

that perpetual irksomeness and constraint which is caused by the life they are obliged to lead."[1] This persistency of character with the Spartans was a very natural result of their education, maxims, and institutions political, moral and social.

The Athenian, on the other hand, was ever changeable, fickle and frivolous. His larger liberty, higher culture, broader and deeper flow of ideas, rendered him more inquiring, more curious, more anxious to know and develop in his own experience all that appertains to life. Hence he was passionately fond of public shows, festivals, and theatrical exhibitions. Everything that could add a new pleasure to the body, a new thought to the mind, or a new emotion to the soul, was sought after with the utmost eagerness.

All such shows, festivals, and theatrical exhibitions, the Spartan looked upon with contempt. He regarded them as an utter waste of time, as even tending to corrupt the morals.

The Athenian, as we shall find, cultivated letters and the fine arts. He had his systems of philosophy, his different varieties and modifications of thought. His productions of art were curious and astonishing.

All these the Spartan little regarded. His doctrine was a rigid, practical utilitarianism. All systems of philosophy, modes of thought, productions of art; all knowledge of every description, was deemed by him perfectly worthless if it could not be brought into the immediate use of every day life.

The Athenian usually rose at day-break, addressed himself to a few devotional exercises, and entered upon the employments of the day. The judge took his seat at the tribunal; the agriculturist, manufacturer and merchant went about their respective occupations. The Athenians worked, although from their plain habits of living, and from the abundance and cheapness of the necessaries of

[1] *Goguet's Origin of Laws*, III, 212.

life, and the ease in procuring them, they had much leisure time on their hands. This they spent in various exercises and amusements, the exercises consisting much in hunting. For the larger animals, as stags and wild boars, the richer citizens kept hounds. For the smaller, as birds, quails, etc., nets and cages. To these they fastened some birds previously taken, and these, by their cries, drew other birds of the same kind into the snare. The amusements will be specially noticed hereafter.

The Spartan might be said to lead a life of idleness. He followed no industrial pursuit. His lands were cultivated by his slaves, the Helots. He practiced none of the manufacturing nor mechanic arts. He entered not into any of the branches of commerce. He had, therefore, nothing to do. A portion of his time was spent in the exercise of hunting. Another very considerable portion was spent in the camp, and in the exercises of the gymnasium. The play of the social affections they looked upon as effeminate, and hence as unworthy of them. The men spent considerable portions of time together in various conversation, but even the topics of conversation were indicated by the laws. They chiefly had relation to the state, to the qualifications of their rulers, to the great exploits of their distinguished men, to the different moral qualities of actions. The Spartan character has been charged as deceitful, imperious, and excessively cruel. The manner in which their children were educated, or forced to come up, evinces, if not cruelty, at least the smallest possible amount of natural affection. But the savageness of their disposition was more especially manifested towards their slaves or Helots. These were originally a people whom they subdued, and to whom they gave the boon of life clogged with the most oppressive slavery. They were subjected to a double slavery, being slaves both to the public and to individuals. It is said the Spartans had a custom of frequently compelling some of them to drink until they were intoxicated, so that the youth might be admonished by the revolting character of the exhibition,

to abstain from too free a use of the intoxicating draft. They imposed upon them burdens without mercy. They subjected them to unmitigated hardships. There was no law to which they could appeal for protection. They were always compelled to go unarmed. The youth were allowed, and even encouraged to massacre them singly, or in numbers together. If they appeared likely to increase too rapidly, some means were devised to thin them out by a more general massacre. It is certainly not at all remarkable that youth trained up under such severity of discipline as they were subject to, and amid such scenes of massacre, should come to possess a disposition cruel and bloody. Little else certainly could in any reason be expected.

The Athenians also had slaves, but their conduct toward them was of a different character. They were doomed, it is true, those I mean that were destitute of mental attainments, to bear the severer burdens of existence, and to undergo the drudgery of life. But their lives were seldom in danger from the wanton cruelty of their masters, nor were they subjected to the stripes, trials, impositions and insults of the Spartan Helots.

The Athenians differed very considerably from the Spartans in their manner of spending their time. They were by no means an idle people. Those not employed in industrial pursuits were many of them at the baths and gymnasia. Some were listening to the instructions of the philosophers and rhetoricians. Others were crowding around the forum, the most frequented part of the whole city, and where the general assembly was held. More especially was this place thronged at all times during the day in time of war, great anxiety being possessed to hear the news. It was here the news was first promulgated. So aptly does Paul describe a certain class of Athenians as spending their entire time in telling or hearing some new thing. In the morning, before noon, and in the evening before supper, it was customary for the Athenians to walk through the delightful groves on the banks of the Ilissus and Cephisus, to enjoy the pureness of the air, and the

agreeable prospects, as also to interchange with each other their sentiments upon the news of the day. At sunset they sat down to supper; and, considering the business of the day as over, devoted the evening to society and amusement, and often continued together until a late hour in the night.[1]

VII. The dress of the Grecians. The dress and ornaments of a people are always interesting, as they are in direct relation with several useful arts, as those of spinning, weaving, dyeing, etc. Besides, they are more or less connected with the fine arts, as those of painting and sculpture. They are also of great value in proclaiming the character, tone of morals, and peculiar tastes of a people.

The dress of the Spartans differed from that of all the other Greeks. There was a difference between that of a married and an unmarried woman. The principal, and in fact, the sole garment of the Dorian maidens was the chiton, or himation, which was made of woolen stuff, and without any sleeves. It was fastened on either shoulder by a large clasp, and gathered on the breast by a kind of brooch. It was a sleeveless robe, which seldom reached more than half way to the knee. But its brevity as to length was not its only difficulty. It was left open up to a certain point on both sides, so that the skirts or wings, flying open as they walked, entirely exposed their limbs.[2]

The married women of Sparta did not appear in public without wearing a second garment, which closely resembled the himatia worn by the men. Another peculiarity of the Spartan women was that those who were married never appeared in public without a veil, while the Dorian maiden always appeared unveiled; the reason assigned being that it was the business of the last to secure a husband, but of the first to retain the one already secured.

[1] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 184–5. [2] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 52; *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 543.

The men of Sparta were less thinly clad than the women. Yet they were scantily covered. Their tribon, or variety of himation, was clipped so close that it would barely enclose their persons. They suffered their hair and beards to grow long, the latter becoming very bushy. Of their hair they took great care to render it glossy and shining. It was usually parted at the top, so that equal portions of it would fall down on each side. So very careful were they to preserve this ornament of their heads, that we find them busily engaged in combing and putting it in order on the very eve of a battle. In other respects the Spartans seem to have set little value on anything contributing merely to beauty of person. They set little value on cleanliness, being only permitted to bathe and perfume themselves on certain prescribed days. They generally wore the same dress both in summer and winter.

In all the states of Greece, particularly at Athens, there was much difference in the style and expense of the dress and ornaments made use of in different periods of their history. The primitive Greeks found their coverings in the skins of the wild beasts which they killed in the chase. They were worn rough, and with the hair on. Their ornament was the fur, which was worn on the outside. They made use of the sinews of the animal for thread, and of thorns instead of needles and bodkins. Even in the heroic ages, the dress both of the men and women must have been extremely imperfect. They knew nothing of breeches, stockings or drawers; nor of pins, buckles, buttons, or pockets. They knew little, if anything, at that period, of caps or hats.

Flax, cotton, and wool were the materials of which the garments of the Athenians and other Greeks, at subsequent periods, were usually made. Cotton was far more generally made use of than linen. The common people wore a cloth which had not been dyed, and which would wash. The rich in Athens usually preferred cloths of various colors. They particularly esteemed those died in scarlet, which was accomplished by means of little seeds of a red-

dish color, gathered from a certain shrub. But they set the most value of all upon purple, and especially upon that which was made up of a very deep red with a mixture of the violet.[1]

The dress of the Athenian ladies was of a much more complicated character than that of the Spartan. The primary garment was a white tunic reaching nearly to the ground, sometimes without sleeves, and fastened on the shoulders; in others, having loose hanging sleeves descending to the wrist, and brought together at intervals upon the arm by silver or golden agraffes. It was gathered into close folds under the bosom by a girdle, or ribbon, being sometimes fastened in front by a knot, sometimes by a clasp. This was made at first of fine linen and subsequently of muslin or Egyptian cotton.

Over the chiton was worn a shorter robe, not reaching below the knee, and confined above the loins by a broad ribbon. This, in some instances, had sleeves, and was of a rich purple or saffron color, frequently ornamented with a broad border of embroidery. Over these, to complete the walking dress, was thrown a magnificent mantle, generally purple, and embroidered with gold, which, floating about, was well adapted to display the arrangement of the inner garments. Beauty of female form seems to have been an early study, and never afterwards to have been entirely neglected. Even at Athens, the *corset* was not wanting to compress, nor the *bustle* to enlarge, what nature had withheld from giving perfection to her form.[2]

The Athenian ladies seldom went abroad without their veil, a light fabric of transparent texture, white or purple, which was obtained generally from Cos or Laconia. They often, during the historic period, wore caps or bonnets. There were other articles of dress not necessary to be enumerated. Women had their heads always covered. Besides the veil which came down from the head to the

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca,* 546. [2] *St John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece,* II, 56.

shoulders they wore a fillet with which the hair was tied; also one of another description in which the hair of women less refined was bound; and a net in which the hair was enclosed. Some wore in their hair golden grasshoppers to show the greatness and antiquity of their extraction. From their ears were suspended earrings, and their necks were adorned with a necklace.

The Theban women concealed their faces when in public, discovering only their eyes. They wore their hair knotted upon their heads, and their feet were confined in small purple slippers.

The Athenian ladies wore armlets and bracelets of great variety. They also wore golden anklets, stockings not being in common use. The fingers of the Grecian ladies were adorned with a profusion of rings, some of which, were set with signets, and others with jewels, remarkable for their color and brilliancy.

The Athenian ladies wore upon their feet shoes or sandals. Snow white slippers of fine linen were occasionally worn. They were flowered with needle work. It would seem from many ancient statues that something very like stockings were early introduced. The women had the art of adding to or diminishing their height at will by means of wearing high cork-heels, and soles of greater or lesser thickness.

With an Athenian beauty the toilette was a matter of vast importance. It usually consumed the entire morning. They painted their eyebrows, and sprinkled a yellowish powder over their hair. Their ambition was to give their tresses the hue of auburn, which was that of Aphrodites, and to effect this they dipped them in drugs, and then exposed them to the noon-day sun, by which means the desired color was acquired. Some were satisfied with their own black hair, and, by steeping it in oils and essences, augmented its rich gloss, and diffused all around it fragrant odors. Curling irons were in daily use, producing, by means of art, those waving ringlets which have ever been admired in their sculpture. White and red paint were

lavished on their complexions, and their lips were enlivened with artificial vermilion. Their robes were made of the choicest materials, but to prevent the use of immoderate finery, certain stuffs of the richest embroidery were enjoined to be the apparel of courtesans.[1]

All this was to make them more appreciated at home, as they were seldom permitted to be out in public. One of the injunctions of Solon prohibited women from going out at night, unless they had an intention to prostitute themselves.

The dress of the men included many of the garments worn by women. They wore the chiton, some with and some without sleeves. In the heroic age, they wore, as a defense against the cold, the chlaina, a cloak resembling the highlander's tartan. It was a square piece of cloth which was wrapped twice around the breast, and then fastened over the left shoulder by a brooch. To these the Spartan added the chlamys, which, as the art of dyeing was not practiced in Sparta, was universally white.

The wealthy Athenians were accustomed to appear abroad in flowing robes of the finest linen, dyed with purple, and other brilliant colors. Under these they wore tunics of various kinds. They wore rings of great variety and splendor. They wore their hair long like the ladies, and had it curled or braided, and disposed of on the crown of the head, or arranged along the forehead by golden grasshoppers. In war they cut their hair short. The Athenian was extremely neat and clean in his person, contrasting in this, as in almost everything else with the Spartan. Thus we find the Grecian preserving the flowing robes of the east, but modifying so as to be better fitted for active life, preserving at the same time their beauty of appearance.

VIII. The dwellings and furniture of the Grecians. It seems to be the impression of many that even at Athens

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 66; *Chenevix's National Characters*, II, 352.

there was no splendor in private buildings, but that all the architectural art and elegance were expended upon the temples, and other public edifices. This, to a great extent, must be an error. During the early ages when manners were simple, and there was little wealth, private dwellings no doubt partook of that simplicity and plainness, and had little of splendor in their proportions or arrangements. As wealth increased, and tastes for luxury and elegance multiplied, the magnitude, complexity of arrangement, and perfection of style in private buildings correspondingly increased. Even at Sparta, soon after the Peloponnesian war, the more distinguished among the citizens erected suburban villas of large dimensions and filled with costly furniture.

In general, the private dwellings of the Grecians, even those of the Athenians, were small and mean, although there were some splendid exceptions. They were frequently built directly upon the street, having their upper stories somewhat projecting, and their staircases and balustrades upon the outside. Some of them had a small court in front, and many of them gardens behind.[1]

We have, at the present time, no very satisfactory information as to the forms or arrangements of a Grecian dwelling. In the Athenian houses the men and women had distinct apartments assigned them. The entrance to the women's apartment was by a long and narrow avenue, which men were not permitted to enter, unless they were near relatives or were introduced by the husband. The apartment was termed thalamos; was in a very retired part of the house, and near the top, being reached by ascending a staircase. It was a lofty and spacious apartment, where all the females of the family usually sat while engaged in embroidery or other needle work. It was likewise the nursery, and in a deep recess was the sleeping apartment of the mistress of the family.[2]

[1] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 194. [2] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 85.

There was also a room set apart for a bath, but in what particular part of the building does not appear. The puelos, or bathing vessel, appears to have borne a resemblance to an Egyptian sarcophagus, and was constructed of white or green marble, bronze, common stone or wood. Sometimes it was round. Besides this, there were public baths of which mention will be made hereafter.

The more ancient Greek houses were generally flat, the roof consisting of beams laid close together and covered with cement. In warm weather many slept upon the roofs.

The kitchen was sometimes a separate building erected in a court yard. Whether separate, or a part of the principal building, we know little of its form or arrangements. The point which has elicited the greatest amount of controversy is whether it was, or was not, provided with a chimney to carry off the smoke.[1] None of the sculptures of the ancients now known represent a chimney. It has not been found in the ruins of Herculaneum. Notwithstanding this want of direct, positive evidence, it has been inferred, from certain expressions made use of in certain writers, that they were early in use. It seems also that recently Col. Leake has found on the rocky slopes of the hill of the Museum and Pnyx at Athens, the remains of a house partly excavated in a rock, in which the chimney still remained.[2]

Another question out of which considerable controversy has grown, regards the fact whether the Greeks had or had not glass windows in their dwellings. Glass was early in use in the form of bowls, goblets, vases, etc., but there seems to be no evidence that it was used for windows. It seems probable that they may have made use of thin plates of the lapis specularis, or of talc or gypsum, or of some other transparent matter that would have served as a pro-

[1] This will be found discussed in *Montfaucon's Antiquities Displayed*, III, 66, *et seq.*; *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 92; *and Blackman's History of Inventions and Discoveries*, II, 62, *et seq.* [2] *Topography of Athens*, 361.

tection, and at the same time have admitted the benign influences of the sun. But it does not seem to be fully established that they did not make use of glass windows.

The principal apartments were furnished with divans, or broad immovable seats, running along the walls, which were composed of carved wood, inlaid with ivory and gold, and studded with silver nails. These seats by degrees became movable, and were converted into couches or sofas, manufactured of bronze, silver, or precious woods.

The street door of the Grecian house had the peculiarity of opening outward, instead of inward, so that it was customary for the individual passing out to knock on the door for the purpose of giving notice to those passing by in the street to get out of the way to avoid being hurt by its opening. A singular law of Lycurgus enacted that the ceilings of the Spartan houses should be made with an axe, and the doors by a saw, without the aid of any other tool.[1] So long as houses could remain so constructed there could be little danger of bringing into them expensive or luxurious furniture. Doors were not usually suspended on hinges, but turned upon pivots inserted above into the lintel, and below into the threshold. In Sparta a person desirous of entering the house shouted aloud at the door, but at Athens a knocker was furnished or little bells were sometimes hung at the door.

The materials the more generally used in the construction of houses were stones and bricks. The latter were made of different sizes, some being very large, and others smaller, for filling up spaces, thus preventing the necessity of shortening them with the trowel. Sometimes they were simply dried in the sun.[2]

The Greeks arranged their movables into certain classes, the first class including everything used in domestic sacrifices; the second included all the female ornaments worn on solemn festivals; the third the sacred robes and military

[1] *Goguet's Origin of Laws*, 211. [2] *St John's Manners and Customs of the Ancient Grecians*, II, 95.

uniforms of the men; the fourth the hangings, bed furniture and ornaments of the harem, or thalamos; and the fifth, those of the men's apartments. Another class still included the various instruments and utensils for culinary use.

Chairs of different sorts occur in old monuments. Some of these have arms not unlike modern ones. Besides these, they had also large stools of various forms. Previous to the oriental habit of reclining at meals, the Greeks sat at table on chairs. These were of more or less costly materials, but all beautiful and elegant in form. Their tables in the heroic ages were generally of wood, of variegated colors, finely polished, and with ornamented feet. As civilization advanced, the tables of the wealthy became more and more costly in materials, and more elegant in form. They were originally supported on four legs, but afterwards rested on three. In the best ages of Greece, their tables were inlaid with silver, brass or ivory, with feet in the form of lions, leopards or other wild beasts.

The bedsteads were the more generally made out of deal wood, bottomed with planks. Sometimes the bed was supported by a kind of netting of strong cord, stretched across the bedstead and made fast all round. In later ages bedsteads were sometimes made of silver or ivory embossed with figures wrought with infinite art and delicacy. The beds were of different materials. In the time of Homer they were stuffed in Thessaly with very fine grass. In other parts they slept on beds of sponge. In Athens, the rich slept upon very soft beds, which were placed on bedsteads considerably above the floor.

The plate of the wealthy Athenians displayed their gorgeous and costly taste. It was fabricated of the rarest materials, and wrought with all the elaborateness and delicacy within the reach of art.

Drinking horns seem to have been not unknown to the ancient Grecians. In very remote ages bull's horns were converted into cups with very little preparation. Afterwards horns of silver were substituted.

Another article of luxury among the Greeks was mirrors. These were sometimes made of brass, but the best prior to the introduction of glass were made of silver, or a species of mixed metal. Glass mirrors appear to have been originally manufactured by the Phœnicians of Sidon, and were of early introduction. The hand mirrors were usually circular and were carefully enclosed in cases. They had mirrors of polished silver which magnified the objects they reflected. They had also mirrors that played off practical jokes by giving distorted appearances to the images reflected.[1]

Another article of furniture possessed by the Greeks, and of early introduction is the lamp. The antiquary has dwelt much upon the lamps of the ancients. Lamps were in use by the ancients in their houses, temples and sepulchres, although they were not always easily distinguishable. Some lamps were plain, and some in the highest degree ornamental. Some were purely the work of caprice, and extremely whimsical. Some were made to exhibit deities and fables, and some true histories.[2] The lamps in common use were fictile, but sometimes they were composed of bronze, silver or even of massive gold. Wooden chandeliers, or candlesticks, were used among people of humble condition.

The weapons, armor and implements of war constituted no inconsiderable part of the furniture of a Grecian dwelling. These consisted principally of helmets, greaves, cuirasses, shields, shield-cases, spears and their sheaths, quivers, arrows and bows, and sometimes all or most of these highly ornamented.

There was also the furniture appropriate to the kitchen, which it is unnecessary to specify. The fuel generally made use of by the Greeks, consisted chiefly of wood and charcoal. It seems, however, that they were not altogether

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 118, 119. [2] The lamps of the ancients in all their variety of forms and ornamental devices will be found well described and exhibited in *Montfaucon's Antiquities Displayed*, V, 137, *et seq.*

unacquainted with mineral coal. Wood was always scarce in Attica, and hence they there used vine cuttings and green branches of the fig tree. They used sometimes to boil their wood in water, or steep it in the dregs of oil, to prevent it smoking, when they were using it in their saloons, halls and drawing rooms.[1]

IX. The food and drinks of the Grecians. In the mild climate of Greece, where the different varieties of bread-stuffs could be so easily obtained, and where so many varieties and such quantities of fruits were annually produced, there existed little necessity for large consumptions of animal food. The varieties of bread were very numerous in Greece, more especially among the Athenians, who were considered to excel in this department of the culinary art. The two kinds the most generally used were the maize bread and the barley bread. A little milk, oil and salt were mixed with the flour, and the loaves were either baked under the ashes or in a baking oven. The Athenians also used millet, corn, rice, and spelt. The wheat cake was made of wheat and honey. Besides this there was the fig cake composed of rice, cheese, eggs and honey; and the cheese cake made of cheese, eggs and garlic.[2]

But the Grecians were by no means confined to vegetable food. The Spartans, while under the laws of Lycurgus, lived in the plainest manner, confining themselves chiefly to the black broth, so celebrated as the principal food on which they subsisted.

Although the Grecians of the early ages subsisted principally on vegetable food, yet they afterwards commenced making use of the animal. The first animal that appears to have been sacrificed to supply the demand of the human system for animal food, was the hog. Next followed the ox, and with him indiscriminately, sheep, goats, deer, hares,

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 124. [2] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 201, 202.

and other animals wild and tame. Salt was used by the Greeks in almost every article of food, and in great abundance.

In remote ages fish formed but a small part of the sustenance of the Greeks. But public opinion afterwards underwent, in this respect, a great change. Fish came to be considered at Athens one of the greatest articles of luxury. So that among the gourmands of Athens there arose a rivalry as to who should be first in the morning at the fish market to secure the choicest kinds of fish. This great demand made fish extremely dear at Athens.

Oysters were esteemed good when boiled with mallows or monk's rhubarb. The physicians of antiquity generally considered them hard of digestion. The second courses consisted of sweetmeats, fruits, almonds, nuts, figs, peaches, etc. The art of cookery came to be held in great estimation in Greece; its importance increasing in proportion as wealth and luxury continued to increase.

In regard to drinks it seems to be very clear that in the primitive ages the common beverage of the Greeks was water. When wine was first introduced it was always drank diluted with water, in about the proportion of two parts of the first to five of the last. The Greeks were in the habit of perfuming their wines with odoriferous flowers, or other substances.

The Greeks kept their wine in earthern vessels, or in leathern bottles, or in casks. Old wines were in the greatest repute.

The Greeks considered drinking to excess as being disgraceful. The drunkard was even infamous, and he who committed a crime, while in a state of intoxication, was more severely punished than if he had committed it when sober. The excess of punishment beyond what was appropriate for committing the crime was inflicted for getting drunk.

X. The baths of the Grecians. The Greeks, with the exception of the Spartans, generally paid great attention

to personal cleanliness. The occasions were frequent when they were accustomed to bathe. Such were—when they put off mourning, when they returned from war, when they had finished any hard labor, when they returned from a journey, and previous to going to any entertainment. They very frequently bathed in salt water. Whatever bathing was done by the Spartans in early times was in the river Eurotas. In the heroic ages men and women, without distinction, bathed themselves in rivers. In the primitive ages, instead of baths, they washed themselves in certain large vessels. The erection of baths was at a later period. As we have already seen, the opulent, especially at Athens, had bathing rooms in their dwellings. Independent of these, however, public baths came to be very common throughout most of the Hellenic cities, especially at Athens.

These public baths at Athens were surmounted with domes, and received their light from above. They were frequented by all classes of women who could afford to pay for such a luxury. It was customary for them to enter the water together in crowds. Here the Grecian matrons who had sons to marry, had a good opportunity of studying the form and character of the young ladies who were in the habit of frequenting the baths. All the defects both of person and features must here be revealed. Hence it was said to be difficult, if not impossible, for any lady, not sufficiently opulent, to keep up a bathing establishment in her own house, to retain for any long period of time, an undeserved celebrity for beauty.[1]

The public baths commonly contained the following rooms: 1. One in which they put off their clothes. 2. The sweating room, which was most commonly of a circular form, and provided with fire that did not smoke, for the benefit of those who wished to sweat. 3. A room in which there was a hot bath. 4. One in which there was a cold bath; and 5. The room in which they were anointed.

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 89.

They had a practice of anointing always after bathing, which was done either to close the pores of the body, which was thought to be especially necessary after the use of hot baths, or to prevent the skin becoming rough after the water was dried off it. This practice of anointing was by no means universal, as it was considered rather effeminate. The feet were oftener washed and anointed than any other part, as they were more exposed.

XI. Their times of eating; entertainments; the ceremonies preceding and attending them; manner of entertaining strangers.

1. Their times of eating. Some are of opinion that the primitive Greeks had but two meals a day, viz: the dinner and supper. The first was a short, plain meal; but the last, taken about sunset, was the principal meal. Other authors mention four times of eating. 1. The morning meal, the breakfast, which was taken about the rising of the sun. 2. The meal at noon, the dinner. 3. The afternoon meal; and 4. The supper. The generality of writers mention but three meals a day, omitting the third.[1]

2. Their entertainments. The origin of entertainments in the primitive ages was devotion to the gods. Hence they were conducted with decency and propriety. Afterwards a more free manner of living was introduced.

There were commonly reckoned three sorts of entertainments. The first was a club-feast, or an entertainment made at the common charge of all present. Every guest contributed, with the exception of poets, singers, and others, whose special business it was to divert the company.

Another was the marriage feast, which occurred on the occasion of a wedding; and a third was an entertainment provided at the expense of one person. The first were the least expensive to each individual, were generally the most frequented, and were considered as tending to produce feelings of friendship and good neighborhood. They

[1] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 204, 205.

were also generally conducted with more order and propriety than any other feast.

In addition to these there were also in many places public entertainments, at which a whole city, a tribe, or fraternity of men were present. The provision for these entertainments was sometimes furnished by contributions, sometimes by the liberality of the rich, and at other times from the public revenue. The design of these was to promote peace and good understanding, and to accustom men to frugality. One of the strongest instances of these was in the public meals of the Spartans. They were conducted with the greatest frugality, and persons of all ages were admitted. The young resorted there to be able to profit from the examples in temperance and sobriety that were here placed before them. They were also taught good manners and useful knowledge.[1]

3. The ceremonies preceding and attending entertainments. The person providing the entertainment was termed the host; those entertained the guests, and those intruding the flies and parasites.

The Greeks before going to an entertainment washed and anointed themselves. It was even customary to wash between the courses, and again after supper. After the guests arrived they saluted the master of the house. This was commonly done by joining their right hands. The men and women were never invited together. In Greece the mistress of a family never appeared at an entertainment, except when relations only were invited.

The Grecians originally sat at meat. There are three different kinds of seats mentioned by Homer. 1. The settee, containing two persons, and which was made use of by the lowest rank. 2. The chair, on which they sat upright, having under their feet a footstool; and 3. The sofa on which they sat, leaning a little backwards. They, at length, acquired the habit of reclining at their meals on couches, which had covers and pillows.

[1] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 204; *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 494.

The following was their manner of lying at meat: The table was placed near the middle of the room, around which were arranged the beds or couches. Upon these they reclined, leaning upon their left arm, with their legs stretched out at length, or a little bent, their heads resting upon pillows. If, as was frequently the case, several persons reclined on the same couch, the first or the most honored, lay on the uppermost part, with his legs extending behind the back of the second, whose head was opposite the breast of the first. The rest were disposed in like manner. The guests were arranged according to their rank, the chief persons having the uppermost places.

The table was accounted sacred. It presented the means of cementing friendships, and of practicing the virtue of hospitality. Their tables were made of wood highly polished. Those of the rich were more or less ornamented.

The supper seems to have been their principal meal, which was taken after all the toils of the day were over. Of this there were three distinct parts. 1. A slight repast before supper, consisting of bitter herbs, eggs, oysters, mead, and other things which were thought to create an appetite. 2. The supper proper, which was always much more plentifully furnished than the former; and 3. The second course, which consisted of sweatmeats of all kinds.

The Greeks first made an offering to the gods of a part of their provisions. During the entertainment the guests were dressed in white, their heads frequently crowned with garlands and anointed with various perfumes. The rooms also were sometimes perfumed by burning myrrh or frankincense, or with other odors.

The chief manager was elected by lot. The one next was termed king who determined the laws of good fellowship, and to whose directions all the guests were obliged to conform. An equal portion was distributed to each of the guests.

There were cup-bearers, who, in the heroic ages, were the heralds. The cups were crowned with garlands and

filled to the brim. The master of the feast drank to his guests in order, according to their quality. The manner of doing this was by drinking part of the cup, and sending the remainder to the person whom they named. It was also customary to drink to persons absent. The practice was first to remember the gods, then absent friends. To the honor of the first three rounds were drank, the first in honor of Jupiter, the second of the heroes or demi-gods, the third of Jupiter the preserver.

The entertainment being ended, a libation of wine with a prayer was offered, and a hymn sung to the gods. Afterwards the company were entertained with diversions, discourses on various subjects, music of all kinds, and whatever tended to excite mirth and cheerfulness. Music and dancing were early introduced as diversions at entertainments. The Athenians were excessively fond of the latter. Dancing girls and performers on the flute were frequently introduced after the guests had drank their wine, the whole company, on their entering, rising from the table and joining in the exercise. After the dancing was over, the guests were invited to wrestle, leap, run races, throw the quoit, and perform other bodily exercises.[1]

4. Their manner of entertaining strangers. The ancient Greeks possessed, in an eminent degree, the virtue of hospitality. Its rights were inviolable. The stranger who crossed their threshold and became their guest, immediately enlisted all their sympathy. He was entertained for several days without even inquiring into his history. When that became known, if found worthy, an alliance of hospitality was formed, which was forever regarded as indissoluble. Alliances thus formed descended from parents to children. They sometimes embraced whole families, and even cities.

This veneration of the rights of hospitality in the early ages of the world, presents an interesting and beautiful

[1] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 206, *et seq.*; *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 507, *et seq.*

picture. The tribes of men were then few, and lived remote from each other. There were no inns or other conveniences for travelers. The sea abounded in pirates, and the country with robbers. The intercourse of men with each other, had, therefore, mainly to depend on the exercise of this virtue.

It was customary to place salt before strangers before they partook of the repast prepared for them, in order to signify that, as salt preserves meat, so the friendship then commenced, should be lasting. To eat at the same table was considered as creating an inviolable obligation to friendship.

It was customary for those who were thus bound together by the rights of hospitality, to give to each other certain tokens, which were to be produced whenever they traveled, and the recognition of which ensured the bearer every attention. These tokens were deposited by the ancient Greeks among their treasures to perpetuate the memory of their friendship to succeeding generations.

It was the custom among those who undertook a journey first to implore the divine protection. Before their departure into a foreign land, they saluted and took leave of the deities of their own country by kissing the earth. The same form of salutation was commonly practiced on their arrival in any country.

XII. Sickness and death. Ceremonies attending each. When any one was dangerously sick, they fixed over his door a branch of rhamn or common buck-thorn and laurel. The object of the first was to keep off evil; of the last, to render Apollo propitious. All sudden deaths of men were attributed to Apollo; of women, to Diana. It was customary to cut off a lock of hair from a person near his end, and consecrate it to the infernal deities. Prayers were also offered to Mercury, whose office it was to conduct souls to the infernal regions.

When at the point of death, the friends and relations of the sick man crowded around his bed to kiss and embrace

him, to bid him farewell, and to catch his dying words, which they ever after repeated with the greatest reverence. As soon as he had expired, they commenced beating brazen kettles, by which they thought to drive away evil spirits, and to secure his soul from the furies.

Everything pertaining to death was expressed in words of gentle import. For instance, instead of using the word which signifies to die, they used the words which signify to cease to exist, to depart, to depart from life, to suffer something; and the dead were termed those who had departed. The primitive Christians even called their burying places the places of sleeping.

XIII. Ceremonies before and at funerals. Processions. Mourning.

1. Ceremonies before funerals. As soon as the sick man had expired, his eyes and mouth were closed, and his face covered. These offices were performed by his nearest relations. All the members were composed and stretched out to their proper length before the body was cold. The female relatives of the deceased then washed it with warm water. It was then anointed with oil, and wrapped in a linen cloth, over which was put some elegant garment, commonly of a white color. The body was then decked with chaplets of flowers and green boughs, which probably was designed to divest death of its horrors, and to signify the pleasure and joy which attended the dèad, when set free from this toilsome and afflictive world.

They next proceeded to lay out the body, sometimes placing it on the ground and sometimes on a bier, which was adorned with various sorts of flowers. The deceased was laid at the entrance of the house, where all could have the opportunity of examination. The feet were turned towards the gate. Before interment, a piece of money, generally an obolus, was put into the mouth of the deceased, which was thought to be Charon's fare for ferrying the departed soul over the river Styx. There was also put

into the mouth, a cake, composed of flour and honey, to appease the fury of Cerberus, who guarded the entrance into hell. The bodies of the dead were thus left exposed usually during a whole day.

2. Ceremonies at funerals, and funeral processions. The time intervening between death and burial varied considerably, depending much on the relative rank and standing of the deceased. Sometimes bodies were kept seventeen days and nights before interment, but burials generally seem to have been on the third or fourth day after death. The obsequies of the poor were not unfrequently attended the day after their decease.

Young men dying in the flower of their age, were buried in the early morning. Hence the stories of youths stolen to the embraces of Aurora. In all other cases funeral obsequies took place during the day, the night being more under the dominion of the furies and evil spirits. But from the fact that funeral processions in the morning twilight were conducted by torchlight it became customary to carry torches at all burials, although they occurred during the day.

In respect to the time of burial, the Athenians had a different practice from that just mentioned. They celebrated their funerals before sunrise, in obedience to a law attributed by some to Solon.

The corpse was generally carried on the shoulders of the bearers. It was sometimes placed upon a bier, instead of which the Spartans used a shield. Hence the exhortation of the Spartan mother to her son "to come back with his shield, or on it."

In the funeral processions, the relatives went next to the corpse, the rest following at some distance. The procession was commonly on horseback or in carriages, but in the case of distinguished personages the company went on foot, that being thought the most respectful.

3. Mourning. The manner of expressing grief and sorrow has ever varied with the national character. The different states of Greece exemplified this variety. Some of

the most common ways of expressing this was the following: 1. Abstaining from banquets and entertainments, banishing all musical instruments, and everything bearing an air of gayety and mirth. Frequenting no public solemnities, they sequestered themselves from company, courting silence, and shades, and solitudes. 2. They threw aside all ornaments and costly apparel. This was practiced by those who were in lamentation for any great calamity. They also put on mourning garments, which were always black, and made of coarse materials. 3. They divested themselves of their hair by shaving, cutting off or tearing. It was sometimes thrown upon the dead body, sometimes cast upon the funeral pile, and sometimes laid on the grave. 4. They threw themselves on the earth and rolled in the dust; intending by their defilement, to express their sorrow and dejection. They also sprinkled ashes on their heads. They kept their heads muffled when they went abroad. They beat their breasts and thighs with their hands, and tore their cheeks with their nails. They accused and cursed the gods. When persons of eminence died, public meetings were suspended, and the schools, baths, shops, temples, etc., were shut up. 5. They employed mourners and musicians to increase the solemnity. These beat their breasts and counterfeited all the actions of real and passionate grief. Musical instruments were employed at funerals, with what design is not perfectly agreed. Some suppose it was to frighten the ghosts and furies from the soul of the deceased; others to denote the soul's entrance into heaven, where the motion of the spheres was supposed to produce a divine and an eternal harmony; some that they were intended to divert the melancholy of the surviving relations, and others that they were intended to excite sorrow.

XIV. Manner of interring and burning the dead. The custom of the primitive ages was to inter the dead. This was more ancient than that of burning. The Athenians interred in the reign of Cecrops. It appears, however,

that as early as the Trojan war the custom of burning was in practice among the Greeks.

The theoretical opinions of philosophers seem to have had some effect upon the mode of finally disposing of the body. Those who thought the human body was compounded of water, earth, or the four elements, were inclined to interment. Those, on the contrary, who, with Heraclitus, held that fire was the first principle of all things, were disposed to burning.

Two reasons were assigned for burning. One that the body, supposed unclean, might be purified by fire; the other that the soul, being separated from gross matter, might take its flight to the heavenly mansions.

The piles upon which bodies were burnt, were not erected in any constant form, nor of the same uniform materials, but were varied according to time, place, and circumstances. They placed the body upon the top of the pile; and, if a person of rank, often burnt with it many slaves and captives. Precious ointments and perfumes were poured upon the flames. The garments of the deceased were thrown thereon. Soldiers generally had their arms burnt with them. The pile was lighted by some of the nearest relations or friends of the deceased. When a general or a commander, the soldiers made a solemn procession three times round the pile. This was performed by turning towards the left hand, which was always expressive of sorrow. While the pile was in flames the friends poured forth libations of wine, calling on the deceased by name.

When the pile was burnt down, and the flames had ceased, they extinguished the remains of the fire with wine, and afterwards collected the bones and ashes. They placed the body in the middle of the pile, and the men and beasts, if any were burnt at the same time, on the sides of it. This was for the purpose of distinguishing the remains of the body from those of the beasts and men burnt with it.

They must also have had some method of preserving in a separate state the ashes of the body from those of the

pile. To effect this purpose they are supposed to have wrapped the body up in the incombustible linen made of amiantus.[1]

The bones and ashes when collected were deposited in urns, which were composed either of wood, stone, earth, silver or gold, according to the quality of the deceased. When interment was practiced, the bodies were placed in coffins with their faces upwards, and their heads so turned as that they might look towards the rising sun.

XV. Honors paid to the dead. Sepulchres. Monuments. Cenotaphs, etc. The Greeks originally had a custom of burying their dead in their own houses. In later ages they carried them without the city, and generally placed them at the sides of highways. The Spartans buried their dead within the city, each family having its proper place of interment.

In early periods of Grecian history, the common graves were only dug in the earth. Subsequently they were paved with stone and arched over. Kings and distinguished men were anciently buried upon mountains, or at the foot of them. Hence, probably, the custom of raising a mound upon the graves of eminent persons.

The ancient monuments consisted of two parts; one was the grave or tomb, the other the ground surrounding it, which was fenced about with pales or walls. Tombs of stone were polished and adorned with great art. The ornaments of the sepulchre were numerous, including pillars of stone frequently marked with inscriptions declarative of the family, virtues, etc., of the deceased. Lycurgus would not permit the Spartans to mark theirs with any inscriptions. Often effigies of the dead were put upon the pillars, nor was it unusual to fix upon graves the instruments which the deceased had used. For instance, on the soldier's grave were placed his arms; on the mariners' their oars.

[1] *Montfaucon's Antiquities Displayed*, v, 19.

The wish and prayer of the Grecians was, that the earth lie lightly on the bosom of their friends, and heavy on that of their enemies.

The Greeks also erected empty and honorary monuments which contained neither the bodies, bones nor ashes of the dead, and were hence termed cenotaphs, an empty tomb. There were two kinds of cenotaphs. The one was erected for such persons as had been honored with funeral rites in another place; the other, for those who had never obtained a proper funeral. The Grecians believed that the ghosts of the unburied wandered about in misery for one hundred years, before they could enter the fields of Elysium. When, therefore, any one perished by shipwreck, or by any such means as that his body could not be found, they erected for him an empty sepulchre, and then repeated with a loud voice, three times, the name of the deceased, by which means they believed his ghost would be recalled to the habitation prepared for it. It was considered both a crime and a sacrilege to violate a sepulchre, and was thought to entail a certain ruin on the violator.

In case the deceased had distinguished himself by rendering important services to his country, it was customary to have a funeral oration pronounced at his sepulchre at the time of the burial, by some one appointed by the magistrates of the city. This was repeated for many years after upon the anniversary of his death.

Where persons of rank died it was also customary to institute games, with many varieties of exercises, to render their death the more remarkable.

It was the general opinion throughout Greece, that a dead body polluted everything with which it came in contact, and hence arose the practice of purifying with water all those who had been attending funerals. This purification was required before the person could enter a temple, or worship the gods. The Spartans, however, did not give in to this superstition, but considered that the bodies of those who had lived virtuous lives could contract no pollution after death.

The funeral being finished, the nearest relative of the deceased furnished, at his house, an entertainment for the company. This sometimes preceded the funeral. The fragments which fell from the tables were considered as sacred to the departed souls, and were carried to the sepulchre, and there left for the manes of the deceased to feed upon.

There were various honors paid to the sepulchres and memories of the deceased. Burning lamps were placed in the subterranean vaults of the dead whither those desiring to express an extraordinary affection for their relations retired. They also decorated the tombs with flowers and herbs, often laying on it their hair, which they dedicated to the dead. It was also customary to perfume the grave stones with sweet ointments, and to run naked around the sepulchres.

They offered sacrifices and libations to the dead. The victims offered were black and barren heifers, or black sheep, similar to those offered to the infernal gods. The sacrifices were performed in ditches, and the hairs upon the victim's head were the first thing offered, which, for that reason, were called firstlings. To the ghosts of the dead were offered libations of blood, honey, wine, milk and water, the object of which was to render them kind and propitious.

These honors were paid on the ninth and thirtieth days after burial, and were often again repeated. There were also anniversary days, on which they paid their devotions to the dead; and on which they called over the names of all their deceased relations.

All these honors were thought most acceptable when offered by their nearest relations, but when by their enemies, they were rejected with indignation, as the emotions of love and hate were supposed to remain after death.

XVI. The amusements of the Grecians. Much of what properly belongs to this head has already been anticipated. The gymnastic exercises of the Grecians, in which very considerable portions of time were spent might, perhaps,

be ranked among the amusements. They were not, however, strictly of that character. There were several things, that might properly rank as amusements, introduced at the close of their entertainments. Professional singers and musicians appeared upon those occasions. They were, for the most part, female slaves educated for the purpose. There were, also, dancing girls who executed a variety of graceful movements, in part pantomimic; now casting up hoops and then catching them as they fell, keeping time with the cadences of the flute. One of these would occasionally throw herself head foremost into a hoop stuck all around with upright swords, and balance the lower part of her body round over the naked points, to the great terror of the spectators. Sometimes she would throw back her head until it reached her heels, and then putting herself in motion, roll about the room like a hoop.

The Grecians, particularly the Athenians, were alive to the charms of conversation. On these occasions there was invariably a large flow of soul. All the intervals between the exhibitions and performances were filled up with various conversation. In a commonwealth like that of Athens, where the study of philosophy, the arts, and the practice of self-government were all assiduously cultivated, there could never be wanting topics of conversation, at once interesting and important.

There were sometimes present professed jugglers, who would exhibit their tricks and necromantic performances. Among other exhibitions was the potter's wheel, a machine on which a young girl was whirled round with great velocity, retaining at the same time sufficient self-possession to be able both to read and to write. Other amusements, as the mimetic dance, succeeded.

So also dramatic scenes were occasionally represented. The meeting and courtship of Dionysos or Bacchus and Ariadne were sometimes performed, and these were rendered not the less interesting by being, as they occasionally were, performed by actors whose words and acts to them were real, while to others they appeared merely as per-

formances.[1] Nor was even the jester wanting. And even the monkey tribe, the forest jesters, were sometimes brought into requisition.

The beauty of broad grins was properly appreciated at Athens, where there was a regular wit's club, consisting of three-score members, who were accustomed to assemble in the temple of Heracles during the Diomeia. The names even of several of them have come down to us.

The Athenians were a people who threw their whole soul into whatever they happened to be engaged in. Amusements were therefore as heartily entered into, and as strenuously pursued for the time being as more substantial realities. Music, both instrumental and vocal, formed no inconsiderable a part of the amusements of the Greeks at their entertainments. Every one poured forth what was inspired by the whim of the moment, and jokes, love-songs or biting satires, were uttered with the freedom and fertility of an improvisatore.

The play of kottabos was in great vogue at Athens. A piece of wood, like the upright of a balance, was fixed in the floor or on some stable basis, and a small cross-beam was placed on the top of it, with a shallow vessel at either end. Under each of these vessels stood a vase filled with water, with a gilt bronze statue fixed upright in its centre. The person playing stood at a little distance, and cast his wine from a drinking cup into one of the pensile basins, which descending with the weight struck against the head of the statue, which resounded with the blow. The victory consisted in spilling the least wine during the throw, and eliciting the most noise from the brazen head.[2]

The Spartans were more addicted to jokes in their convivial meetings, while the more intellectual Athenians supplied their place with an elegant badinage, alternating with profound or impassioned discourse. They possessed the happy faculty of extracting amusement from each other.

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, II, 185, *et seq.*
[2] *Idem*, 212, 213.

Among the means of accomplishing this was the introduction of enigmas and griphoi. The first comprehended all those terminating in mere pleasure; the last, such questions and riddles as involved within them the seeds of knowledge and wisdom. Deep philosophic truths were often wrapped up in these sportive problems, which purposely obscured, so as to afford but dim and distant glimpses of the forms within, necessarily exercised and sharpened the wit, and induced keen and persevering habits of investigation.

A great source of amusement among the Grecians was the theatre. The dramatic art will find its more appropriate place under another head, viz: the element of art. It is not, therefore, proposed to unfold here any of the mysteries of the Grecian drama. Little more is intended than to bring before the mind the great fact that the theatre with the Athenians was a great source of amusement. The extent of it can be somewhat judged of from the enormous size of the Athenian theatre. The great theatre of Bacchus, partly scooped out of the rock on the face of the hill at the south-eastern angle of the Acropolis, stretched forth, on solid pieces of masonry, a considerable distance into the plain, and was capable of containing upwards of thirty thousand people. Nor was Athens the only Grecian city where the theatre existed. It was also to be found at Sparta, Argos and Megalopolis.

The time of acting was during the Dionysiæ and Lenæan festivals, corresponding to the spring and autumn. The theatres were national establishments, and were therefore open, free of expense, to all the citizens. They were not called together by playbills; but, for the most part, knew nothing of what they were going to see till they were seated in the theatre, and the herald commanded the chorus of such and such a poet to advance. It will be seen, while considering the dramatic art, that this kind of amusement must have been very gratifying, and extensively indulged in.

Many other arts contributed also to the amusement of the Grecians, particularly of the Athenians. But it will hardly be necessary to allude particularly to them here.

XVII. The games in which the Grecians participated in common. There were in Greece four solemn games, which were often termed sacred games, as they were instituted in honor of the gods, or of deified heroes, and were always opened and closed with sacrifices. These were the Olympic, the Pythian, the Nemean, and the Isthmian. They differed very little from each other in the ceremonies and exercises in which they principally consisted. They were celebrated at different places, at different periods of time, and had different degrees of celebrity.

Of all these the Olympic was by far the most renowned. These were celebrated once every four years, at Olympia, a place situated on the banks of the Alpheus, about thirty miles from the city of Elis, in the territory of Elis in the Peloponnesus. Their original institution is veiled by the shadows of a remote antiquity too much to permit the indulgence of any certainty in regard to it. They were for a long time discontinued, and were revived in the age of Lycurgus, by Iphitus, sovereign of the district of Elis. One of his principal motives was to protect the territory of Elis, by rendering it sacred. To accomplish this, he obtained from the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, a command that the games should be revived in honor of Jupiter, and that the exclusive right of managing them should be conferred upon the Eleans. They were accordingly established 408 years after the Trojan war, and about B. C. 776, from which period the Olympiads are reckoned.

These games were celebrated every fiftieth month, commencing on the eleventh day of July, and lasting five days. They commenced with offering up sacrifices which lasted till midnight, the games commencing in the morning at daybreak.

The course was divided into two parts, the Stadium and the Hippodrome, the former being about six hundred feet long, and the latter twelve hundred long and six hundred broad. The Stadium was appropriated to the foot races and most of the combats; the Hippodrome exclusively to chariot racing. The morning was generally devoted to

the lighter and the afternoon to the more violent exercises, although no general rule was rigidly observed. No one but a Grecian could offer himself as a competitor. Neither could any one be a competitor who had not previously exercised himself ten months at the combats in which they were about to engage. The moral characters of the competitors were also inquired into, and all of bad moral character were excluded. Before commencing, the competitors all took an oath upon the altar of Jupiter, that they would conduct honorably, and employ no unfair means to gain the victory.

The most ancient of the games, after their revival, was the foot race. So great was the importance attached to this game that the conqueror in it gave his name to the Olympiad in which his victory was achieved. The importance attached to this arose probably from its simplicity, and from its being a distinguished excellence in a warrior, as it served him both for attack and retreat. The measure of the Stadium, where these races were run, was one hundred and twenty-five paces. The race was divided in four parts. The first was simply running to the goal one hundred and twenty-five paces. The second was double the first, or running to and returning. The third was running over the space of seven stadia. In the fourth the competitors ran in armor. The stadium, or race course, had two boundaries, the one the starting place, the other the end, goal or limit. He conquered who first reached the goal. The prize was of little instrinic value being the most commonly a crown of olive or pine.

The chariot races were performed in the Hippodrome. These were very exciting. Sometimes the chariots were drawn by two, three, four or more horses. They were sometimes driven twelve times over the Hippodrome. These chariot races were splendid performances. Great skill was required in the charioteer in turning the goals, so as to avoid coming in contact with them, which was not only disgraceful but dangerous. The owners of the chariots were not required to be the drivers. Kings and

the most wealthy private citizens often sent chariots to the Olympic games, the charioteers having been long trained for the purpose of driving. The richness of the equipages, the neighing of the steeds, the cries of the charioteers, and the shouts of applause from a vast concourse of spectators, altogether made a most animating spectacle.

Another exercise practiced at the Olympic games was throwing the discus or quoit. This was a mass of iron, about three inches thick, of a roundish shape and polished surface. In its centre was a hole, through which was passed the thong by means of which it was thrown. This exercise is said to have been invented in Sparta. In throwing the discus the victory did not consist in striking a given mark, but in hurling it beyond all other competitors.

Another exercise consisted in leaping, which was sometimes performed with the hands empty, and sometimes with weights of lead or stone. These weights might be carried in the hands, or placed upon the shoulders, or fastened upon the feet. Generally they were thrown forward by the motion of the arms in jumping, and thus aided in the act of jumping.

Boxing was another exercise which was done either simply with the fist alone, or with the addition of the cestus. This was a thong made from the hide of an ox, filled with a mass of lead, iron, or other metal, and bound round the arm. It sometimes reached no higher than the wrist, at other times extended to the elbow, and sometimes even to the shoulder, being used both for attack and defense. This was a very severe exercise, one of the combatants being sometimes carried off dead from the ground, and it being frequently attended with the loss of an eye, or the severe maiming of some part of the body.

Wrestling was a very ancient exercise, the combatants endeavoring to throw each other down. They were matched by drawing the same letter out of a silver urn. The bodies of the competitors were first anointed with oil, to give suppleness to their limbs. Afterwards they were rolled in fine sand. Several matches were usually going on at the

same time. To achieve a victory required the competitor to throw his adversary twice out of three times. Sometimes the wrestler who was thrown pulled his adversary down along with him, and then they were obliged to grapple together on the ground, until one of them getting uppermost, constrained the other to yield. A defeat was acknowledged by the voice, or by holding up the finger.

There were two kinds of wrestling, one in which the combatants stood and wrestled on their feet; the other in which they voluntarily threw themselves down, and contended rolling on the ground.

The pancratium was an exercise that combined in itself both boxing and wrestling. The mere boxer never endeavored to trip or throw down his adversary, nor did the wrestler give his antagonist any blows. But in this exercise it was allowable to gain the victory by throwing down, or by giving blows; in fine, in any manner whatever. This was, therefore, the roughest and the most dangerous of all the exercises.

These were the principal exercises performed at the Olympic games. Their tendency was to develop and render perfect the physical man. There were also intellectual exercises that did much to stimulate the genius of the Greeks. Here assembled the poets, orators and historians of Greece, who recited their productions in the presence of the surrounding multitude. Here Herodotus read his history, and here the names of the nine muses were given to the nine books into which it was divided. It was, therefore, a contest of mind as well as of body; and hence, furnished a stimulus to the Grecian mind, to develop its wondrous powers, as well as to the Grecian body, to display its beautiful proportions.

The judges who presided over the games, who awarded the prizes, and punished those guilty of irregularity or unfairness, were always appointed from the Eleans. They were eight in number, one being taken from each tribe, the chief of whom was the president. The judges always preserved a strict impartiality in the discharge of their

duty. They had no connection with any of the candidates, and took a solemn oath that in awarding the prizes they would be governed solely by a regard to justice. It was not allowable for any woman to be present at the games, except the priestesses of Ceres, who remained in a temple built for them near the Stadium.[1]

The prizes awarded to the victors were of little value in themselves, the great incentives being the fame and glory which always attended the victorious. They were simply wreaths of wild olive. But the champion had regard to other things. On his return home he rode in a triumphal chariot into the city, a part of the walls being thrown down to give him admittance. He was generally supported afterwards at the public expense. His honor extended to his parents and embraced his children. Even the city which gave him birth was a sharer in them.

The Pythian games were celebrated in honor of Apollo at Delphi, and were supposed to have been instituted by him after he had overcome the serpent Python. They were at first celebrated every nine, and subsequently every five years. It is supposed that originally these games consisted only of musical contests, the prize being gold or silver, or something of value. In process of time the various athletic exercises, as practiced at the Olympic games, were introduced, and along with them, contests in history, rhetoric, poetry and the fine arts. The prize was then changed to a garland of laurel.

The songs at these games were generally accompanied with the harp. They also sung the Pythian measures, which were accompanied with dances. They sometimes danced to the sound of the lyre, and at one period flutes were introduced. These games were celebrated on the sixth day of the month of May.

The Nemean games were so called from Nemea, a city and sacred grove of Argolis. They were celebrated every third year, on the twelfth day of September. The exer-

[1] *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 137.

cises were very similar to those already described. The Argives generally presided. They were generally supposed to have been instituted by Hercules after his victory over the Nemean lion, in honor of Jupiter. At first the victors were crowned with a wreath of olive, but afterwards with parsley.

The Isthmian games were so called from the place at which they were celebrated, which was the Corinthian isthmus, the small neck of land uniting the Peloponnesus with the continent. They were held near the temple of the Isthmian Neptune. These games were open to all the Greeks, except the Eleans, who were refused admission in consequence of a dreadful execration denounced against them, if they ever should be present. They were celebrated every three years. The contests were the same as in the other sacred games. The presidents were chosen both from Corinth and Sicyon. The prize, at first, was a crown of pine; afterwards of dry parsley; and finally of pine, which was again resumed.

The entire effect of these games upon the Grecian mind and character can hardly now be estimated. Celebrated at different times and at different points in Greece, they afforded frequent opportunities for all those of Hellenic origin to meet together as members of one language and one family. It was a beautiful sight to see states, for the time being, laying aside their hostile attitude, and meeting together as brethren at these great national festivals. The Athenian, Spartan, Argive, Corinthian, all assembled here as simply Grecian, as having a common descent, as speaking the same language, as being of the same brotherhood. It tended to render the Grecian race more an unit, more harmonious, and to enable the different portions of it to cultivate, with each other, relations of amity, of friendship and good will. Their effect, therefore, upon the social and political condition of Greece, was in the highest degree salutary.

Their effect upon the military character was neither small nor trifling. In a climate so mild that it tended

rather to enervate, some counteracting influences were necessary to prevent the human organism from becoming weak and effeminate. The severe hardships encountered in preparing to become competitors at these games, were well fitted to rear up hardy soldiers, who would be well prepared to take their part in the performances of the battle-field. It is to these games, and the gymnasiums where their preparatory courses of instruction were taken, that we are to look for that perfect physical frame which served as such a model for the Grecian sculptor. Nor should we forget that the powers of the mind were tasked as well as those of the body. The mighty stimulus there furnished to genius is one of the great causes which contributed so strongly to develop the powers of the Grecian mind. It afforded a means of publication, a kind of substitute for the present operations of the press. Heroditus, Euripides, Isocrates, Pindar, and other distinguished Grecians, there shone as splendid luminaries in the galaxy of Grecian mind. We should not, therefore, fail to attribute to these great festivals no inconsiderable share of that greatness, which attaches to almost everything Grecian. This closes the consideration of the social element.

CHAPTER V.

GREECE—ITS GOVERNMENT.

The developments of the different states of Greece in the element of government, are full of interest and instruction. Nowhere on the world's surface has so small a spot of earth made such large contributions to the settlement of important questions in the science of government, as Greece. Nowhere else, within the same compass, is exhibited the same variety. Those numerous little cities and states would by no means have passed away a useless existenee, if they had served no other purpose than to give the results of their experience in this single element to the science of general government. That science has been, beyond measure, enriched by the results of that experience. In order to preserve as much method as possible in the treatment of this subject, I shall arrange all I have to say in reference to it, under the following heads, viz:

I. The government, political institutions and laws of the Spartans.

II. The government, political institutions and laws of the Athenians.

III. The government, laws, and political institutions of Thebes, Corinth and Argos.

IV. The leagues of the Bœotians, Ætolians and Achæans and the Symmachia and Hegemonia.

V. The relations between the Grecian states as expressed by the council of the amphyctions.

VI. The relations of the political institutions of the Grecian states to the physical circumstances under which they originated.

VII. The relations of the same institutions to the moral, social, and intellectual state and condition of the Grecians.

VIII. The different degree in which the monarchic, aristocratic, and democratic elements prevailed in the different states, and the order in which those elements were developed.

IX. The problems in government to which the Grecian developments in this element may be considered to have furnished a solution.

I. The government, political institutions and laws of the Spartans. The city of Sparta, or Lacedæmon, was of a circular form, about six miles in circumference, and situated in the province of Laconia, at the foot of mount Taygetus, and on the west side of the river Eurotas. For the space of eight hundred years it had no walls nor fortifications of any kind, depending entirely for its safety on the bravery of its inhabitants. It had some eminences, the highest of which would serve the purpose of a citadel. On its summit was a spacious plain, on which were erected several sacred edifices. Around it were ranged five towns, each being separated from the others by intervals of different extent. These were occupied by the five tribes of Sparta.

Although Laconia was extremely fertile, and well situated in reference to commercial pursuits, yet its inhabitants fail to have made any figure in the early history of Greece. About eighty years after the Trojan war, it was overrun by the Heraclidæ, assisted by the Dorians. They imposed tributes upon the original cities, all of which submitted, except Helos. This city was conquered, and its inhabitants reduced to slavery. Hence the slaves, called Helots. The Heraclidæ afterwards having dissensions among themselves, the weaker party were driven into the country and neighboring towns. These were properly the Lacedæmonians, while the Spartans were those who remained in the city, constituting a body of about ten thousand warriors, holding in their hands the fate of Laconia, and sometimes of almost all Greece.

The Spartan government and institutions are but little known until the age of Lycurgus. The government was

monarchical; and, what was peculiar, two kings held the rule, exercising a joint authority. This peculiarity originated in the fondness of a mother. On the division among the Heraclidæ, Laconia fell to the share of Aristodemus, who left twin sons, Euristhenes and Procles. Their mother refused to indicate which had the right of primogeniture, and it was agreed that both should succeed to the crown with equal authority, and that the posterity of each should inherit.

The nobles naturally enough availed themselves of the jealousies which, from time to time, arose between the two families, obliging each to court them and make them concessions, until very little of the royal authority remained. and a state of anarchy very generally prevailed. In the very midst of this appeared the legislator, Lycurgus, who gave to Sparta such a frame of government and laws as have been the wonder, and in some respects, the admiration of every succeeding age.

Without going into the history of Lycurgus, and the obstacles he had to encounter, I shall limit myself to a brief outline of the government, laws and institutions, which Sparta derived from him, or which grew out of the institutions he gave.

It was important, in the first place, to define the citizen. The citizenship was of two kinds. The one embraced all those who were born citizens; the other, those who were presented with the freedom of the city. In early periods all strangers were admitted to the privilege of citizenship; but afterwards, when the city became more populous, its freedom was more sparingly bestowed. The freedmen were sometimes created citizens, and there were instances of the Helots having bestowed upon them the privileges of the city.

The command of the army, and the various offices of magistracy, were conferred only on the citizen. The privileges of the citizen might be, in part, lost by a flagitious action. The government always manifested great anxiety to favor those who were born at Sparta.

Lycurgus divided the people into five tribes, each having its own peculiar appellation, and occupying its own portion of the city. These were again divided into less parts, which amounted to six in each tribe, thirty in all, each having its own peculiar appellation.

The first distinction that may be noticed at Sparta, was the division into freemen and slaves. The freemen were divided into two classes, the first that of equals, consisting of those who could both vote and be elected to any office, and who might obtain all the honors of the state. The second were inferiors, who were uninstructed in the Spartan discipline, and could only vote for the magistrates.

The domestic slaves were more numerous in Sparta than in any other city in Greece. Their employments were various both in the city and in the army. The slaves were of two sorts. The one included all those who had been reduced to slavery; the other, those who were born in slavery. The origin of slavery in Sparta may be traced to the reduction of the city of Helos, whose inhabitants and their offspring were afterwards known by the name of Helots. These occupied a kind of middle rank between slaves and free citizens. They farmed the lands of the Spartans, paying the owner a rent which would allow of their making a reasonable amount of profits. They also carried on the various mechanic arts, and mercantile pursuits. They were always distinguishable by the dress they were obliged to wear. They were far more numerous than the freemen, and were always a terror to the Spartans. Hence the severe cruelties often exercised towards them on the part of the Spartans.

The government of Sparta was mainly vested in the kings, the senate and the ephori. The kings, as before remarked, were two, thus rendering it a diarchy rather than a monarchy. The two kings were required to be of the house of Hercules, and it was necessary they should marry a native.

In each of the two reigning branches, the crown descended to the eldest of the sons, or if there were no sons,

then to the brother of the king. If the eldest died before his father, it passed to the next son; but if he left a son, that son was preferred before his uncles. Distant relations might be called to the throne, but never those of another house.[1]

If any differences concerning the succession occurred, they were discussed and determined in the general assembly. When a king had no children by a first wife, he was ordered to divorce her and marry another.

The succession to the throne was never limited to a particular age. The presumptive heir was differently educated from other children, and was not brought up with them.

The authority of the kings was extremely limited. An oath was administered to them every month by the ephori, by which they promised to rule according to the laws. Their chief power at home consisted in superintending and directing everything appertaining to religion, and whatever related to the worship of the gods. When a king ascended the throne, he might annul the debts which a citizen had contracted either with his predecessor or with the republic. Certain portions of land were assigned him, which might secure him from want, and of which he had the right to dispose during his life.

The two kings presided in the senate, and proposed the subjects for deliberation. Each could give his suffrage, which was equivalent to two suffrages of the senators.

During peace, the kings were not to be absent, nor both at the same time during war, unless two armies were in the field. If of proper age, they had, of right, the command of the army. During peace, they could only claim to be the first citizens of the state. They appeared in public without a retinue or any ostentation. They were honored with the first places, and all rose in their presence, except the ephori sitting in their tribunal.

The senate was instituted by Lycurgus. It was the supreme council of the republic, consisting of two kings

---

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 143

and twenty-eight aged men. In it were discussed, in the first instance, all questions relative to declaring war, concluding peace, entering into alliances, and other important affairs of state. No one could become a member of this very august body without being eminently distinguished for his valor and virtues, and without having attained the age of sixty years.

When death had deprived the senate of any one of its members, the manner of electing one to fill the vacancy was very peculiar. On the day appointed a number of persons were shut up together in a house near the assembly of the people, where they could hear everything, but could see nothing that was going on. The several candidates were then led successively before the assembly, and the people, as they successively appeared, expressed their opinions by shouts of acclamation. The persons in the house marked the plaudits, and declared him elected who received the loudest and longest testimonies of approbation. The victor was then conducted through all the quarters of the city, with his head bound with a garland, and followed by a number of boys and maidens, who celebrated his virtues and victory.[1]

The newly elected senator was expected to dedicate the remainder of his days to the functions of his office. The senate was a very important element in the constitution of the government of Sparta. The office was for life, which gave the body both permanence and uniformity. The lives and honor of the citizens depended upon this tribunal. They had cognizance of crimes punishable with death, and usually employed several days in their investigation. They never condemned on simple presumption, but an acquittal was no bar to a subsequent prosecution if new proofs were obtained, in this respect contradicting a principle of jurisprudence now generally recognized among most civilized nations, viz: that no person after being acquitted shall ever be again subjected to a trial for the same offense.

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 147; *Cleveland's Grecian Antiquities*, 86.

They could also inflict a stigma which would have the effect of depriving the citizen of a part of his privileges.

The meetings of the senate were held in a court in the forum. They exercised great power in the commonwealth. They contributed to preserve the state from despotism on the one hand, and anarchy on the other. The twenty-eight senators, the five aphori, and the king of the other family, constituted a tribunal, which could condemn a king for violating the laws, or betraying the interests of the state. An appeal, however, lay from the decision of that body to the general assembly of the people.

The ephori formed a very important part of the Spartan constitution. It is not clearly settled whether this office was established by Lycurgus, or about one hundred and thirty years subsequently, during the reign of Theopompus.

They were five in number, and, as they had great authority, were changed every year. They were elected by the people, and could be taken from any rank. They were considered as representatives of the people, and hence, were sustained by them. The office was very analogous to that of tribune of the people in Rome. They were at first only the ministers of the kings, who delegated to them their authority to execute the laws, and decide causes during their absence in war. They gradually increased their authority, until, enriched by the spoils of the senate and of royalty, they became almost supreme. They came, finally, to possess the administration of justice, the maintenance of the laws and of manners, the inspection of the other magistrates, and the execution of the decrees of the general assembly. They had their council hall in the forum, where they held their tribunal. They punished with extreme rigor those faults which immediately attacked the laws and manners. To them, inferior magistrates were to give an account of their administration. They could even put any one to death without assigning a cause, one of the highest prerogatives of tyranny. They followed the whimsical custom once in nine years, of watching, during

a clear night, the motions of the stars, and if any fiery exhalation happened to shoot through the air, it was taken as an indication that the kings had offended the gods. A prosecution was commenced against them. They were deposed, and could not be again restored until their absolution was obtained from the oracle at Delphi or Olympia.

The ephori came to possess the entire executive power. They convened the general assembly, and collected its suffrages. They received the embassadors from other states. They levied troops and sent them to their destination. They controlled the movements of the armies of the republic, ordering the generals wherever they chose, and recalling them at pleasure. The same kind of contest was carried on between the ephori and the kings, as we shall hereafter see between the Roman tribunes of the people and the consuls. They had finally monopolized nearly all the power in the state, and continued to retain their authority until the reign of Cleomenes.

There were also at Sparta, inferior magistrates, such as the bidiaioi who were five in number, and presided over games, having their council hall in the forum. There were also guardians of the laws, who had power to reward such as obeyed, and to punish such as transgressed them. There were others whose office it was to observe the lives and manners of the Spartan women, to preside over their games and exercises, and see that they were conducted with decorum. There were others, four in number, who were sent to consult the oracles of the gods, when it was desirable to ascertain the divine will in reference to any matter. Others had the care and superintendence of strangers. Sparta had also an officer resembling the Roman dictator, who was created in some emergency, and whose functions ceased with the necessity that called them into being. For instance, after the battle of Leuctra, Agesilaus was appointed dictator or legislator, with an authority above the laws to decree what he should think most advisable in regard to those Spartans who had fled

from that battle, and were called tremblers. "Let the laws," said he, "sleep this day, and resume their full vigor to-morrow!" Another kind were appointed to govern the provinces, or rule over the conquered cities. There were also some other inferior magistrates, which it is unnecessary here to particularize.

There were public assemblies at Sparta. There were two kinds of these. The one was the greater, and was composed of the kings, the senators, the different classes of magistrates, and the deputies of the cities of Laconia. In this assembly were usually settled questions relative to peace or war, the contracting of alliances, and other matters of general concern. Among these last were claims and mutual complaints, modes of reconciliation, projects of the future campaign, and the contributions in men and money to be furnished by each city.

The second was the less assembly, and was composed only of the kings, the senate, and the different classes of the magistrates. In this were discussed and decided such things only as pertained to Sparta.

The kings and senators at first convoked these assemblies; afterwards the ephori, who presided in them. The less was held every month; the greater, whenever circumstances required it. The latter reviewed the decrees of the senate.

The matters appointed by the magistrates were discussed in the assemblies. Every person of thirty years old or upwards had a right to speak, provided his manners were irreproachable. The kings and senators had great weight, but the ephori greater. The opinion of the assembly was asked by one of the ephori, and the decision was given not by votes, but by acclamations. If it was impossible to decide in that way, it was ascertained by numbering the two parties, on a division.[1]

In relation to the laws of Sparta, they were first enacted by Lycurgus, the will of the kings having previously con-

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 156, 157.

stituted the Spartan laws. These laws were very many of them obtained from Crete, having been reputedly the work of Minos. They were not all the work of Lycurgus. Some were subsequently added by the kings, Polydorus and Theopompus, by Agis and Cleomenes, and by the ephori and other magistrates. The Spartan laws were neither written nor engraven on tables. They were committed to memory.

These laws had reference to various things. They were, to a large extent, identified with the manners and customs of the people.

In relation to lands, they divided the whole country of Laconia into thirty thousand equal shares, of which Sparta contained but nine thousand. These were designed to remain always the same. The possessions of all were to be equal, which strongly conduced to the stability and tranquillity of the republic.

These possessions were neither to be bought nor sold. They could neither be given away, nor devised by will. If any of these shares fell to a stranger, he might be permitted to enjoy it, provided he submitted to the laws of Sparta.

The city of Sparta was to have no walls, and the houses were to be built only with the saw and the axe. This was to ensure so homely an appearance that no motive could possibly exist for filling them with luxuries.

The number of citizens was to correspond with the lots into which Sparta was divided. If the number of citizens exceeded that of the lots, they were to be sent off to found colonies. Strangers were not suffered long to reside in Sparta, and no citizen was to go abroad unless to carry on war.

The laws in relation to marriage, food and apparel have been already considered under the head of society. The public meals have not been sufficiently alluded to. This was an institution of Lycurgus. They were borrowed from Crete. The kings, magistrates, and private citizens, met together in certain halls, in which a number of tables were spread, most frequently with fifteen covers each.

No man was admitted to a table except by the unanimous consent of the others. The guests at one table never interfered with those at another. They reclined on hard couches of oak, leaning with their elbows on a stone or block of wood. Their food principally consisted of black broth, which is supposed to have been made of pork gravy seasoned with vinegar and salt, and boiled pork from which the broth had been made. The expense was borne by the individuals who were obliged to contribute equally to defray it. The youth were present at these meals, but not to partake of them. Some were there to gather wisdom from the conversation, and some to pilfer what they could to divide among their comrades.

The aged were to admonish the young, and so far was this carried that if an old man was present when a youth committed a fault and did not reprove him, he was to be punished equally with the delinquent.

The Spartans were to have neither gold nor silver. Any one having either in his possession was punishable with death. No other coinage could legally be made use of there but that of iron. This metal, after being taken out of the fire, was to be dipped in vinegar while red hot, to render it brittle and unmalleable, to the end that it might not be applied to any other use. Trade was generally to be done by barter, or the exchanging of one commodity for another. No one was allowed to receive interest. No one could give presents, and no one was authorized to receive them from foreigners.

The Spartans had some peculiar laws relative to war. A man was not capable of serving in the army under thirty years of age. The Spartans were not to march at any time before the full moon. They were not to fight often against the same enemy. They were not to have sailors, nor engage at sea. This last was, after a time, disregarded. The camp was to be often moved. The soldiers were to sleep in their armor. In any engagement the army was to advance at the sound of flutes. No one was to leave the army or desert the ranks, but was to con-

quer or die. The loss of a shield in battle rendered one infamous. When the enemy fled he was not to be pursued far. The dead bodies of the enemy were not to be spoiled. A service of forty years in the army entitled to a discharge from military duties.[1]

The Spartan judgments were of two kinds, public and private. The latter were at first rare, but afterwards became more frequent. The senate were judges in capital offenses, the ephori in causes of a private nature. No orators were allowed at Sparta to plead the cause of the accuser or accused; each one managing his own cause.

The Spartan laws inflicted various punishments. Among the lightest was a pecuniary fine. Whipping was also used as a punishment. Infamy or disgrace was one of the severest punishments inflicted. It was inflicted in various ways. One was compelled to go naked through the forum in the midst of winter, singing verses in derision of himself, and expressive of the justice of his sentence. Another was deprived of all honors, obliged to give up his wife to another person, to suffer himself to be beaten by any one he should meet, and to appear only in ragged and dirty clothes, and with only half of his beard cut off. The Spartans dreaded nothing so much as infamy, or the loss of reputation. Another punishment was banishment. Death was not considered so formidable a punishment by the Spartans as by other nations. The mode of inflicting it at Sparta, was by strangling with a rope. This punishment was always inflicted in the night.

At first, the Spartans had no revenue; afterwards the wars in which they were engaged rendered a revenue necessary. Whilst the estates continued equal, the contributions, levied in the form of taxes, were equal; but tributes were imposed upon other kinds of property which varied according to its value. The cities of Laconia furnished their contingents to the state. The spoils taken by the Spartans were sold by their commissaries to the highest bidders.

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 178, 179.

There was, at first, no public treasury at Sparta. The treasures were deposited with the Arcadians, who dealt treacherously with them. They were subsequently carried to the temple of Apollo at Delphi, and other places of worship. Finally, after the submission of Athens, the treasures were deposited in a public treasury at Sparta, which came to contain more gold and silver than all the rest of Greece.

II. The government, political institutions and laws of the Athenians. Whoever investigates thoroughly the respective civilizations of the Athenians and Spartans, will find that in every single element, excepting, perhaps, that of religion, they strongly contrast; are, in fact, the antipodes of each other. In no one instance is the tendency and power of races more distinctly brought to view than in this instance. Inhabiting substantially the same country; situated at but a small distance from each other; having constant relations of peace or war with each other; subjected to the same general influences, they yet exhibit contrasts the most marked and peculiar. In all things we trace the peculiarities of the Dorian and Ionian races.

We have seen the Spartan development in the element of government, we will now briefly examine the Athenian.

In a republic it will readily occur that it is of the first importance to determine accurately who constitutes the citizen, into what classes the inhabitants are to be divided. The inhabitants of Athens were divided into three classes, 1. Free citizens. 2. Resident aliens. 3. Slaves.

Of these the free citizens were not numerous, being only about twenty thousand, but they monopolized all the political power. There was a distinction between the citizens. The free born Athenians, those whose parents were Athenians, had superior privileges. They excelled all others in honor and power. They enjoyed the exclusive privilege of being present at all public assemblies, and of participating in the government of the state.

In the prosperous days of Athens it was an object of the highest ambition to become one of her citizens. Even

sovereigns were competitors for the honor, thus reflecting lustre on it when they succeeded, and also when they failed. The aspirant to this honor was compelled to go through several ordeals before he could attain it. He first came before an assembly of the people, who inquired carefully into his merits and claims. If these approved he must come before another assembly of six thousand citizens who voted by ballot. Even after this, the lowest among the Athenians had it in his power to object to this double election. In such case a tribunal made examination into the matter, inquired into the life and condition of the person elected, and were, in this instance, empowered to correct even the judgment of the people.

Cecrops divided the citizens into four tribes; each tribe into three parts, and each part into thirty families.

Solon divided the Athenians into four classes, according to their rank and property. The first included all those who were worth five hundred measures or mediums of commodities. The second were the horsemen, including those who could furnish a horse, or were worth three hundred mediums. The third consisted of those who were worth two hundred mediums, and the fourth and last embraced all the rest, who could fill no office in the government, but were entitled to vote in the public assemblies; a power at first deemed of little consequence, but which subsequently grew to great importance. This was a political division.

The tribes were afterwards augmented from four to ten, and had public feasts instituted for the purpose of maintaining mutual acquaintance, and of promoting friendship and kindness among themselves.

The second class, composed of resident aliens or sojourners, were those who, for any reason, had come from a foreign country, and settled in Attica. They had not the privileges of citizens, being debarred both from holding office and voting. They were also obliged to submit to any decree which the citizens might think proper to pass respecting them. Many of them carried on trades, or

served in the navy. They were free, yet dependent, and were always a source of fear to the citizens. They could do no business in their own names, but might submit themselves, each to a citizen, who was to defend them from oppression, and be responsible for their conduct. The citizen was called the patron, who could, in return, exact from them several services. Thus the institution of patron and client, which long subsequently prevailed at Rome, was derived from Athens. The neglect to choose a patron subjected them to a suit, and their goods to confiscation. The head of every family was obliged to pay an annual tribute into the public treasury, of twelve drachms for himself, and six for his children. The neglect to do this subjected him to be sold as a slave. Those, nevertheless, who rendered any important services to the state, were exonerated from all imposts and taxes except those to which the citizens themselves were subject.

The third class embraced the slaves, who constituted altogether the most numerous body in the state. Their number in Attica, in the best days of Athens, is said to have been 400,000, an immense disproportion to the number of free citizens.

There were two kinds of slaves at Athens. The one embraced those who, through poverty, were obliged to serve for wages, but who continued in that state only during their necessities, and could change their masters at pleasure; and, if able, release themselves from servitude. The other included those who were the absolute property of their masters; who were bought and sold as other property; who were utterly incapable of obtaining freedom for themselves or their posterity except by purchase. These were brought from Lydia, Caria, Thrace, Syria, and other countries inhabited by what the Greeks termed barbarians.

Their condition was very miserable. They were employed in the most degrading offices. They were starved, beaten, and tormented at the will of their masters. They were sometimes even punished with death. It was customary to extort confession from them by torture. They

were not permitted to wear arms. The offenses most commonly committed were theft, and desertion to the enemy. If retaken, they were bound fast to a wheel and unmercifully beaten with whips. Theft subjected them to the same punishment. They were also condemned to grind at the mill, a most laborious operation.

They were treated with less rigor at Athens than in any other Grecian city. They were there permitted to flee for sanctuary to the temple of Theseus, from which it was accounted sacrilege to force them. Those who were barbarously treated by their masters, either by having an attempt made upon their chastity, or by being punished with too much severity, might commence a suit at law against them; and if the complaint proved to be well founded, the master was compelled to sell the slave. They were also protected against other citizens. They were even permitted to acquire estates for themselves, paying an annual tribute to their masters. If they could accumulate sufficient they could purchase their liberty. Their masters might voluntarily dismiss them, or the state could reward them with freedom if they had performed an useful action.

The ordinary occupations of the slaves were to cultivate the lands, conduct the manufactures, work the mines, labor at the quarries, and perform all the domestic offices in private houses.

Men became slaves from several causes. One, as already mentioned, was poverty. Another was war, the prisoners being often reduced to slavery.

A fourth was the seizing and selling men and women into slavery by traders; the last being a sample of the slave trade of the present day. Slaves were sold at public sale in the forum, the first day of every month being appropriated for that purpose.

The government of Athens, like that of all the other states of Greece, was at first monarchical. A succession of kings occur down to Codrus, who devoted himself to death for his country in a war with the Spartans. A

dispute sprung up in relation to the succession. A strong party rose up who were for abolishing royalty, and for having no king but Jupiter. It was finally arranged that the kingly office should be abolished, and that Medon, the son of Codrus, should be first magistrate, with the title of archon. It was then a title for life. Twelve archons followed Medon by hereditary succession, and filled up a period of three hundred years. The time was then limited to ten years. Six archons succeeded each other under this arrangement. It was then resolved that the office should be annual, and that there should be nine persons to execute it.

The office of archon was the most considerable in the state. They were elected by lots. They superintended the police, and received all public informations and the complaints of oppressed citizens. Before entering upon the duties of their office, they took an oath to observe the laws, to administer justice, and to accept of no presents. They received no recompense for their services, except they were exempted from the payment of taxes for ship building. These were among them distinctions both of name and function. The first was called, by way of distinction, the archon, who was president of the body, and represented the majesty of the state. The second was called the king, and he was the head of the church. The third was called the polemarch, and he was the chief of military affairs. The other six presided as judges in ordinary courts of justice. Their office was to enforce the execution of justice, and the maintenance of the laws. Each of the three first mentioned, chose two assessors, or side judges, to assist them in their duties.

There were also other magistrates besides the archons. The eleven were elected from the ten tribes, one from each, a clerk being added to complete the number. They superintended the execution of malefactors, and took charge of those committed to prison. They arrested persons suspected of theft and robbery, and prosecuted them in a judicial manner.

The phylarchi presided over the tribes, one over each. They managed the concerns of their tribes, taking care of the public treasure.

The demarchi held the same office in the boroughs, managed their revenues, assembled the people, etc.

The nomothetæ numbered one thousand. Their office consisted in inspecting the old laws; and if they found any of them useless or prejudicial to the state, they caused them to be annulled by the people.

The embassadors were chosen by the senate, and sometimes by the people to treat with foreign states. Sometimes they were clothed with plenary powers, but their power was generally limited.

The senate of five hundred, as it is usually called, was the work of Solon. It was an institution designed to counteract any hasty act on the part of the people. It consisted originally of four hundred, but was afterwards increased to five. It was composed of men of the best character, and they discussed and carefully examined all subjects before they were proposed to the people. From each tribe fifty were elected. They election was by lot, and was done in the following manner: Before the first of June, the president of every tribe handed in the names of every free citizen of good character in his district, who were over thirty years of age. These names were inscribed on small tablets, and put into an urn. There was also another urn or ballot box, in which were put as many beans, fifty of which were white and the rest black. Those whose names were drawn out with the white beans were elected.

The prytanes, or presidents of the senate, were elected in the following manner: The names of the tribes being put into one vessel, and nine black beans and a white one into another, the tribe which was drawn with the white bean presided first, and the rest in the order in which they were successively drawn. These prytanes were divided into five committees of ten each, which presided in turn one week, the presidents, of each week being termed prœdri. These elected their president every day. To his custody were

committed the public seal, and the keys of the citadel and the public treasury; and so important was the office considered that no one could hold it longer than one day, or be elected a second time.

The prytanes assembled the senate, which met every day, except on festivals. Their place of assembling was the prytaneum. The senators were annually elected. Before entering upon the discharge of their duties, they were required to take a solemn oath, that in all their deliberations they would do everything to promote the public good, and do nothing contrary to the laws.

The subjects upon which the senate were to act, were brought before them by the prytanes. After their introduction every one was at liberty to debate them. After the discussion the vote was taken. This was done by means of black and white beans. Each senator put a bean into the ballot box, and if the number of the white exceeded that of the black, the decree passed the body, and was then proposed to the assembly of the people, without whose ratification it could not become a law.

The power of the senate was very great. They were the supreme council of the nation, and upon them devolved the whole care of the republic. Their check upon the public assemblies consisted in the fact, that no measure could be brought before the latter, that had not first passed through the senate.

The public assembly was a meeting of all the free citizens. In it, when convoked, according to law, were lodged all the interests of the commonwealth. The stated assemblies were held either at the agora, or market place, the Pnyx, or the theatre of Bacchus. These assemblies took cognizance of the acts of the senate, made laws, appointed magistrates, declared war, etc.

There were two kinds of assemblies: the one ordinary, the other extraordinary. The ordinary assemblies were held four times in thirty-five days. Upon each assembly devolved different duties. The first was employed in approving or rejecting magistrates, and public confiscations

of property; the second, in making provisions for the administration of the government; the third, in receiving heralds and embassadors; and the fourth, in attending to religious matters, festivals, sacrifices, etc.

The extraordinary assemblies were convoked by the prytanes when any civil affairs were to be disposed of with greater dispatch than could be done in the ordinary. There were no fixed places at which these were held.

The care and management of the public assemblies rested with the prytanes, the epistates, and the prœdri. The first always put up, in some conspicuous place, a public notice, in which was a brief statement of the business to be discussed. The epistates was the president, and was chosen by lot from the prœdri. The prœdri, who occupied the front seats, proposed to the people the subjects on which they were to deliberate.

The public assemblies were not always well attended. So much reluctance was manifested that certain public officers were appointed, whose duty it was to compel attendance. These officers shut up all the gates, except that which led to the meeting, and then went through the forum with cords dyed red, marking all who were found there, and those thus marked had a fine to pay. To influence the poorer citizens, three oboli a day were given to all who appeared at the assemblies at an early hour, while those who came late received nothing.

The assembly began by sacrifice. Then a solemn prayer was offered to the gods for the prosperity of the commonwealth. The subject for discussion was then proposed, and those above fifty years of age were first invited to speak upon it, and afterwards any other person of good character not under thirty. The debate ended, the sense of the meeting was next taken. This was done by all those desiring to establish the decree, lifting up their right hands, and all those opposed the left. Where it was desirable that the voting should be private, it was done by pebbles or beans, which they cast into urns. The suffrages were examined by the prœdri,

and if in favor, the decree was pronounced, which then became a law.

Thus the supreme authority appears to have resided in the people. They decided upon peace or war, received embassadors, confirmed or abrogated laws, nominated to almost every office, imposed taxes, granted the privileges of a citizen to foreigners, and decreed rewards to those who had rendered services to their country.

We witness here the same course of policy pursued in many other Grecian cities, and which was similar to the one subsequently pursued at Rome, and that was to avoid the influence of powerful men by endeavoring to procure the vote by tribes. The vote of each tribe was always in the power of the poorer citizens, who were more numerous than the rich. By such means, if successful, the power would be likely to fall into the hands of the multitude rather than to be retained by the few.

Another very extraordinary institution among the Athenians, and much celebrated, was the court of areopagus. This was the most ancient and upright of the Athenian tribunals. Its place of meeting was upon a small eminence, at a little distance from the citadel, called Mars hill.

The date of this institution is uncertain. It is very ancient, and is referred by many to the time of Cecrops. As originally constituted, it was a mere criminal tribunal, exerting no influence on the civil government. It was greatly modified by Solon. He limited its members to such as had been archons, and greatly extended its jurisdiction, thus adding much, both to its character and power.

The number composing this body is unknown. It probably varied at different periods of time. No one could be admitted without first undergoing a strict examination into his public and private character. If, while a member, any one were convicted of immorality, he was expelled from the body. This strictness in scrutinizing the characters of its members, and in preserving their purity of

character, acquired for it a great reputation, and it was widely celebrated for its wisdom, justice and equity.

The members of this tribunal held their office for life. It took cognizance of crimes generally; of vices and abuses; of murder, robbery, malicious plots, libertinism, and all innovations, either in politics or religion. It had the general inspection and custody of the laws, the management of the public funds, and the education of youth. It punished idleness with great severity, and had power to inquire into the occupations of every citizen of Athens.

It seems not to be clearly settled whether or not an appeal lay from this court to the people. There were cases in which it did reverse the decisions of the public assemblies. On some occasions the areopagites have presented themselves to the assembly, and by arguments or entreaties, have prevailed upon the people to omit the adoption of some measure injurious to the public welfare.

The court met for the transaction of business almost daily. They sat in the open air, that they might not be polluted by being under the same roof with criminals, and that they might contract no pollution by conversing with profane and wicked men. They also held their meetings at night, and in darkness, in order that no extraneous circumstances might affect their decision.

On the assembling of the areopagus, the members divided themselves into committees by lot, in order to expedite business by thus being enabled to hear, at the same time, several causes. The trials were preceded by imposing ceremonies. Sacrifices were offered, and the two parties, placed amid the victims, took a most solemn oath, calling upon themselves the vengeance of the gods if they testified falsely. The accused was allowed to make his defense in two speeches, and, if at the end of the first he feared the issue, he was allowed to go into voluntary banishment. The advocates for either party were not allowed to make any appeal to the feelings or passions of the judges, or to introduce any ornaments of style into their speeches,

but were required to state the simple facts, and to accompany their statements with proof.

After sufficient discussion had been had, the judges proceeded to give their opinions. This they did secretly. They voted with black and white flints, and that these might be distinguished in the dark, holes were made in the black, but not in the white. The white acquitted, the black condemned. These were put into urns; the white into the urn of mercy, the black into that of death. When the votes in the two urns were equal, an inferior officer put one into the urn of mercy in favor of the accused. This was called the vote of Minerva, because at the trial of Orestes, she is said to have given the casting vote in his favor.

The areopagites were maintained at the public expense. They received three oboli for every cause they heard.

This institution maintained its high character until the time of Pericles. Having never filled the office of archon he could not be a member of this body. He succeeded in removing a large number of causes from its jurisdiction, and its power and influence from that time declined.

There were also several other courts of justice besides the areopagus. One court took cognizance of cases of involuntary homicide; another, of such murders as were confessed to be committed by permission of the laws, as in cases of self defense; another of cases where the party had been killed by inanimate things, as trees, stones, etc.

A cause was commenced by the plaintiff's lodging a complaint before the magistrate, and summoning his adversary to appear and answer to it. Before the trial commenced each party was obliged to deposit a certain sum of money with the magistrate, who introduced the cause into court. After all the preliminaries were arranged, the public crier opened the court by reading the indictment. If the defendant neglected to appear, sentence was immediately passed upon him, which was valid, unless within ten days he came and showed sufficient cause for absence.

To be a witness, it was necessary to be free born, disinterested, and deserving of credit. No slave could be examined except by torture. A witness was required to testify, or pay a fine of one thousand drachms.

After the testimony closed, the pleading or summing up was commenced. The speaker stood upon an elevated place near the tribunal. Each party spoke generally what the orator of his selection had prepared for him in private. The time allowed to each was measured by a water clock, resembling an hour glass, only using water in the place of sand. When the water had run out, the speaker was obliged to stop. When both parties had ended, the judges gave their decision, which was done by sea shells, pebbles, or beans, the majority deciding. The punishment inflicted was sometimes a fine, and perpetual imprisonment if it was not paid. They could also inflict the punishment of infamy, by which the person lost forever his character as a citizen.

The method of conducting private causes and public prosecutions was essentially the same.

There were five courts in Athens for the trial of civil causes, the most important of which was the heliæa, so called from its being an open place and exposed to the sun. The judges are appointed by lot out of the body of the people, and their number varies according to the exigency of affairs, being sometimes reduced to fifty, and at others increased to an hundred, or even to a greater number.[1]

There was an immense amount of litigation at Athens. The causes brought before the tribunals of that city alone, were said to be more numerous than those in all the other Grecians states together. The government rather encouraged than repressed them. In the streets of Athens were many vile informers, who were constantly seeking out grounds of accusation against persons of wealth and reputation. This was one of the causes that rendered the liti-

[1] *Athenian Letters*, I, 208.

gation so much more at Athens than in any other city of Greece.

Among the Athenians, punishments were either not capital or capital. Those of the former kind were either 1. A pecuniary fine. 2. Infamy or public disgrace, which was of three kinds: when the possessions were retained, but the privileges of citizenship was taken away; when the convict was deprived of all the privileges of a free citizen, and had his goods confiscated; when himself and all his children and posterity were forever deprived of all rights of citizenship, both sacred and civil. 3. The third species of punishment was servitude, which could only be inflicted on the disgraced, the sojourners and freed servants. 4. Brandmarks made with a red hot iron on the foreheads or the hands. 5. The pillar on which the crimes of the offender were engraven, and which was then exposed to public view. 6. Chains or fetters, as the wooden collar which bent down the head of the criminal; fetters in which the feet and legs were made fast; the pillory to which malefactors were bound; and a wheel, to which fugitive slaves were fastened, and beaten with rods. 7. Exile or banishment, accompanied by confiscation of property. 8. The ostracism, which was instituted by Hippias, and continued to be made use of until it was exercised upon Hyperbolus, whose worthless character caused it to fall into disrepute. This differed from exile or banishment in two respects. 1st, in regard to time; 2d, to its effect upon the estate. The exiled were banished from their country forever; the ostracized for the space of ten years, after which they were at liberty to return. In regard to the second, the exiled had his estate confiscated; the ostracized had his preserved, and could come into the possession and enjoyment of it on his return.

The law of ostracism was a peculiar one, and seems to have obtained only in Athens, Argos and Syracuse.[1] At Syracuse the principal citizens banished each other by hold-

[1] *Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws*, II, 370.

ing the leaf of a fig tree in their hands. It was there productive of many mischiefs. At Athens there were many salutary restraints upon it. It was practiced only once in five years. The process was that every citizen took a shell, marked on it the name of the person he wished to ostracise, and then carried and placed it in a certain part of the forum. The votes, after being all cast, were numbered by the archons. If they numbered less than six thousand, the ostracism was void. If more than that, they proceeded to sort the shells according to the names written on them, and he whose name had been written by the majority was pronounced ostracized.

The object of this was to prevent any citizen obtaining too much power and influence, and thus becoming dangerous to the state. It was designed to teach the lofty and aspiring, that they were not beyond the reach of popular strength. It compelled even exalted worth itself, to account for its very worthiness. It was not considered a disgrace, as those only of the highest character fell under its censure. It was employed as a check to over-weening ambition, but some names that have immortalized Athens, were numbered among its victims. Themistocles, Thucydides, Cimon, and even Aristides the Just, fell beneath its power. Its misfortune was, that it tended to repress all noble efforts to advance their country's interest, lest, by that very means, they should become its victim.

Capital punishment, or the death penalty, was inflicted at Athens in several ways; as 1. By the sword, by which criminals were beheaded. 2. By the rope, by which they were strangled or hung. 3. By poison, of which there were several kinds; but that the most commonly used was the juice of the hemlock. 4. The precipice, from which the malefactor was tumbled headlong. 5. The cudgels, with which he was beaten to death. 6. The cross, upon which he was nailed. 7. The deep pit into which he was thrown headlong. 8. Lapidation, stoning to death, a very common punishment. 9. Demersion or drowning in the sea. 10. Burning.

There were also rewards as well as punishments. The principal of these were, 1. The privilege of having the front seat in all public assemblies. 2. The honor of having a statue erected in some public place. 3. Crowns conferred by the votes of the people. 4. Immunity from taxes. 5. An entertainment given at the public expense.

The laws of the Athenians, unlike those of the Spartans, were committed to writing. Their earliest laws are attributed to Theseus, but the first great lawgiver was Draco, whose laws were of such severity that he punished all offenses indiscriminately with death. They were, therefore, said to have been written with blood and not with ink.

The next great lawgiver was Solon, who gave the Athenians a milder system of laws.

It was dangerous for any citizen to propose a new law at Athens. He was held answerable for its results and consequences. If these proved unfavorable he might be impeached for it at any time within a year.[1]

We can refer here to but few of the Athenian laws. They had a law that no violence could be offered to those who fled to the temples for refuge. One day in every year was to be appropriated to a public cock-fighting. It was a capital crime for any man to cite a fictitious law in a court of justice. If an individual died without issue, one of his natural heirs was to be juridically substituted for the deceased citizen, to assume his name and perpetuate his family. Parents were allowed to disinherit their children.

They who were brought up to no employment, and children born of courtesans were exempted from the obligation of maintaining their parents. He who was undutiful to his parents was to be incapable of bearing any office, and might also be impeached before a magistrate.

It was punishable with death for any one indebted to the public treasury to hold a public trust. An archon who was seen intoxicated with wine, was to suffer death.

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 96.

No one under the age of thirty years was to speak in the senate or popular assembly.

No one was to be a public orator who had struck his parents, refused to maintain them, or excluded them from his house; who had thrown away his shield, refused to enter the army when required, been guilty of incontinence, or effeminate conduct. He was to have children lawfully begotten, and to possess an estate in the territories of Attica.

All debtors to the city were to be infamous till they had paid what they owed, and if they died without paying their public debts, their heirs incurred the same disgrace until they were paid.

Three parts of the debtor's goods, which were forfeited to the public treasury, were to belong to any private person who informed against him.

Pledges and sureties were to be valid only for one year.

He who did not pay in due time what had been adjudged, was to have his house rifled.

They who counterfeited, debased, or diminished the current coin were to lose their lives.

No one was to kill an ox which labored at the plough.

No one was to kill a lamb of a year old, or an ox.

No one was to hurt any living creatures.

No man was to exercise two trades.

No man was to sell perfumes.

Any one might bring an action of slander against him who disparaged or ridiculed another on account of his trade.

No heiress was to marry into another family, but she was to espouse her nearest relation. If a father had buried all his sons, he might entail his estate on his married daughters.

If an heiress bare no children to her husband, she might bestow herself on his nearest relation.

He who ravished a virgin was to be obliged to marry her.

The right of inheritance was to remain in the same family.

All legitimate sons were to have equal portions of their father's inheritance.

No one was to be guardian to another, whose estate he was to enjoy after his death.

The right of prosecuting murderers belonged to the relations of the persons murdered, their sons-in-law, fathers-in-law, and sister's children. No murderer was to be permitted to remain within the city.

Inanimate things, which had been instrumental in the death of any person, were to be cast out of Attica.

A thief was to pay the owner double the value of what he had stolen, and as much to the public treasury.

All pickpockets and burglars were to suffer death.

The ceremony of proclaiming war was to be by putting a lamb into the enemy's territories.

Pericles caused the introduction of two laws, which were mainly instrumental, in the course of time, in producing the downfall of Athens. One of them was the custom of paying soldiers at Athens. The effect of this, was to throw the carrying on of war into the hands of mercenaries, who had no particular interest in the encountering of success. The citizens preferred hiring to fighting.

Another law of his procuring was that every citizen was entitled to a gratuity out of the public money, not only for attending at the courts of judicature, and public assemblies, but also at the entertainments of the theatre, and the public games and sacrifices on their numerous days of festivity.[1] Thus he, in fact, bought the people with their own money. No government, however well constituted, can be proof against corruption, and no republic can stem the current of luxury and effeminacy. The downfall of Athens may very properly date from the introduction of these two laws.

The Athenian revenues were divisible into two branches: the first comprising the regular income, from which the

[1] *Montagu on Republics*, 136.

current expenses were defrayed; the second the extraordinary resources resorted to on extraordinary occasions, such as the maintenance of war. All the regular revenues may be included under the following heads. First, duties from public domains, customs and excise, and taxes upon industry and persons; extending, however, only to aliens and slaves. Second, fines, justice fees and confiscated property. Third, tributes from allies or subject states. Fourth, regular liturgies, as they were termed.

From the silver mines of Laurium a large income was derived. The ores contained silver, lead and zinc. They were worked by slaves, and the income belonged to the state. It was principally by means of them that Themistocles was enabled to raise the naval force of Athens into importance.

The custom duties were raised in part from the harbors, and in part from the markets. The first were chiefly custom duties upon export and import; the last were taxes upon the sale of goods consumed in the country, and fees paid for the right of selling in the market. Exports and imports were also subject to a small duty.

Justice fees were certain specified sums, which both parties were required to deposit in court prior to the commencement of a suit. Fines included all punishments estimated in money. Confiscation was a very common source of revenue. It was enforced against the property of those condemned for murder; of those who were banished; of those who were guilty of sacrilege or treason, or who plotted against the existing government. The most productive source of revenue were the tributes from the allies. The precise amount thus derived was never ascertained. It was not generally supposed to be less than 1,500 talents a year.

By the term liturgy, was understood a service for the community, which was performed by persons of large estates, thus saving the state the expense. Of this character were the providing the chorus for the plays, the care of the training schools, and the feasting of the tribes.

The extraordinary resources consisted in the property tax, and the trierarchy. The latter consisted in the appointment of trierarchs, who were obliged to provide, out of their own means, for the equipment and management of ships in time of war. They were nominated by the commander of the fleet, and so much patriotism was there in Athens that many were even ambitious of being appointed trierarch.

It will be observed generally in relation to revenue, that no tax was levied upon citizens, but that all was upon property. Direct taxes could not but be odious to a people so jealous of liberty as the Athenians.

In regard to expenditure the troops composed of citizens received no pay until the time of Pericles. From that time the expense of the army and navy was very great, and so continued during the remaining part of the Athenian history.

III. The government, laws, and political institutions of Thebes, Corinth and Argos. The city of Thebes was founded by Cadmus the Phœnician. Its form of government was at first monarchical. A list of sixteen kings is given from Cadmus to Xanthus. After the death of the latter, the Thebans changed their government into a republic.

We know little of the Theban form of government except that it was democratic, and, as usually happens in that kind of government, they were divided into factions. Thebes was the principal of the Bœotian cities, but she failed to acquire that supremacy over Bœotia which Athens exercised over Attica, and Sparta over Laconia.

The peace negotiated with Artaxerxes, the Persian king, through the agency of Antalcidas the Spartan, was fatal to Thebes. The principal article was, that all the republics, both small and great, should enjoy the independent government of their own hereditary laws. This gave independence to the inferior cities of Bœotia, and thus lost Thebes its supremacy over them.

This peace of Antalcidas forms a peculiar era in Grecian politics. The negotiation of it was a masterpiece of Spartan policy. The raising of all the cities to an equality, loosened the connections of the smaller with the larger, and thus dissolved the ancient confederacies. All were weakened by being disunited. The secondary towns of Laconia had been so thoroughly crushed by Sparta, that the hope of independence was destroyed. But in other Grecian states it was different, the inferior cities enjoyed a species of liberty; being, in some respects, subordinate to the ruling city. This peace dissolved the connection; and, by rendering all equal, destroyed the strength of the state.

Thebes, through the triumphant treachery of one of its factions, at the head of which was Leonidas, was betrayed into the hands of the Spartans, who, as was usual with them, made a cruel use of their power and authority. The city and citadel were finally delivered from their tyranny by two illustrious Thebans, Pelopidas and Epaminondas, and their associates. Now commenced the glory of Thebes. Its triumphs were brief, but they were splendid. The fields of Leuctra and Mantinea successively witnessed the success of the Thebans, and the defeat and disgrace of the Spartans. But on the latter expired Epaminondas, and with his life ended the glory of Thebes. It was sometime subsequently taken and destroyed by Alexander. This city furnished but a small contribution to the element of government in Greece.

Corinth, like the other states of Greece, was originally a monarchy. After several generations, some of the noble families conspired against the reigning monarch, dethroned him, usurped the government, and instituted an oligarchy. They chose from among themselves, an annual first magistrate, with the title of prytanis, but with very limited authority. Several generations thus passed away, until the people, finding it intolerably oppressive, expelled them all, and established a monarch, or, as he was generally called, a tyrant. This continued for about seventy years, at the end of which time, the nobles, by courting the

people, were again enabled to prevail. The tyranny was demolished, and a new commonwealth established, in which there was a mixture of oligarchy and democracy, to prevent the first running into excess of oppression, and the other into turbulence and license.

We know little of the particular manner in which the government was constituted. In the brief statement made we perceive a circle of action, which is worth adverting to.

The monarch is dethroned by the nobles. The power passes into their hands as the stronger body. They, as might reasonably be expected, share it among themselves, monopolize it, and thus constitute an oligarchy. This is one of the very worst forms of government. Several tyrants are always more oppressive than one. The oppression at last exceeded endurance. The people set up a favorite; rallied around his standard; enabled him to overcome the oligarchy, and concentrate all power in himself; to become what was then termed a tyrant. They threw themselves into the arms of one tyrant to escape from several. The nobles saw in this the power of the people. They knew, therefore, to whom to make application. They profited by experience, courted the power they had formerly despised, and were thus enabled to engraft upon oligarchy sufficient of democracy to render the compound less oppressive on the one hand, and less turbulent and licentious on the other.

Argos, the principal city in Argolis, was founded by Danaus, the Egyptian, about the same period of time at which Cecrops founded Athens. At the time of the Trojan war, this was the first state in Greece. Like all the other cities of Greece, its first form of government was monarchical. It was, however, one of the first states on the continent to abolish monarchy. We have no account of the new constitution it formed. The higher and lower ranks seem to have been continually at variance, the democratic faction being generally in the ascendancy, sometimes a tyranny being established; and once, according to Herodotus, the slaves got possession of the city, took upon them

the administration of affairs, and filled and exercised the offices of the government.

Argos labored under the same difficulty to which the treaty of Antalcidas subjected Thebes. In Argolis were several minor cities and towns. Mycenæ, Trœzene, Epidaurus and some others, were all possessed of the strongest desire to be independent. At the same time, the metropolis, Argos, was no less desirous of extending over them its sovereignty. The result was rebellion on the part of the minor cities, and a state of hostility between them and the metropolis. They reproached Argos with tyranny, and Argos them with rebellion. Combinations were formed among them; unions, which often enabled them successfully to cope with the capital. Thus the Argive forces were wasted in useless contests with each other; and, as a necessary consequence, their power, after the Trojan war, was felt little, if at all, in the general affairs of Greece.

IV. The leagues of the Bœotians, Ætolians and the Achæans, and the Symmachia and Hegemonia. Our attention has been hitherto confined to the political institutions that were to be found in the Grecian cities. The Greeks understood the force of political combinations and associations. They seem, in fact, to have been the first people among the ancients who entertained a correct idea of a state. They regarded it as possessing the moral qualities of a person, and as being, therefore, a fit subject of the law of nations. Its will was the blended wills of all its members; its acts, their acts, modified by each other. It bore nearly the same kind of relation to its members that life does to the organs through which it operates, or that the entire mind does to the faculties that compose it.

The first illustration of this was exhibited in the formation of leagues. Small, independent cities belonging to the same district of country, enter into a league or confederation with each other. The confederation may have originally been established in honor of the common god

of their race. It afterwards embraced a discussion of their common interests and the settlement of disputes with one another. It sometimes extended to the passing of resolutions relative to foreign wars. Thus the Phocians and Thessalians, although divided into independent states, nevertheless chose, on certain occasions, a commander-in-chief or dictator.

We also find an instance of this among the Arcadians, who united with each other in forming a confederation against Sparta. There also existed a species of league among the Ionic and Doric states on the coast of Asia Minor, which was of a loose character and no long continuance.

These leagues, thus formed between cities or towns of the same district, were possessed of little weight, while Athens and Sparta continued to maintain their supremacy in the general affairs of Greece. After their decadence, some of them assumed, for a time, a very great degree of importance.

The district of Bœotia was divided into several independent states, among whom there once existed a confederation or religious union, at Coronea. At the head of the league was a president, who held his office for one year, but might be continued for a longer time, or reelected. There was also a council which had four general meetings, the notice of which was given by the president.

The states composing this league were originally oligarchical; but the democratic elements, as in the other Grecian cities, soon came to exert great force. Thebes was at the head of the confederacy. The peace of Antalcidas had the effect much to impair the force of this league, by destroying the supremacy of this city over the other cities of Bœotia.

In Ætolia is presented another instance of a provincial confederation, which, although it was formed, or first became known, at a comparatively late period in the history of Greece, came, nevertheless, to exercise in its affairs considerable influence. This appears for the first time in

history in the wars carried on by Alexander's successors. The Ætolians were a rough, hardy and warlike race, and became very dangerous enemies to the Macedonians. They at first formed an alliance with the Romans against the Macedonians; but, finally, becoming jealous of their former allies, they united their forces with Antiochus the king of Syria. The overthrow of Antiochus was the downfall of the Ætolians, who came immediately under the Roman yoke, although the league continued to subsist for many years longer.

The constitution of the states composing this league was democratical. These states were all independent and equal. They were represented at the general meetings by their delegates. There were two meetings, the greater and the lesser. The former were held every year near the temple of Apollo at Thermos. The latter had a permanent session. The questions that came up for discussion at the general meeting were those relating to war, to peace, and to the general affairs of the league. The highest officer in the confederation was the strategus. Mention is also made of a hipparch and a grammateus.

Another league which enacted, at one time, a brilliant part in Grecian history, was the Achæan. The Achæans inhabited a long and narrow strip of land along the Corinthian gulf, which, as its shores were rocky, was entirely destitute of good or safe harbors. The Achæans were, therefore, deprived of the advantages of navigation and commerce. They were far more liberal than any other people of Greece in the admission of strangers into their community.

As they had no commercial or political centre, they had no great metropolis, like many of the other states of Greece, to overshadow all the others by its own superior importance. Their cities and towns were all nearly equal, having common laws and institutions, and common weights and measures.

This confederation originally consisted of twelve cities, of which Olenus and Helice, the capital, were swallowed

up in the sea by an earthquake, which happened before the battle of Leuctra. It existed from very early times, and remained but little affected by the political convulsions which, from time to time, were taking place in Greece. There was but little in their situation to render them desirable as a possession, and still less to excite the cupidity of a conqueror.

Soon after the death of Alexander the Great, these cities, chiefly through the artifices of the Macedonian princes, fell into dissensions with each other, each one attending to what it conceived to be its own interests; often operating to the prejudice or destruction of its neighbors. This led to the garrisoning of many of the cities by the Macedonians, and to the subjecting of others to tyrants.

But about the time of the invasion of Italy by Pyrrhus, the Achæans began to perceive the folly of their dissensions, and to seek a return to their former union. The cities of Dyma, Patra and Phara set the example. Ægium, Buca, and Cerauna, afterwards, at different times, followed the example. Many others, not originally parties to the Achæan league, were either delivered from their tyrants, or by their own efforts achieved their deliverance, and became members of it. The league may be said to have been formed anew under Aratus, through whose prudent and judicious conduct there were large accessions, and the league became powerful. This was B. C. 213. Some thirty years later, under Philopœmen, it attained the highest point of its greatness, and was everywhere triumphant. Subsequently disputes occurred among its members, and it became weakened by its struggles with the Ætolians and Spartans. The league finally fell a prey to the Romans.

It was the last power that was subjugated in Greece.

The basis of the league was a perfect equality between the different cities that composed it. All enjoyed equal rights, and all were interested that each one should continue to maintain its democratic constitution.

The citizens of the allied states held their ordinary meetings twice in the year. These were generally held in

the grove of Zeus Homagyrios-Arnarion near Œgion. At these meetings were discussed all important matters which affected the interests of the league. The subject of war, of peace, and of alliances; the admission of new members; the settlement of disputes with one another; and the adoption of new laws for the regulation of the union, came up at these meetings for discussion and decision. Their principal officers were a strategus, a hipparch and a grammateus.

Besides these leagues, or local confederations uniting with each other the cities of one district of country, there were also others more extended, existing between several districts and states. These, when formed for the purpose of mutual defense, were termed symmachia. And when one leading state exercised a legally recognized supremacy, that supremacy was termed hegemonia. Even prior to the Persian invasion, most of the Peloponnesian states, except Argos and some of the smaller districts, formed with each other a confederation for mutual counsel respecting their common interests, and for the decision of questions relating to peace and war. The supremacy or hegemonia of this league was given to Sparta. She conducted the war, appointed the commanders, and settled the contingents of troops and money.

A confederation of a similar character was formed between most of the Grecian states to resist the Persian invasion under Xerxes. Sparta, with the consent of the Peloponnesians, was at the head of this confederacy. At the beginning of this war the deputies had their place of meeting at the isthmus. After the battle of Mycale the colonies of Asia Minor were also comprised in this league.

But while the Spartans were the best soldiers on land, the Athenians were acquiring a naval force, and becoming powerful by sea. On this element the Spartans never excelled, and they were soon compelled to cede the hegemonia by sea to Athens, whose naval force was more considerable, and who had also a powerful support in her Asiatic colonies.

At a period somewhat later, Athens also succeeded in creating a hegemonia in opposition to that of Sparta, so that whilst the latter still remained at the head of the Peloponnesian league, Athens, by degrees, drew to her side an union of the Ionians in the islands, the colonies on the coasts of Asia Minor, Thrace and Macedonia, and some of the Grecian states. But she exercised her power very capriciously, and at length treated her allies rather as vassals than as free and independent states. They were at first merely required to furnish ships and a moderate contingent in money, which was kept at Delos under the superintendence of Attic officers. Subsequently the allies themselves proposed that the duty of performing military service should be dispensed with, and that in lieu of it a sum of money should be paid into the treasury. This had the effect to increase immensely the power of Athens. The treasury was removed from Delos to Athens. She compelled them for the most part to pay tribute at her own discretion. This was greatly increased under Pericles and Alcibiades. Athens also interfered in the government and internal affairs of the allied states, requiring them to adopt democratic forms, claiming jurisdiction in affairs of importance, and sending her emissaries to watch their proceedings. This drove the discontented to attach themselves to Sparta, and hence originated the Peloponnesian war. This continued with some intermissions for about twenty-eight years. Sparta was, in general, victorious, but after her victory she abused her hegemonic authority, and endeavored everywhere to introduce the hated oligarchical form of government. This deprived her of friends and influence, and Athens by degrees again raised herself to power. Even the peace of Antalcidas, although it affected injuriously many of the leagues formed between cities of the same district, yet created no essential change in her power. She exercised her supremacy at first with justness and mildness, but was subsequently guilty of fresh abuses, which, together with her weakness, caused the ultimate loss of her authority.

After the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea, Thebes was the greatest power in Greece, and in a position to claim hegemonical authority. Her power, however, was short-lived, expiring with Epaminondas on the field of Mantinea. The last aspirant for the hegemonia was Philip of Macedon, who assumed it after the victory at Chæronea. He was feebly resisted by the Greeks, but was ultimately successful, and he and his successors continued to bear rule in Greece, with the exception of the triumphs of the Achæans, until all bowed beneath the dominion of Rome.

V. The relations between the Grecian states as expressed by the council of the amphictyons. This was a council, or, perhaps, more properly, a league, much celebrated in Grecian history. Its origin is lost in mythical obscurity. Its name is derived from Amphictyon, the son of Deucalion, who was, perhaps, nothing more than a mere mythical representative of the league. It originated between twelve clans, or nations, in the north of Greece, who, in very remote periods of time, formed a confederation to prevent the evils of war. The jurisdiction of the council was not confined to the nations or races, while inhabiting the country in which we find them originally settled. As the races emigrated, they carried with them the right of attending and voting in this council, still remaining united to the amphictyonic league. Thus the Spartans who anciently inhabited Thessaly, when they settled in Peloponnesus, continued to retain one of the two suffrages to which the Dorians, of whom they formed a part, were originally entitled. So also the double suffrage granted to the Ionians, came at last to be divided between the Athenians and the Ionian colonies of Asia Minor. This fact carries the origin of the council to a date anterior to the Dorian emigration.

The principle involved in the council, may be gathered from the oath by which the league was ratified. That oath was the following: "We swear never to destroy any amphictyonic town, nor ever to divert, either in peace or

war, the springs or streams necessary to supply its wants. If any power shall dare to attempt it we will march against that power and destroy its cities. Should impious men seize on the offerings in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, we swear to employ our feet, or arms, our voices, and all our powers, against them and their accomplices."

The design of the institution as collected from this oath was three-fold: 1. To refrain from destroying or seeking to injure each other. 2. To provide a mutual defense in case of attack from foreign enemies, or from those not members of the league. 3. To protect from sacrilege the temple of Apollo at Delphi.

There were two different places of meeting, and two regular meetings convened every year. One of these was in the spring, the other in autumn. The one in the spring assembled at Delphi, the one in the autumn near the little town of Anthela, within the pass of Thermopylæ, at a temple of Demeter. This circumstance has given rise to the opinion entertained by many, that there were originally two distinct confederations, one, perhaps, formed of inland, the other of maritime tribes; and that, when these became united by the growing influence of Delphi, the ancient places of meeting were retained as a concession to the dignity of each sanctuary.

Whatever was the purpose of the council, or came within its jurisdiction, it obviously did not extend over the whole of Greece. The states of Arcadia, Elis, Achæa, Ætolia, and Acarnania never belonged to it. The ancient members of the confederacy were the Thessalians, the Bœotians, Dorians, the Ionians, the Perrhæbians, the Magnesians, the Locrians, the Œteans, the Phthians, the Malians, the Phocians, and the Dolopians. Some changes of members subsequently occurred.

The constitution of the council rested on the principle of perfect equality among the tribes represented by it. Each tribe, however feeble, had two votes in the deliberation of the congress. None, however powerful, had more.

The council was composed of two classes of representatives called pylagores and hieromnemous. The respective functions of these are not very accurately distinguished. It seems that the former had the power of voting, while the latter prepared and directed their deliberations, and carried their decrees into effect. The number of votes in the council never exceeded twenty-four, but the number of deputies seems not to have been limited.

Before the members of the council proceeded to business, they sacrificed an ox, cut into small pieces, to the Delphian Apollo. They took no cognizance of disputes between private persons. The causes brought before them were more commonly such offenses as openly violated the law of nations. Contests between states were considered proper objects of its jurisdiction, but the superintendence of religion was more especially its care. Whatever the question was, the usual course was first to discuss it, and then decide by a majority of the votes. It was usual to impose a fine on the offending party, which, if not paid within a stated time, was followed by a second sentence, by which it was doubled. If the party still continued refractory, the council might call for assistance to support its decree, and arm against it the whole amphictyonic body. It might also exclude them from the amphictyonic league, or common union of the temple.

Its practical working, however, was not perfect. Its decrees were not always submitted to. The Lacedæmonians, on one occasion, took possession of Thebes. For this they were summoned before the amphictyonic council. They were first fined five hundred talents, and afterwards a thousand, which they refused to pay, alleging that the decision was unjust. We also find the council exerting little, if any, influence in the Peloponnesian war, and other quarrels of the Grecian states with each other.

But, although its influence in the politics of Greece was not strongly felt, yet, in reference to religion, it was very efficient. It originated the holy wars, so called, against the violators of the temple. The war against Circha, as

early as B. C. 600; that against Phocis, B C. 355; that against Amphissa, B. C. 340; and that against the Ætolians, B. C. 280, were undertaken in obedience to the decrees of the council. It cannot, however, fail to be perceived, that in some or all these wars, the more powerful members of the confederacy often employed it as an instrument for carrying out their own plans. As, for instance, in the case of Philip of Macedon, who was admitted into the league, in the room of the Dorians and Phocians.

The meetings of the council were always attended by an immense concourse of spectators. Sacrifices were offered up for the tranquillity and prosperity of Greece. A large number of merchants and traders repaired thither, as they there found an excellent market for their commodities.

Although, therefore, this body seems to have been possessed of little power and influence in general politics, and that of a federal, not a national character, yet its influence in the general affairs of Greece was undoubtedly salutary. Like the games, and other national institutions, it brought the Greeks together, rendered them better acquainted with each other, and taught them that as they had a common language, so they also should have a common destiny.

VI. The relations of the political institutions of the Grecian states to the physical circumstances under which they originated.

Under physical circumstances may be included the climate, the natural divisions of a country, its maritime capacity, the different qualities of its soil, its general adaptations; in fine, all its capacity to call forth and develop human activity, and all the physical influences which it brings to bear upon man and the instruments of progress which he controls. Greece possessed one of those delightful climates which exerts the most favorable influence upon man. At about an equal remove from the frigid and torrid zones it so blends the peculiarities of each together, as to produce a result the best adapted to human development.

Its natural divisions will be apparent from the description already given. Probably no part of the globe's surface exhibits, within so small a compass, such an almost infinite diversity of country and soil. It is peculiarly cut up into districts, or small sections of country, by means of mountains, rivers, or other natural boundaries. By this means it is in the very best degree fitted to be the residence of several independent states. So nearly equal are the districts, that no real danger would arise lest some one, more powerful than the rest, should acquire the supremacy over all the others. It is, therefore, a country in which we should expect to find in its original settlement, a great many independent states. Such we have seen to be the fact.

Again, the diversity of soil and situation must give rise to much diversity of pursuit. In Arcadia the inhabitants led the life of a shepherd. In Messenia, Laconia, and other states, that of an agriculturist. In Athens there was much of maritime life. The silver mines of Laurium, in Attica, led many into a life of mining. Many of the mechanic arts flourished in Athens. Thus there was great diversity of pursuit in the different states of Greece.

Every physical arrangement seemed to conspire to produce the results we have witnessed. Had Greece instead of being intersected by the sea formed one compact whole; had the interior of the country not been broken by natural depressions and elevations; had the natural boundaries of her different states never existed; all her different provinces might probably have formed but one state. In that state, however, we should have found no republican institutions. It would probably have been a repetition of the eastern despotisms.

Some attribute to physical causes a tremendous agency in moulding political institutions, and in forming national character. There is little doubt but that the aggregate of these influences does tell largely upon the state, condition and destiny of a nation. The question here relates solely to the political institutions; and the turn given to freedom, among the Greeks, was brought about in no small degree,

by the great motives and incentives to industry and activity, which grew out of the operation of physical causes. The mountain, the bay, the stream, the harbor, unproductive Attica and fruitful Messenia, all furnished motives and incentives to action. An admirable theatre for it was found in the mildness of a Grecian sky; in the balm of a Grecian atmosphere; in the variegated beauties of a Grecian landscape; in the diversified qualities of a Grecian soil. Man did act, and thus became acquainted with his own powers, and the extraordinary qualities with which his God had endowed him. Here, for the first time, the important secret was discovered, that, in the inventory of the universe, man forms an item of value. The high estimation in which he here held himself, is inferable from the fact, that he has invested his very gods with human attributes. From the volitions, powers and energies he discovered in himself, he inferred that he was something more than a mere machine in the operations he effected. In the relations existing between him and external nature, he discovered a mutuality, that he was as essential to the world as the world was to him.

Man cannot well be free in the direction and exercise of his energies, without carrying that freedom into his political institutions. They must leave him free to act, subject to the smallest restraint that may be consistent with security. Where within a small compass are presented so many varied pursuits, so many motives to action, so many means of progress, it may be reasonably expected that whatever political institutions are tolerated, must be free so far at least as to allow great liberty to the citizen or subject.

"It has been well remarked" by a writer,[1] "that the country situated to the south of Epirus and Thessaly, and which was bounded on the east and west by the Ægean and Ionian seas, which not only received the wisdom of Egypt and of the best parts of Asia, but opened new views and expanded new energies in the human constitution, seemed

[1] *Chenevix's Essay on National Character*, I, 219.

formed by nature to allow one vast step in the progress of political philosophy. It was formed to be the first seat of popular rule, the scene where men should first feel their own strength and importance, and assume the direction of their own concerns.

It will be apparent to any one who closely examines the positions of the Grecian states, and all the physical circumstances of Greece, and compares them with her political institutions, that an admirable harmony characterizes the relations existing between them.

VII. The relations of the political institutions of the Grecian states to the moral, social and intellectual state and condition of the Grecians. The relations of political institutions to the moral, social, and intellectual condition of the people become more close and intimate in proportion as the people are fewer in number. The people of a province have little sympathy with the government of the empire to which they are subject. Even republican institutions that embrace great numbers, and extend over large tracts of country, are felt to be remote, and exert comparatively little influence over individual minds. Hence the moral, social, and intellectual condition of the people are little affected by them. They are felt to belong to too great a number, to be the common property of too many, to enlist the moral feelings or the active sympathies of any one individual. On the contrary, those that embrace but a few, and extend over but a small district of country, are far better known, enlist more strongly the moral feelings, and enter more intimately into the social concerns and habits of the people.

In applying this principle to the Grecian governments, we are to bear in mind that they were not those of a country, but of a town; and that with them the words state and city were synonymous.[1] These towns, cities, or states, were very numerous. There were no less than twenty-two

[1] *Bulwer's Athens*, I, 146.

in Phocis, fourteen in Bœotia, and ten in Achæa. According to Plato, a society of five thousand freemen, capable of bearing arms, was deemed sufficiently powerful to constitute an independent state. If the number sufficed for its defense, that was all that was deemed necessary. Had not Athens and Sparta, at a very early period crushed the cities or states of Attica and Laconia, so as to rule undisturbed over those districts, they might never have attained to be leading states in Greece. Even the number of inhabitants of Sparta did not exceed thirty thousand. Hence we perceive that the Hellenic governments must have come into close and intimate relations with the people, which will serve to explain some of the peculiarities of the Grecian state we shall presently allude to.

Another principle which, no doubt, operated with very great effect among the different Grecian states was that of emulation. Among so many states or cities, all politically equal, and many of them nearly on an equality in relation to their resources, we should naturally expect to find a spirit of emulation active, energetic and untiring. We can hardly measure the strength of this by the loyalty or attachments to country which are felt and witnessed at the present day. This we shall have occasion presently again to allude to.

The principle of emulation and rivalry would also be strengthened by the frequent occasions that existed in Greece of assembling together at stated times many citizens from all parts of the country. The games and festivals already alluded to furnished these occasions. They kept continually alive and active this unslumbering spirit. Hence individual activity received a stimulus which operated extensively in the production of national results.

The most extraordinary of these relations is exhibited in Sparta. History furnishes no instance of a government so inflexible in its principles, so directly at war with the affections of the human heart in its practical operation, and which under the name, and in the garb of freedom, so effect-

ually enslaved its people. The liberty to exchange wives perverted and destroyed the domestic relations; the restriction to the use of iron as coin operated in restraint of the propensity to accumulate; the destruction of infants, and the rejoicing over those who had fallen in battle, not only repressed all tender emotion, but absolutely steeled the human bosom to its influence. Thus it may truly be said that in Sparta the people were drilled into freedom at the expense of moral feelings and social ties; that they paid the price both of the head and the heart for a constitution which made them the slaves of liberty.

And yet this singular constitution continued near five hundred years, much longer than that of any other Grecian state. In Athens, the people were not sufficiently repressed. Liberty there, too frequently degenerated into license.

The relations existing between the political institutions of the Greeks, and their moral, social and intellectual state and condition, were free relations; that is, those institutions in most of the states, permitted great freedom of development. Hence, the astonishing results which present themselves in the moral and social world, and the still more wonderful achievements of the Grecian intellect. Hence the depth and mysteries of her philosophy, and the sublimity and beauty of her art.

VIII. The different degree in which the monarchic, aristocratic, and democratic elements prevailed in the different states, and the order in which those elements were developed.

The great number of the Grecian states, together with the diversity of their political institutions, offers a much better opportunity than is anywhere else presented, of witnessing the action of the different elements, and the order of their succession.

The first element that everywhere presents itself is the monarchic. By this I mean a different element from that which prevails in a despotism. In a monarchy there are

strictly three estates; the prince, the nobles, and the people; in an aristocracy two, the nobles and the people; in a despotism or tyranny, as the Greeks termed it, two, the prince and the people; and in a democracy, one, the people. Thus, of these four, a monarchy affords the most numerous, and the greatest facilities for the employment of checks and balances, to render it secure and give it permanency.

Thus a people, an aristocracy, with a prince at the head, constitutes a monarchy, and this was the earliest constitution in Greece. It arose naturally from the manner in which states were founded. The permanent state of Greece grew out of a very disturbed and unsettled condition. All that constitutes Greece proper had been subject to various revolutions previous to the return of the Heraclidæ. This, which consisted in the Dorian emigration, and the changes occasioned by it, exerted, no doubt, a very extensive influence upon the governments of Greece. This occurred at the close of the heroic age of Greece. In these migratory movements, and the disturbances consequent thereon, in this unsettled state of things, we should naturally expect the boldest and most energetic to take the lead, in all the hazardous expeditions, sustained and supported by his followers, who, on effecting a settlement, would become a body of nobles. Many of the conquered people remain, mixing themselves up with the invaders. Thus we have the materials out of which the three estates, the prince, nobles and people are formed. As these migratory bands might be split up and have many leaders, so there would be many different states formed by their settlements.

It is a remark which is certainly important, and which I believe will be conceded to be true universally, that no people ever became great on the spot where they were originally found; or, in other words, that none but an emigrating people ever attained to any very high degree of civilization. This is certainly true, so far as it relates to Greece. The settlement of a migrating people introduces a new and fresh element, originates new ideas; and

sets in motion new activities that cannot fail to exert a powerful influence upon the present and the future.

We find, too, at this period, not only an original, but a secondary emigration. Many of the original inhabitants preferred emigrating to remaining, besides many ambitious and restless spirits led off bands of followers, and founded new colonies. These retained their intercourse with the parent state, and reacted back upon it, and as colonizing institutions were almost invariably free, the reacting influence was extremely salutary. Here, then, were these several agencies operating, viz: the spirit of the heroic ages, which was a spirit of adventure, and, to a great extent, a free spirit; the new ideas, agencies and activities introduced by the new settlers; and the reaction from the new colonies which had gone out and formed new settlements. All these were too much for the monarchic element. The ancient kings, such as were described by Homer, possessed but a very limited authority. It was much more extensive in war than in peace. The people were even then considered as the source of their authority. Popular assemblies even then existed, and claimed the right of conferring privileges on rank. The nobles were ever jealous of the prince, and encroaching on him. There never was in Greece an attachment to the person, which has characterized the loyalty of modern Europe. With the Greeks, it was not the monarch, but the state, to which he was linked by strong attachments.

Under the accumulated pressure from all these various causes, it could not be expected that monarchy could long sustain itself. It gradually died out and ceased to be. There was little or no violence made use of to terminate it. It went not down in blood. It declined and finally disappeared, rather than was abolished. Gradually, and almost insensibly to itself, it ceased as a thing whose mission had been accomplished, whose fashion was passing away.

The direct line was first broken; the hereditary changed into an elective monarchy. Then the period of power

became shortened. From a continuance during life it was limited to a certain number of years, and subsequently to one year or less. So also the name became changed, and some other term, as that of archon at Athens, was substituted in the place of king.

The element that comes next the most prominently into view after the ceasing of the monarchic was the aristocratic. The nobles were left the most prominent upon the decline of the monarchic power. They, therefore, very naturally assumed the exercise of it. The aristocratic element was exhibited often, perhaps, the most frequently in the oligarchic form. That is, the power fell into the hands of a few of the nobles, and, whenever this occurred, it was, as a general rule, exercised oppressively. This element had a two-fold danger to guard against. If the aristocracy were too numerous there was great danger of their falling into dissensions among themselves. If too few, they created odium by their oppression, and incurred the hostility of all those who were excluded from power. Thus in one case they were weakened by their own jealousies; in the other by the hostility of their rivals, and the opposition of those whom they oppressed.

The ascendancy of this element, especially when it assumed the oligarchic form, was of short duration. It terminated generally in one of two ways. Either a growing tendency to mechanic and commercial pursuits, as at Athens, created a middle class, which in time fused the oligarchy into a democracy; or the people, to escape from the tyranny of the few, threw themselves into the tyranny of the one, and permitted a favorite, usually a demagogue, to assume the sovereignty.

The latter was termed a tyranny. The Greeks understood this word in a different sense from what we understand it. They applied the term in all cases in which a man had succeeded in clothing himself with the supreme power. Many who were stigmatized with this term by the Greeks were very wise sovereigns, and ruled the people with great moderation and justice.

These tyrannies were never of long duration. Those who established them were generally men of power and energy, and they failed to transmit these qualities to their children. When the sceptre came to be grasped by too feeble a hand the people found the less difficulty in wresting it from its possessor and destroying the tyranny. The oldest tyranny in Greece endured but one century.[1]

The downfall of a tyranny the most frequently led to a democracy. The tyrant, if jealous or cruel, was first of all inclined to rid himself of the nobles who were his most formidable competitors. These he disposed of through death or banishment. These out of the way left only the tyrant and democracy, the despot and the people. As we here find them in juxtaposition, it is a favorable opportunity for introducing that observation of Montesquieu, which is to the effect that in a despotism and democracy the people are equal, but the difference is that in one they are nothing, and in the other everything.

When nothing remained but the tyrant and the people, the death of the former was more generally succeeded by the emancipation of the latter. Thus in two ways the democratic element very naturally succeeded the despotic.

From the detail given of the institutions of the Spartans and the Athenians, it is obvious that the aristocratic element greatly predominated in the Spartan constitution, and the democratic in the Athenian. From the prevalence of these two different elements arises the fact that the Spartan possessed such great stability and endurance, while the Athenian was so versatile and changeable. Wherever the aristocratic element enters strongly into the composition of a government, the action of it will be based upon fixed laws and principles, which will ensure to it a reasonable degree of permanence. On the contrary, as the conduct of a democracy depends on the popular will, and that is ever versatile and changeful, it results that in that form of

[1] *Bulwer's Athens*, I, 149.

government there is the least adherence to fixed principles, and the greatest amount of change.

We perceive, clearly, the difference in the spirit of the two governments, in the influence each was found to exert among the other Grecian states. Wherever the influence or control of Sparta was felt, an aristocracy, in the form of an oligarchy, was found to spring up, as in the odious oligarchy established at Thebes, and that of the thirty tyrants at Athens. On the other hand, the Athenians always warmly sympathized with pure democratic principles, and hence they may be expected to be found prevailing wherever their influence was powerfully felt.

The one great fact which the student of civilization will notice in respect to the element of government in Greece, is, that in every state, strictly Grecian, the popular or democratic element always continued to gain the ascendancy, until, in almost all cases, it achieved a final triumph. Athens very early came to be eminently democratic. The strength of the aristocratic element in Sparta, retarded, for a long period of time, the progress of democracy. At length the people succeeded in obtaining the ephori, and from that time they may be said, through these magistrates, to have ruled the state.

IX. The problems in government to which the Grecian developments in that element may be considered to have furnished a solution.

There is no part of the history of civilization, either ancient or modern, that, within the same period of time, furnishes larger contributions to the element of government than that of the Grecian. Every circumstance contributed to render the states of Greece so many different political organizations, to work out their problems, and present their results for the benefit of after ages. They were in a condition where it was safe to experiment. The recent origins of these states, their narrow compass, and the small number of their inhabitants, added to the great

and extraordinary facility possessed by the Greeks so readily to adapt themselves to new changes and new states of things, all contributed to enable them to experiment without endangering their safety.

The first problem which the Greeks may have contributed to solve, was the condition of the individual considered relatively to the state. The Grecian republics regarded the individual in a political point of view very differently from what he is now regarded. With them, all that an individual was, he was as a member of the state. With the moderns the individual is something else besides a mere fragmentary part of a commonwealth. With those republics the rights of the individual as such, were little regarded. With them, the art of government was the art of regulating the state, and the means of preserving and directing it. They start with the state first, and deduce from it the relations of the individual. He could have no rights as opposed to the state. The state was everything, and he simply a component part of it.

The Greek formed a part of his state. Its acts were, therefore, to some extent, his acts. To him that state was the world. It had been hallowed by the achievements of his forefathers. To it belonged the dawn of his infancy, the bloom of his youth, the vigor of his manhood, the decay of his age. Had he affections? that was their centre. Had he powers of action? that furnished motives for their exercise. It embodied all that was beautiful, all that was interesting, all that was lovely, all that was worth living for, all that was worth dying for. Beneath him was the Grecian soil; around him were Grecian monuments; above him was the abode of Grecian gods. The Spartan cheerfully consented to the division of his lands among his countrymen; to use iron as the medium in exchanging his commodities; to lay aside all personal distinction at the public meals; because his own loved Sparta required the sacrifice. The Athenian appealed to the strength of his nation's ties, of his nation's spirit, when he resigned his cherished Athens to the mercy of a Persian foe. To preserve his nation, he

abandoned the monuments of his art; the sepulchres of his sires; the shrines of his gods.

Individual worth in Greece was estimated from the extent of individual sacrifice. The nation was the actor. The straits of Thermopylæ, the wave of Salamis, the plain of Marathon, the field of Platæa, attest the energy of its action. The existence of the individual is here merged in that of his nation. It is that that inscribes its achievements in living lines on this page of the history of our race, investing this era with a nationality, rather than an individuality of character, rendering it resplendent from the display of national glory; imposing from the exhibition of national power. So distinctly is this feature to be recognized; so strongly marked its appearance in all the great leading outlines of Grecian polity; that it is readily inferable that some important purpose was to be answered by it. That purpose must be apparent on a slight observation.

In government we had hitherto seen little, except the despot. He had swayed the physical energies of the nation in obedience to his own will. He alone had appeared prominent on the theatre of action. To his will every other was bound to submit.

A new era opened with the rise of the Grecian states. A new actor appeared on the political arena. The hitherto slumbering energies of a nation were to be aroused into action. It was to be seen what they were capable of accomplishing when wielded by itself and for its own benefit.

That result has been seen and must be felt by the student of history. The torrent of eastern despotism, swollen by accessions from every part of the eastern world, was about commencing to roll over Europe. But on the shores of Greece it met the nation, and was rolled back upon itself, with such tremendous force, as to confine it most effectually within its ancient landmarks. Greece, and probably Europe, were rescued from the fate of being swallowed up by the eastern despotisms. The great seat of civilization was saved, and this important fact has told with prodi-

gious effect upon all the succeeding generations of men. Thus it is possible, occasionally, to trace the finger of God in the development of some of the elements of humanity.

The Greeks therefore made but small progress in solving the great problem now presenting in the element of government, viz: What is the least amount or quantity of power and natural liberty shall the individual be required to surrender to society in order that he shall receive perfect protection in his remaining rights. The consideration of that point never seems to have arisen in the political affairs of Greece. With the Grecian, liberty consisted in the degree or extent to which he had a right to participate in government. In modern times it regards the forms of authority as of little importance in themselves, except as a means of obtaining the protection of the individual and the undisturbed action of society.

One of the consequences resulting from the importance attached to the state, was the minuteness with which the laws descended into every variety of human conduct. Take for instance the following as specimens of the laws of Sparta. Marriages with women not of sufficient size, or for the sake of riches, were punished. King Archidamus is said to have been fined for having taken too small a wife. A youth in Sparta is said to have been punished for rapaciousness, because he bought land for too low a price. Common trades were not permitted to the Lacedæmonian citizen, which was also the case in many other states.[1]

Another consequence was regarding the state as possessed of the power to do all things without reference to the principle of right and wrong. When the Athenians proceeded against the commanders after the battle at Argenusæ, the whole legal procedure was changed for this special case. According to the law of Canonus, the case of every commander should have been voted separately,

[1] *Lieber's Political Ethics*, I, 425.

the only way, of course, in which justice could be done to the individuals. On this trial the people voted on all commanders jointly. Some citizens remarked this discrepancy, but the crowd exclaimed "It would be monstrous if the people could not do what they like."[1]

We ought also to notice some additional deficiencies in the governments of the Grecian states. One was a want of the representative system. This, as a system, seems never to have obtained in Greece. There are, it is true, the rudiments of it discernible in the ephoralty of Sparta, and perhaps in some other Grecian institutions, but it clearly did not exist in Greece as practiced in modern times.

Another point in which the political institutions of Greece fell greatly short of those of modern times, was a neglect clearly to define the powers of government, and rightly to organize and distribute the political forces. The three great departments of the executive, legislative and judicial, were too little separated, too much confounded, and too much blended with each other. The value of two legislative bodies, each having a negative upon each other, and of an executive having a qualified negative upon both, was not understood or properly appreciated by them. Nor did they understand the independence of the judiciary. These defects in the political institutions of the Greeks, may serve, in a great measure, to account for the changeability and brevity that characterized most of the Grecian governments. The establishment of checks and balances between the different coordinate branches, was little, if at all, understood by them. Hence the governments could never acquire that stability which properly belongs to those more favorably constituted.

The solution of the problem of sustained self-government, considering the very early period in the world's history in which it was sought to be solved, was certainly entered upon by the Greeks with very considerable success.

[1] *Lieber's Political Ethics*, I, 422.

They were the first to attempt its solution. They could derive nothing from the experience of others who had gone before them. They had an extremely limited range of ideas. They had not that great engine of power, the printing press. Their lively imaginations were acted upon by orators, declaimers and demagogues. Under all these difficulties and privations, their success was certainly as great as could in reason have been expected.

From the experience which the world has since had in the development of political philosophy, and from the actual facilities which then existed, it is to some a matter of surprise, and even regret, that the Greeks could not have conceived and realized the idea of a great Hellenic nation. Their common race and language, common dangers, common religion and common festivals and games, should have led the Grecian mind strongly in this direction. They did rise to the realization of federal leagues, but nothing beyond. Could the conception, born twenty-two centuries later in America, have had its origin in Greece, and have reared up, under a due mixture of federal and national elements, a great Hellenic nation, possessed of sufficient political strength to bind together all its parts in a permanent union, and yet have left those several parts a perfect freedom in the regulation of their own local matters, and could each part have so preserved its integrity as to have continued equally true to itself and to the whole, we should have had a nation that would not only have repelled all invasions from the east, but would also have taught the future of Europe such a lesson in politics, that its later despotisms would hardly have found a place in history. But the time had not yet arrived for the conception of such an idea. Greece and Rome, and modern Europe were yet to travel on in their destined course, originating and developing new elements and new combinations in political science, before the grand idea of a nation, binding in its whole, and yet free in its parts, could emerge from the dark region of prophecy, and pass into the full daylight of history.

Such great facts teach us forcibly the lesson that men and nations and races are but agents in the conception and gradual development of those great ideas that lie at the foundations of history. We must be content to welcome them gladly as they appear. Greece did much in developing the freedom, activity and power of the state, America has done more in combining free states together, and thus in projecting on to the foreground of history a nation uniting the energy and power of a monarchy, the wisdom of an aristocracy, and the freedom of a democracy.

CHAPTER VI.

GREECE — ITS PHILOSOPHY.

In the development of Grecian thought, as contained in her various systems of philosophy, and methods of philosophizing, we find a theme not only deeply interesting in itself, but one also highly important as affording an *exposé* of Grecian character, and as exerting an influence upon the subsequent history and progress of civilization. Philosophy is an element that reflects all the other elements of humanity. If we can unravel the intricacies of a nation's thought, we have little difficulty in learning its industry, its religion, its society, its government, and even its art. All these are embraced in the operations of the pure intellect.

The development of this element in Greece was almost entirely confined to one state, and even to a single city. There were few Grecian systems of philosophy that did not either originate, or receive their finishing touches around the Acropolis of Athens, on whose proud summit were exhibited so many specimens of Grecian art. We would be safe in saying that the full development of this element was almost confined to the Ionian race.

The topics presenting themselves for discussion under this element will be best considered under the following heads:

I. The three classes of men from whom Grecian thought originated.

II. Philosophy as developed in the reflection and maxims of the Grecian sages.

III. Philosophy as developed in the different sects and schools. The history of these as they successively arose and flourished, including an account of their founders, and

most prominent advocates, together with a brief statement of their peculiar doctrines.

I. The three classes of men from whom Grecian thought originated. The great mass of ideas, maxims, whatever may be embraced under the term philosophy, may be considered as derived from three sources, or rather three classes of men. The one of these embraced the early bards of Greece, as Linus, Orpheus, Hesiod, Homer. The first thought of a nation is uttered forth in the songs of its poets. It is these that depict its passions, and in them is mirrored forth its peculiar characteristics.

The poetry of Greece took a particular direction, and led to a particular result. It took a religious course, and resulted in giving a theogony and theology, cast in its own mould and tinctured with its own hues. We have already considered the religion of Greece. There are those, however, who believe that the poets of Greece intended to convey through the medium of their cosmogonies and theogonies, both religious and moral instruction and improvement. In the language of Vossius they say that "this mythic philosophy places before the reader, under the concealed device, in the attractive envelope, of fables, both the nature of things, and examples or precepts of prudence and of wisdom. The secrets of nature have been concealed and described under the names of gods and goddesses, and their unions and relationships; whence the common people indeed imagined that there was an innumerable multitude of gods; but the more wise were by no means ignorant what was intended to be understood by such language."

We do not adopt this view of the subject, although we deem it highly probable that many myths and fables did really contain many valuable truths; but to suppose that the whole system was devised for the purpose of presenting such truths, is to suppose the Greeks possessed an amount of wisdom which we can hardly attribute to them.

Another important class was composed of the Grecian legislators, their early guides in civil and political conduct.

Among these are to be ranked, Triptolemus, Lycurgus and Solon. These were generally practical men, who endeavored to deduce from general principles such rules as were well calculated to guide and govern men in their civil conduct. They were but little speculative in their tendencies; and in their laws and institutions, sought not for the most perfect, but for those which were the best their people could receive.

We have now presented the extremes: the poetic, the ideal, on the one hand; and the prosaic, the practical, on the other. Between these two lies another class, about at an equal remove from either. These were, properly, the Grecian thinkers; philosophers, who regarded the practical, and yet embraced the speculative, who invented maxims, and also investigated moral and sometimes physical truth. These men and their doctrines, it will devolve on us now to examine.

II. Philosophy as developed in the reflection and maxims of the Grecian sages. The seven wise men of Greece, is a term familiar to everybody. History ascribes to it the following origin. About the year B. C. 580, some fishermen of Miletus, a city of Ionia, having taken a large draught of fish, sold the whole to some young men of the neighborhood. Among these was found a golden tripod of great value. A dispute now arose as to who was legally entitled to it, which was referred to the citizens of Miletus. These applied to the oracle of Delphi for advice, who directed them to award the tripod to the wisest.

The citizens of Miletus, in obedience to this injunction, bestowed it upon Thales, their countryman. He declined to receive it on the ground that there were many others wiser than himself. He, therefore, transferred it to one Bias, an inhabitant of Priene, a city on the coast of Ionia. From him it passed to another, and then to another, until having successively traveled through the hands of those the most noted for wisdom and prudence, it at length came into the possession of Solon, who, observing that no

mortal could lay claim to the epithet of the wisest, dedicated it to the god Apollo. The individuals through whose hands the tripod successively passed, are known by the name of the seven wise men of Greece. The names commonly included under this appellation are, Thales, Solon, Chilo, Pittacus, Bias, Cleobulus and Periander.

Of these, Thales may be regarded as one of the fathers of Grecian philosophy, and as the founder of the Ionic sect or school. He will be considered in connection with that school.

Solon, as we have already seen, was the Athenian lawgiver. He was born at Salamis, and died at Cyprus in the eightieth year of his age. Among the apothegms and precepts ascribed to him are the following: "Laws are like cobwebs, that entangle the weak, but are broken through by the strong. He who has learned to obey, will know how to command. In all things let reason be your guide. Diligently contemplate excellent things. In everything that you do, consider the end."

Chilo was one of the Lacedæmonian ephori. He lived to a great age, and at last died of joy on seeing his son return a victor from the Olympic games. The following maxims are ascribed to him: "Three things are difficult: to keep a secret, to bear an injury patiently, and to spend leisure well. Never ridicule the unfortunate. Think before you speak. Do not desire impossibilities. Gold is tried by the touchstone, and men are tried by gold. Honest loss is preferable to shameful gain; for, by the one, a man is a sufferer but once; by the other, always. In walking, do not appear to be always upon business of life or death; for rapid movements indicate a kind of frenzy. If you are great, be condescending; for it is better to be loved than to be feared. Speak no evil of the dead. Reverence the aged. Know thyself."

Pittacus of Mitylene, in Lesbos, was entrusted with the supreme power by the Mityleneans, which, after establishing salutary laws, he voluntarily resigned. To him are ascribed the following maxims and precepts: "The first

office of prudence is to foresee threatening misfortunes, and prevent them. Power discovers the man. Never talk of your schemes before they are executed, lest, if you fail to accomplish them, you be exposed to the double mortification of disappointment and ridicule. Whatever you do, do it well. Do not that to your neighbor which you would take ill from him. Be watchful for opportunities."

Bias of Priene, in Ionia, acquired his reputation for wisdom chiefly by his generosity and public spirit. The following are given as specimens of his sententious wisdom: "It is a proof of a weak and disordered mind to desire impossibilities. The greatest infelicity is, not to be able to endure misfortunes patiently. Great minds alone can support a sudden reverse of fortune. The most pleasant state, to be always gaining. Be not unmindful of the miseries of others. If you are handsome, do handsome things; if deformed, supply the defects of nature by your virtues. Be slow in undertaking, but resolute in executing. Praise not a worthless man for the sake of his wealth. Whatever good you do, ascribe it to the gods. Lay in wisdom as the store for your journey from youth to old age, for it is the most certain possession. Many men are dishonest; therefore, love your friend with caution, for he may hereafter become your enemy."

Cleobulus of Lindus, in Rhodes, excelled in bodily strength and beauty. He was famous for his skill in the solution of enigmas and obscure questions. His prudential maxims were: "Be kind to your friends, that they may continue such; and to your enemies, that they may become your friends. Happy is the family where the master is more loved than feared. When you go abroad, consider what you have to do; when you return home, what you have done. Marry among your equals that you may not become a slave to your wife's relations. Be more desirous to hear than to speak. Avoid excess."

Periander of Corinth, was the last of the wise men. He was what the Greeks denominate a tyrant, having changed the form of government in Corinth, from an

aristocracy to a tyranny, or monarchy. Among the moral sentences ascribed to him, are the following: "Let the prince who would reign securely, trust rather to the affection of his subjects, than to the force of arms. Pleasure is precarious, but virtue is immortal. Conceal your misfortunes. Study to be worthy of your parents. There is nothing which prudence cannot accomplish." Periander died at the advanced age of eighty years.

From these few specimens it will be perceived what direction the thought of Greece was taking under its sages. Philosophy here was the handmaid of moral feeling, and the exponent of moral ideas. She appears clothed in the garb of maxims and precepts, and presents herself as the guide of man's action and conduct. She has little of the speculative, but far more of the practical; and proposes no solution of any physical problems. We proceed next to the consideration of her sects or schools.

III. Philosophy as developed in the different sects and schools. The history of these as they successively arose and flourished, including an account of their founders and most prominent advocates, together with a brief statement of their peculiar doctrines. From the sententious wisdom of the sages, it was natural that the human mind should pass to more accurate speculations and more connected reasonings. This brings us to the consideration of the sects or schools. The development of school philosophy in Greece divides itself into two periods, the one of which may justly represent its youth, the other its maturity. The first dates from the origin of the school philosophy, and extends to the time of Socrates. This period is from about B. C. 600 to 400. It will be found to be characterized by an ardent spirit of speculation, but with limited views and deficient in system. The second extends from the time of Socrates to the new academy under Carneades, from about the year B. C. 400 to 60. During this period the spirit of inquiry was more universal, more systematic; and this applies equally to dogmatism and skepticism.

We have before had occasion to remark the salutary effect produced upon the progress and civilization of a people by colonization, and to advert to some of the causes or reasons of its production. It is not a little remarkable that we find the two main roots from which Grecian philosophy is derived, the one in Ionia, the other in Magna Græcia, the two main colonizations from Greece. The one is the Ionic school, the other, the Italic or Pythagorean.

We may as well here state the different schools, in the order in which they regularly succeed each other, together with their founders and principal advocates.

In the first period mentioned, the following schools flourished: 1. The Ionian school; Thales, Anaximander, Pherecydes, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Diogenes, Archelaus. 2. The Italic or Pythagorean school; Pythagoras, Empedocles. 3. The Eleatic school; Xenophanes, Parmenides, Melissus, Zeno. 4. Heraclitic school; Heraclitus. 5. The Atomic school; Leucippus, Democritus. 6. The school of the Sophists; Gorgias, Protagoras, Prodicus, Hippias.

In the second period flourished the following schools: The Socratic school, Socrates. Out of this arose two branches, viz:

First. The partial systems of Socrates. These were: 1. The Cynic; Antisthenes. 2. The Cyrenaic; Aristippus. 3. Pyrrhonic or Skeptic; Pyrrho, Timon. 4. Megaric; Euclid. 5. Eliac or Eretriac; Phædo, Menedemus.

Second. The more perfect systems of the Socratic. These were: 1. The Academic; Plato. 2. The Epicurean; Epicurus. 3. The Peripatetic; Aristotle. 4. The Stoic; Zeno. 5. The New Academic; Arcesilaus, Carneades.

1. The Ionic school. We have already seen that in the troubles which followed the Dorian invasion, the colonization of Ionia had its origin. It was the Ionian race that emigrated, and hence they gave to the new country the name of Ionia. This country skirted the shores of the Mediterranean, being the westernmost part of Asia Minor. There were probably few more delightful regions, certainly

few that presented anything near the same facilities for the prosecution of commercial pursuits, as the cities of Ionia. Miletus, Colophon, and Phocæa, more especially rose to opulence by their commerce and skill in the arts.

In the city of Miletus, about six centuries before the Christian era, flourished Thales, the founder of the Ionic school, and by many termed the father of Grecian philosophy. He traveled into Crete, and afterwards into Egypt, in search of wisdom. The priests of Memphis are supposed to have contributed to his philosophical and mathematical knowledge. It seems, however, conceded that he first taught them the method of measuring the pyramids. He was the first Grecian who discoursed on principles of reason, about the origin of the world. He regarded water or humidity as the original element, whence all things proceeded, and spirit as the impulsive principle. By water he is supposed to have understood the first matter, or the chaos of the ancients. He regarded God as the soul of the world, although the precise connection existing between the spiritual principle and the primordial matter constituting the chaos, seems not to be very clearly understood. He affirmed that God was the eldest of all things, for that he was without beginning. He looked upon all things as being filled with the divinity, and regarded the world as animated. He considered that nothing was hidden from God, that the world was made by him, that it depends upon destiny, which is no other than the immutable will of providence. He did not believe there was any vacuum or void.

He looked upon matter as in its own nature changeable, and in a perpetual flux; as being composed of atoms, although almost infinitely divisible. He held that matter could not be divided *ad infinitum*, but that we must stop where infinity begins; that night preceded the day in the order of creation. He taught that the magnet and amber are endued with a soul, which is the cause of their attracting powers. He considered the soul of all beings as a moving power, as having within itself the cause of motion,

and is always in action. According to him all compositions were made out of the four elements; the stars are worlds on fire, the moon receives its light from the sun; that there is but one luminary of this kind, and that its figure is circular.

Thales allowed of spirits, or demons, which were intelligent and immortal substances. He was of opinion that the soul separated from the body after death, that it is always in motion, and that things which are inanimate have a kind of torpid soul.

He claimed that a bad man could not hide his evil actions, nor even his evil thoughts from the divine power; and that the way to lead an honorable and just life was, "By not doing ourselves what we blame in others."

He made many astronomical observations, and was the first to note the true position of the sun's course. He also first ascertained that the solar year consisted of three hundred and sixty-five days. He was so well acquainted with the heavenly motions, as to be able to predict an eclipse. He taught the Greeks the division of the heavens into five zones, and the solstitial and equinoctial points.

Thales is said to have thanked the gods for three things: first, that he was a human being and not a beast; second, that he was a man and not a woman; third, that he was a Greek and not a barbarian.

The following are given as specimens of his sententious wisdom: "It is not the length of a man's tongue that proves his wisdom. Never do that yourself, which you blame in others. The most happy man is he who is sound in health, moderate in fortune, and cultivated in understanding. The improvement of the mind is of far higher importance than the beauty of the countenance."

He never married, and died at the advanced age of ninety years. No writings of Thales have come down to us.

Philosophy had certainly accomplished much through the researches and speculations of Thales. Anaximander,

his friend and companion, was his successor. He was born in the year B. C. 610, and was the first who taught philosophy in a public school. He did not confine himself to oral instruction, but committed his ideas to writing.

He held that infinity is the first principle of all things; that the universe, though variable in its parts, as one whole is immutable; and that all things are produced from infinity, and terminate in it. What he meant by infinity is not universally agreed upon. Many suppose that he used the term to denote the humid mass of Thales, whence all things arose, together with the divine principle by which he supposed it to be animated.

He carried his researches into nature very far considering the time in which he lived, and is even said to have predicted an earthquake. He framed a connected series of geometrical truths, and was the first who undertook to delineate the surface of the earth, and mark the divisions of land and water upon an artificial globe. To him has been ascribed the invention of the sun dial. He taught that the earth is round, and placed in the middle of the universe; that the sun is twenty-eight times larger than the earth, holding the highest place in the heavens, the moon next, and the stars to be situated immediately below the moon, and to be composed of fire and air, and to be inhabited by emanations from the deity.

Anaximenes, also a Milesian, was born B. C. 556, and succeeded Anaximander. He taught that the first principle of all things is air, which he supposed to be infinite or immense. He held air to be God, because it is diffused through all nature, and is perpetually active. This air, was, in his view, a subtle ether, animated with a divine principle, by which means it becomes the origin of all things.

He is also said to have taught that all minds are air; that fire, water, and earth proceed from it by rarefaction or condensation; that the sun and moon are fiery bodies, whose form is that of a circular plate; that the stars, which also are fiery substances, are fixed in the heavens, as nails

in a crystalline plain; and that the earth is a plane tablet, resting upon the air.[1]

Anaxagoras was born at Clazomene, in the year B. C. 500. When in his twentieth year, he went to reside in Athens, where he applied himself to the study of eloquence and poetry. He subsequently became the pupil of Anaximenes. After remaining for some years at Miletus, he left, and returned to Athens, where he taught philosophy in private. Euripides and Pericles were his pupils. Being banished from Athens for introducing new opinions concerning the gods, he took up his residence in Lampsacus, where he passed the remainder of his days in the instruction of youth.

He sustained through life the character of a true philosopher, appearing everywhere superior to motives of avarice and ambition, preserving, amid all vicissitudes, an equal mind; and devoting himself, under all circumstances, to the pursuits of science.

Anaxagoras introduced some important alterations into the doctrines which had thus far been taught in the Ionic school. He taught that the primary particles of matter were not homogeneous, but varying in their qualities. He supposed, for instance, that bone was composed of bony particles, and gold of golden particles; that thus there were as many different kinds of primitive particles as there were different varieties of substances. In this respect he differed radically from the previous philosophers of the Ionic school, who held that the original mass of matter was homogeneous.

But there was another wider and vastly more important difference. The philosophers of the Ionic school had thus far failed to separate mind from matter. They seem, it is true, to have looked upon the former as constituting the principle of action in the latter; but for aught that appears to the contrary, it was a blind action, undirected, uninfluenced by intelligence. Anaxagoras was the first among the

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 84.

Greeks to conceive mind as detached from matter, and as acting upon it with intelligence and design in the formation of the universe.

Several other doctrines are ascribed to Anaxagoras, such as that the moon was a habitable region containing hills and valleys; that the comets are a concourse of wandering stars; that the winds originated from the rarefaction of the air by the power of the sun's heat; that thunder is occasioned by the clashing together of the clouds; and that the rainbow is the effect of the reflection of the solar rays from a thick cloud, placed opposite to it like a mirror. He also supposed that earthquakes arose from the expansive force of the air in the interior of the earth; that the voice is formed by the percussion of the wind; and that the stars are large stones kept in their relative positions by the constant rapid circuit which they make.

Diogenes of Apollonia, succeeded Anaxagoras in the Ionic school. He was the disciple of Anaximenes, an expert philosopher and an eloquent orator. He considered air as the first principle of things, but held also that this air required the divine power to animate its matter into motion. This divine power kept it in continual motion. There was an infinity of worlds. The figure of the earth was oval; the stars he regarded as exhalations formed by the perspiration of the universe; animals were produced without life, and received their soul through their lungs by inspiration.

Archelaus was the disciple of Anaxagoras. He taught the double principle of expansion and condensation, which he regarded as infinite. Heat is the cause of motion, and cold of rest. The earth was in the middle of the universe, and had no motion. It originally resembled a wet marsh, but was afterwards dried up, and its figure resembled that of an egg. Animals, and even men were produced from the heat of the earth. All animals have a soul, which was born with them; the capacity of which is made to vary according to the structure of the bodily organs in which it resides.

In this oldest of the Grecian schools, we recognize the two principal views of nature — the dynamical and the mechanical — prevailing. The first supposes the existence of a living energy, which in its development gives birth spontaneously to all the varieties of form and quality. All generation in nature is explainable upon this principle by the successive transmutations of this energy. The last proceeds upon the supposition of certain permanent material elements which change place in obedience to motion, either originally inherent or extrinsically impressed. This theory rejects all generation in the proper sense of the word, and all alteration of qualities and forms in nature, and seeks to account for all appearances by certain changes in the outer relations of space. It assumes that all apparent generation of natural forms and qualities may grow out of the various combinations into which material elements, of originally distinct qualities and forms, mutually enter. This, in Anaxagoras, so far as concerns the physical part of his doctrine, the mechanical theory obtains its most distinct and fullest expression. Anaximander had explained the *all* as having been produced from primary, material elements, endued with certain constant and unalterable qualities, and from a principle of motion naturally inherent in the material mass.

On the contrary, the other philosophers of the Ionic school, with the exception of Archelaus, follow the dynamical theory, regarding nature as a living force, and its successive changes as so many spontaneous developments of life. In their view a single elementary substance passes through a series of transmutations by means of expansions and contractions, or other modifications, considered as progress of life.[1]

2. The Pythagorean or Italic school; Pythagoras, Empedocles. Another celebrated school in antiquity was the Pythagorean or Italic. It received the first denomination from its founder, and the second from its having been first

[1] *Ritter's History of Ancient Philosophy*, I, 190–2.

instituted in that part of Italy which was called Magna Græcia. This school continued to flourish for about the space of two ages, and was then destroyed. It, however, gave rise to other sects which subsequently sprung up in Greece.

There are many difficulties that much embarrass this portion of Grecian philosophy. There is a lack of authentic writings, and an abundance of those which are apocryphal. There is also much of mystery which envelops the person, character and views of Pythagoras, and much difficulty in discriminating between what was his own, and what was borrowed from the Egyptians, or even from others of his own school.

Pythagoras is generally supposed to have been born on the island of Samos, but was taken, while an infant into Phœnicia, where, in his early days, he was entrusted to the care of the celebrated philosopher, Pherecydes. He traveled into Egypt, and was there initiated into the mysteries of the country. Many points of his philosophy seem to indicate an acquaintance with the Hebrew writings, of which he may have acquired a knowledge while among the Phœnicians.[1] He is supposed to have been a pupil of Thales, and is said by many, to have traveled to Babylon and even into India.

He first attempted to establish a school, and a species of philosophical congregation, at Samos, the place of his birth. He there shut himself up in a cave, where he pretended he had acquired an insight into several mysteries.

Not succeeding in permanently establishing a school at Samos, he proceeded about the year B. C. 527, to Crotona, in Italy, where he established his celebrated school. Here he had a great concourse of hearers and disciples. He was a pretended worker of miracles, was deeply skilled in the arts of deception, and was thus enabled to impose upon the credulity of the people.[2]

[1] See *Gale's Court of the Gentiles*, II, 126, *et sub.* [2] *Fourney's History of Philosophy*, 53.

The morals of Pythagoras were ever strict and regular, while his address was easy, polite, and engaging. He professed great respect for religion, and neglected no opportunity of acquiring popular applause. He, at length, came to be regarded by the people as a person of exalted merit, and as one belonging to a superior order of beings. His family consisted of his wife Theano, two sons and three daughters. The school or society he established, became also of political importance, which circumstance occasioned its ruin about the year 500 B. C. It is also supposed to have occasioned the death of its founder; and, although the time and manner of his death is uncertain, yet it seems very universally conceded that he came to his death by violent means.

Pythagoras was the first who assumed the name of philosopher. It does not appear to be clearly settled whether he did, or did not, leave any writings behind him, but as he was so much attached to secret methods of instruction, the probability is that he did not. History represents him in a three-fold character: first, as a philosopher; second, as the founder of a philosophical institute or corporation; and lastly as a legislator.

The doctrines of Pythagoras, as a philosopher, were of two kinds, public and secret. The first he taught indiscriminately to all, and it chiefly consisted of rules that related to moral conduct. His secret doctrines were communicated only to a few of his most intimate disciples. These he united into a kind of community, and bound them together by the strictest observances. It was absolutely necessary for any one to undergo a long and painful novitiate, before he could expect to be admitted into the secret philosophy. It was necessary that they should first divest themselves of all worldly possessions; to observe a strict silence for several years, and to engage never to reveal the mysteries of their profession. The length of time during which silence was to be observed, was from two to five years. The disciples enjoyed a community of goods, and lived together as one family with their wives and

children. The method of life of this society was very uniform. Each day was commenced by deliberating upon the manner in which it should be spent, and closed with a careful retrospect of the events which had occurred. They rose before the sun that they might pay him homage. They made use of music, both vocal and instrumental, to enliven their spirits and to fit them for duty. They first employed several hours in the study of science. Then succeeded an interval of leisure, very generally employed in a solitary walk. Afterwards conversation, and the hour immediately preceding dinner was devoted to athletic exercises. They ate no animal food, and drank no wine. The remainder of the day was devoted to civil and domestic affairs, conversation, bathing and religious ceremonies.[1]

The doctrines of Pythagoras can only be given in general terms, as those of the Pythagorean school. The end which they proposed to attain by philosophy, was to free the mind from all incumbrances, and enable it to contemplate immutable truth, and to attain a knowledge of divine and spiritual objects. This could only be accomplished by successive steps. The first of these was the study of mathematics. This they deemed important, as they regarded it as a science, contemplating objects lying in the middle way between corporeal and incorporeal beings. Of the mathematics, they made two primary divisions. These were number and magnitude. The first, considered abstractedly in itself, constituted the science of arithmetic; considered as applied to some object, music. The second was either considered as at rest, which constituted geometry; or in motion, which constituted astronomy. The importance attached by Pythagoras to the doctrine of numbers, induces the belief that they were used as symbolical or emblematical representations of the first principles and forms of nature, and of eternal and immutable essences, the same to which Plato afterwards gave the name of ideas. These numbers were either

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 220.

scientific or intelligible: the first being the progression of multitude from the monad or unity, and its return to it; the second being those which subsisted in the divine mind before all things, and from which the forms of all things are derived, they ever remaining the same.

The fountain of all number was the monad, or unity. This was a fixed quantity, destitute of number. It was generally understood to denote the active principle in nature or God.

Next came the duad, which was imperfect and passive, and was regarded as the cause of increase and division. It represented matter.

The triad was composed of the monad and duad, partaking of the nature of both. This was represented by the world, which was formed by the monad and duad, or by the joint action of the active and passive principles of nature.

The tetrad, tetractys or quaternion number, was the most perfect. Some have understood by this number the four elements; others, the four faculties of the human mind; and others still, the four cardinal virtues.

The decad, the sum of the four former, was understood to comprehend all arithmetical and musical proportions.

The principle upon which he made use of numbers as symbols, seems to have been, that as numbers proceed from the monad, branching out into various combinations, and assuming new properties in their progress, so the different forms of nature proceed from deity as their common source, and that every degree of distance by which their recession is marked, is accompanied by an assumption of certain properties, in some measure analogous to those of number. He, therefore, concluded that the origin of things, their emanation from the first being, and also their subsequent progress through various orders, might be illustrated by symbols and resemblances borrowed from numbers.

Music was also regarded as an important preparatory exercise, by means of which the mind could be raised above

the dominion of the passions. It was regarded by Pythagoras not only as an art, but also as a science, and susceptible of reduction to mathematical principles and proportions. The invention of the harmonical canon, or monochord (an instrument of a single string furnished with moveable bridges, and contrived for the measuring and adjusting the ratios of musical intervals by accurate divisions) has been very universally ascribed to him. He is also said to have formed a musical scale, and constructed stringed instruments. After his death, his scale, engraved in brass, was preserved in the temple of Juno at Samos.

Music was applied by him to the cure of diseases both bodily and mental. He supposed that the celestial spheres in which the planets moved, striking upon the ether through which they passed, produced a sound, which would vary according to the diversity of their magnitude, velocity and relative distance. Supposing that all the heavenly bodies were so regularly adjusted as to have their varied sounds chime in with the general harmony, he deduced from thence his fanciful doctrine respecting the music of the spheres.

The science of magnitude, in both its branches, was scarcely less cultivated by Pythagoras than that of number. In the division of geometry, or magnitude at rest, he made several discoveries, besides digesting its principles, and reducing it to a more perfect system. He defined a point to be a monad, or unity, with position. He considered a geometrical point as corresponding to unity in arithmetic, a line to two, a superficies to three, and a solid to four.

He is said to have discovered the three following geometrical theorems, viz: 1. That the interior angles of every triangle are together equal to two right angles. 2. That the only polygons which will fill up the whole space about a given point are the equilateral triangle, the square, and the hexagon; the first to be taken six times, the second four, and the third three times. 3. That in rectangular triangles the square of the hypothenuse is equal to

the squares of the two legs, or sides which contain the right angle.[1]

In the division of astronomy, or magnitude in motion, he assigned the middle place in the universe to fire, placing in the midst of the four elements, the fiery globe of unity. He taught that the earth was a globe which admits of antipodes; that it did not exist without motion, and was not situated in the centre of the spheres. He considered it as one of the planets that make their revolutions around the orb of fire, that is the sun. It has, therefore, been inferred that he was possessed of the true ideas of the solar system. He taught that the moon and the planetary globes were habitable.

These studies were considered as preparatory to those embracing moral and theological science. Wisdom, according to Pythagoras, is conversant with those objects which are, in their nature, immutable, eternal and incorruptible. In its pursuit, great care must be taken to raise the mind above the dominion of the passions, and the influence of sensible objects, and to disengage it from all corporeal impressions. The object sought to be attained by this, was to accustom it to hold converse with itself, and to contemplate things spiritual and divine.

Philosophy, in his view, was either practical or theoretical. The study of the first was limited to those things necessary for the purposes of life; while the last was considered as the perfection of wisdom.

Virtue, he divided into public and private. The first he made to embrace the general subjects of education, silence, abstinence from animal food, fortitude, sobriety and prudence. He made the powers of the mind to consist of reason and passion; and virtue resulted from subjecting the latter to the former. He would inure the young to subjection, in order that they might always find it easy to submit to the authority of reason. Habit will soon render the best course of life the most pleasant.

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 224.

Silence is better than idle words. A wise man will prepare himself for everything which is not in his own power. He is surprised at nothing. If you despise the praise of the vulgar, despise also their censure. Sobriety is the strength of the soul, for it preserves its reason unclouded by passion. No man can be free who has not the command of himself. It is inconsistent with fortitude to relinquish the station appointed by the deity, before we obtain his permission.

Public virtue, according to Pythagoras, respects conversation, friendship, religious worship, reverence for the dead, and legislation.

The first he would have adapted to the characters and condition of the persons conversing. That propriety and seasonableness are ever to be regarded. In all society, regard must be had to subordination. It is a proof of a good education to be able to endure the want of it in others. True friendship he held to be a kind of union which is immortal. He taught that the gods were to be worshiped, not under such images as represented the forms of men, but by such symbols as are suitable to their nature, by simple lustrations and offerings, and with purity of heart. Oaths in no case to be violated.

Theoretical philosophy, treating as it did, of nature and origin, was the highest object of study of the Pythagorean school. In the teachings of this philosophy were employed those profound mysteries, and that formidable array of symbols, which have presented so great a puzzle to subsequent philosophers.

As nearly as we can ascertain, Pythagoras taught in respect to God, that he is the universal mind; diffused through all things; the source of all animal life; the proper and intrinsic cause of all motion; in substance similar to light; in nature like truth; the first principle of the universe; incapable of pain; invisible; incorruptible, and only to be comprehended by mind.[1] He conceived God to be

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 227.

a soul pervading all nature, of which every human soul is a portion. He conceived him to be one, not exterior to the world, but pervading the universal sphere, superintending all productions, the support of all nature, eternal, the source of all power, the first simple principle of all things, the origin of celestial light, the father of all, the mind and animating principle of the universe, the first mover of all the spheres. He seems to have conceived the deity to be the informing soul of the world, animating it in a manner very similar to that in which the human soul animates the body. He conceived of him as free from all the properties of gross matter, and as possessing a power of communicating motion, and of forming and directing the universe, with which he is intimately connected as its animating principle.

Subordinate to deity were four orders of intelligence: gods, demons, heroes, men. These were so many emanations from deity, the great fountain of all being. They were emanations at different degrees of proximity from the supreme intelligence, the particles of subtle ether assuming a grosser clothing the farther they receded from the fountain. Heroes were supposed to be invested with a subtle material clothing. A hero was defined to be a rational mind united with a luminous body.

The Pythagoreans supposed the atmosphere to be full of spirits, demons, or heroes, who cause sickness or health, and communicate a knowledge of future events by dreams, and various species of divination. It is asserted that Pythagoras professed to cure diseases by incantations. They supposed the atmosphere to be a gross, immutable, and morbid mass, but the ether surrounding it was thought pure, healthful, serene, perpetually moving, the region of all divine and immortal natures.

Man was taught by the Pythagoreans to be a microcosm, or compendium of the universe, as he was supposed to be made up both of an elementary nature, and a divine or rational principle. These philosophers seem to have made the first attempt at an analysis of the operations and facul-

ties of the mind. They divided it into the understanding and intellectual faculties, which they located in the brain; and the appetites and the will, which they placed in the heart, calling the first a rational, and the last an animal soul. In regard to the latter, they held that he participated with the brutes. They taught that this portion perished, but that the rational part is immortal, because the source whence it is derived is immortal. At death they supposed the rational mind to be freed from the chains that bound it to the body. It then assumed an ethereal vehicle, and passed into the regions of the dead. There it remained until it was sent back to this world to become the inhabitant of some other body, human or brutal. In this manner, by passing through successive purgations, it would become sufficiently purified to be received among the gods, and thus it would return to the eternal source from which it first proceeded.

This doctrine of the transmigration of souls was probably one reason why the Pythagoreans abstained from the use of animal food. It is beautifully expressed by Ovid when he introduces Pythagoras as saying:

> What then is death, but ancient matter drest
> In some new figure, and a varied vest?
> Thus all things are but altered, nothing dies;
> And here and there th' unbodied spirit flies,
> By time, or force, or sickness dispossessed,
> And lodges where it lights, in man or beast;
> Or hunts without, till ready limbs it find,
> And actuates those according to their kind;
> From tenement to tenement is tost,
> The soul is still the same, the figure only lost;
> And as the softened wax new seals receives,
> This face assumes, and that impression leaves;
> Now called by one, now by another name,
> The form is only changed, the wax is still the same:
> So death, thus called, can but the form deface,
> The immortal soul flies out in empty space,
> To seek her fortune in some other place.

The following are some of the Pythagorean maxims: "Adore the sound of the whispering wind. Stir not the fire with a sword. Turn aside from an edged tool. Breed nothing that has crooked talons. Receive not a swallow into your house. Look not in a mirror by the light of a candle. Sleep not at noon. Abstain from beans." Among Pythagorean precepts of more value are: "Above all things govern your tongue. Engrave not the image of God in a ring. Quit not your station without the command of your general. Remember that the paths of virtue and of vice resemble the letter Y."

Empedocles was of the Pythagorean school, and flourished about the eighty-fourth Olympiad. He was a wealthy citizen of Agrigentum in Sicily; and, espousing the popular party, acquired great weight in the state. He possessed skill in medicine and natural philosophy, by which he was enabled to perform wonders and apparent miracles. He also possessed poetical talents.

The following were among his philosophical tenets: "The truth is judged of by reason and not by the senses. The senses intervene to lead the reason to the contemplation of the real nature and immutable essences of things, Nature's first principles are of two kinds, active and passive. The active is unity or God; the passive, matter. The active gives to all things being, animates all things, and is that into which all things are at last resolved. Both men and animals are allied to the deity, for the same spirit which pervades the universe unites all animated beings to itself, and to one another. No animals should, therefore, be killed or eaten. The world is a whole, circumscribed by the revolution of the sun, and surrounded by a mass of inactive matter. The four elements are originally composed of similar atoms, which are indefinitely small, and of a round form. These possessed the primary qualities of friendship and discord, and when the original chaotic mass was agitated, the homogeneous parts were united, the heterogeneous separated, and the four elements composed, of which all bodies are generated. The first

principles of the elements are eternal. Nothing can exist or be annihilated. All the varieties of nature are produced by combination or separation.

In the world's formation ether was first secreted from chaos, then fire, then earth, by the agitation of which were produced water and air. The heavens are a solid body of air, crystalized by fire. The stars are fixed in the crystal of heaven, the planets wander freely beneath it. The sun is a fiery mass, and the moon in the form of a hollow plate. In regard to the soul and the metempsychosis he held to the Pythagorean doctrine already mentioned. He supposed all nature to be subject to the immutable and eternal law of necessity.

There were other philosophers of the Pythagorean school, as Aristæus of Crotona, Feleauges and Mnesarchus, the sons of Pythagoras, Alemæon, Hippo of Rhegium, Hippasus of Metapontum, Ocellus the Lucanian, Timæus the Locrian, Archytas of Tarentum, and Philolaus of Croto or Tarentum, but of these it is unnecessary to speak particularly.

The Pythagorean doctrines excited great influence in Greece, and upon subsequent schools of philosophy. They influenced, to a great extent, the speculations of Plato and of other eminent philosophers, and thus became perpetuated through the schools of philosophy which subsequently flourished.

3. The Eleatic school: Xenophanes, Parmenides, Melissus, Zeno. This was so termed from the place Elea, a city in Magna Græcia, where it originated. Its founder, Xenophanes, was an Ionian, a native of Colophon, and the contemporary of Pythagoras. His life extended through an entire century. Leaving his native country early in life, he went to Sicily where he supported himself for some time by reciting elegiac and iambic verses. He passed from Sicily into Magna Græcia, where he took up the profession of philosophy.

There are but few fragments remaining of the writings of the Eleatic school. From these, however, we are enabled

to perceive that this school, at its starting point, takes a wide departure from all the previous ones. Both the Ionian and the Italic made experience the basis of their arguments; and as their senses made them acquainted with the contingent and the variable, they endeavored to reconcile these with the invariable and the absolute, by referring all to the same original. We have now arrived at a school which boldly asserts that experience exists only in appearance; that the ideas of movement and change are unintelligible; and who derive all knowledge from the mind itself, as the only substantial foundation of truth; who, in fine, identify the deity with the universe, thus originating that monstrous system of pantheism which only attained its full development at subsequent periods.

The Pythagoreans maintained that everything is contained in the infinite unity, and is derived from it. Xenophanes denied the possibility of such production, or emanation. If, said he, anything new has been produced, it has been made out of that which was, or out of that which was not. The last is clearly impossible, for out of nothing, nothing can come. The first is impossible still, for since it already was, it could not have been made. Setting out, therefore, with the impossibility of any production whatever, he taught that whatever is, always has been from eternity, without deriving its existence from any prior principle. All is immutable and eternal. He regarded all nature as subject to the same law of unity. God, as being the most perfect essence, is eternally one, unalterable, and always consistent with himself. He can neither be regarded as finite or infinite, as movable or immovable. He cannot be represented under any human semblance. He is all hearing, all sight, all thought; and his form is spherical. He may be regarded as the first philosopher who divested the deity of the unworthy images under which he had been represented.[1] He taught that nature is one and without limit; and that what is one is

[1] *Tenneman's History of Philosophy*, 71, 72.

similar in all its parts, otherwise it would be many. It is not easy to understand what, according to Xenophanes, are the precise relations between the deity and the universe; whether he believed the deity to be the soul of the world, or whether it was a system resembling that of Spinoza, who supposed all the appearances in nature to be only modifications of one material substance. The more prevailing opinion is that he held the universe to be one in nature and substance, but distinguished between the matter of which all things consists; and that latent, divine force, which, though not a distinct substance, but an attribute, is necessarily inherent in the universe, and is the cause of all its perfection.

Parmenides was a native of Elea and a disciple of Xenophanes. He is represented as an eminent pattern of virtue. His doctrines were contained in a poem on nature, of which only some fragments have come down to us. He enlarged upon the system of Xenophanes. He maintained that the perception of truth was a matter of mere intellection, and belonged to the understanding alone; and that the senses could afford only a deceptive appearance of it. He, therefore, held to a system of true and apparent knowledge, the one resulting from the understanding, the other from the senses. In the first he begins with the idea of pure existence, which he identifies with thought and knowledge, and concludes that non-existence can never be possible. He held that all things which exist are one and identical; that existence consequently has no commencement, is invariable, indivisible, pervades all space, and is limited only by itself, and that all movement or change exists only in appearance. That nothing in nature is either produced or destroyed, but merely appears so to the senses. He held, however, that there was a uniform manner in which objects presented themselves to the senses.

To account for this appearance conveyed by the senses, he assumed the existence of two principles, that of heat or light, and that of cold or darkness, denominating the first ethereal fire and the second the earth. The first is

pervading and active, the second dense and heavy. The first is positive and real, the intellectual element; the second, the negative element, or as he styled it a limitation of the former. From these he derived his doctrine of changes which he applied even to the phenomena of the mind. The frame of the world he supposed liable to decay, but that the universe itself remains the same, and that the chief seat of the soul is the heart.

Melissus was of Samos, and a disciple of Parmenides. He acquired influence in affairs of state, had at one time the command of a fleet, and even gained a victory over the Athenians in a naval engagement. He adopted the same system of idealism with Parmenides, but stated it with greater distinctness and boldness. He maintained that whatever really existed could not either be produced or perish; that it exists without having either commencement or end; that it is infinite, and, consequently, one, invariable, not composed of parts, and indivisible. This doctrine implies a denial of the existence of bodies, and of the dimensions of space. He claimed that all that our senses present to us is nothing more than an appearance, and is entirely beyond the limits of real knowledge. He held that there was neither vacuum nor motion in the universe, nor any such thing as production or decay.

Zeno, called the Eleatic, to distinguish him from Zeno the Stoic, is the last we shall mention, as belonging to the Eleatic school. He was a dialectician, and laid the foundations of a system of logic, of which he was the first teacher. Being fond of argumentation, he presented the doctrine of this school under the critical and polemic form.

In defending the idealism of the Eleatic school he objected to the empiric realism of the former schools. 1. Because if we admit a plurality of real essences, we must also admit them to possess qualities which are mutually destructive of each other. As instances of this he gave similitude and dissimilitude; unity and plurality; movement and repose. 2. We cannot form an idea of the divisibility of an extended object without a contradiction being

involved; because the parts must be either simple or compounded. In the first the body has no magnitude, and ceases to exist. In the second it has no unity, being at the same time finite and infinite. 3. Innumerable difficulties result from the supposition of motion in space. If such motion be allowed to be possible, the consequence is, that infinite space must, in a given time, be traversed. 4. We cannot form a notion of space as an object, without conceiving it to be situated in another space, and so on *ad infinitum*.

He denies that the absolute unity required by the understanding as a character of real existence, is in any sort to be recognized in the objects of the senses.[1]

The following is Zeno's argument against motion: "No motion can be made through any space whatever, unless the movable first pass through a less, before a greater space; but what part of space soever you shall please to assign, still there will be another less part, and another less than that, and so up to infinity; therefore there can be no motion at all, since it can never begin at a space so little as that no less can remain."[2]

Zeno, by opposing reason to experience, laid the foundation of that skeptical philosophy, which was subsequently more fully developed in the Pyrrhonic or Skeptic school.

The labors of the Eleatic school served to push into their legitimate results some of the more concealed doctrines of the Pythagorean. The latter school, for instance, held to the doctrine of emanations. The former replied that, as in the system of emanation, what appeared to begin to exist already, before existed; the production could be only apparent. It further replied, that if there was no real production, all distinct individual existence is also nothing but a mere phenomenon. Thus the germ of pantheism is found to be contained in the doctrine of emanation.

[1] *Tenneman's History of Philosophy*, 74, 75. [2] *Physiologia, or Doctrine of Atoms*, 23.

It cannot, however, be denied to the Eleatic school, that it made the first attempt to correct the conceptions and representations of sense, by the pure notions of reason, or at least to reduce them to their true value. It was this school that first abstracted the pure speculative element of thought from all that is incidental in its concrete appearance, and thus awoke consciousness to a truer notion of philosophy. But its philosophers failed to perceive the difference between the conditional and the unconditional, and hence could not but succeed imperfectly, if at all, in the attempt to abstract from the sensible appearance, the perfect knowledge of true being.[1]

4. The Heraclitean school; Heraclitus. This sect or school was a derivative from the Pythagorean, and was instituted at Ephesus by Heraclitus. He was of a grave and melancholy disposition, and as he wept over the follies of mankind, he has been called by some the weeping philosopher. He lived in solitude, fed upon fruits and plants, and died of a dropsy. His writings are full of obscurity, whence he obtained the name of the dark, an epithet he seemed to desire.

According to him, reason is the judge of the truth, by means of the senses. It is derived by inspiration from that which surrounds us. The senses are obstructed in dreaming, and the connection of the mind with that which surrounds us is interrupted. The connection is restored, and the power of reason returns on waking.

He sought to discover an elemental principle, which should have an universal application, and this he found in the element of fire. This was the most subtle and active of the elements. He attributed to it an universal agency, and asserted it to be the foundation of all things.

The universe, in his opinion, was a fire continually kept alive, but having alternations of decay and resuscitation, according to fixed laws. From this he deduced the variability, or perpetual flux of things, in which consists the

[1] *Ritter*, I, 523, 524.

life of animals. All formation and dissolution was accomplished by fire. It began the work of creation by boiling the water, and reducing it to vapor. From this all bodies derived their origin, the stars being produced by the purest vapors. Even the soul was made from the evaporations of humidity, and thus its matter continually ascending and surrounding the bodies of men, enters by the channel of their organs, and continues there in continual agitation. The excellence of the soul he maintained to consist in its aridity, or freedom from aqueous particles. The universe he maintained to be full of souls and dæmons, endowed with a portion of this all-pervading fire.

The origin of changes he referred to two principles, viz: discord and concord, and their mutual opposition according to fixed laws of fate. Although he introduced into his system the term god, yet he seems not to have understood by it a distinct being, of a peculiar nature, but merely that innate force in the primary fire, by means of which its particles have been in eternal motion, and have at length united to form the present regular system of nature. The soul, he considered, by its consanguinity to the divine mind, to be capable, by abstraction, of recognizing the universal, and the true; whereas, by the exercise of the organs of the senses, it perceives only what is variable and individual.

In regard to morals, he taught that the end of life is to enjoy happiness; that to this end the body should enjoy repose, and confine its wants within the narrowest possible limits; that it is of more importance for men to know themselves, than to acquire extensive learning; that human life is the death of the soul, as while in the body it is confined and depressed, and never gains its true freedom and activity until it returns to the divine nature from which it comes.

He held temperance as the first virtue, and the following of nature as the first wisdom. That all human laws are founded upon one divine law of necessity, which governs all things. Although the obscurity veiling the

writings of Heraclitus, has probably prevented his philosophy, as a system, from being very fully appreciated; yet there is no doubt but that many hints were furnished by him from which Plato and the Stoics have derived some valuable materials.

5. The Atomic school; Leucippus, Democritus. This school has been regarded and treated by some as the physical branch of the Eleatic, that which has already been considered being looked upon as the metaphysical branch of the same school. The distinct announcement of the atomic theory, has, with others, been deemed sufficient to justify the separate consideration of it, and the ranking it as a distinct sect or school.

The first idea of the atomic system was suggested by Leucippus, improved by Democritus, and afterwards carried to as high a degree of perfection as it would admit by Epicurus. The idea in which it originated was to leave behind the train of numbers, ideas, proportions, qualities, and elementary forms, which had really been only so many refuges of ignorance, and to examine the real constitution of the material world, and inquire into the mechanical properties of bodies. The great object was to restore the alliance between reason and the senses, which metaphysical subtleties had dissolved.

The atomic theory, in its simplicity, introduced the doctrine of indivisible atoms, possessing within themselves a principle of motion. Other philosophers had considered matter as divisible into indefinitely small particles, but the founders of this school were the first to teach that these particles were originally destitute of all qualities except figure and motion. By attributing a principle of motion to the indivisible particles of matter, they sought to account for the production of all natural phenomena without the intervention of deity.

Leucippus taught that the universe is in part a plenum and in part a vacuum. The first contains atoms of various figures, which falling into the second, struck against each other producing curvilinear motions, which continued until

atoms of similar forms met together, and bodies were produced. The atoms being of equal weight, and too numerous to move in circles, the smaller rose to the exterior parts of the vacuum, whilst the larger entangling themselves, formed a spherical shell which revolved about its centre, including within itself all kinds of bodies. This gradually increasing formed the earth. The spherical shell being constantly supplied with new bodies, gathered up from without, some in their combination formed humid masses, which, becoming dry by their circular motion and being ignited, became stars. The sun was formed in the same manner in the exterior surface of the shell, and the moon in its interior. In this manner the world was formed; and, by an inversion of the process, it will at length be dissolved.[1]

Democritus, a native of Abdera in Thrace was the successor of Leucippus. He was cotemporary with Socrates. Anaxagoras, Archelaus, Parmenides, Zeno, and Protagoras. He spent many years in traveling, and acquiring the wisdom and knowledge scattered over many countries. He has been called the laughing philosopher, because he was accustomed, it has been said, to laugh at the follies of mankind. Among his fellow citizens he was called the derider. He lived a life devoted to the acquisition of knowledge, and his chasteness, temperance and sobriety extended it far beyond the usual period. He lived more than an hundred years, and then died through mere decay. He wrote much, but none of his works have come down to us.

In physics, Democritus taught that existence can never be produced by that which has no existence, nor can it ever be annihilated. Hence, whatever is, must be self-existent. The first principles of all things are atoms and a vacuum. Neither of these is produced from the other. They both have the character of infinity, atoms in number, vacuum in magnitude.

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 245.

Atoms are solid, and have the properties of figure, magnitude, motion, and weight. Their figures are various. They differ in magnitude, but are solid, indivisible and unalterable.

These have been eternally moving *in vacuo*, and that motion is of one kind, perpetually deviating from a right line. This kind of motion brings them into continual collision with each other. From this arises innumerable combinations of particles; and hence the various forms of things. These primary particles are thus moved and united by a natural necessity, and this constitutes the fate that creates and governs the world.

According to this doctrine, an organized body is produced, when those atoms, which are in their nature fitted to produce it, happen to be arranged suitable for that purpose. When this arrangement is diversified, an alteration takes place; if it be entirely destroyed, the result is dissolution.

He held that the qualities of bodies are not essential to their nature, but are merely the effect of arrangement, that bitterness and sweetness, for example, are not properties essential to bodies but mere effects produced upon the senses in consequence of the various arrangement of atoms.

The worlds that people infinite space are subject to growth, decay, and destruction. They have no animating principle, but all things are moved by the rapid agitation of atoms, as by an universally penetrating fire. The earth has been increasing in density, the sea is decreasing and will at length be dried up.

Democritus taught that the soul is the result of a combination of round or fiery particles; that it consists of two parts, the one seated in the breast, which is the rational; the other diffused through the whole body, which is the irrational. The soul is mortal, perishing with the body, but human bodies which perish, will revive.

He introduced the hypothesis of images, a species of emanation from external objects, which make an impression on our senses, and from the influence of which he deduced sensation and thought.

Democritus admitted no other soul of the world than one similar to that which he allowed to man, which was nothing more than a certain blind force, resulting from the combination of subtle atoms, of a round form, which produces fire. He differed from former philosophers, concerning atoms, in that they conceived of them as endowed with various qualities; whereas, he taught that the qualities of bodies did not arise from any essential difference in the nature of the atoms, but were due to the mere effect of arrangement.

He taught that there are two kinds of knowledge; one obscure, the other genuine. The first he derived entirely from the senses; the last from the exercise of thought upon the nature of things. He was accustomed to say that truth lay in a deep well, from which it is the office of reason to draw it up.

The moral doctrine of Democritus was essentially the same with that of Epicurus, which is subsequently considered. In the school of the latter is also to be sought the full development of the doctrine of atoms.

6. The school of the Sophists; Gorgias, Protagoras, Prodicus, Hippias. A variety of causes operating upon the Grecian mind led the way to the existence of the sophists. In Athens, all sorts of knowledge were most rapidly diffused. Almost every variety of speculative system was promulgated. Comparatively little attention was paid to the data upon which principles and conclusions were grounded. The great effort was to teach the principles and conclusions, and these were commended by their splendor, almost, or quite, equally with their truth.

The results to which the schools had arrived naturally led to skepticism, and the perversion of philosophy. The Atomic school had expelled God from the universe, and supplied his place by the blind force of atoms. The Eleatic school had opposed reason to experience, and thus thrown doubt upon the reality of things. The Athenian mind still possessed the elements of intense activity. Whether right or wrong it must still go forward. Hence

the school of the sophists was the natural, perhaps the inevitable result.

This school was made up of a class of persons who possessed a merely superficial and seeming knowledge, to the profession of which they were influenced by merely interested motives. The principal of these were Gorgias, Protagoras, Prodicus and Hippias.

The first was a celebrated orator of Leontium, a disciple of Empedocles. In his work on nature, he endeavored to demonstrate by certain subtle arguments, that nothing really exists; nothing which can be known, or which can be communicated by means of words.

Protagoras was a native of Abdera, originally a porter to carry loads upon his back. He attracted the attention of Democritus by the skill and mathematical precision with which he was accustomed to arrange these loads, and was instructed by him in the principles of his philosophy. He afterwards acquired reputation at Athens for his eloquence. The doctrines he taught are probably a fair exposition of those of the sophists.

He taught that contradictory arguments may be advanced upon every subject, no satisfactory truth being clearly settled as to any subject.

He held that all natural objects are perpetually varying; that they are liable to such continual fluctuation that nothing can be certainly known concerning them; that the senses convey different reports to different persons, and even to the same person at different times; and that, nevertheless, we have no other criterion of truth than our own perception, and cannot know that anything is otherwise than it appears to our senses, which are the essence of the soul. As his general conclusion upon these premises, he held that nothing can be pronounced to exist, but that which is at any instant perceived by the senses; and that since these are perpetually or incessantly varying, things themselves vary accordingly; so that upon the same evidence, that of the senses, contradictory opinions may be advanced. The main point in his philosophy, therefore,

was that man himself is the only measure, or criterion of all things.[1]

He wrote "concerning the gods, I am wholly unable to determine whether they have any existence or not; for the weakness of the human understanding, and the shortness of human life, with many other causes, prevent us from attaining this knowledge." This and other similar expressions led to his banishment from Attica, as a disbeliever in the gods.

The sophists were, in general, well practiced in the art of speaking, were more or less acquainted with dialectics, criticism, rhetoric and politics, but were totally devoid of any real love of philosophy. They desired to distinguish themselves by the show of pretended universal knowledge; by solving questions intricate, fanciful and useless; and to accumulate money by teaching the art of persuasion. They contrived certain logical tricks of a kind to perplex their antagonists; and, without possessing in any degree the spirit of philosophy, they maintained all sorts of philosophical theories. The result of all this fully carried out must be to destroy all difference between truth and error.

Thus we have arrived at the perversion of all philosophy. The age required a redeeming spirit. Hence the advent of Socrates.

The second period of Grecian philosophy. The Socratic school; Socrates.

Crito, a wealthy Athenian, was one day passing the small work shop of a sculptor, where a young man was busily employed at his trade. His attention was particularly attracted towards him, as he remembered to have seen him listening with profound attention to the philosophical lectures of Anaxagoras and Archelaus. He entered into conversation with him, and was charmed with his talent as well as modesty. With a generosity worthy of all imitation, he bestowed on the intelligent

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 252.

youth the means of pursuing his studies without need for further manual labor. The name of this youth was Socrates.

This distinguished individual, who opened a new era in the history of philosophy, was born at Athens, in the year B. C. 470, and was the son of a poor sculptor named Sophroniscus, and of Phænarete, a midwife. With no advantages of birth, and very few of education, he presents a remarkable example of one, who by mere force of native talent, self-directed, succeeded in attaining a position which has excited both the wonder and admiration of all succeeding ages. The period of time at which he appeared was little calculated to offer him any inducements to follow the course he seems early to have resolved upon. Athens was at that time the seat of great splendor, and of a profligacy the more dangerous, as it was accompanied with the highest degree of refinement in taste and intellect. A wide-spread corruption in manners, was very appropriately accompanied by the philosophy of the sophist, then in the acme of its popularity, which confounded truth and error, and, aspiring at universal knowledge, really destroyed the foundations of all knowledge.

There is some difficulty in arriving at the precise character and merit of Socrates. He left behind him no writings. He never seems to have made any written record of his thoughts or opinions. He had no regular system or method of lecturing. He neither studied nor practiced any of the arts of speech. But his life was one of continued conversation. His time was almost entirely passed in public. In the gymnasia, in the agora, in the markets and courts, even in the workshops of the citizens, he was found constantly pouring out his ceaseless stream of conversation, reprobating vice in every form, and teaching men to respect and practice virtue. Occasionally he would collect an audience about him in the lyceum, which was a pleasant meadow on the border of the Illissus. At others, he would converse in a familiar way with any of his fellow citizens in places of common resort, or with his friends at

meals, or in their hours of amusement, thus making every place a school of virtue.

He would receive no compensation for his teaching. He would never admit that he was a teacher. He would accept of no presents from the wealthy. Everything sent to him beyond what was necessary for a bare subsistence, he would return. He traveled about with bare feet, and wore the same clothing summer and winter. He never failed to reprove vice wherever he found it, whether among the high or low.

He was the founder of no sect or school in philosophy, although we have termed his the Socratic school. His was rather a movement than a school. He was the first who successfully taught and practiced reflection. He looked at things from a different point of view from preceding philosophers. Thales and the Ionic school took outward nature as a starting point, dealing more in physics. Pythagoras and the Italic school, the first and original cause of things, and hence ran more into theology. Socrates assumed human nature as the starting point for his observation, and hence he was led along the line of psychology.

His great merit consists in teaching men how to think aright; in laying a correct foundation of morals; in purifying the fountains of knowledge; in giving right views of duty; in expanding into life and vigor man's moral, as well as his intellectual nature. The general method which he adopted to accomplish all this was by familiar conversation, often by question and answer. By this method he confounded the sophist, reprobated the vicious, encouraged the worthy, and instructed the ignorant. Protagoras, the sophist, could expatiate for hours, with a specious and showy eloquence, but in attempting to answer the close questions of Socrates he soon rendered it fully apparent that all was nothing more than pretension.

His method was first to obtain the assent of his antagonist to some proposition apparently true; and then by leading him off on to things that were nearly related to it,

finally terminate in his contradicting himself, or denying the truth of the proposition he had started with affirming. His illustrations were drawn from the most familiar objects, and his comparisons such as could be readily understood by the most common mind. The great beauty of his discourses and teachings, that which lent them their peculiar charm, was that they were eminently practical. His philosophy was the hand-maid of common sense. The duties of the citizen and the man, the affairs of every day life, the homely virtues of temperance, sobriety and justice, were those which he principally illustrated and enforced. He had no respect for theories that had not for their object and end the attainment of some practical good.

Socrates had three classes of listeners. The first were neither philosophers, nor did they possess any inclination to study philosophy. They attended upon him merely as a moral preceptor, and as a means of improving their minds, and of fitting them for public stations to which their ambition led them to aspire. Such were Alcibiades and Critias, Evenes and Euripides, Lysias and Isocrates. The second class included all those who were professed philosophers, and, subsequent to his death, became founders of particular sects or schools. Such were Aristippus, the founder of the Cyrenaic sect; Phædo, of the Eliac; Euclid of the Cynic. The third class embraced all those disciples of the Megaric; Plato of the Academic, and Antisthenes of Socrates, who, although philosophers, did not institute any new sect or school. Among these were Xenophon, Æschines, Simon and Cebes, the first of whom was illustrious as a writer, and a warrior in conducting the retreat of the ten thousand Greeks through the heart of the Persian empire back to Greece. What remains to us of the sayings of Socrates are to be found in *The Memorabilia of Socrates* by Xenophon, and also in the works of Plato. The former relates his dialogues with great simplicity, while the latter is supposed to have occasionally mingled his own doctrines with those of his master.

Take the following as a specimen of the method of Socrates, taken from Xenophon's memoirs of Socrates.[1] Aristippus, thinking to puzzle Socrates with a question, proposed this: "If he knew anything that was good?" What, said he, "Aristippus, do you ask me if I know anything good for a fever?" "No, not so," returned the other. "For an inflammation in the eye?" "Nor that, Socrates." "Do you mean anything good against a famine?" "No, nor against a famine." "Nay, then," replied Socrates, "if you ask me concerning a good, which is good for nothing, I know of none such; nor yet desire it." Aristippus still urging him: "But do you know," said he, "anything beautiful?" "A great many," returned Socrates. "Are these all like one another?" "Far from it, Aristippus: there is a very considerable difference between them." "But how can beauty differ from beauty?" "We want not many examples of it," replied Socrates, "for the same disposition of the body which is beautiful in him who runs, is not beautiful in the wrestler; and while the beauty of the shield is to cover him well who wears it, that of the dart is to be swift and piercing." "But you return," said Aristippus, "the same answer to this question as you did to the former." "And why not, Aristippus? for do you suppose there can be any difference between beautiful and good? Know you not, that whatever is beautiful, is for the same reason, good? And we cannot say of anything, of virtue, for example, that on this occasion it is good, and on the other beautiful. Likewise, in describing the virtuous character, say we not of it, 'It is fair and good?' Even the bodies of men are said to be fair and good, with respect to the same purposes; and the same we declare with whatever else we meet with, when suited to the use for which it was intended." "You would, perhaps, then, call a dunghill cart beautiful?" "I would," said Socrates, "if made proper for the purpose; as I would call the shield ugly, though made of gold, that answered not the end for

[1] *Xenophon's Works*, 569.

which it was designed." "Possibly you will say too," returned Aristippus, "that the same thing is both handsome and ugly." "In truth I will," said Socrates, "and I will go still further and add, that the same thing may be both good and evil; for I can easily suppose that which is good in the case of hunger may be evil in a fever; since what would prove a cure for the one, will certainly increase the malignity of the other; and in the same manner will beauty, in the wrestler, change to deformity in him who runneth. For whatsoever is suited to the end intended, with respect to that end it is good and fair; and contrariwise, must be deemed evil and deformed, when it defeats the purpose it was designed to promote."

It would be found no easy matter to give the doctrine of Socrates. All that can be done with safety towards doing it, would be to collect from his remains, as they are found in Xenophon and Plato, such expressions or remarks of his, as show what his belief was upon any point or principle. Thus, in his dialogues with Aristodemus and with Enthydemus, he thus speaks in reference to a supreme being: "Reflect that your own mind directs your body by its volitions, and you must be convinced that the intelligence of the universe disposes of all things according to his pleasure. Can you imagine that your eye is capable of discerning distant objects, and that the eye of God cannot, at the same instant, see all things; or that, whilst your mind contemplates the affairs of different countries, the understanding of God cannot attend at once to all the affairs of the universe? Such is the nature of the divinity: that he sees all things, hears all things, is everywhere present, and constantly superintends all events. He who disposes and directs the universe, who is the source of all that is fair and good, who, amid successive changes, preserves the course of nature unimpaired, and to whose laws all beings are subject, this supreme deity, though himself invisible, is manifestly seen in his magnificent operations. Learn, then, from the things which are produced, to infer the existence of an invisible power, and to reverence the divinity."

Socrates seems also to have believed in the existence of beings occupying a rank below that of the divinity, to whom were to be ascribed the ordinary phenomena of nature, and who were concerned in the management of human affairs. Speaking of these, he says: "Let it suffice you, whilst you observe their works, to revere and honor the gods; and be persuaded, that this is the way in which they make themselves known; for, among all the gods who bestow blessings upon men, there are none who, in the distribution of their favors, make themselves visible to mortals." He regarded thunder, wind, and other agents of nature, as the servants of God.

Concerning the best mode of worshiping the gods, he says: "The man who honors the gods according to his ability, ought to be cheerful, and hope for the greatest blessings; for from whom may we reasonably entertain higher expectations, than from those who are most able to serve us? or how can we secure their kindness, but by pleasing them? or how please them better than by obedience?"

There was one peculiarity which should be mentioned, and that is the genius, or dæmon, which attended him, and which is known as the dæmon of Socrates. The office of this dæmon was to forewarn him from entering upon some proposed project or plan of operations. It was no part of its duty to urge him to the performance of any act. It is not very well agreed upon by authors, as to whom or what this genius or dæmon was. It was conceived of as a secret voice, a sign, or a sudden inspiration that took possession of him. Its whisperings not only concerned himself, but extended also to his friends, and when they communicated to him some proposed plan or purpose of theirs, often dissuaded from entering upon it. Many who neglected these forewarnings, but persisted in their purpose, had afterwards abundant occasion to regret they had not heeded the voice of the faithful monitor.

What this was is by no means agreed, but it was probably the instinctive suggestions of a wisdom which could

read something of the future in the light of the past and present; which from an intimate acquaintance with the acts of men and their consequences, could arm itself with a prescience in reference to the future, and from ill-judged arrangements predict that evil consequences would follow.

According to Xenophon, Socrates taught that the human soul is allied to the divine being, not by a participation of essence, but by a similarity of nature; that man excels all other animals in the faculty of reason, and that the existence of good men will be continued after death, in a state in which they will receive the reward of their virtue. This dialogue on the immortality of the soul as given by Plato, which occurs after his condemnation and in view of a speedy termination of his existence here, cannot fail to impress any one strongly with the sincerity of his belief in the soul's immortality.

But the great business of his life was the teaching of morality, which he based upon religion. The first principles of virtuous conduct are, according to him, the laws of God, because no man can depart from them with impunity. "It is possible," says he, "for men to screen themselves from the penalty of human laws, but no man can be unjust or ungrateful without suffering for his crime; hence, I conclude, that these laws must have proceeded from a more excellent legislator than man.

He taught that true felicity is not to be derived from external possessions, but from wisdom, which consists in the knowledge and practice of virtue; that the cultivation of virtuous manners is necessarily attended with pleasure, as well as profit; that the honest man alone is happy; and that it is absurd to attempt to separate things which are in nature so closely united as virtue and interest.[1]

All the teachings of Socrates evince the recasting, almost the recreating of philosophy. This great element of humanity had now run the first cycle in its history. Commencing with the dynamical philosophy, the Ionic school, it

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 102.

regarded all in the world as replete with a divine life; that the primal substance of all things must be something infinite and sensuously imperceptible, something like a soul which embraces and governs all, in the same manner as we ourselves are cherished and governed by our soul; that the constant harmony existing among all things proves the invariable unity of their principles; that this unity must be infinite; that the world, according to Heraclitus, is an eternal, ever living being, in whose vitality itself there is involved a tendency to contraries, thus carrying the dynamical theory to its highest possible flight.

The mechanical philosophy, on the other hand, regarded the changing phenomena of composition and decomposition of bodies as operated by the motion of their elementary parts. The ground of motion and production was regarded as an infinite, immortal, divine substance, and finally with Anaxagoras the position was taken that the nature of everything is permanent, and that therefore nothing is changeable.

In the meantime the Italic school, under Pythagoras, awoke to the idea that there is a moral power in the universe, maintaining that production is infinite, and that the more perfect is evolved from the less perfect, but referring all the mundane phenomena to moral ends and designs, to a true inner virtue in which respect this school was peculiar.

The atomic theory was destructive of the unity of the world, of the soul, and of consciousness, resolving every thing into a vague multiplicity of atoms. Its natural result was the entire abandonment of life to accident and chance.

The school of the sophists constituted the appropriate finale of this cycle in the history of philosophy. By maintaining that every thought is true for him who entertains it, and that its acceptance as true by others, depends not on anything inherent in itself, but on the force and speciousness with which it is urged; it effectually broke down all moral distinctions, and left nothing but intellect to guide and govern the world.

Hence the advent of Socrates was a moral necessity. By the ancients his school was considered a moral school, probably because as contradistinguished from previous schools the moral element largely predominated. No philosopher before him had asserted the doctrine of a truly intelligent deity without any dualism, and without either physical limitation or pantheistic annihilation of individuality. All before him had confounded nature with intelligence. He first maintained that reason is above nature, and that the natural is merely subservient to intellectual ends. Both in reference to individuals, and to the movements of the universe, he sought to establish intelligence and design as the sole, true and ruling principle. He called attention to the fact that the best is always the unseen, which is noticeable only in its effects; and that the soul, which is the ruling principle within us, and participates in the divine nature, cannot by any means be discerned. That man should recognize the operations of the deity within him, for that the gods have implanted in man's mind a knowledge of their power. He asserted that in the universal reason there was a something corresponding to the reason within us, and that all is formed for some wise end. As his great mission was to awake the human mind to reflection, he could not avoid perceiving that among the thoughts and feelings that successively occupied his mind there were many that presented themselves involuntarily, and which being unable to derive from any agency of his own, he referred to a divine source. He deduced the immortality of the soul from the divinity within man, the intelligence which governs the whole world, and the worthlessness of the body, except so far as it is a mean subservient to the reason. That as sensual enjoyment arises from the mere gratification of wants, he who has the fewest of them approaches most nearly to the gods. In regard to mere physics, he maintained that all the objects in nature are only so far worth knowing as they are capable of being traced to some intellectual thought and design. What he mainly sought was to implant in

the minds of his disciples the living and pregnant thought, to fix in their minds firmly the belief that the intrinsic value of every branch of knowledge can only be tested by its agreement with all others, and that every thought of man must give an account of itself, and must have its root in the knowledge of himself and the deity.

Socrates never failed to enforce his preaching by his practice. His life was his philosophy. The presence of a man so pure, so honest, so fearless, so inflexible in regard to right; whose doctrines of high and pure morality were unceasingly pouring forth upon the public ear, and whose life was furnishing to his doctrines a daily commentary, was a constant, living reproach to the vicious and dissolute in Athens, many of whom stood high in public station. He deprived the sophists of their scholars and emoluments. They could never encounter him without being overthrown, and hence their hostility was incessant and implacable. All things seeming to conspire to a favorable result, an accusation was lodged against him in the senate by one Melitus, sustained by Anytus and Lycon. His accusation, in strange contradiction with his life, was that he violated the laws in not acknowledging the gods which the state acknowledges, in introducing new divinities, and in corrupting the youth of Athens. He made his own defense before his judges, bold, manly, and truthful, but he was condemned by a vote of 281 to 275. His sentence was to drink the hemlock, a species of poison. He heard his sentence with calmness, and as he left his judges, he uttered these words; "An unjust sentence is no dishonor to me; on those who have pronounced it falls the shame; for I know well that all future time will testify, as the past has done, that no one ever suffered injustice from me; that no one was a worse man through my agency; but that it was always my endeavor, without fee or reward, to benefit all who conversed with me, and to make them wiser and better men."

His death afforded the best commentary on his life. The same calmness and composure, the same self-posses-

sion, the same serenity of countenance, the same strict regard to virtue and justice continued to the end; his last discourse or conversation with his disciples being on the day of his death, and the subject of it, the immortality of the soul. This is given by Plato. He drank of the hemlock, and died in the seventieth year of his age.

Thus perished a martyr to philosophy. Although he wrote nothing, yet he stamped his impress strongly upon the age. Although he formed no school, yet he originated the movement which gave life and being to subsequent schools. Although he could not, perhaps, be said to originate a philosophy having its own distinctive characteristics, yet he originated a method and laid a foundation embracing the seeds and germs of all philosophy.

The first thing to be noticed as the result of the Socratic movement is the minor schools or essays towards the organization of philosophy as evidenced in the partial systems which immediately came into being. These may very properly be termed fragmentary, as they contain only some few of the elements which were subsequently combined in the other schools with a more extended system of ideas. Thus, one class of these detached from the fundamental doctrines of Socrates some fragments or portions, adulterating them with other ideas or notions elsewhere obtained; and, by more fully developing them, prepared the way for subsequent systems much more celebrated. To this will be found to belong the cynic and Cyrenaic. Another class may be considered as little more than a continuation of systems which existed anterior to the age of Socrates, but which were modified by the influence of the Socratic philosophy. Examples of this are furnished in the skeptic and Megaric.

Under these partial systems of the Socratic may be mentioned:

1. The Cynic school; Antisthenes, Diogenes. The founder of this school was Antisthenes, originally a disciple of Gorgias, but afterwards a friend and admirer of Socrates. His place of instruction was without the walls of the

city, at a place called the Cynosargum, or temple of the white dog, whence the term cynic is derived.

He borrowed from Socrates the idea that man's supreme good should be placed in virtue, and the great object and end of the cynic school was to develop that idea. But he gave to it only a partial definition. He defined it to consist in abstinence and privations, by means of which we could assure our independence of external objects. By such a course, he maintained that man can reach the highest perfection, the most absolute felicity, and become like to the deity. He taught that nothing is so beautiful as virtue, and nothing so deformed as vice. That all other things are indifferent, and consequently unworthy our efforts to attain them.

He identified wisdom with virtue. He held that a wise man was always contented with his condition, and would live rather according to the precepts of virtue, than according to the laws or customs of his country. Whatever is honorable, is good; whatever is disgraceful, is evil. Virtue is the only bond of friendship. The love of pleasure is a temporary madness.

He accommodated his own manners to his doctrine. He wore no other garment than a coarse cloak, suffered his beard to grow, and carried about with him a wallet and staff like a wandering beggar. He subsisted on the simplest diet, and refrained from all effeminate pleasures. The cynics discarded all dialectic, physical and mathematical speculations, confining themselves to the study and practice of virtue. It was rather an institution of manners than a school of philosophy. The sole object in view, was to subdue the passions, and produce simplicity of manners.

The following are among the maxims and apothegms ascribed to Antisthenes: "As rust consumes iron, so doth envy consume the heart of man. That state is hastening to ruin, in which no difference is made between good and bad men. The harmony of brethren is a stronger defense than a wall of brass. A wise man converses with the

wicked, as a physician with the sick; not to catch the disease, but to cure it. A philosopher gains at least one thing from his manner of life, a power of conversing with himself. The most necessary part of learning is, to unlearn our errors. The man who is afraid of another is a slave." In his work on physics, he says: "The gods of the people are many, but the god of nature is one."

By a practical joke he hastened the reaction that occurred at Athens after the death of Socrates. Some young men from Pontus, attracted by the reputation of Socrates, came to Athens to attend upon his instructions. They arrived some time after his execution. Antisthenes publicly introduced them to Anytus, one of his persecutors, who was a leather-dresser, assuring them at the same time, that he far exceeded Socrates in wisdom. The circumstance, and the bitterness of the sarcasm awoke the Athenian mind to a sense of the injustice that had been done, and Melitus was condemned and executed, and Anytus sent into banishment.

Diogenes may probably be regarded as the most perfect representative of the cynic philosophy. He was of Sinope, a city of Pontus, and was the disciple of Antisthenes. He wore a coarse cloak; carried a wallet and staff, made the porticoes and other public places his habitation, and depended upon casual contributions for his daily bread. He is said to have taken up his abode in a tub, or large open vessel, in consequence of a friend not executing his order and procuring him a cell as promptly as he desired. In this tub, and while sitting in the sun, Alexander the Great is said to have paid him a visit, when the following dialogue took place. The king came up to him and said, "I am Alexander the Great." The philosopher immediately replied: "And I am Diogenes the Cynic." Alexander then requested him to inform him if there was any service he could render him. "Yes," said he, "not to stand between me and the sun." Alexander said to his attendants. "If I were not Alexander, I would be Diogenes."

He inculcated a hardy patience of labor and pain, frugality, temperance, and an utter contempt of pleasure. He practiced the most hardy self-control, and the most rigid abstinence. In his old age he was taken by pirates who carried him to Crete, and there exposed him to sale. When asked by the auctioneer what he could do, he said, "I can govern men, therefore sell me to one who wants a master." He was purchased by Xeniades, a Corinthian, who afterwards committed to him the education of his children. He is supposed to have died at Corinth, of mere decay, in the ninetieth year of his age.

The following are among the moral apothegms of Diogenes: "Virtue of mind, as well as strength of body, is chiefly to be acquired by exercise and habit. Nothing can be accomplished without labor, and everything may be accomplished with it. Even the contempt of pleasure may, by the force of habit, become pleasant. All things belong to wise men to whom the gods are friends. The ranks of society originate from the vices and follies of mankind, and are therefore to be despised. Laws are necessary to a civilized state; but the happiest condition of human life is that which approaches the nearest to a state of nature, in which all are equal, and virtue is the only ground of distinction. The end of philosophy is, to subdue the passions and prepare men for every condition of life."

The cynic school finally merged in that of the stoics. It made an ineffectual attempt to rise again in the centuries immediately succeeding the birth of our Lord; but without displaying the spirit, merely by affecting the exterior of the ancient cynics.

2. The Cyrenaic school of philosophy; Aristippus. This was so called from Cyrene, the birth-place of Aristippus. It was founded by Aristippus who flourished about B. C. 380. He was born to easy circumstances, and was of a light and sportive character. He was one of the pupils of Socrates, possessed at first a strong inclination for self-indulgence, which his illustrious preceptor succeeded in rendering more elevated, without being able to eradicate.

This school borrowed from Socrates the principle that all philosophy ought to have a practical object and that this should be the happiness of mankind. But as the cynic made virtue to consist in self-denial, and a contempt for all life's luxuries, so the Cyrenaic made it to consist in the full enjoyment of all the pleasures of life. Thus as the one was devoted to asceticism, so the other was to enjoyment.

As near as can be collected the following are the tenets of this school: "Perceptions alone are certain; of the external objects which produce them we know nothing. No one can be assured that the perception existed in his mind by any external object is similar to that which is excited by the same object in the mind of another person. Human nature is subject to two contrary affections, pain and pleasure; the one a harsh, the other a gentle emotion. The emotions of pleasure, though they may differ in degree, or in the object which excites them, are the same in all animals, and universally create desire. Those of pain are, in like manner, essentially the same, and universally create aversion. Happiness consists not in tranquillity or indolence, but in a pleasing agitation of the mind, or active enjoyment. Pleasure is the ultimate object of human pursuit; it is only in subserviency to this that fame, friendship, and even virtue, are to be desired. All crimes are venal because never committed but through the impulse of passion. Nothing is just or unjust by nature, but by custom and law. The business of philosophy is to regulate the senses, in that manner which will render them the most productive of pleasure. Since pleasure is to be derived, not from the past or the future, but the present, a wise man will take care to enjoy the present hour, and will be indifferent to life or death."

The following maxims are ascribed to Aristippus: "If there were no laws, a wise man would live honestly. It is better to be poor than illiterate; for the poor man only wants money, the illiterate wants the distinguishing character of human nature. The houses of the wealthy are

frequented by philosophers, for the same reason for which those of the sick are frequented by physicians. The truly learned are not they who read much, but they who read what is useful. Young people should be taught those things, which will be useful to them when they become men. He agreed with the cynics and also with Socrates in dismissing, as wholly unprofitable, all those speculations which have no connection with the conduct of life.

It will be readily perceived that this school must bear the same relation to the Epicurean that the cynic did to the stoic. It will be found, therefore, in the end contributing its element to the philosophy of Epicurus.

3. The Pyrrhonic or skeptic school of philosophy; Pyrrho, Timon. Pyrrho, the founder of this school, was a native of Elea, and was originally a painter. He was afterwards a disciple of Anaxarchus, and became a priest in Elis. He lived a solitary, retired life, dying about the ninetieth year of his age. His doctrine as developed by himself and his disciple Timon, presents a very singular mixture. That all philosophy should relate to virtue was an element he received from the Socratic doctrine. The skeptic tendencies of the Eleatic school in him received their more perfect development. The sophists had more effectually prepared the way by their insisting that every side of a question might be sustained by about an equal amount of argument. The different schools of philosophy had assumed an offensive dogmatism, which as their doctrines differed essentially from each other, would naturally lead a calm observer into doubt and difficulty.

Skepticism, according to this school, was defined to be the recollection of opinions embraced upon the testimony of the senses, or upon any other evidence, by means of which one dogma is compared with another; and all, upon the comparison, are found to be useless and full of confusion. The end proposed by this philosophy was, by an universal suspension of judgment, to establish mental tranquillity. Its fundamental principle was, that to every argument, an argument of equal force may be opposed.

The votaries of this philosophy did not discredit the immediate testimony of the senses. They did not deny what they saw, heard, or felt, but they asserted that the inferences which philosophers had drawn from the reports of the senses were to be doubted. They admitted sensible appearances, but doubted concerning the phenomena of nature. As a specimen of their reasoning, take the following, which is on the subject of morals:

The different opinions concerning good, sufficiently prove that philosophers are ignorant of its nature. Different men are differently affected by things which are called good; and therefore these things in themselves cannot be good. Desire itself, is not good, else we should be contented with it, and not endeavor to obtain its object; nor can the external object of desire be good, because it is external. There appears, therefore, to be nothing really good, and consequently nothing really evil. Since different men judge and act differently concerning these things, some approving what others condemn, and some avoiding what others pursue, there can be nothing in nature really good, evil, or indifferent. Hence it follows that ethics can have no foundation in nature. The art of living well is not innate in man; for if it were, all men would be virtuous; nor can it be taught, for that which is to be taught is doubtful; no one is himself sufficiently instructed to become a teacher; nor are there any means of demonstration, or testimony, by which it can be taught; or if this art could be taught, it would only prove the occasion of endless perturbation of mind, arising from the eager desire and pursuit of things supposed to be good. Tranquillity is best obtained by giving up all expectation of arriving at truth, and sitting down in a state of total indifference with respect to opinions.[1]

The ten arguments constituting the reasons of skepticism, briefly stated, are: 1. Animal bodies have vast variety of organization, therefore the same external object probably

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 288.

presents different images to different animals. Man's perceptions are not more conformable to the real nature of things than those of animals. 2. Among men there is great diversity both of mind and body. Whence a great variety of opinions, no one being able to determine the real nature of things. 3. The different senses give different reports of the same thing, therefore bodies may have different properties from those which the senses lead us to suppose. 4. The same thing appears differently according to the different dispositions, or circumstances, of the person perceiving it. Hence no man can pronounce his judgment as agreeable to nature. 5. Things assume a different aspect according to their distance, position, or place; no reason can be assigned why one of these aspects should agree with the real object, rather than the rest. 6. No object offers itself to the senses, which is not so connected and mixed with others, that it cannot be distinctly separated and examined. 7. Objects of sense appear different viewed in a compound, and in a decomposed state, and it is impossible to say which appearance most truly expresses their real nature. 8. Every object being always viewed in its relation to others, it is impossible to determine what it is simply in its own nature. 9. The frequency or rareness of occurrence renders the judgment uncertain, that which happens every day appearing to us in a different light from that in which the same thing would appear if it were new. 10. Mankind are continually led into different conceptions concerning the same thing, through the influence of custom, law, fabulous tales, and established opinions.

Thus all the skeptic could assume to say concerning anything was that it seems to be, not that it is what it seems.

The skeptic did not, and could not, live in accordance with the real principles of his philosophy. If he were to act in its full spirit he would be inactive, would forego life itself. The doctrine was ever at issue with life. But in practice he abandoned himself to the habit of life, to the

necessity of choosing, and to a decision concerning good and evil; contending all the while, however, that he does not follow such a course as a philosopher, but in accordance with unphilosophical opinion. Thus he was compelled to admit that his life must ever give the lie to his philosophy.

The disciple and successor of Pyrrho was Timon of Phliasii, who was famous for being a philosopher and a satirist. The sect seemed for a while to be extinct; but Ptolemy of Cyrene, and Heraclides, who were his disciples, revived it, and made it subsist for some time.

5. The Megaric or Eristic school of philosophy; Euclid, Eubulides, Diodorus Chronos. This school was so called from Megara, the place where it was founded, and obtained the term eristic, from its disputatious character. Euclid, its founder, not the mathematician of that name, was thoroughly imbued with the writings of the Eleatic school, particularly those of Parmenides. He afterwards became a disciple of Socrates. His chief employment in his school was to teach the art of disputation. He was averse to the analogical method of reasoning, and held legitimate argumentation to consist in deducing fair conclusions from acknowledged premises. He argued that all comparison must either be of like to like, or to unlike; that in the first case it is better to speak of the object itself, while in the latter there must be error.

He assumed that every proposition asserting a possibility must assert some truth; but that only is true, which actually is, or, at some certain time, will be true; and, consequently, that alone is possible, which either actually is, or certainly will be. And so on the other side, that which is not actually becoming to be, is impossible, but whatever is actually becoming, is necessary, for of the true nothing can be changed into the false, nor of the false into the true. A thing, he maintained, can only actually come into being either in its connection with the whole, or under determinate conditions of relation to the external world.[1]

[1] *Ritter*, II, 131.

He held to one supreme good, which he called by the different names of intelligence, providence, god. Evil he considered as an opposite principle to the sovereign good, and as having no physical existence. The supreme good he defined to be that which is always the same. He considered good abstractedly as residing in the deity, and maintained that all things which exist are good by their participation of the first good, and consequently that there is, in the nature of things, no real evil.

Euclid was succeeded by Eubulides of Miletus, a strenuous opponent of Aristotle. He introduced new subtleties into the art of disputation. As a sample of his syllogistic sophisms, take the two following: The first is termed the lying. "If, when you speak the truth, you say you lie, you lie; but you say you lie when you speak the truth; therefore, in speaking the truth, you lie." This was accounted so profound that Chrysippus wrote six books upon it, and Philetus, a Coan, died of a consumption which he contracted by the close study which he bestowed upon it. The second was called the horned. "You have what you have not lost; you have not lost horns; therefore you have horns."

Diodorus Chronos was another celebrated dialectician of this school. To him is accredited the famous argument against motion. "If any body be moved, it is either moved in the place where it is, or in a place where it is not; but it is not moved in the place where it is, for where it is, it remains; nor is it moved in a place where it is not, for nothing can either act or suffer where it is not; therefore there is no such thing as motion." It is said that having dislocated his shoulder, the surgeon kept him some time in torture, whilst he proved to him, from his own method of reasoning, that the bone could not have moved out of its place.[1]

5. The Eliac or Eretriac school of philosophy; Phædo, Menedemus. This school was founded by Phædo, of Elis,

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 111.

whence the term Eliac was derived. Although of illustrious descent, yet he was deprived of his patrimony in early life, and was sold as a slave at Athens. Socrates happening to pass him was struck with his appearance, and persuaded one of his friends, Alcibiades or Crito, to redeem him. He ever after adhered to Socrates with the most affectionate attachment. The school which he afterwards instituted at Elis was after the Socratic model.

Menedemus was originally a house builder. He succeeded in listening to the instructions of Plato, and subsequently of Stilpo, at Megara. He afterwards became the disciple, and ultimately, the successor of Phædo, and transferred the school to Eretria, his native city, whence the term Eretriac.

But little more is known of this school. It avoided all sophisms, and adhered closely to the simple doctrines and precepts received from Socrates.

We now come to the consideration of the more complete systems proceeding from the Socratic movement. Of these we may rank:

1. The Academic school; Plato. Of all the philosophic schools of Greece, or of any other people of the ancient world, the academic and the peripatetic, represented by Plato and Aristotle, have exercised by far the most extensive influence upon mankind. Even to the present day Plato has his followers.

Plato was an Athenian, and was born in the year B. C. 430. He was the son of Aristo and Perictione, and through the first was descended from Codrus, and through the second from Solon. He gave early indications of an extensive and original genius. While very young, he manifested great poetic talent, composed tragedies, and was a proficient in painting. When about twenty years of age he listened to a discourse of Socrates, and from that time gave himself up to the pursuits of philosophy. On the death of Socrates his disciples were dispersed, and Plato availed himself of that opportunity to perfect himself by travel. After remaining for some time with Euclid at Megara, he

proceeded to study geometry under Theodorus at Cyrene. He then visited Egypt to learn from its priests the hidden mysteries of science. From thence he passed into Italy, where he endeavored to make himself acquainted with all that had been taught in the schools of Pythagoras. From Italy he went to Sicily for the purpose of making observations upon Mount Ætna. There he became acquainted with Dionysius the elder, the tyrant of Syracuse. Through the intervention of Dion, whose sister the tyrant had married, he obtained this introduction, and attempted to hold up to his view the beauty of virtue. But this was not agreeable doctrine to a tyrant, who dismissed him rudely; and even bribed the master of the vessel in which he took his departure, to kill him on the passage or to sell him into slavery. He performed the latter alternative by selling him at Ægina, whose inhabitants were then at variance with Athens. He was immediately redeemed by Anniceres and set at liberty.

Having now consumed twelve years in travel and study, Plato returned to Athens, bought some real estate lying without the walls of the city, beautified and adorned it in a tasty manner, and gave it the appellation of the academy, where he instructed in philosophy, and whence his school was termed the academic.

With the exception of two voyages to Syracuse, made at the request of the younger Dionysius, he spent all the remainder of his life in teaching philosophy at the academy. Having originally possessed a vigorous constitution, and lived a life perfectly temperate, he survived until his eighty-first year, and then ceased to live through the mere decay of nature. He lived a life of celibacy.

The learning of Plato was vastly superior to that of any one who preceded him. To a knowledge of what was taught in the Egyptian, Ionian, and Pythagorean schools, he added what he had derived from the wisdom of Socrates, and from his own reflections. His style of writing was highly poetic and elevated, but has been complained of as lacking clearness, and being in some parts almost unintel-

ligible. It has been supposed that Plato, having the death of Socrates before his eyes, was careful to conceal many of his real opinions.

Almost all the writings of Plato appear in the form of dialogue; he reduced into a beautiful whole, the scattered results of the earlier Greek philosophy, reconciling their seeming differences and conflicting tendencies. Absolute science he regarded as the pure self-consciousness of the reason—the conviction it has of itself and which assures to every special science its value and right import, and is at the same time versed in them all, and combines into a whole their various branches. It imparts to life its intellectual energy, affording a definite end to whatever the soul enters upon and accomplishes with a consciousness of its import. He, however, distinguished between the ideal of science and science; maintaining that when directed towards the intellectual, "the sense of beauty attaches itself at first to the contemplation of individual minds, in communion with whom it creates thoughts and images of beauty; afterwards it proceeds to examine the pursuits and inventions of man; the laws and institutions of humanity, from which it rises to the beauty of the sciences, and contemplating them both in their collectivity and unity, the soul is at last absorbed in the science of the one eternal beauty. Thus would Plato lead from the sensible and the individual to the intellectual and the universal." The very basis of the Platonic notion of philosophy is the reference of all to the universal science, which, when complete, embraces the truth of all thoughts; and indeed of all self-conscious life.

He used the term wisdom, to express the knowledge of those things which truly exist, and are comprehended by the intellect. By philosophy, he understood the desire of divine science, and the comprehension, by the mind, of those real essences which are appreciable only by the understanding. His philosophy may be divided into three branches, being the first to originate such a division: 1. Dialectics, or the art of reasoning. 2. Physics, or theo-

retical questions concerning nature. 3. Ethics, or practical subjects respecting life and manners. He would thus have the office of philosophy to be three-fold, viz: dialectic, theoretical and practical.

The dialectic of Plato is the science which has for its object, thought or being, in so far as they are susceptible of eternal and immutable determinations. In his view, language and thought are identical, with the sole difference, that the latter is a dialogue in the soul without sound. Thus dialectic is the logic of the later philosophers. He regarded it as the basis of all philosophy, since he insists upon the necessity of commencing inquiry with establishing the idea of that which is to be its object; and in particular, he rejects all investigations as untenable, which commence with a physical assumption. Having established his dialectic as the basis of all philosophy, he next proceeds to physics as grounded and established thereby, and which, on their side, furnish the principles of ethics, which must be considered as the close and complement of the entire system. He makes every truth in philosophy to depend on the supreme and ultimate truth, to which there is a gradual ascent from lower and individual genera, which, in their turn, are to be tested by this last and highest truth. He thus sought to establish a perfect system of ideas, which should furnish of themselves, the principle and authority of their truth; and hence, we can only admit that to be a result of his philosophy, of which it can be clearly shown, that it has found an appropriate place in his system of ideas.

On the subject of dialectics he taught that truth is discerned by the understanding, not by the senses. He would not admit sensation as the only source of knowledge, because if it were so, nothing can be asserted of the future, for sensation refers only to the present. The intellect is employed upon things comprehended by it, and which are in their nature simple and invariable; or upon things which are revealed through the senses, and are subject to fluctuation and change.

He distinguished between that which results from sensation, and that from reflection, through the understanding or rational contemplation. He held the mission of the senses to be limited to the apprehension of the perpetual change or flux of becoming to that which is in constant transition from a former to a future state. Over against this, and in contrast with it, is the intellect, and that which it apprehends. This latter he assumed to be constant and permanent, unproduced and imperishable, ever identical with itself, and utterly immovable. To this latter belong the things of science; to the former those of opinion. The passive perception of the soul through the medium of the body constitutes sense. The forms of things deeply impressed upon the mind by means of the corporeal organs constitutes memory. From a comparison of the two, that is, of the present with a recollected perception, arises opinion. The soul converses with itself in meditation. By intellection is meant the operation of the understanding contemplating intelligible forms or ideas. This is two-fold. In the first, the soul contemplates ideas before it descends into the body. In the second, it is exercised after it is immersed in the body. The last consists in the recollection of those things with which the mind had become acquainted in a preexistent state. This differs from memory in this, that memory is employed upon sensible things; while this, which is termed reminiscence, is occupied in relation to things purely intelligible.

The intelligible objects are either primary or secondary. The first are ideas; the second the forms inseparable from material objects.

Dialectics consider things in their essence or accidents. The former it divides, defines and analyzes. By the first the genus is separated into its species, the whole into its parts. By the second it is rendered distinctive. By the third there is ascent or advance from objects of sense to intelligibles, from propositions to axioms, from hypothesis to experience. By induction, the mind rises from indivi-

duals to universals. By syllogism a conclusion is produced by means of some intermediate proposition.

Theoretical philosophy was divided into three branches: theological, physical, and mathematical.

On theology he held that from nothing nothing can proceed. Although from some expressions, such as God's being the parent of the universe, and his creating animate and inanimate beings which did not before exist, it has been inferred by some that Plato held matter to have been created by deity, and hence subject to his power, yet the main current of his philosophy seems fully to sustain the position that there are in the universe three primary incorruptible principles, viz: God, matter, and ideas. That God and matter coexist. That by the one all things were made, and from the other all things were made. That the world was made by the great architect out of preexistent matter. The conception of God was as mind and cause, that of matter as without form, and perpetually agitated, and at length as collected and arranged by deity who preferred order to confusion.

Matter he regarded as a substance without form or quality, as capable of receiving all forms, and undergoing all changes, its parts being infinitely divisible, and moving in portions of space which are infinitely divisible. He thus styles matter the mother and receptacle of forms, by the union of which with it the universe becomes perceptible to the senses; the visible world owing its forms to the energy of deity. He carefully distinguished between matter and body. The latter was produced from the former by the energy of the efficient cause.

Plato also held to the doctrine that there was a force in matter which was necessary, but blind and refractory. Hence the tendency to disorder and deformity, and the origin or cause of imperfection in the physical, and of evil in the moral world. He would find something in matter that resisted the will of deity, and prevented his perfect execution of his designs. Hence, he says that "it cannot be that evil should be destroyed, for there must always be

something contrary to good," and again, "God wills, as far as it is possible, everything good, and nothing evil." In explanation of the origin of evil, he says "that before nature was adorned with its present beautiful forms it was inclined to confusion and deformity, and that from this habitude arises all the evil which happens in the world."

Opposed to matter was God. He was the intelligent cause, the origin of all spiritual being, the former of the material world. The existence of this being was a matter of inference. The unity of the material system, and the marks of intelligence appearing in the form and arrangement of bodies, clearly evidence the existence of such a being. He is incorporeal, without beginning or end, subject to no change, and perceivable only by mind. In his nature he is simple, in space uncircumscribed, possessed of the highest possible intelligence, and the author of all regulated motion. This being he distinguished by name of the Good. He embraces the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things. The idea of him comprises all others. It is to be regarded as the supreme idea; as the highest, and being such, both is, and contains in itself, all others. It is that unity which comprises in itself the true essence of all things.

Plato also held to inferior or generated gods, who constituted the connecting link between the supreme God and humanity. It was to these that he attributed the formation of the mortal part of the human soul—that part or portion which could only maintain itself by a constant aggregation; which he called the concupiscible, or that vital impulse which tends from one sensation to another. The other, or the immortal part of the soul, he attributed to the supreme God, who made to it such revelations as to render it happy in the remembrance of the eternal.

There is also a third and very important element in the philosophy of Plato, and that is ideas. There has been some difficulty in arriving at the exact conceptions of Plato, in reference to what he meant by this term. He is supposed to have derived a hint on this subject from the philo-

sophy of Pythagoras, and to have substituted ideas in the place of Pythagorean numbers. He, however, has certainly devised and developed a more perfect system by means of ideas, than ever characterized the numbers of Pythagoras.

These ideas were defined by Plato, to be the peculiar natures of things, or essences as such, and that they always remain the same, without beginning or end. "In order," says Plato, "that God might form a perfect world, he followed that eternal pattern which remains immutable, and which can only be comprehended by reason." By ideas, he seems to have meant certain patterns or archetypes, subsisting by themselves, as real beings, in the divine reason, as in their original and eternal region, and issuing thence to give form to sensible things, and to become objects of contemplation and science to rational beings. For example, the properties of the triangle would continue, although the materials that gave it a visible shape were stricken from existence. All the radii of a circle would retain their properties, and continue to be equal to each other, whether the circle were actually protracted upon paper or not. These ideas constitute all there is of real existence. These exist above and beyond the region of the sensible. They float in the element of the reason, and are only apprehended by the highest forms of intellection. All else is mere similitude; resemblance is within the empire of the sensible, is perceived subject to the conditions of time and space, and exists only by the relation in which it stands to the true measure — the ideas. The bright rays of a luminous body throw upon a screen, rightly located in reference to the observer, the distinct and clearly visible shadows of real objects passing between the screen and the luminous body. The eye of the observer is the human soul; the luminous body, the creator; the shadows upon the screen, the objects of time and of sense; and the real objects whose shadows are thus cast, are the ideas, models and archetypes, which constitute the foundation work, or basis of things. We might, perhaps, go a little further, and regard

the screen as the matter, in, through, or by means of which, these ideas could become revealed to the senses.

He even held that all the different species of animals were to be regarded as merely so many different forms of development of the single idea of the male man; and that all differences between men as to their ideas, must be denied, in consequence of the same first birth being attributed to all mortals.

Plato held, that in the depths of the soul were certain innate ideas, which serve to form the basis of our conceptions, and the elements of our practical resolutions. To these eternal types or models of things, are referred the vast variety of individual objects presented to us. It obviously follows from this, that the details of knowledge are not themselves the results of experience, but that they are developed by it. The soul recollects the ideas, in proportion as it becomes acquainted with their copies, which abound in the world. The process seems much the same as that of recalling to mind the circumstances of a state of preexistence.

As the objects presented to the mind correspond with its ideas, they must have some principle in common with each other. This principle is the deity, who has formed these external objects after the model of the ideas.

Thus he laid the foundation for the fleeting and the permanent. Visible things he regarded as fleeting shades, and ideas as the only permanent substances. The latter could alone be the proper objects of science.

Plato taught that the deity formed the material world after a perfect archetype, which had eternally subsisted in his reason, and endued it with a soul. He supposed mind to have been produced prior to body, in order that the latter might be subject to the former. From the two substances, the one indivisible and always the same, and the other corporeal and divisible, the deity formed a third substance participating of the nature of both. This substance cannot be eternal because it is produced. It derives the superior part of its nature from God, and the inferior

from matter. It was, according to Plato, the animating principle in the universe, pervading and adorning all things.

The visible world, according to Plato, was produced by the supreme architect, by uniting eternal and immutable ideas or forms to variable matter. He supposed the world to have had a beginning in time, and not to have existed from eternity.

Plato also held that the universe was one animated being, including within its limits all animated natures. He also taught that fire and earth were first employed in the formation of the visible world, and that these were afterwards united by means of air and water; that the elementary parts of the world are of regular geometrical forms, the particles of earth being cubical, those of fire pyramidical, those of air in the form of an octahedron; and those of water in that of an icosahedron; that these are adjusted in number, measure, and power, in perfect conformity to the geometrical laws of proportion; that the result is a spherical figure, the most beautiful in itself, and best suited to contain all other figures; that the soul which pervades this sphere is the cause of its revolution round its centre; and that the world will remain forever, but by the action of its animating principle, it accomplishes certain periods, within which everything returns to its ancient place and state.

The human soul he derives as an emanation from God, but this was not immediate, but through the intervention of the soul of the world, and the agency of the inferior deities. As this latter was debased by some material admixture, the human soul being at a still further remove from the first intelligence, must be inferior in perfection even to the soul of the world. The soul having two parts, the material and intellectual, was consequently endowed with two capacities. The first derived from its material part enabled it to converse with sensible objects. By means of the second or intellectual part it was rendered capable of understanding ideas, and of spiritual contemplation. By its affinity to matter it was rendered imperfect,

and hence the source or origin of moral evil. The seeds of this evil were sown both in the soul of the world and in the soul of man, but prevailed more in the latter than the former.

His theory in regard to the origin of the soul was extremely fanciful. He supposed that when God formed the universe, he separated from the soul of the world inferior souls, equal in number to the stars, assigning to each its proper celestial abode. These souls were afterwards sent down to the earth into human bodies, as into a sepulchre or prison. In harmony with this idea of the origin of the soul he believed that the fate of man depended on the complicated motions of the stars, and that by a due and careful contemplation of the heavens, his future destiny may be discovered, thus affording the earliest trace among the Greeks of the principles of astrology. Pursuing further the idea, he held that the soul that lives virtuously here will enjoy hereafter a happy and blissful existence in the mansions of its kindred star, while an unembodied life in God is reserved to those who, impelled by true philosophy are ever striving to emancipate themselves from the bonds and fetters of the body. And as to those who are here immersed in bodily pleasures, hating all philosophical meditation, they will still continue after death to feel the same aversion for the shapeless and incorporeal, and, as shades, still subject to the corporeal principle, will hover round their graves seeking to recover their lifeless bodies.

To this cause mainly he ascribes the misery to which our nature is liable, and also its depravity, and asserts that the only way by which it can be prepared to return to its pristine state is by disengaging itself from all animal passions, and rising above sensible objects to the contemplation of the world of intelligence.

The soul he held to consist of three portions or faculties, for they are spoken of under both these denominations. These were intelligence, passion and appetite. The first of these he conceived to be derived from God, and the second and third from matter. The first he located in the

brain as its seat or organ; the second in the heart, and the third in the intestines. These were the three organic centres, the harmony of which, according to the laws of subordination which hold them together, constitutes the foundation of organic life.

He expressly taught that the soul was immortal, but some of his proofs might be considered fanciful. The following are some of them:

In nature all things terminate in their contraries, as sleep in waking, and waking in sleep. So life in death, and death in life. The soul is a simple, indivisible substance, and hence incapable of dissolution or corruption. It naturally adheres to spiritual and incorruptible objects, and hence its nature must be spiritual and incorruptible. All knowledge is acquired by the reminiscence of ideas contemplated in a prior state. The soul has therefore existed before this life. There is, therefore, nothing inconsistent in its continuing to exist after it. As life is the conjunction of the soul with the body, death is nothing more than their separation. Whatever constitutes the principle of motion must be incapable of destruction.

As to the state and condition of the soul after death, he appears to have favored the doctrine of the metempsychosis. While he who lives righteously will inhabit his kindred star, those men who have lived unrighteously and effeminately will, at their second birth, be changed into women; while those of both sexes whose life has been innocent but frivolous, and who foolishly believed that heavenly things could be seen by the fleshly eye, are changed into birds of the air. All those who have been perfectly estranged from philosophy are changed into beasts of the earth; while the most ignorant and uninformed become creatures of the water, to whom the forming gods do not grant even the privilege of respiring a pure atmosphere. This, it will be perceived, is a somewhat different destiny from that before noticed of souls hovering around their graves and seeking a reunion with their lifeless bodies. The two may be reconciled by supposing the different des-

tinies to apply to different souls. There are, however, some parts of the philosophy of Plato that are difficult to reconcile with each other. This has been explained by some upon the supposition that he is occasionally mythical in what he states or represents.

Plato has left no work upon mathematics, but he required of his disciples a knowledge of their elements preparatory to the study of theoretical philosophy. He considered their value principally to consist in raising the mind from sensible to intellectual objects, and in inuring it to abstract and general conceptions.

In politics, the views of Plato were peculiar. He saw what disorders the vices of men had introduced into the state, and deemed nothing but national virtue adequate for the insurance of national prosperity. He proposed to eradicate these vices, by destroying the individual will of the citizen. This had been, to a great extent, done in Sparta, by the laws and institutions of Lycurgus.

In accordance with the spirit of those laws and institutions, he proposed to make citizens mere portions of the body politic; to divest them of the liberty of regulating their own lives; to have the employments of every hour regulated by law; to have a community of property, and thus destroy all motive for its benefiting the individual by its increase; to have a community of women, and thus annihilate the domestic relations. In the view of Plato, the state is everything; the citizen, in himself, nothing. Whatever does not advance the interests of the state, is diseased, and must be removed. Even the philosopher is only at liberty to withdraw from it, when it is formed upon an imperfect model. To its absolute sovereignty, all must be sacrificed. Children and women belong to it. He did hold to the duty of education, but devolved that duty upon the state. This education he made of a two-fold character; that of the body, which he called gymnastics, and that of the soul, music. The former consisted in all kinds of vigorous exercise and training of the body; inuring it also to hunger and thirst, cold and heat. Danc-

ing was to be a part of this training. The great object, however, of all bodily training was to be, to strengthen the spirit, and thus to enable it to bring the sensual desire under the control of the reason. Under music, he comprised all the arts of the muses, the ordinary instruction in grammar, and also in the sciences and the fine arts. In the study of music, he distinguished two methods for the development of the conceptions and thoughts, the one of which is directed to the sensible, and gives rise to opinion; the other leads to notions, and those kinds and varieties of knowledge, which the soul may attain by its own energy and reflection.

But although this degraded position of women is advocated in his republic, yet it seems to have been abandoned in his laws, in which he proposes to train them, as in Sparta, to martial exercise, and to give them a share in the administration of government. This, he supposed, would be a means of rendering them virtuous and useful, and also capable on emergency of defending themselves and their children from an invading foe. He proscribed commerce as a source of vice, and, in order to avoid contamination, he would insulate the state from all others.

He proposed to institute in society three ranks or castes, which he had probably derived from Egyptian institutions. The first, which should be the learned or philosophical class, should be devoted to the contemplation of ideas; in which should be found the social intelligence, which should make the laws. The second was the irascible element of society. It was the depository of the public force. It was embodied in the soldier. The third was to be composed of laborers and artisans, and to be related to the physical wants of man.

This in the view of Plato was an endeavor to organize the state upon the same principle as the human soul. The first class to which the duties of sovereignty were assigned, corresponded to the reason. The second, or soldier class, answered to spirit, and its province was to assist the sovereign; while the third, which represented the appetite,

was intended to supply the bodily wants of the community. These together made up the three social classes: the ruler, the warrior, and the laborer or artisan. Each was bound to contribute a peculiar virtue of its own to the general body. Thus the ruling class contributed sagacity and foresight; the warrior boldness and valor, while the laborer or artisan contributed a temperate obedience to the orders of his ruler. From a due combination of all these in the whole community, the result was civil justice.

In regard to morals, Plato held that our highest good consists in the contemplation and knowledge of God. All things called good are such only in so far as they are derivatives from this source. Man can only approximate towards God by means of his reason. The knowledge of God as the first good and the first fair can only constitute goodness and beauty. Virtue should be pursued for its own sake, because it only is becoming, and is a divine attainment. It is the gift of God, and cannot therefore be taught. The knowledge of the first good, or God, can alone confer happiness, because the end of it is to render man as much like God as the condition of human nature will admit. This likeness consists in prudence, justice, sanctity and temperance. Virtue is the most perfect habit of mind, which adorns the man, and renders him firm, resolute and consistent in action and speech, in solitude and society. The virtues are all allied to each other, and the kindred ties between them are so strong that they are incapable of separation. They are also perfect, and neither capable of increase or diminution.

The passions are so many motions of the soul, excited by some apparent good or evil. They have their origin in its irrational parts, and should therefore be subdued and regulated by reason. Friendship is reciprocal benevolence, inclining each party to be as solicitous for the welfare of the other as for his own. This could exist only where there was harmony of sentiment. He taught that there are three kinds of love. The first which is derived solely from friendship, from harmony of sentiment, is the

highest and purest, and is that now recognized under the term Platonic love. The second has a regard both to corporeal and mental gratification and perfection; while the third, which is the grossest, has regard to corporeal gratification only.

Such is a brief outline of the philosophy of Plato, and of the academy. Although there is much of it that may now be regarded as theoretical and fanciful, yet there is also much to respect and admire. In the very starting point Plato shows his wisdom. Of the schools that preceded him, one had demanded a demonstration of the existence of the absolute and infinite; another, of the finite. Plato at once admits the existence of both as a primordial conception. He assumes it as the condition and basis of all science, as containing a truth upon which reposes all philosophy.

From the dynamical view, as taken by Heraclitus, he derived the principal features of his own theory of the universe, which he regarded as a perfectly living or ensouled being, subject to the perpetual flux of becoming, and destined, by its order and proportion, to be the most perfect representation of the rational ideas. But he did not neglect the mechanical view, which, although chiefly employed by him in his account of individual objects, is the ground of his general view of body as a lifeless mass, deriving its motion from some extrinsic cause, and merely ministering to the soul. He was thus enabled to assert the rigorous contrariety between body and soul.

Plato rendered great and invaluable service to philosophy by affording it the first sketch of the laws of thought, the rules for propositions, conclusions and proofs, and of the analytic method. He taught the distinction to be drawn between the universal and substance; and also the particular and the accidental. He undertook to investigate the characteristics of truth, and to detect the signs of the phenomenon or apparent truth. He first made the attempt at the construction of a philosophical language. To him we owe the first development of an abstract idea of

knowledge and science, and also the first logical statement of the properties of matter, form, substance, accident, cause and effect, of natural and independent causes, of reality, and of apparent reality; a more adequate idea of the divinity, as a being eminently good, with a more accurate induction of the divine attributes.

He experienced a difficulty of the same kind with that which has since been ever recurring although in another shape, viz: the inability to find a transition from the world of ideas to that of sense. He seems to have had a vague notion that every individual, in opposition to some other object of thought, must, as such, be imperfect; and that, for this reason, every individual soul participating in the nature of opposite or other, must be subject to a relative becoming. But while this conception on the one hand was not fully and clearly worked out, it was, on the other, altogether too vague, shadowy and indefinite to be regarded as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty.[1]

The academy ceased not with the life of Plato. After his death, the school was carried on by his nephew Speusippus, who was a man of wit, of a mild and agreeable temper, and who was well versed in the Pythagorean philosophy.

Xenocrates of Chalcedon was the successor of Speusippus. Although of unsullied reputation and unspotted virtue, yet he was so slow that he was called by Plato his donkey. His aspect was serious, and even forbidding. He was a declared enemy to vice, and carried to an extreme height, the austerity of his virtues. He wrote some works on mathematics. Polemon succeeded Xenocrates. The first part of his life was spent in debauchery, but the latter part he dedicated to philosophy, virtue and solitude. His conversion to philosophy was a very remarkable incident. Very early one morning, crowned with roses, and having his robes disordered, he was reeling home from a supper party. Perceiving the door of the academy open he en-

[1] *Ritter*, II, 450, 451.

tered. All eyes were upon him; and Xenocrates, who was then lecturing, changed at once his subject, and began to discourse upon the beauty of virtue, and the degrading consequences of intemperance. Polemon having entered to scoff remained to listen. He became gradually affected; his heart was moved; he stole his hand to his head and removed the garland; presently he composed his robe to a more decent fashion, and by the time the philosopher had finished his lecture, he left the place sobered forever.

Crates succeeded Polemon; and to him succeeded Crantor, who was a rigid moralist.

Thus far, the doctrines of Plato were strictly maintained in the academy. After the death of Crates a new tribe of philosophers arose, who introduced many innovations into the Platonic system. These will come to be considered under the new academic school.

2. The Epicurean school; Epicurus. Epicurus was the son of Neodes an Athenian, a man respectable but in humble circumstances, who had joined the colonists sent to Samos after that country had submitted to the arms of Athens. His mother, Chærestrata, was a dealer in lustrations and charms, and in her expeditions the young Epicurus accompanied her, for the purpose of reading the lustratory verses. When not thus occupied he assisted his father in the humble business of school teaching.

He continued at Samos and Teos until he was eighteen years of age, when he removed to Athens. Some four or five years afterwards, owing to the disturbed condition of things at Athens, he joined his father at Colophon in Ionia. Here he remained nearly ten years, after which he passed his time partly at Mitylene, and partly at Lampsacus, until he attained the age of thirty-five or thirty-seven, when he returned to Athens.

At Athens he purchased a house and garden for eighty minæ, and opened his school of philosophy. Hence his followers were called the philosophers of the garden. His school became very popular, and attracted disciples, not

only from Greece, but also from Egypt and Asia. Those who were regularly admitted into his school, lived together upon a footing of friendly attachment.

Epicurus lived a life of celibacy. His character has been variously represented, but the strongest proof goes to show that he was exemplary for temperance and continence, and that he taught the necessity of severity of manners, and government of the passions, as the best means of securing a tranquil and happy life. Towards the close of his days he became infirm, and was afflicted with the stone. He expired while in a warm bath, when in the seventy-third year of his age, after exhorting his friends not to forget his doctrines. He was the author of many different works, but a few fragments of which only have come down to us.

The doctrines of Epicurus have been, by many, misunderstood, and will require special consideration. In regard to philosophy in general, he taught that it was the exercise of reason in the pursuit of happiness. That all speculation was useless except as it may enable men to judge what is to be chosen, and what to be avoided, what is conducive to health of body and tranquillity of mind. That no man should be considered as too young or too old to improve his mind, or acquire the art of happiness. Philosophy alone possesses the power of raising man above vain fears, and base passions, and of giving him real self-command. He did not hold to receiving all things or to doubting all things, but required that those tenets only should be embraced which are either built on experience, or on certain indisputable axioms.

He divided all philosophy into two parts; of these the one he denominated physics which consisted in the contemplation of nature. Ethics which embraced morals and manners.

In both, the great object is to arrive at truth. This is of two kinds; the one respecting real existence; the other consists in the agreement between the conception of the mind and the nature of things.

All those judgments are true which agree with the things concerning which they are formed. Truth can only be judged rightly of when the mind employs some criterion or instrument of judging. This will be different according to the nature of the object which the mind, at the time, is contemplating. The senses present external objects to the mind, which apprehends them by means of sensation. The mind also possesses the power of reasoning in reference to its perceptions and of comparing them with certain preconceptions, or general ideas formed from previous impressions of a similar character. Our moral judgments are formed through the instrumentality of the affections or passions. We have then three instruments of judging: sense, preconception, passion.

In regard to the first he lays down four canons or maxims. First. The senses can never be deceived, and hence every perception must be true. Second. Perception is followed by opinion or judgment, and this admits both of truth and falsehood. Third. The truth of every opinion rests upon the evidence of the senses. Sometimes the senses directly report the truth. At other times it is arrived at by an inference from something which is admitted on the testimony of the senses. Fourth. An opinion contradicted or not attested by the evidence of the senses is false.

In regard to preconception, he also lays down four canons or maxims. First. All preconceptions are derived from the senses either by immediate impression; by enlargement or diminution; by resemblance; or by composition. Second. Without preconception there can exist no ability to reason, inquire, or judge. Third. Preconceptions are universal notions. They are the principles of all reasoning and discourse, and constant reference is made to them in comparing one thing with another. Fourth. When truths are not self-evident, they must be deduced from manifest preconceptions, or rendered evident by the intermediate use of some acknowledged principle.

In regard to passion or affection, he lays down four canons or maxims. First. All pleasure, divested of pain is to

be pursued for its own sake. Second. All pain, undivested of pleasure, is to be avoided for its own sake. Third. That pleasure is to be shunned which either prevents the enjoyment of a greater pleasure, or produces a greater pain. Fourth. That pain is to be endured which either removes a greater pain, or procures a greater pleasure.

In physics, the Epicureans adopted the doctrines of the atomic school of philosophy, refining and carrying them out in a more perfect form. According to Epicurus, nothing can ever originate or terminate in nothing. The universe always was and always will be. There are only two things in nature, body and space. The first possesses bulk, figure, resistance and gravity; the second is a vacuum, a region which body may occupy, and through which it may move. The senses acquaint us directly with the existence of body. They also acquaint us with its motion, and hence prove the vacuum. Besides these, there is nothing in nature but qualities, and these are accidents of body.

The universe is infinite, having no limits. Body is infinite as to multitude, space as to magnitude. The universe, as a whole, is immovable, eternal and immutable, but its different parts are subject to change.

Body is made up of parts, and may be resolved into them. These are originally simple principles, or simple atoms, indivisible and immutable. It is to the latter quality, that the uniformity of nature is owing. There is no such thing as infinite divisibility of body, because a finite body cannot consist of parts infinite, either in magnitude or number. Atoms exist, because we cannot conceive that anything which exists, can be reduced to nothing. They are all of the same nature, but, from their different effects on the senses, appear to differ from each other, in magnitude, figure and weight. They are of every variety of figure; round, oval, conical, cubical, sharp and hooked, but are incapable of any actual division.

Gravity is an internal energy, belonging to all atoms. It is the cause of all motion. By means of it, atoms are

carried forward in a direction, nearly, but not quite, rectilinear. The small deviation from a right line which occurs, leads to a percussion of atoms by which means they are turned out of their natural course, and curvilinear motions are produced. One atom reflected from another and repelled by a third, will acquire a kind of vibratory or tremulous motion. Hence in compound masses, this must produce an universal agitation.

The motion of atoms has been incessant and eternal. Its velocity is so great as to be inconceivable. This motion is by no means confined to atoms singly. They also retain the same innate energy in compound bodies. All the parts of a mass which may be apparently at rest are still moved by repercussions too rapid for perception by the senses.

By atoms were meant the elements from which all compounds are formed, and into which they are ultimately resolved. The principle of gravitation is really the sole agent in the operations of nature. Its action creates that motion common to all atoms, that eternal energy which every compound body will possess in proportion to the numbers, figures and relative situations of its component parts.

The facility of movement in the atoms depends much upon their form. Those which are rugged and angular, becoming easily entangled, move less freely than those which are smooth and round. This is given to explain the reason why some combinations of atoms have more activity than others; why, for instance, fire and the vital principle have more activity than granite. But all bodies being compounded of atoms, have a certain self-moving power, which may be variously modified by a variety ot causes.

All changes in figure and other properties are derived from local motion. The change from sweet to bitter, or from soft to hard, occurs through some change in the situation or arrangement of its parts, or some augmentation or diminution in its mass. It is the difference in the

arrangement of the particles that gives different qualities to bodies. The density or rarity of bodies depends on the magnitude of the varieties which intercept the solid atoms of which they are composed.[1]

There are also other properties of bodies which may be traced to the principle of motion. Heat is the influx of small, round, soft corpuscles, insinuating themselves into the pores of bodies in continual succession, till their ceaseless action separates the parts, and dissolves the body. The perception of this separation gives the sense of heat. Cold arises from the influx of irregular atoms, and their slow motion gives rise to it. Pleasure, pain, motion and rest are accidents of bodies. Production and dissolution arise from a change in the position of atoms, or an increase or diminution of the particles composing the body.

The universe is to be regarded as a whole, but not as an organized and animated body. The world is a finite portion of it, and has some figure, but what it is impossible to discover. Everything in the world is liable to production and decay, and as this must therefore apply to the world, that is not eternal. It must have had a beginning, and will have an end.

He thus accounts for the world's beginning. A finite number of atoms happening to fall into the region of space which it now occupies, were, by their inherent energy, collected into a rude, undigested mass. The largest and heaviest atoms first subsided, whilst others that were smaller were driven upwards. The last rose into the outer region and formed the heavens. Those atoms suitable to form fiery bodies, collected themselves into stars. Those not capable of rising so high, formed the atmosphere. Those subsiding, at length produced the earth. Air agitated by heat acting upon the mixed mass of the earth, separated its smoother and lighter particles from the rest, and thus produced water. From the first combination of atoms various seeds arose, from which in due time sprang

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 270.

organized bodies. Well might the poet, Dr. Darwin, exclaim in view of this singular theory:

> Dull atheist — could the giddy dance
> Of atoms lawless hurled,
> Construct so wonderful, so wise,
> So harmonized a world.

The same mechanical causes that framed the world continue to preserve it, and will ultimately dissolve it. Even the incessant motion of atoms will operate towards its dissolution, for nothing is indissoluble but atoms. The infinity of atoms in number, may lead to an infinity of worlds.

The cause of earthquakes is to be sought in the agitation of internal winds and water, or the sudden fall of columns, which support portions of the earth's surface, or the conversion of internal winds into fires. When the round particles of water are cast out by the condensing power of cold, and other particles, from their form more easily entangled, are brought together and united, ice is produced.

The motion of atoms causing continual transposition, accretion, or diminution in individual bodies, produces plants. They have no vital principle. Animals were formed in the beginning of the world, by the casual conjunction of similar atoms, and their production is continued in a consistent and determinate order. There was no design in the formation of animal bodies; no part was framed for the use to which it is applied. The eye was not made for seeing, nor the ear for hearing, but having accidently assumed those forms, they were made use of for those purposes.

The soul is a corporeal substance, but is formed from the finest atoms. The extreme tenuity of these enables it to penetrate the whole body, and adhere to all its parts. It is composed of four parts, viz: fire, an ethereal principle, air, and a fourth, which is the cause of sensation. The sentient principle is corporeal, although differing from the other three.

These four parts together form a subtle substance which is productive of all motions, thoughts, and passions. Sensation is the result of the union of soul and body. It is owing to the peculiar magnitude, figure, motion, and arrangement of the elementary atoms, and is not a property of atoms but a result of their combination, and contexture.

All sensation is produced by means of certain species or images, which are thrown off like thin films from bodies, and which entering the eye cause vision, and the ear, hearing. These species or images are made up of atoms inconceivably rapid in motion, and in form, when combined, are similar to the surfaces of the bodies themselves. Difference in sensation is casual, and is owing to the different organs of the soul, and the different qualities or properties of external objects.

The intellect, or the power which thinks, is formed of particles most subtle in their nature, and capable of most rapid motion. It partakes of any pleasure or pain enjoyed or suffered by the soul, but may have passions of its own, into which the soul does not enter. The seat of intellect is in the middle of the breast or heart. Thought is produced by subtle images which move the intellect to think.

The soul is exercised in two different kinds of affections and passions, the one natural and agreeable, the other unnatural and troublesome; the one is pleasure, the other pain. The first occurs when all the parts of the soul are in their natural state; the last where there is an unnatural agitation.

Death is the privation of sensation, and results as a consequence of the separation of the soul from the body. Whenever it takes place, the soul is resolved into the atoms of which it was originally composed. Sleep is produced when the parts of the soul which, in the waking state, are diffused through the whole body, are repressed or separated by the action of the air, or of food; while dreams are the effect of images casually flying about, and striking upon the mind.

The sun, moon and stars may be fiery bodies, or mirrors reflecting fires, or deep vessels containing fires, or circular plates heated. Their apparent motion may arise from a revolution of the whole heaven, like nails in a solid body; or from the revolutions that may be taking place among themselves. The cause of these motions may be an internal necessity, or the pressure of some fluid from without.

In relation to the gods, Epicurus taught that they must exist in the universe, because nature had impressed the idea of them upon the minds of men. That they had the human form because that is the most perfect; that they were composed of thin, ethereal substances endued with sensation and intellect, and were happy immortal beings; that they have no intercourse with man, nor any concern with the affairs of the world, but on account of their excellent nature are proper objects of reverence and worship.

Thus it will be perceived that the entire phenomena of nature are sought to be explained by Epicurus upon mere mechanical principles. There is in the whole universe nothing but what belongs to matter. He begins by assuming, what every law of nature contradicts, viz: that atoms, which are impelled only by a single force, deviate, nevertheless, from a right line in their motion, and on this hypothesis builds much of his theory of the formation of the world. This supposition of deviation enabled him to escape, at least seemingly, from the dreaded power of necessity, as he assigned for its cause an internal force independent of their weight. It is only by such a supposition that he can give any freedom to the will. This is the only instance in which he admits the existence of any inward energy of atoms, aside from their general nature, and this he conceived of as a purely arbitrary effort, and from it derived the contingency of natural phenomena, the source being the same as that giving the freedom of the will. Thus all volition he held to be as arbitrary as the deviation from the laws of falling bodies.

He seeks to account for all the appearances of nature, and for all the operations of mind, upon the simple prin-

ciples of matter and motion. There was even no other idea of fate introduced into his system than that of blind necessity inherent in every atom. There is certainly little to commend the physics of Epicurus to any reasonable mind.

The ethics of Epicurus have been much misrepresented, and hence by many are not well understood. He taught that the end of living was the attainment of happiness, and that the successful pursuit of it depends on the forming a right idea of the nature of it, and the making use of proper means to attain it.

He defines happiness to be that state in which man enjoys as many of the good things, and suffers as few of the evils of life, as possible, passing his days in a smooth course of permanent tranquillity. Pleasure is a good, and pain an evil. Hence the one is to be pursued, and the other avoided for its own sake. So also do these constitute the measure of what is good or evil in every object of desire or aversion. We are accustomed to pursue one thing and avoid another, because we expect pleasure from the one and apprehend pain from the other. We may decline a pleasure, but it is because we suppose it connected with a greater pain. So we may submit to a pain, because we judge it connected with a greater pleasure. It is, therefore, unwise blindly to pursue the one, and avoid the other; but reason must be employed to compare the nature and degrees of each, to the end that the choice may be dictated by wisdom.

Pleasure is of two kinds. In the enjoyment of the one a state of rest is necessary, in that of the other there is an agreeable agitation of the senses. The pleasure enjoyed in life is mostly derived from the former.

In justice to Epicurus it should be stated that by pleasure he did not mean to embrace solely that violent kind of delight, or joy, which arises from the gratification of the senses and passions, but that placid state of mind where no uneasiness is experienced. That violent kind of delight is not to be pursued as the end of living, but only as a means

of arriving at a stable tranquillity. It is the peculiar office of reason to confine the pursuit of pleasure within the limits of nature, in order to the attainment of that happy state where the body is free from pain and the mind from perturbation. A happy life is neither like a rapid torrent, nor a standing pool, but a gentle stream that glides along smoothly and silently.

The state of tranquillity constituting happiness can be attained only by a prudent care of the body, and a steady government of the mind. Both are subject to diseases. Those of the first may be prevented by temperance, cured by medicine, or rendered tolerable by patience. Those of the last must look to philosophy for an antidote. This consists in the proper use of the virtues, which are all essentially based on prudence. The man who bases his action on this, will consult his natural disposition in choosing his plan of life. He will enter into married life, or remain single; enter into public life, or remain obscure, according as he finds that his natural tendencies lead him to the one or the other.

He defines temperance to be that discreet regulation of the desires and passions by which we are enabled to enjoy pleasures without suffering any consequent inconvenience. There are three classes of desires. The first are both natural and necessary; the second natural but not necessary; and the third neither natural nor necessary. It is the office of temperance to gratify the first class, as far as nature requires; to restrain the second within the bounds of moderation; and to oppose resolutely the third, and if possible to repress them.

Sobriety teaches with how little nature may be satisfied; is conducive to health; gives alertness and activity in the offices of life, and affords good preparation for meeting reverses of fortune.

Continence is strongly enforced, and gentleness contributes to the tranquillity and happiness of life, by preserving the mind from perturbation, and arming it against the assaults of calumny and malice.

Moderation secures against disappointment and vexation. Future events are always uncertain, and a wise man will, therefore, neither suffer himself to be elated with confident expectation, nor depressed by doubt and despair.

The doctrines thus inculcated, enable us to arrive at the precise principle of the philosophy of Epicurus. He did not teach, like Aristippus, that the greatest amount of enjoyment would result from an utter and constant abandonment to the pleasures of the present moment. Such a course, might, in the end, produce a greater amount of pain than pleasure. He would, through the whole of life, regulate enjoyment, but as there was nothing in the universe but matter, it is obvious that it could rise no higher than the sensual material. His philosophy could rank little, if anything, higher than a refined selfishness. The organism being regarded as a source of pleasure, he did not advise the extorting all that was possible from it in the least quantity of time; but to husband its resources, avoid all exciting drafts, and by practicing temperance in enjoyment, and seeking prolongation instead of excess, to derive from it, through the whole of life, all its capacity could possibly afford. Thus, according to him, the sage will make a prudent use of the present, enjoying himself in the recollection of the past, or the hope of future pleasures. Whether this fear of the future would not have the effect to mar the pleasures of the present, or whether this systematic regulation could well accord with a philosophy which discarded all law and left everything to the play of chance, are questions somewhat difficult to answer.

Homage is due to the gods from their superior nature. It should not be rendered through hope or fear. Death is the perfect termination of a happy life. It is no proper object of terror. It neither concerns the living nor the dead; since whilst we are, death is not, and when death arrives we are not.

All the evils we have to apprehend in life are bodily pain and mental anguish. The first should be endured

with patience and firmness, because, if slight, it may easily be borne; if intense, it cannot be lasting. The last arises generally from opinion, not from nature. One very common cause is the loss of the gifts of fortune. Their loss should never be deplored, because they were never our own, but always depended on circumstances. The remembrance of their loss should soon be obliterated by occupying the mind in pleasant contemplation, and engaging in agreeable avocations.

Justice is the common bond of society. It derives its value from its tendency to promote the happiness of life. It never injures the man who practices it, but leads his mind to calm reflection, and to pleasant hopes. Iniquitous actions lead to remorse of conscience, legal penalties, and public disgrace, and against these there is no corresponding enjoyment. The mutual exercise of justice in society is necessary to the common enjoyment of nature's gifts, and is the foundation of all those laws by which it is prescribed. In the practice of this virtue all have an interest, because the safety of each and all depends upon it. Whatever is prescribed should be considered as a rule of justice, so long as the society shall judge the observance of it to be for the benefit of the whole.

Beneficence, compassion, gratitude, piety and friendship are nearly allied to justice. Beneficence confers the enjoyment of being esteemed by others. Gratitude, filial affection, and reverence for the gods is necessary to be practiced in order to avoid the hatred and contempt of men. Friendships are originally contracted for the sake of mutual benefit, but they may at length ripen into disinterested attachment. In true friendship each will love the other as himself. It leads to a mutual partaking in joys and sorrows, to a common mingling together of the enjoyments and the ills to which life is subject.

Thus it will be seen that the philosophy of Epicurus was preeminently material. There is really nothing beyond matter and motion. With him enjoyment, pleasure, happiness are the great ends of life; but neither his life nor

death, his practice or teachings, will justify the charge that it was the pleasures of the senses to which he referred. It was a much higher pleasure, but one, nevertheless, that derived its sources, and was felt and realized only by material compounds. While, however, he conceived the human soul only as a compound of atoms, he was at the same time ascribing to it those faculties which other philosophers termed spiritual, thus vesting man with the capabilities of intellectual and moral action.

3. The Peripatetic school of philosophy; Aristotle. The celebrated Aristotle, the founder of this school, was born at Stagira, in Macedonia, in the year B. C. 384. From the place of his birth he has been often styled the Stagirite. His father, Nicomachus, was a physician, his mother's name was Exstiada. Having received the rudiments of education from Proxenus, he went to Athens at the age of seventeen, and was one of the disciples of Plato. He used to be called by Plato the mind of the school. Strabo says he was the first person who formed a library. He continued in the academy to his thirty-seventh year, when Plato died. On the birth of Alexander the Great, he was appointed his preceptor, and the youthful mind of that conqueror was formed under the instruction of Aristotle.

The conqueror of Asia did not, amid his conquests, forget him who had been so instrumental in developing his mental resources. He employed several thousand persons in different parts of Europe and Asia to collect various kinds of animals, birds and fishes, which he sent to Aristotle. By means of these he was enabled to enlarge his acquaintance with nature, and to write fifty volumes on the history of animated nature, only ten of which are now extant.

From the court of Alexander, Aristotle returned to Athens; and, finding Xenocrates teaching in the academy, he resolved to found a new sect, and teach a system of doctrines different from that of Plato. He accordingly opened a school in the lyceum which was a grove in the suburbs of Athens. His method of instruction was by

conversation or lecture while walking, and hence his followers were called peripatetics.

Aristotle, in common with several other philosophers, had his public, and his secret doctrine, his exoteric, and his acroamatic or esoteric. The first embraced logic, rhetoric, and policy, the last, being, nature and god. The first was delivered in the evening to a promiscuous auditory, the latter in the morning to his select disciples. The one was called the evening, the other the morning walk.

He continued instructing in the lyceum for twelve years. Meeting with persecution at Athens, and fearing the fate of Socrates, he left the city, saying that "he would not give the Athenians an opportunity of committing a second offense against philosophy." He retired to Chalcis, where he remained until his death, which took place in his sixty-third year. It has been supposed by some that this occurred through premature decay, arising from excessive watchfulness and application to study.

Aristotle was slender in his person, had small eyes, a shrill voice, and, when young, hesitated in his speech. He was scrupulously attentive to his dress, was subject to frequent indispositions, through a natural weakness of the stomach, but he always adopted a temperate regimen. He was twice married; once to Pythias, the sister of his friend Hermias, and after her death, to Herpilis, a native of Stagira. By the latter he had a son named Nichomachus.

Aristotle was a most voluminous writer. His writings appear originally to have embraced the whole round of human knowledge, as then understood. Those that have come down to us are obviously in a very imperfect state. The story of their preservation is, that, having passed through the hands of his scholar, Theophrastus, they were left by him to his pupil, Neleus. They were afterwards concealed in a dark vault for many generations, when, being discovered, they were sold to Apellicon of Athens, whence they were subsequently transmitted to Rome, by Sylla. It was, however, only a copy of the original of

which Sylla possessed himself. They were edited at Rome, by Andronicus of Rhodes, in the best manner their mutilated state would admit of.

Aristotle wrote many books that have never come down to us. Those that have, show an amount of industry, learning and research, which are truly astonishing. What he wrote, may, perhaps, be classed under the several heads of logic, physics, metaphysics, mathematics, ethics and rhetoric. The philosophy of Aristotle may be divided into three distinct branches, viz: *a.* Instrumental, embracing logic, or the right use of the mind. *b.* Theoretical, embracing physics, pneumatology, ontology and mathematics. *c.* Practical, embracing ethics and policy.

a. Logic; the instrumental. Its end is the discovery of truth, which may be said to be either probable or certain. To the first belong dialectics; to the second, analytics. The great logical instrument is the syllogism. This consists of three propositions, the two first of which are the premises, and the third, the conclusion. These three terms are called the major, the minor, and the middle term. The middle term shows the connection between the major and minor, and brings out the conclusion. Thus in the following: One Creator must be worshiped — major. God is our Creator — minor. Therefore God must be worshiped — middle. Of the syllogism and its application, Aristotle has treated with great minuteness and subtlety. It consists of propositions, and these again of simple terms. These terms constitute the first part of logic, and are the expression of ideas. Next comes propositions, which are the expression of judgments; and lastly, argumentation. It may be essential to learn the elements of the last. These are propositions. Propositions are resolvable into simple terms. These are of three kinds, viz: Homonymous, where one word is applied to different things. Synonymous or univocal, where the meaning of the word and the definition of the thing, coincide. Paronymous, where the word only varies in case or termination.

Others afterwards added to the peripatetic philosophy the doctrine of predicables, or general modes of predicating. These predicables, according to Porphyry were five: genus, species, difference, property and accident.

Under the synonymous, or univocal terms, came the categories or predicaments of Aristotle, which were originally ten in number. These were: Substance, which is either primary or secondary. Quantity, which is continued or discrete. Relation, the affection of one thing towards another. Quality, by which a thing is said to be such as it is. Action, which signifies the motion of the agent. Passion, which signifies the state of the patient. When, which denotes time. Where, which denotes place. Situation, which expresses local relation. Habit, which expresses the circumstances of being habited. To these were subsequently added five others, viz: opposition; priority; coincidence; motion; and possession. These would all be comprised under the general head of accident, with the single exception of substance.

Propositions are composed of terms, and consist each of a subject, a predicate and a copula; the first being the thing concerning which the assertion is made; the second the accident which is asserted and predicated of it; and the third the assertion itself.

From the proposition is derived the syllogism. These have an application both to dialectics and to analytics. Those of the latter kind respect certain truths, and hence consist of propositions which arise necessarily from the nature of things, or the definition of terms.

There are two kinds of demonstration, the one deriving the cause from its effect, the other reasons from the nature of causes. Science is employed upon those universal natures which are derived from particulars perceived by the senses. These latter are conversant with individual objects only.

Dialectics regard probabilities only, and hence the art of dialectic reasoning is conjectural, not always attaining its end with certainty. Dialectic propositions express genus

and difference, definition, property, or accident. They identify the class to which a subject belongs, and ascertain wherein it differs from others. Also, what properties it possesses, or what casual circumstances attend it.

In reasoning, legitimate syllogisms may be employed to enforce the truth, or sophistical arts in support of error. Of these latter he enumerates eight, viz: Departing from the point. Supposing what is not admitted. Reasoning in a circle, where the same things serve both as the medium of proof and the conclusion. Assigning a false cause. Representing a mere accident as essential. Deducing an universal from that which is true only in a particular. Asserting anything in a compound sense which is only true in a divided sense. Abusing the ambiguity of words.

This part of the works of Aristotle was termed his Organon, organ, instrument. This was in fact, the master work of Aristotle, the key to all his speculations, the bond which unites all the portions of his immense labors. Logic, in its formal parts, still remains essentially what he made it. In that, Aristotle has not yet ceased to rule the mind.

b. The second branch is the theoretical, and of these, the first is physics. In regard to the primary principles of nature, Aristotle endeavored to keep clear of all former theories. He did not, therefore, recognize similar parts, nor atoms, nor sensible elements, nor unity, nor numbers, nor ideas. He could not derive nature out of contraries alone, as he held that two contrary principles would rather destroy each other than cause the existence of a third. He, therefore, held to the necessity of a third principle, to the production of natural bodies. He held to these principles; form, privation, matter, the two first being contrary, the third the common subject of both. According to him, matter and form are the constituent principles of things; while privation is accidentally associated with them, matter is neither produced nor destroyed, but it is that out of which things are formed, and into which they are again resolved. It is entirely destitute of all qualities; it is without quantity, form, or figure, or any of the properties of

body, but at the same time is the eternal subject on which forms may be impressed, and in which they may inhere.

In regard to what Aristotle understood by nature, it is not so easy perfectly to understand. He appears to have considered it as the sum of all existing things, whose existence can be known only by means of perception and the experience which is thereon founded. He also regarded it as the internal principle of change in objects, and this in his view constituted a distinction between her works, and those of art. The knowledge of nature is properly the knowledge of the laws of bodies, so far as they are in movement.

Aristotle seems to have conceived in his mind a vague notion of some internal cause of motion and arrangement, to which he applied the term nature. He says that nature, as a principle of change, does nothing without an end or object, and this end or object is the form which it assumes. That a change is a realization of that which is possible, so far as it is possible. That as soon as the possible assumes a certain form, and is developed after a particular manner, every other condition and state is excluded. That all change necessary presupposes a subject matter, and a form. All motion, or change of any kind, in respect to time is successive, finite, and is produced by some cause external or internal.

He distinguished causes into four kinds. These were: materials, in regard to the materials of which things are made. Formal, by which a thing is that which it is, and no other or different. Efficient, or that by whose agency anything is produced; and final, or the end for which it is produced. Even when we speak of chance, we always, in fact, mean real causes, though unknown to ourselves.

He taught that substances were of three kinds; one of which is eternal, another perishable, and a third immutable. The world is a substance which is eternal and immovable, and is the sum total of all things which are subject to change. Beyond its extreme limits is neither change, nor time, nor space. It is of a spherical form, is

bounded by the heavens, and is without beginning or end. It is the central point, the heavens being the circumference.

There are three kinds of motion. The first is toward the centre. This is gravitation. The second, from the centre towards the circumference. This is only the motion of light bodies. Such, for instance, as fire. The third is a motion about the centre. The last is the most perfect, and the upper region of the heavens where it prevails is perfect and divine, indestructible, and of a nobler nature than sublunary parts. The constellations are animated beings; their principle of motion being within themselves, although they revolve in the circle to which they belong. Their elementary matter is the principle of all life, action and thought in the inferior region; and all things here are subject to its influence and direction.

The stars communicate light and heat to the air, and thence to the inferior world, by means of friction. They are moved through the motion of the spheres in which they are placed. The earth is the centre of motion to all the spheres. The velocities of the spheres of the seven planets are inversely as their distances from the first sphere. There cannot be more than one world, because if there were many, they would move towards each other, and out of their respective places.

Bodies are simple or compound. The simple are produced by the union of primary matter and form, are elementary. The compound are produced from the combination of elementary bodies. The elements are four; fire, air, water and earth. Of these four, the earth has simple gravity, and fire simple levity, while air and water partake of both. Those elements that are governed by levity are uppermost, and are the most perfect.

Bodies are undergoing a perpetual succession of dissolution and reproduction. The first always succeeds the last; because the termination of the first is the commencement of the last, the primary matter remaining unchanged.

In all sensible bodies there are certain primary qualities, some active and others passive, and this it is that consti-

tutes their specific difference. Heat and cold, moisture and dryness, heaviness and lightness, hardness and softness, roughness and smoothness, are instances of this. The elements are formed from the union of these. Fire originates from heat and dryness, air from heat and moisture, water from cold and moisture, and earth from cold and dryness.

Mixed bodies are formed by a combination of all the elements. Their nature, together with the general principles of production and dissolution, producing the natural appearances which we everywhere behold, are sought to be explained from the mutual action and passion of these primary qualities. This mutual action and passion arises from the mutual contact of different bodies, and results in the endeavor of each to reduce the other to its own likeness.

Metaphysics are supposed by some to have been so termed because they were after or beyond physics. The first principle he laid down in reference to being was that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time and in the same respect.

Being either exists by itself, or its existence is by accident. Of the latter no certain knowledge can be obtained. The categories already mentioned may be predicated of being.

Being may be either in power or in act. The first is either active or passive. As active, it is the principle of motion or change. As passive, it subsists in the subject upon which the active is exercised. They are correlatives and cannot be separated. Power may exist although it be not in action.

Again, being is either real or notional. Real is as it exists in nature, notional as it is conceived in the mind. The last may be true or false, either as it corresponds or varies from the real nature of things. Mistake and error can only exist concerning contingent and variable objects. To being belong genus and species.

The first cause of all motion is itself immovable. The circular motion peculiar to the celestial sphere had no be-

ginning. The sphere itself, which is the seat of this motion, is an eternal substance; so also is the substance which from eternity has caused its motion. That substance is simple pure energy, void of matter, eternal and immutable. Its act in the production of motion consists in pure intelligence. This acts upon inferior intelligences, and thus produces motion in the primary subordinate spheres. This first mover is indivisible because of its perfect unity; immutable, because nothing can change it, and eternal because motion itself is eternal. It is an incorporeal intelligence. It is God.

How then does Aristotle solve the problem of the universe? He does not consider the celestial orbs as animated bodies, or as moving by any innate force of their own. He supposes their circular motion to be eternal, but, at the same time, either from necessity or choice, admits into his system a first mover. This first mover is immovable; is divested of all quantity, matter, and motion. How shall a simple immaterial substance, itself incapable of motion, produce motion in material substances? Here was a difficulty, and he attempts to solve it by supposing the first mover to communicate or be the cause of all motion, upon the same principle that the human mind is the cause of all voluntary motion in the material organization with which it is connected.[1]

We cannot, therefore, call Aristotle an atheist, a term which Epicurus really merited. He regards his first mover as a being really distinct from the world, and distinct from matter; as a peculiar substance, possessing intellect, desire, and a power of communicating motion; as vastly superior to all other intelligent natures. And yet his conceptions of him as deity, were remarkably circumscribed. The world had existed from eternity, and was not, therefore, created by him. He was connected with it for no other purpose than as the spring of all motion. This motion he produced necessarily, not voluntarily, and for his own

[1] *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, 162.

pleasure, not for the sake of other beings. His residence was in the first or celestial sphere. He possesses, therefore, neither immensity, nor omnipresence; not even observing what is passing on in the inferior parts of the universe. Such a being could be to the universe, little more than the main spring of a watch is to its movements.

As the first mover resided in, and communicated motion to, the first celestial sphere, so he supposed the lower celestial spheres were presided over by intelligent natures of an inferior order, who also communicated motion to those spheres, but in all things subordinate to the first mover. It does not appear that he considered these inferior natures as worthy of religious worship.

Aristotle considered the soul to be the first principle of action in an organized body. He regarded it as an energy, an activity, the principle of organic, sensitive and intellectual life. It possesses, according to him, three faculties, viz: The nutritive, by which its life is produced and preserved. The sensitive, by which we perceive and feel. The rational, by which we reason.

The acts of mere organic life, he held to be generation and nutrition, and that these were common to all organized beings. The second, a sensitive life, is peculiar only to animals.

The different senses are the recipients of sensible species, or forms, without matter, in the same way as wax receives the impression of a seal without receiving any part of its substance. Each external sense, however, perceives only that which characterizes the object to which it is applied. In addition to the external senses, there is a common internal sense, which receives the impressions transmitted by all the others, and to which is referred the comparison of all those sensations. This internal sense possesses the power of perceiving various objects at the same instant. Accompanying the sensations is an appetite corresponding to them, which, joined with the images perceived by the senses, completes the sensitive life.

Perception belongs in common to all animals, but intellectual life is peculiar to man. It exists in him in two modes, viz: passive, so far as it invests things with forms; and active, so far as by its own power it reacts upon those forms. To the intellect belongs also an appetite, the rational appetite, the desire for truth, which completes the intellectual life. The thinking faculty is an energy distinct from the body, derived from without; resembling the elementary matter of the stars. Memory is the effect of some image impressed upon the soul by means of the senses. Reminiscence is employed in the search for a thing we desire to recollect, through a series of things nearly related to it, until it is brought to the mind.

The intellect becomes theoretical or practical, according to its application, and, together with the will, determines our actions. As theoretical, it considers what is true or false; as practical, it determines whether anything is good or evil. From its practical exercise, therefore, arises desire or aversion, and these produce either rational volition, or sensitive appetite.

c. The practical in the Aristotelian philosophy embraces his ethics, politics, and economics. Moral felicity is summed up, according to him, in the virtuous exercise of the mind. Virtue is either theoretical, or practical. The first consists in the due exercise of the understanding; the last, in the pursuit of what is right and good. Virtue essentially consists in preserving that mean in all things which reason and prudence prescribe.

Fortitude is the mean between timidity and rash confidence; temperance between the excessive pursuit and neglect of pleasure; liberality between prodigality and avarice. Magnificence is the mean between haughty grandeur, and low parsimony; magnanimity holds a middle place between meanness of spirit and pride; moderation is the mean between ambition and the contempt of greatness; gentleness observes a proper medium between anger and insensibility; affability pursues the middle path between moroseness and servility; modesty lies half way between impudence and bashfulness.

Justice includes the observance of the laws and the discharge of obligations. Equity corrects the rigor of laws, or supplies their defects. Friendship consists in perfect affection towards an equal. The object of Aristotle in his ethical writings seems to have been to lay down precepts for civil life, introductory to his doctrine of political wisdom.

A perfect unity of plan is found to prevail throughout his morals, his politics, and his economics. His state is an association of smaller societies, sufficient to provide in common for all the necessities of life. In its government intellectual influence should preponderate. The main principle in the science of politics is expediency, and its perfection the suitableness of means to the end. His principle led him to admit the lawfulness of slavery.

Aristotle differed essentially from Plato in regard to the existence of ideas. He looked upon those phenomena which arise from the mutual relations of ideas in the light of an arbitrary assumption and fanciful conception. But in avoiding Scylla he rushed into Charybdis. In making matter the eternal ground of phenomena, and placing it alongside of the ever-working activity of God, he made the world eternal and coexistent with God, and thus ran into a duality without any means of reconciling or harmonizing each with the other. It is true he made matter subordinate, passive, and devoid of energy, yet it was with him the ground of multiplicity, subject to chances and variations, and presented an obstacle to the world attaining complete perfection.

Aristotle, far more than Plato, was the philosopher of experience. He regarded simply man's condition on earth, and sought nothing in science but what would be suitable to that state, whereas Plato would not submit to the limits of man's earthly relations, but regarded him as capable of being emancipated from these, and of enjoying a higher and disembodied existence. They also differed essentially in regard to the soul. Plato considered it as an essence properly individual, and impliedly held that it might enter indifferently into all bodies, and impart to them motion

and vitality. Aristotle believed the development of the soul to be inseparably dependent on the body to which it is attached, to be in truth that body's form, and to rule the matter of which it is composed. His doctrine could be hardly consistent with its immortality. While Plato busies himself in the contemplation of the ideal of the beautiful and good, Aristotle seeks to derive all possible information, as to the supra-sensible, from the most precise and positive experience. He was really the Bacon of ancient philosophy, although it was left to the real Bacon of modern times to overthrow what passed for the philosophy of Aristotle in the schools. The doctrine of Plato was to arrive at the knowledge of things by ideas, which he considered as their originals. He would follow the order which seems to be established in nature, that is of proceeding from causes to their effects. The doctrine of Aristotle was to arrive at the knowledge of things by their effects, thus seeking to reach the cause by means of its effect. Plato would find the particular in the universal, and would commence with universals and descend from them to particulars. Aristotle, on the contrary, assumed, as his starting point, the principle afterwards so fully carried out by Bacon, that from the knowledge of particular things addressed to the senses, we rise to the knowledge of general and immaterial things. But his misfortune was that his philosophy tended to scholasticism, introducing a countless number of forms and qualities, distinct from substance, thus bewildering his followers, and so filling them with a jargon about entities, as finally to terminate in the scholastic philosophy of the middle ages, as to require the practical good sense of the seventeenth century, under the guidance of Lord Bacon, to give it its proper direction, and to develop to its largest extent the inductive philosophy.

Aristotle was succeeded in his school by Theophrastus, who conducted it with such high reputation as to have near two thousand scholars. He lived to the age of eighty-five years, and died advising his disciples, that since it is the lot of man to die as soon as he begins to live, they should

take more pains to enjoy life as it passes, than to acquire posthumous fame.

He did not implicitly follow the doctrines of his master, as he taught that the categories are as numerous as the motions and changes to which beings are liable; and that among such motions and changes are to be reckoned desires, appetites, judgments, and thoughts. He also held that all things are not produced from contraries, but that some are so produced, some from similar causes, and some from simple energy.

He was succeeded by Strato of Lampsacus, who departed widely from the doctrine of Aristotle. He referred the production and dissolution of bodies to a principle of motion or force inherent in them, which is unconscious, and without intelligence. The world, according to him, has not been formed by the agency of deity, or of any principle distinct from matter, but has arisen from a force innate to matter, excited by accident, and continuing, according to the peculiar qualities of natural bodies. He thus effectually excluded deity from the universe, and went over to materialism.

This was, in reality, only developing more fully, one branch of the philosophy of Aristotle. He had laid its foundation by his admission of two eternal, independent powers in the universe: matter, and motion or God. True, he attempted, in some respects, to subordinate the former to the latter, but that was unphilosophical, as matter, if eternal and independent, as it must be if eternal, could owe no allegiance to any other power. He thought, by giving motion, or God, the superiority of control, and at the same time vesting in matter some inferior energies, such as would subject it to change and variations, he might render it the ground of multiplicity, and thus account for the dependent, the conditioned, the contingent, and the imperfect in the things around us. Strato, unable to recognize this duality, only reduced the system of things to unity; but it was the unity of materialism. Denying the existence of any other power than that of nature, he

regarded the latter as an unconscious ground of things, as mere matter, having, in itself, the potentiality of, and an impulse to, form; and an ability to reproduce, in its more perfect creatures, this form, and along with it, soul and intelligence.

There were others who succeeded him, as Lycon of Troas, Aristo of the island of Coos, Cristolaus, a Lydian, and Diodorus, in whom the uninterrupted succession of the peripatetic school terminated.

4. The Stoic school of philosophy, Zeno. Zeno, the founder of the stoic school, was the son of Mnaseas, a rich merchant of Phœnician descent, and was born at Citium, in the island of Cyprus, in the year B.C. 362. He early developed a disposition to devote himself to philosophical pursuits, and having been brought to Athens on a commercial adventure, he was retained there by philosophy.

He became at first a disciple of Crates, the cynic philosopher, and for some time attended upon his lectures. The cynic sect presented two obstacles to his hearty approval of their doctrine and system. The one was the utter contempt they manifested for all the lesser decencies of life, which he could not but look upon with aversion; the other was their disregard of all physical and speculative science, the confining of themselves simply to the development of their moral system.

He subsequently became a disciple of Stilpo, then the head of the Megaric sect. He also attended the lectures of Xenocrates, the academic, and of Polemon. He was at one time a disciple of Diodorus Chronos, to whose verbal triflings he was an attentive listener.

After rendering himself acquainted with the doctrines of the most celebrated schools, Zeno resolved to become the founder of a system which should, to some extent, combine the principles of all the others. He accordingly established a new school, the place where he lectured being a spacious portico in Athens, and from its Greek name Stoa, his followers derived the appellation of stoics.

It has been said, and undoubtedly truly, that Zeno was not so much the inventor of new tenets, as of fresh terms, which could conceal old doctrines under a novel air.

The stoics believed philosophy to be the science of human perfection, developing itself in thought, knowledge, and action. They made three principal subdivisions. Logic, physiology, and ethics. They regarded the two first as subordinate to the last. Like the peripatetics they based their philosophy on empiricism, the results of experience; and they were not able to digest these into a systematic form, founded on solid principles.

The logic of the stoics was intended to embrace much more than that of the peripatetics. It went to the matter as well as the form of argumentation, and included all the principles of mental philosophy. They considered the mind as originally destitute of knowledge, as a perfect blank. First come perceptions. These are the result of impressions made upon the senses, and to them was given the name of phantasy. These phantasies are subjected to the dominion of reason, a superior directing power; and under its influence opinions and notions are formed. Phantasies require the assent of the mind to be given to them, before they can be received; and this assent the stoic supposed depended upon ourselves, and was entirely voluntary. Those phantasies only should receive assent which really represent the things of which they are the apparent representatives. These alone are strictly true, are freely assented to, and constitute the foundation of all science. The rule of truth he held, therefore, to be right reason which conceives of an object as it is. Subsequent stoics taught that in the mutual comparison of phantasies there was a combining together of whatever they contain of the universal, as well as the particular. This union may be involuntary or voluntary. From the first result natural ideas, from the second notions artificially acquired. The first constitute that common sense which is the criterion of truth.

The physiology of Zeno and the stoics embraced all the phenomena of the universe. According to them there is

nothing in the universe but what is corporeal. All immaterial beings are rejected as being nothing more than chimeras.

The universe is made up of two eternally existing principles, of which the one, passive, is matter; the other, active, is God. This active principle is the only deity of the stoic system. It is the creative principle; the source of activity; the author of form and arrangement. It is a principle corporeal and intellectual, a pure ether, a living fire, which they called spirit, producing, fashioning, pervading all things. The universe is, in fact, a huge animal. God is in, not without it, as the mind is in the human body.

The stoics not only made their God corporeal. They also divested him of omnipotence. They made him subject to a blind, inevitable fate. He could act only according to his nature and the nature of matter, the passive principle which he ensouled. There could, therefore, be no such thing as providence. There was nothing at the foundation but destiny. To this inevitable fate was ascribed the origin of moral evil.

The figure of the universe he supposed to be spherical, containing the earth in its centre, and having beyond it nothing but vacuum. The sun, moon, planets and stars are supported in ether. If rightly read, they unfold to us our destiny, as they are animated, and partake of the divinity.

Although the world, and everything belonging to it is eternal, yet it by no means follows that it is therefore unchangeable. On the contrary, the stoics taught that this globe is subject to periodical revolutions; that after certain periods of time it is resolved back into its original chaos or confusion, to be again reconstructed by the animating principle contained in it.

The soul, according to the stoics, is an ardent, fiery spirit, and a portion of the great soul of the world. It partakes, therefore, of its essential nature, and like it, is corporeal and perishable. The intellectual part of the soul, is, in their view, the foundation or source from which

its chief efficacy is derived. To that they referred not only perception and thought, but also all emotions and passions, because they are all founded on some belief of the reality of their object, on some approbation or judgment.

Thus far we have noticed nothing but pantheism and materialism, such as would readily find a place in the school of Epicurus. All intelligence is enclosed within the circle of sensations; the universe is an assemblage of corporeal principles; while the law presiding over its unfolding and development is the most inexorable fate.

There were, however, other elements, in the doctrine of the stoics, which tend to link it with a different order of doctrines.

In the ethics and practical morality of the stoics is to be found the most remarkable part of their doctrines. Here right is identified with good, and wrong with evil. Whatever is neither right nor wrong, is neither good nor evil; such, for example, as privations, pain and death. Order, law, and reason, are what above all things man is bound to respect, as the only condition on which he can attain virtue, which is the end of his being. All nature is framed to lead us to virtue. The first of all maxims is: "To live agreeably to the law of right reason," or, which amounts to about the same thing, differently expressed, "to live conformably to nature."

The stoics maintained that virtue is the only absolute good, and vice the only positive evil. Everything else in a moral point of view is indifferent. Virtue itself is founded on prudence, and consists in a rational and spontaneous practice, which is both consistent with itself and with nature. It has for its object both the knowledge and the performance of what is good. Virtue, according to them, did not consist in yielding a strict obedience to moral laws alone. It also embraced an acquaintance with rational and physical science, a knowledge of logical, rhetorical, and dialectic subtleties. The stoics, therefore, made the term virtue much more extensive in its significa-

tion than any other sect. In its mere moral aspect they taught that it is a system of conduct regulated by the principle that nothing is good but the practice of good, and that in that alone consists the character of true liberty.

Vice results from the neglect or perversion of reason, and is produced through the action of the evil passions.

Felicity is only attainable through the practice of virtue, and consists in a tranquil course of life which cannot be augmented by any increase of duration. Virtue is one, and vice is one; and neither of them are capable of increase or diminution. All good actions have an equality with each other, and so also do all evil, as they are derived from the same sources. The virtues may be summed up in prudence, courage, temperance and justice.

Zeno differed from the philosophers of the academic school in two or three very important particulars. They taught that each virtue might be considered separately and in itself. He maintained that it is not the occasional use, but the constant habit of virtue, which is really virtue. They taught that the passions of the mind, compassion, desire, fear, and joy, are all impulses implanted within us by nature, and all useful, provided they are properly governed and restrained.

The academies did not seek to divest man of affections, passions, appetites and desires, but to direct them properly in their exercise. According to the stoics the passions should be not moderated but eradicated. Their wise man should be elevated far above them. He is a part of the universal whole, and should live according to the laws of that whole, or, what is equivalent, the laws of nature. His sole effort should be to resemble God.

Many noble Greek and Roman souls are enrolled among the stoics. Many of their maxims are lofty and noble. There is a sternness, a dignity, a severity, a majesty in their ethical doctrines extremely captivating to great minds. Its largest offering was made to human pride, its next to vanity. The consistent stoic was obliged by his doctrine to admit that as deity was diffused through all intelligence,

and all nature, man was a part, and a very essential part of him; that he himself was morally equal with God, because he was a portion of him; because, like him, he depended upon nothing but the laws of nature; because, like him, he was just by the sole energy of his own will; and because he deemed it possible, and expected to attain to a tranquillity of soul as absolute as that which God enjoys. He must in all things act in conformity to nature. God, himself, can do no otherwise. He must be profoundly indifferent to all pleasure or pain, because he must be far above the reach of either. When the burdens of life become too oppressive to be borne, he is at liberty to rid himself of existence, because he is absolutely independent, and free to live or die just as he pleases. Thus stoicism wrought a deification of man, through the action of his own powers alone.

Stoicism had many inconsistencies, which could not be well avoided. In its physiology, it reposed on the materialism of Epicurus; in its ethics it sought to lean upon the spiritualism of Plato. It bound everything fast in fate, and yet gave to the human will entire freedom and absolute independence. Although it had its origin in Greece, yet the roman mind and soul present a soil the best fitted to nourish and perfect it.

5. The New Academy; Arcesilaus, Carneades. Of all the Grecian schools of philosophy, that of the academic, founded by Plato, was undoubtedly the most extensive. It rested on a broader foundation, gave a larger scope, united together a greater mass of principles, and embraced within its range and compass, a vastly greater amount and variety of materials, than any other sect or school in Greece. There was, therefore, more to be developed, more to be unfolded in this, than in any other system. Its pretensions were vastly more elveated than any other. It represented the high aristocracy of the intellect, and was an object of jealousy to all the other schools. Its theory of knowledge differed from every other. Its doctrine of ideas involved the complete and absolute knowledge of

things in themselves. It held in contempt all the theories of knowledge maintained in the other schools. So lofty were its pretensions, that when the followers of Plato once admitted a doubt as to the correctness of their own theory, they began to despair of human intelligence itself.

The doctrine of Plato in its purity continued to be taught in the academy down to the death of Crates. Then we find a new element introduced, and urged with great force. This marks the end of the old and the commencement of the new academy, or, as some have termed it, the middle academy, referring the new to the advent of Carneades. There seems to be no very good reason for this distinction, and accordingly we shall include both under the new academy.

The first philosopher of this academy was Arcesilaus. He was a man of extensive learning, great sweetness of temper and elegance of manners; but fond of splendid entertainments, and a luxurious manner of living. The new element he introduced into the school was that of diffidence, doubt, uncertainty. He still adhered to the principle that in the nature of things there is a real certainty; but he promulgated the distressing doctrine that to the human mind everything is uncertain, and hence that no confident assertions should be made. He introduced into the academy the method of disputation, attacking with great subtlety and force of logic the dogmatical doctrines of the schools.

In consequence of being constantly opposed to the opinions of his adversaries, he was naturally drawn into a general skepticism in reference to our knowledge of the absolute existence and nature of things. He was lead to deny the reality of any adequate criterion of truth, and recommended it as the part of wisdom to suspend all definitive judgment. He would not assent to any proposition, the truth of which is not fully established, and asserted that in all questions opposite opinions may be supported by arguments of equal weight. He questioned the testimony of the senses, and the authority of reason;

but admitted their ability to furnish probable opinions sufficient for the conduct of life. Plato himself had laid the foundation of skepticism in affirming the doctrine that all knowledge derived from sensible objects is uncertain; and that the only true science is that which is employed upon the immutable objects of intelligence, or ideas. The strong tendency and motives to doubt, now led to a more full and perfect development of this foundation. The extent in skepticism to which Arcesilaus went, alarmed both the great body of philosophers, and the state. The former began to treat him as a common enemy, and the latter apprehended that his tenets would unsettle the foundations of society, virtue, and religion. This produced a species of reaction, and resulted in the establishment of what has been termed the new academy under Carneades.

This celebrated man was an African, a native of Cyrene. He was first a pupil of Diogenes, but afterwards became the successor of Hegesinus in the academy. His labors tended to develop the doctrine of probability, and to give to doubt a kind of system. He placed at one extreme the active intellect, and at the other the objects in and upon which its activity was exerted. Between these he placed phantasy, the representative appearance of objects as they are perceived by the intellect, and having relations both to the object and the intellect. We can have no certain knowledge of things, as we have no previous knowledge of the object; and cannot, therefore, compare it with the appearance or its phantasy. But the phantasy, or appearance may nevertheless be true, and it would therefore be unwise to refuse all reliance upon it. We should therefore endeavor to distinguish what is probable from what is not. In seeking for probability we cannot expect to find it in the object, as that, independent of phantasy, is unknown to us. We must, therefore, expect to find it in the other extreme, viz: the intellect.

There are three degrees of probability. The first results from the liveliness of the impression produced in the mind.

The second consists in the agreement of one appearance with other appearances, which, not only fail to contradict it, but go to confirm it.

The third is derived from the examination of the appearance itself, under its different aspects. If it always remains the same under whatever aspect it is viewed, we may place the greater reliance upon it.

Where all these are combined, and tend unitedly to one result, the highest degree of probability is established, and the most complete criterion within the reach of man is attained. This, however, could only give rise to opinion, not science, which, according to the doctrine of this school, is never completely attainable.

Carneades was succeeded by Clitomachus and Philo, and finally by Antiochus of Ascalon, who was the last preceptor of the Platonic school. He endeavored to demonstrate the identity of the academic, peripatetic, and stoic doctrines with respect to morals, asserting that the differences between them were merely nominal. He considered self-love as the primum mobile both of men and animals, regarding its operation at first as instinctive, and as afterwards aided by consciousness and reason.

We have now completed the history of that philosophy which may in strictness be called Grecian. The impulse given to human thought, through the efforts of the Grecian schools of philosophy, was by no means limited to Greece, When the Grecian republics lost their liberty they also at the same time lost their free, bold, and enterprising spirit of inquiry. This was essential to their progress, and hence, when deprived of it that progress ceased. The Grecian schools of philosophy continued to drag out a feeble existence down to the age of Justinian, who closed them up forever.

A few observations should be made in reference to Grecian philosophy. It will be observed that it differed in one important respect from the oriental. It regarded the finite, diversity, rather than the infinite, unity. It also differed in another. Theology was a far less prominent element in it

than anthropology. Whatever regarded human knowledge, morals, and politics, found in the Grecian mind a warm and enduring sympathy.

Although in the Grecian mind imagination had the ascendancy over reason, yet in the forms of their philosophy, in most of the Grecian schools, poetic images were discarded. In their place, however, was too often substituted a vocabulary of subtle and barren abstractions.

In the Greek philosophy we first find the elements of logic. It may not have been used to the best advantage, but its use, as an instrument of thought, was both known and felt.

It will be seen and painfully felt, that in reference to the physical sciences, the Grecian schools made scarcely any progress. The methods and forms of philosophizing which they employed, failed altogether in their application to these sciences. No discovery of general laws, no explanation of special phenomena, rewarded the acuteness and boldness with which they prosecuted their inquiries. They seem not to have been deficient in facts or ideas, but their ideas were not distinct and appropriate to the facts. Their speculations in regard to physics were entirely barren, never producing what, centuries after, Lord Bacon insisted should be their legitimate result, fruit.

From Greece, the course of philosophy is divergent, one branch inclining to the east, and mingling with orientalism in the city of Alexandria; the other to the west, to be modified by the Roman spirit in the city of Rome.

CHAPTER VII.

GREECE—ITS ART.

This is the crowning element of Grecian civilization. In its varied developments; its unsurpassing displays; its astonishing disclosures; we recognize the active exercise of a power, as strong as it is effective; and guided, in its wonder workings, by a taste, as pure as it is perfect. The charm of Grecian art has never vanished from the world. Its spell has never been broken. It has sustained civilization in its most fearful extremity, and in every age and clime where it has become known, has awoke in the human mind, a sense of the beautiful, and kindled in the human soul, a love of the ideal. To the eye it has presented its forms of peerless beauty as they glow on the canvas of Apelles, or stand forth in the sculpture of Phidias; while on the ear has fallen its full diapason, mingling the song of Sophocles and Euripides with the thunder tones of Demosthenes.

To the perfecting of Grecian art, everything seemed to conspire. Around Greece nature lay in all her loveliness. She enjoyed a mild and delightful climate, under the benign influence of which all organized bodies attained their perfect forms, without dwarfing into insignificance, or shooting up into disproportionate luxuriance. She presented, within the briefest compass, the most striking contrasts of land and sea, of bay and promontory, of island and continent. Over her entire land seemed to have waved the wand of classic beauty. The outline of her shore exhibited every variety of curve. From her island gems that lay scattered over the bosom of the Ægean, she stretched off into the mainland, smiling from the depth of her valleys, and laughing from the heights of her hill tops, until, having attained her mountain fastnesses, she

sent back her sparkling streamlet, and her rippling river, to tell the height to which she had mounted, and to furnish to her Theseus, in the attempt to explore her recesses, the thread of Ariadne.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Grecian landscape lay under the arch of a Grecian sky. The one was ever smiling upon the other, except when the one shed down its tearful droppings, that the other through them might appear but the more beautiful. Thus their mutual interchanges of loveliness created all those consonances and contrasts, all those varieties of light and shade, which might be expected from their blended beauties.

But physical nature was not alone in bringing contributions to Grecian art. She furnished the model, but whence came the mind that should give to it immortality? To its origin and growth many things contributed. The form and action of Grecian government; the manners and customs of Grecian society; the ideas and demands of Grecian religion; all furnished their powerful aids in advancing to perfection Grecian art.

The element in government that more especially lent its aid for this purpose, was its freedom; freedom to think, to speak, and to act; freedom in employing the pencil and the chisel in painting and sculpturing every possible form; freedom in the exhibition of different styles of architecture; freedom to the poet in the selection of his theme, in the flow of his numbers; freedom to the actor as he pictured life and manners on the stage; and freedom to the orator as he ascended the Pnyx to practice the art of persuasion. The art last mentioned can only flourish in a free element. It derives its being, the motive that calls it into existence, alone from this element. As soon would the banana of the tropics flourish amid the ices of the poles, as the spirit of eloquence amid the chills and cheerlessness of despotic governments.

Out of the social element of Greece, arose two causes that contributed largely to the perfection of her art. One of these is found in her games and gymnasia. The direct

effect of these exercises was to give to the human form its utmost symmetry and beauty of proportion. The youth of all Greece grew up under these ever active influences. The result was, that the man of Greece, and the woman of Greece presented a physical form that exhibited a symmetry in arrangement, an uniformity in proportion, a harmony in outline, that furnished to the painter and sculptor a most perfect model. Nor had it like the Egyptian, the form and stillness of death. It was a living form, and the grace of motion was superadded to the beauty of proportion.

Another cause was found in the rewards and patronage that stimulated the Grecian artist to his extremest effort. His reward was praise, glory, immortality. His masterpieces were exhibited at the celebrations of the games where all Greece was assembled. He toiled not for money. His aims were higher, nobler. Place money or immortality side by side and within the reach of such a soul as animated the form of Zeuxis, and could he hesitate? He did not. Many of the Grecian artists never worked for pay.[1]

Another great cause is to be found in the patronage extended to Grecian art. That patronage was public, not private. The great *chef-d'œuvres* of the Grecian artists, and their works generally, were never to be found in the private dwelling. They were in the temples, in the places of public resort, where the games were celebrated, where the assemblies of the people were convened, where the gods were worshiped. To see the productions of Athenian art, you would not enter the dwelling of her Themistocles, not even of her Pericles. You would visit her public squares, and ascend her Acropolis. There you would stand in the full blaze of its splendor. The Grecian painter and sculptor plied his pencil and his chisel, not that his finished production might grace the purlieus of a lady's parlor, to attract the gaze of those who were sufficiently fortunate to compose her evening party, but to be posted up in the

[1] *Heeren's Politics of Ancient Greece*, 342.

temple or place of public resort, where the eye of all Greece could look upon it, and read it in his title to immortality. To all the great components of a human soul, this certainly furnished a powerful motive. The emulation that arose among the Greek cities to possess the works of her great artists, furnished also a strong and unceasing incentive to effort.

There were also public meetings and solemn assemblies, to which the most enlightened men of the nation were called, in which prizes were awarded to successful artists. From the time of Phidias a contest among artists existed for painting at Delphi and at Corinth, and at one of these Timagoras of Chalcis wrested the prize from Panæus, the brother or nephew of Phidias. At another, Phidias himself was vanquished by Plycletus. These instances establish confidence by proclaiming the independence of the judges, as also when Timanthes, at the time little known, entered the lists with Parrhasius, and saw his work proclaimed superior to that of the painter who filled all Greece with the fame of his triumphs.[1]

The religion of the Greeks both in its ideas and its demands furnished a powerful aid in the advancement of Grecian art. By ideas I mean those embodiments of qualities and attributes under peculiar forms, which they gave their gods and goddesses. These forms were purely ideal. The human was taken as the standard, because the most perfect of any known. But there is a vast difference between the human form in the general, and that of any one particular individual. All individual forms are imperfect, because they all have peculiarities by means of which each is distinguished from every other. The ideal form is that in which all excellences are combined, from which all mere individual peculiarities are carefully excluded, and which unites in one the perfections that nature has scattered through all her forms. Into this ideal, perfect form, the Greeks infused the divine essence.

[1] *Rochette's Lectures on Ancient Art*, 147.

Nor were they limited to one form. The Greek religion was, in form, at least, a polytheism. Their different deities possessed different powers, exercised different attributes, and were clothed with different forms. We find peculiarities here, but such only as the nature of the case requires. To each deity was assigned certain attributes, and a peculiarity of form the best calculated to proclaim them. To Hercules, for instance, belongs strength; and, wherever represented, his powerful frame leaves little doubt of the deity intended, although his invariable accompaniments, his club and lion skin, were wanting. So, also, the calm dignity of Zeus or Jupiter; the animation of Apollo; the rash valor of Mars, and the soft loveliness of Venus, are depicted in their various forms with most striking accuracy. All the forms and arrangements which accompany and characterize the peculiar qualities and attributes assigned to a god or goddess, were carefully selected and combined together. Each, therefore, was an ideal, but an ideal framed for a special purpose, and for the accomplishment of a special end. In the assignment of these qualities and attributes, and in the fixing upon the forms the best calculated to proclaim them, the Grecian poets and artists found occasion for the exercise of all their refined taste, their accurate selections, and peculiar powers of invention. Their invention and composition, together with their power of giving expression, were all tasked to the utmost in giving these perfect ideal forms. Well, therefore, may they be the forms which constitute the *chef-d'œuvres* of the Grecian artists.

The Greek religion contributed by its demands as well as its ideas to the advancement of Grecian art. These demands were principally summed up in the imagery and description required of its poets, in the temples erected by its architects, and the statuary wrought out by its sculptors. In all these the appeal must be made to the ideal, and the strongest possible motive furnished to attain the highest degree of excellence.

In these various ways religion in Greece took art by the hand, encouraged its infant essays, smiled approvingly upon its maturer labors, and finally clothed herself with its perfect workmanship. She led it from the humble workshop of the artist to the temples of her worship, and there enshrined it in the bosom of deity.

Besides, and beyond all these, there was something in the Grecian character itself peculiarly favorable to the progress and evolutions of art. There was an appreciation of the beautiful which has been recognized among no other people. There was, in the language of Fuseli, "that simplicity of their end, that uniformity of pursuit, which, in all its derivations, retraced the great principle from which it sprang, and like a central stamen drew it out into one immense connected web of congenial imitation."[1]

It seemed to be the great object of the Greeks, to present to the eyes nothing but models of the beautiful, to impress its type strongly on the imagination, to favor its reproduction in every possible manner; and under the influence of these ideas, Greek art received its definite form, and its immutable direction. The nude condition was preferred, because that is the most favorable to the development of beautiful forms. Great care was taken to avoid the presentation of ugliness, even where it was seemingly unavoidable. Thus old age might be indicated by white hairs, or by some of its usual accessories, but never by deep, ugly wrinkles, and mean details. With the Greek artist, no hideous passion disfigures the countenance, no violent motions mar and break the beautiful lines of the body. When he represents the furies, it is not with ugly forms and distorted features, but only with a symbol fitted to make them recognized, viz: with a lash of serpents with which they pursue and avenge crime. The Medusa is a beautiful female head, but it is encircled with serpents; as if her beauty would strike even more than

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 24.

the horror "which turns the gazer's spirit into stone." Never do anger, rage, fury, despair, carried to that degree which disfigures the human countenance, profane the beautiful productions of Grecian art. Every possible means was resorted to, to secure the production and creation of beautiful forms. The women of Sparta kept in their bed-chambers, statues of Nereus, Narcissus, Hyacinthus, Castor and Pollux, that they might have beautiful children. Aristotle made it a rule to remove from the eyes of young men every ignoble image. Their most beautiful women served as the models from which their finest sculptures and paintings were taken. Thus Elpinice, the lovely sister of Cimon, while he was the head of the republic, took a pride in being a model to Polygnotus. The people of Croton brought all the most beautiful girls before Zeuxis, in order that he might gather from them all the elements to compose his Helen.[1]

Under these combined influences we may well look to Greece for many of the most glorious creations of art, and many of the most perfect models it has ever yet presented to the world.

Every branch of Grecian art, as we shall see, had its history. "Greek art" as Fuseli remarks, "had her infancy, but the graces rocked the cradle, and love taught her to speak." It is interesting to trace the evolution of the more perfect forms, as the different schools succeeded each other, each successively excelling in some particular excellence, until Greece lost her nationality, and with it her government, philosophy, and art.

To present any intelligible view of this element of humanity as developed in Greece, it becomes necessary to adopt some method of division, some arrangement in reference to its different branches. For this purpose I propose to include everything appertaining to art, so far as its development in Greece is concerned, under three great divisions, viz: the *objective*, *subjective*, and *mixed*.

[1] *Rochette's Lectures on Ancient Art*, 137–40.

The OBJECTIVE include all those in which the art is developed by the human faculties through the medium of some external object upon which they act. Under this class are included the material or plastic arts, frequently called the arts of design, as painting, sculpture, and architecture.

The SUBJECTIVE include those which are developed by the human faculties in and through their own action, without the necessity of any object upon which to act; and through which to display themselves. These are purely mental. They are arts which orginate and are perfected in the mind itself. They are the arts of music, of poetry, and of eloquence, whether of the writer or the speaker.

The MIXED include those which are neither purely objective nor purely subjective, but which partake something of the character of both. They are the art dramatic, and the art military.

In the development of Grecian art, indeed in that of all art, four things are to be considered, which as they belong to art generally, and not to Grecian art in particular, I shall merely indicate, without dwelling on them.

Of these, the first are the powers and faculties of the human mind, which are directly instrumental in its production; and without the active exercise of which no art would ever exist. It is these that invent, that compose, that give expression.

The second consist in the medium or object, in and through which these powers and faculties are exercised, and by means of which the productions of art are rendered possible. These are wood, clay, canvas, ivory, gold, marble, men, faculties of mind, and all things else in or through which art is developed.

The third consists in the standard of judgment, in the peculiar action of certain faculties, which is summed up in the word taste, to which all the matters of art are to be submitted. This is more a matter of feeling than of intellect. It is to the productions of the artist, what conscientiousness, or the moral sense, is to the actions of the

man. It has different degrees of elevation among different people.

The fourth consists in the object sought to be accomplished by artistic production, and in the comparative strength of that object in the creation of motives to operate upon the mind of the artist. In this is found the motive power to which all art owes, if not its existence, at least its perfection.

I. The first division of art includes the OBJECTIVE. In this are embraced all those varieties of art which are alone wrought out of external nature through the action of the human faculties. The intellectual powers have a threefold action, receptive, reflective, and reproductive.

By the first they simply receive, and in that the external senses are their great instruments. So far as external nature is concerned, they have no other. Through these channels outward nature, with all its mighty machinery of agencies, causes and effects, becomes introduced into, and forms a part of mind. The landscape with all its varieties of hill and valley, of light and shade, exists not in space alone; it becomes also embalmed in human thought.

The receptive power, however, is by no means limited to outward nature, or to the external senses as its instruments. The very term external applied to these senses implies that it is distinctive, and that, therefore, there are others. There are also internal senses that belong to the soul, as well as external that appertain to the body. The sense of the beautiful, of the true, of the just, of the divine, belongs to an organized soul and not to an organized body. From all these sources, both external and internal, the intellect receives.

It also reflects, and that follows next in order. That consists in its own appropriate action upon the materials it has thus received. It analyzes, synthetizes, compares, abstracts, deduces, separates, connects, reasons, and thinks consecutively and otherwise, and thus throws into a thou-

sand different forms the materials it has gathered up from its external and internal senses.

It is now prepared to exercise its reproductive powers. These appear last, and constitute its crowning effort. In the exercise of these, the materials received into the mind, and variously acted upon by its reflective power, are made to reappear in all the various forms of art. The beauties gathered from the landscape glow on the painter's canvas. The forms of beauty and sublimity which nature presents, emerge from the shapeless marble beneath the sculptor's chisel. Thus it is that nature is made to reappear at the bidding of art. It is its high perogative to reproduce the forms of nature cast in the mould of mind. It collects from all forms their peculiar beauties; recombines them in harmonious proportions; adds beauty to the beautiful and sublimity to the sublime; and thus presents its faultless model, and its perfect product.

As we might reasonably expect, the arts first developed are objective. The forms of nature are made to reappear through the instrumentality of outward nature. It seems fitting that mind should be first exercised upon outward or objective nature before it acts subjectively upon itself.

The OBJECTIVE embraces painting, sculpture, and architecture.

1. Painting. The painter's art includes both drawing and coloring. It consists in the representation of visible objects upon a plane surface by means of figure and color. It is founded in the art of designing, which represents objects on a plane by lines and strokes. In its origin it is often intimately connected with the art of writing. There is no evidence that there was ever any period in Grecian history in which ideas were sought to be conveyed, by representations of objects on plane surfaces. The introduction of the alphabet into Greece is attributed to Cadmus, the Phœnician, who founded Thebes.

Painting in Greece, as a fine art, is of less antiquity than sculpture. There exists greater difficulty, and more numerous obstacles, in bringing painting to a comparative

degree of perfection than sculpture. There is so much of the illusive in it, so much of the unreal, so much of the expression outwardly of internal powers, as to render it later than other arts in being brought to any high degree of perfection.

The Greeks seem ever desirous of tracing the origin of things, whether mental or physical, to moral sources. Hence they derive from the depth of affection both the idea and the motive to which they ascribe the first essay in painting and incidentally in sculpture.

A young maiden was about to undergo a temporary separation from her lover. As he happened to be placed between a lighted lamp and the wall, she observed on the latter his profile perfectly shadowed forth. The idea occurred to her that she might trace around that shadow a line, precisely following its contour, and thus preserve his image. She promptly put in practice the suggestion of her mind, and by this ingenious device, laid the foundation of an art as lovely and as lasting almost as the moral feeling in which it originated.

It is added that her father Dibutade was a potter in the city of Sycione. Observing the outline drawn by his daughter, he applied clay on the strokes, following the contours such as she had designed. In this manner he formed a medallion, or profile of earth, which he afterwards burnt in his furnace. This was long preserved as an interesting relic.[1]

The first essays in painting among the Greeks were undoubtedly confined to the linear method. The same word in its etymology with them expressed both painting and writing. The tool employed was a style, or pen, of wood or metal; the materials a board, or plane of wood, metal, stone, or some prepared compound.[2]

Painting, in its first essays, was limited to the formation of sciagrams, which were simply the outlines of a shade,

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, xxxix, 44; *Goguet's Origin of Laws*, ii, 221.
[2] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, ii, 25, 26.

and exhibited merely the profile of the object. From them the advance was made to the monogram, which were also outlines of figures without light or shade, but having some addition of parts within the outline. The monochrom came next, which expressed the painting by a single color on a plane or tablet. The color chiefly used was red. The priming was with white. There was a covering of wax in or through which the outlines were traced with a firm but pliant style called cestrum. When all the necessary alterations were made and the design was settled, it was suffered to dry, covered with a brown encaustic varnish, and the lights worked over again with a point still more delicate than the cestrum. By these means masses of light and shade were at length made to appear, and the polycrom, or employment of different colors, came into use, and finally the pencil was added to the cestrum, and the picture was gradually advancing to perfection.[1]

The pencil finally entirely supplanted the cestrum, as an instrument of painting, but at what particular period of time this occurred, is not well ascertained. The first painting of which we have any satisfactory account, is the battle of Magnetę by Bularchus in the year B. C. 718. This is said to have been purchased by Candaules, king of Lydia, for its weight in gold. There is little remaining to enlighten us in reference to the early progress of painting in Greece. We should bear in mind that sculpture, its sister art, received among the Greeks, much the greatset share of attention. No production of the Grecian cestrum, or pencil, has come down to us, while many specimens of Grecian sculpture, or exact copies from them, still remain.[2]

Another fact, the Greek painters never made use of oil colors. They always used water colors, and those generally the following, viz: white, yellow, red, and black.[3]

The history of painting in Greece is divided by Memes into four periods, of which the first is made to terminate

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 26, 27. [2] *Constable's Miscellany*, XXXIX, 142. [3] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 129.

with Bularchus about B. C. 720. Of this period scarce anything is known beyond conjecture.

The second period is embraced in the time intervening between Bularchus and Zeuxis, who flourished about the year B. C. 400.

This was properly the preparatory period. It is the period where facts first appear and overbalance conjecture. The first great name that adorns this period, is that of Polygnotus of Thasos. He painted the pœcile at Athens, and the lesche, or public hall at Delphi. In his paintings as described, there seems to have been a total want of what is now termed composition, and they had no perspective. He was, nevertheless, a great genius, and his works were monumental, recording the feats, consecrating the acts, perpetuating the rites, propagating the religion, and disseminating the peculiar doctrines of the Hellenic nation. Although he seemed heedless of the rules prescribed to inferior excellence, yet he had a lofty simplicity, and by the glimpses he caught of the genius in the individual, he obviously attained to a sense of ideal beauty and grandeur, and actually improved upon the models furnished by nature. He may be said to be the first who succeeded in what has been termed, "the expression of undescribed being." His paintings were admired by Pliny, six hundred years afterwards.

As Polygnotus was the first, so Apollodorus, the Athenian, and the instructor of Zeuxis, was the last, among the great painters of this period. He improved the art both in its instruments and style. He substituted the pencil for the cestrum. He was the first colorist of his age. He taught the magic of light and shade to play upon the canvas. His great merit, however, probably consists in a more perfect understanding and appreciation of the ideal than any of his predecessors. He was enabled to do this by more thoroughly studying the general forms under which nature arranges her species, by separating the peculiarities that distinguish the individual from those that belong to the species; and thus arriving at the beauty

and grandeur of form as form, without marring it by anything peculiar to the individual. He seized upon and personified the central form of the class to which his object belonged. He could represent elegance without effeminacy, and grandeur without hugeness. He also brought out the mental qualities through the outward form. In his adoring priest, filled with gratitude to God, whose arrows had avenged his wrongs and restored his daughter, we recognize personified the character of devotion; in his wrecked Ajax, hurling defiance from the sea-swept rock, that of impiety. To Apollodorus is ascribed the invention of tints, the mixtures of colors, and the gradations of shade.

The third period in the history of painting in Greece commences with Zeuxis, and ends with Apelles about B. C. 330. The great merit of Zeuxis consists mainly in the rigid comparison he instituted between what belonged to the genus, and what to the class; and in arriving, through that comparison, at that ideal form, which unites the various powers scattered among many, in one object, to one end. He improved form upon form to a perfect image. In his composition was great simplicity. He often relied upon the perfection of a single figure to concentrate interest. He was also simple in his coloring, never using more than four, and frequently only two pigments. He painted monochroms on a background, adding the lights in white, thus extending light and shade to masses.

To him succeeded Parrhasius, who studied the character of outline; examined into its proportions: investigated its elements; and established the standard of the divine and heroic form. He gave to that form in painting, what Polycletus did to the human in sculpture, a canon of proportion.[1] "He fixed the maximum, the point from which descends the ultimate line of celestial beauty, the angle within which moves what is inferior, beyond which, what

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 40.

is portentous." "In the simplicity of this principle," says Fuseli,[1] "lies the uninterrupted progress and the unattainable superiority of Grecian art." Parrhasius claimed that he stood at the boundaries of art.

He was also the master, if not the inventor of allegorical painting. He painted the Athenian demos, or people, which was intended to combine in its varied expression all the contradictory qualities which belonged to that singular but gifted race of men. The personification of the Athenian demos was also an object of sculpture, but whether previous or subsequently to the painting of Parrhasius is not known.

If Parrhasius endeavored to attain the perfect in form, his competitor, Timanthes, the Cynthian, made no less powerful efforts to inspire the form with mind, and animate it with the passions. His most celebrated painting was the immolation of Iphigenia. The father, Agamemnon, was present at the sacrifice of his daughter. The painter shows his art by making him veil his face at the moment of the sacrifice, "when in gradation he had consumed every image of grief within the reach of art, from the unhappy priest to the deeper grief of Ulysses, and from that to the pangs of kindred sympathy in Menelaus, unable to express with dignity the father's woe, he threw a veil or a mantle over his face."[2] Thus, by the gradation of that master passion, grief, in the faces of the assistant mourners, he showed the reason why that of the principal one was hidden from the view.

Apollodorus, Zeuxis and Parrhasius, were the great Grecian painters who had arrived at the ideal in form, and had fixed the canon of proportion.

Timanthes had added the display of thought, feeling and passion. It still remained to add grace and polish to the form; amenity or truth to the tones; magic and imperceptible transition to the abrupt division of masses, and depth and roundness to composition.[3]

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 41. [2] *Idem*, 45. [3] *Idem*, 58.

Eupompus established the school of Sicyon. When consulted by the young sculptor, Lysippus, on the subject of imitation, pointing to the passing multitude, he said, "Behold my models: from nature, not from art, must he study, who aspires to the true excellence of art."

Aristides of Thebes followed Timanthes in evolving from the soul its thoughts, feelings and passions, and in compelling them to speak through his canvas. "His volume was man, his scene society. He drew the subtle discriminations of mind in every stage of life, the whispers, the simple cry of passion, and its most complex accents. Such, as history informs us, was the suppliant whose voice you seem to hear, such his sick man's half extinguished eye and laboring breast, such his Byblis expiring in the pangs of love; and above all, such his half-slain mother, shuddering almost in the very agonies of death, lest her eager babe should suck the blood from her palsied nipple. Her expression, poised between the anguish of maternal affection and the pangs of death, gives to commiseration an image which has never been surpassed. Timanthes had marked the limits that discriminate terror from the excess of horror, while Aristides drew the line that separates it from disgust."[1]

Euphranor the Isthmian, both a painter and a sculptor, the disciple of Aristides, studied the refinements of expression. His statue of Paris has been much admired. Theon of Samos exhibited the eager haste of a young warrior to join the fight. Pamphilus, the Amphipolitan, was eminent for the natural feeling and truth of his style. He was the most scientific artist of his time, and was the master of Apelles.

The fourth and last epoch of painting in Greece commences with Apelles, who flourished about the conclusion of the fourth century before Christ. This epoch witnessed both the glory and the fall of Grecian art. The name of Apelles has came down to us encircled with a halo of glory. It is suggestive of unrivaled and unattainable excellence

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 64, 65.

in art. He, in an eminent degree, united in his own style, the scattered excellences which had separately adorned the performances of his predecessors. Fuseli does not attribute to him exclusive sublimity of invention, nor the most acute discrimination of character, nor the widest sphere of comprehension, nor the most judicious and best balanced composition, nor the deepest pathos of expression. "His great prerogative consisted," he remarks, "more in the unison than in the extent of his powers. He knew better what he could do, what ought to be done, at what point he could arrive, and what lay beyond his reach, than any other artist. Grace of conception and refinement of taste were his elements, and went hand in hand with grace of execution and taste in finish; powerful and seldom possessed singly, irresistible when united.[1]

"His Venus, or personification of female grace, was esteemed the most faultless creation of the Grecian pencil; the most perfect example of that simple yet unapproachable grace of conception, of symmetry of form, and exquisite finish, in which may be summed up the distinctive beauties of his genius. That has been styled "the wonder of art, the despair of artists; whose outline baffled every attempt at emendation, whilst imitation shrunk from the purity, the force, the brilliancy, the evanescent gradations of her tints."[2] This picture was long afterwards purchased by Augustus for one hundred talents, equivalent to twenty thousand pounds sterling.

Apelles had some distinguished contemporaries. Among these was Protogenes, an excellent artist, whose style of finish was much celebrated. Nicias is reported to have touched up the statues of Praxiteles. Somewhat later flourished Nichomachus, Pausias, Ætion, and Albano, and some others; but art began to degenerate.

Portrait painting was later in arriving at perfection than other kinds. This does not seem to have been a branch much cultivated among the Greeks. They much preferred

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 62, 63. [2] *Idem*, 64.

the sculptured bust to the plane surface to which painting was confined. Apelles appears to have been almost alone in practicing portrait painting, but he threw into it all the majesty of his art. This branch did not arrive at much perfection until the time of Alexander. Some idea may be formed of its comparative importance, from the fact that Pausanias, in his travels through Greece during the second century, states that he saw eighty-eight masterpieces of history, and only half the number of portraits. To show the far greater relative importance of sculpture over painting, among the Greeks, it may be stated that the same writer mentions the names of one hundred and sixty-nine sculptors, and only fifteen painters; while after three centuries of spoliation, he found in Greece, three thousand statues, not one of them a copy, while he describes only one hundred and thirty-one paintings.

Painting, together with all the other Grecian arts, declined nearly at the same time, and from the operation of the same causes. The Greeks were animated by a free and a national spirit. Patriotism, love of country, and love of freedom, nerved every hand, animated every heart, and inspired every head with an honest, and powerful enthusiasm. These were inwrought into every production of the Grecian pencil and chisel. They glowed on her canvas; they spoke from her marble. While these continued, the institutions of Greece remained firm, and her arts commanded wonder and admiration. They disappeared with the loss of her national independence. Her institutions sunk under the strokes by which her liberties were cloven down. Her public, national games were discontinued; her gymnasia were closed; the physical education, and martial exercises of her youth were neglected; the streets of her once glorious Athens presented no longer the most perfect forms of living nature.

We should cease longer to wonder at the decline of art. The hand of the painter and sculptor was palsied, the tongue of the orator paralyzed. To borrow the language of another, "When the spirit of liberty forsook the public,

grandeur had left the private mind of Greece. Subdued by Philip of Macedon, the gods of Athens and Olympia had migrated to Pella, and Alexander was become the representative of Jupiter. Still those who had lost the substance fondled the shadow of liberty. Rhetoric mimicked the thunders of oratory; sophistry and metaphysic debate, that philosophy which had guided life; and the grand taste that had dictated to art the monumental style, invested gods with human form and raised individuals to heroes, began to give way to refinements in appreciating the degrees of elegance or of resemblance in imitation.[1]

2. Sculpture. Sculpture was an art early and extensively cultivated in Greece. It is an art far more simple and uniform than that of painting. The subjects to which it may be applied are much fewer in number, and less complicated in their relations. The great object in view may be comprised in giving to the subjects upon which it acts, form and character. In doing this, however, it may be said to have but one style. Painting may have many. It has its various schools. The Roman, Lombard, Florentine, Venetian and Flemish, all pursue the same end by different means. But the sculptor, in the practice of his art, is limited. The magic of light and shade, all the multiplicity of ends accomplished by variety and depth of color, are beyond his reach. He deals in solid realities. His substantial figures defy all attempts at perspective. His stony drapery is of too heavy a material to be lifted by the zephyr, and to float in the breeze. His locks require no binding fillet to render them obedient to the laws of gravity.

The excellence of every art must consist in the complete accomplishment of its purpose; and in reference to sculpture, that purpose is accomplished by perfection of form, and expression of character. The very essence of the sculptor's art consists in correctness, in arriving at perfect accuracy of form. Superadded to this is the ornament of

[1] *Fuseli's Life and Lectures*, II, 60, 61.

grace, dignity of character, and appropriateness of expression. All these may be seen in the Apollo, the Venus, and the Laocoon.

Sculpture in Greece was first employed in fashioning the gods who were the objects of adoration. In primitive periods, the first essays of sculpture were rude and unfashioned. Even coarse stones and trunks of trees were the first representatives of deity. These were subsequently replaced by forms almost divine; still the early representations were preserved and regarded with peculiar veneration as the ancient images of the deities.

As the art advanced, these rude representations became more determinate in their forms, the square column by slow gradations approaching to a semblance of the human figure. The trunk of the body was first made to appear, before the extremities were attempted. For sometime after the attempt was made to bring out the upper and lower extremities, the arms were not separated from the body, nor the limbs from each other. It is in this stage of development that the sculptor's art appears mostly among the ancient Egyptians.

It has been conjectured that the first idea of sculptured art was derived from the Phœnicians. It is well known that that enterprising people, at very early periods, founded banks in some of the Grecian isles, and erected factories on some of her coasts. They were much in the habit of erecting posts or columns at the entrance of their factories, and to these erections they attached the idea of their national God, Thoth, or Theuth, adding to it the Phallas, as an universal symbol of nature. From these posts or pillars, with the appendage just mentioned, resulted directly the form of the Hermes. The Greeks placed a head on this pillar, and by this single addition, probably made on the Attic territory, completed the rough draft of their Hermes—the Mercury of the Romans.

It is also worthy of remark here, that the peculiar element in Egyptian art, which sought to represent a double nature, that is, the human and animal, by combining in

almost infinite variety, the different forms and features of the one with those of the other, found its place in Grecian art, and that, too, with very much greater variety than in the Egyptian. This is attested by the giants, harpies, syrens, sphynxes, centaurs, Pan, without speaking of other and much stranger combinations, such as Pegasus, the griffin, and the chimæra. There is, however, this remarkable difference between the Egyptian and Grecian. In the former the head of the animal is always placed on a human body; in the latter the human head is placed on the body of an animal. There is, it is true, an exception to this in the minotaur, in which the head of a bull is placed on a human body, but that is derived from a Phœnician fable, and hence may come from the same symbolic sources whence Egyptian art derived the type of its images. This reversal of the Egyptian, so generally introduced into Greek art, may rest upon two reasons. First, to give the human the predominance by the endowment of a human head the most noble of all the parts of the human body, and the most difficult of imitation. And second, to avoid producing disgust by excessive hideousness, and also by means of numberless gradations to produce the appearance of simple and real beings endowed with all the organs of intelligence and life. Thus Pan, with the legs and feet of a goat, although represented with a human body and head, yet the latter by the horns on its head, the glands on its neck, its pointed ears, peculiar form of eye, shaggy eyebrows, wide nostrils, elongated face, open mouth, and projecting chin, is made to proclaim, not so much parts of one annexed to parts of the other, as an intimate union, or blending, or creation, as we may say almost the creation of a new species, by so adapting the different parts of two to each other, as to make as nearly as possible one harmonious whole.

But another much more remarkable production of Grecian art in the more advanced stages of its progress, is to be found; not in the attempt to blend and mingle together two species, but the two sexes of the same species, in the Greek hermaphrodite. Here "the man and the woman

are so admirably expressed and so exquisitely blended in all their parts, that they cannot in any way be separated or distinguished one from the other; and the ideal being which results from the blending of the two sexes presents all the appearance of a real being, joined to all the charm of truth, and to all the illusion of nature."[1]

The primitive schools of sculpture in Greece were to be found in the cities of Sicyon, Ægina, Corinth, and Athens. Of these Sicyon lay at the eastern extremity of the Corinthian gulf, and was probably the oldest city in Europe. It was early celebrated for wealth, enterprise, and intelligence. It was the centre of a productive commerce. It early sent forth many masters of design. It obtained the venerable appellation of "mother of the arts."

The foundation of the school of Sicyon in sculpture is attributed to Dibutade, who was a potter, and became acquainted with the art of modeling by filling up with clay the outline which his daughter had drawn on the wall to preserve the likeness of her lover. Thus these two arts of design had a kindred origin.

The rock of Ægina, emerging from the Saronic gulf nearly opposite to Athens, exhibits a remarkable example of the great events which can be accomplished by a comparatively insignificant city. It not only met with great successes in war, but cherished the arts of peace, carrying some of them, especially sculpture, to a high degree of perfection. The school that here originated was greatly distinguished by originality of style and invention. The statue of Juno at Samos, called the most ancient image of that goddess, was the work of her sculptor Smilis. He might be said to have been the first master; and, in his work is discoverable a gravity and austere grandeur, which long remained in the noble marbles which, in Ægina, adorned the temple of Jupiter Panhellenius.

Corinth was, at early periods, more celebrated as the patroness of painting than of sculpture.

[1] *Rochette on Ancient Art*, 82, 5.

Of all the Grecian cities the highest degree of celebrity in sculpture as well as in painting, was attained by Athens. The most celebrated of her early sculptors was Dædalus, originally from Crete, and who accompanied Theseus from thence to Athens, in the year 1234, before the Christian era. He introduced into Athens an improved style of sculpture. The materials out of which his sculptures were made, was chiefly wood. Of them, no fewer than nine were existing in the second century before Christ. His works are described as rude and uncomely in aspect, and yet as having something of divinity in their appearance. He gave a vivacity to the attitude, and an animated expression to the countenance which had not been witnessed in the works of previous sculptors. He is said to have raised the arms in varied position from the sides, detached the legs and opened the eyes, previously narrow and blinking. He was the first to form something like a school of art in Athens, and his works excited the admiration of his own rude age. This indicates an important progress in art, and marks an era in its history. The Egyptian, and indeed all the forms of art previously, had done little more than to indicate the limbs and features, without detaching them, and enabling them to stand out as living realities. This fact of detaching, and complete developments of parts, constitutes the point of divergence at which Greek art, as yet in its cradle, separates itself from Egyptian art, never again to meet. There are those, however, who do not attribute all this advance to Dædalus. They understood under the name of Dædalus, a school of artists, probably Athenians, who disseminated at different periods, and in different places, though not far distant, the one from the other, some knowledge and some mechanical practices derived from a Phœnician source. Thus the Dædalian school, under the name of Dædalus, was employed for some centuries, not only in gathering up all the elements of art that had been developed by the Egyptian and Phœnician, but also to elevate the art of sculpture into a higher position, to give it new tendencies, to animate it with a

new spirit, and to render it more acceptable to the growing demands of Greek taste. At the same time it is highly probable, that during some part of this long period, there may have arisen in this school, a man, such as in the great crisis of history are almost always produced by the ferment of the human mind, and who, from being endowed with peculiar talents, or thrown into some extraordinary enterprise, was enabled to seize the direction of art, and to impress upon it his name, and thus at a later period to be considered as its living expression and personification.

Besides the early seats of Grecian art in connection with sculpture, to which allusion has now been made, there was an Ionian school which was principally confined to the islands of Samos and Chios. Of the former, Rhæcus, the son of Philæus, and Theodorus the son of Telecles, were much celebrated as the first who taught how to cast brass and melt it into statues. They lived about the middle of the sixth century before the Christian era.

The Chian school claim to have been the first to introduce marble as the material of sculpture. The Chian Malas flourished about 649 years B. C. Not only marble but bronze statues are said to have issued first from the insular, and most probably from the Chian school. The early adoption of bronze as a material for sculpture was a fortunate circumstance, for two reasons: one that its hardness was favorable to the perpetuity of the art; and the other that its small value afforded less temptation to the spoiler, and thus it was more likely to have a longer continuance. The earliest works in bronze seem not to have been cast, but were worked out by the hammer.

The most ancient monument of Grecian sculpture, still extant, is generally believed to be the bas-relief, upon a single stone, nine feet in height and thirteen in width, in the portal to the gates of Mycenæ, representing two lions sitting face to face against the sides of a column, their hinder feet resting on the lower part of the block over the lintel of the gate, and their front feet upon the prolonged

pedestal of the column. These are cut out of compact limestone of a green hue.[1]

In the Sicyon school, about the commencement of the sixth century before Christ, flourished Dipœnus and Scyllis, two brothers. Their works, some of them in Parian marble, presented a decided advance beyond any thing the sculptor's art had previously attained. Prior to this period the general style of sculpture had been dry and minute. The hair in locks, curls or little knobs, was labored; the drapery, disposed in rigid and methodical folds, was finished with painful minuteness; the limbs and countenance, while in many respects rude, incorrect and tasteless in expression, were, nevertheless, elaborated with the most extreme care. An attention and care was devoted to the parts, which should rather have been bestowed upon the whole. In regard to the works of these artists, it has been remarked that their execution was much more free, the whole effect more powerful, the forms better selected and composed, and the expression more natural, if not more animated.[2]

A number of pupils were early sent out from this school, whose labors tended much to the advancement of this art, both in Greece, and through the Grecian colonies. The principal of these were Learchus, a native of Rhegium; Theocles, Dontas, Doryclidos and Medon, Lacedæmonians; and Terteus and Angelion of Delos. At Agrigentum also, Perillus rivaled the masters of the parent schools. The colonies in Magna Græcia, embracing Rhegium and Crotona in Italy, and Syracuse and Agrigentum in Sicily, were early seats of the arts, particularly of sculpture.

The two Chian brothers, Bupalus and Anthemis, who lived B. C. 517 years, brought to great perfection sculpture in marble. The beauty of their works caused them to be admired in succeeding ages.

In Athens, the art of sculpture was much indebted to Pisistratus, who, in common with other kings, was called

[1] *Elgin Marbles*, I, 111. [2] *Constable's Miscellany*, XXXIX, 40.

tyrant; but who, nevertheless, laid the foundation of a school which afterwards received general attention. He esteemed highly the elegant arts, and acknowledged the supremacy of intellect. Under him all artists were sure of protection. Eucharis, the sculptor, excelled in his representations of warriors in armor. Callon was celebrated for his statues of bronze. Callimachus introduced into his compositions of sculpture a lightness and elegance before unattained.

The materials have, at different periods of time, been quite various, out of which the Greeks constructed their sculptures. Wood, plaster, and clay, appear to have been those the earliest made use of for that purpose. Subsequently ivory and gold for inlaying, were introduced. For statues of Minerva, the wood of the olive was sought after, while at Temnos, a statue of Venus was made from the female myrtle. Different kinds of wood continued to be made use of, after the art had attained to great perfection, even down to the time of Phidias.

It is by no means well settled when bronze came first to be used by the Grecian artists. It has been supposed to have been made a substitute for wood, about the year B. C. 869. It is obvious from the statements of Homer, and his description of the shield of Achilles, that the art of design, and the working of figures in metal, was brought to a great height of perfection in his time.

The first sculptors in marble were Dipœnus and Scyllis about the year B. C. 580. Not unfrequently a part of the statue was of wood, and other parts, as the face, hands, and feet of stone. The use of marble in sculpture was probably first confined to bas-reliefs alone. Dipœnus and Scyllis are supposed to have been the first who made use of it in the construction of entire statues.

In regard to metal as a material for the sculptor, the most ancient of all works in it is a brazen statue of Jupiter at Lacedæmon, spoken of by Pausanias. It was not made out of a single piece of metal, but of several separate portions, which were a species of hammer work, and were

afterwards closely riveted together. Several statues were made in this way at Lacedæmon, by Gitiadus, before the first Messenian war. Laminæ of metal were placed one over another like the weaving of a garment. The plates so used were carved and chased into the forms required. And this seems to have been an improvement upon the first method, and was applied to the fabrication of colossal statues.

The art of melting and casting brass into statues is attributed to Rhœcus and Theodorus both Samians, who lived about the middle of the sixth century before the Christian era. To them the casting in moulds has been the most generally ascribed. This was entirely distinct from the modeling of figures in clay, which had another, and a prior origin. The art of casting in moulds, so far as the fabrication of statues is concerned, evidently formed an epoch in the history of sculpture.

Of all kinds and varieties of sculpture, the plastic art was justly regarded as the parent. Pasiteles, a self-taught artist, made three divisions, assigning, however, the plastic or modeling art as the origin of each. There were statuary, or the art of making complete figures in any material; sculpture proper, or the art of cutting marble into statues, bas-reliefs, and ornamental pieces for architecture and chasing, or the art of working forms on hammered or hollowed out plates of metal, either for bas-reliefs generally, or as a coating to some other material.[1]

The battle of Marathon infused a new spirit into Grecian art. This occurred B. C. 490, and from that date to the era of Pericles, was the brightest page in its history. A new energy was infused into the moral character of the institutions of Greece, and they acquired a vigor and stability before unknown. To opulence and security were added the consciousness of power, and the love of elegance; and all these were especially propitious to the arts of sculpture and architecture. The results soon began to become

[1] *Elgin Marbles*, I, 105–10.

apparent. Several of the immediate predecessors, or early contemporaries of Phidias, attained distinction in the practice of art. Among these has been more particularly mentioned Pythagoras of Rhegium. He ranks among the inventors of that system of proportion which taught to unite elegance with truth, and which guided the practice, while its perfection was improved by the discoveries of each succeeding master.

But the last and greatest of the early school of sculpture was Myron, the immediate precursor of Phidias. He stands on the line of demarkation between two epochs, exhibiting in his works some of the hardness and defects of that which was expiring, with many of the excellences of that which was opening. His most colossal works were in wood, while others were in bronze. No original of his has come down to us. His great merit consisted in perfecting sculpture as the representation of the external form. He did not reach the embodiment of sentiment by means of it. He rather copied nature exactly as she appeared without seeking to attain the ideal in form. He is said first to have promulgated the principle, "that propriety in the separate parts was beauty, or that a work of art was beautiful as a whole, according as the partial forms and proportions corresponded to their offices and to the general character." This principle fully carried out would constitute the highest refinement of material art, and would give to form, considered merely as form, its noblest expression.

We now approach the age of Pericles, immortalized by the genius of Phidias. This opened a new era for sculpture. It was characterized by great concentration of effort. It was all embraced in one seat, in one parent school. Athens was a common seminary in which was all the stirring rivalry of emulation. Under the rule and guidance of her great men, she had attained a proud preeminence of fame and wealth. She was, therefore, now in a condition to astonish the world by her art. The hour had come, and with it the man.

Phidias, the son of Charmides, an Athenian citizen, was born about B. C. 500, and studied under Eladas. He wrought in many different materials, such as wood, plaster, clay; but his labors in these were comparatively insignificant. His larger works have been distributed into three classes: the toreutic, or statues of mixed materials, of which, however, ivory was the principal ingredient; statues of bronze; and those of marble. To the first mentioned belonged the Olympian Jupiter, and the Minerva of the Parthenon.

These statues were both colossal, were composed of gold and ivory, and were among the most wonderful productions of ancient art. The first was sixty feet in height, the hair of gold bound with an enameled crown, the eyes of precious stones; the rest of ivory, the body being naked to the cincture, and the lower limbs clothed in a robe gemmed with golden flowers. The last was also colossal, being forty feet in altitude, and equal, if not superior, to the first in beauty of workmanship, and richness of material. The nude was of ivory, and the ornaments of gold. Over it was thrown a flowing tunic; in the one hand was a spear, on the head a casque, and on the ground a buckler, on which was most exquisite carving.

The art of casting in bronze was carried by Phidias to great perfection. Of these the principal were, the Amazon, and the Minerva Polias. The latter was of most gigantic proportions. It was discernible from afar off by the Athenian mariner as he rounded the promontory of Sunium, and who was apprised by it that he was approaching the city sacred to the goddess of wisdom. Phidias also performed many of his sculptures in marble, and some of these have been preserved, while those in bronze, and all the others already mentioned, have perished.

In the era of Phidias, Grecian genius attained its great excellence in the arts. His was the school of grandeur. It was the grandeur of simplicity and nature, devoid of all parade or ostentation of art. "All is here sweet and gracious; we are willing captives to the witchery of art.

It is this union of the graceful and the pleasing with the energetic and the great, which constitutes the surpassing merit of his works. Exquisitely delicate in the minute, in the grand, the style is bold, vigorous, and flowing. He united the three characteristics of truth, grandeur and minute refinement, exhibiting majesty, gravity, breadth, and magnificence of composition, with a practice scrupulous in detail, and truthful in individual representation, yet in the handling rapid, broad and firm. This harmonious assemblage of qualities, in themselves dissimilar, in their results the same, gives to the productions of this master, an ease, a grace, and a vitality, resembling more the spontaneous overflowings of inspiration than the laborious offspring of thought and science."[1]

There is still sufficient of his works remaining in the British collections in London, to supply a criterion by which to estimate the principles of the beautiful in execution, and of the ideal in imitative art, as exercised among the Greeks in this their most splendid era.

Phidias derived his ideal from nature. In the *Elgin Marbles*, it has been remarked, "Every conception deeply participates of human sentiment and action. So intimately does the representation belong to reality, that every form seems, by the touch of enchantment, to have become marble in the very energies of its natural life."

In the marbles of the Parthenon appear the perfection of his execution and composition. "The chiseling is detailed and vigorous, harmonizing with attitudes and expressions full of vivacity, natural grace and dignity. The touch is broad, the forms decided, the marking deep and firm, according with and increasing the general grandeur of conception."

Although he imitated nature, yet he imitated no imperfect type; neither, has it been remarked, is "nature the only real object of art, viewed through any medium of fancy, nor imitated according to conventional or imagina-

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, XXXIX, 67, 68.

tive principles. The artist has only looked abroad upon all existence, refining partial conceptions and limited modes by the unerring and collected harmonies of the whole. The true ideal — the ideal of Grecian sculpture, as beheld in these its sublimest productions, is but the embodied union of whatever of beauty and perfection still lingers among the forms of nature, viewed universally free from individuality or accident. Truth is thus the primary constituent of the ideal. Beauty is the perfect expression of this truth, agreeably to the most unblemished and purest models which general nature presents. In this union of collective excellence and individual verisimilitude, the mind feels and at once acknowledges, a power of awakening and reflecting its own truest, best sympathies. These principles are unfolded in their purest elements; and the modes of accomplishing this union distinctly traceable by careful observation on the style of Phidias. The forms are, in the first place, composed with the most correct, but unostentatious science. Hence the freedom of their movements, the ease of their attitudes, seeming to possess the same capabilities of momentary action, as the living models. All is unaccompanied with the slightest exaggeration; the divisions being few, and masses large, the eye runs sweetly along the general forms, yet finds wherewithal to be delighted in resting upon details. This absence, or rather this unobtrusiveness, of all pomp of art, throws over the whole an air of reality and of unsophisticated nature. But with these essential qualities of merely imitative art, are united perfect symmetry, the most harmonious contours, grand composition, the most refined taste, and noble expression. This causes every figure to exhibit an heroic and elevated character. Hence we perceive, that to base ideal upon imitative art, to address the imagination by grandeur of design and perfection of form, while he appealed to the judgment by fidelity of detail and correctness of resemblance, have formed the objects of this great sculptor. The relations under which truth and imagination produce results at once grand and

interesting, he has carefully studied, and successfully rendered. Hence, while the general composition breathes the loftiest spirit of ideal or possible excellence, the means by which the sentiment is rendered are received from individual nature, expressed simply and without artifice. In this happy and unobtrusive union of nature and imagination, in this continually remounting, without convention or ostentation, to the eternal sources of natural truth and beauty, Phidias displays the real sublimity of art, and stands unrivaled among the masters of the ancient world."[1]

Grecian sculpture has been divided into three schools. In the first this art was brought almost to perfection, retaining some degree of restraint, and wanting the expression of mind. The second was the school of Phidias, which has generally been called the sublime school. This was characterized by the lofty height to which the genius of art soared. The third consisted in a somewhat different application of principles, which in their essence could not essentially vary. It has been termed the school of the beautiful, and produces as its representatives Praxiteles and Lysippus, the contemporaries of Alexander. During the short period of his reign, Grecian art shone forth with its splendor and beauty, but after its termination, its light was forever extinguished.

Praxiteles was a native of Magna Græcia, and was born in the year B. C. 364. Finding that the height of sublimity in sculpture had been reached by Phidias, who had already appropriated the masculine graces of the art, he directed his attention to the milder and gentler beauties of style. In this attempt he had eminent success. None ever more happily succeeded in uniting softness with force, elegance and refinement with simplicity and purity. His grace never degenerates into the affected, nor his delicacy into the artificial. He caught the delightful medium between the stern majesty which awes, and the beauty which merely seduces; between the external allurements of form, and

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, XXXIX, 69–71.

the colder, but loftier, charm of intellectuality. Over his compositions he has thrown an expression at once spiritual and sensual; a voluptuousness and modesty, which touch the most insensible, yet startle not the most retiring.[1]

There are but few works of this master now remaining, the faun, the Thespian Cupid, and the Apollino with a lizard, being the principal. His two great works, those on which his fame essentially rests, have perished. Those were the nude and draped, or the Coan and Cnidian Venus. Each one of these formed a standard, which the innovating future has never dared essentially to alter. He appears to have attained the true ideal on this subject. He sought and found it in that perfect union of yielding feminine grace with the dignity of intellectual expression.

Lysippus the Sicyonian, was the contemporary and rival of Praxiteles. He wrought only in metal. To him are attributed six hundred and ten works, but not one of these has survived. He was born in the lower walks of life, was self-taught, and began by simply imitiating nature. He did not, like Praxiteles, entirely confine himself to the wooing of grace and beauty. He also sought the grave and severe in grandeur. He made colossal statues in bronze, which required a forceful and vigorous composition. His Tarentine Jupiter was sixty feet high and of a magnitude in proportion. He made twenty-one equestrian statues of Alexander's body guard. All these were masculine in character. He, however, made many works of a beautiful and delicate description. He was a faithful imitator, symmetrical in his arrangements, and crowned all with an exquisite finish.

These great masters had scholars, imitators, copiers of the works of previous masters; but all progress in the art died with Alexander. During his life there was a factitious prosperity, and a semblance of freedom. His death terminated both.

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, xxxix, 75.

It seems impossible for any of the material arts, except, perhaps, to some extent, the architectural, to flourish in any other than a free atmosphere. It is only in such that the full, fair, free, perfect development of forms, especially the human, can take place. They can nowhere else be properly appreciated, nor properly encouraged. It is to an ardent patriotism, to a deep love of country, to a just pride in the productions of a nation's great artists, that the arts of design owe their perfection. Hence Grecian art fell with her freedom. To show their intimate connection in Greece, the fact may be mentioned that when subsequently the Romans overcame Perseus the Macedonian king, and obtained a supremacy over Greece, they proclaimed freedom to the states of Greece. The result was that the sculptor's art awoke into new life. This revival continued for more than thirty years. During that period flourished Antheus, Callistratus, Polycles, Apollodorus and Pasiteles; all possessing considerable merit, although far below the genius of ancient times. But Greece soon found that her freedom was a mere matter of sufferance, and that she really had a master. When the claims of that master came to be exercised, the last fitful gleam of art's taper was extinguished, and sculpture, with its kindred arts, disappeared forever.

As the arts of painting and sculpture in Greece have been considered as carrying the ideal almost to its extremest possible limit without any obvious departure from the actual forms everywhere presented in nature, it may be well to inquire briefly into some of the causes why these arts were enabled to attain to so high a degree of perfection, and also to some of the principles which may be declared as the results of their successful prosecution. The principal cause for the great advances made in these arts is due to the fact that the study of the nude figure early occupied the greatest attention of the Greek artists. The delineation of this figure, according to Winckelmann, is grounded on the knowledge and conceptions of beauty, these latter consisting partly in measure and relations, and

partly in forms.[1] To this study of the nude, many things in Greece effectually contributed. Their gymnasia and other places where the young exercised naked in athletic and other games, were so many schools in which the artists could take lessons in this species of beauty. To so great an extent was this carried, that at Sparta, even the young virgins exercised naked, or nearly so, in the games of the arena. Thus beauty of form, in all its possible varieties of exhibition, by its frequency and power in presentation, became an ever present reality in the mind of the artist. In the palmiest days of Grecian art, the statues of goddesses were actually made after the likeness of beautiful women, and for such purposes the courtesan was generally selected.[2] The Greek artists in all maters of outline determined the forms of a beautiful body by lines of which the centre is constantly changing, and which, if continued, would never describe circles. Even their utensils and vases were elliptical rather than circular. They held that the greater unity there is in the junction of the forms, and in the flowing of one out of another, so much the greater is the beauty of the whole. They sought ideal beauty, not alone in the selection of the most beautiful parts, but in their harmonious union. They understood, therefore, by the ideal merely the highest possible beauty of the whole figure, and hence in the selection of the most beautiful parts and combining them with rare artistic skill, a whole was produced whose equal could not be found in nature. Thus in the youthful figures of the gods, Apollo and Bacchus, they made the ideal to consist in the incorporation of the forms of prolonged youth in the female sex with the masculine forms of a beautiful young man. A more remarkable instance occurs in the hermaphrodite, or union of the beauties and attributes of both sexes. Of this there were quite a number, differing in size and position, and showing that artists sought to express in the mixed nature of the two sexes an image of higher beauty. In this image was the ideal.

[1] *Winckelmann*, II, 28. [2] *Idem*, 43.

The Greek artists sought more especially to embody their conceptions of the ideal in the forms and positions of their gods and goddesses. They expressed their ideal of male beauty in their Apollo, in whom the strength of adult years is found united with the soft forms of the most beautiful spring time of youth. Apollo was the most beautiful among the gods. The youth which appears in him so lovely, advances to maturer years in other youthful gods, and becomes manly in Mercury and Mars. The youthful form, representing life's spring time, was that upon which the Greek artists delighted to affix the seal of the ideal. Even Hercules, whose great attribute was strength, was often represented in the most beautiful youth, with features which leave the distinction of sex almost doubtful. But the most remarkable instance is that of Bacchus. "The type of this god is a lovely boy who is treading the boundaries of the spring time of life and adolescence, in whom emotions of voluptuousness, like the tender shoots of a plant, are budding, and who, as if between sleeping and waking, half wrapt in a dream of exquisite delight, is beginning to collect and verify the pictures of his fancy; his features are full of sweetness, but the joyousness of his soul is not manifested wholly upon his countenance."[1] "The beauty of deities of a manly age consists in a combination, uniting the robustness of mature years with the joyousness of youth, which in them, as in the images of more youthful divinities, is denoted by the concealment of muscles and sinews, which, in the spring time of life, make but little show." Along with this is an expression signifying the all-sufficiency of the divine nature to itself, that it stands in no need of those parts which are destined to the nutrition of human bodies.

While the ideal occupied the first place in the minds of the Grecian artists, they did not neglect the laws of proportion. These lie at the foundation of beauty. The artist regards the structure of the human body as consist-

[1] *Winckelmann*, II, 74.

ing of triads. First, the body consists of three parts, viz: trunk, thighs and legs. Second, the lower extremity also consists of three parts, viz: thighs, legs and feet. Third, the face also has its three parts, viz: thrice the length of the nose. The foot, among the ancients, was considered as the standard of all large measurements, and the height of the statue was given six of its lengths. The foot was found of a more determinate length than the head or the face, and hence the relation between that and the whole body was uniformly admitted by Grecian and Egyptian artists.

In considering individual parts, the cast of the face — the Greek profile — is the most deserving of attention. It is made to consist in a nearly straight or slightly depressed line, described by the nose and forehead in youthful heads, especially of the female sex. Grandeur, it is said, is produced by straightness and fullness, but tenderness by gentle inflexions of the forms. In constructing a beautiful face, the forehead was regarded as an important feature.[1] It should above all things be low. A high forehead was regarded by the ancients as ugly. This seeming anomaly may be perhaps accounted for, from the fact that it is generally found low in youth, and also in the bloom of life, before the hair which covers it has fallen off. This, therefore, was regarded as a characteristic with which nature endowed the age of beauty. This lowness of forehead is a characteristic mark of the antique head. To complete the beauty of a youthful head, the frontal hair should grow in a curve down over the temples, in order to give the face an oval shape. Such was the forehead found in all beautiful women, and very uniformly adopted in the ideal heads of the Greek artists.

The eyes were regarded as another highly important component part of beauty. Here reference was had to size rather than color. In Jupiter, Apollo, and Juno, the opening of the eye is large and roundly arched. The latter

[1] *Winckelmann*, II, 153.

has been called "large-eyed Juno." It has also in all these less length than usual, in order that the curve which it makes may be more spherical. The eyes of Venus are smaller, and the elevation of the lower lid imparts to them that love-exciting and languishing look, which the Greeks term liquid. The eyelids were regarded as beautiful when they described a line the undulation of which was compared to the flexure of the young tendrils of the vine.

The eyebrows were considered as beautiful in proportion to the delicacy of the line formed by the hairs, which was denoted on the finest heads in sculpture by the sharp edge of the bone over the eyes. Eyebrows which meet were indicative of pride and bitterness of spirit.

In regard to the mouth, the lips displayed a more brillant red then was found elsewhere. The under lip was made fuller than the upper. In the most ancient style the lips are represented as closed, but in later periods of art they often appear slightly open. This is more especially the case with Venus, in order that her countenance may express the languishing softness of desire and love. In portraits of individuals, especially in those of the Roman emperors, the lips are represented as closed, and in the elder style of art they are often denoted merely by an incised line.

The beauty of the chin was made to consist in the rounded fullness of its arched form, to which the lower lip, when short, imparted additional size. To accomplish this the great artists made the lower jaw larger and deeper than is usually found in nature. The dimple was regarded as an isolated and accidental adjunct to the chin, and not as an attribute of abstract and pure beauty.

The management of the hair in sculpture was made to depend upon the quality of the stone. When the hard kind was used, the hair was represented as cut short, and afterwards finely combed. In marble, it was often made in male figures, to curl in ringlets. In the female, it was smoothed upwards, and gathered in a knot on the back of the head; and although without ringlets, yet followed a

serpentine course, and was divided by deep furrows, thus producing variety, and light and shade. In all figures the hair was represented as curly and abundant. In Apollo and Bacchus alone of the divinities, the hair was represented as hanging down upon both shoulders. Children wore their hair long until the age of puberty, when it was usually shortened, especially behind. Flaxen hair was considered the most beautiful, and hence attributed to Apollo and Bacchus, the most beautiful of the gods, and generally to the heroes.

"The beauty of a youthful hand was made to consist in a moderate degree of plumpness, and a scarcely observable depression, resembling a soft shadow over the articulations of the fingers, where, if the hand is plump there is a dimple.[1] The fingers tapered gently toward their extremities, like finely shaped columns; and, in art, the articulations were not expressed." The knees of youthful figures showed no cartilage developed with anatomical distinctness, but were rounded with softness and smoothness, and unmarked by muscular movements. They were so formed that the space from the thigh to the leg presented a gentle and flowing elevation, unbroken by depressions or prominences.

The breast in the figures of the goddesses was represented as virginal in the extreme; its beauty consisting in the moderateness of size. The poets likened it to a cluster of unripe grapes. The Amazons alone, among ideal figures, were represented as having large and fully developed breasts. The nipples on the breasts of virgins or goddesses were not, in marble, made visible. In paintings they were never prominent. The abdomen, in male figures, presented much the same appearance as after a sweet sleep, that is without any prominence, and of that kind which physiologists consider as an indication of a long life.

3. Architecture. This third and last of the objective arts was extensively cultivated in Greece. Many archi-

[1] *Winckelmann*, II, 188.

tectural remains are yet to be found, which are declarative of the grandeur and beauty of this art as practiced among the Greeks. The earliest of these remains are military, or have been constructed for the purpose of defense. This probably grew out of the necessity of the case, as Greece was originally settled by different tribes in most instances hostile to each other, and always more or less fearing the enmity of the aboriginal possessors. Hence the ancient remains, more or less extensively scattered over Greece of walled cities and acropoli. These ancient remains are rugged, rough, and of the Cyclopean order.

The early settlers of Greece, in selecting their sites for cities, the most generally made choice of a plain with a rocky hill or acropolis rising up in its centre. This latter they strongly fortified, generally surrounding the city itself also with walls. Of this kind was Lycosura in Arcadia, which Pausanias says "was the most ancient city in the world, the first the sun ever illuminated with his rays, and that from these venerable walls men learned how to build other cities." Such was Tiryns, which was built in the plain of Argos around its acropolis, and is attributed to the Lycians some six generations prior to the Trojan war. The remains of its walls are as perfect now as they were when described by Pausanias in the second century. It had even in Homer's time the epithet of well walled. The walls were twenty-one feet in thickness, and forty-three in height. They are made up of rough blocks of stone, very little altered after having been taken from the quarry, the vacuities having been filled up with smaller stones. The usual size of the blocks is from three to seven feet. In the west wall occurs the pointed gate, the top being covered as in the great pyramid, by immense stones, placed one on each side, and meeting at an acute angle in the centre.

The acropolis of Mycenæ presents another example of Cyclopean masonry. It is of small dimensions, the city lying beyond it and spreading towards the plain. The walls are of the rough style and of the more improved con-

struction, composed of hewn and well compacted polygons. This characterizes the second style of Cyclopean masonry. This, together with the walls of Tiryns constitute the finest Cyclopean remains that are to be found in Greece.[1]

Another one of the Cyclopean cities of Greece was Argos, the base of whose acropolis, as well as its summit, are still distinguished by some fine remains of the second style of early military construction, consisting of well joined polygons. The Lycosurian and Tirynthian was the rough style.

The acropolis of Orchomenos exhibits three styles of early construction. The rough Tirynthian is observable only in a few places, and is probably of a date prior to Hercules.

The second style, or that of well joined polygons, is predominant, and is of a date subsequent to the early destruction of the citadel. The more regular restorations were subsequent to the demolition of the city by the Thebans. In the acropolis of Amphissa, are also distinguishable three styles of architecture, viz: the second style of ancient Greece, consisting of well united polygons, that of the lower empire, and that of the modern Turkish. In a ruined city near Messalongi, each of its walls has three apertures, or gateways, of unequal dimensions, and of a pyramidal form, terminating at the top in an acute angle. They were pointed gates, and similar ones occur at Mycenæ and at Tiryns, and they are found also, in some ancient cites in Italy, which owe their origin to Pelasgic colonies.[2]

As formerly remarked, almost every city in Greece had its citadel, which generally consisted of a hill rising boldly out of the plain on which the city was erected, the hill being called the acropolis, and was strongly fortified. These ancient citadels were used, not only for the purpose of defense, but also as a protection for their flocks, which, in those early periods, constituted the principal source of their wealth, and the great object of their care.[3]

[1] *Dodwell's Pelasgic Remains in Greece and Italy*, 4–5. [2] *Idem*, 16. [3] *Idem*, 11.

Another very curious and important remain of the early architecture of Greece, is a structure to which has been given the name of treasury. There are at least two of these remaining, the one called the Treasury of Atreus at Mycenæ, and the other, that of Minyas, at Ochomenos in Bœotia. The first is the most celebrated. Externally it appears like a mound of earth. The interior resembles a Gothic dome, its present height being forty-nine feet, and its diameter forty-eight. The stones composing it are all parallelograms, are placed in regular layers, the ranges being thirty-four in number. They are united without the aid of cement. The stones are not of equal dimensions, but are about two feet in thickness. The successive ranges of stone were placed one above another, each course projecting inwards and over the one below, till meeting in a small aperture at top, the whole is shut in by a mass of very large dimensions. The general form of the interior was a hollow cone or paraboloid.

The thickness of this edifice, as it appears at the entrance, is eighteen feet. The lintel of the great portal is composed of two masses of stone, the largest being twenty-seven feet in length, seventeen in breadth, and three and three-fourths feet in thickness. Like the rest of the building it is composed of compact breccia, and is unequaled in magnitude by any other single masses of stone excepting those to be found in Egypt and Balbec.

These singular and strongly constructed edifices are supposed to have been depositories for the treasures of the early kings. Even the names of their architects, viz: Agamides and Trophonius have been preserved. They proclaim not only the genius and industry involved in their construction, but also the prevalence of rapine, robbery and social disorders, so great as to create the necessity calling them into being.

These specimens of a primitive architecture are the remains of a very early period, a period long anterior to the Homeric era. No temple or palace seem of have existed prior to his age. At the time of Homer, the primeval

altar, common both to Europe and Asia, was the only sacred edifice known, and that differed little from a common hearth, the sacrifice itself being little else than a social rite. To this was first added a pavement, a means of cleanliness and comfort. The next improvement was an open colonnade, enclosing both the altar and pavement. This species of religious erection seems to have been coextensive with the spread of the human race, and long subsequently to the flourish and fall of Greece, to have reappeared in the Druidical temple of the more northern regions.

The regular temple, in which the circle was changed to the quadrangle, was the product of a more refined age, after the regal authority had been abolished, the priestly power somewhat advanced, and a greater style of magnificence introduced.

The material first employed in temple erections was wood; and in the use of this the character of the later architecture became fixed. There still, however, remain temples of stone of a date anterior to any epoch of known history. The earliest style of architecture known in Greece, rejected all ornament, and, like the Egyptian, was solemn, massive and imposing. This subsequently became the Doric style or order. This, in its origin, may have been the offspring of Egyptian art. But the Greeks not only borrowed, imitated and selected, they also created. Out of variety they educed solemn, breathing harmony. "They brought out every latent germ of beauty that lay overwhelmed in the mass of more ancient thought. From the dark, yet mighty, accumulations of eastern knowledge and skill, their genius spake forth that light, and that perfection which, in human wisdom and taste, still guides, corrects and animates."

The three orders of Grecian architecture were the Doric, the Ionic, and the Corinthian. These were gradual both in their process of discovery, and also in their advance to perfection. No one of these was introduced wholly, or at once, in a state bordering on perfection. The Doric was

said to have borrowed its sedate grandeur and majesty from imitating man's vigorous frame and decorous carriage, while the Ionic, with its gracefulness and chaste proportions, more resembles the female form.

A word of explanation is here necessary in order to the better understanding of what follows. The entire subject of architecture in reference to its principles, its relations, its materials, and its two great series of developments in its horizontal and vertical styles, will come up more appropriately for consideration when we arrive at the architectonic art of modern Europe. It may be here remarked, however, that it was more especially the mission of the Greek and Roman to develop the horizontal style. This in its simplest elements consists in the erection of two upright posts or pillars, with a horizontal connection at the top between the two, thus ⊓. This is the germ, the primordial form, which, by its successive repetitions and reproductions, and additions by way of ornament and strength, constitutes the whole of the Greek and Roman architecture, and in a more enlarged sense the whole of architecture itself.

In the Doric, or simplest order of Greek architecture, the upright post or pillar is known as the column or shaft, and the connection at the top as the entablature. In the other orders, the Ionic and Corinthian, the base is superadded. In the omission of the latter in the one case, and in the difference in form, proportions, and ornamentation of the column and entablature in all, are to be found the essential differences that distinguish and mark the three orders from each other.

It will be obvious at once, that proportions are necessary to be preserved with a view both to beauty and to perpetuity. The entablature constitutes the weight to be supported, and if that be heavy, the column which supports it must be correspondingly large. So also the proportion must be preserved between the column and the supporting base.

The Greek architecture is said to be modeled upon the log cabin, as that of the Egyptian is upon the cave, and

that of the Gothic upon the bower. To construct an edifice, the uprights or columns must be successively continued to constitute the walls, and so also the horizontal connection or entablature to constitute the roof.

There are divisions of these which are also necessary to be known, in order to understand the history of architecture. Thus, the base has its plinth, or that which forms the lower division of the base of a column, and also the plain projecting face at the bottom of a wall, immediately above the ground. Among the Greeks it was often divided into two or more gradations projecting slightly before each other in succession towards the ground, the tops being perfectly flat, or only sloped sufficiently to prevent the lodgment of wet. This was often connected by mouldings with the column.

Upon the base is placed the column which may be square or round, plain or fluted, and which consists of the shaft and capital. The shaft admits of little ornament otherwise than by fluting, but in the form and ornamentation of the capital are found some of the most distinctive marks of difference in the Greek orders. The abacus, literally a table or slab, is the uppermost member or division of a capital. The Doric shaft diminished in thickness as it ascended, and at the neck where it joined the capital was about a quarter less in diameter than at the bottom. In ancient Doric columns the shaft rises to the height of six of its diameters at the base, the capital to half a diameter, and the abacus to a quarter.

The entablature, which is the superstructure lying horizontally upon the column, and resting immediately upon the abacus, is composed of three parts, the architrave, frieze and cornice. In the Doric order the shaft has twenty flutings, which are separated from each other by a sharp edge. The capital is devoid of all ornament, and consists of the abacus which is flat and square, beneath which is a large and finely formed ovolo, or convex moulding, and below this three annulets or rings, all of which together complete the Doric capital.

The Doric architrave of the entablature is surmounted with a plain fillet, called the tænia, while the frieze has slight projections at intervals, on which are cut three angular flutes, called triglyphs, the intervals between which are called metopes, and are frequently enriched with sculpture. In the Ionic order, it is also occasionally enriched with sculpture, and is sometimes made to swell out in the middle, when it is said to be cushioned or pulvinated. In the Corinthian, it is ornamented in a variety of ways, but usually either with figures or with foliage. In the Doric order the cornice has a large projecting moulding, under which are placed square blocks, named mutules, ornamented with drops. These mutules are placed directly over the triglyphs and metopes.

The Ionic order is more light and delicate, the height of its column being greater in proportion to its diameter. The shaft, in some instances, is plain, but is generally found cut into about twenty-four deep flutes, their edges not meeting like the Doric, but are separated by flat surface or fillet.

The capital is distinguished from the Doric by volutes, or spiral scrolls. As the architectural ornaments are derived from nature, and are the imitations of some form of beauty which presented itself to the eye, much speculation has been indulged in, in regard to the origin of this peculiar ornament. The curls in the female head dress, the spiral form of the sea shell, the unfolding fern, and the horns of the ram offered in sacrifice, have each been suggested as furnishing the original from which its design was taken. Encircling the capital is the echinus, or ovolo moulding, carved with the egg and anchor, and also the astragal, having a beading formed of one large and two small beads, alternately.

The Corinthian order is the lightest and most ornamental of all the Grecian orders. The shaft had originally the same proportions as the Ionic, and was nine diameters in height. It subsequently, including the base, was increased to ten. At first it was often plain, but the later and finer specimens are found fluted and filleted.

The capital is the great distinction of this order. Its height is more than a diameter, and the body of it resembles a vase or basket. The abacus, which rests upon it, is not square, but four-cornered, with concave sides moulded and ornamented in the middle of each with a honeysuckle, or other flower. A space between the abacus and the leaves is occupied by stalks formed into delicate volutes, while still larger volutes meet the four corners of the abacus. The lower part of the capital is decorated with two rows of leaves, eight in each row.[1]

Of these three orders the Doric was the most ancient, and was the most extensively employed in the European states of Greece. It derived its name from the Dorians. The most celebrated remains of ancient art belong to this order. These are to be found both in Greece and in the Greek settlements in Sicily and southern Italy. They cover an era extending from the erection of the temple of Jupiter in Ægina by Æachus in the tenth century before Christ, to the building of the Parthenon, one of the noblest monuments of Grecian architecture. The latest erections in this order were in the age of Augustus. Within these ten centuries the magnificent structures, whose ruins still adorn Greece, were all erected. Of these, and belonging to the Doric order, were the temple of Jupiter at Ægina, which was among the pioneer efforts of art, in its movement westward from its primeval sources to the classic shores of Greece. Next follow the four columns near Corinth, and the celebrated temple of Jupiter at Olympia. On this, marble tiles were first made use of for roofing, the invention of Byzes of Naxos. We then visit Athens, and find there the ancient temple of Theseus. Of a subsequent date are the Propylea and the Parthenon crowning the Acropolis; both built under the direction of Phidias; the former by Mnesicles, the latter by Ictinus in the age of Pericles. The temple of the Apollo Epicurius in Ar-

[1] *L. C. Tuthill's History of Architecture*, 84, *et seq.*; *Glossary of Architecture*, under respective titles.

cadia, one of the most splendid structures in Peloponnesus, and the most perfect vestige of antiquity now remaining, is ascribed to Ictinus. To the same era, and same school, belongs the temple of Minerva on the promontory of Sunium.

From the age of Epaminondas commenced the decline of the Doric order, and the last example remaining is the portico, erected by Augustus, in one of the public squares of Athens. There are also many remains of the Doric architecture in the ancient seats of the Sicilian and Italian colonies. Among these are the temple of Egesta; the temple of Minerva at Syracuse; the extensive ruins at Selinus, consisting of no less than six temples, one, three hundred and thirty-one feet in length, composed of a double peristyle of columns sixty feet high; the ruins at Agrigentum; the temple of Juno of Concord, and the grand temple of Olympian Jupiter, one of the most stupendous buildings of the ancient world.

It is remarkable that the arch was of so late an introduction into Grecian architecture. The weight of evidence is against its use until the age of Alexander. All the orders of Grecian architecture delight in horizontal and perpendicular lines, and are therefore opposed to the contrasts, divisions, and recurring breaks, produced by the arch. The very spirit of improvement in the Grecian art of architecture, tended to a direction contrary to the arch. It sought to elevate the column, and increase the unbroken length of the entablature.

The Ionic was a more refined order of architecture. Whether, in its origin, it was a mere variation on the Dorian mode, or a distinct invention, is not so clearly settled. It is of an antiquity little inferior to the Doric. It arose among the Ionian states, and continued subsequently to be chiefly employed in them.

As compared with the Doric, few remains of the Ionic order are to be found in Greece or her colonies. Among these are the temple of Juno in Samos, the monument at Agrigentum, called the tomb of Theron, a Doric building with Ionic columns, and the temple of Bacchus at Teos,

the earliest example of the true Ionic, and erected about B.C. 440. At Athens are to be found the most perfect remains of this order in the temples of Minerva Polias, and the Erectheus, of about the era of the Peloponnesian war. Near Miletus was the temple of Apollo, and at Priene, that of Minerva erected by Pithias in the age of Alexander.

These two orders embraced together almost every possible beauty of composition. Architecture still, however, lacked that facility of arrangement, with that extreme simplicity in which Grecian taste placed the very perfection of the art.

In the Doric, the triglyphs broke in upon the unity of the entablature when viewed in perspective. In the Ionic, the capital deviated from the simple harmony, the object mainly contemplated by the artist, as it presented different aspects viewed in front or in flank, and also was not equally adapted to all situations in the same range.

To remedy these required the introduction of a new order. Hence the Corinthian, which combined the beauties of the former orders, while their defects were obviated. "The removal of the triglyphs left the arrangement unembarrassed, while the circular capital presented always the same outline, and adapted itself equally to all positions. The system of Greek architecture, the most perfect combination of the necessities of science with forms most pleasing to the eye, that ever did, or probably ever will, exist, was now completed."[1]

This order was the latest in its introduction, being an improvement upon the two already in existence. It was employed as early as 400 years before the Christian era by Scopas in the magnificent temple of Minerva at Tegea. Its general use into Greece was late of introduction, and few remaining monuments can be ascribed to the best ages of Grecian taste. The greater part of the Corinthian remains now found in Greece, were of Roman erection.

[1] *Constable's Miscellany*, xxxix, 307.

Among the remains of this order are included the choragic monument, a circular erection of Lysicrates, built B. C. 342, the octagonical edifice of Andronicus Cyrrhestes, built about the same time; the magnificent remains of the temple of the Olympian Jupiter; and another ruin, called by Stuart, the Poikele Stoa, or painted portico. This has been more recently identified as the Pantheon of Hadrian. These compose nearly all the remains of that order prior to the Roman conquest.

The first mentioned is a real gem of architectural taste, the purest specimen of the order that has reached our time, and which is yet preserved almost entire amid the ruins of Athenian art. The second shows an entire ignorance of the principle of the arch. In the third, the columns are of the best age of Greece. The fourth is of doubtful antiquity.

"These composed of the finest white marble, and of the most perfect workmanship, with an elevation of nearly sixty feet, and belonging to an edifice four hundred feet long, awaken emotions of regret, of magnificence, and of beauty, difficult to comprehend or to impart."

We are now brought down to the period of the death of Alexander, which occurred B. C. 324. From Pericles to Alexander, was a period of about one hundred and thirteen years, and this was occupied almost exclusively with the perfecting and application of the Ionic and Corinthian orders. The art had now attained its highest character of purity and magnificence; but, like all the other arts of Greece, it could make no real progress; indeed it could not sooner or later avoid declining, after Greece lost her nationality, and ceased to be free and independent.

II. The second great division of art includes the SUBJECTIVE. In this are embraced all those varieties of art which are wrought out by the human faculties themselves; which are developed wholly through their own action, having no exterior object upon which to operate. They are those in which the mind originates, is itself the instrument, and

contains within itself the power of appreciating the execution. They are, therefore, in every sense of the term, subjective; being purely mental; those which the mind gathers up from its own resources; furnishing itself the materials, the power that acts upon them, and the capacity that appreciates its action. Although stimulated and aided in their development and progress by society, yet they are not necessarily dependent on it for their existence. They all, however, find their appropriate exercise in the bosom of society, which they tend to elevate, purify and ennoble.

These arts are three in number, viz: music, poetry, eloquence.

1. Music. This is the art of combining sounds in a manner agreeable to the ear and the interior faculty which perceives and feels their force. This combination may be either simultaneous, or successive. In the first case it originates, or constitutes harmony. In the second, melody.

Although the same sounds or intervals of sound, which give pleasure when heard in succession, will not always produce the same effect in harmony; yet the principles which constitute the simpler and more perfect kinds of harmony are mostly, if not entirely, the same with those of melody.[1]

Terpander the Lesbian has generally been accredited as the founder of Greek music. His principal merit consists, not so much in commencing a new era in music, as in systematizing the musical styles which existed in the tunes of Greece and Asia Minor. He first reduced to rule the different modes of singing which prevailed in different countries, and by that means, formed a connected system to which the Greeks ever afterwards adhered.[2]

He flourished about the year B. C. 676, when he was crowned victor at the first celebration of the musical contests introduced at the feast of Apollo, in the 26th Olympiad. Prior to his time, the lyre, called the cithara, was

[1] *Encyclopædia Perthensis*, xv, 433. [2] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 149.

a four-stringed instrument, the tetrachord. This had been in such general use that the music of the Greeks was essentially founded upon it. Terpander added three strings to this instrument, thus making it a heptachord, and in fact, giving it the compass of an octave, or, as the Greeks termed it, a diapason.

The cithara was a favorite instrument among the Greeks. It was invented in Arcadia, where the tortoise was abundant, the shell of which was made use of in its construction. The strings, at first, were made of linen thread, and afterwards of the intestines of sheep. These were struck, sometimes with a bow, and sometimes with the fingers. It was said to require an apprenticeship of three years, to learn to play on it well. It was used both when they sang of love, and of the exploits of valiant men, being employed both on divine and human subjects. It was sometimes called the mother of songs.

Although the cithara was the principal instrument in the Lesbian music, yet there is little doubt but that Terpander also made use of the flute, an instrument generally known among the Greeks in his time.

He was the first who marked the different tones in music. It is also stated that he first added musical notes, although we know nothing of his mode of notation, as that generally in use among the Greeks, was introduced in the time of Pythagoras.

Another great master who enlarged the system of Greek music was Olympus, a Phrygian. His favorite instrument was the aulos or flute, which for its improvement is nearly as much indebted to him as the cithara was to Terpander. The first inventor of the flute among the Greeks is said to have been Hyagnis, also a Phrygian, and a contemporary with Joshua.

Flutes were made of the bones of stags or fawns. They were also made of the bones of asses, and of elephants, and of reed, box and lotus. The people of Greece who excelled the most in playing upon this instrument were the Bœotians.

The flute had the advantage of admitting, more easily than the cithara, the multiplication of tones, more especially as the ancient flute players were accustomed to play upon two flutes at once. Olympus also invented and cultivated the third musical scale, the enharmonic. His nomes, or melodies, determined by inviolable rules, were auletic, that is, intended for the flute, and belonged to the enharmonic scale.

Olympus also introduced a third class of rhythms, this term expressing the relative duration of the sounds that enter into the composition of an air; or, perhaps, in more completely defining it, it may be stated to be that assemblage or union of various times in music, which are joined together with a certain order, and in certain proportions. In developing the rhythms, the instrumental music, and the musical scales of the Greeks, as well as in the composition of numerous nomes, Olympus accomplished much in advancing the science and art of music among the Greeks.

A third great name that marks the era of a third epoch in the history of Greek music, is that of Thaletas, a native of Crete, whose musical and poetical productions were connected with the ancient religious rites of the Greeks, particularly the Cretans. These productions fall under two heads, pæans and hyporchemes. These two, in some respects, resembled each other, and hence were sometimes confounded. Their main features, however, were different. The pæan displayed the calm and serious feeling which prevailed in the worship of Apollo, while the hyporcheme was a dance of a mimic character, which occasionally passed into the playful and comic.

These are the three names that are more especially identified with the progress of Greek music. That music was both vocal and instrumental. The musical instruments were of two kinds; the wind instruments, and the stringed instruments. Of the former were the flute and the pipe; of the latter the lyre or cithara.

The cithara was generally preferred as a musical instrument. The tone of the pipe was sharp and shrill, while

that of the flute was grave, full and mellow. There was a decree in Athens which prohibited all kinds of wind instruments in public education; the reason assigned being that they changed the lineaments of the countenance, and were also injurious to the organs of respiration. Hence Plato banished from his republic the Bœotian flute.

This prejudice against wind instruments arose probably from the violence of effort that was generally made in playing upon them, As an instance of this, it is related that a young flute player named Harmonides, at his first public appearance at the Olympic games, began a solo with so violent a blast, for the purpose of surprising and elevating the audience, that he breathed his last breath into his flute, and died on the spot. It is also said that the trumpet players at these exhibitions expressed great joy when they found their exertions had neither rent their checks, nor burst their blood vessels. We may gather from this some idea of the tremendous style of music which was then agreeable.

The Greeks had a double flute, which was composed of two flutes joined together in such a manner, that the two pipes had usually but one mouth in common to both. These were either equal or unequal in length or in the diameter of the bore. The equal flutes had the same, the unequal, different sounds; of which one was deep, and the other high.

The equal flutes were in unison when the two hands of the performer stopped the same holes of each flute at the same time, producing symphony. The diversity of sounds resulted from the unequal flutes.

The lyre, or cithara, was intended to include every musical instrument, having strings strained over a cavity, for sound. There were several instruments of this kind, differing only in their form, their size, or the number of their strings. To learn to play well on the lyre an apprenticeship of three years was deemed necessary.

The tone or mode which the musicians used in raising or depressing the sound, was called nomos, Greek, and

hence the plural called in Greek nomoi, or in English nomes, expressed the laws or models by which they sang or played.

There were anciently four principal nomes or modes, to which, also, a fifth is the most generally found added, although it is not mentioned by ancient authors. These five were the Phrygian, the Lydian, the Doric, the Ionic, and the Æolic.

They were thus distinguished in their great leading characteristics. The Phrygian was religious; the Lydian, plaintive; the Doric, martial; the Ionic, gay and cheerful: and the Æolic, simple.

These modes might well embrace every variety of music, and present every form in which it could be used effectively. Thus, if a people were to be animated to warlike achievements, or to listen to a recital of the exploits of their heroes, recourse was had to the Doric mode. It was grave, masculine, and full of energy; somewhat monotonous in its character, but well adapted to inspire martial ardor. This mode was particularly agreeable to the Spartans. Their ephori imposed a fine on Terpander for having added an additional string to the lyre. At a much later period, Timotheus, an Ionian, having become a favorite with the people of Athens, paid a visit to Sparta, with his eleven-stringed lyre and his effeminate airs. But the kings and ephori issued against him a decree, in which he was accused of having injured the majesty of the ancient music, and of endeavoring to corrupt the Spartan youth by the indecency, the variety, and the softness of his performances. He was peremptorily ordered to retrench four strings from his lyre. They afterwards required, that, in the pieces offered for competition, the modulation should be executed on a seven-stringed instrument, and turn only on one or two modes.

If it was desirable to stir the depths of popular feeling, and to arouse in the mind a sense of misfortune; then great examples of calamity and suffering were exhibited in elegies and plaintive songs; and the element that gave

to these their vitality, was the piercing and pathetic tones of Lydian harmony. If the object were to inspire awe and gratitude to the gods, to awake in the soul religious feelings, recourse was had to the Phrygian mode. And so the Ionic would inspire gayety and cheerfulness, and the Æolic, great simplicity in feeling. The former was rich, varied, and flexible. It breathed nothing but softness and pleasure; and its power could be felt and fully appreciated, as it was heard murmuring through the groves and temples of Venus, Apollo, and the muses.

Of these different styles or measures, the Doric, had the character of great seriousness and gravity, calculated to produce a calm, firm, collected frame of mind. The Phrygian was peculiarly adapted to the expression of enthusiasm, and was much used in orgiastic worships, particularly in that of Dionysius or Bacchus.

The national instrument of the Phrygians was the flute, and up to a very late period, flute players at Athens were usually distinguished by Phrygian names.

Of the three most ancient styles of music, the Doric, Phrygian and Lydian, the latter had the highest notes, and hence approached nearer to the female voice. Its character was softer and feebler than either of the others, but still it admitted of considerable variety of expression. The Æolic, although simple, was fitted for the expression of lively and even impassioned feelings.

To these five styles were subsequently added an equal number with higher and lower tones, which were annexed at their respective extremes, to the original system.

The music teachers in Greece, composed two classes. The one were termed Citharistæ, and these simply played on the instrument. The other, Citharœdi, and these accompanied the instrument, usually the cithara, with a song. Of these, the humbler taught in the corners of the streets, while the abler, and more fortunate opened schools of music, or gave lessons in the private dwellings of the opulent.

With the Greek, the cultivation of a taste for music, the acquiring the knowledge of it as a science, and the prac-

tice of it as an art, was deemed a very important part of education. It was employed to mollify the fierceness and natural ferocity of the national character, and to prepare the way for the lessons of the poets. This was more especially exemplified in the case of the Arcadians and Cynethians.

The former, although very austere in their manner of life, had nevertheless so high an opinion of music, that they not only taught that art to their children, but obliged young people to apply themselves to it until the age of thirty. They grew up in the neglect of other arts, but it was accounted dishonorable not to have learnt to sing. The object sought to be accomplished by this universal instruction in music seems not to have been the introduction of luxury and effeminacy, but to soften the ferocity of the Arcadians, and to mollify their gloomy and melancholy disposition.

The wisdom of the first law-givers in doing this is made evident by reference to the Cynethians, who inhabited the rudest and most savage part of Arcadia. These became a fierce and barbarous people, so much so, that it was said there was no city in Greece in which great and startling crimes were so frequently committed as in that of Cynethia.

Besides its softening, civilizing, humanizing effect upon the mind and character, the practice of the art among the Greeks entered largely into the amusements of social life. Every person, in his turn, was liable to be called upon, at entertainments, to contribute his part by singing, or playing upon the lyre. The great men of Greece were generally good performers in music. The great Theban hero, Epaminondas, it is said, danced gracefully, and performed upon musical instruments with admirable skill. The illustrious Athenian, Themistocles, at a feast, refused to play an air upon the lyre; and it was made a reproach against him ever afterwards.

In the third place, we have seen that in Greece there was no priest caste, and that all the citizens partook more or less of the sacerdotal character. In performing the

offices of religion, the singing of sacred hymns formed no inconsiderable part.

To enable the citizens to join in the sacred choruses, which were so frequent among the Greeks; and to perform in old age the many offices of religion that devolved upon them, rendered it necessary that they should all be performers in music.

In the fourth place, the Greeks were not only a social, a religious, but also an extremely martial people. Their wars were waged, and their battles fought, by the people for themselves, and not for a ruler. They were, therefore, animated by a patriotic spirit, and resorted to all the means calculated to awaken national enthusiasm. Among these was the martial music of the battle-field. As the embattled hosts stood on that field, and just immediately preceding the shock of the fight, there went up from it to heaven the pæan to Apollo. It was the chant, in the Doric style, of a stirring, impetuous, and terrible melody. It has found its parallel in modern times in that singularly awful Marseillaise hymn to the dread music of which revolutionary France conducted its victims to the guillotine. It was with the Greeks, the song of anticipated triumph, and in it the voice of every Grecian soldier was expected harmoniously to mingle.[1] As every citizen was liable to be called upon that battle-field, every one felt it to be incumbent upon him to tune his voice to harmonize in the awful chorus. We may cease then to wonder at the strength of motive that urged the Greek to the study and practice of music. It is no matter of surprise that it occupied the thought of their philosophers, and the time and attention of their heroes and statesmen.

Another thing in connection with this subject, is to be strictly borne in mind; and that is, that the Greek definition or understanding of music was essentially different from ours. In this, we have demonstrated a curious fact, which is worthy an attentive consideration, as the principle

[1] *St. John's Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, I, 184.

embraced in it, will be found to be a general one. In the infancy of civilization, those which now constitute distinct, separate departments, were not defined, brought out or separated from the others. All those possessing qualities or characteristics in common, that would associate them with each other, were included under the same general term, and studied or practiced in connection. This was most strikingly exemplified in respect to this particular art. What, then, was anciently included under the term music? The following were the particulars: 1. The composition of musical airs, and the execution of those airs, with voices and instruments. 2. The art of poetry, which taught the rules for making verses, of all kinds, as well as to set those susceptible of them, to notes. 3. The art of saltation, or dancing, teaching the step and attitude, and the usual manner of walking, dancing, etc. 4. The gesture proper to be used in declaiming, including also the art of composing and writing notes to the simple declamation. The object was as well to direct the tone of the voice by those notes, as the degree and motions of gesture.

It will be perceived that all these have a natural relation to each other. They composed originally, one and the same art, and were exercised by the same artists. In proportion, however, as civilization began to advance, these began to separate from each other, the art of poetry being the first that separated, forming a distinct art by itself.

All the passions that stir the human heart manifest themselves externally through three agencies, viz: the voice, articulate speech and action. The first from the howl and roaring of the savage finally subsides into measured melody, and becomes music; the second from that which resembles the gabbling of geese, finally becomes smoothed down into verse or numbers; and the third from movements the most uncouth and horrid ends finally in the dance and expressive gesture.

The successive separation of these from each other, and their distinct development, makes of itself an interesting and important chapter in human history. The early bard

has ever been a minstrel, and his poetical recitals have been with musical accompaniments and appropriate gestures. Here the rhapsodist stands at the point of separation. He did not sing but recited his poetry by way of chant. In the earlier, and even the later drama, the voice, articulate speech and action are combined. In the gymnastic games of the Greeks, the dance, a mode of action always particularly favored, became separated from poetry and song. Gesture acquired a distinct separation when on the Roman stage Livius obtained leave to substitute a slave to sing his poem along with the musician, while he himself performed the action in dumb show.[1]

Under all these circumstances, it is not matter of surprise that so much power was attributed by the Greeks to music. Its effects upon mind and body were surprising. It was understood to be that agreeable art of affecting the soul by the powers of harmony, in order either to excite or inflame the passions, according to occasion and reason. Galen gives an account of some young people, that a female performer upon the flute had made frantic by playing in the Phrygian measure; and whom she brought to their senses again by changing the music from the Phrygian to the Doric measure. A musician performing in a martial air on the flute one day before Alexander the Great, so excited him that he ran immediately to his arms. Plutarch also states of one Antigenides, a flutist, who, at a banquet, by means of his music, so fired that prince, that rising from the table like one out of his senses, he snatched his arms, and, clashing them to the sound of the flute, was almost ready to charge the guests.

It was also thought to have great influence over the body in the cure of certain diseases. These diseases have been not only such as had reference primarily to the mind, as in the case of Saul and David, but also to those directly affecting the body, as in the poisonous bite of the tarantula.[2]

[1] *Brown's History of Poetry*, 11, 12, 92, *and* 248. [2] *Rollin's Ancient History*, II, 411.

This power of music in the fabulous and early historic period of Grecian history, had attributed to it great effects. The workmen who built the fortress of Thebes were animated by the songs of Amphion, and hence the poetical idea which fame reports that the walls sprang up at the sound of his lyre. So musical were the notes of Orpheus, and so pleasing the sounds which issued from his lyre, that, it was said, even tigers laid aside their ferocity and crouched at his feet. The Spartans laid aside their divisions among themselves, and were reconciled by the harmonious modulations of Terpander. The Athenians were incited by the songs of Solon, to invade and recover the isle of Salamis, although in defiance of a decree which condemned to death the orator who should dare even to propose the conquest of the island.

2. The art Poetica; art of poetry. Into the exercise of the poetic art enters largely the feelings of the ideal. It finds its appropriate home in the vastness of the sublime, and is also equally in harmony with the spirit of the beautiful. For its imagery it draws upon the entire amplitude of nature, decking in the garniture of fancy, and exhibiting in its variety of colors the hue of human passion and sentiment.

The earliest conceptions of the human mind, the earliest flow of the feelings of the human soul, are eminently poetic. This remark applies both to the individual and to the race.

Heaven lies about us in our infancy,
Shades of the prison house begin to close
Upon the growing boy,
But he beholds the light and whence it flows,
He sees it in his joy;
The youth, who daily further from the east
Must travel, still is nature's priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended.
At length the man perceives it die away
And fade into the light of common day.

Poetry is conversant with forms and fancies; and these it invests with the hue of the mind which conceives them. Over some, settle the shades of melancholy. Around others are thrown the vestments of gayety and gladness. The wailings of woe, and the irrepressible outbursts of joy, are at each extreme of its musical octave. It leans not for its support on the truths of science. If true to nature, and to the promptings of the human heart, it will leave all matters of mere fact, and all scientific knowledge just where it found them.

The right conception of the human mind leads to the belief, that everything that comes to it from without, all external influences, are merely suggestive. They penetrate to the sources of thought, and set it in action. They reach the springs of feeling, and a ready response is rendered up from their silent depths. These great correlative powers of intellect and feeling once awoke into existence, act by virtue of their own laws, and rejoice in their own newness of being. They, in turn, surround all outward objects with their own halo, investing them with the gloom of a profound melancholy, or brightening them with the gladness of resplendent joy.

Of these two, however, the feelings are the earliest developed in their full strength. They all, the moral, social, religious, ideal, prevail early in the life of the man and of the race.

The first conception of the mind belongs to the ideal. The first outpouring of the human soul is in the language of poetry. All great events, all great deliverances, prompt to the immediate outburst of the poetic feeling. Scarce had the hosts of Pharaoh been immersed beneath the returning wave of the Red sea, before we hear floating back upon its dark waters, and ascending to heaven, the song of Moses and of Israel. We send our searching gaze far back along the track of civilization. We penetrate to its distant horizon; and there, amid its hazy light, among the first objects discernible in the distance, wandering upon its remote verge, is the bard. He comes with the

poetry of his age, armed with the power of song. He precedes the art of writing. He even precedes the invention of the alphabet. This is more especially apparent in the early periods of Grecian history.

The Greeks, more especially the Ionian race, appear to have been peculiarly susceptible to the charms of poetry. The earliest poetic effusions seem to have been the songs of the seasons. With these are connected many most interesting events, regarding more particularly the husbandman and his labors. These had their origin in times of ancient rural simplicity, and were sung by peasants during the labors of the harvest. These songs were often of a plaintive and melancholy character, as those ancient songs commemorative of the worship of outward nature, and often contained notes of wailing and lamentation, as well as of rejoicing and mirth.

To this class of plaintive ditties, belongs the song of Linus, so frequently sung in Greece at the grape picking. Songs of this plaintive character abounded in ancient Greece, and especially in Asia Minor, whose inhabitants seem to have had a peculiar fondness for mournful tunes.

There was also another species of song of a very different character, dedicated to Apollo, which was termed the pæan. These were songs in which both the tune and words were eminently expressive of courage and confidence. They were sung both when there was a hope of overcoming a great and imminent danger, and also when the danger was happily past. They embodied the elements of hope and confidence, as well as of thanksgiving and joy. Among the Pythagoreans the solemn purification which they performed in the spring, consisted in singing pæans, and other hymns sacred to Apollo. As formerly mentioned, the pæan was also sung in war before the attack of the enemy, and this prevailed chiefly among the Doric nations.

All those events of private life which strongly excited the feelings, called forth the gift of poetry. Among these was the lamentation for the dead, sung chiefly by women,

with the strongest expressions of grief. They had, on these occasions, professional singers, who, standing near the bed where the body was laid out, began their lament, the women accompanying them with cries and groans.[1]

This was called threnos, and opposed to this the Greeks had the hymenæos, or merry bridal song, which was sung on the occasion of weddings. These effusions were generally accompanied by a dance, and by the music of flutes and harps.

The temples and places of early worship were also the sanctuaries of poetry where the song of the bard was heard and rejoiced in. This song constituted a part of the worship of Apollo in Delphi, Delos, and Crete. There were also singers employed in connection with the cognate worships of Demeter and Dionysius.

In the development of the social element in Greece, during the early periods of its history, the bard performed a conspicuous part. At the festal banquet he was ever a welcome visitor, and the song and the dance were its chief ornaments, and reckoned as the highest pleasure. He there chanted the loves of the young and the beautiful, the praises of the gods, and the achievements of heroes. He enjoyed a dignified position in royal families, and was always entitled to mild and considerate treatment. Thus Ulysses on his return from his wanderings scatters destruction and death among the suitors of Penelope, but respects and saves Phemius their bard. This was more especially the case during the epic period, or while this species of poetry flourished in Greece.

At one period of Grecian history it seems that he was attached to the service of every great family, and treated with an almost religious respect. Agamemnon, when setting out on his expedition against Troy, reposes his most important trusts in the bard whom he leaves at home.

During this period, poetry and music seem to be almost inseparably united. The latter art, however, acts a subser-

[1] *Müller's History of Literature of Ancient Greece*, 21.

vient part, being designed rather as an embellishment of the former, serving to prepare the audience, and heighten the inspiration of the bard.

It should be remarked, however, that in that primitive age, very much passed under the name of song, which in later times would not have been considered as such; for example, any high-pitched sonorous recitation, with certain simple modulations of the voice. This leads to the consideration of the manner in which poetical compositions were delivered.

There seems to have been two classes. The one the Homeric minstrel, who makes use of a stringed instrument called a cithara. These were the citharadi or singers. Their poetical recitals were with musical accompaniments.

The other class were termed rhapsodists. This term was made use of to signify nothing more than the peculiar method of epic recitation. The rhapsodists were the chanters of epic poetry, and the term rhapsodizing applies equally to the bard who recites his own poem, as to him who has learned and recites the poetry of another.

The epic, with the exception, perhaps, of a few fragmentary remains, is the oldest style of Grecian poetry that has descended to us. On that broad field are two names, looming up in the distance, standing forth in proud preeminence, the immortal fathers of song. These are Homer and Hesiod.

It required a singular train of circumstances and events to produce a Homer. The heroic age had just preceded him. Its full and complete development had opened to him its varied stores. The great event of the *Iliad*, the Trojan war, is purely the product of that age. Whether real or fictitious is of little consequence. In either case it was just the event to which the heroic age would be likely to give birth. Its existence was not only rendered possible, but also probable, from the character of that age.

The same age produced also as its legitimate fruit, the epic style of poetry. Of this style, Homer was unquestionably the real father. His pictures on the page of the

Iliad, present in all the vividness of living reality, whatever of social, or civil, or domestic, or religious, or warlike, are presented in the heroic age. The very life of that age is transfused into, and animates the soul of this glorious epic.

The age and the birth-place of Homer, remain to this day, undecided. Like the Nile, he has fertilized where he has flowed, while himself, like the sources of that great giver of plenty, are concealed from mortal view, or remained so until the last half of the present century.

He is supposed to have flourished about B. C. 1000, perhaps a little later. He flourished at a period when the glimmerings of tradition were not yet departed. These traditions had borne to his ears the achievements of heroes, magnified by the misty medium through which they were discerned. His birth-place is by many, and with the most reason, supposed to have been at Smyrna, and his descent from the Ionian race.

His two epics, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed and recited anterior to the art of writing, consisting originally of various rhapsodies recited on festive and other occasions. They remained for a long time unwritten, but the wonderful effects they wrought were by no means diminished by that circumstance. They were rather increased by it, as they were thus the better enabled to enter the memory and mind of the nation. They were first reduced to their present form under the direction of Pisistratus and his son Hipparchus, when it is highly probable they received some additions and interpolations.

The main subject of the *Iliad* is the wrath of Achilles, his separation from the Grecian army in consequence of it, and the events of the Trojan war during his absence and immediately on his return. The Odyssey narrates the wandering of Ulysses, the dangers and sufferings to which he was subjected in returning from Troy to Ithaca, and the events following his arrival.

"It was from Homer," says Pope, "that the poets drew their inspiration, the critics their rules, and the philosophers a defense of their opinions.

"Every author was fond to use his name, and every profession wrote books upon him, until they swelled to libraries. The warriors formed themselves upon his heroes, and the oracles delivered his verses for answers."

The influence of that one mind upon the destinies of Greece and of mankind, has been incalculable. He may be said, in a great measure, to have formed the character of the Greek nation. The great secret of his power consisted in the fact that he had strong sympathïes with his race and his age. His poetry strongly proclaims these sympathies. It embodies the first feelings of human nature, the love of children, of home, of country, and more especially the love of glory. He held up before his nation the mirror, in which they were to behold the world of gods and heroes, no less than of feeble mortals. He placed before their eyes examples of greatness which were clearly seen to be worthy of all imitation; and were not so far removed from reality as to render all efforts to reach them useless. He thus nerved every arm, and fired every mind, and impelled every soul to a higher degree of effort.

The other great name, that of Hesiod, was either contemporary with, or what is more probable, a little later than that of Homer. Homer was an Ionian, and of the coast of Asia Minor, colonized from Greece. Hesiod was of the mother country, born at Cuma in Æolia, and was called the Ascræan, because educated at Ascra in Bœotia. He was reared at the foot of Mount Helicon, and his occupation seems to have been that of a shepherd or herdsman. He belonged strictly to his nation and his times. His poetry, especially that part of it relating to rural economy, the *Works and Days*, is a faithful transcript of the whole condition of Bœotian life: the most complete notions of which can be derived from it.[1]

As a poet he is greatly inferior to Homer. He seems to have been deeply read in the learning of his age, especially in that part of it relating to theology, cosmogony,

[1] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 78.

and mythology; but he is deficient in that sway of fancy, in the strong preponderance of the ideal, which are so eminently displayed in the works of Homer. In the works of Homer there appears to be an utter abandonment of the thoughts to the flow of poetical images which crowd upon the mind, to the exclusion of all other things. In that of Hesiod there is a struggle to emerge out of the bounds of common life, which he strives to ennoble and to render more endurable. The strong effort of the first was to bring heaven down to earth, of the last to elevate earth to heaven.

Mere poetry seems not to have been the ulterior aim of Hesiod. He had in view great practical interests, to inculcate the lessons of civil and domestic wisdom; and to show their application to public and domestic life. These, together with an attempt to reduce to a connected system the mythological lore of his age, were among the great objects of Hesiod.

To accomplish the first was the purpose of the *Works and Days.* He portrays a life of industry, follows the round of the seasons, notes the time of ploughing and sowing, treats of the implements used in these processes, describes the storms of a Bœotian winter, the heats of summer, the dressing and cutting of the vines, the reaping of the grain, the threshing of the corn, the vintage, and the entire circle of rural occupations.

He omits not the commonest affairs of life; speaks of the time of life when a man should take a wife, and how he should look out for her. He enters into the commonest occurrences of every day life, giving some curious precepts to be observed in acts of worship, and treating also of the days on which it is expedient or inexpedient to do this or that business. These precepts are many of them of a superstitious character, and are more or less immediately connected with the different modes of worship which were celebrated upon these days. The great and fundamental idea embraced in this poem, as stated by Müller, is, "that the decrees and institutions of the gods protect justice among men; that they have made labor the only road to

prosperity, and have so ordered the year, that every work has its appointed season, the sign of which is discernible by man.[1]

To accomplish the last, that is, to connect together the mythological lore of his age, and give to it a system, he produced his theogony. This is of the highest importance, as giving a history of the religious faith of Greece; as being a kind of religious code, containing the history of creation, the succession of the gods, their acts, relationships, and peculiar attributes and characteristics.

It aspires to set forth the birth of the gods and the origin of nature; and it unfolds the order and succession of existences, and of creation, in a series of genealogies, which personify the beings contained in it. He begins with Chaos, and from thence derives Earth and Tartarus and Eros, the fairest of the immortal gods. The earth produced the starry heaven, the mountain ranges, and the roaring seas. Earth becomes wedded to heaven, and the descendants of this married pair form a second great generation of deities. He details the tremendous contests waged between the Titans, who represent the elder deities or race of gods and the more modern Zeus or Jupiter, who with the assistance of the hundred-handed giants, vanquishes them in a terrible battle and shuts them up in the bosom of Tartarus.

Afterwards follows the rebellion of Typhon, son of Earth and Tartarus, which was successfully quelled; and the supremacy of the Olympian, or last race of gods, mostly the descendants Zeus or Jupiter, was fully established.

It will thus be seen that Greece owes her mythology to her poets. While Hesiod has given their history, and unfolded their genealogies, and traced their various relationships, it was the genius of Homer that divested them of abstractions, that gave to them individuality, that fed them with nectar and ambrosia, and assigned to them attributes and powers adequate and corresponding to the positions

[1] *History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 86.

they occupied, and such as would interest in them human feelings, and enlist for them human sympathies.

These great names essentially fill the epoch of the epic poetry of Greece.

The epic was the only species of poetry much cultivated in Greece until the beginning of the seventh century before our era. This was undoubtedly a kind the most acceptable to those Grecian princes whose ancestors were the heroes of the mythical age, and the kingly period continued up to the beginning of the Olympiads. As democratic tendencies began then to develop themselves, and continued more and more to prevail, the language and styles of poetry experienced a corresponding change.

The lofty tones and measures of the epic, in which the poet was lost in his subject, began to give place to the elegiac and iambic, which were better fitted to give free vent to the struggling emotions of a soul which had breathed the freer air of a republic.

The word elegeion was applied in Greek rather to the form of the poem than to its subject. In its strict sense it means nothing more than the combination of an hexameter and a pentameter, making together a distich, and elegeia is a poem made of such verses. Elegos, however, the primitive, properly means a strain of lament without reference to a metrical form.

This was probably derived from Asia Minor, and may be traced to the laments over the dead by the Carians and Lydians; and in Phrygia was accompanied by the music of the flute. This instrument was unknown to the Greeks in the time of Homer, and the elegy is the first cultivated branch of Greek poetry, in the recitation of which the flute alone was employed. Banquets and convivial meetings were frequently the occasions on which the Greek elegy was required.

The elegiac metre was but a slight deviation from the epic hexameter, "it seeming," says Müller, "as if the spirit of art, impatient of its narrow limits, made with this metre, the first timid step out of the hallowed precinct."

As understood by the Greeks, it was by no means necessary that lamentations should form the subject of the elegy, still less that it should be the lamentation of love; but emotion of some kind or other was deemed essential to it.

The first class of emotions sought to be awakened by it, was of the political and warlike character. Hence the elegiac muse of Callinus of Ephesus dwells upon the expeditions of the Cimmerians and Treres. Contemporary with him was the poet-general, Tystæus, who flourished about B. C. 647, during the second Messenian war. He was sent from Athens to lead the Spartan forces, in order to conform to the requirements of the Delphic oracle. The subjects in relation to which his elegiac muse was exercised, were justice, good government, the constitution, and many and strong exhortations to bravery. These were not sung on the march of the army, or in the battle. On these occasions they sang the anapæstic marches.

The occasions on which the elegy was recited by the Spartans in their campaigns was after the evening meal, and when the pæan had been sung in honor of the gods. The whole mass did not join in the chant, but it was the subject of competition among individuals, the successful competitor being entitled to receive a larger portion of meat than the others.

Next comes the combination of the iambic with the elegiac, the two great masters being Archilochus and Simonides. Here we find the convivial elegy, which collected all the images, fitted to drive away the cares of life, and give to the mind a serene hilarity. This, however, did not prevent the employment of the same metre for strains of lamentation. In Sparta an elegy was recited at the solemnities in honor of warriors who had fallen for their country.

The elegiac style of poetry flourished chiefly among the Ionian race; and in proportion as this race became more unwarlike and effeminate, the elegy was diverted from sub-

jects relating to public affairs and to struggles for national independence.

Among the elegiac writers of Greece is reckoned Solon, the celebrated law-giver, who flourished about B. C. 604. His elegies were but the expression of his political feelings, as is instanced in that of Salamis, in which having reported himself mad, he one day appeared in the costume of a herald, sprang upon the herald's stand in the popular assembly, and poured forth an impassioned elegy, which had the effect to rouse the Athenians to reconquer Salamis from the Magarians. This was done while there existed a penal law against any motion for the reconquest of Salamis.

The iambic style of poetry was a light, tripping measure, sometimes loosely constructed, or purposely halting and broken, and well adapted to abuse and vituperation. It was created by the Parian poet, Archilochus, who practiced it with terrible effect. His ostensible object was to give reality to caricatures, magnifying, and thus rendering more striking, every hideous feature.

Simonides was almost his contemporary, flourishing about B. C. 664. He vents his displeasure principally upon women who come in for a very large share of his attention. He characterizes them from the origin he assigns to them. Thus, according to him, the uncleanly woman is formed from the swine; the cunning, from the fox; the talkative, from the dog; the lazy, from the earth; the unequal and changeable, from the sea; the sensual, from the ass; the perverse, from the weasel; the one fond of dress, from the horse; and the ugly and malicious, from the ape.[1] According to him, there is only one race created for the benefit of men, viz: the woman sprung from the bee, who is fond of her work, and keeps faithful watch over her house.

The elegy and the iambus contained the germs of the lyric style of poetry, the principal characteristic of which

[1] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 140.

was its connection with music, either vocal or instrumental, or both. This had a species of connection with the epic, elegiac, and iambic, but it was not essential to either.

The Greek lyric poetry was characterized by deeper feeling, and a more swelling and impetuous tone than the elegy or iambus; the effect being at the same time heightened by music-vocal and instrumental, and often, in addition, by the movements of the dance.

The period in which this style of poetry was carried to its highest perfection in Greece, includes the last stage in the career of the epic muse. That muse had drawn so largely upon myths, and mythology, and fable, and heroic achievement, that its resources, as to original material, were becoming exhausted. The poetical genius of the nation must, therefore, take a new direction, and without entirely abandoning the epic field, must explore fresh regions. Hence the origin of the lyric poetry, which was designed to be the expression of the thoughts and feelings belonging to the various occasions of life, public and private, sacred and profane, and growing out of the poet's individual character and situation. It was not, however, like that which passes under that name in modern times, designed for the enjoyment of solitary readers, but to arouse the feelings and awaken the sympathies of large social circles.

The lyric poetry of the Greeks was of two kinds, and was cultivated by two different schools. The one was termed the Æolic, and flourished among the Æolians of Asia Minor, and in the island of Lesbos. It was written in the Æolic dialect. The other was called the Doric, because it was cultivated principally by the Dorians in Peloponnesus and Sicily.

Of these two, the Doric bordered on the epic. It still continued to throw around the main epochs and leading situations in the life of the great, the power and the magic influence of song. It was still the accompaniment of the war march, the religious and convivial procession, the nuptial ceremony, the feast and the funeral. Without it all these would have been spiritless and unmeaning. It is

here that we find the great choral compositions which embodied many high subjects of heroic song in a new shape. This was early carried to a considerable degree of perfection by Arion, Stesichicorus, and some others; and uniting the attractions of music and action with those of a lofty poetry, formed the favorite entertainment of the Dorian cities. This was, in fact, intended to be executed by choruses, and to be sung to choral dances; and hence it is sometimes called choral poetry. It was these choral performances that really laid the foundation for the dramatic art in Greece, hereafter to be noticed.

The Æolic branch of the lyric was never choral in its character. It was intended to be recited by a single person who played upon a stringed instrument, usually the lyre, at the same time making suitable gestures. This embraced a great mass of poetry, which only breathed the thoughts and feelings of individual minds. This was chiefly cultivated in the Ionian and Æolian states. It was the poetry of Alcæus, who displays a noble nature, accompanied with strong passions, and whose metrical forms are mostly light and lively; sometimes with a softer, and sometimes with a more vehement character. It was the poetry of Sappho, the contemporary of Alcæus, although much younger; and who is styled by him in poetic language the "violet-crowned, pure, sweetly smiling Sappho." She originated the Sapphic metre, and the whole voice of antiquity has declared that the poetry of Sappho was unrivaled in grace and sweetness.

It was the poetry of Anacreon an Ionian, the author of the Anacreontic style of poetry; who sang the praises of love, music, wine, and all the social enjoyments of existence. With the deep feelings of our nature he had little sympathy; but from the flowing bowl derived large drafts of inspiration. In him there is little energy, little warmth of moral feeling; little power of serious reflection, little more than a light play of pleasing thoughts and sentiments.

The last great poetic name in Greece, to which the attention may be called, is that of Pindar. He was a

Theban, was born in the year B. C. 522, and was in the prime of life when the battles of Thermopylæ and Salamis were fought. His life, therefore, belongs to a period in which all the energy of the Greek nation was brought into requisition. He is to the lyric what Homer was to the epic style of poetry. Indeed, the two may be said to stand at the extreme points of Grecian poetry. His writing is much of it in the higher kind of lyric verse, which was employed to celebrate the triumphs of heroes and victors. He sang the praises of victors in the great public games of Greece. "He is marked by his lofty sublimity; his bold energy of thought, his vivid and poetical imagination, and the flowing fullness of his diction." He devoted himself both to poetry and music, making these arts the whole business of his life, and his reputation soon spread through all Greece. He lived to the age of eighty years; and, fortunately, many of his works, like those of Homer, have been preserved, and have come down to us.

The writers of tragedy and comedy belong to dramatic art.

It is easy to see that the Greeks are largely indebted to their poets for the great elements of their character. It will cease to surprise us that they made their muses the daughters of Zeus, others deriving them from the same high parentage that they did their Pallas, the goddess of wisdom. From their singular susceptibility to every species of mental emotion and pleasure, we might have a right to expect that they would deem it the highest wisdom to call forth, in their largest extent, the powers of poetry and of song.

3. Eloquence. By eloquence is intended to be expressed the power or effect which one mind can exercise or produce upon another, in the legitimate exercise of its faculties, in the modes in which they can be made the most effective.

It has been termed the art of persuasion, but that is only a part of its office. Before a rational being can be persuaded to act, he must first be convinced; and the art of convincing, if it can be so termed, is as necessary, and often more so, as that of persuasion.

The one, it is true, requires a different set of powers, and a different method of proceeding from the other. The first requires those powers which are purely intellectual, and they address themselves to nothing but the understanding. Their method of proceeding is logic, and the power of convincing is the most perfect when the faculties of mere intellect adduce the strongest arguments, and these are arrayed in the most complete logical form.

In regard to the second, we are in the domain of feeling and the address is to the passions. The method the most certain of success is to urge upon the mind the strongest motives, as it is mainly upon their strength that the man acts. The extent, amount, or quantity of action produced, is a true measure of the success with which this art is practiced.

The fabric of eloquence is supported on three pillars: rhetoric, logic, and oratory.

Rhetoric employs itself in composition, in the structure of sentences, in their arrangement in a discourse. It develops all the beauties of which spoken or written language is susceptible. It claims to comprehend all the uses of language, and to subject it to a thorough analysis, so far as concerns its capacity for unfolding the sublime and the beautiful. It lends an aid both to conviction and persuasion.

Logic claims to instruct in the right use of reason. It looks to the force of arguments and to their consecutive arrangement. It cares nothing for the beautiful or sublime, but seeks only force, and that kind of arrangement which will lead by successive steps to a perfect conclusion. It employs itself solely in producing conviction, and marshals all its forces in reference to that one end.

Oratory embraces both these and something more. It not only deals in rhetorical flourish and embellishment, and in logical arrangement, but superadds to both these the force of gesture, the grace of motion; in fine, all the accompaniments of a powerful delivery. This last was accounted of much more importance among the ancients

than at the present day. It is said that Demosthenes when interrogated the first, second, and third time, in regard to what constituted the first, second, and third most important qualification of an orator, answered each time, "delivery." From the very great efforts made by him to overcome impediments that lay in the way of it, and from the elegance, power and effect with which he practiced it, we may readily conclude that with him it was the first, second, and third requisite to form the orator. A fine tribute, in this respect, is rendered him by his great rival, Æschines, who, in his banishment, being desired to read to the people the oration of Demosthenes on the crown, and the people expressing themselves warmly in approval of it, replied: "How then would you have been affected had you heard him deliver it."

Rhetoric and logic may be employed in reference to both written and spoken language, but oratory has regard to the latter only. It seeks to embody all the elements of beauty, sublimity and power that can attach to spoken language; and, by the superadded elegance and force of delivery, to render it an irresistible agent to convince and persuade. In the tone and the gesture; the emphatic enunciation; the slowness and prolongation of the solemn utterance; the celerity, sudden transition, quick and rapid movement by which thought is broken as it were into fragments, and thrown among the multitude; the deep undertone; the loud bellowing; the nice adaptation of gesture and tone, of modulation and emphasis, to the numerous varieties of thought, and the different shades of meaning; the countenance lit up and glowing in the light of those central fires which are burning brightly in the brain; in all these, are to be found that which gives beauty and sublimity to rhetoric, force and energy to logic, and power and efficiency to oratory. It requires all these, and much more, to constitute the complete orator.

Eloquence, as an art, was cultivated in Athens, and nowhere else in Greece. True, there was power in the sententious brevity of the Spartan; there were glimmerings

in the Theban, of the age of Pelopadas and Epaminondas; but it is Athens alone that presents us with orators upon whom the eyes of the world have ever gazed with admiration, and are gazing still. I must here, however, be understood as speaking of Greece proper. The remark does not apply to many of the Grecian colonies. But those colonies in which eloquence flourished were generally of the Ionian race. In the settlements in Western Asia and in the islands, are to be found many instances in which oratory was successfully practiced.

But in Athens, eloquence was neither of an early nor a sudden growth. It was unknown during the heroic and the kingly period of its history. It was unknown while the songs of Homer were floating in the memories of the Grecian bards; and until after his works had been collected, and had become objects of study.

The growth, progress and successful practice of eloquence in Greece offers another, among many proofs, that it is in popular governments, and amid general prosperity, that this noble art is the most cultivated, and exerts the most commanding influence. It was not until Athens had thrown off her kingly government; had instituted her areopagus; and devolved much of the conduct of affairs upon her popular assemblies; that we find her gifted ones practicing successfully the art of eloquence. This properly dates from the time of Solon, B. C. 600; and at this period some of the Grecian states had existed longer than Rome had at the age of Cicero.

Neither was the period during which eloquence flourished in Greece, of long duration. It lasted about three hundred years. It could not survive the supremacy of Macedon. It died with Demosthenes.

In the history of Grecian eloquence there are three periods, each one of which presents its own representative. The first begins with Solon, and ends with the close of the Persian war. Eloquence properly commenced with this period. Its roots are to be sought for and found in the songs of Homer. And this was the age in which the

poems of the immortal bard were collected and published. This served to give a new impulse to Grecian mind; and oratory, in its infant state, was one of its fruits. It was a poetical oratory. The best models of language and style were in poetry. All kinds of composition bore a poetical structure. Parmenides taught his philosophy in verse, and even Solon threw over his laws the dress of poetry.[1]

This may also be styled the war period. The leading tendencies of the age were warlike. The orators were successful generals, and the influence they exerted was acquired on the battle-field. Their leadership in affairs of state grew out of their conducting warlike expeditions. Their speeches evince little art. Their characteristics, so far as we can judge, were brevity, simplicity and boldness. Our knowledge of them, however, is very slight, as no remains have come down to us. The representative of this period is Themistocles. His reputation, however, is military. He has no fame as a speaker. He accomplished nothing simply by the art of speaking. But he was a politician as well as a military commander, and had also many statesmanlike qualities. He was the great man of his age, and proved adequate for every emergency. The measures he proposed were carried not by the power of his eloquence, but because those to whom they were proposed had entire confidence in his ability to enforce them. He persuaded the Athenians to abandon their beautiful city, and trust to the wooden walls of their vessels. But his arguments were not motives urged by the power of eloquence. They were expedients derived from the superstitions of the age. His was the master spirit that rolled back the tide of the Persian invasion, and sent Xerxes back into Asia in a fishing boat. But his agents were cunning expedients, and the prompt and vigorous execution of whatever he undertook.

Greece and all subsequent time are largely indebted to Themistocles. But for the measures which his vigorous

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 205.

mind conceived and executed, the light of Greece might then have been extinguished, and an eastern despotism have settled down with its sullen weight upon the struggling energies of young and rising Europe.

The second period of Grecian eloquence extends from the close of the Persian to the termination of the Peloponnesian war. This covers a troublesome period in Grecian history, and one which tested very thoroughly the resources of the different states of Greece. Although a period of war, attended with great intestine commotion, yet it was also one in which the arts flourished, and Athens became encircled with a halo of glory, which subsequent ages have dimmed but not destroyed.

The arts of design, during this period, were brought to their highest degree of perfection, and Athens was beautified by paintings and sculpture and architecture, beyond any other city in the ancient world. It was also the reign of philosophy; and the statesmen and orators of Athens began with having their minds deeply imbued with the teachings of the schools. Nor had the poetry of Greece lost its charm or its power. It still gave the touch of the ideal even to the speculations of her philosophers.

It was a stirring era; one in which Greek met Greek. All the mental, and all the material resources of the different states of Greece, were brought into requisition. The attack and defense, the march and countermarch, the fight and the retreat, all the arts of negotiation, all the secret management and the open demonstration, of which a state is susceptible, or was then susceptible, contribute to form the history of that period.

More, perhaps, than all other things, it was the reign of the people. Athens had her areopagus, and her popular assemblies, and these were not dead names. They were in the fullness of life and vigor. Before them came causes to be decided, and measures to be adopted. Here there was presented a field for the finest displays of eloquence.

This field did not remain unoccupied. Everything here conspired to produce the orator, and he was produced.

The great lesson taught by all history was here verified, viz: that when all the circumstances unite in the production of a particular result, that result is inevitable. We are here enabled to perceive the reciprocal influence which exists between men of genius, and the age in which they live.

This age, like every other one that is peculiarly marked, must have its representative; and this it found in the person of Pericles. In him we have the remarkable instance of the mere citizen of a republic elevating his nation, and by that means, all mankind, to a higher position than any ever, up to that period, attained.

He is described as having a person in all respects well turned, except that his head was disproportionately large. Hence his statues represent his head covered with a helmet for the purpose, as is supposed, of hiding that defect. The Athenian poets often allude to his large head. Thus Teleclides:

> Now in a maze of thought he ruminates
> On strange expedients, while his head, depressed
> With its own weight, sinks on his knees; and now
> From the vast caverns of his brain burst forth
> Storms and fierce thunders.

They often call him schinocephalus or onion-head. Other terms applied to him were great-headed, and head-compeller. He was also called Olympius or Jupiter.[1]

"In his political course," says Heeren, "he was guided by a simple principle; to be the first in his own city, whilst he secured to it the first place among cities. Its political preponderance depended on the preservation of its supremacy over Greece; and this was to be preserved, not by force alone, but by everything which, according to Grecian ideas, could render a city illustrious. Hence he felt himself the necessity of improving his mind more variously than had hitherto been common in Athens; and he availed himself for that end of all the means which his age

[1] *Plutarch's Lives*, I, 298.

afforded him. He was the first statesmen who felt that a certain degree of acquaintance with philosophy was requisite, not in order to involve his mind in the intricacies of a system, but to exercise himself in thinking with freedom; and he became the pupil of Anaxagoras. He was the first who came forward as a voluntary orator; and the study of eloquence was necessary for him, although he never made the duties of an active statesman subordinate to those of a public speaker. Whilst he ornamented Athens by masterpieces of architecture and the arts of design, he was not only the patron but the personal friend of Phidias and similar men; and who does not know, that his intimacy with Aspasia, his friend, his mistress, and at last his wife, imparted to his mind that finer culture, which he would have looked for in vain among the women of Athens. But all this he made subservient to his public career. 'There was, in the whole city,' says Plutarch, 'but one street in which he was ever seen; the street, which led to the market place and the council house. He declined all invitations to banquets, and all gay assemblies and company. He never dined at the table of a friend. He did not always appear even in the popular assemblies; but only when important business was to be transacted; smaller concerns he entrusted to his friends and the orators.' Thus Pericles exhibited a model of a statesman, such as Greece had never yet seen, and was not to see again. His history shows, that he became great amidst the collision of parties; all of which he finally annihilated; and we need not, therefore, be astonished, if the opinions of his contemporaries were not united in his favor." [1]

Pericles unfortunately left no writings which have come down to us. The funeral eulogium pronounced over those who fell in the first battles of the Peloponnesian war, which is attributed to him by Thucydides, is probably the work of the latter; but the character of the eloquence of that period may be gleaned from that historian.

[1] *Heeren's Politics of Ancient Greece*, 266–8.

Its distinguishing qualities are described as exhibiting "simple grandeur of language, rapidity of thought, and brevity crowded with matter to such an extent even as to create occasional obscurity. They had very little of artificial plan, or of rhetorical illustration and ornament. Their speeches are seldom marked by any of the figures and contrivances to produce effect, which the rules of sophists brought into use among the later orators. They have less of the air of martial addresses than the harangues of the preceding period, but far more of it than appears in the third. Their character is such as to show, that while the orator was a statesman of influence in the civil council, he was also at the same time a commander in war. Such was the eloquence of the era, which is designated by the name of Pericles.[1]"

The style of eloquence, thus described, well accords with the fact, that the orators of that period were military leaders as well as statesmen. During the last fifteen years of the administration of Pericles he held the place of general without interruption. His entire administration lasted through a period of forty years, and during all this time he ruled by his eloquence and by the confidence which the people placed in him. "His administration," says Thucydides, "was nominally the government of the people, but in reality the government of the first man.

Although Pericles studied the philosophy of that period, yet it is uncertain whether he took advantage of the instructions which the teachers of eloquence then began to give. Whether he was in the practice of writing out his speeches, or what amount of previous preparation he made, is but little known. Plutarch says, "he was accustomed whenever he was to speak in public, previously to entreat the gods, that he might not utter, against his will, any word which should not belong to the subject." This would seem to indicate that he was not in the habit of writing out his orations, and delivering them from memory,

[1] *Manual of Classical Literature*, 206.

but that he left much to be filled up from the impulse of the moment. From all we are enabled to collect they were artfully composed; but there is far less evidence of art in their composition than is apparent in those of Demosthenes.

Pericles, although the greatest, and properly the representative, is not the only orator of this period. There was also Antiphon, some of whose harangues have come down to us. After Pericles succeeded Cleon, Alcibiades, Critias, and Theramenes. Of these, Alcibiades exerted the most influence in the affairs of Athens and of Greece. He had a defective pronunciation and a hesitating delivery, but nevertheless exerted great power in controlling a popular assembly.

The third period extends from the close of the Peloponnesian war to the downfall of Grecian liberty, in the supremacy of Philip and Alexander, kings of Macedon. This is the most brilliant era of Grecian eloquence, and one which, perhaps, is not exceeded by any other in the world's history. The light of liberty in Greece was extinguished amid the most glorious lights which the world has ever seen.

The great name which looms up, and stands forth pre-eminent as the representative of this period, is that of Demosthenes. In him, we behold the embodiment of all the great elements that go to constitute the Grecian orator. There were others eminently distinguished for the practice of that art; but their feebler light paled before that splendid luminary, whose setting the world has never seen, and never will.

It is curious to observe how many things conspired to make a Demosthenes. When a mere boy, his governors and tutors obtained for him a seat, where, without being seen, he could hear the orator, Callistratus, in a cause which excited great public interest. Witnessing, on that occasion, the power of eloquence, he was fired with the spirit of emulation, and resolved thenceforth to devote himself untiringly to the acquisition and practice of that

art. His first efforts at the bar were in calling his guardians to an account for the mal-administration of his estate, in which he acquired considerable confidence, and met with partial success.

At his first appearance before the people, he was laughed at and interrupted by their clamors. He had a weak, stammering voice, a want of breath, and was easily thrown into confusion. He, however, learned his defects, and set at work to remedy them. The hesitation and stammering he corrected by practicing to speak with pebbles in his mouth. He strengthened his voice and increased his power of lungs by running or walking up hill, and pronouncing some passage during the difficulty of breathing which that caused. He built a subterranean study, in which he would sometimes remain for two or three months, studying and practicing, and adjusting with great nicety all his gestures and motions.

There was everything in the circumstances of the times which tended to make Demosthenes the culminating point of Grecian eloquence. The statesman and the soldier had parted company, and the orator no longer mingled civil with military harangues. The conducting of the state trials led to the uniting together the labors of the orator and the statesman. The orators of this period appeared as accusers in public trials, and made a profession of pleading in courts of justice.

Again, it was a period in which the liberties of Greece were threatened with entire subversion by Philip, king of Macedon. It was a time, not so much of war as of impending dangers; a time when arms not only were necessary, but the prudent counsel, the firm determination, the high resolve. The popular assemblies were already accustomed to feel the power of the orator. The bema of the pnyx, the rostrum of Athens, had been repeatedly pressed by the feet of Pericles. The common people of Athens were well informed, and could estimate the merits of those who addressed them. Eloquence had come to be regarded not alone as the mere gift of nature, but also as the fruit of study.

This was the first period in which it could be properly said that there was a school of eloquence; in which oratory became a regular study; and in which there were those who made a business of teaching its rules. Many of these, it is true, taught only a vain and pompous declamation. But to this there were honorable exceptions, among whom was Isocrates, who, by his example and instructions, contributed very much towards forming the character of the eloquence of that period. His instructions related to political science as well as to the rules by the observance of which the orator is formed.

During this period Demosthenes stood not alone. Although the brightest, he was not the only star. It is competition alone that can successfully bring out, and fully develop, all the elements of a great character. Around him stand Isocrates, Lysias, Isæas, Æchines; also Andocides, Dinarchus, Hyperides and Lycurgus. All these had a more or less extensive reputation as speakers, the first mentioned particularly as a teacher.

It is not, however, to be concealed but that, with some, eloquence degenerated during this period. It was an age when the Athenian populace flocked to the courts and the assemblies for the mere purpose of listening to oratorical displays. The triumph of art in oratory was so complete, that there was great danger of its triumphing over nature. The plain and direct simplicity of the latter was sometimes laid aside, and in its place appeared the ambush and the artifice of logic, and the sound and flourish of mere rhetoric.

When the period arrives at which the orator can feel that he is affecting his auditory by the exertion of his mere force and skill in speaking, there is danger of his supplanting nature by art, and of his being entangled and caught in the very net which himself has woven.

But this can never be laid to the charge of Demosthenes. He made use of art, but it was an art derived from the laws of nature. It was an art that brought along with it freedom instead of fetters; one that widened and deepened

the channels of human thought and feeling, instead of narrowing and limiting them. His art was the exponent, not the antagonist of nature.

"Demosthenes," says Fenelon, "seems transported, and to have nothing in view but his country. He does not study what is beautiful, but naturally falls into it without reflecting. He is above admiration. He uses speech, as a modest man does his clothes, only to cover himself. He thunders; he lightens; he is like a torrent that hurries everything along with it. We cannot criticize him, for he is master of our passions. We consider the things he says, and not his words. We lose sight of him. We think of Philip only who usurps everything."

According to the Abbe Maury, "it is the irrefragible force of the reasoning; it is the irresistible rapidity of the rhetorical movements, which characterize the eloquence of the Athenian orator. When he writes, it is to give strength, energy and vehemence to his thoughts. He speaks, not as an elegant writer, who wishes to be admired, but as a passionate man, tormented by truth; as a citizen menaced with the greatest misfortunes, and who can no longer contain the transports of his indignation against the enemies of his country. He is the champion of reason. He defends her with all the strength of his genius; and the rostrum where he speaks becomes the place of combat. He at once conquers his auditors, his adversaries, his judges. He does not seem to endeavor to move you; hear him, however, and he shall cause you to weep upon reflection. He overwhelms his fellow citizens with reproaches; but then, these are only the interpreters of their own remorse. Doth he refute an argument? He does not discuss it. He proposes a single question for the whole answer, and the objection no longer appears. Doth he wish to stir up the Athenians against Philip? It is no more an orator who speaks; it is a general; it is a king; it is a prophet; it is the tutelar angel of his country. And when he threatens his fellow citizens with slavery, we think that we hear from a distance the noise approach-

ing of the rattling chains which the tyrant is bringing them."[1]

Demosthenes was the last martyr who offered up himself on the altar of Grecian liberty. In order to escape from Antipater he had taken refuge in the temple of Neptune. Being urged to surrender himself under a promise of pardon, he pretended he wished to write something, and biting the quill, swallowed the poison contained in it. Soon feeling the operation of it! "O Neptune!" he exclaimed, "they have defiled thy temple; but honoring thee I will leave it while yet living." But in the attempt he sank before the altar, and left a world which had ceased to have any charms for him. The loss of liberty, and the death of Demosthenes closed the brilliant career of Grecian eloquence.

III. The third great division of art is the MIXED; and this includes all those which are neither purely objective, nor purely subjective, but which partakes something of the character of both. They are the art dramatic, and the art military.

1. The art dramatic. The drama had its birth in Greece. The Assyrian, Persian, Egyptian, Hebrew, and Phœnician literature had exhibited no trace of it. It was reserved to Greece, and more especially to Athens, to originate, and, in a surprising degree, to develop the wonders of this art.

The actions of men, heroes and gods had hitherto been simply narrated. The narration had extended to the dialogue. The Old Testament contains narratives interwoven with speeches and dialogues, as the book of Job. So the splendid epics of Homer contained many narrations of dialogues, addresses, interviews, and interchanges of thought between his heroes and gods, which, at times, have almost a dramatic effect.

But there was yet nothing beyond the mere narrative. A very great advance was made when actions instead of

[1] *Maury's Principles of Eloquence*, 65, 66.

being simply narrated, as in the epic, came to be actually represented as in the drama.

Before proceeding to advert to the origin and history of the dramatic act in Greece, it may be well to describe the theatre in which the dramas were performed. The theatres of the Greeks were enormously large stone buildings, of a size sufficient to accommodate the whole free and adult population of a Greek city. They were not designed entirely for dramatic exhibitions. Choral dances, festal processions, revels, and all sorts of representations of public life and popular assemblies, were held in them. Hence theatres were to be found in every part of Greece, although the performances of the drama were almost exclusively confined to Athens.[1]

These theatres were open above; nothing interposing between the stage on which the drama was enacting and the seats of the audience, and the clear azure of a Grecian sky, which overarched them in all its beauty.

The dramas were always acted in open day, and in the broad sun light. The Greeks lived, and transacted much more of their business in the open air than we do, and this may be one reason to account for their excellent health, perfect physical forms, and high degree of enjoyment of physical nature. True, their performances were liable to interruptions, for they had storms as well as sunshine. But they much preferred to subject themselves to such inconveniences rather than to shut out the light and the atmosphere of heaven.[2]

The sites of their theatres were selected with great care. That of Athens was built on the south side of the Acropolis, and a person standing on its stage could see on his right the country of Attica, and on his left the greater part of the city and harbor. Those entering on the right were understood as coming from the country, and those on the left from the city or the neighborhood.

[1] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, I, 299. [2] *Schlegel's Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, I, 54.

The structure of the theatre was controlled in great part, if not entirely, by the arrangement of the chorus. The station of the chorus was the original centre of the whole performance, around which all the rest was grouped. The orchestra, (called by us the pit), occupied a circular level place in the centre, was a level, smooth space; and sufficiently large for the unrestrained movements of a numerous band of dancers. This grew out of the chorus, or dancing place, of the Homeric times. Here were the entrances of the chorus, and here also it generally remained, performing its solemn dance, going backward and forward during the choral songs.

In front of the orchestra, and opposite to the middle of the scene, there was an elevation with steps, resembling an altar, the altar of Dionysus, which was as high as the stage, and called the thymele. This was used as a resting place for the chorus, when it took up a stationary position. On this stood the leader of the chorus, to see what was passing on the stage, and to communicate with the characters. The thymele was situated in the very centre of the building, all the measurements being calculated from it, and the semicircle of the amphitheatre being described around it. It was, therefore, a central commanding position for the chorus.

The seats of the spectators consisted of steps, which rose backwards round the semicircle of the orchestra, so that they were all enabled to see with equal convenience.

The stage consisted of a strip stretching from one end of the building to the other. It was long, and of little depth, being but a small segment cut from the circle of the orchestra, but extending on each side so far that its length was nearly double the diameter of the orchestra. This was called the logeum, and the usual place for acting was the middle of it.

Behind the middle part, the scene went inward in a quadrangular form, having less depth than breadth. The space here comprehended was called the proscenium; the wall behind being properly called the scene. The narrow

walls going up on the right and left of the stage were styled parascenia.

In the back wall or scene, there were three entrances: one large main, and two side ones. The principal actor came in at the large or main entrance, while the actor playing an under part, came in at one of the side entrances.

The Greeks had, therefore, a means of telling the relative importance of the actors from observing the doors or entrances at which they entered. They could also tell what part of the audience came in from the city, and what from the country, by the doors or entrances at which they entered. Thus much for the Grecian theatre.

The drama, among the Greeks, consisted essentially of tragedy and comedy. The first mentioned was not among them what it is regarded at present, viz: a picture of human life agitated by the passions. On the contrary, it departed entirely from ordinary life, assuming a character in the highest degree ideal. This, and, in fact, all dramatic performances, were seen at first only at the festivals of Bacchus, and hence the character of these festivals exercised great influence on the drama.

It seems generally agreed among the ancients that the first tragic exhibition in the dramatic form was effected by Thespis, B. C. 536, in the time of Pisistratus. Prior to him there had been the choral representation at the Bacchic festivals. But all this admitted simply of an interchange of voices. No actions were, or could well be represented by it.

The change made by Thespis was a very simple one, and yet all important in its practical results. He joined one person to the chorus, who was the first actor. He therefore connected with the choral representation a dialogue, distinguished only from the language of common life by its metrical form and elevated tone. According to our present ideas, one actor would give but a lame performance. In order, however, to diversify, Thespis introduced linen masks, by means of which, and of other changes easily effected, the same actor was enabled to play several differ-

ent parts in the same piece. Besides, the chorus was combined with the actor, could carry on a dialogue with him, and thus the means were created, although certainly rather limited, of representing actions. The choral dances were still a principal part of the performance.

The Grecian drama must entirely fail of being understood without a correct idea of the chorus. This was a peculiarity distinguishing the ancient drama from ours; in fact, the feature first leading to the creation of the drama.

The chorus represented the ideal spectator, viewing the progress and development of the drama. It was the personification of public opinion on the action which was going on. It afforded to the poet an opportunity of incorporating into the representation itself, his own sentiments, as the interpreter for public opinion.

The chorus was usually composed of men of advanced age, and long experience, or of young virgins of pure minds. The number was at first fifty. Afterwards Æschylus reduced it to twelve. Afterwards Sophocles increased it to fifteen, at which it remained during the time of Sophocles and Euripides.

The chorus fronted the stage, and remained there during the whole performance. Its presence was indispensable to preserve the unity of the piece, as the performance was not divided into acts as are modern tragedies.

The chorus performed various parts. Intermediate between the acting on the stage it often sang alone. Sometimes it sang alternately with the persons of the drama, and sometimes entered into dialogue with them. This was done by its coryphæus, or leader. When he took such part, he stood upon the thymele in the centre of the theatre. When the chorus moved, it was in the orchestra. When still, it occupied the thymele. When it sang the part called strophe, it moved in a sort of dance across the orchestra from right to left; when the antistrophe, it moved back from left to right. In the epode, its station was in front of the audience.

The chorus, when agitated by conflicting emotions of a very violent character, might carry on a lyrical dialogue;

and hence a peculiar kind of choral poetry actually arose, in which are recognized various voices repeating or disputing what had preceded. In this way long lyrical dialogues sometimes arose.

The dialogues carried on between the chorus and the actor were by its leader. There are rare examples where the members of the chorus converse among themselves.

The chorus came from the people at large, and was in no respect distinguished from the stature and appearance of ordinary men.

Not so the actors. They were usually gods or heroes. They must, therefore, be raised above the usual dimensions of mortals. The tragic actor on the Greek stage made a very extraordinary appearance. His height was increased: first, by the very high soles of the tragic shoe, the cothrunus; second, by the length of the tragic mask, the orkos. The body, arms and legs were padded and stuffed to a corresponding size. The tragic gesticulations were necessarily confined, and consisted of stiff, angular movements.

Masks were used in the performance of tragedy; but whether these were framed with a view to increase the power of the voice, does not seem to be clearly settled. Many suppose they were. The theatres, as formerly remarked, were of immense size, and the voices of the actors must have had immense power. They possessed a power of drawing the tone from the depth of the chest. Hence the whole area of the theatre was filled with a monotonous sort of chant. This had more resemblance to singing than to the speech of common life; and in its uniformity, and measured rhythmical cadence, must have seemed like the voice of some more powerful and exalted being than earth could then produce, resounding through the ample space.[1]

There were usually no combats or violent actions performed upon the stage. The elongated and stuffed figures of the tragic actors were little calculated for the perform-

[1] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 298.

ance of such actions. Accordingly, we find battles, combats, murders, sacrifices, funerals, and the like, occurring behind the scenes.

The Greek tragedy generally observed unity of plan, and hence there was small necessity for a complete change of scenic decorations. All that was required of this character was effected in Athens by means of the periactæ erected in the corners of the stage. These were machines of the form of a triangular prism which turned round rapidly, and presented three different surfaces.

There were other arrangements for scenic effect. Beneath the seats of the spectators was constructed a stair, called the charonic, through which the shadows of the departed, unperceived by the audience, ascended into the orchestra, and made their appearance on the stage.

They had machinery for the descent of gods through the air, and also for withdrawing men from the earth. This was placed behind the walls in such a manner as to be removed from the sight of the spectators. There were also hollow places beneath the stage, and contrivances for thunder and lightning, and other mimic representations.

The opening heavens above seemed to encourage addresses to heaven in the writers of the Greek tragedies. These were probably addressed to the real heaven; and when Electra on her first appearance exclaims, "Oh holy light, and thou air, which fillest the expanse between earth and heaven!" she probably turned towards the rising sun.[1]

In the performance of a tragedy upon the stage, the pauses produced by the choral songs, naturally divided it into three parts, called the prologue, episodia, and exodus; whose number, length and arrangement admit of great variety. "The number of choral songs was determined by the number of stages in the action calculated to call forth reflection on the human affections, or the laws of fate which governed the events. These, again, depend on the

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, 60.

plot, and on the number of persons necessary to bring it about."[1]

To return again to the progress of Greek tragedy, and the great names that are connected with it. Thespis, we have seen, introduced a single actor. Phrynichus, who flourished at Athens, B. C. 512, like Thespis, had but one actor, but he used him for different purposes. He was the first who introduced parts upon the stage to be performed by females.

The three great tragic poets of Greece were Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; and strange to say, these were almost or quite contemporaries. Æschylus, at the age of forty-five, fought at the battle of Salamis; Sophocles during the same or the next year, at the age of sixteen, led the choir of singers and dancers around the trophy erected to commemorate the same battle, while Euripides was born on the same day the battle was fought. Æschylus not only fought at the battle of Salamis, but also at those of Marathon and Platæa. We cannot, therefore, wonder at the bold mode of thought and expression he adopts, and the shocking and terrific scenes he brings to our view. He was a native of Eleusis in Attica, and flourished about B. C. 490. He is justly regarded as the creator of tragedy. He clothed it with the dignity that naturally belongs to it; gave to it its appropriate place of exhibition, invented scenic pomp; appeared himself upon the stage as a player, and instructed the chorus in singing and dancing. But what was of more importance to tragedy, he gave development to the dialogue, and limits to the lyrical part of the tragedy. He found tragedy in the hands of a single actor, assisted by the chorus. It had as yet made no further progress. He added the second actor, and thus first gave the dialogue, the dramatic element, its true development.

His plots are all simple, his characters boldly sketched. The element in which he moves is terror; the instrument he exhibits to his audience, the head of Medusa. He is

[1] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 312.

the advocate of a stern fate which he suspends over the heads of mortals in all its gloomy majesty.

He wrote seventy-five, or as some say ninety tragedies. Of these seven have come down to us. These are; the Prometheus Bound, the Supplicants, the Seven Chiefs against Thebes, Agamemnon, the Choëphoroi, the Furies, and the Persians. Of these the Prometheus Bound is called his masterpiece.

In the terrific and sublime, no tragic poet in Greece exceeded Æschylus. His tragic trilogies, says Müller, gave a dramatic representation to the great cycle of Hellenic legends. In exhibiting the history of whole families, tribes and states, he contrived to show the influence of supreme wisdom and power shining amidst the greatest difficulty and darkness. Every Greek, who witnessed such an exhibition of providence in the history of his race, must have been filled with mingled emotions of wonder and joyful exultation.[1]

Next came Sophocles, born at Colonus, near Athens, who flourished about B. C. 450. He also was not without honor as a warrior; but his fame as a tragic poet is as enduring as the race. There are few examples of men whose lot is more enviable than that of Sophocles. Descended of rich and honored parents, born a free citizen of Athens, participating in his country's glorious triumphs over the Persian, enjoying the benefits of an education the best calculated to develop in harmonious proportions the physical and mental powers, possessing great beauty both of body and soul, living in the possession of an unclouded intellect, until he exceeded his ninetieth year, and then departing without a struggle, while in the employment of his art, "like an old swan of Apollo, breathing out his life in song." He held the rank of general along with Pericles and Thucydides; began the representation of tragedies in his twenty-fifth year, and was twenty times victorious. Towards the latter part of his life, and while

[1] *Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, I, 337.

in extreme old age, his elder sons brought an accusation against him, of having become so childish from age as to be unable to manage his own affairs, which they based chiefly upon too great a fondness for a grandchild by a second wife. He merely read in his defense his Œdipus in Colonos, then just composed in honor of his birth-place; and the astonished judges, without further consultation, conducted him in triumph to his house. To designate the grace and sweetness that attached to his works, he was called the Attic bee.

He wrote some seventy tragedies, of which only seven remain. These are Ajax bearing the Lash, Electra, Œdipus King, Antigone, Œdipus at Colonus, the Trachinian Women, and Philoctetes. Of these, Œdipus King is esteemed the best.

The tragedies of Sophocles, although wanting the boldness of Æschylus, are more faultless productions. They have a regular and well developed plan, a striking truth in their characters, and a strong expression and play of the passions.

But his great merit as a tragedian consists in changing the relations existing between the actors and the chorus. He introduced upon the stage a third actor, thus giving greater variety to the dialogue, and enabling the characters to show themselves on different sides. This also diminished the action of the chorus, and rendered its continued participation less necessary.

In proportion as the actors acquired new means and facilities for expressing the emotions that were actuating them, while their actions were being represented upon the stage, the necessity diminished of merely representing the impression which the events and circumstances brought forward made upon those who took no part in them, the latter being essentially what belonged to the chorus. These changes clearly show that Sophocles desired to make tragic poetry a true mirror which should faithfully reflect the impulses, passions, strivingr and struggles of the human soul.

After the introduction by Sophocles of the third actor, Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides constructed tragedies to be performed by three actors. None of them ventured upon the introduction of a fourth, but Sophocles so framed his Œdipus in Colonus as to require in its performance a fourth actor. It was not, however, performed upon the stage until after his death.

Euripides, born at Salamis, of Athenian parents, was the last great tragic poet, who flourished at Athens. He was the friend of Socrates, and was instructed by Anaxagoras in philosophy, and by Prodicus in rhetoric.

Euripides had too much rhetoric and philosophy to make a good tragic poet of the olden time. The elder mythology, out of which the materials for tragedy had been obtained, was being subjected to the test of a stricter philosophy than had formerly prevailed; and a fondness for philosophical ideas and studies was taking the place of a devotion to the legends and myths of antiquity. These mythical traditions had been recognized by Æschylus, as the sublime dispensations of providence; and by Sophocles, as containing a profound solution of the problem of human existence. But Euripides found a difficulty in reconciling these with his philosophical convictions of God and his relations with human destiny. Hence, probably, the source of his difficulty.

He was mainly instrumental in the introduction of two elements into the outward form of tragedy, viz: the prologue, and the deus ex machina.

In the first, "some personage, a god or hero, tells, in a monologue, who he is, how the action is going on, what has happened up to the present moment; to what point the business has come; and, if a god, to what point it is destined to be carried."

The second, the deus ex machina, bears much the same relation to the termination of the tragedy, that the prologue does to the beginning. The prologue was designed to bring his characters into situations in which the audience could discover that they would naturally be actuated by the emo-

tions and passions he intends to have them represent; and then, after the strong play of passion, and the complication to which it leads, the contests growing hotter and more involved, and at every step the difficulty only increases of winding up the play in a satisfactory manner. Some divinity appears in the sky, supported by machinery, announces the decrees of fate, and makes a just and peaceable arrangement of the affair. These could be hardly termed improvements, in the older forms, and resulted probably from the peculiar philosophical views of the poet.

Some of the better pieces of Euripides, and detached scenes in others, are marked with great force and beauty. There are found interspersed many sententious passages and pathetic scenes. He pursues an easy and regular method. With much truthfulness in expression he unites great richness and fullness. Sometimes he has passages of overpowering beauty; while at others he sinks into the most downright common place.

He composed some seventy-five tragedies, seventeen or eighteen of which remain. The Medea is generally considered one of his best.

A writer, in comparing these three great tragic poets together, remarks: "that Euripides ranks first in tragic representation and effect; Sophocles, first in dramatic symmetry and ornament; and Æschylus first in poetic vigor and grandeur. Æschylus was the most sublime; Sophocles the most beautiful; Euripides the most pathetic. The first displays the lofty intellect; the second exercises the cultivated taste; the third indulges the feeling heart. Each, as it were, shows you a fine piece of sculpture. In Æschylus, it is a naked hero, with all the strength, boldness and dignity of the olden time. In Sophocles and Euripides, it may be, perhaps, the same hero; but with the former, he has put on the flowing robes, the elegant address, and the soft urbanity of a polished age; with the latter, he is yielding to some melancholy emotion, ever heedless of his posture or gait, and casting his unvalued drapery negligently about him. They have been com-

pared by an illustration from another art. The sublime and daring Æschylus resembles some strong and impregnable castle situated on a rock, whose martial grandeur awes the beholder, its battlements defended by heroes, and its gates proudly hung with trophies. Sophocles appears with splendid dignity, like some imperial palace of richest architecture, the symmetry of whose parts, and the chaste magnificence of the whole, delight the eye, and command the approbation of the judgment. The pathetic and moral Euripides hath the solemnity of a Gothic temple, whose storied windows admit a dim, religious light, enough to show its high embowered roof, and the monuments of the dead, which rise in every part, impressing our minds with pity and terror at the uncertain and short duration of human greatness, and with an awful sense of our own mortality."[1]

The essence of the old Greek tragedy may be mainly summed up in the prevailing idea of destiny, in the ideality of the composition, and in the signification of the chorus. In Euripides we no longer find this essence in its pure and unmixed state. His introduction of the prologue and the deus ex machina, led him almost entirely to dispense with the former duties of the chorus. He still, however, retained it, but it performed a different office. It frequently undertook to mediate between, advise, and tranquilize opposing parties. He even makes it the confidant and accomplice of the person whom he represents as under the influence of passion. It receives his wicked proposals, and lets itself be bound by an oath not to betray them. Thus the very theory of the chorus, and the purpose it was designed to answer, became almost entirely changed.

As it had employed the art of the epic poet to bring, by narration, before the mind of the nation the acts of gods and heroes, the myths and fables, all those traditionary treasures, which precede authentic history, and constituted the Grecian mythology, so that of the tragic poet was

[1] *Potter* — see *Manual of Classical Literature*, 193, 194.

equally employed in giving to these an actual representation in the performances of the drama. "The Grecian mythology," says Schlegel, "was a web of national and local traditions, held in equal honor as a part of religion, and as an introduction to history; everywhere preserved in full life, among the people, by customs and monuments, and by the numberless works of epic and mythical poets. The tragedians had only, therefore, to engraft one species of poetry on another; they were always allowed the use of certain established fables, invaluable for their dignity, grandeur, and remoteness for all accessory ideas of a petty description."[1]

It was the mission of Greek tragedy to present in all their fullness and richness, and as a present reality, actually passing before the eyes of the people, these mythological treasures. This is sufficiently apparent by a reference simply to the titles of the few tragedies that have come down to us: Prometheus Bound, the Seven against Thebes, Agamemnon Furies, Ajax bearing the Lash, Electra, Œdipus King, Philoctetes, not to mention any others, afford sufficient evidence of this.

When, therefore, these mythological treasures had been brought out and exhibited, its mission was accomplished; and hence with Euripides, and we may almost say with Sophocles, ends the charm of Greek tragedy. There were other Greek tragedians who succeeded them, and who were also their contemporaries, but these stand preeminent, and, in a general sketch, are the only ones necessary to notice.

The other great branch of the Greek drama was comedy. This also had its origin in the festivals of Bacchus; but they were festivals of a different character, celebrated at different times, in different places, and by different performers, than those which gave rise to the solemnities of tragedy.

Tragedy proceeded from the Lenæa, the winter feast of Bacchus, celebrated in the city. The springs of enjoy-

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, I, 83.

ment, instead of being open, fresh, and sparkling, as in the spring, summer and autumn, were frozen up, the God of nature was draped in the habiliments of sadness, and the human mind was required to sympathize with him in his sorrows. Hence the birth of Melpomene, and the outpourings of the tragic muse.

But Bacchus abounded much more in fun and frolic than in moping melancholy. The orgies or feasts of Bacchus, the Dionysia of the Greeks, were celebrated at the time of the vintage. These were in the country, and were attended with the most unrestrained licentiousness. In the comus, or Bacchanalian procession, the performers were first drawn in cars, until their numbers greatly augmenting, they strolled about the country, committing the wildest excesses. At these times, the Phallic songs were sung, in which the revellers joined. From this Phallic or comus song was derived the Grecian comedy, although some derive its name from kome, a village.

At the commencement of the comus song the festal banquet was turned into a procession of noisy revellers. These carried about with them the symbol of the productive power of nature, and continued, at intervals to sing the wild jovial song in honor of the god. We have also intimations that the revellers wore variegated garments, and chaplets of flowers or masks on the face.

After the conclusion of the song, the revellers usually made the first object they encountered the butt of their merriment, and lashed the innocent spectators with ridicule and witticism. In all this we perceive clearly the rudiments of the elder comedy. Aristotle says that comedy remained in obscurity at the first, because it was not thought serious or important enough to merit much attention; that it was not till late that the comic poet received a chorus from the archon as a public matter; and that previously the choral dancers were volunteers.

Comedy long continued to be a country amusement, in which rustics only participated. Chionides is reckoned the first Attic comedian, and he flourished about the commence-

ment of the Persian war, B. C. 488. But the most flourishing period of comedy occurred during the continuance of the Peloponnesian war. Cratinus died B. C. 423, and in his comedies he even dared to attack Pericles while at the very height of his power. But the greatest of all the comic writers and performers was Aristophanes who commenced his career, B. C. 424, and closed it B. C. 388. He elevated the old comedy to its greatest possible height.

There were several things in the performance of comedy in which it participated equally with tragedy.

The stage and orchestra were common to both. In both, the stage was an open place in the back ground, and on the back wall, called the scene, were represented public and private buildings.

The number of actors, by whom all the parts were to be performed, was limited in comedy as well as in tragedy. Most of the comedies of Aristophanes were performed by three actors, but there were a number of subordinate persons, which rendered the change of parts frequent and varied. In some, as the Wasps, a fourth actor seems to have been required.

The use of masks and costume was also common to both. But the forms and appearances of each were totally different. The costume of the comic actors consisted frequently of close fitting jackets and trowsers, striped with divers colors, resembling much those of a modern harlequin, great bellies, and other disfigurations being added to render the appearance as grotesque as possible. In the masks made use of, the features were exaggerated to caricature, but still the resemblance of particular persons was so truthfully preserved that they could be easily recognized. Aristophanes dressed the chorus in his comedies in the most strange and fantastic manner. In his comedies of the Birds, Wasps, etc., his chorus had appendages which would remind one of those creatures.

In the middle of the comedy was the address of the chorus called the parabasis. Up to this point the chorus had stood facing the stage, between the thymele and the

stage. It now performed an evolution, and proceeded in files towards the place of the spectators. Along with the performing, a very shameless dance was generally carried on called the kordax.

But while comedy had, as we have seen, some things in common with tragedy, it was entirely different in its principle, its exhibition and its object.

In its principle it had all the character of a farce, nothing of the solemn or tragic. Its principal weapons were wit, sarcasm, and ridicule. It brought out the lower developments of human nature, and often in a style offensive and bestial. In doing this, it was in perfect character with the drunken revels of the Dionysia, from which it originated, and to which it more or less strongly adhered. There was one benefit resulting from this. The bitter jests, gibes, ridicule, and coarse abuse which the actors heaped upon men and their acts, were in harmony with the drunken revel which they seemed to be exhibiting. The drunken were then, as now, privileged beings, so far as the use, or abuse, of the tongue was concerned.

Another point of difference was in its exhibition. It brought out nothing of the ancient mythology, no traditionary legend, none of the myths and fables of antiquity. Its themes were the men and the acts of the present day. The events that were passing, the politics of the day, leading men and their acts, the abuses that had grown up in the state, were the materials out of which it wove its comic, and the more generally its caustic web. For instance, the comedy, entitled the Knights, by Aristophanes, and which was the first brought out in his own name, was directed solely against Cleon, not against his measures or policy, but his entire proceedings and influence as a demagogue. Another instance is presented in the comedy of the Wasps. It was an institution of Pericles that the old Athenians might act as judges, receiving fees for their judicial services, and he also imposed on the allies the obligation of trying their causes at Athens. The result of this was greatly to multiply suits and litigation. The play of the

Wasps, therefore, was designed to represent the swarms of Athenian judges, and as the chief attribute of a wasp is its sting, he contrived to represent that as denoting the style with which the judges were accustomed to mark down the number of their division in the wax tablets. He introduced these little waspish judges humming and buzzing up and down, every now and then alternately thrusting out and drawing in an immense spit, which was attached to them by way of a gigantic sting.

The comedy of the Clouds presents another instance of the genius and power of Aristophanes. This was aimed at the sophists, artificial orators and skeptical reasoners of the time; those who annihilated the boundaries between truth and error by endeavoring to make all subjects and all sides equally plausible and acceptable to the mind. They went besides, into a refinement in reasoning, leaving the consideration of things plain and palpable to the senses, and dealing in subtleties, which would mystify and confound rather than convince. But what is singular and almost unaccountable, he took the philosopher Socrates, as the representative of this class. The same man who was the terror of the sophists, and the decided, uncompromising opponent of every species of subtlety, and perversion of the mental faculties.

The ancient comedy differed from tragedy also in its object. The object of tragedy, was, no doubt, to entertain, to a certain extent, but it had also a higher aim; to elevate the mind, enlarge its power, deepen its emotions and passions, purify its affections; in fine, to exalt all the great elements of character. Comedy, on the other hand, dealt in the comic. Its element was fun and frolic. It was intended to amuse, to delight the people at the expense of their rulers and teachers. It gratified the lower propensities of the common people, and aided them in pulling down others to their own level.

The apt representative of the old comedy was Aristophanes, the only complete comic poet from whom any complete plays now remain. He flourished at Athens

about the year B. C. 430. He wrote over fifty comedies, of which eleven only are extant. Among these are the Acharnians, Knights, Clouds, Wasps, Peace, Birds, Lysistrata, Plutus, etc.

The old comedy could only be tolerated, while Athens enjoyed its highest degree of freedom. Its unbridled license in dealing with men and their acts, rendered it dangerous, indeed intolerable, in a despotism. Accordingly, when the thirty tyrants were established over Athens, B. C. 404, a law was passed prohibiting the use of real characters and of names, and also of the chorus.

This led to the introduction of what has been termed the middle comedy. What has generally been termed the middle comedy was in fact little more than a transition from the old to the new. Prior to the reign of the thirty, Athens had been a city of politicians. When their vocation ceased under the iron despotism of the thirty, the unceasing activity of the Athenian mind sought out new channels, and expended itself more in philosophic speculations, and literary efforts. The middle comedy took this direction. Its plays threw ridicule upon the Platonic academy, the newly revived Pythagorean sect, the orators and rhetoricians of the day, and even upon the tragic and epic poets. The poets of the middle comedy are considerably numerous, but not very distinguished. They occupy the interval between B. C. 380, and the reign of Alexander.

The new comedy, as it is termed, was properly a continuation of the middle. It belongs to the Alexandrian period of Greek literature. The chorus was dispensed with. Real names and characters no longer appeared upon the stage as the objects of ridicule; and personal satire, to a great extent, ceased to be indulged in.

The writers of the new comedy borrowed from tragedy a part of its seriousness, and mingled that with the comic satire and gayety. This made the new comedy, in the language of Schlegel, "a mixture of seriousness and mirth. The poet no longer himself turns poetry and the

world into ridicule; he no longer gives himself up to a sportive and frolicsome inspiration, but endeavors to discover the ridiculous in the objects themselves; in human characters and their situations, he paints what occasions mirth; in a word, what's pleasant and laughable. But it must no longer appear as the mere creation of his fancy, but seem probable, that is, real." [1]

Another feature of the new comedy was, that its events and incidents all lay within the circle of experience, and in the place of fate it substituted accident. In view of this change, an old critic called tragedy "the flight of life, and comedy its regulation." It connects together causes and effects in human actions, and regulates them by the laws of experience.

The new comedy sought to be a faithful picture of life. Hence the grammarian Aristophanes exclaims: "O life and Menander! which of you two has imitated the other."

The most celebrated among the writers of the new comedy was Menander. He was born at Athens about B. C. 342, and flourished after Alexander the Great. He began to write at the age of twenty, and although he died at the age of fifty, yet he is said to have written over one hundred comedies. Of these nothing now remains but fragments. To him has been awarded the palm for elegance, delicacy and sweetness, although Diphilus, Philemon, and Apollodorus, have been much celebrated among the writers of the new comedy. Not one entire play, however, of any writer of the new comedy has come down to us. Although the antique tragedy and the old comedy of the Greeks stand alone, and have no imitators in modern times, yet the new comedy connects them with the moderns, and unites both in the same style of art.

2. The art military. This branch of the subject will be best considered under the following heads: *a.* The manner of declaring war. *b.* The raising and support of armies. *c.* The composition of armies; different sorts of soldiers.

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, I, 241.

d. The soldiers' manner of living; the officers. *e.* Arms defensive and offensive. *f.* Order of battle. *g.* Conduct of sieges; means and instruments of taking walled cities. *h.* Ships, and naval warfare.

a. The manner of declaring war. The Greeks had both embassadors and heralds. The former were employed when treaties of peace were to be negotiated; the latter when war was to be declared. Their peace treaties generally came under one of three heads. The agreement was either to cease from all hostilities, and not molest each others allies; or, to assist each other in case of invasion; or, to assist each other when they invaded others, as when they were invaded, having the same friends and enemies.

Prior to engaging in war, it was usual for the Greeks to publish a declaration of the injuries they had received, and to demand reparation. This was done by their embassadors. Both the embassador and herald were deemed sacred personages, and any indignity offered to either was highly resented.

When war was to be declared, a herald was sent, who ordered the party complained of to prepare for an invasion, and he sometimes threw a spear towards them in token of defiance. The Athenians had a custom of letting loose a lamb into the territories of their enemies, intimating thereby that their then populous country should be laid waste, and become nothing better than a sheep pasture.

b. The raising and support of armies. In the early periods of Grecian history, every citizen was liable to be called upon to become a soldier. In Sparta, especially, there were no levies of troops, all the citizens being trained up to war; and all, both infantry and cavalry, being obliged to repair to the field at the command of the ephori.

In the raising of cavalry among the Spartans, the ephori selected three men of valor, called leviers of the horse, and these each raised an hundred men, assigning their reasons for the selections they had respectively made.

In the early ages, the Greeks seem to have levied their troops by lot, every family being obliged to furnish a certain

number. Subsequently, all of a certain age, were enrolled, and liable to be called. Among the Athenians, those of eighteen might be required to guard the city, and its forts; and those of twenty to go on foreign wars. The Spartans seldom sent out their citizens on foreign wars until they were thirty years old. At fourscore they were exempt. At Athens, except in times of great danger, they were not required to serve after attaining the age of forty years.

In order to detect in case of escape, the soldiers were branded in the hand with a mark, sometimes the name of the chief, and sometimes some other name. Before starting on an expedition, they were brought to the lyceum to be reviewed, where those who were thought the fittest for the service were selected.

At first, and during long periods in the early Greek history, the soldiers bore their own expenses, and received no compensation for their services. A change in this respect was introduced at Athens by Pericles. He caused two oboli a day to be given to the infantry, and afterwards four. Those composing the cavalry received a drachm a day. A common seaman, also, was allowed a drachm a day, and another for a servant. The funds necessary for this purpose were revenues derived from the allies and tributary cities, public lands, woods, mines, etc. And when these were exhausted, recourse was had to taxation, the citizens being called upon to contribute according to the value of their estates.

c. The composition of armies; different sorts of soldiers. The Grecian armies were at first, and for a long time continued to be, composed almost entirely of infantry. These were foot soldiers, and were of three sorts. These were: Those who bore heavy armor, having broad shields and long spears, called oplitæ, or hoptetes. The light-armed, including those who fought with arrows and darts, or stones and slings. The middle sort, who carried shields and spears, but those which were greatly inferior in size to those of the heavy-armed, called the peltastæ. The

strong probability is, that originally, and down to a period subsequent to the Trojan war, the Grecian armies consisted entirely of infantry, and those who fought in chariots. These were generally drawn by two horses; sometimes by three and by four. In each chariot rode two men: one the charioteer, whose main business was to guide the chariot; and the other the warrior, whose only purpose was to fight. There were also chariots armed with hooks or scythes, which sometimes, when the battle was fought on a plain, produced a terrible effect.

The cavalry, or soldiers who fought on horseback, were at first few in number. They governed the movements of the horse, at first, with a rope or switch and by the voice. Afterwards they used bridles. At first they used neither stirrups nor saddles. The Spartans seem to have been destitute of cavalry until the Messenian wars. The Athenians had but little cavalry until after the expulsion of the Persians, when they had a body of three hundred horsemen, which were afterwards increased to twelve hundred. But the strength of the Grecian armies always consisted in the heavy-armed infantry.

The Grecian cavalry were distinguished into heavy and light-armed. The cuirassiers were not only heavy-armed themselves, but their horses were also defended; sometimes with coverings made of skins, with plates of metal; at other times with solid plates of brass or other metal. They were also decked with various ornaments, such as bells, tapestry, embroidery, etc.

d. The soldiers' manner of living; the officers. The manner of life led by the soldiers in the camp was subject to considerable variation. It depended much upon the generals, some allowing their soldiers all sorts of excess and debauchery; others obliging them to the strictest rules of temperance and sobriety. The Spartan law-giver allowed the Spartans greater liberty in the camp than in the city. The Spartan soldiers were, however, free from all excess, pomp, and luxury. The young men were employed in some exercise or manly study, and the aged in giving instructions;

their leisure hours being spent in rallying each other after the laconic manner.

The Spartan guards were not allowed their bucklers while on duty, so that if surprised while asleep they would be unable to defend themselves. The other Spartan soldiers slept in their armor, so that they might be at all times ready for battle. They also kept a double watch; one inside the camp upon their allies, to prevent their deserting; the other without the camp, upon their enemies.

In relation to officers, the Spartan armies were generally led by one of their kings, and his power, although quite limited at home, was, nevertheless, supreme in the army. He was usually attended by some of the ephori, who assisted him with their advice. He was guarded by three hundred valiant Spartans, who were horsemen, and fought about his person.

But, while among the Spartans the supreme command was devolved upon one person, which was much the safest and the best course of policy, among the Athenians, a different principle prevailed. All the Athenian tribes, consisting of ten, had an equal amount of power, and each annually appointed a general from their own body. These were nominated in the assemblies of the people, and were invested with equal power. At first they were all sent together to the wars, and, as they could not all rule together, they enjoyed the supreme command by turns.

It came, subsequently, to be considered unnecessary to send them all out together to attend to the affairs of the army, and hence, generally, one or two, as the occasion seemed to require, were dispatched on that service. The ordinary number of generals were still appointed; but those not actually on service had some business or employment confided to them at home. None of them, however, were entirely freed from military concerns. Those who remained at home, determined disputes between military men, and ordered all the affairs of war in the city. Hence the Athenian generals were divided into two sorts: the one

administering the business of the city; while the other regulated the affairs of the army.

There were also among the Athenians a set of inferior officers, ten in number, each tribe electing one, who had the care of marshaling the army; appointing, under orders, the marches; provisioning the soldiers; and cashiering such as were convicted of misdemeanors, their jurisdiction extending only to the infantry.

The chief command of the cavalry was confided to two generals, under whom were ten, nominated by the ten tribes, who had authority to discharge horsemen, and to fill up vacancies as occasion required.

There were also other inferior officers deriving their titles from the squadron or number of men under their command.

c. Arms defensive and offensive. The defensive armor of the Greeks consisted:

Of a helmet, which was to guard the head. This was frequently made out of the skins of beasts, the hair still remaining and often the teeth. It was also sometimes made of brass or other metals. The forepart was open, and the crest was commonly made of feathers, or horse hair.

The thorax, which consisted of two parts, one calculated to defend the back and the other the breast, the sides being coupled together with a sort of buttons. These thoraces were sometimes made of linen, or twisted hemp, but commonly of brass, iron, or other metal. Alexander ordered his soldiers to dispense with that part of the thorax which protected the back, so that while they were facing the foe, they were protected by the front part or breastplate; but the moment they fled, their backs would be exposed entirely unprotected.

The greaves of brass, copper, tin, or other metal by which they defended the legs. The sides of these were commonly closed about the ankles with buttons, which were sometimes of solid gold or silver. These were more generally used by the Greeks than by other nations.

The Greeks also made use of a belt which surrounded the rest of the armor, the putting on of which was with them synonymous with arming.

The shield, or buckler, was a very important part of the defensive armor. This was made of various materials according to the taste and means of the warrior. It was sometimes composed of wickers woven together, sometimes of different kinds of wood, as fig, willow, beech, poplar, elder tree, etc.; but the most commonly of hides, doubled into several folds, and fortified with plates of metal. In form, the buckler was commonly round, but sometimes oblong and bent inward. A leather thong was attached to it, and sometimes a rod of metal, which reached across it, and by which it was hung upon the shoulder. It was sometimes held by little rings, but the more commonly by a handle, composed chiefly of small iron bars placed across each other. Little bells were sometimes hung upon them, to strike terror into the enemy. They were often adorned with various figures of birds and beasts; such, for instance, as eagles, lions, etc. Most of the ancient bucklers were large, covering the whole body. There were, however, shields of less size, and of different forms, which were much in use at a period subsequent to the heroic ages.

In relation to offensive arms, the early Greeks used stones, clubs, and such like instruments, which could be readily obtained. At subsequent periods they used:

The spear or pike. The body of this was composed of wood; in heroic times usually of the ash, while the head was made of metal. There were two kinds of spears: the one of which was used in close fight; and the other, while contending at a distance. The Spartans placed great dependence on their spears, and this gave rise to the reply of Agesilaus, one of their most warlike kings, who being asked where were the boundaries of Laconia, replied "At the end of our spears."

The sword. This hung in a belt which went round the shoulders, and reached down to the thighs. The Spartans used swords that were bent like falchions, and were much

shorter than those used in other parts of Greece. The Greeks had also daggers and poniards which were seldom used in fight, but which might supply the place of a knife.

The poleaxe, or an instrument much resembling it, was sometimes used among the Greeks.

A club of wood or iron was also occasionally used.

The bow, which was commonly composed of wood, and the strings of which were made up either of horse's hair, or hides cut into small thongs. The bows were frequently beautified with gold and silver. The arrows usually consisted of light wood, and an iron head commonly hooked. These heads were sometimes dipped in poison, but not commonly, as that was considered as meriting the divine vengeance. These arrows were generally winged with feathers to increase their speed and force. They were carried in a quiver, usually closed on all sides; and which, together with the bow, was carried on the back. In drawing the bow, they placed it directly before them, returning their hand upon their right breast.

The dart, or javelin, of which there were several sorts, some of which were thrown by the help of a strap girt round the middle.

The sling, which was used the most effectively by the Achæans, who were instructed in it from their infancy. It was in use principally among the common and light-armed soldiers. It was made of wool and other materials. It was broad in the middle, resembling a twined rope, with an oval compass, and generally decreasing into two thongs or reins. It was used to cast arrows, stones, and plummets of lead, some of which weighed one hundred drachms. Some were managed by one, some by two, and others by three cords. The method of using was by whirling the sling twice or thrice around the head, and then discharging its contents. These contents were projected to a great distance, and often penetrated helmet and buckler.

The fire ball. One kind of these was composed of wood, being a foot, and some a cubit in length. "Their heads were armed with spikes of iron, beneath which were

placed torches, hemp, pitch, or other combustible matter, which being set on fire, they were thrown with great force towards the enemies' first ranks; and the iron spikes fastening themselves to whatever opposed them, these balls burned down all in their way."[1]

There was nothing peculiar in the military apparel of the Grecians except in that of the Lacedæmonians, which, under the direction of Lycurgus, was red. This color was the soonest imbibed, was the most durable, the most animating by its brightness, and was also the best calculated to conceal the stains of blood both from the view of the enemy and their own soldiers. The Spartans also, when engaging their enemies, wore crowns and garlands upon their heads.

The Greek soldiers carried along with them their own provisions, consisting chiefly of salt meat, cheese, olives, onions, etc. These were carried in vessels made of wicker, having long narrow necks.

f. Order of battle. In considering the order of battle, two things are to be noticed, which are in some sort independent of each other, although there is between them some connection. These are: first, the choice of the ground or battle-field; and second, the drawing up of the army and the military evolutions. The first is not a thing to be learnt by study. If an art at all, it is one self-created and not acquired. It may be said, perhaps, to be the prerogative of genius. The leader of an undisciplined horde of barbarians may exhibit the same greatness of mind in seizing advantageous positions and in making the most of them, as the commander of the best disciplined army.

The second is of an entirely different character. The drawing up together with the military evolutions repose upon certain fixed rules, which may be acquired by study. This is, however, true only in the abstract. In actual practice, they must both and all have reference to the ground or field in which they are performed, and in this respect we find them intimately coupled together.

[1] *Robinson's Archæologia Græca*, 349.

The art of war, so far as relates to the order of battle, and disposition of forces on the battle-field, did not make the same progress in Greece, as were made by many other arts. There were several reasons for this.

There were properly no standing armies in Greece, unless we call the common citizens of Sparta a standing army, which they certainly did not lack much of being. So also the long continuance of the wars in which they were sometimes engaged, particularly the Peloponnesian, led to the keeping on foot for long periods of time of soldiers under arms. Still the art of war in this respect can only be expected to attain perfection where there are regular standing armies.

Again, the limited extent of the different states of Greece precludes the possibility of raising and keeping on foot, large armies. The very materials, therefore, of perfecting the art in this respect, were wanting.

The greatest generals of Greece, exclusive, I mean, of her naval achievements, were Miltiades, Pausanias, Agesilaus, and Epaminondas. The first was the hero of Marathon. The forces here were extremely unequal. The Persians numbered 100,000 foot and 10,000 horse, the Grecians, 10,000 Athenians and 1,000 Platæans. This little army was drawn up at the foot of a mountain, so that the enemy should neither be able to surround it, nor to charge in the rear. On the two sides of it large trees were thrown in order to cover the flanks, and render the Persian cavalry useless. The wings of the Grecian army were both made very strong, but the main body was left weaker and of less depth. The intention was to gain the victory by the effort to be made by the two wings, which were to break and disperse those of the Persians. The signal being given, the Athenians ran upon the enemy. The Persians attacked the centre of the Grecian army, and made these their greatest effort. This centre was led by Aristides and Themistocles. It sustained the attack with great bravery for a long time. As it was about giving ground, the two wings, which had vanquished those of the enemy, came up.

The attack made by them upon the two flanks of the enemy threw the Persians into disorder. The centre, now reassured, stood their ground, and seconding the attack of the wings resulted in totally routing the Persian forces.

In the battle of Platæa, fought eleven years later, the forces on both sides were more numerous. The Persians, under Mardonius, numbered 300,000; the Greeks, under Pausanias, 70,000. This battle was not won by artful manœuvering, or drawing up of forces, but rather by the first ferocious encounter of the Spartans and Tegeans with the Persians. By this, the Persians were thrown into disorder, and their general, Mardonius, being slain, they were completely routed.

It is not a little remarkable that during the long continuance of the Peloponnesian wars, no great battle was fought on land, unless we embrace within them the war with Thebes. There was some skirmishing, and much manœuvering, but no great battle. Nor was any great progress made during that period in the art of war.

Agesilaus was a great Spartan general. In his wars with the Persians, in Asia, he made one important change, and that was to form a numerous cavalry. This, in his wars with the Persians, was of great importance.

But the greatest of Grecian captains in battles on land was Epaminondas. He has been not inaptly termed the Gustavus Adolphus of Greece. With him, Thebes rose and flourished, and with him, she fell. He succeeded with an inferior force in overcoming a far more powerful adversary. He fought the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea, and both successfully. In the first mentioned, the Spartans, hitherto invincible, numbered 24,000 foot and 1,600 horse; the Thebans 6,000 foot and 400 horse. Up to this time the order of battle had very uniformly been to draw up one line in front of another and so on. His determination was to concentrate the attack in one point with a part of his army, with the view, in that one point, of breaking through the hostile line.

The two armies drew up on a plain, Cleombrotus, the Spartan king, being upon the right, and arranging there

his Lacedæmonians in whom he most confided, and whose files were twelve deep. Epaminondas determined to make the left wing the point of attack, where he commanded in person, and accordingly strengthened it with his heavy-armed troops, arranging them fifty deep. The sacred battalion, consisting of three hundred young Thebans under Pelopidas, was upon the left, and closed the wing. The remainder of the infantry were posted upon his right in an oblique line, which, the farther it extended, was the more distant from the enemy.

In joining battle, Epaminondas, with the whole weight of his heavy battalion, fell upon the Lacedæmonian phalanx. Cleombrotus, in order to make a diversion, detached a body of troops with orders to attack Epaminondas in flank and to surround him. Pelopidas, seeing that movement, advanced with the sacred battalion, with great speed and boldness, and flanked Cleombrotus himself, who was put into disorder by that sudden and unexpected attack. The battle raged for a long time with great violence, but the Lacedæmonian phalanx being broken by the force concentrated at that point, and Cleombrotus being slain, the left wing took to flight, and a total route ensued. The Spartan power was here broken forever, and the empire over Greece, which they had maintained for nearly five hundred years, totally lost.

The same general principle of tactics was again put in force at the battle of Mantinea, which was fought between the combined forces of Athens, Lacedæmon, Arcadia, Achaia, Elis on the one side, and the Thebans, under Epaminondas, on the other.

"Epaminondas," says Xenophon, "advanced with his army like a galley with threatening prow; sure that if he could once break through the line of his adversaries, a general flight would ensue. He, therefore, determined to make the attack with the flower of his army, while he drew back the weaker part of it." In this new mode of tactics we recognize a principle, never since lost sight of, that an army in battle is a species of machinery, which

can be disposed of at will, and hence that victories are more attributable to the genius of individual minds, than to chance, or numerical forces. With this victory expired Epaminondas and the glory of Thebes.

At a later period came into being the Macedonian phalanx, which, although not strictly Grecian, yet had much to do in the overthrow of the Persian empire by the Greeks and Macedonians under Alexander.

This phalanx was of Macedonian invention. It was a body of infantry consisting of 16,000 heavy-armed troops, who were always placed in the centre of the battle. They were armed with a sword, a shield, and a pipe or spear fourteen cubits in length. This phalanx was commonly divided into ten battalions, each composed of 1,600 men drawn up a hundred in front, and sixteen in depth. This file of sixteen might be doubled or divided as occasion required; the phalanx being sometimes eight, and at others thirty-two feet deep, the usual depth being sixteen. In marching, the soldiers were six feet apart, and the ranks six feet asunder. When advancing towards the enemy, this distance, in both cases, was reduced to three. It might be drawn still closer, so that each soldier would occupy only the space of a foot and an half.

In the first case, the front of the phalanx, being composed of 1,000 men, took up a space of 6,000 feet, in the next half that, or 3,000, and in the last 1,500. In the second case mentioned, each soldier took up three feet in breadth and as many in depth. The pikes were always kept projecting in front. Thus the pikes of the first rank advanced ten cubits beyond the bodies of the soldiers who carried them. There was thus a gradation: those occupying the second rank projecting eight cubits; those occupying the third, six; those occupying the fourth four; and those occupying the fifth, two. Those behind the fifth rank held their pikes raised, but inclining somewhat over the ranks who preceded them, thus forming a kind of roof securing them from the darts discharged at a distance. Those thus situated could not engage with the enemy, as they could

not reach them with their pikes. They, nevertheless, gave great support and force to those in front, and also prevented their retreat or flight.

In charging, the phalanx presented a bristling array of pikes in gradually receding tiers, five in number, of a projection towards the enemy of from ten cubits to two, and when they moved all at once, and preserved the phalanx entire, the charge may be said to be irresistible. Indeed, Polybius says that as long as the soldiers preserved their disposition and order as a phalanx, it was impossible for an enemy to sustain its weight, or to open and break it. Hence Paulus Æmilius, the Roman general, owned that in the battle with Perseus, the last king of Macedon, this rampart of brass and forest of pikes, impenetrable to his legions, filled him with terror and astonishment. In fact, it was invincible so long as it continued a phalanx, but the difficulty was, that in order to continue so, it required a flat, even spot of ground of large extent, without tree, bush, entrenchment, ditch, valley, hill, or river, which was of rare occurrence. In the final victory of Paulus Æmilius over Perseus, he had attacked the phalanx in front without any effect, but the unevenness of the ground, soon causing openings and intervals in the phalanx, he attacked them at these openings by detached bodies of soldiers, and thus succeeded in breaking the phalanx, whose force consisted in its union; and, once broken, it could be dispersed without any difficulty.

It was always a practice among the Grecian soldiers to refresh themselves with a meal of victuals just previous to engaging in battle. It was also customary, after the army was drawn up in order of battle, for the general to address the soldiers in a speech, which often had the effect of animating them with fresh courage, and inducing them to make great efforts during the action. They were also accustomed to sacrifice to the gods before the engagement, and the soothsayers inspected the entrails of the victim, in order to foretell from them the success of the battle, and they would not, in general, engage until the omens proved favorable.

The signal for joining in battle was anciently given by lighted torches being hurled by the persons appointed. Also the raising of the standard was the signal to commence battle, and the lowering of it to desist. • Afterwards blasts of sound from shells; and, at last, trumpets were made use of, of which there were several different kinds.

The Lacedæmonians began their engagements with a concert of flutes. The reason assigned for this by Agesilaus was, that they might be enabled to distinguish the cowards, who, on account of their consternation, were unable to keep time with their feet to the music.

The rest of the Greeks advanced to battle with eagerness and fury; and, in the very commencement of the engagement, sent up a general shout both to animate themselves and to strike the enemy with terror. The custom of shouting was made use of by almost all the ancient nations.

g. The conduct of sieges, means and instruments of taking walled cities. Before towns came to be walled, the art of besieging was unknown. In truth, the Greeks never made any very great progress in the art of besieging and taking walled towns, and the Lacedæmonians appear to have been the least skillful of all the Greeks in this mode of warfare. In this comes to be considered:

First. The circumvallation of a town. Where a town was to be taken, the Greeks often first endeavored to possess themselves of it by storm, that is by surrounding it with their whole army and attacking it on all sides at once. That failing, they next had recourse to a siege, and here occurred the process of circumvallation.

This consisted sometimes of one, and sometimes of two walls, or ramparts, made of stone or turf. The interior was designed to protect from sallies from the besieged, and also to deprive them of succor from without. The exterior was to protect the besiegers from foreign enemies, who might come to the relief of the besieged. Above the walls were often reared turrets or pinnacles, and after every tenth pinnacle a large tower was constructed extending across from one wall to the other.

Second. Various engines of attack, which were introduced from the eastern nations, and were not known in Greece until after the Trojan war. With very many of them the Greeks seem to have been little acquainted until about the time of the Peloponnesian war. Among these may be reckoned:

The trupana, which were long irons with sharp ends, which they made use of to demolish the walls.

The testudo, or tortoise, which was resorted to for the purpose of protecting the soldiers, while attacking the fortifications of a town. This derived its name from its covering or sheltering the soldiers, as a tortoise is covered by its shell. It was of several kinds. The military testudo was when the soldiers were drawn close together, and targets were placed over the heads, the rear ranks bowing themselves, or kneeling on the ground, those of the first standing erect, so that the whole resembled a roof covered with tiles, down which the enemies missive weapons would easily glide, without in the slightest degree injuring the soldiers. Another kind was square, and the design of it was to guard the soldiers in filling ditches and in casting up mounts. Another was triangular with a front shelving downwards to protect pioneers who undermined walls. There was another kind by which those who battered the walls were protected. There were also wicker hurdles which the soldiers held over their heads.

Third. The mount, or mound, raised as high, if not higher, than the walls of the besieged. The fore part was advanced gradually nearer the walls, and remained open. The sides were walled in with bricks or stones, or secured with strong rafters. The pile was made up of all sorts of materials, such as earth, timber, boughs, stones, wickers and twigs of trees.

Fourth. The movable towers of wood placed upon this mound. The size of these was proportioned to the towers of the besieged city, and they were driven upon wheels. The front and sides were protected with tiles, and the tops with raw hides and other shrouds. They

were formed into several stories, and could carry engines as well as soldiers.

Fifth. The battering ram was an engine with a head of iron, resembling in form a ram's head. It was used to batter down the wall of the besieged town. There were three kinds of them. A long beam with an iron head, which was driven with force against the wall. The same hung with ropes to another beam, by means of which it was thrust forward with much greater force. The third kind was covered with a shroud, in order to guard the soldiers. The beam part was sometimes one hundred and twenty feet long, and covered with plates of iron to protect it against the fire. The head was armed with strong horns. Sometimes these rams were driven upon wheels.

Sixth. Engines for casting stones and other missiles. Some of these were for small stones only. Others for those of a larger size. The Roman balista seems to have been used by the Greeks, although it acquired no distinctive appellation.

The besieged did not remain inactive. They gave to their friends at a distance notice of the approach of the enemy, during the day by raising a great smoke, and during the night by fires, or lighted torches, which they waved in the air.

When actually invested, the walls were guarded with soldiers, who continually assaulted the invaders with stones and other missive weapons. The Tyrians, when besieged by Alexander, resorted to the expedient of heating brass bucklers red hot, and then filling them with sand and lime, which they poured on the Macedonian soldiers, and which, getting between their armor and flesh, burned them so intolerably that they were obliged to strip off their armor, thereby entirely exposing themselves to the missiles of the besieged. They also undermined the mounts or mounds of the besiegers, countermined their mines, burned their towers and engines with fire balls; broke off the heads of battering rams with great stones from the walls, or cut with long scythes the ropes by which

those engines were governed. Sometimes also they raised new walls or forts within the old.

h. Ships and naval warfare. The peculiar situation of many of the Grecian states, early turned their attention to maritime affairs. Around them lay the Ionian and Ægean seas, gemmed with the most beautiful islands. Whether for the purpose of piracy, commerce, colonization, or war, it was of the first importance, that the Greeks should understand the construction of ships, and the manner of directing and controlling their movements.

There were difficulties, however, that presented themselves in their construction, or rather in the obtaining of the materials of which they were built. These were generally the alder, poplar, and fir. The eastern, the most cultivated part of Greece, did not abound in wood. Although the western and inland districts were more productive, yet their rivers were little better than mountain torrents, and inadequate for the transportation of heavy timber. Hence ship materials were generally imported from considerable distances. Athens imported from Thrace the timber with which she constructed her ships. It was, therefore, only rich cities that could afford to possess navies.

There was also a difficulty in manning fleets. It employed two kinds of men, mariners and soldiers. The last were citizens; but by an early law, they were not obliged to do service on board of ships. It finally resulted in the citizens being compelled to serve as mariners, while the soldiers were composed of mercenaries. This led to great expense in the manning of ships.

The first ships built were of the simplest kind, consisting only of planks laid together, and possessing neither strength nor ornament. All, at first, had the same form. Subsequently, they were of three kinds, viz: ships of war, of burden, and of passage. The principal difference was between ships of burden and of war. The former were of a round form, large and possessing great capacity, the object in their construction being to carry as much cargo

as possible. Ships of war were longer and narrower. They were also chiefly rowed with oars, as it was of the first importance that they should be perfectly manageable, so as to be able to tack about, and approach the enemy on his weakest side. The sail gave them over to the mercy of the winds, and precluded them from being conducted in accordance with the will of the commander.

There was also in later ages another distinction, arising from the several orders, or banks of oars, arising from the seats being fixed at the back of each other, and ascending gradually in the manner of stairs. The most usual number of these was three, four, and five, called the trireme, quadrireme, and quinquereme galleys, which exceeded one another by a bank of oars, and the higher they were built, the more strength was required to row them. Ever after the invention of the triremes, the chief strength of the Grecian fleet lay in them. These were not built at a very early period. Until the Persian wars, the use of the long ships and those of fifty oars was the most common.

The Greeks, in preparing for an engagement at sea, disburdened the ship of everything not strictly necessary for the action. They also took down their sails, leaving the ship to be entirely managed by oars.

The order of battle varied according to circumstances. Sometimes it was formed like a half-moon, the horns of it extending nearest the enemy, and containing the ablest men and ships. Sometimes it was just the reverse of this. Sometimes the vessels were ranged in the form of a circle, sometimes in the figure of the letter V. This was encountered by the enemies ranged in the same form inverted.

Greece has rendered herself immortal in the annals of war by her great naval engagements. These have been characterized, perhaps, in nothing more strikingly than in the advantageous positions which the fleets have taken, and in the great care with which every advantage has been availed of.

The first naval engagement of any importance was that which took place between the Ionians and the Phœnicians,

near the island of Sada, off Miletus. The former had three hundred and fifty triremes, and the latter almost twice that number. An artful position was taken before the battle, but in the fighting of it, but little art or skill is exhibited.

In the battles of Artemisium and Salamis, Themistocles exhibited the most consummate skill in the positions he took, and the manner in which the attack was conducted. The navy of the Persians was immensely superior to that of the Greeks in numbers, and as a large number of Phœnician vessels formed a part of it, that portion at least must have well understood naval tactics. Had he met that large fleet in the open sea, the wings of the enemy would have unavoidably extended beyond his own, and he would have been surrounded. He therefore took up his first position at the northern entrance of the strait of Eubœa, and after the indecisive engagements of Artemisium, retreated through those straits to the Saronic bay, where the nook between Attica and the island of Salamis offered a station still more secure.

In the beginning of the Peloponnesian war a naval fight took place between the Corinthians and the Corcyræans. In this battle the Corinthian fleet formed one line, while that of the Corcyræans was drawn up in three divisions. Still no manœuvres took place, as they grappled at once, ship fighting singly with ship.

The direction which the manœuvering generally took was to sail round and through the enemy's line; the object of the first being to outflank and surround, and of the last to break through and disperse. To meet these dangers, the opposing fleet was drawn up in two lines, having intervals in both so that the division of the second line could pass through the intervals in the first, and thus assist them, when assistance was needed.

This was specially illustrated in the engagement between the Spartans and Athenians near Lesbos. The Athenian fleet was drawn up in two lines. Each wing consisted of two divisions, and each division of fifteen ships. The

second line had also equal divisions to support the first. The centre was composed of one line. The object of this was that the fleet might not be broken through. The Spartan fleet formed but one line, being prepared for sailing round or breaking through the enemy. The battle was obstinate, and finally resulted in the triumph of the Athenians.

Before a naval battle commenced, each party invoked the aid of the gods by prayers and sacrifices. The signal for the commencement was given by hanging from the admiral's galley, a gilded shield, or a garment or banner. The continued elevation of this signal, proclaimed the continuance of the battle; its depression, or inclination to the right or left, indicated in what manner to attack their enemies, or to retreat from them. They also, on commencing, usually sang a pæan or hymn to Mars.

Although there are many things in the art of war, as carried on by the Greeks, that strike us with much force as evidencing their shrewdness, skill, tact, and ingenuity, yet, if we desire to see the ancient war god arrayed in all his terrors, and doing his mightiest among the children of men, we must follow in its flight over the world, the Roman eagle, as it leads on its iron tramp the Roman legion.

END OF VOL. II.