E 12643

THE

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,

BY

AMOS DEAN, LL.D.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

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

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1869,

By A. H. DEAN,

In the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States,
for the Northern District of New York.

E 12643

CONTENTS.

			Page.
Chap. I.	Rome—	The Immediate Sources of its History and Civilization,	1
II.	"	Its Industry,	76
III.	"	Its Religion,	96
IV.	"	Its Government,	136
V.	"	Its Society,	210
VI.	"	Its Philosophy,	272
VII.	"	Its Art,	335
		Index to First Three Volumes,	429

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER I.

ROME—THE IMMEDIATE SOURCES OF ITS HISTORY, AND CIVILIZATION.

The civilizations of the world have ever borne towards each other certain relations. They have had their antecedents, and their consequents. They have grown, in a great measure, out of those which preceded them; while to those which succeeded, they have furnished the germs to be developed, and attain their maturity under such influences as the future should afford. Thus the civilizations of Egypt and the east furnished the matrix in which the seeds of Grecian culture were sown, and nourished to maturity. The civilization of Greece, in its turn, was an essential, a necessary element in that of the Roman, and without which the latter would have been very different from that recorded by history. The Roman, was that gigantic civilization, sustaining almost equal relations with the old and the new world; absorbing and modifying the civilizations of ancient time, and moulding and giving birth to much of the modern. It was the vast reservoir fed from the fountains of Greece and the east, and in its turn sending out its streams to fructify modern Europe and the west. Let us then approach the study of its civilization with the spirit of earnest inquiry, and the determination to let no obstacle effectually impede our progress.

The south of Europe terminates in three peninsulas, the Grecian, Italian, and Spanish. Each one of these enjoys

its own isolation; the first being separated from the continent of Europe proper by the Cambunian mountains, the second by the Alps, and the third by the Pyrenees.

The barriers embraced in the two first mentioned, have served valuable purposes in protecting the Grecian and Italian peninsulas, especially the latter, from hostile invasions while the infant Hercules was growing to maturity. The Gaul, the Carthaginian, the Cimbri, the Teuton, always found the Alps with their snowy summits, and their fearful glaciers, to interpose most formidable obstacles to their reveling on the plains of Campania.

The Pyrenees have also served as a protection, but of a different character. They have interposed their mountain masses, not to protect the peninsula from the rest of Europe, but to guard Europe from the forces imprisoned in the peninsula. But for them, and their hardy inhabitants, the Moor of Spain would probably have borne the crescent in triumph over Europe. Even as it was, the barrier proved not insurmountable, and in A. D. 732, the Saracenic host clambered over it, and would have succeeded in subjugating Europe but for their bloody defeat by Charles Martel near Tours.

The peninsula of Italy is perhaps equally as mountainous as that of Greece; but its mountain ranges are more uniform, more upon one general system, and less broken into parts. The Alps at the north send off as their main spur the Apennines, which pursuing their bold course nearly in the middle of the peninsula, proceed to its south-western extremity, dividing all Italy proper into two nearly equal parts. On the north-east lies the great basin of the Po, the ancient Padus or Eridanus, while from its western slopes descend the Arno and the Tiber; on the latter of which, on the western side, and nearly equidistant from the northern and southern termination of the peninsula, stood and still stands, the city of Rome.

Both on the eastern and western sides of the Apennines are sent off, generally at right angles, many mountain spurs, between which are embosomed fruitful valleys, which occa-

sionally stretch off, forming plains of varied extent, and different degrees of loveliness.

The physical arrangements of Italy leave nothing to ask of the beneficent giver. Surrounded by sea and mountains; with an extremely varied and most lovely landscape; with a climate the most delightful in the world; with capacities for production the most varied and unfailing; and with skies proverbial for their beauty and loveliness, it is not surprising that its pleasant fields have always invited the invader, and hence that it has been so often the theatre of commotion and hostile encounter.

On the banks of the Tiber, about fifteen miles from the Mediterranean sea, and nearly in the same latitude as the city of New York, stands Rome; not inappropriately termed the eternal city; because either by its arms or its arts, it has kept a great part of the world in subjection to itself for more than two thousand six hundred years. When its physical energies were exhausted, and its arms could no longer hold the world in awe, its pope asserted his spiritual dominion as the vicar of St. Peter, and from the Vatican ruled over the consciences and the souls of men. Wonderful city, what a mighty mission was it thine to accomplish in the affairs of men!

No one, however, can fully understand or appreciate the elements of Roman greatness without investigating the condition of Italy at the time Rome is said to have been founded. In that condition, together with the prior and subsequent history of the Italian states, are to be found one of the great secrets of Roman success. Had Rome been located on the banks of the Euphrates instead of the Tiber, neither the bodies nor the souls of men would have been subjected to her iron rule. In order to acquire the force necessary to subject the world, it was necessary she should have been reared among hostile and warlike states, almost or quite her equals in power, and not in a vast and extended empire, or where a dreaded despotism had thrown its net of iron over the struggling energies of humanity.

It should certainly create no surprise that the beautiful region of Italy should early attract the attention of enterprising emigrants from other lands. It furnishes one among the multitude of facts going to show that emigrants, or their descendants, achieve a higher civilization, and accomplish far more in arms, or arts, or both, than the aborigine.

Long prior to the foundation of Rome, Italy had been divided between a variety of separate nations, differing from each other in manners and customs, and in the degrees of civilization which each had severally attained. Of these the Umbrians have long been regarded as the earliest known inhabitants of northern Italy, occupying anciently that portion of it lying between the Alps and the river Tiber. The era of their settlement is supposed to have preceded, by many ages, the existence of any written documents or records. The Etruscans, long prior to the foundation of Rome, dispossessed them of their territories on the north of the Tiber and in the western part of Italy, while the Gauls, in a subsequent age, came into the occupancy of northern Italy. The Romans could, therefore, derive directly from the Umbrians, few, if any, of the elements of their civilization.

Coeval with the Umbri in the north were the Siculi or Sicani in the southern region of Italy. These were of the Iberian stock, and came into Italy from the north, gradually tracing their way to the southern extremity, and ultimately seeking a refuge in the island of Sicily, to which they gave the name of Sicania. Along with these should also be ranked the kindred tribes of the Œnotri, the Morgetes, Italietes, Peuceti, and Japyges, in regard to which there are early traditions. These have been regarded as the aborigines of southern Italy, but they also passed away before the Roman era, and hence could only indirectly have affected its civilization.

A race, however, that did exert, either directly or indirectly, or both, no inconsiderable amount of influence upon Roman civilization, was that known under the names of

Opici, Aurunci, Ausonians, or Oscans. These appear to have been a people warlike in their character, and to have driven the Siculi out of Italy. They appear as the principal people of southern Italy, and within the historical period, are found pressing from Campania northward into Latium. The Oscan language prevailed through all southern Italy until it was at a late period supplanted by the Latin.[1] From their position on the peninsula it would appear that they had entered it earlier than the Umbrians, unless they came by sea.

The Oscans were a pastoral and agricultural people, occupying the hilly country, and scattered about in villages. They had an agricultural priesthood, devoted as well to the cultivation of agriculture, as to the offices of religion.[2] They were a people of industrious habits and of simple manners. Their devotion to agriculture gave health to the mind and body, diffused peace and plenty around their habitations, originated a fine tone of moral feeling, and contributed largely, at a very early period, to bring the valleys and slopes of the Apennines under cultivation, and thus to develop the physical resources of central and southern Italy. Thus the agricultural tendencies, the simple manners, the industrious habits, the moral feelings, and the warlike energies of this people, together with the advanced state and condition of agriculture to which they had attained, all contributed to lay a proper foundation for the structure of a city that should rule the world.

Besides these, there were also other emigrations, or colonizing, done in Italy. The most remarkable of these were the Pelasgians, and the settlements they effected; the Rasena, or Etruscans; and the Gauls who, within the historic age, dispossessed the Etruscans, and occupied the north of Italy.

The three different races or people who have made the largest contributions to Roman civilization were the Rasena, Etruscans or Tuscans, the Sabines, and the Latins.

[1] *Prichard*, III, 217. [2] *Dew*, 211, 212.

The Etruscans calling themselves Rasenæ, occupied the ancient Etruria. Of this they dispossessed the Umbrians. There are reckoned three different Etrurias, once occupied by the Etruscans, viz: Lower Etruria, Circumpadum Etruria, and Campanian Etruria.[1] Indeed, so powerful were the Etruscans at the period when their nation was most extensively spread, that all Italy, from the Alps to the straits of Sicily, was said to have been subject to their government. The region, however, known more generally as the ancient Etruria, was bounded on the south by the Tiber, on the north by the Macra, on the east by the Apennines, and on the west by the Mediterranean, then termed the Tyrrhenian sea.[2] It lay, therefore, directly north of Rome, and was larger than the modern Tuscany. This country was also anciently called Tyrrhenia, and in it were twelve confederated cities, the chief city being called Tarquinii. "The soil," says Diodorus, "will bear everything, and being well cultivated, yields abundance of fruits, not only for sufficiency, but for luxurious enjoyment, so that servants and freemen alike have their own separate houses. From the universal fertility of the country, they can always keep large stores in reserve, for, in short, Tyrrhenia sits everywhere on open plains, divided by gently sloping hills, serviceable to agriculture, and is moderately humid, as well in summer as in winter."

The following were the physical characters of the Etruscans. Countenances not acute, but large and of a round shape; nose thick, but not long; chin strong, and somewhat protruding. Stature small, great head, short thick arms, and a clumsy and inactive conformation of body appear to have characterized the Etruscan form.[3]

The origin of the Etruscans has been a problem which has never admitted of a clear solution. Many suppose, and apparently with good reason, that their mother country was the ancient Lydia. The evidence adduced to prove this

[1] *Prichard*, III, 238, *etc.* [2] *Regal Rome*, 104. [3] *Prichard's Physical Researches*, III, 256, 257.

origin is derived in part from the fact that the Lydians themselves believed the Etruscans to have been their kinsmen, and to have come from Lydia. The Etruscans claimed for themselves a Lydian origin. The language, manners, customs, habits, and civilization of the Etruscans, all seem to indicate them of Asiatic, if not of Lydian, origin.[1]

The Etruscan alphabet was written from right to left, which strongly suggests its transmission from the east. The direct proof of their Lydian origin, very much relied upon, is derived from the following fact. The tomb of Alyattes, the father of Crœsus, was a mound or tumulus of earth, raised upon a solid mass of masonry, and surmounted by five pyramidal columns or cones.[2] At Clusium in Etruria the tomb of Porsena exhibited a massive stone basement, on the summit of which were five pyramidal columns or cones. So also a monument still extant on the Via Appia, exhibits a basement supporting five pyramidal columns.

But the strongest evidence of this particular character is offered by the sephulchral tumuli, called cucumelle, spread over the deserted plains of the Roman Maremma, once the cemeteries of the Etruscan cities of Volci and Tarquinii.[3] These have only come to light within the last few years.

The plan of the great cucumella of the Volci corresponds so closely with that of the Lydian tomb, as to suggest the notion that it must have been erected upon the same original model. It consists of a solid stone casement seventy or eighty yards in diameter, supporting a tumulus surmounted by pyramidal cones, fragments of which are still strewed over the sides of the mound. The original number of these cones are recognized to be five, which stand on the summit of an equal number of towers, carried up from the foundation, through the centre of the tumulus,

[1] See Article in *London Quarterly Review for* 1845, 21; *Prichard's Physical Researches*, III, 242, 243; *Dennis's Etruria*, xxxvii. [2] *London Quarterly, June*, 1845, 32. [3] *Idem*, 33.

and in the lower recesses of which were the sepulchral chambers.

These resemblances may justly be regarded as too striking and peculiar to be the result of accident. So also many of the manners and customs, and much of the civilization of this peculiar people, proclaim their oriental, if not Lydian, origin.

The custom stated to have been common among the Etruscans, that young girls should earn their dowries, by prostitution, with a view to forming respectable marriages, was of Lydian extraction.

Although many things seem to indicate the Lydian origin of the Etruscans, yet that is a point by no means generally conceded. As we shall hereafter have occasion to show, the early Etruscan style of art indicates a close affinity with the Egyptian. So the subjects represented, as also the later style of art, indicates as clearly the influence of the Grecian mind. While, therefore, there is much among the Etruscans that reminds one of an eastern people of Asiatic extraction, so also is there much that indicates the working of the Greek mind among the elements that contribute to form the Etruscan character.

A modern writer, Dr. Donaldson, distinguishes between the Tyrrhenians, who were located on the Mediterranean sea, and the Etruscans, or Rasena, situated in the interior. The former he supposes to be the most civilized branch of the Pelasgians. The Etruscans he supposes to be a Gothic tribe from Rhætia, who, having sallied forth from the plains of Lombardy, where it was settled in connection with sister tribes in the Tyrol and south-western Germany, not only effected a permanent conquest of Umbria, but also settled itself as a military aristocracy among the civilized Tyrrhenians on the right of the Tiber.[1]

The identity of the Etruscans, or Rasena invaders, with Scandinavian or Gothic tribes, he seeks to find in the similarity of their physical characteristics, in the gladiatorial

[1] *Varronianus Donaldson*, 24.

combats of the one with the duel of the other, and in the correspondence between certain words used by both.[1] With the Etruscan monuments, however, that still remain, and all that has survived of their history and language, it will hardly be possible to refer them exclusively, or principally, to a Gothic ancestry, and the riddle in relation to their origin remains still unsolved. It would also seem that a good deal of confusion is here introduced by creating a distinction between the Tyrrhenians and the Etruscans, and by attributing to the former the locality, and consequently the monuments of civilization that have generally been attributed to the latter. Wherever we are to look for the original home of the Etruscans, the civilization attributed to them certainly indicates an eastern origin.

The difficulty in arriving at the origin of the Etruscans may, perhaps, in part arise from the fact that the people known to the Romans by that name were a very mixed race of people. The earliest occupants of the country were the Umbrians. The next, a Greek race, the Pelasgi, one stream of whose population entered Italy at the head of the Adriatic, and crossing the Apennines, and uniting themselves with the aborigines, or mountaineers, took possession of Etruria, driving out the earlier inhabitants, and raising those mighty walls and Cyclopean structures that enabled them for some time to reign supreme in the land.[2]

To this must be superadded a third race, called by the Greeks Tyrrheni, or Tyrseni, by the Romans Etrusci, Tusci, or Thusci, and by themselves Rasena, who are supposed to have established their power in the land about three centuries before the foundation of Rome. Whence they came will perhaps never be clearly settled. But the strong probability seems to be from Lydia.

The civilization of the Etruscans was very far in advance of the other nations of Italy. That civilization, too, was in

[1] *Varronianus Donaldson*, 80, 81, 82. [2] *Dennis's Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, xxxi.

many particulars quite oriental in its character. One of its peculiar marks was the existence of castes, thus clearly indicating an Asiatic origin. It may not, perhaps, be considered as very clearly settled to what extent this system of castes was established.

Those who adopt the conclusions of Niebuhr, assert that there was a vast chasm between the ruling race and the great mass of the people, who were miserable and degraded. It does not appear that the common people ever concerned themselves in the affairs of state, or that the democratic element was ever developed in Etruria.

The power resided in a patrician order, which also constituted a sacerdotal caste, the priesthood being hereditary, and surrounded by serfs and slaves, who were born to serve and obey. In this respect there was a great resemblance to the civilization of Egypt; the priest caste, however, possessing greater civil power than it possessed among the Egyptians.[1] Like the priest caste of Egypt, it transmitted from one generation to another the secrets of its power and influence; not by written records that could be read and understood by others, but by oral instruction and tradition.

In relation to government, the administration of public affairs in ordinary times seems to have been confided to a senate; but in times of emergency, a king or regent, termed lucomon, or lucomo, was elected for a limited period, whose power was both temporal and spiritual. He executed many civil functions, commanded the armies, and was the high priest, or chief minister of religion. Thus in the element of government, we find the prototype of regal Rome in the cities of Etruria. It was from these that Rome derived her pomp and ceremonial, the purple robe, the golden crown, the curule chair, the eagle sceptre, the fasces, and the axe of the lictors.

So far as forms and ceremonies were concerned, the Etruscans were a very religious people. It entered into

[1] *Dew*, 214.

all their civil and social life. It threw over all its protecting mantle. It was a religion of rites and ceremonies; one of pomp and parade; in which the splendor of its exhibitions, and its marvels and mysteries, all united to enlist the senses, and thus to create a sensuous devotion. The simple element of faith or belief seems to have been wanting.

Tarquinii, the principal city of the Etruscans, was a great mart for commerce. By means of it, the elegant arts of Egypt, and Phœnicia, and subsequently of Greece, were introduced into Etruria. There are still many remains that attest the high degree of civilization of the ancient Etruscans. Their tombs, in a more especial manner, proclaim their luxury and industrial power. Their fleets rode in triumph over the seas, and their soldiers, armed and mail-clad, were unmatched on the land before Rome existed as a city.

Like the Egyptians they made their tombs their records, covering over their inner walls with paintings, and stocking them with valuable pottery and furniture.[1] "The internal history of Etruria" says Mr. Dennis, "is written on the mighty walls of her cities, and on other architectural monuments; on her roads, her sewers, her tunnels, but above all in her sepulchres. It is to be read on graven rocks, and on the painted walls of tombs. But its chief chronicles are inscribed on sarcophagi and cinerary urns, on vases and goblets, on mirrors, and other articles in bronze, and a thousand et cetera of personal adornment, and of domestic and warlike furniture, all found within the tombs of a people long passed away."

The Etruscans were great cultivators of music. The use of wind instruments at Rome was considered to be peculiarly a Tuscan art. The trumpet was introduced into Rome from Etruria.[2] The Greeks derived the use of these same instruments from Phrygia and Lydia. The musical art of the Etruscans was either identical with that of the Lydians, or was very similar to it.

[1] *Regal Rome*, 107. [2] *Prichard*, III, 251.

The architectural art of the Etruscans is also worthy of notice.[1] The cities of Etruria generally stood on open plains, or on a tongue of land at the junction of two ravines, their walls being built of large blocks of hewn stone laid in regular courses. In the gateways and vaults of the Etruscans we find the perfect arch, formed of massive stones fitted without cement. So also were bridges constructed with a single arch which are standing firm at the present time. They tunneled roads through rocks to lessen the distance.[2] The walls of their tombs were paneled in relief. Within them are found easy armed chairs with footstools attached, carved out of the rock. So also are there vases, goblets, drinking horns, wine coolers, plates, cups, etc., armor and weapons, as if the belief were entertained that departed spirits in another state had necessities similar to what they had in this, and that the tomb was a counterpart of the abode of the living.

Such were the ancient Etruscans, masters of the arts of civilized life long before Rome came into being.

Another people of Italy, who have exerted great influence upon the destinies of Rome, were the Sabines. These were a branch of the great central people of Italy, dwelling between the Tiber and the Anio, and almost touching on Rome. The country originally possessed by the Sabines was in the highest region of central Italy.[3] They derived their name from Sabinus, the son of Sancus, a genius of their country. They were of a kindred tribe with the Samnites, and are the more generally supposed to have been of the Opic or Oscan race, the Oscan idiom being the language of all the countries conquered and colonized by the Samnites in southern Italy.

The entire character, and the whole civil and social life of the Sabines, appear to have been the complete antipodes of the Etruscans. They delighted to find their homes amid the highlands of the Apennines. Their austere simplicity of taste, and their extreme rustic manners, contrast most

[1] *History of Architecture*, 80. [2] *Idem*, 81. [3] *Prichard*, III, 223.

strongly with the luxurious habits and the gorgeous displays of the Etruscans.[1] Their mode of living was in unwalled villages, trusting, like the Spartans, to their weapons as a sufficient defense.

Their civil system, as connected somewhat with their social, was a peculiar one. It was of the patriarchal character. Each family, or rather clan, constituted a state by itself, and the nation was made up of a confederacy of clans, having few points of union between them, and those points generally relating to war. Each clan enacted laws for the government of its own members. A very natural result of this was, that each clan came in time to have its own manners, customs, forms of social intercourse and other peculiarities, that continued to exist long after the Sabine name had been swallowed up in the Roman. What tended strongly to preserve the identity of each clan was that each individual in it bore its name.

Among the Sabines the father possessed the power of life and death over his grown-up son. He might sell him into slavery, and might resume his rights over him if he was set free. Every noble family had dependents, who were permanently attached to it, and were called its clients. The entire clan was, in one sense, a single large family, accustomed to yield the guidance of all external affairs to its leader. They were bound together by oaths.

These relations were of a very different character when they existed among men in the primeval ages, before avarice had eaten up the human soul, and men were regarded for their qualities as men, and not as mere money making machines, from what they came to be after every sentiment, and passion, and aspiration of the soul had been offered up on the shrine of mammon. Then it was that the slaves of avarice became, in their turn, the tyrants over those whom law or custom had made their inferiors. Then the chief or patron would covet the land for the sake of rent, and not of men, and, becoming the owner of the soil,

[1] *Regal Rome*, 55-56.

the relation of patron and client often became one of antagonism.

It is supposed that the relations between the Sabine patron and his clients were much the same as those existing between landlord and tenants. The occupations of the Sabines were pretty much confined to pastoral and agricultural pursuits. These were simple, healthful and moral in all their tendencies. This rendered the land the sole source of income, and the cultivation of it by the clients enabled him to obtain not only his own subsistence but also that of his patron.

Social, civil, and political distinction, however, that may have first originated out of the necessities of the case, by being continued, become more and more marked, and difficult of annihilation. It came, for instance, soon to be a settled principle that intermarriages between patrons and clients could not take place, and hence the division between noble and vulgar, or plebeian families, became more marked.

There was a peculiarity in the Sabine marriages. The bride fell into the condition of a daughter to the bridegroom, and this resulted in giving every husband the same power over the life of his wife, as a father possessed over that of his child. The wife even inherited on her husband's death as a daughter. The presence of an augur was always necessary to invest the marriage ceremony with the sanction of religion.

The Sabines were a people sternly moral in their whole outward conduct. They recognized the claims of duty, were a highly religious people, had great power of self-devotion, and were possessed of dignity and self-respect. Their mode of access to the divine will was by means of auguries, and one of the most efficient means of ascertaining that was by the flight of birds.

Living in the pure atmosphere of the Apennines, hardy, healthy, moral, and devoted to the industrial pursuits of pastoral or agricultural life, their increasing numbers, from time to time, led them to extend their settlements, and thus to spread over larger extents of country.

Hence the Sabine race, in conjunction with tribes of a kindred character, became in time scattered over very considerable portions of the Italian peninsula. In the doing of this, however, mixtures occurred with various other populations, although the pure manners of the Sabines, together with their tendency, so strongly manifested, to intermarriages among themselves, would, for long periods, preserve them separate and distinguishable.

In this extension of the Sabine race and lineage, and in the contests, mixtures and displacements consequent upon it, we see exhibited in Italy, on a smaller scale, what, some twelve centuries later, constituted the great movement of nations from the northern and north-eastern parts of Europe, deluging and overturning the Roman empire.

It is stated that among the Sabines it was their custom to proclaim a sacred spring, during which whatever was born, belonged to the national god, or to some particular god.[1] All the children born during that spring, were regarded as sacred, and on attaining full age, were sent out to acquire new abodes either peacefully or by conquest; and when they had so acquired them, they became an independent people. This was certainly a novel mode for providing for the birth of nations. This sacred spring seems to have been held at fixed intervals, and quite frequently.

Among the Sabines the god of the spear was termed Quirinus, and a particular branch of the nation appears to have been dedicated to him, and hence called Quirites. It is for this reason that the Romans are sometimes called Quirites.

These are the people who in the infancy of Rome took by storm the Capitol, and Citadel or Tarpeian rock, and established themselves on the most northern of the seven hilled city, which after them was called the Quirinal; the people, who after their union with Rome, gave that infant city a new stamp, by impressing upon it their religion, their political

[1] *Regal Rome*, 64.

institutions, and what probably was of far greater consequence, their inherent irrepressible force of character. It was the Sabine element that contributed the most largely to the conquest of the world.

A third people mentioned as having furnished an important element in the composition of Rome, were the Latins. These were the inhabitants of Latium, which in early periods, was comprised within very narrow limits. It lay on the sea coast, extending from the mouth of the Tiber south to Circeii about fifty miles. In breadth from the coast to the Sabine hills, it was at most but thirty miles. This entire country, with the exception of the hilly parts, and a few other favored localities, is now totally uninhabitable from malaria. And yet within it, many Latin cities must have flourished before the dawn of history. Within the boundaries of ancient Latium was included the city of Rome. Latium afterwards became extended, reaching to the river Liris, from which were derived the appellations of old and new Latium.

The origin of the Latins is not so clearly established. They were termed aborigines, and their original seats were on the borders of the Apennines, where they dwelt in mountain districts, dispersed about in villages without walls.[1] It would thus appear that the same high region of the Apennines, or nearly adjoining regions, were the cradles both of the Sabines and the Latins.

But the Sabines in their necessities for extension, came in contact with the Latins, and hostilities commencing between them, the latter were forced to abandon their mountain homes, and retiring down the Anio, they came into the country of the Siculi and to Latium.

In occupying a region bordering upon the sea, they were necessarily exposed to all the migratory influences which, in early periods, were so prevailing. It was owing in a great measure to this that the Latins were a mixed race, having little of the simplicity of the Sabines and Etruscans.

[1] *Prichard*, III, 222.

Among other elements that entered into their composition were the Siculians.

The Siculians appear first to have visited, and spread along the eastern coast of Italy, extending from north to south. A branch of them crossed the Apennines and settled in Latium, and are reckoned among the progenitors of the Latin nation. They contributed largely to the Latin language. Besides these, a Pelasgian element is also found entering into the Latin character. The Latin language has many things in common with the Greeks, thus showing that the descendants of the Hellenes, in all probability, once formed a part of the population of Latium.

However, or from whatever source derived, the Latins were a people possessing many elements of an early civilization. Their towns, at a very early period, grew up into free and well organized confederations. Their political experience was by no means inconsiderable.

There was an equality among the inhabitants of Latium that did not obtain either among the Sabines or Etruscans. The division into patron and client seems never to have obtained in Latium. The commonalty were citizens of the state, and were practically skilled in that cooperation for self-government on which all political freedom everywhere depends.[1] Under all circumstances, they have known how to order their political organization, to arrange their tribes, elect their tribunes, sanction their marriages and testaments, and thus sustain their own nationality. Although the Latin communities in general enjoyed republican forms of government, yet for the necessities of war, they were in the habit of electing, from time to time, a dictator, who was temporarily despotic. Here, therefore, we find the origin of the Roman dictatorship.

The Latins were strong believers in augury. With them the flight of birds was supposed to indicate the will of the gods. This, undoubtedly, in early periods, was the fruit of natural feelings, but we shall be surprised to find to what

[1] *Regal Rome*, 21.

extent the Romans carried this principle of augury through all their political and military operations, and how slavishly dependent they were upon favorable signs and indications in the movements of their armies, and in all their transactions.

Another thing to be noticed in regard to the Latins is their peculiar strong fortifications. They very much resemble those of the early Grecians, or rather those in Greece, which have been attributed to the Pelasgians. These were strong, massive walls, constructed of huge polygonal blocks of stone, many of them remaining to this day, thus attesting their strength and durability. These walls, as in Greece, were erected on or near the summits of hills, thus constituting the citadel, around which dwelt the population in comparative security. Thus at Norba, Signia, Palestrina, and Terracina, besides several other places, are reared those immense walls of Cyclopean architecture, which have generally been attributed to the Pelasgians, and which attest the strength and perseverance of those who constructed them. This plan of fortification must have been introduced from abroad, as there is no evidence that the Latin aborigines ever practiced it while dwelling upon the slopes of the Apennines. But however or whenever introduced, it was found to be extremely useful, and the Latin cities, by means of it, were long enabled to maintain their separate independence. It was also at much later periods, one of the principal means by which the Romans upheld their frontier garrisons in the midst of half subdued and oppressed races.

These were the nations which principally furnished to Rome the sources of its power, its greatness, and its civilization. It is fabled of Perseus, that when he set out on his journey to attack the Gorgon, he borrowed from Pluto a helmet which had the power of rendering the wearer invisible; from Minerva, a buckler, which was as resplendent as glass; and from Mercury, the talaria, or small wings, and the falx or falchion. So also Rome, when she started on her career of conquering a world and holding it in subjection, borrowed from the Etruscans much of their elder

civilization; from the Sabines, their men and manly virtues; and from the Latins, their political institutions. With all these united, her mission must succeed, and we shall behold her returning with the head of Medusa.

A cluster of hills, counted as seven, which upreared themselves from the plain on the east banks of the Tiber, below its junction with the Anio, served as a foundation for the city of Rome. Some of these appear to have been the sites of towns or villages before the Roman period. On one of them, the Palatine, is reputed to have settled a Greek colony under their leader Evander from Arcadia. In fact, seven different fortresses seem to have been placed on the site of Rome, which were surrounded by small villages.[1] This is inferred from the fact that a feast, called the septimontium, appears, at this early period, to have been celebrated by a union of the inhabitants of seven hills.

Although the origin of Rome dates not back into a remote antiquity, and occurred at a time when the civilization of the Etruscans was probably at its height, yet little reliable has come down to us in reference to its early history. Everything connected with it bears much the aspect of fable.

In the eighth century before the Christian era a secession from the Latin city of Alba established itself on the Palatine hill, where was the colony of Evander. The leaders were Romulus and Remus. The former is said to have founded Rome with Etruscan ceremonies. These consisted in yoking together a cow and a bull, attaching the team to a plough, and driving it round the limits of the city, being careful to turn every clod inward. The spot of ground, thus surrounded, was consecrated, the city wall being erected within it. In the centre was reserved a square, surrounded with massive stone. Within it was dug a pit, into which were cast the first fruits of all useful things, which was solemnly covered up. Round the Palatine hill

[1] *Regal Rome*, 38.

was ran a wall, inclosing very little beyond it, and this was the Rome of Romulus.

The first object would naturally be to draw together a population. For this purpose, a Greek custom is said to have been introduced. The depression between the Capitol and the Tarpeian rock on the Capitoline hill, was proclaimed an asylum, and all who fled to it for protection were to be entitled to it. It should, however, be understood that the harboring of political offenders is a very different matter from that of protecting criminals. It is not improbable, however, that both came to form constituent parts of Roman population.[1] Rome, in its origin, was undoubtedly a robber city. And yet there is no evidence of any strong taint of crime, or any peculiar bloodthirstiness of disposition. One result might be safely calculated upon, and that is, that the active and enterprising, the strong bodies and the turbulent minds, those who could make themselves felt by their strong arm, or their subtle thought, would be the very ones the most likely to identify themselves with the new and rising city. Thus, in its commencement, was impressed upon it the elements of a power which could not fail to be exercised in time to come.

The foundation of Rome dates from the year B. C. 753. The nature of the means resorted to for peopling the new city, would result in giving a great preponderance of males. To procure females, Romulus is reported to have proclaimed a festival, the consualia, to be celebrated at Rome, to which the neighboring Latins and Sabines were invited. While engaged in its celebration, the Romans fell upon the strangers, dispersed the men and carried off their women. This led to a war with the Sabines, which was compromised through the interference of the women, having now become reconciled to their new husbands. A peace was arranged upon the basis, that the two nations should henceforth be united in one state under the name of Romans and Quirites, having all temples and religious

[1] *Regal Rome*, 46.

rights in common, although each was to have their own king. But the death of the Sabine king, Titus Tatius, soon afterwards left Romulus the undisputed ruler over both nations.

Whatever of historical truth there may be in this account, there are certainly several things that indicate a duality in the origin of the Romans. There is the tradition of the twin brothers, Romulus and Remus;[1] the double faced Janus, the symbol of the double state; the double throne of Romulus; the title of the whole body of Roman citizens, *populus Romanus Quirites*, that is, *populus Romanus et Quirites*, and, as we shall see in the element of government, the dual number of so many of the Roman magistrates.

Romulus is said to have ruled thirty-seven years, and is naturally regarded as the author of the ground work of the political constitution of the new state. When, however, we consider the length of time required to found, fortify, carry on wars with neighboring states, protect, procure the means of population, and consolidate by political institutions, it seems obvious that a long series of years are necessary, and hence Romulus has been believed to have been to Rome what the name Pharaoh was to the ancient Egyptians; a collecting under one name of all the rulers who, through the whole period, exercised authority and dominion there. This, in the present case, derives a greater probability from the name itself, being obviously a derivative from Rome.

The name Rome, according to the belief of the Romans themselves, was not a Latin term, the Latin name being kept a profound secret.[2] The early settlement on the Palatine hill was in all probability called Roma.

The design here is to give the briefest possible outline of the history of Rome so far only as regards her relations with other states, or in other words her outward, exterior history, embracing her wars, negotiations and conquests. That which is far the most interesting to the student of

[1] *Schmitz*, 26. [2] *Idem*, 25.

civilization, her interior or inward history, embracing the statement, progress, development, and decay of her wonderful institutions, and form or forms of government; those which in truth enabled her by her arms and her policy to conquer, and hold in subjection a world, will be reserved for another connection.

After the death of Romulus follows the rule of the interrex, a term applied to each senator, as he enjoyed for a year the regal power. At length it was conceded by the senate that a king should be elected by the people subject to their approval. A dispute now occurring between the Romans and Sabines, it was finally settled that the Romans should elect, but that the person chosen should be a Sabine. The choice fell upon Numa Pompilius of Cures, renowned for his wisdom and piety. During his long reign of forty-three years, the temple of Janus, which was erected by him, was kept closed in token of profound peace. The great mission of Numa, the object which he seemed solely desirous of attaining, was the establishment of the religion of the Romans upon a permanent basis. It is, therefore, to him as we shall see, that the religion of the Romans stands largely indebted.

It has been greatly doubted whether Numa, any more than Romulus, was a real historical person. As the last has been by many supposed to be merely legendary, embracing under that name all those whose efforts were successfully directed to the establishment of well ordered, civil and political institutions, so the former has in like manner been supposed to represent the reign of those whose attention was mainly directed to the systematizing of religious observances, and to the permanent establishment of those forms, and ceremonies, and acts, and modes of worship, which were deemed the best calculated to nourish the religious principle of the Roman people, and to continue it ever in the most active exercise. It is not, perhaps, so material whether Numa be a historical personage or not, but whether he be one, or the representative of a number, the fact is important to notice, that Rome, after having

her political institutions, in a great measure consolidated, enjoyed a long time of profound repose, during which her religion became reduced to a system, and most thoroughly incorporated with her civil and political institutions; the arts of peace practiced; and those elements of growth and strength successfully cultivated, which, in the end, should be productive of most astonishing results. It is to the circumstances under which a nation has its birth, and which call forth the most successfully its elements of growth and strength, that we are to look mainly for the causes of its greatness and glory.

Numa was succeeded by Tullus Hostilius, who approaches nearer than the preceding to a historical person, and who again revived the warlike spirit of the Romans. Under his leadership is reported to have fallen Alba Longa, and also to have occurred the fight between the Horatii and the Curatii. The fall of Alba, which is regarded as an historical fact, doubled the power of Rome.[1] The Albans were, most of them, transplanted from their fallen city and planted on that one of the seven hills called the Cœlian, which had previously been in part occupied by Etruscan settlers. A war also took place with the Sabines, although unattended with any marked results. After the destruction of Alba, Tullus claimed the right of exercising the same supremacy over the Latin towns which Alba had formerly exercised. This led to a five years war with them, carried on chiefly by ravages made in the enemy's country.

After the death of Tullus, who reigned thirty-two years, the Romans elected Ancus Martius, who was the son of Numa's daughter, and whose first endeavor was to restore the religious observances instituted by Numa, which had fallen into neglect. During his reign a war broke out with the Latins, which ended in the destruction of three of their towns and the transplanting their inhabitants to Rome, where they were planted on the Aventine hill. Another victory was afterwards obtained, and many thousand more

[1] *Schmitz*, 39, 40.

carried to Rome, where they were assigned districts between the Aventine and Palatine. The hill Janiculum, on the side of Etruria, and as a defense against it, was also incorporated with the city, and the first wooden bridge was thrown over the Tiber. He first extended the Roman dominion to the sea-coast, and built at the mouth of the Tiber, the town of Ostia, which became the port of Rome.

He was succeeded by Tarquin the Elder, known as Tarquinus Priscus, who was of Corinthian birth, but who came from Etruria to Rome. Hence he has been termed an Etruscan. He seems to have been the first who offered himself as a candidate for the royal power, and was elected.[1] He was the most splendid and successful of the Roman kings. With Greek ideas, and imbued with Etruscan civilization, he was rightly calculated to act successfully upon the rigid Sabine system. He assumed the Etruscan insignia of magistracy, a golden crown, and ivory chair, a sceptre topped with an eagle, a crimson robe studded with gold, and a variegated crimson cloak, such as the kings of the Lydians and Persians wore, except that it was semicircular instead of square. He doubled the number of cavalry in the Roman army, and undertook to surround Rome with a wall of stone; but this excited the jealousy of the Sabines, who made war upon him. They were, however, defeated, and Collatia and all its territory taken from them. This was followed by a war with the ancient Latins, in the course of which several cities were taken, and the power of Latium essentially broken. This seems to have been in part owing to the neglect or inability of the Latins to act in concert.

But the works of Tarquin, more than his wars, have ennobled him with posterity. The changes introduced by him into the social and political condition, are referable to another head. The structures he erected were upon a stupendous scale. He surrounded the city with a stone circuit wall. Until his reign, the valleys and lower parts of the

[1] *Regal Rome*, 128, 129.

city, were nothing more than marshes or swamps. He constructed large sewers which led the waters into the Tiber. He constructed, or at least commenced, the construction of the great sewer, cloæa maximæ, which remains to this day, exciting the astonishment of every beholder. It is of such solidity, from the magnitude of the stones, as to have remained unaffected by earthquakes, by frost, or by the effects of vegetation. After an able and prosperous reign, his career was terminated by assassination, as was currently reported, by the sons of Ancus Martius.

Servius Tullius, who had married the daughter of Tarquin, was his successor. He was the first king who reigned at Rome without having been elected by the senate, and sanctioned by the curiæ.[1] He was, however, afterwards invested with the imperium, by the curiæ. His first act was to repel the aggressions of the Etruscans, of the city of Veii. In this attempt he was successful. His reign, however, is not one distinguished for great military achievements. His great deeds were laws, and he is regarded by many as the founder of all the civil rights and institutions of the Romans. He surrounded the entire city with a wall, embracing seven distinct districts, commonly called hills. The magnitude thus given to the city by the course of this wall, the Romans did not for centuries seek to exceed. During his reign, also, there was an accession of the remaining Latin towns. This was rather at the desire of the towns themselves, as they recognized in Rome their own race and lineage, and very many of their own political institutions.

After a long reign, distinguished far more by his civil institutions at home, than his triumphs abroad, Servius was assassinated by the orders of his son-in-law, Tarquin, called Superbus, or the Proud, who was the seventh and last king of Rome. He was both bold and warlike, and fond of splendor and magnificence. He did not seek any election by the people. Having attained power through

[1] *Schmitz*, 54, 55.

the senate, when firmly established, he protected himself by a body guard, and arbitrarily put to death whatever members of the senate he chose, without supplying any to fill their places. He seldom assembled the senate, carrying on public affairs chiefly by a domestic cabinet. He oppressed the people with terrible severity, compelling them to labor in the erection of his magnificent buildings.

At the same time his commanding talents were everywhere recognized. He compelled all Latium to bow before the majesty of Rome, and to acknowledge her as the head of the Latin confederacy. This was accomplished principally by persuasion, and by family influence.

He carried on a war against the Volscians, and took the Volscian town, Suessa Pometia, in which he found an immense amount of booty. He also directed the Roman arms against Gabii, one of the Latin towns which refused to join the confederacy with Rome. This was taken by stratagem, or rather through the treachery of his son Sextus, when the Roman franchise was given to its citizens. After these military achievements, he devoted his attention to the completion of the Capitoline temple, the sewers, and other useful or ornamental buildings. But his security was disturbed by alarming prodigies. To quiet the murmurs of his oppressed people, he undertook a war against Ardea, a Rutulian town, situated on a lofty rock. Not being able to take it by assault, the Romans laid siege to it, hoping in time to compel it to surrender.

But the days of kingly power in Rome for some centuries, at least, were numbered. Although to all appearances the power of Tarquin was firmly established, yet a single event drove him from his throne an exile, and ended in abolishing the kingly power. His son Sextus violated the chaste Lucretia at Collatia, and she in despair, gave herself a mortal wound with a dagger.

The dead body of Lucretia annihilated the power of Tarquin. Its eloquence was irresistible, and Rome, with one voice, decreed the expulsion of himself, and his whole race. Thus in the year B. C. 510, Rome having been a monarchy

for two hundred and forty-three years, abolished the kingly dignity, and outlawed every one who should attempt to rule as king. The laws of Servius Tullius were restored, and for the kingly was substituted the consular office.

Tarquin fled to Tarquinii, the principal city of the Etruscans. From thence embassadors came to Rome to demand his restoration, or that his property should be given up. To the latter alternative the senate at first assented, but upon detecting a conspiracy entered into between them and certain young men of Rome to effect his restoration, they revoked their decree, and distributed his estates among the plebeians, consecrating them to Mars, and hence they came afterwards to be called Campus Martius, the field of Mars.[1] It was on this occasion that Junius Brutus condemned to death his own sons by virtue of the power he had over them as their father.

Upon the return of the embassadors, Tarquin, by promising the Tarquinians and Veientines that the districts which Rome had taken from them should be restored, was enabled to place himself at the head of a large army. A great battle was fought near the forest Arsia, which resulted in the flight of the Etruscans.

During the first year of the republic occurs the first treaty with Carthage, which was of a commercial nature, and contained stipulations, that in Sicily, the Roman merchants should have the same privileges as the Carthaginians; that they should be allowed to trade at Carthage, on the coast of Lybia west of Carthage, and in Sardinia; but that the Romans were not to sail into any of the harbors, south of Cape Hermæum, which formed the eastern boundary of the gulf of Carthage.

After the defeat of the Tarquinians, the exiled king fled for refuge to Porsena, king of Clusium, in Etruria, who invaded the territory of the republic with a numerous army. He drove the Romans from the Janiculum across the wooden bridge thrown over the Tiber,[2] and laid siege to

[1] *Schmitz*, 81, 82. [2] *Idem*, 86, 87.

the city. Here occur the legends of Horatius Cocles, Mutius Scævola, and Clœlia, and some others, which have probably little in them of historic truth. From all that can be collected, Rome was forced to surrender to Porsena, and one of the conditions of peace is stated to have been, that the Romans were forbidden the use of iron, except for agricultural purposes.

A war with the Sabines followed, in which the Romans were successful in three successive campaigns, at the end of which the Sabines purchased peace at some sacrifice of corn, money, and lands.

Next the Latins were induced to arm themselves in behalf of the exiled king. T. Larcius was appointed dictator, who ravaged the territories of the enemy. After a suspension of arms, the war again broke out, and the new Roman dictator, Aulus Posthumius, inflicted upon the Latins a decisive defeat, at the lake of Regillus. This was B. C. 499, and was followed some years after by a treaty of peace with Latium, by which the Latins were admitted to an equality with the Romans. A similar confederation was subsequently made with the Hernians.

We next find the Romans embarked in wars with the Æquians and Volscians. Those with the latter came near proving fatal to Rome, in consequence of the aid they received from a distinguished Roman, Coriolanus, under whom they inflicted several severe defeats upon the Romans, and finally laid siege to the city itself.

In this emergency, Rome is said to have owed her preservation to the intervention and efforts of Veturia and Volumnia, the mother and wife of Coriolanus, through whose influence he was persuaded to grant a peace to the Romans.

Next follows a war with the Etruscans, in which the Romans were at first unsuccessful, the Etruscan armies advancing within sight of Rome, encamping on the Janiculum, and ravaging both sides of the river. They were, however, forced to retreat through the efforts of the consuls Virginius and Servilius, who, following up their successes,

a peace was finally concluded, by which the Romans recovered the territory of which they had been deprived by Porsena.

By far the most interesting part of the Roman history, during all this period, relates to the contests and changes that were going on in the bosom of Rome herself, which finally resulted in that arrangement of principles, and that distribution of political forces, which gave to her senate and people the government of the world. But all this belongs to another connection.

The exterior history of Rome, consisting mainly in its relations with other states, which we are at present pursuing, presents little of interest or instruction for several years. It is made up principally of desultory wars with the Æqui and Volsci, and with a succession of physical calamities in which the horrors of pestilence and famine play no inconsiderable part.

It was during the Æquian war of B. C. 457, and on the occasion of a consular army being intercepted and completely hemmed in by the enemy in the defiles of Mount Ægidus, so that its utter destruction seemed inevitable, that the senate called T. Quintius Cincinnatus from following the plough, and created him dictator. He having ordered an enlistment of every one capable of bearing arms, at the end of three days marched into the field so powerful an army as to be able to surround the Æquians, and by attacking them both from without and within, totally defeated them, and thus rescued the consular army, returning to Rome and laying down his dictatorship in sixteen days.

A more important event was the war with the city of Veii, an Etruscan city, at a small distance from Rome. Its king, Tolumnius, had put to death the Roman embassadors to the people of Tidenæ, and refused to render any satisfaction for the outrage. It was the richest city of Etruria, and Rome resolved on its destruction.

Two important facts come here to be noticed, viz: First, that to blockade such a city a permanent standing army is

required; and second, that to maintain such an army a tax was necessary to be levied upon the people.

The siege of this city had continued ten years, the Etruscan armies sent to its aid having been defeated by Camillus. About the end of that time he was created dictator, and under his directions a mine was constructed from the Roman camp into the citadel of Veii, through which an entrance was obtained, and the city taken B. C. 395. It was, according to a custom then too common, given up to pillage, its inhabitants enslaved or held to ransom, and the images of its gods transferred to Rome.

But Rome was now about to be exposed to a new enemy. The hordes of barbarians, whose homes were beyond the Alps, were about to pay to Italy their first installment. Under the name of Gauls, they crossed their mountain barrier, poured their hosts over the fertile fields of Etruria, and laid siege to Clusium. Possessing huge bodies, wild figures, long and shaggy hair, they dispersed the Etruscan armies, and having become offended that the Roman embassadors had aided the garrison of Clusium, they marched under Brennus, their chieftain, directly upon Rome. A Roman army hastily collected, met them about eleven miles from the city, but were defeated with great slaughter, and pursued to her very gates. The troops retired to the citadel, while the Romans deserted their city, dispersing themselves about the neighboring country. The Gauls laid siege to the citadel, and would probably have taken it by storm, had not the cackling of the sacred geese in the temple of Juno, given a timely warning, and the valor of Marcus Manlius effectually repelled them. The final result was that the Gauls were either bought off by the Romans, or defeated, according to the accounts of some, by Camillus, or were hastily recalled to protect their own country from invasion. Which of these is not certainly settled.

They left Rome in a very reduced and helpless condition; their walls battered down, their houses destroyed, their funds exhausted, their armies annihilated, and the

people dispersed, the project was seriously entertained of abandoning Rome and removing to Veii. This is said to have been decided by a lucky omen. While under discussion, as a senator was rising to speak, a centurion, coming with his company to relieve guard, gave the usual word of command: "Ensign, plant your colors," *hic manebimus optime*, "this is the best place to stay in." The senators immediately rushed out of the temple, exclaiming, "O happy omen; the gods have spoken—we obey." The multitude caught the enthusiasm, and exclaimed with one voice: "Rome forever."

A succession of internal struggles followed, notwithstanding which, and their prostrate condition, they maintained their reputation abroad by several victories over their enemies, especially the Gauls and Etruscans.

We have hitherto seen the Romans, with the exception of the Gallic invaders, engaged in warlike contests only with neighboring tribes of people, viz: the Etruscans, Sabines, Latins, Æqui and Volsci. In these contests they had been generally successful, although their extent of territory was still very limited. We have now, however, arrived at the period of the war with the Samnites, a war more important in its consequences than any the Romans had hitherto been engaged in.

The Samnites were a tribe of the Sabine race, like them occupying mountainous districts, but extending much farther down into southern Italy. They were a populous and wealthy nation, the most powerful and warlike in Italy, and in many respects superior to Rome and her allies. Their state consisted in a confederation of four cantons.

A custom of a somewhat curious character is mentioned as prevailing among the Samnites.[1] The young people, at certain stated periods of time, were all convened together in one place, and their conduct was examined. He that was declared the best of the whole assembly, had leave given him to take which girl he pleased for his wife.

[1] *Spirit of Laws*, 157–8.

The second best chose after him, and so on. This custom could only successfully prevail in a small republic.

This contest with the Samnites lasted, with a few intermissions, more than half a century. Its consequences were all important, as it opened a way for the subjugation of southern Italy, and laid the foundation of Rome's future greatness.

It occurred upon the following occasion. The Samnites invaded Campania, and the people of Capua, for their own protection, declared themselves subjects of Rome. The Samnites were warned against invading the new province, but they disregarded the warning, upon which war was immediately declared.

The first war was carried on slowly for some time, but generally to the advantage of the Romans, until a truce was sought by the Samnites. During its continuance the Samnites were attacked by the Latins, and requested assistance from the Romans, who commanded the Latins to desist. As the latter failed to obey, the former declared war against them. In the battle which ensued, the Romans were on the point of being totally routed, when Decius, one of the consuls, according to the superstitions of the age, devoting himself to the gods, rushed into the thickest of the fight and fell pierced by the lances of the Latins. The Roman soldiers, confident of the acceptance of this sacrifice, rushed forward with enthusiastic confidence, and the Latins were defeated. During the three ensuing campaigns, all Latium and Campania were subdued, and annexed as provinces to the Roman republic.

This career of success aroused the Samnites, and states in southern Italy, especially the Lucanians and Tarentines. The Romans, however, under Papirius Cursor, gained several victories over the Samnites, which being followed up by other advantages, finally reduced the enemy to so low a condition, as to force them again to solicit a cessation of arms. This was B. C. 321.

This truce continued but a few months, when Pontius, the Samnite general, again renewed hostilities. A large

consular army, under Veturius and Postumius, was sent to invade Samnium. This army, Pontius contrived to draw into a mountainous and rocky defile, called the Caudine Forks, where to fight or fly was equally impossible. All the passages were effectually blockaded by the Samnites, and nothing was left to the Romans but to capitulate. Pontius was advised by his father, either to send the Roman soldiers back with honor and freedom, or to slaughter them without mercy. But he adopted a middle course, sparing their lives, but compelling them to pass under the yoke, and forcing the consuls to give hostages for evacuating Samnium.

The Roman senate disavowed this treaty, sending the officers who had executed it, bound to Pontius; but he demanded the fulfillment of its stipulations, or that the whole Roman army should be again placed in his power. The Romans refusing either alternative, the war was again renewed, the consul, Papirius Cursor, conducting it successfully against the Samnites. The latter were in the end so much humbled, that they sought and obtained a peace in B. C. 303.

This, however, was not of long continuance. It was yet undecided to which of these powers should be yielded the supremacy of Italy. The war was renewed in B. C. 297, Fabius Maximus conducting it successfully on the part of the Romans. The Samnites, however, succeeded in enlisting a formidable array of power against the Romans. The Umbrians, Etruscans, and Gauls, united their forces with theirs, and thus threatened the utter extinction of the Roman name. Rome, however, proved to have resources adequate to any emergency. The bravery of her soldiers, and the devotion of her officers, always arose as the occasion required. They were at one time on the point of a total defeat by the Gauls, when the younger Decius, imitating the example of his father, devoted himself an offering to the gods, and fell in the midst of the enemy. Then the Roman army, putting forth almost superhuman energy, achieved a complete victory.

The Samnites finally lost their brave general Pontius, and the Roman consul Curius Dentatus, after a series of successes, finally compelled them to submit to the terms he chose to impose in the year B. C. 290. He also brought a war with the Sabines to a successful close, and thus achieved the unusual honor of having two triumphs decreed him in one consulate. Rome had now conquered her enemies, and was ruling without a rival over central Italy.

In southern Italy was the city of Tarentum, whose citizens had aided the Samnites, and were, therefore, in fear of the vengeance of the Romans. They entered into negotiations with the Gauls, who were induced again to attack the republic. They were at first successful, but were finally defeated and dispersed by Dentatus and Fabricius. Having humbled this formidable enemy, they prepared to wreak upon the luxurious Tarentines a signal vengeance.

These latter well knew what they had to anticipate. They accordingly invoked the protection of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus. This monarch seems to have imbibed the idea that he could overrun Europe as Alexander had Asia; and having first made sure the citadel of Tarentum by a strong detachment, he soon followed with a powerful army, in the year B. C. 279. His army consisted of 20,000 foot, 3,000 horse, and 20 elephants. This was the first time these animals were used in the wars of western Europe. The Romans sent eight legions into the field. They had more to dread from the elephants, the great generalship of Pyrrhus and his Macedonian tactics, then unknown to the Romans, than from his numerical forces.

The hostile armies met on the banks of the Liris, where a terrible battle was fought. Seven times did both armies advance and retreat alternately, but the elephants and Thessalian cavalry of Pyrrhus finally secured the victory, and the Romans were defeated. Pyrrhus, on visiting the field of battle the day following, and seeing the ghastly array of the Roman soldiers, all fallen with their faces towards the enemy, exclaimed, "With such soldiers I could conquer the world."

In the next campaign, that of B. C. 279, the two armies again met in the neighborhood of Asculum, where another bloody battle was fought. In it, Decius, imitating the example of both his father and grandfather, offered himself up as a sacrifice to the infernal gods by seeking and obtaining his death at the hands of the enemy. Notwithstanding this, however, which had formerly proved so successful, and notwithstanding the exertion of almost incredible valor on the part of the Romans, they were defeated, but with such terrible slaughter of the invading army, as to draw from Pyrrhus the exclamation, "Another such a victory, and I am undone."

In the summer of B. C. 278, Pyrrhus passed over into Sicily, to deliver the Greeks of that island from the Carthaginians, and, during his absence, the Romans triumphed over the Samnites, Lucanians and Bruttians, who, in their distress, implored the return of Pyrrhus.

Pyrrhus returned to Italy in B. C. 274, and the two consuls, Curius Dentatus, and Cornelius Lentulus, with two very considerable armies, hastened to meet him. The king marched against the former, hoping to surprise him, during the night, in his camp near Beneventum. He failed in his calculations on account of his lights getting extinguished, and being obliged to halt until the dawn, was then attacked by the Roman army. His elephants were driven back on his own lines by torches and fire-balls. His army was totally defeated, and fled for refuge to Tarentum. Thence he returned to Epirus with remnants of his army, consisting of 8,000 foot and 2,500 horse. After his departure, the Samnites, Lucanians and Bruttians were easily subdued. This, together with the taking the Etruscan town of Volsinii, where the slaves and freedmen had rebelled, completed the subjugation of Italy. Thus, after a struggle of nearly five centuries, the peninsula of Italy, from the northern frontiers of Etruria to the Sicilian straits, and from the Tuscan sea to the Adriatic, acknowledged the supremacy of Rome.

But a people who had grown up in arms; who were always in harness; who had struggled into being and supremacy under the pressure of obstacles, at times seemingly insurmountable, could not be expected to rest satisfied with the exercise of supremacy over the Alps-bound and sea-girt Italy. Through the political divisions, aided by the difference in races and the manner of their distribution over the peninsula, they had marched successfully onward until their dominion was undisputed. By means of similar political divisions, aided to some extent by the same, or similar things, we are now to see the same people commence their march onward to the achievement of universal dominion.

But here the first step is the most difficult and dangerous. It involves the decision, which shall have the empire of the sea and the land, the republic of Rome or that of Carthage.

The last was a Tyrian colony, and was established about seventy years before the building of Rome. It was Tyrian, or in more general terms, Phœnician, in its language, laws, customs, and national character.

The progress of Carthage had an unexampled rapidity, especially in everything connected with commerce, maritime enterprise, and the accumulation of wealth. One of the first naval engagements in the world, was that in which the Carthaginian fleet, in conjunction with that of the Etruscans, fought against the Phocians of Ionia, who were desirous of escaping the yoke of the Persian monarch.

Carthage, at this period of time, was one of the most magnificent and populous cities of the world. Its inhabitants are said to have amounted to 700,000, and it had under its sovereignty about three hundred towns along the Mediterranean coast.

Their government was one of the most perfect among the ancient republics. They had two chief magistrates, called suffetes, chosen annually, in whom resided powers somewhat similar to those confided to the Roman consuls.

[1] *Tytler*, I, 358.

They had an elective senate, which deliberated on the most important business of the state; but whose decrees must be unanimous in order to have effect given to them. If they were not so, and there was a difference of opinion, the matter was then remitted to the assembly of the people.

Chosen from the senate, was a tribunal of one hundred and four judges, to whom the generals of their armies were responsible for their conduct; and they not unfrequently punished an unsuccessful general with death.

Provided, therefore, there was a concurrence of opinion, all the powers of government seem to have resided in the suffetes and the senate, as the popular assembly had nothing to do with the matter, except in the case of disagreement between these bodies.

The pursuits for which the Carthaginians were the most celebrated were commercial, and the spirit of maritime adventure was always rife with them. They passed the straits of Gibraltar, and formed settlements on the African coast three degrees south of the Canary islands. They also pushed their maritime discoveries north of the straits, carrying on a trade with the ports of Gaul, and even the southern coast of Britain, whence they drew tin, lead and copper.

The Greek literature also, to some extent, seems to have prevailed in Carthage. The Carthaginian spirit was more commercial than warlike. Its citizens had industrious and mercantile habits, and were generally averse to war. Hence their wars were generally carried on by mercenary troops, which their immense wealth easily enabled them to obtain from Africa, Spain, Italy, the Mediterranean islands, Gaul, and even Greece.

Probably no two republics, except under peculiar circumstances, whose territories adjoin each other, can long exist without one of them being destroyed or subjected, or united with the other.

Although Carthage was apparently much the more powerful republic of the two, yet a shrewd judge of national resources must have decided in favor of Rome. The first

had undisputed dominion over the seas, and a well filled treasury, by which she could command the services of hired mercenaries to almost any extent. But Rome was a nation of warriors. Her soldiers were citizens, not mercenaries. She was strong in herself, and had resources adequate to any occasion. The Carthaginian was an elder, and a worn-out civilization, while that of the Roman was fresh, vigorous, hardy, and yet to develop itself in everything that pertains to history.

The wars waged between the Romans and Carthaginians are termed Punic wars. The first of these originated from a very slight cause. When nations are determined upon picking a quarrel with each other, occasions never fail to offer themselves which are sufficient for the purpose. The cause arose in Sicily. Some Mamertine mercenaries had seized Massena, and slaughtered the citizens. They now dreaded the vengeance of the Syracusans, and divided into two parties, one invoking the protection of the Carthaginians, the other that of the Romans. Thus, at best, the only contest that could arise between these must be as to which should have the honor of protecting a piratical banditti from a merited punishment, stained as they were by every species of crime.

The Carthaginians first succeeded in gaining possession of the Messenian citadel, but the Romans took prompt steps to prevent their rivals from becoming masters of Sicily. They had already made large strides toward the entire subjugation of that island.

The Romans sent an army under the command of Appius Claudius, which crossed the straits, and gained possession of Messena. This army was successful against the Syracusans and Carthaginians, until, finally, Hiero, the politic king of Syracuse, withdrew from his former allies, and entered into an early alliance with the Romans.

The Carthaginians had already large possessions in Sicily, and anticipated an early entire possession of the island. Finding themselves severely pressed in that quarter, they hired a vast number of mercenaries in Gaul,

Liguria and Spain. The city of Agrigentum was made their chief naval and military depot, where they stored their munitions of war. The Romans immediately laid siege to this city, and defeated an immense army that had been sent to its relief. The city was abandoned by its garrison, and, with all its stores, fell into the hands of the Romans.

As the Romans were never a commercial people, and their wars had hitherto been confined to the Italian peninsula, they had little knowledge of shipping, or of maritime affairs. They now began to perceive that they could accomplish but little while the Carthaginians continued to remain the sovereign at sea. A Carthaginian ship of war, which had been driven ashore in a storm, served them for a model. Italy was at that time well wooded, and, thus prepared with model and materials, they set at work creating a navy. Knowing that the vessels were clumsy and not easily manageable, and that the Carthaginians were very expert at manœuvering, the consul C. Duilius, invented, and had prepared for each Roman ship, a corvus, or boarding bridge, which held two or three men abreast, and which was thrown upon the hostile ship by means of a simple mechanism, and fastened the two together, taking hold of the ship upon which it was thrown with grappling irons.

With this contrivance, he hazarded an engagement with the Carthaginian fleet. As soon as the hostile ships approached within sufficient distance, the new machines were lowered on the enemy's decks, and, fighting hand to hand, no fewer than fifty galleys were carried by boarding. The naval tactics of the Carthaginians, in which they so much excelled, were rendered useless by this new mode of attack. The effect of it was to render a fight at sea little different from one on land. The Carthaginian admiral drew off the rest of his fleet. The Romans commemorated this their first naval victory by erecting a rostral column in the forum, which remains to the present time.

A second naval engagement occurred near the island of Lipari, in which the Carthaginians lost eighteen vessels. The success of the Romans for some years experienced little interruption. They took the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, and, in a naval engagement at Ecnomus, captured sixty of the enemy's vessels.

Emboldened by their success, the Romans now resolved to carry the war into Africa. Accordingly, they fitted out an armament of three hundred and thirty ships, entrusting them to the command of the consuls Regulus and Manlius. It was between this armament and the Carthaginian fleet, under the command of Hamilcar, that the great and decisive naval engagement took place near Ecnomus, which resulted so disastrously to the Carthaginians. The victorious fleet pursued its voyage, and Regulus, having effected a landing without loss, attacked and took by storm the city of Clypea. A Carthaginian army was sent to oppose his progress. He defeated the army and seized the city of Tunis. The Carthaginians sued for peace. The terms proposed by Regulus were of a most humiliating character. Pending the negotiations, the Carthaginians were induced to place their armies under the command of Xantippus, a Spartan general of high reputation, and who had arrived with a body of mercenary troops from Greece. It was reserved to him to change the entire fortune of the war. He raised new forces, disciplined the troops, and introduced the use of elephants in war, training one hundred of them for this campaign. With an army of 14,000 foot, 4,000 horse, and a number of elephants, he set out to meet Regulus, who commanded an army of 30,000 foot. A well organized battle was fought, in which the elephants and cavalry contributed mainly to give the victory to the Carthaginians, who cut to pieces or took prisoners the entire Roman army except about 2,000 who escaped to Clypea. Regulus himself was among the captives.

A Roman fleet of three hundred ships was dispatched to Africa to relieve the garrison of Clypea. This was met by the Carthaginian fleet near Cape Hermæum, where the

latter met a terrible defeat, 104 ships being destroyed and 30 taken with their crews. The victorious fleet then brought off the garrison at Clypea, but on its return was entirely destroyed, with all on board, by a terrible tempest. A second fleet of two hundred and twenty ships was completed in three months. After ravaging the coast of Africa, and when on their return, and in sight of Cape Palinurus, this fleet was overtaken by a fearful storm in which one hundred and fifty ships were wrecked, and all the booty they had brought from Africa was swallowed up by the waves. This induced the Romans, for a time, to abandon the sea to their enemies.

The Romans, undismayed by these disasters, prosecuted the war in Sicily with renewed vigor, where Metellus defeated Asdrubal, the Carthaginian general, in a signal engagement near Panormus. The Carthaginians strongly desired peace, and, as a means of accomplishing it, sent embassadors to Rome, with the captive Regulus, having first exacted from him an oath to return in case there should neither be peace nor an exchange of prisoners. At Rome he counseled against peace, knowing well the weakness of the Carthaginians, and even against an exchange of prisoners, for the reason the Romans then had some of the best Carthaginian officers their prisoners. His counsels prevailed, and, the mission being unsuccessful, he returned to Carthage in fulfillment of his oath.[1]

The war, in the meantime, continuing, Lilybæum, one of the strongest Carthaginian holds in Sicily, after a long siege of nearly ten years, was at length compelled to surrender.

In the year B. C. 242, the Roman senate decreed for the third time to build a fleet. They accordingly borrowed the money, and built and equipped a fleet of two hundred ships. The command was entrusted to Lutatius Catullus. At the same time strong reinforcements were sent to the army in Sicily. The Roman fleet encountered the Carthaginian near the Ægatus, where a decisive

[1] *Tytler*, I, 269, 270.

battle was fought, which resulted in the total defeat of the Carthaginians. Of the Carthaginian fleet, fifty vessels were sunk, and seventy taken. This defeat totally destroyed the power of the Carthaginians upon the sea. They never afterwards recovered their dominion over it.

The consequences of this told with dreadful effect upon the falling fortunes of Carthage. The last army upon which they could place any dependence was under the command of Hamilcar Barca, and was closely blockaded in a corner of Sicily, cut off from all communication with Africa, by the Roman cruisers. If he were compelled to surrender, Carthage must fall a prey to the victor, or to the barbarous tribes in its neighborhood. Under these circumstances, the Carthaginians most urgently sought peace; but the Romans would listen to no other terms than those which had been demanded by Regulus, when victorious, and in sight of their gates. It seems to have been a peculiarity in the Roman policy, never to relax in the terms of peace they had once proposed, relying upon their power to compel the nation to their adoption, if there was, at first, a reluctance. This peculiarity was manifested in the war with Pyrrhus, and now again with the Carthaginians. These terms were: 1. That the Carthaginians should evacuate all the islands of the Mediterranean. 2. Restore all the Roman prisoners without ransom. 3. Pay three thousand talents of silver (about £600,000), to defray the expenses of the war. Upon these terms, a peace was concluded, which brought to a close the first Punic war, after a continuance of twenty-three years.

After the close of the first Punic war, Rome enjoyed a brief period of tranquillity. The Romans had a custom of keeping the temple of Janus open in the time of war, and of shutting it in time of peace. It was closed at the end of this war for the second time since the foundation of the city. It had been closed previously, in the reign of Numa, but since that time it had remained open, a period of almost 500 years.

This temple, however, was not destined long to remain closed. The Romans next waged war against the Ligurians and the Gauls which had settled in northern Italy. A much more important war, however, was that provoked by the piracies of the Illyrians. The embassadors sent to remonstrate against these outrages, were procured to be murdered by Teuta, their queen.

The Romans established a navy in the Adriatic, and dispatched an army into Illyricum. The Illyrians were driven before it, and the queen, Teuta, was finally compelled to purchase peace by resigning the greater part of her territories. The war was subsequently renewed, and the Illyrians again overthrown with still greater disgrace and loss.

The peace between the Romans and Carthaginians continued but twenty-three years, long enough for the latter to recruit somewhat their wasted strength. The terms to which they had been compelled to submit were so humiliating, that their continuance longer than what was necessary could not reasonably be anticipated. Sicily was lost to Carthage, and to make amends for that, her attention was turned towards Spain, the subjugation of which she was rapidly effecting. Hannibal, the son of Hamilcar Barca, had laid seige to Saguntum, a Greek colony on the Iberus. The Roman embassadors remonstrated but in vain. The Carthaginian senate sustained Hannibal, and the second Punic war commenced.

Hannibal, having subjugated Spain, crossed the Pyrenees on his route to Italy. The next obstacle that presented were the Alps, which interposed but a feeble barrier. He crossed them with his army in fifteen days, and after a march of five months and an half, he fell down upon the plains of Italy, advanced through the country of the Taurini, and took their capital city (Turin) by storm.

The military strength of the Romans was at this time considerable, having six legions in the field amounting to 24,000 foot and 18,000 horse, and, besides, they had from the auxiliary states of Italy, an army of 48,000 men, and

their marine consisted of twenty-four ships of war. Hannibal, on leaving Carthage, had an army of 50,000 foot, and 20,000 horse, but on arriving in Italy there remained only 20,000 foot, and 6,000 horse.

The Roman consul, Scipio (the father of the two great Scipios, Africanus and Asiaticus) met Hannibal with an army, and a battle was fought on the banks of the Ticinus, which ended in the defeat of the Roman army, the consul himself being wounded, and the Gallic mercenaries deserting the standard of Rome, and flocking to that of Hannibal.

Soon afterward, through the impetuosity and rashness of Sempronius, the other consul, the Romans sustained another defeat near the river Trebia, in the neighborhood of Placentia. This victory secured to Hannibal the alliance of the Gauls in northern Italy.

The next year, B. C. 216, the consul Flaminius, with another consular army, marched in pursuit of Hannibal. He was impetuous and incautious, and, when near the lake Thraxymenus, fell into an ambuscade, and was slain with the greater part of his army. This terrible defeat and destruction caused an alarming panic at Rome, which resulted in the creation of Fabius Maximus dictator.

He adopted a new system of tactics, which consisted in his declining to take the hazard of a pitched battle, in moving his camp along the summit of the hills, in closely watching the motions of the invaders, harassing their march and intercepting their convoys. During all this time the Romans had armies in Spain under the Scipios, which gained many important advantages, thus holding the Carthaginians in check, and preventing them from sending succors to Hannibal.

Fabius Maximus resigned his authority at the close of the year, and in the year B. C. 215, the two consuls, Paullus Æmilius and Terentius Varro took the field with a large army, but with the unwise arrangement that they should each have the entire command on the alternate days. Varro, desiring to distinguish himself on his day

of command, managed to bring on a general engagement, although the Carthaginian army was admirably posted, and had every advantage both of disposition and situation. This was the celebrated battle of Cannæ, near the river Aufidas, in which the Romans suffered a much more dreadful and destructive defeat than they had ever before received at the hands of Hannibal. Forty thousand Romans were left dead on the field of battle, and amongst them the consul Æmilius, and almost the whole body of the Roman knights.

This was indeed a terrible blow to Rome. Hannibal acquired by it a secure position in southern Italy, and it has been thought by many that had he marched directly upon Rome that proud city would have been erased from the record of nations. But Hannibal undoubtedly best knew what he could undertake with success, and what he could not, and that he did not undertake it is the best evidence that there were sufficient reasons why he did not do it.

The Romans, however, did not despair. The young Scipio rallied around him the nobles of his own age. Fabius Maximus was again appointed to the command of the army, and again resumed the cautious policy which he had formerly practiced. A new army was created by all above the age of seventeen enrolling themselves, thus forming four legions and ten thousand horse. Eight thousand slaves voluntarily offered their services, and, with their master's consent, were embodied and armed.

While Rome was thus exhibiting her greatness in the midst of such terrible disasters, Hannibal was choosing for his winter quarters the luxurious city of Capua, the capital of Campania. Here his army became enervated. The luxury and licentiousness of that corrupting city accomplished a victory, which the Roman soldiers had been unable to achieve.

Hannibal concluded an alliance with Philip II, king of Macedon, but the Romans, through their intrigues in Greece, kept that monarch pretty much occupied.

The general policy pursued by Fabius Maximus in Italy, was to act on the defensive, to avoid general engagements, but to harass, weaken, and wear out the Carthaginians by a gradual exhaustion. He very well knew that an army at a distance from the source of its supplies, and in a hostile country, must act with unremitting vigor, or perish.

The successive defeats of the Romans had rendered doubtful the fidelity of their allies. In Sicily the Syracusans had broken their alliance with Rome, and gone over to the Carthaginians. Marcellus laid siege to the city, a siege which was rendered memorable in the annals of war by the mechanical inventions of Archimedes. By means of his machines, he rained on the Romans, while at a distance, showers of darts, stones and burning torches, and when their ships approached near he whirled them into the air by his cranes and grappling irons, dashing them in pieces by the fall. The siege continued for nearly three years, and was finally carried by surprise, and the kingdom of Syracuse, and the greater part of Sicily, was now reduced to the condition of a Roman province.

The Romans were also successful in Spain. The younger Scipio, afterwards Africanus, had succeeded his father as proconsul in that peninsula, and was fast accomplishing its complete reduction. The taking of Carthagena, New Carthage, was a fatal blow to the enemy. Besides being the most opulent of the foreign ports, it was the great magazine of military stores, having served as their depot for the conquest of Italy.

The great protraction of the war in Italy had weakened the forces of Hannibal, so that he required a fresh supply. He summoned his brother Asdrubal from Spain to join him in Italy with reinforcements. He accordingly crossed the Pyrenees and the Alps with a powerful army. Could he have effected a junction with his brother, their combined forces might have rendered a long continuance of the contest in Italy very doubtful. But the Romans took especial care to prevent such a junction. Hannibal was in southern Italy, and the consuls, Livius and Nero, hastened to

encounter Asdrubal at the north, as soon as he should emerge from the Alps. The latter was led by the treachery of his guides into a disadvantageous situation, where the Roman army came upon him by surprise, engaged and entirely defeated him. The first intelligence of the disaster that reached Hannibal, was when the head of his brother, slain in the battle, was thrown into his camp. This rendered darker and more doubtful the prospects of Hannibal, while it gave fresh vigor and courage to the Romans.

At length Scipio was chosen consul, and he prevailed upon the senate to allow him to carry the war into Africa, and he landed there with his army, in B. C. 202. He suddenly, and in the midst of negotiations with Syphax, king of Numidia and the ally of Carthage, surprised and burned his camp, and, attacking the Numidians in the midst of the confusion, he put 40,000 of them to the sword. He immediately laid siege to Utica, and when the Carthaginians raised and dispatched a large army to relieve the city, he routed it with great slaughter, pursuing the flying soldiers even to the walls of Carthage. Tunis opened its gates to the Romans, and the Carthaginian senate, having no other resource, recalled Hannibal from Italy. After being sixteen years in Italy, he was compelled to return for the defense of Carthage.

He first opened negotiations for a peace, which would have probably been concluded had it not been for the folly of the Carthaginians, who now supposed themselves invincible under the command of Hannibal. Negotiations were broken off, and the great battle of Zama fought, which decided the fate of the war. The Carthaginian army consisted of 50,000 men and 80 elephants, but the men were mostly new recruits. The force of Scipio consisted of but 24,000, but they were veteran soldiers, and he drew them up in columns, leaving between them large spaces for the escape of the elephants, the spaces to be immediately filled up by the cavalry so as to prevent their return. The victory finally perched upon the Roman standard. The

Carthaginians were defeated, leaving 20,000 dead upon the battle-field.

Hannibal himself barely escaped, and, on returning to Carthage, informed the senate that "Carthage had no resource but in peace." A peace was accordingly concluded on the humiliating terms: that the Carthaginians should abandon Spain and Sicily, together with all the islands lying between Italy and Africa; that they should make restitution of all prisoners and deserters, give up all their ships, except ten galleys, and all their elephants; restore Numidia to Massinissa; pay within fifty years ten thousand talents, and should undertake no war without the consent of the Romans. Thus ended the second Punic war, after a continuance of sixteen years. Scipio returned to Rome, where he was honored with the most splendid triumph, and was surnamed Africanus.

The conclusion of the second Punic war, in B. C. 201, rightly considered, constitutes an important era in Roman history. Rome had now enjoyed an historical existence of five centuries and an half. She had occupied that period of time in the subjugation of one people after another in Italy; and in her wars with Carthage. With the exception of driving from Italy the invader, Pyrrhus, she had warred with no foreign power but Carthage. The war between these two republics was, in fact, to test which should have the conquest and government of the world, for in the state of things which then existed, the successful one, under able commanders, would find no real difficulty in subjugating the world under its dominion. That contest was now decided. Carthage, although still nominally existing, was never afterwards an object of fear. She was shorn of her honors, deprived of her wealth, divested of her power, degraded, and rendered harmless. It is a remarkable fact, and one going to show the immense power and resources of Rome, that she could come out from such a contest fresh and vigorous, and ready to embark in new undertakings. She had now become familiarized with plunder, and got a taste for luxuries. Her pride and arro-

gance were unrestrained. War and conquest were fast becoming a necessity.

The world, or the civilized part of it, was then in a condition to admit of an easy subjugation. There was everywhere to be found only a worn-out civilization; an utter exhaustion of all vital forces. The kingdoms that composed it were the fragments of that colossal empire reared by Alexander. These had been contending with each other until their exhaustion was more or less complete. It was under this condition of things that Rome came forward as a candidate for universal empire.

An occasion first offered itself in the Grecian peninsula. The Athenians invoked the aid of the Romans against Philip II, king of Macedon. This aid was readily furnished. War was declared against Philip. An army was sent into Macedonia under the command of Quintius Flamininus. A decisive battle was fought at Cynoscephalæ, in which the Macedonians were totally routed, and compelled to submit to such terms of peace as the conquerers chose to dictate. Soon after this, at the Isthmian games, Flamininus proclaimed liberty to Greece, which, although but a solemn mockery, nevertheless excited the liveliest emotions in that sensitive and imaginative people.

The next war introduced the Romans into Asia. The most powerful fragment of the empire of Alexander was, at this time, the kingdom of Syria, which was under the rule of Antiochus. He had given an asylum to Hannibal, and by other acts had given displeasure to Rome. The Ætolians invited him into Europe, and, passing over into Greece, he made himself master of the island of Eubœa. War was instantly declared. The consul, Acilius Glabro, appeared in Greece with a powerful army. A great battle was fought near the straits of Thermopylæ, in which the Syrians and Ætolians were totally defeated. In the following year, B. C. 189, the conduct of the war was entrusted to Lucius Scipio, the brother of Africanus, who, together with his brother, having tranquilized Greece, passed into Asia. There was fought a general battle near the city of

Magnesia, in B. C. 189, in which Antiochus was entirely overthrown. It was from this that Lucius Scipio acquired the surname of Asiaticus.

Antiochus was now forced to purchase a peace, by resigning all his possessions in Europe, and those in Asia, north of Mount Taurus; paying a fine of fifteen thousand Eubœan talents (about three millions sterling); and promising to give up Hannibal. The latter fled for refuge to Prusius, king of Bithynia, where he finally put an end to his life by taking poison, which he always carried with him concealed in a ring.

On the return of the Scipios, as an instance showing the ingratitude of republics, an accusation was brought against them for having taken bribes of Antiochus, and embezzled the public money. Africanus refused to plead to it, preferring to go into voluntary exile at Literuum, where he died. Asiaticus was condemned, and on his refusal to pay the fine imposed, all his property was confiscated.

The next contest in which the Romans embarked was with Perseus, king of Macedon. He had succeeded his father, Philip II, having first by misrepresentation and falsehood procured the death of his brother Demetrius. One of his first acts was an alliance with several of the Grecian states to make war against the Romans. In B. C. 170, he entered Thessaly, took several important towns, defeated a Roman army on the river Peneus, and was joined by the greater part of the Epicots.

The senate entrusted the conduct of this war to Æmilius Paullus, whose father had fallen in the battle of Cannæ. While he advanced against Macedon, the prætor Ancius invaded Illyricum, the latter having formed, with the former, an alliance against the Romans. The whole of Illyricum was subdued in thirty days, leaving Perseus single handed to contend with the Romans. His fate was decided in a great battle near the walls of Pydna, in which being totally defeated, he fled to Samothrace, but was soon forced to surrender, and was reserved to grace the triumph of the conqueror. The triumph awarded to Æmi-

lius Paullus, was the most splendid ever before exhibited. Illyricum, Epirus, and Macedon were reduced to the condition of Roman provinces.

Rome next turned her ambitious eye towards Carthage, commencing by interfering on the occasion of a quarrel between the Carthaginians and Numidians, in which the former acted only on the defensive. The conduct of Rome in regard to this war was such as to deserve the execration of the civilized world. She first took advantage of the reduced state of Carthage, having suffered terribly in a war with the Numidians. As the Carthaginians, knowing their weakness, attempted to disarm their enemies by submission, she next promised to show them favor on condition that they should perform what the consuls required, and send to Rome three hundred hostages of high rank, as security for their performance of what should be required of them, which were sent accordingly. Then a consular army landed in Africa, and required that they should give up all their arms and the military stores contained in their magazines. They submitted even to this, thus rendering themselves utterly defenseless. The next demand of Rome was, that they should abandon their city, which the senate had devoted to utter demolition.

The Carthaginians now took courage from despair, barricaded the gates of their city, resolving to expend all their energies in its defense, and if necessary, to die amid its ruins.

Then follows the most vigorous and unremitted efforts. Temples and palaces were turned into work-houses for the fabrication of military engines. Men of every rank and station toiled night and day in the forges. Women surrendered up their ornaments of precious metal, and even cut off their long hair to form bow-strings and engines for the slingers.

The Romans found Carthage not quite so easy a conquest as they had anticipated. The war lingered during the first two years, the Romans suffering repeated disappointments. But Scipio Æmilianus, the adopted son of

Africanus, having been appointed to the command in B. C. 147, restored discipline among the soldiers, restrained licentiousness, corrected abuses, and pressed vigorously the siege of Carthage. At length the Romans made themselves masters of the great wall. The Romans then cut their way to the principal square of the city. After severe fighting, the whole city was taken, except the citadel and temple of Æsculapius. The citadel finally surrendered at discretion, and those in the temple of Æsculapius, setting it on fire, perished in the flames. Pillage, carnage and desolation ensued. The city was fired in several places; the conflagration lasted seventeen days. Thus were an entire people erased from the record of nations, and have never since reappeared. *Delenda est Carthago*, the watchword of the Roman Cato, was most fearfully and terribly realized.

The same year, B. C. 146, that witnessed the downfall of Carthage, was also signalized by the fall of Corinth, and the extinction of the liberties of Greece. The Achaians had taken up arms, and the war was terminated by the consul Mummius, who sacked and burned Corinth and Thebes, and reduced Greece into a Roman province under the name of Achaia.

For some years prior to the fall of Carthage, Corinth and Thebes, a war of conquest had been carrying on for the subjugation of Spain. That peninsula was then densely peopled, and studded with natural fortresses. The people were courageous, and not easily subdued. They were Celtiberians and Lusitanians, the latter ancestors of the present Portuguese. The Lusitanians, in B. C. 146, found a courageous leader in Viriathus, who, from a shepherd, became a hunter and a robber, and, finally, general-in-chief of his countrymen. He long maintained his ground successfully against the Romans, being enabled, from his great knowledge of the country and its inhabitants, to give them the greatest possible annoyance, whether successful or defeated. At length the Roman consul Cæpio procured his assassination, and the Lusitanians were subdued.

The subjugation of the Lusitanians was succeeded by an attack upon the Celtiberians, which has been termed the Numantine war, from Numantia, the principal city. This war was at first extremely disastrous to the Roman arms, until the Romans raised Scipio Æmilianus a second time to the consulship, assigning him Spain as his province. So badly had the war been conducted, and so dispirited were the Romans by their numerous defeats, that it required the entire consular year to restore the discipline of the soldiers. Afterwards, having received reinforcements from Africa, he laid siege to Numantia, closely investing it in every part. After a siege of six months, the Numantines destroyed their wives and children, set fire to their city, killed or burned themselves, and left to the Romans the naked walls of their city. This was B. C. 133. Henceforth Spain became a Roman province.

Nearly about the same time the kingdom of Pergamus in Asia came into the hands of the Romans. Attalus, its king, dying, bequeathed his dominions to the Roman republic. The senate took possession, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the legitimate heir.

Next followed the Jugurthine war, which, in its developments, disclosed the profligacy and corruption of the senate. Massinissa, the old Numidian king, and ally of the Romans, left his kingdom to Micipsa, who, at his death, left it to his two sons Adherbal and Hiempsal, and his adopted nephew Jugurtha. The latter soon found means to destroy Hiempsal; and Adherbal, dreading a similar fate, fled to Rome for protection. Jugurtha, by means of bribery, secured a reference to ten commissioners to be sent into Africa with plenary powers, and then having bribed these also, secured to himself the sovereignty of one-half of Numidia. He now declared war against Adherbal, and besieged him in the town of Cirta. The Romans again sent commissioners into Africa to put a stop to these proceedings, but these were not proof against bribery. Adherbal was obliged to capitulate and was slain by Jugurtha.

Even this would have failed to arouse the senate, but the Roman people had not been bribed, and they demanded that justice should be done to the usurper and murderer. His conduct having at length excited the utmost indignation of the Romans, Metellus, the consul, was sent against him at the head of a large army. He chose for his lieutenant the celebrated Marius, of mean birth, but of great military talents and personal intrepidity. He managed to supplant Metellus, and to be elected to the consulate, and thus to obtain the charge of prosecuting the war against Jugurtha. The perfidious Jugurtha was at length made the victim of perfidy, and Sylla, then quæstor to Marius, seduced Bocchus, king of Mauritania, the father-in-law of Jugurtha, from his alliance; and that prince, to purchase peace with the Romans, delivered up Jugurtha into their hands. He was brought to Rome in chains, graced a triumph, thrown into a dungeon and there starved to death.

But the Romans were now compelled to turn their attention to a more formidable foe. The northern nations of Europe were in motion. The barbarous hordes of the Cimbri and Teutones were ravaging transalpine Gaul, or Gaul beyond the Alps, and had defeated the Roman armies sent to check them. This horde numbered 300,000 men-at-arms, and were accompanied by their women, children and cattle. They fought in a dense and solid mass, the foremost ranks being chained together by their girdles. They overwhelmed the consul Papirius Carbo like a tempest, but instead of crossing the Rhætian Alps into Italy, they passed onward through the southern Gaul to the vicinity of the Pyrenees. They then began to overrun the Roman province in Gaul in separate large bodies. One large body poured down by the passes of Carinthia or the valley of Trent, to join another detachment on the banks of the Po. But here they met Marius, now raised to the consulship for the fourth time. In B. C. 100, he fought a decisive battle with the Teutones at Aquæ Lutæ, obtaining a complete victory, more than 100,000 of the invaders having been either slain or made prisoners. Another battle was

SALAR JUNG LIBRARY

fought with the Cimbri, which was alike successful. During the whole campaign 200,000 of the barbarians were slain, and 90,000 taken prisoners, among whom was Teutobocchus, one of their kings. Thus this formidable host melted entirely away.

The next war in which the Romans were engaged, was the Marsic, Social or Italic war. It arose out of contests between Rome and her Italian allies. These latter claimed that as they paid taxes to the state, and contributed soldiers to form the Roman legions in war, they ought to share also in the privileges of the republic. The principal states entered into a secret league, which soon extended from the Tiris eastward to the extremity of ancient Italy. The senate still refused to grant their demands, and a war was kindled in the bosom of Italy, which required all the energies of Rome, under the direction of their ablest generals, Marius Sylla, Pompey and Crassus, to carry on with any prospect of success. This war continued three years, with various success. About half a million of men are supposed to have perished in it, and it was at length terminated by a consent on the part of Rome to extend the privilege of citizenship to the inhabitants of such of the states as should lay down their arms and return to submission and allegiance.

Asia next became the theatre of war. The most formidable enemy Rome had for a long time encountered was found in the person of Mithridates, king of Pontus. He threw down the gauntlet to Rome by seizing Bithynia and Cappadocia, besides a large part of Greece; by capturing many of the ships belonging to the Romans by means of his fleet in the Ægean sea, and by causing a general massacre, in one day, of every Roman citizen in Asia Minor. There was here, therefore, on the part of Rome, no want of just cause of war.

Two appeared as competitors for the consulship, and the conducting of this war, Marius and Sylla, and here occurs the commencement of that series of intestine wars, which finally ended in the ruin of the republic. Sylla finally prevailed, and Marius was sent into banishment,

narrowly escaping with his life. He was proscribed and pursued, and taken in the marshes of Minturna, where he had sought concealment by plunging himself up to the chin in water. He effected his escape into Africa, where, being required by the Roman governor to depart, he said to the messenger, "Go and tell thy master that thou hast seen Marius sitting amidst the ruins of Carthage." He afterwards, in the absence of Sylla, gained the ascendancy at Rome, where he caused a dreadful slaughter of his enemies; but these intestine commotions will perhaps form a more appropriate part of the interior Roman history.

In the mean time, Sylla was prosecuting the war successfully against Mithridates. He took Athens by storm, slaughtering its citizens without mercy, defeated the armies of Mithridates, at the great battles of Chæronea and Orchomenos, and compelled the king of Pontus to conclude with him a humiliating peace. He then returned to Rome, defeated the army of the consuls Carbo and Norbanus consisting of 20,000 men, entered Rome in triumph, massacred in cold blood 6,000 men, proscribed and caused to be slaughtered without mercy all his opponents, filling Rome with consternation, desolation and mourning.

Another war, not strictly intestine, originated in the bosom of Rome, growing out of the revolting, barbarous custom of gladiatorial exhibitions. There was a school in Capua for the training of gladiators, with the design of rendering their performance in the arena more skillful and perfect. Spartacus, with about eighty companions, forced his way out of this school, resolving to make war on the republic rather than hazard his life in the arena for the brutal sport of the Roman populace. This dangerous insurgent achieved two victories, which so established his fame, that the slaves everywhere deserting their masters, flocked to his standard, and he soon found himself at the head of 10,000 men. He still continued to be successful. He defeated prætors and consuls that were sent against him, his forces rapidly increasing to 120,000 men. He even attempted to make himself master of Rome.

But the army of the insurgents lacked both union and discipline. A battle was fought with the prætor Crassus, in which Spartacus fell, and the rebels routed with terrible slaughter.

In the mean time, Mithridates was again assuming a warlike attitude in Asia. He was earnestly bent upon recovering those possessions in Asia, of which the Romans had deprived him. The Romans entrusted the conduct of the war to Lucullus, a very able general. He defeated Mithridates in two engagements, and recovered Bithynia. The latter was compelled to retreat into Armenia, whither he was followed by Lucullus, who defeated the combined forces of Mithridates and Tigranes, king of Armenia. But Lucullus becoming unpopular with his army, he was in a subsequent engagement defeated by the Pontic king.

At Rome, Crassus and Pompey were chosen consuls, and the latter was selected to manage the war against the Cilician pirates, to which the Manilian law added the government of Asia, and the entire management of the war against Mithridates.

Pompey prosecuted the war with great vigor against Mithridates, and very soon compelled his ally Tigranes, the king of Armenia, into terms of unconditional submission. In the next succeeding campaign he pushed Mithridates to extremity. One of the strongest fortresses of his kingdom was treacherously surrendered into the hands of the Roman general by one of his concubines. His fortunes at length becoming perfectly desperate, he had recourse to a voluntary death. Pontus and Syria were then reduced to the condition of Roman provinces, and the sway of Rome was undisputed over by far the greater part of western Asia.

The rising fortunes of Julius Cæsar now begin to claim attention. His first prominent appearance was in the Roman senate on the trial of the Catalinian conspirators. This conspiracy, headed by Cataline, had for its object the subversion of Rome, and the sacrifice of her principal citizens. Cicero was consul, and by his vigilance detected the

conspiracy. Cataline fled, but many of the conspirators were apprehended, and put to death by a decree of the senate. On this occasion Cæsar, almost alone, protested against such a decree as a violation of the Porcian law, which forbade the capital punishment of a Roman citizen. Cataline, after his escape, on hearing of the fate of his coconspirators, attempted to lead his forces into Gaul, but he was overtaken by a consular army, defeated and slain.

On the return of Pompey from Asia, Cæsar had the address to unite the former with himself and Crassus, thus forming what is commonly known as "the first triumvirate." This was B. C. 59. He now rose to power, but instead of remaining at Rome, and taking part in all the bloody scenes and intrigues of that dissolute city, he chose to have assigned to him the government of cisalpine and transalpine Gaul and Illyria for five years, with the command of four legions, then consisting of about 4,000 men each. He thus chose a kind of voluntary exile, totally excluding himself from enjoying the luxuries and pleasures of Rome, in which he had always largely indulged, subjecting himself to the hardships of the camp, and choosing for his theatre of action, a land of barbarians, which would require the highest order of military talents, the extremest degree of suffering, and the utmost continuity of effort, to sustain and extend the arms of Rome. Here he continued nearly eight years, carrying on both summer and winter campaigns; fighting at all seasons of the year; overcoming all the enemies of Rome; and, in his victorious career, subduing all the barbarous and warlike tribes between the Pyrenees and the German ocean. He even crossed the Rhine, gained several victories over the Germans, passed over into Britain, subduing all the southern part of that hitherto unknown island.

The achievements of Cæsar in Gaul not only acquired for him a high degree of reputation at Rome, but also enured himself and his legions to the toils and hardships of a soldier's life; accustomed them to rigid discipline; and rendered them certain of victory while under his command.

It was the campaigns in Gaul that gave to Cæsar the legions that afterwards enabled him to subjugate the world to himself.

In the mean time, while Cæsar was pursuing his victorious career in Gaul, the other two members of the triumvirate, Pompey and Crassus, being elected consuls, the former chose Spain, and Africa; the latter, Syria for his province, in the hope that out of its immense wealth his boundless avarice would be gratified. Pompey remained at Rome, and administered his government by lieutenants. Crassus repaired to Asia, where the Parthians were in arms against the republic. He marched against them, crossed the Euphrates, and, near Carrhæ, was defeated, with great loss, by Surena, the Parthian commander. He finally surrendered, and was put to death, and, as is said, his skull was filled with molten gold as a reproach for his avarice.

Thus the first triumvirate ended by the death of Crassus, and Julia, the daughter of Cæsar and the wife of Pompey, dying, the bond that had hitherto held these two together, became sundered. Pompey had procured for Cæsar a prolongation of his command and supplies for his troops, but he soon became envious of his exploits. It was soon evident that their differences could only be decided on the battle-field.

The contest commenced by Cæsar's demanding to hold the consulship while absent. He had secured in his interest Caius Curio, a powerful and popular tribune. He proposed that both Pompey and Cæsar should resign their offices, and retire to private life. This was not acceptable to Pompey. The senate were in his interest, and finally, B. C. 51, passed a decree requiring Cæsar to disband his army before a specified day, or be declared a public enemy.

The moment Cæsar received intelligence of this, his resolution was taken at once. He determined upon marching immediately into Italy, and of disconcerting Pompey by the rapidity of his movements. In this he perfectly

succeeded. The Rubicon was the boundary of his province on the south, and no sooner had the news of his passing it reached Rome than the utmost alarm and confusion prevailed. The party of Pompey, including the senate, abandoned the city, leaving behind them, in the precipitancy of their retreat, the public treasure. It required only sixty days for Cæsar to subdue all Italy. Pompey sailed for Greece, and both Sicily and Sardinia followed the fate of Italy, being subdued by Cæsar.

He returned to Rome, and possessed himself of the public treasure, after which he set out to attack Pompey's lieutenants in Spain. At Herda he encountered his enemies under the command of Afranius and Petreius, and compelled them to surrender at discretion. The reduction of the entire Spanish peninsula soon followed.

Afterwards, completing the reduction of Marseilles, he returned to Rome, where he was created dictator. Pompey, in the mean time, had collected together from the states of the east, an immense army, and was in Greece awaiting the coming of Cæsar. The latter transported his soldiers into western Greece, and, for some time, both generals appeared reluctant to hazard a general engagement. Both armies moved into Thessaly. That of Pompey amounted to 45,000 foot and 7,000 horse, which was more than double the forces of Cæsar. But they were troops hastily collected, and some of them inexperienced in war. On the other hand, Cæsar's soldiers had served in Gaul, were trained in war, and were men of tried valor. Both commanders had a right to expect success, for neither of them had ever been defeated.

The battle which was to decide the fate of the world was fought on the 30th July, B. C. 48, on the plains of Pharsalia in Thessaly. The forces of Pompey were completely routed, their camp stormed, and great numbers killed or taken prisoners. Pompey himself fled in disguise when the enemy began to storm his intrenchments. He made good his escape to Egypt, where he was treacherously murdered.

Cæsar soon after arrived in Egypt, where he first learned of the death of Pompey. He ordered his head, which had been preserved for presentation to him, to be interred with due honor, and caused a temple to be erected near his tomb, dedicated to Nemesis, the avenger.

His first business was to settle the affairs of Egypt, a dispute having arisen between Cleopatra and her brother Ptolemy. In this affair, Cæsar is represented to have been not so entirely impartial, as he was smitten with the charms of Cleopatra. He tarried long in Egypt, and, in a commotion excited in Alexandria, came very near losing his life, having but few forces with him. Some succors arriving from Syria enabled him to bring Egypt under subjection. The young Ptolemy was slain, and Cæsar bestowed the sovereignty jointly on Cleopatra and a younger brother, a child of only eleven years of age.

From Egypt he went to Pontus, where Pharnaces, the son of Mithridates, was in arms against the Romans, having seized upon the kingdom of Pontus. It was on this occasion, and to express the ease and celerity of his conquest, that he wrote that celebrated letter to Rome consisting of three words, *veni*, *vidi*, *vici*, I came, I saw, I conquered.

Thence he returned to Rome, but shortly after, he passed into Africa, where Cato and the sons of Pompey had raised the banner of the republic. Then followed the battle at Thapsus, in which Cæsar was entirely successful. He next advanced to Utica, which was garrisoned by Cato, who, not being supported by his followers, committed suicide.

Having concluded the African war in about five months, he returned to Rome, where an obedient senate decreed him a triumph, and created him dictator for ten years. He was distinguished by his acts of clemency towards those who had been the adherents of Pompey.

The two sons of Pompey had escaped to Spain, where they attempted to rekindle the war. Cæsar repaired thither in the spring of B. C. 44. The two armies met on the plains of Munda. Cæsar came near experiencing a

defeat. He had never been exposed to such danger, and his veterans began to give way. By leading to the charge his favorite tenth legion he restored the fortunes of the field, and acquired a decisive victory. One of the sons of Pompey was taken and slain. The other escaped to the mountains of Celtiberia.

On his return he was made consul for ten years; created perpetual dictator; his person was declared sacred; he was allowed to wear constantly a circlet of laurel; he was decreed the title of imperator; and invested for life with the power of chief commander of the whole armies of the state.

All enemies being now subdued, and having the reality of sovereign power, he planned vast schemes of public improvement. He proposed to collect, arrange, and methodize the Roman laws; to drain the Pontine marshes; to deepen the bed of the Tiber; to form a capacious harbor at Ostia; to have made a survey and geographical delineation of the whole Roman empire; to cut a canal through the isthmus of Corinth; to rebuild and repair several towns in Italy; and to revenge the defeat and death of Crassus on the Parthians.

In the midst, however, of these splendid schemes, he was cut off by assassination, in the senate house, on the 15th March, B. C. 44, where he fell pierced by twenty-three wounds, at the base of Pompey's statue. An effort was now made by Brutus and Cassius, the principal conspirators, to restore the republic, and liberty to the Romans. But all seemed struck with horror at the deed. The senate met and confirmed all the laws of Cæsar, but declared that his murderers should not be prosecuted. Mark Anthony, in a funeral oration, wrought up the popular mind into a state of fury, so that the conspirators, having first fled to the capitol for safety, finally abandoned Rome and sought a shelter in the provinces.

Anthony now sought to concentrate in himself the supreme power, but while taking effective steps for that purpose, Octavius Cæsar, the nephew and heir of Julius, arrived at Rome, and entirely disconcerted his operations.

The senate siding with Octavius, and finding their parties pretty nearly balanced, they came to an understanding with each other, and, uniting with them Lepidus, who then had the command of transalpine Gaul, they formed, what is called, the second triumvirate, in B. C. 43. This confederacy was cemented by the blood of the noblest citizens of Rome, each triumvir surrendering up to the other two his most valued friends. Among those who were doomed to form a part of this bloody sacrifice, was the celebrated Cicero, who was surrendered up by Octavius, and who subsequently fell under the hands of the assassin.

The triumvirs, having thus glutted themselves with the blood of their friends, turned their attention to Brutus and Cassius, the conspirators, who were then in Macedonia. Anthony and Octavius marched against them. The armies here were more numerous than any Roman armies that ever met to decide the fate of the world. Each party led into the field above 100,000 men. A great, or rather double battle, was fought at Philippi. Brutus, with the division he commanded, was successful, but pursuing his success, he separated himself from the main body. That was attacked by Anthony, and defeated. Cassius, ignorant of what had become of Brutus, destroyed himself. Brutus, returning, was forced by his troops, now flushed with success, into a general action, and was totally defeated. He terminated his life by falling upon his own sword.

The two triumvirs separated after the battle, Octavius proceeding to Italy, where he took the most effectual means to consolidate his power; and Anthony first to Greece, next Asia, and finally to Egypt, where he became entangled in the wiles of Cleopatra, and gave up all hopes of ambition to a life of pleasure.

Lucius, the brother, and Fulvia, the wife of Anthony, excited a war against Octavius in Italy, but the capture of Perusia, their stronghold, put an end to it in B. C. 41. Anthony was finally roused by the progress of Octavius, but his wife, Fulvia, having died, a reconciliation took place between the two triumvirs, which was sought to be

cemented by the marriage of Anthony with Octavia, the half-sister of Octavius.

But the peace was not of long continuance. Octavius deprived Lepidus of his power, sent him into retirement and possessed himself of his dominions. Anthony made a show of attacking the Parthians, but finally retired to Alexandria, and, having divorced Octavia, again surrendered himself up to Cleopatra.

Both parties now prepared for war. Anthony had the most numerous soldiers, but Octavius the better disciplined army. The fate of the world was now to be decided by a naval battle, the battle of Actium, which was fought on the 2d September, B. C. 31. In the midst of it, Cleopatra, with her Egyptian squadron of sixty sail, tacked about, and fled toward the Peloponnesus, and Anthony immediately fled after her. His fleet was dispersed, and his land forces, after waiting for some days to no purpose for his return, made their terms with the conqueror.

Anthony and Cleopatra returned to Egypt, where an appearance of war was for a short time kept up, but was finally ended by the death of Anthony by his own hand, and by that of Cleopatra, also, by her own means, she having caused herself to be destroyed by the bite of an asp. This was followed by the reduction of Egypt to the condition of a Roman province.

Octavius, on his return to Rome, was saluted by the name of Augustus, and had conceded to him the entire authority of the state by the senate. Thus the era of the Roman empire dates from January 1, B. C. 28.

This empire, which henceforth was in reality despotic, although for some time ruled under the forms of the republic, now extended in Europe to the ocean, the Rhine and the Danube; in Asia to the chain of Causasus, the river Euphrates, and the Syrian deserts; and in Africa to Ethiopia, and the sandy deserts. It included the fairest portions of the known world surrounding the Mediterranean sea, and embraced a population estimated at one hundred and twenty millions.

The reign of Augustus lasted forty-four years. The prætorian guards, afterwards so fatal to the empire, was an institution of his creation. The object was to protect his person, and to crush the first germs of rebellion. He, however, dispersed them through Italy, and while so dispersed, they knew not their own strength. It was not until they were collected together, and concentrated in Rome, that they commenced giving emperors to the Roman world.

The reign of Augustus was one of peace. The temple of Janus, always kept open during war, and closed in peace, and which had been continually open since the beginning of the second Punic war, a period of one hundred and eighty-eight years, was now shut, as a sign that Rome was at peace with all the world. It was during this period that the Saviour was born, a new dispensation commenced, a new chronology was introduced.

She who sat on the seven hills that lifted their heads on the banks of the Tiber, had now realized her dream of universal empire. All the nations and peoples, embraced within the civilized world, were subject to Rome; and Rome was subject to Cæsar Augustus. Her wars had been:

First. Wars for existence, when she struggled along through her numerous contests with the Latins, Sabines, Etruscans, and Samnites.

Second. Wars for conquest, when, after she had acquired a permanent foothold, and the problem of her continued existence was no longer doubtful, she carried on wars for the direct purpose of subjugating Italy, and then Carthage, and then the Spanish and Grecian peninsulas, including Macedonia.

Third. Wars for plunder; when having tasted of the luxuries and wealth of Carthage, and the booty acquired in Macedonia, she prosecuted wars against the rich kingdoms of Asia, laying her hand upon the kingdom of the Syrian princes, and the dominions of Mithridates, and finally upon the land of the Ptolemies in Africa.

Fourth. Wars of ambition and revenge among her own citizens, as those between Sylla and Marius, Cæsar and

Pompey, Octavius and Anthony, and Brutus and Cassius, and finally between Octavius and Anthony.

But all these were now ended. Her existence stood out in bold relief. It might be said to be the only national existence among civilized men that promised perpetuity.

There was no further occasion for wars of conquest. The whole civilized world was already subdued, and all beyond that must prove but a barren sceptre.

Again, the wars for plunder might justly be considered as at an end. The wealth of the world was now at her disposal. All its rich kingdoms and nations were numbered among her provinces.

There was apparently no further occasion for wars of ambition or revenge. The sway of Augustus was undisputed. The turbulence of faction had ceased, and a still, silent, undisturbed despotism had settled down upon the entire length and breadth of the Roman world.

What then is there in the outward relations of Rome further to record? Very little in which the student of civilization can take an interest. Here is a colossal empire, which had absorbed into itself all the civilizations of the old world. It stood upon the strength of an hundred battle fields, in which the prowess of the Roman soldier had remained undisputed, and the disciplined valor of the Roman legion had always eventually triumphed. The arch on which it rested had spanned seven and an half centuries of the world's history. Could the full current of national life have given vitality to every part of this vast empire; could its integrity have been preserved; could it have escaped corruption; could it have preserved its unity; could its legions on the frontiers have preserved their discipline and valor, the words *esto perpetua* might have been written upon this gigantic structure. But the flow of national life was feeble; the empire was made up of provinces, which had little in common with each other, and still less with the city of Rome itself; corruption was all-pervading; patriotism and love of country had ceased, and the courage and valor of the soldier could not endure forever.

During the space of nearly two hundred years, extending from the accession of Augustus to the death of Antoninus Pius, the Roman power might be said to continue stationary, and the empire to enjoy a state of political prosperity. No neighboring nation presented any object that could be a temptation to avarice, and hence no inducement to war existed unless for the acquisition of glory, or the repelling the inroads of barbarians.

The political system of the emperors was, in general, more pacific than had been that of the republic. The war of Vespasian and Titus against the Jews, and that of Trajan against the Parthians, were exceptions to this general system. But, with these exceptions, we meet with few scenes of carnage and devastation during that whole period.

There are, however, some circumstances which abate what might otherwise have been the felicity of this period. These were: 1. The personal vices of several of the emperors, as Nero, Vitellius and Domitian. 2. The existence of slavery. 3. The frequent persecutions of the Christians.

The most flourishing and pacific period of the imperial government ended with the reign of Antoninus. In that of his successor, Marcus Aurelius, the nations of Germanic race, the Quadi, Allemanni, Marcomanni, etc., who inhabited some parts of Austria, Bavaria, and other districts of Germany, on the north side of the Danube, began to pour their united forces into the empire, as did afterwards the Dacians, who inhabited Moldavia, and Transylvania, and most of that part of Hungary lying on the north side of the Danube. After these the Goths, having seated themselves in Dacia, crossed the Danube and made their first inroad into the empire during the reign of the emperor Decius. He was defeated and slain by them. In the reign of Gallienus they crossed the Euxine, plundered the city of Nicomedia, and all Asia Minor. They sailed down the Hellespont, took Athens and plundered Greece.

These barbarous hordes, although generally defeated, and sometimes with prodigious slaughter, incessantly renewed their depredations, until in the reign of Gallienus,

they invaded Italy, and actually advanced to Ravenna. The dissolution of the empire seemed actually to be threatened. Besides the pressure of the barbarians from without, many of the commanders of armies, and governors of provinces, raised the standard of revolt, thus rendering the empire itself a scene of anarchy and confusion. A dreadful famine, succeeded by a pestilence, also occurred, in which, for a considerable period, more than 5,000 persons died daily in the city of Rome.

Three emperors succeeded, originally Illyrian peasants, who restored Rome to her former power. These were Claudius, Aurelian and Probus, who immediately succeeded each other, with the exception of the short reign of the emperor Tacitus between the two latter. Under these warlike emperors, the barbarians were checked, internal revolts crushed, and disorders corrected, and under one of them, Aurelian, occurred the war with Zenobia, the queen of Palmyra, the fall of that city, and the end of her reign.

To Probus, after the short reign of Carus, succeeded Dioclesian, in A. D. 284, by birth a Dalmatian, and of mean extraction. He raised himself, by his merit, to the command of the army, and by means of that, to the empire. This is called "the era of Dioclesian," or "the era of the martyrs," on account of the persecutions he set on foot against the Christians.

Dioclesian divided the empire into four different governments, assigning to Galerius the Illyrian provinces; to Constantius, Gaul, Spain and Britain; to Maximian, Italy and Africa; and to himself Thrace, Egypt, and the Asiatic provinces. He associated with himself Maximian as his colleague, with the title of Augustus, while he bestowed on Galerius and Constantius the titles of Cæsars. Each of these was supreme in his own dominions, and yet during the reign of Dioclesian a perfectly good understanding prevailed among them.

By the vigor of Dioclesian's administration, and the abilities of his colleagues, the Roman arms regained for a while

their ancient splendor, and general good order pervaded the empire.

But all at once Diocletian, with his colleague Maximian, the former voluntarily, the latter rather reluctantly, surprised the world, by resigning the royal dignity, leaving the government in the hands of the two Cæsars, and returning to the condition of private citizens.

Constantius and Galerius now jointly governed the Roman empire, but the former soon after dying in Britain, his son, the celebrated Constantine, was proclaimed emperor in the city of York. A series of wars was now carried on between him and other claimants to the empire, which resulted in his complete triumph.

During the space of an hundred years, immediately preceding the reign of Constantine, the Roman empire, while it was the theatre of frequent revolutions, frequent scenes of anarchy and intestine commotions within, yet presented on every side a formidable and terrific front to its foreign enemies.

Constantine was the first Christian emperor. In the great battle fought between him and Licinius, near Adrianople, the former displayed the banner of the cross, the latter the ancient idolatrous standards of the empire. The struggle was fierce, but it ended in the total overthrow of Licinius.

Constantine showed his regard for the Christians in the issuing of two edicts; the one assigning them the temples of the gods, in places where they had not suitable churches; the other, giving them the preference in all appointments to civil and military offices.*

But Constantine and Rome had no sympathies with each other. Born, nurtured, and matured in a foreign clime, he came to Rome as a stranger. He found it full of pagan forms of worship. Its populace loaded him with insults and execrations for abandoning the religion of his forefathers. He was unfortunate in his domestic relations. At the instigation of the empress Fausta, he caused his eldest son, Crispus, to be put to death without a trial.

He afterwards discovered his error, and the deception practiced upon him, and put to death Fausta and her accomplices. These acts increased his unpopularity with the Romans, and were no doubt among the causes that led to his removal of the seat of empire. He fixed his eyes on Byzantium, and resolved upon making that the capital of his empire. Considerations of public policy no doubt had their share in the creation of this resolution. The sources of attack upon the empire lay far more in the east than in the west. In Persia was reigning the powerful dynasty of the Sassanides, who aspired to the establishment of the ancient empire of Cyrus. On the frontiers of the Danube, were pressing the Goths and Sarmatians. A residence in western Europe presented inconveniences to the meeting and repelling invasion from these sources. A metropolis on the confines of Europe and Asia was therefore strongly recommended, both from its central situation and the advantages for commerce which it offered.

The position of the new city, its advantageous situation, the numerous facilities it offered, its subsequent history, all went to demonstrate the wisdom of Constantine in establishing it as the metropolis of the empire. On one side of it lay the Euxine, which afforded an avenue through which could be received the productions of Asia, and on the other, the Ægean, which served, in like manner, to connect it with Europe. At the same time its shape, an irregular triangle, rendered it easily defensible against the savage tribes of Thrace.

Constantine introduced many important changes, which told with tremendous effect upon the future of the empire. These were principally, changes in the religion of the empire, and changes in the administration of its civil and military affairs. These belong to another connection.

Constantine, at his death, divided the empire between five princes, viz: three sons and two nephews. The latter were massacred by the soldiers. The three former, Constantine, Constans, and Constantius, made a new division of the empire; but a series of wars between them followed,

which continued for about twelve years, when Constantius, the youngest and most ambitious of them all, succeeded in possessing himself of the whole empire, securing the throne to himself by the murder of most of his relations.

He was succeeded by his cousin Julian, generally known as the Apostate, who was both a scholar and a soldier, who abjured the Christian religion, and endeavored to restore the worn-out forms of paganism. He lost his life in a war he was waging against the Persians.

After the short reign of Jovian succeeded Valentinian, a Pannonian, who associated with himself his brother Valens, the latter governing the eastern, the former the western empire, Constantinople being the metropolis of the former, and Rome that of the latter. Here occurs, A. D. 364, the division into the eastern and western empire.

Valens carried on a war with the Persians in the east, while Valentinian, in the west, was engaged in almost continual struggles with the German nations. His first efforts were directed against the Franks, the Saxons, and the Alemanni, who were pressing upon the banks of the Rhine, and afterwards against the Quadi and other nations on the Danube.

The eastern and western empire, although nominally under different sovereigns, continued, nevertheless, for some time to be substantially one. In the east Valens was unsuccessful. A new enemy had appeared in Europe, the Huns. These had driven before them the Goths, who fled beyond the Danube into the Roman empire for refuge. An asylum was afforded them by Valens, but some misunderstanding occurring, they took up arms, and defeated and slew Valens on the plains of Adrianople.

At this juncture, Gratian, who had succeeded Valentinian I, in the west, arrived at Constantinople. He associated with himself as his colleague, Theodosius, an able general, who, soon after, upon the death of Gratian, became the guardian of the young emperor Valentinian II, who for sometime ruled as emperor in the west. He at length,

fell a victim to the treason of one of his generals, Arbogastes, the defeat of whom, by Theodosius, rendered him sole emperor both of the eastern and western empire.

Theodosius, deservedly called the Great, procured the esteem and affection of his subjects by the wisdom of his laws, and inspired terror into the surrounding barbarians by the power of his arms. His character was worthy the best ages of the Roman state. His reign was signalized as the era of the downfall of the Pagan religion in the Roman empire, and the full establishment of Christianity.

Theodosius left two sons, between whom the empire was divided. These were Arcadius and Honorius. To the former, the eldest, was assigned the eastern empire, to the latter, the western. These two empires were never afterwards reunited under one ruler. These two princes were both minors, the first being seventeen, the latter ten years of age. Their guardians, or ministers were: for the first, Rufinus, the Gaul; for the second, Stilico, the Vandal. The intrigues of these men, especially the former, brought great misery upon the empire. The last was an accomplished general, and, during his life, did much to keep back the barbarians, who were every day growing more and more formidable to Rome. He succeeded in preserving Italy, by a victory which he gained over Alaric, king of the Visigoths, at Verona, in A. D. 403, and another over Radagaisus, in A. D. 405, who, with other German hordes, had advanced as far as Florence. But being accused of aspiring to the throne, he was cut off on the 23d Aug., A. D. 408. In him, Rome lost not only her ablest, but her only general. The same year Alaric invaded Italy, and laid siege to Rome. The latter purchased a peace, but the conditions not being fulfilled, he again laid siege to Rome, and took it, creating Attalus emperor, instead of Honorius, who had shut himself up in Ravenna. But in A. D. 410, he assumed the diadem, made himself master of the city by force, and gave it up to be plundered by his troops.

In the mean time the Alani, Suevi, and Vandals, taking advantage of these disorders in the western empire, passed the Pyrenean mountains, and desolated all Spain. Their ravages were dreadful, and the calamities inflicted were aggravated by a pestilence and famine. The Romans still kept possession of New Castile in Spain, and all the rest of the kingdom was in the possession of the Vandals.

Alaric having deceased was succeeded by his brother Adolphus, who made peace with the empire, received as his bride Placidia, the sister of Honorius, left Italy, went into Gaul, and from thence proceeded to Spain, where he founded the empire of the Visigoths. Thus, during the reign of Honorius, a great part of Spain, and a part of Gaul, were cut off from the Roman empire.

He was succeeded by his nephew Valentinian III, who was a minor, and for a long time was under the guardian care of his mother, Placidia, now a widow. Under this miserable reign the western empire was stripped of almost all her provinces with the exception of Italy. He was compelled to cede Africa to Genseric the king of the Vandals, in Spain. Western Illyricum, embracing Pannonia, Dalmatia and Noricum, were also ceded away. On the south-east of Gaul, in 435, was formed the kingdom of the Burgundians, which comprised Switzerland and Savoy, and also the south-east part of France, the south-west being under the dominion of the Visigoths. The territory north of the Loire still submitted to the Roman governors.

A new outbreak of the Huns now took place. These hordes now occupied the territory which had formerly been the seat of the Goths, between the Don and the Theiss, and extending even as far as the the Volga. In A. D. 444, they united under Attila, the most powerful prince of his time. The eastern empire purchased a peace by paying tribute, and he fell with his entire force upon the western provinces. With an army of 500,000 men he invaded Gaul. On the plains of Chalons he encountered the Roman and Visigoth forces under Ætius and Theodoric. The latter was slain. The superior military skill of the former en-

abled him finally to triumph, and the barbarian received an effectual check in that tremendous battle.

The succeeding year, having a secret understanding with Honoria, Valentinian's sister, he poured his forces into Italy. From some cause or other he was induced to withdraw, and death soon after relieved Italy of him who has been not inappropriately termed the "scourge of God."

The emperor, soon after, upon the strength of unjust suspicions, put to death the brave Ætius, one of the greatest of Roman generals. His own death, however, soon followed. He fell a victim to a conspiracy formed by Petronius Maximus, whose wife he had dishonored, and some of the friends of Ætius.

Between the assassination of Valentinian, and the final destruction of the Roman empire in the west, there intervenes a period of about twenty years, during which there occurs one continued series of intestine revolutions. No less than nine sovereigns reigned, each succeeding the other with great rapidity. Their names, and the chief events of their reigns are of little importance.

Genseric, the Vandal king, having by his naval power, become master of the Mediterranean and of Sicily, could ravage the coasts of defenseless Italy at pleasure, and even capture Rome itself. The Gothic nations also continued their progress. Euric, king of the Visigoths, had subdued nearly all Spain, as well as the southern part of Gaul.

The succession of emperors, or Augusti, was governed mainly by the German general, Ricimer, who, in the pay of Rome, had the command of the forces in Italy. After his death, Julius Nepos was appointed emperor by Leo, the eastern or Greek emperor. Having sent his general, Orestes, to oppose the forces of Euric, king of the Visigoths, the latter drove his sovereign from the throne, who fled into Dalmatia, where he was assassinated.

Orestes then gave the throne to his son Romulus, surnamed Augustus, or, more commonly Augustulus, who was the last of the western emperors.

In Pomerania, on the shores of the Baltic, were seated the Heruli, a people of the Gotho-German stock. It was reserved for this tribe, which Rome in the days of her glory had never heard of, to put the finishing stroke to the empire of the west. This tribe, moving into Pannonia, and then into Noricum, finally, in conjunction with other tribes, appeared in Italy, headed by the valiant Odoacer. Orestes attempted to defend Pavia, but it was taken, and he was beheaded. All the cities opened their gates at the approach of Odoacer. Romulus resigned sceptre, purple, and crown, and Odoacer proclaimed himself king of Italy.

Thus Rome began and ended with Romulus. Her dominion had continued 1,224 years. She had, however, long ceased to exist for any effective purpose. This was in the year A. D. 476.

The eastern, or as it has often been termed the Greek empire, still continued to exist. Although its situation was nearly similar to that of the western empire, and although the intestine broils within, and the attacks of barbarians from without, both on the side of Europe and Asia, would each have seemed sufficient to have destroyed it several times over, yet still it continued for nearly 1,000 years after the destruction of the western empire. This continuance, under these circumstances, has no equal in the history of the world. The purpose answered by it was undoubtedly an important one, viz: to preserve the seeds of the ancient civilization through the dark and troublous periods of the middle ages in European history, until the peoples of central and western Europe had so far emerged from barbarism, as to present a soil fitted for their germination; and then in 1453, Mahomet II, took the city of Constantine, extinguished there the lights of civilization, but threw those seeds over Europe, which, striking into Teutonic, Celtic, and Saxon soil, were to ensure a future, and far more abundant harvest.

CHAPTER II.

ROME—ITS INDUSTRY.

The principle of utility underlies the element of industry, furnishes the motive to its exertion, and gives its application a practical character. This principle will be found to have gained vastly in length, and breadth, and all substantial dimensions, in passing from the Grecian peninsula into that of the Italian.

The Greeks excelled the Romans in many of the higher styles of mental culture. In their philosophy there was a higher, finer, more etherial style of theorizing. Their models of art were more faultless in their proportions, more beautiful in their outline, more paragons of perfection. Their eloquence was more stirring, more impelling, more high wrought in its essential character. Their poetry partook more largely of the ideal. In their lighter literature the play of fancy was more predominant. The Greeks excelled in taste, and in those fine arts, in relation to which taste is especially required to be exercised.

The great currents of Roman civilization flowed in a different channel. The main directions they took were towards the securing the greatest amount of domestic, personal enjoyments, and the largest degree of true civil liberty. Hence it is that the industrial, social, and civil elements of Roman civilization, are worthy an attentive, a most thorough examination. It is fortunate that it happens to be confided to different nations and peoples to develop different elements in civilization, as by that means all the elements become, in the end, more fully and thoroughly developed.

Pastoral life must have prevailed in some parts of Italy. The oxen must have been remarkable, or it would not have been fabled that the whole peninsula derived its name

from *ïtalos*, a Greek word for that animal. There is, however, little evidence that the Romans ever followed, to any extent, a pure pastoral life.

Those industrial pursuits that appear to have been the most followed, cherished, and in return to have exerted the greatest influence on the Roman character, were those of agriculture and their kindred branches.

The early Romans were greatly devoted to agriculture. The senators commonly resided in the country, and were accustomed to cultivate the ground with their own hands. Some of the noblest families even derived their surnames from the successful cultivation of particular kinds of grain; such, for instance, as the Fabii, Pisones, Lentuli, etc. It was a matter of pride, and entitled to the highest praise, to be a good husbandman; and whoever neglected his ground, or was guilty of cultivating it improperly, subjected himself to the animadversions of the censors.

Any branch of industry acquires importance in the estimation of a people, from the fact that their great men are found devoting themselves to it. This was more especially the case with agriculture among the Romans. Some of their most renowned commanders were taken from the field to head their armies. Their consuls and dictators came directly from the plough. Manius Curius Dentatus, who had thrice received the honor of a triumph, cultivated his land with his own hands. The embassadors from the Samnites found him by his fireside, boiling roots. On offering him a great sum of money, they received for answer, "that gold was of very small value to one who could be satisfied with such a dinner; and that for his part he thought it more glorious to conquer those who had that gold, than to possess it himself."

Cincinatus, the dictator, in whose hands was vested absolute power over his fellow citizens, was called from the plough to save the city from the attacks of the Æqui; and, after compelling the enemy to pass disarmed under the yoke, after leading the vanquished general in triumph, after being presented with a golden crown by his rival,

abdicated his power at the end of sixteen days, and returned again to his humble occupation.

Valerius Flaccus, one of the most noble and most powerful persons of Rome, was accustomed in the morning to go to the small cities in the neighborhood, to plead and defend the causes of those who applied to him for that purpose. From thence he returned into the field, where, clad in mean clothing, appropriate to the occupation, he worked with his servants, afterwards sitting down with them at the same table, eating the same bread, and drinking the same wine. The pursuits of agriculture could not fail of being honorable when ennobled by such examples.

A valuable test to show the amount of attention given, as also the progress made, in any particular pursuit, is to notice the works that have been written in relation to it. On this subject we have to notice in the first place the work of the Carthaginian general, Mago, consisting of twenty-eight books which the Roman senate ordered translated into the Latin language, and one of the principal magistrates took upon himself the care of doing it.

Cato, the censor, renowned as a general, a statesman, an orator, and a philosopher, one of the most illustrious of the Romans, left a treatise upon this subject. Varro, the lieutenant of Pompey, and who was once honored with a naval crown, wrote largely *de re rustica*, displaying much erudition. The great Roman epic poet, Virgil, not only sung the pleasures of a pastoral life, in his Bucolics, but also gave sage precepts for the labors of the country, in his Georgics. No one can certainly suppose that in Greece the poetic muse could have busied herself with the subjects of ploughing or sowing, or the management of cattle.

Another able writer on agriculture was Columella who flourished in the time of Tiberius.

One important principle, in itself well calculated to make good husbandmen, was adopted in the outset, and that was, that each citizen should have no more ground than he could cultivate himself, and the quantity each was allowed to

have was small indeed. Romulus allotted to each only two acres, called hæredium. After the expulsion of the kings, and proclamation of the republic, seven acres were granted to each citizen, which continued for a long time to be the usual portion assigned them in the division of conquered lands. The farms cultivated by Cincinnatus, Dentatus, Fabricius, Regulus, etc., contained that number of acres. In, fact the farm of Cincinnatus, according to Columella and Pliny, contained only four acres. It was on these small farms that these great men, and others like them lived and labored. It was thus that the small quantity of land cultivated led naturally to the adoption of more effective and thorough systems of culture; to the opening up of new resources and the devising of new means and instrumentalities to render that small quantity more productive. It was in those happy times that, as Pliny, expresses it, "the earth glorious in seeing herself cultivated by the hands of triumphant victors, seemed to make new efforts, and to produce her fruits with greater abundance."

The Romans were attentive to every part of husbandry. They reckoned six different kinds of soils: the fat and lean, free and stiff, wet and dry. These were adapted to the production of different kinds of crops. The free soil, for instance, was most proper for vines, and the stiff for corn. Those soils, in general, were considered the best, which were found possessed of the following qualities, viz:

First. Were of a blackish color, glutinous when wet, and easily crumbled when dry.

Second. Having an agreeable smell, and a certain sweetness.

Third. That readily imbibes water, retains a proper quantity, and discharges a superfluity.

Fourth. That when ploughed exhales mists and flying smoke, not hurting the plough irons with salt rust.

Fifth. That where the ploughman is followed by rooks, crows, etc.

Sixth. That, which, when at rest, carries a thick grassy turf.

The Romans understood resorting to manures to improve the soil. They made use of various kinds, particularly dung, which they collected and prepared in dung-hills constructed in a particular manner. They were accustomed to sow pigeon's dung on the fields like seed, and then to mix it with the earth by weeding hooks, or other instruments. They mixed together earths of different qualities when dung was wanting. They understood the use of green manures, as well as dry, as they were accustomed to sow lupines, and afterwards plough them in, for the purpose of manure. They also burned on the ground, the stubble, shrubs, twigs and small branches, in order that the organic elements which they contained, should become fertilizers of the soil. They were also well acquainted with lime, but do not seem to have used it for manure.

They were also acquainted with methods of draining wet land for the purpose of tillage. For this purpose they made water furrows. Still more effectually, they constructed drains, both covered and open, according to the nature of the soil in which they were made.

The Romans made use of various instruments in tillage. The most important was the aratum, or plough, concerning the precise form of which, authors are not agreed. Its principal parts were, the beam, to which the jugum, or yoke, was fastened; the plough tail or handle, on the end of which was a cross-bar, which the ploughman took hold of, and by means of it directed the plough; the ploughshare; a crooked piece of wood, which went between the beam and the ploughshare, and to this were affixed two aures, as they were termed, supposed to have served in place of what we call mouldboards, or earthboards, by means of which the furrow is enlarged, and the earth thrown back. To these were added the coulter, much the same as our coulter, and the plough-staff, used for cleaning the ploughshare. They had ploughs of different kinds. Some with wheels, earthboards, and coulters; others without them. Wheels could have been of no use in a plough,

except in fat land having an even surface. In dry, rough, or stony ground, they could have been of no service. The common plough had neither coulter nor earthboards.

Besides the plough, they used the spade, chiefly in the garden and vineyard, but in early times also in corn-fields; the rake, the hoe, or weeding hook, also a kind of hoe or drag, with two hooked iron teeth, for breaking the clods, and drawing up the earth around the plants; a harrow; a plank with several teeth, drawn by oxen as a wain, to pull roots out of the earth; a mattock, or hand hoe, for cutting out weeds; an addice, or adze, with its edge athwart the handle; and an axe, with its edge parallel to the handle.

The Romans ploughed with oxen, most commonly with a single pair, sometimes with three in one yoke. While young, the oxen were trained to the plough with great care. They were usually yoked by the neck, sometimes by the horns. The same person managed the plough and drove the oxen, with a stick called a goad. The common length of a furrow made without turning was one hundred and twenty feet, which, squared and doubled in length, made a jugum or jugerum, which was used to express the quantity of land which a single yoke of oxen could plough in one day. The oxen were allowed to rest a little at each turning, and not at any other time.

The Roman ploughmen did not go round when they came to the end of the field as our ploughmen do, but returned in the same track. They made straight furrows, and of equal breath. The form of the Roman plough was such, that, when held upright, it only stirred the ground, without turning it aside.

To break and divide the soil, the furrows were made so narrow, that it could not be known where the plough had gone, especially when a field had been frequently ploughed. Several ploughings were given to stiff land. At least four or five, and sometimes to the number of nine.

The depth of a furrow in the first ploughing, was usually three-fourths of a foot, or nine inches. Fallow ground was

usually ploughed in the spring or autumn; dry and rich land in winter; and wet and stiff ground chiefly in summer.

The Roman husbandmen entertained the idea that the raising and carrying away a crop exhausted the soil on which it grew, hence they had a common practice of tilling their ground one year, and leaving it fallow the next, and thus alternating, so as to allow the soil a year to recover from its exhaustion by the crop.

The principal seed-time for wheat and barley with the Romans was from the autumnal equinox to the winter solstice, and in spring as soon as the weather would permit. They sowed either above furrow or under furrow, the most commonly in the latter way. The seed was generally sowed on a plain surface, and then ploughed, so that it rose in rows, and readily admitted the operation of hoeing. It was sometimes covered with rakes and harrows.

The Romans took great care to adapt the quantity and kind of seed to the nature of the soil. They had two methods of destroying the weeds. 1. By weeding, pulling the weeds with the hand, or cutting them with a hook. 2. By means of the hoe in hoeing.

The grain chiefly cultivated by the Romans was wheat of different kinds and called by different names. The term corn will often be found used in respect of grain cultivated by the Romans, and by the ancient world. This must not be understood as intended to mean maize, or Indian corn, the product of this country. It was a term covering the different varieties of grain.

Barley was cultivated by the Romans, but principally as the food of horses, although it was sometimes used for bread, and was given to soldiers by way of punishment, instead of wheat. So also oats were cultivated chiefly as food for horses, but sometimes also made into bread. Flax was cultivated chiefly for sails and cordage for ships, and also for wearing apparel. Various kinds of pulse, such as the bean, peas, lupine, lentil, etc., were cultivated by the Romans, serving principally as food for cattle, and sometimes for slaves.

The Romans exercised great care in the raising of hay, for the purpose of feeding to their cattle. Their meadows were carefully prepared for that purpose, by cleaning and dunging, and then sowing them with various grass seeds, defending them from cattle, and sometimes watering them. Their hay was cut and piled up in cocks, or small heaps, of a conical figure, then collected into large stacks, or placed under cover.

The ancient Romans had various kinds of fences. There was the wall, hedge, wooden fence, and ditch. The purpose for which they desired a fence was principally to enclose and thus protect their corn-fields, gardens, and orchards, but not their meadows and pasture grounds. They followed the custom so generally adopted in the old world, and which so naturally succeeded the pastoral state, of pasturing their cattle and sheep in the open fields, with persons to attend and watch them. The only enclosures, therefore, that we find mentioned for cattle, were folds for confining them in the night time, either in the open air, or under covering. They had parks for deer and other wild beasts.

Their grain was generally cut by a sickle, hook, or scythe. It was afterwards carried to the threshing floor, or barn, or to a covered place adjoining the threshing floor. This threshing floor was placed on high ground, near the house, was of a round figure, open on all sides to the wind and raised in the middle.

The grains of the corn were beaten out by the hoofs of cattle driven over it, or by the trampling of horses, or by flails, or by a machine, which was a kind of drag or sledge, a carriage without wheels.

The method adopted to winnow grain, or clean it from the chaff, was by a kind of shovel, which threw the corn across the wind, or by a sieve, which seems to have been used with or without wind.

The straw was made use of to litter cattle, to fodder and to cover houses. Oxen and sheep were reared by the Romans with great care; the former chiefly for ploughing,

and the latter for their fleeces, from which clothing was manufactured.

The Romans propagated trees and shrubs, much after the modern methods. These in regard to trees, were: 1. By suckers. 2. By sets; that is, by fixing in the ground branches, or pieces of the cleft wood. 3. By layers; that is, bending a branch, and fixing it in the earth, without disjoining it from the mother tree, whence new roots spring. 4. By slips or cuttings. 5. By grafting, or in-grafting; that is, inserting a scion, shoot or sprout, small branch or graft of one tree into the stock or branch of another. Of this latter there were several methods practiced.

There was what is called cleft grafting; performed by cleaving the head of a stock, and putting a scion from another tree into the cleft, and it was the received opinion as expressed by Virgil and Columella, that any scion may be grafted on any stock, whether it be that bearing fruit of the same kind or any other.

There was also practiced inoculation, or budding, which was performed by making a slit in the bark of one tree and inserting therein, the bud of another tree. Forest trees were propagated chiefly by seeds.

The cultivation of vines received great attention. They were planted in furrows or in ditches, disposed in rows, in the form of a square or quincunx, and were well trenched and cleaned. The vines were supported by reeds, or round stakes, or by pieces of cleft oak or olive, which served as props around which the tendrils could twine.

Vines were planted at different distances, according to the nature of the soil, usually at the distance of five feet, and sometimes of eight. Vineyards, like fields, were divided by cross-paths, the breadth of which was determined by law.

In the different operations of husbandry, the Romans paid great attention to the rising and the setting of the stars, and also to the winds. They observed only four

winds called venti cardinales, because they blew from the four cardinal points of the world.

The Romans were uncommonly fond of gardens, which, in early times, were chiefly stored with fruit trees and pot-herbs. But at subsequent periods more attention was devoted to the rearing of shady trees, aromatic plants, flowers and evergreens. They were also adorned with the most beautiful statues. They were especially careful to have them well watered, conveying the water for that purpose in pipes, if there was none in the ground. Adjoining the garden were beautiful walks, shaded with trees, and a place for exercise.

The law in relation to conquered land was, that all such territory became the property of the Roman state. The disposition made of it was as follows. One portion was used for the purpose of establishing colonies; another was restored to the original proprietors; and a third was left unoccupied, to be either parceled out among the Roman citizens,[1] or left as a precarious tenure to those who chose to cultivate it and pay a certain small rent for it to the state.

The simplicity and beauty of this element of industry, among the Romans, were limited to the early periods of their history; to periods when they cultivated their farms with their own hands. It was the great effort of Roman legislation, or of attemps at legislation, to preserve the principle which she adopted in the beginning, viz: to continue the division of the landed property into small farms, each being under the immediate superintendence of its owner, and to prevent the accumulation of that species of property in a few hands. This they sought to attain:

1. By their laws of succession. The object of these laws was to prevent the property of one family from passing into another.[2] To effect this, two orders of heirs were established, and only two, viz: the children and all the descendants that lived under the power of the father, called *sui hæredes*, and, in default of them, the nearest relations on

[1] *Schmitz*, 52, 53. [2] *Spirit of Laws*, II, 253.

the male side, called agnati. The relations on the female side called cognati could not succeed, as that would have carried the estate into another family. The law of the twelve tables allowed the agnati only to succeed. Children could not inherit from the mother, nor the mother from her children. The inheritance might descend indifferently to the male and female of the agnati, but though the female heiress should marry, yet the estate always returned into the family from whence it came. Hence the grandchildren by the son were entitled to succeed to the grandfather, but not the grandchildren by the daughter, as the agnati were preferred before the latter to prevent the estate from passing into another family. It will be seen, therefore, that among the primitive Romans, the law of the division of lands, and their continuation in the same family, was the great governing principle in the law of descent.

So firm and fixed was this principle, as evidenced by this law, that in the early periods of Roman history, no citizen was permitted to disturb it by directing the distribution of his property by will. At length, however, this power was given, and the citizen was permitted to dispose of his estate in an assembly of the people, rendering every will in some sort, an act of the legislative power. At length a certain definite number, five citizens, might be selected, who were to represent the body of the people, and in whose presence the will might be executed and declared. This power of making a will was, however, the introduction of a principle completely adverse to the policy adopted and hitherto maintained by the Romans, of preserving the landed estates in the same families, and of preventing their accumulation. This, therefore, was among the causes that drove the Romans to another resource to prevent this accumulation, viz:

2. By legislation. An attempt was made to limit the disposition by will, by the Voconian law, passed Anno Urbis 384,[1] which provided that no one should make

[1] *Adams*, 156.

a woman his heir, nor leave to any one by way of legacy, more than to his heir or heirs. This law was evaded and finally fell into disuse. Its manner of evasion was curious, as giving origin to the extensive doctrine of trusts. A citizen would give his estate to a friend, but coupling the gift or bequest with a request that he should give it to a daughter or other female relation. This he could not be compelled to do. It was with him simply a matter of conscience, a trust.

Other attempts by legislation to correct the evil of accumulating estates in one person or family are to be found in the passage of Agrarian laws. The most important of these, the Licinian law, was passed, Anno Urbis 277, through the instrumentality of C. Licinius Stolo, tribune of the people. This law ordained that no person should possess above five hundred acres of land, or keep more than an hundred head of great, or five hundred head of small cattle.

This law had fallen entirely into disuse, until it was attempted to be revived by T. Sempronius Gracchus, tribune, by what is termed the Sempronia lex prima, Anno Urbis 620. This law confirmed the Licinian law, and required all persons who held more land than that law allowed, immediately to surrender it up to be divided among the poorer citizens, and constituted three officers to take charge of the business, and see that the law was carried out.

The attempt to carry this, and one or two other laws kindred to it, into effect, resulted in tumult, disorder and riot, which led to the death of Tiberius Gracchus, and ultimately, also, of his brother Caius, and in fact, to the downfall of Roman freedom; for the stern old Roman virtue ended with the Gracchi.

Thus all legislation to the contrary proving useless, the necessary tendency of things led unavoidably to the accumulation of all the landed property in a few hands. One great feature in Roman civilization, and one which had a bearing upon all its elements, and more especially upon that of industry, was that in Rome, there was no middle

class. There was the rich and the poor; the former having at their disposal, the wealth of the world, and the latter inheriting and possessing nothing but the most abject, hopeless poverty. The relations existing between these, the warfare carried on, and their varied history, will come more appropriately into another element.

The effect of this large accumulation of landed property in a few hands, led to two results, both adverse to the element of industry.

The first was the employment of slaves in the cultivation of the land. The rich proprietors were removed beyond the necessities of labor, and they had the ability to own slaves as well as lands. The incessant wars in which the Romans were engaged, and the prisoners taken on the field, or in sacked cities, always furnished an unfailing supply in the slave market. Hence the good old times, when Roman senators were found cultivating their own farms, passed away, and with them the homely, hardy virtues of that era. In the place of the free cultivator and owner, was found the slave, and wherever slave labor is employed, free labor will always cease. The two can never coexist together. Hence the one here supplanted the other. One consequence of this was, that a proportion of the Roman population lived in idleness. They, therefore, readily fell into all the vices incident to that state; and hence the corruption, depravity, cruelty, and utter abandonment of all principle that were too frequently to be found among the Roman people.

Another, and second result, was made to tell strongly upon the element of industry itself. The uses to which the lands were put, became changed. The slaves employed, proved unproductive farmers. The consequence was, that tillage, which had constituted the crowning virtue of Roman agriculture, nearly ceased. The immense estates possessed by the wealthy Romans, instead of being made productive by judicious systems of tillage,[1] were, for

[1] *Schmitz*, 457.

the most part, made use of as pastures, on which large flocks were kept by gangs of slaves. Thus a retrograde step was taken, and industry fell back from the agricultural state to the pastoral, instead of advancing from the latter to the former.

Another practice occasionally resorted to by the Romans, was the establishment of military colonies. Thus portions of the lands of Italy were parceled out among soldiers, who were put into the possession of them in the place of the industrious peasants who had been their former occupants. These were reckless in their character, of idle and dissolute habits, ill qualified for agricultural pursuits, having no knowledge of agriculture, and no inclination to obtain it.

Towards the latter period of the republic, instead of the small farms, well cultivated, and smiling in rustic simplicity, with which Italy was adorned, we find numerous villas established in which the wealthy, and now voluptuous Romans resided during certain portions of the year. Around these lay their parks and pleasure grounds, baths, ponds, and groves, which altogether often equaled large towns in extent. Other large portions were occupied as pasture land.

The result of all this was, that Roman agriculture no longer supplied Rome with food. Little or no dependence was placed upon the fields of Italy for agricultural produce. The countries that anciently abounded the most in wheat and most other kinds of grain crops were Thrace, Sardinia, Sicily, Egypt, and Africa. Cato, the censor, used to call Sicily the magazine and nursing mother of the Roman people. It was from thence that, at one period, Rome brought almost all her corn, both for the use of the city, and the subsistence of her armies. The island of Sardinia also supplied the Romans with abundance of corn.

Egypt was, in ancient times, the great granary of the world. Its fertility, owing to the overflowing of the Nile, knew no bounds. The bed and canals and mouths of that

all beneficent river had become, through the inattention of the kings of Egypt, much clogged up and filled with mud. Augustus, on reducing Egypt to a Roman province, caused those obstructions to be removed, and opened the mouths of the Nile to the facilities of commerce. The consequence was, large importations every year, amounting to about twenty millions of bushels of wheat. Without this supply, the capital of the world was in danger of perishing by famine. At one period, during the reign of Augustus, there remained only three days provision of corn in the city. That prince was almost reduced to despair, and had resolved to poison himself if the expected fleets did not arrive before the expiration of that time. They came, and thus Rome was saved from all the horrors of famine.

After the destruction of Carthage, Africa was one of the great storehouses of the Romans. The whole coast of Africa abounded greatly in the production of corn. This furnished one of the great resources of Carthage, and constituted one of the elements of her wealth. In the war against Philip II of Macedon, Carthage supplied the Romans with a million of bushels of corn, and five hundred thousand of barley. Massinissa, king of Numidia, gave them also as much.

To guard against accidents and contingencies and the occurrence of famine, the practice was resorted to of storing up grain in granaries. When the emperor Septimus Severus died, there was corn in the public magazines for seven years, on the supposition that there were expended daily seventy-five thousands bushels, that is bread for six hundred thousand men.

These immense supplies of grain were distributed among the Roman people either gratis, or at a price that was little more than nominal. Thus, after the spirit of agriculture had died out in Italy, there was little productive industry among the Romans. On the one hand, stood the wealthy, who commanded the resources of the provinces, and who had really the wealth of the world at their disposal; on the other, the poor, who lived in comparative

idleness, relying upon the distributions of food that were made for their support.

The Romans were never a manufacturing people. Their genius little inclined them in that direction. As before remarked, there was no middle class among whom manufacturers are generally to be found. To show the little encouragement given at Rome for manufacturing it may be mentioned that glass was made there during the reign of Tiberius, and that he had the artist put to death for having rendered it flexible. Glass was, however, made at Rome, and wine bottles and drinking vessels were manufactured of it in the time of Martial. There was a company of manufacturers, who had a quarter in the town allotted to them, near the Capena, the great gate of triumph, and who were so wealthy in the reign of Alexander Severus, that he laid a tax on them. Plates of glass were used in rooms, but there is no certainty that windows were made before the end of the third century. The glass made at Rome was very much inferior to the modern composition, and was applied to but few of the purposes for which it is now used.

The earlier Romans used every method to encourage domestic industry in women. Spinning and weaving constituted their chief employment. The principal manufacture was of wool. They also manufactured linen, but it was not much worn. The wool was dressed, picked, combed and carded, then spun with a distaff and spindle, winding or forming the thread into clues, and afterwards dyed or colored. It seems to have been sometimes put up in round balls before it was spun. The weaving was done in a loom much resembling the hand loom in use at the present time. When figures were to be woven on cloth, several threads of the warp of different colors, were alternately raised and depressed; and, in like manner, the woof was inserted.

The Romans were altogether too military in their character to have much regard for the peaceful pursuits of commerce. But there was probably, from a very early

period, a commercial element in Rome, although it failed to secure for itself much respect or regard. The Etruscans were early attracted to Rome as traders, and a Tuscan street was to be found in Rome soon after its foundation,[1] in which were located the shops of Etruscan merchants. It was from the traffic of these that so many of the Etruscan fashions, forms of dress, etc., came to have their early introduction into Rome. The city and port of Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, was built by Ancus Martius about B. C. 640. Prior to this, Roman commerce had no maritime facilities. Subsequently it had, and a commercial intercourse seems to have been carried on to a considerable extent with the Etruscans and southern Italians, with whom that intercourse was kept up even in war, during those months in which there was a cessation of hostilities.[2] It is also obvious from the treaty made with Carthage during the first year of the republic, that the Romans did not altogether neglect the affairs of commerce. But they were never a commercial people. There was nothing that called upon them to be such. The products of their agricultural industry were all necessary for their home consumption. They were not a manufacturing people, and hence did not create products for exportation. The wars in which they were so incessantly engaged, were pouring into Rome such streams of plunder as to enable the Romans to realize from that source, what other nations much more legitimately derived from commerce. Their employments were all of a different character. In the city these related to war, politics, elections, factions, law-suits; in the country to agriculture; while in the provinces, a severe and tyrannical government, was incompatible with commerce.

Many of the principles of their law were averse to commerce. "The people," says Pomponius the Civilian, "with whom we have neither friendship, nor hospitality, nor alliance, are not our enemies;[3] however, if anything belonging to us falls into their hands, they are the proprie-

[1] *Regal Rome*, 42, 43. [2] *Schmitz*, 212. [3] *Spirit of Laws*, II, 64.

tors of it; freemen become their slaves; and they are upon the same terms with respect to us." Where such a principle prevails, there must be a very restricted commercial intercourse, if any at all.

So a law of Constantine confounds women who retail merchandises, with slaves, with the mistresses of taverns, with actresses, and with the daughters of those who keep public stews, or had been condemned to fight in the amphitheatre.[1] And this had its origin among the ancient institutions of the Romans.

The general policy of the Romans, was to avoid all communication with those nations whom they had not subdued. They feared lest they should carry among them the art of conquering. They even made laws to hinder all commerce with barbarians. "Let nobody," said Valens and Gratian, "send wine, oil, or other liquors, to the barbarians, though it be only for them to taste.[2] Let no one carry gold to them," adds Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius; "rather, if they have any, let our subjects deprive them of it by stratagem." So the exportation of iron was prohibited on pain of death.

Domitian ordered the vines in Gaul to be pulled up, lest their wines should draw thither the barbarians.

The Romans, in fact, destroyed the commerce of the ancient world. That commerce centered in Carthage, and Rome attacked that, not as a commercial city, but as a rival. She might have succeeded to the immense commercial industry of that republic; but hers was a mission of conquest, not of the peaceful pursuits of traffic.

An obstacle to the early commerce of Rome was to be found in the fact, that Italy has few or no mines of gold or silver, and in early periods there was little gold or silver in Italy. The precious metals are necessary to the prosecution of a very extensive or a very varied commerce.

For quite a long period of time, the Romans made use of copper money only, but it was not until after the peace

[1] *Spirit of Laws*, II, 64. [2] *Idem*, 65.

with Pyrrhus that they had silver enough to coin money.[1] At that time the proportion of silver to that of copper was one to nine hundred and sixty. Afterwards when the Romans became masters of Sicily and Sardinia, and especially when they began to know Spain, the quantity of silver greatly increased at Rome.

The Romans resorted to the practice of tampering with their currency, a practice that has had imitators in modern Europe, particularly in France. They commenced this in the time of the republic, and the process then was by diminishing it. In the second Punic war, Rome found herself unable to pay her debts. The Roman coin called the *as*, weighed two ounces of copper, and the denarius, valued at ten ases, weighed twenty ounces of copper.[2] The republic made the as of one ounce of copper, instead of two. Thus she was enabled to pay the value of a denarius with ten ounces of copper instead of twenty, and in this manner to pay off her debts with half the money it should have taken for that purpose. In order, however, to affect, as little as possible, the citizens in respect of each other, it was ordained that the denarius, which hitherto contained but ten ases, should contain sixteen. By this means the price of merchandise was increased only a fifth, the real change of money being only a fifth.

The republic, in this, acted openly. There was no deception. But the emperors took a different course. They proceeded by way of alloy. Reduced by their luxuries, extravagance and liberalities, to the necessity of degrading the specie, they took the indirect method, by which they diminished the evil, without seeming to touch it. While they actually withheld a part of the debt or gift, they concealed the hand that did it. This was first began by Didius Julian. The coin of Caracalla had an alloy of more than half; that of Alexander Severus of two-thirds.[3] The practice of debasing continued to increase, until under Gallienus, nothing was to be seen but copper silvered over.

[1] *Spirit of Laws*, II, 112. [2] *Idem*, 111. [3] *Idem*, 114.

Although, as formerly mentioned, the Romans had no commerce with those termed barbarians, that is the nations occupying the most part of Europe,[1] yet they did ultimately have a foreign commerce with Arabia Felix and with the Indies. The Arabians had immense sources of wealth in their seas and forests, and as they sold much and purchased little, they naturally drew to themselves the gold and silver of the Romans. This branch of commerce did not open until the time of Augustus. The Arabians were then a trading people, and situated as they were, neighbors both to the Parthians and the Romans, they acted as auxiliaries to both.

The commerce of the Romans to the Indies was very considerable. This commerce was carried on entirely with bullion.[2] Four hundred thousand pounds was annually sent thither.

Prior to the time of Pompey, pirates had, at different times, infested the seas, proving dangerous and destructive to commerce. He succeeded in clearing the seas very thoroughly, so that under the empire, which shortly succeeded, very little trouble was experienced from them.

Again the long peace of the Roman world, under the empire, except the contests with barbarians, very much favored the commerce of Rome with the east. . The Romans had acquired a taste for eastern luxuries, and the immense sums of money they drew from their conquered provinces, enabled them to indulge themselves to the fullest extent. Hence the extensive commerce with the east, Arabia and the Indies, which continued to follow the taste of the Romans, as it varied from necessary to luxurious industry, until the removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople, when Rome ceased to be the capital of the commercial, as of the martial world.

[1] *Spirit of Laws*, II, 66. [2] *Chenevix*, II, 39.

CHAPTER III.

ROME—ITS RELIGION.

In considering the religion of the Romans, we shall, of course, confine ourselves to that element as it formed a component part of Roman civilization, not as it has existed in Rome since the Christian era. It is the religion of Numa and the republic, not that of the pope and his cardinals.

We approach the consideration of this element in Rome with a less weight of responsibility than was experienced while on the same subject in Greece. Religion there constituted such a central element; so reflected the Grecian character; was so modified by the Grecian philosophy; and so embalmed by Grecian art, as to render the precise truth in relation to it of the most desirable attainment. It was, besides, to a great extent, the creation of the Grecian mind, and hence gathered round it an interest strongly commending it for thorough investigation.

In Rome, we shall find this element wanting in several of these important particulars. Besides, there is much that is common to the religion both of the Greeks and Romans, and this having been once considered, it will be unnecessary to repeat.

Religion, as one of the elements of Roman civilization will be best treated under

I. Its sources.
II. Its deities.
III. Its ministers.
IV. Its worship.
V. Its influence.

I. The sources of the Roman religion. These sources were principally three in number, viz: Etruscan, Sabine, Grecian.

The Etruscans had an elaborate and complicated religious system and mythology. Their proximity to Rome, as well as the commanding influence which their superior civilization must necessarily exert over her then infant institutions, favors the presumption that she must have been indebted to them, in part, for her religion. Rome itself was laid out, by Romulus, with all the solemnity of Etruscan rites. The first Tarquin has generally been looked upon as an Etruscan, and he introduced into Rome many of the forms, rites and observances of that people. Many of these were civil, and some religious.

The Etruscans had strong religious peculiarities, and it seems to have been the business of that class of men, called haruspices, to instruct in their religious observances.[1] The term, however, appears evidently to be of Hellenic or Greek origin. Both the Hellenic religion and art sensibly modified those of southern Etruria.

These haruspices we shall find among the ministers of religion at Rome. They were at first selected from the Etruscans. In the performance of their offices, however, that is in inspecting the entrails of beasts offered for sacrifice, they proceeded much according to the Greek fashion. In divining the omens gathered from lightning, they proceeded according to Etruscan rules.[2]

The practice of augury, as a peculiar mode of gaining access to the divine will, existed among the Etruscans. But it was by no means confined to them. It is also found among the ancient Sabines and Latins, and other Italian nations. It should not, perhaps, so much excite our wonder, that a people, in the early periods of their history, anxious to gather from every source some evidence of the divine will, should look to the circumstance of the flight of birds while in their state of freedom as affording some indication of it. It only becomes supremely ridiculous, when, as in later times in Rome, the eagle and the vulture became supplanted by the common domestic fowl; and the

[1] *Regal Rome*, 218. [2] *Idem*, 135.

solitary poulterer, watching his hencoop, reports how many morsels fall on the pavement from the mouths of his chickens. The augury of barbarous days was the fruit of natural feeling, that of later of the merest supposition.

The workings of this were to be found in the very origin, and much of the early history of Rome. Accordingly it is fabled that when Romulus and Remus disagreed as to the site to be selected for their new city, the former desiring to build on the Palatine and the latter on the Aventine hill, they referred the settlement of the controversy to the divine will, and Romulus planting himself on the former, and Remus on the latter, they carefully scanned the heavens, referring it to the will of the gods, to be manifested by augury, not only on which site the city should be built,[1] but which should be king and whose name it should bear. Remus, it is added, had the first augury, seeing six vultures flying from north to south. Shortly after, Romulus saw twelve flying past him. This led to controversy between the two, Remus having the right, but Romulus having seen the double number. It was finally decided in favor of Romulus. These two hills were about four miles apart, and it did not then probably occur to the twin brothers, that there might be a city erected, which, in time, should cover both, and thus demonstrate the truth of both their auguries.

From the Sabines the Romans derived a much more important element in the composition of their religion, and an element, too, in which the Greeks were in a great measure wanting.

The Sabines were a religious nation. They had a positive morality, which was sharply defined, and strongly influential in their outward conduct. They were capable of furnishing men who knew how to die for duty, a thing extremely uncommon under the pagan systems of the old world.[2] They were enabled to do this because they saw duty as the enforcement of God. They possessed

[1] *Schmitz*, 19, 20. [2] *Regal Rome*, 62.

great power of self-devotion, high dignity and self-respect, and a generally pervading sternness.

On its purely religious side, the Sabine character was simple and pleasing, but its morality had in it a strong dash of unreasoning superstition. It treated all foreigners, more or less, as enemies, and as a natural prey; but, in this respect, it differed not from other ancient systems of religion and morals.

The Sabine religion and morality embraced within them this erroneous principle: that they ranked obedience higher than truth. The necessary result of this was, that in time, religion degenerated into a set of punctilious observances, to the utter neglect of great and important moralities.

This may account for some of the unfavorable exhibitions of later Rome. The principle still continued to prevail, and mere form and observance too often took the place of reality.

Thus we find the Sabine religion possessing, to some extent, the elements of faith and trust; elements which were greatly wanting in the pagan superstitions of the old world. It will be perceived from this, that the Roman character, in regard to all the essential elements of its greatness, derived much, very much, from the spirit of Sabine religion.

The positive institutions of religion in Rome are referred to the age of Numa. He was a Sabine, and is said to have declined the distinctions of royalty until the sanction of heaven was first obtained. Accordingly, taking with him the priest and augurs, he ascended to the Capitol, then the Tarpeian rock.[1] There, the chief of the augurs covered his head, and turned his face towards the south. Then standing behind him, and laying his right hand upon his head, he offered up his devotions, and looked around in the hope of seeing birds, or some other signal of the gods. An unbroken silence reigned among the people, who were anxiously held in suspense. At length, the auspicious birds appeared, and passed on the right hand.

[1] *M. A. Dwight*, 384.

Then Numa, taking the royal robe, descended from the mount, and the people received him with acclamations, as the most pious of men, and beloved of the gods.

To Numa is ascribed the organization of the Roman hierarchy, or the different colleges of priests, and the important religious affairs of the state. He instituted the flamines, or priests of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, to minister in the temples of these divinities. He originated the institution of the vestal virgins, the twelve Salii of Mars Gradivus, who worshiped the god with songs and dances in armor; and also the pontiffs, to whose keeping were entrusted the written instruction about sacred rites, sacrifices, temples, etc., and under whose superintendence was placed all things relating to the religious affairs of the state, and who were vested with the power of chastising any violation of the laws of religion.

It is also said that the augurs were instituted by him, and that he had himself learnt the incantation, or charm, by which he was enabled to compel Jupiter to make known his will by lightning, or the flight of birds. He also built numerous temples and altars to the gods, and, among others, the temple of Janus.

The existence of Numa, as a historical person, has been considerably doubted. However that may be, no one will claim that the religious institutions of Rome are to be referred to his creation. No one man could have created and organized the religion of the Romans. All that a king, to whom the legends assign the name of Numa, could be supposed to do, would be to regulate the elements he found already existing, to educe order out of the previous confusion, and to reduce the outward religious forms and observances to a system.

In the doing of this, however, it is obvious that he must have taken the religious ideas, notions, and observances as he then found them. These must have been gathered up principally, if not wholly, from Rome and the surrounding nations, the Sabines, Etruscans and Latins. The institutions of Numa must, therefore, have been the embodiment

of the early ideas and modes of worship of those nations. As confirmatory of this may be stated the fact, that for a period of one hundred and seventy years, the Romans are said to have worshiped their gods without any images; and that it was not until the time of the elder Tarquin, that statues of Juno and Minerva were erected. He had been initiated into the Samothracian mysteries, and from this period dates the departure from the elder forms of worship, or rather the elder deities worshiped. The earlier objects of worship were, like those of Epypt and the east, principally the powers and manifestations of nature. Hence the earlier religious system of the Romans was, in fact, a theology, rather than a mythology, such as existed among the Greeks.

It was, however, from the Grecians that the Romans ultimately derived most of their deities. The Grecian and Roman mythology are essentially the same, although differing from each other in some of their minor details. The mixture, however, of the religion and mythology of Greece with that of the Romans; or rather, the substitution of that mythology in the place of the Roman theology, was a gradual process.

The Romans were always extremely tolerant in regard to all foreign religions. I am aware that the later emperors lit the fires of persecution against the Christians, but that was their act, not that of the Romans. The latter always respected the gods and religious ceremonies of other countries. It was probably owing to this feature in the Roman character that the Christian religion was suffered to get so firm a foot-hold on earth, and so strong a grasp on the minds of men, that all the fires of persecution could not destroy it. It may be, therefore, that this feature was created, and the advent of that religion under the strong arm of the Roman power expressly ordered, for the very purpose of enabling it to become so established as to ensure its perpetuity among men. He reads history to little purpose, who does not recognize in it the medium through which the purposes of God are ever being developed. Its

mighty current, the stream of events that is ever rolling onward, is to be scanned, not alone to compare those events with each other, but also with the fixed purposes of God, which remain embosomed in the depths of their own eternity, like permanent objects on shore, past which the rapid river is gliding.

The Romans even went further, and recognized in foreign gods and rites only modifications of those to which they themselves had been accustomed.[1] Hence, they very frequently contrived to make out that foreign gods were the same as their own. From this circumstance, arises no little difficulty and confusion in some parts of the history of the Roman religion, as the Romans, in later times, sometimes forgot the meaning and import of their own ancient divinities, having been in the habit of transferring to them all the attributes that were given to the Greek gods, with whom they were indentified.

II. The deities worshiped by the Romans.

The theogony of the Romans was less complicated than that of the Grecians, and, as far as it goes, is remarkably similar or identical. It begins with the reign of Saturn. He was at first regarded as the god of husbandry, but being subsequently confounded with Chronos, he came to be honored as the god of time. His reign, precautions, and dethronement by his son Jupiter, have already been considered under the element of Grecian religion.

After his dethronement, he escaped into Italy, where he met with a cordial welcome from Janus, and obtained for his future residence a beautiful tract of land surrounded by mountains. Here he is fabled to have built the city of Saturnia, which he erected on the Capitoline, formerly the Saturnian hill. At the same time Janus established himself on mount Janiculus.

Here, under the reign of Saturn, has been described the golden age of mankind. Poets have exhausted their fancy

[1] *Schmitz*, 36.

in embellishing it with all their beauties of imagery. They have pictured it as the abode of peace, political equality, honesty, confidence, and love. There was no distinction between rich and poor, noble and plebeian. All was harmony throughout the entire brotherhood of men; the whole of life was devoted to rational enjoyment; and a wide-spread and general happiness was universally diffused.

To perpetuate the memory of this glorious era, were founded a series of festivals, termed the saturnalia. These originally were but of one day's continuance, but under the emperors they came to be prolonged from the 17th to the 23d of December.[1] During its continuance, the most unbounded hilarity everywhere prevailed. The session of the senate was adjourned; law suits were suspended; punishments remitted; no war proclaimed; prisoners set at liberty; friendships created or strengthened by the exchange of presents, while to commemorate the equality of that period, the condition of master and servant was totally reversed, the slaves being seated at the table, and served by their masters.

But Saturn being at length dethroned, a new order of things commenced. The gods of Greece, under Latin names, and with some varieties of worship and attributes, became gradually introduced.

Among the Romans, there were reckoned twelve superior gods: six males and six females, who, together, constituted the divine council, to the decision of which, all human affairs were submitted. These corresponded with the twelve Olympian gods of the Greeks.

These were, JUPITER, NEPTUNE, MARS, MERCURY, VULCAN, and APOLLO; JUNO, VENUS, DIANA, CERES, MINERVA, and VESTA. These were so fully considered under the head of Grecian civilization, that to dwell upon them here is unnecessary. Any peculiarity in their worship will be noticed under that head.

[1] *Iconographic Encyclopedia*, 149.

There were also a number of inferior gods, some of whom were more peculiarly Italian in their origin and attributes. Of these, SATURN, an Italian deity, corresponding with the myths of the Greek Chronos, has already been mentioned.

JANUS was an Etruscan deity, the god of time, of the year which he opened and closed. He is represented with two faces, one looking back upon the closing, the other forward upon the opening year. As an old Italian deity, he presided over gates and doors. The Romans supposed the commencement of all undertakings to be under his protection. He also presided over the harvest, representing the sun, and acted as mediator between mortals and immortals, conveying the prayers of men to the ears of the gods. He was also vested with the attribute of omniscience, and to express this, he is sometimes found represented with four faces, indicating his power of looking at once into the four quarters of the world.

Pluto, Bacchus, Sol, and Luna were essentially Grecian.

There were als ogods of a second order, *dii minores*, to whom limited divine honors were paid, who were supposed to possess a species of divine nature. Such were:

TERMINUS, an ancient Italian god, whose deification is ascribed to Numa. His altar was on the Capitoline hill.

DEUS FIDIUS, the god of contracts, and protector of popular rights, an ancient Sabine deity; in later times, somewhat confounded with Hercules.

QUIRINUS, also an ancient Sabine deity, who was worshiped under the emblem of the spear, like the Scythian Mars, the Sabines having no images for their gods. A particular branch of the Sabines was dedicated to this god, whom they call Quirinus, and themselves Quirites.

VERTUMNUS was a Tuscan god, who presided over agriculture and gardening. By the renewal of the year he brought back the fruits and blessings of which he was the harbinger. He holds a shepherd's crook, and a sickle or garden knife, and wears a crown of fir cones. His wife

POMONA, was the goddess of orchards, carrying in one hand the fruit of a tree, and in the other a flower stalk.

FLORA was the goddess of flowers, and is represented with a crown of flowers, or with a wreath of flowers in her hands.

FAUNUS was the Grecian Pan, a rural god, ranked with mountain and forest deities. His wife

FAUNA, who is confounded with Ops, Cybele, and Bona Dea, whose feast was celebrated only by women in the house of the prætor.

SILVANUS was an Italian god of the woods.

The Romans had also gods of the affections and social feelings.

AMOR, the Grecian Eros or Cupid, the son of Venus, and the god of love.

HYMEN, the god of matrimony, uniting those whom Amor had brought together, and attached to each other. He is represented as a handsome youth, holding the wedding torch in one hand, and a cup in the other.

The GRACES are represented as standing in the attitude of persons who are returning thanks. They, in the main, correspond with the Graces of the Greeks.

The Romans had also deities of happy conditions and virtues. Such were

PAX, the goddess of peace, the most commonly described as a young woman with wings.

BONUS EVENTUS, or happy result, originally represented as a youth, bearing in one hand ears of corn, and in the other, a sacrificial cup.

CONCORDIA, the goddess of concord or harmony, represented as a stately woman, sometimes standing, at others sitting, and holding in one hand a cornucopia, in the other, a sacrificial cup.

PIETAS, the goddess of piety, had various meanings, and, of course, various representations. In the character of piety, or affection for children, she appears extending her mantle over two children who stand near her.

PUDOR, or PUDICITIA, the goddess of modesty, was represented as a maiden seated and veiling her face.

ASTRÆA, the goddess of equity and justice, held in one hand a cornucopia, in the other a balance.

SPES, the goddess of hope, was represented as carrying a blossom of the pomegranate tree in one hand, and gracefully adjusting her dress with the other.

FORTUNA, the goddess of fortune, was variously represented. In one she appears carrying on her head a diadem and measure, the latter to indicate that she does not act blindly and capriciously, but distributes her favors knowingly and in accordance with merit. With one hand she points to the earth, with the other towards heaven. In another, she is represented with her principal attributes, the cornucopia and the rudder, with other insignia, making altogether a combination of the attributes of several other deities.

VICTORIA was the goddess of victory. The Romans had also deities of time.

AURORA was the goddess of the morning, and was represented riding on a car drawn by four horses, preceded by Diana Lucifera bearing two torches.

The HORÆ, or SEASONS, were represented as four children: Spring carries a flower casket; Summer a sickle; Autumn a fruit basket and rabbit; and Winter, a rabbit, and a branch of a tree for burning.

The river gods were, first, the

NILUS, or NILE, who was represented as an old man, reclining on a low plinth, whose upper surface represents the waves, with one elbow he leans on a sphinx, and holds in his hand a cornucopia, containing wheat ears, grapes, wild roses, lotus flowers, the Egyptian arum, and a child with folded arms. His head was crowned with the fruit and leaves of the lotus, while the right hand grasps a bunch of wheat ears. The urn of the god is being covered with a heavy veil, to signify the obscurity of his sources.

Second, the TIBRIS, or TIBER, who had also the figure of an old man crowned with laurel and reclining upon his garments. In his right hand was a cornucopia containing clusters of grapes, flowers, vine leaves, and fruits, from between which projected a pine-apple, and behind this a

coulter, as an emblem of agriculture. On his shoulder was an oar to indicate the navigable quality of the river. On his left arm was a wolf.

The LARES were patron gods of the house, the family, and even the community, city or kingdom. They were sometimes regarded as specific deities, though frequently other gods exercised their office. Their representations varied. Those of the purely domestic kind appeared as youths, dressed in dogs' skins, and wearing a hat.

At a later period, and under the empire, the habit of deifying men was practiced, and the Roman emperors, whether virtuous or vicious, very generally attained the honor of the apotheosis. The general regard for the gods must have become weakened in proportion as the additions to their number became such as to fail in securing for them the respect and confidence of men.

III. The ministers of religion among the Romans.

These may be divided into two classes.

1. Those who were engaged in the common service of the gods generally.

2. Those who were devoted to the worship of particular gods.

Of the first division, we will mention

a. The pontifices, the pontiffs, of which there were originally four in number. These were all chosen from the patricians until the year of the city 454, and then four more were created who were taken from the plebeians. Sylla increased their number still more, making it fifteen. They were divided into majors and minors, and their whole number constituted the collegium.

This was an institution of Numa. From his time until the year of the city 650, the vacant places in the number were supplied by the college. Then Domitius, a tribune, caused that right to be transferred to the people. The law thus passed was annulled by Sylla, but afterwards restored by Labienus in the time of Julius Cæsar. Anthony again transferred it to the college, and Pausa subsequently

to the people. On the accession of the empire, permission was granted to Augustus to add to all the orders of priests as many as he thought proper. So that after that the power of appointment lay with the emperor.

The college of pontiffs had the right of judging in all causes relating to sacred things. In the absence of written law, they prescribed what regulations they thought proper. They could fine such as neglected their mandates. They had the superintendence of the inferior priests, to see to it that they performed their duties. They had the regulation of the year and the calendar. They marked in the calendar the days of each month, which they termed fasti and nefasti, fortunate and unfortunate, the knowledge of which was entirely confined to the members of the college, and to the patrician order, until they were divulged by C. Flavius.

The pontifices wore a robe bordered with purple, with a woolen cap in the form of a cone, with a small rod wrapt around with wool, having a tuft or tassel on the top of it.

The pontifices had a chief, who was termed the pontifex maximus. This was an office of great dignity and power. The chief pontiff was created by the people, while the other pontifices were chosen by the college. He was supreme judge in all religious matters. To him it belonged to see that all the sacred rights were properly performed, and all the other pontiffs were subject to his order.

His presence was rendered necessary in public and solemn religious acts, and he repeated over the form of words proper to be used. He attended at the comitia, especially when priests were created, in order that he might inaugurate them, and so also when adoptions and testaments were made.

In earlier times, he was accustomed to draw up a brief account of the public transactions every year in a book, and to expose them to the view of the public in an open place at his house. This practice continued until the time of Sylla, after which it was discontinued.

He always resided in a public house, and his office was for life. He was thought to be polluted by touching and

even by seeing a dead body. In certain cases the pontifex maximus, and his college, had the power of life and death, but their sentence might be reversed by the people.

b. The augures, whose office it was to foretell future events. These were made known chiefly from the flight, chirping or feeding of birds, and from other appearances. This body of priests possessed immense authority in the state, as nothing of importance could be done at home or abroad, or in peace or war, without first consulting them. No battle could be fought without first ascertaining whether the omens were favorable for the successful issue of it.

The augures were anciently called auspices, and the terms augurium and auspicium, are commonly used indiscriminately. Strictly, however, auspicium was the foretelling of future events from the inspection of birds; augurium, from any omen or prodigy whatever.

The knowledge of augury was derived chiefly from the Etruscans, although the principal ancient Italian nations, as the Sabines and Latins, seem also to have practiced it. The Etruscans were probably the more perfect masters of the art. It was early decreed by the senate that six of the sons of the leading men at Rome should be sent to each of the twelve states of Etruria to be taught.

The institution of the augurs is referred to Romulus, although their more perfect constitution was given by Numa. Their number was, at first, three; one to each tribe. A fourth was added by Servius Tullius, when he increased the number of tribes to four.

The augurs were, at first, taken entirely from the Patrician order. Thus it continued until Anno Urbis 454, when five plebeians were added. Sylla increased their number to fifteen in all. They were anciently chosen, like the other priests, by the comitia curiata. They had a chief, termed the *magister collegii.* In the delivery of their opinions, when assembled as a college, the precedency was always given to age. In their original selection, they had this privilege, that no one could be admitted

into their number who was known to be inimical to any member of the college.

They also enjoyed another privilege, which was a peculiar one, and that was, that of whatever crime they were guilty, they could not be deprived of their office. The reason assigned was, that they were entrusted with secrets of state, and their continuance in office was connected with their preserving a strict secrecy.

The principal difference between the pontifices and the augures was, that to the former it belonged to prescribe solemn forms and ceremonies, to the latter to explain all omens. The latter, like the former, were elected for life; and, while in the performance of their sacred functions, they must be free from any taint of disease. When a vacancy occurred, a candidate was nominated by two of the elder members of the college, the electors were sworn, and the new member took an oath of secrecy before his inauguration.

The equipment of the augures for their sacred functions consisted: 1. In a robe called trabea, striped with purple, or made of purple and scarlet. 2. A cap of a conical shape, resembling that of the pontifices. 3. A crooked staff, called the lituus, which they carried in their right hand and which served them as a wand to mark out the quarters of the heavens.

The omens, which it was the duty of the augur to interpret, were derived principally from five sources. Of these there were

Omens derived from birds, and hence called auspices from *avis* and *specio*. Some birds furnished them by chattering and singing, others by their flight. The former were called oscines, and were crows, pies, owls, etc.; the latter præpetes, and were eagles, vultures, buzzards, etc. For the purpose of making these observations, particularly the latter, and also for observing the signs in the heavens, the augur went out usually before the dawn of day, and, taking his stand in an open place, with his head veiled, and his body covered with a gown peculiar to his office, called

the læna, and turning his face towards the east, or according to some towards the south, he proceeded to mark out with his lituus, or wand, the heavens into four grand divisions, declaring the limits assigned, and making shrubs or trees his boundary on earth correspondent to that in the sky. The included space was termed the templum.

With a light burning in a lantern open to the wind, he then took his seat. The object of this precaution was to test the calmness of the atmosphere, because if a breath of air disturbed the perfect calmness of the heavens, the auspices could not be taken. A sacrifice was then offered, and a set form of words uttered as a prayer, after which the augur waited in silence for the omen.

So far as the flight of birds was concerned, they prognosticated good or bad omens, from the manner of their flying.

But while in this position, the augurs derived omens not only from birds, but also from the appearances in the heavens. The most unerring of these was the thunder and the lightning; and more especially if it occurred in serene weather.[1] The thunder which passed from north to south, was reckoned auspicious. The thunder and lightning coming from the left hand was considered a good omen, and a bad one if it came from the right. The reason of this was alleged to be, that all appearances on the left hand were understood to proceed from the right hand of the gods. They required the omen to be confirmed by another of the same sort, before it could be safely secured; that is to say, although the omen was favorable, yet the enterprise was often deferred until the gods should confirm it by a new sign.

After completing his observations, the augur came down from his place, and intimated the result to the people. The manner of his intimation was — the birds approve it, or disapprove it.

The third species of omen was that derived from the eating of chickens.[2] This was an auspice more commonly resorted

[1] *Mayo*, I, 160. [2] *Idem*, 259.

to on military expeditions. So great was the faith reposed by the Romans in their manner of feeding, that they were loath to undertake anything of importance without having previously taken this sort of augury. The commander of armies had the chickens brought into the camp, and consulted them before the giving of battle, and often has the fortune of the day depended upon the strength of a chicken's appetite.

The manner of taking this omen, was as follows: The chickens were confined in a cage, which was committed to the care of the pullarius. When all around seemed favorable, and either at dawn or in the evening, the pullarius opened the cage, and threw to the chickens, pulse, or a kind of soft cake. If they refused to come out, or to eat, or if they uttered a cry, or beat their wings, or flew away, the signs were unfavorable, and the battle or proposed enterprise was delayed.

But if, on the contrary, they ate greedily, so that something fell and struck the earth, it was considered a favorable omen, and the Romans joined in battle with the full assurance that the gods had promised them success; and this, not unlikely, was one of the secrets of their experiencing it. They also derived omens from the cry of the birds, and the sound of the pulse as it fell on the ground.

The fourth species of omen, was that derived from beasts, insects and reptiles. Of these, bees were esteemed an omen of eloquence; snakes and serpents were deemed ominous. Boars were always deemed unlucky, and if they appeared in time of war, it signified defeat and disaster.

The animals in relation to which omens were the most generally drawn, were wolves, foxes, goats, heifers, asses, rams, hares, weasels and mice. The observations the most commonly made about them were: whether they appeared in a strange place, or crossed the way; or whether they run to the right or the left, etc.[1]

[1] *Kennett*, 86.

A fifth source from whence omens were derived is from uncommon accidents, portents and prodigies. The term for these was diræ. Some of these were of the most trivial character; such, for instance, as sneezing, stumbling, seeing apparitions, hearing strange voices, spilling salt upon the table, or wine upon one's clothes, the meeting a wolf, a fox, a hare, and such like.

The portents or prodigies were meteors, showers of blood, stones, ashes, fire; monstrous births, whether of men or animals; the occurrence of eclipses, the aurora borealis, and such as these; some of them purely natural events, and others more unusual in their occurrence.

The college of augurs possessed its greatest power during the earlier periods of Roman history. The old legions delighted to proclaim the triumphs of religion. The belief in augury is generally supposed to have been of Sabine extraction. Certain portions of it certainly well accord with the simplicity of a primitive pastoral life. Its organization, however, or reduction to system, may have been derived from the Etruscans.

The augurship, while the omens it proclaimed and interpreted, were matters of belief among the Romans, was really one of the highest dignities of the state. It possessed the authority to prevent the comitia from voting, and could even annul resolutions already passed, if the auspices had had not been duly performed. A decree of the college, several times rescinded laws, and the words *alio die*, on another day, pronounced by a single augur, might have the effect of suspending all business.

It will be readily seen, therefore, how vastly important this power was in the hands of the senate and patrician order, and with what tremendous effect it could be exercised in the maintenance of their power. The comitia, curiata and centuriata were subject to the auspices. The favorable and unfavorable signs were known only to the augurs. Whenever it was desirable to postpone an assembly, it was easy for the augurs to announce the signs unfavorable for its meeting. Even after it had met, a decree

of the college might find that the auspices had not sanctioned it. Yet it does not appear that in early times the augurs were the instruments of the senate. They seem rather to have formed by themselves a portion, and no unimportant one neither, of the Roman state. Wielding men and masses, to a large extent, through the superstitions of which they were the subjects, they could turn the terrors of religion against the senate and patricians, as well as against the plebeians, more especially when the latter had their representatives in their body.

The Ogulnian law, passed A. U. 453, added to the four augurs then existing, five more to be selected from the plebeians. This alone might have had the effect of operating a radical change in the Roman constitution. During the civil wars the augurs were employed by both parties as political tools. The college of augurs was finally abolished by the emperor Theodosius.

A body of men, in many respects resembling the augurs, was the haruspices, or aruspices. They were diviners who interpreted the will of the gods. They were Etruscan in their origin. The great difference between them and the augurs consists in the fact that they were resorted to merely as a means of ascertaining the will of the gods, without possessing any religious authority. They had not, as the augurs had, a political importance in the state. They formed no part of the ecclesiastical polity of the Roman state during the republic. They were not called sacerdotes.[1] They do not seem to have formed a college, nor to have had a magister at their head.

The art of the haruspices was termed haruspicina, and consisted principally in examining the victims offered up in sacrifice, together with the circumstances attending the offering. Their observations were directed to the following four points:

To the beasts prior to the offering. Under this head they took notice whether they were forcibly dragged to

[1] *Anthon's Haruspices.*

the altar; whether they got loose out of the leader's hands; whether they escaped the stroke, or bounded up and roared very loud when they received it; and whether they expired with a great deal of difficulty. All these were counted as unfortunate omens. But if they followed the leader without compulsion, received the blow without struggling or resistance, bled easily, sending out a great quantity of blood, all these were considered as fortunate omens.

To the entrails of the beasts that were offered up. And here they observed whether any part was wanting, or in the wrong place; and what was the color and appearance of the parts, and whether any were withered or little or lean. A double liver was accounted highly unfortunate, and so also was a little or lean heart. If the entrails were of a pale, livid color, or more bloody than usual, they portended sudden danger and ruin; and if, in the course of the examination, they fell from the hands of the haruspex, it was a fearful portent.

To the flame that rose when they were burning. In regard to this, it furnished them with a good omen, if it gathered up violently, and readily consumed the sacrifice; if it was clear, pure, transparent, without any mixture of smoke, and not discolored with red, pale, or black; if it was quiet and calm, not sparkling or crackling, but run up directly in the shape of a pyramid.[1] But it portended misfortune, if at first it required much pains to light it; if it failed to burn upright, but rolled into circles and left vacant spaces between them; if it did not readily catch hold on the whole sacrifice, but crept up by degrees, from one part to another; if it happened to be spread about by the wind, or to be put out by sudden rain, or to leave any part of the sacrifice unconsumed.

To the flour or bran, to the frankincense, wine and water used in the sacrifice. In regard to these, they observed whether they had their due quantity, their proper

[1] *Kennet*, 88.

taste, color and smell. Besides these the haruspices also explained portents and prodigies.

Besides the modes already mentioned of consulting futurity, the Romans had a method of prognostication by the drawing of lots. These were a kind of dice made of wood, gold, or other matter, having inscribed on them certain letters, words or marks. They were thrown into an urn, whence they were drawn out frequently by the hand of a boy, and the import of them explained by the priests.

There were also astrologers among the Romans, and those who foretold future events by interpreting dreams. Persons of deranged mind were supposed to possess the faculty of presaging future events.

c. The duumviri, decemviri, quindecemviri, keepers of the Sibylline books. These were first two in number: duumviri, selected from the nobility, and receiving their appointment from Tarquinus Superbus, who, at the bidding of the augurs, had purchased of a strange old woman three of those books, at the same price originally asked by her for nine of them; she having twice successively burnt three, and still continuing to require for those remaining, the same sum of money originally demanded for the whole number.

The duumviri continued until A. U. 388, when the tribunes of the people obtained the passage of a law increasing the number to ten, thus creating the decemviri, five of whom were taken from the patricians, and five from the plebeians. Sylla afterwards increased the number to fifteen, thus making the quindecemviri. They were created in the same manner as the pontifices. The chief of them was called magister collegii.

These Sibylline books were kept under ground, in a stone chest, in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. They were supposed to contain the fate of the Roman empire, and hence, in times of great public danger and calamity, their keepers were ordered by the senate to consult them. During the Marsic war, in the year A. U. 670, the Capitol being burned, the Sibylline books were destroyed.

What these books contained is not very clearly settled, for after the terrible punishment inflicted on Atilius for revealing their secrets, their contents were little known. The principal question seems to be, whether they contained predictions, or merely directions for conciliating or appeasing the gods. Niebuhr arrives at the conclusion that these original Sibylline books were not consulted for the purpose of obtaining light as to future events,[1] but to learn what worship was required by the gods, when they had manifested their wrath by national calamities or prodigies. They were probably written on palm leaves, and in referring to them, as is generally supposed, they did not search for a passage for the purpose of making an application of it, but only shuffled the palm leaves, and then drew out one.

Upon the destruction of the Sibylline books in A. U. 670, embassadors were sent everywhere to collect the oracles of the sibyls. The two principal of these was the sibyl of Cumæ, and the sibyl of Erythræ, a city of Ionia. The latter was accustomed to utter her oracles with such ambiguity, that whatever happened, she might seem to have predicted it. The verses, however, were so contrived, that the first letters of them joined together would make some sense.

From the Sibylline verses thus collected, the quindecemviri made out new books, which Augustus afterwards deposited in two gilt cases, under the base of the statue of Apollo. The Sibylline books were kept with great superstitious reverence, until about the time of Theodosius the Great, when the general prevalence of the Christian faith threw these vanities into the shade,[2] and at length the books were all burnt by Stilicho, in the reign of the emperor Honorius.

These keepers of the Sibylline books were exempt from serving in the army, and from other offices in the city. Their priesthood was for life. They were properly priests

[1] *Anthon.* [2] *Kennett*, 98.

of Apollo, and hence, each of them had, at his house, a brazen tripod, similar to that on which sat the priestess of Delphi.

d. Septemviri epulonum were those who prepared the sacred feasts, at games, processions, and other solemn occasions.

The epulones were originally three in number, but they were soon increased to seven, from which is derived the above term, septemviri. They also formed a collegium, and were one of the four great religious corporations at Rome, the other three being the pontifices, augurs, and quindecemviri. To each of these collegiums, Julius Cæsar added one, and to the septemviri, three. To Augustus, after the battle of Actium, was granted the power of adding to these colleges, as many extraordinary members as he thought proper, and as the subsequent emperors possessed and exercised that power, the numbers composing them were afterwards very uncertain.

The Romans had a custom, in time of public danger, of making for their gods a sumptuous feast in their temples. To these feasts the deities themselves were invited. Thither were their statues brought on rich beds, with the pulvinaria or pillows on which to recline themselves.[1] The gods, or rather their statues, were placed at the most honorable part of the table as the principal guests.

These regalias they called epulæ or lectisternia, and the care of superintending these belonged altogether to this order of priesthood.

There were other fraternities of priests, but they were less considerable and will require only a very brief notice.

Fratres ambarvales, twelve in number, whose office it was to offer up sacrifices for the fertility of the ground. Their sacrifices were attended by a crowd of country people having their temples bound with garlands of oak leaves, dancing and singing the praises of Ceres. Their office was for life, and they wore a crown made of the

[1] *Kennett*, 100.

ears of corn, and a white woolen wreath around their temples.

Curiones, the priests who performed the public sacred rites in each curia, thirty in number.

Feciales, who were sacred persons employed in declaring war and making peace. These are supposed to have been twenty in number, and to have been instituted by Numa. It was their province to judge concerning everything which related to the proclaiming of war, and the making of treaties. When a message was to be sent to the enemy to demand a restitution of effects, they were the bearers of it. They always carried in their hands, or wreathed around their temples, vervain, a kind of sacred grass or clean herbs, plucked from a particular place in the Capitol, with the earth in which it grew. When sent to make a treaty, each carried vervain as an emblem of peace, and a flint stone to strike the animal, which was sacrificed.

Sodales titii, or titienses, who were priests appointed by Titus Tatius to preserve the sacred rites of the Sabines; or as some allege by Romulus, in honor of Tatius himself.

Rex sacrorum, or rex sacrificœlus, who was a priest appointed after the expulsion of Tarquin to perform the sacred rites, which the kings themselves used formerly to perform. It was an office of small importance, and subject, as in fact all the other priests were, to the pontifex maximus.

The second division of priests include those devoted to the worship of particular gods. These were the flamines, so called from the cap, or fillet, which they wore on the head. Of these there were

a. Flamen dialis, who was sacred to Jupiter, and a person of high authority in the commonwealth. He was distinguished by a lictor, sella curulis, and toga prætexta, and had a right from his office of coming into the senate.

There was also the flumen martialis, the priest of Mars, and quirinalis, of Romulus. These were all chosen from the patricians, and owe their institution to Numa. The

pontifex maximus nominated three persons to the people out of whom they chose one.

The flamines wore a purple robe, called læna, which was thrown over their toga, and a conical cap called apex. They had a seat in the college of pontifices.

b. Salii, who were the priests of Mars, twelve in number, also instituted by Numa, on the occasion of the fabled descent from heaven of the sacred shield, or ancylia of Mars, which terminated the raging of a fearful pestilence. Eleven others of similar construction were made, and the institution of the salii was for their safe keeping, and for the performance of certain ceremonies. Their name is derived *a saliendo* from leaping or dancing. They all lived together in a body, and composed a college. The government of the college was confided to the three seniors, of whom the first was called præsul, the second vates, and the third magister. No one could be admitted to membership, unless a native of the place, and free born, whose father and mother were yet living.

On the first of March they had a solemn feast, when they carried their sacred charge about the city. They went on with a nimble motion, keeping just measures with their feet, and demonstrating great strength and agility by the various, complicated and handsome turns of the body.

Their feasts and dances were not limited to March, but if at any time a war had been proclaimed by order of the senate, against any state or people, the salii were, in a solemn manner, to move the ancylia, as if, by such means they could rouse Mars from his seat, and send him out in aid of their arms.

c. Luperci. These were an ancient order of priests sacred to Pan, the god of the country, and particularly of shepherds. They derived their name from *lupus*, a wolf, because the god Pan was supposed to protect the sheep from the wolves.

Their great annual festival, the lupercalia, was celebrated in February. It was then that the luperci ran up and down the city naked, with the exception of a girdle of

goat's skin round their waist, and having thongs of the same in their hands. With these latter, they were in the habit of striking those whom they met, particularly married women, who were thence supposed to be rendered prolific.

The luperci were the most ancient order of priests, being said to owe their institution to Evander. And so also they continued the longest, not being abolished till the time of Anastasius, who died A. D. 518.

d. Politii and pinaii, who were the priests of Hercules, also an ancient order reputed to owe their institution to Evander.

e. Galli, who were the priests of Cybele. They were so called from Gallus, a river in Phrygia, which was supposed to make those who drank it mad, so that they castrated themselves, as did the priests of Cybele.

The chief priest was called archigallus. In their solemn processions they danced in armor, running round the image of Cybele, with the gestures of mad people, rolling their heads, beating their breasts to the sound of the flute, sometimes also cutting their arms, and uttering dreadful imprecations. They seem to have been always chosen from a poor and despised class of people, for while no other priests were allowed to beg, the Galli were allowed to do so on certain days.

f. Virgines vestales, the vestal virgins, were the priestesses of Vesta, and consecrated to her worship. This priesthood is supposed to have had its origin in ancient Troy, and to have been brought into Latium by Æneas. Its existence at Alba Longa is connected with the earliest traditions relative to the foundation of Rome, for Rhea Sylvia, the mother of Romulus, was a member of the sisterhood.

This institution, in common with most others of the religious character, is ascribed to Numa. The number originally selected were four. Two more were added by Tarquinius Priscus or Servius Tullius, and the number, thus augmented, continued ever after, during the existence of the priesthood.

The manner of choosing these vestals was first by the kings, and after their expulsion, by the pontifex maximus. The maiden selected should not be under six nor above ten years of age, perfect in her limbs, in the full enjoyment of all her senses, and the daughter of free born parents who resided in Italy. Under the Papian law the pontifex, on the occurrence of a vacancy, selected twenty maidens, and it was determined by lot in an assembly of the people which of these twenty should be appointed.

Those selected took upon themselves vows of the strictest chastity for thirty years. The first ten of these, they were novices, and as such spent their time in learning the ceremonies, and perfecting themselves in the duties of their religion. The next ten, they actually discharged the sacerdotal function; and the last ten, they spent in teaching and instructing others. After the thirty years service was completed, they might leave the temple and marry, but this was seldom done, as it was always reckoned ominous.

The vestals wore a long white robe, bordered with purple, their heads being decorated with fillets and ribbons. Their duties were principally of three kinds, viz:

To watch, by turns, night and day, the everlasting fire which blazed upon the altar of Vesta. The extinction of that fire was regarded as a most fearful prodigy, and emblematic of the extinction of the state. Hence, if it occurred through the carelessness of the vestal on duty she was stripped and most severely scourged by the pontifex maximus, and besides, extraordinary sacrifices were offered. The flames was rekindled by the pontifex, not from another fire, but by the friction of two pieces of wood from a felix arbor. Every year on the first of March, the beginning of their year, the flame was lighted anew.

To preserve the sacred pledge of the empire, sacred relics, which constituted the fatale pignus imperii, granted by fate for the permanency of the Roman dominion. What this really was, no one knew. By some it is supposed to have been the palladium; by others, the Samo-

thracian gods carried by Dardanus to Troy, and from thence to Latium by Æneas. It was something contained in a small earthen jar, closely sealed, while another, exactly similar in form, but empty, stood by its side. These were deposited in the inmost adytum, the most secret recess of the temple of Vesta. They were placed under the charge of the vestals, and no one was permitted to enter except one of their number, or rather the vestalis maxima alone, and the pontifex maximus.

To perform constantly the sacred rites of the goddess, to present to her offerings at stated times, and to sprinkle and purify her shrine each morning with water, drawn from the Egerian fount, or at later periods from any living spring or running stream. They also assisted at all great public holy rites, such as the festivals of the Bona Dea, and the consecration of temples.

The vestals enjoyed extraordinary honors and privileges. From the moment of their consecration they became sacred to Vesta, were her property, and released from all parental sway. They were maintained at the public cost. They might make their last will and testament, although under age. They could give evidence in a court of justice without taking an oath. From the time of the triumviri, they had a lictor to attend them in public. They rode in a chariot, and occupied a place of distinction at the spectacles. Consuls and prætors made way for them and lowered their fasces. The tribunes of the people respected their holy character, and if any one passed under their chariot he was put to death. Wills, even those of the emperors, were entrusted to their care, and the most solemn treaties were placed for safe keeping under their protection. Great weight was attached to their intercession in behalf of those in difficulty and danger, and if they chanced to meet a criminal as he was led to punishment, they had a right to set him free, provided the meeting was accidental.

The violation of her vow of chastity by a vestal was attended with awful consequences. It was thought to forebode some dreadful calamity to the state, and hence was

always expiated with extraordinary sacrifices, and the punishment inflicted was most exemplary. Her paramour was scourged to death in the forum, and the vestal herself, after having been tried and sentenced by the pontifices, was buried alive with funeral solemnities in a place called the campus sceleratus, near the Porta Collina.

These were the principal divisions of the Roman priests. In regard to their means of support, we have too little knowledge to say much with certainty. On the first division of the Roman territory, Romulus set apart what was sufficient for the performance of sacred rites, and for the support of temples. So also Numa, who, or under whose name, was instituted the greatest number of priests and sacrifices, provided a fund for defraying these expenses, but appointed a public stipend to none but the vestal virgins. We do not find that any fixed salary was ever given to the priests. It was thought that honor was the chief or only reward of the dignified priests, who attended only occasionally, and whose rank and fortune raised them above desiring any pecuniary reward, but that those who devoted themselves wholly to sacred functions had, in some manner, sufficient provision made for their maintenance.[1]

IV. The Roman worship. This will be embraced in the consideration:

1. Of the temple, in which the acts of worship were principally performed.
2. Of the altar.
3. The sacrifices.
4. Of other modes of worship.

1. Of the temple, including also the lucus or grove. 1. the temple. Of all the places appointed for the worship of the gods, this was the most common name. There were other words besides templum made use of among the Romans, to express their places of worship. These were fanum, sacrarium, ædes, delubrium, all of which

[1] *Adams*, 209, 210.

signified sacred buildings, differing from each other rather in greatness than in form. It seems that they were all taken for temples.[1]

The site of the temple was always selected by the haruspices. They also determined the time of its erection. Before commencing the work, the place was purified with great care, and even encircled with fillets and garlands.[2] The spot of ground was washed with pure, clean water, by the vestals, accompanied with young boys and girls. The priests also expiated it by a solemn sacrifice. One of them touched the stone that was to be first laid in the foundation, which was then bound with a fillet; after which the people threw it in, together with some pieces of money or metal, which had never passed through the furnace. On the completion of the edifice, there was also a consecration of it, with grand ceremonies, in which some one of the colleges of priests presided.

The location and general description of the Grecian temples already given, has so close an application to the Roman that a repetition here is uncalled for. A reference to what is there said is all that is deemed necessary.

The same general observations relative to the Grecian temples being asyla for criminals applies also to the Roman with the qualification, that among the Romans only, some particular temples had this privilege, and that they possessed it from their very foundation.[3] Such, for instance, was the templum misericordiæ, and that constituted by Romulus between the Fort and Capitol, called inter duos lucos.

During the early periods of the Roman history there were very few temples at Rome, the places of worship among the earliest Romans having been in most cases simple altars or sacella. The Romans came, however, ultimately to have numerous temples, there being, as some assert, in Rome over four hundred. This probably included all religious buildings, the ædes sacræ, although none of

[1] *Montfaucon's Antiquity Displayed*, II, 29. [2] *Mayo*, I, 141. [3] *Antiquity Displayed*, III, 37.

these were properly temples except those which had been solemnly consecrated by the augurs.

In times of great public calamity the women were accustomed to prostrate themselves in the temples, sweeping the pavement with the hair of their heads, and if they found the gods inexorable, and their evils still continuing,[1] the people lost all patience, and finally became so outrageous, as to throw stones against the temples.

One of the most celebrated of the Roman temples was the Pantheon, erected by Agrippa, the son-in-law of Augustus, which still remains the pride and ornament of the eternal city. It is now the Church of All Saints, as, in paganism, it was the temple of all the gods. Its form is circular, to represent heaven, the seat of the celestial deities. It is one hundred and fifty feet in height, and the same in breadth. In the walls are niches, which were intended to receive the statues of the deities; and in the vaulted roof there is an opening, twenty-five feet in diameter, for the admission of light. The great portico at the entrance is supported by sixteen pillars of beautiful granite, each not less than five feet in diameter, and one entire piece. The order is Corinthian. A brazen gate admits from the portico into the temple, the door case being one entire piece of marble fifty feet in height, and about half the same in breadth. There are no windows, and the lighting of it is all done from a large opening in the crown of the vault. The thrones and seats of Jupiter and Juno, and the great celestial deities, are now very quietly occupied by madonnas and martyrs, with pink sashes, faded roses, red petticoats, tin crowns, and tinsel decorations.

There was also the temple of Apollo, built by Augustus on the Palatine hill, in which was a public library, where authors, particularly poets, used to recite their compositions, sitting in full dress, and often before select judges, who determined upon their comparative merits.

[1] *Montfaucon*, II, 38.

There was also the Capitol, dedicated to Jupiter, built on the highest part of the city, called the Tarpeian rock, and strongly fortified. Here the senate assembled, and here were deposited the most sacred and valuable things belonging to the state. Here they made their vows, and took the oath of allegiance. The ascent from the forum was by one hundred steps. The front was adorned with three rows of pillars, and the sides had two. The gates were of brass, and the gilding cost twelve thousand talents, or nearly two millions sterling. A few vestiges of it still remain.

There was also the temple of Diana on the Aventine mount; that of Janus, built by Numa, with two brazen gates, one on each side, to be opened in war, and shut in peace. Those of Saturn, Juno, Venus, Minerva, Neptune, etc., of Fortune, Concord, Peace, etc., of several of which, vestiges are still remaining.

2. The altar. Many of the remarks already made on this subject in the religion of Greece have also an equal application here. These it is unnecessary to repeat.

The altar was a kind of pedestal among the Romans, which was either square, round or triangular. It was also adorned with sculpture, with basso-relievos, and inscriptions. On them were burnt the victims that were sacrificed.

In many cases, if not as a general principle, those altars set apart for the superior gods, were placed on some tall pile or building, and hence called altaria, from *alta* and *ara*, a high elevated altar. Those designed for the inferior gods were laid on the surface of the earth, and called aræ. In following out this principle, they dug into the earth, and opened a pit for those of the infernal gods.

The Roman altars, which were designed for offering sacrifices, were usually covered with leaves and grass, and adorned with wreaths of flowers. Romulus appointed certain altars as places of refuge to slaves from the cruelty of their masters, to insolvent debtors, and to criminals.

During the second triumvirate it was directly forbidden to take by force any criminals out of the temple of Julius Cæsar, who had fled there and embraced his statue.

In the great temples at Rome, were generally to be found three altars. The first was in the sanctuary, at the foot of the statue, and this was for incense and libations. The second was before the gate of the temple, and this was for the sacrifice of victims. The third was a portable one for the offerings and sacred vestments or vessels to lie upon.

The most ancient ceremony in the act of consecration was in the use of unction, and this ceremony appears to have descended to the Catholics, through the medium of the Romans. At the time of consecration, great numbers of sacrifices were offered, and entertainments given.

3. The sacrifices. These seem, in some respects, to have been borrowed from the Greeks. They were of different kinds. While some were at stated periods, others were only occasional. Among the latter were those called expiatory, for averting bad omens, or making atonement for a crime.

Human sacrifices were also offered among the Romans. During the first ages of the republic, they seem to have been offered annually, and it was not until the year of the city 657, that they were prohibited by a decree of the senate. By a law of Romulus, persons guilty of certain crimes, as treachery or sedition, were devoted to Pluto and the infernal gods. Subsequently, a consul, dictator or prætor, might devote, not only himself, but any one of the legion, and slay him as an expiatory sacrifice.

The sacrifices consisted of five principal parts, viz:

Libatio; the pouring wine upon the victim.

Immolatio; scattering the sacred paste upon its head.

Mactatio; killing it.

Redditio; offering the entrails to the gods.

Litatio; the completion of the sacrifice without any blunder or omission.

Great chastity and purity was required in those who offered the sacrifices. They were required to bathe them-

selves, to be dressed in white robes, and to be crowned with the leaves of that tree which was thought most acceptable to the god whom they worshiped. Sometimes, however, they appeared with disheveled hair, loose robes, and bare feet.

It was required, in the animals that were to be sacrificed, that they should be without spot or blemish, and that they never had submitted to the yoke. The victim was led to the altar by the popæ or slayers, with a slack rope; the object of which was, that it might not seem to be brought by force, for if so, it was reckoned a bad omen. The procession advanced to the sound of musical instruments, and on their arriving at the altar, the priest placed his hand upon it, while he offered up prayers to the gods. During this time the music still continued to play to prevent the hearing of any unlucky noise, as if their ability to shut it out destroyed the unlucky event it presaged.

Upon restoring silence, a salted cake, called mala, was sprinkled upon the head of the victim, and frankincense and wine were poured between his horns, by way of libation. The next act of the priest was to pluck the highest hairs from between the horns, and to throw them into the fire that was burning on the altar, and then, turning himself towards the east, he drew a sort of crooked line with his knife from the forehead to the tail, which was the signal for the public servant to slay the victim. The victim was first struck with an axe or mall, then stabbed with knives, and the blood, being caught in goblets, was poured upon the altar. It was then flayed and dissected.

The haruspices were next called upon to inspect the entrails. If the signs were favorable, they pronounced the offering an acceptable sacrifice. If not, another victim was offered up, and sometimes several. The part chiefly inspected was the liver, as that was supposed to give the most certain presages of futurity. It was divided into two parts, called pars familiaris, and pars hostilis. From the first they derived what was to happen to themselves; from the last, what was to happen to an enemy. Each part was called caput, by which term they understood a protuber-

ance at the entrance of the blood vessels and nerves. A liver without this protuberance, or from which it was cut off, was reckoned a very bad omen. The principal fissure or division of the liver, was likewise particularly attended to, as also its fibres or parts, and those of the lungs.

After the inspection of the entrails was completed, the parts which fell to the gods were sprinkled with meal, wine and frankincense, and then burned on the altar.

Upon the completion of the sacrifice, the priest washed his hands and uttered certain prayers, again made a libation, and then the people were dismissed in a set form.

A feast followed the sacrifice. This, in public sacrifices, was prepared by the septem viri epulones. In those which were private, the persons who offered the sacrifice, together with their friends, feasted on the parts which fell to them. On certain solemn occasions, especially at funerals, a distribution of raw flesh was made to the people.

Those sacrifices, which were offered to the celestial gods, were different from those offered to the infernal deities in at least three particulars:

a. The victims sacrificed to the former were white,[1] and were brought chiefly from the river Clitumnus, in the country of the Falisci, while those sacrificed to the latter were black.

b. The first mentioned were sacrificed while their neck was bent upward, the knife being applied from above, the last with their faces bent downward, the knife being applied from below.

c. In the first, the blood was caught in cups, or sprinkled upon the altar; in the last, it was poured into a ditch.

Again there was a difference in those sacrificing.

Those who sacrificed to the celestial gods were clothed in white, bathed the whole body, made libations by heaving the liquor out of the cup, and prayed with the palms of their hands raised to heaven. Those sacrificing to the infernal gods were clothed in black; only sprinkled the

[1] *Adams's Roman Antiquities*, 214.

body with water, made libations by turning the hand, and throwing the cup into the fire, and prayed with their palms turned downward, at the same time striking the ground with their feet.

There were also various vessels and instruments used in sacrifices. Such were the acerra, a censor for burning incense; the patera cups used in libations; ollæ pots; tripodes, tripods; secures or bipennes, axes; cultri or secespitæ, knives, etc. But these require no particular description.

There were also other ceremonies embraced in the Roman worship. Among these were

a. The expiation, which was an act of religion instituted for purifying the guilty, and the places which were reckoned as defiled. The motive that lay at their origin was the dread of public calamities, and the hope of appeasing the incensed gods. The occasion that required them were the occurrence of monsters, prodigies, presages, and auguries. They came to apply to almost every action of public and private life.

On the appearance of a prodigy, the senate would order the Sibylline books to be consulted, and ordinarily would appoint days of fasting, festivals, games, public prayers, and sacrifices. On such days might be seen the whole city of Rome in mourning and consternation; the temples adorned; the lectisternia prepared in the public places; expiatory sacrifices frequently repeated. Marching gravely through the streets, preceded by the high priest and the duumviri, might be seen every tribe, every order, senators and patricians, their wives and children, with garlands on their heads. Accompanying this procession was the youth singing hymns or repeating prayers, while the priests were offering expiatory sacrifices in the temples, and invoking the gods to divert the calamities, with which they thought themselves threatened.

There was an expiation for cities, which occurred at stated periods, and on a day answering to our fifth of February. There were private expiations more numerous

than public ones. These preceded nuptials and funerals and other events of life. In many cases of private expiation, a simple ablution was all that was necessary.

b. The oath. This was not only very common, but was also much regarded among the Romans. The great deference paid to an oath by the Romans has been generally ascribed to Numa. The men swore by the gods, and the women by the goddesses. The Roman soldiers took an oath that they would run the same risks, and submit themselves to all the fortunes of their general, that they would obey their commanders, and not desert their standards.

The Romans, in solemn oaths, used to hold a flint stone in their right hand, saying, "Si sciens fallo, tum me Diespiter, salvo urbe arceque, bonis ejiciat, uti ego hunc lapidem." The most solemn oath of the Romans was by their faith or honor.

c. The public supplication. This was made either at some critical juncture, as in time of plague, or some epidemical calamity, or after an unexpected victory, or when a newly elected general applied to the senate to be confirmed by them. These occasioned solemn days, and were celebrated by sacrifices, prayers, and public feasts. Among these were:

a. The lectisternia, which were entertainments served up in the temples, at which the gods were invited, and their statues placed in couches round the table, in the same manner as men were accustomed to sit at meat. They lasted for several days, during which no species of punishment could be inflicted upon any person, the criminals being even set at liberty. The object was to appease the gods, or to supplicate them for favors.

b. The evocation. This was of three kinds; the first belonging to magic, which consisted in the calling up the souls of the departed, not much known among the Romans. The second was generally employed during the siege of some town, and consisted in invoking the gods under whose protection it was supposed to be. The third was that used in calling up the gods. They had the pro-

per hymns for this purpose, which were taken up in the praises of the gods, and in celebrating the different places where their presence was necessary. When the danger which had caused their invocation was over, they gave them liberty to retire, and they even had hymns celebrating their departure.

c. The devoting. And here the forms were either private, as those of the Decii, and of Marcus Curtius, who devoted themselves to save the Romans; or public, as when done by a dictator, or consul, at the head of an army. It was to Pluto, and other infernal deities, that criminals were devoted.

d. The public festivals. The Romans had even a greater number of festivals than the Greeks. In common with them they had the saturnalia, at which the slaves were permitted to ridicule their masters; the jovialia, corresponding with the Greek diasia; the junonia, corresponding with the Greek hersæa; the megalesia, instituted in honor of Cybele; the bacchanalia, in honor of Bacchus; and several others. In the last mentioned, the promiscuous meeting of men and women caused horrid irregularities.

Those festivals that were peculiarly of Roman institution, for the most part, had their origin in some rational motive, such as supplicating the gods for some blessing, appeasing them for some injury, or seeking to avert a threatened calamity. Sometimes it was to keep alive the remembrance of a benefit, as the luceria, derived from lucus, a grove, into which the Romans, by retreating, saved themselves from the Gauls. Sometimes it was to preserve the memory of a disaster, as the populifugia, to commemorate the day when the Romans fled upon the news that the Fidenates and other Latins had entered into a confederacy against the Romans. Sometimes the object was merely to promote mutual joy, as the maumæ, celebrated on the first of May, when the senators and patricians repaired to Ostia, where they exercised themselves in various sports.

There were also festivals appropriated to certain stations in life, as the caprotinæ for the maid servants, and others for men servants; the mercurialia, for the merchants; the matralia for the matrons, of which there were two kinds, the one of the goddess Matuta, another called matronalia in honor of Mars. So also the pastors and shepherds had a festival, called the palilia, dedicated to Pales their goddess. And the young people and students had also their festivals called quinquatria.[1]

The games celebrated among the Romans were also viewed as festival occasions in honor of their gods, and were consecrated by their religion, but these form a more material part of the element of society, and will be considered there.

The Roman religion had no oracles, properly so called, but their place was supplied by the augurs, haruspices, and Sibylline books, heretofore referred to.

V. The fifth and last subject for consideration under this element, is the influence exerted by religion on the Roman character.

There are two respects in which the religious element exhibits quite a different character at Rome from what it did in Greece.

1. At Rome there was a connection between religion and government. The last was the central, the all controlling element, and the first was one of its chief aids and assistants. The interests of the hierarchy, senate, and patrician order, were, for a long period, identical. This will be rendered more apparent by reference to the element of government. So intimate was the connection, that it would seem, in some cases, only to exist for the sake of the state, while in Greece, whatever services were rendered by it to the state were merely voluntary.

[1] The Romans had festivals during every month in the year, an enumeration of which may be found in the *Manual of Classical Literature*, 501–3.

2. At Rome, the religious element was a reality, a sentiment of the heart. In Greece, especially at Athens, it was a poetic fancy, a creature of the imagination. The Romans paid to their deities a sincere and a fervent devotion. This element in their character was probably derived from the Sabines. It had much to do with their wonderful success in the conquest of the world. It grew, in great part, out of the severity of their struggles for existence and ascendancy, and continued long after the necessity in which the elements of its power were matured, had ceased. Those that strike us as the two great elements of the Roman character were pride and piety; two that are seldom combined, and not so easily reconcileable with each other.[1] The latter outlived the former. The worship of the gods continued to be devoutly rendered, and their sanctity remained inviolate, long after Marius, and Sylla, and Cæsar, had extinguished the last feeling of national pride. At last, the altar fires became dimmed, the religious feeling died out, and Rome had nothing more to lose.

[1] *Chenevix*, I, 100.

CHAPTER IV.

ROME—ITS GOVERNMENT.

This element in Roman civilization is deserving of great attention. It is the central element, that around which all the others revolve, and which, therefore, to a great extent, controls the disposition and direction of their forces. Whenever we look at Rome, it is *the state* that first meets our view, and absorbs our attention.

In this element the Romans are the teachers of mankind. In it they have developed much to instruct and profit all coming time. They have solved many problems in relation to the disposition and action of political forces, and the operation of checks and balances, which have had their influence upon all subsequent civilized governments.

The right understanding of this element among the Romans will furnish no inconsiderable contribution in enabling us to understand an enigma in their history, otherwise unaccountable. We have seen this remarkable people marching on, with unfaltering step, to the conquest of the world; and what has struck us with amazement was, that they could go from one war immediately into another; that they could apparently use up all their energies in the subjugation of one nation, and then, without any time to recover, recruit, or even to breathe, plunge into an exhausting war with another, and thus continue until the civilized world had acknowledged their dominion. We naturally inquire whence the sources of supply? How is it that that which in other nations only exhausts, appears here to furnish new energies to be expended in new efforts equally exhaustive? Where are we to look for the exhaustless fountain, welling up from its fathomless depths those ever fresh supplies, which, obedient to demand, continued to be poured forth, until the boundaries of Rome became those of the civilized world?

We find it mainly in the state, that wonderful assemblage of political forces so skillfully arranged, so wisely constituted, so energetic and powerful in their action. In the Roman state, as organized during the most prosperous periods of her history, we shall find secured the following important particulars. Its political forces were so arranged as to provide:

1. Those checks and balances, mutual curbs and restrictives, which were essential to its own perpetuity.

2. A freedom in deliberation, and far-seeing wisdom in the adoption of measures, by the great minds that successively controlled in public affairs.

3. A firmness and determination in carrying them out, which no apprehended danger could appall, and no unforeseen contingency weaken.

4. A faith, trust, reliance, patriotism, which pervaded all ranks and orders, uniting patrician and plebeian, senate and people, citizen and soldier altogether, making of all one common Rome.

If we succeed in rendering this sufficiently clear, the successful strides of Rome towards universal dominion will be no longer an enigma. She succeeded wonderfully in impressing upon other nations a sense of her greatness and superiority. When Pyrrhus, while invading Italy, sent Cineas to Rome with proposals for an amicable arrangement, the latter, on beholding it, was filled with amazement. The city, he said, was one temple, and the senate an assembly of kings.[1]

This element in Roman civilization, more than any other, has a history. No correct idea can be obtained of it without attending to its successive development. In doing this, we shall gain a knowledge of the interior history of Rome, which will render its exterior, outward history, a matter of less surprise and wonder.

Rome, as a state, presents three different phases. We have

[1] *Schmitz*, 195.

Regal Rome,
Republican Rome, and
Imperial Rome.
Of these, the first is the regal.

I. The king, senate, people.
II. The tribus, curiæ, gens, familia.
III. Patricii, equites, plebes.
IV. Patronus, cliens.
V. Comitia curiata, centuriata, tributa.
VI. Senatus consulta, leges plebiscita.

A right understanding of these will give us an insight into the Roman constitution during the kingly period, and also lay the foundation of a correct knowledge of it while exhibiting its republic phase. The real change which occurred at the termination of the kingly rule will not be found so striking or important.

Regal Rome.

I. The king, senate and people, during the regal period, or the early part of it, exercised the entire political power in Rome. During that period Rome was an elective monarchy, but one in which the power of the king was limited by the senate and people. It is true tradition states, that the sons of the later kings claimed a certain right to the succession, but no such right was ever recognized.

The process of election was, that an officer, termed an interrex was appointed, the object being to fill the vacancy occasioned by the demise of the king, and to provide for the election of another. The senate and interrex having agreed upon a fit candidate, he was proposed to the assembly of the people, and it lay with them whether to accept him or not. But there was something wanting still beyond this, and that was, the approval of the gods, to be determined by augury. If the signs were propitious, the new

king was inaugurated; if not, another election was to be gone through with.

When the ceremony of inauguration was over, the king proposed to the curiæ, that they should pass a decree or law, conferring on him the imperium, or highest judicial and military power.[1] When, under the constitution of Servius Tullius, the election of the king was committed to the comitia centuriata, the imperium still continued to be conferred on him by the curiæ.

The income of the king was derived from two sources, viz: from a portion of the domain land; and also from his share of the booty that was taken in war.

In regard to the power exercised by the king, it was probably different with different sovereigns. The circumstances attending the early history of Rome, and the necessities of an infant people struggling into existence, should not be lost sight of in the decision of this question. The king was at the head of the military organization, commanded the armies, and hence, in time of war (which continued during far the greater part of the time), was necessarily possessed of great power. That power was limited by no written constitution, or expressed reservation of rights; nor had forms and precedents grown up in the senate, upon which they could ground claims for the exercise of power in opposition to that of the king.

The king was not only at the head of the military, he was also at the head of religious affairs, besides exercising judicial functions. He was the supreme commander in war, the chief judge, and the high priest of the nation. In his judicial functions, he was probably assisted by a council, and in criminal matters, a person condemned to die might appeal to the assembly of the curiæ.

The great source and instrument of power with the Roman king lay in the army. There, a severity of discipline was established, rendering it necessary that the commander should be extremely despotic. Beyond the walls of Rome,

[1] *Schmitz*, 75.

there was little, if anything, to check or interrupt the exercise of his power. Over the plebs, the commonalty, within the walls, he seems also to have been absolute, the appeal in criminal cases lying only in favor of the people of Rome proper, the patricians.

In the undefined state of politics during the kingly period the power actually exercised depended much on the character of the king, on his warlike operations, his successes, the amount of booty he had to distribute, and his just and equitable distribution of it. At the same time the people who were warlike, and had arms in their hands, knew enough to curb any excessive exercise of power, and thus prevent kings sinking into the tyrant.

The regular power of the kings in the conduct of civil affairs, was never very great. The government of Rome, even during the continuance of the monarchy, was essentially aristocratic. The great principle must not be lost sight of, that all the powers legitimately exercised by kings were delegated powers. They were powers bestowed upon them at their election, and at death returned again to the senate and people. They were powers that remained to be exercised somewhere, and by somebody, after the termination of the kingly authority by the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus. The difference was that, after that event, instead of being exercised by one, they were divided among a number. During the continuance of the monarchy, the king was the only permanent magistrate, the tribune of the celeres being only the kings vicegerent in all military undertakings.[1] There was a prefect of the city who was entrusted with the protection and defense of the city whenever the king was absent, and who owed his appointment directly to the king himself.

The king was entitled, as an ensign of his power, to the fasces, which were bundles of axes carried before him by twelve lictors. These, and also some other badges of royalty, as the curule chair, and toga prætexta, were sup-

[1] *Schmitz*, 76.

posed to have been of Etrurian origin, and to have owed their introduction into Rome to the elder Tarquin.

A prominent institution during the existence of regal Rome, and which subsequently became a decidedly leading feature in the Roman constitution, was the senate. This was originally the great council of state, and was the first element and witness of constitutional freedom. During the existence of the monarchy, it stood between the king and the people, presenting a barrier against the usurpation and tyranny of the one, and the tendencies towards a state of anarchy in the other.

An element similar to this in its origin, naturally finds a place in all early established communities. The Homeric period in Grecian history found the king consulting his council on all great occasions. Amid the forests of Germany and in the wilds of North America, the chieftain consulted his leading warriors before determining the questions of war and peace.

The origin of the senate; to whom the senator owed his dignity; are questions involved in much obscurity. It is supposed by many that the kings appointed the members of the senate at their own discretion. On the contrary, others, and among them is Niebuhr, affirm that the populace of Rome was the real sovereign, and that the senate was an assembly formed on the principle of representation, that it represented the populace, and that its members were elected by them.

However that may be, it is clear that they were appointed for life, were not removable at the pleasure of the king, and that they thus constituted a permanent body. The senate itself appears to have had some influence upon the election of new members, as it possessed the power of raising objections against a person elected.

Previous to the incorporation of the Sabines into the Roman state, there was but one tribe, the Ramnes, and from out this tribe were chosen one hundred senators. They were called patres, fathers. The Sabines, when they became incorporated with the original Latin tribe,

formed another, called the Tities, and the number of senators was then increased to two hundred; but those representing this latter tribe were distinguished from those representing the former by the term patres minorium gentium. On the accession of the elder Tarquin, a third tribe was added, called luceres, and an additional one hundred to represent it, with a like designation as those last above mentioned, were introduced into the senate. Its entire number was now three hundred, and this continued to be its number for several centuries.

The last had also the term patres conscripti applied to them, which subsequently became common to the whole body. The necessary age and qualifications for being elected senator, appear not to be very clearly settled. The senate was, for the most part, composed of old men. The earliest period at which one could be elected was probably about thirty. No senator was allowed to carry on any mercantile business.

The senators were taken from among the patricians, the plebeians not being there represented.

The senate held its regular meetings on the calends, nones, and ides of every month. Extraordinary meetings might also be convoked on any other day, excepting those which were atri, and those on which comitia were held. The right of convoking the senate belonged to the king, or to his vicegerent, the custos urbis. If a senator neglected to appear he was liable to a fine.

The senate could only be held in a temple, or in a place consecrated by the augurs, which was usually within the city. The most ancient place was the Curia Hostilia, in which alone, originally, a senator's consultum could be made. Afterwards several temples were used for this purpose.

The king, or in his absence, the custos urbis, presided over the meetings of the senate. The questions for discussion and decision were presented by him. He called upon the members separately to give their opinions. These they delivered standing. But when they only

assented to the opinion of another, they continued sitting. In matters of very great importance the senators sometimes delivered their opinions upon oath. Decrees of the senate were rarely reversed. While a question was under debate, every one was at liberty to express his dissent; but, once determined, it was looked upon as the common concern of each member, to support the opinion of the majority.

The presence of the king, and his right of proposing the subject or question for discussion and decision, must have limited very considerably the range of subjects as well as the freedom of debate. This feature, however, may have had a more special reference to the function of the senate as a great council of state.

The subjects laid before the senate were of a three-fold character. They related either:

To the internal affairs of the state; or, to legislation; or, to finance.

A very important feature in this element was the fact that no measure could be brought before the populus without having previously underwent discussion and preparation in the senate. Thus the senate was the medium through which all affairs of the whole government had to pass. On the one hand, it considered and discussed whatever measure the king thought proper to introduce; and on the other, exercised a control over the assembly of the populus, which could only accept or reject what the senate brought before it.

The subjects that were chiefly brought before the senate for discussion were those which related to affairs with foreign cities or nations, such as, the beginning of war; the conclusion of peace; and the formation of treaties and alliances. What part the senate took in legislation, and the administration of public affairs during this early period, we have little information. What may justly lead to a reasonable doubt of the power of the senate during this period is the fact that Servius Tullius was enabled to make great constitutional changes without consulting the senate.

It is hence inferable that that body had no means of thwarting the king's plans. The lands conquered in war can hardly be supposed to have been disposed of without the cooperation of the senate, and the king could not tax his subjects at discretion or without the consent of this body.[1]

It will be perceived, therefore, that the senate, during the kingly government, represented the aristocracy, being composed of the heads of the great houses which constituted the tribes. It not, improbably, grew out of the patriarchal form of society so generally prevalent in early times.

The third estate was the people, the Roman populus; and who and what were they? They were the members of the original Roman families; the Roman citizens; the Sabine Quirite chieftains. They were the real source of all power.[2] The formula of their decision on the creation of a king was: "The people orders Numa Pompilius, or Ancus, to be king." They were identical with the patricii, hereafter considered, and their political power will be rendered apparent under our subsequent heads.

II. The tribus, curia, gens, familia.

The early Roman organization partly political, partly social, possesses many peculiarities. These are necessary to be well understood, or Roman history presents little less than a profound enigma.

The tribe is the largest division that first presents itself. The eldest was the Ramnes, or the Ramnenses, which comprised the immediate followers of Romulus, and seated themselves upon the Palatine hill. This tribe was a Latin colony, and they were the founders of Alban Rome. While this tribe continued to stand alone it contained only one hundred gentes, and had a senate of one hundred members.

The next accession was the tribe of Tities, or Titienses, which comprised the Sabine settlers on the Quirinal and Viminal hills. The union of this tribe with the Ramnes,

[1] *Schmitz*, 76, 77. [2] *Regal Rome*, 77.

which probably took place during the reign of Romulus, gave to the world the Sabino-Alban Rome. This increased the number of gentes, and also of senators to two hundred.

These two continued together for some time without any additions. At length a third, the luceres, or lucerenses, consisting chiefly or wholly of Etruscans who had settled on the Cœlian hill, became incorporated with the other two, giving to Rome its Etruscan element. At what period of time this was effected, is by no means well settled. There is little doubt but that the Etruscan settlement was as old or even older than the Sabine; but it was probably originally more limited, and continued to gain strength by fresh accessions of settlers. The union of this with the other two brought in an additional one hundred gentes, and as many senators, thus making the entire number three hundred.

Thus we find at a very early period, a period even anterior to authentic history, the Roman state was formed by the union of these three tribes, viz: the Ramnes, Tities, and Luceres. The latter continued a tribe for some time before its union with the other two, and after its union remained so far distinguished from the other two as to receive the term patres minorum gentium.

These tribes were composed wholly of patricians; they were the populus Romanus; but their political importance only continued down to the time of the decemviral legislation. At a date long anterior to that they were of very little consequence. These must not be confounded with the tribes into which we shall subsequently find the plebeians divided, these latter differing entirely from the former in the materials out of which the division was made, the principles upon which it proceeded, and the political results which were effected by it.

The primary division of the tribes was into curiæ. Each was divided into ten, making in all thirty curiæ. These curiæ were, in fact, close corporations, formed of the original burghers of the three patrician tribes. They had a

general assembly; the comitia curiata, hereafter mentioned, and their representatives formed the senate.

Like other corporations, they were essentially exclusive bodies, and in them and their representatives resided in early periods, the power of the state. They appear to have been local, something of the nature of parishes. Each one of these had its common hall, also called curia, in which those composing the curiæ met for religious and other purposes.

Each had also its presiding officer, curio, who not only performed the sacred rites, but also many miscellaneous functions, being a sort of mayor, recorder and steward. Besides this, he was the priest of the curia, ward, or parish. He was chosen by his curia, or parish, assembled for the purpose. His duty was to officiate at the sacrifices of the curia, called curionia, and to make provision for them out of the money allowed him by the people of his own division for that purpose. He was subject to the curio maximus, whose authority extended over all the curiæ. The latter was chosen by the assembly of the curiones, and confirmed by the senate. It devolved upon him to superintend the curiones, give directions concerning festivals, and settle the ceremonies of sacrificing. Hence the curiæ served the valuable purpose of forming so many centres of religious union, and of common sacrificial rites. The participation in all these formed a bond of union among the members. The civil purposes answered by the curiæ will be considered under the head comitia curiata.

All the offices of the curiæ had reference to peace, but there was another division of the people into centuries, which was for the purposes of war, or rather which contemplated military operations, although really embracing much of a civil character. According to this latter division the three tribes were represented by three centuries of horse, just as the thirty curiæ were represented by thirty centuries of foot, and this constituted the original Roman legion.[1] While the curio presided over the curiæ, being

[1] *Dew*, 217.

both a civil and religious officer, the centurion presided over the century, and was a military commander.

But whatever is in its nature exclusive, repelling all principles that are not derived immediately from itself, always contains within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. It was so in Rome in reference to the curiæ. Within no long period of time both the curiæ and their comitia became little, if anything, more than a name and a form.

The inquiry next arises, into what were the curiæ resolvable? And the answer is, into the gentes or houses. What then was a gens or house? It was the original element of Roman society and government. It was the smallest political division. Beyond it no further division was made, or could be, that could be in its nature political. The necessary consequence was, that when we inquire into the component parts of a gens we arrive at the individuals which were comprised in it. The union of several families then constituted a gens or house.

But what served as the bond of this union? Was it kinship, consanguinity of blood? Were all the families which composed a gens descended from a common ancestor? This is certainly a most natural way of accounting for it. It is also strengthened by the fact that the members of the gens were distinguished by a common name, as Cornelia, Julia, etc. But many circumstances, besides that of a common origin, may have given this common name. All the members of a curia, or tribe, had a common name, without a common origin.

There is no proof that the Romans considered that there was kinship among the familiæ originally included in a gens. The earlier traditions were to the effect that the gentes were subdivisions of the curiæ, and thus analogous to the curiæ, which were themselves subdivisions of the tribes. That there were ten in each curiæ, and, consequently, one hundred gentes in each tribe, and three hundred in the three tribes. Granting the truth of these traditions, there could have been no necessary kinship

among the members of the gens. The state, it is obvious, could have had a political origin in two different ways, the one by having all the familiæ related by blood form themselves into gentes, to have these formed into curiæ, and these curiæ into tribes. The other to begin at the other end, and divide or resolve the tribes into curiæ, the curiæ into gentes, and the gentes into familiæ. Tradition gives us the latter, and as we really know nothing excepting what we derive from it, we may as well take it as reject it.

As the gens was a subdivision of the curiæ, and these again were subdivisions of the tribes, it follows that the populus Romanus, the patricians alone had their gentes, and in conformity with this, we find the expressions, gens and patricii constantly united.

The following conditions were necessary to constitute a gens. Those composing it must bear the same name.[1] They must have been born of freemen. None of their ancestors must have been a slave, and they must have suffered no capitis diminutio.

The gens, as a political body, had certain sacred rights, to the observance of which all the members were bound, whether they had become such by birth, adoption, or adrogation. The tie that connected the familiæ composing a gens together was that of religion, the joint performance of the same religious rites. These rites, the sacra gentilitia, were performed at stated times, and had their own place for celebration, the Sacellum. It was made the duty of the pontifices to look after the due observance of these rights, and see that they were not lost. Among these sacra gentilitia, was the possession of a common burying place, and the right of all the members of the gens to interment therein.

We thus find that the religious tie was, in fact, the bond that principally served to bind together the two ultimate divisions of the Roman state, viz: the gens and the curiæ.

[1] *Anthon's Gens*, 468.

All this tends to show the strong original tendency of the Roman mind to religion, and the influence possessed by that in moulding the Roman character.

The Roman gens was made up of familiæ, and what then was the family as it existed at Rome? It embraced the entire household of the Roman citizen, the totality of what could belong to him as such.

The notion of familia comprehends the five following personal relations, viz:

1. Manus, or the strict marriage relation between husband and wife.

2. Servitus, or the relation between master and slave.

3. Patronatus, or the relation of former master to former slave.

4. Mancipii causa, or that intermediate state between servitus and libertas, which characterized a child who was emancipated by his father.

5. Tutela and curatio, the origin of which must be traced to the patria potestas.

As the familia formed no political element in the Roman state, the further consideration of it is deferred to the element of society where it properly belongs.

III. Patricii, equites, plebes. These are the three primary divisions of the Roman people and commons. The people, the populus Romanus, appear very clearly from the researches of Niebuhr, to have been all patricians. The word is derived from *pater*, and patricii, therefore, signifies those who belonged to the patres. Some have inferred from this, that they were the descendants of the senators, who were called patres; but since the researches of Niebuhr, it seems very evident that the senators sustained to the patricians, a representative, and not a paternal relation. During that early period, from the foundation of Rome to the birth of the plebeian order, as the patricians embraced the whole populus, the entire body of burghers, or Roman citizens, it is evident they could have no rights or privileges belonging to them ex-

clusively, nor can they be regarded as constituting an aristocracy.

But after the commencement of the plebes as an order, and they came to possess some rights, then it is evident that whatever they exercised, or shared with patricians, were lost to the latter as exclusive rights. On the other hand, whatever were those rights and privileges in which the plebes had no share, they belonged exclusively to the patricians, and in respect of them, the latter were a privileged class, an aristocracy.

Anterior to the existence of the plebs, all political power and all religious power were vested in the patricians, as their ultimate earthly possessors. The king, the senators, all the magistrates and officials were creatures of their own creation. From them they received all the power and authority they exercised, and to them, when from any cause they ceased to exercise it, that power returned. Thus the Roman formula, in the case of an interregnum, was: "The auspices come back to the patricians (patres)."[1] This formula is very expressive. If, for instance, there should be discovered to have been some flaw in the auspices, all the magistrates elected, must resign, and new auspices must come "fresh from the fountain, that is, from the bosom of the patrician society, which was prior to the state, and was the parent of all state religion, as well as of state authority."

The manner, peculiar organization, by which this power came to be exercised, will be considered under the heads of comitia, curiata and centuriata.

Subsequent to the existence of the plebs, or to that period at which they acquired any political power in the state, the privileges and power exercised by the patricii were always fluctuating, and always diminishing, until there were no strictly exclusive rights left to them, and they were placed on a common platform with the plebeians. This will be rendered more apparent hereafter. It may

[1] *Regal Rome*, 78.

be here remarked, however, that the religious element of authority continued to be retained and exercised by the patricii, for centuries after they had lost the political.[1]

The equites or Roman knights, as an institution, is attributed to Romulus. The three hundred celeres he kept about his person in peace and war, were the three centuries of equites first formed during his reign. They consisted of three hundred of the stoutest young men out of the most noble families; and, by way of distinction, they were to serve on horseback.

This original number of three hundred was doubled on the union with the Sabines. The more complete organization of this body has been attributed to Servius Tullius. He formed, from the leading men of the state, twelve centuries of equites, making six also out of the three established by Romulus.

Each of the equites received from the state a horse, or the money to purchase one, and also a gold ring. Each was also entitled to receive a sum of money for the annual support of his horse, which money last mentioned was obtained by a tax levied upon orphans and unmarried females. Thus was organized the equestrian order, which was of great utility in the state, as an intermediate bond between the patricians.

The period of time at which they became a distinct order is not so clearly settled, but it seems to have been during the regal government. After this period it would not be proper to term all those who served on horseback equites, or knights, but such only as were chosen into the equestrian order. There was another class of equites who did not receive a horse from the state, and were not included in the eighteen centuries. The two should not be confounded with each other.

The equites were chosen both from the patricians and plebeians. The age requisite was about eighteen years, and the amount of money necessary to be possessed at one

[1] *Regal Rome*, 77.

period of Roman history was 400 sestercia equivalent to over £3,200.

When vacancies occurred in the eighteen centuries, the descendants of those who were originally enrolled, succeeded to their places, whether patricians or plebeians, provided they had not dissipated their property.

The badges of the equites were: 1. A horse and its keeping given them by the public. 2. A gold ring to become a knight. 3. Augustus clavus, or tunica augusticlavia. 4. A separate place at the public spectacles, viz: next to orchestra, where sat the senators.

The equestrian centuries were regarded rather as a division of the army than as forming a distinct order in the constitution. In a mere political point of view, the community was only divided into patricians and plebeians, and the equestrian centuries were composed of both.

As the number of the equites was limited, and the increase in population and wealth brought forward increasing numbers who were duly qualified to become members of the equestrian centuries, and who would much prefer serving among the cavalry than the infantry, this led to the providing themselves with their own horses, which enabled them to serve in the cavalry.

There being always a sufficient number of equites in the city, there required only a review to fit them for service. There were three severals sorts of reviews:

1. Probatio which was a diligent search into the lives and manner of the equites, and a strict observation of their plights of body, arms, horses, etc.[1] This is generally supposed to have been made once a year.

2 Transvectio was rather a pompous ceremony and procession than an examination. It resembled a triumphal march made by them through the city every year on the fifteenth day of July. Then, after the completion of the sacrifices, all those properly belonging to the the equestrian order, that is, whose horses were furnished at the

[1] *Kennett*, 194.

expense of the state, rode along in order, as if returning from battle, being habited in the togæ palmatæ or the trabeæ, and crowned with wreaths of olive. The procession commenced at the temple of Mars without the walls, and was carried on through all the principal parts of the city, particularly the forum and the temple of Castor and Pollux. The number sometimes reached to five thousand, all riding on horseback and carrying in their hands the military ornaments, which they had received from their general, as the reward of their valor. At this time it was not allowable to cite them before a court of justice.

3. The recensio, which was an account taken by the censors every lustrum,[1] when all the people, as well as the equites, were to appear at the general survey. This was only a more solemn and accurate kind of probation. New names being enrolled, old ones canceled, and other things of a like nature done.

If any eques became corrupt in his morals, or had diminished his fortune, or even had not taken proper care of his horse, the censor ordered him to sell his horse, and by so doing he was considered as removed from the equestrian order.

The office of the equites was at first limited to serving in the army. But afterwards, they acted as judges or jurymen, and also as farmers of the public revenues. In the notice thus given of the equites, as we design to have little, if any thing, more to say of them, we have not confined our remarks entirely to the regal period, as during that period they performed no other part in the state but that of soldiers.

Plebes or plebs, plebeii, plebeians, were the body of commons, the commonalty of Rome. They thus constituted one of the two great elements of which the Roman nation consisted, and which has imparted to the earlier periods of Roman history, much of its character and in-

[1] *Kennett*, 195.

terest. The patricii and plebeii were the two main pillars upon which Rome rested, the two legs upon which she was enabled to walk over the world, in her career of conquest.

We have already seen the origin of the patricians; but the question here occurs when and whence came the plebeians? This has been a question of much doubt and difficulty. There appears to have been at Rome from a very early period, despised and dreaded by the nobility, or patricians, a mass of rabble, who gained their livelihood as artisans, or petty shop men. They paid no court to the great.

The number of these, at first, could not have been very great. They do not appear, as a class, in contradistinction to the patricians until the reign of Tullus Hostilius. His reign, and that of his successor, Ancus Marcius, were signalized by many successes obtained over the Latin nations bordering upon Rome. Among these was Alba Longa, which from henceforth vanished from among the states of Latium, Rome claiming to succeed to all her rights. In the result of this successful war upon Alba, and other cities of Latium, it is generally supposed we are to look for the first regular organization of the plebs.

The walls of Alba were razed to the ground, and its population dispersed. The most distinguished of its inhabitants, and perhaps those who were Roman partisans, were transplanted to Rome, and received among the patricii. The great mass of Alban citizens, and other conquered Latins, were allowed to take up their abode on the Cœlian hill, the Aventine, and the valley between the Aventine and the Palatine.[1] Those residing in the country the most probably did not remove to Rome, but continued to reside on their own farms.

About this period of time not only was Alba Longa taken and destroyed, but a considerable extent of country containing a number of Latin towns, as Medullia, Fidenæ, Politorium, Tellenæ, and Ficana was also subjugated by

[1] *Schmitz*, 43.

Rome. Great numbers of the inhabitants of these towns also found their way to Rome, were incorporated with the plebes, already settled there, and the Aventine mount was assigned to them as their habitation. These were Latins, and hence of the same original stock with the Ramnes, or primitive tribe of the patricians. The great point of difference between them was that the one was a conquered people, and the other their conquerors.

But all these conquered Latins did not find their way to Rome. Some portions of the land they had formerly possessed was restored to them by the Romans, and on these resided many of those who had been original proprietors, but who had now lost their independence and were subject to Rome.

The disabilities, rights, obligations, and relations existing between the plebes and the patricians or populus Romanus, were peculiar, and worthy of very particular notice. There is, perhaps, no greater anomaly anywhere presented, and no greater history anywhere recorded, than is found in the origin and progress of the Roman commons. They were, with the possible exception of the English, the greatest commons the world ever saw.

We find the plebes in their origin to be perfectly free from the patricians. They formed no part of the three tribes, nor of the curiæ, nor of the patrician gentes. As a necessary consequence resulting from this, they were excluded from the comitia, the senate, and all civil and priestly offices of the state.

They had no connubium, that is, right of forming marriage connections with the patricii. The old patrician blood must remain pure, and could not be mingled with that of plebeian origin. It is true they might be free landholders, and had their own gentes. The plebeian had also the patria potestas, or power over his own children, which belonged to the patrician. The plebeians had also their own sacra, or sacred things, which they had before the conquest, but then they were regulated by the patrician pontiffs. They could not only aspire to no privileges or

offices, but in all judicial matters they were entirely at the mercy of the patricians, and had no right of appeal against any unjust sentence which might be pronounced against them. Thus, although free and equal as between themselves, and personally independent, yet they were politically, civilly and socially inferior to the patricians. The latter formed a ruling class, an aristocracy, and the plebeians a commonalty, which, although derived from the same source as their rulers, and even exceeding them in numbers, were yet denied the enjoyment of any of those rights which would entitle them to take a part in public affairs, either of a religious or civil character.

Thus they were connected with the state and yet were no part of it. They were subjected to its burdens, to fight its battles, and yet had no participation in its benefits. They were in one sense citizens, but their citizenship more resembled the relation of aliens to a state, in which they were merely tolerated on condition of performing certain services. On the part of the patricians, the ruling class, we find a perfect organization, into tribes, curiæ, and gentes; on the part of the plebeians no such organization, except the mere division into gentes. Their relations with the patricians were in no way defined, and as a class, therefore, they had no way of protecting themselves against the arbitrary proceedings of their rulers.

There was, however, one point of contact between the two orders, and that was the army. That furnished an avenue to the turbulent spirits that arose among the plebeians. They were the great defenders of the Roman state. It was this circumstance as we shall see that furnished them, in great part, with the means of mounting up to the attainment of political privileges.

There was also another direction in which their energies might be expended, and that was in the acquisition of property. As they could be the legal owners of it, they could push their industry to all reasonable limits, and thus make handsome accumulations. They were a people enterprising, energetic, and intelligent. While many were

battling the enemies of Rome in her legions, others were acquiring property on their farms, or growing rich by their trades and pursuits on the Cœlian and Aventine hills. It was not to be presumed that such a people would always remain without privileges, and degraded in their social, civil, and political condition. Scarcely had the ruins of Alba become cold, and its inhabitants, with other Latins, become occupants of the Cœlian and Aventine, before the murmurings of discontent fall upon the ear. These become more and more audible as time moves on, as the peculiarities of their condition became more painfully felt, and their energies and powers became more thoroughly developed. It is mainly the conflicts carrried on between these two orders; the steady march of the one onward and upward, wresting one right and privilege after another from the ruling order, as its constantly increasing strength and power gave it the ability, until the pride of privilege yielded before the principle of equality, until the entire Roman plebs fight their way within the pale of the constitution, that chiefly invests this element in Roman civilization with its interests and importance.

The first attempt at organization, with the view of vesting the plebeians with political power, was made by the elder Tarquin. He conceived the idea of dividing them into tribes to be called after his own name and those of his friends. This purpose and plan were entirely frustrated by the augur Attus Nævius, who was in the interest of the patricians. All he could effect was the introduction of the noblest or wealthiest plebeian families into the three old tribes, and these were distinguished from the old patrician families, by the names of Ramnes, Tities and Luceres secundi, and their gentes are sometimes distinguished by the epithet minores, as they entered into substantially the same relation in which the Luceres had been to the first two tribes before the time of Tarquin. This, however, did not benefit the plebeians as an order, because the families thus elevated ceased to be plebeians, and became patricians, and the result, therefore, was that the latter became

strengthened by their accession, while the former was weakened by their desertion.

Servius Tullius, the successor of Tarquin, in the introduction of new and important changes into the Roman constitution, was the first to give to the Roman commonalty, a regular internal organization, and to determine their relations to the patricians. His design was, not to upset the old constitution, but so to enlarge it as to enable it to embrace the plebeian order as an element of the state.

First, directing his attention to the city itself, he divided it into four regions or districts, called tribes. From this division was excepted the Aventine and Capitol hills, the former being included in the country division, and the latter being appropiated more particularly to the gods. The Roman territory, surrounding the city, he, in like manner, divided into twenty-six other tribes. These thirty tribes were local, and inhabited by patricians, as well as plebeians, but their institution was exclusively plebeian; and in regard to political arrangements, the patricians no more formed a part of them, than the plebeians had previously formed a part of the old patrician tribes.

To those without landed property, who inhabited the country tribes, he assigned lots of land to cultivate. At the head of each tribe was placed a præfect, called tribunus. The tribes had also their own sacra, festivals, and meetings, convoked by their tribunes.

The effect of this was to give the plebeian order an internal organization. It was analagous to the division of the patrician order into thirty curiæ, It will be perceived, however, that this conferred no right to interfere in any way in the management of public affairs, or in the elections. These were left still to the senate and the curiæ.

These was, however, another institution of Servius Tullius, which gave the plebeians a portion of political power, and made them a part, although a very small one, of the Roman state. This was the organization of the comitia centuriata, hereafter mentioned, by which the entire body of Roman citizens, patricians and plebeians, were arranged

in five classes, according to the amount of their property. Thus was formed a great national assembly, called the comitia centuriata. In this assembly both patricians and plebeians met on a footing of apparent equality, but the votes were distributed in such a way as to throw the power into the hands of the wealthy classes.

There was also an organization by Servius Tullius of the tribes, called the comitia tributa, hereafter considered, but this organization gave them no other power than that of discussing the affairs of the tribes as such, and all resolutions passed in them were binding only on those contained in the tribes, that is, on the plebeians. The twenty-six country tribes contained the wealthier portion of the plebeians, who lived on their farms, carrying on agricultural pursuits, which was deemed the most honorable occupation among the early Romans. Those inhabiting the four city tribes were mostly engaged in trade and manufactures, and were hence thought less honorable than the country tribes.

But although in the Servian constitution, the plebeians obtained, to a limited extent, the right of voting, yet they could never as such obtain admission to the senate, nor to the highest magistracy, nor to any of the priestly offices. To all these, patricians were alone eligible.

Thus we find the plebeians under this constitution, possessing an organization as among themselves, which was an invaluable addition, as it enabled them to act in concert, and also a small power, and what we shall see to be rather a possible power in the Roman state, but coupled still with an exclusion of the right of connubium or intermarriage with the patricians and from the enjoyment of office in the Roman state.

Servius also admitted a number of families which had been noble among the Latins, but which, when conquered, became plebeians, into the number of equites, with twelve suffragia in the comitia centuriata.

It will be perceived, therefore, that Servius Tullius was to the element of government what Numa was to that of

strengthened by their accession, while the former was weakened by their desertion.

Servius Tullius, the successor of Tarquin, in the introduction of new and important changes into the Roman constitution, was the first to give to the Roman commonalty, a regular internal organization, and to determine their relations to the patricians. His design was, not to upset the old constitution, but so to enlarge it as to enable it to embrace the plebeian order as an element of the state.

First, directing his attention to the city itself, he divided it into four regions or districts, called tribes. From this division was excepted the Aventine and Capitol hills, the former being included in the country division, and the latter being appropiated more particularly to the gods. The Roman territory, surrounding the city, he, in like manner, divided into twenty-six other tribes. These thirty tribes were local, and inhabited by patricians, as well as plebeians, but their institution was exclusively plebeian; and in regard to political arrangements, the patricians no more formed a part of them, than the plebeians had previously formed a part of the old patrician tribes.

To those without landed property, who inhabited the country tribes, he assigned lots of land to cultivate. At the head of each tribe was placed a præfect, called tribunus. The tribes had also their own sacra, festivals, and meetings, convoked by their tribunes.

The effect of this was to give the plebeian order an internal organization. It was analagous to the division of the patrician order into thirty curiæ, It will be perceived, however, that this conferred no right to interfere in any way in the management of public affairs, or in the elections. These were left still to the senate and the curiæ.

These was, however, another institution of Servius Tullius, which gave the plebeians a portion of political power, and made them a part, although a very small one, of the Roman state. This was the organization of the comitia centuriata, hereafter mentioned, by which the entire body of Roman citizens, patricians and plebeians, were arranged

in five classes, according to the amount of their property. Thus was formed a great national assembly, called the comitia centuriata. In this assembly both patricians and plebeians met on a footing of apparent equality, but the votes were distributed in such a way as to throw the power into the hands of the wealthy classes.

There was also an organization by Servius Tullius of the tribes, called the comitia tributa, hereafter considered, but this organization gave them no other power than that of discussing the affairs of the tribes as such, and all resolutions passed in them were binding only on those contained in the tribes, that is, on the plebeians. The twenty-six country tribes contained the wealthier portion of the plebeians, who lived on their farms, carrying on agricultural pursuits, which was deemed the most honorable occupation among the early Romans. Those inhabiting the four city tribes were mostly engaged in trade and manufactures, and were hence thought less honorable than the country tribes.

But although in the Servian constitution, the plebeians obtained, to a limited extent, the right of voting, yet they could never as such obtain admission to the senate, nor to the highest magistracy, nor to any of the priestly offices. To all these, patricians were alone eligible.

Thus we find the plebeians under this constitution, possessing an organization as among themselves, which was an invaluable addition, as it enabled them to act in concert, and also a small power, and what we shall see to be rather a possible power in the Roman state, but coupled still with an exclusion of the right of connubium or intermarriage with the patricians and from the enjoyment of office in the Roman state.

Servius also admitted a number of families which had been noble among the Latins, but which, when conquered, became plebeians, into the number of equites, with twelve suffragia in the comitia centuriata.

It will be perceived, therefore, that Servius Tullius was to the element of government what Numa was to that of

religion among the Romans. His institutions were fraught with consequences far reaching into the future. He, in effect, created a third power in the state, or gave it its beginnings. The more immediate result was to strengthen the power of the king. His army did not now, as formerly, alone consist in patricians with their retainers. There were also bands of militia attached to the royal estates, and large masses of Latin plebeians who were unattached to patrician clans; for all the unattached plebs were virtually in clientship to the king. This threw the balance of power into the kingly scale. This may be, and most probably was, one of the reasons why we subsequently find Tarquinius Superbus a tyrant, and hence among the causes that overthrew the kingly government.

IV. Patronus, cliens. The relation of patron and client served as a strong connecting link between the patricians and plebeians. This was indicated by the word clientela. According to Dionysius, the patron was the legal adviser of the client. He was the client's guardian and protector; maintained his suit when he was wronged, and defended him when another complained of being wronged by him. In other words he guarded his client's interests both public and private.

In return the client contributed to the marriage portion of the patron's daughter if he was poor, and to effect his ransom if he was taken prisoner. He paid the cost and damages of a suit which the patron lost, and of any penalty in which he was condemned. He also bore a part of his patron's expenses, which were incurred by his discharging public duties, or filling honorable places in the state. Neither party could accuse the other, or bear testimony against the other, or give his vote against the other.

It was the glory of illustrious families to have many clients, and as this relation descended from father to son, it was the desire of every successive generation to add to the number transmitted to them from their ancestors.

This relation seems not to have been limited to individuals, but colonies, and states connected with Rome by alliance and friendship, and conquered states also, had their respective patrons at Rome; and when disputes arose between such states, the senate frequently referred them to be adjusted and settled by their respective patrons, and abided by their decision. It is also added by Niebuhr, that if a patron died without heirs, his patron inherited.

In the view thus given this was certainly a beautiful relation, and one that would serve wherever it existed to bind together the parties in the strongest bond of amity. There is much in it resembling the feudal relations which long afterwards constituted such a distinctive feature of the middle ages.

It is, however, probably an error to suppose that the clients were limited to the plebs. It is generally understood that any Roman citizen, who wanted a protector, might attach himself to a patron, and would thenceforward be a client. This is supposed to have been originally a Sabine institution, and it was of early introduction into the Roman state, where it continued to exist for centuries.

V. Comitia, curiata, centuriata, tributa. This, in a more especial manner, embraces the organization of political elements, and discloses the methods by which political forces were made to bear upon the affairs of the state.

By comitia is meant those public assemblies of the Roman people, at which all the most important business of the state was transacted, such, for instance, as the election of magistrates, passing of laws, decision of questions of peace and war, etc. Of these comitia there were three kinds, according to the three different divisions of the Roman people. Of these there was

1. The comitia curiata. This was the assembly of the curiæ; the meeting of the populus or original burgesses, which was of so early an origin, that there was then no second order in the state. It was the primitive assembly of the Romans, in which they assembled in their tribes,

and no member of the plebs could vote at such a meeting. It was one peculiarly patrician, and which always continued to be so, although in time it lost its power. Its institution is assigned to Romulus, and no doubt exists of its early introduction into the Roman state.

The place where the comitia curiata met was in that part of the forum called comitium, in which stood the pulpit or tribunal, afterwards called the rostrum, from which the orators were accustomed to harangue the people.

During the existence of regal Rome, this comitia or assembly was convened only upon the call of the king. There existed no set times for its session, but was held only as business required. The favorable report of the augurs was as necessary here as in other assemblages among the Romans. Upon meeting and receiving this report, the rogatio, or business upon which they had met, was publicly read. There was no deliberation had upon it. It was in fact no deliberative body. No individual was free to speak in it. Only the king or his representative might address them, after which he asked them to reply "yes" or "no" on the matter which he laid before them.[1]

In voting upon a question, the vote was taken by curiæ, of which there were thirty. Each one of these separately passed upon the question. The result of the vote of each curia was reported or announced by its officer, the curio, and after the reports of the whole were received, the question was declared decided by the votes of a majority of the curiæ, sixteen being necessary to affirm or negative any rogation. In this way the majority of patrician votes in each curia decided the vote of the curio, and the majority of the curiæ decided the question submitted.

It will be seen by this, that the comitia curiata could originate nothing, their function being entirely confined to affirming or negativing the matters brought before them. This being originally the great popular assembly, in which

[1] *Regal Rome*, 80.

should be heard the voice of the people, the inability to originate measures must have been a most serious defect, as it deprived the people entirely of the power of originating and carrying through any measures of reform. Thus the constitution failed to provide, in the popular branch, any means of its own amendment.

Thus the comitia curiata, although the great council of the nation, in which all the patricians or burgesses assembled in their curiæ and tribes, were in reality regarded as a meeting principally for the purpose of confirming some ordinance of the senate. A senatus consultum was the first indispensable preliminary. As to elections and laws, they had merely the power of confirming or rejecting what the senate had already decreed.

There were two principal occasions for summoning the comitia curiata:

a. For the elections of priests.

b. For the passage of a law by which military command was conferred on magistrates. This was called the lex curiata de imperio. Without it, the magistrates possessed only a civil power, or the right of administering justice, and were not allowed to meddle with military affairs, to command an army, or to carry on war.

The comitia curiata were also held for the purpose of carrying into effect, the form of adoption called adrogatto, because no one could change his state or sacra, without the order of the people. So also last wills and testaments were also made, during the early periods, at these comitia. So also was made here, what was termed the detestatio sacrorum, as when it was solemnly announced to an heir or legatee, that he must adopt the sacred rites which followed the inheritance.

The meetings of the comitia curiata, became, in time, mere matters of form. Their suffrages were represented by the thirty lictors of the curiæ, whose duty it was to summon the curiæ, when the meetings actually took place, in much the same manner as the classes in the comitia centuriata were summoned by a trumpeter.

2. The comitia centuriata. These were instituted by Servius Tullius, and formed the distinguishing feature of the Servian constitution. There were two grand objects sought to be attained by it:

a. The giving to the plebs some political importance, enabling them to vote, and thus bringing them on the same platform with the patricians.

b. The graduating the power and extent of the political importance by the amount or quantity of property possessed and owned by the individual. In the comitia curiata it was the race that decided the right to vote; in the comitia centuriata, the amount of property possessed and owned.

The great principle that presided over this organization was to give property the power of controlling the state, and that without any distinction between patricians and plebeians. Hitherto, birth and descent had alone constituted any legal distinction between Roman citizens; but Servius now established a timocracy, by making property the standard to determine the rights and duties of the citizen. His plan was to enable the people to vote on all important occasions, according to their equipments when on military service. This was substantially according to their property, for it was this that enabled them to equip themselves according to the prescribed method.

In making this organization he considered the whole state as forming a regular army, having its cavalry, heavy armed infantry, reserve, carpenters, musicians, and baggage train. This would probably sooner commend itself to the warlike ideas and feelings of that military age.

The cavalry included first, the six equestrian centuries, or the sex suffragia, which made up the body of the populus, and who voted by themselves in the comitia curiata.

To these were added twelve centuries of plebeian knights, who were selected from the richest members of the commonalty. Thus there were eighteen centuries of cavalry.

Next followed the infantry, or foot soldiers, who were organized in five classes. The first included all those

whose property was at least one hundred thousand ases, or pounds weight of copper. These were all equipped in a complete suit of bronze armor. These were reckoned as forming eighty centuries, viz: forty of young men (juniores) from seventeen to forty-five, and forty of older men (seniores) of forty-five and upwards.

The second class included all those whose property amounted to any sum between seventy-five thousand and one hundred thousand ases, who were equipped with the wooden scutum instead of the bronze clipeus, having no coat of mail. They also were divided equally into juniores and seniores, and together made up twenty centuries.

The third included all those whose property was above fifty thousand and below seventy-five thousand ases, and who had neither coat of mail nor greaves. Their number of centuries was the same as the last class, and they were similarly divided.

The fourth class included all those whose property exceeded twenty-five thousand ases and was below fifty thousand, and whose only arms were the pike and the javelin. This class also contained twenty centuries.

The fifth class comprised all those whose property was between twelve thousand five hundred and twenty-five thousand ases, and who were armed with slings and darts. They formed thirty centuries. Of these, the first four classes composed the phalanx, and the fifth the light-armed infantry.

In regard to those citizens whose property fell below that which was necessary to form the fifth class, they were reckoned as supernumeraries. Of these there were made four centuries.

The classification thus far has been according to property; but besides these there were three centuries classed according to their occupation. These were the fabri or carpenters, the cornicines or hornblowers, and the tubicines or liticines or trumpeters.

In this matter we reckon up in all one hundred and ninety five centuries, viz: eighteen of cavalry, one hundred and forty of heavy infantry, thirty of light infantry, four

of reserve and camp followers, and three of smiths and musicians.

The classification according to property rendered it necessary that the property of each citizen should be ascertained, and for that purpose, a census was instituted, which ascertained alike the property of the patrician and the plebeian. As property is in its nature a fluctuating thing, Servius ordained that a census should be held every five years, which period was called a lustrum.

The assembly of the centuries, preserving throughout the symbols of its military origin, held its place of meeting outside the city, on the field of Mars, where it was the usual custom to review the troops. Their meeting was summoned by the sound of the horn, and not by the voice of the lictors, as were the comitia curiata.

The power of summoning this assembly lay originally in the king; and after the establishment of the republic, in some one of the magistrates, as dictator, consul, prætor, who represented some one or more of the kingly functions. Seventeen days notice was required to be previously given of the time of the meeting. The first step in holding it was to take the auspices. If not properly taken, all the proceedings of the comitia were held to be vitiated, and all magistrates elected were compelled to vacate their offices. This was necessary in such a contingency, even though they had entered upon them, and had been some months in their performance.[1]

The auspices the most generally resorted to, which pertained to the comitia centuriata, were of two kinds: in the appearances of the heavens, as lightning, thunder, etc., and the inspection of birds, the omens from the latter being chiefly derived from their flight and singing. Omens were also taken from the feeding of chickens.

This necessity of having the auspices all right gave great power to the augur, and made it at times, a very important office. If a postponement of the comitia was

[1] *Adams*, 62.

desirable, the augur had only to hear thunder or see lightning, or declare some other defect in the auspices, and the comitia were at once broken off. So, also, were the comitia stopped, if, while they were holding, any person was seized with a falling sickness, or epilepsy, or if a tribune of the commons interceded by the solemn word veto, and so also were they broken off by the occurrence of a tempest.

The first step taken after organizing was for the magistrate who held them to repeat the words of a form of prayer after the augur. Next followed the business to be transacted, the names of the candidates for election were read; the proceedings or bills proposed were read by a herald, and the speakers heard on the subject; afterwards the question was taken.

The order in which the centuries voted was decided by lot. In early times the people were polled by word of mouth. But at a later period the ballot was introduced. The laws, however, relating to the introduction of the ballot until from B. C. 140 to 108, being towards the later periods of republican Rome.

In voting, the centuries were summoned in order into a boarded enclosure, into which they entered by a narrow passage slightly raised from the ground. There was probably a different enclosure for each century. On their entrance into the enclosure, the tabellæ, with which they had to ballot, were given to the citizens, and here intimidation was often practiced. These tabellæ had on them the initials of the candidates, if the meeting was for an election. If it were the passing or rejection of a law, the voter received two tabellæ, by one of which he could vote for the law, and by the other for the old law.

Under the old system of polling, each citizen was asked for his vote by an officer called rogator, or the polling clerk. Under the later, or ballot system, they threw whichever tabella they pleased into a box at the entrance of the booth, where certain officers were standing to check off the votes by points marked on a tablet.

The general causes for assembling the comitia centuriata were, to create magistrates, to pass laws, and to decide capital causes when the offense had reference to the whole nation, and not merely to the rights of a particular order.

Thus we find that under the guise and forms of a vast army, the Roman citizens were drawn out into the Campus Martius, to conduct their general affairs. Servius, however, hesitated as to the propriety of consulting the army on any matters that were clearly and purely civil or religious, and accordingly these were still left to the comitia curiata. But in such a martial community as the Romans, the most essential topics were the election of officers, and the division of land and spoil. These claimed and received much the largest share of attention, while admission into the patriciate, testaments, marriages and adoptions, and also special questions between patricians, were of little concern to the mass of the plebeians.

Accordingly, these questions were referred to the comitia curiata, and so also most of the decisions of the comitia centuriata were at first referred to them for their confirmation, and they were allowed to reject anything which offended against religion. By such means the curiæ retained a right of objection on formal or ceremonial grounds alone, and gradually sank into a mere ecclesiastical position. At first, the acceptance of a law by the comitia centuriata did not acquire full force until after it had been sanctioned by the comitia curiata, except in the case of a capital offense against the whole nation, when they decided alone.

Thus we discern three elements which determined the votes, age, wealth, and numbers. The centuries, as we have seen, were divided into seniores and juniores, and an equal number of votes was given to the two parts, although the latter must probably have been three times as numerous as the former. This would tend to remove the worst dangers of democracy, in which the younger are always able to outvote the elder men. Much the more important feature,

This relation seems not to have been limited to individuals, but colonies, and states connected with Rome by alliance and friendship, and conquered states also, had their respective patrons at Rome; and when disputes arose between such states, the senate frequently referred them to be adjusted and settled by their respective patrons, and abided by their decision. It is also added by Niebuhr, that if a patron died without heirs, his patron inherited.

In the view thus given this was certainly a beautiful relation, and one that would serve wherever it existed to bind together the parties in the strongest bond of amity. There is much in it resembling the feudal relations which long afterwards constituted such a distinctive feature of the middle ages.

It is, however, probably an error to suppose that the clients were limited to the plebs. It is generally understood that any Roman citizen, who wanted a protector, might attach himself to a patron, and would thenceforward be a client. This is supposed to have been originally a Sabine institution, and it was of early introduction into the Roman state, where it continued to exist for centuries.

V. Comitia, curiata, centuriata, tributa. This, in a more especial manner, embraces the organization of political elements, and discloses the methods by which political forces were made to bear upon the affairs of the state.

By comitia is meant those public assemblies of the Roman people, at which all the most important business of the state was transacted, such, for instance, as the election of magistrates, passing of laws, decision of questions of peace and war, etc. Of these comitia there were three kinds, according to the three different divisions of the Roman people. Of these there was

1. The comitia curiata. This was the assembly of the curiæ; the meeting of the populus or original burgesses, which was of so early an origin, that there was then no second order in the state. It was the primitive assembly of the Romans, in which they assembled in their tribes,

and no member of the plebs could vote at such a meeting. It was one peculiarly patrician, and which always continued to be so, although in time it lost its power. Its institution is assigned to Romulus, and no doubt exists of its early introduction into the Roman state.

The place where the comitia curiata met was in that part of the forum called comitium, in which stood the pulpit or tribunal, afterwards called the rostrum, from which the orators were accustomed to harangue the people.

During the existence of regal Rome, this comitia or assembly was convened only upon the call of the king. There existed no set times for its session, but was held only as business required. The favorable report of the augurs was as necessary here as in other assemblages among the Romans. Upon meeting and receiving this report, the rogatio, or business upon which they had met, was publicly read. There was no deliberation had upon it. It was in fact no deliberative body. No individual was free to speak in it. Only the king or his representative might address them, after which he asked them to reply "yes" or "no" on the matter which he laid before them.[1]

In voting upon a question, the vote was taken by curiæ, of which there were thirty. Each one of these separately passed upon the question. The result of the vote of each curia was reported or announced by its officer, the curio, and after the reports of the whole were received, the question was declared decided by the votes of a majority of the curiæ, sixteen being necessary to affirm or negative any rogation. In this way the majority of patrician votes in each curia decided the vote of the curio, and the majority of the curiæ decided the question submitted.

It will be seen by this, that the comitia curiata could originate nothing, their function being entirely confined to affirming or negativing the matters brought before them. This being originally the great popular assembly, in which

[1] *Regal Rome*, 80.

should be heard the voice of the people, the inability to originate measures must have been a most serious defect, as it deprived the people entirely of the power of originating and carrying through any measures of reform. Thus the constitution failed to provide, in the popular branch, any means of its own amendment.

Thus the comitia curiata, although the great council of the nation, in which all the patricians or burgesses assembled in their curiæ and tribes, were in reality regarded as a meeting principally for the purpose of confirming some ordinance of the senate. A senatus consultum was the first indispensable preliminary. As to elections and laws, they had merely the power of confirming or rejecting what the senate had already decreed.

There were two principal occasions for summoning the comitia curiata:

a. For the elections of priests.

b. For the passage of a law by which military command was conferred on magistrates. This was called the lex curiata de imperio. Without it, the magistrates possessed only a civil power, or the right of administering justice, and were not allowed to meddle with military affairs, to command an army, or to carry on war.

The comitia curiata were also held for the purpose of carrying into effect, the form of adoption called adrogatto, because no one could change his state or sacra, without the order of the people. So also last wills and testaments were also made, during the early periods, at these comitia. So also was made here, what was termed the detestatio sacrorum, as when it was solemnly announced to an heir or legatee, that he must adopt the sacred rites which followed the inheritance.

The meetings of the comitia curiata, became, in time, mere matters of form. Their suffrages were represented by the thirty lictors of the curiæ, whose duty it was to summon the curiæ, when the meetings actually took place, in much the same manner as the classes in the comitia centuriata were summoned by a trumpeter.

2. The comitia centuriata. These were instituted by Servius Tullius, and formed the distinguishing feature of the Servian constitution. There were two grand objects sought to be attained by it:

a. The giving to the plebs some political importance, enabling them to vote, and thus bringing them on the same platform with the patricians.

b. The graduating the power and extent of the political importance by the amount or quantity of property possessed and owned by the individual. In the comitia curiata it was the race that decided the right to vote; in the comitia centuriata, the amount of property possessed and owned.

The great principle that presided over this organization was to give property the power of controlling the state, and that without any distinction between patricians and plebeians. Hitherto, birth and descent had alone constituted any legal distinction between Roman citizens; but Servius now established a timocracy, by making property the standard to determine the rights and duties of the citizen. His plan was to enable the people to vote on all important occasions, according to their equipments when on military service. This was substantially according to their property, for it was this that enabled them to equip themselves according to the prescribed method.

In making this organization he considered the whole state as forming a regular army, having its cavalry, heavy armed infantry, reserve, carpenters, musicians, and baggage train. This would probably sooner commend itself to the warlike ideas and feelings of that military age.

The cavalry included first, the six equestrian centuries, or the sex suffragia, which made up the body of the populus, and who voted by themselves in the comitia curiata.

To these were added twelve centuries of plebeian knights, who were selected from the richest members of the commonalty. Thus there were eighteen centuries of cavalry.

Next followed the infantry, or foot soldiers, who were organized in five classes. The first included all those

whose property was at least one hundred thousand ases, or pounds weight of copper. These were all equipped in a complete suit of bronze armor. These were reckoned as forming eighty centuries, viz: forty of young men (juniores) from seventeen to forty-five, and forty of older men (seniores) of forty-five and upwards.

The second class included all those whose property amounted to any sum between seventy-five thousand and one hundred thousand ases, who were equipped with the wooden scutum instead of the bronze clipeus, having no coat of mail. They also were divided equally into juniores and seniores, and together made up twenty centuries.

The third included all those whose property was above fifty thousand and below seventy-five thousand ases, and who had neither coat of mail nor greaves. Their number of centuries was the same as the last class, and they were similarly divided.

The fourth class included all those whose property exceeded twenty-five thousand ases and was below fifty thousand, and whose only arms were the pike and the javelin. This class also contained twenty centuries.

The fifth class comprised all those whose property was between twelve thousand five hundred and twenty-five thousand ases, and who were armed with slings and darts. They formed thirty centuries. Of these, the first four classes composed the phalanx, and the fifth the light-armed infantry.

In regard to those citizens whose property fell below that which was necessary to form the fifth class, they were reckoned as supernumeraries. Of these there were made four centuries.

The classification thus far has been according to property; but besides these there were three centuries classed according to their occupation. These were the fabri or carpenters, the cornicines or hornblowers, and the tubicines or liticines or trumpeters.

In this matter we reckon up in all one hundred and ninety five centuries, viz: eighteen of cavalry, one hundred and forty of heavy infantry, thirty of light infantry, four

of reserve and camp followers, and three of smiths and musicians.

The classification according to property rendered it necessary that the property of each citizen should be ascertained, and for that purpose, a census was instituted, which ascertained alike the property of the patrician and the plebeian. As property is in its nature a fluctuating thing, Servius ordained that a census should be held every five years, which period was called a lustrum.

The assembly of the centuries, preserving throughout the symbols of its military origin, held its place of meeting outside the city, on the field of Mars, where it was the usual custom to review the troops. Their meeting was summoned by the sound of the horn, and not by the voice of the lictors, as were the comitia curiata.

The power of summoning this assembly lay originally in the king; and after the establishment of the republic, in some one of the magistrates, as dictator, consul, prætor, who represented some one or more of the kingly functions. Seventeen days notice was required to be previously given of the time of the meeting. The first step in holding it was to take the auspices. If not properly taken, all the proceedings of the comitia were held to be vitiated, and all magistrates elected were compelled to vacate their offices. This was necessary in such a contingency, even though they had entered upon them, and had been some months in their performance.[1]

The auspices the most generally resorted to, which pertained to the comitia centuriata, were of two kinds: in the appearances of the heavens, as lightning, thunder, etc., and the inspection of birds, the omens from the latter being chiefly derived from their flight and singing. Omens were also taken from the feeding of chickens.

This necessity of having the auspices all right gave great power to the augur, and made it at times, a very important office. If a postponement of the comitia was

[1] *Adams*, 62.

desirable, the augur had only to hear thunder or see lightning, or declare some other defect in the auspices, and the comitia were at once broken off. So, also, were the comitia stopped, if, while they were holding, any person was seized with a falling sickness, or epilepsy, or if a tribune of the commons interceded by the solemn word veto, and so also were they broken off by the occurrence of a tempest.

The first step taken after organizing was for the magistrate who held them to repeat the words of a form of prayer after the augur. Next followed the business to be transacted, the names of the candidates for election were read; the proceedings or bills proposed were read by a herald, and the speakers heard on the subject; afterwards the question was taken.

The order in which the centuries voted was decided by lot. In early times the people were polled by word of mouth. But at a later period the ballot was introduced. The laws, however, relating to the introduction of the ballot until from B. C. 140 to 108, being towards the later periods of republican Rome.

In voting, the centuries were summoned in order into a boarded enclosure, into which they entered by a narrow passage slightly raised from the ground. There was probably a different enclosure for each century. On their entrance into the enclosure, the tabellæ, with which they had to ballot, were given to the citizens, and here intimidation was often practiced. These tabellæ had on them the initials of the candidates, if the meeting was for an election. If it were the passing or rejection of a law, the voter received two tabellæ; by one of which he could vote for the law, and by the other for the old law.

Under the old system of polling, each citizen was asked for his vote by an officer called rogator, or the polling clerk. Under the later, or ballot system, they threw whichever tabella they pleased into a box at the entrance of the booth, where certain officers were standing to check off the votes by points marked on a tablet.

The general causes for assembling the comitia centuriata were, to create magistrates, to pass laws, and to decide capital causes when the offense had reference to the whole nation, and not merely to the rights of a particular order.

Thus we find that under the guise and forms of a vast army, the Roman citizens were drawn out into the Campus Martius, to conduct their general affairs. Servius, however, hesitated as to the propriety of consulting the army on any matters that were clearly and purely civil or religious, and accordingly these were still left to the comitia curiata. But in such a martial community as the Romans, the most essential topics were the election of officers, and the division of land and spoil. These claimed and received much the largest share of attention, while admission into the patriciate, testaments, marriages and adoptions, and also special questions between patricians, were of little concern to the mass of the plebeians.

Accordingly, these questions were referred to the comitia curiata, and so also most of the decisions of the comitia centuriata were at first referred to them for their confirmation, and they were allowed to reject anything which offended against religion. By such means the curiæ retained a right of objection on formal or ceremonial grounds alone, and gradually sank into a mere ecclesiastical position. At first, the acceptance of a law by the comitia centuriata did not acquire full force until after it had been sanctioned by the comitia curiata, except in the case of a capital offense against the whole nation, when they decided alone.

Thus we discern three elements which determined the votes, age, wealth, and numbers. The centuries, as we have seen, were divided into seniores and juniores, and an equal number of votes was given to the two parts, although the latter must probably have been three times as numerous as the former. This would tend to remove the worst dangers of democracy, in which the younger are always able to outvote the elder men. Much the more important feature,

Another ancient Roman magistrate was the quæstor. This name was given to two distinct classes of Roman officers. The one were public accusers, and were termed quæstores parricidii; the other were collectors and keepers of the public revenues, and were termed quæstores classici.

The former were two in number, and they conducted the accusation of persons guilty of capital offenses, and carried the sentence into execution. They existed at Rome during the period of the kings, and, in the early period of the republic, they became a standing office, which, however, was only for one year. The populus, or curies, appointed them on the presentation of the consuls.

It was the duty of these quæstors, on discovering that a capital offense had been committed, to convoke the comitia, proclaim the day of meeting, both at the gates of the city and the house of the accused, and when sentence had been pronounced by the people to carry it into execution. From the year B. C. 366, they disappeared from Roman history, their functions being transferred to other officers.

The quæstores classici were entrusted with the care of the public money. They were at first two in number, and were taken only from the patricians. They were very little different from the treasurer of modern times, as the senate had the supreme administration of the finances, and they could not dispose of any part of the public money without the direction of that body. Their duties, mainly, therefore, consisted in receiving the public revenues, in making the necessary payments, and in keeping and rendering correct accounts of both. They registered demands and outstanding debts, and also registered and exacted fines. They also provided the proper accommodations for foreign embassadors, and all such as were connected with the republic by the ties of public hospitality. On the death of distinguished men, and when the senate decreed that the expenses should be defrayed by the treasury, it was the duty of these quæstors to take charge of conducting the burials, and erecting the monuments.

In the year B. C. 421, the number of quæstors was doubled, and a law was passed that their election should not be restricted to patricians. At a subsequent period, a quæstor accompanied the consuls when they took the field against the enemy to superintend the sale of the booty, the produce of which was either divided among the legion, or transferred to the treasury at Rome. At a still later period, the quæstor kept the funds of the army, which they had received from the treasury at Rome, and paid the soldiers; thus occupying the post of paymasters in the army. After the Romans had commenced extending their dominion beyond the limits of Italy, the number of quæstors was increased to eight, and continued to increase in proportion as the empire became extended. It was the duty of one of these to provide Rome with corn.

Besides the ordinary Roman magistrates, there were two extraordinary, and which might with propriety be termed provisional. These were the interrex and dictator.

The interrex existed in regal Rome, the office being said to have been instituted on the death of Romulus. The senate nominated a board of ten, with the title of interreges, each one of whom enjoyed in succession the regal power and its badges for five days; and if no king was appointed at the expiration of fifteen days, the rotation began anew. This period was called an interregnum, whence the origin of that term. This board agreed among themselves as to who should be proposed as king, and on the approval of the senate, they summoned together the comitia curiata, and proposed the person to them. The action of the comitia was confined to his acceptance or rejection.

In republican Rome there was also a provisional arrangement in case the consuls, through civil commotions, or other causes, were unable to hold the comitia for an election. In such cases, interreges were appointed for holding the comitia. Each held the office for only five

days, as under the kings. Under the republic the interreges were elected by the senate from the whole body. No plebeian was admitted to the office, and therefore after plebeians were admitted into the senate, the patrician senators met by themselves to elect an interrex. This seems to have been the only office which the plebeians did not, in time, come to share with the patricians.

This office continued to exist down to the time of the second Punic war; from which time no instance occurs of the appointment of an interrex until the time of Tulla, and only some two or three instances afterwards.

The other provisional and extraordinary office, which was somewhat peculiar to the Roman constitution, was that of dictator. The term is of Latin origin, and the office had existed among the Albans. At Rome, a dictator was sometimes created for some special purpose. Thus, dictators have been there created for the following purposes: 1. For fixing the annual nail on the temple of Jupiter, in times of pestilence or civil discord. 2. For holding the comitia or elections, in the absence of the consuls. 3. For appointing holidays on the appearance of prodigies, or for celebrating games when the prætor was indisposed. 4. For holding trials; and 5, once for choosing senators. The great public occasions, however, which called for and procured the creation of a dictator among the Romans, were, when the republic was surrounded with circumstances of extraordinary danger, arising either from foreign enemies or domestic sedition. It was a provision in the constitution, by means of which when the emergency required it, the republic could at once assume the unity, secrecy, concentration and power of the most absolute despotism.

A dictator was first created about ten years after the expulsion of Tarquin. The cause of such creation was the fear of a domestic sedition, and of a dangerous war from the Latins. From that time down to the period when the perpetual dictatorship was conferred upon Sylla, the occasions in Roman history were frequent when the republic

fled for protection from its foreign foes or its internal convulsions, to the arms of a dictator.

No one was eligible to the dictatorship unless he had previously been consul or prætor. With respect to the mode of his election, it appears that on the first institution of the office he was created by the populus or burghers. But the more common practice, even in very early times, was for the senate to select an individual, who was nominated at or near midnight by one of the consuls, and then received the imperium, or sovereign authority, from the comitia curiata.

The power of the dictator was supreme both in peace and war. He could raise and disband armies; could decide on the lives and fortunes of Roman citizens without consulting either senate or people. He was attended by twenty-four lictors with the fasces and secures, the latter being instruments of capital punishment. From his decisions and edicts there was no appeal. It is true there was a law passed in A. U. 304, and again in A. U. 453, providing that no magistrate should be created without the liberty of appeal, but it is doubtful whether either of these had any application to the dictator.

On the creation of the dictator, all the other magistrates, except the tribunes of the commons, abdicated their authority. The consular office still continued, but the consuls acted in obedience to him, and, while in his presence, had no ensigns of authority.

There were the following limitations upon the power of the dictator: 1. It was limited to six months continuance. But a dictator, appointed for a particular purpose, usually laid down his authority whenever that purpose was accomplished. 2. He could expend no public money without the authority of the senate or order of the people. 3. He could not go beyond the limits of Italy. 4. He could not ride on horseback without asking the permission of the people. 5. He might be called to account for the manner in which he had exercised his power, after he had resigned his office.

For a period of one hundred and twenty years before Sylla no dictator was created, but in dangerous emergencies the consuls were armed with dictatorial power. After the death of Cæsar the dictatorship was abolished by law.

We have now gathered together all the elements that entered into the composition of republican Rome, in the outset of its career. We have its populus and plebs; its curia and tribus; its patronus and cliens; its comitia curiata and centuriata; its leges and senators consulta; its senate, consuls, prætor, quæstor, and censor, with the power to create, if necessary, the interrex and dictator.

The republic springs at once into existence from the iron sway of Tarquin. The populus, the patrician order, was the only one accustomed to exercise of power. In that order was found wealth and cultivated mind, and means and facilities for uniting their energies for a common purpose. Among them was political organization. The senate was the centre of immense power. It was composed of the heads of the aristocracy. The consuls, more immediately representing the king, were taken from the patrician order, and their interests were all one with the senate. So also the prætor, censor, quæstor; and, when created, the interrex and dictator, as also the priestly hierarchy, were all taken from the same order. At the commencement of the republic, no plebeian was eligible to any office. The entire conduct of public affairs, with all the agents, means and instrumentalities of conducting them, belonged exclusively to the patrician órder, and was wholly monopolized by them. It is not, therefore, matter of surprise, if we find at first all political power and influence, and most of the wealth and cultivated mind centering in the patrician order.

There was, however, one necessity, from which the patricians fortunately could not claim exemption, and that was the aid of the plebs in carrying on their wars and fighting their battles. A large proportion of the physical force resided with them. They had only to learn their im-

portance, and the means of availing themselves of it, to enforce a compliance with any reasonable demands they might make.

Tarquin survived the expulsion from his throne about thirteen years, during all that period stirring up the nations of Italy to war with the Romans. The patricians, under the pressure of these foreign foes, and depending much on the plebeians for their aid in fighting their battles, found it for their interest to treat them with mildness and some consideration. No sooner, however, was this pressure removed by the death of Tarquin in B. C. 496, than the patricians commenced oppressing and impoverishing the plebeian order.

From this period of time commences that remarkable system of reunions and separations; actings in concert and hostility; peaceful and warlike arrangements; which enter so largely into the constitutional history of Rome, and constitute in fact the interior life of the republic.

The constitution of a state may be changed in two ways. 1. By its amendment. 2. By its corruption.

The first occurs when a change takes place while its principles are fully preserved; the more fully developing and carrying out of the principles, producing the change.

The second marks a change, which occurs after its principles are lost; after its strength and vigor have departed. It is a progress towards decay and dissolution, and every change brings it nearer to its final termination.

The last is a change developed in weakness, the first in strength. We shall find the Roman constitution, through the entire life of the republic in a state of change, of transition; and that may perhaps account for the strength, energy, and often superhuman efforts that distinguished the history of that remarkable people.

Constitutions, when the change is in accordance with their principles, often exhibit more strength and power while that change is being affected than at any other time. It is then that their elements are all at work; that their various powers and capacities are strained and stretched

to their utmost limit of tension; that new and fresh sympathies, friendships, and enmities arise between men; that new associations are formed; and new modes and habits of thought, feeling and action, take the place of a dull and monotonous uniformity. We are to see how far these views are sustained by bringing out and exhibiting to view the interior life and history of Rome.

The distress and poverty of the plebeians were the results of several causes. They paid tribute, served in the armies, were often obliged to neglect the cultivation of their farms, which were frequently overran and ravaged by the enemies of the state. Thus they became impoverished and were driven to the necessity of borrowing money at an exorbitant rate of interest from the wealthy patricians. The Roman creditor might deprive his insolvent debtor of his freedom, and even of his life. Even his children and grandchildren might be left to languish out their lives in dungeons. If unable to satisfy his creditor, the debtor might be given over to him as his bondsman, becoming technically his addictus. So also a person might borrow money of another, and sell himself and all he possessed to his creditor, becoming what was technically termed his nexus, or nexu vinctus. In such case, he could only redeem himself by repaying the money. If not repaid, the creditor laid claim to the debtor's property. A nexus might pay off his debt by labor, but an addictus was thrown into prison, and became the slave of his creditor. But if a nexus was unable to pay his debt, he might be declared by the magistrate an addictus. In such case, his lot was chains, corporeal punishment, and the hardships of slavery.

In the year B. C. 495, the year succeeding the death of Tarquin, Appius Claudius and P. Servilius being consuls, an old man, emaciated and miserable, rushed into the forum, exhibited the bloody stripes on his back, and told his history. He had served in war, his cattle had been driven away, his farm ravaged and ruined. He had been compelled to borrow money to pay his taxes at

exorbitant interest, had been unable to repay it, had been deprived of his estate, and at length been compelled by his creditor to work as a slave.

It has been said that "no people were so easily moved with public spectacles as the Romans.[1] That of the impurpled body of Lucretia put an end to the regal government. The debtor, who appeared in the forum covered with wounds, caused an alteration in the republic. The decemvirs owed their expulsion to the tragedy of Virginia. To condemn Manlius, it was necessary to keep the people from seeing the Capitol. Cæsar's bloody garment flung Rome again into slavery."

The excitement created through the whole city by the appearance and story of the debtor was immense. Large crowds assembled in the forum. A feeling of indignation pervaded the masses. In the midst of this confusion it was announced that a Volscian army was on its way to Rome to lay siege to the city. The plebeians were called upon to enlist, but they refused; compulsion was impossible. The consul Servilius issued a proclamation that the complaints of the commonalty should be looked into after the war; that no person imprisoned for debt should be hindered from serving, if he were willing; that no creditor should possess or sell the property of any one serving in the army; and that the children and grandchildren of the soldiers should remain at liberty during the war.

Upon this, the plebeians enlisted; an army was raised, the Volscians defeated, and the consul returned victorious to Rome. They then asked of Servilius to redeem his pledge, but this required the aid of the senate and his colleague Appius Claudius. They refused to give it. Those who had been slaves for debt, were sent back to their prisons. The next were given up to their creditors as addicti.

Upon this, the plebeians went into open insurrection. The Sabines threatened war. An army was to be raised,

[1] *Spirit of Laws*, I, 251.

but the plebeians refused to enlist. Whenever compulsion was attempted, they resisted with violence. They held public and secret meetings on the Esquiline and Aventine.

All the constituted authorities seemed at a stand. The wheels of government stood still, as if they had lost their power of movement. Rome threw herself into the arms of a dictator. Fortunately, M. Valerius was created to that office.

The plebeians had confidence in the family of the Valerii. They enlisted, and the Sabines, and the Volscians, and the Acquians were all routed and put to flight. After a number of brilliant victories gained, and the victorious armies had returned to Rome, Valerius demanded that the condition of the plebeians should be investigated. The senate refused, and he resigned his dictatorship.

The senate refused to disband the consular armies, lest secret, nocturnal meetings should again be held. The legions were ordered to remain under arms.

This drove the army into open rebellion. Crossing the Anio, they retired to the sacred mount, and there, appointing L. Sicinius their leader, they took up a strong position.

Rome was in consternation. The senate well knew that a resort to force was out of the question. They sent an embassy to negotiate, at the head of whom was Menenius Agrippa. He addressed the insurgents, relating to them the fable of the belly and the members; the latter rebelling against the former; the legs declaring that they would no longer carry it, and the arms and hands that they would furnish it with no further supplies of food. But the inevitable consequence was, that in the end, the rebelling members were equal sufferers.

The result of the negotiation was that a solemn compact was entered into between the two orders, by which it was agreed that all the contracts of insolvent debtors should be canceled, and that all those who had been made slaves, on account of debts, should be restored to freedom. This could be at best but a temporary provision, as the laws in relation to debts remained unchanged.

But from another portion of the compact were derived results which were of a permanent character. This was the institution of the tribunes of the plebs. There were already tribunes of the Servian tribes, but they were merely for the purpose of organization among the tribes. The plebeians, as yet, had no magistrate or officer whom the patricians were bound to respect. This magistrate or officer was first found in a tribune of the people.

This was the first concession which the patrician order had made to the plebeian. It was the first element of political power which the latter had wrenched from the grasp of the former.

The purpose for which the tribunes were appointed was only to afford protection against abuse on the part of the patrician magistrates. To effect this purpose, the persons of the tribunes were declared sacred and inviolable. Whoever was guilty of violating the person of a tribune was declared an outlaw, and any one might kill the offender, and his property was forfeited to the temple of Ceres.

The tribunes were originally two in number, and they were always taken exclusively from the plebeians. No patrician could become a tribune without renouncing his order, and uniting with the plebeians, or without being adopted into one of their families.

They were at first elected by the comitia centuriata on the tenth day of December of each year, and their election was confirmed by the curiæ. Soon, however, three additional tribunes were superadded, one being taken from each of the five classes.

At a subsequent period, however, we find the election of the tribunes transferred to the comitia tributa, thus confiding to the plebeians themselves the selection of their own officers. So, in the year B. C. 457, the number of tribunes was increased to ten, two being taken from each class.

Although the tribunes were created to be a protection against the patricians, yet the plebeians soon came to look upon them also as mediators and arbitrators in matters

among themselves. They presided in the assemblies of the plebeian tribes. They might bring before them any proposal they thought fit; and if any one impeded them in so doing, they could arraign him before the commonalty.

The whole power possessed by the college of tribunes was designated by the term tribunicia potestas, and extended at no time farther than one mile beyond the gates of the city. In their capacity of public guardians, their houses were kept open day and night for all who were in want of aid either against a magistrate or a private individual.

Along with the tribunes another officer was created, the ædile, whose duties, at first, seem to have been merely ministerial. They were the assistants of the tribunes in such matters as the tribunes entrusted to them, among which were the hearing of causes of small importance. They were the keepers of the senatus consulta, and also of the plebiscita. They performed some duties analogous to those of the censors. They had the general superintendence of buildings, both sacred and private. They repaired temples, curiæ, etc. The care of the streets and pavements, with the cleansing and draining of the city, belonged to the ædiles. They also had the office of distributing corn among the plebes, but not of procuring it. They superintended buying and selling, and had a supervision of the markets. They also looked after the observance of religious ceremonies, and the celebration of the ancient feasts and festivals.

The ædiles curules were two in number, and originally chosen only from the patricians, afterwards alternately from the patricians and plebeians, and at last indifferently from both. These were created subsequently to the plebeian ædiles. Their duties were different, as they had the right of promulgating edicts, and the rules comprised in them served for the guidance of all the ædiles. They wore the toga prætexta, had the right of images, and a more honorable place of giving their opinion in the senate.

They used the sella curulis when they administered justice, while the plebeian ædiles sat on benches; but their persons were inviolable as were those of the tribunes.

The ædileship furnished its aid, but the tribuneship was the great stepping stone to power for the plebeian order. The tribunes wore no toga prætexta, nor had they any external mark of dignity, except a kind of beadle called viator, who went before them.

The tribunitian power was at first very limited. The object of its creation was protection, to protect the plebeians against the patricians and magistrates. Their power consisted not in action, but in hindering action. They were vested with the veto power, and never probably was the extent of that power so fully developed as in the constitutional history of the Roman republic. One-half the energy that lies concealed within it was not probably perceived when it was granted. They could hinder the collection of tribute, the enlisting of soldiers, and the creation of magistrates, as they did at one time for five years. They could negative all the decrees of the senate and ordinances of the people, and a single tribune, by his veto, could stop the proceedings of all the other magistrates. So great was the force of this word, that whoever disobeyed it, whether magistrate or private person, was immediately ordered to be led to prison by a viator, or a day was appointed for his trial before the people, as a violator of the sacred power of the tribunes, the exercise of which it was a crime to restrain.

The mere preventive character, which the tribunes originally possessed, gradually rose to a preponderating, indeed, to an overwhelming power. Every other power in the state but this, was annihilated before the dictator, but this still remained. The plebeians had now, therefore, an organ through whom they could speak, and make known their wants and wishes. It is interesting to trace, in Rome's constitutional history, the progress of the tribunitian power, and the manner and means by which it became developed.

The two years succeeding the secession of the plebs, and the creation of the tribunes, were signalized by the prevalence of a famine in Rome, in which the plebeians were the greatest sufferers. When in B. C. 491, a supply of corn arrived from Sicily, the patricians entertained the idea, whether they could not compel the plebeians to sell for bread, the rights which they had gained by their secession to the sacred mount. Coriolanus, a distinguished patrician, was the foremost to urge this upon the senate. That body, however, rejected the scheme as too inhuman. This led to the impeachment of Coriolanus, by the tribunes, before the commonalty, for attempting to destroy the compact entered into by the two estates, on the sacred mount. This was a new exertion of the tribunitian power. Coriolanus did not appear, and was condemned in his absence.

In the year B. C. 486, we, for the first time, hear of an agrarian law in Rome. There had been large tracts of land conquered from the enemy, and which had, therefore, been regarded as public land, and the property of the populus or patricians. This had come to be possessed by private patricians. The consul, Sp. Cassius, proposed that this land should be taken from the patricians, and distributed among the plebeians, they having assisted in its conquest, and generally were as yet without landed property. The law was finally enacted, although many years elapsed before it could be carried into effect. The tribunes became aware of its importance, and repeatedly demanded its execution. In B. C. 481, the tribune, Icilius, made an unsuccessful attempt; and in B. C. 473, the tribune Genucius arraigned the consuls before the commonalty, for delaying its execution, and was assassinated by the patricians. Still, there were bold men among the plebeians, who demanded its execution. The patricians, to evade it, stirred up wars. In B. C. 484, an attempt was made to restore the right of electing magistrates to the comitia curiata, instead of the comitia centuriata, by which the plebeians would have been excluded from exercising

any influence upon the elections. The attempt succeeded for two years. As a kind of reprisal, the plebeians refused to serve in the wars that had been kindled by the patricians. In B. C. 482, the tribunes and the whole commonalty, by their united endeavors, enforced the election by the centuries, instead of the curiæ. But after that, and down to the decemvirate, one consul, and sometimes both, continued to be elected by the curiæ, on the proposal of the senate.

In the year B. C. 472, the tribune Publilius Volero brought a proposal before the commonalty that the tribunes should be elected in the comitia of the tribes, instead of those of the centuries. The curiæ seem by this time to have lost the right of sanctioning a tribune elect.

The proposal was opposed by the patricians, and defeated for that year. But P. Volero, having been again elected the year following, when he not only made the same proposal, but, in addition, proposed: 1. That the plebeian ædiles should also be elected in the comitia of the tribes. 2. That on the proposal of a tribune, the comitia tributa might deliberate and pass resolutions (plebiscita) on all matters affecting the welfare of the whole nation. Up to this period, they could pass no resolutions to affect any other than their own order. This latter, therefore, will be readily perceived to be a proposal of immense importance. It was, in fact, to give the plebeian tribes not only the power of electing their own magistratus, but also of enacting laws which should be equally as binding upon the patricians as upon them.

The attempt to bring these proposals to an issue caused a fearful scene in Rome. The patricians, with the aid of their clients, gathered about the forum to disturb the proceedings of the plebeians. The messengers of the tribunes required them to withdraw, but in vain. The consul App. Claudius sent his lictors to seize Lætorius, the tribune, who, at the same time, dispatched some of his men to arrest the consul. The plebeians rushed forward to defend their tribune, and putting the patricians to flight, occupied the

Capitol with armed men. The senate was compelled to yield, and the proposals, termed lex publilia, became a law.

Thus there were three material points gained by the plebeians:

1. The law itself had originated with the tribune, and the assembly of the plebes; a thing before unheard of in Roman constitutional history. It might serve as a formidable precedent in the future.

2. The right was secured to the plebeians of electing their own magistrates.

3. The right was secured of passing plebiscita upon all questions of public interest. These, when passed, were of course the declared will of the plebs, and, as such, must exercise great influence, even before they acquired the force of laws binding upon the whole nation.

Political power gained on the part of the people is seldom lost for want of exercise. In B. C. 462, the tribune C. Terentillus Arsa brought a proposal of great importance. The consuls had hitherto acted according to hereditary usage, and their own discretion, and without the guidance of any written rule. The proposal now brought forward was that five men should be appointed to frame a code of laws for all classes of Roman citizens. The bill was passed by the tribes, but rejected by the senate and comitia curiata. The bill slumbered for some years, but was not forgotten. At length in B. C. 454, the patricians consented that the laws of the republic should be revised, but reserved to themselves the right of framing the new code. This brings us to a new phase in Roman government, viz: the rule of the decemvirs.

The following is the origin of the decemvirs: After the passage of the last mentioned bill, three senators were sent to Athens to acquaint themselves with the laws of Greece, and also of other countries, and, on their return, to make their report to the senate and people of Rome. On their return, it became necessary to constitute a board to frame and promulgate the new laws. The plebeians demanded that their order should be represented by five

in the board of ten. This point they finally yielded, and the decemviri were all taken from the patricians. This was a matter of some importance, as it was a principle adopted in all the states of antiquity, that when a commission was appointed to frame a new code of laws, or remodel a constitution, it was for the time invested with the supreme power, and all other authority ceased.

This was observed here. The decemvirs entered upon their office on the ides of May, B. C. 451. The object of the new legislation, if conducted agreeably to the spirit in which it was conceived, was to establish a unity between the two estates. These had hitherto existed independently of each other. At the same time, the design was to embody in the new code such of the earlier laws and customs, as would not disturb the intended unity.

The decemvirs discharged the duties of their office with diligence, and dispensed justice with impartiality. Each, as during an interregnum, administered the government day by day, and the fasces were only carried before the one who presided for the day. The peace of the republic was not disturbed by any foreign enemy, and the decemvirs during the year drew up a body of laws, which, after they had received the sanction of the senate, the centuries and the curiæ, were engraven upon ten tables of brass, and set up in the comitium, that everybody might obtain access to and read them.

At the close of the year, all were so well satisfied with the manner in which they had performed their duties, and the claim being made that the work was not completely finished, it was resolved to continue the office another year. Ten new decemvirs were accordingly elected, of whom Appius Claudius alone had belonged to the former body. These magistrates framed several new laws, which were approved of by the centuries, and engraven on two additional tables. After this was completed, the decemvirs began to act as despots. Each was attended by twelve lictors, who carried not only the fasces, the rods, but also the secures, the axe, the emblem of sovereignty.

They committed all kinds of outrages upon the persons and property of the plebeians. When their year of office expired, they refused either to resign, or to appoint successors.

The sacrifice of Virginia broke the power of the decemvirs. The people retired to the sacred mount, where they demanded the restoration of the tribuneship, the right of appeal against any magistrate, a general amnesty; and that the decemvirs should be delivered up and suffer death at the stake. All these were granted except the last, which was so modified as to give them the right to impeach every one of them separately. The decemvirs laid down their power, and the consuls, tribunes, and other magistrates were again elected.

The legislation of the twelve table is not so clearly settled. Several facts conspire to show that they contained a provision by which the whole body of Roman citizens, embracing as well the patricians and their clients as the plebeians, became members of the local tribes, in which hitherto the latter alone had been contained.[1] This created the comitia tributa, a great national assembly for legislative purposes; but the measures passed by it still required the sanction of the curiæ. It had also the election of all minor magistrates, as the ædiles, quæstors, and tribunes, and was also the high court of appeal. But the assembly of the centuries still retained the election of the high magistrates, the decision upon peace and war, and the privilege of acting as a court of justice in certain cases.

But many exclusive laws and customs of former times were still preserved, such as the severe law of debt; the law declaring all marriages between a patrician and plebeian illegal, and that which still continued the highest magistricies inaccessible to the plebeians.

Upon the reestablishment of the offices which had been vacated during the rule of the decemvirs, and the election of the proper officers to fill them, several new regulations

[1] *Schmitz*, 121.

were passed bearing upon the rights and privileges of the plebeians.

The old laws were revived, rendering the persons of the tribunes inviolable.

A law was passed that no magistrate should ever be appointed, from whose decree or sentence an appeal could not be taken.

A new law was passed by the centuries, giving to any measure passed by the assembly of the tribes the same force and effect as one passed by the centuries. The effect of this was to render all measures so passed, after they had received the sanction of the curiæ, just as much laws for the whole nation, as if they had been proposed by the consuls and passed by the centuries.

A law was also passed enacting that the ordinances of the senate should henceforth be deposited in the archives of the temple of Ceres, and be there kept under the charge of the plebeian ædiles.

A plebiscitum was also carried, that any one who should cause the plebeians to be without their tribunes, or should appoint a magistrate without the right of appeal from his sentence, should be scourged and put to death.

In the year B. C. 445, the tribune C. Canuleius brought forward a bill to establish the connubium or right of marriage between the two estates. At the same time, his nine colleagues proposed another, enacting that henceforth one of the consuls should always be a plebeian.

These proposed bills produced, on both sides, mutual exasperation, and while the patricians attempted to prevent their passage by causing a new levy to be made for the army, the tribune C. Canuleius refused to allow the levy to be made before the plebs had voted on the bills which had been brought before them.

The patricians finally yielded so far as to allow the bill respecting the connubium to be passed. This had a powerful tendency to break down the immense social barrier which had hitherto existed between the two estates. Marriages, it is true, had before been contracted, but they were

attended with this disadvantage, that the children which sprung from them always followed the baser side. From this, and other causes, the patricians had been diminishing and the plebeians always increasing in number.

The bill to divide the consulship was modified in such a manner as to allow, in future, military tribunes with consular power to be elected indiscriminately from both orders. This, however, was clogged with the provision that it should be optional with the senate to determine whether, in any given year, consuls or consular tribunes should be appointed. Thus the patricians contrived still to retain the exclusive possession of the consulship.

It was quite obvious, however, to the patricians, that the plebeians had an eye upon the consulship, and that they would not cease their efforts until they had attained it. They, accordingly, in the year B. C. 443, deprived the consulship of a very important branch of its power, which they expressly reserved for themselves under the title of the censorship. The duties and power of the censors have been formerly considered.

Upon the taking and destruction of Veii, in B. C. 396, another cause of contention arose between the two orders. The patricians desired, as usual, to divide among themselves the conquered territory. The plebeians demanded that it should be divided among all the Roman citizens indiscriminately. This last was opposed by the senate and even some of the tribunes. At length, after considerable controversy, the senate decreed the distribution of the Veientine territory in lots of seven jugera, among all the plebeians.

The next very important event that occurred in Roman history was the invasion and destruction of Rome by the Gauls, an event which came very near blotting out the Roman name from the catalogue of nations. From the fall of the decemvirs down to the occurrence of this event, the plebeians had continued in a prosperous condition. They had the Veientine territory divided among them. The booty taken in the wars was very considerable, and in that they had participated, and in about the year B. C. 407,

the senate, for the first time, decreed that the soldiers in the army should receive pay from the public treasury, all these being superadded to the larger liberty they were suffered to enjoy, had resulted in their enjoying a high degree of prosperity, so that they were, in general, enabled to pay their debts, and hence we hear of no harsh application of the law of debt.

But the destruction of Rome, and the devastation of the Roman territory by the Gauls, led to very unfortunate results. The rebuilding of the city, the purchase of cattle and agricultural implements, to supply the place of those destroyed, added to the necessity of a high rate of taxation, led to the creation of debts on the part of those who were in medium circumstances. There again occurred the necessity of borrowing, and the wealthy Romans, chiefly patricians, became usurers; and the cheerless dungeon became again the abode of the wretched debtor. The distress among the poor continued to increase, the number of free citizens to diminish, and the glory of Rome would, in all probability, soon have disappeared forever, had it not been for the efforts of two bold tribunes of the people, who seem to have been raised up for the very purpose of accomplishing a great work.

In the year B. C. 376, L. Licinius Stolo, and L. Sextius were elected tribunes of the people. They acted in concert with each other, and proposed three laws.

First. That the amount of interest, which debtors had paid up to that time, should be deducted from the principal, and that the remainder should be paid off by three yearly installments.

Second. That no one should be allowed to possess more than five hundred jugera of the public land, or keep upon it more than one hundred large, and five hundred small cattle; and that any one acting contrary to this law, should be compelled to pay a heavy fine.

Third. That henceforth consuls should be elected instead of consular tribunes, and that one of the consuls should always be a plebeian.

The proposing of these bills created a great alarm among the patrician order. They immediately set at work, and gained over all the eight other tribunes, who, uniting in their opposition, prevented the bills being put to vote in the assembly of the tribes. Licinius and Sextius resorted to their veto, or hindering power, and prevented the election of consular tribunes for the succeeding year, allowing the tribes to elect only their ædiles and tribunes. Thus the struggle was carried on for five successive years, Licinius and Sextius being reelected to the tribuneship each year. At length, in B. C. 371, the urgent demand for an effective Roman army, induced them to give way, and consular tribunes were elected.

Licinius and Sextius still continued to be reelected, and the opposition of their colleagues gradually ceased, so that in B. C. 369, the number of those opposing was diminished to five. This emboldened Licinius to bring forward a fourth bill, providing that instead of the two men, who had hitherto been entrusted with the keeping of the Sibylline books, ten should be appointed, one-half of whom should be plebeians. The object of this was to enable the plebeians to possess the same auguries as the patricians, and the same means of interpreting the will of the gods. This knowledge had before enabled the patricians to prevent or stop the proceedings of the popular assemblies. All discussion and action on these rogations were deferred until the return of the soldiers engaged in the siege of Velitiæ. Then the matters were sought to be brought to an issue.

The patricians, seeing no way of escape, had recourse to the last extremity, the creation of a dictator. They appointed M. Furius Camillus to the dictatorship in B. C. 368. While the tribes were actually voting, Camillus ordered them to quit the forum, threatening a resort to force. The tribunes opposed him with firmness and determination, and he abdicated, and P. Manlius was appointed to act in his stead. Licinius and Sextius being elected tribunes for the tenth time, they obtained

the passage of the bill respecting the keeping of the Sibylline books, and they again allowed consular tribunes to be appointed for the year B. C. 367.

After another contest with the Gauls, and their defeat by Camillus, the contest between the patricians and plebeians on the bills, or rogations, proposed by the two tribunes, was again renewed, until, finally, the former were compelled to yield, and the bills became laws, and were sworn to by both estates. L. Sextius was elected the first plebeian consul in B. C. 366. But here another difficulty occurred. The election to be complete required the sanction of the curiæ, and they refused to give it. The plebs threatened a secession.

A compromise was finally effected. The patricians yielded upon the following terms, viz:

1. That a new officer should be created, called the prætor, to whom the judicial part of the consular jurisdiction should belong, and that he should be taken exclusively from the patricians.

2. That two additional ædiles should be appointed, the curule ædiles, and that these should be taken exclusively from the patricians.

In this manner the knowledge and right of administering the laws was still retained by the patricians. Thus the first office in Rome, except the occasional one of dictator, was brought within the grasp of the plebeian. But, although the right existed, still the patricians used all their efforts to postpone its realization as long as possible. This they succeeded in doing by means of the creation of dictators and interreges. They also often succeeded in excluding the plebeians from it. They also, for some time after the passing of the Licinian laws, abstained from making war upon any of their neighbors, in order to avoid giving to a plebeian consul an opportunity of distinguishing himself. They even went so far as to rejoice when the plebeian consul, L. Genurius, in the war against the Hernicans, had the misfortune to be ensnared by the enemy, and to be slain himself, and have his legions dis-

persed. They also availed themselves of the circumstance to create App. Claudius dictator, and this same course of proceeding was resorted to in each of the three succeeding years.

In the war against the Etruscans, however, in the year B. C. 356, we find a plebeian, C. Marcius Rutilus, raised to the dictatorship, and while the patricians were reluctant, and even obstinate in their refusal to provide him with the means to carry on the war, the people the more readily supplied him with everything necessary. He was eminently successful.

An insurrection in the Roman army, in B. C. 342, led to the passage of several important laws. The cause of the insurrection seems not well understood, but is supposed to have been owing to the severe laws relative to debt, which were still continued at Rome. So strong had the feeling become against the usurers at Rome, that the tribune Genurius procured the passage of a law which forbade the loan of money on interest; but this law does not appear to have remained long in force.

Another important law, about the same time enacted, that no one should be reelected to the same magistracy until after an interval of ten years, and also that no one should be invested with two curule offices at a time.

Another law was also proposed making it lawful to elect both consuls from among the plebeians, but it is not clear that this was passed. It is a fact that many years elapsed before both consuls were plebeians.

Again in B. C. 339, the dictator Q. Publilius Philo proposed and carried three laws which were of very great importance.

The first enacted that the curiæ should confirm the results of legislative measures brought before the centuries, previous to the commencement of voting upon them; or in other words, the veto of the curiæ, on any law passed by the centuries, was abolished.

The second provided that the decrees of the plebs, the plebiscita, should be binding as laws upon all Roman citizens.

The third ordained that one of the censors should always be a plebeian. Two years later we find the prætorship also thrown open to the plebeians.

In the year B. C. 326, a law was passed that no plebeian should become a nexus; that is, should pledge his personal property for debt.

There was also a change made in the comitia, but at what time is uncertain. The comitia centuriata had been gradually losing their importance in proportion as that of the comitia tributa increased. At length, a combination of the two was devised to meet the altered exigencies of the time, the centuries being engrafted on the tribes; each of the latter voting as two centuries, one of the seniors, and the other of the juniors. But this assembly in which the centuries were thus combined with the tribes, was quite distinct from the comitia of the tribes, which continued to be held as before.

There still, however, remained one entire department into which the spirit of plebeian reform had scarcely entered, and that was the priestly hierarchy, the colleges of augurs and pontiffs. These had hitherto consisted of four priests each, all of whom were patricians. We have heretofore seen the entire control of the augurs and pontiffs over the auspices; and the slavish dependence upon them of all civil, political and military transactions. The plebeians could not expect security even in the exercise of power so long as the patricians retained the exclusive right to interpret the auspices. They might declare an election void because the auspices were unfavorable.

This was remedied in the year B. C. 300, by the tribunes Q. and Cn. Ogulnius. They procured the passage of a law, called the Ogulnian law, by which the number of augurs was increased to nine, and that of the pontiffs to eight (the chief pontiff who is not included in this number, being the ninth), and which ordained that four of the pontiffs and five of the augurs should always be plebeians.

Thus had the plebeians steadily marched forward, wresting from the patricians one right and privilege after an-

other, until they had acquired, in every material respect, a political equality. They began with nothing but with physical force, a fair amount of intelligence, and an unconquerable determination. It was, in fact, the same forces that conquered the world, that overcame the craft, ingenuity, and strong combination of the patricians to retain and perpetuate their own power. These Roman plebeians were the greatest commons the world ever saw unless we except those of England and America. Although the patricians had contested every inch of ground, and had resorted to every means that a refined, unscrupulous, and calculating ingenuity could suggest, yet the plebeians, by their perseverance, steady efforts, well arranged secessions, and judicious measures, had always succeeded in the end in whatever they had undertaken, and had at last substantially broken down the wall of partition that had so long formed a constitutional barrier between them and the patricians. That wall had been four centuries and a half in getting demolished, but it had now substantially disappeared. The senate henceforth represents the aristocracy as opposed to the people, who consist of patricians and plebeians indiscriminately. It will be clearly perceived from all this, that the conquest of the world by Roman arms is no longer a secret to him who comprehends Rome's constitutional history. Like everything else, it is within the empire of cause and effect.

But the plebeians were hardly disposed to stop when they had acquired an equality with the patricians. They had learnt the wonderful power that lay in secession. The great difficulty still, and what had ever been the curse of the plebeians, was their poverty, or the poverty of great numbers among them, and the consequent necessity of borrowing money at usurious interest. This was an evil which the acquisition of political rights could not cure. It was one which the long continued and exhausting wars carried on by Rome, the devastation and destruction of property to which they gave rise, and the scarcity and epidemic diseases that followed in their wake, only tended

to aggravate and increase. To so great an extent did these disorders prevail, that some of the tribunes thought it necessary to propose a general cancelment of debts. There finally occurred in B. C. 287, a secession of the commonalty, and an encampment by them on the Janiculum. This is the last that occurs in Roman history.

Recourse was had to a dictator, and Q. Hortensius was appointed. He resorted to conciliatory means, and among these was the passage of the celebrated Hortensian law, which gave to the decrees of the plebs, the plebiscita, the power of a law binding on the whole nation. The point in which this law differed from the Publilian is probably to be found in the fact, that Hortensius abolished the veto of the senate upon those legislative measures which had been passed by the plebeian assembly.

The constitution of republican Rome had now attained its highest degree of perfection. Like the English constitution, it had been the work of time and progress. It had been reared on traditionary forms and customs; had, in a measure grown out of usages, and were cemented by written laws and compacts between the two orders. It had resulted from secessions, negotiations and compromises. It commenced with an oppressive aristocracy, swaying an iron sceptre over the plebeian masses. It had gradually settled down into a mild and temperate form of democracy in which all the political forces were very nicely balanced and rightly adjusted. We have already seen their disposition, and traced the general current of their history.

It is important to know something of the relations existing between Rome and her conquered provinces. She never rose to the idea of granting liberty to a conquered people. She never aspired to Italian nationality. Her ambition was to be a sovereign city, and she desired to keep her subjects in subjection, and to receive from them aid whenever it should be needed. If their territory was left to them, it was simply as a gift from the Romans.

Sometimes the Roman franchise was extended to towns, and then they were called municipia, and their citizens

municipes. Of these there were some which had the Roman franchise, but whose citizens had neither the right to vote in the assemblies at Rome, nor to hold any magistracy there. Others, which were completely incorporated with the Roman state, having no separate administration of their own internal affairs. There were others still whose inhabitants might go to Rome, and there exercise all the rights of Roman citizens, and yet retain at home their own administration.

The colonization of Rome was a part of her politics. No colony was ever founded without a decree of the senate. It was established in towns and cities already inhabited. It amounted to little more than permanently garrisoning the conquered towns and provinces. The colonists received the third part of the territory as their property, the remainder being left to the original inhabitants. The colonists were the ruling body, and the inhabitants the subject people.

There was another class of towns besides the municipia, which were the præfecturæ. These continued to form distinct political communities, to which Rome sent annual præfects, to administer justice to the Romans residing in them. Their inhabitants might still be in the enjoyment of the full Roman franchise. The socii, or allies, were either people whose rights were secured by treaties with Rome, and by mutual oaths; or those to whom, after their subjugation, the Roman senate had granted their full independence, and whose rights depended for their continuance on the good-will of the Romans. Where a place was taken by the sword, or had been compelled to surrender at discretion, it no longer formed a political body, had no freedom nor communium. They stood to the Roman people nearly in the relation of serfs. They not only lost their own landed property, but were not allowed to acquire any elsewhere.

The foregoing remarks apply to the people of Italy. In relation to foreign nations, the practice was very uniformly adopted, of reducing them to the condition of Roman

provinces; a condition in which the ruling was all done by Roman officials, and the people, by a grinding system of oppression, were compelled to support the very agents by whom, and the instruments by which, they were enslaved. A country, which had once become a Roman province, almost inevitably fell into decay. In addition to the causes just mentioned, it was quite common for numbers of wealthy strangers, or Roman speculators, to settle in the provinces, and to purchase the lands at reduced prices. Thus, between these foreign owners, and the administration of the government by Roman officials, the people were borne down by a grievous oppression.

The Roman constitution, the history of which we have imperfectly traced, might be said to have attained its perfect development shortly previous to the second Punic war. Its healthful working was for some time secured by the virtue and patriotism of the citizens, by their reverence for law, and regard for an oath. But all this did not long continue. The Roman citizen forgot everything else in his inordinate desire of dominion and wealth. In pursuit of these, it seemed of little consequence to violate his faith, and despise and contemn his religious convictions. The senate were increasing their power and influence, and kings and nations were brought into obedience to their commands. The people, composed now of patricians and plebeians, were constantly endeavoring to increase their power and wealth. Among them was a large class of poor and freedmen. There came to be scarcely the vestige of any middle class in Rome. On the one hand were the illustres or optimates, the nobles; and on the other the great mass of the common people. Between these, while the law made no distinction, custom and feeling did. These optimates were, for the most part, plebeians, whose ancestors had, by their acquisitions of wealth, stepped into the place of the old patrician aristocracy, and the offices originally conferred meritoriously, had come to be hereditary in their families. They now formed an aristocracy fully as exclusive and oppressive as the patricians

had been. The poor had sunk to the lowest depths of poverty. Those exalted to power, and holding offices, were often wild and irregular in their acts. Even the tribunes, once the great champions of the people, were occasionally so lawless in their acts as to require restraint. In the year B. C. 167, it was provided by the Aelian and Fufian law, that the assemblies convoked by the tribunes, should, like the comitia, be liable to be dissolved by signs in the heavens, such as thunder and lightning. This had the effect of giving the augurs a veto upon the transactions of the tribunes, just as these latter had a veto on those of the government.

Besides the free population in Rome and Italy, there had come to be large numbers of slaves, who were employed in those works, which had formerly been performed by freemen. Thus, as an almost necessary consequence, the citizens became idle, neglected all useful occupation, and gave themselves up to indulgence in vice and debauchery.

Italy having been entirely conquered, there was not, for a long period of time, any fresh distribution of public land among the people. Incessant foreign wars being carried on, the small landed proprietors were often compelled to neglect their farms, and ultimately to sell them to their wealthier neighbors. Thus the distance between the rich and the poor became every day more distinct and marked.

The rich and powerful belonged to the senate. In that body was an immense concentration of power. The illustrious families holding the exclusive possession of the most important and lucrative offices, and having accumulated their wealth in the provinces, were enabled at home, to amuse and corrupt the people, by distributions of money and food, by games, spectacles and bribes. There existed in Rome a numerous populace, having neither property nor industry, and who were always in the market, and to be had by the highest bidder.

Such was the state of things when there arose in Rome two illustrious plebeians, who determined, if possible, to

bring up the lower classes, and restore the balance. These were Tiberius and Caius Sempronius Gracchus. The former was the elder, and was elected to the tribuneship in B. C. 133. His determination was to restore the Licinian agrarian law, which had limited the domain land to be occupied by one person to 500 jugera. This law had never been repealed, and it had never been observed. Tiberius Gracchus undertook to restore it to observance; to take away the surplus from the wealthy owner, and distribute it among the poor, thus affording them opportunities for industry, and the means of living.

This was a test well qualified for determining what amount of real virtue and patriotism still remained among the Roman people. Had it succeeded, it would have proved that Rome was still sound at the core, and the effect would have probably been to prolong the existence of her republican institutions. But Rome had lost her virtue and her patriotism.

Notwithstanding, however, the fiercest opposition, the bill proposed by him passed, and a triumvirate consisting of the two Gracchi and Appius Claudius, was appointed to carry it into effect. But the hatred engendered on the part of the senate and aristocracy against Tiberius Gracchus was such, that his life was obviously in danger, and he was finally slain in a tumult created by the senate, and in which the senators themselves actually took a principal part.

His brother Caius still remained. He was younger than Tiberius, seemed animated by the same spirit, and was possessed of more talent and skill as a politician and orator. He was elected tribune in the year B. C. 123. While tribune during this, and the succeeding year, he proposed and urged the adoption of many laws which were extremely judicious, and well calculated to preserve and perpetuate the republican institutions of Rome. The general object of them was to raise the lower classes, remove abuses, and limit the power of the senate. But the tactics of the senate were too much for him. They resorted to the singular

expedient of undermining his popularity by prevailing upon his colleague in the tribuneship, M. Livius Drusus, to outbid him in the proposal of popular measures. This, together with combination against him of all the senate and aristocracy, resulted in his defeat, when, a third time, he offered himself a candidate for the tribuneship. Rome had now arrived to that condition, when a virtuous, patriotic man, who was obnoxious to the senate and aristocracy, and who was not invested with the sacred character of tribune, could not remain within her walls in safety. Thus it is proved in the case of Caius Gracchus. A tumult in the city was excited, the senatorial party made a violent attack upon Gracchus and his friends. Three thousand of them were slain, and their bodies thrown into the Tiber. Among these was Caius Gracchus himself.

After this sad experience, it could not be expected that any one would be bold enough to attempt to stem the current of corruption. Republican Rome, in its spirit and essence, expired with the Gracchi.

Imperial Rome.

The last phase of this element, imperial Rome, was a state necessity. It arose out of the same contingency, which, under similar circumstances, will always produce the same result. Rome had become divided into two classes, the rich and the poor. The former had lost their virtue and patriotism, the latter their independence of thought and action. Among the first prevailed an irreclaimable selfishness; among the last, a willing servility to the highest bidder. The pride and passion of the former had grown too strong for the restraints of law; and the latter offered the willing instruments by which every legal barrier could be beaten down. Hence the destructive contests between Sylla and Marius, and between Pompey and Cæsar. The latter finally triumphed over all his enemies, and Rome bowed her imperial head beneath the dominion of a master. It is true, there still existed some

heat among the dying embers of a worn-out patriotism. Brutus and Cassius, particularly the former, did attempt, through the death of Cæsar, again to revive the republic. Vain attempt — as well might a dead body be galvanized into new life. All the essential elements that go to sustain a republic were wanting. The attempt was merely spasmodic, and, after a series of bloody contests, the rule of Augustus Cæsar became fully established throughout the whole Roman world.

From this period, the government of Rome became, and so continued throughout, to be really despotic. It differed in no respect but one from any other despotism, and that was, that through the reign of Augustus, and some of his immediate successors, some regard was paid to Roman prejudices, and to Roman horror of kingly rule. This was made abundantly manifest from the fact that the first Cæsars, particularly Augustus, were careful to rule under the forms of the republic. The real power resided with the Cæsars, and the exercise of that, they thought an abundant compensation for their allowing the semblance of it to remain still with the senate and people. Accordingly, we find all the offices still remaining. The incumbents, it is true, whoever were elected, must obey the commands of Cæsar. But the people cared not to look beyond the forms, and if the semblance of liberty was there, they did not care to push their investigations any further. An unwelcome truth is very often kept out of view as much as possible. Even Augustus himself, during his long reign, submitted five times to the formality of an election. While he was apparently receiving office at the hands of the people, they forgot that he commanded all the troops. He himself organized the prætorian guard, which constituted the body guard of the emperor, and ultimately took so conspicuous a part in the creation and deposing of emperors.

The emperor soon concentrated in his own person all the powers which had formerly been exercised by the different magistrates. In the reign of Tiberius, the election of the magistrates was transferred from the people to the

senate. On the demise of the emperor, and when he had omitted to nominate a successor, the senate had the right to appoint one, but this was a right they seldom exercised, as it was usurped by the soldiers.

The senate also had, at first, the nominal control of the ærarium, or treasury. But the emperors gradually took it under their exclusive management. The senate was a body more easily controlled than the people, and hence the policy of the emperors was to transfer to it whatever power had been formerly exercised by the people. Thus Augustus ordained that no accusations should be any more brought before the comitia, but that the judicial functions should be exercised by the senate. Thus gradually the office of every magistrate came to be concentrated in the emperor, the senate was his willing instrument, and the prætorian cohorts embodied the elements of power by means of which he was enabled to carry into effect all his objects and designs. During the continuance of the empire some changes were introduced, but the despotism remained unchanged in its character until the final overthrow of Rome and all her institutions.

CHAPTER V.

ROME—ITS SOCIETY.

The element of society, among the Romans, like that of government, has its history. The social instinct, in its development, must always, more or less faithfully, reflect the character of the people. It may be successfully appealed to as a test of the sterner virtues; or as furnishing the most indubitable proofs of corruption and depravity. Perhaps no more perfect barometer can be afforded of the actual state and condition of a people, or of the progress made in the refinements of virtue or vice, than is offered by the development of this element. Society, while it furnishes a theatre in which all the virtues and accomplishments that dignify and adorn human nature may have full opportunity for unlimited display; is also equally effective in evolving from its own bosom the materials of strife and enmity, and that wild play of propensity and passion that may transform the globe into a worse than Pandemonium, and men and women into demons incarnate. To form an adequate idea of Roman society, we must attend to the following particulars:

I. The Roman dress and habit.

II. The Roman houses and their domestic arrangements.

III. Of the Roman convivial entertainments.

IV. Of the baths and exercises of the Romans.

V. Of the Roman games: 1, private; 2, public.

VI. The domestic relations of the Romans; the subjects of marriage and divorce; the filial and parental relations; the condition of women.

VII. The Roman funerals.

I. The Roman dress or habit. The different habits or modes of dress worn by the Romans have been subjects of much research and controversy among antiquarians. One cause of this has undoubtedly been, that the fashions at Rome, like those of more modern times, were extremely changeable. At different times, not only new articles of dress came into use, but old articles were changed so as to be adapted to new styles. All, therefore, we can undertake to do, is to notice the several sorts of garments that were in use with both sexes at Rome, confining them entirely to the Roman citizen, and not the soldier.

The two most important garments worn by the Romans were the toga and tunica.

One of the distinguishing marks between the Greeks and Romans, in the matter of dress, was that the former wore the pallium, for their common garment, while the latter wore the toga. This latter, however, was the badge of peace, being laid aside upon engaging in any martial design. The toga, or gown, was a loose, flowing, woolen robe, of a semicircular form, without sleeves, differing in largeness, according to the wealth or poverty of the wearer, and generally used only upon occasions of appearing in public. None but Roman citizens were permitted to wear the toga. Its color was white, and on festival days they usually wore one newly cleaned. Candidates for office wore one whitened by the fuller.

The form of the toga varied with the times. The Romans at first had no other dress, and it was then straight and close, covering the arms and coming down to the feet. It was made wider or straighter in proportion to the size of the person that wore it.

The toga is generally supposed to have been an open garment, the right arm being at liberty, while the left was supporting that part of it which was drawn up and thrown back over the left shoulder. There is some controversy as to whether a girdle was worn or not with the toga; but it seems clear that the ancient statues never exhibit a

girdle about it, and if those Romans represented in marbles with these habits are girt, it is with nothing but the toga itself, which they wrap around the body and fasten by a kind of knot.

The Romans were commonly bareheaded, but in case of excessive heat, cold, or rain, they made use of the upper part of the toga for a covering. Whenever they met a person entitled to extraordinary respect, their practice was to show it by uncovering the head.

The toga prætexta, so called from the purple border that adorned it, was given to the sons of patricians until they arrived at the age of puberty, which is generally supposed to have been the age of seventeen. The same kind of gown was also worn by the superior magistrates, the pontifices and augurs.

The toga pura, so called because no purple was added to the white, was the ordinary garment of private persons when they appeared abroad.

The toga virilis, or manly gown, was so called because when the youths came to man's estate, or to the age of seventeen years, they laid aside the toga prætexta, and assumed this in its place. On this occasion, the friends of the young man carried him into the forum, and attired him in the new gown with much ceremony. After this, young men of rank commonly lived in a separate house from their parents.

There were several other kinds of the toga, which it is not necessary to mention.

Another article of dress among the Romans was the tunica, or close coat, which was the common garment worn within doors by itself, and abroad under the gown. This was not worn by the early Romans. The tunic was a kind of white woolen vest, which was at first short and straight, not covering the arms. Afterwards they had sleeves coming down to the elbow. This garment continued to grow, until, in the declension of the empire, the sleeves came down to the hands, and the tunics themselves were made to reach down to the ankles.

The tunic was often fastened by a girdle or belt about the waist to keep it tight, and which also served as a purse, in which they kept their money. This girdle, however, does not seem to have been used at home or in private.

There were several sorts of tunics, such as the palmata, which was worn by generals in a triumph.

The tunica clava, called the latus clavus, has given rise to a vast amount of discussion and controversy. It was a tunic appropriated to the senatorian order, and the peculiarity, or the latus clavus, seems to have been a piece of purple sewed upon the tunics, or rather several pieces so sewed on as to resemble nails. Hence the word clavus.

Under the tunic, the Romans wore another woolen covering next to the skin, much like our shirt. Linen cloths were not used by the ancient Romans, and are seldom mentioned in the classics. In the later ages, the Romans wore, above the toga, a kind of great coat called lacerna, which was opened before, and fastened with clasps or buckles. They had also had another kind of great coat or surtout, very much resembling the lacerna, but shorter and straighter, which was worn above the tunic, and had a hood, and was called penula.

In the time of any public calamity, it was the usual custom of the Romans to change their apparel. The senators laid aside their lata clava, and appeared in the habit of knights. The magistrates threw off the prætexta, and appeared in the senatorian garb. The knights also left off their rings, and the commons changed their gowns for the military coat.

It is worthy of remark, that the habit of the Romans differs from the modern dress in this remarkable respect, that they had nothing in any degree answering to our breeches or stockings. Instead of these, under their lower tunics or waistcoats, they sometimes bound their thighs or legs round with silken scarfs, or fasciæ.

The observations hitherto made, are confined to the male sex. In the earliest periods of Roman history there

was no difference. Both sexes alike used the gown or toga. At subsequent periods, the women took up the stola and the palla for their separate dress. The stola was an ordinary vest, which they wore within doors, and which came down to their ankles. The palla was a long open manteau, which covered the stola, and together with it their whole bodies, and which was chiefly used whenever they went abroad. They also dressed their heads with what they called vittæ, and fasciæ, ribbons and thin sashes. They had a practice of twisting the latter around their whole body, next to the skin, in order to make them slender.

The common courtesans were not allowed to appear in the stola, but were compelled to wear a sort of gown, resembling the habit of the opposite sex, and which was regarded as a mark of infamy.

The women, equally with the men, wore the tunic; but with them, this garment always came down to the feet, and covered the arms. They also, both before and after the marriage, made use of the girdle.

So far as relates to the attire of the head and feet, as formerly remarked, the Romans ordinarily used no covering of the former, except the lappet of the gown, and this only occasionally to avoid rain or sun, or accidental inconveniences. The old statues represent the Romans without any covering upon their heads. Yet there were occasions when they wore coverings upon their heads, such as at the sacrifices, at the public games, at the feast of Saturn, and upon a journey, or a warlike expedition.

The head dress of women, as well as their other attire, was different at different periods. It was at first very simple. As they seldom went abroad, they found they could sufficiently conceal themselves by keeping their faces veiled. But when riches and luxury increased, ornaments were resorted to, and a woman's toilette became extremely complicated. Although they never used powder, which had not then been invented, yet they anointed their hair

with the richest perfumes, and sometimes painted it, making it appear a bright yellow, with a certain composition or wash, a lixivium or ley. They also frizzled or curled their hair with hot irons, and sometimes, according as the fashion prevailed, raised it to a great height, by rows and stories of curls. Every woman of fashion, had, at least, one female hairdresser.

The hair was also adorned with gold, pearls and precious stones. The head-dress and ribbons of matrons differed from those of virgins. The latter seem to have been peculiar to modest women, and when joined with the stola were the badge of matrons. Immodest women wore mitres, which were also sometimes worn by men although esteemed effeminate.

Women also used various cosmetics, and washes or wash balls, with a view to improving their color. They often wore at home a thick covering of paste over the face. Five hundred asses are said to have been daily milked at Rome, to furnish Poppæa, the wife of Nero, with the milk to bathe in, and also the material for making a kind of pomatum or ointment, called poppæanum, which she had invented to preserve her beauty.

At a comparatively early period, paint was made use of by the Roman women, ceruse, or white lead, or chalk, to render the skin white, and vermilion to redden it. They also used a certain plaster which took off the small hairs from the cheeks; or they sometimes pulled them out by the roots. They painted the edges of the eyelids and eyebrows with a black powder or soot.

The Romans were careful to preserve their teeth by washing and rubbing them. When they lost them they made use of artificial teeth of ivory.

The Roman ladies used earrings of pearls, three or four to each ear, and which were sometimes of immense value. They also wore necklaces made of gold and set with gems. They wore around the breast a broad ribbon which served the purpose of a bodice or stays, having a clasp, buckle, or bracelet on the left shoulder.

During the era of the republic the ordinary color of clothes was white, but at subsequent periods, the women used a great variety of colors, selecting such as the mode, or their particular taste dictated. The material of silk did not come into use until near the end of the republic, and then only for the dress of women. It was too expensive for men, and the emperor Aurelian is said to have refused his wife a garment of pure silk, on account of its exorbitant price.

The custom of wearing rings was derived from Sabine Rome. It was an ornament very generally worn. The plebeians wore iron rings, the senators and equites golden rings, as also did the legionary tribunes. Rings were often set with precious stones of various kinds, on which were many engravings. A ring was given by a man to the woman he was about to marry, as a pledge of their intended union.

The ancient Romans wore their beards very long. This practice continued until about the year of the city 454, when barbers were introduced from Sicily, and the custom of shaving was commenced. They usually wore their hair short, dressing it with great care, and making use of ointments and perfumes. The ancients regarded so much the cutting of the hair, that they believed no one died till Proserpine cut from the head a lock of hair, which was considered a kind of first fruits of consecration to Pluto.

In regard to the feet, the Romans wore several sorts of shoes. Of these, the perones were formed of raw hides; were high, reaching up to the middle of the leg, and were worn more by country people. The calcei lunati were peculiar to the patricians, so much so that even those senators who were not patricians did not wear them. The calcei mullei were of a red color, covering the sole, but not the whole foot, and coming up to the middle of the leg. They were worn by the Alban kings, afterwards by the kings of Rome, and, upon the establishment of the republic, were appropriated to those who had borne any curule office.

The ordinary fashion of the women was the soleæ which were a species of sandal, covering only the sole of the foot, and without any upper leather, being fastened above with straps and buckles.

The caliga was the soldier's shoe, made after the fashion of sandals, not covering the upper part of the foot, although it reached to the middle of the leg. The sole was of wood, and stuck full of nails, which were usually very long, especially in the shoes of scouts and sentinels, mounting the wearer to a higher pitch, and thus giving a greater advantage to the sight.

It will thus be seen that the Romans, especially those of the earlier periods, of both sexes, adopted that species of dress which was little cumbersome, which afforded the greatest freedom of development to their physical frames, and which also subjected them to all the hardening processes resulting from exposure. The feet slightly protected, the head uncovered, and the coarse woolen toga wrapped around the body, without sleeves, the right arm entirely exposed, the left supporting a part of the toga, presents a correct figure of the ancient Roman. No human body, thus clad, could endure the severity of the seasons in a latitude nearly the same as that of the city of New York, without possessing an uncommon hardihood of constitution. It is not surprising that physical frames, reared up under this freedom to develop, and this severity of exposure, should acquire a power of endurance, a strength of muscle, and an inherent energy, that should enable them to rise triumphant over every opposing obstacle.

But as Rome degenerated, her citizen, and ultimately her subject, became more effeminate in his dress and costume. He sought finer materials for its composition, devised new garments to protect him, resorted to ornaments, sacrificed freedom to show and warmth, and lost the hardihood of ancient time amid the luxuries of more recent inventions. The dress of a people will furnish a very good barometer to measure their physical capacities both while at their zenith and in their decline.

II. The Roman houses, and their domestic arrangements. The habitations of the Romans differed very materially in the different periods of their history. Prior to the destruction of the city by the Gauls, they are supposed to have been nothing but cottages thatched with straw. The Rome that arose out of the ruins of that terrible destruction, was more solid and commodious, although the great haste with which the rebuilding was accompanied, prevented the paying a sufficient attention to the regularity of the streets. Until the war with Pyrrhus, the houses were covered only with shingles or thin boards.

It was in the Augustan era that Rome began to exhibit splendor and magnificence in her buildings; but the streets were still narrow and irregular, and private houses incommodious, being very high and built mostly of wood.

More than two-thirds of the city was burnt to the ground in the time of Nero. From that destruction it was rebuilt with greater regularity and splendor. The streets were constructed straight and broader. The houses were restricted in height to seventy feet. Each had a portico before it fronting the street. A certain part of each was built of Gabian or Alban stone, which was proof against fire. The Romans were partial to marble for the decoration of their houses. These were sometimes reared and perfected at great expense. Cicero purchased the house of Crassus for £31,000, while that of Publius Clodius cost £131,000.

Our knowledge of the arrangement of a Roman house is derived principally from Vitruvius, and from the remains of houses that have been found at Pompeii. From all we have been able to collect, there has been found to have been considerable uniformity in the arrangements so far as the principal rooms were concerned. These were:

1. The vestibulum; which, however, was not properly a part of the house, but merely a vacant space before the door, forming a court, surrounded on three sides by the house, and open on the fourth to the street. By this arrangement, two sides of the house joined the street, while

the middle part of it, in which was placed the door, was at some little distance from it.

2. The ostium, or janua, constituted the entrance to the house. The street door, which was generally composed of wood, as cedar, cypress, elm, oak, etc., admitted into a hall, which was called ostium. The doors of the Roman houses opened inwards. When shut, they were secured by bars, bolts, chains, and locks. Knockers were fixed to the doors, or bells hung up, as among us. Another door opposite the street door, led into the atrium.

3. The atrium, or aula, which is also the same with the cavum ædium, was a large apartment, which appears to have been an oblong square, the three sides of which were supported on pillars, which in later times were composed of marble. The atrium was roofed over, with the exception of an opening in the centre, in which was an unglazed skylight, termed compluvium. Towards this, the roof sloped, so as so throw the rain water into a pond or cistern below in the floor, termed impluvium, and which corresponded with the compluvium above.

The atrium was the most important room in the house, and originally served the purpose both of a sitting room and a kitchen, and this it long continued to do among the lower and middle classes. In the houses of the wealthy, it was distinct from the private apartments, and was the reception room. In it were placed the ancestral images, and it was adorned with pictures, statues, etc. It came, in later times, to be divided into different parts, which were separated from one another by hangings or veils, and into which persons were admitted, according to their different degrees of favor. It was in this that they placed the hearth or fire-place, which was dedicated to the lares of each family.

4. The alæ, wings, were small apartments, or recesses, on the left and right sides of the atrium.

5. The tablinum was a recess or room at the further end of the atrium, opposite the door which led into the hall, and was commonly regarded as part of the atrium. It contained the family records and archives.

These parts, with the addition of sleeping rooms arranged on each side of the atrium, seem originally to have constituted the Roman dwelling. But when the atrium and its surroundings came into use as reception rooms, additions were required, and then we find

6. The fauces, which appear to have been passages, which passed from the atrium to the peristylium or interior of the house.

7. This latter, the peristylium, was much like the atrium in its general form. It was a court open to the sky in the middle, with the open part surrounded by columns.

In addition to these parts there were others, which, in their location, were more varied. Among these, were the cubicula, bed chambers, which were small, and were separate for the day and night. The triclinium, or dining room, which was of an oblong shape, being about twice as long as it was broad. The culina, or kitchen, for which a separate part was taken after the atrium came to be altogether appropriated to different purposes. The diæta was an apartment used for dining in, and also for other purposes. It was smaller than the triclinium. The apartments of a house were variously constructed, and arranged at different times, and according to the different taste of individuals.

The floor of a room was seldom composed of boards. Those of the common kind were paved with pieces of bricks, tiles, stones, etc. Those of the more wealthy were covered with stone, marble, and frequently with mosaics. The latter, as they appear in the houses of Pompeii, are usually formed of black frets on a white ground; or white ones on a black ground, though some of them are in colored marbles. The materials are small pieces of red and white marble and red tile, set in a very fine cement, and laid upon a deep bed of mortar.

The Roman houses had few windows, The earlier ones had only openings in the walls to admit the light. The principal apartments, as the atrium, peristyle, etc., were lighted from above, and the cubicula, and other small

rooms generally derived their light from them, and not from windows looking into the street. In general, it was only the rooms in the upper story that seem to have been lighted by windows at all. Very few houses at Pompeii have windows on the ground floor opening into the street.

In regard to the material of which windows were made, it seems they first employed a transparent stone, called lapis specularis, mica, which was easily split into thin laminæ. Paper, linen cloth and horn, were also, at different periods of time, used for windows. Glass seems to have been first used for windows under the early emperors.

The Romans resorted to various methods of warming their rooms. They made use of portable furnaces for carrying embers and burning coals to warm the different apartments of the house, and which they seem to have placed in the middle of the room. They also had a method of heating the rooms by hot air, which was conveyed by means of pipes through the different apartments. They also had a kind of stove, in which wood appears to have been usually burned. It has been a matter of much dispute whether the Romans had chimneys to carry off the smoke, but it does not appear that these were entirely unknown to the Romans.

III. Of the Roman convivial entertainments. The entertainments of the Romans will be best considered under three heads:

1. The time.
2. The place.
3. The manner.

1. The time. The principal, and as some have supposed, the only meal of the Romans was their cœna, or supper. The ordinary time for this was the ninth hour in the summer, or our three o'clock in the afternoon, and the tenth hour in the winter. Besides this, it was customary to take in the morning a breakfast, and also at midday a little light food for dinner, which was usually without any formal preparation.

The early Romans subsisted on the simplest fare, living chiefly on pottage, or bread and pot-herbs. Their chief magistrates, and most illustrious men, usually sat down at the same board, and partook of the same food with their servants. But with conquests came wealth, and with wealth the desire and power to possess themselves of luxuries, which seized upon all ranks and degrees of men. The pleasures of the table were the most strongly coveted, and hence, their principal meal, the supper, was regarded as a matter of great attention.

2. The place. This was the triclinium, or dining room, which was often called cœnaculum. The former term was the most commonly used. It was borrowed from the Grecians.

3. The manner. Anciently the Romans always sat at their meals in the same manner as the Greeks and the modern Europeans, making use of a long table. This they continued to do until the end of the second Punic war. By that time the influx of wealth, and the growth of luxury and effeminacy, led them to adopt the custom of reclining on couches at their principal meal, the supper. This custom was introduced from the eastern nations. It was first adopted only by the men, but afterwards extended also to the women. The monuments now remaining generally represent the reclining posture, as that in use by the Romans.

This reclining was upon couches, commonly three upon a couch. "They lay with the upper part of the body reclined on the left arm, the head a little raised, the back supported by cushions, and the limbs stretched out at full length, or a little bent; the feet of the first behind the back of the second, and his feet behind the back of the third, with a pillow between each.[1] The head of the second was opposite to the breast of the first, so that if he wanted to speak to him, especially if the thing was to be secret, he was obliged to lean upon his bosom. In con-

[1] *Adams*, 804.

versation, those who spoke raised themselves almost upright, supported by cushions. When they ate, they raised themselves on their elbow, and made use of the right hand, sometimes of both hands; for we do not read of their using either knives or forks.

The number of couches around a table was various. It was said they should not be below three, the number of the graces, nor above nine, that of the muses.

The tables were square, and on three sides of them were placed three couches, the fourth side being left empty to afford an opportunity for the slaves to bring in and out the dishes.

It was a very general practice for the Romans to bathe immediately before supper. After bathing, it was their custom to lie down, and have their suppers brought to bed to them. It is from this circumstance that many suppose the custom to have originated of reclining at their meals, or rather at this meal, for they do not seem to have resorted to that custom at any other.

It was the custom, at their great banquets, to choose one of the company to be king, who assigned to every man his place. He was either chosen by lot, or nominated by the master of the feast. His will was a law to the company, which every one was obliged to obey.

The Romans began their feasts by prayers and libations to the gods. They consecrated before tasting, usually throwing a part into the fire as an offering to the lares; and when they drank, pouring out a part in honor of some god on the table.

Among condiments, salt was held in great veneration by all the ancients. It was always used in sacrifices. It was the chief thing eaten by the ancient Romans with bread and cheese. Hence a family salt-cellar was kept with great care. It was reckoned a symbol of friendship to set salt before a stranger, and to spill it at table was esteemed ominous.

As the ancients had no inns, or public houses, for the accommodation of travelers, the Romans, when traveling

used to lodge at the houses of those whom they, in return, would entertain at Rome. Hence the hospitium, or jus hospitia. Out of this grew very intimate relations, to violate which, was deemed the greatest impiety. Relations of this kind were sometimes formed by mutually sending presents to each other.

The Roman supper usually consisted of two parts, the first course being made up of different kinds of meat; and the second, of fruits and sweet-meats. Among the birds they delighted in, was the attagen, from Ionia or Phrygia, the peacock, pheasant, nightingales, thrushes, etc. They also ate the flesh of the boar. They seem to have been particularly fond of fish, as the mullet, the turbot, the lamprey, the scar, the sturgeon, the pike, etc., but more particularly of shell fish, and of these the oyster, which they sometimes brought all the way from Britain.

The invention of oyster beds was first made by one Sergius Arata, before the Marsic war, in the year A. U. 660. They were planted and nourished on the shore of Baiæ, and on the Lucrine lake.

The Romans used to weigh their fishes alive at table, and one portion of their highest entertainment was to see them expire.

The dishes of the second course, or dessert, consisted of a great variety of fruits, as apples, pears, nuts, figs, olives, grapes, almonds, raisins, etc., also sweet-meats, as various confectioneries.

The various dishes were brought in, either on the tables themselves, or on frames, each one containing a variety of dishes.

The preparation and serving up of the dishes were entrusted to slaves. The baker and cook were originally the same, but after the luxury of the table had made great advances, cooks were purchased at a great price. Even carving was taught as an art, and performed to the sound of music. An uncommon dish was introduced to the sound of the flute. During the time of supper the guests were entertained with music and dancing, sometimes with

pantomimes and play-actors; with fools and buffoons, and even with gladiators. Sometimes select passages from books were read and repeated, and sometimes agreeable conversation was enjoyed.

These entertainments were sometimes prolonged till late at night; and to avoid the bad effects of repletion, it was sometimes the practice to induce vomiting. Even women, after bathing before supper, used to drink wine and throw it up again, to sharpen their appetite.

The ordinary drink of the Romans, at their entertainments, was wine, which they generally mixed with water, and sometimes with aromatics and spices. Wine was anciently very rare, and used chiefly in the worship of the gods. But in subsequent periods the vine was much more extensively cultivated, so that wine was brought into common use.

It was brought in to the guests in earthen vases, having handles, or in jugs or bottles of glass, leather or earth. It was mixed with water in a large vase or bowl, whence it was poured into cups, these latter being of different materials, as wood, earth, glass, etc.

The Romans had a practice of drinking to the health of one another, and sometimes in honor of a friend or mistress. They had sometimes also a practice, which must have been borrowed from the Egyptians, of introducing at their feasts, and in the time of drinking, a skeleton, or the representation of one. The master or king of the feast looking at it would say: "Let us live while it is allowed us to enjoy life."

The Romans ended their entertainments in the same manner in which they began them, with libations and prayers. The guests drank to the health of their host, and during the empire, to that of the emperors.

The master of the house was accustomed to give the guests certain presents at their departure; and sometimes presents were sent after them to their different homes.

The Romans long struggled to overcome the growing tendency to luxury in their entertainments, by legislation.

The Fannia lex, passed Anno Urbis, 588, ordained that upon the higher festivals, no person should expend more than one hundred ases in a day; or ten other days in any month, thirty ases; and at all other times, ten. The lex Licinia subsequently was passed, agreeing in many respects with that last mentioned, and prescribing further, that on ordinary days, there should be spent only three pounds of dry flesh, and one pound of salt meat, but allowing as much fruit as any one desired. The Æmilia lex was passed about A. U. 678, respecting the several sorts of meats in use at that time, and stating the just quantities allowable of every kind. The lex Oppia, passed A. U. 540, ordained that no woman should have above half an ounce of gold, wear a parti-colored garment, or be carried in a chariot, in any city, town, or to any place within a mile's distance, unless upon the account of celebrating some sacred solemnity. The Roman history has well demonstrated how utterly useless are all sumptuary laws in arresting the progress of a people towards the extravagance of luxury.

IV. Of the baths and exercises of the Romans. The early Romans bathed in the Tiber. They did this from motives of health and cleanliness, and not of luxury. As the use of linen was little known at that early period, they found their health as well as comfort much promoted by frequent ablutions. To this source may be undoubtedly in part, at least, referred that strength and power of constitution, that so preeminently marked the old Roman.

The Romans, for a long time, derived almost all their water from the Tiber. The first aqueduct was build about the year of the city 441. Afterwards some seven or eight aqueducts were constructed at a prodigious expense, being carried a distance of many miles through rocks and mountains, and over valleys, supported on stone or brick arches, by means of which the city was most plentifully supplied with water. The water thus brought into the city was collected in reservoirs, and thence distributed by leaden pipes through the city. After this

abundant supply was obtained, the erection of baths commenced both by private individuals, and for the use of the public. On the first institution of the public baths, they were only for the lower orders, as the patricians and people of wealth used private baths in their own houses. But at subsequent periods, men of distinction, and even emperors, bathed in public. The construction and arrangement of the public baths is obtained not only from the writings of Vitruvius, but also from the ruins of Pompeii.

The building was oblong, and had two divisions; one for males and the other for females. In both, the arrangements admitted of the taking of cold or warm baths. The heating room was on the ground floor. Above this was an apartment in which three copper kettles were walled in, one above another. Of these apartments, the lowest, which contained the first or lowest kettle, was called the caldarium, this being immediately over the fire. The second, which was over the first, was the tepidarium; and the third, which was over the second, was the frigidarium.

Between these vessels was a constant communication, so that either boiling, luke-warm, or cold water, could be readily obtained. The terms above stated were also applied to the apartments in which the cold, tepid, and hot baths were placed.

The common practice was first to enter the frigidarium; then the tepidarium, in which the body was prepared for the more intense heat of the vapor and hot baths, and the return was in the same gradual manner, so that the transition to the external air might not be too sudden.

The baths were, in general, opened at sunrise and closed at sunset. The price paid was a quadrant, the smallest piece of coined money. The time usually assigned by the Romans for taking the bath was the eighth hour, our two o'clock, P. M. Prior to that time invalids were accustomed to bathe. The Romans were accustomed to take a bath after exercise, and previously to their principal meal; but the practice was indulged in by many of taking one also after the meal. In fact, it came ultimately to be

indulged in as a luxury, and the daily bath was sometimes repeated as many as seven or eight times in succession. Upon quitting the bath it was usual for the Romans to be anointed with oil.

Bathing, or rather its appliances, were carried to the greatest excess in the time of the emperors. Under the sway of these latter, were erected the thermæ, which were buildings of great magnificence. These not only furnished accommodations for hundreds of bathers at once, but had also spacious porticos, rooms for athletic games, and halls for the public lectures of philosophers and rhetoricians. There were several of these erected at Rome. They were built among gardens and walks, the main building containing extensive halls for swimming and bathing; others for conversation; others for various athletic and manly exercises; others still for the declamation of poets and the lectures of philosophers. The intention seems to have been, to combine in them every species of polite and manly amusement. The rooms were decorated in the finest style of art, both in painting and sculpture, covered with precious marbles, and adorned with fountains and shaded walks, and plantations like the groves of the Academy. Within these, most of the different athletic exercises could be carried on; the taste of the more refined in relation to mental culture indulged, and all the varieties of hot and cold bathing enjoyed. There were rooms here in which were collected unguents of great value, and all the varieties of perfumes which were then known.

Bathing, simply as a luxury, commenced and ceased with the empire. The baths when legitimately used, and for the purposes of health and cleanliness, no doubt contributed largely to the strength and perfection, in all its physical relations, of the old Roman. Few, certainly in ancient or modern times, ever exceeded him in physical power and endurance.

In regard to the exercises of the Romans, little seems required to be said here, as many of them will be included

under games and exhibitions hereafter mentioned. Those properly coming under this head were

The ball, or tennis, of which there were four kinds, viz; 1. Follis or balloon, in which the ball inflated with wind, like our foot-ball, was struck about with the arms, if large; or, if small, with the hand, armed with a kind of gauntlet. 2. The pila paganica, or village ball, stuffed with feathers, which was less than the follis, but more weighty. 3. The harpastum, the smallest of all, which they snatched from one another. 4. The pila trigonalis, which was so called, because those who played at it were placed in a triangle, and tossed it from one to another. He who first let it come to the ground was the loser. In country villas there was usually a tennis-court, or place for ball playing and other exercises, laid out in the form of a circus.

Besides the ball, there was also an exercise of throwing the javelin, and throwing the discus or quoit. It was not unfrequent for young men and boys to amuse themselves in whirling along a circle of brass or iron, set round with rings, much as the children of the present day do wooden hoops. The top was a different exercise, and was peculiar to boys.

There were various places for the exercise of walking, both public and private, both in the open air and under covering. Covered walks were built in different places, chiefly round the Campus Martius, and forum. They were supported by marble pillars, and adorned with statues and pictures, some of them of immense extent.

There was also a place set apart for the pupose of exercise on horseback or in vehicles. In villas it was generally contiguous to the garden, and was laid out in the form of a circus.

Hunting was an exercise or sport often indulged in by the Romans. They hunted both in parks kept solely for the sport, and also in fields and forests. The ancient monuments exhibit both these kinds. They had a practice of surrounding the places where they knew the game was with nets and pales. Hunting with dogs was uni-

versal. The most common mode was that of hunting on horse-back, armed with a sort of spears, and with long swords. So also one of the most common ways of hunting was with the bow and arrows. The employment of nets and toils was more common among the peasants and not the patricians or men of quality. The Romans were very particular in the training of their dogs. They distinguished them according to the countries from which they were obtained. Some of them were trained up to hunt the lion, the bear and other wild beasts, and others for hunting the stag and the hare. They had also hunting dogs of a mongrel character, being half wolf, lion or tiger.

The exercise of boar-hunting was very common among the Romans, and is often exhibited on the monuments. They had a curious way of hunting the tiger by exhibiting a looking-glass. The tiger seeing his own image would stop in his career.

It seems that hawking, or hunting with the hawk and other birds of prey, was also in use among the Romans.

In fishing, the Romans made use of the rod and line, and also of nets, the same as in modern times. Fishing with the line, or angling, was very common with them. They also made holes in the ice when rivers were frozen over, and let down their lines through them. The Romans had also large fish ponds near their country villas, in which they took great care to cultivate different varieties of fish. Lucullus even dug through a mountain near Naples, and brought rivers of salt water into his fish pond. He also brought his favorite fish into cooler places, in order that the excessive heat might not injure them.

The remaining exercises peculiar to the Romans will be considered under subsequent heads.

V. Of the Roman games. These are susceptible of a two-fold division, viz: 1, private; 2, public.

1. The private games are not in themselves objects of much interest, and require, therefore, but a slight allusion. They were:

a. The latrunculi, which much resembled our modern chess. It was a game of war, and may well, therefore, have captivated the Roman. The Roman chess men were generally of wax or glass. There were two sets of men, one being black, the other white or red. They were called soldiers, foes, and marauders, and were designed to represent a miniature combat between two armies. The object of each player was to get one of his adversary's men between two of his own, in which case he was entitled to take the man thus kept in check. Some of the men were obliged to be moved in a certain direction, while othere might be moved any way, in this respect resembling chess.

b. The tali and tesseræ, which were a species of game at dice. The Romans had two sorts of games of dice. They played at the one with four tali, and at the other with three tesseræ. The tali had but four sides, marked with four opposite numbers; one side with a tres, and the opposite with a quatre; one with an ace, and the contrary with a sice. The dice had six faces, four marked with the same number as the tali, and the two others with a deux and a cinque, always one against the other; so that in both plays the upper number and the lower, either on the talus or tessera, constantly made seven.

In playing they used four tali and three tesseræ, putting them into a long box made in the form of a small tower, straight necked, wider below than above, and fluted in ringlets, from which after being shaken, they were thrown out upon the gaming board or table. The great master of this game was the emperor Claudius, who even composed a book on the subject. Hence in his apotheosis, Seneca, after carrying him through a number of adventures, at last brings him to hell, where the infernal judges condemn him to play continually at dice with a box that had the bottom out; which kept him always in hopes, and yet always balked his expectations.

c. The varieties of ball or tennis, including the follis, the pila paganica, the harpastum and the pila trigonalis, have already been mentioned under the head of exercises.

d. The par impar, even and odd, was a game proper for children, and was sometimes resorted to at feasts and entertainments, as were also the tali and tesseræ.

e. Under the empire, a diversion was introduced at entertainments, similar to what we call a lottery. Tickets, or sealed tablets, were sold at an equal price, which, when opened or unsealed, entitled the purchasers to things of very unequal value.

f. The trochus, which was an iron hoop, five or six feet in diameter, set all over in the inside with iron rings. It was whirled along, directed by means of an iron rod called radius. It required great dexterity to guide it. The iron rings kept up a constant clattering, which gave warning of their approach, and also contributed to the excitement of the diversion.

2. The public games. These were of different kinds at different periods of the republic. We shall begin with

a. The games of the circus. The circus maximus was erected by the elder Tarquin, between the Palatine and Aventine hills. It was in length 2,187 feet, and in breadth about 730, having rows of seats all around, rising one above another, and accommodating, as variously estimated from 150,000 to 250,000 individuals. It was a mile in circumference, and was of an oblong circular form. In the middle, through almost its entire length, was run a brick wall, about twelve feet broad, and four high, called spina, having at each extremity three columns, or pyramids, on one base, called metæ. These served as goals round which the horses and chariots turned in the races. The public games constituted a part of the religious worship, and hence before they began, it was their practice to carry along on men's shoulders, or on carriages and in frames, the images of the gods. Accompanying these, was a great train of attendants both on horseback and on foot. The combatants and performers followed next in order.

The Circensian games of the Romans were derived almost entirely from the Greeks. These consisted principally:

1. In the cursus or races. Of these the Romans were extravagantly fond. The carriage was usually drawn by two or four horses. The usual number of chariots which started for each race was four. The charioteers were divided into four parties or factions, and each could be distinguished from every other by a difference in dress or livery. There were the white, red, sky-colored, and green factions, to which Domitian added two others, the golden and purple. The names and colors of the horses and charioteers were handed about, and heavy bets made upon each faction. The contests between these factions sometimes terminated in violence and bloodshed. At a later period, the disputes, which originated in the circus or great Hippodrome in Constantinople, nearly lost the emperor Justinian his crown. Thirty thousand men are said to have lost their lives in the tumult growing out of the disputes.

The order in which the chariots or horses stood, was determined by lot; and the person who presided at the games gave the signal for starting, by dropping a napkin or cloth. One match, or heat, was completed by running seven times round the metæ. Usually, there were twenty-five of these in one day. They reckoned the conclusion of the race, from the passing by the meta the seventh time. The greatest specimen of art and sleight appears to have been to avoid the meta handsomely, when they made their turns, otherwise both the chariot and charioteer would encounter both danger and disgrace.

The voice of a herald proclaimed the victor, who was crowned, and received also a prize in money of considerable value.

2. The pentathlum, which consisted in contests of strength and agility, of which there were five kinds, viz: running, leaping, boxing, wrestling, and throwing the discus or quoit. In these exercises, the combatants had nothing on but trowsers or drawers. This covering went from the waist downward, and supplied the place of a tunic.

These different exercises were performed by the athletæ, who were carefully trained for the purpose. Previous to engaging in the contests, they were anointed with a glutinous ointment called ceroma. Boxers covered their hands with a kind of gloves, which had lead or iron sewed into them, called cestus; the object being to make the strokes fall with a greater weight. All these were essentially the same as those celebrated by the Greeks.

3. The ludus trojæ is supposed to have been the invention of Cescanius. It was a mock fight performed by young noblemen on horseback; and from its resemblance to the jousts and tournaments of the age of chivalry, some have inferred that the latter were derived from them.

4. The venatio, or exhibition of wild beasts, was an entertainment of which the Romans were passionately fond. In the latter days of the republic, and under the empire, an immense variety of animals was collected from all parts of the Roman world, to be exhibited for the gratification of the people. These were either domestic animals, as the bull, horse, elephant; or wild beasts, as the lion, bear, tiger, panther, leopard, and others. They were kept in enclosures until the day of exhibition.

There were reckoned three sorts of diversions of this kind.

a. When the people were permitted to run after the beasts and catch what they could for their own use.

b. When the beasts fought with one another.

c. When they were brought out to engage with men.

The first mentioned seems to have been an institution of the emperors. There were many contrivances about it. The middle part of the circus was set over with trees, thus making an artificial forest, into which the beasts being let, the people at a given sign commenced to hunt them, and carried away with them what they had succeeded in killing. The beasts usually given for this purpose were boars, deer, oxen, and sheep.

The second mentioned were exhibited with great variety. Sometimes the beasts fought with one another of the same

species. At other times, we find a tiger matched with a lion, a lion with a bull, a bull with an elephant, a rhinoceros with a bear, etc. Sometimes a deer is hunted on the area by a pack of dogs. But the most wonderful of all contrivances was, by bringing the water into the circus or amphitheatre, to introduce huge sea monsters to combat with wild beasts.

The third was, where the combat was carried on between wild beasts and men. Some of these were condemned criminals, and they were pardoned if they succeeded in killing their savage adversaries. Others hired themselves out for the purpose, like a class of the gladiators, and, in such cases, they had their schools where they were trained and instructed in such combats. So highly was this exercise prized, that many times several of the nobility themselves voluntarily undertook a part in these encounters. Even the very women were at times ambitious of showing their courage on these occasions. The primitive Christians were in this way often exposed to wild beasts.

The tactics of the men who engaged in these contests, consisted frequently not so much in displays of strength, as agility. In the former, and when they undertook to cope with beasts on the plain ground, they commonly met with an unequal match. Their safety, therefore, generally consisted in their feats of agility, in the nimble turning of their body, and leaping up and down to elude the force of their adversary.

5. The naumachia were mimic sea fights among the Romans, and the term was also applied to the place where such engagements took place. These fights were sometimes exhibited in the circus or amphitheatre, but more commonly in buildings specially devoted to this purpose. The first permanent one was made by Augustus, who dug a lake for this purpose, near the Tiber, and planted around it a grove of trees. Nero preferred introducing water into the amphitheatre for this purpose.

These sea fights were exhibited with the same magnificence, and wasteful expenditure of human life which

marked and peculiarly characterized the gladiatorial and other public games of the Romans. The naumachiarii, or combatants, were usually captives taken in war, or criminals condemned to death. They fought until one party was slain, unless preserved by the clemency of the emperor. To give it all the appearance of a real battle, the ships engaged in it were divided into two parties, assuming different names, as Tyrians and Egyptians, Rhodians and Sicilians, etc. Vessels of different sizes, as biremes, triremes, and even quadriremes, engaged in the fight.

In the naumachia of Nero there were sea monsters swimming about in the artificial lake. The style of extravagance greatly increased. In the naumachia exhibited by Titus there were three thousand naumachiarii engaged. In that exhibited by Domitian the ships were almost equal in number to two real fleets. In the magnificent naumachia exhibited by Claudius on the lake Fucinus there were no less than fifty ships on each side and nineteen thousand combatants.

6. The gladiators. These were men who fought with swords in the amphitheatre, and other places, for the amusement of the Roman people. This barbarous custom is said to have commenced with the Etruscans, and the origin of it is referred to the ancient practice of killing persons at the funerals of great men. It was an early impression that the ghosts of the deceased were satisfied and rendered propitious by human blood, an idea that could only have had its origin in a barbarous age. At first they purchased captives or slaves, and offered them at the obsequies. Afterwards their barbarity was attempted to be veiled over by a specious show of voluntary combat, certain persons having been procured and trained up for the purpose. On the day appointed for the sacrifices to the departed ghosts, they were obliged to maintain a mortal encounter at the tombs of their friends.

The first public exhibition of gladiators at Rome was in the year Anno Urbis 460, B. C. 264, by the two brothers

Bruti, at the funeral of their father. These shows were at first given only at the funerals of senators and chief magistrates, but it afterwards grew into a custom among private persons also. These latter sometimes directed in their wills that their funerals should be celebrated with gladiators, leaving a sum of money to pay the expenses of such an exhibition. Even the funerals of their women were sometimes celebrated in the same manner.

From these public exhibitions at funerals, gladiatorial combats came to be exhibited at entertainments, and more especially at public festivals by the ædiles and other magistrates. But it was under the empire that the passion of the Romans for this amusement rose to its greatest height. After Trajan had triumphed over the Dacians, public spectacles were exhibited for one hundred and twenty-three days, in which 11,000 animals of different kinds were killed, and 10,000 gladiators fought.

These gladiators consisted either of captives, slaves, criminals, or freeborn citizens, who fought voluntarily. These latter, under the empire, embraced knights and senators, and even women. They took an oath on entering upon the service, which, according to Petronius, was this: "I am ready to be burnt, bound, scourged, and die by the sword, to do the duty of a gladiator."

Gladiators were kept in schools, where they were trained by persons called lanistæ. They were sometimes owned by the lanistæ, who let them out to such persons as desired to exhibit them, but at other times they belonged to citizens who employed the lanistæ to instruct them. In their training great attention was paid to their diet, in order to increase their strength and power. They were fed with nourishing food, and kept as much as possible in a healthy atmosphere. At the schools they were taught to fence by using wooden swords called rudes.

The place of exhibition, as already mentioned, was at first the funeral pile. Afterwards they came to be exhibited in the forum. At last the common, and almost the only place of exhibition was the amphitheatre. This was so

called because it was seated all around, like two theatres joined together.

One of the largest amphitheatres was that commenced by Vespasian and completed by Titus, of which the ruins still remain, and are known as the Colosseum at Rome. Its form was oval, and it is said to have contained eighty-seven thousand spectators.

The place where the combats of the gladiators were performed, was called the arena. It was so called because it was covered with sand or saw-dust, which answered the double purpose of preventing the gladiators from sliding, and also to absorb the blood.

Next to the arena, was the podium, where sat the senators, and embassadors, together with the emperor, the person exhibiting the games, and the vestal virgins. This projected over a wall surrounding the arena, and had an elevation of from twelve to fifteen feet above it.

Behind the senators sat the equites, ranged in fourteen rows, the seats of both being covered with cushions. Behind all these sat the rest of the people, on stone seats. Like the section of a circle, this space gradually widened from the arena to the top.

There were present certain persons occupying the place of masters of ceremonies, whose duty it was to assign to every one his proper place, much after the same manner as undertakers did at funerals.

In the amphitheatre were secret tubes, from which the spectators could be sprinkled with perfumes, issuing from certain figures. There were also coverings to draw over them whenever it rained or was excessively hot.

During the earlier periods at which these exhibitions were made, women were not allowed to be present, without the permission of the exhibitor. This restriction was subsequently removed, and Augustus assigned them a particular place in the highest seats of the amphitheatre.

Near the amphitheatre was a place called spoliarium, to which those who were killed or mortally wounded, were dragged by a hook.

Some days before the exhibition, the person who was to give it, announced the show by an advertisement or bill, posted up in some public place, in which he mentioned the number and names of the most distinguished gladiators.

When the day of the exhibition arrived, the gladiators were led along the arena in procession. They were matched by pairs, and their weapons carefully examined by the exhibitor.

There was at first a sham fight, as a kind of prelude, in which they fought with wooden swords, flourishing them with great dexterity. This was continued for some time, until the sound of the trumpet gave the signal for the commencement of the real battle. They then laid aside their wooden swords, and assumed their proper arms. These they adjusted with great care, standing in a particular posture.

The instrument of combat was a short sword. With this they both cut and thrust at each other. It was more easy to parry direct thrusts, than back or side strokes. They took particular care to defend their side. Some had the faculty of not winking, which gave them a decided advantage over the others.

When a gladiator was wounded he lowered his arms in token of submission, but his fate depended on the pleasure of the people. If they desired him to be saved, they pressed down their thumbs; if to be slain they turned them up, and ordered him to receive the sword, which was usually submitted to with amazing fortitude. A gladiator was also sometimes rescued by the entrance of the emperor, and by the will of the exhibitor. If the life of a vanquished gladiator was spared, he obtained his discharge for that day, which was called missio; and hence in an exhibition of gladiators sine missione, the lives of the conquered were never spared. This kind of exhibition was forbidden by Augustus.

While these contests were going on, there was always, among the spectators, more or less betting upon the different gladiators.

To those gladiators who came off victorious various rewards were given. One was a palm, another a palm crown with ribbons of different colors appended to it. Another was a sum of money. Another still was a rod or wooden sword, as a sign of discharge from fighting. This was sometimes granted by the exhibitor, at the desire of the people, to an old gladiator, or even to a young one for some extraordinary act of courage. In such case, if the person had been originally free, he became so again on his discharge. If he had been a slave, he returned to the same condition again.

The gladiatorial exhibitions were at first continued during the entire day without any intermission. Afterwards they were dismissed to take dinner, which custom was observed at all the spectacles exhibited by the emperors.

These exhibitions were prohibited by Constantine, but they were not entirely suppressed until the time of Honorius.

These gladiatorial exhibitions proclaim the true nature of the Roman character. When the vestal virgin, the Roman matron, and the young lady could find amusement in such scenes of human slaughter, it can certainly surprise no one that the Roman character, in its constituent elements, possessed so much hardihood, and could remain such firm proof against every tender feeling of humanity. The school of blood in which the young were reared, and the old matured, was eminently calculated to form precisely the character which the Roman possessed. It is thus that the manners and customs of a people are influenced by, and in their turn, influence the character from which they originate.

VI. The domestic relations: marriage, divorce; filial and parental relations; condition of women.

These topics are all important in their bearing upon the general condition of the people and prosperity of the nation.

The domestic relations are the first to which we are subject, and the last from which we can claim exemption.

Their influence in giving birth to habits, in forming character, and thus creating an element of immense importance in national weal or woe, lies far beyond any one's power to calculate. It will be of the first importance, then, to ascertain how these relations stood among the Romans.

The Roman, as we have already seen, was restricted as to the person he could marry. There could be no legal marriage, unless there was connubium existing between the parties. This is a mere term, which comprehends all the conditions of a legal marriage. Thus, during the early periods of Roman history, there was no connubium between the patricians and the plebeians, although this barrier was subsequently broken down. So, also, there were various degrees of consanguinity within which there was no connubium. Thus there was no connubium between parent and child, nor between brothers and sisters, whether of the whole or the half blood. Neither was there any between persons within certain relations of affinity.

Where parties united between whom there was no connubium, the result was that there was no legal marriage. The man had no wife, and the children no father.

Their could also be no connubium where certain bodily imperfections existed, as, for instance, in the case of eunuchs. This class, also, embraced all those cases where for any reason the party could never attain to puberty.

Among the Romans, the essence of marriage was the consent given by the parties, and this consent must be not only of the parties who came together, but also of those in whose power they were. The consent of the latter would seem to have been of the most importance. According to the earlier law, a father could give his child in marriage, unless the child was emancipated, without asking the child's consent.

Monogamy was strictly enforced at Rome. A man, therefore, who had married, and divorced his wife, could not enter upon a second marriage, unless the divorce was an effectual one.

By the marriage, cum conventione, as it was termed, the wife passed into the familia of her husband, and stood to him in the relation of a daughter: or, as it was expressed, "in manum convenit." But by the marriage, sine conventione, the wife's relation to her own familia remained as before, and she was merely uxor.

In the marriage, sine conventione, it does not appear that any forms were requisite. The cohabitation of the parties seems to have been all that was necessary.

In the marriage, cum conventione, there were the following modes to effect it:

1. The usus, which occurred if a woman lived with a man for a whole year as his wife, and hence the twelve tables provided that if a woman did not wish to come into the manus of her husband in this manner, she should absent herself from him annually for three nights, and so break the usus of the year.

2. Confarreatio, which occurred when the man and woman were joined in marriage by the pontifex maximus, or flamen dialis, in presence of at least ten witnesses, by a set form of words, and by tasting a cake made of salt, water and flour, which, together with a sheep, was offered in sacrifice to the gods. This was the most solemn form of marriage, and by it the woman was said to come into the possession or power of her husband by the sacred laws, becoming a partner in all his substance and in his sacred rights. In case of his death without leaving a will, or any children, she inherited his whole fortune as a daughter. If he left children she shared equally with them. If, during the marriage, she committed any fault, her husband, in company with her relations, passed judgment upon it, and punished her at pleasure.

3. Cœmptio, which was a kind of a mutual purchase, the man and woman delivering to one another a small piece of money, at the same time repeating certain words. The result of a marriage in this form was, that the woman came to sustain to the husband the relations of a daughter, and he to her those of a father. She assumed his name,

together with her own. She resigned to him all her goods, and acknowledged him as her lord and master.

The common mode of betrothing was by writings drawn up by common consent, and sealed by both parties. This was usually done at the house of the woman's father, or nearest relation, where there was a meeting of friends. These writings constituted the contract, espousals, or sponsalia, and was made in the form of a stipulation. This engagement was entered into by the friends on both sides, and might be done as well between absent persons as present, and as well in private as before witnesses.

It was then that the dowry was promised, which was either to be paid down on the day of the marriage, or afterwards, usually in three separate payments. This was commonly the occasion for a feast, and the man, if the parties were present, gave the woman a ring, by way of pledge. This she put on the finger next to the least of the left hand, because it was believed a nerve reached from thence to the heart.

The sponsalia, embodying as it did the agreement to marry, was made in such form as to give each party a right of action against the other in case of nonperformance. These espousals were commonly celebrated in the night, and sometimes at day-break. They were never celebrated in times of earthquakes, or in stormy, tempestuous weather.

We next come to the customs and rites observed by the Romans in their marriages. In the first place, they were very particular as to the day on which these rites were to be celebrated. Certain days were reckoned unfortunate, such as the kalends, nones and ides, and the days which followed them, particularly the whole month of May. The most fortunate season was reckoned to be that which followed the ides of June.

No marriage was celebrated without consulting the auspices, and offering sacrifices to the gods, especially to Juno, the goddess of marriage. Anciently a hog was sacrificed, the gall of the victim being taken out and thrown

away, to signify the removal of all bitterness from marriage. In consulting the auspices, a crow was reckoned a bird of good omen, because it was believed that when that bird had lost its mate it always remained in widowhood. The Latins are said to have been anciently accustomed to put a yoke upon the neck of the betrothed, to denote that wedlock was a real yoke, and that from that custom, came the word conjugium.

The marriage ceremony was performed at the house of the bride's father, or nearest relation. The nuptial ceremonies always began with the taking of the omens by the auspices. The bride was decked out in a long white robe, with a purple fringe, or adorned with ribbons. The dress was called tunica recta, and was bound round the waist with a girdle, which it was made the duty of the husband to untie in the evening. The bridal veil was of a bright yellow color.

Another ceremony consisted in combing the hair of the bride, and dividing the locks with the point of a spear, which had been dipped in the blood of a gladiator. Various are the reasons assigned for this as: 1. To furnish a token that their marriage first began by war, alluding to the rape of the Sabine virgins. 2. As an omen of bearing a valiant and warlike offspring. 3. To remind the bride that being married to one of a martial race, she should use herself to no other than a plain unaffected dress. 4. Because the greatest part of the nuptial care was referred to Juno, to whom the spear was sacred. They also crowned her with a chaplet of flowers, and put on her a veil.

With the exception of the marriage by confarreatio, there were no religious rites resorted to, the other forms being mere civil acts, were probably solemnized without any religious ceremony. In the mode embraced in the above exception, a sheep was sacrificed, and its skin being spread over two chairs, the bride and bridegroom sat down on it with their heads covered. A solemn formula, or prayer, was then pronounced, after which another sacrifice was offered, which completed the marriage ceremony.

Soon after followed the ceremony of forcing the bride away from her mother, after which, and in the evening, she was led towards the bridegroom's house by three boys, who were habited in the prætexta, and whose fathers and mothers were living. Five torches were carried to light her; and after her were borne along a distaff and spindle. Arrived at the door, which was garnished with flowers and leaves, she was lifted over the threshold, which she was by no means to touch.

Upon her entrance into the house, she had delivered to her its keys, and along with these the bridegroom also presented her with two vessels, the one of fire, and the other of water, either as an emblem of purity and chastity, or as a communication of goods, or as an earnest of sticking by one another in the greatest extremities. A feast given by the husband to the whole train of relatives and friends, who accompanied the bride, usually concluded the solemnity of the day. Prior to the feast they took their omens and presages, which, had they omitted, the marriage would have been thought unfortunate. If the presage was good, a sacrifice was offered with acclamations and wishes in favor of the new married pair.

In case of the marriage of a widow, the bed of the former marriage was taken away, in order that the new bridegroom might not occupy that upon which the former husband had died. Even the door of the bed-chamber was changed, and all the movables disposed differently from what they had formerly been; so that as little as possible might remain to remind of the former husband.

The Roman notion of marriage was that there was a complete unity between husband and wife. The deduction from this was, that her legal personality was merged in that of her husband; all her property passed to him, and she could from that time acquire no property in her own right. The consequences were:

1. That the husband could exercise a controlling power over the children of the marriage.

2. That both parties were liable to the punishments which were affixed to the violation of the marriage union.

3. The relation of husband and wife with respect to property.

Another subject connected with the marriage relation is that of divorce.

It seems not perfectly settled whether the right of divorce or of dissolving the marriage contract, belonged originally to the husband, or was equally possessed by either party. Plutarch asserts the former. Others affirm that as one essential part of the marriage was the consent and conjugal affection of the parties, it was considered that this affection was necessary to its continuance, and that in accordance with this principle, either party might declare his or her intention to dissolve the connection.

To obtain a divorce, no judicial decree was necessary, nor any interference on the part of any public authority. Where the accusation was against the wife, the tribunal that decided was the husband, together with the wife's relations. It was reckoned a sufficient cause of divorce that the wife had violated the conjugal faith, had used poison to destroy his offspring, had brought upon him supposititious children, had counterfeited his private keys, or had even drank wine without his knowledge.

It is certainly a remarkable feature in the history of this relation at Rome, that notwithstanding the facility of obtaining divorces, something more than five hundred years occurred from the building of the city, before there is any record of any one having been obtained. In B. C. 234, occurred the case of Sp. Carvilius Ruga, who put away his wife on the ground of barrenness.

Afterwards, however, and at the close of the republic, and under the empire, divorces became very frequent. Cicero divorced his wife Terentia, having lived with her thirty years, and married a young woman. So also Cæsar divorced his wife, because Clodius, in a woman's garb, had obtained admission into his house while the sacred rites of bona dea were celebrating, declaring that Cæsar's wife

must not only be above reproach, but also above suspicion. So common at last did this become, that some women deserted their husbands so frequently, and with so little shame, that Seneca says, they reckoned their years not from the number of consuls but of husbands, and this desertion very frequently happened without any just cause. If, however, a husband divorced his wife, the wife's dowry, as a general rule, was restored to her. This was also done when the divorce took place by mutual consent. But if the wife was guilty of infidelity she forfeited her dowry.

As divorces became more common, attempts were made to check it indirectly, by affixing pecuniary penalties or pecuniary loss to the party whose conduct rendered the divorce necessary. After the divorce, either party was at liberty to marry again. Under the Christian emperors divorce was punished in various ways, but the power of obtaining it still remained. The terms repudium and divortium appear, at times, to have been used indifferently, although the former properly applied to a marriage only contracted, and the latter to one actually consummated.

In regard to the formalities that were gone through with in the case of divorce, they varied somewhat with the forms of marriage, and probably also at different periods of time. The most common way seems to have been, by sending a bill to the woman, containing reasons of the separation, and the tender of all her goods, which she brought with her; or the whole formalities were performed in her presence before witnesses, the writing embracing the marriage contract being torn in pieces, the dowry refunded, the keys taken away, and the woman turned out of doors.

Another topic connected with this relation, is the relations that existed between the parent and the child, involving what was termed the patria potestas, which is no unimportant subject of inquiry.

This term was employed to signify the power which a Roman father had over the persons of his children, and other descendants. This power was, originally, almost unlimited.

He could give a wife to his son, or a husband to his daughter, and could divorce any child of his at his pleasure. He could give him in adoption, and emancipate him. He could sell his son, and had even the power of life and death over him as a member of his familia. He could disinherit him, give his property to another, and appoint by his will a tutor or guardian over him.

The commencement of the patria potestas dated from the birth of a child in lawful marriage, and one of its conditions was that the child should be born in marriage. It could also be acquired by adoption.

The exposure of children who were defective, or had ill health in their early childhood, was practiced at Rome. This barbarous custom, established by Lycurgus at Sparta was introduced into Rome by Romulus, but with this qualification, that no such exposure should take place until after the child had attained the age of three years. By that time it was supposed a state of health might be attained, or if not, the father and mother might then conceive an affection for it, and thus prevent its exposure. This qualification was subsequently made a part of the twelve tables, but was neglected afterwards, and the custom of exposing children became quite common at Rome.[1]

This patria potestas was dissolved in various ways. The death of the father was one method. So, also, it could be dissolved during the life of the father, by the emancipation of the child. It ceased when the son was elected flamen, or the daughter was chosen a vestal.

In connection with this should also be considered the rights and disabilities of the child. In his private rights he was incapable of any power or dominion. But this incapacity did not prevent him from acquiring property, but all he acquired belonged to his father.

So far, however, as regarded his relations to the state, he labored under no incapacity. He could vote at the comitia

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 274.

tributa, could be a tutor, and even a magistrate. He had both connubium and commercium, but they brought to him no present power or ownership. His connubium, or marriage, when accompanied with the in manum conventio had the effect of placing his wife within the power of his father. His children were, in all cases, in the power of their grandfather whenever the parent was. He could not have an heir, having nothing to descend, and could not make a will, having nothing to leave.

Although he could acquire no rights for himself, yet he could for his father. He could also incur obligations. But as between him and his father, no civil obligations could exist. Neither of them could have a right of action against the other.

It will, therefore, be perceived, that there was a species of slavery embraced in this patria potestas. The fundamental maxim was, that a man may be made richer, but not poorer, by his slaves and children. There was, however, this important distinction between them, that the son was an heir, and the slave was not. The latter, therefore, could, in no event, acquire anything for himself, which the former, although equally incapacitated from acquiring for himself, yet all that he did acquire for his father, might become his own in the event of his father's death.

The incapacity of the child, however, to acquire property for himself, did not always exist. About the time of Augustus, this was varied, and the son was empowered to acquire for himself, and to treat as his own, whatever he got in military service.

When a Roman had no children of his own, he was allowed to adopt the son of a relation or friend. All the rights which the fathers had over their children, were transmitted to those who adopted them; and those who were adopted, became the heirs and lawful successors of their adopting fathers. They were placed in his rank, entered into his family,[1] and took the name of it, adding

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 279.

that of the family from whence they came, to preserve something of their origin.

This adoption was of two or three kinds. The first was properly adoption. It was for minors, and was made in the presence of a magistrate and witnesses, being accompanied with ceremonies similar to those of emancipation.[1] The second, the arrogatio, regarded those, who, being their own masters, subjected themselves to the power of him who adopted them. This required only the consent of the people to acquire the force of law.[2]

There were three conditions necessary to render both these kinds of adoption regular.[3] The first was, that he who adopted should have no children, nor hopes of any, and should be about eighteen years older than the son to be adopted. The second, that neither the honor, religion, domestic worship, or sacrifices, of the two families, should receive any prejudice; and third, that there should be no fraud or collusion. In case any question arose, the college of pontiffs was to decide, and when they approved, it was referred to the decision of the people, and under the empire, to the emperors. The third kind of adoption was made by will or testament, to be confirmed by the prætor, or by the people, after the death of the testator.[4]

These adoptions finally led to abuse. The patrician, to obtain the tribuneship, would be adopted by some plebeian, and those who were without children, that they might enjoy office to which only fathers of families could be elected, adopted children, whom after obtaining the offices, they emancipated. This finally required, to remedy it, a decree of the senate in the reign of Nero.[5]

It was early felt as important among the Romans to keep some registry of births and deaths, and assumptions by the citizens of the virile robe. Accordingly, it was ordained by Servius and Tullius that at the birth of each child they should carry a piece of money into the temple

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 280. [2] *Idem*, 281. [3] *Idem*, 281. [4] *Idem*, 281, 282. [5] *Idem*, 284.

of Juno Lucina;[1] one at each death into that of Venus Libitina; and a third into that of the goddess Juventa, when a citizen assumed the virile robe. This had grown nearly obsolete until revived in a more perfect form by Marcus Aurelius, who ordained that the name of each child, born free in Rome, should, within thirty days thereafter, be carried to the archives of the treasury in the temple of Saturn; and he also, for the same end, established registers and public records in the provinces. This enabled the citizen more easily to prove his rank if it was contested.[2]

The Romans had two, three, and sometimes four names. These were the prænomen, the proper; or, as we should term it, the baptismal name; the nomen, or family name; the cognomen or surname, in its original a sort of nick-name or honorable title, distinguishing the different branches of the same house; and the cognomen, another surname, but entirely personal, and given usually as a title of honor.[3] Thus take the name of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus.

P. Publius is the prænomen usually abbreviated.

Cornelius is the family name, usually ending in *ius*.

Scipio is the name of the family branch which distinguished it from that of Sylla.

Africanus was given him by reason of his exploits in Africa.

In regard to the origin of the family name, the Romans are supposed to have drawn from their agricultural and rustic life; thus the families, Asinia Vitellia, Suillia, Porcia, Ovinia, etc., were so named because their authors had been famous in the art of rearing these sort of animals, as others had been for the culture of certain kinds of pulses, such as the fabii, the lentuli, the pisos, the ciceros, etc.[4]

The Romans gave the boys the nomen, or family name, the ninth day after birth, and girls on the eighth; but the prænomen was not given to the former until they took the virile robe, nor to the latter until they were married. The

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 1, 285. [2] *Manners of the Romans*, 285. [3] *Idem*, 287. [4] *Life of the Romans*, 287.

prænomen of the latter was marked by letters, reversed; for example, C and M reversed signified Cara and Marcia[1]

The care and education of children varied amongst the Romans according to the times, and according to the manners. The earlier Romans employed their time principally in agriculture and in wars. These two objects, therefore, naturally entered largely into the training of youth.

The cares of infancy devolved upon the mother. They nursed their own children, and the custom of choosing nurses was not established amongst them until idleness and pleasure had proved too strong for the maternal affections. As the boys advanced in age and strength, their fathers accustomed them to the toils of husbandry, the handling of arms, and the exercises of war. They were also instructed in the laws and manners of the country. But in the early history of Rome there was little knowledge of reading or writing among the Romans.[2]

The introduction of the science, literature, and arts of Greece, wrought a great change among the Romans. Public schools were established, in which both sexes received instruction. It was a custom among the great at Rome to keep in their houses some philosopher or learned Grecian, permitting him to open school for the young nobility, who came thither to be taught with their children.[3]

The two great points towards which the attention of the early Romans seem to have been directed in their educational training, were to give strength of body, and correct moral perceptions. With a view to the former, they practiced wrestling, boxing, throwing the quoit, running, riding, driving the chariot, drawing the bow, whirling the sling, darting the javelin, leaping of ditches, and swimming over rivers. With a view to the latter, they were early committed to the care of some matron of their relations, who was commissioned to watch over their rising passions, to direct their inclinations; and as they advanced in age and in reason, to inure them to discipline and regularity

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 286, 287. [2] *Idem*, 290. [3] *Idem*, 291, 292.

of manners; to place before their minds, such examples as would inspire them with sentiments of virtue and probity, of generosity and disinterestedness, of justice and good faith, and such precepts as would lead them to venerate the gods, submit to parents, love their country and liberty, and render them zealously attached to the constitution and to the laws.[1]

The virile robe was taken at the age of seventeen. This, to the young Roman, was a great occasion; in fact, the entering upon a new era of existence. It freed him from the authority of governors, and raised him to a state of greater liberty. He was thereby introduced to the forum where the general assemblies were held, where the people were harangued by the magistrates, and where the most important causes were pleaded. It was the school of public affairs and of eloquence, the scene where the great interests of the republic were discussed, the source of private fortunes, and of public hopes.[2] The young Roman was presented there with great solemnity, to enter upon his career of business, and of honors, and to form himself to everything which might render him useful to the state.

It was not unusual for the young Roman, on his introduction to the forum, to be placed under the special protection of some senator who was celebrated for his eloquence, and his skill in the laws of the republic. Thus, the most distinguished senators, without being professional teachers, were, in fact, so many masters, directing the young people both by their counsels and by their example.[3]

The principal studies to which the attention of the young Roman was directed, was the laws, eloquence, and the art of war. The first were regarded as so necessary for attaining employments, that children were required to commit to memory those of the twelve tables. Eloquence was learnt by study and by exercise. There were in Rome both Greek and Latin schools, and young men were accustomed to compose and declaim in both languages. The

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 295. [2] *Idem*, 296. [3] *Idem*, 297.

games heretofore referred to, and their employments in the camp, were of a nature calculated to make the most hardy soldiers.[1]

The education of the female sex was at first confined to the interior economy of the house, to needle work and spinning, in which the mothers instructed their daughters. But after the taste for arts and sciences had become diffused at Rome, the education which was given them took a larger scope; and to the care of forming their manners, and regulating their appearance, was joined that of cultivating and adorning their minds.[2]

Another topic embraced under this general head, and the importance of which cannot well be overestimated, is the condition of women among the Romans. This condition always forms an important element in civilization.

One thing that no doubt had its influence upon the condition of women among the Romans, was the condition of that sex among the ancient Etruscans. There they enjoyed high privileges. They were admitted to all social meetings, public and private. Marriage, among them, was a ceremony of much pomp; and they had a custom of adding the mother's name to the designation of the son, thus acknowledging the claim of the woman to be the foundress of families. Thus the old Etruscan civilization presents, as one of its proudest monuments, the elevated condition of women.

This, no doubt, exerted a modifying influence among the Romans; but the peculiar relations resulting from marriage among the latter seem to have been borrowed from the Sabines. From the first moment of her marriage she was regarded as the daughter of her husband, and, consequently, in the sequel, as the sister of her own children. The sacred laws of Numa gave the husband an authority over his wife equally as great as that exercised by a father over his children, except that there could be no sale of a wife, although the father might dispose of his sons and daughters. Ac-

[1] *Life of the Romans*, 297. [2] *Idem*, 303.

cording to these laws, the wife was subjected to a species of slavery, in which she nominally possessed the rights of a Roman citizen, at the same time that she really lost all the most valuable prerogatives of a free woman.

From this assumed filial relation she derived rights, however, as well as disabilities. As the daughter of the husband, she was sole heir to his property, if he left no issue; but if she had borne children, she received, in quality of their sister, an equal portion with them. Among the filial rights of the Roman wives, was that first recognized by the ancient Roman laws and customs, that the bonds of conjugal union were indissoluble.

The duties and obligations of Roman wives sprung from their rights. They were equally incapacitated with their children from acquiring any individual rights in property, but whatever they earned or came legally into possession of, belonged ipso jure to the husband. In case of his survivorship he retained all she had brought him, not as heir, but as property belonging to him. Wives, equally with children, were precluded from making wills, and the wife could not receive a present even from her husband, because a gift to her was equivalent to one for himself. Adultery, poisoning, inebriety, employing false keys, were all punished with death, without any tribunal but the husband's pleasure.

From the early traditionary history of Rome, as well as from subsequent events, are to be found many facts that undoubtedly exerted their influence upon the condition of women. The Romans were at first a nation of men. In the acquisition of their Sabine wives, a nation of women was brought in. Each one of these should have enjoyed equal rights.

One of the first of the Roman wars was undertaken in the cause of women; and in one of the first treaties of peace and alliance, women were the negotiators. One of the first religious festivals instituted, was the matronalia, an annual commemoration of the reconcilement effected by them between the Romans and the Sabines. The institution

of the vestals, with their peculiar rights and privileges, was an early tribute paid to the worth of woman. We have seen in what manner Lucretia and Virginia caused a change in the constitution of the state. Rome was saved from Coriolanus through the efforts of his wife and mother. From these and other instances of patriotism and devotion, we derive the reasons why the government granted new honors to the sex. It became legal to praise them in the tribune as generals and magistrates were praised, to pronounce funeral orations at their death; and to draw them in chariots to the public games.

The Roman ladies of the early times possessed private virtues to even a greater extent than public. They were retired in their habits, although their confinement could in no respect be compared with that of the eastern nations, not even of the Athenians. They were far more the companions of men, and lived in the enjoyment of the society, affection and esteem of their husbands. Their occupations were almost entirely domestic. They busied themselves chiefly with their household affairs, with spinning, weaving, and embroidery. The emperor Augustus is said to have worn the garments which were spun by his wife and daughter.

To these occupations were generally superadded the care of educating children. Thus, there were many guards and securities placed around the mother, wife, and daughter, which all tended to enforce a strict morality, and in this manner to secure the respect and confidence of the father, husband and son.

There were, however, practices at Rome permitted by the laws, which were at variance with sound morality. A law is attributed even to the sage and philosophic Numa, by which a husband, after having children by his wife, might lend her to another for the same purpose. This, if extensively acted upon, would lead to a species of polygamy highly unfavorable to the ends of matrimony. Although instances are not wanting of its occurring in high life, yet there is no evidence that the practice was at all extensive.

There were instances of Roman women, even in the early periods of Roman history, who were monsters of cruelty. Such was Tullia, who could drive her chariot over the body of her father. So also under the republic, about four centuries from the building of the city, a terrible mortality, in every case attended by similar symptoms, was observed to prevail among the upper classes. This excited no little astonishment, but without any suspicion of the real cause. At length, however, a female slave offered to reveal the truth on condition of pardon for herself. She conducted the magistrates to the houses of several women, who were found busily employed in the preparation of various ingredients. They were charged with the preparation of poisons. They denied it, and to prove their innocence, swallowed the drugs they had prepared. Death in a short time followed, preceded by the same symptoms that had characterized the mortality. The fact was, that some one hundred and seventy, or, as some say, three hundred and sixty Roman ladies, had entered into a plot to poison their husbands.

The Romans had no particular magistrates to inspect the conduct of women. The censors had no particular authority over them. They had no other than such as resulted from regarding them as component parts of the republic. There was, however, a domestic tribunal, which, to some extent, supplied this want of particular magistrates.

This tribunal consisted of the wife's relations, who were summoned by the husband, and before whom the wife was tried. It seems that in ordinary cases the husband sat as judge in the presence of the wife's relations; but that in heinous crimes, he determined the case in conjunction with five of the relations.

The penalties inflicted by this tribunal were necessarily arbitrary. No code of laws can well regulate manners, or prescribe definite rules to modesty. What we owe to others may be matters of legal regulation, not what we owe to ourselves.

Although the general conduct of women was inspected by this tribunal, yet there was one crime, which, besides being subject to its animadversion, might also be made matter of public accusation. This was the crime of adultery.

This tribunal went far towards preserving the manners of the republic. And, in return, these very manners, while they continued to be preserved, maintained, in its integrity, this tribunal. It decided both in regard to the violation of laws and also of manners.

The Roman laws also subjected women to a perpetual guardianship, except when they were under the authority of the husband. This guardianship was given to the nearest of the male relations.

Notwithstanding the effects of this tribunal and guardianship, the Roman ladies enjoyed much freedom and had many privileges. They were never confined and separated from the society of the men. They might walk or ride abroad, consulting their own wishes as to time and place. They always ate with their husbands, and were never excluded from entertainments to which strangers or friends were invited. There was, for some time, a difference in their position at table. While the men reclined upon a kind of couch or sofa as already stated, the women sat upon chairs, preserving an erect attitude. This difference, however, was laid aside before the time of Valerius Maximus, after which the women were found reclining like the men.

Notwithstanding this greater freedom enjoyed by the women at Rome, they appear to have been extremely silent and reserved, and the husbands by no means communicative to their wives.

The Roman ladies were allowed, from the earliest period, to ride in carriages in the city, to decorate their persons much more than the men, to wear purple garments, and all kinds of ornaments of gold and silver. In the second Punic war was passed the Oppian law, which forbade women to ride in carriages in the city and its environs, to wear purple garments, and gold trinkets of the weight of

more than half an ounce. The reason assigned was, that the exigencies of the state required the money.

Immediately, upon the termination of the war, an effort was made to procure a repeal of the law. On the day appointed for discussing its repeal, the women of Rome assembled in the streets, stopping the senators and tribunes, and endeavoring to prevail upon them to go for the repeal of the law. This conduct was much censured by Cato, the censor, who characterized it as a highly dangerous inversion of ancient order and decorum, as rebellion against their husbands, the laws, and the government, and as irrefragible proof, that the men had lost their majesty and supreme authority which their ancestors had sought to establish by so many wise regulations.

Notwithstanding his opposition, however, the ladies in the end prevailed, the law was repealed, and they recovered the liberty of riding and dressing as they had formerly done.

In early times, the appearance of females, whether married or single, before a court of justice, was a thing extremely uncommon. The ancient laws and customs of the Romans rendered it almost impossible for a woman to be brought in private causes before a court. Those laws and customs came, in time, however, to be disregarded, and when the first woman undertook her defense before a judicial tribunal, the senate deemed this instance of masculine boldness, an omen, the signification of which, it was necessary to implore the gods to reveal. But at the period of the second triumvirate, viz: that of Augustus, Anthony, and Lepidus, Hortensia, the daughter of the great Hortensius, in a speech, replete with all the fire and eloquence which had distinguished her father, pleaded the cause of the women from whom the rapacious triumvirs had demanded the payment of a large sum of money.

During the censorship of Cato, two rather remarkable events took place in the simultaneous expulsion of two senators. One was expelled for having kissed his wife in the presence of his daughter, and the other for having

killed a Boiian chief to gratify a young Carthaginian, who had expressed a wish to see a man expire by a violent death. These facts, especially the latter, show the peculiar state of morals of the times, and the rigid severity of Cato.

But the virtue of women waned with those Roman virtues which had sustained the republic, but which perished with the Gracchi. After their death, it was observed that the chastity of the vestals was more frequently drawn in question, and some of them were condemned to death. With the triumph of faction over law, came that of licentiousness over every opposing barrier. The selfish and disorganizing passions are extremely apt to act together. and unite their forces for the destruction of order. It is not a little remarkable, that the men whose inordinate ambition led them to crush the rights of their countrymen, were those whose wives and daughters were the most depraved. And although the wives of their country's defenders had in them more of the early Roman virtues and severity of manners, yet a mighty change was very apparent in the whole sex. The truth is, a great general change had taken place, in which they could not well avoid participating. Wealth, luxury, the arts, literature, had all sprung up. Social intercourse had been very greatly enlarged. New wants had arisen, and new exercises had been originated. Female minds were more cultivated. They had become active and inquiring. Plain and simple virtue had become too antiquated; and the esteem of husbands was less sought for, than more general admiration.

There not only occurred this general declension from virtue, but monsters in vice began to make their appearance. Metella, the wife of Sylla, was notorious for her incontinence. The sister of the sage Cato was renowned for her licentiousness. She became enamored of Cæsar, who is supposed to have been the father of her son, Brutus, the conspirator.

These social vices are said to have found their way into the empire from Asia. The wealth of the Asiatic pro-

vinces afforded to the men very extensive means of dissipation. What the men thus won with the sword, the women purchased by the sale of their charms. Hitherto, those of the same town or city had not, in general, embarked in a life of prostitution. But now all those scruples were laid aside. Prostitution became a profession. Julia, the daughter of the Emperor Augustus, led the way in extreme profligacy.

This led to a reluctance on the part of the male to enter the marriage state. Hence, the reason why the legislation of the Augustan period was directed to the encouragement of marriage. A tax was laid upon every Roman who remained unmarried at a certain age. Notwithstanding this, and other regulations, calculated to promote matrimony, they nevertheless failed in their object, and the reason, no doubt, was that the men feared the utter profligacy of the women.

In the reign of Tiberius, the licentiousness of women became still more flagrant. It prevailed to an alarming extent in the upper classes. It was an early legal provision rendering it necessary for every woman intending to devote herself to the trade of prostitution, to make her official declaration to that effect in the presence of the ædiles. It was presumed that no woman would ever have the hardihood to do this, and hence that none would be prostitutes. But about this period, one Vestilla, a lady of prætorian birth, presented herself before the ædiles to make this declaration. This created quite a sensation in Rome, and the senate passed a decree forbidding any woman to be enrolled upon the lists of public women, whose father, grandfather or husband, had the dignity of knight.

Nor did subsequent times bring along with them any improvement. Under each successive emperor female morality became more and more corrupt. Caligula lived with his own sister as his wife. Messalina, the wife of the emperor Claudius, was so utterly profligate that she married one Silius in the presence of the whole Roman people.

It should, however, be remarked that during the very worst of times there were not wanting instances of Roman women who maintained the honor of their sex, and appear with so much the greater splendor in consequence of the surrounding profligacy. Such was Aria, and her daughter of the same name. Such Paulina, the wife of Seneca; and more distinguished than all, Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus.

The emperor Septimius Severus once resolved to reform female morals; but finding a list of three thousand persons accused of adultery in the space of seventeen years, he gave up his project as entirely chimerical. The palace of Heliogabalus became a common brothel, and his favorites were the most infamous for their profligacy. He created a senate of women, over which his mother presided, and whose duty it was to enact laws upon modes and fashions.

Thus it has been well remarked, "the progress of male and female morality, in the wonderful city of Rome, as she rose from the first huts of the twin brothers to become the mistress of the world, kept equal pace together in good and in bad. As heroes grew out of the wants of the times, heroines sprung to meet them, worthy to be partners of their lives. At home or abroad, in peace or in war, congenial virtues hailed them in the fair sex, and for every Brutus there was a Lucretia. The noble qualities of Veturia bore the stamp of the same age as the loftiness of Coriolanus. The daughter of Scipio Africanus was courted by a monarch, but she preferred remaining the widow of a Roman citizen, to sharing the throne of the Ptolemies. She it was who educated her sons, the Gracchi, and the children of Cornelia could not die otherwise than in the people's cause. Brutus had his Portia, Cassius his Junia, and Cæsar his Pompeia, the mistress of the thrice incestuous Clodius; Augustus and Anthony were followed by Julia and her daughter. The brutish Claudius was consorted with Messalina. Nero lived in a court of prostitutes, and Heliogabalus having married four wives before he was eighteen, professed himself to be a woman. A small num-

ber of females, as rare as honest men were, in the decline of Rome, burst through the crowd of profligates, and virtuous hearts often found each other. But Agrippinas were as thinly scattered as Germanicuses, and Seneca could not have found a second Paulina. Let such a parallel be drawn in every state, and the inseparability of male and female virtue will be proved."

The principal cause which undoubtedly contributed to increase the depravity of the Roman women, was probably the extreme abruptness of the transition from great simplicity of manners to extreme opulence. There are generally intermediate steps between these, but in Rome there were none. The fall of Carthage opened the flood gates of corruption upon Rome, and there had previously been no proportional cultivation of the female mind. The education of women was not such as might fit them for leaving their retired and simple mode of life for one more social and more elegant, without danger to themselves, and they became acquainted with luxury before they knew what civilization was. This opened their whole souls to the admission of pleasure, at the same time leaving no power in their minds to aid their moral repugnances in combating vice. The consequence was, that they plunged at once into the abyss of general depravity, and followed wherever bad men led the way.

The general fact must, however, be admitted, that the condition of women in Rome, was, on the whole, superior to what it was in Athens, or in any part of the world which had preceded her in civilization. This is more especially the case if the inquiry is confined to the republic, comparing the period between Romulus and Sylla with that which separates Codrus from Pericles. The superiority of the Roman matrons consisted mainly in the following particulars.

1. They were admitted to a fairer participation in human concerns.

2. They were allowed to share, on a more equal footing, the pains and pleasures of the other sex.

3. They were much better known and valued, the greater confidence and esteem of men arousing their faculties into a higher degree of action, and thus giving them a greater influence and power in the general affairs of the world.

VII. One more topic remains for discussion under the head of the social habits of the Romans, and that is, their funerals.

Among the Romans the disposition of their dead was a matter of great importance. They believed the souls of the unburied were not admitted into the mansions of the dead, or, at least, that they were condemned to wander along the banks of the Styx for one hundred years before they were permitted to cross it. Hence arose their fear of death from shipwreck, and their anxiety to have bestowed upon all their departed friends the rights of sepulture.

When a Roman was about expiring, the nearest relative present endeavored to catch his last breath. This effort was prompted by the belief that the soul, or living principle, in that breath made its escape from the body. At the same time the ring was also taken from the finger, although it was again restored before the body was placed on a funeral pile. The eyes and mouth were also closed by the nearest relative present. But the eyes were also afterwards opened on the funeral pile. The reason assigned was, because they counted it impious, and equally so, that the eyes should be seen by men at their last motion, or that they should not be exposed to the view of heaven.

After death, the ceremonies may be reckoned of three sorts:

1. Such as were performed before the burial.

2. Such as concerned the act of burial, or the funeral proper.

3. Such as were done after that solemnity.

The first of these relates to what occurred after the death and before the burial.

1. The first thing done was to wash and anoint the body with oils and perfumes, after which it was dressed in the best

robe which the deceased had worn when in life. The ordinary citizens were dressed in the white toga, while magistrates were arrayed in their robes of office. These funeral gowns, or robes, were often woven during the life of the party for whom they were intended. If a crown had been won by bravery, that was placed on the head. The couch, on which the body reposed, was sometimes decked with leaves and flowers. A small coin was placed in the mouth of the deceased to enable him to pay the ferryman Charon for his passage over the Styx.

The body was then laid out by the nearest relative. It was always placed near the threshold at the entrance of the house, the feet turned outward toward the gate, as if about to take its last departure.

Next follows the conclamatio or wail for the dead. This was a general outcry, made at intervals, by persons waiting for that purpose before the corpse. The reason for it is not so apparent, but it has been supposed that it was either because they hoped by this means to stop the soul, or else to awaken its powers, which they thought might only lie silent in the body without action. When this crying out was perceived to be unattended with any effect, the deceased was said to be conclamatus, or past call.

There existed a custom at Rome of rearing some sign or indication, by which it would be perceived that the house was in mourning. This was done by placing a branch of cypress at the door of the deceased, more especially if he were a person of consequence, the object of which was to prevent the pontifex maximus from entering, and thereby being polluted, for it was unlawful for him not only to touch, but even to look at a dead body.

2. The second division relates to what concerned the act of burial, or the funeral proper.

The earlier Romans, like most of the ancient nations, interred their dead. They however, occasionally followed a custom, which they seem to have borrowed from the Greeks, of burning the body. This is mentioned even in the laws of Numa, and of the twelve tables, but it was far

from becoming general until towards the end of the republic. The first institution of this custom among the Romans is ascribed by Pliny to their having discovered that the bodies of those who fell in distant wars were dug up by the enemy. The custom of burning became almost universal under the emperors, but upon the introduction and greater prevalence of Christianity it gradually fell into disuse towards the end of the fourth century. Persons struck with lightning were buried just where they fell, the spot being enclosed with a wall, no one being allowed to tread upon it.

Funerals were of two kinds, public and private. The people were invited to a public funeral by a herald. Whenever such was intended, the body was kept usually some seven or eight days, a keeper being set to watch it.

On the arrival of the day of the funeral, when the people were assembled, the body was carried out, the feet being foremost, on a couch which was commonly supported on the shoulders of the nearest relatives of the deceased. The poorer citizens were carried in a plain coffin, or on a plain bier, and usually by four bearers.

The ancient custom was to solemnize all funerals in the night time, with torches. The principal reason assigned for this is, that they might not fall in the way of magistrates and priests, who were supposed to be so far violated by seeing a corpse, that they could not perform sacred rites, until they were purified by an expiatory sacrifice.

But, at subsequent periods, public funerals came to be celebrated in the day-time, and at an early hour in the forenoon; but still with torches. Private funerals were always at night.

There was present the undertaker, or master of ceremonies, under whose direction the funeral procession was regulated, and every one's place assigned him. In this procession first marched the musicians, the pipers, trumpeters, and corneters. Next in order were the mourning women, hired for the special purpose of lamenting, of

singing the funeral song, or the praises of the deceased, to the sound of the flute. For this last purpose they sometimes employed boys and girls.

Next came players and buffoons, who both danced and sung. These sometimes introduced apt sayings from dramatic writers. Some one of them acted out the character of the deceased, imitating his words and actions while in life.

Then came the freedmen of the deceased, with a cap on their heads. Some, at their death, freed all their slaves for the sole purpose of having their funeral procession attended by a numerous train of freedmen.

They bore before the corpse, on long poles or frames, and in the same form and garb as when alive, the images of the deceased and his ancestors.

If the deceased had distinguished himself in war, the crowns and rewards he had received for his valor were displayed, as also the spoils and standards he had taken from the enemy. If a renowned commander, there were carried also images, or representations of the countries he had subdued, and the cities he had taken. The lictors also attended such funerals with the fasces inverted, and sometimes officers and troops, with their spears pointing to the ground, or laid aside.

Behind the corpse walked the friends of the deceased in mourning, the magistrates without their badges; the nobility without their ornaments; the sons with their heads veiled, and the daughters with their heads bare, and hair disheveled, which was contrary to the ordinary custom of both.

There were also not wanting what were deemed demonstrations of deep grief. The nearest relatives tore their garments, covering their hair with dust, or pulling it out. The women in particular frequently distinguished themselves by beating their breasts, tearing their cheeks, etc.

Whenever the funeral was of a very distinguished citizen, the corpse was carried through the forum, where the procession stopped, and a funeral oration, in praise of the

deceased, was pronounced from the rostrum. This was usually done by a son, or by some near relative or friend, and sometimes also by a magistrate, according to the appointment of the senate.

The practice was to place the corpse before the rostrum while the funeral oration was delivering. Upon the conclusion of the oration the body was carried to the place of burning or of burial. This place the law of the twelve table ordered to be without the city. The Romans would not permit burning or burying within the city, both from a sacred and civil consideration; the sacred, that the priests might not be contaminated by seeing or touching a dead body; and the civil, that houses might not be endangered by the frequency of funeral fires, or the air infected by the noxious effluvia.

The burial places were either private or public. The former were in fields or gardens, usually near the highway, in order to be conspicuous, and to remind those who passed, of mortality.

It was the privilege of the vestal virgins to be buried in the city, and also of some illustrious men, which right their posterity retained, but did not always use.

When the body was to be burnt, the funeral pile was built in the form of an altar, with four equal sides. The material was wood, such as fir, pine, cleft oak, etc., which might easily catch fire. It was stuffed with paper and pitch, and made higher or lower according to the rank of the deceased, having cypress trees set around to prevent the disagreeable smell.

On this pile was placed the corpse with the couch, the eyes being opened. The body was wrapped in a species of cloth not combustible, called by the Greeks, asbestos. It was made of thread spun from a kind of stone, which, on exposure to the fire, becomes white.[1] The nearest relatives, after kissing the body, set fire to the pile with a lighted torch, at the same time averting their face, to show

[1] *Manners of the Romans*, 347.

that they did it with reluctance. It was thought extremely fortunate if a wind arose to assist the flames.

While the fire was burning they threw into it various perfumes, incense, myrrh, cassia, etc., also cups of oils and dishes, with titles marking what they contained; likewise clothes and ornaments, as well their own as those of the deceased. The object was to throw in everything that was supposed to be agreeable to the deceased while alive. If the deceased had been a soldier, they threw on the pile his arms, rewards, and spoils. If a general, the soldiers sometimes threw on their own arms.

At the funeral of an illustrious commander or emperor, the soldiers made a circuit from right to left three times around the pile, having their ensigns inverted, and striking their weapons on one another to the sound of the trumpet, all present accompanying them.

It would hardly have been in perfect character with the Romans, to have ceremonies of this kind pass away without the shedding of blood. They supposed the manes to be delighted with it, and hence, in ancient times, they slaughtered and threw on to the pile, men, captives or slaves. This was afterwards changed, and, instead of human beings, they slew various animals, especially such as the deceased had been fond of in his life time. Finally gladiators were made to fight, and slay one another around the pile.

There are recorded instances of persons returning to life on the funeral pile, after it was set on fire, and too late to be preserved. Also of others who revived before the pile was kindled.

When the pile was burned down, the fire was extinguished, and the embers soaked with wine; the bones were gathered up by the nearest relatives. These, after being sprinkled with the richest perfumes, were put into an urn made of earth, brass, marble, silver, or gold; and sometimes along with them, a small glass vial full of tears. The urn was afterwards solemnly deposited in the sepulchre.

When the body was not burned, it was put into a coffin, which was deposited in the tomb. Those who died in prison were thrown out naked on the street.

After the remains were laid in the tomb, those present were three times sprinkled by a priest with pure water, from a branch of olive or laurel, in order to purify them, after which they were dismissed.

3. The third and last division relates to what was done after the proper funeral solemnities had closed.

Upon the return of the friends from the funeral, the first thing to be done was the purification. This was done by sprinkling with water, and also by stepping over a fire. Not only the person, but the house was also purified, and swept with a broom or besom of a particular kind.

There were also ceremonies gone into for the purification of the family, consisting of burying a thumb, or some part cut off from the body before it was burned, or a bone brought home from the funeral pile.

The mourning and ceremonies connected with the dead, lasted for nine days after the funeral. During this time, and while the family were employed in certain solemnities at the tomb, it was unlawful to summon the heir, or any near relation of the deceased, to a court of justice, or in any other manner to molest them. At the end of that time, was performed the sacrifices called novendiale, which concluded these solemnities.

Nor was the sepulchre without its adornments. It was spread with flowers, and covered with crowns and fillets. Before it was a little altar, on which libations were made, and incense burned. The tomb was frequently illuminated with lamps, and a keeper was appointed to watch it.

To these ceremonies was generally added a feast, called the silicernium, both for the dead and the living. That part which was designed for the dead, consisted commonly of beans, lettuces, bread and eggs. These were laid on the tomb, and after the ghosts had eaten sufficiently, they burnt the remainder on the stone. At all banquets in honor of the dead the guests were dressed in white.

After the funeral of great men, there was not only a feast for the friends of the deceased, but also a distribution of raw meat among the people, together with shows of gladiators and games, which sometimes continued for several days.

There was no limited time for men to mourn, but the time did not usually exceed a few days. Women mourned for a husband or parent ten months, or a year, but not longer.

During the period of mourning, the Romans kept themselves at home, avoiding every entertainment and amusement, neither cutting their hair nor beard, dressed in black, and laying aside every kind of ornament; the women their gold and purple. Under the republic the latter dressed in black like the men, but under the emperors they wore white in mourning.

The Romans were accustomed to visit the tombs of their relatives at certain periods, and to offer to them sacrifices and various gifts. They appear to have regarded the manes, or departed souls of their ancestors, as gods, whence arose the practice of presenting to them oblations, consisting of victims, wine, milk, garlands of flowers, and other things.

CHAPTER VI.

ROME—ITS PHILOSOPHY.

The cultivation of philosophy, as also of the arts, went through a different process in Italy from what it had done in Greece. This arose from the immense difference in the essential elements that composed the Greek and Roman mind. The first was eminently speculative in its character, lively, imaginative; sending its full tide of life, its fine flights of fancy, and its wealth of original conception, into every department of thought. The last was as eminently practical, slow and sure in its advancement; deriving its lights mainly from experience, and more solicitous of acquainting itself with the great beaten highways of common life, than with the flowers that bloom, or even the fruits that ripen on its borders.

The Grecian mind revelled in the process of thinking; the Roman, in the different varieties of action. In the former, the powers of the imagination were more completely developed; in the latter, those of the practical.

The circumstances under which Rome was reared up, will, in some measure, account for this difference. We see her a nation of soldiers, always in armor, with industrial pursuits, religious observances, governmental institutions, social regulations, and forms and modes of thought, all based upon, and adapted to, that one great necessity of her being. The most cogent wants must first be satisfied before the mere pleasures of mind could be indulged in. The sterner requisitions of business must never yield to the lightness and comparative frivolity of mere speculation. And thus the rapid march of the imagination is restrained and made to conform to the slow and more measured tramp of reason.

Perhaps the most distinguishing feature between the two is the reversal of these two great elements of mind. In the Greek, the imagination led; and reason was relied upon to furnish forces in its aid. In the Roman, the reason led, while the imagination was checked and trammeled in such a manner as to be hardly capable of acting at all. It is in practical wisdom, in the application of sound judgment to the affairs of life, that the first intellectual progress of the proud Romans became apparent, and the first development of their reason was in political philosophy. And here they stand vastly superior to their predecessors. In the science of legislation there is no one among the ancients who stands higher than Numa Pompilius. Others of the Roman kings were also skilled in jurisprudence, and the founders and supporters of the republic were sound political philosophers. The political forces were adjusted, and the political elements arranged with the most consummate skill. The twelve tables were compiled, a work which Cicero claims to be superior to all that philosophers had ever conceived on the subject; and schools were instituted in order to promote their study. During several centuries the principal characteristic of the Romans, next to military prowess, was reason, and their principal occupations were government and jurisprudence. With them, therefore, philosophy was practical before it was theoretical, as it ever must be when it arises out of necessity. The Romans were a nation of instinctive sages before they had heard the word wisdom pronounced.

Under these circumstances, we cannot surely expect that the Roman mind will originate any new systems of speculative philosophy. We shall be much disappointed even if it add much to the old. From the building of Rome, through the whole period of the regal government, and for many years after the establishment of the republic, the Romans discovered little inclination to cultivate any knowledge except that which was purely practical, and involved in governing or in conquering.

Towards the close of the sixth century, from the building of Rome, an embassy was sent from Athens to the Romans to obtain the remission of a fine of five hundred talents, which had been inflicted upon them for laying waste Ocopii, a town of Sicyonia.

The powers of eloquence displayed by these philosophical missionaries awoke in the mind of the Roman youth a strong thirst after knowledge. Three young Romans of distinction, Lælus, Furius and Scipio desired to enlist under the banners of philosophy. But Cato, the censor, strongly opposed it as an innovation upon the severity of the ancient manners, and philosophy was dismissed. His fear was, that its introduction would effeminate the spirit of the young men, and enfeeble the hardy virtues of the Romans. Subsequently a decree of the senate was passed requiring the prætor Pomponius to take care that no philosophers were residents in Rome. Some years afterwards the censors issued a similar edict against rhetoricians. Although these continued in force for some time, yet philosophy was finally introduced into Rome under the protection of those great commanders who had conquered Greece.

The Romans, however, never, like the Greeks, pursued the study of philosophy as an end. This was owing to the peculiar character of their mind, their regard for the practical, and disinclination to that which is merely speculative. Hence their study of philosophy was rather as a means than an end. They desired it either as an embellishment to their elegant leisure, or in order the more effectually to attain some personal or political end. This furnishes the clear demonstration that the Romans did not possess the true, genuine, philosophic spirit. They did not love philosophy for its own sake. They nevertheless, as the depositaries of Grecian thought, form an important link in the history of philosophy.

As a result, however, of being little more than depositaries, it would naturally follow that the spirit of research was exhausted. That spirit may be said to have been used up in the efforts of the Grecian mind. Reason, aided

by a lively imagination, had tried every path, had explored every avenue, had wandered in every direction then open to her, without being able to satisfy herself. Each one of the different philosophical systems that had started into being in Greece, had enabled her to view truth only in one of its aspects, and consequently error must be prevalent in each. Reason had not advanced to the original sources of knowledge, and consequently had continued to be an enigma to herself.

Neither was there, as yet, any correct method of philosophizing. Bacon had not yet pointed out the inductive process. The want of a proper method had rendered the disentanglement of errors a task impossible, or one of extreme difficulty. The different sects had become so well marked, and their peculiar doctrines so definitely settled, and each so variant from every other, that a reconciliation or adjustment between them had become impossible. The result was, that the mind was generally exercised in relation to them in disputation, and while this prevented a subsiding into lethargy, it also had the effect of detracting from the pure and disinterested love of truth. Hence, the mental efforts were not so much directed to the investigation of the first principles of knowledge, as to illustrate and apply conclusions which had been already drawn.

Among the distinguished Romans who were the first to cultivate philosophical pursuits, was Scipio Africanus. Although one of the great generals of the age, and the conqueror of Hannibal, yet he found time to familiarize his mind with the best Grecian writers, and to become intimately acquainted with the men of letters at Rome, particularly Polybius and Panætius.

So also Lælius and Furius were great admirers of Greek learning. It is to be observed of all these that they did not join themselves to the band of philosophers, but rather sought for distinction in the offices of civil or military life.

Another great captain and distinguished Roman who cultivated philosophical pursuits, and was the patron of

philosophy, was Lucullus. His taste for it was derived from conversing with the Grecian philosophers. He founded a library, erecting galleries and schools adjoining, thus affording to the Grecian philosophers a safe retreat from the tumults of war. Others followed his example, so that this period has been considered as the first age of philosophy in Rome. It was also the custom, at this time, to send Roman youth to Athens, to study at the schools of the philosophers. But there were not during this period any professed Roman philosophers. They were content simply to receive the dogmas of the Grecian sects, making no attempt to form for themselves any new systems of philosophy. They had subdued Greece by their arms; and now, in their turn, submitted their understandings to the dominion of Grecian ideas.

The ruling minds at Rome had little leisure for speculative thought. Their somewhat complicated machine of government, the strife between factions, the steady progress of jurisprudence, and the control and direction of those destructive elements that were continually marching on to the conquest of the world, were altogether sufficient to occupy the attention, and employ the time of the Romans. In addition to this, the different philosophies of Greece had become so thoroughly developed, and were so varying from each other in their spirit and essence, that almost every Roman could find in the doctrine of some one of the Grecian sects, such tenets and principles as were adapted to his own views, feelings, disposition and situation. The lawyer and magistrate, as a general thing, preferred the stoic philosophy, because of the utility of its moral doctrine; the gloomy and contemplative, the Pythagoric and Platonic, while the more selfish spirits welcomed the Epicurean.

Although the Italic or Pythagorean sect originated in Italy, yet it seems to have been confined to that part of it termed Magna Græcia, and not to have been much known at Rome until near the seventh century from the building of the city. This philosophy found an advocate in Publius

Nigidius, surnamed Figulus, who was the contemporary of Cicero. He possessed considerable mathematical and astronomical learning, and, like his master, lent his knowledge of nature to the purposes of imposture. This sect, however, contained too many mysteries and obscure dogmas to admit of its being much cultivated among the Romans.

The philosophy of the old academy was more successful. Among its advocates were Lucullus and Marcus Brutus. Of these, the former is known to us as a great captain, and the latter as a great patriot, but notwithstanding the civil and military engagements of the latter, he found time to make himself acquainted with the tenets of the different sects of Grecian philosophers, and to write treatises on virtue, patience, and the offices of life. He, for the most part, embraced the doctrine of Plato and the old academy. He also furnished the example of carrying philosophy into his actions as well as his words. His manners, mental endowments, entire self-command, and, more than all other things, his inflexible integrity, endeared him to his friends, and rendered him the admiration of the multitude.

Another disciple of the old academy was M. Terentius Varro. His writings were numerous, although but few have come down to us.

The doctrines of the new academy were more successful still in finding advocates among the Romans. Among these was Marcus Tullius Cicero, a name with which every school boy is familiar. His reputation, however, rests rather upon his qualities as an orator than as a philosopher. His studies and pursuits at some periods of his life were more philosophical than oratorical. At an early period he withdrew from Rome and went to Athens. Here he frequented the schools, and listened to the teachings of the philosophers. Among these, the one to whom he paid the greatest degree of attention, was Posidonius, the Rhodian. He also admired the doctrine of the stoics concerning natural equity and civil law, and adopted their ideas concerning morals. He also held Plato in high re-

spect, especially for his philosophy of nature. The sect to which he was the most averse was the Epicurean. He no doubt owed much of his success as an orator and statesman to the ardor and success with which he devoted himself to these studies. At last, when his career as a statesman was closed by the fall of the republic, he retired from public affairs, devoting himself assiduously to the study of philosophy; laboring to transplant the theories of the Greeks into the Roman soil. In all speculative questions he regarded the doctrines of the new academy as the safest guides, following also the method of that school in the form of his writings. In questions of morality he was a stoic, preferring their rigid principles to those of any other sect. His philosophical works contain little that is original, at the same time that they are a valuable record of the thoughts and opinions of others, but presented in a new, and more accessible form. They are valuable as throwing light on the history of philosophy, and having contributed to form the technical language of this science.

The stoic philosophy also received a large share of attention in the Roman republic. Its stern moral doctrine, and its adaptations to the purposes of civil policy, seemed to fit it more peculiarly to the qualities of the Roman mind. Several of the most zealous supporters of the tottering republic derived a great share of their strength from the principles of stoicism.

Among these was the younger Cato, a descendant of Cato the censor. His was a life of action, rather than of study and thought. He was one of the last sons of the republic, and could not survive its overthrow. His life, rather than any writings of his, affords the most effectual commentary upon the doctrine of the stoics. He sustained throughout a character of the most inflexible integrity, and uncorrupted public spirit. While he lived, he ever continued to hold up before his fellow citizens, a pattern of manly virtue.

The peripatetic philosophy did not find its way into Rome until near the end of the republic, in the time of

Sylla. In the taking of Athens he became possessed of the library of Apellicon, containing the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, which he brought to Rome. This attracted the attention of many Romans, who knew the value of Greek learning. There was, however, an obscurity in the writings of Aristotle which obstructed the progress of the peripatetic philosophy.

The Epicurean philosophy was never a favorite in the Roman republic. Some of its followers had been in the practice of irregularities, which rendered it unpopular, and the stoics were always decidedly and openly hostile to it. There were, nevertheless, persons of distinction in Rome who favored the Epicurean doctrine. This doctrine was never very truly or fully set forth by any Roman writer until the time of Lucretius. He was born in the year of Rome 659, and in his poem, *On the Nature of Things*, has unfolded the Epicurean system with accuracy of conception, clearness of method, and strength and elegance of diction. He was insane towards the close of his life, and finally died by his own hand, in the forty-fourth year of his age. This deservedly celebrated poem was written during his lucid intervals.

The erection of an empire on the ruins of the republic, although it destroyed every vestige of freedom in action, yet operated favorably upon philosophy. The Augustan age was distinguished for its learning, taste, and great refinement. Almost every statesman, lawyer, and man of letters, was conversant with the writings of philosophers, and discovered a leaning towards some ancient system. So also the Roman poets were tinctured with the philosophy of some Grecian sect. The same remark may also be applied to the Roman historians.

Even the doctrines of Pythagoras, although not perhaps in their pure original form, were revived under the empire. Among those who contributed to this revival were Anaxilaus, Quintus Sextus, Sotion Alexandrinus, and Moderatus. But the man who appears the most perfect representative of Pythagoras, and who made quite a conspicuous

figure in his day, was Apollonius of Tyana, in Cappadocia. He early accepted the discipline prescribed by Pythagoras. He refrained from animal food, living entirely upon fruits and herbs. He wore no articles of clothing made of the skins of animals. He went bare-footed, suffering his hair to grow to its full length.

Another kind of Pythagorean discipline through which Apollonius resolved to pass, was that of silence. He accordingly remained for the space of five years, without once exercising the faculty of speech. After the expiration of this term, he visited Antioch, Ephesus, and other cities, where at sunrising he performed certain religious rites, which he disclosed only to those, who, like himself, had passed through the discipline of silence. He devoted the morning in instructing his disciples, and at noon held a public assembly for popular discourse.

He afterwards traveled extensively, and finally settled at Ephesus, when he opened a school of philosophy, which, unlike the ancient Pythagorean, was open to all; every one being permitted to speak and inquire freely.

There has been considerable controversy as to the real character of Apollonius. Many extraordinary things have been related of him. Some have supposed that he was intimately acquainted with nature, and deeply skilled in medicinal arts; and that he applied his knowledge and skill to the purposes of imposture. Others imagine, he accomplished his fraudulent designs by means of a real intercourse with evil spirits. He was probably one of those who profess to practice magical arts, and to perform other wonders, for the sake of acquiring fame, influence and profit among the vulgar. Eusebius speaks of him as a man who was eminently skilled in every kind of human wisdom, but who affected powers beyond the reach of philosophy, and assumed the Pythagorean manner of living as a mask for his impostures.

So very successful was he in the practice of these impostures, that he succeeded in establishing over the minds of men a dominion, which continued after his death, so that

he was a long time ranked among the divinities. His name was made use of in incantations, and even many philosophers regarded him as a being of a superior order, and partaking of a middle nature between gods and men.

Apollonius was not, however, in his doctrine, a pure Pythagorean, for he borrowed from the Heraclitean school, the notion that the primary essence of all things is one, endued with certain properties, by which it assumes various forms; and that all the varieties of nature are modifications of this universal essence, which is the first cause of all things, or God. Hence he taught that all things arise in nature according to one necessary and immutable law, and that a wise man, from his acquaintance with the order of nature, can predict future events.

The Platonic philosophy, as embraced in the academic sect, seems not to have flourished under the Roman empire. But the true doctrine of Plato was, nevertheless, revived, and found many followers. Among these was Thrasyllus, a Mendasian; Theon of Smyrna; Favorinus of Arles; and Culvisius Taurus of Beryta who lived at Athens, and taught both in the schools and at his table. His custom was to invite a select number of friends to a frugal supper, consisting generally of lentils and a gourd, cut into small pieces upon an earthen dish. His disciples, the invited guests, were expected to contribute their share towards the expense of the repast. While at table, philosophical conversation upon various topics was introduced. Every one came furnished with some new subject of inquiry, which he was allowed in his turn to propose, and which, during a limited time was debated. The subjects brought forward for discussion embraced such questions as might afford an agreeable exercise to the faculties in the moments of convivial enjoyment.

There were also Lucius Apuleius of Medaura, and Atticus, who undertook to ascertain the exact points of difference between the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle. He held it utterly impossible for any imbued with peripa-

tetic notions to elevate their minds so as to understand and appreciate the sublime conceptions of Plato.

Plutarch of Chæronea is commonly reckoned as a Platonist, although he derived his philosophic tenets from various sources. He borrowed his ethics from Aristotle, his doctrine of the soul from the Egyptians or Pythagoreans, and his metaphysics from Plato and the academy. He always opposed the Epicureans and stoics. He had not probably digested for himself any accurate system of opinions, and was rather a recorder and interpreter of philosophers than a philosopher.

The sect which, of all others, requires the most attention under the Roman empire, was the eclectic, which may be said to have first risen to the dignity and importance of a sect or school under the empire. The practice of philosophizing eclectically had previously existed. Even several of the leaders of the Greek sects, as Plato, Zeno, and Aristotle, adopted it to some extent. Much more, however, did the practice prevail among the Alexandrian philosophers from the very commencement of their schools. The idea, therefore, out of which the eclectic school proceeded, had been for some time growing upon the mind.

This idea was that thought had sufficiently developed itself to produce all the truths which the mind was capable of comprehending, but that all these were mingled up with errors. That every philosophical system was a combination of truth with error. That between these there was no necessary connection; and that it was possible to sift these different philosophical systems; to separate, in each the truths from the errors; to preserve the one, and to reject the other; and thus to build up a new system, which should embrace every known truth, with no errors to deface and weaken it.

Such was the theory, but in practice, it resulted in the erecting a shapeless and incoherent mass of materials, without form or comeliness, and having little consistency with each other. One of its difficulties consisted in assuming that any mind was competent to disentangle all

truths from their associate errors, and to build them up into a beautiful and harmonious system.

This sect took its rise at Alexandria in Egypt. The history of philosophy had now arrived at that period at which this sect would naturally arise; and of all places, Alexandria was its most befitting theatre. The dogmatists had long been engaged in contests, which seemed to approach no nearer a decision than they ever did. This was sufficient to betray their weakness to their common adversaries, the academics and sceptics. Scepticism had also about run its race. It was clearly seen, that, if given its full sway, it would contradict the common sense and experience of mankind, and would threaten the world with universal uncertainty and confusion.

There was also a new philosophy, or rather a new body of doctrine, that now appeared in the field. This was the Christian religion, and when it presented the miracles upon which it rested, and the pure doctrines of which it was composed, the schools of Alexandria could offer to it but a feeble resistance. In such an emergency, they adopted the course the most likely to succeed in supporting the declining credit of their own schools, and that was to incorporate Christian ideas and principles into their own system.

Neither should it be forgotten that the elder philosophy of the Egyptian priesthood still continued to exert some influence. On Egyptian ground it possessed some force, although embracing all the elements of decay. So also Alexandria was open to all the influences from the east, and the philosophical system of the orient had their admirers here. It cannot, therefore, be deemed extraordinary, that at Alexandria, out of the confused mass of opinions, Egyptian, oriental, Pythagoric, Platonic, and Christian, should rise up, about the close of the second century, the eclectic system.

The first projector of this system was Potamo, a Platonist. Although the practice of philosophizing eclectically had previously existed, yet he appears to have been

the first to institute a new sect upon that principle. One great leading object had in view by him was to effect a reconciliation between the precepts of Plato and those of other masters.

But the eclectic sect is more indebted for its complete constitution to Ammonius, surnamed Sacca, who flourished about the beginning of the third century. He was born of Christian parents, and had the benefit of early Christian instruction. It is stated, however, and probably with truth, that he apostatized to the pagan religion. There is no doubt of his thorough acquaintance with the Christian doctrine, and that he endeavored to incorporate it into his system. It is said that one great motive which induced him to go for a distinct eclectic school, was a strong desire to put an end to those contentions which had so long distracted the philosophical world.

He imitated the example of Socrates in committing nothing to writing; but he departed very much from his example in teaching mystical practices. He had a number of select disciples to whom he taught certain sublime doctrines, and also mysteries, the latter under a solemn injunction of secrecy. Among these select disciples, who were taught these mystical practices, were Herennius, Origines, Longinus and Plotinus. Of these, the two former were celebrated for little more than violating their promise by divulging the secrets of their master. But the two latter were born to a different destiny.

Longinus was so erudite and profound, that he was called the living library. But of his numerous writings nothing now remains except his treatise on the sublime. He was acquainted with the Jewish scriptures, as is evident from the example he gives of the sublime. "And God said, let there be light, and there was light." He was the preceptor and minister of Zenobia, the queen of Palmyra, and was put to death by the Emperor Aurelian when he took captive Zenobia, and terminated her empire.

Plotinus was the most celebrated of his disciples, the chief of the Alexandrian Platonists, and who completed

the eclectic system. He prosecuted his studies under Ammonius for the period of eleven years. After Herennius and Origines had disclosed the mysteries of their master, he considered that the injunction of secrecy was removed, and became a teacher of philosophy upon eclectic principles. His disciples were very numerous, and for ten years he confined himself entirely to oral discourse, encouraging them to start difficulties, and propose questions upon every subject. He afterwards adopted the practice of committing the substance of his lectures to writing.

It was said to have been a practice with him to prepare himself for his sublime contemplations by watching and fasting. He adopted in theory some ideas which were very inconvenient in practice. He had learned from Pythagoras and Plato that the soul is sent into the body for the punishment of its former sins, and must, in this prison, pass through a severe servitude before it can be sufficiently purified to return to the divine fountain from which it flowed. Hence he had a great contempt for the corporeal vehicle in which his soul was enclosed. As a consequence of this, and by his rigorous abstinence and determined neglect of health, he at last sunk into a state of disease and infirmity, which clouded, and rendered extremely painful, the latter part of his life. He finally died in Campania, giving utterance to a leading principle of his philosophy, when, as he found his end approaching, he said, "The divine principle within me is now hastening to unite itself with that divine being which animates the universe."

There was much of the mystical in the system and writings of Plotinus. He seems rather to have sought to dazzle his own mind, and the minds of others, with the meteors of enthusiasm, rather than to irradiate them with the rays of truth. He attempted to soar in ecstatic flights into the regions of mysticism; and, according to his biographer, Porphyry, he ascended through all the Platonic steps of divine contemplation, to the actual vision of the deity

himself, and was admitted to such intercourse with him, as no other philosopher ever enjoyed.

Among the disciples of Plotinus, was Amelius, a Tuscan, who was employed in writing solutions of questions proposed to him by his disciples, and refutations of the objections and calumnies of his enemies.

Another much more distinguished follower, and powerful supporter of the Plotinian school, was Porphyry, the Tyrian, the great upholder of pagan theology, and enemy to the Christian faith. His earliest teacher was the Christian preceptor Origen, and subsequently under Longinus. At Athens he acquired an extensive acquaintance with antiquity, at the same time that he improved his taste in literature, and enlarged his knowledge of the Plotinian philosophy. Afterwards he became a disciple of Plotinus, and continued, for six years, a most diligent student of the eclectic system.

In the thirty-sixth year of his age, he formed the determination of putting an end to his own existence, from which, however, he was finally dissuaded by Plotinus.

After the death of Plotinus, and while in Sicily, he commenced his warfare against the Christian religion, writing against it some fifteen distinct treatises, all which, except some unimportant fragments, are lost. He afterwards returned to Rome, where he taught the doctrines of Plotinus, claiming to be not only a philosopher endued with superior wisdom, but also a divine person, favored with supernatural communications from heaven. He relates that in the sixty-eighth year of his age, he was in a sacred ecstasy, in which he saw the supreme intelligence, the God who is superior to all gods, without an image. He wrote a number of works which have come down to us, and died about the year A. D. 304.

His immediate successor was Jamblicus, a native of Chalcis in Cœlo-Syria. He flourished about the beginning of the fourth century. He mastered all the mysteries of the Plotinian system, and acquired a great reputation as a teacher. Numerous disciples crowded to his school, with

whom he conversed upon philosophy, and before whom he displayed his theurgical powers. He surprised and astonished them with wonders, which he professed to perform by means of an intercourse with invisible beings. He was called "the most divine and wonderful teacher." His philosophical works are very obscure, but are valuable as authentic documents respecting the Alexandrine school.

The immediate successor of Jamblicus, was Ædesius of Cappadocia. He also pretended to supernatural communications with the deity, and practiced theurgic arts. To him it is stated that a most wonderful event happened, viz: that his future fate was revealed to him in hexameter verses, which suddenly appeared upon the palm of his left hand.

One of the disciples of Ædesius, was Eusebius of Myndus, in Curia. He endeavored to restore the contemplation of intelligibles, or ideas, holding, with Porphyry and Plato, that they were the only real and immutable natures. He discouraged, as unworthy a true philosophy, all pretended intercourse with demons, or inferior divinities, as illusions of the fancy, or the tricks of imposture. But the doctrine of intercourse between men and demons, and the arts of theurgy, had become too deeply rooted to be easily overthrown.

Maximus of Ephesus, was the preceptor, and subsequently the flatterer of Julian. When the latter became emperor, he accommodated his predictions to the wishes and hopes of his patron. He accompanied the latter in his expedition against Persia, and by his flattery and arts of divination, persuaded him that he was a second Alexander. The event of the expedition was fatal to Julian, and disastrous to Maximus, who afterwards fell a sacrifice to the cruelty of Festus, the proconsul.

Among the philosophers, is also reckoned the emperor Julian. His earlier education was in Christian principles, but while quite young, he sought occasions to converse with philosophers, and became strongly attached to the

system taught by the Alexandrian Platonists. He soon became a great proficient in the abstruse speculations, and theurgic arts of this school. He completed his studies at Athens, and was initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. He carried the magic arts into politics and war, and when clothed with the imperial purple, employed his power in restoring the pagan philosophy and the heathen superstitions. He closed the schools of the Christians, but resorted to no violent means to compel them to forsake their religion.

He was himself not only the patron of learned men, but also a learned writer. He was a great admirer of Pythagoras and Plato, and a strict adherent to the Alexandrian or eclectic school. He was accustomed to term Jamblicus, "the light of the world," and "the physician of the mind."

He was also extremely temperate, and practiced a rigid abstinence from food, as a means of preparing his mind for conversing with the gods. He also dealt in visions and ecstacies, and pretended to a supernatural intercourse with divinities.

He never laid aside his philosophical character; and even after receiving his mortal wound, held a conference with the philosophers Maximus and Priscus concerning the soul, in the midst of which he expired.

Hierocles flourished in Alexandria towards the close of the fifth century. He wrote a treatise on providence, and also on fate, and a commentary on the golden verses of Pythagoras.

Although the eclectic school was Alexandrian in its origin, and Asiatic in many of its features, yet it finally came to exert no inconsiderable influence in Europe. Greece, after it became subject to Rome, lost with its independence, its power to foster and encourage philosophy. But Athens was destined once more to rejoice in her schools of philosophy. The emperor Adrian founded there a library, and Aurelius founded and endowed schools, establishing professors in rhetoric, and in the principal sects of philosophy. During the reign of Julian

the Alexandrian philosophy was publicly professed at Athens. Chrysanthias was appointed its teacher by Julian. He was followed by Plutarch, the son of Nestorius, who was an eminent teacher of philosophy, and a famous master of the theurgic arts.

After him Syrian, an Alexandrian, prosecuted the eclectic method of philosophizing, with great ingenuity and industry. Although he wrote on several subjects, yet nothing has come down to us, except his commentary on Aristotle's metaphysics.

Proclus was a native of Constantinople, and having spent several years at the Alexandrian schools, he visited Athens. There he became acquainted with Syrian and Plutarch, under whose instruction, particularly the former, he prosecuted his studies with unwearied industry. On the recommendation of Plutarch, he was accustomed to write, from his own recollection, compendious abridgments of the lectures which he had heard from his teacher.

He studied the theology of the sect, both that relating to the contemplation of the supreme deity, and that which was supposed to lead to an intercourse with inferior divinities. He also studied the Chaldæan arts of divination, the use of mystical words, and other charms, and was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. He abstained from animal food; practiced rigorous fastings; spent whole days and nights in repeating prayers and hymns, to prepare himself for immediate intercourse with the gods. He observed new moons and all public festivals, and pretended to converse with superior beings, and to be able to expel diseases, command rain, stop an earthquake, and perform other similar wonders. With all these indicia of fanaticism or hypocrisy, he seems to have had a perfect knowledge of the Alexandrian philosophy, to have improved it by many new discoveries, and to have introduced many new opinions both on the subject of physics, and also in the science of ideas. His lectures were obscure and enthusiastic, deriving their materials from the Chaldaic, Orphic, Hermetic, Pythagoric, Platonic, and Aristotelian doctrines, inter-

mixed with occasional fictions and allegories. Several of his writings, philosophical, theological, critical and mathematical, have come down to us.

Isadorus, a native of Gaza in Palestine, commenced his studies at Alexandria, but was called to Athens by the fame of Proclus. His mind was inured to profound meditation, while his imagination was inflamed with enthusiasm. He could, therefore, the more readily soar into the region of mysticism. He subsequently returned to Alexandria, and afterwards fled to Persia to escape the persecution of Justinian.

Damascius, a Syrian, terminated the succession of the Platonic or eclectic school in Alexandria. He studied both at Athens and Alexandria, and in the latter was a professor of philosophy. He also was driven into Persia by the severities of Justinian.

Among the list of Alexandrian philosophers is included a celebrated female, Hypatia, the daughter of Theon, a mathematician of Alexandria. Possessing a judgment of great acuteness and penetration, added to great fertility of genius, after making herself mistress of polite learning, and of geometry and astronomy, so far as then known, she entered upon the study of philosophy. So eminently successful was she in the prosecution of this study, that she became a public preceptress in the same school in which Plotinus and his successors had taught. Her elocution was ready, her address graceful, her judgment sound and erudite, and in the schools and other places of public resort, she discoursed upon philosophical subjects, drawing after her numerous followers and admirers. Although beautiful, she was not vain, and no suspicion existed against her chastity.

Her house was the general resort of persons of learning and distinction. Her end was an extremely tragic one. A quarrel had arisen between the bishop Cyril, and Orestes the prefect of the city. Hypatia was identified with the latter, and as she was one day returning from the schools, a mob, in the interest of the bishop, seized her,

put her to death with extreme barbarity, and finally, having torn her body limb from limb, committed it to the flames.

These were the founders and supporters of the eclectic system of philosophy. We have seen some of the practices and pretensions of these philosophers. As the doctrines of this sect were very widely disseminated, and obtained among other philosophical sects not only, but even in the Christian church, a powerful influence, it may be well to examine more particularly its foundation, and the particular tenets it embraced.

The foundation upon which this sect reposed was an amalgam of the philosophy of Plato and of Pythagoras. Hence the terms, Neoplatonism, and later, Platonists, which have been occasionally used. They went even beyond Plato in the intuitive contemplation of intelligibles, and especially of the first intelligence, the supreme deity, in that they aspired after a sort of deification of the human mind. In the attempt to accomplish this, they forsook the dualistic system of Plato, and in its place substituted the system of emanation, which was adopted from the oriental philosophy.

This admitted an indefinite series of spiritual natures, derived from the supreme source. As the human mind constituted a link in this chain of intelligence, they held that by passing through various stages of purification, it might at length ascend to the first fountain of intelligence, and thus enjoy a mysterious union with the divine nature. They even thought the soul, while in union with the body, if properly prepared by discipline, could hold immediate intercourse with good demons, and even enjoy an intuitive vision of God.

But the philosophers of this school were not content to rest alone on the basis of Plato and Pythagoras. They attempted also to blend with these, the doctrines of Aristotle. So far as dialectics were concerned, this was not a difficult matter, but in physics and metaphysics, no union could be effected without distorting and misrepresenting

both, and resorting to strange and fanciful hypotheses to reconcile them.

They also drew upon the stoic system, and endeavored to accommodate it to the Platonic, explaining the moral writings of its philosophers upon the principles of Plato. There was, however, one sect, the principles of which were found too totally incongruous for any attempt at introduction, and this was the Epicurean. Its mechanical principles of nature were contrary to the fundamental doctrines of Platonism.

Nor did the spread of Christianity have an unimportant part to perform in the founding of the eclectic system. The philosophers of the latter sought to accomplish two objects by combining into one system all the important tenets, both theological and philosophical, of the pagan and Christian schools. They hoped to confirm the pagans in their attachment to the old superstitions, and also to reconcile the Christians to paganism. They accordingly represented the numerous train of heathen divinities as so many emanations from the supreme deity. And that through all these, he himself was worshiped.

They attempted to incorporate with their own dogmas, several Christian doctrines. Their practice of rigid abstinence, professing by such means to purify themselves from moral defilement, passing entire days and nights in contemplation and devotion, were borrowed mainly from the then doctrines and usages of the church.

Nor could they permit the Christian church alone to enjoy the reputation of miracles. They also pretended to a power of performing supernatural operations, by the aid of invisible beings; and asserted that the miracles of Christ were wrought by the same magical, or theurgic powers, which they themselves possessed.

Thus much for the origin of the eclectic system. Being a method of philosophizing, which undertook to combine the tenets of many different sects, it could, in practice, answer no other purpose than to confound all former distinctions, and to give birth to new absurdities.

No very accurate detail of the tenets of this philosophy can be given, as the philosophers themselves were not agreed in any one system.

In metaphysics, as expounded by Plotinus, a distinction was taken between the first principle of the universe, and the universe itself. This principle was regarded as simple, having no place, and being neither in motion nor at rest. It was the fountain of all being, and incapable of division or increase. It was infinite and illimitable, being itself essential good, and the beginning and end of beauty. The nature of this principle was to be comprehended rather by profound contemplation than by any act of the understanding.

This first principle, this primary, essential good, was the centre of all things. From this first, proceeded mind or intellect, which remained fixed. This mind was the light which emerged from it. There were also two other substances proceeding from this principle, viz: soul, which was the motion of the emanating light and body, the opaque substance, which was indebted to the soul for its illumination.

In the creation of mind, they did not deem any kind of action or will necessary, otherwise the second place would have been given to that action or will. Mind, being produced, was regarded as inferior to its cause, but superior to all other natures. It was necessarily united to its source, the image of God, and bearing such resemblance to him as light bears to the sun.

The production of this second principle, mind, leads to other creations. It was to the energy of this principle in action that the fair universe of ideas, or intelligible natures, was attributed. Hence that must necessarily comprehend a plenitude of all things as essential principles before they exist as material substances. They regarded intelligence as the act of intellect, in its contemplation of intelligible natures. These natures they considered as numbers proceeding from the monad, or first principle, and duad, or first emanation; but the first principle considered in itself, they considered different from these.

The soul, or active principle of life, they considered as produced from the emanative energy of mind. They regarded it as the immediate source of the principle which animates the world, and is diffused in various portions, through animated nature; as subsisting, like intellect, within the divine essence, and, therefore, as supramundane.

They regarded matter as having in itself, neither figure, quality, magnitude, nor place, but as being the mere receptacle and subject of forms. Its existence was potential only, while bodies, with their peculiar qualities, were a part of the actual. That there never was a time when matter and form existed separately, or when the universe was not animated. They conceived the world as always existing, and mind as prior to it, not in the order of time, but of nature, and hence the eternal and necessary cause, both formal and efficient of its existence.

Mind, in their philosophy, poured forth upon matter some portion of its own nature, thus gave it the first unconscious principle of motion and form. By these means, the sensible world was produced after the pattern of the intelligible world.

They attributed to the world two regions, the superior and inferior; the former belonging to the gods and other celestial beings, the latter to men and inferior animals. They believed the world to be of perpetual duration, assigning as a reason, that it includes everything within itself, and that there is nothing into which it can be changed, nor any external force by which it can be dispersed.

They deemed the souls of men and inferior animals as forming the common limit between the intellectual and sensible world; and they recognized various orders among the celestial natures, possessing different degrees of perfection, as gods, demons, genii, heroes, but all entitled to religious worship.

In relation to the connection of the soul with the body, they held that the soul, partaking of the nature of real being, was immutable. That it was the principle of mo-

tion, both moving itself and communicating motion to bodies. That its power was diffused through every part of the body, and although acting principally in the brain, yet that it is incorporeal, and exists entirely everywhere within the sphere of its energy. That its relation to the body was simply as its animating principle, as all our knowledge that it is present with the body is derived entirely from this animating principle. That souls, therefore, are not in the body as their place, nor as their receptacle, nor as their subject, nor as a part of the whole, nor as form united to matter. That the human soul is derived from the supramundane soul, or first principle of life, and is, in this respect, sister to the soul of the world. That the vices, imperfections and infelicities of the soul are derived wholly from its union with the body.

They held the doctrine of the metempsychosis, believing that after death the souls of men pass into other animals, or ascend into superior regions, and are converted into beings of a higher order, according to their present degree of defilement or purification. They believed that souls, in the periodical revolutions of nature, separate themselves from their fountain, and descend into the lower regions of the world. That in their passage thitherward, they attract to themselves an ethereal vehicle, and at last sink into animal bodies, as into a cavern or sepulchre. But when, by the power of reminiscence, they again contemplate intelligible and divine natures, they regain their freedom.

They believed that God, by reason of his greatness, cannot be known by intelligence or sense, but by a kind of intuition; the soul apprehending him in his real nature, as the fountain of life, mind, and being, and the cause of all good. That a soul, which has achieved this vision of God, will lament its union with the body, and will rejoice to leave its prison, and return to the divine nature from which it proceeded.

In theology, the philosophers of this sect held that the human soul, being originally derived from God, and sub-

sisting in the divine nature, possessed an innate knowledge of the divine being prior to all reasoning. That it enjoys communications with the superior divinities, and even with God himself, through the intervention of demons. That intercourse of this character is maintained by means of prayers, hymns, lustrations, and sacrifices.

They maintained that gods, demons, and heroes appear to men under various forms; in dreams or waking visions, to render them bodily or spiritual services, and to enable them to predict future events. That this could only be secured by the observance of certain sacred rites, whose symbolical meaning is known only to the gods, and to those who are conversant with these mysteries. That the signs and indications of divine communication were a temporary suspension of the senses and faculties; the interruption of the ordinary functions of life, and a capacity of speaking and doing wonders.

In regard to morals, the philosophers of this sect maintained that the mind, originally partaking of the divine nature, but having become defiled by its connection with the body, is to go through a gradual process of emancipation, from the impurities of matter, and through the contemplation of real entities, to rise to the knowledge and vision of God. They held, therefore, that the end and object of all philosophy, was the liberation of the soul from its corporeal imprisonment.

They asserted that there are two kinds of virtues, the human and divine. The first being physical, economical, and political, or those regarding the body, and the offices of domestic and civil life; the last, purgative, theoretic, and theurgic. The first consisted in bodily abstinence, and other voluntary mortifications; the last comprehending all those exercises of the intellect and imagination by which the mind rises to the contemplation of abstract truth and intelligible natures. It also includes, under its theurgic branch, those religious exercises that qualify for an immediate intercourse with superior beings, giving a power over demons, and elevating so far above the ordi-

nary condition of humanity, as to enjoy the vision of God in this life, and ensure a return at death to the divine mind, whence it first proceeded. To accomplish the entire liberation of the soul, it must pass through the several stages of these human and divine virtues.

Thus we perceive the eclectic sect to have been raised upon the triple foundation of superstition, enthusiasm, and imposture. It proved mischievous both to the Christian religion and philosophy.

In regard to the first mentioned, its pretensions were of such a character, that some Christian professors were so far deluded as to entertain the idea that an union might be formed between it and Christianity. But it resulted in blending pagan ideas and opinions with the pure and simple doctrines of the gospel. The religion of Christ became corrupted, and the church itself a field of contention and a nursery of error.

In regard to philosophy, it operated injuriously in that it blended together the truths and errors of the prior philosophies, and thus rendered it impossible to form an accurate notion either of the Platonic, the peripatetic, the stoic, the Egyptian or the oriental philosophy. Previously, each one of these had its peculiar character and tenets, so that any one might form a judgment for himself, of their respective merits; and thus being enabled to arrive at a correct understanding of each system, he could, if he preferred, make from each his own selections, and thus model for himself a philosophy to suit his own views of life.

But in attempting to harmonize the different systems, they were compelled to devise fanciful conceptions, subtle distinctions, airy suppositions, and vague terms. They lost themselves in subtleties, and were perpetually endeavoring to explain, by imaginary resemblances, and arbitrary distinctions, what they themselves probably never fully comprehended. Thus they corrupted philosophy as well as religion.

Along with the eclectic flourished other sects, retaining their original form and features. Among these was the

peripatetic, which, from the time of its introduction to the reign of Nero, was taught with great purity in the schools of Rome. But the spirit of eclecticism soon began to be felt, and there was a revival of the plan of Antiochus to form a coalition between Aristotle, Plato, or Zeno. This led to the formation of two classes, one of which attempted to combine the doctrines of other schools with those of Aristotle, while the other were desirous of preserving in their purity the doctrines of Aristotle.

Both Julius Cæsar and Augustus were favorably inclined towards the peripatetic philosophy. Subsequently it fell into disrepute, but met with a temporary revival when Agrippina, the wife of Claudius, committed the education of Nero to Seneca, the stoic, and Ægeus, the peripatetic. But philosophy and Nero were not of a character to remain long together.

During the first century of the Roman empire, there were but few celebrated names among the peripatetic philosophers. The principal of these were Sosigenes, an Egyptian, a great mathematician; Bœthius, a Sidonian, and Nicolaus of Damascus, a man of extensive learning, and an ornament of the peripatetic school.

Alexander Aphrodisius flourished about the year A. D. 200. So many and valuable were his commentaries upon the works of Aristotle, that he was called the commentator. Some of his works are still extant, and among them a treatise on fate, in which he supports the doctrine of divine providence. He maintained that the soul is not a distinct substance by itself, but the form of an organized body.

Themistius, who was born in an obscure town of Paphlagonia, was a man of eloquence, wisdom and ability in public affairs, lived on terms of great friendship with several Roman emperors, and illustrated several of the works of Aristotle, particularly the analytics, physics, and the book on the soul, in commentaries written with great perspicuity and elegance.

Olympiodorus, an Alexandrian philosopher, flourished about the year A. D. 430. He was celebrated for his knowledge of the Aristotelian doctrine.

This sect, upon the whole, was not a very flourishing one under the empire. It held to a concise and logical method of philosophizing, which was ill suited to the loose and florid kind of eloquence, which at that period so generally prevailed. There were three things that operated against the peripatetic philosophy, impairing its purity and throwing doubt on its doctrines. These were

1. The prevalence of the eclectic spirit.

2. The attempts by many of the critics to supply chasms, and clear up obscurities in the writings of Aristotle, from their own ingenious conjectures, which they presumed to incorporate with the author's text.

3. The great rage for commenting upon the works of Aristotle, which prevailed among his followers. Notes, paraphrases, arguments, summaries, and dissertations, piled up, century after century, under the general name of commentaries upon Aristotle, created endless disputes concerning the meaning of his writings, and leaving it doubtful, after all the pains which have been taken to explore it, whether their true, genuine sense does not yet remain undiscovered.

The cynic sect of philosophers never prevailed to any great extent under the empire. They were always distinguished from others more by their appearance, manners and conduct, than by any peculiar set of opinions which they entertained. They were voluntarily poor, lived upon the charity of the rich; and, practicing the most rigorous abstinence from pleasure, were in a proper situation to become censors of public manners. While they continued to adhere to their original principles and character, they commanded respect; but after a time, they became haughty and insolent, their great and unnatural severity of manners degenerating into a gross contempt of decorum, and an impudent freedom of speech. They had become, as early as the time of Cicero, gross and shameless in their manners,

violating all the proprieties of life, and the feelings of modesty. Under the virtuous Antonines, they were forbidden to hold public schools, and in the fifth century the sect became almost extinct.

There were, however, some cynics who were men of great virtue. Among these was Musonius, a Babylonian, who flourished in the reign of Nero, and who was a man of great wisdom and virtue. As he spared not the vices of Nero, the resentment of that tyrant consigned him to prison. He was at last banished to the isthmus of Greece, where he was condemned to remain a slave, and to labor daily with a spade. How long he continued to live is uncertain.

Demetrius the Corinthian, the contemporary and friend of Musonius, was also banished from Rome, because of his free censure of public manners. He was subsequently recalled, and banished by Vespasian. Afterwards recalled by Titus, and then sharing the common fate of the philosophers, withdrew to Puteoli under Domitian. He laid down to himself this prudent maxim: "That it is better to have a few precepts of wisdom always at hand for use, than to learn many things which cannot be applied to practice."

Demonax, a native of Cyprus, is highly extolled by Lucian. He removed early in life to Athens, and in his youth became intimately conversant with the poets. In his philosophical pursuits his habit and manner of living resembled that of Diogenes, and hence he has been ranked among the cynics. But in refusing to philosophy its speculative character, and in making it a rule of life and manners, he resembled Socrates. He never openly espoused the doctrines of any particular sect, but took from each whatever tenets he judged most favorable to moral wisdom. He was once at Athens arraigned upon a charge of not sacrificing to Minerva, and of refusing to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. To the former he pleaded that Minerva did not stand in need of his offerings, and to the latter that if the secrets involved in those mysteries were bad, he ought not to conceal them; and if they were good, his love to mankind would oblige him to disclose them.

A rhetorician, who was a wretched declaimer, once saying to him: "I frequently practice by myself." "No wonder," replied Demonax, "that you are so bad a speaker, when you practice before so foolish an audience." He lived nearly to the age of an hundred years, without suffering pain or disease, and at his death the Athenians honored his body with a public funeral.

Cresceus, a Megalopolitan, is said to have disgraced the name of cynic by his infamous practices.

Peregrinus of Parium, in Pontus, after practicing the most extravagant exploits of fanaticism in Egypt, where he sustained the character of a Mendican cynic; and after roving through Italy and Greece, he finally went to the Olympic games, and there, in the presence of a vast concourse of spectators, raised a funeral pile, and thereon devoted himself to voluntary death.

The last philosopher we shall mention of this sect was Salustius, a Syrian, who flourished about the beginning of the sixth century. He was instructed in the Alexandrian philosophy, but being disgusted with its useless speculations, and its confusion of principles, he determined to adopt a kind of philosophy better suited to the practical purposes of life, and became a cynic.

The stoic was the favorite philosophy of the Roman republic. It then obtained so firm a hold, especially among the professors of the law, that it continued to flourish under the emperors until after the reigns of the Antonines. Its great popularity at Rome arose principally from its ethical doctrines. These became the permanent basis of the Roman jurispudence, and through that have exerted a prodigious influence upon the world.

Under the Antonines, schools of the stoics were flourishing at Athens, Alexandria, Tarsus and Rome. In the time of Juvenal this sect prevailed almost through the whole Roman empire.

But although so popular, and so generally prevalent, this sect was not of long continuance. It was only during the short space of two centuries that the Roman school

of Zeno was in its most flourishing condition and was adorned with the illustrious names which claim a place in the history of philosophy. Stoicism always met with a powerful opposition from the skeptics, who were ingenious and indefatigable in their endeavors to overturn every dogmatic system. It also found a fatal enemy in the eclectic sect, which, by its destructive plan of coalition, corrupted the genuine doctrine of every other school. From the establishment of the last mentioned sect, stoicism began to decline, and in the age of Augustine it no longer subsisted as a distinct sect. There is also another cause probably as efficient as any that have been mentioned; and that is to be found in the fact that the minds of men were so bowed beneath an iron despotism, and their moral powers had become so weakened and perverted through the operation of various causes, that the stern and high-toned ethical doctrines of stoicism no longer found a response either in the intellectual or moral nature of man. So far as this cause could have any effect, the decay and death of stoicism was a necessary result.

During the flourishing period of stoicism, it boasts of many proud names. Among these is Athenodorus of Tarsus in Cilicia. He spent the most of his life at Rome enjoying a high reputation for wisdom, learning and moderation. He was highly esteemed by Augustus, and his advice is supposed to have had much weight in organizing the imperial government. He finally retired to Tarsus, where he died in his eighty-second year.

Annæus Cornutus, an African, lived and taught at Rome in the reign of Nero. He excelled in criticism and poetry, but he made philosophy his principal study. He was driven into exile by Nero for his freedom of speech.

Caius Musonius Rufus, a Tuscan, was a great admirer of stoicism, and sought to disseminate its doctrines among the Roman youth, and the officers of the army. Nero, displeased with his freedom of speech, banished him to Gyæra. He was afterwards recalled by Vespasian. His

philosophy, like that of Socrates, was adapted to the purposes of life and manners.

Chæremon, an Egyptian, in his youth had charge of the Alexandrian library, but afterwards removing to Rome, was one of the preceptors of Nero.

But the name which of all others stands the highest on the roll of stoicism under the empire, is that of Lucius Annæas Seneca, who was a native of Corduba in Spain. He was born the year before the commencement of the Christian era. He was brought to Rome when young, and his first study was eloquence. But he soon passed from words to things, and chose rather to reason with the philosophers than to declaim with the rhetoricians.

He became a disciple of Attalus, a stoic, but made himself acquainted with other systems of philosophy. He did at one time engage in the business of the courts, and with very considerable success.

Arrived at the age of manhood he aspired to the honors of the state. He was first quæstor, and soon rose to distinction in the court of Claudius. In consequence of a charge brought against him of adultery, with Julia, the daughter of Germanicus, he was banished from Rome and spent eight years in the island of Corsica. He was subsequently recalled through the influence of Agrippina, the second wife of Claudius, and had bestowed upon him the office of prætor. To Seneca, and Burrhus, the philosopher and prætorian prefect, was confided the instruction of the youthful Nero. The latter schooled him in the military art, and the former in the principles of philosophy, and the precepts of wisdom and eloquence. The efforts of both were perfectly harmonious, and at first crowned with great seeming success. For a long time after Nero was advanced to the empire, he continued to load Seneca with honors and riches. He possessed a large estate, and lived in great splendor, having at command all that wealth could procure.

But he was in the court of Nero, and safety there could not long be expected. Knowing that the emperor's vices,

jealousy and suspicions, were every day becoming more violent and ungovernable, he asked permission to withdraw from court, to devote himself to his favorite pursuits, and even offered to refund the treasures that had been lavished upon him, and to retire with a bare competency. Nero rejected the proposal. He was soon after, probably through the instigation of Nero, named by Natalis, as having been concerned in the conspiracy of Piso.

This was laid hold of by Nero, who sent to Seneca his peremptory command immediately to put himself to death. He caused veins to be opened in his arms and legs, but those not proving sufficiently effectual, he finally suffocated himself in a warm bath.

The writings of Seneca were chiefly of the moral kind, consisting of epistles and treatises on anger, consolation, providence; tranquillity of mind; constancy; clemency; shortness of life; a happy life; retirement; and benefits.

Dio of Prusa, in Bithynia, lived in the time of Nero, and followed at first the profession of a sophist. Leaving Rome he went to Egypt, and there assumed the character of a stoic philosopher, adapting his principles and practice to the stoic doctrine, and boldly censuring vice whenever and in whomsoever it appeared. His freedom of speech offending Domitian, he voluntarily exiled himself to Thrace, where he lived in great poverty, supporting himself by servile labor. After the death of Domitian he returned to Rome, and was admitted to the confidence both of Nerva and Trajan. He lived to old age, and his orations are still extant.

Euphrates, of Alexandria, was the contemporary and friend of Dio. He was universally esteemed at Rome for his talents and virtues.

But next to Seneca, the greatest ornament of the stoic school under the empire, was Epictetus. He was born at Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in a servile condition, and was sold as a slave to Epaphroditus, one of Nero's domestics. He was lame, but from what cause does not plainly appear. He succeeded at last in obtaining his manumission, and

then confining himself to a small hut in the city of Rome, with a supply of bare necessaries, he devoted himself to the study of philosophy.

He lived for some time entirely alone, and, by diligent study, succeeded in acquiring a competent knowledge of the principles of the stoic philosophy. He also received instructions in rhetoric from Rufus. He was a close observer of manners. He became, notwithstanding his poverty, a popular moral preceptor. His eloquence was nervous, simple, penetrating. The doctrine he inculcated embraced the purest morals; and his life, sober, temperate, earnest, was ever furnishing a living commentary upon the truth of his doctrines.

With the rest of the philosophers, he was banished from Rome by Domitian. He made Nicopolis the place of his exile, and there, whenever he could obtain an auditory, he discoursed concerning the true way of attaining contentment and happiness. It is uncertain whether he returned to Rome after the death of Domitian. His was a life of great poverty; his whole furniture, when he was living at Rome, consisting of a bed, a pipkin, and an earthen lamp; the last of which, after his death, was purchased for a hundred pounds, by some one, probably, who hoped to acquire his wisdom by studying over it.

Several of the works of Epictetus have come down to us. We have his moral manual, or enchiridion, his dissertations collected by Arian, and originally drawn up from notes taken on the spot by his disciples, besides various fragments.

His doctrine was essentially stoic, although less extravagant than much that passes under that name. He often mentions three topics or classes under which the whole of moral philosophy is comprehended. There are the desires and aversions, the pursuits and avoidances, or the exercise of the active powers, and the assents which are given by the understanding. His moral precepts are mainly summed up in two words: endure and abstain. He urges contentment upon the principle that all things occur under

the allotment of providence, that is that an inexorable fate presided over all things.

Sextus of Chæronea was a philosopher of some eminence, and the preceptor of Antonius.

The last philosopher of this sect was Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, as much distinguished by his learning, wisdom and virtue, as by his imperial dignity. He was born A. D. 121, and at the age of twelve forsook the common pursuits and amusements of childhood, and assumed the habit of a stoic philosopher. He used to sleep on the ground, having no other covering than a cloak.

His exemplary character and attainments were his recommendation to the emperor Adrian, who appointed Antoninus Pius his successor upon the express condition that Aurelius should be next in succession. The death of Antoninus Pius occurred in A. D. 161, upon which Marcus Aurelius Antoninus was advanced to the imperial purple.

After repelling an invasion from the north, he devoted his attention to the institution of useful laws, and the correction of civil and moral abuses. While emperor, he still continued his philosophical pursuits, and patronized men of talents and merit. His meditations are reckoned among the most valuable remains of stoic philosophy. He visited Athens, endowed schools of philosophy, appointed public professors, and conferred many honors upon persons of distinguished merit.

Returning to Rome, he was soon called upon to repress an invasion from the north, and on his way home he was seized at Vienna with a mortal disease. He died in his sixtieth year, meeting his end with great firmness and true stoical indifference.

He had manifested through life a true example of stoic equanimity. An innate benevolence of heart served to chasten the severity of the pure stoic system. No emotions of joy or sorrow were ever permitted to illumine or darken his countenance, and he never suffered himself to be elated by victory or depressed by defeat.

The Epicurean sect was better received under the empire than the republic. It permitted great freedom of manners, and boldly combated superstition. It was in much better harmony with the laxity of morals, the refinement of manners, and general effeminacy of feeling and character that prevailed under the empire. There was, among the members of this school, the prevalence of a strict union, and the implicit deference they paid to the doctrines of their master, served long to identify and perpetuate the sect. As the stoic and Epicurean were wholly irreconcilable with each other, it is easily perceptible that whatever general causes arising out of the character and disposition of the people, would lead to depress the stoic, might also at the same time tend to the elevation of the Epicurean.

But although the doctrine of Epicurus was publicly taught in many places, and at Athens a school for teaching it was endowed, yet it is somewhat singular that no great names of any philosophers of this sect during this period, have been handed down to us. This may, perhaps, be accounted for from the great deference paid to the doctrines of Epicurus himself. All his successors aimed at, all they were at liberty to do, was to teach the simple doctrines of their master. They could neither add to, nor take from, what he had taught. So sacred was that doctrine considered that it was not permitted even to his disciples to write commentaries upon it, lest by that means it should become corrupted. We can, therefore, readily conceive, that although there may have been a succession of teachers, yet as they all taught the same thing, their names would stand little chance of being preserved, and handed down to posterity.

But although there were none of this sect that made it their particular business to teach or practice philosophy during this period, that have come down to us, yet there were instances of learned men who have generally been ranked in the class of Epicureans.

Among these was Pliny the elder, a native of Verona, and born A. D. 23. He was a man of most profound and

varied learning. He prosecuted his studies in private during the reign of Nero. Under Vespasian he was much employed in public affairs. But in the midst of his numerous avocations he continued to prosecute his studies with an industry and perseverance that has scarcely a parallel in history. His general mode of life and habits of study have been well described by his nephew, Pliny the younger. In summer, he began his studies as soon as it was night; in winter, generally at one in the morning. He slept little, and often without retiring to his chamber, he took a light repast at noon, and then, often in summer, would recline in the sun, some author being in the mean time read to him, from which he made extracts and observations. This being over, he went into the cold bath; on coming out took a slight refreshment, and then reposed himself for a short time. After this he resumed his studies till supper time, when a book was again read to him, upon which he made some cursory remarks. In summer, he rose from supper by day light, and in winter, as soon as it was dark. These were his habits in the city. In the country, his whole time was devoted to study. Even in a bath, while being rubbed and wiped, either some book was read to him, or he dictated himself.

By adopting and rigidly carrying out these habits, he was enabled, although he attained only his fifty-sixth year, to become a voluminous writer. Of all his works, however, only his *Natural History of the World* has reached us; but this, considering the time at which it was written, will almost justify the judgment of Pliny the younger, who styles it "a comprehensive and learned work, scarcely less various than nature herself."

Pliny did not rigidly adhere to any particular sect of philosophy, but chose rather to select from each such tenets as would best suit his purpose. For the most part he held to the doctrine of Epicurus.

He finally died a martyr to his own insatiable curiosity and thirst after knowledge. During the terrible eruption of Vesuvius that occurred in A. D. 79, he approached so

near the mountain to ascertain the actual phenomena and cause, that he was suffocated by the gross and noxious vapors it sent forth.

Celsus, the adversary of Christianity, was born towards the close of Adrian's reign, and although he occasionally resorts to Platonic and stoic weapons, yet he is generally ranked among the followers of Epicurus. He was not destitute of learning and ability.

Lucian, the celebrated satirist, was born at Samosata, and flourished in the time of the Antonines and Commodus. He gave himself up while young to the practice of eloquence, as a sophist or rhetorician, and in this capacity, he traveled through Spain, Gaul, and Greece.

He passed next to the study of philosophy, and without attaching himself exclusively to any sect, he gathered up from each whatever he deemed useful, and ridiculed whatever he thought absurd. He wedded the arts of eloquence with the precepts of philosophy.

He favored the Epicurean more than any other sect in philosophy, regarding Epicurus as the only philosopher who had formed an acquaintance with the nature of things. He lived to the age of eighty. His dialogues are still extant.

Diogenes Lærtius is supposed to have had a predilection for Epicureanism, although he seems occasionally to favor the doctrine of divine providence. All that is really known of him is derived from his memoirs of *The Lives, Opinions, and Apothegms of Celebrated Philosophers*, which is a repository of many materials for the history of philosophy, and, although a work in many respects faulty, has nevertheless preserved much which would otherwise have been wholly lost. This work probably appeared about the middle of the third century.

The skeptic sect could not be said to have flourished under the empire, nor did it even achieve a prominent position. Still the doctrine of Pyrrho, or some modified form of it, was not without its advocates. One of the most prominent of these was Ænesidemus, who was a

native of Gnossus, in Crete. He settled at Alexandria, and maintained that we ought to admit universally, that contradictory appearances are presented to each individual. He placed the thought under the dominion of external objects, and made truth to consist in the universality of the opinion or perception of man. He deduced doubt sufficient to justify a suspense of all positive opinion from the following ten topics, viz:

1. From the diversity of animals.
2. From that of mankind, considered individually.
3. From the fallibillity of our senses.
4. From the circumstances and condition of the subject.
5. From position, distance, and other local accidents.
6. From the combinations and associations under which things present themselves to our notice.
7. From the different dimensions and various properties of things.
8. From their mutual relations.
9. From the habitude or novelty of the sensations.
10. From the influence of education and institutions, civil and religious.

He regarded skepticism as being a criticism exercised with regard to sensible phenomena, and our ideas of them. He attacked the reality of the idea of causality; arguing that such an idea is unfounded, because we cannot understand the relations of cause and effect.

He was followed by a succession of skeptics, all of them physicians of the empiric and methodic schools. They confined themselves to the observation of facts, and rejected all theory respecting the causes of diseases. Among these were:

Agrippa, who reduced the ten topics of dubitation to five more general ones, viz:

1. Difference of opinions.
2. The necessity that every proof should be itself capable of proof.
3. The relativeness of our impressions.
4. The disposition to hypothesis.

5. The fault of arguing in a circle.

He maintained that there cannot be any certain knowledge, either immediately or mediately.

Sextus, surnamed Empiracus, from the school of physicians to which he belonged, was a native of Mitylene, and flourished about the close of the second century. He contributed much to define the object, end, and method of skepticism, and made more accurate distinctions than had previously existed between the operation of his system, and the practice of the new academicians, or the dogmatists themselves.

He defines skepticism to be the faculty of comparing the perceptions of the senses, and the conclusions of reason together, in order to arrive at a suspension of all judgment on matters, the nature of which is obscure to us. Hence, he contends, should result a certain repose of the mind, and, in the end, a perfect equilibrium.

His system seems to be less a doctrine than a manner of contemplating subjects, and hence, is rather to be stated than proved. His skepticism admits the fact of perceptions, and also of appearances. It does not deny the possibility of knowledge, but does the certainty of it, and hence abstains from its pursuit. He maintained that no one thing deserves to be preferred to another. He begins by demanding that every truth should be proved; and then proceeds to show that such proof is impossible, for want of self-evident data.

This skepticism was imposing in its appearance. Cutting off all further research, it seemed to threaten science itself with extinction. But when closely examined, it contained in itself its own contradiction. It did this, by pretending to restrain the natural tendency of the human understanding to these inquiries, without, at the same time, being able to make good the object it promised to realize, viz: the repose of the mind itself.

The record of the philosophies that prevailed during the continuance of the Roman empire, would be imperfect without a reference to the philosophy of the early Christian fa-

thers, and also the two gigantic heretical systems with which they had to contend, viz: the Gnostic and Manichæan. It was in the early part of this period, when the civilized world had settled down under the sway of Augustus, when the temple of Janus was closed, and a state of profound peace prevailed among all nations, that the wise men of the east followed the star which heralded the advent, and the incarnation and death upon Calvary, broke upon the world's startled vision.

The doctrine of the cross was not simply a religion. It was also a new philosophy. Its precepts were eminently practical, embodying the highest forms of wisdom. While it presented to the understanding, objects for its faith, it also kindled in the depths of the soul, the feelings of hope, and love, and joy. It taught those weighty truths respecting God and man, which were adapted to strengthen the intellect, and to nourish the soul up to the full measure of its capacity. It stood face to face with the older philosophies, when Paul, from the summit of Mars hill, proclaimed to the assembled Athenians, the unknown God.

The founder of the Christian faith was early ranked among philosophers. Several of the followers of Plato speak of him as a man animated by a divine demon, and sent from heaven for the instruction of mankind. He was in one sense, the founder of a new sect, a new school. His philosophy had but little in it of the merely speculative character. His disciples were fishermen, selected from the common walks of life. Their sole object was to disseminate the pure doctrine of their master, and to do this required but little of this world's learning. Their immediate successors, the apostolic men, pursued the same object. Witness the epistles of Clemens Romanus, Ignatius and Polycarp.

But it was too much to expect that these pure doctrines could long remain in their original simplicity. There were two, perhaps three causes, that tended to corrupt the purity of the Christian faith. One was, the very general practice then prevailing of clothing the doctrines of

religion in an allegorical dress; another, the habit of subtle speculation which very many of the learned converts from paganism brought with them from the schools of philosophy. Perhaps another might have been the desire to advance the doctrines of the Christian faith as far as possible into the schools of philosophy with the view of making converts from the schools, and thus of strengthening the cause of religion.

This naturally led to some difference of views between the early fathers; some of them regarding with settled aversion all the systems of pagan philosophy; looking upon them as monuments of human folly, and as enlisted in the support of the pagan superstitions; while others were even advocates for different sects of Grecian philosophy. This last tendency, however, was not fully developed until after the establishment of the eclectic sect at Alexandria. It was not, however, every sect that was equally favored. The Platonic was the most so; many of the fathers imagined that they found in the writings of Plato many divine truths, which they supposed he had received either directly or indirectly from the Hebrews, and which they had, therefore, a right to transfer from the academy to the church.

Next to the Platonic, the stoic system, or some of its doctrines, were perhaps the most generally received. But the Epicurean never received any countenance or support from the Christian fathers.

After the introduction of eclecticism, Origen and other Christians who had studied in his school, imagined they discovered in the system of the Platonists, traces of a pure doctrine concerning the divine nature, which they thought themselves at liberty to incorporate into the Christian faith. Hence they tinctured the minds of their disciples with the same prejudice, thus disseminating Platonic notions as Christian truths, and corrupting the purity of the Christian faith.

Another evil to which this blending of Christian with pagan philosophy in some cases led, was the introduction of speculative, fanciful, and inconclusive reasoning on many

subjects. Witness, for instance, the argument of Lactantius, to demonstrate the absurdity of worshiping idols, in which he says: "When men take an oath, they look up to heaven. They do not seek God under their feet; because whatever lies below them must necessarily be inferior to them; but they seek him on high, because nothing can be greater than man, except what is above him; but God is greater than man; he is therefore above, and not beneath him, and to be sought, not in the lower, but the higher regions, whence, it is evident, that images formed of stones dug out of the earth, cannot be proper objects of worship."

And so also, when Clement of Alexandria represents it as a meretricious practice for a woman to look at herself in a mirror: "Because," says he, "by making an image of herself, she violates the commandment, which prohibits the making of the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or on earth beneath."

This corruption of the Christian faith also discovered itself in a peculiar species of fanaticism, consisting in a certain mystical notion of perfection, originating in a notion common to Platonists, orientalists, and gnostics; that the soul of man is imprisoned and debased in its corporeal habitation; and in proportion as it becomes disengaged from the incumbrance, and purged from the dregs of matter, it is prepared for its return to the divine nature, the fountain from which it proceeded. Hence the doctrine that severe abstinence, and all kinds of mortification of the body, tended to disengage from the incumbrance, to elevate the soul, and thus to enable it to approach nearer to God and to heaven. Many, under this mistaken idea, even as early as the second century, became anchorites, quitting the busy haunts of life, and retiring into solitary places, where they devoted themselves wholly to abstinence, contemplation and prayer.

Of the Christian fathers, Origen may be taken as the representative of the oriental bearing of the Christian philosophy, and Justin Martyr of its proclivities to the Grecian sects.

The former was born at Alexandria, in A. D. 183. When about eighteen years of age, he opened a school in Alexandria, for the instruction of youth in grammar and philosophy. Upon the death of Clement, he took upon himself the charge of the Christian catechetical school, following closely in the steps of his predecessor. His manners were severe, and his morals, according to the most rigid system. He wore no shoes upon his feet, and resorted to voluntary emasculation, to destroy all sexual desires. He resorted to an allegorical method of explaining the writings and traditions of the ancients; his fundamental canon of criticism being, that wherever the literal sense of scripture was not obvious, or not clearly consistent with his tenets, the words were to be understood in a spiritual and mystical sense. This rule, it will be perceived, would readily admit to an incorporation with the Christian creed of all the fancies and dreams of a vivid and disturbed imagination.

The peculiar tenets of Origen were, that God is the creator because omnipotent. That he is from eternity, and must necessarily have created beings subject to his empire. That the imperfect nature of matter interposes a limit to his operations. That the divine nature must be the fountain of matter, and is itself, in some sense, material. That God, angels, and the souls of men, are of one and the same substance.

He asserted that there are in the divine nature, three subsistences. And that the son was the first emanation from God, proceeding from him like a solar ray from the sun, but dependent upon him, and his minister in creation. That spirit which informs matter, is the intelligent, active principle, of the same nature as the divine logos, but circumscribed by matter. That all spirits existed at first as perfect intelligences, living a pure, divine life. That angels are clothed with a subtle, corporeal vehicle. That minds are of various orders, and are placed in various regions of the world, according to their use or abuse of liberty. That evil spirits are degraded by being confined

to a grosser body, and in these they are purged from their guilt, until they are prepared to ascend to a higher order. That every man is attended here both by a good and a bad angel. That human souls were created before the bodies they were designed to inhabit; that they were sent into these bodies as to a prison, for the punishment of sin, and that they pass from one body to another. That the prison of these souls varies according to the degree of their demerit. That the heavenly bodies are also animated by souls, which have preserved their purity, and that these souls are capable of predicting future events.

He maintained that the creation, or rather the formation of the actual world, was not, properly speaking, a creation, but a catastrophe, a fall; but that the fallen world was nevertheless subject to a law of restoration, which is fulfilled in a long series of periods.

He asserted that all things are in perpetual rotation; receding from and at last returning to the divine fountain; whence an eternal succession of worlds, and the final restoration of the souls of bad men, and of evil spirits, after certain purgations, to happiness. That the souls of the good are continually advancing in perfection, and rising to a higher state. That matter itself will hereafter receive a glorious transfiguration, and be refined into a better substance; and that thus, after a great revolution of ages, all things will return to their source, and that then God will be all in all.

Such was, in substance, the system of Origen, obviously linked with the oriental emanative system, and which was among the causes that gave rise to gnosticism; and to the Jewish Cabala.

Justin, surnamed the martyr, was born about the beginning of the second century. He first studied the stoic, and afterwards the peripatetic philosophy. Not finding in these that which could satisfy the wants of his mind and soul, he resorted next to the Platonic, and in this he took great delight, "finding," as he says, "that the contempla-

tion of incorporeal ideas added wings to his mind, so that he hoped soon to ascend to the true wisdom."

In one of his solitary rambles he met with the venerable Polycarp, and, through his teachings, was induced to consult the writings of the prophets and apostles. He read them with great attention, and then confessed that the gospel of Christ was the only certain and useful philosophy. About the year A. D. 133, he embraced the Christian faith.

His love, however, for the Platonic philosophy still continued, and he drew largely upon it in his explanation and defense of the Christian doctrine. As he perceived, or imagined he saw, many points of agreement between Platonism and Christianity, he concluded that whatever was valuable in the former, had either been communicated directly to Plato by inspiration, or had been transmitted to him by tradition from Moses and the Hebrew prophets. In either case, the Platonic philosophy might be justly claimed as belonging to divine revelation, and hence should be incorporated into the Christian creed.

All good doctrine according to him proceeds from the logos or first emanation of the divine nature, and, for that reason, belongs of right to the Christians wherever it may be found. "Next to God," says he, "we revere and love the logos of the underived and ineffable deity, who for our sake became man, that partaking of our infirmities he might heal our diseases." "All writers," he adds, "through the seed of the logos sown within them, are able obscurely to discern those things which have a real existence." And in another place, "We are instructed that Christ is the first begotten son of God, and have already shown that he is the logos, of which the whole human race partakes, and that whoever lives according to the logos are Christians, even though, for their neglect of pagan divinities they have been reckoned atheists, as, among the Greeks, Socrates, Heraclitus, and the like; and among barbarians, Abraham, Ananias, Azarias, Misæl, Elias and many others."

From these and other passages in the works of Justin, it is evident that he applied the term logos to the emanating reason of the divine nature, and that to this divine reason he attributed the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets; and he supposed this same to have been the Christ who appeared in the flesh. But he did not limit the influence of this divine reason to the Hebrew patriarchs and prophets. He also supposed that the excellent pagan philosophers participated in it, and hence he regarded every tenet in the writings of the philosophers, which he could reconcile with Christian doctrine, as being also a portion of divine wisdom.

He derived from Plato the idea, that man can only arrive at divine science, through the medium of the logos. Hence, he was led to refer all Christian knowledge to the perception of the divine reason inhabiting in men; and thus laid the foundation of an error, which is still retained in some of the Christian sects, that Christ, or the word, is a substantial ray of divine light, internally communicated to man. He also borrowed from Plato his notion of angels employed in the government of the elements, the earth, and the heavens, and many other ideas not derived from the scriptures. It will be clearly perceived, therefore, that Justin represents philosophical, particularly the Platonic, element, in the Christian philosophy of the fathers.

The speculations of the early fathers mainly relate to the deity, and to the relations existing between the world, and mankind and God.

I. In relation to deity, they maintained that there are three different ways in which God may be known, viz:

1. By his image.
2. From external nature.
3. By immediate revelation.

Of these three, they appear to have assigned the most importance to the last named; considering the existence of God, rather as based upon faith, than knowledge, and the idea of a divinity, they regarded as innate, because of

its universality. On this point there was not a perfect unanimity of opinion; some maintaining the possible application to this subject of our ideas and understanding, unaided by revelation; while others insisted that the nature of God is not capable of being known by the unassisted understandings, at least by any conceptions of our own, without divine revelation.

Many, at first, represented the deity as associated with space and time, like a corporeal being; but they gradually corrected these notions, and reduced them to those of immateriality, or to something nearly approaching it. All the notions which we can form of the divine essence, according to the fathers, ascend and meet at last, in a radical notion, beyond which the mind cannot go; that notion being the idea of substantial unity. This unity, they represented as indistinct, invisible, and concealed, in such a sense, that it presents to our minds no special quality which can be seized upon.

They maintained, that inasmuch as all notions refer to existences, that that which is above all existence evades all notion. That it falls neither under the senses, nor the imagination, nor thought, nor language. That it is the one, unknown, supersubstantial, who is goodness itself.

They held that the essence, life, intelligence of this infinite one, are all incomprehensible. That it is beyond everything which can be expressed. And consequently, that he is without existence, without substance, without intelligence, without life, not by privation of these things, but by superlation. That everything which those words express, are posterior to his unity.

This unity, although inconceivable in itself, was nevertheless regarded as the principle, the basis of everything which exists, as in fact, the root and ground of all being. "All things," says St. Augustine, "exist in as far as they have unity; and this is a vestige of the hidden unity through which they exist."

Says one: "Everything is in the unity and with the unity; the one is all, everything." Another designates

the being of God, by name of the immense sea of substance. A third says: "We may fix the place of everything in him; that he contains everything, because everything comes from him." A fourth calls him the unity of unities, the root of roots, the idea of ideas, the world of worlds.

II. Relation of God to creation. In passing from God to his creation, the fathers were compelled to combat two great systems of error, viz: pantheism and dualism.

They objected to the first, that it destroyed the proper notion of God. That in assuming that all beings are fractions, portions of God, who divides himself in producing them, the unity, the essential character of the divine substance, is entirely broken up.

Again they urged that infirmity, error, crime, all attach to created beings; and that if these beings are only parts of the divine essence, according to the system of pantheism, that then that divine essence must be imperfect, and subject to infirmity, error and crime. They opposed, therefore, to pantheism, the proposition that the divine essence is neither divisible, nor in any degree corruptible, nor under any relation.

Their objection to dualism was grounded upon the same style of reasoning. They maintained that to attribute eternity, independence, and necessary being to matter, they destroyed the notion of God by divesting him of his proper and incommunicable attributes. That the necessary eternal existence of the evil principle would impair the notion of infinite power, intelligence and love; of the first, inasmuch as that principle was held to be independent of God; of the second, since matter, as essentially dark, was incomprehensible even to God; and of the third, since the divine goodness was resisted and checked by an infinite principle of hatred, discord and destruction. They opposed therefore to dualism the proposition: that God has made everything that exists out of that which did not before exist, that is, without preexistent matter.

But on this a question arose: did the creation take place within the limits of time? or from all eternity? Some were advocates of the former, and some of the latter.

But another question was presented, and that was: how did finite beings proceed from the infinite? and to this no answer was attempted to be given. The fathers claimed that the act of creation was a mystery, a problem incapable of solution. And they maintained that it was necessarily so, since, in order to comprehend completely this relation, it would be necessary to embrace both the terms, that is to say, it would be necessary for the finite intelligence to transform itself into infinite intelligence.

They held that creatures can be conceived as existing only by communication from God, and that this idea of communication is the key to the mystery of creation. That to conceive of creation, it is necessary to distinguish three things, viz: God, individual beings, and an intermediate order of realities called communications. That, as to the first, God, so far forth as he is infinite, is essentially incommunicable. That individual beings, being, as individuals, necessarily finite, are the opposites of God. That the communications are certain divine properties, attributes, or virtues, such as power, wisdom, goodness, life, etc.; which exist in creatures in finite degrees.

These latter, therefore, must sustain two relations; the one where they exist in God, being divine properties, and infinite as deity. The other where they are communicated to creatures in finite degrees. In virtue of the quality of finite they must be creations; for nothing finite can be God. They exist, therefore, out of God, and hence are called the divine processions. In individuals, they are their constituent principles; created themselves, they are in turn the principle of every particular creation.

To sum up this doctrine—these communications, in as far as they exist in God, are out of individual beings; in as far as they are the efficient principles of every individual or limited being, they exist out of God, and thus form the union of every particular being with God.

In regard to the government of the world, and the ordering of events, the fathers directly opposed fatalism in all its forms, whether it assumed the garb of the astrologer or the stoic. They maintained the doctrine not only of a general, but also of a particular providence; asserting the maintenance and government of the world by the ministry of angels, and believing these latter to be incorporeal in that part of their nature which renders God visible to them, and corporeal in that part which renders them visible to men.

The fathers strongly asserted the doctrine of free-will, and endeavored to reconcile the omniscience of God with the free agency of man; in the doing of which, they entered largely into the discussion of the origin of physical and moral evil. Most of them taught that it was unavoidable, and maintained that it took place neither with nor in opposition to the will of God; that all that could be said was that it was simply permitted by him. They attributed it in part to human agency, and in part to the influence of evil spirits. They asserted the existence of spiritual beings endowed with a subtle essence, who minister to the deity in the government of the world.

In reference to evil, the following canons may be laid down:

1. Evil considered generally, is not anything positive, but a simple privation of good.

2. Evil is not in the universe as a whole; for, as a whole, the universe tends towards God.

3. The mutability, that is, the birth and dissolution of things, is the necessary means by which the creation tends to its accomplishment.

4. Moral evil, or sin, which proceeds from the free-will of intelligent creatures, does not destroy, in their being, the predominance of good over evil.

Thus it will be seen, that the Christian metaphysics considers moral evil, as not the product of necessity, but of free-will. In thus considering it, there is a fortunate avoidance, both of dualism and pantheism, and a very obvious superiority to both.

In putting the supremacy of God in opposition to dualism, it has changed the conditions and character of the error itself. Dualism has been exhibited in two forms. In the one it presents two principles; absolute good and evil, waging with each other an eternal war. In the other, it exhibits itself as spirit and matter; two substances harmoniously united to form the universe, as the soul and body are united to form the man. The last has been reproduced in modern times, the first never can be.

III. Man. How is he composed, or of what? Of two or three essential elements, body, soul and spirit, matter and mind. The fathers admitted two general elements of the creation: the material and the spiritual principle. The first they looked upon as inert and passive, as an almost nonexistence; the last, as the superior principle, the source of activity and motion, of intelligence and life, as being, in fact, the image of God, while matter is nothing but the shadow.

As regards the origin of souls, they were conceived to be created, by some, immediately; by others, mediately. The soul's immortality was thought, by some, to be inseparable from its essence; while by others, it was deemed a peculiar gift of God, either bestowed on all, or specially on the elect.

IV. Ethics. The relation of man to God. The ethics of the fathers were of a strict and uncompromising character, and they were such as tended to elevate man above the dominion of the senses. The great fundamental principle which they laid down as the basis and ground of all volition and act, was the will of God. And how should that will be ascertained? There were two sources of evidence to resort to, viz: the scriptures, and reason. In all cases where the former had distinctly spoken, their evidence was regarded as conclusive. Reason, with all her lofty powers, must remain silent, where the God who had created her had himself made a proclamation of his

own will. But in all those cases where the scriptures themselves were silent, it was then the high prerogative of reason to resort to every accessible source of evidence, to determine that will. When once clearly determined, from whatever source of evidence, there was but one thing to do, and that was to obey.

In regard to the final cause, or motive, why God requires the fulfillment of his will, there was some difference of opinion. According to some, God so required it in virtue of his almighty power; according to others, with a view to the eternal welfare and felicity of man. There was also a third theory upon this subject, viz: that which made God at the same time the sovereign legislator, and the supreme good and end of all reasonable beings. That to be united to him is the height of happiness.

The fathers preeminently commended the virtues of sincerity; disinterested love of our neighbor; patience and chastity; the three last, more especially, being enforced with peculiar strictness.

The philosophy of the early fathers had two principal objects. The first was to prove the necessity of taking revelation as the basis or rule of rational speculations; and the second, to construct an order of speculations in harmony with revealed doctrines. These speculations all concentrated in one central point — revelation.

Again, the object of that philosophy was practical. It substituted faith in the place of doubt and disbelief. It proposed a moral life as the immediate end, and the salvation of man as the definitive end.

When this philosophy is placed in relation with the anterior philosophies, it appears like a vast eclecticism. It selected from all the schools those conceptions which seem to be the most in harmony with the revealed doctrines. It rested on the basis of faith, and this animating principle ran through, and vivified every conception which entered into, or formed any part of its great system.

This philosophy had two great missions to perform. The first was to purify the human mind from the errors

which had been propagated by false systems of philosophy; and the second, to organize all the sciences upon its own enduring basis. These missions it did much toward accomplishing, even in the Roman world; but for light, and love, and truth to work their way effectually through darkness, and hate, and error, requires long periods of time, and well sustained efforts under the most favorable circumstances.

The two great systems of error with which the early fathers had to contend, were gnosticism and Manichæism.

The first was derived from *gnosis*, knowledge, and expressed the three-fold superiority of their doctrine. They ranked it as superior:

1. To the pagan rites and symbols, which it professed to explain.

2. To the Hebrew doctrines, the errors and imperfections of which it pretended to unfold.

3. To the common belief of the Christian church, which, in the view of the gnostics, was nothing but the weak or corrupted envelope of the transcendent Christianity of which they claimed to be the depositaries.

The advocates of this system, or sect, pretended to a superior and mysterious knowledge of the divine being, and the origin of the world; blending the religious dogmas of the Persians and Chaldees, with those of the Greeks and Christians. Gnosticism, in fact, presents a combination of Persian, Chaldæan, and Egyptian doctrines, united to conceptions of oriental or Indian origin, and to the cabalistic science of the Jews.

The gnostics supported the system of divine emanation, taught by Zoroaster and his followers. One division of them maintained that all natures, both intelligible, intellectual and material, are derived, by a succession of emanations, from the infinite fountain of deity. From this secret and inexhaustible abyss, they conceived substantial powers, or natures, of various orders, to flow; till, at the remote extremity of the emanation, evil demons and matter, with all the natural and moral evils necessarily

belonging to it, were produced. These emanations from deity, they divided into two classes; the one including those powers which are wrapped up in the divine essence, completing the infinite plenitude of the divine nature, while the other has an external existence in reference to the divine essence, and includes all finite and imperfect natures. Within the divine essence itself, they imagined a long series of emanative principles, to which they ascribed a real and substantial existence. These they termed æons, which are described as divine spirits. The doctrine of these æons seems to have been a derivative from the Platonic notion of ideas, inasmuch as the notion entertained of both, was that of beings which existed distinctly and substantially. Within this series, they included the demiurgus, or maker of the world, whom they supposed to have been an æon, so far removed from the first source of being, as to be allied to matter, and capable of acting upon it. They conceived both the spiritual and material world to have flowed from the same great fountain, and their system, in order to be sustained, required substantial virtues, or powers of two kinds, active and passive. Hence, in their figurative and emblematical language, they speak of male and female æons.

There was another division of the gnostics, who, instead of deriving all possible existences from one great fountain of all being, asserted the existence of two first principles, a good and an evil one, which were continually opposed to, and conflicting with each other.

There was also a third division, which was, perhaps, only a modification of the first, who maintained the existence of two principles, light and darkness; but asserted that they were both derived from one common creator.

In general, matter was identified with the evil principle, and hence, the formation of the universe was regarded as a declension and fall from the divine being.

The gnostics divided all nature into three kinds of beings, viz: hylic, or material; psychic, or animal; and pneumatic, or spiritual. So also they distinguished three sorts

of men, material, animal and spiritual. The first they held to be material and incapable of knowledge. These perished inevitably, both soul and body. The psychic or animal, being of a middle nature between the two extremes, were capable either of being saved or damned, according to their good or evil actions. The third, the pneumatic or spiritual, who were the gnostics themselves, were all to be certainly saved.

The gnostics were much divided in regard to their moral doctrines and conduct. A greater proportion of them adopted very austere rules of life, recommending rigorous abstinences and prescribing severe bodily mortifications, with a view to the purification and exaltation of the mind. But there was a class of them who maintained that there was no moral difference in human actions. These fully exemplified their utter confounding all right and wrong by giving a loose rein to all the passions, and asserting the innocence of following blindly all their wild and riotous desires and inclinations.

Manichæism is perhaps only a modification of gnosticism, It was originated by Manes, a Persian or Chaldæan, in the latter part of the third century. He was educated among the magi, and taught the existence of an eternal self-existent being, whom alone he called God. But along with this, he also believed in an evil principle or being, which he called hyle, or the devil, who was the god of this world.

The Manichæans considered God as the author of the universe, and they also entertained a belief in the trinity, supposing the Father to dwell in light inaccessible; the Son in the solar orb, and the Holy Spirit to be diffused throughout the atmosphere. They asserted the eternity of matter, which they called darkness, and supposed hyle, the devil, to be the result of some wonderful and unaccountable commotion in the kingdom of darkness, which they seem to have borrowed from the Mosaic chaos. By these means darkness became mingled with light, and thus good and evil became mixed together in the world.

The same doctrine substantially was carried into their explanation of the human soul. They asserted the doctrine of two souls in man, two active principles: one, the source and cause of all vicious passions, which derived its origin from matter; the other, the cause of the ideas of the just and right, whose origin was God. As all mere sensual enjoyments are material, and hence sinful, they were enemies to marriage, allowing it only to the second class of their disciples, but not to the perfect or confirmed believers. Another consequence of attaching moral evil to matter was, that they denied the real existence of Christ's human nature, and supposed him to have suffered and died in appearance only. According to them he took the form only of man. They denied the doctrine of the resurrection, asserting that Christ came to save the souls of men, and not their bodies. No part of matter according to them could be worthy of salvation.

In reference to the final consummation of all things, the Manichæans agreed with the gnostics in maintaining the return to God of all purified divine emanations; but they differed from each other in regard to the final destination of matter. The hylic or material principle, could not, according to the Manichæans, be annihilated. As in their doctrine it was uncreated, it must, therefore, be indestructible. To reconcile its indestructibility with the final triumph of God, they were under the necessity of supposing that it would be reduced forever to a sort of cadaverous state; to a kind of immortal death. Its ashes, they maintained, would be consigned to the abyss from which it issued, and the souls, who had suffered themselves to be seduced by it, would be condemned to keep guard, motionless and sad, around this eternal sepulchre.

This will close the consideration of the Roman element of philosophy. It will be readily perceived that its treatment consists more in giving an account of the different systems of philosophy that prevailed and maintained their sway in the empire of thought during the ascendancy of Roman dominion, than of the Roman philosophy itself.

Indeed, Rome could never boast that she had given birth to any peculiar system of philosophy. Nor has she added much, if anything, to the stock of philosophical knowledge. It is by her arms; by her indomitable perseverance; by her unconquerable spirit; by her admirably contrived system of government, while under republican institutions; and by her sound and judicial system of jurisprudence, that she has been enabled to give such a mighty impress upon the world's advancing civilization.

A few reflections naturally arise on bidding adieu to the ancient philosophy. We have now passed through one great cycle in the history of thought. Although its development during this long period is marked by a less degree of perfection in its method, less rigorous exactness in its processes, and a less completeness in its results, than have characterized modern times, yet it still presents itself as a worthy subject of study. Every nation or people that has had a history has had also a culminating point in its development beyond which their powers were incapable of rising. This point has been attained in its philosophy, in which has been found the mirror that has reflected all the other elements of humanity.

The great point of distinction between the speculative thought of the ancient and modern world, consists in the fact that, although reflection is an essential characteristic of each, yet in the former that reflection had in it more of the spontaneous, while in the latter it was conducted more according to method. In the world's early history it was the reaching out of thought in every possible direction; the exploring what problems were to be solved, as well as attempting the methods of solution. This freedom of direction, and of speculative action, would seem to have been the best calculated to furnish the amplest materials for the more mature, methodical, and better directed mind of modern times to act upon. Although many of the same problems have returned to demand the action, and test the strength of modern thought, yet while in the ancient philosophies there is more of spontaniety in their evolution;

in the modern will be found greater rigor in the analysis, more distinctness in the statement, a stronger logic in the conclusions.

The culminating point in the development of Grecian, in fact of ancient philosophy, so far as science was concerned, was reached by the teachings of Plato and Aristotle. In its speculative character the philosophy of Greece ran through all grades, from the most unqualified skepticism to the most unmitigated dogmatism; at one time wholly rejecting the sensuous presentation, relying on nothing but reason; while at another, it is found yielding itself entirely up to sensation. One inquires what we are to regard as the true character of the Grecian scientific view? And answers "that we are to regard it as a series of developments, as a life which attempts gradually to understand itself,[1] and in this cause is liable to aberrations; nay, in the recklessness of folly or the agony of grief, even to total despair of its powers." Thus in the Ionic school the ruling idea was, that whatever is real and true is in a perpetual evolution, whether it be of a single force or of a plurality of motions in the contrariety of a moving force and a moved matter, holding that reason is the ruling principle in the flux of phenomena. So the Pythagoreans conceived the world as a living development, whose ultimate contrarieties blend together in the production of harmony. Their hope for the duration of life, was in the conflict of these opposite momenta. The Eleatic school, of all the pre-Socratic, declared against the verdict of the senses, reposing everything in the pure reason. This impeachment of the veracity of the senses offered the entering wedge to skepticism, and gave occasion to the school of the sophists. This was but a modified form of skepticism; whatever direction it took, whether it contented itself with ascribing to the corporeal alone a perfectly inscrutable truth, rejecting whatever belongs to soul or reason; or whether it made all truth to lose itself amid

[1] *Ritter*, IV, 672.

the ceaseless flux of things flowing into existence; or whether it reached its ultimate limit in ascribing precisely the same truth to the nonexistent as to the existent, thereby utterly overthrowing the possibility of the truth of language and thought.

From this utter annihilation of all dependence upon the results of mental action, the human mind appealed and offered its protest in the advent of Socrates. He gave a new direction to the powers of reflection, awoke the Greek mind to a sense of the moral, and upreared amid the conflicts of selfish men the standard of conscience. He summoned men to the practice of virtue, and to place reliance upon the strong common sense convictions of the human mind. In thus anchoring the convictions of men in two strong-holds, viz: 1, in the conscience or moral sense, thus originating ethics; and 2, in the common sense convictions of men in reference to outward nature, thus giving birth to physics, and in weaving around each the defenses of consecutive reasoning, thus rightly shaping the powers of logic, are to be found the great merits of Socrates.

The problem left unsolved by Socrates, and which he bequeathed to his successors, was the modes of connection and the relationships existing between these two strong-holds; or, in other words, between the immutable, eternal, and unconditioned on the one side, and the fluctuating, perishing, and conditioned on the other.

The solution of this problem was first undertaken by Plato. His mode of effecting it, was by establishing a system of ideas, which had themselves all the characters of the immutable and eternal, and by which a knowledge of the perfect and the good might be rendered attainable. In this system he thought the unity of science and being, of reason and of truth, was to be found. But this failed to render a perfect explanation. The constant flux of things in the sensible world, revealed only a complicated confusion, in which truth and error were so blended together, as to admit of no clear and satisfactory separation.

His only explanation was, that the ideas separately, and one by one, are incapable of perfection, and that besides good, evil also must be eternal in this world, where nothing more than a striving after good is possible, the full and complete attainment of it being utterly impossible. Thus he, in effect, merged the soul into the fluctuating, perishing and conditioned, without offering the hope of an ultimate perfect delivery.

Aristotle saw in the fluctuating element an union of real entity with potentiality, and an unceasing effort to realize the latter. He invoked the aid of experience, and proposed by means of that, the penetrating intellect, and the practiced understanding, to discover the essential by means of the accidental, and to trace the principle in its phenomena. As truth is eternal and immutable, so reason requires an unity of science, and an ultimate principle of motion, which is not to be found in itself, but is immutable and eternal. Thus occurred to him the idea of God, who, without being himself moved, is yet the prime mover, the principle from which proceeds all change, who, remaining himself unmoved, moves all things by the desire which they all have for him. God, or the good, is pure energy, operating in all things; the source of all energy, of all truth; possessing a complete intelligence, the complete idea of the all perfect — of himself. Thus he succeeded better than Plato, in bringing life and the fluctuating things of nature, into a closer union with God. But his philosophy was far less elevating than that of Plato, as it regards man as a merely transitory being, having only an indirect contact with the divine, by means of numerous intermediate essences. Besides, it was utterly inadequate, to explain the existence and operation of a series of imperfect objects, along with the perfect operation of God. He could only resolve it into a law of necessity, that it should be so, without assigning any origin to the law, or other reason for its existence.

Both systems agree in one respect, that it is necessary to investigate and determine the good. They differ as to

where it is to be found; Plato, placing it in a system of immutable ideas, and Aristotle, in the energy of life. The dream of Plato was of an ideal world, which should possess good in its absolute purity. But Aristotle rejected the hypothesis of such a world, and looked for it, although under some limiting conditions, in the world of sense. A single step only was now required to plunge man again in the sensible world. Here he was taken immediate possession of by the skeptic and Epicurean philosophy.

The former, however, still vacillated between the sensible and the suprasensible world; holding the latter to be the true world, but teaching that it exists not for man, who cannot escape from the sensible. The Epicurean went further, and taught that the good was really to be found in the sensible world, and placed it in a wise adjustment of sensual pleasures.

The rebound from both these systems of philosophy brings us to that of the stoic, the origin of which may be traced to the inadequacy of the Platonic and the Aristotelian philosophy to discover the principle of connection between God and the sensible world. It was urged that if necessity required that a world imperfect, mutable, and conditioned, should be placed alongside of the unchangeable perfect, it must apparently involve a dualism. And again, that any idea of God which fails to represent him as an active and efficient energy, and producing by himself all things that are in the world, must derogate from his vitality; claiming that God cannot reveal himself to man, and thus become an object of human cognition in the world, without being actually in it.

Hence the stoic philosophy declared God to be the vital force, which in certain periods of life originates the world, and again dissolves it into himself; who fashions in himself his own proper matter, forming out of its generality its special properties, which he again resolves into the general. This philosophy holds that all the things of this world, whether they enjoy in the general course of life a longer

or shorter existence, are alike swallowed up in the necessity of life.

Thus the stoics united, to some extent, the unchangeable and unconditioned with the mutable and conditioned, by arriving at the idea of a corporeal God, who is nevertheless full of the most active vitality, and endowed with most perfect wisdom and intelligence. He comprises in himself all ideas, each being a living force, and bearing in itself the germ of development. To this philosophy everything is corporeal and sensible, and hence according to it the sensuous presentations are alone worthy of trust and confidence. But in the progress made by life in its various developments it distinguished several degrees of existence, the highest of which is the force which holds the whole in union and combination, ruling as well in the individual parts as in the whole. This was declared to be reason. And thus acknowledging the superior dignity of reason, the stoics resolved the opposition between the sensible and the suprasensible into a difference of degree. The life of the world, they held, has its ultimate destination, and that all things must again return into their generality. Thus it is that in these successive developments or puttings forth into the sensible, and again the absorption of all things into himself, the cycles of eternity are run, and it is even this unceasing circulation of life and activity that constitutes the true essence of divinity. Thus by his very vitality he is subject to perpetual change. The later character of stoicism placed a firm reliance in the moral energy of man, teaching the necessity of dispensing with, and the absolute worthlessness of, external advantages; referring all truth to the sensuous presentation, and recommending in all things, resignation to the divine dispensations. This was the stoicism of the Roman. The decline of ancient philosophy, or its intermingling with the new element of Christianity, requires here no special comment.

CHAPTER VII.

ROMAN ART.

Art as an element of Roman civilization, with the exception of that part of it which relates to military and naval tactics, is very much inferior to that which brightens and beautifies the whole field of Grecian culture. Art, in Greece, struck out its own courses, formed its own models, worked with its own instruments, pursued its own ends, and achieved its own glorious triumphs. In Rome, it has accomplished little except as a feeble and rather imperfect imitation of the Grecian models. Indeed, so far as relates to the arts of design, and those which fall more peculiarly within the denomination of fine arts, those who studied and practiced them under the Roman dominion, were generally Grecians, or some other than Romans. There were few elements in the Roman character that led to the cultivation of art. The Roman spirit was too entirely practical, too much utilitarian, to find a delightful home amid the splendors of the ideal. The Roman delighted in the pleasures of sense; in the pursuits of jurisprudence and the affairs of government; in yielding to the calls of ambition, and endeavoring to obtain distinction both in the administration of government at home and the command of armies abroad; and thought little of philosophy or of the different species of art. It seems to have been the peculiar mission of Greece to develop the elements of philosophy and art in the ancient world. To Rome was assigned the participation in sterner realities. She was to instruct in practical life; in the affairs of government and jurisprudence; in the art of war and career of conquest. Each have well performed the part assigned, and thus the result has been to make subsequent ages wiser and better by their labors, and their examples; teaching almost equally successfully both by their successes and their failures.

The general remarks made while on the subject of Grecian art have an equal application here.

A similar division may also be adopted, and all Roman art may be included under three great divisions, viz: the OBJECTIVE, SUBJECTIVE, and MIXED.

Under the first will be included all those in which the art is developed by the human faculties, through the medium of some external object upon which they act. All the arts of design come here to be considered, viz: sculpture, painting, and architecture.

The SUBJECTIVE will include all those developed by the human faculties, without a necessary object upon which to act. They are purely mental, and are the arts of music, of poetry, and of eloquence.

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.

First. Sculpture. The first native school of art in Italy, was the Etruscan. It was in Etruria proper, in her twelve capital cities, separate and independent, yet allied together, and before the iron grasp of Rome had extinguished all political freedom in Italy, that the arts, especially those of design, flourished. Sculpture in Etruria, attained a coeval, if not a prior degree of refinement, as compared with Greece. The remains of it that have come down to the present day, are not numerous. The works of national art consist of medals and coins; statues of bronze and marble; relievos; sculptured gems; engraved bronzes; and paintings.

An idea of the degree of perfection attained by the plastic arts among the Etruscans, is furnished by their works in burnt clay, of which several have come down to us. Several of these exhibit a distinct, well developed, native style, exhibiting everywhere a preference for plastic ornament. This is displayed in the reliefs and statues in the pediments of the temples. The Etruscans executed colossal figures in burnt clay, as the quadriga on the Capi-

toline temple, and the statue of Jupiter in the same, both of which were formed of burnt clay.

The Etruscans also possessed the art of brass founding, as both bronze colossi and little statuettes have come down to us. They also understood how to gild the bronze statues. There have also been found statues in marble, but it is difficult to say whether they are early Greek or Etruscan.

The medals and coins were very numerous, and of these there are many beautiful and wonderful specimens. They are cast of a compound metal, and are either mythological or symbolical in their representations.

The art of chasing was practiced in Etruria, which led to the production of embossed works in gold and silver. Among these were candelabra, goblets, mirrors, shields, chairs, trestles, etc. So also they had carved works in ivory.

Of the ancient relievos found in various parts of Italy, several are admitted to be genuine Etruscan, although the art of sculpturing stone in relief seems not to have been extensively practiced.

The art of gem engraving was brought to great perfection at an early period, both in Greece and Italy. We have also fragments of Etruscan sarcophagi, which were the more generally made of alabaster, tufaceous limestone, travertine, and sometimes of burnt clay. They were adorned with bas-reliefs, pertaining mostly to the tragic mythology, and containing many allusions to death and the lower world. Parting scenes, dying scenes, and funerals, are also frequently represented on such sarcophagi.

There have been traced three distinct eras of art among the Etruscans. "The first, or ancient style, commences with the earliest notices of the people. It has been confounded with the Egyptian and the Grecian; but the similarity is not greater than characterizes the infancy of invention among every people. And though, apart, it might be difficult to discern their national or original elements, considered in connection with the style of the following era, their distinctive character becomes apparent,

of an unfettered imagination, essaying its feeble powers by no systematic, no conventional representation, arising, as in Egypt, from an impulse foreign to art; while, from Greek sculpture of the same age, we clearly distinguish the rudiments of new modes, and certain specialties in the relations between fancy and feeling with nature. The vigorous imagination, the bold forms, and general tendency to exaggeration, which may be traced even in its infancy, display in its perfection, during the second epoch, the peculiar characteristics of Etruscan sculpture. In the works of this age, there is strength, and massiveness, and power; but they want delicacy of proportion, discrimination of character, and graceful simplicity. The third epoch embraces that period, which beheld the gradual disappearance of the Tuscans as an independent state from the face of Italy. Their political empire was engulphed in the extending dominion of Rome; the discriminative character of their genius merged in the arts of the colonial Greeks, when the schools of Rhegium and Crotona sent forth masters equal, if not superior to those of Greece."

The Tuscan school of art continued in operation long after the foundation of Rome. Indeed, it did not terminate until some 480 years after the building of that city. For a long time even after the subjugation of the Tuscan republics, sculpture was practiced, but it had lost all national character. That this art was cultivated with great zeal and ardor is evident from the fact that the Romans carried off from Volsinum alone no fewer than two thousand statues. The Romans, however, did not foster the arts either as native ornaments, or as moral causes in their empire. They possessed merely sufficient knowledge to value the fruits of genius, as the harvest of conquest.

The art of sculpture among the ancients is indebted, to a very great extent, for its origin and progress, to the heathen mythology. We have already seen this illustrated in Grecian art. The Romans, prior to the reign of the elder Tarquin, are said to have had no images of the gods.

For a long time subsequently, their statues of gods in clay or wood were made by Etruscan artists. These were quite rustic and common in their appearance, and hence we find Cato opposing the introduction of Greek statuary, urging as a reason, that its divine forms would expose to ridicule the rude fashioning of the Roman deities.

In the early times of the republic, Roman art, or what might perhaps pass under that name, was of a character public and practical. Roads on a gigantic scale were constructed. Aqueducts were conceived and executed of such vast magnitude and proportions as to create sentiments of awe and wonder during all subsequent times. In all these works practical utility and not ornament was consulted. Little, if any, attention was bestowed upon the cultivation of art for its own sake.

But in process of time, policy led in the direction of art. The practice commenced of erecting bronze statues to distinguished persons, in the forum. This was found useful in the creation of motives to render valuable services to the public. In consequence of this, the number of statues of men in the forum soon became very great. The artists by whom these were executed, were undoubtedly Greeks and Etruscans. During the period of the Samnite war, Rome extended her dominion over Magna Græcia, and then commenced the custom after the manner of the Greeks, to dedicate statues and colossi to the gods, out of the spoils of war.

It was not until towards the latter period of the republic, that attempts were made to render Rome the home of the arts. After she had acquired a marked political ascendancy, her leaders, as Sylla, Pompey, and Cæsar, made some efforts to concentrate the arts in Rome. Yet they did little more than to collect together in Rome, those beautiful forms of Grecian sculpture, which the Roman arms had ravished from conquered Greece.

It is but justice, however, to add, that after the taking of Corinth by the Romans, and the transplanting of so many beautiful specimens of sculpture to Rome, and after

Rome had become politically the queen city of the world, innumerable artists were attracted thither, and a species of taste was created for artistic productions.

Upon the establishment of the empire, it was a part of the plan of policy adopted, to turn the attention of the people as much as possible from political matters, and one method of doing this, was to encourage artists, and the creation of works of art. Augustus could wield the energies of the entire civilized world, and could thus most effectually patronize art. And yet of all the sculptors of the Augustan age, whose names have reached us, every one is Greek, and chiefly Athenian. Among these Pasiteles, Arcesilaus, Zopirus, and Evander, were the most eminent. But although, under the immense patronage of the emperors, there seemed to be a revival of the arts; yet the creative spirit which infuses life and soul into their productions, and which stamps them with originality and thought, had gone, and could not be recalled. It was, in truth, a continuation of the last era of sculpture in Greece, but in the finest specimens there is no evidence of new energies, nor any exhibition of the more original, though it might be ruder, efforts of an aspiring and distinct national taste. Everything in the sculpture of this era shows a descent from a state of higher excellence. It was the execution of the hand, after absolutism had crushed out everything which the spirit of freedom had originated.

From Augustus to Trajan, a period of one hundred and forty years, the Grecian principles and practices continued to be observed, with the evidences still apparent of a progressive decay. The most favorable periods during this space, were the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, and Trajan. The best sources for the study of the art of that period are: the sculptures on public monuments, and the statues of the emperors. Among the former, are the reliefs on the arch of Titus, representing the apotheosis of the emperor, and the triumph over Judea. Of the latter, some are very well executed, both as clad in the Roman toga, and in the Roman arms.

The reliefs upon Trajan's column were executed during his reign. The figures are energetic, the heads characteristic, and the positions good.

In the commencement of the second century, under the reign of Hadrian, a new style of sculpture is introduced, which may be more strictly termed Roman. The emperor himself had a great fondness for art, and a fine relish for its higher beauties. Hence probably resulted the distinguishing characteristic of this style, which is extreme minuteness of finish, indicating the labor more of the hand than the mind. All the instruments of the art, the chisel, file and drill, have been plied with great care and mechanical dexterity. Over the whole genius and spirit of the art seemed diffused an air of studied and affected refinement, the difficult being substituted for the sublime, and the florid for the elegant.

The art of sculpture in the ancient world went into a sensible state of decline from the reign of the Antonines. With the fall of the ancient world fell also ancient art. During the reign of Constantine fell the gods of paganism, and then disappeared the entire mode of viewing things in which ancient art originated.

There were three causes that mainly contributed to retard the progress of sculpture at Rome :

1. It was regarded as an art more especially excelled in by a conquered people. Having, therefore, no real respect for its professors, they were led to cherish no enthusiasm for its excellences.

2. Their national manners were inclined more to action and business than to elegant accomplishments. They desired to be constantly represented in armor, and this operated directly against the improvement of sculpture, excluding from it the free forms of nature, and substituting in their place, the form cased in armor, harsh and artificial in its outline, and offering litttle or nothing to excite to action the higher powers of the sculptor.

3. The splendid results of Grecian art in sculpture were scattered throughout Italy, and when these were contrasted

with the inferior productions of the Romans, it produced in reference to the latter an unfavorable impression.

Second. Painting. It has generally been supposed that sculpture was a more ancient art than painting, but the two arts appear to be one in origin, end, and principle; and differ only in their development. They have clearly both the same basis, design. Color cannot be said to be essential to either. The majority of the illustrations upon the ancient vases are colorless. That which seems to form the connecting link between sculpture and painting is the relief which belongs to the former.

There are many remains of the old Etruscan drawing and painting, the most considerable of which are the wall paintings of the tombs, the pictures on vases, and the engravings on metallic mirrors. These seem to be derived mainly from two sources, viz: from the scenes of their domestic life, and from their religious myths. There is but little merit in the drawing, the forms appearing to be rather conventional than imitations of nature, and the drapery indicated by fine lines. The features are generally destitute of expression. The coloring very much resembles the Egyptian, the colors being laid on simply and separately without light and shade. There is, however, a marked progressive improvement in the style of the Etruscan paintings, which advance from the formally severe to the light sketchy manner. Grecian art seems to have exerted a great influence on the Etruscan, their later vases being in no respect distinguishable from the Greek.

These pictorial representations are monograms, executed with the cestrum, or style, in black, upon a red or yellow ground, the order of the colors being sometimes reversed. The lines are vigorous, but the representation, on the whole, is inferior to the abstract perception of the beautiful in form.

In the vases found in the Etruscan tombs, there appear three grand differences of style. The first is like the Egyptian, presenting in its pictures, harpies and sphynxes, which alike disregard nature, the Greek mythology and heroic tradition. The second present the black figures, "quaint,

stiff and peculiar, of the most beautiful workmanship, but without ease or grace in the human outline; with splendid processions of warriors, groups of divinities, and mysterious allegories." The third present the red figures "with the most spirited and elegant forms of men and women, true to nature, and sometimes absolutely lovely, representing stories of gods and heroes, as well as incidents of domestic life." [1]

So there have been enumerated three different styles of Etruscan art: the more ancient, the later, and the improved style, or that which has grown out of imitation of the Greeks. The more ancient is characterized by straight lines in their drawing, together with the stiff attitudes and constrained action of their figures; and also by their imperfect idea of beauty of the face. The outline of the figure is made to sink and swell but little, and hence the figures themselves look thin and spindle-like, the muscles being slightly marked. The stiffness in attitude is owing partly to the mode of drawing and partly to the ignorance of the earliest ages. "Art," it is said, like "wisdom, begins with self-knowledge." Their imperfect idea of beauty of face is evidenced by their giving the head the form of an elongated oval, with a pointed chin, narrow opening of the eyes and turning obliquely upwards, with the corners of the mouth also turned upwards; thus giving a strong resemblance to the earliest Egyptian figures. This, together with the attitude, manner of laying on the paint in successive coatings, and size of the figures, evidence a strong connection between the ancient Etruscans and the Egyptians.

But notwithstanding the want of skill in the drawing of figures, a knowledge of the elegance of forms is conceded to the earliest Etruscan artists. They had learned the ideal and scientific, but were deficient in the excellence acquired by imitation. In the earliest ages, like the Greeks, they made more draped than nude figures, but this became reversed in subsequent periods.

[1] *Sepulchres of Etruria*, 50.

The point of transition between the more ancient and the later style is marked by a stronger degree of expression, and a visible marking of parts in their figures. This gives, as a principal characteristic and mark of the later style, a perceptible signification of the joints and muscles, and the arrangement of the hair in rows, also a constrained attitude and action, which in some figures is violent and exaggerated. In order to effect the first mentioned the muscles are tumidly raised, and lie like hills; the bones are sharply drawn, and hence rendered too visible, thus giving to the style a hard and painful appearance. The expression and marking of the bones were more studied by the Etruscans; those of the muscles by the Greeks. The second style has also been termed mannered, and by this is meant a constant uniformity of character in all sorts of figures, which results in none of them really having any character, as it is distinctiveness, and not uniformity that constitutes character.

The third, or improved style, very much resembles the Greek in its important characteristics. This close imitation of the Greek style and manner was owing to two causes. One was the original connection or derivation of the Etruscans from the early ancestors of the Greek race. The old Pelasgi, at a period far back in the history of the world, found their way into Italy, where many of their Cyclopean remains are still to be found. These no doubt, at least, in part, were the ancestors of the Etruscans. Then another emigration from Greece into Etruria is said to have taken place about three hundred years after the time of Homer, and about the era of Thales and of Lycurgus. Thus not only the mode of writing with Greek letters, but the mythology of the Greeks became introduced into Etruria. Hence the figures and the subjects of Etruscan art are essentially Greek.

The other cause arose from the fact that the numerous emigrations of the Greeks into Italy finally resulted in the building up of many cities in the southern part of the Italian peninsula, which were so essentially Greek in their

character, that they have received the term Magna Græcia. In these cities, thus removed from the factions and wars that devastated the parent land, the arts began to flourish at an earlier date even than in Greece itself, and to diffuse light among their neighbors, the Etruscans. The aid thus rendered by the Greeks was effectual in perfecting Etruscan art, and this third style is that of the greater number of Etruscan works of art.[1]

We know very little of the Roman painting independent of that of Greece. It is true, however, that as early as B. C. 304, the head of the noble house of the Fabii received the surname of Pictor, because of some paintings which he executed in the temple of Salus at Rome. So also about the year B. C. 180, Pacuvius, the tragic poet, distinguished himself by some paintings in the temple of Hercules.

There are reckoned three periods in the history of painting in Rome. The first dates from the conquest of Greece until the time of Augustus. This was the period of Græco-Roman art. The artists were chiefly Greeks.

The second period extended from the age of Augustus to that of Dioclesian, or from the commencement of the Christian era until about the latter end of the third century. It was during this period that the great majority of Roman works of art were produced.

The third period comes down to and includes the exarchate of Ravenna, when the seat of empire was removed to Constantinople, and Rome became the prey of the northern invader. She was then doomed to suffer spoliations very similar in their character to those which she had inflicted upon Greece.

The first period was little, if at all, distinguishable from Grecian art. The conquest of Greece was signalized by the destruction or removal to Rome of a vast variety of sculptures and paintings. Of the real value of these the Romans had, at the time, but a feeble conception. It is stated of Mummius, the Roman general, that when he

[1] *Winckelmann's History of Ancient Art*, 328, *et seq.*

seized the picture of Bacchus, and gave it over to his soldiers, who were using it as a table, the Corinthians, on account of its superior excellence, were very desirous to regain it. Their efforts to accomplish that awoke the suspicions of Mummius, who conceived the picture contained gold, which he might perhaps discover when more at leisure. He accordingly delivered it to a common messenger with the injunction that he was to carry it safely to Rome, and that if any accident happened to it, he should paint another equally as good!

There were different processes resorted to in painting, and these were applied to wood, cloth, parchment, ivory and plaster. There were three kinds of the method, termed encaustic. The first was executed in colored waxes, so prepared as to be sufficiently liquid to be laid on cold. The second was done with a graver upon ivory, and was confined to very small pictures. The subject was first sketched out with a graver, and then colors were introduced into the lines. In the third sort, colored wax was melted by heat, and laid on warm with a brush.

So far as the obtaining a variety of colors was concerned, the Romans had superior advantages to the Greeks. New coloring substances continued to be found, and so great is the number of pigments mentioned by ancient authors, and such the beauty of them, that, with all the aid of modern science, it is very doubtful whether modern artists possess any advantage in this respect over their predecessors.

The Romans made a two-fold division of their colors, viz: into florid and grave. The former were high priced, and usually furnished by the employer. These were also divided into natural and artificial.

The florid colors were six in number, viz: minium, red; chrysocolla, green; armenium, purpurissum, indicum, ostrum, various shades of blue. The first mentioned, minium, was that we now call vermilion. This was first obtained from Ephesus, and subsequently from Spain.

Chrysocolla was a native substance, found in mines of gold, silver, copper and lead. An artificial sort was also

made from the sediment of water which was left standing in metalic veins. It was probably carbonate of copper. Most or all the ancient greens were combinations of copper. Armenium was a metallic color, and was prepared by being ground to an impalpable powder. It was of a light blue color.

Purpurissum, purple, was made from a fine chalk or clay steeped in a purple dye. It included every degree in the scale of purple shades.

Ostrum was a liquid color which acquired consistence by having honey added to it. It was obtained from the juice of a fish called murex, and was of a deeper and more violet color when brought from the northern, and of a redder when brought from the southern coasts of the Mediterranean.

The grave colors were more numerous. Of reds there was the red lead, (cerussa usta) much used in shades. There was also an earth of a beautiful red called sinopis, which was brought from the city of Sinope in Pontus. The red grounds found at Pompeii were made of this. It was of three shades; the red, the middle and the less red.

Sandaracha was a color found in gold and silver mines. It varied in shade between red and yellow. A paler sort was used for yellows.

Atramentum, or black, was of two sorts, natural or artificial; the first obtained from a black earth, or from the blood of the cuttle fish; the last, from the dregs of wine carbonized, calcined ivory, or lamp black.

Cæruleum, or azure, was a sand brought from Egypt, Scythia, and Cyprus.

Appianum, or green, was a very ordinary color made use of to imitate the chrysocolla lutea.

Sir Humphry Davy remarks "that the Greek and Roman painters had almost all the same colors as those employed by the great Italian masters, at the period of the revival of the arts in Italy. They had the advantage over them in two colors, the vestorian or Egyptian azure, and the Tyrian or marine purple."

The Romans and the ancients generally painted their pictures in the full light of day, and hence their pleasing effect when only surrounded by a simple line of red.

In regard to the different kinds of painting among the Romans, one was the mosaic. This was very general in Rome, in the time of the early emperors. The origin of mosaic pavements has been attributed to the Greeks. There was, in ancient times, a profusion of mosaics, so much so, that even the dwellings of a second rate town abounded in rich specimens. Those of Pompeii are found to have been chiefly composed of black frets, or meandering patterns, on a white ground, or white ones on a black ground. The most interesting and valuable is one lately discovered, and which is supposed to represent the battle of Issus. Its design and composition are much superior to its execution, the original being evidently the production of an age long anterior to that of the mosaic itself.

The practice among the ancients of decorating their walls with paintings, may be traced to a remote antiquity; but, until the time of Augustus, it seems to have been usual only to paint the walls of houses one single color, which was relieved with capricious ornaments. He is said to have been the first sovereign who thought of covering whole walls with pictures and landscapes. It was in his time, that the painter Ludius invented what is now termed the arabesque, or grotesque. He illustrated his landscape decorations with figures, actively employed in occupations that were suited to the scenes.

The buried curiosities of Pompeii and Herculaneum, show that the Romans practiced fresco painting. Their historical paintings were chiefly confined to poetical and mythological subjects, the only ones which seem to have obtained popularity in the hands of either poets or painters.

Landscape painting was also of frequent occurrence among the Romans. The perspective is not found to be very accurate, although the ancients were by no means ignorant of that science. Buildings usually form a prominent feature in the landscapes at Pompeii.

There was an unique method of painting at Pompeii, which is thus described: "It is singular that in many cases, though a picture be not ill preserved, and may be seen from the most convenient distance, a style of painting has been adopted, which, though calculated to decorate the wall, is by no means intelligible on a nearer approach. In a chamber, near the entrance of the chalcidium, by the statue of Eumachia, is a picture, in which, from a certain distance, a town, a tent, and something like a marriage ceremony, might be perceived; but which vanished into an assemblage of unmeaning blots, so as to entirely elude the skill of an artist who was endeavoring it at the distance of three or four feet. Another picture of the same kind is or was visible in the chamber of the Perseus and Andromeda. An entire farm-yard, with animals, a fountain, and a beggar, seemed to invite the antiquary to a closer inspection, which only produced confusion and disappointment, and proved that the picture could not be copied, except by a painter, possessing the skill and touch of the original artist. It is probable that those who were in the habit of painting these unreal pictures, had the art of producing them with great ease and expedition; and that they served to fill a compartment, where greater detail was judged unnecessary."

Another species of painting which remains to be mentioned, is that of portrait painting. This dates back to the era of Augustus. Since that period, portraits have been very numerous among the Romans. If a man had performed an important public service, his portrait or statue, or both, were placed in the temples, or other public places. So also were the portraits of authors placed in the public libraries. The Romans had a curious custom of apparently fixing the portrait of an author above the cases which contained his writings, below which chairs were placed for the convenience of readers. They were also painted at the beginning of manuscripts.

A much heavier style of painting seems to have been adopted by the ancient Romans, than has been practiced

by the moderns. In the painting of the three Graces, found among the the ruins of Pompeii, the entire color laid upon the colored ground, has actually peeled off, in consequence of damp, and recent exposure to the air, while the outline remains, cut deep into the back ground with some sharp instrument. Some of these figures are expressed with great vigor of touch. The ancients painted the lighter parts with great body of color; and rather exaggerated the dark touches of the eyes and mouths of their heads, which has the effect of giving to them almost a speaking expression.

Painting finally came to be practiced almost exclusively by slaves; and painters, as a body, were consequently held in little or no esteem. Pliny spoke of it in his time as a dying art, and the establishment of Christianity, the division of the empire, the incursions of the barbarians, and the fanatic fury of the iconoclasts, succeeded finally in destroying almost every vestige of it that had hitherto remained.

Third. Architecture. The Romans invented as little in architecture as they did in painting and sculpture. Their genius was never inventive. It rather tended to make a practical application of the inventions of others. The founders of the Roman state, and their immediate descendants consulted none of the elegancies of the architectural art. They invoked it simply as a means of protection from the elements, and not as an art, which could gratify the eye, and minister to the demands of a refined taste.

But Rome was never backward in availing herself of the arts and labors of others. There were two sources of architectural art that early opened themselves up to the industry of the Romans. These were the Etruscan, and the Grecian. Aside from these, however, there was an elder style of architecture in some parts of Italy relating back to an early period in human history. This was the Cyclopean, as evidenced in the still existing walls of those old cities that were perched like eagles' nests on the very crests of the mountains, appearing rather as means of

defense than as cities to dwell in. These walls are formed of huge blocks of calcareous stone, roughly hewn, and laid together without cement. The manner in which the Cyclopean gates were generally formed was by placing an enormous stone over two upright ones. They even made an approximation towards the formation of an arch, the stones being sometimes so arranged as to meet in a point at the top. The true principle of the arch, however, is never found in this ancient style.

The cities and architecture of Etruria were of a different style. The cities stood generally upon low ground, and the walls were constructed of large blocks of hewn stone laid in regular courses. In the Etrurian architecture we find the true principle of the arch, which was formed of massive stones fitted together without cement. That most remarkable people built bridges with a single arch, several of which still remain apparently as firm as when first erected. They often cut their roads through rocks, to lessen the distance, much like the tunneling of modern times.

Their sepulchres were peculiar, having little or no resemblance to the Roman. Neither were they copied after the Grecian, but have been likened by some to the Egyptian, and by others to the Lydian. They seem to have been an imitation of the dwelling house of the living.

With the exception of some wall, or stone structures, the sepulchres and their contents are all that remain to proclaim the arts and civilization of the ancient Etruscans. The Romans adopted whatever of their arts and civilization they chose, or whatever was adapted to the wants of a rude and semi-barbarous people, and destroyed whatever they could of every vestige that remained. But the Etruscans, as if anticipating what the barbarous policy of Rome afterwards accomplished, so constructed and adorned their mansions of the dead as to leave in the solid rock, beneath the earth's surface, many evidences of their power, greatness, and early civilization. It is true many of these rock sepulchres have felt the hand of the spoiler, and have been

successively rifled of their valuable contents. But the forms of all still remain, and in some the paintings and sculptures.

In a wild rugged glen at the Castel D'Asso, are found a large number of these rock sepulchres. These have been rifled of their contents, but they present the oldest recorded form of human burial for the great amongst mankind. Here is to be seen the cavern sepulchre similar to that purchased by Abraham in the cave of Machpelah. The style of structure is low, with heavy top and wings. Brass arms have been found in these sepulchres, which would refer them to a very ancient period. So also scarabei, that is, beetles wrought in cornelian and other stones, have been met with in the Etruscan tombs as in the Egyptian, but always with Greek or Etruscan subjects engraved upon them. It is truly unfortunate that the knowledge of the Etruscan language is lost, and that hence the interpretation of the inscriptions, beyond family names and a few oft repeated phrases, has hitherto wholly baffled the efforts of the learned.

To this singular people hasbeen ascribed a style of architecture, called the Tuscan, which at one period was introduced into Rome by Etruscan architects, and adopted in the principal buildings. No specimen of the Tuscan capital has come down to our times. It much resembled the Doric, and at a later period, the latter style was very generally adopted at Rome in the place of the Tuscan.

The accession of the elder Tarquin marked the period at which the Etruscan architecture was introduced into Rome, and the works erected in that early age were remarkable for solidity, being constructed of large blocks of stone, in the most substantial manner.

When the Romans became a conquering people they naturally transplanted to Rome the arts of those whom they conquered. Among these were the Grecian styles of architecture. The Romans invented no new orders, but they combined the arch and vault with the Grecian column and entablature.

The pure Doric order was seldom employed by the Romans, and when they did imitate it, the proportions and ornaments were different from the Grecian.

The Romans also varied the Ionic, adding nothing to its beauty, but making it more elaborate.

They seem to have more favored the Corinthian than any other. They varied the decorative part, ornamenting the capitals with laurel, olive, thistle, and other foliage differently disposed, in place of the acanthus. They also placed upon the entablature an endless variety of mouldings, wreaths of flowers, and heads of animals.

But the Romans, although possessing and exercising little inventive power, yet in employing the principles they derived from others, they have shown great native force of character. They have everywhere infused the majesty of the Roman people into their different varieties of architecture. The splendid remains of their public roads, aqueducts, temples, theatres, tombs, triumphal arches, and other architectural erections have come down to us, the monuments of those wonderful men whose works have never ceased to attract the attention of mankind.

Their public roads were constructed on a magnificent scale. They were often paved with flint and covered with gravel. Sometimes they were of large basaltic stones, neatly smoothed. They were raised, giving a view of the adjacent country, and having side walks for foot passengers.

The aqueducts for the supply of water to the imperial city were carried through rocks, over hills, and through valleys on arches, and that sometimes for a distance of fifty or sixty miles. In the deepest valleys they placed one row of arches over another, and sometimes still another, to the height of more than a hundred feet.

The Roman temple generally differed from the Greek. The latter was uniformly oblong, while the former was circular, hexagonal, octagonal, and even triangular, combining many different varieties of forms. The celebrated Pantheon at Rome was circular, and so also were the

temples of Vesta at Rome, and at Tivoli. The temple of Peace at Rome was oblong.

There still remain gigantic remains of the theatre, amphitheatre, and circus, and they were each constructed on a similar plan. The theatre was a semicircular, and the amphitheatre a circular edifice. The Colisseum, or Flavian amphitheatre, erected by Flavius Vespasian, in A. D. 72, was one of the most remarkable structures of antiquity. So great was the quantity of blood shed in its arena, that two aqueducts were scarcely sufficient to wash away what the sport of a few hours shed. This enormous structure was of an oval form, five hundred and eighty feet in length, and four hundred and seventy feet in breadth. It was of different orders of architecture, the lower part being Doric, the next Ionic, and the next Corinthian; above being a row of composite pilasters, and the whole crowned with an attic. The arena was two hundred and eighty-five feet long, and one hundred and eighty-two feet wide. Around it were arranged seats for the spectators. These would accommodate 80,000, besides affording room for 20,000 in the piazzas above. All the large Roman cities had their theatres, amphitheatres, and circuses.

The arches were very solid, lofty structures, erected to commemorate victories. That of Titus, erected after his destruction of Jerusalem, was ornamented with various sculptures in bas-relief, representing the triumphal procession on the return of the conqueror.

Among the historical columns, the most remarkable is that known as Trajan's column, having a Doric shaft, a Tuscan base and capital, and a pedestal with Corinthian mouldings. This column is of marble, and is covered with sculptures in bas-relief, representing the victories of Trajan.

Another is the column of Marcus Aurelius, erected in honor of him by the Roman senate, but he afterwards dedicated it to his father-in-law, Antoninus Pius.

The Romans also exhibited the greatness of their architecture in the construction of their tombs. That of Cecilia Metella was the most noted. It was constructed of im-

mense blocks of travertine, the walls being circular, about ninety feet in diameter and twenty-four feet in thickness. It is surrounded by a Corinthian entablature, ornamented with festoons and heads of oxen. This was subsequently converted into the citadel of a fort, and proved a stronghold not easy to be taken.

The tomb of Caius Cestius was a pyramid one hundred and thirteen feet high, and eighty-nine on each side at the base, the sepulchral chamber being eighteen feet long, twelve wide, and thirteen high. Another, that of the Plautius family, was in the form of a round tower, with an entablature similar to that of the monument of Cecilia Metella. This was also made use of as a fortress during the civil wars of the dark ages.

The tomb of the Scipios was discovered in 1780. The lower story is of a square form hollowed into the ground; the upper is entirely gone.

It is singular what numerous transformations some of these ancient architectural works have undergone. The mausoleum of Augustus, for instance, was used in the middle ages as a fortress; next, it was hollowed out for a vineyard; and finally, it became a circus, serving for a place of amusement.

The thermæ, or hot baths, of Rome, and other cities of the empire, were wonderful specimens of architecture. They were designed not only for bathing, but also for gymnastic exercises, and a variety of other amusements. They sometimes even had temples connected with them.

There were several noted thermæ, or baths. Those of Dioclesian covered several acres of ground. They were generally square, with a circular edifice at each angle. The interior of the square was filled with gardens, groves, porticoes, and an amphitheatre.

The baths of Caracalla, although smaller than those of Dioclesian, could nevertheless accommodate three thousand people.

The baths of Titus were the first gallery of ancient painting that was restored to the world.

The Roman forum was an oblong square extending from the arch of Septimius Severus to the temple of Antoninus and Faustina, and from thence to that of Romulus. The forum of Trajan is mentioned as the wonder and glory of Roman architecture.

It will be perceived that in the architectural art, the Romans, while they invented nothing new, made, nevertheless, some novel applications of old principles. They viewed the constituents of the Greek orders, and even the orders themselves, as so many conventional ornaments, which might be changed or superseded on the laws of association, in much the same manner as they were supposed to have been framed. There is in some of the remains of Roman architecture, a massive grandeur, and greatness in design and execution, to which the Greeks had never attained. "Although not the original inventors, yet they were the first to discover and boldly apply the powers of the arch; nor is there one dignified principle in its use which they have not elicited. Rivers are spanned; the sea itself, as at Ancona, is thus enclosed within the cincture of masonry; nay, streams were heaved into air, and, borne aloft through entire provinces, poured into the capital their floods of freshness and health. The self-balanced dome, extending a marble firmament overhead, the proudest boast of modern skill, has yet its prototype and its superior in the Pantheon."

It is said the Colisseum alone contains more solid material in its immense structure, than all the works of either Louis XIV, or the Russian czar, Peter the Great, the two greatest builders among the sovereigns of modern times. The practice of the art everywhere proclaimed the national character of the people. The numerous applications of it to all the important practical purposes of life, were great, substantial and useful. The very greatness of some of their edifices proved a source of after corruption; the attention, by means of it, being withdrawn from the delicacies of composition, thus substituting brute mass for the refinements of science.

The architectural art declined from the time of Hadrian. Its downward progress was stayed by the personal virtues or activities of the prince, who happened to sway the sceptre of the Roman world. The remarkable talents of Diocle-sian seem to have elicited the last splendors of Roman skill. His circular hall is reckoned inferior only to the Pantheon, while his Dalmatian palace was the finest build-ing which was seen in several succeeding centuries.

The SUBJECTIVE ARTS are those of music, poetry, and eloquence.

First. Music. This is purely a mental art, as its effects are produced directly on the mind. The peculiar opera-tion of it lies beyond the power of the understanding to disclose. "It is the art of expressing conditions and emo-tions of the soul by means of beautiful tones."

Music, as an art, was much more thoroughly cultivated in Greece than Rome. The early Romans paid but little attention to its cultivation, regarding it rather as an ener-vating art, and one, therefore, belonging rather to slaves and freedmen, than Roman citizens.

There was, however, a new element introduced into the arts of Rome, which often served very considerably to modify their character, and this was the Etruscan element. This partook of an eastern or oriental character. The early Roman music was undoubtedly rude and coarse; but from a very ancient period they appear to have made use of hymns and flutes in their triumphal processions. Every species of musical instrument found on Greek works of art, is found also on Etruscan. If, as supposed by many, the Etruscans were of Lydian origin, it is easy accounting for their taste for music, and their great variety of musical instruments.

Music was early introduced as an element into the political organization of the Romans. Servius, in his comitia, constituted two whole centuries of cornicines and tibicines. So the laws of the twelve tables allowed, at funerals, ten players on the flute, and also enjoined that

the praises of great men should be sung in mournful songs accompanied by the flute.

The Romans made use only of wind music in their army. The instruments there made use of, were the tubæ, the cornua, the buccinæ, and the litui.

The tubæ resembled our trumpet in that it continued to widen in a direct line to the orifice.

The cornua owe both their name and origin to the horns of beasts. They were bent almost round.

The buccinæ seem derived from *bos* and *cano*. They nearly resembled the cornua, although they seem to have been of a different species. They were something less, and not quite so crooked.

The litui were of a middle kind between the cornua and the tubæ. They were almost straight, turning in a little at the top like the rod made use of by the augurs, called lituus.

These instruments were all made of brass, and in a battle some of the performers on them took their station by the ensign, or colors, of their particular company or troup, while others stood near the chief eagle in a ring, close by the general and prime officers. When, at the word of the general, the alarm was to be given, these latter began it, and were followed by the common sound of the rest, dispersed through the several parts of the army.

In the year B. C. 365, music was adapted to theatrical amusements. Actors were brought from Etruria who danced to the sound of the flute, in dumb show, without verses. So important did the Roman flute-players become, that they were finally incorporated into a college.

The study and practice of music became at times an imperial pastime. Among the first musicians of his age was Nero. He was accustomed to lie on his back with a thin plate of lead on his stomach, in order to preserve his voice. For the same purpose he also took frequent emetics and cathartics, and at last transacted all business in writing. He was an admirable player on the flute, and, as is stated, bore off the spoils in 1800 musical contests.

It does not appear that the Roman system of music differed in any material respect from the Greek. They understood the laws of contrast, of light and shade, of loud and soft, of swelling and diminishing; and they also had instrumental music distinct from their vocal. Roscius says, that when he perceived himself grow old, he obliged the instruments to play in a slower time.

The main improvement made in music by the Romans, in perfect consistency with their general character, was of a practical, rather than a theoretical character. They simplified the musical nomenclature, rejecting the arbitrary signs in use among the Greeks, and substituting, in their place, the first fifteen letters of the Roman alphabet. This they did by a reduction of the modes.

The Romans, no more than the Greeks, had any notation with reference to time. When vocal music was united with instrumental, the time was marked by the metre of the song. Inasmuch as they lacked a notation of time, it would seem doubtful whether any other than a very simple style of merely instrumental music prevailed among them. Among the violent political revolutions that convulsed the Roman empire, music sank into the darkness of barbarism.

Second. The ars poetica, art of poetry. The character of the real Roman had little in it that could originate, encourage, or even appreciate the true poetic feeling. That stern, practical sense, ever utilitarian in its object and scope, could have but small sympathy with the ideal world, which constitutes the domain of the poet. Hence results the fact, that in all or most, of the productions of the Roman muse, we find very much of the spirit that had presided over the birth of Grecian song. Roman poets have been accused, probably too strongly, of a servile imitation of those of Greece. It is quite clear, that in traveling far back to the infancy of Roman institutions, we meet with no one who, like Homer, has moulded the character of a nation by his wonderful powers of song. Rome, in the common every day life of its founders, could no more have given birth to a Homer, than could Athens to a Cato the censor.

Greece began with the poetic. With her, feeling, passion, fancy, and imagination were the first to exert their energies. In Rome, with the slight exception hereafter mentioned, the common affairs of life, a practical philosophy, were the first to engage the attention, and to occupy the thoughts. Imagination there did not precede the reason. The convictions of the mind were based upon realities, and not upon matters fanciful or imaginary. There seems, however, to have been one exception to this, and one, too, of a character very commonly to be found in the infancy of nations.

There are traces, although they are faint ones, that there were early heroic tales and national poems among the Romans. These traces consist of certain passages of those Roman writers, who were best acquainted with the ancient usages and manners of their country, in which allusion is made to the existence of certain old songs, whose purpose was to celebrate the illustrious actions of their early ancestors, and which had commonly been sung at their religious festivals, as well as at the private entertainments of the Roman nobles.[1] The themes of those songs were undoubtedly the birth, fortune and fate of Romulus; the rape of the Sabine women; the combat of the Horatii and Curatii; the death of Lucretia; the war of Porsena; the banishment of Coriolanus; and many other stirring events which occurred, or were fabled to have occurred, in early Roman history. These early songs borrowed nothing from the Greek masters. They were originals, and had they been continued, would have given the character of originality to the Roman muse. These historical or heroic adventures were sung in a loose sort of verses, which the ancient Italians called saturnalian; and which, except their lacking the rhyme, strongly resembled the Alexandrines, so much in use among the nations of Europe during the period of the middle ages.

Two facts at least, will strike us in reference to these early heroic ballads. First, they aimed at the narration of

[1] *Schlegel's Lectures*, 119.

no incident which did not belong to their country; and second, they gave expression to no feelings except to those which were purely patriotic. It is true, the love of the marvelous very plainly appears, but the fablers of the Romans indulged in the creation of no wonders that might not redound to the honor of their ancestors or to the glory of Rome.

Another species of poetry very early cultivated among the Romans, was the pastoral. This took its rise in Sicily; the earliest cultivator of it being Stesichorus, a native of Imera. This species of poetry not only took its rise in Sicily, but it was also there brought to a high grade of excellence. Both Theocratus and Moschus were natives of Syracuse, the latter being much celebrated, and the former taken by Virgil as a model in this branch of poetry.

With the exceptions just mentioned, the first five centuries of the existence of Rome found the Romans so exclusively occupied in warlike operations, either of defense or aggression, as to leave neither time nor inclination for the cultivation of the poetic art. It was towards the close of the fifth century from the foundation of Rome, that they effected the conquest of Magna Græcia and Sicily. This opened up to the Romans new sources of mental culture, of which they had hitherto been entirely ignorant. The change was first manifested in the direction of the theatre, and the dramatic poetry of Livius Andronicus, Nevius, and Ennius, although comparatively rude and unadorned, attracted, nevertheless, much attention. Nothwithstanding, however, the great advance of dramatic literature through the labors of Plautus and Terence, and the improvement in the Latin language which was effected through their efforts, still it was apparent that the language itself, as an instrument for developing the higher beauties of poetry, was very far behind the flexible and highly polished Greek.

There was besides little encouragement for Roman talent to embark seriously in poetic pursuits. Aside from the fact that the Roman genius seemed ill adapted to it,

another reason for neglecting it was to be found in the fact that exclusive devotion to it as a study, was regarded by the Romans of that period as a mere mental recreation, which well became a conquered people, but was rather beneath the dignity of conquerors. The time was nevertheless approaching when a change in this respect would be effected in the Roman mind.

It will excite no wonder or surprise, that Roman genius, to impress more favorably the Roman mind, should seek out new avenues through which to develop the poetic spirit. Accordingly, we find the Romans actually inventing a new species of poetry, viz: that of satire. This, it is true, was introduced by way of interlude, in the Greek tragedies, the persons performing it being satyrs, fauns, rural deities, and peasants.

The Romans first introduced it without the decorations of scenes and action. It was written in verses of different measures, by Ennius; but the father of satire was C. Lucilius, who was born in the year of the city, 605. He moulded it into the form we now have it, embodying it in hexameter verse, of which the Greek literature furnished no example. It is divided into two species: the jocose, or that which ridicules vice and folly; and the serious, or that which was severe and acrimonious. The former exposes to view the foibles of mankind; the latter, their detestable crimes. These two species, subsequently, had their respective embodiments, the first in Horace, and the second in Juvenal.

Another avenue in which the Roman muse sought to win for itself the attention and approbation of the Roman mind, was in clothing a philosophic system in the habiliments of poetry. S. Lucretius Carus was born in the year of Rome, 658, and, although he lived only to see his fortieth year, yet he rendered his name immortal by his great poem still extant, entitled *De Rerum Natura*, concerning the nature of things.

As philosophy generally preceded poetry in the development of the Roman mind, we should be little surprised

at this effort to exhibit a system in the garniture of poetry. The wonder, perhaps, is greater, that the poet should have selected for this purpose the system of Epicurus, the one probably the least acceptable to the Romans. Besides, it was a system least of all adapted to kindle the inspiration, or awaken the moral purpose, or sustain the upward flights of the poetic fancy. While it annihilated all belief, and all lofty feeling, it reveled in the most absurd hypotheses; was totally selfish in its influence on life, and the enemy of everything like fancy and poetry. And yet, Lucretius, as he was unquestionably the first to bring the fancies, ornaments and graces of poetry to the service of didactic and philosophical writing, so in inspiration and sublimity, he is regarded by many as the first of Roman poets, and as a painter and worshiper of nature, as the first of all the poets of antiquity whose writings have come down to us.

We come now to the Augustan age; an age in which the Roman world submitted to the sway of a despot; in which political parties and the passions that animated them, were broken down and hushed to silence. All ambitious aspirings after political distinction were crushed or annihilated. The fine arts only remained, to enable men of talents to gain fame and distinction. Among these, poetry was, perhaps, the least ostentatious, and was susceptible of the greatest amount of adulation. It may well be expected that where the poetical talent of a nation unfolds itself, as at Rome, in the middle of an enlightened century, it is enriched by its knowledge and experience.

During the tempestuous period of the civil wars, the voice of poetry had been scarcely heard. It was then, and during the latter stages of the republic, that eloquence, unfettered in its free displays, was most glaringly conspicuous. When that, in its turn, was crushed under the iron heel of despotism, men turned to poetry, and invoked the muse, as a solace in affliction, and a means of acquiring fame. The restoration of peace, and the happy reign of

Octavius, might well be signalized by the appearance of great national poets, who might supply what had hitherto been a defect in the literature of their country, and create a body of classical works, in which the ancient Roman traditions might be handed down to posterity.

Every era of literature has its epoch of poetry, and that epoch is usually characterized by some prevailing spirit. In the Roman, it was the Epicurean philosophy. Although entirely deficient in moral grandeur, and in all the lofty elements of spiritual being, yet to the lover of nature, and of all the agencies in the natural world, it presented a host of gorgeous attractions.

One of the simplest, as well as the most beautiful, of the forms of poetry, is that which celebrates pastoral life. This was admired both by the Greeks and Romans, both being about equally delighted with the same imagery. To the Roman, under the empire, it was particularly refreshing to escape from the turmoil and tyranny of cities; and to revel amid the rural delights with which nature everywhere surrounded them in the country.

This age was distinguished by the Latin classics. Their many beauties were perhaps rather reflected than original. They borrowed much from the Greeks, and it seems as if that remarkable people ever would remain the standard of the art.

Among the foremost of the distinguished poets of this era stands Virgil, who was born in the territory of Mantua, in the year of Rome, 683. In character, he was of a mild disposition, unassuming in conversation, timid rather than bold, and sincere in his friendships. His love for nature and country life shows itself in the first work of his youth, the *Eclogues;* and again in a more perfect form in his *Georgics.*

We have already seen that the old Roman mode of life was agricultural and rural. Long after corruption had rioted in the metropolis, the rural districts continued to present simplicity of manners, and much of natural feeling. It was, therefore, a happy thought that led the great poet

of the Augustan age, to dwell on rural enjoyments, and to make the nation's heart once more beat in view of the simple pleasures of rural and agricultural life. It seemed to realize the poet's mission of bringing man back to nature, and awakening him once again to a sense of its quiet beauty, its delightful scenery, and its many sources of real unalloyed enjoyment.

But Virgil sought also to revive the heroic traditions of early time, and to present these to the more refined taste of the Augustan age. Hence the *Æneid*, which, although he himself despised and even wished to destroy, has nevertheless always kept its place as the peculiar national poem of the Romans. For the original conception of this great epic, he was undoubtedly indebted to Grecian literature, especially to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer, with which it has frequently been compared. Homer, it has been said, is the greater genius, the most preeminent in invention, discovers the most vivacity, with an imagination the most rich and copious, a style the most simple and animated, and a power the greatest of warming the fancy; while Virgil is the more correct writer, more chaste in his imagination, and more uniform and elegant in his style. The argument of the *Æneid* is asserted to be grander and more worthy the song of the muses; its fable better conducted; and displaying more striking superiority in the dramatic parts, and in tender and pathetic scenes. But it was subsequent to Homer, and there is a struggle obvious between borrowed art and native strength, which has led necessarily to a consequent want of harmony in materials, and even in language. Still, the epic poetry of different nations has always many points of coincidence, as the heroic legends of one people are generally easily ingrafted on those of another. The early traditions of nations the most remote from each other, invariably present a thousand circumstances in which very close resemblances may be easily detected. Does this result from the similarity in the situation of all nations in the infant periods of society, or is it derived from their common origin?

Another poet of the Augustan age was Albius Tibulus, a patrician by birth, who died in the same year as Virgil, in the year of Rome 735. He directed his attention almost solely to elegiac poetry, and his verses are characterized by their union of the sweetness, elegance, harmony, tenderness, and all the other ornaments of that species of poetry. Following nature as his guide in painting sentiments and feelings, he is always happy and clear in expression, always tender and passionate, always elegant and refined.

Another great luminary of the Augustan age was Q. Horatius Flaccus, Horace, born in the year 688 of Rome, who was at first a soldier, but threw away his shield at the battle of Pharsalia. He was the first of Roman poets who dared to launch his muse in lyrics. Although this, of all other species of poetry, loses the most by imitation, its great excellence essentially consisting in its being the free emanation of individual feelings; yet, in spite of this, Horace, although an imitator of Pindar, has succeeded in throwing an enthusiasm, emphasis, and force into his odes, which prove him inspired with that fire which alone can form a great poet. His peculiar gift is an impassioned tenderness, which pervades his odes. His greatness is more conspicuous when he speaks as a Roman; "when he dwells upon the sublime magnanimity of antiquity, on the solitary grandeur of the exiled Regulus, or on those other heroes who 'were prodigal of their great souls,' in the service of their country."

Horace possessed great diversity of poetic talent. He excelled in satire, which received at Rome the rank and characteristics of a distinct species of composition. This was a place and an age which, in a peculiar manner, called for the lash of satire. Rome had become the seat of much of the wealth, and all the government of the civilized world. It was the central point of attraction for all that class of adventurers who are constantly floating about on the surface of society, ever ready to drift into what may seem to promise the most varied and complete success. The corruption of manners was approaching its extremest verge,

and hence the themes for satire became innumerable. They were derived from the social habits and customs, amusements, spectacles, and assemblies of the Romans. Out of such materials, satire, in the hands of Horace, was a substitute for a certain species of comedy which the Roman people do not seem to have possessed.

At a later period, the *Satires of Juvenal* exhibit a terrible vehemence in the expression of withering scorn and indignation excited by the contemplation of the execrable vices of the times; but although abounding in impetuous and passionate declamation, yet they lack the grace and delicacy of Horace and some of the earlier satiric writers.

Another poet of the Augustan age of some celebrity was P. Ovidius Naso, Ovid, who was born at Sulmona in the year 710 of Rome, and died an exile in the sixtieth year of his age. The best works of Ovid are his *Metamorphoses*, his *Heroides*, and his *Books of the Fasti*. Beautiful and impassioned are the various descriptions and narrations frequently met with in his *Metamorphoses*. Many of his *Heroides* also possess much tenderness and grace. Even in the last years of the long reign of Augustus we perceive symptoms of a decline in taste, and these are manifested in the works of Ovid, who is overrun with an unhealthy superfluity of fancy, and a sentimental effeminacy of expression.

The classical period of the Roman literature, reckoning from the consulate of Cicero to the death of Trajan, included about one hundred and eighty years. But after the death of Augustus very few poets arose of much eminence or distinction. Among those deserving to be mentioned are Germanicus, Lucian, whose *Pharsalia* alone has reached us; Petronius, who excelled in satires; and Martial, who was a popular epigrammatic writer.

Third. Eloquence. The eloquence practiced in a republic ought to reflect the true character of the people. It is the one great political instrument by which they are influenced, moved, controlled. This instrument, to be effectual, must be adapted to its purposes. This adapta-

tion consists in its embracing elements, essentially the same as those to be found in the great mass of the people. Hence we are to regard it as a mirror, which faithfully reflects the main features that constitute the moral life of the people.

Rome became early a republic, and hence afforded to her great men, motives for the cultivation of eloquence. This is a plant that can grow only in a free state. It is there alone that motives can be furnished sufficiently strong to render its possession and exercise a very desirable object.

We have no means of estimating the degree of eloquence attained by the ancient Etruscans. All the records of it have perished. No monument proclaims its trophies; but the silence of the sepulchre alone remains.

It is not so with southern Italy. Sicily was early the cradle of a certain species of eloquence. Lysias of Syracuse had the reputation of being an eloquent and elegant writer. A part only of his orations have come down to us. Gorgias of Leontium acquired a still higher reputation. He long held a school of rhetoric at Athens, and surpassed all the rhetoricians of his time, in the subtlety of his reasonings, the depth of his study, and the greatness of his eloquence. He was the most celebrated of the sophists. It is not a little remarkable that these two orators should have been among the first to teach the Greeks the art of eloquence, and that they should have set those agencies in motion which ceased not until they had produced a Pericles and a Demosthenes.

The early Romans, however, studied more the art of conquering in the field than in the forum. They understood much better the art of marshaling legions than arguments. In the early periods of the republic, little seems to have been attempted in the way of practicing eloquence, as a means of accomplishing judicial or political ends. But as the decisions of the state on all the most important questions depended in great part on the talents and eloquence of the orators, it must follow as a necessary

consequence, that the aspiring minds of public men must have been led to the cultivation of that art.

Cicero extols highly the eloquence of Cato the censor, and asserts that his orations abound in magnificent expressions, displaying all the excellences proper to an orator. But, although he undoubtedly displayed much native strength, yet Cicero himself acknowledges his eloquence to have been "a rude and harsh strain of speech."

The history of Roman eloquence, with our knowledge of Roman orators, is derived principally from Cicero. In his work, *De Claris Oratoribus*, he has given a very full enumeration of all those who arrived at much eminence in the practice of that art. After Cato he mentions Sergius Galba, and the two friends, Scipio and Lelius. He extols M. Emilius Lepidus, as adding new features of grace and ornament to Latin eloquence, rendering it more harmonious by the imitation of Grecian models. It was not in fact, until after the Greek rhetoricians had been heard at Rome, had taught there, and their books began to be read, that eloquence as an art began to be practiced. From that time it was gradually advancing towards perfection, being materially assisted in its progress by the great advantages it was found to secure those public men who sought to obtain the highest offices of the republic, The honor in which they were held, the power they enjoyed in the state, the riches and high offices they were enabled by means of it to obtain, induced the first minds to devote themselves with great ardor to the study of it.

Among those who were celebrated for the displays of oratorical power during the waning fortunes of the republic, were the two tribunes, Tiberius and Caius Gracchus. Their eloquence was manly and vigorous, but void of ornament. Caius was a person of the highest abilities, powerful in expression, brilliant in ideas, and impressive in delivery. M. Antonius and L. Crassus, the former consul in the year of Rome 654, and the latter in 658, are spoken of highly as orators by Cicero, but none of their productions have come down to us.

But the golden age of Roman eloquence was that of Cicero. We perceive here evidence of the fact so generally proclaimed by history, that great men, either in social, civil, scientific, political, or military departments, seldom or never appear upon the theatre of action alone. It is emulation; the strife of mind that brings out all its latent forces; stimulates to constantly renewed and persevering efforts, and results in the ultimate production of the highest degree of excellence.

Another inference equally clear is, that it is the greatness of the occasion, the strength of the emergency, that often calls into existence the men in whom are combined the elements that constitute greatness. The downfall of the Roman republic was not to occur without a struggle. Its waning spirit invoked the aid of the tongue of eloquence, as well as the arm of strength. Its invocation was heard by the Gracchi, and the tongue of the eloquent was theirs, and the resolve of high minded men was theirs; but the torrent of corruption was too strong to stem, and they sank beneath it. It was heard by Cicero, whose eloquence has astonished and delighted his own, and all subsequent ages. But it was all in vain. The republic had run its course, had fulfilled its mission.

The three most distinguished orators of this age were Hortensius, Cæsar and Cicero.

Hortensius was eight years older than Cicero, and even in the twentieth year of his age gave proof in the forum of the possession of rare talents as an orator. In his first displays he dazzled the eyes of all; and, as Cicero remarks, like a statue of Phidias, scarcely yet even fully seen, excited admiration and applause. It was, no doubt, the admiration acquired by Hortensius, at so early an age, that furnished to Cicero the strongest incentives to pursue the same career. His efforts were confined mainly to the forum, and none of his productions have come down to us.

The forensic efforts of Cæsar characterize his genius as of the first order. Had he made eloquence his one great study, and the forum the theatre of his performances,

there is little doubt that he would have rivaled, if not outshone, Cicero himself. He is described to have had such force, such talent, and such vivacity in argument, as to show that the same abilities evidently directed him in the rostrum as on the field of battle.

Cicero was undoubtedly the culminating point of Roman eloquence, as Demosthenes was that of Grecian. These two together stand out as the great luminaries of the ancient world, and are clearly visible in the light which they themselves have created.

Cicero enjoys a reputation as a philosopher, as a politician, and even as a poet, and an elegant writer; but he is here to be considered only as an orator. He was led early to entertain the conviction, that a talent for speaking could only be acquired by a vast extent of erudition. He accordingly devoted himself to the most arduous and persevering study, and on his first appearance at the bar, rose immediately to distinction.

In his early efforts he displays a rich and lively imagination, and a style at once polished, florid, abundant and luxuriant. These qualities, however, are exceedingly apt to characterize the forensic efforts of the young, but gifted speaker. Nor should they be regarded as undesirable. Subsequent retrenchment becomes easily practiced.

After visiting Athens and Asia Minor, where he applied himself to the study of the rhetorical art, he returned much changed in his style. He had learned to retrench the superfluity and redundance that proceeded from the warmth and vivacity of his years, and, by condensing, to give more solidity and weight to his orations. This is meant only as comparative, as his style always lacked that sententious brevity which characterizes that of some effective orators.

He knew extremely well the heart of man, and could touch its springs of action with a master's hand. He seems to have excelled in that part of a public speech which is termed the peroration. He himself attributed his success in this, not to his having more wit than others, but to the fact that he was more moved and affected himself.

Previous to his appearance, or rather prior to Hortensius, the Roman orators had not generally studied the graces of style, nor had they sought for ornament. Their orations had in them solidity and strength, but they had neither symmetry nor beauty. They had nothing to delight the ear, or to gratify a refined taste.

But the models of Cicero were Greek rather than Roman. He surprised Rome with a new style of oratory. He withheld not from eloquence the graces to which it may properly lay claim. He was highly artistic in his oratorical performances. Beginning with a regular exordium, he was clear in the arrangement of his arguments, never seeking to move until he had first endeavored to convince.

Far beyond all other Roman orators he studied and best knew the power of words, and that kind of disposition of them which tells with the most effect. In this respect he followed the Greek models, in which the sweetness and harmony of disposition carried this kind of beauty to the highest degree of perfection. Of these he had a great exuberance, being rather diffuse in his manner, rolling them along with great beauty and pomp. He is very exact in the structure of his sentences, and skillful in the adaptation of his style and matter to the nature of his subject. When a great public object or occasion roused his mind, demanding force and indignation, he is found departing from a loose and declamatory manner, and becomes more like Demosthenes, cogent and vehement. His orations against Anthony, Verres, and Cataline are instances. When resorting to invective he waits not for ornament, but pours out the energies of his pent up soul with directness and power.

As compared with Demosthenes, except in the instances just mentioned, he is more diffuse, ornamental, artistic. He may be sometimes said to sacrifice strength to ornament; Demosthenes, never. There is also about his orations, of which no less than fifty-nine have come down to us, a greater apparent amount of labor, and display of

skill. This is proclaimed in his arrangement of words; in his structure of sentences; in his rounding of periods; in his disposition of ornaments; and in the higher beauties of adapting his style and matter to the particular subject to which they have relation. Of all the instances on record in which eloquence has been studied and practiced as an art, there is probably no example equaling that of Cicero.

Roman eloquence expired with Cicero. It could not flourish under the despotism of the Cæsars. "Taste became corrupted and genius discouraged. Luxury, effeminacy and flattery overwhelmed all. The forum, where so many great affairs had been transacted, was now become a desert. Private causes were still pleaded; but the public was no longer interested; nor any general attention drawn to what passed there."

Eloquence became corrupted in the schools of the declaimers. The subjects of declamation were imaginary and fantastic, having no reference to real life or business. They were stuffed up with all manner of false and affected ornaments. Even in the writings of Seneca this corrupt manner has a commencement. In Pliny the younger, although a man of genius and talent, it has made a manifest progress. His panegyric on Trajan may be considered as the last effort of Roman oratory.

The MIXED ARTS, as partaking both of the objective and the subjective, are the dramatic and military arts.

First. The art dramatic. Although the dramatic art in Greece, the place of its birth and advancement to a considerable degree of perfection, required much attention, yet in Rome, both on its own account, as well as by reason of the little influence it exerted in moulding the national character, it becomes comparatively small matter for the student of civilization to investigate.

The Roman theatre, in its construction, very much resembled that of the Greek. It was of an oblong, semicircular form, like the half of an amphitheatre. Like the latter, the benches or seats rose one above another. Those

next the stage were called orchestra. Neither this, nor the rows of seats formed anything more than a semicircle, the diameter of which was the front line of the stage. The orchestra, unlike the Greek, contained no thymele, and was not destined for a chorus, but in it were seats for senators, embassadors, and other distinguished persons. Behind the orchestra rose seats, which, by a law of L. Roscius Otho, passed in the year B. C. 68, were assigned to the equites. The same law also assigned to spendthrifts a separate place specially set apart for them. By the same decree, the soldiers, and also the women, were separated from the people, occupying different cunei, or wedge-shaped compartments in the theatre.

Of the different parts of the Roman theatre, the pulpitum was the place were the actors recited their parts; the proscenium, the place before the scene, where they appeared; the orchestra, about five feet below the pulpitum; that where they danced; and the postscenium, or place behind the scene, was the place where the actors dressed and undressed. The scena, or wall which closed the stage from behind, was a place of great magnificence, adorned with columns, statues, and pictures of various kinds, according to the nature of the plays exhibited. This was so constructed as to be capable of being suddenly changed, by means of certain machines. The scenery was concealed by a curtain, which, contrary to the modern custom, was dropped down, instead of being drawn up, when the play began, and raised when the play was over, and sometimes, also, between the acts.

The place selected for their erection was similar to that of the early Italian Greeks, viz: a position upon the sides of hills. The materials were at first wood, and these continued to be employed for that purpose, down to the last period of the republic. The first regular stone theatre was built by Cn. Pompey, in B. C. 55. The wooden ones, however, those more especially that were of later construction, were adorned in the most costly style of magnificence. Curio, a contemporary of Cæsar, constructed

two large theatres of wood, adjoining one another, and looking opposite ways, and so contrived by suspension upon hinges, that stage plays could be performed in each in the former part of the day, without disturbing each other, and then by suddenly wheeling each around, they were made to stand over against each other, thus forming an amphitheatre, in which, in the afternoon, he exhibited shows of gladiators.

The dramatic literature of the Romans was all derivative, and not of early introduction. From the ancient Etruscans they borrowed the first idea of a play: from the Oscians their low comedy, or effusion of sportive humor; and from the Greeks, the higher class of dramatic productions.

The early Romans had no theatrical entertainments. Their sports consisted in gymnastic exercises, and games of the circus. In the year of the city 391 occurred at Rome a devastating pestilence, against which all remedies proved unavailing. The Romans, as a *dernier ressort* to appease the anger of the gods, had recourse to the performances of the theatre. They obtained from Etruria the histriones, or stage players, who at first did nothing but dance to a flute, displaying mere bodily activity, without even attempting pantomimic movements.

The oldest spoken plays were derived from the Oscians or Oscans, one of the indigenous Italian tribes. They were termed fabulæ Atellanæ, from Atella, a town of the Oscians, whence they were derived. They were at first merely improvisatory farces, without any dramatic connection, their chief design being the production of mirth and laughter. They were presented between the acts by way of interlude, or after the play was completed. This became so popular that the Roman youths of noble families were accustomed to engage in it, which had the effect to redeem this part of the performance from the reproach, which, at Rome, generally rested upon those who were engaged in the drama as performers.

The Romans, like the Greeks, had also their mimi, which, with them, were in verse, were represented, and

often delivered extempore, while the latter were dialogues in prose, and not destined for the stage. These were not of Greek derivation, as the manners portrayed in them had a local truth. The Italians, from the earliest period, have displayed a native talent for a rude species of farce or buffoonery, as developed in extemporary speeches and songs, with appropriate accompanying gestures. Both these and the fabulæ Atellanæ employed different dialects to produce a ludicrous effect. These probably furnished the germ from which was derived the improvisatory farce with standing masks, the laughter-loving displays of Harlequin and Pulcinello.

The dramatic art in Rome was exhibited under three forms, viz: the comedy, tragedy and pantomime.

The first mentioned, for the most part, appeared in Grecian dress, and represented Grecian manners. The only writers of comedy whose works are extant are Plautus and Terence, the former an Umbrian, and the latter a Carthaginian, who flourished in the sixth century of Rome. Both of these were formed upon the Greek writers. All the Roman writers of comedy copied mostly after the Greek of Menander. The attempt to bend the Greek forms and spirit so as to adapt them to Roman manners and habits was an undertaking of extreme difficulty. While the Greek, especially the Athenian, was lively and comic, the Roman was serious and grave, although in private society he displayed a great turn for wit and joviality. An original comedy among the Romans, that would reflect the true Roman character, would be indeed a desideratum, but we do not seem to possess it.

Comedies, at Rome, were chiefly distinguished by the character and dress of the actors. The comedia togata was that in which the characters and dress were Roman, and derived its name from the Roman toga. So palliata was that in which the characters were Grecian, and so called from pallium the robe of the Greeks. The prætextatæ were when magistrates and persons of dignity were introduced; and the trabeatæ when officers and generals were

the actors. The performers in comedy wore a low heeled shoe called soccus. It has been asserted that the Latin literature was lamest in comedy. Indeed it may probably be safely asserted, that with the exception of the low species of buffoon writing embraced in the fabulæ Atellanæ, the Romans never possessed anything which deserved to be called a dramatic literature of their own. Their comedy was little less than a representation of Athenian manners, which, to Roman spectators, could have conveyed but little life or interest.

In regard to tragic representations, the Roman theatre presents some different arrangements from the Grecian. The chorus had no place in the orchestra, but remained on the stage itself. In the Roman theatre the singing was separated from the mimetic dancing, so that the latter only remained to the actor. This applied more particularly to the monodies, or lyrical pieces, which, instead of being sung by the chorus, were sung by a boy, who stood beside the flute-player, and accompanied him with his voice.

The tragic literature of the Romans has been divided into two epochs, the first embracing the period of time intervening between Livius Andronicus and the downfall of the republic, and the last, the Augustan age.

Livius Andronicus flourished in the year of Rome 512, about one hundred and sixty years after the death of Sophocles and Euripides. Like all the others, he performed his own plays. After him succeeded Ennius Nævius, Pacuvius and Attius. These were little more than translators, or at least close imitators of Grecian works. There seems, however, to have been greater success in tragedy than in comedy, owing probably to the more grave and serious character of the Romans being best adapted to the former.

In the second epoch, that constituting the Augustan age, there was a strong effort at originality. Many attempted to shine in tragedy. Among them was the impassioned Asinius Pollio, and even Ovid attempted tragedy. The only tragedies, however, that have come down to us, are

those that pass under the name of Seneca; but whether this was a rhetorician of that name, or the philosopher, his son, or some one of the same name different from both, is still a matter of uncertainty. These tragedies, among some redeeming qualities, such as tragic situations, strokes of ingenuous dialogue, elevated and sublime thoughts, profound sentences, and beautiful verses, present also many faults; such as a declamatory style, a pedantic air, a superfluity of words and expressions, a vain ostentation of wit, besides a sad want of nature, probability, uniformity of character, tenderness of feeling, contrast of passion, and management of accident. All this goes effectually to show that it was no part of the mission of the Roman to develop the truly dramatic in art, whether it display itself in the tragic or comic character. The great difficulty arose from the attempt to transplant the Greek tragedy into Roman soil, and to make it flourish there. There, no doubt, existed materials for an original Roman tragedy, but to be such, it should have been conceived in the old Roman character of religion and patriotism. "Everything like creative poetry can only be derived from the inward life of a people, and from religion, the root of that life. The spirit of the Roman religion was originally, and before the substance of it was sacrificed to foreign ornament, quite different from that of the Grecian. The latter was plastically flexible, the former sacerdotally immutable. The Roman creed, and the customs founded on it, were more serious, moral, pious, displayed more insight into nature, and had something more of magic and mysticism, than that part at least, of the Greek religion, which was not included in the mysteries. As the Greek tragedy represented the struggle of man in a state of freedom with destiny, a true Roman tragedy ought to have exhibited the subjection of human impulse to the holy and binding force of religion, and the visible presence of that religion in all earthly things."[1]

[1] *Schlegel's Dramatic Literature*, I, 290.

Thus perceiving what the Roman tragedy ought to have been, we can better understand the vast difference between that and the real elements of all their tragic performances, as actually enacted upon the stage. The Roman character was far from being a fitting soil to receive and properly nourish the Greek tragedy. It was deficient in that milder humanity, of which we everywhere observe traces in Grecian history, poetry, and art. It was composed of that sterner stuff, that rendered them the great tragedians in the performance of the world's history. Their enactments were on the stage in the world's great theatre. It was there that they led armies to conquest; that they made kings their captives; that they became universal destroyers, sparing neither age, sex, nor condition; that they trampled upon all national right; and, amid trembling thrones, and decaying dynasties, established their own power with the absolutism of a despot. "It was not given to them," says Schlegel, "to excite emotion by the mitigated accents of mental suffering, and to touch with a delicate hand, every note of the scale of feeling. They naturally sought also in tragedy, by overleaping all intervening gradations, to reach at once the extreme, both in the stoicism of heroism, and in the monstrous fury of criminal desires. Nothing of their ancient greatness had remained to them, but the contempt of pain and death, when, after an extravagant enjoyment of life, they were at last called upon to submit to these evils. They then impressed this seal of their former grandeur on their tragic heroes, with a self-satisfied and ostentatious profusion."[1]

There were, aside from these causes already mentioned, two others that had their effect in preventing the Romans from excelling in tragedy.

The first of these grew out of the corruption of the Roman stage. The tendency of everything was to sensualism. The pleasure of the senses absorbed every other

[1] *Schlegel's Dramatic Literature*, I, 292.

consideration. We are told that "delightful odors, the richest decorations, ingenious machines, and whatever could satisfy the senses, and introduce an agreeable surprise to an idle people, were all employed with the most studious care and greatest luxury, on the Roman stage. The dances, music, dresses, scenery, and machinery of the stage, with its richness of display, were the objects of attraction to the Roman audience; while the beauties of the drama, or the fineness of its art, were held but as secondary objects."[1]

The other cause was derived from the fact, that the Romans accustomed themselves to behold too much real tragedy, to allow themselves to get much interested in that which was merely represented. In the arena of the circus could be witnessed great effusion of real blood. Not only wild beasts there exhibited their terribly destructive propensities in tearing and killing each other, but gladiators also, men trained to kill, were daily compelled to murder each other in cold blood, for the gratification of a Roman audience. Could any tenderness of inward feeling, or any sympathy for inward suffering, be looked for in the breasts of human beings who could derive pleasure from sights and scenes like these? Clearly not. The more refined gradations of tragic pathos could produce no effect whatever upon nerves so steeled. Even in the age of Augustus, the Romans often caused the stage representations to be interrupted, to enjoy the combats of bears and wrestlers. Neither can we suppose that the Romans, after witnessing the real shedding of blood in the arena, could ever be satisfied with the mere tragic representations upon the stage.

The third species of performance mentioned, was termed pantomime. This included all representations by dumb show. There was no speaking upon the stage. There was merely acting by gestures, movements and attitudes. This art was not carried to any degree of perfection until

[1] *Barbacovi's Literary History of Italy*, 103–105.

the time of Augustus. In performing them, all the actors termed pantomimes, wore masks, so that the features of the countenance were concealed. All the other parts of the body, and especially the arms and hands, were called into action. Although it was mere dumb show, yet the pantomimes succeeded admirably in expressing actions, feelings and passions. They, however, only represented mythological characters, which were known to every spectator. There were also certain conventional gestures and movements, which everybody understood. In the time of Augustus, there was never more than one dancer at a time on the stage, and he represented all the characters of the story, both male and female in succession. Towards the end of the second century, the several parts of a story began to be acted by several pantomimes dancing together. During the latter period of the empire, women acted as pantomimes in public, and in some cases they even appeared as such in a state of nudity. Thus these representations became, in an extreme degree, vicious and licentious.

Second. The second of the mixed arts is the art military. This art, among the Romans, is worthy of special consideration. It was, from the very commencement, an essential element in their national existence. Rome planted herself in the midst of communities already having made considerable advances in civilization. Her enemies were not wild beasts or savages, but men attached by labor and prescription to the soil. The Greeks, in their original settlement, encountered no opposition from men, and they had, therefore, only to turn the soil and climate to the best account; but the Romans found themselves surrounded by men who were prepared to dispute with them on the principle of prior labor and possession. Hence their earliest want, their first necessity, was a thorough knowledge of the science and methods of practice of the military art.

It has been said that every Roman was as one of the three hundred Spartans under Leonidas, and that every

inch of ground on which he had trodden was his Thermopylæ, which it was destruction for an enemy to pass, even in thought. We have generally seen conquests the pursuits of kings, not of magistrates, and the spirit of a republic has not generally been deemed military. To this, however, the Roman commonwealth was an exception; but it was such upon the principle, that whatever is most strongly felt by the people, is most ardently pursued where they are the sovereign. With the Romans, wars were undertaken upon popular principles, and hence the spirit of the republic was essentially martial. It became such in a great measure from necessity. The young republic was in the midst of hostile states. Many, having been conquered, had revolted; some had shaken off their allegiance. If she had not put herself in an attitude of defense, she might have been subverted. The best defense she could undertake was to become an active aggressor. During three and a half centuries, with but one single exception, her sons had no repose but in arms; no home but the camp and battle-field; no pillow but their shields. And after this long period they had, with the exception of Italy, a world to conquer. There is, therefore, sound reason in regarding the Romans as, at least, among the great teachers of the military art. What we have to say upon this subject, may be embraced under the following heads:

I. The Roman method of declaring war and making peace.

II. The method of levying soldiers, infantry and cavalry.

III. The military oath taken by the soldiers.

IV. The evocati.

V. The composition of the Roman armies; different kinds of soldiers.

VI. The officers of the Roman armies.

VII. The pay of the Roman soldiers.

VIII. The duties, works, and exercises of the Roman soldiers.

IX. The military habits, armor, arms and weapons of the Roman soldiers.

X. The march and encampment of a Roman army.

XI. The ensigns or standards and colors, music, harangues, and word in engagements.

XII. The order of battle.

XIII. Military punishments.

XIV. Military rewards.

XV. The methods of attacking towns and fortified places, and the instruments of such attack and defense.

XVI. The Roman method of treating the people they had conquered.

XVII. Ships and naval warfare of the Romans.

I. The Roman method of declaring war and making peace.

The ceremonies to be observed in declaring war were prescribed by Ancus Martius. One of the feciales, or order of priests, habited in the vest belonging to his order, with other ensigns and habiliments, having reached the frontiers of the enemy's country, made there public proclamation of the grievances of the Roman people, and the satisfaction they demanded, thus imprecating the gods: "Great God, if I come hither to demand satisfaction in the name of the Roman people, contrary to equity and justice, never suffer me to behold my native country again." Substantially the same thing was repeated to the first person he met, and at the entrance of the principal city, and in the public market place. At the end of thirty days and no satisfaction being made, the same official again returned, and publicly called the gods to witness that the people (naming them) was unjust, and refused to make satisfaction. He then returned and reported to the senate. The affair then came up for deliberation and ultimate decision, and, if the majority were in favor of war, the same officer returned to the frontier, and there in the presence of at least three persons, pronounced a certain form of declaration of war, after which he threw a spear upon the lands of the enemy, which implied that the war was fully de-

clared. Thus it will be seen that all the proceedings were open, and the other party had ample notice before hostilities were actually commenced. The person of the fecialis was always held to be inviolable, so that he ran no risk of personal danger. These formalities were afterwards modified, when wars came to be waged against foreign nations whose territories lay remote from that of Rome. The ceremony was then performed in a certain field near the city, which was called *ager hostilis*.

In regard to the ceremonies attending the making of peace, the ancient custom, as related by Polybius, was to swear by a stone and then by Mars. The herald, swearing in behalf of the republic, taking up a stone pronounces these words. "If I keep my faith, may the gods vouchsafe their assistance, and give me success; if, on the contrary, I violate it, then may the other party be entirely safe, and preserved in their country, in their laws, in their possessions, and, in a word, in all their rights and liberties; and may I perish and fall alone, as now this stone does;" then letting the stone fall out of his hands.

II. The method of levying soldiers, infantry and cavalry. The Roman armies were composed of Roman citizens. Once they armed slaves, and sometimes, although very seldom, those who were confined in prisons, either for debt or crimes. Even the poor citizens were not generally enlisted. They preferred those for soldiers whose fortunes might be answerable to the republic for their zeal in its defense. Those from whom the soldiers were selected, either lived on and cultivated, with their own hands, their small farms in the country; or, residing in Rome, they had each their portion of land which they cultivated in the same manner. Thus were secured the services, not only of those who had a deep interest in the success of the Roman arms, but who were accustomed to those exposures, fatigues and hardships, which would best fit them for a soldier's life. Reference is here had to the early periods of Roman history, and not to the practices long subsequently

adopted of trusting to allies and even to foreign mercenaries. The method of enlisting soldiers, and everything else included in the military art, continued essentially the same until the time of Marius, in the last days of the republic; and he introduced many changes.

The age at which citizens could be compelled to enlist was seventeen, and the liability continued to that of forty-six. At first, no one could enjoy an office in the city who had not served ten campaigns. Every foot soldier was obliged to serve twenty campaigns, and every horseman ten.

In the first ages of the republic, the regular practice was to raise four legions, two to each consul; two legions then composing a consular army. But very frequently a far greater number were raised; as ten, eighteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-three; under Tiberius, twenty-five; under Adrian thirty.

Before proceeding to levy, the consuls gave the people notice that on a certain day named, all Roman citizens, who were of military age, should assemble in the Capitol. On the day appointed, the people assembled, and the consuls presided, seated in their curule chairs. The military tribunes then drew the several tribes by lot, and as the lots were drawn, the tribes severally came up.

The choice was then made of these citizens, taking them each in his rank, four by four, as nearly as possible of equal stature, age, and strength. This they continued to do until the four legions were complete. Before the making of the selection, the tribes were made to divide into their proper centuries, and out of each century were soldiers cited by name, respect being had to their estate and class. To determine this, tables were ready at hand, in which were described the name, age, and wealth of every person.

In the selection, they observed the superstitious custom of first making choice of those soldiers who had fortunate names, as Salvius, Valerius, and the like.

There were several legal excuses which would exonerate from service. Such as:

1. That the individual was under seventeen, or over forty-six.

2. That he enjoyed some civil or sacred office which he could not conveniently relinquish.

3. That he had already made twenty campaigns.

4. That on account of extraordinary merit he had been by public authority released from the trouble of serving for such a time.

5. That he is maimed in some part, and so ought not to be admitted into the legions. And for this purpose, the practice was occasionally resorted to, of cutting off the thumbs, in order to keep them out of the army.

If no legal excuse was presented, the individual selected was obliged to serve. In case of refusal, he was punished either with imprisonment, fine, or stripes, according to the lenity or severity of the consul.

The cavalry were chosen from the body of the equites, and of these there were always a sufficient number in the city. Some of these, on extraordinary occasions, served on their own horses, but not usually. All the cavalry in the Roman armies continued to be taken from the equites until the time of Marius. He introduced several changes into the military system. These regarded the composition both of the cavalry and infantry. The former, subsequent to his time, was composed, not merely of Roman equites, but also of horsemen raised from Italy and the provinces. The infantry he made to consist chiefly of the poorer citizens, or of mere mercenary soldiers. These changes in the composition of the Roman armies were alone sufficient to lead to the ruin of the republic.

III. The military oath taken by the soldiers.

Upon the completion of the levy, the next thing was the administration of the oath. For this purpose, the tribunes of every legion chose out one whom they thought the fittest person, and, in a very solemn manner administered the oath to him. The substance of this was, that he should obey the commanders in all things to the utmost

of his power; that he should be ready to attend whenever they ordered his appearance; and that he never would leave the army unless with their consent. After he had ended, the whole legion, passing one by one, swore to the same effect, each, as he passed along, saying *idem in me.*

The taking of this oath was accounted no light or trivial matter. It was so essential to the military state, that the word sacramenta was sometimes used for milites or militiæ, and no one could justly fight with the enemy, who had not taken the oath.

We have spoken only of the levy of Roman soldiers, but it must not be inferred that none but those born in Rome followed the Roman banners. After Latium and the other states of Italy were either subdued or admitted into alliance, they always furnished infantry in equal number with the Romans, and sometimes more than double the cavalry. The consuls generally sent them notice what number of troops they required, appointing, at the same time, the day and place of assembling. The forces were then raised much in the same manner with those of the Romans. When at a subsequent period the Italians were admitted to the freedom of the city, their forces were incorporated with those of the republic.

The foreign troops were called auxiliaries, and usually received pay and clothing from the republic. The first mercenary soldiers in the Roman army were the Celteberians of Spain, in the year of the city 537. Under the emperors, the Roman armies were almost entirely composed of foreigners.

IV. The evocati. These were old and experienced soldiers, and generally such as had served out their legal time, or had received particular marks of favor as a reward for their valor. These were taken as well out of allies as citizens, out of horse as foot. They were not taken by force, but at the request or entreaty of the consuls or other officers. They were invited into the service, and generally in great numbers whenever a war was undertaken. They

were reckoned almost equal with the centurions. While in actual service, they were excused from all military drudgery, such as standing on the watch, laboring in the works, and other servile employments, having usually confided to them the highly important and responsible duty of guarding the chief standard.

V. The composition of Roman armies, different kinds of soldiers.

The first division was into infantry and cavalry, both being required to compose the legion. There were regularly three different sorts of soldiers that made up the legion, viz, the hastati, principes and triarii.

The hastati were so called because they first fought with long spears, which were afterwards laid aside. They consisted of young men in the flower of life, and formed the first line in battle.

The principes were men of middle age in the vigor of life, and occupied the second line. Anciently they occupied the first, whence their name.

The triarii were veterans, or hardy old soldiers, of long experience and approved valor. Their name was derived from their position, being marshaled in the third place, and constituting the main strength and hopes of the army.

These, together with a body of three hundred cavalry, composed the Roman legion.

The first and largest division of the legion was into cohorts. The number of these was ten.

These again were divided into manipuli or companies, whose number was thirty.

Each manipulus was divided into two centuries.

There were, therefore, thirty manipuli and sixty centuries in a legion, and if there had always been one hundred men in each century, as its name imports, the legion, so far as the infantry was concerned, would have been composed of six thousand soldiers. But this does not seem to have been the fact, at all times, although after the reception of the Sabines, it was fixed at that number. But

afterwards, and during the first period of the republic, it was four thousand. In the war with Hannibal it was five thousand. Subsequently, and in the age of Polybius, it was four thousand two hundred.

The cavalry required to complete every legion was three hundred. This was divided into ten turmæ, or troops, thirty to a troop, every turma making three decuriæ, or bodies of ten men.

There was also, during some periods of the Roman history, a fourth kind of troops, which from their swiftness and agility were called velites. These were light armed soldiers, formed no part of the legion, having no certain post assigned them. They fought in scattered parties where occasion required, and usually before the lines. They were first instituted in the time of the second Punic war.

The soldiers composing the legions were all Roman citizens. The auxiliaries, or foreign troops, furnished by the allies, were thrown into large bodies termed alæ or cornua, and these again into companies. The term alæ was derived from their position in the army, being placed at the wings, the Roman legions occupying the centre. These foreign forces were equal to the Roman in foot, and double in horse; but they were disposed with great policy and caution, about a third part of the horse and a fifth of the foot being separated from the rest, under the name of extraordinarii, and so arranged as to prevent their combining together.

VI. The officers of the Roman armies. Of these there were two classes: the one presiding over some particular part of the army, the other using an equal authority over the whole force. Amongst those first mentioned were:

1. The centurions. We have already seen that each manipulus or company was divided into two centuries. Over each one of these was placed a centurion or captain, making sixty to the legion. Thirty of these were first made, and always took the precedency of their fellows, with the

right to command the right hand century, as the others had the left. The principilus who commanded the right hand order of the first manupilus of the triarians, or pilani, was the principal centurion. He presided over all the other centurions, and generally gave the word of command in exercises and engagements, by order of the tribunes. He had also the care of the eagle, or chief standard of the legion. The duties of the centurion were chiefly confined to the regulation of his own century, and the care of the watch. He had the power of granting remission of service to the private soldiers for a sum of money. This became the source of much corruption and exaction.

These officers were usually elected by the military tribunes, subject to the confirmation of the consul. They wore the short tunic, and were also known by letters on the crest of the helmet. Their badge of office was the vitis or rod which they bore in their hand, and with which they inflicted punishment upon their men.

2. The military tribunes, whose name and origin are referred to an institution of Romulus, when he chose three officers in chief of that nature, out of the three tribes into which he divided the city. These were originally appointed by the generals themselves. The number was afterwards increased to six in every legion, and in the year B. C. 363, their appointment was assumed by the people assembled in the comitia centuriata. The appointing power seems to have been subsequently fluctuating between the people and the consuls, until they finally made a division of it between them, three receiving their appointment from the consuls, and the same number being elected by the people. They were often taken out of the equestrian and senatorian orders.

These officers wore a gold ring, in the same manner as the equites. Their command lasted but six months. Their duties consisted principally in preserving order among the soldiers in the camp; in superintending their military exercises; inspecting outposts and sentinels; procuring provisions; deciding all controversies in the army;

giving the word to the watch; superintending the health of the soldiers, and such like duties.

Besides these, every turma, or troop of horse, had three decurions, or captains of ten; but the one first elected commanded the troop, the others being his lieutenants.

Among the second class of officers, embracing those who exercised an equal authority over the whole force, were

1. The legati, or lieutenant-generals, who acted under and in aid of the consuls. The original design in their creation seems to have been not so much to command as to advise. They were nominated by the consul or dictator under whom they were to serve, but the sanction of the senate was essential to their regular appointment. Their number was never fixed, but was governed by the exigences of the occasions requiring their service. The smallest number was three, but Pompey when in Asia had fifteen. There are supposed to have been one to every legion.

The persons appointed to this office were usually men of great military talents, in whom the consul placed great confidence. They were frequently his friends or relatives. It was their duty to advise and assist him in all his undertakings, but, except in certain contingences, they had no power independent of him. Whenever the consul was absent from his army, the legati, or one of them, took his place; and then had the insignia as well as the power of his superior. During the latter period of the republic, the consul sometimes carried on a war through his legati, while he himself remained at Rome or was elsewhere conducting some other more urgent affairs.

2. The consul, imperator, dictator. By these different terms are meant the commander-in-chief of the army. In ordinary terms this was the consul. We have already seen that he was an important state officer, but we are here to regard him only in his military capacity.

The starting of the consul upon any military expedition, more especially if it were one against a potent or renowned adversary, was always signalized with great pomp and

ceremony. Public prayers and sacrifices for his success were first offered up. Then, habited in a rich robe of purple and scarlet, interwoven with gold, he began his march out of the city. He was accompanied by a vast retinue of all sexes and ages, who were desirous of beholding and following with their wishes, him on whom the consummation of their hopes so much depended.

There were two circumstances attending the consul or commander-in-chief deserving of special notice.

a. He had the control of the auspicia, the taking of omens. These were taken under his directions by help of the divines. It constituted a very solemn ceremony, the result being to decide the fact of a battle. What influence he might have had upon the haruspices or divines, in obtaining from them the announcement of a favorable result, when the position, and all the circumstances were favorable for a battle, it may be difficult to say. It must be clear, however, that the announcement of a favorable result, and its proclamation through the army, produced a tremendous moral effect upon the minds of the soldiers, the force of which it is not easy to calculate. Where the gods had promised victory, it was not difficult for Roman soldiers to win it.

b. The second feature regards the nature of the power confided to the general. Here the Romans showed the greatness of their wisdom. They gave their generals unlimited commissions. Their powers in the conducting of campaigns were general. They could fight or not fight, assault a town or omit it, just as they chose. The sole power reserved by the senate, in this respect, was to make peace or war. The conducting of the latter, according to his own views, but on his own responsibility, was the right and duty of the commander. He was on the spot, and could, therefore, act in full view of all the circumstances. The Romans were indebted for many victories, and much of their success, to this single circumstance.

The early Romans entertained the superstitious belief that if their general would devote, or sacrifice himself to

one or more of the gods or infernal deities, all the misfortunes which were destined to fall on his army would, by that act be transferred to his enemies. There were several instances of this, in which a successful result was attained. In the family of the Decii, the father, son, and grandson, all devoted themselves for the safety of their armies. In each case the Roman armies triumphed. The true reason is probably to be found in the moral effect of the act. The firm conviction that such a result would follow, would be all powerful in its effect upon the minds of the Roman soldiers, and hence be the most effectual means to secure it.

VII. The pay of the Roman soldiers.

The extreme frugality and even penury of the Romans was displayed in the treatment of their soldiers in regard to pay for their services. For more than three hundred years from the building of the city the army served gratis and at their own charge. When granted, it was an extremely trifling sum. Under the republic it was two oboli, about two and one-half pence English, a day to a foot soldier, double to a centurion, and triple to an eques. Thus it continued until the time of Julius Cæsar, who doubled it. Under Augustus it was increased to six oboli, seven and one-half pence, and still further additions to this were made under the subsequent emperors.

The pay of the tribunes was considerably more, but the precise amount was uncertain. The prætorian cohorts had double the pay of the common soldiers.

Each soldier was also furnished with clothes and corn, commonly four bushels per month, the centurions double, and the equites triple. But a part of their pay was deducted whenever these were furnished.

In the early times of the republic there were no cooks in the Roman army. The soldiers prepared their own food. Some ground their corn with hand-mills which they carried about with them. Others pounded it with stones. It was then hastily baked upon coals. They took food upon a signal publicly given twice a day, at dinner and supper.

The first was a slight meal commonly taken standing. Their ordinary drink was water, which they sometimes sharpened with a mixture of vinegar called posca.

VIII. The duties, works, and exercises of the Roman soldiers.

Their duties and works had reference chiefly to their watches and guards, and to their severe labors in casting up entrenchments and ramparts. Their watches and guards were the excubiæ and the vigiliæ. The first kept by day, the last by night.

The first kept in the camp, or at the gates and entrenchments. There was assigned to each of the four gates every day one company of foot, and one troop of horse. The triarii, as the most honorable order, were excused from the ordinary watches. It was regarded as a most unpardonable crime to desert their post, or abandon their corps of guards.

The night guards were of the same nature as those of the day. They were more frequently relieved, there being four sets during the night according to the four watches. They had also, in addition, a visiting the watch, which was performed commonly about four times during the night, by some of the horse. The works of the Roman soldiers were principally performed in the construction of camps and fortifications, and in the attack and defense of towns, hereafter considered.

The proper exercises of the soldiers consisted in walking, running, leaping, vaulting, and swimming. They had also exercises of arms, the palaria and armatura.

In the first they set up a post about six feet high, to resemble a man. This the soldiers assailed with all the instruments of war, as if it were a real enemy, thus learning how to aim and strike their blows so as to produce the greatest effect.

The armatura consisted in exercises performed with missive weapons, as throwing the spear or javelin, shooting of arrows, etc. In these, the newly enlisted soldiers were trained with great care, and with the severest discipline.

These exercises were not confined to the common soldiers. The officers themselves often set them the example, and were very eminent for their dexterity in these kinds of performances.

IX. The military habits, armor, arms, and weapons of the Roman soldiers.

All these bear so near a resemblance to those of the Greeks as to render it unnecessary to dwell upon them very much at length. The military habit of the Roman soldier was of two sorts, the one their ordinary habit, and the other that which they used to wear in cold weather. There were two kinds of the ordinary habit. In the one the cuirasses were more simple, short and light, and the shields of an oval form, so that those clad in this armor have been taken for the velites; but although more lightly armed than the rest, yet was their armor too weighty to enable them to rank with the velites.

The other kind of military habit was a weighty one, and was worn by those who constituted the strength and support of the legions. These were girt about the lower portions of the body with a kind of harness that ran up in several folds as high as the armpits. They had also a species of shield that was hollow like a tile.

There is little doubt but that the habits, armor and arms of the Roman soldiers, were subject to considerable changes during the long period of the Roman history.

The cuirass, or coat of mail, more commonly termed thorax among the Greeks, and lorica by the Romans, was much the same among both. With the Roman soldiers it consisted of thongs, with which they were girt from the waist to the armpits. In later times they were made of leather covered with plates of iron disposed like scales. Another method was to make them of iron rings so let into each other as that they would be chained and interlaced together. They also made them of brass or iron in two pieces, which they fastened together with buckles. Some again were made of small chains and covered with iron

plates. Others were made simply of linen, consisting of various folds.

The helmet, galea, was a head-piece coming down to the shoulders, and was commonly made of brass, although sometimes of iron, as the stronger metal. On its summit was the crests, in adorning which the soldiers took great pride.

A most important piece of defensive armor was the shield, scutum, which, with the Romans, was concave, and of the shape of a hollow tile, in length about two feet and an half, and in breadth one foot and an half. The material was at first wood, but subsequently covered with plates of iron.

There was also a shield of an oval form, lighter than the one last mentioned, and which was the more commonly used. As the concave ones were used to form the testudo, they could never be entirely dispensed with.

The parma was a small round shield, some three feet in diameter, made out of leather. The cavalry made use of this sort of shield.

The pelta was a light piece of armor, shaped like an half-moon or semicircle. The cetra very much resembled it. The ancilia were sacred shields religiously kept, and borne only in solemn processions.

The clypeus was a round concave shield, in occasional use among the Romans.

The Roman cavalry at first used only their ordinary clothing. This enabled them the more easily and quickly to mount their horses, for they had no stirrups, neither saddles such as ours, but certain coverings of cloth to sit on. But they afterwards imitated the Greeks, and used nearly the same armor as the infantry.

In regard to offensive arms, the Romans made use of

1. The sword, which was of different forms as to length and breadth, and which they generally wore on the right side, that it might not interfere with the free use of their shield.

2. The pilum, a kind of dart, which the Roman legionaries threw at the enemy before they came into close fight with their swords.

3. The hasta, or spear, which the Romans derived from the Sabines, and is supposed to have been Etruscan in its origin, was of two kinds, viz: the one used by the velites and cavalry, and which they darted like javelins; the other used by the infantry, with which they pushed at the enemy.

4. The pike, or lance, often occurring in the monuments of the Roman emperors, and which, with the point, were about six feet and an half in length.

5. The bow and arrow were generally used in the Roman armies, but mostly by the auxiliaries, and not by the Roman soldiers themselves. They were not, however, ignorant of its use. It was a part of their military education, and they often used it with great dexterity.

X. The march and encampment of a Roman army.

The usual march of the Roman army was 20,000 paces a day, at least six leagues; and this, at least three times a month, the soldiers, infantry, as well as cavalry, were accustomed to take.

The form of the army, while on the march, varied according to circumstances, and the nature of the ground. Not unfrequently it was disposed in the form of a square, with the baggage in the middle. The army was preceded by scouts, to reconnoitre the ground. The soldiers were trained with great care to observe the military pace, and to follow the standards.

The loads under which the soldier marched, are almost incredible. He carried first his arms, the buckler, sword, helmet, etc., but these he considered as a part of himself. Then he carried his provisions for several days, and sometimes for three weeks or a month, with all the implements for dressing their food, and also a stake or palisade of considerable weight. The whole, independent of his arms, would not fall short of sixty pounds. And yet, under this heavy load, they often marched twenty miles a day, and sometimes more. The tents, mills, baggage, etc., were carried on beasts of burden. The consul, or com-

mander, marched usually in the centre, sometimes in the rear, or wherever his presence was necessary.

The Romans excelled all the soldiers of antiquity in the regularity and perfect system of their marches and encampments. In the latter more especially, did they make great progress in the military art. On this point, there seems to have been two rules from which they never deviated. The one was never to pass a night, even in the longest marches, without pitching a camp, and fortifying it with a rampart and ditch. This was done although in the Roman territory, and within a day's march of Rome.

The other was, never to hazard a battle till they had finished their camp. This was their city of refuge. It put a stop to the enemy's victory, received the routed troops in safety, prevented their entire defeat, and enabled them to renew the battle with a greater prospect of success.

The form of their camp, and their method of encampment were always the same. That form was a square. They began by digging trenches, varying in breadth and depth from eight feet by six, to fifteen or twenty, according to circumstances; the usual breadth being twelve, and depth nine. The earth thrown up in the excavation formed the rampart, upon the brow of which they planted stakes or palisades. If the enemy were near, a part of the soldiers continued under arms, whilst the remainder were employed in throwing up the intrenchments.

The arrangement and distribution of the different parts of the camp never varied, so that the soldiers knew immediately where their tents were to be pitched. It had four gates, one on each side. It was divided into two parts, called the upper and lower.

In the upper part was the general's tent, called prætorium, with a sufficient space around for his retinue. Surrounding it were the tents of the lieutenant-generals, the quæstor, tribunes, and evocati.

Between the upper and lower was a broad, open space in which the consul or commander had his tribunal; the tribunes their courts, and the gods their altars.

In the lower part the troops were disposed, the cavalry in the middle; on both sides the triarii, principes, and hastati; and next, the cavalry and infantry of the allies, always in separate places, to prevent their union.

The tents were covered with leather or skins extended with ropes, each usually containing ten soldiers, with their petty officer. The centurions and standard bearers were posted at the head of their companies.

In the labors of pitching the camp, as also in the rendition of the various services during the encampment, such as the procuring of water, forage, wood, etc., different divisions of the army were appointed, and they were performed under the inspection of the tribunes or centurions.

Guards were always kept at the gates, on the rampart, and in other places of the camp, both by day and by night, who were changed every three hours. Whoever deserted his station was punished with death.

Every evening, just before the watches were set, a square tablet of wood in the form of a die, having inscribed on it the watch-word or private signal, by which they might distinguish friends from foes, was distributed through the army. This was given by the consul to the tribunes, by them to the centurions, and by them to the soldiers. It was varied every night. This having been done, and the watches set, the trumpets sounded and the soldier retired for his night's repose.

To render everything safe, certain persons were appointed to go round the watches every night. This was at first done by the equites and tribunes, subsequently particular persons were selected for that purpose by the tribunes. The signal for changing the watches was given with a trumpet or horn.

When the time to decamp arrived, the consul gave a signal, upon which all took down their tents, the soldiers theirs after they saw those of the commander and tribunes taken down. Another signal, and they put their baggage upon beasts of burden; a third, and they began their march.

XI. The ensigns or standards, and colors, music, harangues, and word in engagements.

The common ensign of the whole legion, after the time of Marius, and the more generally before, was an eagle of gold or silver, fixed on the top of a spear, holding in its talons a thunderbolt. It was carried in the centre of the army, and near it was the ordinary place of the consul or commander.

There were also ensigns for the cavalry and infantry. That of the former was a flag or banner, being a square piece of cloth fixed on the end of a spear. This was also used by the infantry, particularly by those veterans who had served out their time, but were still retained in the army.

Each century or certainly each maniple, had its proper standard and standard-bearer; the ensign of which was anciently a bundle of hay on the top of a pole. Afterwards was substituted a spear with a cross piece of wood on the top, having sometimes the figure of a hand above, and below a small round or oval shield of silver or gold, on which were represented the images of the warlike deities, such as Mars or Minerva. It may have been owing to this latter circumstance that the standards were often worshiped with religious adoration. The soldiers were accustomed to swear by them. To lose them was always esteemed disgraceful, especially to the standard bearer, sometimes even a capital crime. Hence it was a stratagem not unfrequently resorted to in a dubious engagement, for the officers to snatch the ensigns out of the bearer's hands, and throw them among the troops of the enemy, knowing that their men would venture the extremest danger to recover them.

The Romans used only wind instruments of music in the army. These were the tubæ, the cornua, the buccinæ and the litui.

The first resembled our trumpet, growing wider and wider in a direct line to the orifice.

The cornua were bent almost round, and owe both their name and origin to the horns of beasts, which in the ruder ages were put to the same use.

The buccinæ are hard to be distinguished from the cornua, unless they were something less, and not quite so crooked, and yet they appear to have been of a different species.

The lĭtui were a middle kind between the cornua and the tubæ. They were almost straight with the exception of a little turning in at the top like the lituus, or sacred rod of the augurs, whence was derivedthe name.

These instruments were all made of brass, and some of the performers were assigned to every manipulus and turma, while several of a higher order were common to the whole legion. In battle, the former were ranged around the ensign or colors of their particular company or troop, while the latter were located near the chief eagle, in a ring, very near the general and prime officers. The alarm being given, these last began it, and were followed by the common sound of the rest, who were dispersed through the several parts of the army.

The signal for a preparation for battle, was the display of a red flag on a spear, from the top of the prætorium. The trumpet having summoned the soldiers together, next succeeded the harangue of the general. This was addressed to the army, and was designed to animate them with fresh hope, inspire them with new courage, and thus impel them to deeds of unexampled bravery. This often had the desired effect; the soldiers signifying their approbation by their shouts, by raising their right hands, or beating on their shields with their spears.

The harangue being closed, all the trumpets sounded, and the soldiers called out "to arms." The standards, previously fixed in the ground, were pulled up, and if done easily it was reckoned a good omen; if not, the contrary. The watch-word was given either *vive voce*, or in the same manner as in the camp.

As the army was advancing, the general often rode round the ranks, again exhorting the soldiers to courage. He then gave the signal to engage. All the trumpets then sounded, and the soldiers rushed forward to the

charge with a great shout. To increase the effect, they, at the same time, clashed their arms with great violence.

XII. The order of battle.

No one order of battle seems to have been exclusively adhered to by the Romans during the republic. That which may be said to be the most common, was the following:

The Roman army was drawn up in three lines, the hastati, principes, and triarii. The usual depth of each line was ten men. An interval was left between every two of these divisions. This, in the first and second lines, was equal to a manipulus. In the third, greater. The effect of this arrangement was, that each foot soldier, besides the ground on which he stood, had a space equal to three feet between himself and the next man, both in length of front, and in the depth of the files. This enabled him to shift the position of his buckler, according to the action of his opponent; to throw his javelin, or use his sword with advantage.

The divisions of the second line were, in general, placed opposite the intervals of the first; and, in like manner, the divisions of the third were opposite the intervals in the second. There was, however, one remarkable exception to this, and that for a particular reason. This was in the celebrated battle of Zama, fought between Scipio and Hannibal.

In this battle Scipio drew up his army, in such a manner, that the division of troops in the several lines were exactly opposite each other. The object of this was to allow the elephants in the Carthaginian army to pass quite through the Roman army to its rear, which they could do by following the open spaces.

Thus an army drawn up in battle array presented:

First, the hastati, placed in the front in thick and firm ranks.

Second, the principes behind them, but not quite so close.

Third, the triarii, in so wide and loose an order, that, upon occasion, they could receive both the principes and the hastati into their body upon any emergency.

The velites, or light armed soldiers, embracing in later times the bowmen and slingers, formed no part of the legion. They were disposed of variously, sometimes before the front of the hastati; at others, scattered up and down among the void spaces of the same hastati; and at others still in two bodies in the wings. But wherever they were placed, they generally began the combat by skirmishing in flying parties with the first troops of the enemy. By means of this arrangement, the army was not only set out to the best advantage, and made the greatest show, but every particular soldier had free room to use his weapons, and to withdraw himself between the void spaces behind him, without occasioning any confusion or disturbance.

The practical operation of this arrangement was the following: The velites being repulsed by the enemy, as they generally were, fell back by the flanks of the army or again rallied in the rear. This left an open field for the hastati, who thereupon advanced against the enemy. These carried on the contest with the enemy for a longer or shorter time according to circumstances. If overpowered they retired slowly towards the principes; and falling into the intervals, or vacant spaces before mentioned, the two classes in conjunction continued the combat. During all this time, the triarii were keeping themselves in reserve with one knee on the ground, and protected by their bucklers from the darts of the enemy. If the hastati and principes, when united, were too weak to sustain the fury of the battle, they all fell back into the wider intervals of the triarii. All were now united into a firm mass, with the advantage of bringing forward the veteran triarii entirely fresh to the combat. Here was made another stand, and another effort much more impetuous than any one before, and which, if the others failed, was almost sure to secure the victory.

The secret of the Roman success lay very much in their order of battle. Most other nations, and even the Grecians themselves, generally drew up their whole army in one front, trusting themselves and their fortunes to the success of a single charge. Not so the Roman. His tactics were of a far higher order. With the modes of warfare then in use, it was almost impossible he should prove unsuccessful. In every engagement, fortune must have failed him three several times, before he could be routed; and the enemy must have had the strength and resolution to overcome him in three several encounters, for the decision of one battle.

The station of the consul, or commander, was commonly near the middle of the army, between the princeps and the triarii, the fittest place to give orders to all the troops. The legati and tribunes had their positions wherever he chose to place them.

Each centurion stood at the head of his century, the chief centurion standing with the tribunes.

The common soldiers were placed in the several ranks, at the discretion of the centurions, according to their age, strength and experience, and their discipline imposed it upon them as the severest religious duty, never to abandon their ranks, or to break their order upon any account whatever.

Besides the common method of drawing up an army already alluded to, there were also other peculiar methods occasionally resorted to, and which were made to depend upon the nature, form, or situation of the opposing army.

One of these was to assume the form of the cuneus or wedge, when the army was ranged in that figure; which was often done in order to pierce or break the order of the enemy.

Another was the globus or globe, when the soldiers cast themselves into a firm, round body, practiced usually in cases of extremity, when the army was about to be surrounded by the enemy.

When the opposing army assumed the form of the cuneus, the Romans drew up their soldiers in the form of a forceps or pair of shears in order to receive the cuneus. By this means, they not only hindered the damage designed, but commonly cut the adverse body to pieces.

There was also another form called the serra or saw, which occurred when the first companies in the front of the army, beginning the engagement, sometimes proceeded, and sometimes drew back; some resemblance being thus found to the teeth of that instrument.

The order of battle described was that of the republic before Marius. He and those contemporary or immediately succeeding him, introduced several alterations. Among these, was that of drawing up the army in lines by cohorts, which gradually led to the abandonment of the ancient division of the legion into manipuli, and of the distinctions of hastati, principes and triarii. Each legion was then divided into ten cohorts, each cohort into three maniples, and each maniple into two centuries, making thirty maniples and sixty centuries in a legion.

In the regular order of battle, the Roman legions occupied the centre, the allies and auxiliaries the right and left wings. The cavalry were variously arranged, sometimes behind the infantry, whence they could be suddenly led out on the enemy through the intervals between the maniples. But they were commonly posted on the wings.

It is a matter of some surprise that the Roman armies contained such small bodies of cavalry. Hannibal was greatly indebted to his superiority in cavalry for his four first victories over the Romans. This apparent deficiency will, perhaps, excite less surprise, when we recur to the fact, that the first wars of the Romans, for even several successive centuries, were carried on with the neighboring states, in a country wooded, covered with vineyards and olive trees, and amid the Apennines, where there were small opportunities for the exercise of cavalry. Add to this the fact that their early enemies had but few cavalry, and we shall see clearly enough a reason why the Romans

contracted early habits of carrying on their wars, mostly with infantry, having but a mere sprinkling of cavalry.

XIII. Military punishments.

These were both of the lighter and severer kind.

Among the former were:

1. Forfeiture of their spears.
2. Deprivation of pay either in whole or in part.
3. Removal from their tents, sometimes to remain even without the camp.
4. Not to recline or sit at meals with the rest.
5. To stand before the prætorium in a loose jacket.
6. To get an allowance of barley instead of wheat.
7. Degradation of rank, an exchange into an inferior corps or less honorable service.
8. To be removed from the camp and employed in various works, imposition of labor, or dismission with disgrace.

Those of the severer kind were:

1. To be beaten with rods, or with a vine sapling.
2. To be scourged and sold as a slave.
3. To be beaten to death with sticks, the usual punishment of theft, desertion, perjury, etc.
4. To be overwhelmed with stones and hurdles.
5. To be beheaded, sometimes crucified.
6. To be stabbed by the swords of the soldiers.

When a number had been guilty of the same crime, as in the case of a mutiny, either the most culpable were selected and punished, or every tenth or twentieth man was chosen by lot for punishment.

XIV. Military rewards.

The object of bestowing rewards was to encourage valor and heroism in the soldier. With this view, whenever it occurred, a great public occasion was selected. After a victory, the consul or commander assembled the army, and, in the presence of all the soldiers, bestowed rewards on those deserving them. These were:

1. The hasta pura, a fine spear of wood without any iron on it, usually bestowed on him, who, in some little skirmish had killed an enemy, engaging him hand to hand.

2. The armillæ, a sort of bracelets, given only to such as were born Romans, upon account of some eminent service.

3. The torques, golden and silver collars, wreathed with curious art and beauty.

4. The phaleræ, a suit of rich trappings for a horse, or, as some suppose, golden chains hanging down to the breast.

5. The vexilla, a sort of banners of different colors, worked in silk, or other curious materials.

6. The crown, or coronet, and this was of various kinds, such as:

a. Corona civica, which was given to any soldier, who had saved the life of a Roman citizen in an engagement. The material of which it was composed, was oaken leaves, but it was reckoned more honorable than any other crown. It was presented by the person who had been saved, to his preserver, whom he ever after respected as a parent. The person receiving it, wore it at the spectacles, and was entitled to sit next the senate. On his entering, the audience rose up as a mark of respect.

b. Corona muralis, bestowed upon him who first scaled the walls of a city, in a general assault.

c. Corona castrensis, or vallaris, the reward of him who had first forced the enemy's intrenchments.

d. Corona navalis, set round with figures like the beaks of ships, and bestowed on such as had signalized their valor in a maritime engagement.

e. Corona obsidionalis, presented by the soldiers to their commander, when he had delivered the Romans or their allies from a siege. It was composed of the grass growing in the besieged place.

f. Corona auræ, golden crowns, often bestowed upon officers and soldiers who had displayed singular bravery.

g. Corona triumphalis, made of laurel wreaths, and appropriate only to such generals as had the honor of a triumph. This was subsequently changed to gold, and not restrained only to those who had actually triumphed, but they were presented on several other accounts, as by the foreign states and provinces, to their patrons and benefactors.

But the greatest honors were bestowed upon the victorious general. When any remarkable success had been achieved, the first act of the Roman senate frequently was, to salute him with the title of imperator.

This was succeeded by the supplicatio, or a solemn procession to the temple of the gods to return thanks for the victory. The occasion was made a holiday by the whole body of the commonalty, who frequented the religious assemblies, giving thanks, and imploring a long continuance of the divine favor and assistance. The last of these were the supplications decreed Nero for the murder of his mother, and the fruitfulness of Poppæa.

But the more important honors decreed to the general, were the ovation and the triumph. The first was a lesser triumph, in which the general entered the city on foot, wearing simply the toga prætexta of a magistrate, his brows encircled with a myrtle wreath, the procession enlivened by a crowd of flute players, attended chiefly by knights and plebeians, and the ceremonies concluded by the sacrifice of a sheep, from which was derived the name. This was granted when a victory was achieved, but the circumstances were such as not to warrant a triumph.

The triumph was much the nobler procession. None could aspire to this honor but dictators, consuls and prætors. On the occasion of its celebration, the streets were strewed with flowers, and the altars smoked with incense. The procession, moving from the Campus Martius, passed along the via Triumphalis, through the Campus and circus Flaminius, to the porta Triumphalis; thence through the most public places of the city to the Capitol. The order was generally as follows:

1. The musicians singing and playing triumphal songs.

2. The oxen designed for the sacrifice, having their horns gilt, and their heads adorned with fillets and garlands.

3. The carriages containing the spoils taken from the enemy, statues, pictures, plate, armor, etc., titles of the vanquished nations inscribed on wooden frames, and images or representations of the conquered countries, cities, etc.

4. The captive leaders in chains, with their children and attendants.

5. The lictors, with fasces wreathed with laurel, followed by a great company of musicians and dancers, dressed like satyrs, and wearing crowns of gold, and in their midst a pantomime, in a female garb, whose business it was to insult the vanquished by his looks and gestures.

6. A long train of persons carrying perfumes.

7. The victorious commander, in purple and gold, his head crowned with laurel, in his right hand a branch of laurel, in his left an ivory sceptre, standing in a gilded chariot, adorned with ivory, drawn by four white horses, and surrounding him his children, relations, and a great crowd of citizens all in white. By his side usually rode his legati and military tribunes.

8. The consuls and senators on foot. Before the time of Augustus they usually went before him.

9. And last, came the victorious army, cavalry and infantry, crowned with laurel, and decorated with the gifts which they had received for their valor, singing their own and their generals' praises, but sometimes throwing out railleries against him.

It was often, but not always, the practice for the commander, when he began to turn his chariot from the forum to the Capitol, to order the captive kings and leaders of the enemy to be led away to prison, and there to be slain; and when he reached the Capitol, to wait until he was informed of the execution of these orders.

At the Capitol he deposited his golden crown in the lap of Jupiter, and caused sacrifices to be made to the gods

after which he there gave a magnificent entertainment to his friends and the chief men of the city. After its conclusion he was conducted home by the people with accompaniments of music, and amid a great number of lamps and torches. The triumph was generally completed in one day, but that of Paulus Æmilius continued three.

XV. The methods of attacking towns and fortified places, and the instruments of such attack and defense.

The strongest towns among the ancients were situated upon eminences. They were fortified with walls, fosses and towers. The walls and fosses corresponded with each other in number, and were from one to three, the strongest being surrounded with three walls and fosses. The walls were generally built of stone, and not supported on the inside with earth in the manner of a slope. They were of various dimensions as to height and thickness.

Towns were not always protected by stone walls. They were sometimes enclosed within ramparts of earth of great firmness and solidity. These were occasionally coated with turf, and supported with strong fascines made fast by stakes.

Above the walls, at appropriate distances, projected strong towers, generally round, faced with stone, and so high that the defenders upon the right and left might attack the approaching enemy in flank.

The first act of the Romans on investing a fortified town was one of devotion. It was the evocatio deorum tutelarium, or the inviting out of it the guardian deities. They either thought it impossible to force any place, while it enjoyed such powerful defenders, or they regarded it as the highest impiety to act in hostility against the persons of the gods. In either case, the custom proclaimed what we have before stated, that the Romans had a stronger sense of religion than the Greeks, or than most other ancient nations.

Having faithfully performed the evocatio, the next thing done was to summon the town to surrender. If the sum-

mons was not obeyed, there were then two methods of procedure to possess themselves of it; the one by storm, the other by the result of a regular siege. The last was, in all the cases that were possible, avoided. It was left for the last resort, and even then was seldom undertaken until all other means had failed, and the possession of the town was a seeming necessity to their further progress.

In a storm, they drew their whole army round the walls, and fell on all the quarters at once. They advanced altogether to the assault with all their forces, and all their battering rams, and all their dart and stone throwing engines, endeavoring to batter down the walls, or dislodge the enemy from them, so as to get the possession.

The besieged were always in danger from a general storm. The reason was, that their walls must be made good in all places at once, and they sometimes lacked the men to relieve all the parts; or they did not all prove of equal courage; and if any gave way, or any one point proved defective, the whole town was in imminent hazard of being lost. So true was this in practice that the Romans often carried very considerable places at one storm. If they failed in possessing themselves of it in a little time, they frequently raised the siege, and prosecuted the war by other means.

There were, however, instances in which all the resources of a regular siege were pressed into service, and in which the valor, hardihood, ingenuity, and powers of endurance of the Roman army were tasked to the utmost to insure success. The most notorious of these were the sieges of Veii, Carthage, and Jerusalem.

The first thing a besieging army looked to was protection. To secure this, if the place was one of importance and strongly fortified, they drew two lines of fortifications or entrenchments around it, at some distance from each other. These were called lines of contravallation and circumvallation. The one served as a protection against the sallies of the besieged, the other against attacks from armies sent to their relief. These lines were often com-

pleted at the expense of incredible labor. Each was composed of a ditch and a rampart, strengthened with a parapet and battlements. Sometimes a solid wall was constructed of considerable height and thickness, flanked with towers or forts at proper distances from each other. Between these lines lay encamped the army of the besiegers.

Having thus secured safety by acting on the defensive, they were ready to commence operations of an offensive, aggressive character. This was done in a variety of ways. The first act of this kind was often the construction of a hill, or mount, composed of earth, wood, hurdles and stone, which was made gradually to advance towards the town, always increasing in height, until it equaled or overtopped the walls. This was kept secure by towers consisting of different stories, from which showers of darts, stones and various missiles were constantly discharged on the beleaguered townsmen. This was accomplished by means of engines singularly adapted to the purpose. These engines were the catapulta and balista, and it is astonishing with what an amazing degree of force they could hurl large stones to great distances.

They also constructed movable towers, so fixed upon wheels as to be pushed forward and then brought back. They were covered with raw-hides, and pieces of coarse cloth and mattresses, to protect them from being set on fire by the enemy. They were of immense bulk, often thirty, forty, or fifty feet square, and higher than the walls, or even than the towers of the city. They had the advantage of being moved towards any point where an attack was to be made. The same engines for hurling all manner of missiles could there be made use of with much greater effect. Besides the engines, they carried also soldiers with ladders, casting bridges and other necessaries.

There were also what were termed testudines, which were of an oval figure, composed of boards and wattled up at the sides with wickers, and which served for the conveyance of the soldiers near the walls on occasions when they

were there required. The same term, testudo, was always applied to a figure which the soldiers cast themselves into, when they so arranged themselves as that their shields should close altogether above their heads, and defend them from the missive weapons of the enemy. This was used as well on battle-fields as in sieges, but more frequently in the latter.

The machine termed the musculus was of much the same nature as the testudines, but of smaller size, and composed of stronger materials. In these musculi the pioneers were sent up to the very walls themselves, and often continued there for considerable periods of time, endeavoring, by their pickaxes and other instruments, to undermine their foundations.

All the engines and machines we have mentioned were designed either to protect the soldier while fighting the enemy, or to hurl against him with greater effect various kinds of missiles, darts, stones, etc. As yet nothing has been made to bear, in a hostile manner, upon the walls themselves. There was an instrument peculiarly adapted to that purpose, the aries, or ram.

This was an immense long beam of timber, like the mast of a ship, and armed at one end with iron in the form of a ram's head. It was protected with sheds or mantlets, called vineæ, which were machines constructed of wood and hurdles, and covered with earth or raw-hides, or any other materials not easily set on fire.

The ram was used in three different ways, the object sought to be accomplished being the same in each. In one of these, and probably that in which it was first employed, it was worked directly by the soldiers, who, in great numbers, seizing hold of it, pulled it back and thrust it forward against the walls with all the force they were masters of.

In another, and probably the most common way, it was suspended by the middle with ropes or chains fastened to a beam that lay across two posts, and hanging thus equally balanced, it was, by great numbers of men, violently

thrust forward, drawn back, and then pushed forward, till by numbers of strokes, thus repeated, it had shaken, and prostrated the wall with its iron head.

The third manner of using it was to place it on wheels, and then by means of the artificial mount, formerly mentioned, it could often be made to act powerfully upon the walls.

There were other means of taking towns besides attacks upon the besieged, and battering down the walls. These were sapping and mining. A mine was sometimes worked into the very heart of the besieged city, intercepting and cutting off the springs which supplied it with water. By this means also they would succeed in sapping the foundation of the walls; as fast as they dug supporting the part to be thrown down with wooden props, which being consumed with fire, the wall would fall to the ground.

The besieged, during all this time, were by no means idle. Against every varied method of attack, they had a means of defense. The mining was met by countermining, and this sometimes led to meetings and conflicts under ground. The besieged also resorted to mining, to meet and frustrate the various methods of attack devised by the besiegers. By running a mine under the mount or hill of earth, they would cause it to sink and disappear. By the same means they would sometimes disable the towers, battering rams, and other engines of attack. They would also occasionally succeed in setting on fire the engines and machines of the besiegers.

They deadened the force of the ram by letting down sacks of wool, or other soft material, at the part of the wall against which it was leveled. If they apprehended the wall was too weak to stand its repeated attacks, they would build a new wall behind the old one, as the Jews did during the siege of their city by Titus.

By these, and other such like varied means, the siege of a city would sometimes be protracted through long periods of time. One of the most memorable sieges on record, is that of Jerusalem by the Roman army, under

Titus. All the varied means of attack and defense that could be resorted to in ancient times by either party, seem to have been in this case. It is truly the embodiment of the ancient system of attacking and defending towns and fortified places.

XVI. The Roman method of treating the people they had conquered.

The Romans varied their treatment of the conquered, in accordance with what they deemed their policy in their career of conquest. Where the resistance had been great or long continued, they resorted to severe methods of treatment. Sometimes they seized upon the greatest part of the land, and appropriated it to their own use, removing the natives to another soil. Where a people held out until necessity compelled a surrender, they were made to pass under a yoke, in token of subjection. This was done by setting up two spears, and laying a third across them at the top, the people who surrendered being compelled to pass under them without arms or belts. They took by force those who would not deliver themselves up, and inflicted upon them severe penalties, not unfrequently publicly selling them for slaves.

There were four several forms of government which the Romans established in their conquests.

The first was the coloniæ, and these were states or communities, where the chief part of the inhabitants had been transplanted from Rome. It was by this means that the veteran soldiers, who had served out their full term in the armies of Rome, were ultimately rewarded, and enabled to spend the remainder of their life in peace and quiet. Although in such cases the original inhabitants were often suffered to remain, yet the colonists obtained the whole power and authority in the administration of affairs.

The second was the municipiæ, which were properly corporations, or enfranchised places, where the original inhabitants were permitted the use of their old laws and

constitutions, and at the same time were honored with the privileges of Roman citizens. But this sometimes amounted to nothing more than a bare title.

The third was the præfecturæ, which were certain towns in Italy, whose inhabitants had the name of Roman citizens, but in fact were governed by annual præfects sent from Rome. This was reckoned the hardest condition imposed upon any people of Italy.

The relative position of the three now mentioned will be best understood by a brief reference to the privileges of Roman citizens, and seeing how they compare with those enjoyed by each one of these.

The six great privileges of the Roman citizen were:

1. To be registered in the census.
2. To have the right of suffrage and of bearing honors.
3. To be assessed in the poll-tax.
4. To serve in the legions.
5. To use the Roman laws and religion.
6. To be called quirites and populus Romanus.

The first four of these might be enjoyed by the municipiæ, but not the two last.

The fourth and fifth were enjoyed by the coloniæ, but they were debared from the others.

The people in the præfecturæ were obliged to submit to the Roman laws, but enjoyed no privilege as citizens.

There were also other states in Italy not coming under either one of the forms of government now mentioned. These were called fœderatæ civitates; and they enjoyed their own customs and forms of government, without any alteration, and only joined in confederacy with the Romans, upon such terms as were adjusted between them.

The fourth and last was the provincialia, the provinces, which were the conquests effected by the Roman arms. These were sometimes of large extent, and of difficult reduction under the Roman dominion. They were subjected to the command of governors annually sent from Rome, and commonly compelled to pay such taxes and contributions as the senate thought fit to require. There were, however,

very considerable differences made in regard to the burdens imposed upon the provinces, depending upon the conduct of the people, and the obstinacy with which they resisted the Roman power. In some cases the people were permitted in many respects to use their own constitutions, and were even excused from the payment of tribute. As a general rule, justice was administered in the provinces according to the laws of the provinces, and such Roman laws, senatus consulta, as were specially enacted for them, and such edicts as the governors from time to time published.

The tribute required was of two sorts, certain or uncertain. The certain, stipendium, was either a specified sum of money, to be collected by the provincial quæstor (this they called the pecunia ordinaria); or it was a subsidy raised on the provincials for particular occasions, such as the maintaining of so many soldiers, the rigging out and paying such a number of vessels, or the like; this was termed pecunia extraordinaria.

The uncertain tribute was of three kinds, the portorium, scriptura, and decuma.

The first was a duty imposed upon all goods and wares imported and exported.

The second was a tax laid upon pastures and cattle.

The third was the quantity of corn which the farmers were obliged to pay to the Roman state, commonly the tenth part of their crop.

These were usually farmed by the publicans.

In addition to these, there was the frumentum emptum, which was either decumanum or imperatum, the former being another tenth paid upon consideration of such a sum as the senate had determined to be the price of it, rating it at so much a bushel according to their pleasure; the latter was a quantity of corn equally exacted of the provincial farmers after the two-tenths, at such a price as the chief magistrate pleased to give. So there was also the frumentum æstimatum, which was a corn tax required of the chief magistrate of the province for his private use,

and the occasions of his family. This was commonly compounded for in money.

XVII. Ships and naval warfare of the Romans.

The Romans, in the earlier periods of their history, never conceived the idea of increasing their power by the formation of a fleet. Nor did they, although on the Tiber, and within fifteen miles of the Tyrrhenian sea, appear to understand what advantages might be derived from commerce, and the interchange of commodities. They were at first purely an agricultural people, having but few and simple relations with other nations. This fact has been assigned as one of the main causes which preserved that state so long in its primitive innocence and integrity; and kept it free from all those corruptions which an intercourse with foreigners might probably have brought into fashion.

They at first had nothing but boats made of thick planks, which were used on the Tiber. They never made any figure at sea until the first Punic war. About the year of the city 492, they began to perceive that the Italian coast lay exposed to the depredations of the Carthaginian fleet, which often made descents upon it at different points. They felt, therefore, that a fleet was necessary for their security. And yet they were little skilled in the art of ship-building. A fortunate circumstance, however, came to their aid. They acquired the possession of a Carthaginian galley, which, venturing too near the shore, had become stranded. This served as a model, and from it they built their first fleet. The vessels, however, were awkwardly built, and were obliged to be manned with soldiers, as they had no marines. Being unused to the sea, they saw that their chance for victory lay in bringing a sea-fight to resemble one on land. To accomplish this they invented a machine, which was a sort of crane called corvus.

The corvus was a strong piece of iron, with a spike at the end, which could be raised or lowered at pleasure by means of drawing in or letting out a rope, which was attached to certain machinery. On the approach of an ene-

my's ship the machine was turned outwards, by means of a pivot, in the direction of the assailant. Connected with the machine was a breast-work let down from a ladder, and serving as a bridge, on which to board the enemy's vessel. The act of boarding brought the combatants into close fight with each other, and thus assimilated it to a land contest. Wherever this could be effected, the Romans, as usual, were victorious.

The ships of the Romans may be divided into oneraciæ, ships of burden; and longæ, long vessels, ships of war. The former were almost round, very deep, were driven by sails, and were used mostly as transports, for the carriage of stores. The latter were ships of war, vessels of much greater length than breadth, and were impelled by oars, so as to be more perfectly under command. The rowers were occupied exclusively in the movements of the ship. They were placed one above another, not in a perpendicular line, but obliquely. The oars of the lowest bank were shorter than the rest, which increased in length in proportion to their height above the water. Each oar was tied to a piece of wood by thongs or strings.

The ships of war were variously named from their rows or ranks of oars. Those having two rows, or tiers, were called biremes; three, triremes; four, quadriremes; five, quinqueremes, etc. They scarcely had any ships of more than five banks of oars.

The Roman ships were guided by a rudder, and sometimes by two, one at each end; so that they might be rowed either way without turning.

The ships of the ancients had only one mast, which was in the centre, and was taken down when they approached the land. The anchors with which they were moored, were at first of stone; sometimes of wood filled with lead, but afterwards of iron. The materials with which they built their ships, were the fir, alder, cedar, pine, and cypress, also occasionally of oak and greenwood.

Some of the ships of war were entirely covered with a deck, others only at the prow and stern, where those who

fought stood. Their prows were armed with a sharp beak, which had three teeth, for the purpose of sinking the ships of their adversaries. They also, when about to engage, erected upon their decks, towers or turrets, from whence the enemy was annoyed with stones and missile weapons.

The Romans employed freedmen and slaves as their mariners or rowers. They were furnished by the citizens and allies. The fighters, were, at first, the legionary soldiers; but when they came to have regular and constant fleets, there was a separate kind of soldiers raised for the marine service, which was reckoned less honorable than the legionaries, and sometimes performed by manumitted slaves.

Before a fleet set sail, it was solemnly reviewed like an army. Prayers were offered and victims sacrificed. The auspices were consulted, and the occurrence of any unlucky omen, as a person sneezing on the left, or swallows alighting on the ships, would suspend the voyage.

The order in which the Romans arranged their ships for battle, was various, but had a great similarity to that in which their armies were drawn up on land. Certain ships were placed in the centre, others on the right wing, and others on the left. Some as a reserve. Sometimes they were disposed in the form of a wedge, a forceps, a circle; but most commonly in that of a semicircle or half moon.

Before the engagement commenced, sacrifices and prayers were offered to invoke the assistance of the gods, and the admiral sailed from ship to ship exhorting the men. A red flag was displayed from the admiral's ship, as a signal to engage. The trumpets were then sounded from every ship, and a shout sent up from all the crews.

The ships began the engagement by endeavoring to disable or sink those of their adversaries with their beaks, or to sweep off their oars. They grappled each other with iron hooks, and the combatants boarded and fought as on land. Others poured pots full of coals and sulphur, or threw firebrands into the enemy's ship. The ships of the

victorious fleet sailed triumphantly home, with their prows decked with laurel, and dragging after them the captive vessels.

From the brief review taken of the military art as practiced by the Romans, we should not, perhaps, be led to expect the wonderful success which always attended upon their arms. That success was in a great measure owing to many elements in the Roman character not necessarily connected with the military art. It has been well remarked that "the Romans were always more resolute when unfortunate, than when successful. Their valor rallied when put to route. They often lost a first and second engagement, and yet won the war of which those engagements were the incidents."

The Romans never granted peace, or seriously listened to overtures until they were victorious. Whenever they observed in an enemy anything which could improve their own tactics or discipline, they were wise enough to adopt it. Thus every battle was a lesson, and every war a course of study.

"The Roman policy, both before and after conquest, was as remarkable as all the rest of their military conduct. The fundamental principles of their relations with other states, before they broke out into open warfare, were to divide in order to command; always to excite an internal faction or a neighboring enemy to weaken and distress a powerful opponent; to acknowledge no political connections unless entered into by their permission; to treat as their allies all provinces who chose to shake off their allegiance to a metropolitan state; to establish themselves heirs to the rich possessions of friendly sovereigns; to grant peace adroitly to a less powerful antagonist, until the concerns of one more mighty were dispatched; to check one enemy by another; and, finally, to prevent every coalition into which the threatened states might be tempted to enter. Their conduct after success was equally politic. They were skilled alike in every international concern; they knew when to weaken, when to destroy, when to spare an

enemy, when to colonize a conquered territory, when to receive the inhabitants of a ruined city into their own, when to subvert, when to respect the laws and customs of a prostrate foe, when to admit him to become a participator in the mighty destiny of Rome, and when to exclude him; and above all, they never received as a soldier, the man who had not first been acknowledged a Roman."

We here close the history of the ancient civilization. From its ancient seats on the banks of the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile, we have traced it in its more recent developments upon those of the Ilissus, the Eurotas, and the Tiber.

We have now completed the survey of two great eras of human progress. The one, the oriental, was characterized by an envelopment, an intimate commingling of all the great elements, industry, religion, government, society, philosophy, and art. The other, the Greek and Roman, by an inherent spirit of freedom giving rise to a strong tendency in these elements to separation and development. Industry, religion, government, society, philosophy, and art, no longer exist as they did in Asia, one commingled mass. Art and philosophy here achieve their enfranchisement. The productions of the former exhibit definiteness and precision, and beauty of proportion. The enfranchisement of the latter was still more important. The very point of separation is the centre of a deep feeling, of an intense interest. Why? That point was sealed with the blood of a Socrates. In him philosophy first awoke to a knowledge and comprehension of herself. She afterwards soared from the earth in the researches of her Aristotle. She ascended to the source of things in the splendid idealism of her Plato.

The remaining elements, industry, government, society, and religion, were still intimately blended together. A successive separation was necessary for the purpose of allowing each an opportunity of being developed, or carried out into all its possible applications. Of these yet unde-

veloped elements, that of government, or the state, was predominant. As religion was the central element of the east, so was government that of the Greek and Roman movement. Around this, as a nucleus, gathered all the others. To strengthen the patriotic love of country, industry lent its application, religion her inspiration, society her attractions, philosophy her deductions, and art her living canvass and chiseled monument.

We are now to enter upon a new era, and to find upon the banks of the Danube, the Rhine, the Seine, and the Thames, the seats of a healthier, a higher, a loftier, and a fuller and more perfect civilization. In central and western Europe we are to find that portion of our world's surface which is to be devoted to this new era, to be characterized by the movement of a new spirit. In the immediately preceding, we have seen art and philosophy separated from the other elements, and, to a very considerable extent, developed by the Greek and Roman spirit. In that which we are now to contemplate, we are to witness the efforts of industry in effecting its separation from the remaining primary elements, and its consequent development. This effort of industry will bring to light the powers and energies of man as an individual, and from their freedom and vigor in action will arise the distinctive spirit of this era. This truth is deeply engraven upon every page of modern European history. It is told in the insubordination of its earlier periods; in the anarchy of the middle ages; in the necessity that originated the feudal system; in the strong effort, finally successful, by which its bonds were sundered, and its vassalage thrown off; in the curious institution of chivalry; in the spirit throes of the reformation; and in that singular fanaticism that prompted the monk to abandon the solitude of his cloister, the peasant the homely delights of his cottage, and the prince the splendor of his palace, to wrest the Holy Land from the dominion of infidels. True, this spirit has been both warlike and peaceful. At one time it has appealed to the sword as the sovereign arbiter of individual right;

at another, pursued the even tenor of its way under the quiet sanction of law. It was, nevertheless, the same spirit still. Its achievements in all the departments of industry, as well as in philosophy and art, are numerous and important. The inventions, the discoveries of modern times, all stand its debtors. It has pervaded space; sought an acquaintance with other orbs; followed the trackless course of the comet in its wanderings; and brought back intelligence, almost from the very outposts of creation.

In the sciences that instruct, in the arts that refine, we shall find it no less conspicuous. It has demanded of the material world the elements that compose it; the manner of their combination; the mode of their action. It has sought a familiar acquaintance with the laws of life; the subtleties of organization; the main facts of existence. It has penetrated the deepest recesses of mind; investigated its powers, classified its faculties, and explained their modes of operation. It has added a new world to the old, and fearlessly explored every accessible part of both. It has been active in agricultural pursuits, in the mechanic arts and inventions, in the direction of human industry into every possible available channel. It has instituted commercial relations, and connected together the human family by the mutual ties of a common intercourse. It has acquired a mastery over physical nature, and compelled the very elements to labor for its benefit. It has permeated the spiritual world; ascended to the source of things; inquired into the modifications and reasons of existence, and investigated God's moral government of the world.

In this effort of industry to enfranchise itself, and in the individual energy so strongly marking this era, we are to recognize the key that will enable us to explain some otherwise anomalous appearances in the governments of modern Europe. Government here was still involved with religion, and was, therefore, to a greater or less extent, modified by it. It acquired for itself distinct characteristics. It became an independent science, possessing its own rules, its own system of tactics. That singular personage, the state, ex-

changed the moral for the political mantle. Governments were sustained, not upon the principle of accountability to their constituents, but by virtue of the system of checks and balances established externally between themselves, and internally between the component parts of each individual government. They might rather be said to protect than be protected; to uphold, than be upheld.

This singularity in the constitution of modern European governments, we shall find originating a new principle of action. This principle has been developed in the strong and ceaseless efforts of those governments accurately to maintain the balance of power. It arose from the anxiety of government to perpetuate itself; to foster and protect its own interests. It was a refinement in governmental reasoning. It was the "logic of empire." The consequences resulting from the actual development of this principle, we shall find all important in European politics.

We shall find the very despotic tendency of modern European governments to result from the prevalent spirit of this era. In the earlier periods of their existence, the spirit of liberty and equality was largely infused into these governments. Of this, the diets of Germany, the cortes of Spain, the parliament of England, and the states-general of France, are so many attesting witnesses. They have descended to us as the relics of that period. On the very first page of modern European history, therefore, individual genius predominates. It was left free to obey its own impulses. That freedom, with some qualification, it has ever since enjoyed, both under the common law of England, and the civil law of the continent. Its prominent objects have been the acquisition of knowledge, and the accumulation of wealth, or creation of value out of the inert things of nature.

We shall find the governments of modern Europe, with few exceptions, become established over territories of large extent, and embracing a numerous population. Government was therefore the common property of too great a number, to concentrate in itself the affections of individuals.

Hence that affection attached itself to other objects, and accomplished its purposes in the advancement of the individual, through the medium, not of the state, but of the acquisition of knowledge, and the accumulation of wealth.

We shall find two important results to have followed; the one a national, the other an individual.

From the engrossing character of individual pursuits, the first result was, that governments were left to take care of themselves. They did take good care of themselves. Their tendency has been decidedly despotic.

The other result, we shall find, told in the fact of individual advancement. The science of political economy originated from the activity of the individual spirit of this era. That science was unknown to the Greeks and Romans. They never dreamed of dividing themselves into producing, distributing, and consuming classes. It was left to the era to which we have now arrived to develop the individual spirit in all the various departments of industry. To facilitate the operations of that spirit, the numerous and diversified objects of individual pursuit have been subdivided into their distinct and appropriate classes. The division of labor has been regarded as the true barometer indicating with unerring certainty, the degree towards perfection to which every social system has advanced. That division has been refined; and refined, until the very pin that connects our garments has passed through eighteen distinct operations, requiring the agency of eighteen different persons, before a complete finish could be given to it. This extreme division of labor has resulted in affording every person employment; in presenting to every one a choice of employment; in extending the comforts and conveniences of life to the greatest possible number; in producing a mutual intercourse between man and man; in rendering all the parts of society reciprocally dependent on each other; thus consolidating the whole by the strongest of earthly bonds—the bond of interest.

We shall find the spirit of philosophy expending itself in inductive processes, in developing the great truths of

science, and in making an application of them to all the economical purposes of life. We shall find religion inspiring man with higher aims, and, arming him with motives from the world to come, will send him forth to battle successfully with the ills of life, and even to triumph in the hour of death.

Thus we find the march of civilization to be onward and upward, and the nearer we approximate towards its culminating point, the more perfectly we can adopt the beautiful language of Whewell, and say: "We have been lingering long amid the harmonies of law and symmetry, constancy and development; and these notes, though their music was sweet and deep, must too often have sounded to the ear of our moral nature, as vague and unmeaning melodies, floating in the air around us, but conveying no definite thought, moulded into no intelligible announcement. But one passage which we have again and again caught by snatches, though sometimes interrupted and lost, at last swells in our ears, full, clear, and decided; and the religious 'Hymn in honor of the Creator,' to which Galen so gladly lent his voice, and in which the best physiologists of succeeding times have ever joined, is filled into a richer and deeper harmony, by the greatest philosophers of these later days, and will roll on hereafter, the 'perpetual song' of the temple of science."

INDEX

TO FIRST THREE VOLUMES.

Aaron, i, 578.
Abantes, i, 36.
Abassides, i, 92, 491, 492, 493, 532 535, 550, 551.
Abbas, i, 490.
Abdalrahman, i, 489.
Abd-el-Azis, i, 496.
Abd-el-Wahab, i, 495.
Abdera, ii, 328, 331.
Abd-er-rahman, i, 491.
Abdullah Ebu Abbas, i, 496.
Abdullah Ben Sund, i, 497.
Abinadab, i, 575.
Aborigines, inhabitants of Italy, i, 38; iii, 4.
Abraham, i, 46, 421, 468, 470, 505 506, 508, 553, 554, 558, 564, 572, 592, 604, 631, 658, 674; iii, 317, 352.
Absolution, doctrine of, i, 98.
Abstinence of the Mahometans, i, 515.
Abul Abbas, i, 491.
Abubeker, i, 473, 474, 478, 480, 503.
Abu-Dalama, mount, i, 518.
Abu Moslem, i, 491.
Abu Obeidah, i, 483, 484.
Abu Sofian, i, 486.
Abu Taleb, i, 472.
Abu-Thaher, i, 495.
Abyla, i, 652.
Abyssinia, i, 260, 264, 462; mountains of, 260.
Abyssinians, i, 56.
Abydos, ii, 35.
Abydus, i, 325, 390.
Accad, i, 53, 107, 111.
Aces, river, i, 233.
Academic school, i, 68; philosophy as developed in, ii, 353, 370.
Academy, new, philosophy of, iii, 277; old, philosophy of, iii, 277.
Achæan league, ii, 9.
Acarnania, the western part of Hellas, ii, 3, 5, 14, 41, 64, 68, 278.
Achæans, ii, 14, 15, 64, 238, 271, 274-277.
Achæmenes, governor, i, 282.
Achæmenian, Persian language of the cuneiform inscriptions, i, 200.
Achæminadæ, family of, i, 205, 224. 227.
Achæas, insurrection headed by, i, 636.
Achaia, once termed Ionia, ii, 8, 9, 14, 20, 52, 61, 63, 278, 284, 524; prophetic fountain in, 147.
Achaian republic, its original organization, ii, 61.
Acharnians, the, comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 512.
Achelous river, ii, 5.
Acheron river, ii, 86, 88.
Achilles, i, 661; ii, 104, 109; the subject of the Iliad, 472.
Acquitaine, i, 41, 489.
Acra, mount, i, 562, 563.
Acropolis of Athens, ii, 10, 46, 453.
Acrocorinthus, ii, 9.

Actium, naval battle of, iii, 64, 118.
Adad, deity, i, 660.
Adam, i, 48, 51, 505, 506, 508, 580.
Adami, i, 51.
Addictus, iii, 183.
Aden, i, 465, 490, 499, 530.
Ader, deity, i, 660.
Adherbal, iii, 53.
Admetus, ii, 98.
Adoption of children among the Romans, iii, 249, 250.
Adolphus, iii, 73.
Adona festival, ii, 139.
Adonis, i, 663, 664, 667; ii, 139.
Adrian, emperor, i, 562, 564; iii, 288, 306, 309; increased the number of legions, 385.
Adrianople, iii, 69; battle fought near, 71.
Adriatic sea, i, 36, 38; ii, 52; iii, 9, 52.
Adrogatto, form of adoption, iii, 163.
Adrumetum, i, 653.
Æachus, ii, 453.
Æcus, judge, ii, 88.
Ædesius, iii, 287.
Ædiles curules, iii, 187.
Ædipus, 116.
Ægatus, naval engagement near the, iii, 41, 42.
Ægean, sea, i, 206, 681, 689; ii, 2, 3, 7, 29, 52, 101, 109, 282, 407, 530; iii, 55, 70; isles, ii, 16.
Ægeus, iii, 298.
Ægialus, ii, 14, 20.
Ægidus, mount, iii, 29.
Ægina, ii, 12, 36, 354, 428, 453.
Æginetes, ii, 76.
Ægium, ii, 62, 274.
Ægos Potamos (Goat's river), ii, 45.
Ælia Capitolina, i, 564.
Ælian law, iii, 205.
Æmaturia, festival, ii, 189.
Æmilia lex, iii, 226.
Æmilianus, Scipio, iii, 51, 53.
Æmilius, consul, ii, 65; iii, 44, 45.
Æneiad, the national poem of the Romans, iii, 365.
Æneas, ii, 113, 115; iii, 121, 123.
Ænesidemus, iii, 309.
Æolia, i, 683; ii, 20, 473.
Æolian colonies, ii, 26; isles, 104.
Æolians, ii, 14.
Æolic, branch of lyric poetry, ii, 480.
Æolus, ii, 14, 111, 120.
Æqui, iii, 31, 77; wars with the, 29.
Æschines, ii, 52, 335, 483, 492.
Æschylus, ii, 498, 501, 503, 504, 505, 506.
Æsculapius, ii, 112; temple of, iii, 52.
Æson, king of Thessaly, i, 115.
Æther, ii, 79; origin of, 83.
Ætion, ii, 423.
Ætius, Roman general, i, 84; iii, 73, 74.
Ætna, mount, ii, 83, 104, 107, 114, 354.
Ætolia, i, 693; ii, 3, 5, 14, 20, 68, 272, 278.
Ætolians, ii, 64, 238, 271, 273, 274, 280.
Afghanistan, mountains of, i, 33.
Afranius, iii, 60.
Africa, i, 143, 222, 350, 467, 488, 647, 650, 653, 656, 671; iii, 37, 40, 41, 42, 47, 48, 51, 53, 56, 59, 61, 64, 65, 68, 73, 89, 90, 468, 487, 488, 492, 493; central, i, 53; ascertained to be a peninsula by the Egyptians, 281; circumnavigation of, by the Phœnicians, 679.
African desert, i, 228; race, its birthplace, its characteristics, 20.
Africanus, Scipio, iii, 52, 262, 275; raises a volunteer army, 45; chosen consul, 47; enters Africa with his army, 47; his force at the battle of Zama, 47; defeats the Carthaginians under Hannibal, 48; honored with a triumph at Rome, 48; accused of bribery, 50; a voluntary exile, 50.

Agamides, ii, 448.
Agamemnon, ii, 7, 21, 470; tragedy by Æschylus, 502, 507.
Aganippe, ii, 4.
Agar, i, 468.
Agathocles, ii, 29.
Agathodæmon, i, 346.
Agesilaus, ii, 47, 48, 345, 519, 522, 523, 527.
Ager hostilis, iii, 384.
Agis IV, ii, 63, 247; attacks Athens, 45.
Aglaia, one of the Graces, ii, 118.
Aglibolus, god, i, 659.
Agnati, iii, 86.
Agora of Athens, ii, 11.
Agræ, ii, 159.
Agrarian laws, iii, 87; in Rome first heard of, iii, 189.
Agriculture of the Assyrians, i, 147, 148; Babylonians, 182, 183; Chaldæans, 114, 115; Grecians, ii, 70; Egyptians, i, 297, 303; Lydians, 690; Medo-Persian, 211, Palestine, i, 566, 567; Romans, iii, 77-85.
Agricultural industry lies at the foundation of all civilization, i, 288.
Agrigentum, ii, 30, 319, 431, 454; iii, 39.
Agrippa Menenius, iii, 126, 185, 310.
Agrippina, iii, 262, 298, 303.
Ahab, i, 633.
Ahasuerus, i, 205, 225.
Ahriman, symbol, i, 218, 219.
Aidys, i, 689.
Ai, Gula, or Arrunit, goddess, i, 121.
Ajax bearing the Lash, tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 503, 507.
Akkerkuf, i, 180.
Akori, i, 346.
Alæ, or foreign troops, iii, 389; small apartments of the Romans, iii, 219.
Alani, tribe, i, 83; iii, 73.
Alaric, king of the Visigoths, i, 488; iii, 72, 73.
Alba city, iii, 19, 157.
Alba Longa, iii, 23, 121, 154.
Albano, ii, 413.
Alban Rome, iii, 144.
Albategnius, i, 534.
Albany Female Academy, i, xiv; Law School, i, xii; Medical College, i, xi, xii.
Alcæus, ii, 480.
Alcestis, ii, 113.
Alcibiades, ii, 43, 44, 199, 276, 335, 353, 490; flees to Thrace, 45; slain, 45.
Alcmena, wife of Jupiter, ii, 94, 113.
Alden mountains, i, 43, 75.
Alea, ii, 108.
Alecto, one of the Furies, ii, 86.
Alemaron, ii, 320.
Aleppo, city of, i, 86, 95, 484, 497.
Alexander the Great, i, 182, 210, 211, 242, 284, 441, 543, 561, 633, 637, 641, 661, 678; ii, 53, 179, 273, 274, 345, 383, 406, 424, 438, 439, 518, 525, 529, 454, 455, 456, 466, 490, 512, 513; iii, 34, 49, 287, 288; his parentage, ii, 55; strictly a historical personage, 55; appointed commander-in-chief of Greeks against the Persians, 56; defeats the entire Persian host, 56; totally defeats Darius, 56; takes Tyre and Gaza, 56; founds Alexandria, 57; obtains a complete victory over the Persians, 57; projects the invasion of India, 57; defeats an Indian army, 57; his army force him to return, 57; his policy in consolidating his empire, 58; his death, 59; tyrant of Phere, 50.

Alexandria, i, 284, 285, 287, 318, 319, 413, 414, 415, 484, 536, 638; iii, 61, 64, 283, 290, 301, 304, 310, 313, 314, 315; founded, ii, 57.
Alexandrian library, i, 413; church, 415.
Alexandrines, iii, 360.
Alexandrinus, Sotion, iii, 279.
Algazali, recent translation of a work of, i, 539; his notions of the source of truth, i, 540, 542.
Alhambra palace, ruins of the, i, 60, 544.
Al-Harisi, i, 548.
Ali, i, 473, 480, 485, 486, 487, 491, 492, 496.
Ali Bey, i, 287.
Ali Hassan, i, 525.
Allies in the Roman armies, iii, 385.
Allah, i, 118, 500.
Allat, i, 501.
Allemanni, iii, 67.
Allophyllian race, i, 24, 25, 26, 33, 40-42, 51, 52.
Almansor, i, 492.
Al-Mamon, i, 287.
Al Mamoun, i, 550, 552.
Almohades, i, 487.
Al Orf, i, 510.
Alp Arslan, i, 86.
Alphabet, Etruscan, iii, 7.
Alpheus, river, ii, 8.
Alps, i, 39; iii, 2, 4, 6, 30, 43, 46, 47, 54.
Al Saffah, i, 491.
Al Sirat, i, 509.
Altai, mount, i, 20, 25, 43, 75, 76.
Altaku, i, 143.
Altars, Grecian, ii, 129, 130; Roman, iii, 127, 128.
Althæa, ii, 115, 116.
Altis, sacred grove, ii, 8, 134.
Altius, i, 489.
Altus Nævius, iii, 157.
Al Uzza, i, 501.
Alyattes, i, 203, 206, 689; tomb of, i, 691; iii, 7.
Amalekites, i, 557.
Amalthea, goat, ii, 81.
Amanoph I, i, 442.
Amanus, mount, i, 142, 630.
Amasis, king, i, 281, 282, 318.
Amathus, ii, 104.
Amazons, ii, 16, 113, 114; statue, ii, 135.
Ambracia, ii, 417.
Ambracian gulf, i, 37.
Amalekites, i, 470.
Amenemes, i, 273; III, i, 274.
Amenenha III, i, 430; IV, 295.
Amente, goddess, i, 118, 333, 339, 340, 378, 342, 343, 346, 449.
America, i, 624; ii, 296; iii, 201; North, i, 420; aborigines of, i, 40.
American Indians, medicine man of the, i, 410; savage, pure specimen of oratory of, i, 547.
Ammon, i, 118, 325, 329.
Ammonites, i, 557, 573; iii, 284, 285.
Amoor, river, i, 25, 43.
Amor, iii, 105.
Amosis, king, i, 276, 277, 442.
Amphictyon, ii, 277.
Amphictyonic council, ii, 277; league, 16.
Amphion, ii, 467.
Amphitheatre, Roman, iii, 254.
Amphipolitan, ii, 422.
Amphissa, ii, 280, 447; taken by Philip, ii, 52.
Amphitrite, ii, 109, 110, 117.
Amram, mound, i, 177.
Amur (error *Amru*), i, 483.
Amrou, Joseph, i, 475, 542, 543.
Amraphil, king of Shinar; i, 110, 112.
Amset, i, 449.
Amun-Generator, i, 345.

Amun, god, i, 327, 328, 331, 345, 346.
Amun-nou-het, queen, i, 277.
Amunoph I, i, 277; Amunoph II, 422, 443; i, Amunoph III, 422.
Amunre-Generator, god, i, 328.
Amun-Re, god, i, 327, 328, 330, 345, 346.
Amuntimæus, i, 274.
Amur, river, i, 76, 287, 484, 485, 486.
Amusements of the Egyptians, i, 367, 368, 369; of the Grecians, ii, 227-230; of the Romans, iii, 226, et seq.
Amyhia, i, 202.
Amyitis, i, 202.
Amyntas II, ii, 53.
Amyrtæus, i, 283.
Ana, god, i, 118, 124.
Anacreon, ii, 480.
Anactorium, ii, 41.
Ananias, iii, 317.
Anas, river, i, 40.
Anastasius, iii, 121.
Anata, i, 119, 120.
Anatolia, i, 92, 95, 681.
Anaxagoras, ii, 303, 307, 308, 309, 328, 332, 340, 488, 504.
Anaxarchus, ii, 348.
Anaxilaus, iii, 279.
Anaximander, ii, 303, 305, 306, 309.
Anaximenes, ii, 303, 306, 307, 308.
Anchises, ii, 113.
Ancius, iii, 50.
Ancilia, sacred shields of the Romans, iii, 396.
Ancona, iii, 356.
Ancus Martius, iii, 23, 25, 144.
Andalusia, i, 652.
Andocides, ii, 492.
Andromache, i, 661.
Andromeda, iii, 349.
Andronicus Cyrrhestes, ii, 456; dramatic poet, iii, 369, 385.
Angelian, ii, 431.
Angora, city of, i, 95.
Animals, worship of, among the Egyptians, i, 347-352.
Anio, river, iii, 12, 16, 19, 185.
Annata, female deity, i, 118.
Aphrodisius, Alexander, iii, 298.
Aphrodite or Venus, i, 340; ii, 102, 103, 108.
Apis, god, i, 337.
Apis-Osiris, i, 337.
Apollinopolis, i, 429.
Apollino with a Lizard, statue, ii, 439.
Apollo, son of Jupiter, i, 325, 339, 661, 662, 684, 685; ii, 93, 96, 97, 98, 105, 112, 118, 130, 143, 144, 145, 147, 152, 220, 411, 426, 441, 442, 443, 445, 455, 457, 459, 469, 470; iii, 103, 118; how represented, ii, 97; statue of, depository of the Sibylline books, iii, 117; temple of ii, 5, 132, 462, 464; iii, 126; Belvidere, ii, 163; Epicurius, temple of, 453; Triopus, temple of, ii, 27.
Apollodorus, ii, 419, 420, 421, 440, 513.
Apollonia, ii, 308.
Apollonius, i, 415, iii, 280, 281; character of, 280.
Apologus, i, 183.
Apophis, i, 276.
Apothegms, ascribed to Antisthenes, ii, 344, 345; Aristippus, 347, 348; Bias, 301; Chilo, 300; Cleobulus of Lindus, 301; Diogenes, 346; Periander, 302; Pittacus of Mitylene, 300, 301; Pythagoras, 319; Solon, 300; Thales, 305.
Apotheosis, iii, 107.
Appianum, color, iii, 347.
Appius Claudius, iii, 38.
Apple mountains, i, 75.
Apries, king, i, 180, 281, 282.
Apuleius, Lucius, iii, 281.

Anniceres, ii, 354.
Anouke, i, 345.
Ant, ii, 152.
Antæus, ii, 113.
Antalcidas, ii, 271, 272, 276; peace of, 48, 268, 269.
Antes, i, 85.
Anthela, ii, 278.
Anthemis, ii, 431.
Anthesteria festival, ii, 140.
Antheus, ii, 440.
Anthony, Mark, iii, 62, 63, 64, 66, 107, 259, 262; fascinated by Cleopatra, i, 286.
Antigenides, ii, 466.
Antigone, tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 508; daughter of Œdipus, 117.
Antigonius Doson, ii, 62, 64.
Antigonus, i, 684; ii, 59.
Antilibanus, mount, i, 631, 646.
Antioch, i, 484, 635, ; iii, 280.
Antiochus, i, 634, 635, 636, 637; ii, 45, 273, 405; iii, 49, 50, 298.
Antipater, ii, 56, 59, 60, 494, 561.
Antiphon, ii, 490.
Antonia, tower of, i, 563.
Antonines, iii, 300, 301, 341.
Antoninus, iii, 356.
Antonius, Marcus Aurelius, Latin orator, iii, 306, 369.
Antiquity of man, i, 47, 50, 51.
Antisthenes, ii, 303, 335, 343, 344, 345,
Anubis, god, i, 334, 340, 344, 378.
Anytus, ii, 342, 345.
Apelles, i, 9; ii, 179, 420, 422, 423, 424.
Apennine mountains, ii, 2, 5, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 405: eastern boundary of Etruria, iii. 6.
Appellicon, ii, 384; iii, 279.
Aphac, i, 667.
Aphophis, i, 342.
Aquæ Lutæ, battle at, iii, 54.
Aqueducts of the Romans, iii, 353.
Arab-Egyptians, i, 267.
Arabesque, i, 544; invented, iii, 348.
Arabia, i, 16, 26, 27, 150, 316, 350, 469, 470, 553, 630, 656, 662; man in, an institution, 2, 3; its description, 461, 467; its monuments are men, 461; its boundaries, 462; its divisions, 462; primitive tribes of, 462, 471; Mahomet in, 471–480; establishment of Mahometanism in, 476; Saracenic empire commences in, 480; foundation of the Ommiade dynasty of caliphs in, 486; overthrow of the Ommiade line in, 491; separation of church and state in, 496; rise and overthrow of the Wahabees in, 495-497; its industry, 497–500; its religion, 500–515; its society, 515-522; its government, 522; its philosophy, 530–543; its art, 544–552; Deserta, 462, 464, 467; Felix, 462, 463, 464, 465, 468; iii, 95; Petræa, i, 462, 463, 470; Southern, 467, 468; monuments in, 54.
Arabian, desert, i, 106, 643, 646; gulf, 53, 468, 469, 645, 653; Irak, 462, philosophy, 60; race, 28, 204; science, 60; sea, 469; Nights' Entertainments, their birth, 551.
Arabians, iii, 95, 97; 112, 155, 253, 275, 283, 643; mission of, i, 254.
Arabs, i, 56, 59, 142, 177, 483, 643.
Aradus, i, 140, 672.
Aral sea, i, 76.
Aram, i, 105.
Aramæan language, dialect of the Semitic, i, 28, 253, 466, 553; race, 466, 632.
Aratus, ii, 62, 63, 274; poisoned, ii, 64.
Araxes river, x, 2, 16, 81, 95, 104, 197, 239, 252.
Arba Lisun, i, 110.

Arbela, i, 210; ii, 57.
Arbogastis, iii, 72.
Arboriculture, Grecian, ii, 73; Roman, iii, 84.
Arcadia, ii, 13, 19, 21, 75, 112, 119, 278, 281, 446, 454, 458, 463, 514; iii, 19; the Switzerland of Greece, ii, 6; cradle of the Palasgic race 6.
Arcadian mountains, ii, 7.
Arcadians, ii, 250, 272; their character, 6.
Arcadius, iii, 72.
Arcesilaus, ii, 303, 340, 402, 403, 404.
Archangel, i, 80.
Arch, of Titus, iii, 354; Roman combined with the Grecian column, iii, 352.
Arches, Roman, iii, 354.
Archelaus, ii, 53, 303, 308, 309, 328, 332.
Archidamus, ii, 50, 180, 298.
Archigallus, iii, 121.
Archimedes, ii, 29; inventions of, iii, 46.
Archilochus, ii, 477, 478.
Archipelago, islands of the, ii, 27, 67.
Archon, Athenian, ii, 254.
Architecture, ii, 74; Assyrian, i, 148, 159–166; Chaldæan, 132–134; Babylonian, 196; Egyptian, 243, 244, 417, 319, 322; Etruscan, iii, 11, 351, 352; Grecian, ii, 445–456; Medo-Persian, i, 211, 239–245; Phœnician, 677; Roman, iii, 350–357.
Archytas, ii, 320.
Ardea, iii, 26.
Areopagus, court of, ii, 258, 260.
Areopagites, ii, 260.
Ares, or Mars, ii, 101.
Argæus defeated, ii, 53.
Argean, i, 181.
Arginusæ, ii, 45, 293.
Arges, origin of, ii, 80.
Argives, ii, 7, 71.
Argo, ship, ii, 18.
Argolis, i, 37; ii, 7, 15, 19, 235, 270, 271.
Argonauts, ii, 18.
Argonautic expedition, ii, 18, 115.
Argos, ii, 7, 12, 15, 20, 41, 48, 94, 95, 98, 230, 238, 262, 268, 271, 275, 446, 447.
Aria, iii, 262.
Ariadne, ii, 141.
Arian, iii, 305.
Arians, i, 415.
Aries, or ram, instrument used in war, iii, 413, 414.
Arimanius, symbol, i, 218.
Arioch, king of Larsa, i, 110, 112.
Arion, ii, 480.
Aristæus, ii, 320.
Aristeus, king of Arcadia, ii, 73.
Aristides the Just, ii, 33, 34, 38, 187, 263, 422, 522.
Aristippus, ii, 303, 335, 336, 337, 346, 347, 381.
Aristo, ii, 353, 397.
Aristobulus, i, 561.
Aristodemus, ii, 240, 337.
Aristomenes, ii, 24.
Aristophanes, ii, 509, 510, 511, 513.
Aristotle, i, 8, 68, 535, 536, 537; ii, 182, 303, 352, 353, 383, 384, 385, 387, 388, 391, 392, 394, 395, 396, 413; iii, 279, 281, 282, 289, 291, 298, 299, 330, 232, 333, 422.
Arles, iii, 281, 489.
Armatura, exercise of arms among the Romans, iii, 394.
Armenia, i, 32, 56, 75, 92, 95, 106, 141, 142, 145, 155, 185, 198, 199, 200, 485, 634, 643, 647, 682; iii, 57; highlands of, i, 55; king of, i, 206.
Armenians, i, 143.
Armenium, color, iii, 347.

Armies, the Grecian method of raising and supporting, ii, 514; the Grecian composition of, ii, 515; composition of the Roman, iii, 388.
Armillæ, the, reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 406.
Armor of the Roman soldiers, iii, 395 Persian, i, 247.
Armsby, Dr. James H., i, xi.
Arms, of the Grecians, defensive and offensive, ii, 518, 521; and weapons of the Roman soldiers, iii, 396.
Army, Roman, served gratis for more than three hundred years, iii, 393.
Arno river, iii, 2.
Arnus river, i, 39.
Arrunit, god, i, 121.
Arsa, C. Terentillus, iii, 191.
Arsaces III, i, 636.
Arsia, battle near the forest of, iii, 27.
Arsinoe, i, 350.
Art, the foundation of, i, 4; of the Arabians, 544-552; of the Assyrians, 159-172, of the Babylonians, 196, 197; of the Chaldæans, 132-134; among the Egyptians, 416-460; of the Grecians, ii, 407-533; of the Hebrews, i, 623-629; of the Medo-Persians, 238-252; of the Phœnicians, 677-680; of the Romans, iii, 384-42.
Artabanus, i, 210.
Artabazus, ii, 37.
Artaphernes, ii, 33.
Artaxerxes, king of Persia, ii, 50, 47, 268.
Artemis, or Diana, ii, 98, 99,
Artemisium, battle of, ii, 532.
Artists, Grecian, their compensation, ii, 409; their models, 413.
Arumah, i, 567.
Aruspices, iii, 114, 115, 116.
Arvath, i, 670.
Aryan, language, i, 25, 27, 28, 30, 110; nation, 25, 26, 54; race, 551 110, 181, 197, 199, 200, 201, 204, 219.
Aryans, i, 23; original homes of, 32, 34.
Aryesis, i, 203.
Asbestos, iii, 268.
Ascalon, i, 555, 659, 665; ii, 405.
Ascra, ii, 473.
Asculum, battle in the neighborhood of, iii, 35.
Asdrubal, iii, 41, 46, 47.
Ashdod, i, 555.
Ashtoreth, i, 123, 665.
Asia, 24, 53, 73, 76, 90, 93, 143, 184, 222, 467, 489, 647, 694; ii, 131, 282, 371, 383, 449, 485; iii, 34, 49, 50, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 63, 64, 65, 70, 75, 260; the historical drama opens in, i, 4; Central,; plateau of, i, 5, 74, 75, 88, 470; Minor, i, 26, 32, 36, 55, 75, 145, 184, 200, 202, 206, 207, 209, 681-695; ii, 56, 90, 275, 276, 277, 303, 457, 469, 473, 476, 479; iii, 67; its physical features, 680-683; Upper, i, 32; Southern, religion of, 60; Western, 145, 146, 154, 181, 210; Western high, height of, 77.
Asmonæan princes, i, 608.
Asmonæans, dynasty of, i, 561.
Aspasia, ii, 179, 488.
Asphaltites, lake, i, 555.
Astarte, i, 123, 663, 664, 665, 667; ii, 103.
Asteria, daughter of Cœus and Phœbe, ii, 80.
Assassination of, Adherbal, iii, 53; Caius Gracchus, 207; Cicero, 63; Hypatia, 291; Pompey, 60; Tarquin, 25; Valentinian, 74; Viviathus, 52.
Assassins of Persia, i, 92.
Assemblies, public, of Sparta, ii, 246.

Assembly, public, of the Athenians, ii, 256, 258.
Asshur, god, head of the Assyrian pantheon, i, 135, 138, 139, 140, 151.
Asshur-kinat-ili-kain, [Saracus], last king of Assyria, i, 145.
Asshur-bani-pal, i, 144, 166; his library, 145.
Asshur-idannipal, i, 140.
Association for the advancement of science, i, xvii.
Assyria, i, 134-172, 173, 198, 202, 468. 645, 683; its description, 134, 136; its ethnography, 137; its history, 139, 146; its monuments, 22; its industry, 147, 151; extinction of the empire of, 146; Eastern, 135.
Assyrian race, i, 16.
Assyrians, i, 112, 280, 197, 466, 659, 660; origin of, 138; their language, 137; their agriculture, 147, 148; their architecture, 148; manufactures, 149; their source commerce of the, 149-151; their of wealth, 150; religion of the, 151, 152; their government, 153-255; society of the, 155-158; their dress, 156, 157; their sports, 156, 157; their manner of attacking fortified places, 171.
Astracan, i, 92, 94.
Astræa, iii, 105.
Astræus, origin of, ii, 80.
Astrologers among the Romans, iii, 116; Chaldæans, i, 194, 196.
Astrology, judicial, i, 193–195; of the Egyptians, i, 411.
Astronomy of the Arabians, i, 532, 533; of the Chaldæans, i, 130, 193; among the Egyptians, i, 405–408.
Astyages, i, 203, 205.
Atergatis, deity, i, 659.
Athanasius, i, 415.
Atheists, iii, 317.
Athenæa, festival, ii, 140.
Athena, Pallas, Minerva, ii, 99, 100.
Athenians, ii, 20, 42, 173, 258, 262, 264, 289.
Athenodorus, iii, 302.
Athens, i, 422; ii, 10, 12, 14, 24, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 45, 48, 54, 62, 66, 112, 115, 130, 137, 140, 165, 152, 172, 176, 178, 179, 185, 190, 191, 192, 194, 204, 205, 209, 210, 211, 214–5, 229–30, 250, 252–3, 259, 261, 262, 263, 266, 267, 268, 270, 272, 275, 276, 281, 284, 285, 288, 290, 291, 297, 307, 330, 331, 333, 342, 345, 353, 354, 370, 383, 384, 397, 419, 424, 425, 429, 431, 434, 453, 454, 455, 460, 461, 462, 471, 483, 484, 487, 488, 490, 491, 495, 500, 501, 502, 504, 510, 511, 512, 513, 515, 524, 530; iii, 56, 67, 263, 274, 276, 277, 279, 281, 286, 288, 289, 290, 300, 301, 306, 307, 359.
Athos, mount, i, 209; ii, 32.
Atlius, iii, 117.
Athor, god, i, 341, 344, 346, 351.
Atthyr, goddess, i, 338.
Atlantic ocean, i, 55, 678, 680.
Atlantis, island of, i, 50.
Atlantides, a lost race, i, 50.
Atlas, mount, i, 20, 80, 661; king, ii, 113.
Atmoo, god, i, 344.
Atomic school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 327–330.
Atramentum, color, iii, 347.
Atrium, room in a Roman house, iii, 219.
Atropos, one of the Fates, ii, 85, 90.
Attack, engines of, used by the Grecians, ii, 528.
Attalus, king of Pergamus, ii, 64; iii, 53, 72, 303.

Attica, the home of the Athenians, 8, 37, 695; ii, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12, 13 14, 15, 36, 68, 71, 73, 74, 76, 87, 101, 115, 156, 160, 169, 213, 252 266, 282, 284, 332, 495, 501, 532.
Atticus, iii, 281.
Attila, i, 79, 82–84, 489; iii, 73; his physique, i, 82; his marriage to Ildico, i, 84; his first defeat, i 84; death of, i, 84.
Attius, dramatic poet, iii, 277.
Atyadæ dynasty, i, 689.
Atys, i, 691.
Aufidus, river, iii, 45.
Augeas, ii, 71; stables of, ii, 113.
Augures, equipment of the, iii, 108, 109.
Augurs, ii, 152; iii, 134; college of, iii, 113, 114.
Augurium, iii, 109.
Augury, the Latin belief in, iii, 17; practice of, among the Romans, iii, 97, 98, 99, 100.
Augustan age, its character, iii, 363; decline of taste in, 367.
Augustine, Count, ii, 69.
Augustus Cæsar, ii, 423, 453, 454; iii, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 90, 95, 108, 126, 208, 209, 235, 238, 239, 249, 256, 259, 261, 262, 298, 312, 340, 345, 349, 355; the fascination of Cleopatra, unavailing against, i, 286; increases the pay of the Roman soldiers, iii, 393.
Augustine, iii, 302.
Aulus Posthumius, iii, 28.
Aurelian, iii, 68, 284.
Aurelius, Marcus, iii, 251, 266, 288, 354.
Aurunci, iii, 5.
Aurora, ii, 106, iii; origin of, 80; how represented, ii, 111.
Auspicium, iii, 109.
Aventine hill, iii, 23, 24, 98, 157, 158, 232.
Averrhoes, i, 536.
Avicenna, i, 536.
Ayesha, i, 474, 477, 480, 485.
Azad Bahman, the first intelligence, i, 214, 217.
Azarias, iii, 317.
Azerbijan, i, 202.
Azoph, i, 94.
Azrael, 1, 505.
Azure, Egyptian color, iii, 447.

Baal, god, i, 331, 658, 665, 666, 667.
Baalbek, i, 332.
Babylon, i, 53, 54, 59, 104, 111, 112, 120, 122, 139, 143, 144, 145, 155, 173, 174, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 192, 196, 206, 207, 208, 228, 238, 242, 243, 252, 256, 405, 580, 639, 640, 645, 649; ii, 57, 310; monuments of, i, 2; description of, 174, 178; fall of, 182.
Babylonia, i, 27, 105, 122, 140, 141, 142, 143, 148, 163, 173-197, 198, 203, 228, 238, 482, 631, 632, 662, 674; its monuments, 22.
Babylonians, i, 16, 56, 143, 144, 155, 203, 206, 643, 660, their land trade, 184; strange custom among the, i, 190; their manner of treating the sick, 190; learning of the, confined to the priest caste, 192; the first to discover the zodiac, 193; their lack of sculpture, 196.
Babel, i, 53, 107, 131, 173, 177; tower of, 175.
Bab-el-Mandeb, i, 467, 468.
Babil, mound of, i, 176.
Bacchanalia, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Bacchus, god, i, 335, 519; ii, 71, 72, 93, 104, 108, 119, 120, 125, 135, 140, 441, 442, 445, 454, 497, 507, 508; iii, 104; temple of, ii, 132, how represented, 108; picture of, story of a, iii, 345-346.

Bacon, Lord, i, 68; ii, 395, 406,; iii, 375.
Baconian school, i, 68.
Bactria, i, 81, 286; ii, 57.
Bactriana, i, 75, 243.
Badahshan, [Cushgar], mountain range of, i, 243.
Bagdad, i, 86, 92, 95, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 530, 535; structures in, i, 60.
Baggage, Roman, military, how disposed of during a march, iii, 307.
Bagoas, i, 224.
Bahr Youssouf, canal, i, 294.
Bahrein, i, 468, 494; islands, i, 185.
Baikal, lake, i, 43.
Bait, i, 346.
Bajazet, emperor, i, 95.
Balbec, i, 646; ii, 448.
Baleh, i, 90.
Baldwin, Count, i, 564.
Balhor, i, 345.
Balista, Roman, iii, 412.
Balkh, i, 535.
Balkash, lake, i, 77.
Ball, or tennis, game of the Romans, iii, 229.
Ballads, Roman heroic, iii, 360, 361.
Balloting, Roman, iii, 167.
Baltic sea, i, 41, 55, 80, 655; iii, 75.
Banquets, Assyrian, i, 158.
Baptism, doctrine of, i, 98.
Baptismal names of the Romans, how taken, iii, 251.
Barnard, Windsor county, Vt., birthplace of the author, i, v.
Barca, Hamilcar, iii, 42, 43.
Barter, among the Phœnicians, i, 655.
Bashan, bulls of, i, 566.
Basque dialect, i, 25; its difference from the Celtic, and affinity to that of the American aborigines, i, 40.
Bas-reliefs of the Assyrians, i, 164, 165; of the Egyptians, 436, 438.
Bassora, i, 485, 494, 495, 496, 535, 536.
Baths, and exercises of the Romans, iii, 226–230; of Caracalla, 355; Grecian, ii, 214–216; of Titus, iii, 355.
Baton, his ravages and conquests, i, 92, 93.
Batrachocephalus, god, i, 329.
Batric, fortress of, i, 94.
Battle, Grecian order of, ii, 521–527; Roman order of, iii, 402–406.
Bavaria, iii, 67.
Baz, Nin, or Ninip, god, i, 122.
Beards, Roman, iii, 216.
Beauty, component parts of, ii, 443–445.
Beder, vale of, i, 474.
Bedouins, i, 275, 465, 469, 471, 497, 520, 693.
Begu, i, 92.
Behistan, i, 245.
Bel, i, 176, 658.
Bellona, i, 119; ii, 103.
Bellerophon, ii, 16, 19, 115.
Belly and the members, fable of, iii, 185.
Bel-Merodach, god, i, 122.
Bel-Nimrod, i, 111, 119, 120, 123.
Belshazzar, i, 182.
Beltis, female deity, i, 119.
Belurland, i, 184.
Belus, i, 124, 131, 151, 176, 331, 658; temple of, 175, 177, 189; tower of, 192.
Belut-tagh, mountains, i, 43, 76.
Belzoni, i, 435.
Beneventum, iii, 35.
Bengal, i, 93.
Benhadad, i, 633; II, 660, 663;
Beni-Hassan, i, 370; tombs at, i, 307, 308, 321.
Beni Kahtan, i, 468.
Benjamin, tribe of, i, 559.
Beosus, i, 174.
Berecyntus, i, 684.

Bertesena, i, 85.
Beryta, iii, 281.
Bessus, i, 210; ii, 57.
Betrothing, among the Romans, iii, 242.
Beth-Sargina, i, 141.
Bezetha, mount, i, 562.
Bhota, i, 25.
Bias, ii, 299, 300, 301.
Bidiaioi, inferior magistrates of Sparta, ii, 245.
Bil, or Enu, god, i, 118, 124.
Bil-Nipur, city of, i, 119.
Bil-shar-urzur, i, 182.
Binothris, king, i, 376.
Birds, the, comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 509, 513.
Birket el Keroun, i, 294.
Birs, i, 178.
Birs-Nimrod, mound, i, 123, 177, 180.
Biscay, gulf of, i, 40.
Bisutum, i, 245.
Bithynia, i, 682; iii, 55, 57, 304.
Bitlis Chai, i, 150.
Bit-Sargina, city, i, 135, 161, 183.
Black forest, i, 34.
sea, i, 5; ii, 27, 30.
Boats introduced, ii, 76.
Bochara, city of, i, 85, 90.
Bocchoris the Wise, i, 280.
Bocchus, iii, 54.
Boethius, iii, 298.
Bœotia, i, 37, 651; ii, 3, 4, 5, 15, 40, 41, 133, 147, 268, 272.
Bœotians, ii, 64, 238, 271, 458.
Bœtria, i, 40.
Bogheda Oola, mountain, i, 76.
Bolingbroke, Lord, definition of history, i, 1.
Bolor mountains, i, 43.
Bona Dea, iii, 105; festivals of the, iii, 123.
Bonaparte, i, 288.
Bonus Eventus, iii, 105.
Books of the Fasti, Ovid's, iii, 367.
Borac, Mahomet's horse, i, 478.
Boreas, ii, 111.
Borghites, i, 287.
Borsippa, i, 120, 123, 177, 178, 180.
Borysthenes, i, 92, 420.
Bosnia, i, 93.
Bosra, city of, i, 483.
Bostra, i, 500.
Botta, M., i, 161.
Bow and arrow, used by Roman auxiliaries, iii, 397.
Bowides dynasty, i, 86; annihilated, i, 86.
Brahe, Tycho, i, 533.
Brahma, i, 346.
Brahmanic, Indian idioms of, i, 56.
Bramaputra river, i, 25, 76.
Brasidas, Spartan general, ii, 43.
Brass, first in statues, ii, 430, 433; founding, Etruscan, iii, 337.
Bread, manufacture of, among the Chaldæans, i, 114, 115; Grecians, ii, 12.
Brennius, chieftain of the Gauls, iii, 30.
Briareus, origin of, ii, 80.
Bricks, Chaldæan manufacture of, i, 132, 133; Grecian, ii, 74.
Britain, i, 680; iii, 58, 68, 69; language of, i, 33.
British constitution, i, 11.
Isles, i, 11, 33, 655.
Museum, i, 158.
Britons, ancient, i, 25.
Brontes, origin of, ii, 80.
Bronze in statuary, ii, 430, 435.
Bruti, the, iii, 237.
Bruttians, iii. 35.
Brutus, iii, 62, 63, 66, 208, 260, 262.
Bryant, i, 275.
Bubastis, city, i, 258, 269, 330, 348, 355; deity, i, 330, 327.
Buca, ii, 274.
Buccinæ, musical instruments of the Romans, iii, 258, 401.

Bucharia, Great, i, 75.
Bucolics of Virgil, iii, 78.
Bularchus, ii, 418, 419.
Bulgaria, i, 93.
Bull, the sacrifice to Jupiter, ii, 137; black, sacrifice to Pluto, ii, 137.
Bunsen, Chevalier, i, 22, 46, 269, 276, 271, 429.
Bupalus, ii, 431.
Burnet, Dr., ii, 79.
Burial of the Roman dead, iii, 265–270.
places of the Romans, 268.
Burning the dead, Roman custom of, iii, 265, 268, 269, 270.
Burrhus, iii, 303.
Buschmanno, of Berlin, i, 22.
Busiris, god, ii, 113, 273; city, i, 339, 355.
Buto, god, i, 327, 348; city of, 325.
Byblos, i, 140, 663, 664, 665, 672.
Bythynia, i, 655.
Byzantium, or Constantinople, ii, 27, 58, 67.
Byzes, ii, 453.

Cabala, Jewish, iii, 316.
Cabeiria, ii, 158.
Cabiri, gods, i, 659.
Cabul, i, 150.
Cacus, robber, ii, 113.
Cadesia, battle of, i, 545.
Cadiz, i, 488, 652.
Cadmus, i, 37, 119, 651; ii, 15, 16, 18, 71, 75, 116, 133, 268; introduces letters into Greece, 416.
Cæpio, iii, 52.
Cæruleum, color, iii, 347.
Cæsar, Augustus, ii, 144; iii, 65, 117, 118. Julius, i, 561; ii, 67, 107, 118, 128, 181, 184; iii, 59, 60, 65, 135, 207, 208, 246, 260, 262, 298, 339; his first prominent appearance, iii, 57; protests against a decree
Cæsar, continued—
of the senate, 58; one of the first triumvirate, 58; has assigned to him the government of Gaul and Illyria, 58; subdues all the barbarians between the Pyrenees and the German ocean, 58; his bond with Pompey sundered, 59; ordered to disband his army, 59; passes the Rubicon, 60; subdues Sicily, Sardinia, Spain, and Italy, 60; after reducing Marseilles, created dictator, 60; routs the forces of Pompey at the battle of Pharsalia, 60; causes a temple to be erected to Pompey in Egypt, 61; settles the affairs of Egypt, 61; smitten with the charms of Cleopatra, i, 286, iii; 61; veni, vidi, vici, 61; successful at the battle of Thapsus, 61; concludes the African war, 61; created dictator for ten years, 61; acquires a decisive victory over the two sons of Pompey in Spain, 62; created perpetual dictator, 62; plans vast schemes for public improvements, 62; assassinated, 62; mentioned, 107, 118, 128, 181, 284, 298; Roman orator, 370; doubles the pay of the Roman soldiers, 383; Octavius, iii, 62, 63.
Cæsars, i, 459; the despotism of, iii, 373.
Cæsarea, i, 601.
Cairo, city, i, 259, 296, 297, 536.
Caius, iii, 87.
Calah [Nimrod], i, 120, 135, 198, 140, 141, 148, 163, 164.
Calendar of the Egyptians, i, 406, 407.
Caligula, iii, 261.
Caliga, serpent, i, 339.
Callicratidas, ii, 45.
Callimachus, ii, 432, 477.

Calliope, the muse of epic poetry, ii, 118.
Callistratus, ii, 440, 490.
Callon, ii, 432.
Calneh, i, 53, 107, 111, 119.
Calpe, i, 652.
Calvary, mount, i, 554.
Calydonian boar, ii, 115.
Cambunian mountains, ii, 1, 52; iii, 2.
Cambyses, i, 205, 208, 217, 221, 223, 239, 268, 282, 441.
Camels, i, 183, 184.
Camillus, M. Furius, iii, 30, 197, 198.
Campania, iii, 5, 32, 45, 285; plains of, iii, 2.
Campus, Flaminius, iii, 408; Martius, iii, 27, 408.
Canaan, i, 52, 53, 562, 639, 669, 670; descendants of, 557.
Canaanites, i, 26, 53, 274, 631.
Canals of Egypt, i, 294, 297.
Canary isles, iii, 37.
Cancer, i, 195.
Candahar, i, 90.
Candaules, i, 689; ii, 418.
Cannæ, field of, i, 10; battle of, iii, 45, 50.
Canonus, ii, 293.
Canopic, mouth of the Nile, i, 258.
Canopus, city, i, 258.
Canuleius, C., iii, 194.
Cape Hermæum, iii, 28.
Good Hope, i, 319, 500, 642.
Capena, iii, 91.
Capitol, of Rome, iii, 15, 99, 116, 127, 408, 409; hill, 138.
Capitoline hill, iii, 20, 104; temple, iii, 26, 336.
Capitolinus, Jupiter, iii, 116.
Capo d'Istria, ii, 69.
Cappadocia, i, 634, 646, 662, 682; iii, 55, 286, 287.
Capricorn, i, 195.
Caprotinæ, Roman festival, iii, 134.
Captivity of the Hebrews, i, 560.
Capua, city of, i, 39; iii, 32, 45, 56, 61.
Caracalla, emperor, i, 401; iii, 94, 355.
Caranus, ii, 52.
Caravans, African, i, 316.
Carbæ, i, 470.
Carbela, i, 496.
Carbo, Papirius, iii, 54.
Carchemish, i, 178, 179.
Carrhæ, battle near, iii, 59.
Caria, i, 682, 683; ii, 252; called Doris, 20.
Carians, ii, 16.
Carinthia, iii, 54.
Carisme, i, 90, 94.
Carlovingian line of kings, i, 489.
Carmania, 200, 203.
Carmel, mount, i, 554.
Carneades, ii, 302, 303; ii, 402, 403, 404, 405.
Carpathian hills, i, 92.
Carteia, i, 652.
Carthage, i, 10, 28, 637, 640, 650, 651, 653, 670; ii, 26, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 51, 53, 56, 65, 90, 92, 93, 95, 263; treaty with, iii, 27; its power, 36; its government, 36, 37; its commercial pursuits, 37; siege of, 411.
Carthagena, iii, 46.
Carthaginians, i, 56, 375, 667; iii, 35.
Carts and carriages, invention of, ii, 76; introduced, 77.
Carus, S. Lucretius, writer of philosophic poetry, iii, 68, 362; see Lucretius.
Cashgar, i, 94.
Caspian gates, i, 150, 184, 204.
sea, i, 5, 75, 76, 86, 198, 200; ii, 27.
Cassander, ii, 60.
Cassius, iii, 62, 63, 66, 189, 208, 262.
Castalian fountain, ii, 5, 118, 146, 147.

Caste, among the Babylonians, i, 186 among the Egyptians, 265, 382, et seq; in India, 265.
Castor and Pollux, ii, 16, 115, 473 offspring of Jupiter, ii, 93; iii, 153.
Catacombs of Egypt, i, 432–435.
Catalans, ii, 67.
Cataline, iii, 57, 58.
Catalinian conspiracy, iii, 57.
Catapulta, Roman, iii, 417.
Cataracts of the Nile, i, 257, 345, 351.
Cato, iii, 259, 260, 274, 339, 359; the censor, 78, 89, 278; eloquence of, 369; the younger, 278.
Cattle rearing among the Romans, iii, 83, 84.
Catullus, Lutatius, iii, 41.
Caucasus, i, 25, 32, 145, 146, 200, 646; mount, 20, 198; iii, 64.
Caucasian dialects, i, 56; race, 267; its birth-place, 20; its characteristics, 20.
Caudine Forks, battle at the, iii, 33.
Cavalry, importance of, i, 251; method of raising, among the Spartans, ii, 514; Grecian, 516; Roman, how chosen for service, iii, 386; clothing of the, 396; deficiency of, in the armies, 405.
Cebes, ii, 335.
Cecrops, i, 37; ii, 15, 16, 71, 72, 73, 100, 119, 135, 169, 175, 176, 223, 254, 258, 270.
Cedrei, i, 470.
Celeres, king of Eleusis, ii, 70.
Celestial regions, war in, ii, 81, 82.
Celsus, iii, 309.
Celt, i, 24.
Celtiberians, i, 40, 41; iii, 52, 53, 62; the first mercenaries in the Roman army, 387.
Celtic language, i, 24, 28, 56; race, i, 32, 56, 57, 60.
Celts, i, 35, 36, 40, 41.
Cenotaphs, Grecian, ii, 226.
Censors, the, in the Roman government of, iii, 173-175.
Centaurs, the, ii, 119.
Central Asia, physical formation of, i, 74-78.
Centuries, division of the army into, iii, 388.
Centurions, their position and duties, iii, 389, 370; pay of, 393; station of, in the Roman army, 404.
Cephisus, river, ii, 4, 11, 202.
Cephren, pyramid of, i, 419.
Cerauna, ii, 274; Ptolemy, i, 635.
Cerussa usta, color, iii, 347.
Cerebus, three headed dog, i, 334, 343, ii, 87; iii, 113.
Cercasorus, city, i, 247, 258, 259.
Ceremonies attending entertainments of the Greeks, ii, 217; funerals, 221, 222, 223.
Ceres, wife of Jupiter, i, 119, 338, ii, 90, 106, 107, 110, 111, 120, 134, 135, 140, 146, 159, 160, 161; iii, 103, 118; her parentage, ii, 81; how represented, ii, 81; Queen of Sicily, ii, 70.
Ceranicus, ii, 161.
Cescanius, iii, 234.
Cestius, Caius, iii, 355.
Ceta, ii, 119.
Cetra, a light piece of armor, of the Roman soldier, iii, 396.
Ceuta, i, 652.
Ceylon, i, 185, 656, 680.
Chæronea, ii, 13, 277; iii, 306; battle of, ii, 4; iii, 56.
Chæremon, i, 402; iii, 303.
Chærestrata, ii, 370.
Chalcedon, ii, 27, 369.
Chalcis, ii, 28, 384, 410; iii, 286.
Chalcidian peninsula, ii, 54.
Chaldæa, i, 51, 104–125, 135, 138, 140, 141, 143, 168, 173, 198, 467; its agriculture, 114, 115; descrip-

Chaldæa, continued—
tion, 105–108; ethnology, 108; chronology and history, 111–113; industry, 113–117; religion, 117–124; government, 125; manufactures, 115, 116; society, 126–128; philosophy, 128–130; art, 132–134.
Chaldæan, race, i, 15; monuments, 26; characters, 110, 111; kingdom, duration of the, 113; astronomy, 130, 131.
Chaldæans, i, 26, 151, 155, 174, 191, 281, 400, 405; ethnic affinities and characteristics of the, 108–110; their commerce, 117; dress, 126, 127; food, 127; burial of the dead, i, 127; speculative talent of the, 131; traditions of the account of the deluge, i, 131; architecture, 132, 133, 134.
Chaldee language, dialect of the Semitic, i, 28, 674.
Chalons, battle of, i, 73, 84, 489; plains of, 84; iii, 73.
Chalybon, in Syria, i, 228.
Champollion, i, 344, 401, 428.
Chaos, ii, 84, 123, 475; the seeds of things first existed in, 79; the ancestor of Nature, 79.
Charlemagne, i, 490.
Charmides, ii, 435.
Charon, i, 379; ii, 84, 88; iii, 265.
Chasars, i, 42.
Chasdim, i, 128.
Chasing, art of, among the Etruscans, iii, 337.
Chedorlaomer, i, 109, 112.
Cheese, manufacture of, among the Greeks, ii, 73.
Chehel Minar, palace of Xerxes, i, 241.
Chemmis, city of, i, 257, 258, 330.
Chemistry, early Arabian works on, i, 534.
Cheops, i, 421; pyramid of, i, 418.
Chersonesus of Thrace, i, 83, 687; ii, 54.
Chian school of art, ii, 430.
Childhood of the Romans, iii, 248.
Chilmad, i, 180.
Chilo, ii, 300.
Chimæra, the fire-vomiting, ii, 115.
Chimeras, land of the, i, 243.
China, i, 70, 73, 76, 81, 85, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 243, 355, 394, 542.
Chinese, i, 73, 85, 90, 91, 431; intellect of, 7; not necessary to consider the civilization of, 15; language, 23, 24, 29; empire, founders of the, 24; ancestors of the, 81.
Chionides, ii, 505.
Chios, ii, 41; and Samos, 20.
Choaspes river, i, 2, 16, 104, 197, 221, 252.
Chœphoroi, tragedy by Æschylus, ii, 502.
Cholula, pyramid of, i, 420.
Chorasan, i, 90.
Chrishna, god, i, 339.
Christ, iii, 318; gospel of, 317.
Christian, doctrine, iii, 284; faith, 312, 313; founder of the, 312, 317; fathers, 312, 325; metaphysics, 322; philosophy, 314; religion, i, 28, 254; ii, 283, 286.
Christians, i, 639; iii, 69, 313, 325; early, i, 355; schools of the, closed, iii, 288.
Cross, doctrine of the, iii, 312.
Christianity, iii, 292, 297, 325; full establishment of, in Rome, iii, 72; and the lama doctrine, resemblance between, i, 97, 98.
Chronology, i, 45–48.
Chronos, or Saturn, ii, 91; origin of, 80; iii, 102, 104.
Chrysanthias, iii, 289.
Chrysippus, ii, 352.

Chrysocolla, color, iii, 346.
Church and state, union of, in Egypt, i, 392;
of All Saints, Rome, iii, 126.
Chwolson, Professor, i, 57.
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, i, 548; ii, 484; iii, 57, 63, 218, 246, 273, 277, 299; historian of Roman eloquence, 369; orator, 370; poet, 371; compared with Demosthenes, 372.
Cicilian pirates, iii, 57.
Cicilia, i, 662, 682; iii, 302.
Cimbri, iii, 54, 55.
Cimmerians, i, 689; ii, 477.
Cimon, ii, 39, 40, 176, 263, 413.
Cincinnatus, iii, 29, 77, 79.
Cineas, iii, 137.
Cintharidi, singers, ii, 471.
Cinyras, i, 663.
Circassia, i, 287, 646.
Circeii, iii, 16.
Circha, ii, 279.
Circumvallation of a town, by a Grecian army, ii, 527; iii, 411.
Circus, Flaminius, iii, 408.
of the Romans, its effect upon the character of the people, iii, 380; games of the, 232.
Cirta, iii, 53.
Cithæron, mount, ii, 4, 12, 108.
Citharœdi, music teachers, ii, 462.
Citharistæ, music teachers, ii, 462.
Citium, ii, 397.
Citizen, Athenian, defined, ii, 250, 251, 252; Roman, privileges of the, iii, 416; Spartan, defined, ii, 240.
City, founding a, Etruscan ceremonies in, iii, 19; of refuge of a Roman army, 398.
Citycus, ii, 27.
Civil wars adverse to the art of poetry, iii, 363.
Civilization travels from east to west, i, 252.
Claros, ii, 147, 148.
Classical period of Roman literature, iii, 367.
Claudius, Appius, iii, 68, 183, 184, 190, 192, 199, 206, 236, 261, 298, 303.
Clay tablets of the Chaldæans, i, 110.
Clazomenæ, ii, 307.
Clemens, Romanus, epistles of, iii, 312.
Clement, iii, 314, 315.
Cleobulus, ii, 300, 301.
Cleombrotus, ii, 49, 523, 524.
Cleomenes, ii, 63, 64, 245, 247.
Cleon, ii, 490, 510.
Cleopatra, i, 286; iii, 61, 63.
Climate of Medo-Persia, i, 199.
Clio, the muse of history, ii, 118.
Clitomachus, ii, 405.
Clitumnus, river, iii, 130.
Cloæa maximæ, the great sewer constructed by Tarquin, iii, 25.
Clœlia, legend of, iii, 28.
Clodius, iii, 246, 262.
Clothing, among the Greeks, iii, 73.
Clotho, one of the Fates, ii, 85.
Clouds, the, comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 511, 512.
Clusium, iii, 7, 27, 30.
Clymene, ii, 80.
Clypea, iii, 40, 41.
Clypeus, a shield of the Roman soldier, iii, 396.
Clytia, ii, 98.
Cnidus, ii, 27, 48.
Cnidian Venus, statue, ii, 439.
Cooking in the Roman army, iii, 393.
Coan, ii, 352.
Coan Venus, statue, ii, 439.
Cobi, desert of, i, 243.
Cochineal, i, 184.
Cochin-China, i, 92.
Cocytus, i, 664; bogs of, ii, 88; river, 88.
Codrus, ii, 20, 353.

Cœlian hill, iii, 23, 157.
Cœlo-syria, i, 637, 638; iii, 286.
Cœlus, ii, 86.
Cœmptes, iii, 242.
Cœus, origin of, ii, 80; married Phœbe, 80.
Coffins, clay, i, 134.
Cogende, i, 90.
Cognati, iii, 86.
Cohorts, Roman, pay of, iii, 3! divisions of the army into, 388.
Coin, Daric, i, 232.
Coinage, Roman, iii, 94.
Coins, Etruscan, iii, 337.
Cholchis, ii, 18, 115.
Colisseum, iii, 356.
Collatria, iii, 24, 26.
Cologne, i, 34.
Coloniæ, Roman form of government, iii, 415.
Colonies, military, of the Romans, iii, 89.
Colonization, causes of, i, 649; of Greece by the Phœnicians and Egyptians, argument in favor of, ii, 16; of Rome, part of her politics, iii, 203; system of, among the Phœnicians, i, 648, 649.
Colonus, ii, 502, 503, 504.
Colophon, ii, 304, 320, 370.
Colossus of Rhodes, ii, 134.
Columella, iii, 78, 79, 84.
Column of Marcus Aurelius, iii, 354.
Combabus, i, 661, 662.
Comedians, costume of the Roman, iii, 377.
Comedies, Roman, iii, 376.
Comedy, Greek, ii, 508–513; middle, 512; new, 512, 513; old, 512.
Comets, ii, 152.
Comitia centuriata, the, in the Roman government, iii, 164; objects sought to be attained by it, 164; causes for assembling, 168.
Comitia, curiati, the, in the Roman government, iii, 161; occasions for summoning, 163.
tributa, the, in the Roman government, iii, 169.
Commander-in-chief of the Roman army, iii, 391; his dress, 392; his control of the taking of omens, 392; the power confided to the, 392; station of, in the army, 404.
Commerce of the Chaldæans, i, 117; Assyrians, 149–151; Babylonian, 183–185; Egyptians, 314–319; Phœnicians, 643–649; Trojans, 684; Greeks, ii, 76; Etruscans, iii, 11; Carthaginians, 37; Romans, 91.
Commissions, unlimited, given to Roman generals, iii, 392.
Common soldiers, station of, in the Roman army, iii, 389.
Complaint, origin of, as one of the Grecian deities, ii, 84.
Compass, known to the ancient Arabians, i, 542.
Comus, Bacchanalian procession, ii, 508.
Conclamatio, or wail for the dead, among the Romans, iii, 265.
Concord, temple of, ii, 454; iii, 127.
Concordia, iii, 105.
Confucius, i, 68.
Confarreatio, iii, 242.
Conquered, Roman method of treating their, iii, 415–416.
Conon, ii, 48, 60.
Constans, iii, 70.
Constantine, i, 564; ii, 67, 240, 241; iii, 69, 70, 73; city, i, 536.
Constantinople, i, 482, 493, 639; founded, ii, 67; iii, 71, 95, 345.
Constantius, iii, 70, 71; the first Christian emperor, 68, 69.

Consuls, the, in the Roman government, iii, 172, 173.
Contention, origin of, ii, 84.
Contravallation, lines of, iii, 411.
Coptites, i, 349.
Coptos, i, 350.
Corbo, iii, 56.
Corcyra, ii, 41, 42.
Corea, i, 92.
Cordova, i, 536, 492, 544.
Corduba, iii, 303.
Corinthia, ii, 9.
Corinth, ii, 9, 12, 19, 20, 28, 48, 55, 56, 62, 66, 76, 112, 178, 236, 238, 268, 269, 301, 346, 410, 438, 453; iii, 52, 339; destroyed, ii, 66; bay of, 5; isthmus of, iii, 62.
Corinthian order of architecture, ii, 450, 452, 455, 456; iii, 353, 364.
gulf, ii, 2, 8, 9, 273, 428.
isthmus, ii, 236.
Coriolanus, iii, 28, 189, 256, 262, 360.
Corn, Roman soldier's method of preparing, iii, 393.
Corneia, battle at, ii, 48.
Cornicines, centuries of, iii, 357.
Cornish dialect, i, 33.
Cornua, musical instrument of the Romans, iii, 358, 400.
Cornutus, Annæus, iii, 302.
Cornwall, i, 150.
Corona muralis, reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 407.
castrensis, or vallaris, iii, 407.
navalis, iii, 407.
obsidionalis, iii, 407.
auræ, iii, 407.
triumphalis, iii, 407.
Coronea, ii, 272.
Coronis, ii, 112.
Coroultai, the, i, 101.
Cors, ii, 397.
Corsica, i, 4; iii, 40, 303.
Corupedion, battle of, i, 635.
Corvus, naval machine, iii, 418, 419.
Corybantes, i, 687.
Cos, ii, 205.
Cosmetics among the Romans, iii, 215.
Cosmogony of Sanchoniathon, i, 675, 676.
Cothus, origin of, ii, 80.
Courtesans, in Greece, ii, 178, 180; Roman, dress of the, iii, 214.
Courts of justice in Greece, ii, 260, 262.
Cow, black, sacrifice to Proserpine, ii, 137.
Cracow, i, 92.
Crantor, ii, 370.
Crassus, Latin orator, iii, 55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 218, 369.
Craterus, ii, 59.
Crates, ii, 370, 397, 403.
Cratinus, ii, 509.
Creation, date of the, i, 46.
Creed of the Jews, i, 590, 591.
Creon, ii, 18.
Cresceus, iii, 301.
Cretans, i, 270; ii, 117, 173.
Crete, i, 650; ii, 14, 20, 29, 140, 247, 304, 310, 346, 459, 470; island of, 81; white bull of, 113.
Creusa, ii, 14.
Crispus, iii, 69.
Cristolaus, ii, 397.
Critias, ii, 335, 490.
Crito, ii, 332, 353.
Crius, origin of, ii, 80.
Croatian dialect, i, 35.
Crocodilopolis, i, 350.
Crœsus, king of Lydia, i, 181, 206, 236, 249, 689, 690; ii, 148; iii, 7.
Croto, ii, 320.
Croton, ii, 28.
Crotona, ii, 310, 320, 431; iii, 388.
Crown, or coronet, reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 407.
Ctesias, i, 136, 174.

Cubicula, bedchambers of the Romans, iii, 220.
Cublai, founded a new dynasty in China, i, 91.
Cucumella of the Volsci, iii, 7.
Cufa, i, 535, 536.
Cuirass, or coat of mail, of the Romans, iii, 395.
Culasiri, i, 385.
Culina, kitchen of the Romans, iii, 220.
Cuma, ii, 473.
Cumæ, ii, 28, 29; sybil of, iii, 117.
Cuneiform character of the Chaldæans, i, 110.
Cuneus, or wedge, a position of the Roman army, iii, 404.
Cupid, ii, 79.
Curatii, their contest with the Horatii, iii, 23.
Curatio, iii, 149.
Curetes, the tutors of Jupiter, ii, 81.
Curia, iii, 287; in the Roman government; 145, 146, 147, 148; Hostilia, iii, 142.
Curio, Caius, iii, 59; constructed wooden theatres, 374.
Curiones, iii, 119.
Curius Dentatus, iii, 34, 35.
Currency, Roman practice of tampering with, iii, 94.
Curtius, Marcus, iii, 133.
Cusan, i, 92.
Cuseans, i, 275.
Cush, i, 52, 53, 466, 467, 469; descendants of, i, 275; land of, i, 467.
Cushan, i, 275, 467.
Cushans, i, 275.
Cushgar, mountain range of, i, 243.
Cushites, i, 466, 467, 468, 469.
Cushite race, i, 52, 53.
Custom, curious, among the Samnites, iii, 31.
Custos urbis, iii, 142.
Cutha, i, 180.
Cuvier, Baron, i, 19.
Cyaxeres, i, 145, 146, 178, 179, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 689; founded the empire of the Medes, 202.
Cybele, i, 684, 687, 688; ii, 20, 90, 134, 135; iii, 105, 121, 133.
Cyclops, ii, 81, 98, 104; origin of, 80.
Cyclopean, order of architecture, ii, 446, 447; iii, 18, 350, 351; monsters set free, ii, 81; monuments, 13.
Cyme, ii, 26.
Cylicus, ii, 20.
Cynic school, 294, 306; philosophy as developed in, iii, 343-346.
Cynoscephalæ, iii, 49; battle of, ii, 64, 65.
Cynopolis, i, 348.
Cyparissus, ii, 98.
Cyprus, island of, i, 191, 282, 650, 663, 665; ii, 39. 300, 397, iii, 300, 347.
Cythera, i, 665; iii, 104.
Cytheria, ii, 43.
Cyzicus, ii, 44.
Cyrenaic school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 346-348.
Cyrene, ii, 30, 346, 351, 354, 404.
Cyril, bishop, iii, 290.
Cyrus, i, 181, 182, 201, 203, 205, 206, 207, 220, 221, 222, 234, 239, 248, 249, 268, 282, 560, 651, 671; ii, 45, 47; iii, 70; Persian empire founded by, i, 205; considered to have been condemned to death by his grandfather, but saved, 205; brought up in obscurity, 205; rebels, and succeeds in dethroning Astyages, 205; reduces to obedience the king of Armenia, 206; defeats Crœsus at the battle of Thymbra, 206; takes Sardis, 206, 207; takes Babylon, 207; terminates the cap-

Cyrus, continued —
tivity of the Jews, 207; rules his empire seven years, in peace, 208; his manner of death uncertain, 208; the inscription on his tomb, 208; tomb of, 208, 239; family of, 227.

Dabistan, i, 204, 205, 212, 220.
Dacia, iii, 67.
Dacians, i, 36; iii, 67, 237.
Dædalian, school of artists, ii, 429.
Dædalus, ii, 74, 134, 429.
Dæmons, or genii, ii, 118.
Dahi, tribe, i, 200.
Dalmatia, iii, 73, 74.
Dalmatian palace, iii, 357.
Damascus, i, 86, 95, 141, 142, 143, 464, 483, 486, 491, 492, 494, 495, 497, 500, 630, 633, 660, 670, 673, 674; iii, 290, 298; kingdom of, 290, 298.
Damietta, one of the mouths of the Nile, i, 258.
Damy, i, 424.
Dan, river of, i, 554; city of, 555.
Danæ, ii, 113.
Danaides, their punishment for murdering their husbands, ii, 90.
Danaus, i, 37; ii, 15, 110, 270.
Dancers upon the stage, iii, 381.
Dancing among the Egyptians, i, 363, 364.
Daniel, i, 182, 201.
Danes, i, 34.
Danube river, i, 33, 36, 82, 83, 92, 93, 489; iii, 64, 70, 71, 423.
D'Anville, i, 387.
Daourian mountains, i, 75.
Daphne, ii, 98.
Dardanus, iii, 123.
Daric, coin, i, 232.
Darkness, origin of, ii, 83.
Darius, i, 208, 209, 228, 232, 240, 295, 401; ii, 32, 33, 56, 57.
Codomanus, i, 210.
Hystaspes, i, 218, 220, 221, 239, 246.
the Mede, i, 205.
Ochus, i, 639.
Darwin, ii, 376.
Darwinian method of self-development, i, 52.
Dashoor, i, 418.
Date palm, cultivation of the, among the Chaldæans, i, 115.
Datis, i, 209; ii, 23.
David, ii, 466, 559, 573, 575, 606, 625, 628, 673.
Dav-kina, female deity, i, 120.
Davy, Humphrey, iii, 347.
Day, origin of, ii, 79.
Dead, honors paid to the Grecian, ii, 225, 227; Grecian manner of interring and burning the, 223-225.
sea, i, 112, 554, 555, 557.
Dean, Prof. Amos, LL. D., birthplace of, i, iv; his parentage, vi; his natural love of literature stimulated by his uncle Hon. Jabez D. Hammond, vi; attends district school during the winter months, vii; obtains knowledge under difficulties, vii; occupation as teacher, viii; boarding around, viii; has a chance to enter college, ix; presents himself to Dr. Nott, ix; his college life, ix; graduates, ix; commences the study of the law, ix; his profession of the law, ix; withdraws from the bar, x; devotes himself to the law school, and historical studies, x; widely known as an educator, x; organizes the Young Men's Association, xi; assists to organize the Medical

Dean, Prof. Amos, LL.D., contin.—College, xi; accepts the chair of medical jurisprudence in the Medical College, xi; his method of teaching, xi, xii; assists to establish a law school, xii; assumes the active management, xii; resigns his chair in the Medical College, xii; the preparation of his lectures, xii, xiii his relationship to his students, xiii, xiv; elected chancellor and professor of history of the University of Iowa, xiv; resigns, xiv; his connection with the educational interests in Albany, xiv, xv; his character as a scholar and author, xv; his appreciation of Shelley, xv; had an idea of preparing a work on political economy, xv; gives his attention to phrenology, xv; publishes a work on Phrenology, which is successful, xv; his work on the Philosophy of Human Life, xv; his work on Medical Jurisprudence, xvi; his work entitled Bryant & Stratton's Commercial Law, xvi; commences the History of Civilization, xvi; his plan of the History of Civilization, xvi, xvii; his completion of the History of Civilization, xvii; his systematic mode of writing and studying, xviii, xix; his general character, xix–xxiv; his political views, xx, xxi; his domestic habits, xxi, xxii; his marriage, xxii; death of two children, xxii; his belief in religion, xxiii; his connection with the Fourth Presbyterian church of Albany, xxiv; his last sickness, and death, xxiv.
Dean, Nathaniel, i, vi.
Death a constant attendant on the Furies, ii, 87; origin of, 84.
Deborah, i, 628.
Deccan, Southern India, i, 25.
Deceleia fortified, ii, 44.
Deceit, origin of, ii, 84.
Decemviri, iii, 116.
Decemvirs, the, in the Roman government, iii, 191, 192, 193; origin of, 191.
Decii, family of the, iii, 393.
Decius, iii, 32, 33, 35, 67.
De Claris Oratibus, Cicero's, iii, 369.
Decree of the Roman senate passed, that no philosophers be residents of Rome, iii, 274.
Decuma, iii, 417.
Dedan, i, 467.
De Gama, Vasco, i, 281.
Deious, i, 202.
Deities of happy conditions and virtues, among the Romans, iii, 105, 106.
worshipped by the Romans, iii, 102-107.
Dejanira, ii, 114.
Delenda est Carthago, iii, 52.
Delhi, i, 94.
Delium, battle of, ii, 43.
Delopians, ii, 278.
Delos, ii, 97, 110, 112, 128, 276, 431, 470.
Delphi, ii, 5, 36, 51, 98, 128, 144, 145, 180, 278, 419, 470; iii, 410.
Delphos, ii, 134, 135, 143, 147, 148.
Delta of the Nile, i, 257, 258, 266; how formed, i, 264.
Deluge, the, i, 48, 131.
Demarchi, Athenian magistrates, ii, 255.
Demeter, ii, 106, 158, 278, 470.
Demetria festival, ii, 140.
Demetrius Phalerius, governor of Athens, ii, 60, 62; iii, 50, 300; given as hostage to the Romans, ii, 65.

Democritus, ii, 308, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331.
Poliorcetes, ii, 60.
Demodice, i, 687.
Demosthenes, i, 9, 548; ii, 11, 33, 54, 59, 60, 407, 433, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494; culminating point of Grecian eloquence, iii, 371.
Demosthenian oratory, power of, ii, 52.
Demonax, iii, 300, 301.
Dennis, Mr., ii, 11.
Dentatus, iii, 34, 79.
Marius Curius, iii, 77.
Dentistry among the Romans, iii, 215.
Deportation of nations, Sargon, king of Assyria, inaugurates, ii, 143.
Derar, i, 482.
Dercẹto, deity, i, 659.
De Rerum Natura, poem by Carus, iii, 362.
Derreia, i, 496.
Desatir, i, 216.
Descartes, i, 68.
Desertion, Grecian soldiers branded to prevent, ii, 575.
Dessert of the Romans, ii, 224.
Despotism in Rome, iii, 208, 209.
propitious to poetry, iii, 363.
Deucalion, ii, 13, 14, 131, 144, 577.
Deucalion's flood, i, 661, 662; ii, 117.
Deus ex machina, introduction of, into tragedy, ii, 504.
Fidius, iii, 104.
Devoting, forms of, iii, 132.
Dexterity of Roman officers, iii, 395.
Dia, Bartolomeo, i, 281.
Diæta, dining room of the Romans, iii, 220.
Dialect, Syriac, i, 674.
Diamastigosis festival, ii, 140.
Diana, daughter of Jupiter, i, 119, 325, 330, 661; ii, 93, 97, 99, 134, 135, 171, 220; iii, 103, 106; temple of, ii, 98, 133; iii, 127; how represented, 99; Lucifera, iii, 106.
Diasia, Greek festival, iii, 133.
Dibutade, ii, 417, 428.
Dictators in the Roman, government, iii, 179-181.
Dictatorship, origin of the Roman, iii, 17.
Dido, i, 640.
Digits, figures, introduction of, due to the Arabians, i, 533.
Dii minores, among the Romans, iii, 104, 105.
Dinarchus, ii, 493.
Dindymum, i, 684.
Dio, iii, 304.
Dioclesian, iii, 68, 69, 245, 355.
Diodorus, i, 122, 135, 136, 174, 270, 291, 294; iii, 6.
Chronos, ii, 351, 352, 397.
Diogenes, ii, 303, 308, 343, 345, 346, 404; iii, 300.
Diomed, i, 684.
Diomedes, ii, 100; horses of, 113.
Dion, ii, 354.
Dione, wife of Jupiter, ii, 93.
Dionysia, festival, ii, 140, 570.
Dionysius the Elder, ii, 354; the younger, 354.
Dionysus, or Bacchus, i, 519; ii, 107, 462, 470; iii, 160.
Dioscuri, ii, 93, 115.
Diospolis, i, 325.
Diphilus, ii, 513.
Dipœnus, ii, 431, 432.
Dis, god, i, 118.
Disease, origin of, ii, 84.
Dives, a lost race, ii, 50.
Diviners, ii, 138, 149.
Divination, ii, 149; by birds, etc., 152; by ashes, 157; by fire, 152; by insects, 152; by ominous words and things, 153; by lots, 153; by

Divination, continued—
sacrifice, 150, 151, by dreams, 149; by water, 152; among the Arabians, i, 517; among the Phrygians, 688.
Divinities, Chaldæan, relationship of the, i, 124.
Division of labor, iii, 426.
Divorce among the Romans, iii, 246, 247; among the Grecians, 173.
Dodona, i, 329, ii, 127, 144, 149, 325; forest of, 94, 144; temple of, 144.
Dodonæan, name under which Jupiter was worshiped, ii, 94.
Dogmatists, sect, iii, 283.
Domestic relations of the Romans, iii, 240-264.
Domitian, iii, 67, 233, 236, 300, 304, 305.
Domitius, iii, 107.
Don, river, i, 92, 94; iii, 73.
Donaldson, Dr., iii, 8.
Dontas, ii, 431.
Dordogue, i, 489.
Dore, ii, 152.
Dorian, or Spartan race, character of the, ii, 22, approximates to the English, 23; colonies, 27, 28; emigration, 8.
Dorians, ii, 14, 20, 239, 277, 278, 280.
Doric idiom, i, 37.
order of architecture, ii, 132, 449-452, 455; iii, 353, 354.
Doris, ii, 3, 5, 14, 21.
Dorus, ii, 14, 68.
Doryclidos, ii, 431.
Dowries, Etruscan custom of obtaining, iii, 8.
Draco, ii, 264.
Drainage of the Romans, iii, 80.
Dramatic, the art of, the Grecians, ii, 494–513; Romans, iii, 373–381.
poetry introduced to the Romans, iii, 361, 377.
Dramatic, literature of the Romans, iii, 375–376; Romans deficient in, iii, 377.
Dreams, ii, 85, 149; origin of, ii, 84.
Dress of the Assyrians, i, 156; Babylonians, 188; Chaldæans, 126, 127; Egyptians, 371–374; Grecians, 203–207; Hebrews, 595, 596; Romans, iii, 210–217; Persians, i, 236.
Drinks of the Greeks, ii, 214; Romans, iii, 225.
Druidical temple, ii, 449.
Drusus, M. Livius, iii, 207.
Dryades, nymphs of the woods, ii, 118.
Dualism, iii, 319.
Duality in the origin of the Romans, ii, 20.
Dudley Observatory, i, xiv.
Duilius, C., iii, 39.
Dumatians, i, 502.
Dur-Sargina, i, 120.
Duties of the Roman soldiers, iii, 394.
Duumviri, iii, 116.
Dwellings and furniture of the Greeks, ii, 207–213.
Dyeing, art of, among the Phœnicians, i, 656, 657.
Dyma, ii, 274.

Earth, ii, 81, 82, 475; sprung from chaos, 79; marries Uranos, 80.
and water, demand of, as tokens of submission, ii, 32.
Earthquakes, ii, 153.
Eating, times of, in Greece, ii, 216.
Ebro, i, 490.
Ecbatana, i, 228, 238, 239, 242.
Eclectic doctrine, i, 413; school, iii, 282, 299.
Eclipses, ii, 153.
Eclogues, Virgil's, iii, 364.

Ecnomus, naval engagement near, iii, 40.
Edfou, i, 259, 346; temple of, 427.
Edictum perpetuum, iii, 176.
Edom, land of, i, 142, 463, 470, 664.
Edomites, i, 557.
Educational training of the Roman youth, iii, 252, 254; Grecian, ii, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193.
Education of the Roman women, iii, 254.
Egesta, ii, 454.
Egypt, i, 26, 52, 53, 54, 105, 142, 143, 144, 145, 153, 178, 181, 217, 462, 468, 475, 484, 488, 492, 493, 497, 499, 604, 621, 625, 631, 638, 639, 644, 651, 664, 665, 693; ii, 15, 16, 56, 70, 90, 101, 120, 158, 282, 304, 310, 354, 371, 426, 427, 448, 645; iii, 1, 10, 11, 60, 61, 63, 64, 68, 89, 90, 101, 283, 301, 304, 338, 347; the land of the monument, i, 2, 3; monuments of, 22; language, 26; its description and history, 255, 460; its topography, 257, 264; its divisions, 257; canals of, 262; its history, 264–288; its inhabitants, whence they came, 265, 266; its history best comprehended when divided into five periods, 268; first colonized, 269; Menes, the first king of, 270; civilization of, anterior to Menes, 271: a puzzling part in the history of, 274; Hyksos, or shepherd kings, their mission to, 274, 275; their rule over, extended several centuries, 276; the expulsion of the Hyksos from, 276, 277; the Augustan age of, passed away with Rameses II, 279; the power of, revives under Tehrak, 280; renaissance of, 281; preparations set on foot by Cyrus to invade, Egypt, continued — 282; submits to the Persian yoke, 282, 283; the conquest of, by Alexander the Great, 284; enters into political relations with Rome, 285; becomes a province of the Roman empire, 286; the granary of Rome and Byzantium, 287; falls a prey to the Saracens, 287; the Mamelukes assume the government of, 287; becomes a Turkish province, 287; the French become masters of, 288; barbarism returns to, 288; adopts European models for imitation, 288; its industry, 288–322; its religion, 322–359; its society, 359–381; its philosophy, 400–416; its art, 416–460.
Egyptians, i, 26, 53, 56, 143, 167, 179, 192, 203, 209, 253, 481, 642; ii, 99; iii, 21, 225.
Ekron, i, 555.
Eladas, ii, 435.
Elah, i, 555.
Elamitic dynasty, i, 112; mountains, i, 112.
Elateia, the capital of Phocis, ii, 52, 54.
Elath, i, 633.
Elea, ii, 320, 322, 348.
Eleatic school, the, iii, 330; the philosophy as developed in, ii, 320, 325.
Electra, ii, 500; tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 503, 507.
Elegiac poetry of Tibulus, iii, 356.
Elements, monarchic, aristocratic, and democratic; their prevalence in the different states of Greece, and the order in which they were developed, ii, 285–290; of humanity, i, 62–104.
Elephantine island, i, 327, 345, 357.

Elephanta-Ellora, rock temples at, i, 5, 265.
Elephants first used in battle, iii, 34.
Eleusinia, i, 158; festival, 140.
Eleusinian mysteries, ii, 107, 126, 127; iii, 289.
Eleusis, ii, 128, 158, 159, 160, 161, 501; mysteries of, i, 332.
Eliac, or Eretriac school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 352, 353.
Elias, iii, 317.
Elis, ii, 7, 14, 19, 20, 64, 112, 147, 231, 278, 348, 352, 353, 524, 535; its peaceful character, 8.
Ellora, rock temples of, i, 5.
El Maasara, i, 321.
Elohim, i, 118, 347.
Eloquence, a plant that can grow only in a free state, iii, 367, 368; conspicuous during the civil wars, 363; of the Grecians, ii, 481–494; of the Romans, iii, 367–373.
Elpinice, ii, 413.
Elymais, i, 53, 144.
Elysian fields, i, 622.
Elysium, ii, 89.
Emanation, divine, iii, 325, 326.
Embalming amongst the Egyptians, i, 447, 454.
Embassadors, Athenian, ii, 255.
Empedocles, ii, 303, 309, 319, 331.
Empire, course of, travels from east to west, i, 252.
Empyracus, Sextus, iii, 311.
Emulation, origin of, ii, 84.
Encampments of a Roman army, iii, 398, 399.
Enchorial character, i, 401.
England, ii, 69; iii, 201; parliament of, i, 11; iii, 425.
English language, i, 24.
Ennius, dramatic poet, iii, 361, 362, 377.
Enoch, i, 51, 505.
Ensigns of a Roman army, iii, 400-402.
Entertainments, convivial, of the Romans, iii, 221–226; the time of, 221; the place of, 222; the manner of, 223.
among the Grecians, ii, 216.
Enthydemus, ii, 337.
Enu, god, i, 118.
Epaminondas, ii, 49, 50, 51, 53, 269, 277, 454, 463, 484, 522, 523, 524, 525; iii, 304.
Ephesus, ii, 26, 99, 133, 325; iii, 280, 287, 326, 477.
Ephori of Sparta, ii, 47, 244, 245.
Ephorus, i, 53.
Epicotic tribes, i, 36, 37,
Epicots, iii, 50.
Epic poetry of Greece, ii, 471, et seq. coincidence of, iii, 364.
Epictetus, iii, 304, 305.
Epidaurus, ii, 63, 271.
Epicurus, i, 675; ii, 303, 330, 348, 370, 371, 378, 379, 381, 382, 391, 400, 402; iii, 307, 308, 309; character of his philosophy, 363; it fosters Roman poetry, 364.
Epicurean school, i, 68; iii, 276, 278, 279, 307, 308, 309; philosophy as developed in, ii, 370, 383.
Epigoni, ii, 18.
Epimetheus, origin of, ii, 80.
Epiphanes, Antiochus, i, 563, 601, 633, 661.
Epirus, ii, 3, 68, 144, 282; iii, 51.
Epulæ, iii, 118.
Eques, Roman, pay of, iii, 393; the, in the Roman government, 151-153; badges of the, 152; pay of, 393.
Erato, the muse of amatory poetry, ii, 118.
Eratosthenes, i, 270.
Erebus, ii, 84, 88; sprung from Chaos, 79.
Erech, i, 53, 107, 111, 112, 118.

Erectheum, ii, 12.
Erechtheus, ii, 14, 158, 455.
Eretria, ii, 353.
Erichthonius, king of Athens, ii, 76, 77; discoverer of silver, 75.
Eridanus, river, ii, 88.
Erinnys, ii, 86.
Eros, Love, or Cupid, ii, 83, 475; iii, 105.
Erymanthean boar, ii, 113.
Erythræ, sybil of, iii, 117.
Erythræan sea, i, 53, 201.
Esau, i, 470, 557.
Esarhaddon, i, 144, 165; palace of, 165.
Escurial, library of the, i, 549.
Esdraelon, plain of, i, 554, 555.
Eseneh, i, 259, 346.
Essenes, i, 618, 621, 622, 623.
Esthonians, i, 41.
Eta, mount, ii, 14.
Eteocles, ii, 18.
Eternal city, Rome termed, iii, 3.
Etesian winds, i, 261.
Ethics, Christian fathers,' iii, 323, 324; Aristotle's, 282.
Ethnic affinities and characteristics of the Chaldæans, i, 108-110.
Ethnography, Baron Cuvier's division into varieties, i, 19, 20; what it teaches, 21; Col. Rawlinson's introduction of a new family into, 26, written remains of, 110.
Ethiopia, 53, 143, 208, 260, 264, 281, 316, 327, 418, 581, 645, 683; iii, 641.
Ethiopian race, i, 26; dynasty, 280.
Ethiopians, i, 53, 266, 467, 468.
Etiquette at the table of the king of Persia, i, 228.
Etruscan art, styles of, iii, 343-345.
eloquence, no records of it, iii, 368.
language, i, 39.
Etruscans, i, 38, 39, 692; iii, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33, 36, 65, 97, 100, 109, 113, 145, 236; physical characters of, 6; origin of the, 6; alphabet of the, 7; custom of young girls to obtain dowries, 8; their style of art allied to the Egyptians, 8; Dr. Donaldson's views of the origin of, 8; their government, 10; their religion, 11; their commerce, 11; tombs of the, 11, 12; music of the, 11; their architecture, 12; Rome's elder civilization borrowed from the, 18; war with Rome, 28; furnished Romans with ideas of dramas, iii, 375; tombs of the, i, 317.
Etruria, i, 39; iii, 9, 10, 11, 24, 27, 29, 30, 35, 97, 109, 336, 337, 344, 351, 358; position of the cities of, 12; soil of, 6.
Etrurians, stage players obtained from, iii, 375.
Eubœa, ii, 5, 53, 68, 532; iii, 49.
Eubulides, ii, 351, 352.
Eucharis, ii, 432.
Euclid, i, 415; ii, 303, 335, 351, 352, 355.
Eudes, Count, i, 489.
Eudoxus, i, 332.
Eumachia, iii, 349.
Eumenides, ii, 86.
Eumolpidæ, family of, ii, 127.
Eumolpus, ii, 72, 158.
Eumenes, i, 637; ii, 59.
Euphranos, ii, 422.
Euphrates, river, i, 2, 16, 27, 94, 104, 105, 106, 107, 134, 141, 150, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 182, 183, 185, 197, 198, 245, 252, 269, 422, 462, 464, 467, 469, 492, 630, 634, 646; ii, 56, 58; iii, 3, 59, 64, 304.
Euphrosyne, one of the Graces, ii, 118.
Eupompus, ii, 422.

Eurialis, ii, 74.
Euripides, i, 9; ii, 124, 287, 307, 335, 407, 498, 501, 504, 505, 506, 507.
Euripus, river, ii, 588.
Euristhenes, ii, 240.
Europe, i, 16, 26, 32, 55, 222, 488, 489, 490; ii, 383, 449, 450, 486; iii, 2, 15, 34, 49, 50, 54, 64, 70, 71, 75, 94, 288, 360.
Europa, son of Jupiter, ii, 93.
European powers, restrictive systems of, i, 13.
Europeans, i, 56; iii, 222.
Eurotas, river, ii, 7, 8, 10, 215, 239; iii, 422.
Eurus, ii, 111.
Euryale, ii, 119.
Eurybia, ii, 80.
Eurybiades, ii, 36.
Eurydice, ii, 155.
Eurymedon, river, ii, 39.
Eurynome, wife of Jupiter, ii, 93, 109.
Eurystheus, king of Mycenæ, ii, 113.
Eusebius, iii, 280, 287.
Euskaldunes, i, 40.
Euskara, i, 40.
Euterpe, the muse of music, ii, 118.
Euthydemus, i, 636.
Euxine sea, i, 681, 682; ii, 18; iii, 67.
Evander, iii, 19, 121, 340.
Evenes, ii, 335.
Evil-Merodach, i, 181.
Evocati, experienced soldiers, iii, 387; excused from camp drudgery, 388.
Evocatio deorum tutelarium, iii, 410.
Evocation, the Roman, iii, 132.
Excubiæ, watches of the Roman army, iii, 394.
Exemptions from military service, iii, 386.
Exercises of the Roman soldiers, iii, 364.
Expedition against Syracuse, ii, 44.
Expiation, Roman ceremony, iii, 181.
Expiations, ii, 140, 141.
Exports of Egypt, i, 316, 317.
Expulsion of Tarquin, iii, 26.
Exstiada, ii, 383.
Extraordinarii, foreign troops of the Romans, iii, 389.
Ezekiel, i, 150.

Fabii, surname of, derived from the successful cultivation of, iii, 77.
Fabius Maximus, iii, 33.
Fabricius, iii, 34, 79.
Fabulæ Atellanæ, first Roman plays, iii, 376, 377.
Faioum, vale of, i, 294.
Fame, ii, 112.
Familia, the, in the Roman government, iii, 147, 148, 149.
Family names of the Romans, how taken, iii, 251.
Fannia lex, iii, 226.
Farce, improvisatory, of the Romans, iii, 570.
Fasces, ensign of power, iii, 172,
Fasting, theory of, of the Mahometan doctors, i, 513.
Fatalism, iii, 322.
Fatale pignus imperii, iii, 122.
Father of mankind, i, 51.
Fatima, i, 480, 491, 492.
Fatimites of Egypt, i, 487.
Fauces, passages in a Roman house, iii, 220.
Faun, statue, ii, 439.
Fauna, iii, 105.
Fauns, ii, 119; in Greek tragedies, iii, 362.
Faugana, i, 490.
Faunus, iii, 105.
Fausta, iii, 69, 70.
Faustina, iii, 356.
Favorinus, iii, 281.
Fear, origin of, ii, 84.

Feciales, iii, 119.
Fee of Charon, ii, 88.
Feleauges, ii, 320.
Fellahs, modern, i, 267.
Female beauty, Arabian poet's idea of, i, 522.
Fences of the Romans, iii, 83.
Fenelon, ii, 493.
Fergusson, i, 161.
Ferlini, monuments of, i, 265.
Festival, ii, 139, 140; public, of the Romans, iii, 133.
Festus, iii, 287.
Fez, i, 536.
Ficana, town, iii, 154.
Fidenæ, town, iii, 154.
Fidenates, iii, 133.
Figulus, iii, 277.
Filial affection among the Grecians, ii, 187.
Finland, i, 25.
Finnic colony, i, 25.
Finnish idiom, i, 40.
tribe, i, 80.
Finno-Ugrian tribe, i, 80.
Finns, i, 41.
Fire, veneration paid to, i, 217.
Fishing, a sport of the Romans, iii, 230.
Flaccus, Valerius, iii, 78.
Flamen dialis, iii, 119.
martialis, iii, 119.
Flamines, priests of Jupiter, iii, 100, 119; dress of the, 120.
Flamininus, Quintius, iii, 49.
Flaminius, consul, ii, 64, 65; iii, 44.
Flavius, C., iii, 108.
Flax, cultivation of, by the Romans, iii, 82.
Flemish, school of painting, ii, 425.
Floors of Roman houses, iii, 220.
Flora, iii, 105.
Florence, iii, 72.
Florentine, school of painting, 425.
Flute players, Roman, iii, 358.
Fo, i, 97, 98.
Follis, or balloon, game of the Romans, ii, 229.
Food of the Assyrians, i, 157, 158; of the Chaldæans, 127; of the Egyptians, 365, 366; of the Greeks, ii, 213, 214; of the Hebrews, 594, 595.
Foot, the standard of Grecian measurements, ii, 443.
soldiers, Roman, pay of, iii, 393.
Foreigners in the Roman army, iii, 387.
Forests, destitution of, in Greece, ii, 4.
Fortifications, Latin, iii, 18.
Fortuna, iii, 106.
Fortune, ii, 112, 146; temple of, iii, 127.
Forum, Roman, iii, 356; desecrated, 373.
Fountains, origin of, ii, 8.
Four kings, league of the, i, 109.
Fourth Presbyterian church of Albany, i, xxiv.
France, i, 11, 14, 489; ii, 69, 464; iii, 73, 94, 425; states-general of, i, 11.
Fratres ambarvales, iii, 118.
French language, i, 28.
Free-will, doctrine of, iii, 322.
Fresco painting of the Romans, iii, 348.
Frugality of the Romans in the treatment of their soldiers, iii, 393.
Frumentum emptum, iii, 417.
æstimatum, 417.
Fucinus, lake, iii, 236.
Fufian law, iii, 205.
Fulling, art of, ii, 74.
Fulvia, iii, 63.
Funeral ceremonies of the Egyptians, i, 377–380; of the Hebrews, 601, 603; of the Grecians, ii, 221, 223; of the Romans, iii, 264–271.

Furies, the, ii, 84, 86, 87; origin of, 80; how represented, 87; tragedy by Æschylus, ii, 502.
Furius, iii, 274, 275.
Furniture of the Hebrews, i, 593, 594.
Fuseli, ii, 421.

Gabii, iii, 26.
Gabriel, i, 474, 478, 502, 503, 505, 507, 508.
Gades, i, 650, 652, 653, 655, 671.
Galatia, i, 636, 682, 683.
Galba, Sergius, Roman orator, iii, 369.
Galen, i, 535; ii, 466; iii, 425.
Galenus, iii, 68, 69.
Galilæans, i, 623.
Galilee, sea of, i, 555.
Galli, priests of Cybele, i, 662, 687; iii, 121.
Gallicia, i, 40.
Gallienus, iii, 67, 94.
Gallus, i, 687; iii, 121.
Games, Roman, iii, 230-240; Grecian, ii, 233-237.
Ganges, i, 33, 94, 76, 634.
Gar-Dan river, i, 554.
Gardara, ruins of, i, 645.
Gardening, Roman, iii, 85; Egyptian, i, 301.
Garonne, i, 489.
Gasna, city, i, 86.
Gates of the Roman camp, guard at iii, 394.
Gath, i, 555.
Gauls, i, 33, 39, 41, 83, 84, 636, 683; ii, 101; iii, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 43, 54, 58, 59, 60, 63, 68, 73, 74, 195, 218, 309; 34.
Gaza, i, 281, 483, 555; ii, 56; iii, 290.
Gaznevedes, i, 86.
Gebel-Berkel, i, 418.
Geber, i, 534.
Gedrosia, ii, 58.
Geese, sacred, saved Rome, iii, 30.
Gelon, ii, 29.
Gelu, saved China from total annihilation, i, 91.
Gem engraving, iii, 337.
Gem-Shid, i, 205.
Genealogy of the nomadic tribes, i, 101.
of the Scriptures, uncertainty in its computation of time, i, 46.
Geneseric, iii, 73.
Genesis, i, 471.
Genii, ii, 118.
Genius, good, ii, 146.
Genoese, i, 680.
Gens, the, in the Roman government, iii, 147, 148.
Genseric, king of the Vandals, iii, 74.
Gentiles, isles of the, i, 55.
Genucius, iii, 189.
Genurius, L., iii, 198, 199.
Geography and chronology, i, 44.
Geological structure of the mountains of Egypt, i, 259.
Geometry, Egypt's knowledge of, i, 59.
Georgia, i, 95, 646; Christians of, 94.
Georgias of Leontine, iii, 368.
Georgics, Virgil's, iii, 364.
Geougen nation, i, 85.
Gepidæ, i, 83.
Gerasa, ruins of, i, 645.
Gerizim, mount, i, 554.
German language, i, 56.
family, i, 36, 60.
ocean, iii, 58.
Germanicus, Roman poet, iii, 262, 303, 367.
Germany, i, 11, 33, 489; iii, 8, 67, 141; ancient boundary of, i, 33; diets of, 11, 425.
Getæ, i, 35.
Getes, country of the, i, 94.

Ghizeh, i, 259, 418; pyramids of, i, 272, 273.
Ghunfude, i, 525.
Giants, origin of, ii, 80.
Gibraltar, i, 489, 652; iii, 37.
Gilgal, i, 575.
Gitiadus, ii, 433.
Glabro, Acilius, iii, 49.
Gladiators, Roman, iii, 56, 236–240; shows of, 375; consecrate themselves to Pluto, ii, 90.
Glass, manufacture of, among the Phœnicians, i, 657; in Rome, iii, 91.
Globus, or globe, a position of the Roman army, iii, 404.
Gnidos, ii, 104.
Gnosticism, iii, 325-327.
Gnossus, iii, 310.
Gnostic school, iii, 316.
God in history, i, 207.
Gods, superior, among the Romans, iii, 103, 104.
of the affections and social feelings among the Romans, iii, 105.
Goguet, i, 192.
Golden age introduced in Greece, ii, 82.
Gomorrah, i, 555.
Gordian knot, i, 686.
Gordias I, i, 686.
Gordium, i, 686.
Gorgias, ii, 303, 330, 331, 343.
Gorgon, monster, ii, 113; iii, 18.
Gorgons, the, ii, 119.
Gornon, palace of, i, 425.
Gortys, ii, 13.
Goshen, i, 275.
Gothic style of architecture, i, 431.
race, 34.
Goths, i, 82, 431, 488; iii, 67, 70.
Government of the Arabians, i, 522–529; of the Assyrians, 153–155; of Chaldæa, 125; of Carthage, Government, continued — iii, 36, 37; of the Egyptians, i, 381–399; of the Etruscans, iii, 10; of Greece, ii, 238–296; of the Hebrews, i, 604–616; of the Medo-Persians, 221–235; of the Latins, iii, 17; of the Phœnicians, i, 669–674; among the Phrygians, 689; of the Romans, iii, 136–209; of the Sabines, 13–15.
Government, laws, and political institutions of Thebes, Corinth and Argos, ii, 268–271.
foundation of, i, 4.
political institutions and laws of the Athenians, ii, 250–268.
political institutions and laws of the Spartans, ii, 239–250.
problems in, to which the Grecian development may be considered to have furnished a solution, ii, 290–295.
Gracchi, iii, 87.
Gracchus, Caius, iii, 87.
Caius Sempronius, Roman orator, iii, 206, 207, 369, 370.
Tiberius, Roman orator, iii, 87, 206, 369, 370.
T. Sempronius, iii, 87.
Graces, the, ii, 118; offspring of Jupiter, 93.
Grain, cultivated by the Romans, iii, 82; winnowing, Roman method of, 83; imports of, into Rome, 89, 90.
Granada, i, 544, 536, 652.
Granaries of the Romans, iii, 90.
Grand Lama, i, 98.
Granicus, battle of the, i, 210.
Gratian, iii, 71, 93.
Great Canal of Babylon, i, 179.
Hall at Susa, i, 242.
Septis, i, 653.
Wall of China, i, 90, 91, 96, 179.

Greece, i, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 36, 57, 59, 81, 85, 87, 209, 210, 252, 316, 317, 444, 536, 608, 673, 678, 685, 693; iii, 18, 37, 45, 49, 52, 55, 60, 63, 67, 96, 101, 103, 105, 127, 134, 135, 252, 272, 274, 275, 276, 288, 300, 301, 309, 335, 336, 337, 339, 344, 345, 359, 360; its description and history, ii, 1–70; its boundaries, 1, 2, 3; extent of, 2; the most southern country in Europe, 2; its divisions, 3; originally inhabited by the Pelasgi and Hellenes, 12; Pelasgic remains in, 13; its inhabitants principally derived from the Hellenes, 14; the immigration into, set in motion the elements of civilization, 15; Cadmus first introduced the use of letters into, 15; early colonization of, by the Egyptians and Phœnicians, argument in favor of, 16; early infested by bands of robbers, 16; the Trojan war the cause of a great many troubles in, 18, migration into, 21, 22; colonies of, 25–30; its first entrance into general history the result of the Persian invasion, 31; coasts of, colonized, i, 33; wars with the Persians, ii, 31–38; treasury of, removed from Delos to Athens, 40; domestic troubles in, 40, et seq.; under the dominion of Macedonia, 52; Demosthenes' exertions to secure the freedom of, 59; introduction of the Romans into, 64; the Romans proclaim liberty to, 65; reduced to a Roman province under the name of Achaia, 66; subject to the Turks, 67; revolution in, in 1820, 68; separated from Turkey, 69; ultimately becomes a limited monarchy, 69; its industry, 70–77; its religion, 70–164; its element of society, 165–237; its government, 238–296; its philosophy, 297–406; its art, 407–533.

Greek art, in comparison with the Egyptian, i, 446, 447.
character, its formation, i, 37.
language, i, 28, 39, 56; preservation of the, 37; superior to the Latin, iii, 361.
tragedies, mode of introducing satire, iii, 362.

Greeks, i, 31, 37, 38, 150, 152, 170, 209, 280, 281, 318, 335, 384, 402, 412, 443, 533, 647, 658, 683; iii, 76, 222, 232, 233, 265.

Grote, Mr., ii, 15, 17.

Guadalquiver, i, 652.

Guadiana, i, 652.

Gula, god, i, 121.

Gunpowder known to the ancient Arabians, i, 542, 546.

Gushan, i, 275.

Gustavus Adolphus, ii, 523.

Gyæra, iii, 302.

Gyges, i, 689.

Gymnasia, the Grecian, furnished models for Grecian artists, ii, 441,

Gymnastic exercises of the Grecians, ii, 192, 193, 196, 197, 198.

Gyges, origin of, ii, 80.

Hadadeser, i, 673.

Hades, ii, 87, 88, 90, 91.

Hadrian, iii, 341, 357; pantheon of, ii, 456.

Hæmus, mount, i, 83.

Hæredium, allotment of land, ii, 79.

Hagar, city of, i, 468.

Hagarenes, i, 468, 469.

Hagarites, i, 468, 469.
Hake, 346.
Hales, Dr., i, 46.
Hali, i, 525.
Haliartus, Spartans defeated at, ii, 48.
Halicarnassus, ii, 27.
Halyattes, i, 420.
Halys, i, 202, 206; river, i, 689.
Ham, i, 51-53, 56, 267, 269, 467, 557; descendants of, i, 466.
Hamadam, i, 245.
Hamadryades, nymphs of the woods, ii, 118.
Hamah, i, 501, 628.
Hamath, i, 141, 143.
Hamilcar, iii, 40.
Hamitic, language, i, 26, 27, 110; race, 15, 26, 60, 112, 197, 199, 267, 631; physical characteristics of, 109; the pioneers of civilization, i, 54.
Hammond, Hon. Jabez D., i, vi, ix.
Hanging gardens of Babylon, i, 175.
Hannibal, i, 637; ii, 30, 64; iii, 43–50, 275, 402.
Hapi, i, 449.
Harb, i, 470.
Harem, Persian, i, 227.
Harka, i, 345.
Harlequin, origin of, iii, 376.
Harmonia, ii, 116.
Harmonides, ii, 460.
Harpagus, i, 205.
Harpies, the, ii, 118.
Harpocrates, i, 345, 346.
Harris, Hon. Ira, i, xii.
Hartz, i, 34.
Harun, i, 492.
Harun-al-Raschid, i, 287, 550, 552.
Haruspices, iii, 97, 114, 115, 116, 134.
Haschemiah, i, 492.
Haskem, i, 472, 474.
Hassan, i, 486, 487.
Hassan Pasha, i, 288.
Hasta pura, the, reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 407.
or spear, of the Roman soldier, iii, 397.
Hastati, or spearman, iii, 388.
Hat, i, 340.
Havilah, i, 467, 468.
Hay, raising of, by the Romans, iii, 83.
Hazael, i, 633, 670.
Hea, or Hoa, god, i, 119, 120, 124.
Head dress of the Roman women, iii, 214, 215.
Hebe, ii, 95.
Hebrew, i, 137; language, dialect of the Semitic, 26, 28; poetry, 60; race, 28.
Hebrews, i, 56, 58, 253, 466, 467, 645, 651, 669; mission of the, 254; original dialect of, 28.
Hebron, i, 559.
Hecate, i, 339; ii, 150; name of Diana, 99.
Hector, i, 661.
Hecuba, i, 661.
Hedjaz, i, 465, 470, 497, 525.
Heeren, ii, 244, 487, 680.
Hegel, i, 541.
Hegemonia, ii, 238, 271, 275.
Hegesinus, ii, 404.
Hegira, i, 45, 474, 485, 487, 492, 501, 503.
Heifer, the sacrifice to Juno, ii, 137.
Helen, i, 661, 683.
Heliastæ, ii, 129.
Helice, ii, 273.
Helicon, ii, 9; mount, 118, 473.
Heliogabalus, iii, 262.
Heliopolis, i, 269, 325, 332, 350, 351, 355, 385, 399, 407.
Helios, Sol, Phœbus, Apollo, or Sun, ii, 96; origin of, 80.
Hellas, ii, 2, 5, 9.
Hellen, ii, 14, 102, 115.

Hellenes, ii, 158; iii, 17; tribe, how called, ii, 13; driven out of their original seats by a deluge, 13; expelled the Pelasgi from Thessaly, 14; the parent stock of the Grecians, 14; their divisions, 14.
Hellenic tribes, ii, 121; race, ii, 27.
Hellespont, i, 33, 684; iii, 37, 67.
Helmet, Galea, headpiece of the Roman soldiers, iii, 396.
Helos, ii, 239, 241.
Helots, ii, 24, 40, 239, 240, 241.
Hemonian dialect, i, 33.
Hephæstos, or Vulcan, ii, 103, 104.
Hera, or Juno, ii, 94, 95, 96.
Heracleopolites, i, 348.
Heracles, or Hercules, ii, 113, 114.
Heraclidæ dynasty, i, 689; ii, 14, 19, 21, 239, 240, 351.
Heraclitean school, iii, 281; philosophy as developed in, ii, 325-327.
Heraclites, ii, 368; iii, 317.
Heraclitus, ii, 303, 325, 340.
Heraclius, i, 481, 482, 483.
Herat, i, 90, 150.
Hercules, i, 325, 348, 663, 666, 667; ii, 7, 16, 19, 113, 115, 119, 241, 411, 442, 447; iii, 104, 121, 345, 348; how represented, 114; pillars of, i, 50, 652, 653, 678; son of Jupiter, ii, 94; temple of, 132; twelve labors of, described, 113, 114.
Hercyne, river, ii, 146.
Hercynian forest, i, 34.
Herda, battle at, iii, 90.
Herennius, i, 414; iii, 284, 285.
Herir, i, 149.
Hermæa festival, ii, 140.
Hermæum, cape, naval engagement near, iii, 40, 41.
Hermes, or Mercury, i, 256, 342, 395, 402, 403, 408, 414; ii, 105, 426.
Hermanric, i, 82.
Hermes Trismegistus, a different being from the Hermes of Greece, ii, 105.
Hermias, ii, 384.
Hermoneans, ii, 88.
Hermonthis, i, 346, 429.
Hermopolis Magna, i, 350, 429.
Hermotybi, i, 385.
Hermus, i, 682; ii, 20.
Hernians, iii, 28.
Herod, i, 561, 563, 575, 601; palace of, 563.
Herodians, i, 623; dynasty, ii, 561, 562.
Herodotus, i, 88, 119, 150, 174, 200, 201-2, 221, 228, 270, 281, 291, 294, 387, 390, 402, 420, 429, 449, 450, 679, 689, 692; ii, 237, 270.
Heroides of Ovid, iii, 367.
Herpilis, ii, 384.
Hersæa, Greek festival, iii, 133.
Hesiod, ii, 71, 84, 298, 471, 473, 474, 475.
Hesperides, garden of, ii, 113.
Hestia, or Vesta, ii, 106.
Hexameter verse, satire embodied in by Lucilius, iii, 362.
Hezekiah, i, 628.
Hiempsal, iii, 53.
Hieracon, i, 350.
Hieraconpolis, i, 350.
Hierapolis, iii, 304.
Hieratic character, i, 401.
Hiero, king of Syracuse, iii, 38.
Hierocles, iii, 288.
Hieroglyphic character, i, 401.
Hieromnemous, a representative class in the amphictyonic council, ii, 279.
Hieropolis, i, 660.
High places of the Hebrews, i, 575.
Himmaleh, i, 14; mountains, 5, 25, 75, 76.
Hindo-khuh, i, 143, 176, 200.

Hindo-khuh, race, i 204.
Hindoos, i, 73, 266, 270; intellect of, 7; not necessary to consider the civilization of, 15.
Hindostan, i, 86, 94, 243; plains of, 33.
Hinnom, i, 555.
Hipparchus, ii, 472.
Hippasus, ii, 320.
Hippias, ii, 32, 33, 262, 303, 330, 331.
Hippo, ii, 320.
Hippocrates, i, 88, 535.
Hippocrene, ii, 4; fountain, 118.
Hippodamia, ii, 119.
Hippodrome, ii, 231.
Hippolyta, girdle of, ii, 113.
Hippolytus, ii, 110.
Hiram, king, i, 640, 666, 667.
Hispalis, i, 652.
Historians, Roman, iii, 279.
History, definition of, i, 1; present mode of teaching, 1; a record of human progress, 2; revelations of, 2; development of, 3, 4; events of, where transpired, 5; geography and chronology important to be considered in connection with, 44; successfully cultivated by the Arabians, 530; the result of the Bible being struck out of, 557.
Hit, i, 178, 179.
Hoa, i, 120, 123, 124.
Hodhail tribe, i, 501.
Holagon Khan, i, 92.
Holocausts of the Hebrews, i, 582.
Home manufactures of the Phœnicians, i, 656.
Homer, i, 647; ii, 7, 71, 84, 103, 126, 192, 211, 287, 298, 344, 359, 432, 446, 448, 471–76, 481, 484, 494.
Honain, valley of, i, 676.
Honey of Mount Hymettus, ii, 4.
Honoria, iii, 74.
Honorius, iii, 72, 73, 117, 240.
Hoptetes, Grecian soldiers, ii, 515.
Horace, writer of jocose satire, iii, 362; a luminary of the Augustan age, 366.
Horæ, the offspring of Jupiter, ii, 93, 103; or the seasons, iii, 106; or the hours, ii, 118.
Horatii, iii, 23.
Horatius Cocles, legend of, iii, 28.
Hor, mount, i, 463, 644.
Horeb, mountains of, i, 463.
Hor-hat, i, 340, 346.
Horpire, i, 346.
Horse flesh, nomadic manner of cooking i, 99.
Hor-Sened-To, i, 346.
Hortensia, iii, 259.
Hortensian law, iii, 202.
Hortensius, Roman orator, iii, 202, 259, 370.
Horus, god, i, 334, 335, 336, 338, 339, 340, 341, 345, 346, 442.
Hosea, king, i, 280.
Hosein, i, 486, 487.
Hospitium, iii, 224.
Hostilius, Tullius, iii, 134.
Hours, ii, 118; see Horæ.
Houses, and the domestic arrangements of the Romans, iii, 221; of the Hebrews, i, 592, 593.
Hundred-armed giants, origin of, ii, 80, 81.
Hungarians, i, 42, 44.
Hungary, i, 42, 80, 92; iii, 67; plains of, i, 83.
Huns, i, 81, 82; white, i, 81, 85; their mission, 81; expiration of the power of, 84.
Hunting, a sport of the Romans, iii, 229, 230.
Huruk, i, 107.
Huski, god, i, 120.
Hyacinthus, ii, 98, 413.
Hyagnis, ii, 458.
Hybla, ii, 28.

Hydramaut, monuments at, i, 54.
Hydromancy, ii, 151.
Hygeia, ii, 112.
Hyksos, i, 268, 269, 274, 277, 390, 421, 430; definition of, 275.
Hymen, iii, 105.
Hymenæos, merry bridal song, ii, 470.
Hymethus, mount, ii, 4, 12.
Hypatia, iii, 290.
Hyperbius, ii, 74.
Hyperbolus, ii, 262.
Hyperides, ii, 492.
Hyperion, origin of, ii, 80; marries Thia, 80.
Hyrcania, i, 75, 184, 636.
Hyrcanian mountains, i, 184.
Hyrcanus, i, 561.
Hystaspes, i, 208; ii, 57.
Hystaspid dynasty, i, 208.

Iambo, i, 525.
Iberia, ii, 2.
Iberians, i, 40, 41.
Iberus, river, iii, 43.
Ibrahim, i, 491, 497; takes possession of Navarin, ii, 68.
Icelanders, i, 34.
Icelos, ii, 150.
Iconium, sultans of, i, 92.
Iconoclasts, iii, 350.
Ictinus, ii, 453, 454.
Ida, mount, i, 683, 684; ii, 56.
Idæan, name under which Jupiter was worshiped, ii, 94.
Idalia, ii, 104.
Idumea, i, 463, 470.
Ignatius, iii, 312; epistles of, 312.
Igurs, i, 103.
Ihoah, i, 347.
Il, god, i, 118.
Ildico, i, 84.
Ili, river, i, 77.
Iliad, Homer's, ii, 18, 471, 472; iii, 365.
Ilissus, river, ii, 4, 11, 159, 202.
Illoarudamus, i, 181.
Illyria, ii, 55; iii, 58.
Illyrian dialect, i, 35; race, 36.
Illyrians, ii, 53.
Illyricum, iii, 43, 50, 51.
Ilus, ii, 100.
Imaum, i, 487.
Imaus, i, 75.
Immortals, body of Persian soldiers, ii, 35.
Imperator, the title of, how bestowed, iii, 408.
Imperial Rome, iii, 207–209.
Imports of the Assyrians, i, 150.
Inachus, ii, 12, 161.
Indes, iii, 95.
India, i, 25, 26, 70, 73, 81, 90, 150, 316, 339, 469, 490, 500, 533, 636, 643, 645; invaded, ii, 57.
Indian ocean, i, 55, 86, 198, 462, 468, 469, 653, 680.
Indo-Chinese peninsula, i, 81.
European language, i, 28; nation, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60; race, 15, 55, 56, 80, 199, 200.
Inductive process of philosophy, iii, 275.
Indus, i, 33, 53, 57, 58, 76, 85, 86, 94, 198; upper, 200.
Industry of the Arabians, i, 497–500; of the Babylonians, 182–285; of the Egyptians, 288–322; the foundation of, 4; of the Greeks, ii, 70–77; of the Palestine, i, 565–571; of the Medo-Persians, 211; of the Phœnicians, 642–657; of the Romans, iii, 76–95; of the Trojans, i, 684.
Infanticide, in Greece, ii, 184.
Infants, treatment of, in Greece, ii, 183, 184.
Intaglio rilevato of the Egyptians, i, 436, 438.
Interlude in Greek tragedies, iii, 362.

Interrex, the, in the Roman government, iii, 178.
Introduction, i, 1-18.
Invasion of Greece under Xerxes, ii, 34, 35, 36.
Invocation of saints, i, 98.
Ion, ii, 14.
Ionia, i, 682, 693; ii, 20, 147, 299, 301, 303, 304, 370; iii, 36, 117, 224.
Ionian colonies, ii, 26, 28.
or Athenian race, character of, ii, 23; approximates to the French, 23;
sea, i, 36; ii, 2, 7, 282, 530.
Ionians, ii, 8, 14, 20, 276, 277, 278.
Ionic idiom, i, 37.
order of architecture, ii, 132, 353, 354, 454-456; probable source of, i, 241.
sect, Thales the founder of, ii, 400.
school, the philosophy as developed in, 303-309.
Iotuns, i, 41.
Iowa, city, i, xiv, University of, xiv.
Iphicrates, i, 283; ii, 50.
Iphitus, ii, 231.
Ipsambul, temple at, i, 437.
Ipsus, battle of, i, 634, 635; ii, 58.
Irak, province of, i, 482, 483, 674.
Iranian language, i, 28; monarchy 204; nation, 25; race, 55, 199.
Irawaddi, river, i, 25, 76, 81.
Ireland, i, 24; language of, 33.
Iris, i, 682; ii, 95, 110, 111.
Irish dialect, i, 33.
Irrigation, artificial, of the Assyrians, i, 147, 148.
Irtish river, i, 77.
Isaac, i, 554, 572, 604.
Isadorus, iii, 290.
Isæas, ii, 492.
Isaiah, i, 628.
Isauria, i, 682.
Ishitha (Seth), i, 51.
Ishithians, sect, i, 51.
Ishmael, i, 468, 469, 517.
Ishmaelites, i, 184, 497.
Ishtar, i 124.
Isis, goddess, i, 332, 333, 334, 335, 338, 340, 342, 345, 346, 355, 505, 507, 664; ii, 99.
Islam, i, 476.
Islamism, i, 478, 506.
Ism Allah, science of, i, 530.
Ismaelians, i, 92.
Isocrates, ii, 237; 335, 492.
Ispahan, i, 85, 86, 535.
Israel, i, 633; ii, 468; mountains of, i, 554; kingdom of, 559, 560.
Israelites, i, 143, 155, 633; settlement of, in Egypt, i, 276.
Issus, i, 210; bay of, ii, 56.
Istar, or Nana, goddess, i, 123.
Isthmian games, ii, 9, 49, 65, 236.
Italian language, i, 28.
Italic war, iii, 55.
Italiotes, iii, 4.
Italos, a Greek word, Italy derived from, iii, 77.
Italy, i, 2, 11, 36, 38, 39, 84, 488; ii, 13, 90, 101, 274, 310, 354, 431, 447, 453; iii, 2-6, 9, 12, 15, 17, 31 37, 39, 43, 46, 47, 48, 54, 55, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 68, 72, 76, 89, 90, 93, 102, 122, 137, 175, 180, 182, 203, 205, 272, 276, 301, 341, 336, 337, 338, 344, 347, 350; coasts of colonized, i, 33; condition of, investigated at the foundation of Rome, iii, 3, 4, 5.
Ithaca, ii, 472.
Iva, god, i, 121.
Iva-lush IV, i, 141, 142; ii, 119.
Ivan, kingdom of, i, 23, 85, 204, 245.
Ivory used by the Assyrians in their furniture, i, 150.
Ixion, his doom for his boast, ii, 90.

Jab, river, i, 491.
Jacob, i, 470, 572, 604, 659, 674.
Jamblicus, iii, 286, 287, 288.
Janiculum hill, iii, 24, 27, 28, 102.
Janus, iii, 42, 102, 104; temple of, 22, 65, 100, 127.
Japan, sea of, i, 43, 76.
Japetus, origin of, ii, 80; marries Clymene, 80.
Japhet, i, 51, 267.
Japyges, iii, 4.
Jason, i, 601; ii, 18, 115.
Javelin, throwing the, game of the Romans, iii, 229.
Jealousy of the Arabians, i, 518.
Jebus, i, 562.
Jebusites, i, 562.
Jebus-Salem [Jerusalem,] i, 562.
Jenesei, river, i, 49.
Jericho, i, 561.
Jeroboam, i, 559.
Jerusalem, i, 180, 218, 483, 515, 559, 560, 562–564, 573, 575, 601, 633; iii, 354; Egyptians take, i, 280; siege of, iii, 411.
Jesus, i, 506, 508.
Jew, i, 56.
Jewish nation, mission of the, i, 207; religion, i, 28.
Jews, i, 155, 179, 203, 357, 638; when properly termed, 560.
Jezebel, i, 666, 667.
Jezreel, plain of, i, 554, 555.
Job, ii, 494; book of, i, 628, 629.
Jobates, king of Lycia, ii, 115.
Jocastus, ii, 116, 117.
Joktah, i, 466-469.
Joktanites, i, 466.
Jonah, i, 136.
Jones, Sir William, i, 204.
Jordan, i, 554.
Joseph, i, 184, 276, 279, 321, 362, 402, 416, 428.
Joseph's well, i, 296, 297.
Josephus, i, 46.
Joshua, i, 558, 562, 572, 606, 610; ii, 458.
Josiah, i, 281.
Jove, ii, 110, 124.
Joviala, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Jovian, iii, 71.
Jubilee, year of, i, 569, 570, 587.
Judah, i, 633; mountains of, 554; tribe of, 559; kingdom of, 559, 560.
Judea, i, 180, 280, 562, 608; iii, 340.
Jugurtha, iii, 53, 54.
Jugurthine war, iii, 53, 54.
Julia, iii, 59, 262, 303.
Julian, i, 564; iii, 287-289; count, i, 488; the Apostate, iii, 71; Didius, iii, 94.
Junia, iii, 262.
Junius Brutus condemns his sons to death, iii, 27.
Juno, i, 119, 661, 662; ii, 94, 95, 97, 101, 103, 104, 111, 113, 124, 135, 443, 444; iii, 101, 103; her parentage, ii, 81; how represented, ii, 96; temple of, ii, 454; iii, 127; wife of Jupiter, ii, 93.
Junonia, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Jupiter, i, 119, 121, 178, 194, 213, 325, 384, 661, 662; ii, 84, 88, 95, 97, 101–105, 107, 109, 110, 113, 115, 118, 120, 121, 124, 126, 130, 135, 146, 147, 219, 425, 432, 443; iii, 100, 102, 103, 119, 127; Ammon, i, 228; his realm, ii, 82; how represented, 94; planet, i, 122; presented with his thunderbolt, ii, 81; statue of, ii, 134, 135; iii, 337; temple of, ii, 453.
Jus honorarium, iii, 176.
hospitium, iii, 224.
Justinian, iii, 290.
Juvenal, satires of, iii, 362, 367.

Kaaba, i, 472, 473, 475, 476, 477, 495, 496, 502, 514, 530, 549.

Kadesia, plains of, i, 483.
Kadijah, i, 472, 473.
Kadraitæ, i, 470.
Kaianian dynasty, i, 208.
Kaiomarth, the founder of the Peshdadian dynasty, i, 205.
Kaled, i, 475, 482.
Kama, river, i, 92.
Kandil mountains, i, 150.
Kant, i, 541.
Karakorum, i, 89, 93.
Karmath, i, 494, 495.
Karmathians, i, 494.
Karnac, i, 425, 426, 427; hypostyle hall of, 278; temple of, 278, 279 * 280, 281, 428.
Kashgar, river, i, 77.
Kasr, i, 177.
Katabeni, i, 468.
Kedar, i, 470.
Keli-shin pass, i, 149.
Kenanah tribe, i, 501.
Kendah tribe, i, 518.
Kentai mountains, i, 75.
Kerman dynasty, i, 86.
Khabour, river, i, 134.
Khaled, i, 482, 483.
Khaluli, i, 143.
Khamil, i, 43.
Khanis-Nipra, temple, i, 119.
Khem, god, i, 327, 328, 330.
Kheme, the land of Ham, i, 269.
Khitans, i, 96.
Khonso, i, 345.
Khorassan, i, 202, 491.
Khorsabad, i, 161, 164.
Khosr, i, 136, 148.
Khosrôes, i, 205.
Khoten river, i, 77.
Khozaah tribe, i, 501.
Khutukthu, i, 98.
Kin dynasty, i, 91.
dominions in China, i, 91.
King, the, in the Roman government, iii, 138–141; of Sparta, ii, 241.
Kinganoola mountains, i, 76.
King's mountain, Persepolis, the tombs of the kings of Persia situated at, i, 241; described 241.
Kiow, i, 92.
Kiprat-arbat, i, 109, 110.
Kipsah, plains of, i, 92.
Kipsar, i, 94.
Kirk, Edward N., i, xxiv.
Knights, the comedy, by Aristophanes, ii, 510, 512.
Koht, goddess, i, 345
Koran, i, 95, 478, 479, 484, 488, 489, 490, 495, 502, 503, 505, 506, 510, 516, 522, 529.
Koreish, tribe, i, 470, 471, 475, 499, 501, 518.
Koreishites, i, 473.
Kouyunjik palaces, i, 164.
mound, i, 186.
Kudur Lagamer, i, 112.
Kuen-lun, mountain, i, 76, 77.
Kufa, i, 486, 492, 494, 495.
Kuna, science of, i, 531.
Kurdistan, i, 105, 142.
Kuthami, i, 50, 51.

Laban, i, 656.
Labienus, iii, 107.
Labor, division of, i, 12; origin of, 84.
Laborosoarchod, i, 181.
Labyrinth, built by Amenemes, i, 274.
Lacedæmon, i, 210; ii, 432, 433, 524.
Lacedæmonians, ii, 99, 279.
Lachesis, one of the Fates, ii, 85.
Lachsa, i, 465.
Laconia, i, 37; ii, 6, 7, 10, 15, 19, 23, 49, 196, 239, 240, 247, 249, 268, 269, 281, 284, 519; earthquake at, 39.
Lactantius, iii, 314.
Lælus, iii, 274.
Lærtius, Diogenes, iii, 309.

Lætorius, iii, 190.
Lagidæ, race, i, 268, 284.
Lagus, ii, 59.
Lajihan, i, 150.
Lama doctrine, i, 98; worshipper of the, i, 97.
Lamachus, ii, 44.
Lamentations of Jeremiah, i, 629.
Lamps, use of, in Greece, ii, 73.
Lampsacus, i, 234; ii, 27, 307, 370, 396.
Land trade of the Phœnicians, 664, et seq.
Landscape painting of the Romans, iii, 348.
Language, the present mode of viewing, i, 22; the original three great families of, 22; agglutination of, 23; Chinese, its monosyllabic character, 23, 24; the oldest form of, 24; roots of the Egyptian monosyllabic, 26; pronominal system of, 26; death of the Hamitic, 26; peculiarity of the Semitic, 27; development of the Semitic, 27; different idioms of the Semitic, 28; the Indo-European is that to which the destinies of civilization have been committed, 28; what compose the family of Indo-European, 28; terminational stage of, 29; monosyllabic, radical, inorganic, or Chinese stage of, 29; inflectional stage of, 30; organic or amalgamating stage of, 30; phonetic corruption of, 30; changes its grammatical coloring as it passes through new deposits of thought, i, 30; why the classical languages have become dead, 30, 31; phonetic decay of, 31; dialectical regeneration of, 31, 32; Muller's reflections on, 32; dialects of the English and Irish, 33; grammatical flexions of the Etruscan, 39; Basque nearly resembles some of the dialects spoken by the aborigines of America, 40; of the nomadic tribes, 104; of the Assyrians, 137; of the Pelasgi, the mother tongue of the Greeks, ii, 12; Oscan supplanted by the Latin, iii, 5; Latin, the Siculians contributed largely to the, 17.
Laocoon, ii, 426.
Lapithæ, i, 119.
Lappes, i, 41.
Larcius, T., iii, 28.
Lares, the, iii, 107.
Larsa, i, 107, 121.
Latin, ii, 31, 37, 39, 56.
eloquence, M. Emilius Lepidus the ornament of, iii, 369.
classics, the age of, iii, 364.
language, i, 24, 28; improved by Plautus and Terence, iii, 361.
Latins, i, 38; iii, 5, 20, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 65, 100, 109, 159, 141, 144, 135, 179; their origin, 16, 17; their government, 17; their belief in augury, 17; their fortifications, 18; Rome's political institutions borrowed from the, 19; accession of, to Rome, 25.
Latium, ii, 82; iii, 5, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 32, 121, 123, 154; furnished soldiers, 387.
Latona, i, 325, 348; ii, 89, 97, 112; daughter of Cœus and Phœbe, 80; wife of Jupiter, 93.
Latopolis, i, 351.
Latrunculi, private game of the Romans, iii, 231.
Latus, i, 351.
Laurel wreaths used to crown triumphant Roman generals, iii, 408.

Laurium, mount, ii, 4, 12, 267, 281
silver mines of, 76.
Laws, Athenian, ii, 264, 265, 266; of O. Publilius Philo, iii, 199, 200; of Sparta, ii, 246-249; of Stolo and Sextius, iii, 196.
Layard, Mr., i, 161, 165.
Leagues of the Bœotians, Ætolians, Achæans, and the symmachia, and hegemonia, ii, 27.
Leake, Col., ii, 209.
Learchus, i, 431.
Leather manufacture, among the Egyptians, i, 311.
Lebadea, ii, 146.
Lebanon, mountains of, i, 140; boundary of Palestine, 553.
Lectisternia, iii, 118, 132.
Leda, wife of Jupiter, ii, 93, 115.
Legati, or lieutenant generals, of the Romans, iii, 391; station of, in the Roman army, iii, 404.
Leges agrariæ, iii, 170.
Legion, Roman, composition of a, iii, 388.
Legions in the army, their numbers, iii, 385, 388; composed of Roman citizens, 389.
Lelius, Roman orator, iii, 369.
Lemnos, ii, 104.
Lena, river, i, 25, 76, 80.
Lenæa, the winter feast of Bacchus, ii, 507.
Lentuli, surname of, derived from the successful cultivation of, iii, 77.
Lentulus, Cornelius, iii, 35.
Leo, iii, 74.
Leonidas, ii, 5, 35, 63, 209, 269.
Leontium, ii, 331.
Leontopolis, i, 348.
Leopold, Prince, ii, 69.
Lepidus, iii, 62, 64, 259; Roman orator, 369.
Lepsius, i, 265, 271, 429.
Leptis, i, 651.
Lernæan hydra, ii, 113.
Lesbos, i, 26, 41, 479, 532, 684.
Lethe, river, ii, 88, 147.
Letters, introduction of, into Greece, ii, 15.
Leucasia island, ii, 41.
Leucippus, i, 675; ii, 303, 327, 328.
Leuctra, battle of, ii, 4, 49, 245, 269, 274, 277, 523.
Levant, i, 55, 681, 682.
Levi, i, 578.
Levies for the army, how made, iii, 385.
Levites, i, 578, 606, 617.
Levying soldiers, Roman method of, iii, 384-387.
Lex cincia de donis et muneribus, iii, 170.
Licinia, iii, 226.
Oppia, iii, 226.
Libanus, mount, i, 631, 646, 667, 674.
Libatio, sacrifice, iii, 128.
Libations in sacrifices, ii, 137, 138.
Library, Ptolemy laid the foundation of a, i, 285.
Alexandrian; 400, 413.
of Appellicon brought to Rome, iii, 279.
founded by Adrian, iii, 288.
founded by Lucullus, iii, 276.
public at Rome, iii, 126.
Roman, portraits of authors placed in, iii, 349.
Liburnians, i, 39.
Libya, desert of, ii, 94.
Libyan mountains, i, 432, 433.
Libyans, i, 53.
Licinian law, iii, 87.
Licinius, iii, 69.
Lignits, battle of, i, 92.
Liguria, iii, 39.
Ligurians, i, 39, 41; iii, 43.
Lilybæum, surrendered after a ten years' siege, iii, 41.

Limyra, ii, 147, 148.
Linaut, i, 294.
Lindus, ii, 301.
Linos, song of, ii, 469.
Linus, ii, 298.
Lipari, ii, 104; naval engagemen near the island of, iii, 40.
Liris, river, iii, 16; battle on the banks of, iii, 34.
Litatio, sacrifice, iii, 128.
Liternum, iii, 50.
Lithuanian race, i, 32, 34.
Little Septis, i, 653.
Litui, musical instruments of the Romans, iii, 358, 401.
Liturgy of the nomadic tribes, i, 1
Lives, opinions, and apothegms of celebated philosophers, work by Laertius, iii, 309.
Living Library, Longinus called, iii 284.
Grecian soldiers' manner of, ii 516, 518.
Livius, iii, 46, 466.
Andronicus, Roman dramatic poet, iii, 361; performed his own plays, 377.
Load of a Roman soldier while on the march, iii, 397.
Lobhor, i, 43.
Locrians, ii, 51, 52, 278.
Locris, ii, 3, 5, 14, 41, 68; east, 3, 5; western, 3, 5.
Loftus, Mr., i, 133.
Logic, ii, 482.
Loire, banks, i, 489.
river, iii, 73.
Lokkum mountains, i, 468.
Lombard, school of painting, 425.
Lombardy, iii, 8.
London, i, 649; ii, 436.
Longæ, Roman ships of war, iii, 419.
Longinus, i, 313; iii, 284, 286.
Lop Nor, i, 77.
Lot, i, 557.
Lottery, Roman, iii, 282.
Louis XIV, iii, 356.
Love, origin of, ii, 84; affairs of, among the Grecians, 166-168; tokens expressive of, 166, 167; potions used as a means of exciting or allaying, 167; magical incantations in, 168.
Lublim, i, 92.
Lucani, ii, 28.
Lucanians, iii, 32.
Luceres, iii, 145, 157,
Luceria, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Lucian, ii, 105; iii, 300, 309; Roman poet, 367.
Lucilius, C., father of satire, iii, 362.
Lucina, i, 349, 661; ii, 95.
Lucius, iii, 63.
Lucretia, iii, 171, 184, 256, 262, 360; suicide of, iii, 26.
Lucretius, iii, 279.
or Carus, regarded as the first of Roman poets, iii, 363.
Lucrine lake, iii, 224.
Lucullus, iii, 57, 276, 277.
Ludius, iii, 348.
Ludus trojæ, mock fight of the Romans, iii, 234.
Luna, ii, 99; iii, 104, 661; origin of, ii, 80.
Lupercalia, festival of the Luperci, iii, 120.
Luperci, iii, 120, 121.
Luristan, i, 105.
Lusatia, i, 35.
Lusitanians, iii, 52, 53.
Luxor, i, 425, 426, 427; palace of, 427; temple of, 279.
Lybanus, mount, i, 469.
Lybia, iii, 27.
Lybian desert, i, 258, 263.
Lycaonia, i, 682.
Lychnis, gem, i, 661.
Lycia, i, 682; ii, 112.
Lycians, i, 32; ii, 446.

Lycon, ii, 342, 397.
Lycopolis, i, 349.
Lycortas, ii, 62, 66.
Lycosura, ii, 13, 446; ruins of, i, 2.
Lycosurian style of architecture, ii, 447.
Lycurgus, ii, 63, 66, 99, 171, 180, 181, 183, 194, 199, 213, 225, 231, 239, 240, 241, 242, 246, 247, 299, 365, 492, 521; iii, 248, 344.
Lydia, i, 181, 191, 282, 682; ii, 252, 418; iii, 9, 11, 67; its situation, i, 689; its dynasties, 689; its agriculture, 690; its religion, 690; its society, 691.
Lydian kingdom, i, 683.
Lydians, i, 32, 179, 203, 207, 222, 407; iii, 24.
Lynceus, ii, 115.
Lyric poetry, first attempted by Horace, iii, 364.
Lysander, ii, 45, 46; slain, 48.
Lysias, ii, 335, 492.
of Syracuse, iii, 368.
Lysicrates, ii, 456.
Lysimachus, i, 635; ii, 59.
Lysippus, ii, 422, 438, 439.
Lysistratra, comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 512.

Maccabees, i, 6, 8, 561, 601, 611, 638.
Macedo, god, i, 344.
Macedon, ii, 484, 490, 526; iii, 50, 51.
Macedonia, i, 36, 83; ii, 1, 14, 27, 68, 276, 388; iii, 49, 63, 65; how bounded, ii, 52; an Argive colony laid the foundation of, 52.
Macedonian phalanx, ii, 525.
Macedonians, i, 36, 268, 269, 641; ii, 73, 274.
Machichæan heresy, i, 336.
Macra, northern boundary of Etruria, iii, 6.
Mactatio, sacrifice, iii, 128.
Madan Arabs, i, 126.
Madeira, i, 653.
Madian, i, 466.
Madness, origin of, ii, 84.
Mæonians, ancient name of the Lydians, i, 689.
Mæotis, i, 351.
Magarians, ii, 478.
Magi, Persian, i, 400.
Magic among the Egyptians, i, 411; in connection with the Grecian religion, ii, 154–157; introduction of, into Greece, 155.
Magna Græcia, ii, 303, 310, 320, 431, 438; iii, 276, 339, 345; conquered by the Romans, 361.
Magnesia, city, i, 234, 667; iii, 50.
Magnesians, ii, 278.
Magnite, ii, 418.
Mago, work by, translated by a principal Roman magistrate, iii, 78.
Magyars, i, 42, 80.
Mahabad dynasty, i, 205.
Mahabadian, prophet kings, i, 216.
Mahmood, called the Gaznevide, i, 85, 86.
invaded India, i, 86.
Mahmoud, Sultan, i, 94,
Mahomet, i, 462–480, 506, 510; his birth and ancestry, 471, 472; his education, 472; begins the promulgation of his pretended mission, 473; loses his wife and uncle, 473; his Hegira, 474; espouses Ayesha, 474; his first regular battle, 474; takes Mecca, 476; his complete triumph in Arabia, 476; supposed to have been poisoned, 475; dies in the lap of Ayesha, 477; flight of, 45; II, iii, 75; Saoud, i, 496.
Mahometan religion, i, 254.
Mahometanism, source of, i, 515.
Mahometans, i, 97.
Mahrah, i, 465.

Mahsara, i, 346.
Maia, wife of Jupiter, ii, 93, 105.
Maiming to avoid military service, iii, 386.
Mainotes, ii, 67.
Malacca, i, 652.
Malachbelus, god, i, 659.
Malachi, i, 581.
Malaga, i, 652.
Malaic, gulf, i, 37; tribes, 25.
Malayans, i, 81.
Maleh, i, 548.
Malek Shah, i, 86.
Malians, ii, 278.
Mamelukes, i, 92, 255, 287, 288, 564.
Mamertine mercenaries, iii, 38.
Man, early Christian fathers' definition of, iii, 328.
Manah, i, 501.
Manasseh, i, 144.
Manchew Tartars, i, 97.
Mancipii causa, iii, 149.
Mandane, i, 205.
Mandoo, i, 243, 346.
Mand-Shu Tartars, i, 43.
Manes, the, ii, 119, 150, 327.
Manetho, the Sebennyte priest, i, 270, 276, 277, 291, 376, 390, 402.
Manichæism, iii, 327, 328.
Manipuli, a part of a Roman legion, iii, 388.
Manlius, iii, 184.
P., iii, 40, 197.
Manner of consulting the oracle of Trophonius, ii, 146, 147, 148.
Manners and civil life in Greece, ii, 199–203.
Mantinæa, i, 43, 50, 269; battle of, 51, 277, 523, 524.
Mantua, birth-place of Virgil, iii, 364.
Manufactures of the Assyrians, i, 149; of the Babylonians, 183; of the Chaldæans, 115, 116; of the Egyptians, 305, 314; of the Romans, iii, 91.
Manures of the Romans, iii, 80.
Manus, iii, 149.
Manx, dialect, i, 33.
Maraphii tribe, i, 201.
Marathon, ii, 501; battle of, i, 209; iii, 33, 433; plain of, i, 10, 292.
Marble quarries, ii, 4.
Marcellus, iii, 46.
March, Dr. Alden, i, xi.
of a Roman army, iii, 397; length of a, 397.
Marcius, Ancus, iii, 154.
Marcomanni, iii, 67.
Marcus, Aurelius, iii, 67.
Brutus, iii, 277.
Manlius, iii, 30.
Mardi tribe, i, 200.
Mardonius, i, 209, 210; ii, 32, 37, 523.
Mare's milk, intoxicating drink made from, i, 97.
Mariaba, i, 468.
Marib, [Seba,] i, 54, 468; monuments at, 54.
Mariners, Roman, iii, 420.
Marius, iii, 54, 55, 56, 65, 135, 207; introduced changes in military art, iii, 385, 386.
Marriage, Babylonian, i, 189, 191; ceremonies in Greece, ii, 173; among the Greeks, 169, 172; of the Hebrews, i, 597, 598; institution of, ii, 15; among the Romans, 241–245; among the Sabines, iii, 14.
Mars, i, 8, 178, 194, 213, 325, 348, 663; ii, 101, 103, 105, 111, 116, 121, 411, 442, 533; iii, 100, 103, 104, 120, 134, 153, 166.
son of Jupiter, ii, 93.
how represented, ii, 102.
Ultor, i, 343.
temple of, ii, 132.
planet, i, 123.
Marseilles, iii, 60.
Marsh, Mr., i, 106.

Marsic war, iii, 55, 116.
Marsyas, ii, 98.
Martel, Charles, i, 489, 490; iii, 2.
Martial, popular epigrammatic writer, iii, 91, 367.
Martius, Ancius, iii, 92; his mode of declaring war, 383.
Martyr, Justin, iii, 314, 316, 318.
Masius, mount, i, 134.
Masks, used in tragedy in Grecian theatres, ii, 499.
Maspii, tribe, i, 201.
Massacre of every Roman citizen in Asia Minor, iii, 55.
Massena, iii, 38.
Massinissa, king of Numidia, iii, 53, 90.
Massoud, i, 86.
Mathematics among the Egyptians, i, 404.
Matronalia, Roman festival, iii, 134.
Matuta, iii, 134.
Maumæ, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Mauritania, iii, 54.
Maury, Abbe, ii, his description of an Athenian orator, 493, 494.
Maut, i, 345, 346; goddess, i, 330.
Maximinian, iii, 68, 69.
Maximus, iii, 287, 288.
Fabius, iii, 44, 45, 46.
Valerius, iii, 258.
Meander, i, 682.
Mecca, i, 465, 471, 472, 474, 475, 476, 385, 490, 495, 496, 497, 499, 500, 503, 504, 512, 513, 525.
pilgrimage to, i, 514.
temple of, i, 502.
Mecherinus, pyramid of, i, 419.
Medals, Etruscan, iii, 337.
Medaura, iii, 281.
Medea, tragedy of, by Euripides, ii, 505.
Medeenet Haboo, temple at, i, 279.
Medes, i, 146, 407, 689.
Media, i, 33, 53, 75, 81, 86, 141, 142, 144, 145, 149, 155, 181, 184, 636.
Medicine, science of, among the Arabians, i, 535; among the Egyptians, 408–411.
Medina, i, 466, 474, 475, 485, 486, 494, 496, 503.
Medinet Abou, palace of, i, 423; temple of, 424, 427.
Mediterranean sea, i, 2, 5, 16, 27, 55, 112, 140, 141, 184, 198, 253, 258, 260, 462, 553, 554, 555, 562, 630, 642, 647, 650, 654, 655, 678; ii, 30, 303; iii, 3, 8, 37, 64, 74, 347; south boundary of Greece, ii, 2; western boundary of Etruria, iii, 6.
Medon, ii, 254, 431.
Medo-Persian empire, i, 198–237; race, 16.
Medullia, town, iii, 154.
Medusa, the Gorgon, ii, 100, 113, 119, 154, 501.
Megalesia, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Megalopolis, ii, 230.
Megara, ii, 20, 28, 41, 62, 63, 351, 353; one of the Furies, 86.
Megaric or Eristic school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 357.
Megaris, ii, 3, 4, 42.
Megiddo, battle of, i, 281.
Mehon, river, i, 81.
Mehong, river, i, 76.
Meikong, river, i, 25.
Meinam, river, i, 25.
Melchizedek, i, 562.
Meleager, ii, 115, 116.
Melissa, ii, 155.
Melissus, ii, 303, 320, 323.
Melitene, i, 142.
Melitus, ii, 342, 345.
Melkarth, i, 666.
Melos, ii, 41; massacre at, 43.
Melpomene, the muse of tragedy, ii, 118, 508.

Memes, ii, 418.
Memnon, i, 255, 424; ii, 56.
Memnonium, i, 279, 424, 427.
Memphis, i, 257, 264, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 276, 281, 283, 284, 329, 337, 350, 351, 385, 399, 402, 418, 422, 432, 644; ii, 304.
acropolis of, i, 421.
monuments at, i, 54.
pyramids of, i, 269.
Menander, ii, 513; Greek writer, iii, 376.
Mencheres, i, 273.
Mendean nomes, i, 387.
Mendesian kings, i, 283.
nome, 349.
Menedemus, ii, 303, 352, 353, 421.
Menelaus, i, 683; ii, 102.
Menes, king, i, 268, 293, 294, 390; first king of Egypt, i, 270, 271, 272.
Men-ka-re of the monuments of Egypt, i, 273.
Mencetius, origin of, ii, 80.
Mentz, i, 34.
Menu, the first lawgiver among the Hindoos, i, 270.
Merab, i, 499.
Mercenaries, Gallic, iii, 44.
Mercurialia, Roman festival, iii, 134.
Mercury, i, 105, 178, 194, 213, 342, 395, 402, 403, 661, 685; ii, 103, 111; iii, 18, 103, 153, 220, 426, 442; planet, i, 123, 407; how represented, ii, 106; son of Jupiter, 93; temple of, 132.
Merdasht, i, 239.
Mermnadæ dynasty, i, 689.
Merodach, i, 124.
Meroe, city, i, 264, 265, 269, 281, 418; monuments at, 54.
Meron, i, 90.
Mesopotamia, i, 149, 198, 462, 557, 634, 658, 669, 674; lower, 105, 111, 112, 142, 173; upper, 106, 141, 146, 199; valley, 134.
Messalina, iii, 261, 262.
Messalongi, ii, 447.
Messana, ii, 28.
Messene, ii, 20, 24, 28; rebuilt, 50, 51, 66.
Messenia, i, 8, 695; ii, 7, 19, 76, 281, 282.
Messenians, ii, 23, 24, 39, 40, 166.
Messiah, i, 572, 609; mission of the Jews in the production of, i, 207.
Metallurgy, ii, 75; among the Chaldæans, i, 116; of the Egyptians, 306-309; of the Assyrians, 150.
Metamorphoses of Ovid, iii, 367.
Metaphysics, Plato's, iii, 282, 289; Plotinus's, 293.
Metapontum, ii, 320.
Metella, iii, 260; Cecilia, 354, 355.
Metellus, iii, 41, 54.
Metempsychosis, doctrine of, i, 97; 295, 334, 501.
Method of the work, i, 62-73.
Metis, the wife of Jupiter, ii, 93, 109.
Metre, elegaic, ii, 476, 477, 478; hexameter, 476; iambic, 477, 478; sapphic, 480.
Mexico, monuments in, i, 54; plains of, 420.
Michael, i, 505, 507.
Micipsa, iii, 53.
Midas V, i, 686, 687.
Midian, i, 466.
Midianites, i, 184, 557.
Migration into Greece, ii, 20, 21.
Miletus, ii, 26, 27; 179, 299, 304, 352, 387, 455, 532.
Military art among the Romans, iii, 381-422; of the Greeks, ii, 513-533; duty, Grecian citizens exempt from, 515; habits of the Roman soldiers, iii, 395.
Miltiades, i, 209; ii, 34, 39, 522.
Milton, i, 60.
Minerva, i, 325, 331, 349, 384, 661, 684; ii, 38, 72, 73, 95, 102, 134,

Minerva, continued —
135, 140, 152, 432, 454, 455; iii 18, 101, 103; daughter of Jupiter, ii, 93, 99; how represented 100; of the Parthenon, collossal statue, 435; Polias, collossal statue, 435; temple of, 3, 454, 455; iii, 127.
Minos, i, 270; ii, 88, 114, 134, 198, 247; Judge, son of Jupiter, ii, 93.
Minotaur, a terrible monster of Crete, ii, 114.
Minturna, iii, 56.
Minyas, ii, 448.
Misael, iii, 317.
Misery, origin of, ii, 84.
Misraim, i, 52, 53, 54, 267, 269, 557.
Mississippi, monuments on the, i, 54; valley of the, mural monuments of, i, 420.
Missolonghi, constitution published at, ii, 68.
Mithridates, iii, 56, 57, 61, 65; king of Pontus, 55; VI, i, 692.
Mitylene island, ii, 26, 300, 370; iii, 311.
Mixed arts of the Romans, iii, 378–422; Grecians, ii, 494–533.
Mnaseas, ii, 397.
Mnemosyne, ii, 118, 147; origin of, 80; wife of Jupiter, 93.
Mnesarchus, ii, 320.
Mnesicles, ii, 453.
Moabites, i, 557, 573.
Moawiyah, i, 485, 486, 490, 491, 492.
Mochus, i, 675.
Models for Grecian artists, i, 441.
Moderatus, iii, 279.
Mœris, king, i, 274, 294.
lake, i, 294, 295, 429.
Mœso-Gothic idiom, i, 37.
Moguls, i, 87.
Mohadi, i, 492.
Mohammed I, ii, 67.
Ali, i, 497.
Mohammed, Ali Pasha, i, 496.
Sheik, i, 496.
Sultan of Carisme, i, 90.
Mokawkas, i, 481.
Moldavia, iii, 67.
Momemphis, battle at, i, 282.
Money, ii, 76.
Mongoles, i, 43, 87, 88–104.
Mongolia, i, 85.
Mongolian race, characteristics of, i, 20, 88; where originated, i, 88.
Mongolians, i, 43; peculiarity of the muscles and bones, i, 89.
Mongolic races, i, 25.
Monochrom, ii, 418, 420.
Monodies of the Roman theatre, iii, 377.
Monogamy, i, 59; strictly enforced at Rome, iii, 241.
Monogram, ii, 418.
Monograms, Etruscan, iii, 342.
Monotheism, ii, 123; among the Arabians, i, 500.
Montesquieu, ii, 289.
Monument builders, i, 54.
Monuments, Grecian, to the dead, ii, 225, 226.
Moon, i, 178, 213; ii, 150; goddess, i, 338.
Morals, eclectic, iii, 296.
Morea, ii, 67; originally the Peloponnesus, 6.
Moresque, style of architecture, i, 544.
Morgetes, iii, 4.
Moriah, mount, i, 562, 563, 575.
Morocco, i, 536.
Morpheus, ii, 85, 150.
Mors, or Death, ii, 85.
Morton, Dr., i, 375.
Mosaic pavements, ii, 348.
paintings of the Romans, iii, 348.
Moscheris, pyramid of, i, 419.
Moschus, i, 675; native of Syracuse, iii, 361.
Moscilama, i, 480.

Moscow, i, 92, 94.
Moses, i, 46, 347, 402, 405–407, 409, 412, 468, 506, 558, 564, 573, 580, 604, 606, 609, 610, 618, 628, 651; ii, 107, 130, 468; iii, 313.
Moslem, i, 486, 503, 504.
Moslems, i, 476, 505, 506, 507, 509, 510, 511, 512.
Mostajem, caliph, last of the temporal successors of Mahomet, i, 92.
Motion, principle of, iii, 294, 295.
Mound, raised, used to besiege a city, ii, 528.
Mountains, the, origin of, ii, 80.
Mourning, Herod's method to secure, for himself, i, 561.
period of, among the Romans, iii, 271.
Movable towers, Roman, iii, 412.
Mughier, i, 115.
Muleh Al Salah, i, 287.
Mulita, i, 119.
Muller, Max, i, 22; ii, 474, 476, 502.
Mummius, consul, ii, 66; iii, 52, 345. 346.
Munda, iii, 61.
Municipia, class of towns, iii, 203; Roman form of government, 415,
Murcia, i, 652.
Murg-curb, the site of Pasargadæ, i, 201.
Musa, i, 488.
Musæus, ii, 158.
Musculus, machine used in war, iii, 413.
Muses, the offspring of Jupiter, ii, 93, 118.
Music among the Arabians, i, 542.
of the Assyrians, i, 168, 169.
art of, among the Egyptians, i, 364, 457–460.
of the Etruscans, iii, 11.
of the Grecians, ii, 457–467.
power of, in Greece, ii, 467.
Music among the Hebrews, i, 526, 627.
instruments of, used in the Roman army, iii, 400, 401.
of the Romans, iii, 357–359.
Musical instruments, ii, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462.
of the Assyrians, i, 168.
Musonius, iii, 300.
Mus-tagh, i, 43.
Mutius, Scævola, legend of, iii, 28.
Muwaun, i, 490.
Mycale, i, 210; ii, 275.
battle at, ii, 37.
Mycenæ, ii, 7, 13, 271, 430, 446, 447, 448.
Mycerinus, i, 273; pyramid of, 419.
Mygdonia, i, 143.
Mylitta, goddess, i, 119, 190.
Myndus, iii, 287.
Myrionymus, i, 338.
Myron, ii, 434.
Myrrha, i, 663.
Myrtle wreaths used to crown triumphant Roman generals, iii, 408.
Mysia, i, 682.
Mysteries in connection with the Grecian religion, ii, 157–161.
Mythological characters represented on the stage, iii, 381.
Myus, i, 234.

Nabatene, i, 409.
Nabathæan agriculture, the book of, i, 50, 470.
dialect, i, 674.
Nabathæus, i, 467, 497.
Nabis, murdered, ii, 66.
Nabonadius, i, 181, 182.
Nabopolassar, i, 146, 177, 178, 179, 202.
Nahala, i, 497.
Naharain, i, 105.

Nahavund, i, 483.
Naiades, nymphs of the fountains, ii, 118.
Nana, goddess, i, 123.
Napææ, nymphs of the vales, ii, 118.
Napoleon I, i, 14, 390.
Napoli de Romania taken by capitulation, ii, 68.
Narcissus, ii, 413.
Natatis, iii, 304.
Natural history of the world, by Pliny, iii, 308.
Naturalism, i, 54.
Nature-worship, ii, 161.
Naucratis, city, i, 318.
Naumachia, mimic sea fights among the Romans, iii, 235.
Naupactus, ii, 41.
Navarin, ii, 68.
Navigation, art of, among the Phœnicians, i, 678–680.
Navy, the first, of the Romans, iii, 39.
Naxos, ii, 28, 108, 453.
Nearchus, ii, 58.
Nebaioth, i, 469.
Nebbi Yunus, mound, i, 136, 137.
Nebo, god, i, 123, 124.
Nêbou, i, 346.
Nebuchadnezzar, i, 177, 178, 179, 180, 202, 203, 281, 562, 563, 575, 640, 678; sent by his father against the Egyptians, 179; defeats Necho, 179; ascends the throne of Babylon, 179; extorts labor from his military prisoners, 179; covers his whole territory with gigantic works, 179, 180; his impress on bricks in ruins, 180; takes Tyre after a long siege; 180; subdues Syria, Judea, and Phœnicia, takes and destroys Jerusalem, 180; afflicted with lycanthropy, 181.
Necessity, ii, 85.
Necho, i, 179, 281.
Necropolis, Theban, i, 433.
Nectanebo, king, i, 283.
Nedjed, i, 468, 495.
Nedsjed, i, 465.
Nehimeon, i, 346.
Neith, i, 327, 331, 338, 345, 346, 349, 356.
Neleus, ii, 384.
Nemæan lion, ii, 113.
Nemea, ii, 7, 235.
Nemean games, ii, 235.
Nemesis, i, 661; ii, 33, 84, 87.
Neodes, ii, 370.
Neph, god, i, 118, 327, 328, 329, 330, 345, 346, 349, 350.
Nepos, Julius, ii, 74.
Nepte, i, 342.
Nepthys, goddess, i, 333, 334, 338, 342, 346.
Neptune, i, 73, 98, 105, 109, 110, 111, 117, 120; iii, 103; his parentage, ii, 81, 108; his realm assigned to him, 82; how represented, 111; temple of, iii, 127.
Nereides, nymphs of the seas, ii, 109, 118.
Nereus, i, 661; ii, 109, 120, 413.
Nergal, god, i, 123, 124.
Nero, iii, 46, 67, 215, 218, 235, 236, 250, 262, 298, 300, 302, 303, 304, 308, 358, 408.
Nerva, iii, 304.
Nessus, the centaur, ii, 114.
Nestorian monastery, i, 472.
Nestorius, iii, 289.
Netpe, i, 332, 345, 351.
Nevius, dramatic poet, iii, 361, 377.
Nexu vinctus, iii, 183.
New academy school, philosophy as developed, in, ii, 402–405.
Carthage, iii, 46.
Castile, iii, 73.
York, iii, 217; nearly in the same latitude as Rome, 3; State Normal School, i, xv.

Nicæa harbor destroyed ; ii, 43.
Nichomachus, ii, 384, 423.
Nicias, ii, 44, 74, 423.
Nicolaus, iii, 298.
Nicomachus, i, 415 ; ii, 383.
Nicomedes, i, 635.
Nicomedia, iii, 67.
Nicopolis, iii, 305.
Niebuhr, i, 88 ; iii, 10, 117, 141, 149, 161.
Niffer, i, 112.
Night, ii, 85, 88, 123 ; ancestor of nature, 79 ; brother of sleep, 84 ; how represented, 84.
Nigidius, Publius, iii, 277.
Nikkum mountains, i, 468.
Nile, river, i, 257, 258, 469, 664 ; ii, 89, 90, 422, 472 ; iii, 422.
upper, i, 26, 54.
valley of the, i, 16, 26, 54, 257, 264, 281, 290.
delta of the, i, 257, 258.
cataracts of the, i, 257.
basin of the, i, 258.
development and resources of the, i, 292–297.
its fertilizing power, i, 260–263.
overflowing of the, cause of, i, 260, 261.
period of its inundation, i, 262.
turned into a new channel by Menes, i, 270.
Niloa, i, 355.
Nilotic valley, i, 2.
Nilus, i, 346 ; iii, 106.
Nimrod, i, 53, 54, 111, 119, 173, 177, 205, 467 ; ii, 107 ; dynasty of, i, 111 ; local traditions of, i, 111.
Nimrud, i, 138, 148, 149, 160, 164.
Tepasse, i, 180.
Nin, god, i, 122, 124.
Nineveh, i, 104, 135, 137, 138, 141, 145, 146, 149, 160, 163, 178, 179, 252, 649 ; monuments of, 2 ; walls of, 135.
Ninip, god, i, 122, 124.
Ninua, city, i, 135.
Niobe, ii, 98.
Niphates, mountains, i, 139, 141.
Nipur, i, 107, 119.
Nisabour, i, 90.
Nitocris, i, 376, 390.
Noah, i, 48, 49, 51, 177, 267, 506, 508, 557, 674 ; ii, 107.
Nola, city of, i, 39.
Nomadic tribes, their industry i, 97 ; 97 ; religion, 98 ; social instinct of the, i, 98 ; funeral rites, 99, 100 ; their dwellings, 100 ; their government, 100, 101 ; arts of the, 102 ; their philosophy, 103.
races, i, 74–104.
Nome, signification of, i, 387.
Nomothelæ, Athenian magistrates, ii, 255.
Non-Shufu of the monuments of Egypt, i, 273.
Northmen, i, 34.
Noori, i, 418.
Norba, iii, 18 ; ruins of, i, 3.
Norbanus, iii, 56.
Noricum, iii, 73, 75.
North America, iii, 141.
Norwegians, i, 34.
Notre Dame, i, 427.
Nott, Dr., president of Union college, i, ix.
Notus, ii, 111.
Nox, or Night, ii, 84, 86.
Nubia, i, 264.
Nuiglissar, i, 181.
Numa, iii, 42, 96, 99, 100, 104, 107, 109, 119, 120, 121, 132, 159, 256, 265 ; temple of, 127.
Pompilius, iii, 22, 23, 273.
Numantia, iii, 53.
Numantine war, iii, 53.
Nurses, Roman, iii, 252.

Nymphs, the, ii, 118; origin of, ii, 80.
Nysa, ii, 108.

Oaths, ii, 141.
Roman, iii, 132.
Obededom, i, 573, 575.
Obeidah, i, 482.
Obi, river, i, 76.
Objective, one of the divisions of Grecian art, ii, 415, 416-456.
one of the divisions of Roman art, iii, 336-357.
Obstinacy, origin of, ii, 84.
Ocadh, i, 549, 550.
Oceanidi, the offspring of Jupiter, ii, 93.
Oceanus, ii, 109, 120; origin of, 80.
Ocellus, ii, 320.
Ochus, king, i, 283.
Ocopii, iii, 274.
Octavia, iii, 64.
Octavius, iii, 64, 65, 66.
peaceful reign of, iii, 364.
Odemvald, i, 34.
Odin, ii, 101.
Odoacer, iii, 75.
Odyssey, Homer's, iii, 365, 472.
Œdipus, ii, 18, 117, 503.
king, tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 503, 507.
at Colonus, tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 503.
Œgion, ii, 275.
Œnotri, iii, 4.
Œnotrians, i, 38.
Œta, mount, ii, 3, 5.
Œtcans, ii, 278.
Œthanes, ii, 155.
Œtoleans, ii, 66.
Offensive arms of the Romans, iii, 396, 397.
Officers of the Roman armies, iii, 389-393.
Grecian, ii, 516-518.
Ogulnian law, iii, 113, 200.
Ogulnius, Q., iii, 200.
Cn., iii, 200.
Ohio, valley of the, mural monuments of, i, 420.
Ohud, mount, i, 475.
Oil colors, the Grecians never used, ii, 418.
Old age, origin of, ii, 84.
palace of Babylon, i, 175.
Olenus, ii, 273.
Oligarchies established, ii, 46.
Olive oil, manufacture of, in Greece. ii, 72.
Olivet, mount, i, 554.
Olympia, ii, 425, 453; temple at, 94.
Olympiad, i, 45; the first, 45; introduction of, into chronology, ii, 117.
Olympiads, ii, 474; Grecian method of, computation by, i, 45.
Olympian Jove, ii, 163.
Jupiter, colossal statute, ii, 485; temple of, 454, 456.
Olympic games, ii, 231.
name under which Jupiter was worshiped, ii, 94.
Olympiodorus, iii, 299.
Olympius, or Jupiter, Pericles called ii, 487.
Olympus, mount, ii, 3, 81, 82, 93, 98, 103, 111, 121, 458, 459; the fabled residence of Jupiter, 93.
Olynthus, ii, 54.
Oman, i, 465, 499, 531.
mountains of, i, 468.
Omar, i, 483, 484, 485, 487.
caliph, i, 287.
mosque of, i, 564.
Ombo, i, 341.
Ombos, i, 346, 350.
Ombte, i, 341.
Omens, iii, 100, 111, 112, 113.
in Roman marriages, iii, 243, 244, 245.

Ommiade, i, 486.
Ommiades, i, 490, 491, 492, 550.
Omphale, i, 689.
On, or Heliopolis, city, i, 269, 332, 384.
On the nature of things, poem by Lucretius, iii, 279.
Onamarchus, ii, 51.
Oneraciæ, Roman ships of burden, iii, 419.
Ophir, i, 656.
Opici, i, 38; iii, 5.
Oplitæ, Grecian soldiers, ii, 575.
Ops, ii, 90, 120; iii, 105.
Oracle of Amphiaraus in Attica, ii, 148.
Apollo at Claros, ii, 147, 148.
Jupiter at Dodona, ii, 144.
Mercury in Achaia, ii, 148.
Trophonius at Lebadea, ii, 146.
Orations, funeral, of the Romans, iii, 267, 268.
Oratory, ii, 482.
of the Arabians, i, 547, 548.
Orchestra in the Roman theatre, its location, iii, 347.
Orchomenos, ii, 447, 448; battle of, iii, 56.
Orchomenus, ii, 13.
Orcus, the infernal regions, ii, 114.
Order of Roman ships in battle, iii, 420.
Oreades, nymphs of the mountains, ii, 118.
Orestes, ii, 260; iii, 74, 75, 290.
Origen, iii, 286, 313, 314, 315, 414.
Origines, iii, 284, 285.
Orkhon, river, i, 103.
Ormuzd, symbol, i, 218, 219.
Ornaments of the Phœnicians, i, 657.
Oromasder, symbol, i, 218.
Orontes, river, i, 631, 632, 634, 635.
Orpheus, ii, 88, 155, 298.
Osburn, Mr., i, 261, 274, 276, 434.
Oscan race, Sabines supposed to have been of the, iii, 12.
language, i, 39.
Oscans, iii, 5.
Oscians furnished low comedy to Romans, iii, 375.
Osiris, i, 273, 328, 332, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 343, 345, 346, 349, 355, 378, 423.
Osirtasen I, i, 274, 308, 313, 416, 428; II, 321.
Osirtasens, i, 273, 274.
Osmanli Turks, i, 44.
Ossa, mount, ii, 3.
Ostia, iii, 24, 62, 92, 133.
Ostiaets, i, 42.
Ostium, or janua, entrance to a Roman house, iii, 219.
Ostrogoths, i, 83.
Ostrum, color, iii, 347.
Osymandias, palace and tomb of, i, 424, 426.
Otba, i, 479.
Othman, king, the name Ottomans derived from, i, 87, 486, 503.
Othmans, i, 87.
Otho, L., Roscius, his law regulating theatres, iii, 374.
Prince, ii, 69.
Othrys, mount, 81.
Otrar, i, 90, 96.
Ottoman empire, i, 36, 487.
Ottomans, i, 87, 269.
Ougres, i, 41, 42.
Ovation, honor given to a Roman general, iii, 408.
Ovid, ii, 318; the works of, iii, 367; attempted tragedy, 377.
Oxen, Roman, iii, 76, 81.
Oxus, river, i, 77, 81, 85, 198, 200, 634.
Oxyrhinchus, i, 351.
Oyster beds, invention of, iii, 224.

Pacific ocean, i, 76, 80.
Pactolus, i, 689.
Pacuvius, dramatic poet, iii, 345, 377.

Padus, or Eridanus, iii, 2.
Pæonians, ii, 58.
Pagan oracles, ii, 147.
religion, downfall of the, in the Roman empire, iii, 52.
Paint used by Roman women, iii, 215.
Painting of the Assyrians, i, 166, 167.
of the Egyptians, i, 439–441.
among the Romans, iii, 342–350.
among the Grecians, ii, 416–425.
the first, ii, 418.
in Greece, decline of, ii, 424.
Roman, process, resorted to, iii, 346.
Palace, the, of Babylon, i, 176, 179.
Palaces of Egypt, i, 423.
Palaria, exercise of arms among the Romans, iii, 394.
Palatine hill, iii, 19, 21, 24, 98, 126, 232.
Palatines, Polish, i, 92.
Paleness, a constant attendant on the Furies, ii, 87.
Pales, iii, 134.
Palestine, i, 16, 53, 112, 144, 145, 155, 178, 180, 275, 409, 462, 484, 630, 645, 658, 669, 674; ii, 133; iii, 290, 553, 629.
the mission of its inhabitants, i, 552; its description, 553–555; climate of, 555, 556; its productions, 556; how originally peopled, 557; Canaanites in, 557; the heroic period in the history of, 558; commencement of the Hebrew monarchy in, 559; separation into the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, 559; Shalmaneser terminates the kingdom of Israel in, 560; Nebuchadnezzar carries into captivity the inhabitants of, 560; subject to the Seleucidæ, 561; establishment of the dynasty of the Asmonæans in, 561; Pompey reduces Judæa into a Roman province, 561; the inhabitants dispersed, 562; its industry, 565–571; its religion, 571–591; its society, 591–603; its government, 604–616; its philosophy, 617–623; its art, 623–629.
Palestiners, i, 275.
Palestrina, iii, 18.
Palilia, Roman festival, iii, 134.
Palinurus, cape, iii, 41.
Palladium, iii, 122.
Pallas, i, 8, 684; ii, 99, 121, 481.
Athene, ii, 101, 103, 104.
M., i, 50.
origin of, ii, 80.
temple of, ii, 11.
Palmyra, i, 659.
ruins of, i, 645, 646.
Palus Mæotis, ii, 27.
Pamer, table land of, i, 76.
Pamphilus, ii, 422.
Pamphylia, i, 682.
Pan, of Thebes, i, 328.
god, i, 330; ii, 112, 120, 427.
Panætius, iii, 275.
Panæus, ii, 410.
Panes, ii, 119.
Pannonia, iii, 73, 75.
Panopolis, i, 330.
Panormus, iii, 41.
Pantheism, i, 54; iii, 319.
Pantheon of Rome, iii, 126, 354, 356.
Pantomime, its mode of performance, iii, 380.
of the Romans, iii, 376.
Paper, invention of, claimed by the Arabians, i, 542.
manufacture of, by the Egyptians, i, 310.
Paphlagonia, i, 682; iii, 298.
Paphos, ii, 104.
Papian law, iii, 122.

Papirius Cursor, iii, 32, 33.
Papremis, i, 348.
Par impar (odd and even), game of the Roman children, iii, 332.
Parcæ, the, or Fates, ii, 85.
how represented, 86.
origin of, ii, 84.
their temples and statues, ii, 86.
Parian marble, ii, 431.
Paris, i, 649, 661, 683, 685; ii, 95, 102.
Parium, iii, 301.
Parker, Hon. Amasa J., i, xii.
Parma, small round shield of the Roman soldier, iii, 396.
Parmenides, ii, 303, 320, 322, 323, 328, 351, 485.
Parnassus, mount, ii, 5, 9, 13, 118.
valleys of, ii, 144.
Paros, island of, ii, 33.
Parrhasius, ii, 410, 420, 421.
Parsees, i, 200.
Parsi, i, 200.
Partheniæ, ii, 24, 28.
Parthenon of Athens, ii, 11, 12, 436, 453.
Parthia, i, 75, 636.
Parthian mountains, i, 184.
Parthians, iii, 62, 64, 95.
Parysatis, i, 224.
Pasargadæ, i, 205, 224, 227, 228, 238, 239.
city, i, 208, 211.
tribe, i, 201.
Pasent, i, 200.
Pasht, goddess, i, 330, 355.
Pasiteles, ii, 433, 440; iii, 340.
Pastoral poetry cultivated by the Romans, iii, 361, 364.
Patra, ii, 274.
Patras, gulf of, Greek victory at, ii, 68.
Patres conscripti, iii, 142.
senators, iii, 141.
Patria potestas, iii, 248, 249.
Patricii, the, in the Roman government, iii, 149–151.
Patron and client, relation of, in Rome, iii, 160, 161.
Patronatus, iii, 149.
Paulina, iii, 262, 263.
Paullus, Œmilius, ii, 526; iii, 50.
Pausa, iii, 107.
Pausanias, ii, 13, 37, 38, 47, 48, 55, 133, 424, 432, 446, 522, 523.
Pausias, ii, 423.
Pavia, iii, 75.
Pax, iii, 105.
Pay of the Roman soldiers, iii, 393.
Peace, Roman method of making, iii, 384.
offerings of the Hebrews, i, 582.
temple of, iii, 127.
the, comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 512.
Pearl fisheries of the Babylonians, i, 185.
Pecunia ordinaria, iii, 417.
extraordinaria, iii, 417.
Pegasus, iii, 18, 115.
winged horse, its origin, ii, 113.
Pehlevi language, i, 200.
Pekin, i, 90.
Pelasgi, i, 32, 37, 38; ii, 27, 120, 122, 125, iii, 9.
tribe, the ruling tribe in Greece; ii, 12; their language, 12; their first settlement in Greece, 12; their monuments in Greece, 13; their architecture, 13; remains found in Italy, 13; their industry, 13.
Pelasgian, i, 24.
Pelasgians, iii, 5, 8.
Pella, ii, 425.
Pelopidæ, ii, 19, 28, 49.
Pelopidas, 50, 269, 484, 524.
Peloponnesian war, ii, 40, 486, 488, 490, 509, 528.

Peloponnesus, i, 37; ii, 2, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 21, 62, 231, 454, 479; iii, 64.
called from Pelops, ii, 15.
Pelops, i, 37, 686; ii, 15, 16, 90, 139.
peninsula of, ii, 6.
Pelta, a light piece of armor of the Roman soldier, iii, 396.
Peltastæ, Grecian soldiers, ii, 515.
Pelusiac, mouth of the Nile, i, 258.
Pelusium, i, 208, 283.
city, i, 258, 269.
Pemoon, i, 344.
Penelope, ii, 470.
Peneus, river, ii, 3; iii, 50.
valley of the, i, 37.
Pentateuch, i, 505, 506, 577, 592.
Pentathlum, public game of the Romans, iii, 233.
Pentelic mountains, ii, 4.
Pentelius, mount, ii, 12.
People, the, in the Roman government, iii, 144.
Perdiccas, king of Macedon, ii, 43, 50, 53, 59.
Peregrinus, iii, 301.
Perfumery among the Trojans, i, 685.
Pergamus, i, 637; iii, 53; king of, ii, 64.
Periander, ii, 175, 300, 301.
Pericles, ii, 11, 40, 41, 42, 122, 176, 178, 179, 260, 266, 268, 276, 307, 409, 453, 456, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 502, 509, 510, 515; iii, 263.
Perictione, ii, 353.
Perillus, ii, 431.
Peripatetic philosophy, iii, 299.
school, i, 68; iii, 278, 298; philosophy as developed in, ii, 388-397.
Peris, a lost race, i, 50.
Peristylium, court of a Roman house, iii, 220.
Permland, i, 42.
Perrhæbians, ii, 278.
Perseidæ, ii, 19.
Persepolis, i, 104, 197, 201, 228, 238, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 252; ii, 57, 58.
monuments of, i, 2.
ruins of, i, 239-241.
splendid edifices at, i, 212.
Perses, origin of, ii, 80.
Perseus, ii, 16, 113, 119, 526; iii, 18, 349.
king of Macedon, ii, 440; iii, 50.
defeated by Æmilius, ii, 65.
succeeds Philip II as king, ii, 64.
Persia, i, 33, 58, 79, 80, 86, 90, 92, 94, 144, 148, 184, 482, 483, 561, 608, 636; ii, 55, 155; iii, 63, 70, 287, 290.
proper, 200, 208.
dialects of, i, 56.
polygamy in, i, 223.
sophis of, 487.
Persian gulf, i, 106, 112, 141, 179, 180, 185, 198, 200, 462, 464, 466, 467, 468, 496, 632, 653.
harem, i, 227.
invasion, ii, 31, 32, 33.
language, i, 28, 246.
navy defeated, ii, 36, 37, 39
religion, dualistic features of the, i, 218, 219.
war, ii, 484, 509.
Persians, i, 85, 155, 269, 483, 638; iii, 24.
defeated, ii, 56.
mode of retaining possession of the countries they had subdued, i, 221, 222.
physique of, i, 235.
their rule in Egypt, i, 283.
the, tragedy by Æschylus, ii, 502.
Personification, beautiful, i, 216.
Perspective, Roman, iii, 348.
Peru, i, 654.
monuments in, i, 54.
Pesh-dad, i, 205.

Pesh-dadian dynasty, i, 205.
Pestilence at Rome, iii, 68, 375.
Peter the Great, iii, 356.
Petra, i, 644, 645.
city of, i, 468, 469.
Petreius, iii, 60.
Petronius, iii, 237.
Maximus, iii, 74.
satirist, iii, 367.
Petschenegers, i, 42.
Peuceti, iii, 4.
Phædo, ii, 303, 335, 352, 353.
Phænarete, ii, 333.
Phæton, the story of, ii, 96, 97.
Phagrus, i, 351.
Phalanx, Egyptian, i, 282.
Macedonia, i, 282
Phaleræ, the reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 407.
Phalerum harbor, ii, 11.
Phallas, i, 335, ii; 426.
Phantasos, iii, 150.
Phara, ii, 274.
Pharaoh, ii, 468; iii, 21.
Necho, king, i, 281, 679.
Hophra, i, 180, [error Hophea].
Pharaohs, i, 568.
Pharisees, i, 618, 619, 620, 621.
Pharnabazus, i, 45, 283.
Pharnaces, iii, 61.
Pharsalia, iii, 60.
battle of, ii, 67.
Horace threw away his shield at, iii, 366.
Lucian's, iii, 367.
Phemius, ii, 470.
Pherecydes, ii, 303, 310.
Pheidon, king of Argos, ii, 76, 77.
Phidias, i, 9; ii, 8, 33, 87, 94, 134, 407, 410, 432, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 453, 488.
Phiops Apappus, king, i, 276.
Philadelphia, ruins of, i, 665.
Philæ, island of, i, 339, 345.
Philemon, ii, 513.
Philetus, ii, 352.
Philip II, king of Macedon, ii, 51, 52, 53, 64, 180, 277, 280, 425, 430, 490, 491, 493; iii, 45, 49, 50, 90.
his history, ii, 53, 54, 55.
his policy, ii, 55.
murdered, ii, 55.
Philippi, battle at, iii, 63.
Philistia, i, 142.
Philistines, i, 53, 153, 275, 557, 672.
Philo, ii, 405.
Philo, Q. Publius, iii, 199.
Philoctetes, tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 503.
Philolaus, ii, 320.
Philomel, i, 661.
Philomelus, ii, 51.
Philopœmen, ii, 62, 66, 274.
Philosophers, Alexandrian, iii, 282.
Philosophy, the basis of, i, 1, 4.
as developed in different sects and schools, ii, 302-405.
as developed in the reflections and maxims of the Grecian sages, ii, 299-302.
preceded poetry in the development of the Roman mind, iii, 362.
of the Arabians, i, 530-543.
of the Assyrians, i, 158, 159.
of the Babylonians, i, 192–196.
of the Christian fathers, iii, 324, 325.
among the Egyptians, i, 400-416.
of the Hebrews, i, 617–623.
of the Medo-Persians, i, 238.
of the Phœnicians, i, 674–676.
speculation of the Phœnician, i, 668.
of the Romans, iii, 272–335.
Phineas, ii, 113.
Phlegethon, ii, 88.
Phliasii, ii, 351.
Phobetor, ii, 150.

Phocæa, ii, 26, 304.
Phocians, ii, 51, 278, 280; iii, 36.
destroyed, ii, 54.
Phocis, ii, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 35, 41, 68, 280, 284; Pythian games, celebrated, at 5.
Phœbe, ii, 145; origin of, 80.
Phœbidus, ii, 48.
Phœbus, ii, 96.
Phœnicia, i, 16, 141, 178, 180, 314, 316, 553, 658, 693, 694; ii, 15, 16, 90, 101, 116, 120, 131, 310; iii, 11.
the home of the written record, i, 2, 3.
and Syria, i, 630–680, no individual history, 639; their principal cities, 641, 642, 643; their industry, 642, 657; their religion, 658–668; their society, 668, 669; their government, 669–674; their philosophy, 674–676; their art, 677–680.
Phœnician language, dialect of the Semitic, i, 28.
Phœnicians, i, 37, 56, 150, 179, 253, 466, 573; ii, 212, 272, 426.
mission of the, i, 254.
Phorcys, ii, 119.
Phraortes, i, 202.
Phrygia, i, 682; ii, 15, 90, 476; iii, 11, 121, 224, 304.
Phrygian kingdom, i, 683.
Phrygians, i, 32, 37; ii, 462.
religion of the, i, 687.
Phryne, ii, 179, 180.
Phrynichus, ii, 501, 502.
Phtha, god, i, 329, 345, 346; temple of, 272, 284.
Tore, i, 329.
Phthians, ii, 278.
Phut, i, 52, 53.
Phylarchi, Athenian magistrates, ii, 255.
Phyle, ii, 46.
Physcon, i, 638.
Pictor, iii, 345.
Picture writing of the Chaldæans, i, 110.
Pictures, unreal, at Pompeii, iii, 349
Pierus, mount, ii, 118.
Pietas, iii, 105.
Pike, or lance, of the Roman soldier, iii, 397.
Pila paganica, game of the Romans, iii, 229.
trigonalis, game of the Romans, iii, 229.
Pilum, dart, of the Roman soldier, iii, 396.
Pinaii, iii, 121.
Pindar, ii, 237, 480.
imitated by Horace, iii, 366.
Pindus, mount, ii, 3, 118.
Piræus harbor, ii, 11, 37, 47, 76.
Pirates, iii, 95.
Pirithous, ii, 114, 119.
Pisa, ii, 8.
Pisander, ii, 48.
Pisidia, i, 682.
Pisistratus, ii, 431, 472, 497.
Piso, iii, 304.
Pisones, surname of, derived from the successful cultivation of, iii, 77.
Pittacus, ii, 300.
Pius, Antoninus, iii, 67, 306, 354.
Placentia, battle near, iii, 44.
Places of worship, Grecian, ii, 130.
Placidia, iii, 73.
Platæa, ii, 41, 501.
battle of, ii, 4, 37, 52, 523; field of, ii, 292.
surrenders to the Spartans, ii, 42.
Plato, i, 50, 68, 332, 407, 414, 444, 458, ii, 124, 182, 303, 312, 320, 327, 335, 337, 339, 343, 353, 354, 355, 356, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369,

Plato, continued—
370, 383, 394, 395, 402, 403, 404, 460; iii, 277, 281, 282, 284, 285, 287, 288, 291, 292, 298, 312, 313, 317, 318, 330, 331, 332, 333, 422.
idealism of, i, 8.
nuptial diagram of, i, 338.
Platonic school, iii, 276, 281.
Platonists, i, 414.
Alexandrian, iii, 288.
Plautus, comic writer, iii, 376.
improves dramatic literature and the Latin language, iii, 361.
Plebes, or plebs, plebii, plebians, the, in the Roman government, iii, 153-160.
Plebiscita, iii, 187.
Plebiscitum, iii, 194.
Pliny, i, 351, 468; ii, 419; iii, 79, 266, 350.
the elder, iii, 307, 308.
the younger, iii, 308, 373.
Plotinian school, iii, 286.
Plotinus, i, 414; iii, 284, 285, 286, 290, 293.
Ploughmen, Roman, iii, 81.
Ploughs in use among the Greeks, ii, 71; Roman, iii, 81.
Plutarch, i, 402; ii, 466, 488, 489; iii, 174, 246, 282, 289.
Pluto, i, 118, 335, 663; ii, 88, 88, 90, 91, 107, 119; iii, 18, 104, 128, 133, 216.
his parentage, ii, 81.
his realm assigned to him, ii, 82.
Plutus, i, 118.
comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 501.
Plycletus, ii, 410.
Pneb-to, i, 346.
Pnyx, ii, 11.
Poetry, anacreontic, ii, 480.
art of, among the Romans, iii, 359-367.
art of, in Greece, ii, 467-481.
Poetry among the Hebrews, i, 620, 629.
of the Arabians, i, 549-551.
lyric, ii, 479.
Poictiers, i, 489.
Poikele Stoa, ii, 456.
Poland, i, 92.
Polemon, ii, 369, 370, 397.
Poles, i, 35.
Polish dialect, i, 35.
Political economy, science of, i, 12.
forces of Rome, their provisions, iii, 137.
Politii, iii, 121.
Politorium, town, iii, 154.
Pollio, Asinius, tragic poet, iii, 377.
Pollux, ii, 115.
Polybius, ii, 526; iii, 275, 284.
Polycarp, iii, 312, 317.
epistles of, iii, 312.
Polycles, ii, 440.
Polycletus, ii, 420.
Polydectes, ii, 113.
Polydorus, ii, 247.
Polygamy among the nomadic tribes, i, 99.
among the Egyptians, i, 374.
among the Greeks, ii, 169.
among the Persians, i, 237.
Polygnotus, ii, 413, 419.
Polyhymnia, the muse of eloquence, ii, 118.
Polynices, ii, 18.
Polyperchon, ii, 60.
Polytheism of the Greeks, ii, 123.
Pomerania, iii, 75.
Pomona, iii, 104.
Pompeia, iii, 262.
Pompeii, iii, 218, 220, 221, 227, 347, 348, 349, 350.
Pompey, i, 561, 563; ii, 67; iii, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 78, 95, 207, 339.
Cn., erected first stone theatre, iii, 374.

Pompilius, Numa, iii, 144.
Pomponius, the civilian, iii, 92, 274.
Pontiffs, iii, 100.
Pontifices, or pontiffs, iii, 107.
dress of the, iii, 108.
Pontine marshes, Julius Cæsar's proposal to drain the, iii, 62.
Pontius, iii, 32, 33, 34.
Pontus, i, 682; ii, 80; iii, 57, 61, 301, 345, 347.
or the sea, origin of, ii, 80.
kingdom of, i, 692.
king of, iii, 56.
Pope, the, ii, 472; iii, 96.
Poppæa, iii, 215.
Poppæanum, the wife of Nero invented, iii, 215.
Population, redundancy of, i, 649.
Populifugia, Roman festival, iii, 133.
Po, river, i, 39; iii, 2, 54; valley of the, i, 39.
Porcian law, iii, 58.
Porphyry, ii, 386; iii, 285, 286, 287.
Porsena, iii, 27, 28, 29, 360; tomb of, iii, 7.
Porta triumphalis, iii, 408.
Portia, iii, 262.
Portorium, iii, 417.
Portrait painting, Grecian, ii, 423, 424.
of the Romans, iii, 349.
Portugal, i, 36, 39.
Portuguese, i, 319, 500.
language, i, 28.
Porus, ii, 57.
Poseidon, i, 120; ii, 100, 108, 109, 110.
Posidonius, iii, 277.
Posts and couriers, system of, in the Persian empire, i, 234.
Postumius, iii, 33.
Potamo, iii, 283.
Potamides, nymphs of the rivers, ii, 118.
Potidæa surrenders to the Athenians, ii, 42.
Pott, Professor, of Halle, i, 22.
Pottery, art of, among the Chaldæans, i, 116.
of the Assyrians, i, 149.
of the Egyptians, i, 312.
Præfectura, class of towns, iii, 203.
Præfecturæ, Roman form of government, iii, 416.
Præsul, iii, 120.
Prætor peregrinus, iii, 175.
urbanus, iii, 176.
Prætorian guards, iii, 65.
Prætors, the, in the Roman government, iii, 175, 176.
Praxiteles, ii, 134, 179, 180, 423, 438, 439.
Priam, i, 683, 684, 685; ii, 95.
Priene, ii, 299, 301, 455.
revenue of, in Greece, ii, 128.
Priestesses of Greece, ii, 127, 128.
Priesthood, Egyptian, iii, 283.
Priests, in Greece, ii, 127, 128.
Princeps, station of, in the Roman army, iii, 404.
Principes, soldiers of the second line, iii, 388.
Priscus, iii, 283.
Tarquinius, iii, 121.
Probatio, the, Roman review, iii, 152,
Probus, iii, 68.
Procles, ii, 240.
Proclus, iii, 290.
Procrustes, bed of, i, 6.
Prodicus, ii, 303, 330, 331, 504.
Prædri, ii, 255.
Prætus, ii, 115.
Progress travels from east to west, i, 252.
Prologue of tragedy, introduction of, ii, 504.
Prometheus Bound, tragedy by Æschylus, ii, 502, 507.
origin of, ii, 80.
the rock bound, ii, 113.
Property, descent of, in Greece, how regulated, ii, 187.

Property, landed, accumulation of, Roman attempts to prevent, iii, 85, 86, 87.
Prophets among the Hebrews, i, 579–581.
Propontis, ii, 27, 30, 54, 56.
Propylæa of Athens, ii, 11, 453.
Propylæum of Xerxes, i, 240.
Proserpine, i, 338, 339; ii, 90, 99, 106, 107, 111, 140, 158, 159, 160, 161, iii, 216.
daughter of Jupiter, ii, 93.
abduction of, 90.
Proseuchæ (oratories), i, 577.
Protagoras, ii, 303, 328, 330, 331, 334.
Proteus, ii, 109.
Protogenes, ii, 423.
Provençal language, i, 28.
Proverbs, book of, i, 629.
Provisions, the Grecian soldier's, ii, 521.
Proxenus, ii, 383.
Prusa, iii, 314.
Prusius, king of Bithynia, ii, 64; iii, 50.
Prussia, i, 35, 36.
Prytanes, presidents of the Athenian senate, ii, 255.
Psalms, i, 629.
Psammenitus, i, 282.
the last of the Egyptian Pharaohs, i, 208.
Psammetichus I, i, 280, 281, 295, 320.
Pthah, god, i, 327, 329, 345, 351.
Pthahmen, king, i, 279.
Pthah-Sokar-Osiris, god, i, 329, 351.
Ptoas, mount, ii, 4.
Ptolemaic dynasty, i, 284.
Ptolemy, i, 284, 285, 466; ii, 59, 351; iii, 61.
Euergetes, i, 285.
Philadelphus, i, 286.
Philometor, i, 638.
son of Lagus, i, 268.
Ptolemy Soter, i, 285.
Public supplications, ii, 142.
Publilian law, iii, 202.
Publius Clodius, iii, 218.
Pudor, or Pudicitia, iii, 105.
Puebla, plain of, i, 420.
Punic war, the first, iii, 38–42, 418.
the second, iii, 43–48, 94, 204.
Punishments among the Athenians, ii, 262, 264.
among the Spartans, ii, 249.
military, of the Romans, iii, 406.
Punjab, i, 33, 94, 200; ii, 57.
Purgatory, i, 98.
Purification, custom of, among the Romans, iii, 270.
Purpurissum, color, iii, 347.
Pursuits of the gods, ii, 121.
Pydna, battle of, ii, 65.
great battle near the walls of, iii, 50.
Pygmalion, i, 640.
Pylagores, a representative class in the Amphictyonic council, ii, 279.
Pylos, ii, 42.
Pyramids, i, 175.
of Egypt, the form of, i, 417; the situation of, 417, 418; size of, 418; antiquity of, 419; use of, 421.
Pyrenees, i, 25, 40, 488, 490; iii, 2, 43, 46, 54, 58, 73.
Pyrephlegethon, river, ii, 88.
Pyromancy, ii, 151.
Pyrrho, ii, 303, 348, 351; iii, 309.
Pyrrhus, iii, 34, 35, 42, 48, 94, 137, 218, 274.
Pythagoras, i, 408, 458, 675; ii, 303, 309, 310, 311, 312, 314, 315, 316, 318, 320, 334, 340, 354, 360, 434, 458.
Pythagorean or Italic school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 309-320.
Pythagoric school, iii, 276, 280.
Pythia, Delphic priestess, ii, 144, 146.

Pythian games, 144, 235.
Pythias, ii, 384, 455.
Pytho, serpent, i, 339.
Python, ii, 144.

Quadi, iii, 67.
Quadrigi, colossal figure, iii, 336.
Quæstores classici, iii, 177.
parricidii, iii, 177.
Quæstors, the, in the Roman government, iii, 177, 178.
Quindecemviri, iii, 116.
Quinquatria, Roman festival, iii, 134.
Quirinal, iii, 15.
Quirinalis, iii, 119.
Quirinus, an ancient Sabine deity, iii, 15, 100, 104.
Quirite, Sabine, iii, 144.
Quirites, iii, 20, 104.
how called, iii, 15.
Quoit, throwing the, game of the Romans, iii, 229.

Ra, god, i, 117, 327, 531.
Raamah, i, 467.
Rabbins, Jewish, i, 609, 623.
Races of the Romans, iii, 233.
Rachel, i, 658.
Radagaisus, iii, 72.
Rage, a constant attendant on the Furies, ii, 87.
Rahdi, i, 493.
Ram, battery, ii, 528.
Ramadan, month of, i, 473, 504, 513.
Rameses I, i, 278.
II, i, 278, 279, 368, 442, 443.
III, i, 279, 307, 442.
VIII, i, 279.
tablet of, i, 270.
Ramle, science of, i, 531.
Ramnes, iii, 141, 144, 145, 155, 157.
Ramnus, ii, 87.
Randolph, Vt., academy at, i, viii.
Raphia, i, 148.
Rasena, or Etruscans, iii, 5, 6.
Rashid, i, 492.
Rasil, i, 482.
Rations of the Roman soldier, iii, 393.
Ravenna, iii, 68, 72, 345.
Rawlinson, Col. i, 26, 54.
Re, i, 149, 327, 331, 332, 346, 442.
Rebia, i, 479.
Recensio, the, Roman review, iii, 153.
Redditio, sacrifice, iii, 128.
Red sea, i, 55, 259, 263, 279, 461, 462, 466, 467, 468, 496, 557, 633.
Regal Rome, iii, 138-171.
Regillus, lake, iii, 28.
Registry of births and deaths among the Romans, iii, 250, 251.
Regulus, iii, 40, 41, 42.
Rehoboam, i, 559.
Rehoboth, i, 134.
Relation, the, of the political institutions of the Grecian states, to the moral, social, and intellectstate and condition of the Grecians, ii, 283-285.
the, of the political institutions of the Grecian states, to the physical circumstances, under which they originated, ii, 280-283.
Religion of the Arabians, i, 500–515.
of the Assyrians, 151–152.
of the Babylonians, 186.
of the Chaldæans, i, 117–124.
of the Egyptians, i, 322–359.
of the Etruscans, iii, 11.
of the Grecians, ii, 78–164.
of the Lydians, i, 690.
of the Medo-Persians, i, 212–220.
of Palestine, i, 571–591.
of the Phœnicians and Syrians, i, 650–668.
of the Phrygians, i, 689.
of Southern Asia, i, 6.

Religion of the Romans, iii, 96–135.
of the Trojans, i, 684.
the foundation of, i, 4.
its influence upon the development of the Grecian mind and character, ii, 161–164.
sources of the Roman, iii, 96–102.
on the Roman character, influence of, iii, 134, 135.
ministers of, among the Romans, iii, 107–124.
Religious oracles, ii, 142.
Remus, iii, 19, 21, 98.
Renaissance of Egyptian art, period of, i, 281.
Republican Rome, iii, 172–207.
Resin, city, i, 135, 633.
Reto, i, 346.
Return of the Heraclidæ, ii, 19.
Revenue of the Spartans, ii, 249.
Revenues of the Athenians, ii, 266, 267, 268.
Revolution in Greece, ii, 68.
Rewards among the Athenians, ii, 264.
military, of the Romans, iii, 406.
Rex sacrificœlus, iii, 119.
sacrorum, iii, 119.
Rhacia, ii, 71.
Rhadamanthus, judge, son of Jupiter, ii, 88, 93.
Rhæa, god, i, 345.
Rhætia, iii, 8.
Rhætian Alps, iii, 54.
Rhapsodists, ii, 471.
Rhea, Ops, Cybele, ii, 81, 90, 91, 106, 110, 120, 661.
origin of, ii, 80.
how represented, ii, 91, 92.
Sylvia, iii, 121.
Rhegium, ii, 28, 320, 431, 434; iii, 338.
Rhetoric, ii, 482.
Gorgias's school of, at Athens, iii, 368.
Rhine, river, i, 33, 34; iii, 58, 64, 71, 423.
Rhodes, i, 485; ii, 20, 301, 385.
colossus of, ii, 134.
Rhœcus, ii, 430, 433.
Rhone, i, 41, 489.
Ricimer, German general, iii, 74.
Rig-veda, i, 33.
Rimmon, god, i, 660.
Roads, public, Roman, iii, 353.
Robertson's History of America, i, vii.
Roderic, i, 488.
Rogator, Roman polling clerk, iii, 167.
Rogne, i, 661.
Roma, early settlement on the Palatine hill called, iii, 21.
Roman Catholic religion, i, 98.
genius illy adapted to poetic pursuits, iii, 361.
eloquence, golden age of, iii, 370; last effort of, 373.
empire, i, 82.
literature, classical period of, iii, 367.
mode of life agricultural, iii, 364.
school of painters, ii, 425.
Romans, i, 24, 39, 45, 85, 152; ii, 273, 274, 561, 608, 609, 658.
their introduction into Greece, ii, 64.
introduced dramatic poetry, iii, 361.
addicted to war, iii, 368.
Romanus, iii, 145, 148, 149, 312.
Rome, i, 8, 15, 16, 422, 481, 638, 688; ii, 67, 110, 244, 252, 258, 295, 384, 385, 406, 484; the immediate causes of its history and civilization, iii, 1–75; nearly in the same latitude as New York, 3; condition of, investigated at the foundation of, 3–5; the races who have made the largest con-

Rome, continued—
tributions to its civilization, 5, 12; the locality of its foundation. 19; founded by Romulus, 19 means resorted to for peopling, 20; the interrex in, 22; election of kings in, 23–26; kingly power abolished in, 26; wars with the Equians, Volscians, and Etruscans, 28, 29; saved by the efforts of the mother and wife of Coriolanus, 28; Gauls invade and impoverish, 30; war with the Samnites, and its important consequences, 31, 32, 33; the first Punic war, 38–42; the first navy of, 39; the first naval victory of, 39; war against the Ligurians, Gauls, and Illyrians, 43; the second Punic war, 43–48; numerical military strength of, during the consulate of Scipio, 43-44; alarming panic at, caused by the defeat of Flaminius, 44; Antiochus, gives displeasure to, 49; forces Antiochus to purchase peace, 50; erases Carthage from the record of nations, 52; Greece becomes a province of, 52; Spain becomes a province of, 53; Attalus bequeaths the kingdom of Pergamus to, 53; Jugurtha brought to, and starved to death, 54; the Cimbri and Teutons defeat the armies of, 54; the invading Teutons and Cimbri melt away before the armies of, 55; its energies required to terminate an intestine war kindled in the bosom of Italy, 55; Mithridates, king of Pontus, throws down the gauntlet to, 55; is filled with consternation by Sylla, 56; war in the bosom of, grown out of the custom of gladiatorial exhibitions, 56–57; Spartacus attempts to make himself master of, 56; history of, during the supremacy of Julius Cæsar, 57–62; the era of the empire of, 64; Egypt reduced to a province of, 64; subject to Augustus Cæsar, 65; the division of the empire of, by Dioclesian, 68; the first Christian emperor of, 69; Constantius possesses himself of the whole empire of, 71; division of, into eastern and western empires, 71; Alaric lays siege to, and takes the city of, 72; full establishment of Christianity in the empire of, under Theodosius, 72; stripped of territories, 73; Odoacer conquers, 75; Romulus or Augustulus, resigns the throne of, 75; its industry, 76–95; its religion, 96–135; its government, 186–209; its society, 210–272; its philosophy, 273–334; its art, 335–427.
Romulus, iii, 79, 97, 98, 109, 119, 121, 124, 125, 127, 128, 145, 151, 162, 178, 248, 263, 356, 360; founder of Rome, 19, 20; death of, 22; or Augustulus, 74, 75; duration of his reign, 21.
Rosary, use of the, i, 98.
Rosellini, Professor, i, 317.
Rosetta, one of the mouths of the Nile, i, 258.
stone, i, 256.
Roum dynasty, i, 86.
Rowandit, i, 149.
Rubicon, Julius Cæsar passes the, iii, 60.
Rufinus, the Gaul, iii, 72.
Rufus Carus Musonius, iii, 302, 305.
Ruga, Sp. Carvilius, iii, 246.
Rusa, in Bithynia, i, 87.

Russia, i, 42, 43, 655; ii, 69.
Russian dialect, i, 35.
Russians, i, 35.
Rutilus, C. Marcius, iii, 199.

Saad, i, 501.
Saana, i, 499.
Saba, i, 465.
Sabaco, i, 143.
Sabacos, kings, i, 280.
Sabbatical year, i, 568–570, 587.
Sabe, i, 467.
Sabeans, i, 178, 468.
of Yemen, i, 468.
Sabian idolatry, i, 658.
religion, i, 500, 501.
Sabine hills, iii, 16.
Sabines, i, 38; iii, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 65, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 109, 141, 151, 184; their ethnology, 12; their character, 13; their civil system, 13, 14, 15; power of, over their sons, 13; peculiarity in their marriages, 14; influence of climate on their character, 14; sacred spring of the, 15; Rome's manly virtues borrowed from the, 19.; war with the Romans, 23; defeat of the, 24; close of the war with the, 34; received into the army, 388.
Sabino-Alban Rome, iii, 145.
Sabinus, iii, 12.
Sabtah, i, 467.
Sacca, iii, 284.
Saccas, Ammonius, i, 414.
Sacra gentilitia, iii, 145.
Sacred war, ii, 51.
obligations and duties of the Hebrews, i, 587.
times and seasons of the Hebrews, i, 584–586.
Sacrifices of the Grecians, ii, 136.
of the Romans, iii, 128–131.
Roman, instruments and vessels used in, iii, 131.
manner of, ii, 137.
occasions of, iii, 139.
Sada, island, ii, 532.
Sadducees, i, 618, 621.
Sadie, i, 525.
Sadok, i, 621.
Saggara, i, 320.
Saguntum, ii, 30; iii, 43.
Said, i, 482.
Sais, city, i, 258, 269, 331, 339, 355, 356, 384, 385; ii, 15, 72.
Sakhem, i, 344.
Salamis, i, 210; ii, 300, 467, 478, 501, 504.
battle of, ii, 36, 481, 532.
island, ii, 12.
wave of, i, 10; ii, 292.
Salem, original name of Jerusalem, i, 562.
Salic law, i, 376, 390.
Salii, twelve, of Mars Gradivus, iii, 100, 120.
Salona, constitution published at, i, 68.
Salsette, rock temples at, i, 26,
Salt, held in great veneration among the Romans, iii, 223.
Salus, iii, 345.
temple of, iii, 345.
Salustius, iii, 301.
Salvius, a fortunate name, iii, 385.
Samarcand, i, 85, 90, 96, 490, 535, 542.
Samaria, i, 122, 141, 142, 143.
Samaritans, i, 554, 623.
Samnites, iii, 12, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 65, 77.
Samnium, iii, 33.
Samoides, i, 80.
Samoiedic language, i, 25.
Samos, ii, 41, 94, 95, 310, 314, 323, 370, 422, 428, 429, 454.

Samosta, iii, 309.
Samothrace, ii, 158; iii, 50.
island, i, 659.
Samothracian mysteries, iii, 101.
Samuel, i, 559, 617.
San, or Sansi, i, 121, 124.
Sana, i, 464, 465.
Sanchoniathon, works of, i, 675.
Sanctuary, right of, ii, 132, 133.
Sancus, iii, 12,
Sandaracha, color, iii, 347.
Sandrocothus, i, 634.
Sangarius, i, 682.
Sanhedrim, i, 606.
Sansi, i, 124.
Sanskrit, i, 26, 28, 29, 31, 35, 37.
Saophis, i, 421.
Saoud, i, 496.
Sappho, ii, 480.
Sapping and mining in Roman sieges, iii, 414.
Saracen, i, 400.
Saracenic empire, i, 481, 490, 494.
style of architecture, i, 544.
Saracens, i, 269, 287, 413, 470, 483, 488, 489, 492, 564, 639.
Saracus, [Asshur-kinah-ili-kain], i, 145, 146.
Sarah, i, 470.
Sarcophagi, Etruscan, iii, 337.
Sardanapalus, i, 661.
I, i, 164.
palace of, i, 160.
Sardinia, i, 41, 650; iii, 27, 40, 60, 89, 94.
Sardis, i, 181, 184, 206, 207, 420, 647; ii, 21, 39.
Sarephta, i, 657.
Sargon, [Sargina], i, 135, 142, 143, 165.
palace of, i, 162.
Sarmatians, iii, 70.
Saronic, ii, 76.
bay, ii, 12, 532.
gulf, ii, 2, 428.
Sarpedon, ii, 124.
Sassan dynasty, i, 483.
Sassanides, iii, 70.
Saté, goddess, i, 330, 345.
Maut, god, i, 327.
Satire invented by the Romans, iii, 362.
excelled in, by Horace, iii, 366.
Satires of Juvenal, iii, 367.
Satirical poetry among the Romans, iii, 362.
Satraps of Persia, i, 229, 230, 233.
Saturn, i, 178, 194, 213, 332, 687; ii, 80, 81, 86, 87, 88, 106, 130, 146; iii, 102, 103, 104.
how represented, ii. 90.
his escape, ii, 82.
temple of, iii, 127.
Roman festival of, iii, 102, 133.
Saturnia, city of, iii, 102.
Saturnian hill, iii, 102.
Saturnos, origin of, ii, 80.
Saturnus, ii, 110.
Satyrs and Fauns, ii, 119.
in Greek tragedies, iii, 362.
Saudanis, i, 236.
Saul, i, 559; ii, 466.
Savak, i, 346.
Saviour, i, 580.
the birth of, ii, 65.
Savoy, iii, 73.
Saxartes, river, i, 77.
Saxons, i, 34.
Sayan, i, 43.
Sayanian mountains, i, 75.
Scamander, i, 682.
Scandinavia, i, 80, 83.
Scandinavian tribes, identity of the Etruscans with, iii, 8.
Scarabæus, i, 135.
Scenite Arabs, i, 518.
Schelling, i, 541.
Schenectady, i, ix.
Schlegel, ii, 507, 512.
Schleicher, of Jena, i, 22.

Schoraiph, i, 548.
Sciagrams, the first essays of painting limited to, ii, 417.
Scillæum, promontory of, ii, 7.
Scilly isles, i, 150.
Scipio, iii, 44, 45, 47, 48, 274, 402.
Africanus, iii, 44, 46, 49, 50.
Asiaticus, iii, 44, 50.
Roman orator, iii, 369.
Lucius, iii, 49, 50.
Sclavonic language, i, 28, 32, 56.
Scopas, ii, 455.
Scottish Gaelic dialect, i, 33.
Scouts, Roman, duties of, iii, 397.
Scriptures, iii, 284, 417.
teach no system of chronology, i, 45.
Sculpture of the Assyrians, 163–166.
of the Babylonians, i, 196.
of the Egyptians, i, 435–443.
Grecian, ii, 425.
of the Medo-Persians, i, 243–245.
of the Romans, iii, 336–342.
Scyllis, ii, 431, 432.
Scythia, i, 83, 209, 646; iii, 347.
Scythians, i, 81, 88, 145, 146, 202, 219.
Scythic (Hamitic), dialect, i, 54, 246.
race, i, 200.
Seamen, Grecian, compensation for their services, ii, 515.
Sea trade of the Phœnicians, i, 655.
Seats of the Greeks, ii, 217.
Seb, god, i, 332.
Seba, i, 467.
monuments at, i, 54.
Sebaim, i, 467.
Sebennytus, dynasty, i, 271.
Second Peloponnesian war, ii, 43.
Seed time with the Romans, iii, 82.
Seffein, plains of, i, 485.
Segeste, ii, 28.
Seine, river, iii, 423.
Seir, mount, i, 470.
Sel, god, i, 345.
Selemnus, river, ii, 168.
Selenga, river, i, 104.
Seleucas, ii, 59.
Seleucia, i, 635.
Seleucidæ, i, 561, 634, 636, 639, 670.
Seleucus, i, 636.
II, i, 256.
Miator, i, 634, 635.
Selim, sultan, i, 287.
Selinus, ii, 454.
Seljuk, i, 86.
Seljukian dynasty, i, 86, 92.
Selk, goddess, i, 344.
Selli, family of, ii, 127.
Semele, wife of Jupiter, ii, 93, 107.
Semiramis, i, 142, 659, 661, 675.
Semitic, i, 52.
dialect, i, 267.
language, i, 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 56, 110.
nation, i, 54, 58, 59.
race, i, 15, 55, 56, 57, 110, 112, 137, 197, 198, 199, 253, 267, 466, 477, 553.
Semitism, i, 631.
Sempronia lex prima, iii, 87.
Sempronius, iii, 44.
Senate, Athenian, ii, 256.
in the Roman government, iii, 141–144.
of Five Hundred, Athenian, ii, 255.
of Sparta, ii, 242–244.
Senatus consulta, keepers of the, iii, 187.
Seneca, iii, 247, 262, 263, 298, 304.
Annæas, iii, 303.
his writings, iii, 373.
tragedies of, iii, 378.
Sennacherib, i, 143, 144, 165, 170, 280.
palace of, i, 160.
Sens, i, 489.
Sensuphis, pyramid of, i, 419.

Septemviri epulonum, iii, 118.
Septuagint, i, 46.
Sepulchres, Grecian, ii, 225.
Roman, iii, 270.
of the Etruscans, iii, 351, 352.
Serai, i, 94.
Sergius Arata, iii, 224.
Serica, ii, 2.
Serpents, mountains of, i, 50.
Serra, or saw, a position of the Roman army, iii, 405.
Servia, i, 93.
Servian constitution, iii, 170.
Servilius, iii, 28.
P., iii, 183, 184.
Servitus, iii, 149.
Servius, iii, 164, 166, 170, 171, 250, 357.
Tullius, iii, 25, 27.
Sesostris, i, 274, 276, 278, 295, 481.
Sestos, ii, 35.
Seth, i, 505.
Sethi I, i, 278.
II, i, 279.
Sethos I, i, 442.
king, i, 278.
Seven chiefs against Thebes, tragedy by Æschylus, ii, 502, 507.
wise men of Greece, origin of the term, ii, 299.
Severus, Alexander, iii, 92, 94.
Septimus, iii, 90, 262, 356.
Seville, i, 490, 544, 536, 652.
Sextius, L., iii, 196, 197, 198.
Sextus, Quintus, iii, 26, 279, 306; iii, 26, 306.
Shalmaneser, i, 560.
I, i, 138, 139.
II, i, 14.
IV, i, 142.
Shamasiva, i, 141.
Shamy, southern, colossus, i, 424.
Sheba, i, 463.
Shebans, i, 467.
Shebe, i, 468.
Shebeks, kings, i, 280.
Sheibani Khan, i, 93.
Shem, i, 51, 56, 151, 267, 467, 468.
descendants of, i, 466.
sons of, inaugurated polygamy, i, 59.
Shensi, forest of, i, 81.
Shepherd, Egyptian, industry of, i, 303–305.
Philition, i, 275.
Sheshonks, kings, i, 280.
Shield, scutum, of the Roman soldiers, iii, 396.
Shiites, i, 487, 496.
Shiloh, i, 575.
Shinar, land of, i, 53, 188, 107, 174, 177.
plains of, i, 105, 111, 199, 269.
monuments on the, i, 54.
Shinocephalus, or onion-head, nomenclature of Pericles, ii, 487.
Ships, Roman, how guided, iii, 419; materials of which they were built, 419; naval warfare with, 418-421.
and naval warfare of the Grecians, ii, 530, 533.
Shishak, 280, 563, 575.
Shoes, Roman, iii, 217.
Shospho, pyramid of, i, 418, 421.
Shufu, of the monuments of Egypt, i, 273.
Shur, i, 468.
Shushan the palace, i, 242.
Siberia, i, 25, 42, 49, 75, 93.
monuments in, i, 54.
once enjoyed a mild climate, i, 49.
sepulchres in, i, 50.
Sibylline books, iii, 116, 117, 134.
Sicania, iii, 4.
Sicilian straits, i, 39; iii, 6, 35.
Sicily, i, 40, 41, 650; ii, 7, 28, 101, 319, 320, 354, 431, 433, 479; iii, 4, 27, 35, 38, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 60, 74, 89, 94, 189, 216, 286.

Sicily, conquered by the Romans, iii, 361.
cradle of eloquence, iii, 368.
pastoral poetry of, iii, 361.
Sicinius, L., iii, 185.
Sickness and death, among the Grecians, ii, 220, 221.
Siculi, i, 38; iii, 4, 5, 16.
Siculians, iii, 17.
Siculus, Diodorus, i, 402, 449.
Sicyon, ii, 9, 12, 236.
liberated, ii, 62.
school of painting, ii, 422, 428, 431.
Sicyona, ii, 9.
Sicyonia, iii, 274.
Sidon, i, 28, 140, 212, 281, 555, 639, 640, 649, 657, 670, 671, 672, 675.
Sidonians, i, 677.
Sieges, the conduct of, ii, 527.
Sienite Arabs, i, 497.
Signal for battle in the Roman army, iii, 401.
Signia, iii, 18.
Sigu, i, 661.
Sihon, i, 90, 94, 96.
Silbury hills, Wiltshire, i, 420.
Sileni, ii, 119.
Silenus, ii, 108.
Silesia, dukes of, i, 92.
Silius, iii, 261.
Silsilis, i, 346.
Silvanus, iii, 105.
Simia, science of, i, 531.
Simois, i, 682.
Simon, ii, 335.
Simonides, ii, 477, 478.
Sin, or Haski, god, i, 120, 121, 124.
Sin offerings of the Hebrews, i, 582.
Sinai, mount, i, 463, 468, 554, 609, 618.
peninsula of, i, 27, 275.
Single men, their penalties in Greece, ii, 169.
Sinope, ii, 27, 345; iii, 347.
Sinopis, color, iii, 347.
Siolki hills, i, 43.
Sión, mount, i, 562, 563, 575.
Sippara, i, 121, 180.
Sipylus, i, 637.
Sirani, i, 41.
Sirens, the, ii, 117.
Sischo, god, i, 345.
Sisyphus, his penalty for revealing the secrets of the gods, ii, 90.
Siva, i, 346.
Skeptic or Pyrrhonic school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 348; iii, 283, 309–311.
Slavery in Athens, ii, 252, 253.
among the Egyptians, i, 375.
among the Hebrews, i, 569, 598, 599.
among the Phœnicians, i, 673.
in Sparta, ii, 241.
Slaves armed for war service, iii, 384; employment of, in the cultivation of land, iii, 88.
Slavic race, i, 57.
Slavini, i, 35.
Slavonian family, i, 35, 36.
Slavonians, i, 42.
Slavonic nations, i, 35.
Sleep, ii, 85.
origin of, ii, 84.
god of, ii, 150.
Smautf, i, 440.
Smerdis, the magician, i, 208.
Smilis, ii, 428.
Sminthian Apollo, i, 684.
Smyrna, ii, 26, 112, 472; iii, 281.
Sneezing, ii, 154.
Snowy mountain, i, 75.
So, king, i, 280.
Soanites, sect, i, 512.
Social war, iii, 55.
Society, the foundation of, i, 4.
element of, in Greece, ii, 65–217
of the Arabians, i, 515–522.
of the Assyrians, i, 155–158.

Society of the Babylonians, i, 186–192.
of Chaldæa, i, 126–128.
of the Egyptians, i, 359–381.
of the Hebrews, i, 591–603.
of the Lydians, i, 691.
of the Medo-Persians, i, 235–237.
of the Phœnicians, i, 668, 669.
of the Romans, iii, 210–272.
of the Trojans, i, 685.
Socrates, i, 68; ii, 159, 179, 302, 303, 328, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 351, 353, 354, 355, 384, 504, 511; iii, 284, 300, 303, 317, 331, 422.
condemned, ii, 47.
death of, i, 8.
Socratic school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 332–343.
Sodales titii, or titienses, iii, 119.
Sodom, i, 555.
Sogdiana, i, 75; ii, 57.
plains of, i, 81.
Soil of Etruria, iii, 6.
good, Roman idea of, iii, 79.
Roman method of treating the, iii, 82.
Sol, ii, 75, 96; iii, 104.
Soldiers, Grecian, compensation for their services, ii, 515.
method of levying, iii, 384.
separated from the people in theatres, iii, 374.
Soliman, i, 495.
Solomon, i, 559, 573, 575, 577, 607, 608, 640, 671.
palace of, i, 593.
temple of, i, 484.
Solon, ii, 176, 178, 186, 187, 191, 192, 207, 222, 255, 258, 264, 299, 300, 353, 467, 478, 484, 485.
Somnus, or Sleep, ii, 85.
Song, dynasty, i, 91.
Songs of the seasons, ii, 469.
of Solomon, i, 629.
Songs, Roman, themes of, iii, 360.
Sonnites, i, 487.
Sophists, school, philosophy as developed in, ii, 330–332.
Sophocles, i, 9; ii, 407, 498, 501, 502. 503, 504, 505, 506, 507.
Sophroniscus, ii, 333.
Sophronius, i, 484.
Sosigenes, iii, 298.
Soufis, sect, i, 540.
Soul, doctrine of the, iii, 382.
Souliotes, ii, 67.
Spain, i, 36, 39, 40, 41, 487, 488, 492, 493, 536, 542, 650, 652, 654, 655, 671; iii, 37, 39, 43, 44, 46, 48, 52, 53, 59, 60, 68, 73, 74, 303, 309, 346.
cortes of, i, 11; iii, 425.
Moor of, iii, 2.
Spanish language, i, 28.
Sparta, ii, 7, 10, 20, 24, 38, 39, 40, 41, 50, 60, 64, 165, 169, 170, 171, 172, 180, 182, 183, 184, 189, 194, 196, 198, 204, 207, 208, 210, 230, 233, 239, 240, 241, 243, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 268, 269, 272, 274, 276, 284, 285, 290, 291, 293, 365, 366, 413, 441, 461, 477, 514, 522.
attacked by Epaminondas, ii, 50.
revolutionized, ii, 63.
Spartacus, iii, 56, 57.
Spartans, ii, 23, 173, 175, 238, 239, 248, 249, 253, 264, 289; iii, 13.
besiege Pylos, ii, 42.
defeated, ii, 64; defeated at Cyzicus, ii, 44.
navy annihilated, ii, 48.
solicit peace, ii, 42.
Speculative talent of the Chaldæans, i, 131.
Spes, iii, 106.
Speusippus, ii, 369.
Sphacteria, ii, 43.
Sphinx, ii, 116.

Spinoza, i, 60; ii, 322.
Spires, i, 34.
Spitzbergen, i, 49.
once enjoyed a mild climate, i, 49.
Sponsalia, iii, 242.
Sports among the Hebrews, i, 601.
of the Babylonians, i, 189.
of the Assyrians, i, 156.
Spring, iii, 106.
St. Augustine, iii, 319.
St. Matthew, i, 46.
St. Paul, ii, 130.
St. Peter, the pope vicar of, iii, 3.
St. Sophia, Constantinople, i, 87.
Stadium, ii, 231, 232.
Stage, Roman, character and corruption of, iii, 379, 380.
Stagira, ii, 383, 384.
Standard bearer in the Roman army, iii, 400.
Statues, ii, 134, 135.
materials of which they were made, ii, 135.
bronze, iii, 339.
Steinthal, of Berlin, i, 22.
Steropes, origin of, ii, 80.
Stesichorus, ii, 480; iii, 361.
Stheno, ii, 119.
Stilicho, the Vandal, iii, 72, 117.
Stilpo, ii, 353, 397.
Stipendium, iii, 417.
Stoic school, i, 68; iii, 278, 301–306.
philosophy as developed in, ii, 397–402.
Stolo, C. Licinius, iii, 87.
L. Licinius, iii, 196, 197.
Stones, engines for casting, ii, 528.
Strabo, i, 39, 53, 208; ii, 383.
Strangers, manner of entertaining, in Greece, ii, 219, 220.
Strasburg, i, 34.
Strato, i, 641; ii, 396.
Stratonice, i, 66.
Straw, use of, among the Romans, iii, 83.
Streams, origin of, ii, 80.
Stuart, ii, 456.
Stygia flood, ii, 88.
Stymphalis, birds of, ii, 113.
Styx, river, ii, 88, 109, 141; iii, 265.
Subjective, one of the divisions of art, ii; 456–494; iii, 357–373.
Succession, Roman laws of, iii, 85.
Succoth-Benoth, i, 122.
Suessa Pometia, iii, 26.
Suevi, iii, 73.
Suevians, i, 34.
Suez, i, 259, 464.
isthmus of, i, 264, 266, 267, 269, 461, 462.
Summer, iii, 106.
Sun, i, 178.
worship of the, ii, 96.
Sunium, ii, 454.
cape of, ii, 3, 101.
Superbus, Tarquinus, iii, 140.
Suphis [Cheops], i, 273, 421.
II, i, 273.
pyramid of, i, 418.
Supper in Greece, ii, 218.
Roman, iii, 224.
Supplicants, the, tragedy by Æschylus, ii, 502.
Supplicatio, iii, 408.
Supplication, public, of the Romans, iii, 132.
Surat, i, 490.
Surena, iii, 59.
Susa, i, 104, 144, 184, 197, 228, 238, 242, 243, 252; ii, 57.
monuments of, i, 2.
splendid edifices at, i, 212.
Susiana, i, 53, 142, 145, 198, 203, 228, 238.
Susianians, i, 144, 146, 155.
Sutlej, river, i, 76.
Swedes, i, 34.
Switzerland, iii, 73.
Sword of the Roman soldier, iii, 396.

Sybaris, ii, 28.
Sycione, ii, 417.
Syene, i, 257, 259, 293, 345, 351.
rock obtained from, for the Egyptians to build their monuments, i, 259.
Sylla, ii, 384, 385; iii, 54, 55, 56, 65, 107, 108, 109, 116, 135, 179, 181, 207, 260, 263, 279, 339.
Symmachia, ii, 238, 271, 275.
Synagogues, i, 577, 578.
Synesius, i, 444.
Syphax, king of Numidia, iii, 47.
Syracuse, ii, 28, 29, 44, 262, 354, 431, 454; iii, 46.
Syria, i, 95, 112, 145, 150, 178, 180, 281, 462, 464, 469, 472, 475, 481, 482, 483, 484, 491, 499, 553, 562; ii, 90, 252; iii, 49, 57, 59, 61.
description of, i, 630, 631; its ethnology, 631, 632; a province of the Assyrian empire, 633; a new empire called from, 633, 634; added to the dominion of Seleucus, i, 634; becomes a Roman province, 639; becomes dismembered, i, 639; is abandoned to the Turks, 639; early republic, 673; dynasty of, 86.
upper, i, 141.
Syriac, i, 137.
dialect, i, 674.
Syrian, i, 469; iii, 289.
desert, i, 462, 464, 643, 666.
gates, ii, 56.
Syrians, i, 28, 56, 141, 179, 253, 466.
Syro-Arabian desert, i, 105.
Median empire, founded by Seleucus, i, 634; Syria, the chief province of, 634; Asia Minor added to the, 635.
Taaif, i, 525.
Tabernacle of the Hebrews, i, 573-575.
Tablinum, room in a Roman house, iii, 219.
Tacitus, iii, 68.
Tadmor, i, 659.
Tænaros, ii, 87.
Tai dialects, i, 24.
tribes, i, 25.
Ta Kiang, river, i, 76.
Tali and tesseræ, private game of the Romans, iii, 231.
Talmud, Hebrew, i, 592, 611, 620.
Tamerlane [Timour], 79, 103; his origin, i, 93; invested with the command of the Mongolian army, 93; made sovereign of the kingdom of Zagata, 93; subdues the provinces of Persia, Cashgar and western Tartary, 94; Moscow trembles at his approach, 94; reduces Azoph to ashes, 94; condemns to death Christians, 94; burns the cities of Serai, and Astracan, 94; invades India, 94; reduces the fortress of Batric, 94; takes Delhi and pillages it, 94; compels the Christians of Georgia to become martyrs or believers in the Koran, 95; sacks Aleppo, 95, his horrible custom, 95; massacres the inhabitants of Damascus, 95; sets fire to Aleppo, 95; revisits Georgia, 95; marches through Armenia and Anatolia, 95; conquers and captures Bajazet, the Ottoman emperor, 95; carries Bajazet around with him in his marches in an iron cage, 95; Anatola submits to him, 95; the Mediterranean a barrier to his advance, 95; satisfies his conscience for sacrificing so many Musselmen, 96; his death, 96.

Tamulian race, i, 81.
Tamulic, colony, i, 25.
tribes, i, 25.
Tamun, i, 345.
Tanagra, battle of, ii, 24, 40, 49.
Tanais, battle of, i, 82.
river, i, 82.
Tantalus, his condemnation for cheating the gods, ii, 90.
Tarentine Jupiter, colossal statue, 439.
Tarentines, iii, 82.
Tarentum, ii, 24, 28, 320; iii, 34, 35.
Taric, i, 488.
Tarina, river, i, 77.
Tarpeian rock, iii, 15, 127.
Tarquin the Elder, or Tarquinus Priscus, iii, 24, 101, 141, 142, 157, 232, 338, 352.
Superbus, iii, 25, 116.
Tarquinii, iii, 6, 7, 26, 27, 97, 158, 171, 179, 181, 182, 183.
Tarshish, i, 652.
Tarsus, i, 490; iii, 301, 302.
Tartar dialect, i, 246.
race, i, 204.
Tartarus, i, 622; iii, 8, 82, 87, 89, 475.
gulf of, ii, 82.
Tartary, i, 76, 90, 490.
Tartessus, i, 652.
Tatius, Titus, iii, 119.
Tauria, ii, 99.
Taurini, iii, 43.
Taurus, mount, i, 27, 32, 75, 145, 631. 681; iii, 50.
Culvisius, iii, 281.
Taygetus, mount, ii, 71, 184, 239.
Tegea, ii, 455.
Tegyra, battle of, ii, 49.
Tehama, i, 464, 520.
Tehameh, plains of, i, 465.
Tehrak, i, 280.
Telecles, i, 430.
Teleclides, ii, 487.
Tellenæ, town, iii, 154.
Tellus, ii, 120.
Telys, usurper, ii, 28.
Temnos, ii, 432.
Tempe, vale of, ii, 8.
Temple of Belus, its destruction by Xerxes; 176.
of Jerusalem, i, 563, 575–577.
Roman, iii, 353.
of Solomon, i, 638.
Temples, Grecian, ii, 130, 131.
form of, ii, 132.
Roman, iii, 124–127.
Tenedos, i, 684.
Tents of the Bedouins, i, 521.
of the Roman soldiers, iii, 398, 399.
Tentyris, i, 429.
Teos, ii, 370, 454.
Teredon, i, 180.
Terence, comic writer, iii, 376.
improves dramatic literature and the Latin language, iii, 361.
Terentia, iii, 246.
Tereus, i, 661.
Terminus, iii, 104.
Terokshad, i, 483.
Terpander, founder of Greek music, ii, 457, 458, 461, 467.
Terpsichore, the muse of the dance, ii, 118.
Terra, ii, 86, 90, 145.
Terracina, iii, 18.
Terror, a constant attendant on the Furies, ii, 87.
Terteus, ii, 431.
Testudines, machines used in war, iii, 412, 413.
Tethys, ii, 80, 109.
Teuntopolis, i, 429.
Teuta, queen, iii, 43.
Teutobocchus, iii, 55.
Teuton, i, 24.
Teutones, iii, 54.
Teutonic or German nations, i, 32, 33, 34.

Teutonic language, i, 28.
race, i, 56, 57.
Textile, fabrics of Assyria, i, 150.
among the Chaldæans, i, 116.
of the Egyptians, i, 309, 310.
among the the Phœnicians, 65.
among the Romans, iii, 91.
Thakif, tribe, i, 501.
Thales, i, 8, 408; ii, 299, 303, 304, 305, 306, 310, 334, 344.
Thaletas, ii, 459.
Thalia, the muse of comedy, ii, 118.
one of the graces, ii, 118.
Thames, iii, 423.
Thapsus, ii, 28.
battle at, iii, 61.
Thases, ii, 419.
The Seven against Thebes, war of, ii, 18.
Theans, ii, 311.
Theatre, Roman, iii, 354, 373, 375, 377.
introduced in Rome, iii, 361.
Grecian, description of, ii, 495, 497.
Roman and Grecian, iii, 373.
first one of stone, iii, 374.
singular structures of wood, iii, 375.
Thebaid, i, 269, 276, 316, 327, 350, 422.
Thebais, i, 257.
Theban dynasty, i, 277, 278.
wars, the two, ii, 18.
territories invaded, ii, 48.
Thebans, ii, 49, 50, 51, 185, 269.
Thebes, city of, i, 144, 257, 265, 272, 281, 297, 318, 325, 328, 329, 331, 341, 349, 350, 351, 373, 384, 385, 390, 399, 482, 407, 421, 422, 423, 432, 644, 651; ii, 9, 15, 40, 46, 48, 49, 54, 60, 71, 108, 116, 144, 147, 179, 238, 268, 269, 271, 272, 277, 279, 290, 416, 467, 523, 525; iii, 52.
Thebes, taken, ii, 55.
Cecrops founded, ii, 15.
tombs of, i, 348.
Theiss, river, iii, 73.
Themis, ii, 102, 112, 145.
origin of, ii, 80.
wife of Jupiter, ii, 93.
Themistocles, i, 234; ii, 34, 36, 37, 38, 176, 263, 267, 409, 463, 485, 522, 532.
Theocles, ii, 431.
Theocracy of the Hebrews, i, 605.
Theocratus, native of Syracuse, iii, 361.
Thedoric, king of the Visigoths, i, 84; iii, 73.
Theodorus, ii, 354, 430, 433.
Theodosius, emperor, i, 83, 287; ii, 158.
the great, iii, 71, 72, 93, 117.
Theogony, Grecian, ii, 79–83.
Theological anatomy of the Egyptians, i, 344, 345.
Theology, eclectic, iii, 295, 296.
Theon, ii, 422; iii, 281, 290.
Theophrastus, ii, 384, 395; iii, 279.
Theopompus, ii, 244, 247.
Thera, ii, 41.
Theramenes, ii, 490.
Thermæ, or hot baths, of Rome, iii, 335.
Thermopolis, i, 348.
Thermopylæ, straits of, i, 10, 51, 209; ii, 54, 278.
battle of, ii, 481; iii, 49.
pass of, ii, 5, 135, 292.
Theron, tomb of, ii, 454.
Theseus, ii, 16, 114, 115, 264, 429.
temple of, ii, 453.
Thespiæ and Platæa destroyed, ii, 36.
Thespian Cupid, statue, ii, 439.
Thespis, ii, 497, 501.
Thessalians, ii, 272, 278.
Thessaly, i, 37; ii, 3, 13, 28, 37, 51, 68, 98, 119, 211, 277, 282; iii, 50, 60.

Thetis, ii, 109.
Theurgic arts, iii, 287.
Theuth, god, ii, 426.
Thia, origin of, ii, 80.
Thian-Shan, mountain, i, 75, 76, 77.
Thibet, i, 92.
great, i, 75.
little, i, 75.
Thin, city of, i, 271.
Thinite dynasty, i, 27, 273.
Thmei, goddess, i, 334.
Thor, god, i, 339.
Thoricus, ii, 13.
Thoth, i, 234, 342, 346, 348, 350, 395, 402, 426.
Thothmer III, i, 277, 278.
Thothmes III, i, 308.
IV, i, 442, 443.
Thought, Grecian, the three classes of men from whom originated, ii, 298, 299.
Thrace, i, 83, 683; ii, 27, 75, 101, 252, 276, 328, 530; iii, 68, 70, 89, 304.
Thracian, i, 16, 32, 37, 53.
family, i, 36.
Thracians and Illyrians revolt, ii, 55.
Thrasybulus, ii, 29, 46.
Thrasyllus, iii, 281.
Thraxymenus, lake, battle near, iii, 44.
Threnos, lamentation for the dead ii, 470.
Threshing floor, Roman, iii, 83.
Thucydides, ii, 41, 263, 488, 489, 502.
Thurii, ii, 28.
Thuringia, i, 34.
Thurki, i, 124.
Thymbra, battle of, i, 206, 249.
Tiber, i, 39; iii, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 16, 19, 24, 25, 27, 62, 65, 92, 106, 207, 226, 235, 418, 422; southern boundary of Etruria, iii, 6.
Julius Cæsar's proposal to deepen the bed of the, iii, 62.
Tiberias, lake of, i, 645.
Tiberius, ii, 133; iii, 78, 91, 208, 261.
increased the number of legions, iii, 385.
Tibet, i, 25, 43; see Thibet.
Tibicines, centuries of, iii, 357.
Tibulus, Albius, a poet of the Augustan age, iii, 366.
Ticinus, river, battle on the banks of, iii, 44.
Tidal, king, i, 109, 112.
Tidenæ, iii, 29.
Tiglathi-Nin, i, 139.
II, i, 140.
Tiglath-Pileser, i, 140, 633, 660.
I, i, 139.
II, i, 142.
Tigranes, iii, 57.
Tigris, river, i, 2, 16, 27, 53, 55, 86, 92, 94, 104, 105, 106, 107, 134, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 146, 150, 173, 197, 198, 200, 245, 252, 490, 492, 634, 635; ii, 56; iii, 422.
Til, i, 150.
Tillage, instruments of, among the Romans, iii, 80, 81.
Tilleh, i, 150.
Timæus, ii, 320.
Timagoras, ii, 410.
Timanthes, ii, 410, 421, 422.
Timoleon, ii, 29.
Timon, ii, 303, 348, 461.
Tirhakah, i, 144, 280.
Tiris, river, iii, 55.
Tiryns, ii, 7, 13, 446, 447.
Tirynthian style of architecture, ii, 447.
Tisiphone, one of the Furies, 86.
Tissaphernes, ii, 44.
origin of, ii, 80.
place of confinement, ii, 88.
vanquished, ii, 82.
Titanides, origin of, ii, 80.
Titans, ii, 8, 70, 107, 110, 475.
Titienses, 111, 119.
Tities, iii, 142, 144, 145, 157.

Titus, i, 562, 563; iii, 67, 236, 238, 300, 340, 354, 355.
Tatius, iii, 21.
Tivoli, iii, 354.
Tobolskoy, Siberia, i, 93.
Togrul Beg, i, 86.
Tomb of Caius Cestius, iii, 355.
of Cecilia Metella, iii, 354, 355.
Tombs of the Etruscans, iii, 11.
Tomolus, mount, i, 689.
Tonkin, i, 91, 92.
Tools used in painting, ii, 417, 418.
Top, an exercise of the Roman boys, iii, 239.
Torch-bearer, Greek, i, 55.
race, Greek, i, 48, 49.
Tore, god, i, 329.
Torques, the reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 407.
Toula, river, i, 104.
Tours, i, 489.
battle of, i, 545; iii, 2.
Towers, movable, ii, 528.
Towns and fortified places, Roman method of attacking, iii, 410.
Toys, children's, in Greece, ii, 485.
Trachinian Women, tragedy by Sophocles, ii, 503.
Tragedy, Roman, iii, 377–379.
Greek, 499–507.
Tragic literature of the Romans, iii, 377, 378.
representations of the Roman theatre, iii, 377, 378.
Trajan, iii, 67, 237, 304, 340, 341, 354, 356.
Trajan's column, iii, 354.
reliefs upon, iii, 341.
Transoxiana, i, 85, 90.
Transubstantiation, doctrine of, i, 98.
Transvectio, the Roman review, iii, 152.
Transylvania, iii, 67.
Treasury removed from Delos to Athens, ii, 40.
Treasury of Atreus, ii, 448.
of Minyas, ii, 448.
Trebia, river, iii, 44.
Treres, ii, 477.
Trespass offerings of the Hebrews, i, 582.
Triads of the Egyptians, i, 345, 346.
Triarii, veterans of the Roman army, iii, 388.
station of, in the Roman army, iii, 404.
Tribes, the, in the Roman government, iii, 144, 145.
method of selecting from, for the army, iii, 385.
Tribunes, the, in the Roman government, iii, 186-188.
pay of the, iii, 393.
military, of the Romans, iii, 390.
station of, in the Roman army, iii, 404.
Tribunitia potestas, iii, 117.
Tribute, Roman, iii, 417.
Triclinium, dining room of the Romans, iii, 220.
Triformes, name of Diana, ii, 99.
Trilingual inscription on the rocks of Behistan, i, 246.
Tripolis, i, 673.
Tripolizza taken by Greeks, ii, 68.
Triptolemus, ii, 70, 107, 299.
Trismegistus, i, 256, 403.
Tritons, ii, 117.
Triumph, honor given to a Roman general, iii, 408.
Triumvirate, the first, iii, 58.
Troas, i, 682; ii, 397.
Trochus, game of the Romans, iii, 232.
Troezene, ii, 63, 271.
Trojan kingdom, i, 683.
war, ii, 18, 102, 110, 239, 446, 471, 472, 515, 528.
Trojans, war with the Greeks, i, 683; their industry, 684; their com-

Trojans, continued—
merce, 684; their religion, 684; their society, 685.
Trophonius, ii, 146, 148, 448.
cave of, ii, 94.
Troy, i, 682, 683; ii, 98, 100, 101, 110, 124, 470, 472; iii, 121, 125.
siege of, instigated by Juno, ii, 96.
Trusts, doctrine of, iii, 86.
Trysdus, i, 653.
Tschudes, i, 41.
Tson-t-nofre, i, 346.
Tubæ, musical instrument of the Romans, iii, 358, 400.
Tulla, iii, 179.
Tullia, iii, 257.
Tullius, iii, 250.
Servius, iii, 109, 121, 139, 143, 151, 158, 159.
Hostilius, iii, 23.
Tundras, mountains, i, 25.
Tungusic tribes, i, 25.
Tungusians, i, 43, 80.
Tunis, iii, 40, 47.
Turan, land of, i, 85.
Turanian language, i, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 100.
race, i, 26, 51, 52.
Turfan, i, 43.
Turin, iii, 43.
Turkestan, i, 90.
plains of, i, 92.
Turkey, i, 148.
Turkish dominion, 85–87.
race, i, 80.
tribes, i, 25.
Turkmans around the Caspian, i, 86.
Turks, i, 43, 44, 68, 88, 95, 496, 639; their name first revealed to the world, i, 84; their first leader, 48; conquer Greece proper, the Morea, and Negropont, ii, 67; take Jerusalem, i, 564.
Turmæ, troops of the Roman army, iii, 389.
Turushkas, i, 81.
Tuscan school of art, iii, 338.
sea, iii, 35.
Tuscany, iii, 6.
Tutela, iii, 149.
Tuthmosis, tablet of, i, 270.
II, i, 442.
III, i, 442.
Twelve table, legislation of the, 198.
laws of the, iii, 357.
Tyana, iii, 280.
Tyndaris, ii, 28.
Typho, i, 333, 335, 336, 349, 350, 356,
Typhoeus, his origin, ii, 82; overcome in a contest with Jupiter, ii, 83.
Typhon, ii, 475.
his origin, ii, 82.
Typhus, ii, 88.
Tyre, i, 28, 140, 142, 180, 183, 318, 319, 640, 641, 649, 651, 663, 667, 670, 671, 672; ii, 26, 56.
Tyrians, i, 183, 640, 641, 653, 666, 677, 678.
Tyrius, ruins of, i, 3.
Tyrol, iii, 8.
Tyrrhene sea, i, 39.
Tyrrhenia, iii, 6.
Tyrrhenian sea [Mediterranean], iii, 6, 418.
Tyrrhenians, iii, 9.
Tyrrhenus, i, 691.
Tysiphone, ii, 88.
Tystæus, ii, 477.

Ugrian tribe, i, 80.
Ulysses, i, 684; ii, 117, 421, 470, 472.
Umbria, i, 38.
Umbrians, i, 38, 39; iii, 4, 8, 38.
Unity of the deity, iii, 319.

Unknown god, the proclamation of the, by St. Paul on Mars hill, iii, 312.
Ur, i, 107, 112, 120, 631.
Kingi-Accad, king of, i, 111.
(Mugheir), i, 112.
Uræus, i, 345.
Ural, i, 25, 42.
Uralian mountains, i, 80.
Urania, the muse of astronomy, ii, 118, 519.
Uranus, or the sky, origin of, ii, 81; 80, 81, 109.
Urim and Thummim, i, 605.
Urukh, i, 111.
Urumiyeh, basin, i, 149.
Usher, archbishop, i, 46.
Usus, iii, 242.
Utica, i, 650, 651, 653; iii, 47, 61.

Valens, iii, 71, 93.
Valentinian, ii, 158; iii, 73, 74, 93.
II, iii, 71.
Valerius, M., iii, 185.
a fortunate name, iii, 385.
Vandals, i, 82; iii, 73.
Varro, iii, 78.
M. Terentius, iii, 277.
Terentius, iii, 441.
Vases, Etruscan, iii, 342, 343.
Vates, iii, 120.
Vatican, iii, 3.
Van, lake of, i, 150.
Vedas, i, 219.
Veii, iii, 25, 29, 30, 31, 195.
siege of, iii, 411.
Velitiæ, iii, 197.
Velites, agile troops so called, iii, 389.
Venatio, exhibition of wild beasts among the Romans, iii, 234.
Venetian school of painting, ii, 425.
Venetians, i, 680; ii, 67.
Venice, i, 319.
Venti cardinales, winds, iii, 85.
Venus, i, 1, 8, 178, 190, 194, 213, 340, 340, 344, 661, 663, 667; ii, 93, 95, 101, 102, 105, 111, 113, 116, 118, 135, 178, 411, 426, 432, 444; iii, 103, 105.
temple of, ii, 132, 462; iii, 127.
how represented, ii, 104.
planet, i, 123, 407.
celebrated picture of, ii, 423.
Verona, iii, 307.
battle at, iii, 73.
Verses, saturnalian, iii, 360.
Vertumnus, iii, 104.
Vespasian, iii, 67, 238, 300, 302, 308, 340.
Flavius, iii, 354.
Vesta, i, 120, 125; iii, 103, 121; her parentage, ii, 81; how represented, 106; temple of, iii, 123; altar of, 122, 123.
Vestal virgins, iii, 100, 121, 124.
Vestibulum, iii, 218.
Vestilla, iii, 261.
Veturia, iii, 28, 262.
Veturius, iii, 33.
Vexilla, reward of the Roman soldier, iii, 407.
Via triumphalis, iii, 408.
Victims, sacrificial, among the Romans, iii, 130.
Victoria, iii, 106.
Victory, temple of, ii, 12.
Vigiliæ, watches of the Roman army, iii, 394.
Vine, cultivation of the, in Greece, ii, 72.
cultivation of the, among the Romans, iii, 84.
Vineyards, Roman, how divided, iii, 84.
Virgil, iii, 84; foremost of Roman poets, iii, 364; regarded Theo-

Virgil, continued—
cratus as a model of pastoral poetry, iii, 361.
Virginia, iii, 184, 193, 256.
Virginius, iii, 28.
Viriathus, ii, 52.
Vishnoo, i, 333, 339, 346.
Visigoths, iii, 73.
Vistula river, i, 34, 35, 92.
Vitellius, iii, 67.
Vitruvius, iii, 218, 227.
Voconian law, iii, 86.
Volci, iii, 7.
Volero, Publilius, iii, 190.
Volga, river, i, 81, 82, 83, 92, 93; iii, 73.
Volsci, iii, 31; wars with the, iii, 29.
Volscians, war against the, iii, 26.
Volsinii, iii, 35.
Volumnia, iii, 28.
Vossius, ii, 298.
Vul, or Iva, god, i, 121, 124.
Vulcan, i, 329, 384; ii, 95, 103, 105, 111, 113, 120; iii, 103; temple of, i, 132; how represented, ii, 105.

Wady Mousa, i, 463.
Wahab, i, 496.
Wahabees, i, 495, 496, 497.
Wales, i, 25.
Walid, i, 482.
Wallachian language, i, 28.
Walls of Babylon, i, 174, 179.
War, art of, among the Arabians, i, 545, 546.
among the Assyrians, i, 169–172.
among the Egyptians, 455–457.
among the Hebrews, i, 624–626.
War, art of, among the Persians, i, 246–252.
origin of, ii, 84.
between Romans and Antiochus, ii, 66.
the Grecian manner of declaring, ii, 514.
between Romans and Achaians, ii, 66.
Waraka, i, 473.
Warfare of the gods, ii, 81, 82.
Warka, i, 112, 118.
Wars undertaken upon popular principles, iii, 382; Roman method of declaring, 383.
Wasps, the, comedy by Aristophanes, ii, 509, 512.
Watchwords in use among the Persians, i, 250.
of the Roman army, iii, 399, 401.
Water colors, material used by Grecian painters, ii, 418.
Wayland, Dr., i, xii.
Weapons of Assyrians, i, 169, 170.
Weaving among the Greeks, ii, 73.
Weeds, Roman method of destroying, iii, 82.
Welsh dialect, i, 33.
Western Illyricum, iii, 73.
Westerwald, i, 34.
Wheat, indigenous to Chaldæa, i, 108, 114.
Whewell, iii, 425.
Wife, duties of a good, among the Grecians, ii, 176.
Wills and testaments in Greece, ii, 186–187.
Winckelmann, ii, 440.
Windish dialect, i, 35.
Windows of the Romans, iii, 220–221.
Wine, making in Greece, ii, 72.
Winter, iii, 106.

Wogouls, i, 42.
Wolga, i, 42.
Women, condition of, in Greece, ii, 174.
condition of, among the Romans, iii, 254, 264.
separated from the people in theatres, iii, 374.
as pantomimes on the Roman stage, iii, 381.
treatment of, a good criterion to test the progress of civilization, i, 375, 376.
Wooden theatres, singularly constructed, iii, 375.
Word in Roman engagements, iii, 401.
Works and Days, ii, 473, 474.
of the Roman soldiers, iii, 394.
Worship of images, i, 98.
the Roman, iii, 124-134.
the Grecian, ii, 136.

Xantippus, iii, 40.
Xenocrates, ii, 369, 370, 383, 392.
Xenophanes, ii, 303, 320, 321, 327.
founder of the Eleatic school, ii, 320.
Xenophon, i, 221; ii, 182, 335, 336, 337, 339, 524.
Xeres, i, 488.
Xeniades, ii, 346.
Xerxes, i, 176, 209, 210, 240, 242, 246, 282; ii, 34, 35, 36, 275, 285; conquers the Egyptians, i, 209; invades Greece, i, 209; defeats the Greeks at the straits of Thermopylæ, 209; escapes into Asia, leaving Mardonius to subdue Greece, 210; experiences domestic difficulties, 210; murdered by Artabanus, 210.
Xoites, i, 276.
Xuthus, ii, 14.

Yakutes of the Sena, i, 80.
Yamb, i, 497.
Yarkiang river, i, 77.
Yasdan, symbol, i, 318.
Yellow, river, i, 76, 90.
Yembo, i, 466.
Yemen, i, 464, 465, 469, 643, 645; monuments at, 54; mountains of, 499; sultans of, 487.
Yenisei, river, i, 41, 76, 80.
Yermuk, battle of, i, 488.
Yetzdijird, i, 483.
Yezid, i, 482, 486, 461.
York, city of, iii, 69.
Young Men's Association of Albany, Amos Dean organized, i, xi.

Zab, river, i, 141, 148, 149, 150.
Zaccara, i, 418, 432.
Zacynthus, ii, 41.
Zadok, i, 621.
Zagatai, i, 93.
Zagoum, i, 294.
Zagros, mountains, i, 134, 139, 141, 200, 245.
Zama, battle of, iii, 47, 402.
Zametas, mount, i, 469.
Zande, ii, 28.
Zardusht, i, 220.
Zayif, i, 496.
Zayoum, i, 274, 429.
Zealots, i, 623.
Zeid, i, 473, 477.
Zeinab, i, 477, 503.
Zemugin, i, 89.
Zend, language, i, 31, 80, 200, 219.
Zendavesta, i, 33, 200.
Zenghis Khan, i, 79.

Zengri, lake of, i, 77.
Zengri-tagh, i, 75.
Zeno, ii, 303, 320, 328, 397, 398, 401.
the Eleatic, ii, 323, 324.
the Stoic, ii, 323.
Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, iii, 68, 284.
Zephyrus, ii, 111.
Zeraphims, gods, i, 658, 659.
Zerubbabel, i, 562, 575.
Zeus, or Jupiter, ii, 90, 92, 93, 94, 105, 411, 475, 481.
Zeuxis, ii, 409, 413, 419, 420, 421.
Zingis Khan, i, 89–91, 94, 101; his first battles, i, 89; how he signalized one of his first victories, 89; how he came to take his name, 89; promulgates a code of laws, 89; his religion a pure theism, 89; his object of life, 90; his conquests, 90; great battle on the plains of Sihon, 90; his ravages of four years required five centuries to repair, 90.
Zir-Banit, goddess, i, 122.
Zobah, i, 633, 673.
Zodiac, i, 193, 407.
Zopirus, iii, 340.
Zopyrus, i, 208; iii, 340.
Zoroaster, i, 6, 57, 220, 483; iii, 325.