LECTURES

ON

THE HISTORY OF ROME,

FROM

THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE.

BY

B. G. NIEBUHR.

EDITED BY

DR. LEONHARD SCHMITZ, F.R.S.E.,

RECTOR OF THE HIGH SCHOOL OF EDINBURGH.

Second Edition.

WITH EVERY ADDITION DERIVABLE FROM DR. ISLER'S GERMAN EDITION.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

TAYLOR, WALTON, AND MABERLY,

UPPER GOWER STREET, AND IVY LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.DCCC.XLIX.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE CVIII.

LECTURE CIX.

LECTURE CX.

LECTURE CXI.

LECTURE CXII.

LECTURE CXIII.

LECTURE CXIV.

LECTURE CXV.

LECTURE CXVI.

LECTURE CXVII.

LECTURE CXVIII.

LECTURE CXIX.

LECTURE CXX.

LECTURE CXXI.

LECTURE CXXII.

LECTURE CXXIII.

LECTURE CXXIV.

LECTURE CXXV.

LECTURE CXXVI.

LECTURE CXXVII.

LECTURE CXXVIII.

LECTURE CXXIX.

LECTURE CXXX.

LECTURE CXXXI.

LECTURE CXXXII.

LECTURE CXXXIII.

LECTURE CXXXIV.

THE

HISTORY OF ROME, FROM THE FIRST PUNIC WAR.

LECTURE XC.

BEFORE proceeding to describe the third Mithridatic war, I will give you a brief survey of the states and nations over which the Roman dominion extended at this time, as well as of those with which Rome was likely to come in contact. The Roman empire in Europe comprised, besides Italy, Provence with a part of Dauphiné, and the whole of Languedoc and Toulouse. Although the more distant tribes of Spain were only in a state of half dependence, yet, after the war of Sertorius, the whole of Spain may be regarded as under the Roman dominion, with the exception of Biscay and Asturia. The Cantabri, a great nation in the north of Spain, the separate tribes of which seem to have been perfectly distinct and independent of one another, were quite free. Gaul was in a condition which I shall describe more accurately when I reach the time of Caesar's conquests in that country. The Aedui had the supremacy; the whole country was in a state of very great weakness, and was already overwhelmed with German tribes. The entire coast of the Adriatic, Dalmatia, and Illyricum, were under Rome, but not to a great distance from the sea; the inhabitants of the high mountains of Bosnia and Croatia were independent. The whole extent of Macedonia, such as it had been under the last kings, as well as Greece, was a Roman province. Thrace, and the country north of Scardus and Scodrus, were still independent.

Bithynia in Asia had been bequeathed to the Romans by the will of its last king, Nicomedes. Mithridates was confined to Pontus proper, and a part of Cappadocia; but the country north of Trebizond was under his supremacy, and many great kingdoms on the coasts of the Black Sea, such as the northern

part of Armenia, the country north of Erzeroum, Georgia, (Iberia), Imereti (Colchis), Daghestan and the nations south o the Kuban, were tributary to him. The Bosporus, and the Greek towns in the Crimea were really a province of his empire; but his influence extended as far as the river Dniester, and this influence was, in fact a sort of feudal sovereignty. His connexions extended even beyond the Danube, and as far as the frontiers of the Roman empire in Thrace. The Seleucidan kingdom had become quite extinct. After the death of Demetrius II., the succession was disputed; and the consequence was, that the kingdom was divided into small principalities, which although they were very weak, made war upon one another with great fury. It was only in a single district of the coast that one Antiochus maintained himself as king; but he in vain implored the support of the Romans; and the other parts longing for peace readily recognised Tigranes as their king. His dominion extended from the frontier of Erzeroum to Coele-Syria, embracing Great Armenia, Kurdistan, Mesopotamia, the north of Syria, Hyrcania and a part of Cilicia—a very rich and mighty empire. The Parthian empire, to the east of that of Tigranes, comprised nearly the whole of modern Persia and Babylonia: in the eastern parts of Persia, Bactrian kings seem still to have maintained themselves, and to have possessed a part of Korasan, unless it was already occupied by the Scythians. At the time of the outbreak of the war of Pompey, Media perhaps did not yet belong to the Parthian empire, which was, however, in a state of considerable weakness. It was probably governed in the same manner as Assyria had been in former and its provinces were under the administration of princes of the royal family, whose relation to the sovereign was that of feudal kings, so that the Parthian kings were literally kings of kings. The towns on the coast of Phoenicia and all Coele-Syria were free; Judaea and Jerusalem likewise formed a free state; and some of its princes (tetrarchs), of the house of the Maccabees, even bore the title of king. Coele-Syria was divided among several princes of this kind, who were called tetrarchs.

Egypt, under the Ptolemies, was confined within its narrowest limits, from the brook Aegyptus to Elephantine, but was, nevertheless, a very rich country. It is a mere chance,

that we know that the kings of Egypt still had a revenue of three millions sterling[1], for they were the only proprietors of the soil; but, as a state, Egypt was very weak and contemptible, and going rapidly towards its dissolution. In Asia Minor, the Romans under Servilius Isauricus, had recently conquered the Pisidians, Lycians, and Pamphylians. These countries had, till then, been free, the former ever since the Antiochian war, and the latter since the disputes with the Rhodians. A portion of Cilicia was yet independent, but in a state of complete decay, and divided into petty states, which were real nests of pirates. Cyprus was a dependency of Egypt, but governed by its own kings.

After the death of Jugurtha, Numidia, though it was undoubtedly confined to much narrower limits than in the time of Jugurtha, was still a kingdom, and governed by another descendant of Masinissa, whose name is not known with certainty; for the genuineness of the inscription in Reinesius in which Gauda is mentioned, and which is the only authority for it, has justly been doubted.[2] In Sulla's time, Numidia was governed by one Hiempsal. Africa, the province, was of course governed by Roman proconsuls.

The Gallic tribes which had formerly been so much harassed by their kinsmen, still dwelt on the Danube, such as the Scordiscans and Tauriscans, and, somewhat higher up, the Boians. The tribes of Noricum practically acknowledged the supremacy of Rome. The German tribes, at this time, scarcely extended further South than the river Main. A line, running from the Rhine between the Main and Neckar across the Odenwald, Spessart, and the Thüringerwald into the heart of modern Poland, was then, in all probability, the southern frontier of the German tribes.

The consulship of Pompey and Crassus became remarkable for a constitutional change introduced by the praetor L. Aurelius Cotta. Many of the institutions of Sulla, especially that by which he had transferred the judicia from the equites to the senate, had become so odious and detestable in their consequences, that many honest men of the ruling party itself did not feel disposed to support them: the good men among

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 798.

[2] No one knows where the original inscription is, and we are only told that it was discovered in the sixteenth century.—N.

them saw the disgraceful abuses, and were ashamed of them. The venality of the courts was quite manifest, as we may see from the speeches of Cicero. To take away the judicial power from the senate, and to vest it in an independent body of men, had therefore become the great problem. But no one was desirous of restoring that great privilege to the equites, and Rome found herself involved in difficulties, from which she was unable to extricate herself. In such times, the classes of society are distinguished from one another by their landed property or their capital. If a person wants to generalise, he cannot adopt any other principle, although it is thoroughly false. This division, however, cannot be prevented under such circumstances, and Rome was on that false road, on which France is at the present day. There existed already a census for the members of the senate; though it is uncertain whether it was necessary for every senator to possess 800,000 sesterces, or one million; but the *census senatorius* must, at all events, have been higher than the minimum of the *census equestris*. Regulations respecting the *census senatorius* had probably existed as early as the Hannibalian war. The judicial law of L. Aurelius Cotta ordained that a number of senators, equites, and the *tribuni aerarii*, should be invested with the judicial power. The *tribuni aerarii* were probably people of a lower census than the equites, and chosen by the tribes to represent that class of citizens who possessed smaller fortunes. These three classes, probably furnishing the same number each, were to form a very numerous jury. The particulars of this law are, fortunately preserved in the Commentaries of Asconius Pedianus upon Cicero.[3] This reform was wise and salutary, and although the judges were still bad enough, yet they were infinitely better than the senators.

Another great change which Pompey made in his consulship, and without the assistance of Crassus, was, that he restored the power of the tribunes exactly to what it had been previously to the reforms of Sulla[4]; so that only the augurs had the right of interfering to prevent their bringing measures before the people: thus, just as Sulla had narrowed the tribunician power too much, Pompey now went too far in the

[3] *In Pison.* p. 16; *in Cornelian.* p. 67, 78, foll.; Pseud. Ascon. *ad Cic. Divin. Verr.* p. 103; compare Schol. Bobiens. p. 339; Livy, *Epit.* 97; Vell. Paterc. ii. 32.

[4] Livy, *Epit.* 97; Vell. Paterc. ii. 30; Appian, *De Bell Civil.* i. 121; Cicero, *De Legib.* iii. 9, and 11, *in Verrem*, i. 15, foll.

opposite direction. It is the besetting sin of all men of mediocrity, and of every-day politicians, to abolish restrictions entirely, which appear to them, or really are, injurious. In all such cases, moderation is the most important requisite; but shallow politicians never see any difficulty in settling a question under such circumstances; and their argument is simply this:—"Here we see a wrong, and we will tear it up by the root." The restoration of the tribuneship in the seventh century was a monstrous absurdity; but Rome's condition was such that an angel from heaven would not have been able to bring about any essential improvement. These things happened during Pompey's consulship, in the year 682. I shall relate the further changes down to Cicero's consulship (689), when I have reached that period.

The third war against Mithridates broke out almost immediately after the death of Nicomedes.[5] Various provocations on the part of the Romans had preceded it; but the immediate cause was the treaty of the king of Pontus with Sertorius. Mithridates was perfectly prepared, at least as far as his riches and great exertions enabled him to be so; but the mere fact of his being an Asiatic rendered his fall unavoidable. He is much overrated in history, and too much honour has been paid to him; for all he did was of such a nature that it might have been done by any one who possessed large sums of money and numerous armies. As a general, he was wretched, and not able to conduct either a campaign or a battle. He overran Paphlagonia, and advanced into Bithynia and Cappadocia, and having proceeded as far as Chalcedon on the Bosporus, he compelled the consul M. Aurelius Cotta to throw himself into Chalcedon. His fleet also was successful, and chased that of the Romans into the harbour, where he captured all their ships of war. The Romans had now (678) been keeping the soldiers of Valerius Flaccus (the Valeriani[6]) in those regions for nearly thirteen years: they had become quite savage, and were in the highest degree indignant at their long banishment from home. After taking Heraclea and Chalcedon, Mithridates therefore appeared before Cyzicus, a most populous and wealthy town, which remained faithful to

[5] Appian, *De Bell. Mithrid.* 71.

[6] Dion Cass. xxxv. 14; Sallust, *Hist. fragm.* lib. v. Compare *Lecture* lxxxvi. p. 379, note 15.

the Romans with the same determination, as in former campaigns. We have a detailed description of the exertions with which it was besieged by sea and by land[7]: Mithridates had landed his troops in the island which contained a part of the city, and was connected with the main land only by a dam; from that island and from the sea he conducted the siege with the greatest vigour; but without being supported by the Romans, the citizens of Cyzicus repelled every attack.

In the meanwhile, Lucullus arrived in Asia. He was a determined champion of the party of Sulla, and immensely rich: he has acquired an unfortunate importance, as having more than any one else familiarised his countrymen with Asiatic luxuries. He was a distinguished general, and must have had other estimable qualities besides, as Cicero esteemed him highly: but his exorbitant riches cannot have been acquired in an honest way; they must have been accumulated in time of war. He brought a fresh army with him to Asia, at the time when Mithridates was engaged with the siege of Cyzicus, and took up a favourable position on the Aesepus in Phrygia; by this means he rendered it so difficult for Mithridates to obtain the necessary supply of provisions, that the king at last felt obliged to raise the blockade and to retreat. The circumstance of his having continued the siege of Cyzicus too long was but a slight mistake and must not be urged too much against him; for even the greatest generals of the eighteenth century committed similar blunders. Frederic the Great and Napoleon made great mistakes: the duke of Wellington is, perhaps, the only general in whose conduct of war we cannot discover any important mistake. Pyrrhus committed very great faults, and Hannibal was probably not altogether free from them. After leaving Cyzicus, Mithridates retreated, and could not maintain himself anywhere; and, when he had escaped to the interior of Pontus, we entirely lose sight of him. Lucullus set out in pursuit of him, and transferred the war into Pontus. Here too Mithridates did not know how to render the sieges of his towns difficult for the Romans, although the towns themselves, as Amisus, Sinope and others, held out very bravely. He actually allowed himself to be driven out of his own country, and threw himself into the arms of his son-in-law, Tigranes of Armenia.[8]

[7] Appian, *l. c.* 73, foll; Plutarch, *Lucull.* 9.
[8] Appian, *l. c.* 76—78; Plutarch *Lucull.* 9—14.

LECTURE XCI.

It was, as we have seen, in his second campaign, that fortune turned against Mithridates. His armies, amounting to hundreds of thousands of hoplites were dispersed, his principal towns in the west of Pontus, which is the most beautiful part of it, were taken, and he himself sought refuge with Tigranes, his son-in-law. After having completed the conquest of western Pontus, Lucullus followed him across the mountains into Armenia, and laid siege to Tigranocerta, the capital of Tigranes, whose Armenian army was routed and dispersed like chaff. The capital itself, although defended with somewhat greater energy than the Armenians had shewn in the open field, was taken after a short siege, and Tigranes retreated before Lucullus. Gibbon justly remarks, that the character of a nation often undergoes a surprising change even under apparently unfavourable circumstances, but that sometimes it changes only slightly, or even remains the same, notwithstanding the influence of the greatest vicissitudes; as an instance of which we may mention the Spaniards. Some nations grow worse; but the Armenians improved. Towards Lucullus, and even long before, during the retreat of the Ten Thousand Greeks, they behaved in as cowardly a way as the Persians under Xerxes did towards the Greeks; but during the period of the eastern empire, and down to a late period of the middle ages, they were the bravest among the Asiatics, and were the flower of the Byzantine armies. It has been remarked, with equal justice, that their cowardice can be the less acounted for, as Armenia is a very cold country, and in its mountains the winter is much more severe than in Germany. In the neighbourhood of Erzeroum, snow often falls even before the end of September, and in October it is very common.[1] Lucullus penetrated into Mesopotamia, and took his headquarters at Nisibis (the ancient Zaba in the second book of

[1] Gibbon did not sufficiently consider the fact, that the Armenians embraced Christianity with great enthusiasm; and that, as Christians, they were for the most part hostile towards the Persians and the Magian religion, and attached to the Christian emperors of Byzantium. At a later period, they were enthusiastic adherents of the Paulician doctrines. — N.

Samuel[2], or according to the vulgate the second book of Kings) the seat of the Syrian kings in Mesopotamia. This town came to be of great importance during the decline of the Roman empire; and under Diocletian it was the chief fortress of the eastern frontier. Here Lucullus seems to have amassed immense treasures during his proconsular government; and here also he was surprised by an insurrection in his army. The soldiers were incited by P. Clodius, the same who afterwards acquired his sad celebrity in Roman history, and one of whose sisters was married to Lucullus.[3] The first elements of the insurrection were among the Valeriani. The time of their service had been greatly prolonged, for they had now been in arms twenty years, and as they had served so long they had a right to demand to be sent home. The period of military service had been gradually increased. In the time of the younger Scipio no more than six years of uninterrupted service had been required. Clodius played the mutineer, as he did in fact throughout his life. Lucullus refused to let the Valeriani go, probably because he had not received the necessary reinforcements, and therefore could not spare them. This insurrection prevented Lucullus from acting energetically against Mithridates, who now gained fresh courage. Lucullus withdrew into Cappadocia; and Mithridates, who had followed him and defeated his legate, C. Valerius Triarius, again got possession of the greater part of his dominions. Lucullus had even before drawn upon himself the suspicion of protracting the war, in order to enrich himself; and now, just at the time when he was not favoured by fortune, his adversaries increased their exertions that the command against Mithridates might be given to Pompey.

After the war against Sertorius, Pompey had conducted that against the pirates. Piracy must have been an old evil in the eastern parts of the Mediterranean. The rude inhabitants of the mountainous parts of Cilicia had probably been practising this profitable kind of warfare for a long time; as pirates and archipirates are mentioned in those parts as early as the Macedonian time, so that even then they must have had their strongholds there; but they had then been insignificant in comparison with what they were at this time. The coast of Cilicia was well suited to them, for although it contained

[2] viii. 3.

[3] Plutarch, *Lucull.* 21.

some important and flourishing towns, such as Tarsus, yet the majority were small places as in Maina. That coast had formerly been under the dominion of the Syrian kings, but after the dissolution of the Seleucidan empire (A.U. 630) Cilicia became independent, and the numerous little fortified places and commercial towns on the coast, especially in *Κιλικία τραχεῖα*, were the landing places of the pirates; here they established themselves by land and by sea. During the war with Mithridates, who encouraged them, their boldness surpassed all belief. We need only read Cicero's speech for the Manilian bill[4], to form an idea of their number and their robberies.[5] The whole of the Mediterranean, from the coast of Syria to the pillars of Hercules, was covered with privateers, and there was no safety anywhere. Their prisoners were dragged to fortified places on the coasts, and were compelled to pay enormous sums as ransom; and, in case of their being unable to raise the money required, they were sold as slaves or tortured to death and thrown into the sea. These pirates made descents even upon the coast of Italy, and took towns; once they landed in the very neighbourhood of Ostia, and distinguished Romans, nay, even praetors with all the ensigns of their office were dragged from the high roads as prisoners. Rome required to be supplied with corn from Sicily and other agricultural countries; and as the communication between Italy and those countries was frequently interrupted, the city was perpetually suffering from scarcity. The Cretans, who had, at all times, been notorious as pirates and highway robbers, were the allies of the pirates. The navy of the Romans had fallen greatly into decay, while the numbers of the pirates' boats, which were small like those of the Mainotes, but dangerous to merchant vessels, were incalculable. The time when Pompey had the command against the pirates was the most brilliant period of his life, and his excellent conduct deserves great praise. He took his measures in such a way, that he drew them together, as it were, by a bait, from all parts of the Mediterranean towards Cilicia, where he conquered them in a glorious sea-fight. He captured all their ships, took the towns which had served as their strongholds, transplanted them from places difficult of access, partly to larger towns of Cilicia and to fertile districts

[4] In all the MSS. it is more correctly called "De imperio Cn. Pompeii."—N.

[5] Compare Appian, *De Bell. Mithrid.* 92 and 93; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 24.

where they had the means of living and could be watched, and partly to the deserted places of Peloponnesus, such as Dyme in Achaia, where they could be more easily looked after and kept in check. This was a great benefit to the civilised world, for which Pompey deserved the everlasting gratitude[6] of all the nations round the Mediterranean.

After this war Pompey stood higher in public opinion than ever, and this popularity induced the Romans to invest him with the supreme command in the war against Mithridates. The Romans had never any reason to regret this step; but they made his position easier than that of Lucullus had been, for they increased his army with considerable reinforcements. Mithridates lost in a single battle all that he had gained, without the Romans acquiring any great reputation by their victory. He fled into Colchis, and thence along the Caucasus to the Bosporus Cimmerius. Pompey followed him through Erzeroum, and advanced as far as Georgia and the country of Tiflis, through countries, for an accurate knowledge of which we are indebted to the late Russian war. The princes of those countries paid homage to Rome. Machares, one of the sons of Mithridates, who held the kingdom of Bosporus as a fief of his father, and had concluded a separate peace with the Romans, now put an end to his life from fear of his father, who was approaching. For in times of misfortune, when Mithridates gave vent to his grief with oriental fury, his own domestics, and even his children, who were extremely numerous, used to tremble, to hate him, and to wish for his destruction. The retreat of Mithridates was undertaken partly to enable him to pursue and punish his personal enemies, and partly as the commencement of a gigantic enterprise. He had still immense treasures concealed; and his intention was to rouse the Bastarnae, and other nations on the Danube, and to lead them into Italy.[7] When his soldiers heard of this plan, a rebellion broke out in his army at Panticapaeum[8], as they knew that none of his undertakings had yet succeeded, and no advantageous results could be anticipated from such a bold expedition, in which he, as well as his army, would undoubtedly have perished. Pharnaces, his own son, was at the head of the rebellion. Mithridates had so often shewn his fearful

[6] Appian, *De Bell. Mithrid.* 94—97; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 26.

[7] Appian, *l. c.* 101, foll.

[8] Dion Cass. xxxvii. 12.

oriental character, that his son could not feel safe until his father was dead. The insurrection assumed the awful character of all Asiatic rebellions, so that Mithridates, who had every moment to fear being murdered by his son, put an end to his life by poison. Pharnaces now made peace with Pompey, and did not scruple to deliver up to the conqueror the body of his own father; but Pompey behaved humanely, and had it buried with regal magnificence.[9] Pharnaces remained in possession of the Bosporus and the adjoining country of the Kubanians, and retained them until the time of Caesar, when he ventured to meddle with the civil war of the Romans[10], and ruined himself by the attempt.

Pompey followed up his victory, and now directed his arms against Tigranes, who was glad enough to obtain a disgraceful peace: he had to pay a heavy sum of money, and to surrender all his possessions, with the exception of Armenia Proper, being even obliged to give up a part of Armenia to his rebellious son, though he soon afterwards recovered it. Syria was ceded altogether, and was made a Roman province. Pompey advanced as far as the frontiers of Egypt, meeting with no opposition from the Syrian or Phoenician towns, of which he took possession. One of his generals even penetrated into the country of the Nabataean Arabs, where homage was paid to him by the Arab king, Haret. In the contest between the two brothers, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, princes of the Jews, Pompey declared himself in favour of the former. Aristobulus was made prisoner, and afterwards adorned the triumphal procession of Pompey. Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Romans by capitulation; but the temple held out for three months, and when it was taken Pompey allowed his soldiers to plunder, but not to destroy anything.[11] The death of Mithridates falls in the year of Cicero's consulship; the conquest of Syria belongs to the year following, and the triumph of Pompey took place either at the end of the year 690, or at the beginning of 691.

The conduct of Pompey after the termination of the war, was praiseworthy. He disbanded his whole army, although he might have acted as Sulla did, and assumed the *tyrannis;* but

[9] Appian, *l. c.* 113; Dion Cass. xxxvii. 14.

[10] *Se inserere armis Romanis*, as Tacitus expresses it.—N.

[11] Dion Cass. xxxvii. 15 and 16; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 39 and 45.

he would not, and shewed a true *animus civilis*. He took no improper advantage of the senseless honours which were paid to him, and appeared only once in his triumphal robe in the Circensian games; although, on the whole, he shewed himself mean and miserable during the time of peace, and certainly did not deserve the name of the Great, which had been given to him by Sulla in war. His triumph was most magnificent.[12] It is related that he displayed in his triumph, among other trophies, a list of the tributes which the republic had acquired from the countries conquered by him. The numbers, as they are stated by Plutarch, do not appear to me too great, but rather too small. If we consider the revenues, and exorbitant land-taxes which were raised in Syria, Judaea and other countries, at the time of the Maccabees, it appears to me inconceivable that the numbers in Plutarch should be correct. The amount of tributes gained by Pompey was indeed greater than all the previous tributes put together. But Syria was at that time one of the most prosperous and wealthy countries in the world, though at present it is a desert. To give an account of the princes whom Pompey restored, would lead us beyond our limits; and the subject belongs more properly to a universal history.

Let us now turn our attention to Catiline, a dreadful name, of which we may say what an English author says of Cromwell, that it is "doomed to everlasting fame"; although Cromwell was an angel in comparison with Catiline.[13] I shall give you only a brief sketch of his history, as I can refer you to Sallust for a perfectly satisfactory account. Sallust has a great love of truth, is just towards every one, and does perfect justice to Cicero, without heeding the vulgar talk of other people. At the time of Catiline's conspiracy, he was a young man, and perfectly able to make correct observations of what was going on. Very soon after these events, he became personally acquainted with Caesar, Crassus, and other leading men; when Crassus died, Sallust was not yet thirty years old. It is always of great importance for the historian of such events as

[12] Appian, *De Bell. Mithrid.* 116, foll.; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 45; Dion Cass. xxxvii. 20, foll.

[13] In the middle ages, Catiline, with the slight alteration of his name into *Catellina*, was quite a standing character in the tales and legends of Florence, as in Malespini, where he is the real impersonation of evil; and, owing to this extraordinary popularity, the vulgar form of the name, *Catellina*, is found in a great many MSS of Roman authors—N.

this conspiracy, to become acquainted with the leading men who acted a part in them; and not to write about them till some time after, when prejudices and delusions cease to exercise their influence.

According to the accounts both of Sallust and of Cicero, Catiline was certainly an extraordinary man, endowed with all the qualities which are necessary to constitute a great man in such times: he had an incomparable and indescribable courage and boldness, and a gigantic strength of both mind and body; but he was so completely diabolical, that I know of no one in history that can be compared with him; and you may rely upon it that the colours in which his character is described, are not too dark, though we may reject the story of his slaughtering a child at the time when he administered the oath to his associates[14], and making them drink the blood mixed with wine. He had served in the armies of Sulla, and had greatly distinguished himself. His position resembled that in which the most formidable terrorists and Septembriseurs found themselves after the 18th of Brumaire, under the consular government in France. Many of those who have indulged in all excesses in a fearful civil war, find it afterwards impossible to abstain from bloodshed, even when they have nothing to gain by it. If we suppose that Catiline had any definite object in view, which he meant to attain by his crimes, it is very difficult to say in what it consisted; but if the crimes themselves were his object, we can understand his character. To comprehend the occurrences of this time, it is essential to form a clear notion of the immensely disordered condition of Rome. There never was a country in such a state of complete anarchy: the condition of Athens during its anarchy, of which people talk so much, bears no comparison with that of Rome. The anarchy of Athens assumed a definite form; it occurred in a small republic, and was quite a different thing altogether. Rome, on the other hand, or rather some hundreds, say even a few thousands, of her citizens, who recognised neither law nor order, had the sway over nearly the whole of the known world, and pursued only their personal objects in all directions. The republic was a mere name, and the laws had lost their power. There were laws, to mention one instance, which, under a heavy penalty, forbade bribing the electors, and their severity

[14] Dion Cass. xxxvii. 30. Compare Sallust, *Catil.* 22.

had repeatedly been increased; but it was nevertheless a well-known fact, that every candidate, with the exception of Cicero, spent enormous sums upon his election, for which they always contrived afterwards to indemnify themselves during the time of their office. The *Romani rustici* had lost their importance, and the city populace was a tool in the hands of the nobles in their feuds against one another. In such a corrupt state of things, Catiline was a welcome instrument for many; and it is for this reason that I do not consider the charge which was brought against Crassus to be unjust. The latter was a very insignificant person, and Catiline would have crushed him under his feet, if his schemes had been realised, although it would perhaps have caused his own ruin. If Catiline really had any object at all, it must have been that of making himself tyrant, and of becoming a second Sulla, without the intention, however, of ever resigning his *tyrannis*. Two years before Cicero's consulship, he had formed a conspiracy to murder the consuls and proclaim himself master of Rome. We know his most brilliant qualities through Cicero, of whom he had an immense hatred, and who says of him that he possessed a magic and fascinating power, by which he subdued and swayed all with whom he came in contact, and that therefore it was no wonder that young people were attracted by his extraordinary talents. He never let loose those whom he had once ensnared. I believe that Cicero had on one occasion defended him; he had been an officer in Sulla's army, and after his praetorship, having had the administration of the province of Africa, he was charged with malversation when the year of his office had elapsed. It was only with the greatest difficulty that he was acquitted, and it may have been on that occasion that Cicero spoke for him.[15] Everybody's attention was drawn towards Catiline: every one dreaded him, but no one had the courage to come forward against him. His character was so well known that all agreed in their fear, and in the conviction that fire and plunder would be the order of the day if he should gain power; and persons of the most different characters and parties, even many partisans of Sulla, were convinced that they would be his victims.

Under these circumstances, Cicero, who had already been praetor, offered himself as a candidate for the consulship. He bore down all opposition by his great integrity and his extra-

[15] Asconius, *ad Cicer. in toga cand.* p. 85. ed Orelli.

ordinary talents; he was in great favour with the people, but the nobles at first opposed him as a *novus homo*, and would hear nothing of him; but the well-known fact that Catiline and his associates intended to murder the candidates for the consulship, and the prospect that it would be impossible to keep C. Antonius, uncle of the triumvir, who was probably an accomplice of Catiline, from the consulship, induced the optimates to declare for Cicero, who was thus unanimously elected consul for the year 689, according to Cato.

LECTURE XCII.

M. TULLIUS CICERO was born on the third of January, 647, or, according to Varro, 649[1], at Arpinum, the native place of Marius. Arpinum was a municipium of great extent, considering that it was a provincial town in the interior of the country, and was one of the so-called Cyclopian towns. At present it is a very small place. We can easily conceive that all the citizens of Arpinum were proud of Marius; and Cicero, who shared this general feeling, had an additional motive for it, as there existed a sort of relationship between the two families. M. Marius Gratidianus was one of his kinsmen.[2] The Ciceros were among the most distinguished families of the place, and during the petty disputes at Arpinum, his grandfather, a man of considerable merit, always sided with the optimates.[3] Cicero's father, as well as his grandfather, were intimate with the first families of Rome, and especially with those who were opposed to Marius in their political sentiments. Cicero was thus brought in contact with the Scaevolas and others who belonged to the party of Sulla: a circumstance which retained its influence upon him throughout his life, and produced a kind of discord in his character.

As regards his early youth, we only know that he shewed great mental activity, and was of a lively character. His first

[1] This date is so much the easier to remember, as it reminds us of the year in which Goethe was born (1749).—N.

[2] Asconius, *ad Ciceron. in toga cand.* p. 84, ed Orelli; Cicero, *Brutus*, 45.

[3] Cicero, *De Legib.* ii. 16.

inclinations were of a poetical nature, and his earliest poetical productions were composed in the old Roman form. The poem "Pontius Glaucus," in *versibus longis*, was written when Cicero was a mere boy. In poetry he adhered throughout his life to the ancient Roman forms, while in his prose he was entirely the child of his own age. We can hardly form a notion of the nature of the education which such a distinguished Roman received in a municipium; we can only say that the Greek language and literature were among the earliest subjects in which he was instructed, as in my youth a knowledge of French was the first thing that was imparted to the boys in Germany. A short time before the outbreak of the Italian war, Cicero, then about fourteen or fifteen years old, was taken to Rome by his father, perhaps because Arpinum, which lay on the frontier of the Italicans was not thought safe enough. Here he associated with Greek philosophers and rhetoricians, and throughout his life he considered it as his greatest happiness to have been introduced, at so early a period, to the two Scaevolas, by whom he was treated like one of their family, and to have been connected with Crassus and others. That time was one of great excitement, and this was one of the fortunate circumstances of his life. It is very doubtful (for Cicero nowhere mentions it) whether he was with Sulla during the Italian war[4]; it can, at any rate, have been only for a short time, and had no lasting influence upon him; he was naturally in fact not a military character. In his intercourse with the great Scaevola, he occupied himself with the study of the civil law. This method of studying the law, as an apprentice, under a man distinguished in his profession, resembles the method which was formerly followed in France, and which is still customary in England. It afforded immense advantages to young men of talent, as they became acquainted with the law *in concreto*. They assembled early in the morning in the *atrium*, and listened to the advice which was given to those who came to consult the lawyer. This mode of education is the best in all cases where it is practicable. Although it is a very just remark that Cicero had no scientific knowledge of the law, still it was not without an important meaning, that he said, "If I wished to acquire a scientific knowledge of the law, it would not take me more than two months." He may

[4] Plutarch, *Cicero*, 3.

not have had a systematic and general view of the law, but he had a good practical knowledge of it, and knew an immense number of cases.

As I am relating to you the history of the greatest man of his kind, I am anxious to make the causes of the embarrassments which he met with during his life as clear as possible. If we consider his attachment to his friends among the optimates, and, on the other hand, the favour he bestowed upon their opponent, P. Sulpicius, we cannot deny that he was in contradiction with himself; but he followed truth in every way, and here we recognise the discord of his mind. Sulpicius was the man of his choice, and of a more congenial mind and talents than those old gentlemen, who were men of very great respectability indeed but narrow-minded. Sulpicius moreover belonged to the party of Marius; and that Cicero too was favourably disposed towards Marius is clear from the fact that Cicero, when a young man, wrote a poem in his praise.

When the revolutions broke out, Cicero remained at Rome, and during the strife of the parties he was protected by that of Marius, while the partizans of Sulla were not against him, for he was true and favourable to both. In the meantime he continued to work, though his heart was torn, and seeing the wrongs on both sides, he maintained himself in a kind of neutrality. In the second consulship of Sulla, Cicero attained his twenty-seventh year. He had already spoken in public several times, *in causis privatis*; his first speeches indeed belong to an unusually early period of his life.[5] His defence of Roscius of Ameria, whom Chrysogonus, a freedman of Sulla, wanted to get rid of, excited still greater admiration of his talents, together with the highest esteem for his own personal character. It was an act of true heroism for a young man like Cicero, not to fear that dangerous favourite of Sulla, and still more so if we consider his family-connexion with Marius. Cicero saved his client, but his friends advised him to quit Rome, that Chrysogonus might forget him. He accordingly went to Rhodes and Asia, where, in the midst of Greeks, he

[5] The speech for Roscius, the comedian, is the earliest of his orations. Garatoni and Gronovius have proved that it must have been spoken several years previously to the oration for Quinctius, in the year 677. The latter caused a great sensation, on account of the boldness with which he protected the persecuted Quinctius.—N.

completed his Greek education. Cicero was deficient in mathematical knowledge; for he never received any instruction on that subject, which the Greeks themselves rarely neglected. Another point in which he was deficient was the history of his own country, a subject of which he never made a regular study. It had no attractions for him; but he had an extraordinary partiality for the historians of Greece, especially Herodotus and Thucydides, and he was well read in Timaeus and Theopompus. He was fond of poetry, though only in a limited sense. The Attic orators were the objects of his enthusiastic admiration, for he felt that it was his vocation to become their rival. He possessed the greatest vivacity, an excellent memory, a quick perception, and remarkable facility of expression; all gifts which may make a great orator; but the predominant and most brilliant faculty of his mind was his wit. In what the French call *esprit*, light, unexpected, and inexhaustible wit, he is not excelled by any among the ancients.

If we look at his personal relations, he seems to have passed his youth without any intimate friend, and it was only in his maturer age that a pure and true friendship was formed between him and Atticus. His brother Quintus, for whom he had a great brotherly affection, was an unworthy man, and in no way to be compared with him. In his marriage, Cicero was not happy; his wife Terentia, whom he had been induced by his friends to marry, was a domineering and disagreeable woman; and as, owing to his great sensibility, he allowed himself to be influenced very much by those who surrounded him, his wife also exercised great power over him, which is the more remarkable, because he had no real love for her. She unfortunately led him to do things which drew upon him the enmity of others; and I believe that the implacable hatred which Clodius entertained towards Cicero was brought upon him by Terentia. The men of a more advanced age looked upon him as a very distinguished person, but none of them ever felt a true affection for him.

On his return from Asia, the Sullanian oppression had ceased; Sulla himself was dead, the commotion of Lepidus was over, and a reaction against the tyranny of the oligarchs was beginning. Such a reaction in its origin is always like something peculiarly youthful and conciliating, people of the most different parties joining one another and acting together as friends. I

have seen this state of things in France, where it lasted from 1795 to 1797: the persons by whom it was headed were of the most different characters and inclinations, but they were united among themselves, animated by a good spirit, and with good intentions. During the reaction against the tyranny of the French in Germany, down to the year 1813, I often felt convinced that many persons, who were then closely united, would give up all connexion with one another, if the reaction should cease. The event proved that I was right, for of ten who were then united, not two have kept together. The same was the case after the reactions against Robespierre and Sulla had ceased. Among all classes at Rome, the general opinion was against Sulla, although his party still had the power in their hands. This accounts for the manner in which they lost it; for they themselves, as they grew tired, gave up their advantages one after another; just as the National Convention did, after the death of Robespierre; and the consequence was, that the people at Rome began to feel more safe and comfortable than they had any reason for, considering the circumstances of the time. The danger from without, in consequence of the efforts of Spartacus, was still so great that they ought to have kept together.

Although it very rarely happened that a *novus homo* succeeded in raising himself to the highest offices of the state, Cicero, who had not distinguished himself in war, resolved upon obtaining them. All the offices for which he had offered himself as a candidate had been given to him with the greatest willingness on the part of the people, and he discharged his duties in a manner which distinguished him from all his contemporaries. He acted upon the principles of a man of honour —and such he was in the highest degree—not like others, for the sake of obtaining fame, or with the intention that it should become known that he had made sacrifices. His pure mind was above all baseness, and it was only the consequence of his noble ambition that he wished to shew himself in the most brilliant light. The feeling that he *must* distinguish himself, and his success, were among the sources of that boasting, with which he has been reproached so often, and from which he would assuredly have been quite free if he had lived in other circumstances. He obtained great reputation by his accusation of Verres, but still more by his defences; for while the other

eloquent men of his time mostly indulged in their inclination to accuse, Cicero defended. If we consider the persons whose causes he pleaded, it certainly appears strange that he spoke for men in whose favour I, for one, should not be able to say a single word, and for actions which he himself detested; but, in many cases, this was the effect of his amiable disposition.[6] As an instance, I will mention his defence of M. Aemilius Scaurus, the son, in which he made an apostrophe to the father, the deep hypocrite, who in his later years indeed was really the worthy man of whom he had before only assumed the appearance. Cicero greatly admired him; for in his early youth he had been kindly received by him, and it may perhaps have been extremely flattering to Cicero to have attracted Scaurus' attention. I cannot understand this admiration, and no one can share it who knows Scaurus only from the facts which history has transmitted to us. But Scaurus was a *grand seigneur* and had been censor and *princeps senatus*, the first man of the republic. His personal acquaintance with such a great personage had made an indelible impression upon Cicero, the pleasing remembrance of which diffused a lustre around the whole history of the man. I have myself experienced a similar impression in my youth, and with similar consequences. I confess that a great statesman, in whose house, as a young man, I was received almost as in my own home, appears to me in a different light from what he would do, if I had not known him personally. I believe, therefore, that when the son of Scaurus was charged with criminal acts, it was merely by his feelings towards the father that Cicero was induced to try to spare him the pain of seeing his son condemned. Cicero also defended P. Vatinius, although he had, on a former occasion, spoken against him with the utmost bitterness. But Cicero had forgiven him; and we must suppose that he pitied him, and that his first speech had been too vehement and passionate. He knew that Vatinius was generally hated, though he was not bad in the same degree in which he was hated, as we see from his letters, which, curious as they are, shew his gratitude towards his patron. His accusers, moreover, were contemptible persons. But independently of all this, the consciousness of his power to protect and assist was so agreeable and pleasant a feeling to him, that Cicero sometimes exercised that power

[6] The German expression is *Seine schöne Seele*, for which it is difficult to find an equivalent in English.

in cases where ordinary men would have shrunk from it. He himself said, *deorum est mortalem juvare*. His only act for which I can find no excuse, is that he spoke for A. Gabinius; but this was a sacrifice which he made to the republic, and by which he hoped to win Pompey over to the good cause, and he no doubt felt the degrading necessity very keenly. It is to be lamented that he lived at a time when it was necessary to be friendly towards villains, in order to do good. It is a great pity that his defence of Gabinius is lost; it was of the same kind as his speech for C. Rabirius Postumus, who was certainly not innocent, and we may therefore conjecture its tone and character. He assuredly did not assert that Gabinius was innocent; but after all, we must remember that those courts were not juries, whose object is simply to discover whether a person is guilty or not, and over which there is a higher power which may step in, either pardoning or mitigating the sentence. In those *quaestiones perpetuae* the judges had stept into the place of the people, who formerly judged in the popular courts, and they pronounced their sentence in the capacity of sovereign: they decided whether a person was guilty or not, and might at the same time pardon. The people more frequently pardoned than they acquitted, so that pardoning and acquitting came to be regarded as identical; and as there was no other place in which the pardoning power could manifest itself, it was exercised in the courts of justice. Such a pardoning power must exist in every state; for it is but too often true that *ubi summum jus, ibi summa injuria*. This is the point of view from which we have to consider the courts of justice and the pleaders for the accused at that time. When the great Kant, in his criticism of the power of judgment, depreciates eloquence, and the vocation of an advocate, he does it in a work which is itself written so eloquently, that he is, in some measure, in contradiction with himself. Eloquence in our courts of justice is certainly an evil, for in our whole administration of justice the object is simply to discover whether the defendant is guilty or not; and every thing which might mislead the jury ought to be avoided. If, on the other hand, there existed a body of men to place the sentence before the sovereign for ratification, or for the purpose of investigating whether pardon could be granted, there an eloquent orator would be in his proper sphere. I have been more minute on

this subject than I should have been, had it not been my earnest wish to prevent your forming any erroneous opinions respecting the character of Cicero.

After having gone through the offices of quaestor, aedile, and praetor, Cicero was unanimously elected consul in his forty-third year. I will not deny that, at the end of his consulship he felt rather giddy; but he entered upon it with great joy and confidence, though under very perilous circumstances. The tribunes abused their recently recovered power, and all kinds of movements were going on, such as the lex agraria of P. Servilius Rullus, on which occasion Cicero induced the people to decline great largesses, which it was proposed to make by a distribution of land[7]: one of the most brilliant achievements of eloquence. Another noble act was, that he persuaded the sons of the proscribed, many of whom belonged to the first families, and all of whom had been reduced to poverty, to renounce their claims, for the sake of maintaining peace and concord, although they had received promises that they should be restored to their rights by a motion of the tribunes. At the beginning of his consulship his attention was directed towards Catiline. An attempt of the latter to murder Cicero was discovered, and frustrated by the consul himself. Respecting the watchful care with which Cicero observed the proceedings of the conspirators, and discovered their secrets, without being seen himself, I refer you to Sallust and to Cicero's speeches against Catiline. In the end, however, things went so far, that Cicero thought it necessary to attack Catiline in the senate. Thereupon Catiline left Rome, which many thought to be a great advantage gained, and went to Etruria, where one of his followers had gathered some thousands of armed men, consisting of exiles, Etruscans, impoverished colonists, and desperadoes of every kind. The greatest danger, however arose from the fact, that Catiline's most influential accomplices were still at Rome; among them was the praetor Lentulus, who had already been consul; but having been convicted of *ambitus*, his name had been struck out from the list of the senators; afterwards he passed through the lower offices, in order to find his way back into the senate. Cicero knew him to be an accomplice. With regard to others, such as Crassus, it was very probable, that they were concerned in the

[7] Cicero, *in Pison.* 2.

conspiracy, though there was no positive evidence. Caesar too was mentioned, but Cicero thought him innocent; and I am perfectly convinced that it was impossible for a mind like his to participate in such things. In order to get to the bottom of the affair, and to obtain such evidence as might make the crime, according to the Roman law, a *delictum manifestum*, Cicero made use of a stratagem. He availed himself of the presence of some ambassadors from the Allobrogians, who had been Roman citizens ever since Pompey's return from the war against Sertorius, and whose delegates were now at Rome, in order to negotiate a loan and improve their condition. These ambassadors had been drawn into the conspiracy by Catiline, and were acquainted with the whole plan. Cicero prevailed upon them to disclose to him the proposals which had been made to them by the Catilinarians, to obtain letters from the conspirators and then to deliver them up to him; but for the sake of appearances, he ordered the praetors, L. Valerius Flaccus and C. Pomptinus, to arrest them. Those letters were found among their papers, and the evidence was complete. The punishment to be inflicted on the conspirators was discussed in the senate. There is no question that, according to the Roman law, the conspirators were punishable with death, and the only thing required to make their execution legal was to prove the identity of their signatures. The proposal of D. Junius Silanus therefore was quite just. Caesar, on the other hand, considered this step highly dangerous, and as calculated to excite great exasperation, because it would be necessary to have recourse to the wholesale executions of former times; he therefore advised that the conspirators should be distributed in several towns, and kept in strict custody for life. This would, perhaps, have been the wisest plan, and does not by any means prove that Caesar was a member of the conspiracy. If in after-times, Cicero did ever ask himself the question, whether his mode of proceeding against the conspirators was really the wisest, and best for the republic, he cannot have denied to himself that, independently of the unfortunate consequences to his own person, it would have been better if Cato, honourable as he was, had not spoken, and that the execution of the conspirators was a misfortune for the republic.

LECTURE XCIII.

THE reader of Cicero's works will remember that he frequently mentions the day of the complete dissolution of the conspiracy, and will be surprised at the manner in which he speaks of it in the oration for P. Sextius[1], where he asks what would have been the consequence, if the conspiracy had been discovered later, and if Catiline had had time during the winter to throw himself into the mountains. This is strange; for every one knows that Cicero describes the *nonae illae Decembres*, as the day of his triumph; and surely the winter in Etruria has commenced in December. But this arises from the irregularities in the calendar. Caesar once went into winter quarters in February. The events followed one another very rapidly; which we cannot wonder at, for the most important occurrences may happen in the course of a few weeks.

Catiline had joined C. Manlius in Etruria. Cicero had taken the most excellent precautions. Q. Metellus Celer, who was with an army in Picenum, in the neighbourhood of Rimini, marched towards the northern foot of the Apennines, to seize the passes of Faesulae, by which Catiline intended to hasten to Gaul. Cicero, with wonderful skill, kept Antonius, who likewise commanded an army, away from the conspirators, and paralysed him, by giving up to him various advantages which he might have claimed for himself, such as the presidency at the elections, and the like; and as Antonius was ill, the command against Catiline was undertaken by his lieutenant M. Petreius. As Metellus had occupied the road from Etruria to Gaul, Catiline was compelled to accept a battle. He fell as he had lived, an able soldier: his men fought like lions, and died like the soldiers of Spartacus.

Thus ended the consulship of Cicero. The gratitude of his country, which he had so truly deserved, instead of being lasting, was only momentary, and was followed by hostility and malice. The contemplation of such a state of things is one of the saddest in human life. It is natural that an eminent man should demand acknowledgment: for as truly as it is the will of nature that we should not lie, so also it is her will that

[1] c. 5.

we should honour noble acts and acknowledge them. Plato says, "the last garment which a pure man puts off is the love of fame," and if he does put it off, he is in a dangerous way. I have once said in my public life, that I consider too slight a love of fame, that is of true and immortal fame, as one of the greatest dangers in our lives: but where that love does exist, I apprehend nothing. When I contemplate the disease of our time, I perceive with pain, that there are very few who strive after immortal fame: that wretched and unsatisfactory life which is confined to the present moment, leads to no good. The poems of Count Platen, the first among our poetical geniuses, offend many readers by the frequent appearance of the poet's painful desire to be honoured and acknowledged. An actual saint, such as Vincent de Paula, would not experience any painful feeling at not being duly appreciated, but his is a different sphere. If an extraordinary mind can always be active, he will not be much concerned about being honoured or not honoured; if, however, it is his destiny not to command over bodies, but over minds, he will be much more easily wounded by the want of appreciation. Cicero was a man of a curious, we may almost say, of a morbid sensibility to any affront: envy and hostility were ruinous to him. It was a misfortune for him that he endeavoured to counteract the want of appreciation on the part of his fellow-citizens, by coming forward and shewing what he was, sometimes doing so by way of reproach, sometimes by argument. Persons who have themselves displayed their vanity in the pettiest affairs of their little native places have censured Cicero for his vanity, and have written upon it in a very edifying manner. It always grieves me to hear such expressions, which we meet with even among the ancients; for I love Cicero as if I had known him, and I judge of him as I would of a near relation who had committed a folly. On one occasion he felt much hurt by the indifference which Pompey shewed towards him. Cicero seems to have seen little of Pompey before he went to Asia; for Pompey was constantly absent from Rome, and Cicero was always at home. It can have been only during Pompey's first consulship that the two men came in close contact with each other; and the question is, how far their acquaintance had the character of a real friendship. Cicero was aedile elect in the year in which Pompey was consul. When Pompey had gained his

great victory over Mithridates, and was thinking of nothing and nobody but himself, Cicero sent to him in Asia an unfortunate letter[3] to inform him of his having saved his country from destruction, and to express his disappointment at Pompey's not having taken any notice of it in his letter. This letter to Pompey afterwards became the cause of infinite sorrow to Cicero. Pompey answered it in a very cold manner, and was mean enough to think himself insulted by Cicero, who had dared to mention his own merits by the side of those of the conqueror of Mithridates. Here we must also remember the aristocratic sentiments which Pompey liked to display towards a *novus homo* like Cicero, for his family was at that time at the head of the aristocracy, although his great grand-father had been a musician. They had amassed immense riches by robbery and plunder.

All party opinions had lost their significance; sons were found among the opponents of the party to which their fathers had belonged. Even at the end of his consulship Cicero was most impudently assailed by Metellus and Bestia, two men of very high plebeian nobility, who then acted the part of demagogues. It is very pleasing to read Cicero's oration for Murena, and to see the quiet inward satisfaction which made him happy for some time after his consulship. This speech has never yet been fully understood, especially by the jurists who have come forward as the champions of the great lawyer Ser. Sulpicius; no one has recognised in it the happy state of mind which Cicero enjoyed at the time. If a man has taken a part in the great events of the world, he looks upon things which are little as very little; and he cannot conceive that people, to whom their little is their All and their Everything, should feel offended at a natural expression of his sentiments. I have myself experienced this during the great commotions which I have witnessed. Thus it has happened that the sentiments expressed in the speech for Murena have for centuries been looked upon as trifling, and even at the present day they are not understood. The stoic philosophy, and the jurisprudence, of which Cicero speaks so highly on other occasions, are here treated of as ridiculous; but all this is only the innocent expression of his cheerful state of mind.

In his youth Cicero had been without friends, and afterwards

[2] *Ad Famil.* v. 7.

he attached himself chiefly to young men of talent, whom he raised and drew towards himself wherever he had an opportunity. Hortensius, who was exceedingly afraid of being eclipsed, pursued the very contrary plan towards rising young men. In this manner, Brutus and the very different Caelius Rufus became attached to Cicero, and Catullus too knew him, and was treated by him with affection. Cicero was not repulsive even to those young men who had gone astray from the path of virtue; and thus we find him exerting himself to the utmost to lead the talented Curio to adopt a better mode of life, though unfortunately without success.[3] Among the few interesting things which occur in the letters of M. Aurelius to Fronto, there is one passage in which the emperor intimates that the Roman language had no word for *φιλοστοργία*, that is, a tender love for one's friends and parents.[4] This feeling was not a Roman one, but Cicero possessed it in a degree which few Romans could comprehend; and hence he was laughed at as unmanly and effeminate for the grief which he felt at the death of his daughter Tullia.[5] But nevertheless he was not a man of weak character; whenever there was need of it, he shewed the greatest firmness and resolution. What makes him appear weak is his sensitive nature; a thing which he thought an indignity (*indignum*) completely annihilated him. When Milton makes God say to Adam

> A nice and subtle happiness, I see,
> Thou to thyself proposest,

he makes me think of that class of men to which Cicero belonged. I have known a man of a very similar character, Frederic Jacobi, who has likewise been charged with vanity, irascibility, and weakness. He often reminded me of Cicero, whose character has, in fact, become clear to me in my intercourse with Jacobi.

The root, indeed, of the Catilinarian conspiracy was destroyed, but many of its fibres yet remained, and soon began to shoot. Not long after Cicero's consulship, an event took place to which the misfortunes of the rest of his life were attributable. This was the trial of P. Clodius, the youngest of the three sons of Appius Claudius, and a direct descendant of Appius Claudius the decemvir. The eldest, who bore the family name, Appius,

[3] Cicero, *Brutus*, 81.
[4] *Frontonis Reliquiae*, p. 144, ed. Niebuhr.
[5] *Ad Famil.* iv. 5, ix. 11, *ad Atticum*, xii. 12, 18, 19, 26.

was a good-natured, but superstitious and little-minded person; as, however, he was wealthy, and belonged to a noble family, he obtained the highest honours in the republic. Clodius had also two sisters, one of whom was married to Lucullus. He thus belonged to the highest aristocracy of Rome; but this was no longer of any consequence: the question at that time was, not who was the noblest, but who possessed the greatest power. P. Clodius is an exemplification of that most fearful state of demoralisation, which was just then at its height; he was one of those who contributed most to the fall of Rome. At the festival of the Bona Dea, which, like the Thesmophoria, was celebrated by the vestals and matrons, he had sneaked, in the disguise of a woman, into the house of the pontifex maximus, to have a rendezvous there with Pompeia, the wife of J. Caesar. The crime was discovered, and Clodius was brought to trial. The whole proceeding shews that a change must have taken place; for, according to the ancient law, he ought to have been tried by the ecclesiastical court of the pontiffs; and would to God that this regulation had now been in force, for Clodius would unquestionably have been condemned, and Cicero would have been spared all his subsequent misfortunes. But the old law, and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the pontiffs, except in cases relating to the ceremonies, must have been abolished, though nobody knows when this was done. Clodius tried to prove an *alibi*, and had the impudence to call Cicero as his witness.[6] Up to this time, no hostility is said to have existed between the two men; and Clodius was so dangerous a person, that Cicero ought to have been satisfied with simply stating that he knew nothing about the matter; but he was led away, it is said, by the desire to justify himself to his domineering wife, and to prove to her that he was not a friend of the Claudian family. Accordingly, he not only bore witness against Clodius, but gave free expression to his indignation, and said things which would necessarily have brought about the condemnation of Clodius, had he not purchased his acquittal.[7] Things were then in such a frightful condition, that the defendant had to deposit his bribe before the trial began.

Clodius could never forget the conduct of Cicero on that day,

[6] Cicero, *ad Atticum*, i. 14.

[7] Cicero, *ad Atticum*, i. 16, 18; Plutarch, *Cicero*, 29, *Caesar*, 10, and especially Cicero, *In Clodium et Curionem.*

and meditated revenge. Pompey, too, on his return to Rome, shewed the same conduct towards Cicero as before. He treated him with worse than indifference; he insulted him, and encouraged Clodius to undertake something against him. Clodius now caused himself to be adopted into a plebeian family for the sake of appearances, in order to obtain the tribuneship.[8] Disgraceful things were then going on at Rome, and Clodius had a hand in all of them. I shall mention only one. Ptolemy Auletes, who had been expelled from Alexandria on account of his vices, came to Rome, and bargained with the rulers about the price of his restoration. The people of Alexandria sent an embassy to Rome to justify themselves, and to prove the shameful conduct of their late king: but he, with the connivance of the Romans, caused the most distinguished among the ambassadors to be assassinated.[9]

The tribuneship of Clodius falls in the year after Caesar's consulship (A.U. 693) and four years after that of Cicero. It may be considered as the beginning of the civil wars. Pompey and M. Crassus had hitherto been the most powerful men in the republic, and Caesar had not yet exercised any great influence, though his favour with the people was immense. It is greatly to be regretted that we know so little about his family.[10] The Julia gens which had come from Alba to Rome, was one of the most ancient gentes minores. During the first period of the republic, members of it were often invested with curule

[8] Such *transitiones ad plebem* were not unfrequent in early times, when it was not even necessary to be adopted into a plebeian family, for a man might go completely over to the plebeians by the mere act of his own will. He became an aerarian, and was registered by the censor in a tribe. But this custom had long fallen into disuse, and persons knew little or nothing about it; hence Cicero disputed the legality of Clodius' tribuneship, but there was no real ground for doing so.—N.

[9] Cicero, *pro Caelio*, 10. Compare the fragments of Cicero's oration, "De rege Alexandrino."

[10] It is a singular circumstance that his two biographies by Suetonius and Plutarch are both ἀκέφαλοι. With regard to Suetonius the fact is well known, but it is only since the year 1812 (Lydus, *De Magistr.* ii. 6) that we know that the part which is wanting also contained a dedication to the praefectus praetorio of the time, a fact which has not yet found its way into any history of Roman literature. That Plutarch's life of Caesar is likewise ἀκέφαλος has, as far as I am aware, not yet been noticed. The fact is not mentioned any where; but there can be no doubt that the beginning is wanting. Plutarch could not have passed over Caesar's ancestors, father, and whole family, together with the history of his youth. The life, as it now stands, opens with the demand of Sulla relative to Caesar's second wife Cornelia; but this is no beginning at all.—N.

offices; but from the fourth to the seventh century it entirely disappears, and it is only about the end of that period that it comes forth from its obscurity. The patrician rank had then so little meaning that, with the exception of Sulla and a few others the patricians sided with the popular party. Such also was the case with the Julii. Julia, the sister of Caesar's father, was married to the elder Marius; and Caesar therefore was attached to his uncle Marius and his recollections, from his early youth, just as Plato was attached to his mother's uncle. He himself was married to Cornelia, the daughter of Cinna, and Sulla wished to dissolve this marriage; but Caesar, young as he was, shewed his noble soul, for where all trembled, he refused to bend, and resisted. They might take her from him by force, and might threaten his life, but he would not consent to divorce the wife he loved. Her dowry however was taken away, because the property of her father was confiscated. Caesar was not on the proscription list of Sulla, but was obliged to conceal himself, for he was persecuted, with the knowledge of the dictator, by his catchpolls, the Cornelii, and was reduced to the necessity of purchasing his own life. Caesar, according to the custom of the young nobles, had married very early, and was still very young at the time of Sulla's tyranny: but there was something so extraordinary in his character, that even some of the savage agents of Sulla could not bear the thought that so distinguished a young man should be sacrificed; and Sulla was at last induced, though not without great difficulty, to stop the persecution against him. Caesar now returned to Rome. Had Cicero been as thoughtful as Cæsar, he would have been a happier man, for Caesar possessed the greatest boldness and resolution, combined with an incredible degree of prudence and cunning; so long therefore as Sulla lived, Caesar spent his time in the active pursuit of study, like an ordinary man of good education; and he, who was afterwards the greatest general of his age, shewed no trace of military ambition, and received no military training. When he went to Spain as quaestor he, for the first time, commanded a detachment of troops, and became a great general at once, just like Moreau who served in his first campaign as commander of a division. Frederic the Great too never went through any military training. After his quaestorship, Caesar obtained the aedileship, in which he distinguished himself by his extraordinary munificence and splendour, although he was by no means rich. He was unconcerned about money matters, reckoning upon great things that were to come; and whoever lent him money had in Caesar's heart a security that he would be repaid tenfold, if Caesar should come into power.

It was during his aedileship that he attracted general attention, by placing himself at the head of the remnants of the Marian party, for the party of Sulla was already sinking in public opinion. In this spirit he had honoured his aunt Julia, the wife of Marius, with a splendid funeral oration, the first that was ever delivered upon a woman. It was an unworthy act of the victorious party that it had destroyed all the monumental honours of Marius, and had removed his statues and monuments; but Caesar one night secretly caused the statue of Marius to be restored in the Capitol, together with a statue of Minerva putting a crown on the head of Marius, and an inscription recording all his titles. This created such a terror at Rome, that the aged Catulus, in his folly, wished the senate to interfere and accuse Caesar; but public opinion was in favour of the latter. After his aedileship, Caesar became praetor, and four years after Cicero's consulship, he was elected consul, A. U. 693.

There are many isolated facts in ancient history, to which attention is not usually paid, although to an attentive observer they are of the highest interest. One such is the account—whether it is true or not I cannot decide—that when Cicero as a young man went to Rhodes to complete his education, and consulted the oracle of Delphi about his life, the Pythia advised him to live for himself, and not to take the opinions of others as his guide.[11] If this is an invention, it was certainly made by one who saw very deeply, and perceived the real cause of all Cicero's sufferings. If the Pythia did give such an answer, then this is one of the oracles which might tempt us to believe in an actual inspiration of the priestess.

[11] Plutarch, *Cicero*, 5.

LECTURE XCIV.

AMONG the features which are particularly characteristic in Caesar, I must mention his great openness, lively disposition, and love of friendship. He was cordial, but not tender, like Cicero: he also differed from him in his natural desire to have many friends. Great qualities and talents alone were sufficient to attract him, and this circumstance led him to form friendships with persons whose characters were diametrically opposed to his, and who injured his reputation. He was perfectly free from the jealousy and envy of Pompey, but he could not tolerate an assumed superiority which was not based upon real merit. Bad as Lucan's poems are, the words in which he describes this feature in Caesar's character are truly great.[1] Pompey could not bear to see Caesar standing beside him, and Caesar could not endure the pretension of Pompey to stand above him, for he knew how infinitely inferior he was. His talents were of the most varied kind: he possessed an unparalleled facility and energy in the exercise of all his faculties; his extraordinary memory is well known. He had great presence of mind, and faith in himself and his fortune; this gave him an undoubting confidence that he would succeed in every thing. Hence most of the things he did bear no impress of labour or study. His eloquence, for instance, and his whole style are not those of any school; every thing was with him the mere exercise and development of his innate powers. He was, moreover, a man of uncommon acuteness and observation, and of great scientific acquirements; all his knowledge was obtained at a time when it had a real interest for him, and engaged all the great powers of his mind. As a prose writer, Caesar stands forth as the greatest master in Roman literature in the γένος ἀφελές; and what Cicero says of him in his Brutus[2] is true and altogether excellent. His style (*sermoni propior*) is that of the conversation of a highly educated and accomplished man, who speaks with incomparable gracefulness and simplicity. His speeches must have been of the most perfect kind. Posterity has been more just towards his talents than his

[1] *Pharsal.* i. 125: *nec quemquam jam ferre potest Caesarve priorem, Pompeiusve parem.*

[2] c. 71, foll.

contemporaries: Tacitus had a thorough appreciation of him.[3] It is no slight honour to grammar that Caesar took a great interest in it. If we had his work on "Analogy," we should probably find that it surpassed the productions of the grammarians, as much as his history surpasses all similar works recording the exploits of their authors. I have already remarked that his military genius burst forth at once, and without previous training. Caesar was one of those healthy and strong characters who have a clear perception of their objects in life, and devise for themselves the means of obtaining them. Far from being an intriguer, like most men of his time, he was the most open-hearted being in existence. In his connexions with others he knew nothing of intrigues; and this led him to overlook many things which he would not otherwise have failed to observe. Many of his acts of violence were only the consequences of previous carelessness, openness, and confidence in others. His humanity, mildness, and kindness of heart were manifested after his victory in a manner which no one had anticipated; and these qualities were realities with him: they were not artificially assumed, as they were by Augustus, who was a mere actor throughout his life. Had Caesar been born on the throne, or had he lived at a time when the republic was not yet in so complete a state of dissolution, and could have been carried on—for instance, in the time of Scipio—he would have attained the object of his life with the greatest éclat. Had he lived in a republican age, he would never have thought of setting himself above the law; but he belonged to a period when, as the poet says, he had no choice between being either the anvil or the hammer; and he had of course no difficulty in making his choice. It was not Caesar's nature, as it was Cicero's, to go with the wind; he felt that he must master events, and could not avoid placing himself where he stood: the tide of events carried him thither irresistibly. Cato might still dream of the possibility of reviving the republic by means of the *faex plebis*, and of carrying it on as in the days of Curius and Fabricius: but the time for that was gone by.

With regard to Caesar's military career, it cannot be denied that he acted unconscientiously. His Gallic wars are, for the most part truly criminal: his conduct towards the Usipetes and Tenchteri was horrible; and that towards Vercingetorix

[3] See his *Annales*, xiii. 3, *Germania*, 28.

deplorable, the consequence of an unhappy ambition. These and similar acts are to be lamented, and are altogether unjustifiable, though they may be accounted for by the views then entertained in respect to the Gauls; but towards his fellow-citizens he was never guilty of such conduct. The ruling party acted towards him not only foolishly, but very unjustly. They ought not to have opposed his suing for the consulship from Gaul; and if he had obtained it peaceably, it would not only have been better than Pompey's second and third consulships, but would probably have been tranquil and beneficial to the state. If there was any means of remedying the condition of the republic—which, in my opinion, was almost impossible—Caesar was the only man capable of devising and applying it. His mildness towards many, and especially his generous conduct towards Cicero, who had greatly provoked him, shew a very different spirit from that of Pompey, whose vanity was hurt by the merest trifles. Cicero had every where joined Caesar's enemies; but Caesar would nevertheless have been glad to take Cicero with him to Gaul, in order to protect him.

But notwithstanding the benevolence and amiableness which he shewed on all occasions, Caesar was a demoniac, who went on in life with a passionate rapidity. His extravagance, for example, in his aedileship, not for himself, but for the people, was immense; and this made him dependent upon others, especially upon Crassus, who advanced him enormous sums. If, during his consulship, there had been a party desirous of making themselves independent of Pompey's influence, and of honestly attaching themselves to Caesar, his consulship would not have been marked with any stain. It was then customary to give the consulship *in rebus urbanis*, and the office was thus to Caesar a loss of time, for his object was to get a province, which, according to the custom of the time, he could not enter upon till after the expiration of his year of office. In that year, Q. Vatinius, who was tribune of the people, caused, with a violation of the law then not uncommon, the whole of Illyricum and Cisalpine Gaul to be given to Caesar as his province for five years; afterwards Transalpine Gaul, which was not yet a Roman province, was added to it.[3] This was the first instance of a province being

[3] Scholia Bobiens. *in Vatin*, p. 317, ed. Orelli; Sueton. *Caesar*, 22; Dion Cassius, xxxviii. 8: Appian, *de Bell. Civil*, ii. 13.

assigned to a proconsul for a definite period longer than one year; for Pompey had hitherto always had his provinces for an indefinite time.

In his consulship, Caesar carried several popular laws, and founded a colony at Capua.[4] It is difficult to conceive how Capua, ever since its conquest in the second Punic war, could have remained in that singular condition, in which the land and the buildings upon it were the property of the Roman republic. The houses may have been let; but the land was cultivated by hereditary occupants, on condition of their paying the tithes of its produce. The republic, however, always retained the right to take the land back, and to make such new arrangements as were thought useful or necessary. Two attempts had already been made to change this state of things. The first was a proposal of M. Brutus, in Cinna's consulship; the second was made by Servilius Rullus, who in Cicero's consulship, had proposed that the *ager Campanus* should be divided among the Roman citizens; but Cicero had opposed this scheme of establishing a colony. When Caesar brought forward his bill concerning the colony at Capua, Cicero declined being appointed one of the commissioners who were sent to superintend the establishment of the colony.[5] Caesar took this as a great personal insult; and the two men thus became, for a time, alienated from each other. But the enmity would soon have passed over, had Cicero been willing to accompany Caesar to Gaul. Cicero's brother, Quintus, who did go with Caesar, was always treated by him with especial favour. Caesar afterwards again endeavoured, on all occasions, to give Cicero proofs of his attachment and devotion to him. But Cicero was kept at Rome by his evil star. Caesar's colleague in the consulship, M. Calpurnius Bibulus, was an honest man, but narrow-minded and obstinate; and Caesar's relation to him was exceedingly unpleasant.

The year following was that of the unfortunate consulship of L. Calpurnius Piso and A. Gabinius, two men whom we may truly call ἀλιτήριοι, or sinful, and what Cicero says of them is no declamatory exaggeration. They literally sold Cicero to Clodius, who promised to secure to Piso the province of Macedonia; and to Gabinius the rich province of Syria, with

[4] Vell. Paterc. ii. 44; Sueton. *Caesar*, 20; Appian, *l. c.*; ii. 10; Cicero, *ad Atticum*, ii. 16.

[5] Cicero, *ad Atticum*, ii. 19.

the prospect of restoring Ptolemy Auletes to his throne. The consuls accordingly assisted Clodius in his detestable rogations which were directed against Cicero. Clodius then accused Cicero of having put to death Roman citizens without a trial.[6] I have already stated that the case of Catiline and his associates was a *manifestum delictum*, that according to the old criminal law no further trial was necessary, and that Cicero was undoubtedly justified in putting them to death. But the *leges Porciae*, of which there were three[7], the last of which had probably been enacted by L. Porcius in the social war, had, it may be, introduced a modification, according to which a Roman citizen could not be put to death in all places. In former times a person might evade the sentence of a popular court by withdrawing to a municipium; but since the Italicans had obtained the franchise, a change in this respect had become necessary, and in Cicero's time we actually find that it was the current opinion, that a true citizen could not legally suffer the penalty of death. It was, therefore, according to the Porcian law, either altogether illegal to put a citizen to death, or it was commanded that, if absolutely necessary, he should be executed on the spot. Hence, it might have been urged against Cicero, *quod civem Romanum necasset*, but there would have been no reason for adding *indemnatum;* for the crime was a *manifestum delictum*. However, whether justly or unjustly, Clodius brought forward the accusation.

Every body withdrew from Cicero. Pompey went into the country, and kept aloof from all Cicero's friends. Caesar was absent in Gaul; and M. Crassus bore a deep grudge against Cicero: he was implacable, because he had been mentioned in connexion with the Catilinarian conspiracy[8]; and it was a general opinion, not without foundation, that Crassus had been an accomplice. Cicero himself had not been guilty of any malice; for he had only repeated the evidence of the witnesses, who stated what was true. It is one of the beautiful features of Cicero's great soul, that he loved P. Crassus, the son of his enemy, without any regard to circumstances; he heartily wished young Crassus to rise in the republic and become great. Cicero could not await the day of trial, for he would have been irrecoverably lost. The concilia no longer consisted of honest country people, but of the lowest rabble, who allowed themselves to be driven by their leader in whatever direction he pleased. Cicero was obliged to quit Rome, in order to save his life. The senators, bad as they were in other respects, shewed great sympathy for him, and encouraged one another. Cicero, however, was condemned; and Clodius followed up his victory, because he saw that the goverment had no power. He destroyed Cicero's houses and villas, and offered his property for sale, but no one would purchase. He then dedicated a chapel of Liberty on the Palatine, on the site of Cicero's house[9], which I have discovered; that is to say, I know the place within about fifty feet, where the house must have stood, and have often visited the spot. Clodius outlawed not only Cicero, but all those who should afford him any protection. Cicero at first wished to go to Sicily, but the praetor of that province, who had formerly been his friend, was too cowardly; he therefore went to Macedonia, and lived with the quaestor Plancius, who received and treated him like a brother. Clodius kept the promise he had made to the consuls: Gabinius obtained Syria, and Piso Macedonia.[10] Clodius himself robbed with the greatest impudence whatever he pleased. This lasted as long as he was in office.

The year after, public opinion turned so much in favour of Cicero, indignation was expressed so loudly, and so many petitions were sent in from all quarters, that he was formally recalled. His return was a triumph which comforted him for the moment. He felt happier than ever; but his happiness did not last long: misfortune had made a deep impression upon him. The speeches which he had delivered the year before his misfortune, especially that for L. Flaccus, who was a man of too different a turn of mind from his own to be his friend, but who had assisted him in suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy, are as interesting as that for Murena. In the latter, we see Cicero's quiet satisfaction and happiness, the result of what he had accomplished; whereas the former is pervaded by a suppressed

[6] Vell. Paterc. ii. 45; Livy, *Epit.* 103; Dion Cassius, xxxviii. 14; Plutarch, *Cicero*, 3, foll.

[7] Cicero, *De Re Publica*, ii. 31: *tres sunt trium Porciorum.* Compare Orelli, *Onomast. Tullianum*, iii. p. 251, foll.

[8] Asconius, *in Cic. in tog. cand.* p. 83, ed. Orelli. Compare Sallust, *Catil.* 17.

[9] Cicero, *ad Atticum*, iv. 2, *pro Domo*, 41, foll. In the reign of Claudius, the house was restored, but was again destroyed in the fire of Nero.—N.

[10] Cicero, *in Pison.* 16; Plutarch, *Cicero*, 30.

and deep grief, the consequence of his feeling that, after all, it had been of so little advantage to him to have saved his country, and that it had even endangered his life. His happiness was disturbed the very year after his return. The internal condition of Rome grew worse and worse. Pompey was now friendly towards Cicero, but only because he had fallen out with Clodius. Pompey and M.Crassus were anxious to obtain the consulship a second time. All the *viri boni* opposed this scheme by all means; but it was realised by violence, in the same manner as Saturninus and Glaucia had formerly gained their ends. L. Domitius, a brother-in-law of Cato, who was likewise a candidate, was intimidated by armed soldiers when he was going to attend the elections. His servant, who bore the torch before him, was cut down before his eyes, to intimate to him that he had to expect the same fate, if he persisted in his suit for the consulship.[11]

In this manner the two pillars of the optimates entered upon their second consulship, which is marked in history by many acts which no one can justify. The consuls caused provinces to be given to themselves for five years by a lex Trebonia[12]: Pompey obtained Spain, and Crassus Syria, with the command in the war against the Parthians. This unconstitutional act received its punishment afterwards, for Crassus fell in the war against the Parthians, and Pompey, too, laid the foundation of his own ruin. In order to conciliate Caesar, the administration of his provinces was likewise prolonged to him for five years more. It was a painful thing for Cicero to be obliged to speak in favour of this arrangement about the provinces, merely for the sake of maintaining peace; but experience had taught him to yield to necessity.

The state of anarchy and internal convulsions went on increasing at Rome; and things came at last, in the year 701, to such a point, that not only was it absolutely impossible to hold the elections (which had often happened before), but that Pompey was appointed sole consul, a thing which had never yet occurred. In this consulship, which was his third, Pompey carried several laws, especially one concerning *res judiciariae*,

[11] Dion Cassius, xxxix. 27, foll.; Plutarch, *Cato Min* 41. foll., *Pomp.* 52, *Crassus*, 15; Appian, *De Bell Civil.* ii. 17; Vell. Paterc. ii. 46.

[12] The gentes of the Italicans now begin to appear in the Fasti: Trebonius is a Lucanian name; Asinius Pollio, Munatius Plancus, and others, likewise came from Italian towns. — N.

the particulars of which, however, are but very imperfectly known, and I have never been able to form a clear notion of it; but this much is certain, that it greatly increased the number of equites, from among whom the jury were taken.[13] The mode of proceeding in the courts of justice was also modified by these laws, and the powers of the pleaders seem to have been increased.[14] His law *de ambitu* was ridiculous; for it was a notorious fact, that no man could obtain the consulship unless he purchased it; and it almost appears as if it had only been Pompey's intention to prevent a certain grossness or licentiousness in the commission of the crime.

It was shortly before the third consulship of Pompey, that Milo, the descendant of an ancient Sullanian[15] family, met Clodius, his mortal enemy, on the road leading from Rome to the modern Albano. Each was accompanied by a band of men to protect him, in case of an attack, just as our nobles used to travel in the 16th and 17th centuries. In a severe struggle which took place, Clodius was fatally wounded and died. This gave rise to a fearful tumult, and Milo was charged with having murdered him. Pompey, wishing to prevent Milo from obtaining the consulship, for which he was then a candidate, declared against him. Cicero undertook his defence; but the measures which had been taken by Pompey intimidated him to such a degree that, for the first time in his life, he lost his self-possession while pleading the cause of his client. Milo went to Marseilles into exile; he afterwards returned under Caesar; but having taken part in an insurrection against him, he was killed.[16]

In the following year, Cicero was compelled, though with great reluctance, to accept the proconsulship of Cilicia. This province was then in a highly dangerous position on account of the Parthians, who since the death of Crassus had been unrestrained, and threatened to overwhelm Cilicia. Cicero

[13] Asconius, *in Pison.* p. 16.

[14] Sallust, *De Re Publ. Ord.* II. 3. 7. 12. (?)

[15] This mysterious expression occurs in all the MS. notes, whence I am unwilling to suppress it. It is well known that Milo was a native of Lanuvium, and adopted into the family of the Annii, whereas he himself belonged to the Papia gens. It seems that the epithet Sullanian refers to his being married to Fausta, the daughter of the dictator Sulla.

[16] Caesar, *De Bello Civil.* III. 22; Vell. Paterc. II. 68; Dion Cassius, XLII. 25.

was disgusted at the idea of living in a half-Greek province, in a corner of Asia Minor, the nobles of which had but a short time before been the captains of pirates. The death of M. Crassus falls ten years after Cicero's consulship.

LECTURE XCV.

I HAVE to mention one curious fact about Caesar, namely, that not one witty saying of his is recorded; whereas a great many, which are no doubt genuine, and are at any rate very peculiar and excellent, are ascribed to Cicero.

Some time before the second consulship of Pompey, Caesar, Pompey and Crassus had held a congress at Lucca, at which each of them appeared accompanied by a mighty train of followers. Here they had concluded a peace, and determined on the fate of the republic. This fact at once discloses to us the condition of the state. In order to secure the maintenance of peace, Caesar had given his daughter Julia in marriage to Pompey; but, two years after the treaty of Lucca, she died in child-bed, and her child followed her soon after to the grave; an event which rent the tie between Pompey and Caesar completely asunder. Caesar's affection as a father was so great, that he would have brooked anything if his daughter had remained alive.

With regard to his campaigns in Gaul, I have only to refer you to his own commentaries on the Gallic war, with the supplement of A. Hirtius, a work which every scholar must have read. It is written with such conciseness and brevity, that if I attempted to abridge it, as I should be obliged to do if I were to give an account of those campaigns, nothing would be left but a miniature outline. I strongly advise you to read Caesar's account of his Gallic wars as often as you can, for the oftener you read it, the more will you recognise the hand of a great master.

Much yet remains to be done for the works of Caesar, and a critical edition is still a desideratum. Our materials are of very different value. Many of the manuscripts which contain

the *Bellum Gallicum* have already been collated, but a still greater number of them have not been consulted; and the collation of them is an undertaking which I can strongly recommend to young scholars, and which they will find of very great advantage. In Italy, and especially in the Vatican library and at Florence, the manuscripts of Caesar are very numerous, and mostly very old; many of them have never yet been collated. The English manuscripts have been consulted by Davis and others; but they are, on the whole, of much inferior value, and belong to a very recent time. The manuscripts of the *Bellum Civile* may be traced back to a single family of manuscripts; with extremely few exceptions they have all the same gaps, and a collation would yield but few results. The work *De Bello Civili* is also *ἀκέφαλος* in all MSS. The first sentences, as they now stand, were patched up in the middle ages to supply the deficiency, a fact which has been recognised by Davis and Oudendorp. I once proposed a prize essay upon the other historical works usually connected with those of Caesar, but the problem was not solved. I will briefly tell you my opinion about them. The last book of the commentaries on the Gallic war, and the book on the Alexandrine war, are, as is proved by their style and diction, the production of one and the same author, that is, of A. Hirtius. There is no ground whatever for ascribing them to Pansa. A. Hirtius was a highly educated man, and well able to execute such works. They belong to the most excellent compositions in the Latin language: they are in the highest degree classical; and the language, like that of Caesar, is such as was spoken by the best educated and most eminent men of the time. The book on the African war I assign, without hesitation, to C. Oppius; it is very instructive, and the author is an intelligent man, a good officer, and highly trustworthy; but the language is quite different from that of the work on the Alexandrine war: there is a certain mannerism about it, and it is on the whole less beautiful. C. Oppius was the companion of Caesar in all his wars, and one of his dearest friends. At the time when Caesar's power had reached its height, he and Oppius were travelling together, and arrived at a small farm house. Oppius was ill, and Caesar made him spend the night in the only room that was to be had in the house, while he himself slept outside in the open air.[1] This is a natural feature in his character, and

[1] Sueton. *Caesar.* 72.

quite free from affectation. The author of the book on the Spanish war is unknown: it is certainly the production of a person who did not belong at all to the educated classes; but it is, nevertheless, highly interesting on account of its language, which is nothing else than the common language of the Roman soldiers. It is an abridgment of a diary kept by some narrow-minded person during the war, and is altogether a remarkable and singular piece of composition.

When Caesar went to Gaul, its inhabitants were in great commotion. Languedoc and Provence, Dauphiné and Savoy, the country of the Allobrogians, were under the dominion of Rome. The Allobrogians called on Caesar to assist them against the Helvetians, whose emigration is one of the most remarkable phenomena in ancient history. A person of wealth and distinction persuaded the whole nation to abandon their native land, and endeavour to conquer a new country for themselves in Gaul, not with the view of tilling the new land in the sweat of their brows, but of making themselves its lords, and of compelling the conquered inhabitants to cultivate the soil for them. This must have been their intention, if we consider the state of dissolution in which Gaul was at the time. An additional motive may have been the fact, that they apprehended in their Alpine country an invasion of the Suevi, who had already begun to stir, and against whom they would have had to defend themselves under unfavourable circumstances, or to seek the protection of the Romans. But it is nevertheless strange that a whole nation—in an individual it would not be very surprising—could be induced to destroy their towns and villages, and to abandon their homes; and that afterwards, when their leader had perished, they still persisted in carrying out their plan. United with the Tigurini they marched towards southern Gaul. But I must be brief: how Caesar treated with the Helvetians—how he obstructed their march towards the Roman province—how he followed and defeated them in two battles, and compelled them to capitulate, after a fearful massacre, in which the Romans took vengeance on the Tigurini for their having joined the Cimbri, all this may be read in detail in the first book of his Commentaries on the Gallic war. The power of the Helvetians was broken, and the survivors were obliged to return—a frightful end of a fantastic undertaking! All that can be said to

account for their forming such a wild scheme, must be gathered from a careful examination of the condition of Gaul. The Gauls consisted of a great number of isolated nations; and as France is now the most united and most compact state in Europe, so ancient Gaul was the most distracted and broken up of all countries. We have to distinguish in Gaul the Aquitanians, who were Iberians, in Guienne; the Iberians mixed with Celts in Languedoc; Celts and Ligurians on the Rhone; Ligurians on the coast of Provence; and Celts or Gauls occupying the whole country from Languedoc to the north of France. I think, however, that Caesar's statement, that all the inhabitants from the Garonne in the south, to the Seine and Marne in the north, were Gauls, is incorrect, and believe that Cymri, or Belgae, inhabited Britany as early as that time: their emigration from Britain in the fifth century of our aera is certainly fabulous. The Cymri were in reality quite foreign and hostile to the Gael, or Celts. There is nothing surprising in the Gael having maintained themselves in Britany; for originally they occupied the whole country north of the Seine and Marne, but were afterwards torn asunder by the Celts, who pressed forward from the south to the north.

In former times, the Arverni had been the ruling people, and in possession of the supremacy in the remaining free parts of Gaul; the other nations were in a state of dependence on them, resembling the relation which at one time had existed between Sparta and the rest of Peloponnesus. Afterwards the Aedui rose by the side of the Arverni, just as in Greece Athens rose to dispute the supremacy with Sparta. As soon as the Romans began extending their dominion beyond the Alps, they had recourse to their usual policy of bringing about divisions in foreign countries, and encouraged the Aedui to share the supremacy with the Arverni. The Aedui had been on terms of friendship with the Romans in the year 631, when the Arverni and the Allobrogians carried on their unfortunate war against the Romans; and it must have been on that occasion that the Aedui were honoured with the title of friends and brothers of the Roman people. The Aedui then became great, for a time, at the cost of the Arverni; and when their power declined, that of the Sequani, the inhabitants of Franche Comté, rose, and this occasioned the invitation of the German tribe of the Suevi into Gaul.

The Arverni never recovered their former position. Gaul, as I have already remarked, was in a state of dissolution, and may have been exhausted by emigrations, although emigrations do not, in times of prosperity, exhaust a country, unless they be like that of the Helvetians; for even if we suppose that as many as two-thirds of the inhabitants of a country emigrate, the population will, if circumstances are not unfavourable, be restored to its original numbers, in a period of from seventy to eighty years.

The causes which then induced the German tribes to cross the Rhine are hidden in utter obscurity. They formerly inhabited a vast extent of country, which probably reached as far as the valleys of the Alps, before the Gauls occupied those districts. The passage of Livy[2], in which he states that the valleys of the Pennine Alps were inhabited by Germans, is a proof of this: they must have been overpowered by the Celts, for the Germans had not gone there as a conquering nation. Ariovistus had settled in the country of the Sequani, and his mode of acting was the same as that which we afterwards find always adopted by the Germans. He divided the land for cultivation between the old inhabitants and his own people, some of whom cultivated it themselves, while others employed the conquered to do it for them. The Aedui and Sequani now implored the protection of Caesar against him. Caesar entered upon the undertaking, although it was a very bold one, for the Suevi were held to be irresistible; but he did so just because it was a difficult matter. He took upon himself what he had legally no right to do as proconsul, for Ariovistus had been recognised by the Roman people as sovereign king in the year of Caesar's consulship. The soldiers of Caesar looked forward with great apprehension to the decisive moment, but they gained a complete victory in the neighbourhood of Besançon, in which most of the Suevi were killed; the survivors fled across the Rhine, whither Caesar was wise enough not to follow them.

Caesar now commanded seven legions, with as many auxiliary troops as he had been able to obtain from his allies[3], and he

[2] xxi. 38.

[3] *Socii* are now no longer mentioned in the Roman armies, but only *Auxilia*, and there is a great difference between the two. The *Socii* were now true Roman legionaries, and were armed in the Roman fashion; whereas the *Auxilia* formed cohorts, and the majority of them did not bear Roman arms, but had their own national weapons.—N.

had the administration, not only of all the countries north of the Alps, but of Cisalpine Gaul as far as Romagna and the foot of the Apennines—the country of the Ligurians did not belong to his province—and Illyricum, as far as the frontiers of Macedonia, while on the side of the barbarians, Illyricum had no boundaries at all, the whole forming an empire not inferior to the greatest in modern Europe. After his victory over the Germans, something must have happened which excited the fear of the Belgians, that he would turn his arms against them. In his own account, no mention is made of anything of the kind. It always appears, on the contrary, as if the Gauls might have remained quiet without any danger, and that they themselves were ill-disposed towards the Romans. All the Belgians between the Seine, Marne, and Rhine, with the exception of the Remi, the most distinguished tribe among them, rose in arms against the Romans. My belief is that the Remi intrigued with Caesar, in order to obtain, through his influence, the supremacy among the Belgians, whereby the other tribes would have been reduced to a sort of clientship. The condition of Gaul is excellently described by Caesar. The Belgians and Gauls were weak nations, because the mass of the population was not free. The nation consisted of druids, knights, and serfs: the last of these classes often fought very bravely; but on many occasions they shewed that they had no desire to make any sacrifice for their country, for they could not forget that they were serfs. When provoked, they would often fight like lions, but they had no perseverance. As regards the Nervii, however, we might almost believe that they had no serfs. Caesar decided the fate of the Belgians in two battles, on the Aisne and Sambre, and penetrated into the modern Brabant, the country of the Nervii, who fought very gallantly, but nearly their whole nation was extirpated.

The Aedui and Arverni, and, in fact, most of the nations as far as the sea-coast, now tacitly recognised Rome's supremacy. Caesar took up extensive winter quarters among the Belgians, from whom he expected more serious opposition. There he again came in contact with the Germans. The Usipetes and Tenchteri had come across the Rhine, and made war upon the Belgians on the Meuse. Caesar, being always ready to avail himself of such an opportunity, advanced against them; and it is against these tribes that Caesar committed one of the foulest

acts of his life. His own account shews his guilt. He negotiated with them, and required their leaders to appear before him. When they came honestly and without suspicion, he treated them as prisoners, and attacked the people while they were without their leaders. His excuse is detestable. This base act was afterwards discussed in the senate at Rome; and Cato is said to have proposed that Caesar should be delivered up to the barbarians, to atone for his violation of the laws of nations[4]; but the motion led, of course, to no result.

Another expedition was undertaken against the Veneti, a seafaring people about the mouth of the Loire, for which Caesar had a fleet built in that river. This war, like all his Gallic wars, was carried on with great cruelty, and the Veneti were conquered. Soon after his fraudulent treatment of the Usipetes and Tenchteri, he undertook his first invasion of Britain, which had long been known under this name. The Phoenicians of Gades traded with Britain on account of its tin mines in Cornwall, which are the only ones in Europe, with some insignificant exceptions in the Harz mountains and the Saxon part of the Erzgebirge.[5] Britain was believed to be a perfectly inaccessible country, though, besides the Phoenicians of Gades, the Veneti also carried on a considerable commerce with the Britons.[6] The tin trade was also carried on either entirely by sea, by way of Gades, or by land, by way of Narbonne and Nantes. None of the inland and northern parts of Britain, however, were ever visited. It flattered the fancy of Caesar to subdue this country which no enemy had yet set his foot within. Much booty he could not expect, and the tin district was in a very distant part of the country. Kent and Sussex which he entered were then exceedingly poor, and had neither gold nor silver, whereas the Gauls possessed great quantities of the former metal. The success of his undertaking

[4] Plutarch, *Caesar*, 22; Appian, *De Rebus Gall.* 18.

[5] Tin occurs elsewhere only in the East Indies, in the peninsula of Malacca and the island of Banca. All the tin which the ancients used seems to have come from Britain, for there is nothing to suggest that they received it from India. It was used for the purpose of alloying copper, the use of calamine for the same purpose being a later discovery. How ancient the art of founding bronze must have been, may be inferred from its being mentioned in the description of the temple of Solomon and the tabernacle; and this art presupposes the use of tin.—N.

[6] Caesar, *De Bell. Gall.* iii. 8.

was very insignificant, and he nearly lost his fleet. The ships were badly built, and the Romans were unacquainted with the nature of that part of the ocean where, especially in the British channel, the tides are so strong. Caesar, however, landed in Britain, defeated the half-naked and badly armed barbarians, and accepted their apparent submission, in order to be able to return to Gaul. He afterwards made a second attempt, but with little better success than the first time, though in the second invasion he penetrated beyond the river Thames, probably somewhere above London, in the neighbourhood of Windsor; but, having received some hostages, he returned to Gaul, and no sooner had he quitted the island than the submission of the Britons ceased.

Caesar twice crossed the Rhine in our neighbourhood [Bonn], once against the Sigambri, and a second time against the Suevi, but neither of these expeditions yielded any advantageous results, a thing which is not to be wondered at; but it is very surprising that it was possible for a Roman army to penetrate into those wild countries, where a forest extended, without interruption, from the banks of the Rhine to the interior of Poland. The Westerwald is really the Western part of that immense forest, and was for a time the southern frontier between the Germans and Celts. It cannot have been booty, but only ambition, that tempted Caesar to make conquests on the east of the Rhine.

While Caesar was in Britain, the oppression and licentiousness of the soldiers caused the great insurrection of the Eburones under Ambiorix, which was at first completely successful. The Eburones destroyed one whole Roman legion, under L. Titurius, while another under the command of Q. Cicero was brought into great danger; and would probably have been annihilated had not Caesar returned from his somewhat Quixotic expedition to Britain. The Aquitanians, on the other hand, were subdued by M. Crassus. Caesar was thus master of all Gaul when he entered on the seventh year of his proconsulship; but a great insurrection now broke out among tribes which had before been the friends of the Romans. It was headed by Vercingetorix. The description of this war is in the highest degree worth reading, on account of the horrors which attended it; the fury and immense exertions with which the struggle was carried on on both sides, and

especially on account of the proofs which it affords of Caesar's greatness as a general. His military superiority enabled him to destroy numberless hosts of the enemy. He does not give a detailed account of the operations, yet it occupies the whole of the seventh book, which consists of ninety chapters. The whole country, from the Saone to the ocean and from the Loire to the Cevennes, was in arms. The war was conducted by the Aedui and Arverni, who had formerly always been rivals, but the Aedui joined the insurrection later than the Arverni. Vercingetorix, an Arvernian, had the supreme command, and was worthy of his post. The breaking out of the insurrection was accompanied with acts of great cruelty and savageness. At Genabum, the modern Orleans, all the Romans were put to the sword. Caesar was at the time in the north; but he quickly assembled his troops and marched to the south, and the Belgians, notwithstanding the opportunity they now had for shaking off the Roman yoke, remained perfectly quiet. Caesar conquered Orleans, and took revenge for the murder of the Romans. He then captured Avaricum (Bourges), after a long siege and a brave defence on the part of its inhabitants, and advanced into the interior of Auvergne. The war was carried on for a long time in the neighbourhood of Gergovia, above Clermont. Here Caesar suffered a defeat: one legion was cut off and he was obliged to raise the siege. As the Aedui likewise now revolted, the war was transferred to Alesia, in the neighbourhood of Autun and Langres, in the country of the Aedui. Many thousand Gauls flocked to Alesia. Caesar besieged it with all the military arts that he could devise. The great Vercingetorix pressed him on the other side with a very powerful army. The issue of the contest was very uncertain. Caesar himself, on one occasion, fell into the hands of the Gauls; and it was only owing to a piece of good luck, or to the work of Providence, that he escaped, through the folly of a Gaul. This is the account which Caesar himself afterwards gave of the affair[7]; but it is more probable, that it was an occurrence similar to that which happened to Napoleon, in the month of May, 1800; when, being on a reconnoitering excursion with his staff, he fell in with an Austrian patrol, the officer of which was induced by bribes to let his prisoners escape. When

[7] Serv. *ad Virg. Aen.* xi. 743.

famine had reached its highest point at Alesia, and the troops who were sent to its relief became desponding and dispersed, Vercingetorix, whom I hold to be one of the greatest men of antiquity, had the magnanimity to come forward among the citizens of Alesia, and to request them to deliver him up to the enemy as the author of the war, and advised them to endeavour to save their own lives. This was done accordingly, and Vercingetorix surrendered himself. When he appeared before Caesar, he reminded him of their former acquaintance and mutual esteem; but Caesar here again acted badly. He ought to have treated his enemy in a different manner from that which the Romans had adopted towards C. Pontius: he ought to have been more than a Roman, and have kept him somewhere in *libera custodia;* instead of this, however, he ordered him to be chained, and dragged him about with him until his triumph, and afterwards had him put to death.

After Caesar had gained this victory, there occurred some trifling insurrections, and the Belgians also now began to stir when it was too late; the Bellovaci, in the neighbourhood of Beauvais and Chartres, also rose, but it was an easy matter for Caesar to conquer them. In these occurrences we cannot help seeing the finger of Providence, which made Rome great, and intended to bring all the then known nations under the dominion of Rome. The subject-nations always acted either too early or too late. Had Vercingetorix deferred the insurrection of the Gauls but a few years, and waited till the outbreak of the war between Caesar and Pompey, the Gauls might have recovered their freedom; whereas now their strength had become exhausted, and during the time of the civil war no one was able to move.

LECTURE XCVI.

WHEN his term of office in Gaul was coming to a close, Caesar's relations to the republic were so unfortunate, that it was beyond human power to end them in a happy or satisfactory manner.

It had been difficult even for Scipio, after his victory to live as a true citizen in the republic, and to know what line of conduct to adopt; but the difficulty was infinitely greater for Caesar, who had for a series of years been in the exercise of an unlimited command in a great country, and had been accustomed to act like a sovereign prince. It is by no means an easy thing to lay aside such habits when they are once acquired, as we may see even in the far less important circumstances of ordinary life, where the termination of a certain position, and the transition to another, are connected with incredible difficulties. All that Caesar could lawfully obtain was a second consulship, which he felt would confer on him nothing but an empty honour, for what could he have done with himself and the republic? He might, it is true, have withdrawn from public life, and employed his time in the cultivation and exercise of his great mental powers. He had not been at Rome for the last ten years; for had he gone thither, his imperium would have ceased: and all that he had heard of Rome, and of those who had the power in their hands, made him only hate and despise the government. Even if he had merely lived among those men, many of whom were really bad, he could not have borne all their pretensions and insolence: the state of things was in short so complicated, that no one could anticipate a happy solution of the difficulties. We cannot blame those men who thought with horror of the consequences if Caesar should acquire the supreme power in the republic; but his opponents, instead of endeavouring to bring about a reconciliation, shewed towards him every symptom of hostility, which must have provoked him in the highest degree. Even as early as the year 701, the consul, M. Claudius Marcellus, lost no opportunity of insulting Caesar. On one occasion, a magistrate of Como in Cisalpine Gaul, to whom Caesar, by virtue of a right which had been transferred to him, had shortly before given the Roman franchise, came to Rome; and although the man was perfectly innocent, Marcellus had him flogged, as though he had been the lowest provincial, merely to insult Caesar.[1] This was a significant hint to Caesar himself.

In the following year, 700, C. Claudius Marcellus, a nephew of M. Claudius Marcellus, was consul with L. Aemilius Paullus. In the same year, C. Scribonius Curio, the son of the consul of

[1] Plutarch, *Cass.* 29; Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 26.

the same name, was tribune of the people. Among Cicero's letters, there are some addressed to him by Curio, a man of great talent, but of the most decided profligacy and immorality. This judgment is surely not too severe. He had at first belonged to the Pompeian party, with which he was connected by ties of relationship and by other circumstances; and he was considered the most hostile and decided among the adversaries of Caesar. But the latter knew that Curio was overwhelmed with debts, which amounted to nearly half a million sterling. This gives us a notion of the extent of private property at that time; for a noble Roman might, without difficulty, obtain the means to pay a debt like that, if he received an imperium. Caesar is said to have paid Curio's debts, and to have thus gained him over to his side. In the same manner, Caesar bought over the consul L. Aemilius Paullus with an enormous sum.[2] Such proceedings afford some insight into the state of anarchy in the administration of the provinces. The time for rendering an account was when the proconsul returned from his province, and had celebrated his triumph. This had been the case from the earliest times, and still remained so, whatever might have been the number of years during which he had been invested with the imperium; but the account required of him related only to the sums which the senate had granted to him out of the aerarium. The proconsul had to prove that the soldiers had received their pay, and had no further claims upon the republic. People had expected at first that Curio would direct his power as tribune against Caesar. But he was exceedingly clever and adroit, and assumed an appearance of neutrality: he at first did use his power against Caesar; he then directed it against both Pompey and Caesar; and at length he threw off the mask, and openly declared for the latter.

In the following year, Caesar's proconsular imperium was to terminate, and he now offered himself as a candidate for a second consulship; but, as he wished previously to celebrate his triumph, he would not disband his army, just as Pompey had done after the war against Mithridates; for no Roman general

[2] Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 26; Plutarch, *Caes.* 29; Suetonius, *Caes.* 29; Dion Cassius, xl. 60; Vell. Paterc. ii. 48; Val. Maximus, ix. 1, 6. With this sum, Paullus built the Basilica Paulli in the Forum. The splendid columns of the church of St. Paul, which perished in the fire of 1823, undoubtedly once belonged to this basilica, as Nibby believes. — N Comp. Bunsen, *Beschreib. der Stadt Rom*, vol. iii. pt. 2 p. 110.

could triumph without his army; according to some irregular custom which had been established in the seventh century, he demanded to become a candidate while he was in his province with the imperium. He then intended after his election to return with his army to Rome, celebrate his triumph, and then disband his army. In order to prevent such irregularities, it had been ruled, we do not know when, that no one should be allowed to sue for the consulship, while at the head of an army. His opponents, therefore, required him to lay down his imperium, as he might afterwards petition for a prolongation, and to disband his troops, a demand which was equivalent to asking him to renounce his triumph. He was to come to Rome as a private person, and in that character sue for the consulship; but he was convinced that his life would be lost if he complied with this demand. Now, the proposal of Curio was, that both Pompey and Caesar should lay down their imperium, disband their armies, and come to Rome in the character of private citizens. This was the fairest proposal that could have been made, but Pompey's party replied that his imperium had a longer period yet to last than that of Caesar, and that therefore the two men could not be placed on a footing of equality. It was a misfortune for Rome that Pompey, who was then severely ill, did not die, as his friends apprehended. He was so popular, or perhaps so much feared, that all Italy offered up prayers for his recovery. Pompey assumed the appearance of being ready to yield, but lamented the manner in which he was treated by Curio. When Curio put the question to the vote, as to whether both were to lay down their imperium, an immense majority of 370 senators answered in the affirmative, while only twenty-two voted against it.[3] But the consul Marcellus rejected the decree; the state was in perfect anarchy and dissolution. Marcellus was a champion for the authority of the senate, and nevertheless he refused to acknowledge that authority: the supporters of Pompey decried rebellion, while they themselves were the worst revolutionists, whenever things did not go on as they wished. It is generally observed that, when the government displeases the faction which claims for itself the title of supporter of the government, that faction immediately calls upon the people to revolt, and even goes so far as to preach regicide,

[3] Appian, *De Bell. Civ.* ii. 30.

as De Lamennais has done in his last work. I have heard persons of the *droite* in France speak like Jacobins, at a time when they reckoned upon leading the populace: they asserted that the commonest people possessed an incredible degree of intelligence, that they evinced the highest interest in the public good, just like the best-educated persons, and that it was necessary humbly to defend the holy cause with the assistance of the lowest classes. The optimates of Rome, or the faction of Pompey, were persons of precisely the same kind; they were thorough *populaciers*. Curio had not indeed made his reasonable proposal from any honourable motive, for he saw no help for himself except in the ruin of the state; but the Pompeian party too wished for confusion.

Among the tribunes of the year following, there were some detestable persons who had sold themselves body and soul to Caesar, and among them was the frightful M. Antony, afterwards the triumvir. The senate had already given Pompey the command to raise an army in Italy for the protection of the republic, but through his want of resolution he effected nothing. On the 1st of January of the year 703 the question was again discussed in the senate, as to what was to be done about the provinces. The party of Pompey was predominant: he had troops in the city, and through his influence it was resolved that Caesar should be commanded to lay down his imperium. The tribunes opposed the decree, which they had a perfect right to do, but they were not listened to, and the consuls had recourse to personal threats against them. The fear of the tribunes only made them worse; and, perhaps exaggerating the danger, they fled from Rome to Caesar, who was then at Ravenna, on the frontier of his province of Cisalpine Gaul.[4]

The people at Rome, and especially Pompey and his party, believed the most absurd reports, which told them exactly the contrary of what was really the case. It was thus reported and believed that Caesar's soldiers were highly discontented and wished to be disbanded, that they were enraged against Caesar for keeping them in arms so long without necessity, and that they were not numerous, and

[4] This appears very strange, as all the country south of the river Po had the Roman franchise, so that Caesar's province comprised a large district which was completely Roman.—N.

completely exhausted by their long and difficult service. All these things and many more were firmly believed, because people wished them to be true. Caesar, indeed, had not more than 5000 foot and 300 horse with him[5], partly because he wished not to frighten the people of the province, and partly because he did not like to evacuate Gaul; but now, when he heard of the last decree of the senate, and when the arrival of the tribunes enabled him to make up his mind, he gave orders that all his troops should break up and join him. It is almost inconceivable that the Gauls, who had revolted at the time when there were eight or ten legions in their country, now remained so perfectly quiet; but their intention probably was to allow the Romans to destroy their own strength, and then to rise against them. Caesar had, before this time, given up to the senate, two legions, which were to be sent to Syria. He had offered, even at the end of the year, to disband his army, with the exception of two legions, or even one; to resign his province of Transalpine and Cisalpine Gaul; and to retain only Illyricum and Gallia Cispadana, if Pompey would lay down his imperium in like manner; but all proposals were rejected, Pompey's case was not to be touched upon at all; and hypocrisy insisted on the letter of the decree being obeyed.

When the tribunes arrived at Ravenna, and Caesar received the command of the senate to return to Rome and give up his army to his successor, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, he feared lest on his arrival at Rome he should be brought to trial; his passion gained the upper hand and he resolved to break up. He marched towards Rimini. On arriving at the banks of the river Rubicon (the bridge was probably in the neighbourhood of Cesena, beyond Rimini)[6], he hesitated for a while, doubtful whether he should sacrifice himself or venture upon the unconstitutional act; he was probably actuated more by the desire to save himself than to rule; at length, however, he crossed the river, and Rimini opened its gates to him. This was an unexpected event, for his enemies had made no preparations in those districts, and confidently believed that the soldiers would desert Caesar and join Pompey, whose popularity was thought to be still as great as it had been before. But things had assumed a completely different aspect; and Pompey had lost his position in public estimation. The soldiers of Caesar, on the other hand, shared the ambition of their commander, for they knew well that they had fought in greater wars and battles than those of Pompey. We can scarcely imagine a more remarkable contrast than that between the state of of Italy thirty years before, and the condition which it presented at the outbreak of the civil war. The Italian allies had disappeared in the wars of the time of Sulla, which had been carried on for nearly three years between the two great parties which divided Italy; on the advance of Caesar's small army, no one moved a finger. His cohorts, which were few in number, quickly overran all Italy; for the inhabitants of the municipia and other places were as unwarlike then as they are at the present day. One of the causes of Caesar's success may also have been the circumstance, that Sulla's legions in the military colonies were more inclined to side with the great general than with Pompey; but the main cause was the total absence of all feeling. No one had any interest in the success of either party; for the people had gradually become convinced that it was useless to fight for justice, and their condition was so sad that no one had anything to protect or to lose. Persons of a military disposition had some reason for supporting Caesar; but for Pompey no one could feel any enthusiasm. Nobody had suspected that things would come to this. Pompey had hoped to make an impression by vaunting phrases: he had declared that he need only stamp the ground with his foot to raise up an army; but when the tidings arrived that Caesar was advancing on the Flaminian road, Pompey and all the senators could think of nothing but flight. They had no other army than the small one of L. Domitius, who was to have gone to Gaul and to have received the army of Caesar, which was now advancing irresistibly towards the city.

Cicero who had sometime before returned from Cilicia, now endeavoured to act as mediator; but no one listened to his counsels, though they were the best and most wholesome that could be given; and in fact, if peace had been possible, it could have been established only on Cicero's plan. The party of Pompey fancied that they could not and ought not to defend

[5] Caesar, *De Bell. Civil.* i. 7. 12; Plutarch, *Caes.* 32, *Pomp.* 60; Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 32.

[6] There are several small rivers in that district, and the inhabitants dispute as to which is the Rubicon.—N.

themselves at Rome, and that they ought to allow Caesar to act in Italy as he pleased, because he would be sure to incur the hatred of the people, and thus call forth a reaction against himself. Pompey had seven legions in Spain, under the command of Afranius and M. Petreius; but he was of opinion that they ought not to be withdrawn from that country, but that fresh forces ought to be concentrated in Greece, and money raised in the East. Africa was, like Spain, occupied by his party, and it was confidently hoped that Gaul also would rise against Caesar; and the Pompeian party thus calculated, to their great satisfaction, that Caesar would work out his own ruin in Italy.

Pompey went to Brundusium. The army of L. Domitius was besieged by Caesar in Corfinium. Even here the state of public opinion became manifest, for Domitius was forsaken by his troops, who capitulated for themselves, and obtained a free permission to depart; most of them, however, went over to serve in the ranks of Caesar, and the rest were allowed to go whither they pleased. Caesar thus rendered it easy for every one to take up arms for him or to remain quiet. He was expected at Rome with the utmost fear. Cicero's letters of this period are particularly interesting and instructive; they shew the tyranny of the Pompeian faction, for whosoever wished to remain at Rome was denounced as an enemy of his country; it was proclaimed that no neutrality would be recognised, and that after the victory every one who had not joined the camp of Pompey should be proscribed. Caesar, however, did not go to Rome, but marched from Corfinium to Brundusium. Pompey had wished to keep Brundusium, in order to have a place of arms and a landing-place for his fleet, in case Caesar should go to Spain. The Pompeian party undoubtedly imagined that Caesar would not venture upon a siege, as he had scarcely any ships, whereas the whole of the eastern world with its fleet was at the command of Pompey, who collected his fleet in the port of Brundusium. Caesar was obliged to attack him; and he did it with such resolution and energy; that Pompey thought it necessary to quit the town and cross over to Illyricum. This step afforded Caesar immense advantages, for Brundusium had hitherto been faithful to the interests of the Sullanian party, of which Pompey was the representative

Caesar now went to Rome, where he acted as absolute master.

He had the treasury broken open, as the keys were concealed: he appointed magistrates and disposed of everything like a sovereign monarch. The opposition of the tribune, L. Metellus and of his friends, who intended to act a comedy of liberty, was put down without much ceremony. Before Caesar's arrival, everybody at Rome had apprehended that the nephew of Marius would follow in the footsteps of his uncle; but he did not act with harshness towards any one. All who were at Rome and trusted to him, were perfectly safe so far as he could secure them; but this was not the case in other parts of Italy, where everything was not under his personal control. Many of his soldiers and their officers were guilty of great atrocities; and public opinion in those places began to turn against Caesar.

After having hastily made the most necessary arrangements at Rome, he marched through southern Gaul into Spain. The generals of Pompey did not even come as far as the Pyrenees to meet their enemy; they had seven legions, and were far superior to him in the number of their forces. Caesar had left troops to besiege Marseilles, which was not absolutely necessary, for the town would have remained neutral; but he may have owed the town a grudge for something it had done before, and he demanded of its inhabitants the recognition of his party. As they refused compliance, he left two legates to lay siege to the place. This siege, which is accurately described by Caesar in the second book of his History of the Civil War, is a remarkable example of the mode of besieging a town employed at that time, which was very different from the Greek method. After a long siege, and not till Caesar's return from Spain, the town was compelled to surrender. He did not destroy the town, nor treat the inhabitants with cruelty, but only made them give up their arms, and deprived them for a time of their free constitution. The triumph over them was very disgraceful, for the Massilians had always been cordial allies of the Romans.

Afranius and Petreius were stationed at Ilerda in Catalonia. Caesar brought all his military talent into play against them, but conquered them in reality by his own kindness of heart; for he caused so great a desertion among the enemy's troops, that in the end their commanders were obliged to capitulate. Afranius, an insignificant person, was the first to urge the necessity of entering into negotiations. Petreius, on the other

hand, would hear nothing of it, and even inflicted severe punishments upon those of his men who shewed any desire to treat with Caesar. But his opposition was of no avail; and as the legions would, in the end, have completely deserted him, the legates capitulated for themselves and M. Varro, on condition of their evacuating Spain. The soldiers who were unwilling to serve in the army of the conqueror obtained a free departure, but most of the men remained with Caesar, who thus became at once master of all Spain.

Cato, who had been praetor of the province of Sicily, had left the island; and after his withdrawal, C. Curio, who had the command against him, went over to Africa, where he was opposed by the Pompeian commander, Attius Varus, and the Numidian king, Juba, who was a client of Pompey. This expedition of Curio came to a deplorable end. He had taken two legions to Africa; but desertion among his troops, his own unskilful management, and various misfortunes, brought about his defeat and death in a battle against King Juba. The remainder of his troops dispersed, most of them were taken prisoners, and only a few returned to Sicily.

On his return to Rome, Caesar was made dictator, but the form in which the appointment was made is not the same in all accounts.[7] He did every thing with the utmost rapidity, and within a very short time made the most necessary regulations at Rome, enacted several welcome laws, some of which were very reasonable; as, for instance, the one by which debts were made to represent property, and which prevented money retaining its original value, when the value of other property had fallen. With this view he appointed a commission to determine the value which landed property had had previously to the Civil War, and ordained that creditors should accept such lands as payment for their outstanding debts at the value determined by the commissioners. I also believe the statement[8], that he deducted the interest already paid, to be correct, for it was a thing which had often been done before. A number of other measures were likewise calculated to supply real wants; and he introduced them because he felt that it was his duty to do so. After his army had returned from Spain

[7] Caesar, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 21, iii. 1; Dion Cassius, xli. 36; Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 48; Plutarch, *Caes.* 37; Cicero, *ad Attic.* ix. 15.

[8] Sueton. *Caesar*, 42.

to Italy, and new legions had been formed out of those who had deserted to him, Caesar marched towards Brundusium to attack Pompey. It was now nearly a twelvemonth since Pompey had quitted Rome. He had not only collected the Romans from all parts of the empire and formed them into camps, but had also an extraordinary number of auxilia, and in addition to this, he had a large fleet by which he commanded the sea, and to which Caesar had nothing to oppose; but unfortunately for Pompey, his generals shewed great awkwardness in conducting the war.

LECTURE XCVII.

POMPEY had spent the winter at Thessalonica, and his army in Macedonia; but his main strength consisted in his fleet. The Rhodians, as well as many other states and subject-towns in Greece, still possessed their fleets, and all these, together with that of Egypt, were at the disposal of Pompey. M. Calpurnius Bibulus, who had been Caesar's colleague in the consulship, had the supreme command of the united fleet. As Caesar had scarcely any ships, it was hoped that it would be impossible for him to cross the Adriatic with an army, and that, as some had been forced to do in former times, he would be obliged to march through Dalmatia, where he would be opposed by Pompey's ablest general, M. Octavius. But here again, Caesar endeavoured to act in an imposing manner, and thereby to turn the balance in his own favour. Just as in the first Punic war, the Romans had not been afraid to sail to Sicily, although the Carthaginians were masters of the sea, so now Caesar did not hesitate to avail himself of any ships that could be got, however bad they were, and thus succeeded in crossing over into Illyricum. Bibulus was an able man, and deserves praise for his personal character, for he did his duty; but was not sufficiently active and watchful. Caesar's whole conduct was eminently characteristic of the man. Every great general, like every great painter, has certain peculiarities which characterise him, just as much as every man is characterised by his own hand-writing. Caesar's peculiarity was that,

in cases when a quick resolution was necessary and his forces were not yet assembled, he always ventured upon a battle with the part of his forces which was ready to act, in order to gain a firm footing, until all his forces should be collected. This principle he followed in his passage to Illyricum, and afterwards also in going to Egypt and Africa. One of the features of a truly great general is the ability to calculate the magnitude of what he ventures to undertake, and how much he can effect with the means he has. Thus Caesar appeared unexpectedly with a small squadron at Oricum, an Epirot or Greek town, on the southern frontier of Illyricum, in the corner of the Acroceraunian Gulf. Here he landed; and after taking possession of the place, he immediately set out towards Apollonia, which opened its gates to him; for his mere name was the great herald that went before him, and no one suspected that he had come over with only a few thousand men. There he established himself: an attempt upon Epidamnus or Dyrrhachium, however, did not succeed so easily, for Pompey hastened from his winter quarters, and endeavoured to repel or surround Caesar with his numerous forces. As Caesar's orders that the troops should immediately follow him from Italy, where they were assembled, had not been obeyed, he was in great difficulty, and he himself attempted to cross over that dangerous and stormy part of the sea in a small boat of twelve oars: he struggled for a whole day against storm and waves; but the thing was impracticable. The immediate execution of the orders he had given to his officers was of the utmost consequence; but Gabinius despairing of its possibility disobeyed them. He hesitated at first, and then commenced his march round the Adriatic; but at Salonae in Dalmatia he fell in with M. Octavius, and was defeated. M. Antony, however, succeeded in passing close by the fleet of Bibulus, and with the loss of only a few ships reached the eastern coast of the Adriatic. Bibulus had been taken ill and died soon afterwards.

Although his forces were still very inferior to those of Pompey, Caesar advanced towards Dyrrhachium, and ventured to besiege Pompey, by forming lines of circumvallation around the place. This was an undertaking which Pompey could not much care about, as he received his supplies from the sea, while Caesar, who had no such means of providing for his

army, was obliged to forage in the neighbouring country. He tried to bring the war to a close at Dyrrhachium, but was unsuccessful; and when he made an attack upon the place, he was repulsed with considerable loss. Pompey at that moment shewed resolution: he gained a part of the line of fortifications which had been constructed by the besiegers, and thus destroyed the blockade. Caesar's loss on that day was very great; his soldiers began to despond, and he himself nearly despaired of success. The soldiers were suffering from extreme want of food, and lived upon grass[1] and roots. Caesar himself afterwards said that he had not only been beaten on that day, but that Pompey might have decided the victory, if he had known how to follow up his success. This opinion is quite correct; but Pompey had become old and dull, and had lost the power to justify the enormous pretensions he still made.

After this catastrophe, Caesar could not continue the war at Dyrrhachium; and he now ventured upon an expedition which, if it had failed, would have been mentioned among rash and inconsiderate acts, such as, for example, the expedition of Charles XII. of Sweden to Pultowa. He broke up from Dyrrhachium and went to places where he could reckon upon no one, and where he had to conquer every inch of ground. Pompey undoubtedly expected that Caesar would return to Illyricum, and there join his other troops: but, far from doing this, he marched towards the lofty mountains between Epirus and Thessaly, and advanced irresistibly as far as the town of Gomphi in Thessaly, which closes the pass from Janina to Thessaly. Gomphi was taken by storm, and the soldiers now recovered their confidence and refreshed themselves with the rich booty. The destruction of this town induced all the Thessalians to surrender, and Caesar obtained provisions in abundance. Pompey ought now to have returned to Italy: the number of his troops far surpassed that of his enemy; and if he had had any judgment he would have made himself master of Italy, particularly as he knew that a portion of the legions in Spain, which had been formed out of the troops of Afranius and Petreius, had revolted against Caesar. If Pompey had at that time established himself, with his fleet, in Italy, Caesar

[1] Grass must be taken here in its widest sense, meaning salad. In the south, people frequently live upon bread and salad, with some vinegar and oil, and the poor of those countries are perfectly satisfied and happy with this food. Caesar's troops of course had no oil or vinegar. — N.

would never have been able to return to it. But Pompey had no resolution, and the men by whom he was surrounded were beside themselves with joy, when they heard that Caesar was marching towards the mountains, where they thought he would be caught as in a trap.

Pompey, therefore, followed Caesar into Thessaly, where the latter had already taken his position in the neighbourhood of the wealthy town of Pharsalus; and here the hostile armies met each other. For a few days they only manoeuvred; as Caesar was in want of provisions; and as Pompey's cavalry was far superior to that of Caesar, the position of the latter was again very difficult. The advice of the most prudent among the friends of Pompey was to wait patiently, and gradually to destroy the army of Caesar by famine, desertion, and the like. This was Pompey's own opinion also; but most of his officers and friends were so childish and intoxicated with their thoughts of victory, that they considered moderation or caution to be a disgrace to themselves. The senators in the camp of Pompey, who were quite ignorant of war, firmly believed that the issue of the contest was already decided, and discussed the advantages which each of them was to derive from the victory. Like the French emigrants in 1792 at Coblenz and in Champagne, those senators disputed, for example, which of them was to have Caesar's office of pontiff, and which was to obtain this or that estate after the proscriptions which they intended to institute on their return to Italy; these and similar disputes were carried on with so much earnestness that they even gave rise to quarrels among the senators. Caesar was very anxious to bring matters to a speedy decision: he had the highest confidence in his own talent as a general, and felt a contempt for Pompey, as he then was, and for those who surrounded him. The Pompeian party themselves rendered a battle unavoidable, and that so hurriedly that Caesar had scarcely time to call back three legions which he had sent to Scotusa for the purpose of foraging.

The accounts of the battle which now took place differ widely from one another. The best is, of course, Caesar's own description, though we may believe that the charge of Asinius Pollio[2] is not wholly unjust; according to whom Caesar is not always accurate· he may have exaggerated the numbers, but

[2] In Sueton. *Caes* 56

this much is certain, that Pompey was very superior in numbers. It is not at all improbable that Caesar had not more than 22,000 infantry, and that Pompey had about 40,000, besides his auxilia consisting of Greeks and Asiatics, which however were of no use, as Pompey seems to have been ashamed to allow them to take part in a battle between Romans. Pompey's cavalry also was much more numerous than that of Caesar, who, however, had some good Gallic and German horsemen; and it is a well-known fact that, in reality, the German horsemen decided the issue of the battle. The cavalry of Pompey on the other hand, consisted, for the most part, of young Romans and volunteers, who had perhaps never seen an enemy before, and were therefore like children in comparison with Caesar's veterans. The statement, that Caesar ordered his men to aim at the faces of these young men to make them afraid of losing their beauty[2], must not be taken literally. Caesar opposed the enemy's cavalry not only with his own horse, but also with his infantry, which he had trained to hold out against cavalry. His cohorts warded off the first attack, and then the Gallic and German cavalry were let loose against the enemy. We may imagine their delight in being thus allowed to take vengeance upon the Romans. The left wing of Pompey's army was first defeated; and that so completely that the right, too, which till then had fought with considerable success, could not maintain its ground. The Pompeian army fled back to their camp, foolishly believing that all was now over, and that Caesar would not venture to prosecute his victory any further. But when it was observed that the conquerors did not indulge in plunder, but were advancing in order of battle towards the hostile camp, all dispersed in confusion, and Pompey jumping up in a great rage exclaimed, "Not even here then will they leave us." The whole army was routed, and no one had the presence of mind to keep together even a cohort. During the battle itself, Caesar had given orders that no harm should be done to those who did not flee or make any resistance; whole cohorts thus laid down their arms, and the enemy's camp was found full of Asiatic luxuries and all kinds of comforts; many of the tents were arbours provided with costly carpets and furniture, and the booty was immense. You will not easily find the date of the battle of Pharsalus mentioned any where; it is a day

[2] Plutarch, *Pomp.* 69, 71, *Caes.* 45; Appian, *De Bell Civil.* ii 76.

remarkable for great events, and is known from Foggini's calendaria, the tenth of August[3], according to the old calendar, which was reformed by Caesar two years later; so that it is impossible to say what day it really was, though it must have been in June.

Pompey fled from the battle-field of Pharsalus to Larissa, and embarked with his generals either there or at Thessalonica. He sailed to Mitylene, where he met his wife Cornelia; his intention was to go to Cilicia and Cyprus, and thence to the Parthians. This most cowardly plan, however, was opposed by his friends; and he saw no place of refuge except Egypt. He should have gone to his fleet, which was yet complete, have sailed to Africa, and have continued the war there; but Pompey was quite broken down, and resolved to take refuge with the king of Egypt, Ptolemy Auletes, who had once been expelled in an insurrection of his people, but had been restored by Gabinius through the connivance of Pompey, to whom he was accordingly under great obligations. He had sent a fleet to Pompey, but had withdrawn it after the battle of Pharsalus. He had since died, leaving two daughters, Cleopatra and Arsinoe, and two younger sons, one of whom bore the name of Ptolemy Dionysus, and was not advanced beyond the age of boyhood. Cleopatra, his ambitious sister, was ordered by the will of her father to marry her elder brother, according to the common custom of incest among the Macedonian kings at Alexandria, and to rule over Egypt conjointly with him. But as he was very domineering and endeavoured to deprive her of her share in the government, he, or rather his guardians, Achillas and Pothinus, had expelled her. She had fled to Syria, where she was collecting an army to effect her return by force of arms. Young Ptolemy and his guardians were at this time encamped near Mount Casius, on the frontier of Syria, to oppose Cleopatra. Pompey's evil genius led him to the camp of Ptolemy. There was at that time in Egypt a Roman of the name of L. Septimius, whom Gabinius had left behind as commander, at the time when he led Ptolemy Auletes back to Egypt. This Septimius advised the young king to have

[3] v. *id. Sextil.* that is, the 9th of August, according to the Calendarium of Amiternum in Foggini, pp. 112, 153. Not having the book at hand, I take the reference from Fischer's *Rom Zeittafeln*, p 272, which agrees with that in Orelli's *Inscript* vol ii p 397

Pompey put to death, in order to secure by this sacrifice the favour of Caesar, who would reward him with the crown of Egypt. Such advice was just suited to the mind of an Alexandrian prince. Septimius was sent out with a boat to receive Pompey. All his companions were suspicious, and he himself had some presentiment of the fate which awaited him; but he was so confused and bewildered, that he resolved to enter the boat and follow Septimius. He was murdered before he reached the coast, and his body was cast away unburied.

Caesar had continued his pursuit without ceasing, and with a few companions he arrived in Egypt, which again was one of the boldest undertakings. The account of the Egyptians surrendering to him Pompey's head and ring is well known; and history has not forgotten Caesar's tears. I will not deny that the issue of the war had delivered him from great anxiety; for however much he might have been inclined to make peace, it would probably never have been established, and the war could not terminate otherwise than with the destruction of Pompey; but if I consider Caesar's kind heart, I feel convinced that his tears were sincere. He had the body of Pompey buried, but in the tumult and confusion of the moment the erection of a monument was not thought of; and if Caesar had erected one, it would almost have looked like a farce. Pompey's family, however, which continues to be mentioned in history even in the time of Tiberius, caused a humble monument to be raised to him. In the reign of Hadrian it was buried in sand, and the statue had been removed to a temple, but Hadrian had it restored.[4] There is an epigram consisting of two distichs relating to Pompey's tomb. It cannot be otherwise than a genuine ancient poem, and is in my opinion one of the most beautiful epigrams that have come down to us:—

Marmoreo Licinus tumulo jacet, at Cato nullo,
Pompeius parvo. Quis putet esse deos?
Saxa premunt Licinum, levat altum fama Catonem,
Pompeium tituli. Credimus esse deos[5].

Caesar now proceeded to Alexandria, whither he was to be

[4] Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 86; Spartianus, *Hadrian*, c. 14.

[5] H Meyer, *Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigram. et Poemat.* No. 77, where the epigram is ascribed to P. Terentius Varro Atacinus. (The Licinus here mentioned was a barber, an upstart, who had become very rich, and had a magnificent monument erected to himself.—N)

followed by his troops. The periodical winds, which last till the dog-days, and blow full sixty days in the Mediterranean, are north-west winds, and prevent ships sailing from Alexandria. Caesar's despatches could not therefore reach Rhodes. The people of Alexandria consisted at that time of the most licentious and audacious populace that one can imagine; they combined all the vices of the East with those of the West. The Graeco-Macedonian population had been extirpated for the most part under Ptolemy Physcon, and there only remained the disgusting Alexandro-Egyptian race. The eunuch Pothinus, who was then regent of the kingdom, conceived the plan of overwhelming Caesar, who had only a few troops, and whose situation at Alexandria was similar to that of Cortez in Mexico. Caesar was in possession of the king's palace, and here he fortified himself until assistance came. The insurrection at last became general. The palace was set on fire, and the library, which had been founded under Ptolemy Philadelphus, was burnt to ashes. The struggle in the streets was fearful: the danger in which Caesar was thus placed, the boldness with which he destroyed the entrance to the port of Alexandria, his narrow escape, his taking of the island of Pharos, and his maintaining himself there until reinforcements arrived, all this is pleasantly and vividly related by A. Hirtius, in his book on the Alexandrine war. Caesar at last succeeded in making himself master of Alexandria, which he compelled to surrender; and he placed Cleopatra, who had ensnared him by her coquetry, and her younger brother on the throne. Her elder brother, Ptolemy, whom he had been obliged to dismiss from the palace, and whom the Egyptians had proclaimed their king, perished in the Nile, fortunately for Caesar. Cleopatra afterwards received still greater favours from Antony.

While he was still in Alexandria, Caesar heard that Pharnaces had invaded Pontus from the Bosporus, and defeated Domitius Calvinus, the general of Caesar. Caesar hastened through Syria into Pontus, where he met the enemy. On the very day of his arrival, and without allowing himself any rest, he attacked the enemy, and the Asiatics were routed in a moment. It is of this victory that he sent to Rome the famous account, *veni, vidi, vici*.[6]

[6] Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 91; Sueton. *Caes.* 37.

He now returned to Rome for the first time since his departure from Brundusium, made various arrangements, did many things to please his friends, and appointed a provisional government; which was, indeed, highly necessary, for the leaders of his own party differed very widely in their views and plans, and formed rather a motley assemblage. During his absence, they had undertaken the most contradictory things; but I shall not here dwell upon the insurrections of Milo, Caelius Rufus and Dolabella, which had occurred in his absence, but had been quickly put down: I shall mention them afterwards.

LECTURE XCVIII.

CAESAR did not remain at Rome very long. The servility of the senate and people conferred upon him the most senseless and extravagant distinctions; the whole republic was placed in his hands. In their excuse, however, we must say that the people could not help becoming attached to him, on account of his great and unexpected mildness: they also knew, on the other hand, that if Pompey had been the conqueror, he would have caused a general massacre, like that of Sulla. Caesar, on the contrary, so far as he was able, protected those who had fought against him: and as many were yet living in exile, he empowered each of his friends to restore one of the hostile party to his former position and honours in the republic. Those who were thus restored had, indeed, lost much of their property, but it had not been in Caesar's power to prevent this. A great many still remained in exile, whom he allowed to return one after another. The senate conferred honours upon Caesar at three different times; but of this I shall speak when we come to his last stay at Rome, after his return from Spain.

While he was at Rome, he had to quell a dangerous insurrection among his troops, who were too impatient to wait for the triumph and the advantages they hoped to derive from it. The tenth legion, his favourite one, which he had brought over to Italy in order to take it with him to Africa, revolted, and the veterans, whose period of military service

was over, demanded not only the arrears of their pay, but also the rewards in money and the assignment of lands which Caesar had promised them. The mutiny became dangerous. Sallust, the historian, was sent by Caesar to the revolted soldiers with fresh promises; but he was insulted by them, and several senators were killed. Caesar now had the courage to allow the mutineers, who had been stationed in Campania, to come to Rome, on condition that they should leave behind their pila, and bring with them only their Spanish swords. He addressed the soldiers in the forum; and his self-possession, as well as the confidence which he shewed that he still had in them, made such an overawing impression upon them that they became perfectly submissive. He treated them, however, with symptoms of contempt, called them *Quirites*, and announced to them that they were dismissed from service, leaving it however to their choice whether they would once more share with him the honour of a campaign. Hereupon, the soldiers almost unanimously implored him to allow them to continue in his service.

Caesar now went with a small part of his forces to Africa, where M. Cato, Q. Metellus Scipio, the father-in-law of Pompey through his fifth and last wife Cornelia, Afranius, and Petreius, were prepared to meet their enemy. After the battle of Pharsalus, Cato, who had not been present at the battle, had gone from Dyrrhachium to Corcyra, and thence to Cyrene, where he collected a number of scattered Romans. The men whom he thus assembled were more distinguished for their high rank than their military spirit. Cyrene, in a secluded part of the world, had scarcely the honour of being regarded as a Roman province. Cato led his band round the Syrtes over Tripolis, and through the sandy deserts—a fearful and difficult march—into the Roman province of Africa. Here the supreme command of the Pompeian forces was offered to him, but he declined it, and undertook only the command of Utica. When Caesar landed, the party of Pompey had a considerable army, and were allied with King Juba, who ruled over the greatest and most beautiful part of the kingdom of Jugurtha. Mauretania was governed by Bogud; and in his dominion there was a Roman adventurer, of the name of P. Sitius of Nuceria, with other Roman deserters and adventurers, of whom Sitius had formed a regiment, which, in

conjunction with King Bogud, gained a victory over Juba, and declared for Caesar, whose proceedings were thus greatly facilitated. P. Sitius was a very enterprising man, and Caesar rewarded him with the rights of a Roman citizen.[1] Sitius infested the dominion of Juba, who was thus kept engaged, while Caesar established himself on the coast of Tunis. The reinforcements which were expected gradually joined Caesar, and he then advanced against the Pompeian generals. The campaign lasted for several months, until Caesar took his position in the neighbourhood of Thapsus, a fortified town, which is situated on a peninsula, connected with the main land by a small isthmus. Here he was blockaded by Petreius, Afranius, Scipio, and Juba, who occupied the isthmus, and cut him off from the main land; but he broke through the hostile army, first defeated the Romans, who were infinitely superior to him in numbers, and then routed the army of Juba. No sooner was the battle won than hosts of Romans deserted to him—a thing which commonly happens in civil wars. Juba was so reduced that he was obliged to flee from his kingdom, and as all was over, he and Petreius killed each other.

Cato alone was now holding out at Utica with the Roman garrison which he did not wish to abandon. I have purposely deferred speaking of Cato till now. If there is any man in Roman history who deserves the reputation which he enjoys with posterity, it is Cato. Caesar's depreciation of him was only the pardonable consequence of his personal irritation. If we possessed Cicero's work on Cato[2], we should undoubtedly see Cicero's heart in all its goodness and amiability. It does honour to his courage to have written such a work under the circumstances; and it does honour to Caesar also that he was unprejudiced enough to allow Cicero to express his admiration of Cato, without imputing it to him as a crime. Caesar declared that Cato had injured him by his death, as he had thereby deprived him of the pleasure of pardoning him: Caesar could not have said anything more concise. It is, on the other hand, no more than natural that Caesar should have been deeply wounded by Cicero's praise of Cato, and this feeling

[1] See some remarks which I have made upon him in my edition of Fronto. —N. p. xix. foll.

[2] It was after Cato's death that Cicero wrote the celebrated "Laudatio M. Catonis"—N.

induced him to write his work against Cato (Anti-Cato), in which he may have given the reins to his passion, which would never have arisen in his soul if Cato had remained alive. There was, in fact, nothing that Caesar was more desirous of than Cato's friendship, a desire which Cato could not gratify. The Stoic philosophy never produced any heroes among the Greeks. If we except Zeno, the founder of the school, and Cleanthes, not one Greek statesman was a stoic philosopher. Among the Romans, on the other hand, many a great and virtuous statesman was a votary of the Stoa; and although some of them, such as Cicero, were not real Stoics, yet they admired the system and loved it. It would be a most unpardonable misapprehension of human virtue, if any one were to cast a doubt upon the sincerity of Cato's intentions; and this sincerity is not impeached by the assertion which has often been made, and I think with great justice, that Cato with his philosophy did incalculable injury to the commonwealth. He would have retained the old forms absolutely, and have allowed nothing which bordered upon arbitrary power. There is no doubt that in this manner he estranged the equites from the senate, after Cicero had succeeded with great difficulty in reconciling the two parties. Cato thus tore open the old wound by opposing a demand of the publicani in Asia, which was not unjust, merely because he considered it advantageous to them. This produced a breach which was never healed. Cato's advice to put the accomplices of the Catilinarian conspiracy to death was not mere severity, but a pure expression of his sense of justice, and perfectly in accordance with the laws of Rome; but it was nevertheless very unfortunate advice. Such was his conduct always, and it was a principle with him not to pay any regard to circumstances; the consequence of which was that, when his opinion was followed, many things turned out far worse than they had been before. His personal character was above all censure and suspicion; dissolute persons, such as A. Gabinius, might laugh at him, but no one ever ventured to calumniate him.

It was highly unfortunate for him even while Pompey was alive, that he was mixed up with the Pompeian party; and, now that Pompey was dead, his situation was downright miserable. The men of that party acted in Africa like savages, and Cato saved Utica from their hands with great difficulty; for

the leaders wished to plunder the town, because its inhabitants were said to be favourably disposed towards Caesar, but in reality because they hoped thereby to secure the attachment of the soldiers. The inhabitants of Utica thus looked up to him as their deliverer. He had undertaken the command of the place only for the purpose of protecting it, and he pacified the mutineers by promising that the place should remain quiet, and that, if it were spared, it would not be ungrateful. When Caesar, after the conquest of his other enemies, appeared before Utica, Cato advised his people not to continue their resistance. The generals and the men capable of bearing arms had taken to flight, and Cato's opinion was that the garrison, which consisted for the most part of old men and unprincipled young nobles who were incapable of handling a weapon, should sue for pardon. His own son received the same advice from his father, who thus shewed a very amiable inconsistency in his conduct; for here the father got the better of the Stoic. Cato excused himself, by saying that he had seen the days of the republic and could live no longer; "but my son," he added, "who is a stranger to the republic, can live in different circumstances." He then withdrew to his room, and spent the night preceding the morning when the gates were to be thrown open, in reading Plato's Phaedo, assuredly not for the purpose of strengthening his belief in the immortality of the soul; for a person who does not possess that belief will never acquire it from reading the Phaedo, and Cato had undoubtedly read it so often that he knew it by heart; but in that awful and sublime moment, in which he was to breathe out his soul, it was less the thought of immortality that engaged his attention, than the contemplation of the death of Socrates, though he believed in immortality as taught by the Stoics. He took leave of the world while directing his mind to the last moments of one of the most virtuous men of all ages. He then inflicted a mortal wound upon himself, in consequence of which he fell from his bed. When his son and friends found him, they raised him up and dressed his wound; he pretended to sleep, but took the first opportunity to tear open the wound, and died almost instantly.

After the surrender of Utica, the other towns soon followed its example. Juba, the son of King Juba, surrendered to Caesar, and afterwards received such an excellent education

at Rome that he became one of the most learned men of his age. The loss of his historical and geographical works is one of the greatest that we have to lament in ancient literature, for he was a perfect master of the Punic language, and undoubtedly gave in his Greek works the substance of the historical books of the Carthaginians.

Meantime fresh disturbances had broken out at Rome, the origin of which were the quarrels between Antony and Dolabella, of whom the one was as bad as the other. It was Cicero's great grief that Dolabella was his son-in-law. Caesar therefore went to Rome and restored peace; but he was soon called away, and went to Spain against Cneius and Sextus, the sons of Pompey, both of whom had been in Africa, and had gone thence to Baetica, where a legion, formed of the remnants of the African armies, had revolted against Caesar's generals. Their example was followed by others, and the greater part of southern Spain was soon in arms. Many towns readily joined the Pompeian party, but the towns even of the same province could not agree upon their course, as they had done in the time of Sertorius; and it was this absence of union among them that paralysed the party of Pompey in all the wars between it and Caesar. The war in Spain, however, was by far the most important and most difficult for Caesar. It is quite astonishing to see the men of the Pompeian party fight in Spain with a bitterness and vehemence of which there had been no trace before, although all their hopes of success must now have vanished. The beginning of the war is described in the barbarously written book *De Bello Hispaniensi*. Caesar was obliged for several months to exert all the powers of his mind. The scene of action was Granada and Andalusia, or more properly speaking, it was almost confined to Granada. The northern mountains of Granada are nearly impregnable; and it was there that the sons of Pompey had established themselves. Cneius, who had the supreme command, displayed greater qualities as a general than his father. The battle of Munda, on the 17th of March, was the termination of the civil war; but Caesar was on the point of losing it: his soldiers gave way so decidedly, that he himself gave up all hope. In his despair he jumped from his horse, and placing himself in the way of the fugitives, called upon them to run him through with their swords, and at least not to

compel him to survive such a day.[4] He succeeded in stopping the flight, but thereby gained nothing, except that the day was restored. He owed his final victory to his Mauretanian auxiliaries, who attacked the feebly defended camp of the enemy and plundered it. Labienus, with one legion, marched towards the camp to repel the Mauretanians; but his approach to the camp was believed by the men of his own party to be a retreat, and the troops yielded, but did not take to flight. The battle of Pharsalus had been decided in a similar manner. The dispersal of the enemy obliged Caesar to destroy the several detachments one by one. Cneius, who fled with the rest, was wounded and cut down; but Sextus escaped to the Celtiberians, where he remained concealed till after Caesar's death, when he again acted a conspicuous part. Several months passed away after this victory before the campaign in Spain was entirely finished. The men with whom Caesar had to deal there would not condescend to sue to him for pardon.

After his return from Africa, Caesar had celebrated a triumph which lasted four days; it was a triumph over Gaul, Pharnaces, Egypt, and king Juba, no Roman general being mentioned as the subject of his triumph. After his return from Spain, he celebrated a triumph over Spain, and the conquered towns of Spain were specified. The first triumph had filled the Romans with delight, but the Spanish triumph hurt their feelings; for, notwithstanding his extraordinary presents to the people, they could not help looking upon it as a triumph over Roman citizens, though they were not mentioned. Vellcius Paterculus[3] states that the sum of the treasures which Caesar brought to Rome in his triumph (probably the first) was *sexies millies HS.*, that is 600,000,000 sesterces. Caesar had obtained from several towns immense sums, under the name of loans and contributions, to defray the expenses of the war; and if we consider that he gave to each soldier 20,000 sesterces (more than £100), the sum will not appear by any means incredible. Appian[4], however, mentions the enormous sum of six and a half myriads, that is, 65,000 talents, which here must be understood to mean

[4] The Russian General Suwaroff acted in a similar manner in the battle of Kinburn, 1787, when his soldiers refused to obey an order which he had given, because they thought that they would be lost. When his soldiers fled, he called out to them. "Run on, run on, and leave your general to the Turks as a monument of your cowardice."—N.

[3] II. 56.

[4] *De Bell. Civil.* II. 102.

not Attic, but Egyptian, that is, copper talents, according to the standard of Ptolemy Philadelphus. On this supposition the sum of Appian, though not agreeing with the other accounts, ceases to be a ridiculous exaggeration. Justus Lipsius could not see his way in these contradictory statements.

Caesar, who returned to Rome in October 707, employed the last months of the year, partly in making preparations for a Parthian war, and partly in introducing various regulations, as he had done after his return from Africa. During the latter period of the republic, it had been very common to insert an intercalary month, quite arbitrarily, for the purpose of gaining certain advantages. The refusal on the part of the Pontifex Maximus to make such an insertion had been the cause of Curio's hostility towards the senate. Caesar remedied the evil consequences and confusion arising from such proceedings by his reform of the calendar, which he introduced after his return from Africa.

LECTURE XCIX.

It is one of the inestimable advantages of an hereditary government commonly called the legitimate, whatever its form may be, that it may be formally inactive in regard to the state and the population—that it may reserve its interference until it is absolutely necessary, and apparently leave things to take their own course. If we look around us and observe the various constitutions, we shall scarcely perceive the interference of the government; the greater part of the time passes away without those who have the reins in their hands being obliged to pay any particular attention to what they are doing, and a very large amount of individual liberty may be enjoyed. But if the government is what we call a usurpation, the ruler has not only to take care to maintain his power, but in all that he undertakes he has to consider by what means, and in what ways, he can establish his right to govern, and his own personal qualifications for it. Men who are in such a position are

urged on to act by a very sad necessity, from which they cannot escape; and such was the position of Caesar at Rome. In our European states, men have wide and extensive spheres in which they can act and move. The much-decried system of centralisation has indeed many disadvantages; but it has this advantage for the ruler, that he can exert an activity which shews its influence far and wide. But what could Caesar do, in the centre of nearly the whole of the known world? He could not hope to effect any material improvements either in Italy or in the provinces. He had been accustomed from his youth, and more especially during the last fifteen years, to an enormous activity, and idleness was intolerable to him. At the close of the civil war, he would have had little or nothing to do, unless he had turned his attention to some foreign enterprise. He was obliged to venture upon something that would occupy his whole soul, for he could not rest. His thoughts were therefore again directed to war, and that in a quarter where the most brilliant triumphs awaited him, where the bones of the legions of Crassus lay unavenged—to a war against the Parthians. About this time the Getae also had spread in Thrace, and he intended to check their progress likewise. But his main problem was to destroy the Parthian empire, and to extend the Roman dominion as far as India, a plan in which he would certainly have been successful; and he himself felt so sure of this, that he was already thinking of what he should undertake afterwards. It is by no means incredible, that, as we are told, he intended, on his return, to march through the passes of the Caucasus, and through ancient Scythia into the country of the Getae, and thence through Germany and Gaul into Italy.[1] Besides this expedition, he entertained other plans of no less gigantic dimensions. The port of Ostia was bad, and in reality little better than a mere road-stead, so that great ships could not come up the river. Accordingly, it is said that Caesar intended to dig a canal for sea-ships, from the Tiber, above or below Rome, through the Pomptine marshes as far as Terracina. He further contemplated to cut through the isthmus of Corinth. It is not easy to see in what manner he would have accomplished this, considering the state of hydraulic architecture in those times. The Roman canals were mere *fossae*, and canals with

[1] Plutarch, *Caes.* 58.

sluices, though not unknown to the Romans, were not constructed by them.[2] The fact of Caesar forming such enormous plans is not very surprising; but we can scarcely comprehend how it was possible for him to accomplish so much of what he undertook in the short time of five months preceding his death. Following the unfortunate system of Sulla, Caesar founded throughout Italy a number of colonies of veterans. The old Sullanian colonists were treated with great severity, and many of them and their children were expelled from their lands, and were thus punished for the cruelty which they or their fathers had committed against the inhabitants of the municipia. In like manner, colonies were established in southern Gaul, Italy, Africa, and other parts; I may mention in particular the colonies founded at Carthage and Corinth. The latter, however, was a *colonia libertinorum*, and never rose to any importance. We do not know the details of its foundation, but one would imagine that Caesar would have preferred restoring the place as a purely Greek town. This, however, he did not do. Its population was and remained a mixed one, and Corinth never rose to a state of real prosperity.

Caesar made various new arrangements in the state, and, among others, he restored the full franchise, or the *jus honorum*, to the sons of those who had been proscribed in the time of Sulla. He had obtained for himself the title of imperator and the dictatorship for life, and the consulship for ten years. Half of the offices of the republic, to which persons had before been elected by the centuries, were in his gift; and for the other half he usually recommended candidates, so that the elections were merely nominal. The tribes seem to have retained their rights of election uncurtailed, and the last tribunes must have been elected by the people. But although Caesar did not himself confer the consulship, yet the whole republic was reduced to a mere form and appearance. Caesar made various new laws and regulations; for example, to lighten the burdens of debtors, and the like; but the changes he introduced in the form of the constitution were of little importance. He increased the number of praetors, which Sulla had raised to eight, successively to ten, twelve, fourteen, and sixteen, and the number of quaestors was increased to forty.[3]

[2] The first canals with sluices were executed by the Dutch in the fifteenth century.—N.

[3] Dion Cassius, xliii. 47, fol.

Hence the number of persons from whom the senate was to be filled up became greater than that of the vacancies, and Caesar accordingly increased the number of senators, though it is uncertain what number he fixed upon[4], and raised a great many of his friends to the dignity of senators. In this, as in many other cases, he acted very arbitrarily; for he elected into the senate whomsoever he pleased, and conferred the franchise in a manner equally arbitrary. These things did not fail to create much discontent. It is a remarkable fact that, notwithstanding his mode of filling up the senate, not even the majority of senators were attached to his cause after his death.

If we consider the changes and regulations which Caesar introduced, it must strike us as a singular circumstance that, among all his measures, there is no trace of any indicating that he thought of modifying the constitution, for the purpose of putting an end to the anarchy, for all his changes are in reality not essential or of great importance. Sulla felt the necessity of remodelling the constitution, but he did not attain his end; and the manner, too, in which he set about it, was that of a short-sighted man; but he was, at least, intelligent enough to see that the constitution, as it then was, could not continue to exist. In the regulations of Caesar we see no trace of such a conviction; and I think that he despaired of the possibility of effecting any real good by constitutional reforms. Hence, among all his laws, there is not one that had any relation to the constitution. The fact of his increasing the number of patrician families[5] had no reference to the constitution; so far, in fact, were the patricians from having any advantages over the plebeians, that the office of the two *aediles Cereales*, which Caesar instituted, was confined to the plebeians[6], —a regulation which was opposed to the very nature of the patriciate. His raising persons to the rank of patricians was neither more nor less than the modern practice of raising a family to the rank of nobility; he picked out an individual, and gave him the rank of patrician for himself and his descendants, but did not elevate a whole gens. The distinction itself

[4] When Dion Cassius, *l. c.*, says, ὥστε καὶ ἐννακοσίους τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτῶν γενέσθαι, he probably does not mean that this was a fixed number, but only indicates that it was the highest number to which the senate was then accidentally raised.—N.

[5] Tacitus, *Annal* xi. 25; Sueton. *Caes.* 41; Dion Cassius, xliii. 47, xlv. 2.

[6] Dion Cassius, xliii. 51.

was merely a nominal one, and conferred no privilege upon a person except that of holding certain priestly offices, which could be filled by none but patricians, and for which their number was scarcely sufficient. If Caesar had died quietly, the republic would have been in the same, nay in a much worse, state of dissolution than if he had not existed at all. I consider it a proof of the wisdom and good sense of Caesar that he did not, like Sulla, think an improvement in the state of public affairs so near at hand or a matter of so little difficulty. The cure of the disease lay yet at a very great distance, and the first condition on which it could be undertaken was the sovereignty of Caesar, a condition which would have been quite unbearable even to many of his followers, who as rebels did not scruple to go along with him. But Rome could no longer exist as a republic.

It is curious to see in Cicero's work, *De re publica*, the consciousness running through it, that Rome, as it then stood, required the strong hand of a king. Cicero had surely often owned this to himself; but he saw no one who would have entered into such an idea. The title of king had a great fascination for Caesar, as it had for Cromwell,—a surprising phenomenon in a practical mind like that of Caesar. Every one knows the fact that while Caesar was sitting on the *suggestum*, during the celebration of the Lupercalia, Antony presented to him the diadem, to try how the people would take it. Caesar saw the great alarm which the act created, and declined the diadem for the sake of appearance; but had the people been silent, Caesar would unquestionably have accepted it. His refusal was accompanied by loud shouts of acclamation, which, for the present, rendered all further attempts impossible. Antony then had a statue of Caesar adorned with the diadem; but two tribunes of the people, L. Caesetius Flavus, and Epidius Marullus, took it away: and here Caesar shewed the real state of his feelings, for he treated the conduct of the tribunes as a personal insult towards himself. He had lost his self-possession, and his fate carried him irresistibly onward. He wished to have the tribunes imprisoned, but was prevailed upon to be satisfied with their being stripped of their office and sent into exile. This created a great sensation at Rome. Caesar had also been guilty of an act of thoughtlessness, or perhaps merely of distraction, as might happen very easily to a

man in his circumstances. When the senate had made its last decrees, conferring upon Caesar unlimited powers, the senators, consuls, and praetors, or the whole senate, in festal attire, presented the decrees to him, and Caesar at the moment forgot to shew his respect for the senators; he did not rise from his *sella curulis*, but received the decrees in an unceremonious manner. This want of politeness was never forgiven by the persons who had not scrupled to make him their master; for it had been expected that he would, at least, behave politely, and be grateful for such decrees.[7] Caesar himself had no design in the act, which was merely the consequence of distraction or thoughtlessness; but it made the senate his irreconcilable enemies. The affair with the tribunes, moreover, had made a deep impression upon the people. Cicero, who was surely not a democrat, wrote at the time, *turpissimi consulares, turpis senatus, populus fortis, infimus quisque honore fortissimus*, etc. The praise here bestowed upon the people may be somewhat exaggerated, but the rest is true. We must, however, remember that the people, under such circumstances, are most sensible to anything affecting their honour, as we have seen at the beginning of the French revolution.

In the year of Caesar's death, Brutus and Cassius were praetors. Both had been generals under Pompey. Brutus' mother, Servilia, was a half-sister of Cato, for after the death of her first husband, Cato's mother had married Servilius Caepio. She was a remarkable woman, but very immoral, and unworthy of her son; not even the honour of her own daughter was sacred to her. The family of Brutus derived its origin from L. Junius Brutus; and from the time of its first appearance among the plebeians, it had had few men of importance to boast of. During the period subsequent to the passing of the Licinian laws, we meet with some Junii in the Fasti, but not one of them acquired any great reputation. The family had become reduced and almost contemptible. One M. Brutus in particular, disgraced his family by sycophancy (*accusationes factitabat*[8]) in the time of Sulla, and was afterwards killed in Gaul by Pompey. Although no Roman family

[7] I have known an instance of a man of rank and influence, who could never forgive another man, who was by far his superior in every respect, for having forgotten to take off his hat during a visit. — N.

[8] Cicero, *De Offic.* II. 14. Compare *Brutus*, 74, and Plutarch, *Brut.* 4. where, however, he is erroneously described as the father of Brutus the tyrannicide,

belonged to a more illustrious gens, yet Brutus was not by any means one of those men who are raised by fortunate circumstances. The education, however, which he received had a great influence upon him. His uncle Cato, whose daughter Porcia he married—whether in Cato's lifetime, or afterwards, is doubtful—had initiated him from his early youth in the Stoic philosophy, and had instilled into his mind a veneration for it, as though it had been a religion. Brutus had qualities which Cato did not possess. The latter had something of an ascetic nature, and was, if I may say so, a scrupulously pious character; but Brutus had no such scrupulous timidity; his mind was more flexible and loveable. Cato spoke well, but could not be reckoned among the eloquent men of his time. Brutus' great talents had been developed with the utmost care, and if he had lived longer, and in peace, he would have become a classical writer of the highest order. He had been known to Cicero from his early age, and Cicero felt a fatherly attachment to him; he saw in him a young man who, he hoped, would exert a beneficial influence upon the next generation. I have already had occasion to mention this amiable feature in the character of Cicero, of which Virgil also furnishes an example; for after reading some of Virgil's youthful productions, Cicero called him "magnae spes altera Romae.[9]" It was with a similar feeling that he looked upon Brutus. Caesar too had known and loved him from his childhood; but the stories, which are related to account for this attachment, must be rejected as foolish inventions of idle persons; for nothing is more natural than that Caesar should look with great fondness upon a young man of such extraordinary and amiable qualities. The absence of envy was one of the distinguishing features in the character of Caesar, as it was in that of Cicero. In the battle of Pharsalus, Brutus served in the army of Pompey, and after the battle he wrote a letter to Caesar, who had inquired after him; and when Caesar heard of his safety he was delighted, and invited him to his camp.[10] Caesar afterwards gave him the administration of Cisalpine Gaul, where Brutus distinguished himself in a very extraordinary manner, by his love of justice.

Cassius was related to Brutus, and had likewise belonged to the Pompeian party; but he was very unlike Brutus: he was much older, and a distinguished military officer. After the

[9] Donatus, *Vita Virgilii*, p. v. ed. Burmann.

[10] Plutarch, *Brut.* 6.

death of Crassus he had maintained himself as quaestor in Syria against the Parthians, and he enjoyed a very great reputation in the army, but he was after all no better than an ordinary officer of Caesar. After the battle of Pharsalus, Caesar did not at first know whither Pompey was gone. Cassius was at the time stationed with some galleys in the Hellespont, notwithstanding which, Caesar with his usual boldness took a boat to sail across that strait, and on meeting Cassius called upon him to embrace his party. Cassius readily complied, and Caesar forgave him[11], as he forgave all his adversaries: even Marcellus, who had mortally offended him, was pardoned at the request of Cicero. Caesar thus endeavoured to efface all recollections of the Civil War.

Caesar had appointed both Brutus and Cassius praetors for that year. With the exception of the office of praetor urbanus, which was honourable and lucrative, the praetorship was a burdensome office, and conferred little distinction, since the other praetors were only the presidents of the courts. Formerly they had been elected by lot; but the office was now altogether in the gift of Caesar. Both Brutus and Cassius had wished for the praetura urbana, and when Caesar gave that office to Brutus, Cassius was not only indignant at Caesar but began quarrelling with Brutus also. While Cassius was in this state of exasperation, a meeting of the senate was announced for the 15th of March, on which day, as the report went, a proposal was to be made to offer Caesar the crown. This was a welcome opportunity for Cassius, who resolved to take vengeance, for he had even before entertained a personal hatred of Caesar, and was now disappointed at not having obtained the city praetorship. He first sounded Brutus, and finding that he was safe, made direct overtures to him. During the night some one wrote on the tribunal and the house of Brutus the words, "Remember that thou art Brutus." Brutus became reconciled to Cassius, offered his assistance, and gained over several other persons to join the conspiracy. All party differences seem to have vanished all at once: two of the conspirators were old generals of Caesar, C. Trebonius and Decimus Brutus, both of whom had fought with him in Gaul, and against Massilia, and had been raised to high honours by their chief. There were among the conspirators persons of all parties. Men who had fought

[11] Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 88; Sueton. *Caes.* 63; Dion Cassius, xlii. 6.

against one another at Pharsalus now went hand in hand, and entrusted their lives to one another.[12] No proposals were made to Cicero, the reasons usually assigned for which are of the most calumniatory kind. It is generally said that the conspirators had no confidence in Cicero[13], an opinion which is perfectly contemptible. Cicero would not have betrayed them for any consideration, but what they feared were his objections. Brutus had as noble a soul as any one, but he was passionate; Cicero, on the other hand, who was at an advanced age, had made sad experiences, and his feelings were so exceedingly delicate, that he could not have consented to take away the life of him to whom he himself owed his own, who had always behaved most nobly towards him, and had intentionally drawn him before the world as his friend. Caesar's conduct towards those who had fought in the ranks of Pompey and afterwards returned to him was extremely noble, and he regarded the reconciliation of those men as a personal favour conferred himself. All who knew Cicero must have been convinced that he would not have given his consent to the plan of the conspirators; and if they ever did give the matter a serious thought, they must have owned to themselves that every wise man would have dissuaded them from it; for it was in fact the most complete absurdity to fancy that the republic could be restored by Caesar's death. Goethe says somewhere that the murder of Caesar was the most senseless act that the Romans ever committed; and a truer word was never spoken.[14] The result of it could not possibly be any other than that which did follow the deed.

Caesar was cautioned by Hirtius and Pansa, both wise men of noble characters, especially the former, who saw that the republic must become consolidated, and not thrown into fresh convulsions. They advised Caesar to be careful, and to take

[12] The real number of conspirators is not known; and our accounts are not quite trustworthy.—N.

[13] Demosthenes has been calumniated in a similar manner. The verses in Plutarch (*Demosth.* c. 30) Εἴπερ ἴσην ῥώμην γνώμῃ, Δημόσθενες, εἶχες Οὔποτ' ἂν Ἑλλήνων ἦρξεν Ἄρης Μακέδων, have often been misunderstood. I do not mean to say that his courage was equal to his talents; but the meaning of the passage is, "If thou hadst had as much power as thou hadst intelligence, the Macedonians would never have ruled over the Greeks."—N.

[14] *Nachgelass. Werke*, vol. xiii. p. 68, Goethe says: "How little even the better sort (among the Romans) knew what government is, is clear from the most absurd act that ever was committed, the murder of Caesar."

a body guard; but he replied that he would rather not live at all, than be in constant fear of losing his life. Caesar once expressed to some of his friends his conviction that Brutus was capable of harbouring a murderous design, but he added, that as he (Caesar) could not live much longer, Brutus would wait and not be guilty of such a crime. Caesar's health was at that time weak, and the general opinion was that he intended to surrender his power to Brutus as the most worthy. Whilst the conspirators were making their preparations, Porcia, the wife of Brutus, inferred from the excitement and restlessness of her husband that some fearful secret was pressing on his mind; but as he did not show her any confidence, she seriously wounded herself with a knife, and was seized with a violent wound-fever. No one knew the cause of her illness; and it was not till after many entreaties of her husband that at length she revealed it to him, saying that as she had been able to conceal the cause of her illness, so she could also keep any secret that might be entrusted to her. Her entreaties induced Brutus to commmunicate to her the plan of the conspirators. Caesar was also cautioned by the haruspices, by a dream of his wife, and by his own forebodings, which we have no reason for doubting. But on the morning of the 15th of March, the day fixed upon for assassinating Caesar, Decimus Brutus treacherously enticed him to go with him to the curia, as it was impossible to delay the deed any longer. The detail of what happened on that day may be read in Plutarch. The conspirators were at first seized with fear, lest their plan should be betrayed; but on Caesar's entrance into the senate-house, C. Tillius (not Tullius) Cimber made his way up to him, and insulted him with his importunities, and Casca gave the first stroke. Caesar fell covered with twenty-three wounds. He was either in his fifty-sixth year, or had completed it; I am not quite certain on this point, though, if we judge by the time of his first consulship, he must have been fifty-six years old. His birthday, which is not generally known, was the 11th of Quinctilis, which month was afterwards called Julius[15], and his death took place on the 15th of March, between eleven and twelve o'clock.

[15] Macrobius, *Saturn.* i. 12; Lydus, *de Mensibus*, p. 110, according to which authorities, however, it was the 12th of Quinctilis.

LECTURE C.

No provision at all had been made as to what was to be done after Caesar's death, especially with regard to Antony. In the heat of the moment, when everything was possible, Cassius had demanded that Antony too should be killed; but Brutus declared that the sacrifice of one life was enough, an opinion which was decidedly wrong. Many ought to have been sacrificed, to make all things straight; but Antony ought to have been killed at any risk, if a simulacrum of the republic was to continue; for it was in reality he, and men like him, who had rendered Caesar's government odious. Antony especially had induced him to take the diadem; and it is acknowledged on all hands that Caesar alone would have governed in a beneficial manner. But as it was, the tumult and commotion were great, and in their alarm most of the senators took to flight, and a few only remained at Rome. It was a courageous act on the part of Cicero that he, with a few senators, immediately and publicly declared himself in favour of the conspirators as tyrannicides. Both parties were blind at the moment, and knew not what was to come next. One might have expected that the people would rejoice at the death of Caesar, as public opinion had expressed itself so loudly against him, ever since the affair with the tribunes Caesetius and Marullus; but the people is a hundred-headed monster, and there is nothing more fickle and inconstant than man. The same persons who had cursed Caesar only a few days before, had now quite changed their minds: they cursed the murderers and lamented Caesar. It is a common thing with men who have no character, to wish for extraordinary events; but as soon as the danger which is inseparable from them appears, they denounce those whom they urged on before.

The tumult at Rome lasted for several days. Caesar had fallen on the 15th of March, and on the 17th there was a meeting of the senate, to deliberate what was to be done during the state of excitement. At this meeting Antony shewed a conduct very different from what had been anticipated: he offered his hand in token of reconciliation, and expressed himself in a manner which scarcely any one could

take to be sincere; but the senate, nevertheless, became pacified, as it was thought that Antony was obliged by circumstances to act in the way he did. Cicero also came forward and spoke, and a general amnesty was decreed concerning all that had taken place; just as had been the case at Athens after the expulsion of the Thirty Tyrants. But the great question was, what to do? Brutus and Cassius had fled to the Capitol to escape from the storm, for public opinion in the city was decidedly against them. A great number of Caesar's soldiers were in the city, and many more flocked thither from other parts. The excitement was so great, that there was ground for apprehending acts of extreme violence. Brutus and Cassius began negotiating from the Capitol. The decrees of the senate, intended to bring about a reconciliation, were full of contradictions. While one party was inclined to honour the murderers of Caesar, the decrees of the senate were framed in the very opposite spirit. The proposal which was made to declare Caesar a tyrant, and his acts to be invalid, was not only rejected, but the senate went so far, in its fear of Caesar's veterans, as to decree divine honours to him, and the express validity of all his regulations. It had further been proposed that his will should be declared void; but L. Piso, his father-in-law, opposed the measure with obstinate impudence, and induced the senate to recognise the will as valid, to have it read in public, and carried into execution. Piso's intention was to inspire the soldiers and the populace with enthusiasm for the deceased, who had possessed enormous riches, which had been amassed partly in war, and partly in the administration of the republic. He had left munificent legacies to the soldiers and every Roman citizen, and these bequests were sure to produce the effect which the friends of Caesar desired.

Some few persons wisely proposed that his burial should take place quite quietly and in private; but this plan too was frustrated by the impetuosity of the faction and the cowardice of the senate; and it was resolved that the body should be buried with the greatest solemnity in the Campus Martius. It was a general custom for the bodies of distinguished persons to be carried on a bier uncovered, as is still the fashion in Italy. The bier was put down in the Forum before the rostra, and one of the relatives of the deceased delivered a funeral oration. The nearest relative of Caesar was Antony,

whose mother, Julia, was Caesar's sister, and he accordingly delivered the funeral oration. He produced a fearful effect upon the minds of the people; for he not only dwelt upon the great exploits of Caesar amid roars of applause, but after he had excited their minds in the highest degree by his recital, he lifted up the bloody toga, and shewed the people the wounds of the great deceased. The multitude were seized with such indignation and rage, that instead of allowing the body to be carried to the Campus Martius, they immediately raised in the Forum a pile of benches, and any wood that could be got, and burnt the corpse there. One person, whom they thought to be one of the murderers, though he was quite innocent, was literally torn to pieces. The people then dispersed in troops; they broke into the houses of the conspirators, and destroyed them. It was not till after receiving a formal promise upon oath from Antony and Lepidus, that Brutus and Cassius ventured to come down from the Capitol; but as, after the events of that day, they saw no safety at Rome, they went to Antium. The other conspirators dispersed themselves over the provinces. Decimus Brutus went to Cisalpine Gaul, which had been promised him as his province by Caesar, and administered to the legions the oath of allegiance to himself. Brutus had been promised the province of Macedonia, and Cassius that of Syria.

The events of the year of Caesar's death are so manifold and complicated, that it is impossible for me to mention them all in their succession. If you will read Fabricius' Life of Cicero, you will find a detailed account of the history of the last two years of his life. I cannot give you a strictly chronological account, but am obliged to place the events before you in a somewhat different order. An accurate knowledge of the chronological succession of the occurrences during those two years, is necessary, however, to enable one to understand Cicero's Philippics.

Caesar in his will had appointed C. Octavius, the grandson of his sister Julia, heir *ex dodrante*, that is, of three-fourths of his property, after the deduction of all legacies, and his other relatives were to have the remaining fourth. Antony, however, and L. Piso were not among his heirs. Caesar's aunt Julia, the sister of his father, had been married to Marius, and his sister Julia to M. Atius Balbus. Atia, the daughter of

this latter Julia, was married to C. Octavius, a worthy man, whose father, C. Octavius, a person of distinction, had died too early to obtain the consulship. Whether this family of the Octavii was connected with those Octavii who had acted a prominent part in the earlier periods of Roman history, and especially with the colleague of Tib. Gracchus, is not clear, though I am inclined to deny it, since the family is spoken of as only of equestrian rank.[1] Young C. Octavius was in his nineteenth year when Caesar was murdered, having been born on the 23rd of September, 689. Caesar had taken an interest in him ever since his return from Spain; whereas, before that time, he does not appear to have taken any particular notice of him. Caesar had intended to take him with him in his expedition against the Parthians, to complete his military education; but, some time previously to his death, he had sent him to Apollonia in Illyricum to acquire a Greek culture, which was then so prevalent among the Romans, that Cicero and his friends wrote Greek letters to one another, and often spoke Greek, as we see from the history of Brutus, Cassius, and Messala[2], who conversed in Greek with one another.[3] C. Octavius was to stay at Apollonia, until his uncle should set out for Asia. When he received the sad intelligence of Caesar's death, he went to Rome, and claimed from Antony the inheritance of his uncle. This was a highly disagreeable thing for Antony, who had the most urgent reasons for not letting the property go out of his hands, as he was responsible for it, and had to take care that no mistake should be made, and that it should be most faithfully administered. But in reality he looked upon that property as the French looked upon the five millions which Napoleon had deposited at Paris, and was unwilling to give it up. C. Octavius had been adopted by Caesar, which is the first instance of an adoption by will that I know in Roman history; afterwards, such adoptions are very frequent.

[1] Vell. Paterc. ii. 59; Sueton. *Aug.* 2.

[2] It was then at Rome with Greek as it was with French in Germany at the the time when I was a young man. I used then to speak with older friends more French than German, and it was not looked upon as affectation when French words or phrases were occasionally introduced into German conversation. So, at Rome, every man of education was obliged to speak and write Greek; though their Greek, as, for example, the specimens in Cicero's letters often had something peculiar; as was the case with the French spoken in Germany during the last century. It would be interesting to examine this point minutely.—N.

[3] Plutarch, *Brut.* 40

Antony seriously endeavoured to deter the young man from accepting the inheritance, on the ground that he was yet too young; and Atia, his mother, and L. Marcius Philippus, his step-father, intimidated as they were, advised him to withdraw his claims.[4] But Agrippa, whose subsequent conduct is very praiseworthy, had already become the adviser of C. Octavius, or, as he was called henceforth, C. Julius Caesar Octavianus. His connexion with Octavian, however, was at this time a misfortune for the republic; for, had it not been for Agrippa, Octavian would have acted quite a different part; he would have allowed himself to be intimidated, affairs would have taken a different turn, and Brutus would perhaps have been obliged in the end to undertake the dictatorship, but probably under some other name, and then have placed himself at the head of the republic; for soon after Caesar's death the dictatorship was abolished for ever.[5]

As Octavian discovered in Antony his principal enemy, he attached himself to the party of his opponents, especially to Cicero, who was perfectly pure. He could not, of course, form any connexions with Brutus and the other murderers of his uncle. Cicero had confidence in him, which the murderers could not have had; and he, in fact, allowed himself to be imposed upon by the deep cunning of the youth, as he was always longing to see what he wished, and what he thought should be. He was thus willing to see in Octavian such sentiments as he thought salutary to the republic, and formed a friendship with him. Octavian compelled Antony to surrender Caesar's will, and put himself in possession of his inheritance so far as it had not been already disposed of by Antony, who had secreted the greater part of the money which Caesar had collected. The exasperation between Octavian and Antony rose very high about this time, and each suspected the other, perhaps not unjustly, of attempts at assassination.

The ferment at Rome had, in the meantime, increased to such a point, that Cicero resolved to go to Greece, and spend his time at Athens till the beginning of the following year, when Hirtius and Pansa were to enter on their consulship, for Hirtius was a worthy, able, and well-meaning man and a friend

[4] Vell. Paterc. ii. 60; Sueton. *Aug.* 8, foll.

[5] Cicero, *Philip.* i. 1. 13, ii. 36; Livy, *Epit.* 116; Appian, *De Bell. Civil* iii. 25; Dion Cassius, xliv. 51.

to Cicero; Pansa was of much less consequence, and not better than an ordinary soldier. There is no other period in Cicero's life in which he shewed such intellectual activity as during that summer. He began his work *De Officiis* during the greatest convulsions of the republic, which is a proof of prodigious strength and self-possession: he wrote his works *De Divinatione*, *De Fato*, the *Topica*, and the lost work, *De Gloria*, all of which, and an enormous number of letters, many of which are lost, were produced in that summer. I know no other man who, at any time of his life, was so intensely active as Cicero then was. His activity was a consolation to him in his grief; and the fact of his being able to throw himself so completely into intellectual pursuits, is a convincing proof of the extraordinary power of his mind: any other man would have been crushed under the weight of his sorrows, and the terrors of the time. Cicero, on the other hand, although he knew all that was going on, did not allow himself to be overpowered by it. His intention to go to Greece had not been carried into effect, for contrary winds kept him at Rhegium.

Antony, by forced decrees of the senate, had caused the province of Macedonia to be given to his brother Caius Antonius, and that of Syria to Dolabella, who had been appointed with him to the consulship after Caesar's death. For himself, Antony had reserved Cisalpine Gaul; but he, nevertheless, now turned round, and declared himself in favour of the optimates. He seemed all at once to have become a different man: he was quite willing to bring about a reconciliation, and carried several laws which breathed that spirit. Every one who knew him was struck with amazement. Cicero, who was informed of the change, was urgently requested by his friends to return and become reconciled with Antony. But here he was influenced by an unfortunate timidity. Had he appeared in the senate at the risk of being murdered there, and had he ventured to address Antony as if he had confidence in him, he might have prevented great misfortunes. Antony felt a bitter enmity towards him, and hated him; but I believe that he would, notwithstanding, have consented to a reconciliation. Cicero here erred in allowing himself to be overcome by the just horror and disgust he felt for Antony, by whose really detestable and profligate character he is sufficiently excused; although Antony was not altogether without any good quality, as Cicero

imagined. If we compare Antony with Octavian, we must admit that Antony was open-hearted; whereas Octavian was made up of hypocrisy: his whole life was a farce. It is well known that on his death-bed at Nola, he asked his friends, whether he had not played the comedy of his life well? He was an actor throughout ; everything he did was a farce, well devised and skilfully executed. The most profound hypocrisy was his greatest talent. In the vicious and profligate life of Antony, on the other hand, there occur some actions which shew good nature, generosity, and even greatness; and if Cicero had appeared in the senate, a reconciliation would certainly have been possible. This, however, Cicero did not do; and he may even have offended Antony by his wit and satire, for it was his wit that in most cases gave rise to the enmity of others against him. As Cicero did not go to the senate, Antony attacked him in the most improper and outrageous manner. This gave rise to Cicero's second Philippic, which was not spoken, but only written. It was, however, published, and immediately produced the greatest effect; it was devoured by the friends of Cicero, who was himself staying in the country for the sake of safety.

Towards the end of the year, Antony went to Lombardy, or Cisalpine Gaul, the inhabitants of which were indebted to Caesar for their franchise. As the senate had recognised the validity of the acts of Caesar, Antony had acted during the summer after the dictator's death in the most outrageous manner; for under the pretence of proceeding according to the regulations laid down in Caesar's papers, he did anything he pleased: he sold to some the *jus Latii*, and to others the franchise; he conferred immunities upon colonies, and called a number of his creatures into the senate. After such proceedings, it was difficult indeed for a man like Cicero to become reconciled to him. The administration of Spain was at the time in the hands of Asinius Pollio, and M. Lepidus and L. Munatius Plancus had that of Gaul. On arriving in his province, Antony endeavoured to induce the legions to revolt against Decimus Brutus, but with little success. The towns north of the Alps and in Illyricum seemed at first inclined to embrace his cause; but his mad conduct and his extortions soon deterred them from doing so.

On the first of January, 709, Hirtius and Pansa, who had been appointed consuls by Caesar, entered upon their office: so great was his power even after his death! Antony was declared a public enemy, and the senate gave the provinces of Gaul and Italy to the consuls, to carry on the war, in common with Decimus Brutus, against Antony. Octavian had prevailed upon Cicero to induce the senate to grant him the power and ensigns of a praetor. Antony recalled the legions which Caesar had sent to Macedonia, with the view of employing them on his expedition against the Parthians and Getae; but on their arrival in Italy, two of them deserted to Octavian, and formed the nucleus of an army with which he was enabled to oppose Antony. So long as the hostility between Octavian and Antony lasted, these legions were really prepared to protect Cicero and other patriots, although the soldiers hated no one more than him and whatever there remained of the Pompeian party. Brutus and Cassius had in the mean time gone to Greece.

LECTURE CI.

THE last Philippics, which extend to the month of April, as well as several of the letters *Ad Diversos*, which are extremely important for contemporary history, belong to the year 709, the last of Cicero's life. The letters to Brutus refer to the same period. They consist of two parts: an earlier one, which is found in the same manuscripts as the letters of Cicero to his brother Quintus; and a later one, which was first published in the *editio Cratandrina*, and was, I believe, discovered in Germany. Whether the letters contained in the second part were forged in the sixteenth century, or are ancient and genuine, is a question which I cannot answer. If they are a forgery, it is a masterly one. The genuineness even of the first part, which has come down to us in very ancient manuscripts, is likewise very doubtful. They are of great interest to those who have Cicero's history at heart. They were unquestionably written at a very early period, and belong probably to the first century of our era. I am almost inclined to consider them as a production of the first century, perhaps of

the time of Augustus or Tiberius. Their author was evidently a man of talent, and perfectly familiar with the circumstances of the period to which they relate. The question respecting their genuineness was raised about a hundred years ago by English critics, and I know that F. A. Wolf was decidedly of opinion that they are a fabrication, but I cannot express myself with the same certainty. I should like to see them proved to be spurious, as I am morally convinced that they are[1], but there are some serious considerations opposed to this view. These letters to Brutus shew a certain difference of feeling between Cicero and Brutus; and if a person of talent contrasts the psychological natures of the two men, that want of harmony would naturally present itself to him as the result of his comparison. But in whatever manner the letters may have been composed, their author lived so near the time to which they refer, and their substance is based upon such authentic documents, that we may take them as trustworthy sources of history.

The first months of the year of Hirtius and Pansa's consulship were spent by Antony in besieging Decimus Brutus at Modena. All the towns in Cisalpine Gaul had by this time declared against Antony. Modena must then have been a town of very great extent, since Decimus Brutus was in it with his whole army. Antony had eight or nine legions, and was far superior in numbers to the besieged, so that there was no prospect for the latter except ultimate surrender. But Hirtius, Pansa, and Octavian as praetor, came with three armies to relieve the place. Hirtius and Octavian appeared first, and pitched their camp in the neighbourhood of Bologna, and Pansa followed with reinforcements. The army of Octavian alone consisted of veterans; those of Hirtius and Pansa, for the most part, of newly-formed legions, so that the two latter were labouring under disadvantages. Antony broke up and advanced against the enemy, for his plan was to prevent the hostile armies uniting. This occasioned an engagement, into which the troops of Pansa, especially the legio Martia, which had been sent to his succour, inconsiderately allowed themselves to be drawn. The fight was quite an irregular one. Antony was at first nearly defeated, but he afterwards gained the upper hand, and he was on the point of winning

[1] I am convinced with Wolf that the oration for Marcellus is a forgery. —N.

the battle, when Hirtius arrived from his camp with reinforcements, and Antony was beaten.[2] Pansa however had been severely wounded, and died soon afterwards.

Some ten days or a fortnight later, during which Antony kept within his fortifications, so that the situation of Decimus Brutus was in no way improved, the troops of Pansa joined the other armies, and Hirtius now attacked Antony, through the upper lines of whose position he broke, and took his camp; but he himself fell in the battle. During the engagement, Decimus Brutus made a sally, and succeeded in joining the armies of his defenders. Antony might still have maintained himself in the country, but he was bewildered, and resolved to quit Italy. He cannot have thought at that time of the possibility of becoming reconciled with Octavian.

About the end of April, the prospects of Rome were favourable, except that both consuls were dead. Octavian's reputation was, even as early as that time, such as to occasion a report, which was surely not quite without foundation, that he had caused the surgeon to poison the wound of Pansa, and had hired an assassin to murder Hirtius. If we apply the *cui bono* of L. Cassius[3], a strong suspicion indeed hangs upon Octavian; and if, in addition to this, we consider that he was not a man whose moral character was too good to allow him to commit such acts, we cannot help thinking that the suspicion was not altogether unfounded. The republic was thus in the condition of an orphan, and those who might have become the successors of the consuls were in circumstances which did not permit it to entrust itself to them. In this sate of affairs, Octavian placed himself at the head of the armies of the two consuls; that of Antony was dispersed, and he himself fled with a small band across the Alps. Lepidus, who was then in Gaul, had it in his power to put an end to Antony's career. He was one of those who had, unfortunately, been among the friends of Caesar; he was a contemptible person, and after the death of Caesar, he had been raised to the office of pontifex maximus, without having any claims to it. Lepidus and Munatius Plancus, who had strong armies in Gaul, might as I said before, have put an end to the war by cutting off Antony;

[2] We have in Appian a sort of official bulletin of this battle, which was sent to Rome, and from which probably some deductions must be made.—N.

[3] See Cicero, *pro Sext. Roscio*, c. 30.

but Lepidus had no resolution, and would not lift up his hand against him. He had previously endeavoured to bring about a peace between the senate and Antony, whom he now received into his camp, and who was proclaimed, perhaps only in mockery, imperator by the armies of both Lepidus and Plancus. This happened in the course of the summer, which begins in Italy on the 7th or 8th of May.

During the perplexities into which the republic was thrown by the death of the two consuls, Octavian began to disclose his real sentiments, by causing his veterans to demand the consulship for him. In his first attempt he proposed Cicero for his colleague, and declared that he would follow his advice in all things; but this was a mere farce, devised to deceive the people. Cicero however did not fall into the trap, for he now saw that everything was hopeless. These last months of his life, from the beginning of June, formed the most unhappy period of his existence, of which he now felt completely tired, so that we need not wonder at his refusing to escape from death. The veterans demanded the consulship for Octavian with threats, and Cicero, as resolutely as any other senator, at first resisted them—certainly not a sign of cowardice, for which his great sensibility is too often mistaken; but in the end Octavian's opponents were obliged to yield. He and his nephew, Q. Pedius, were accordingly proclaimed consuls on the 19th of August. All hopes of the patriots had now disappeared: the senate was reduced to complete servility, and Cicero withdrew from its meetings altogether. One of the first measures of the new consuls was the frightful *lex Pedia*.[4] Its being passed by the people was a mere form. It ordained criminal proceedings against all who had been accomplices in the murder of Caesar. The partizans of Octavian also accused the senate of having treated him with neglect after the war of Modena, although the senate could not have done more than it did, as Octavian was only practor. In accordance with the lex Pedia a commission was now appointed, before whom Brutus, Cassius and other conspirators were summoned to appear *pro forma*. All of them, however, seem to have taken to flight, and the accused were condemned *in contumaciam*, and contrary to the Roman law, proscribed. According to the ancient privileges, persons who were

[4] Vell. Paterc. ii. 69; Appian, *De Bell Civil.* iii. 95; Livy, *Epit.* 120.

condemned might withdraw; but in this case they were hunted up wherever they were, and prizes were offered for their heads. Decimus Brutus fled from his own troops, whom Octavian had already induced to revolt, and he was murdered on the frontier of Gaul by a former friend.

While these things were going on, the month of November was approaching. Antony, accompanied by Lepidus and Plancus, had come from Gaul, and Octavian was stationed near Bologna to meet them. Through the mediation of Lepidus negotiations were commenced, and a meeting took place on a small island in the river Reno near Bologna. Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus agreed to undertake the government of the republic for five years, under the title "Triumviri rei publicae constituendae." This was, according to the old Licinian law, an extraordinary magistracy, which may however have existed at other times also, and the idea itself was not new.[5] Italy was to belong to the two consuls in common; but the provinces were distributed in such a manner that Lepidus obtained Spain and the part of Gaul near the Pyrenees; Antony Cisalpine Gaul, Lugdunensis, and Belgica; and Octavian Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia. The eastern provinces were not disposed of. The first thing that was now done was to proclaim a proscription of seventeen persons.[6] Antony sacrificed his own uncle, and Lepidus his own brother, whose proscription he is even said to have demanded. Velleius[7] and others who follow the writers of the Augustan age, state that Octavian was induced with great difficulty to consent to the sacrifice of Cicero: but I do not believe that he had any scruples about it. To a man of his nature, it was a relief to get rid of a benefactor before whom he had so often played the hypocrite, and to whom he had so often promised to remain faithful to the republic.[8] After this proscription there followed another of 130 senators, but the triumvirs did not stop short here. It is on the whole very surprising to see how frankly the historians of the age of Augustus, such as Asinius Pollio, express themselves upon the events of the time. The reason probably was that the occurrences were looked upon as the acts of private persons, or that

[5] See *Lectures*, vol. i. p. 367. [6] Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* iv. 6, foll. [7] ii. 66.

[8] It is on the whole astonishing how little we learn from the Epitome of Livy concerning this period, although it is probable that he was more honest than others; for it is known that Octavian called him a Pompeian. His fragment on Cicero also shews that he was honest and unprejudiced.—N.

the works were not immediately published. Many of our historians justly remark that these proscriptions were much worse than those instituted by Sulla; for the latter had been dictated by a furious party spirit. Sulla hated the men whom he sacrificed because they were his antagonists, and he had no scruples about killing them; but plunder was a secondary matter, and only an unavoidable consequence, which Sulla himself would willingly have dispensed with. The proscription of the triumvirs, on the other hand, was not so much the consequence of their desire to take vengeance as of their rapacity: wealthy persons, who had not done anything to provoke their anger, were put on the lists for no other reason than because they were rich, for the property of all the proscribed was confiscated. We know the history of a great many who fell victims during that frightful period, but I will here confine myself to the fate of Cicero.

He was in his Tusculanum at the time when the lists of the proscribed were published. He was undecided whether to await death in his villa or not, but he was prevailed upon by his brother to take to flight. They went along the sea coast to Astura, where he took a boat. His brother, who returned, was murdered soon afterwards. Having gone on board the boat, Cicero could not make up his mind as to whither he should sail: he was in fact tired of life, and unwilling to flee, so that a murderer was not unwelcome to him. He might himself have put an end to his existence; but, however much he respected Cato, such an act was, in his opinion, wrong and repugnant to all his feelings. He gave himself up to Providence. Had the winds been favourable he would, perhaps, have gone to Sex. Pompeius, who was already master of Sicily. If he had done so, he would probably have died a natural death, and lived to see the time when Sex. Pompeius made peace, and when the distinguished proscribed who lived in exile obtained permission to return to Rome. But he was very sick, and as the rowers wanted to return, he allowed them to land at Mola di Gaëta, in the neighbourhood of which he had a villa, intending to wait till the storm was over. He was betrayed by one of his own domestics, a freedman of his brother. A centurion, Popillius Laenas, a person belonging to one of the most distinguished plebeian families, and who is said to have once been defended by Cicero—which is, however, probably a

rhetorical invention to aggravate his crime—overtook Cicero, who had been persuaded by his friends to allow himself to be carried out in a lectica to a plantation near the coast. His slaves were ready to fight for him, but he forbade it. He put his head forward from the lectica, to receive the deadly blow, and died with the greatest courage. The day of his death was the 7th of December, 709. His son Marcus, who was at the time with Brutus in Macedonia, had until then behaved in a manner which justified the hope that he would one day distinguish himself, but he afterwards sank into the grossest sensuality and voluptuousness. He was, however, a man of talent and wit, which he had inherited from his father, of whom, in all other respects, he was unworthy. The opinions of Livy, Asinius Pollio, and Cassius Severus upon Cicero, which are preserved in Seneca's seventh Suasoria, differ very much in their spirit. Some of their sentiments are very beautiful, but some are only remarkable as characteristic of the authors themselves.

I have thought it my duty, in my account of Cicero, to direct your attention to the manner in which he has been judged of by vulgar men, who had scarcely received such an education as to entitle them to express an opinion on Cicero. I will mention, as an instance, Hook, whose voluminous history is in reality only patchwork; he is nowhere master of his subject. I have never been able to read through his book, for he is unjust towards Cicero in a manner which is quite revolting. Middleton's Life of Cicero, on the other hand, is written very beautifully, and in a noble spirit. The period in which Cicero began to be treated with contempt was the time when I was growing up to manhood, but until that time, and throughout the middle ages, Cicero was a great name, a sort of θεὸς ἄγνωτος, before whom all bowed the knee, but whose works were read by only a few. Dante, Petrarch, St. Bernard, a man of great intellect, and other eminent men of the middle ages, comprehended Cicero well, and were able to enter into his spirit. At the time of the revival of letters, the admiration of Cicero still increased. The rage of the Ciceroniani in the sixteenth century is well known; they regarded it as a heresy to use a word or a phrase which was not found in Cicero. Most of them lost their own wits by their slavish imitation; but others, such as P. Manutius, were extremely benefited by

taking Cicero for their guide. Towards the end of the eighteenth century a reaction took place; Roman literature began to be neglected, in proportion as the study of Greek struck root, and during the first decennium of our century that tendency continued to increase. At that time it was painful to a lover of Cicero to see even scholars of distinction treat him as utterly contemptible, especially on account of his philosophical writings, which were decried as ludicrous gossip. That time has fortunately passed away, and I believe that at present the value both of Greek and Roman literature is, on the whole, correctly estimated. The attention which has of late been bestowed upon Roman history, has been followed by a more accurate estimate of the value of Roman literature. With regard to Cicero as an author I cannot say anything better than Quintilian, that the pleasure which a man takes in the works of Cicero is the standard by which we may estimate his own intellectual culture.[9] Cicero's style was not, however, altogether perfect. His early works, especially his celebrated orations against Verres, contain passages which are entirely unworthy of him, and are pure Asiatic declamations, which he himself afterwards censured in his maturer work, "Brutus." His latest productions, on the other hand, contain no symptoms of old age, they are not stiff, and no one can say that he had sunk. His genius was in its bloom at the period about his praetorship and consulship. This, however, was followed by a time of great depression, which lasted until his return from exile. The most distinguished of his orations after his return is that for Caelius. The orations delivered when Caesar was at the head of affairs must not be judged of too severely; we have to take into consideration the pressure of circumstances. The second Philippic, I think, has been estimated too highly by all rhetoricians. In his vehemence Cicero here exaggerates, though this was not his natural disposition, which was, on the contrary, mild and benevolent. There were some persons whom he hated; but at heart he was thoroughly benevolent.

His death is for us the last event of that unhappy year, in the course of which Brutus and Cassius established their power in the East. Brutus had made himself master of Macedonia, and was recognised by the legions. Dolabella, who had gone to Syria, was pursued by Cassius. His legions deserted him,

[9] Quinctilian, xi. 1, § 71.

and he was obliged to surrender at Laodicea, where he lost his life. Dolabella as *consul suffectus* had thrown down Caesar's statue, and afterwards in Asia killed Trebonius, who having before been one of Caesar's friends, was certainly one of the most guilty among his murderers. Cassius was still very popular in Syria, from the time of the Parthian war: the legions declared for him, and all Syria submitted to his authority. In this manner Brutus and Cassius were, at the end of the year, masters of Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia; in short, of all the countries east of the Adriatic, as far as the frontiers of Egypt, while Rome was the scene of fearful proscriptions. C. Antonius, the brother of the triumvir, was a prisoner of Brutus, in Macedonia, and when the news of the proscriptions arrived, he was put to death.

LECTURE CII.

THE unfortunate issue of the war of Philippi shews what the ancients call the irresistible power of fate, against which all human devices turn into misfortunes. What we call chance, or accident, had here the most lamentable influence. The long expeditions, for example, of Brutus and Cassius in Asia, though they were of some immediate advantage to them, since they afforded them opportunities for recruiting their exhausted means, and training their troops, were followed by most unfortunate consequences.[1] Had they been in Macedonia and Greece, they might have rendered it impossible for the triumvirs to assemble their masses and to land; they might have compelled them to march round the Adriatic and through Illyricum, whereby they would have had great advantages on their side. The commanders of the fleet of the patriots, Statius Murcus, and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, who were stationed in the Illyrian sea, appear to have neglected nothing; but fate was against them likewise: the winds were favourable to the

[1] I here pass over the manner in which Brutus chastised Xanthus in Lycia and in which Cassius conquered Rhodes, for these events belong to the later history of Greece.—N. See Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* iv. 65—81.

triumvirs; they landed two or three different times on the coast of Illyricum, in separate squadrons, and advanced into the country. Brutus and Cassius had no troops at all in Illyricum and Macedonia, although they had no lack of soldiers; and those which had been there must have been removed to Thrace, not being strong enough to resist the enemy.

It was not till after the armies of Antony and Octavian had established themselves, and spread over Greece, which submitted to them, that Brutus and Cassius collected their forces in Asia, and crossed the Hellespont to march into Macedonia. The armies of the Julian party had already advanced as far as the narrow pass in the neighbourhood of Philippi, and the gold mines of Mount Pangaeus. The pass was between the mountains and the sea, and through it ran the road from Amphipolis to Thrace. Brutus was guided by a faithful Thracian ally, who enabled him to avoid the pass which was already occupied by the enemy, so that the patriots were enabled to pitch their camp near Philippi, opposite the enemy, while their fleet was in the western seas.[2] The question now was, what was to be done? Opinions were very much divided, Cassius, an experienced general, dreaded a quick decision; the army, on the other hand, demanded an immediate attack upon the enemy. There was no desertion among the troops, who kept faithfully to their leaders. It might therefore have been possible to protract the war, if the patriots had called the fleet to their assistance; but they did not know that they could have done so. If the fleet had arrived in the north of the Aegean, and had acted for a time on the defensive against the enemy, Antony and Octavian would probably have been obliged to retreat for want of provisions, and then Brutus and Cassius would perhaps have been successful. But unfortunately a battle was resolved upon. Nearly all the Romans of rank and wealth were in the armies of Brutus and Cassius; for the most distinguished persons had been proscribed, and the greater number of them had taken refuge with Brutus and Cassius, whilst a few only had gone to Sicily to Sex. Pompeius, who kept a considerable fleet of privateers, with which men of honour did not like to have anything to do, independently of the consideration that such a connexion would be likely to injure the cause of the exiles with the Roman people.

[2] The vision which Brutus is said to have had, before he set out on his march, and which alluded to his fall at Philippi, appeared to him, according to some, at Sardes, according to others at Abydos.—N.

In the battle which was fought near Philippi, Brutus commanded the left, and Cassius the right wing, or, according to a more correct mode of speaking, division; for, as in this case there was no centre, we cannot speak of wings. They were two distinct armies, drawn up side by side. In the battle again a fatal accident occurred: Brutus, who faced the army of Octavian, gained a victory without any difficulty. M. Messala, a very young man, who had been introduced to Brutus by Cicero, distinguished himself above all the other generals. He was a man whom Cicero had loved, and who was afterwards, in the reign of Augustus, the most distinguished person in his way. Octavian is generally charged with having betrayed his cowardice by not taking part in the battle. Antony himself afterwards brought this charge against him in public as well as in private letters; and the way in which some writers try to defend Octavian is a very shallow one. His army was probably commanded by Agrippa; and if so, it was certainly not in bad hands; but it was completely defeated, with the exception of its centre, which made a vigorous resistance; and the Julian camp was taken. On the other hand, the army of Cassius, which faced that of Antony, was decidedly beaten, but the camp was not taken, although the army was to some extent dispersed. Cassius believed that everything was lost, as the centre of Octavian's army held out; but as he could not form an accurate estimate of what was going on on the left wing, he dispatched an officer to bring him a report of the state of things in the army of Brutus. As a considerable time elapsed before the officer returned, either from accident or neglect on the part of the messenger, Cassius became the more confirmed in his belief, and requested one of his servants to put an end to his life. There was a suspicion in antiquity that this servant had not acted by his master's command, but had treacherously murdered him.

Brutus was greatly disheartened at this unfortunate occurrence; but all was not yet lost. The battle had not been decisive either way, and matters still stood almost as they had been before the battle. Twenty days now passed away without anything further being done. Had Brutus known that

his fleet had gained a complete victory on the same day on which the first battle of Philippi was fought, he would now have maintained himself on the defensive, according to his original plan; and by making the fleet land troops in the rear of the hostile armies, he would have compelled them to retreat. But it was not till after Brutus had yielded to the impatient demand of his army to bring the matter to a decision, that he heard of the news of his naval success having arrived in the enemy's camp; which, moreover, he did not believe, for the message which was sent to himself had been intercepted. Accordingly he allowed himself to be persuaded to fight another battle. It was painful to him that he had been obliged to promise his soldiers, who were as much demoralised as those of his opponents, the plunder of Thessalonica and Lacedaemon, if they should gain the victory. In this battle, however, his troops did not display the same bravery as before, and were completely routed. Brutus escaped with a number of his companions to a hill. Had he been able to reach the sea-coast, he might have been able to join his fleet. Life was now a burden to him, as it had been to Cicero, and the end of it was welcome to him. He commanded a faithful servant to perform the last duty towards him, and as the servant refused, he threw himself upon his own sword. He was at the time of his death not more than thirty-seven years old, so that at the time of Cicero's consulship he was only fifteen years of age.[3]

After this victory, Antony behaved very differently to what had been anticipated. The better part of his nature here gained the ascendancy, and many a one was saved by him, whilst Octavian displayed a cold-blooded and scornful cruelty, which was revolting to the minds of his own partisans, as we see from the account of Suetonius[4], who shews a strange impartiality, although from his account it would seem as if Octavian himself had had little to do with the atrocities which were committed. One man, who was to be executed, prayed that Octavian would allow his body to be buried, to which he

[3] According to Cicero, *Brut.* 64 and 94, Hortensius spoke first in the consulship of L. Crassus and Q. Scaevola (657, according to Cato), and ten years before the birth of Brutus, so that the latter was born in 667; and as he died in 710, he must have been in his 44th year. The other statement is that of Velleius Paterculus.

[4] *Aug.* c. 13.

received the answer, that this was a point which he had to settle with the ravens. Antony ordered the body of Brutus to be honoured with a magnificent burial; but the son of Hortensius was ordered to be put to death, because Antony ascribed to him a share in the murder of his brother Caius. The majority of the proscribed who survived the battles of Philippi put an end to their own lives, as they despaired of being pardoned. It is surprising to find among them the father of Livia, who subsequently became the wife of Octavian, and whose husband, Tib. Claudius Nero, with his whole family, belonged to the Pompeian party. He even endeavoured to organise an insurrection in favour of the last proscribed. In the reign of Livia's son, Tiberius, Cremutius Cordus, the historian, was obliged to put an end to his own life for having praised Brutus and Cassius, and for having called the latter the last of the Romans.[5]

After the battles of Philippi the fleet of the patriots yet remained, but their armies were dispersed, and most of the soldiers entered the service of the conquerors, as was done so frequently in the Thirty Years' war. Many also returned to Italy in secret; as for example Horace, the poet, who had been among the volunteers in the army of Brutus. He had been staying at Athens, like many other young Romans, for the purpose of studying; and Brutus had received those young men as volunteers into his army, and appointed them tribunes. After his arrival in Italy, Horace was in difficulties, until he obtained pardon through the influence of Maecenas, and enjoyed safety and admiration.[6]

[5] Tacitus, *Annal.* iv. 34, foll. Compare Plutarch, *Brut.* 44; Dion Cassius, xlvii. 24.

[6] The ode (ii. 7) beginning with

> O, saepe mecum tempus in ultimum
> Deducte, Bruto militiae duce,

belongs either to the time after the peace between Sex. Pompeius and the triumvirs, namely to the year 713, when Horace was twenty-five years old, or to the year 712, in which Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus joined Asinius Pollio (Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* v. 50; Velleius Paterc. ii. 76; Dion Cassius, xlviii. 16). In our editions of that ode there is a sad blunder in the punctuation. I do not remember how Bentley has managed it, but in the edition of Lambinus the punctuation is decidedly wrong. After *minaces* (v. 11) a comma must be inserted, and after *turpe* a sign of exclamation. *Turpe* is not an adjective, but an adverb, according to the usual Horatian mode of writing. *Solum tangere mento* is not to be understood of those who had fallen in the battle, but of those who stumbled in their flight. — N.

Octavian returned with his legions to Italy, where he exercised a fearful sway. Antony remained behind, as the real master of all the countries subject to Rome east of the Adriatic. During the time immediately succeeding the victory, he everywhere acted humanely; and the nations tried to console themselves with the prospect of having a mild master. The provincials were accustomed to being ill-treated, and they thanked heaven when the conduct of a governor was at all bearable. But soon afterwards, Antony travelled through Asia Minor, and extorted enormous contributions. A short time before, those unfortunate countries had been compelled by Brutus to pay their tributes for five years at once, and Antony now commanded them to do the same within a very limited period so that the inhabitants were thrown into frightful distress. But Asia Minor afterwards recovered, as it always does, unless it is governed by barbarians. Antony marched as far as Cilicia, and here he invited Cleopatra to come to him. He was either induced to take this step by the reputation of her beauty, or it was a mere act of pride. Cleopatra felt sure that the voluptuous Roman would not be able to resist her charms, and she went to meet him without any fear, although she had done various things to support Cassius, for which she might have been taken to account. She sailed up the river Cydnus to Tarsus, attended by galleys adorned with gold and purple, and with a pomp which made her appear almost like a queen of fairies, and invited Antony to an entertainment. Here everything was prepared with a splendour and magnificence which the Romans could not have produced with all their treasures.[7] Antony fell completely into her net. She travelled for some time with him in Asia Minor, and he then accompanied her to Alexandria.

In the mean time there arose in Italy fresh misfortunes, the cause of which was the connexion between Antony and Cleopatra. Octavian had led his legions into Italy. The veterans were at that time as impetuous and impudent as after the death of Commodus.[8] Octavian had promised them the

[7] The Romans squandered a great deal of money; but few were able to arrange anything in a really splendid or tasteful manner.—N.

[8] It is a remarkable phenomenon that those wild beasts, who, for more than two centuries, held the fate of the empire in their hands, could be made to obey and feel that they were subjects.—N.

most flourishing municipia and colonies of Italy. The year 711, which followed that of the battles of Philippi, saw the general establishment of the Julian colonies in Italy.[9] The places in which such colonies were founded are not well known, and it is difficult to acquire an accurate knowledge of them.[10] Every one knows that Cremona was one of them. It had originally been a Latin colony. After the Julian law it had become a municipium, and it was now changed into a military colony; which it may have been even as early as the time of Sulla. Virgil's life was endangered on the present occasion. In ancient times, when a place was assigned to the veterans, each man received only two jugers; but now, things were managed very differently, a common soldier receiving from 50 to 100 jugers, a centurion twice, and an eques three times that amount. When a town became a military colony, many square miles of the country around it were distributed among the soldiers, and if the territory of the place was not sufficiently extensive to make the necessary assignments, portions of the adjoining territory were cut off to make up the deficiency. The state of things at that time very much resembled that which existed in the Thirty Years' war in Germany, when the citizens and peasants were not taken into consideration at all, and the soldiers were everything. Let us take Cremona as an example of such a military colony. Andes, Virgil's birthplace, was about three miles from Mantua, and as the distribution of the territory of Cremona extended as far as Mantua and Andes, we may easily imagine the extent of such assignments, and dreadful distress of the people. In most cases, the former owners became of course the farmers of the soldiers. Horace mentions in one of his Satires[11], Ofellus, who farmed his former estate, and was anxious to see the soldier, to whom it then belonged, lead so extravagant a life as to be obliged to sell it, in which case Ofellus would purchase it back. This state of things is so different from any with which we are acquainted, that we can scarcely form a clear notion of it.

All Italy was seized with the utmost alarm and despair; places which had done nothing to provoke the triumvir, and

[9] Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* v. 12; Sueton. *Aug.* 13.

[10] I intend one day to write a separate work upon these Julian colonies, and hope to arrive at results which will be tolerably satisfactory.—N.

[11] ii. 2, 112, foll.

had never thought of opposing the Julian party, were confiscated like those which had openly espoused the cause of Pompey. Endless tumults and confusion reigned throughout Italy. Among those who were expelled from their homes, there were unquestionably many of the sons of the old Sullanian colonists, who were ready to take up arms, and looked around to see who would come forward as their leader. Two men responded to the call, and declared for the dispossessed malcontents. One of them was L. Antonius, consul of the year (711), and brother of Antony the triumvir, who sought an opportunity of overthrowing the rival of his brother, and was instigated in particular by Fulvia, Antony's wife. Fulvia was a true Megaera, bloodthirsty and of violent passions. She had formerly been licentious in her conduct; but since her marriage with Antony she clung to him with all the passion of love.[12] She had been a deadly enemy of Cicero, whose head she had caused to be brought to her from the rostra, and had feasted her eyes upon his dead features. Her jealousy was now excited by her husband's amour with Cleopatra, and she meditated upon creating a commotion which might induce Antony to return to Italy. Her motive was a very natural one, and she tried to excite a civil war. She accordingly went to Praeneste and there proclaimed the protection of the oppressed. L. Antonius joined her at Praeneste, and Tiberius Nero, the husband of Livia, came forward in Campania on the same side, though it would seem, from no other motive than humanity. Octavian on this occasion acted with skill and prudence, the merit of which however belongs to Agrippa, who was a wise man. Octavian was naturally a coward, but events had matured him. He applied to his veterans, whose interest it was to support him. The generals of the Antonian party who were in Italy were deficient in resolution. Asinius Pollio, who was in his province of Gaul and Illyricum, would not fight for either party, although he belonged to that of Antony; and Octavian thus succeeded in isolating L. Antonius, who went to Perusia, accompanied by Fulvia, a division of Antony's veterans, and numbers of fugitives from the municipia, senators and equites. At Perusia they were besieged by Octavian. As it was believed that peace was impossible, the besieged bore the famine which

[12] The late Queen Caroline of Naples, the wife of King Ferdinand, and a woman of great talent, very much resembled Fulvia in her conduct.—N.

raged in the place with great resolution. This siege is one of the most frightful in history. As all attempts at forcing their way through the besieging army failed, L. Antonius and his party at last capitulated. Octavian granted pardon to L. Antonius, who now turned round and acted as a traitor towards his own party. Fulvia was set free on condition of quitting Italy, whence she went to Greece. The veterans entered the service of young Octavian, in the hope of receiving new assignments of land, for he promised to take care of them, as if they were his own; the newly enlisted soldiers likewise went over to him, so that there remained only the unfortunate senators, equites, and the inhabitants of Perusia, all of whom were obliged to surrender at discretion: 300 of the most distinguished citizens of the town were afterwards solemnly sacrificed at the altar of Divus Julius. The town itself was reduced to a heap of ashes, either by the despair of its inhabitants or by the soldiers while plundering it. Perusia was afterwards restored as a Julian military colony, under the name of Perusia Augusta[13], by which on solemn occasions it is still called. Thus terminated an undertaking, in which people had been obliged to entrust themselves to an unprincipled man, who was not only without skill, but without any sense of honour. There was now every appearance of the speedy breaking out of a civil war.[14]

LECTURE CIII.

DURING the war at Perusia, Antony had not been able to make up his mind to do anything, and it was not till the issue of the contest was decided that he assembled his troops in Greece, and came over to Brundusium. The mediation of Maecenas and Cocceius now brought about the peace of Brundusium[1], between Octavian and Antony, which delayed the outbreak of a fresh civil war, for nine years. To secure the

[13] Appian, *de Bell Civil.* v. 32—50; Sueton. *Aug.* 15.

[14] The celebrated fourth Eclogue of Virgil was written in 712, the year of the Perusinian war. It is an eulogy on Asinius Pollio, who was then in Cisalpine Gaul, and not on good terms with Octavian. Virgil was at the time probably at Mantua, and protected by Asinius Pollio.—N.

[1] Horace (*Sat.* i. 5. 29) alludes to this mediation, when he says of Maecenas

permanence of the peace, it was agreed that Antony should marry Octavia, the widow of C. Marcellus, and half sister of Octavian, not by Atia, but by the same father, so that she did not belong to the Julian house. Antony was unworthy of her, and treated her in the most disgraceful manner. She was a noble woman, though she lived in a very corrupt age, and is a sad instance of the personal and domestic misfortunes to which persons of high rank are exposed. Her conduct as a wife was exemplary, towards Antony who shamefully neglected her, as well as towards C. Marcellus. As a mother she was excellent, but she had the misfortune to lose her dearest son, M. Marcellus, who was the hope of the Roman people; among her children by Antony seems to have been one only, —Antonia, subsequently the wife of Drusus, the son of Livia, —that was a pleasure and a comfort to her. A new division of the empire also was made at Brundusium: Antony was to have the whole of the eastern part from the Ionian sea[2], and Octavian the western with the exception of Africa, which was given to Lepidus, to whom, I believe, Sicily and the islands between Sicily and Africa also were assigned, although Sicily was yet in the possession of Sextus Pompeius, the younger son of Pompey the great

After the battle of Munda, Sex. Pompeius had taken refuge among the Celtiberians, and collected a force. During the year of Caesar's death he carried on a war against Asinius Pollio, in which he maintained himself, although nothing decisive was effected. During the amnesty which was proclaimed after the death of Caesar, he with the other exiles had been recalled by the senate from Marseilles, and the value of his paternal property and the *imperium orae maritimae* were to be restored to him. The former he did not receive, but he created the imperium for himself. The proscriptions which then

and Cocceius *aversos soliti componere amicos.* Most of Horace's poems are productions of his youth, or at least belong to the period previous to the battle of Actium. But I do not believe that we possess any of his productions which belong to an earlier date than the battle of Philippi. The most poetical period of his life was when he was about the age of thirty. — N.

[2] This division appeared so natural to the ancients that, in the time of the emperors, the same line of demarcation was drawn between the eastern and western parts of the empire; in the reign of Severus it was projected; under Diocletian it was almost fixed, and at last under the sons of Theodosius was permanently established. — N.

followed brought him into great danger, and he could not venture to go to Rome, as Antony was in possession of his father's house in the Carinae, and would have killed him. He now wandered about as an adventurer, and as the captain of a band of pirates, like those whom his father had conquered; for the sons of those pirates, or they themselves, were, according to the oriental fashion, attached to their conqueror or his family as their patrons. With the help of these pirates, Sext. Pompeius made himself master of Sicily, which was still almost wholly a Greek country. The pirates were either Greeks or Hellenised Asiatics, so that the power which now became established in Sicily, was a very peculiar and strange one. After the battle of Philippi, Statius Marcus joined Sext. Pompeius with a part of the fleet of Brutus and Cassius. Domitius Ahenobarbus with the rest of the fleet, carried on war for two years on his own account, and then joined Asinius Pollio; who reconciled him to Antony to whom Domitius then attached himself. Before going to Philippi, Antony had made an unsuccessful attempt upon Sicily, and during the two years which followed the defeat of Brutus and Cassius down to the peace of Brundusium, 712, Sext. Pompeius greatly increased his forces and established his power.

Octavian and Antony had made the new division of the empire independently of Lepidus, whom they had confined to Africa without asking his consent. A peace was also concluded between Sext. Pompeius and the triumvirs, near Cape Misenum. Pompeius here appeared with his fleet and received the triumvirs in his admiral-ship. He then returned their confidence by landing and partaking of an entertainment with them. While the triumvirs were on board the ship of Pompeius, Menodorus, one of his commanders, who had formerly been the leader of a band of robbers, conceived the plan of cutting the cable, and carrying off the two triumvirs. But Pompeius would not allow the scheme to be carried into effect. By the peace of Misenum, which remedied the great distress of the Roman people, who were severely suffering from want of provisions, Pompeius obtained Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, to which, according to a very probable account, Achaia and Sardinia were added, so that he was in the centre of the maritime region; he remained in the undisturbed possession of these islands for four years. By this peace also all the surviving proscribed obtained permission to return to Rome.

Sext. Pompeius is said to have been *sermone barbarus*[3]; he was indeed a very rough person and a mere *condottiere*, who had no thought except that of maintaining himself at the head of his forces and in his dominion. If he could have effected this, he would have been perfectly satisfied; for he never dreamt of restoring the republic. It should however be remembered that he was very young when he was obliged to leave his country. It is remarkable to see how, at that time, men who did not receive a thorough education neglected their language, and spoke a corrupt form of it. Only those who were very well educated, spoke pure Latin; the urbanity or perfection of the language, easily degenerated, unless it was acquired by careful study. Cicero[4] speaks of the *sermo urbanus* in the time of Laelius, and observes that the ladies of that age spoke with exquisite beauty. But at the period now under consideration the refined language had already sunk, as is, generally speaking, the case everywhere in our days, even in England and France.

As peace was thus restored, Antony returned to the East. After the battle of Philippi, T. Labienus, who had been in the army of Brutus, had fled with some troops to the Parthians. His misfortunes cannot excite our sympathy: he was a seditious tribune in Cicero's consulship, and allowed himself to be used as a tool by Caesar in his usurpation. He belonged to a seditious family; his uncle had been killed in the Capitol with Saturninus, in the sixth consulship of C. Marius. In his tribuneship, Labienus endeavoured to avenge the murder of his uncle upon C. Rabirius, who was one of the few survivors of those who had stormed the Capitol with Marius, thirty-seven years before.[5] Labienus, who was very rich, and a mutineer from inclination, then threw himself into the arms of Caesar. He served in Caesar's Gallic wars, and distinguished himself, for Caesar speaks of him with great praise; but afterwards Labienus for some reason with which we are not acquainted, joined the party of Pompey. He fought with Pompey in the battle of Pharsalus, and afterwards went to Africa, and thence to Spain. We next find him fighting in the army of Brutus; on whose defeat he escaped to the Parthians, and soon afterwards led a Parthian army into Syria. The Parthians, thus commanded by one of Caesar's generals, accomplished things

[3] Vell. Paterc. ii. 73. [4] *De Orat.* iii. 12.

[5] See Cicero's oration for C. Rabirius.

in which they could not otherwise have succeeded; but after several victories, they were defeated by Ventidius. Labienus joined the party of Caesar at first only in consequence of the political views entertained by his family, as we often find in the history of that time.[6]

After his departure from Italy, Antony again went to the East, and lived for a time with Octavia, without any connexion with Cleopatra; but after some months he obliged Octavia to return with her children to Rome, while he himself henceforth lived sometimes in Asia, and sometimes at Alexandria. In Asia, he was tempted by the prospect of gaining laurels in a war against the Parthians; for he, like all the Romans of the period was stung to the quick when he thought of Crassus and his legions which had been defeated by the Parthians. Artavasdes, king of Armenia, held out to Antony hopes of wiping off the disgrace. All Parthia consisted of separate kingdoms; not satrapies, but feudal principalities, under the Parthian king of kings, whose court was at Ctesiphon near Seleucia. Antony traversed Armenia and Azerbidjan with an enormous army, and advanced into Media, the real Irak Adjemi. Very few places in those countries can be identified; for although the ancient oriental names are known, those by which the towns were called in the West are not. Antony besieged Phraata, a town the site of which is altogether unknown, but his plan was not good. In consequence of bad roads he had left his artillery behind him, under the protection of two legions and his legate Statianus. Phraates, the king of kings, acted very skilfully, and took possession of the depôt,

[6] The fact of Asinius Pollio being so decidedly against Pompey, the senate, Cicero, Brutus, and other men for whose personal character he must have had great regard, was, according to my firm belief, the consequence of personal circumstances; Pompeius Strabo, the father of Pompey, had conquered, in the Social war, the Picentines and Marrucinians, to which people Asinius Pollio belonged, and had put to death Herius Asinius, his father or grandfather (probably the former, for Pollio called his own son Herius Asinius. Vell. Paterc. ii. 16; Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* i. 40). Now as Caesar's party had at that time taken the same ground as that of Marius, and had, in fact, inherited its principles, Asinius Pollio joined it. I do not mean to defend L. Munatius Plancus, although he was a man of great talent; but if we trace the connexion of events, we cannot but perceive that he was influenced in his conduct by the fact of his being a Tiburtine. The Tiburtines, Praenestines, and in short all the Latins were sincerely attached to Cinna's party; and as Caesar was Cinna's son-in-law they naturally supported his party. These things are not mere speculations; analogous cases constantly occur in the political history of England.—N.

after having annihilated the troops who were to protect it. This and other circumstances placed the main army of the Romans in such difficulties, that they retreated, until after struggling with great difficulties they reached Armenia: Antony nearly met with the same fate as Crassus; a fourth of his army was destroyed, and the greater part of his baggage was lost.[7]

Antony returned to Alexandria, and there again revelled in sensual pleasures with his concubine to whom, to the great annoyance of the Romans, he gave Coele-Syria, Judaea, and Cyprus.[8] Plutarch's life of Antony is very lengthy, but it contains many interesting anecdotes which he had received from the mouth of his grandfather or great-grandfather. It shews the fearful distress of those times; and his descriptions of the condition of Greece in particular, are extremely interesting. His comparing Antony with Demetrius at first excites our surprise; but there is, nevertheless, a great analogy between the two characters. Antony lived surrounded by eastern splendour and luxuries, procured by the sums which he had extorted from the subject nations, and Plutarch's anecdotes shew in what a contemptible manner he spent his time. If one is occupied with the history of a man, he usually excites a kind of sympathy in us; but this is not the case with Antony: we feel, on the contrary, glad that things are coming to a close with him. He did not however forget the disgrace of his Parthian campaign; to expiate which he invaded Armenia and made prisoner Artavasdes, who had before deserted him in his war against the Parthians. Artavasdes was carried to Alexandria, where Antony celebrated a splendid triumph.

In the meantime Octavian made war upon Sext. Pompeius. Agrippa was the soul of the undertaking: he built a fleet in the lake Lucrinus, formed the lake into a harbour, by digging a canal from it to the sea, and trained his fleet for maritime warfare. A reasonable pretext for the war did not exist, but notwithstanding this, the conquest of Sicily was undertaken.

[7] Plutarch, *Anton.* 33, foll.; Pseudo-Appian, *De Bell. Parth.* p. 71, foll ed. Schweigh.; Vell. Paterc. ii. 82.

[8] It is an unaccountable phenomenon that this kingdom received the name of Chalcis, which, as far as I am aware, occurs only on coins of Cleopatra. I cannot explain it, but do not agree with the numismatists, who refer the name to the tetrarchies as they existed at a later period.—N.—(Compare Eckel, *Doctr. Num. Vet.* iii. p. 264, foll)

Octavian was anything but perfectly successful in the war, although he conquered his enemy in the end. His fleet was twice destroyed by storms; but Agrippa restored it, and at last gained a glorious victory off Mylae (Milazzo). Octavian's fleet, on the other hand, was completely defeated before his eyes off Tauromenium, and it must be said, to his disgrace, that the commanders of the enemy's fleet were freedmen, Mena and Menecrates.[9] Octavian's troops had indeed landed under Cornificius, one of his most faithful friends; but he too was defeated, and would have been destroyed with his forces, had not Agrippa saved him. A new fleet was built; and another great naval victory gained by Agrippa decided the contest. Sext. Pompeius fled to Asia Minor, and implored the protection of Antony, who was inclined to grant it, but could not make up his mind as to what he should do. At last Sext. Pompeius was murdered in Phrygia by Titius.[10] What renders this murder more revolting, is the fact that its perpetrator was one of the proscribed men on whose behalf Pompeius had exerted himself; for, in his treaty with the triumvirs at Misenum, he had stipulated for the suppression of the proscription, that the lists should be destroyed, and that those whose names were on them should be restored to their former rights. Whether the Pompeian family now became extinct, or whether the Sext. Pompeius who is mentioned as Consul in the reign of Tiberius was a descendant of the family, I cannot now say.

By the expulsion of Pompeius from Sicily, Octavian became master of the island. At the beginning of the war he had called in the assistance of Lepidus; but the latter, dissatisfied with the proceedings of his colleagues, who had made all their arrangements without consulting him, now wished to shew them a kind of defiance, and he delayed coming to Sicily. At last, however, when the matter was already very complicated, he came with a considerable army. After the defeat of Pompeius, he quarrelled with Octavian about the possession of Sicily, and if we look at the question as one of absolute justice, —if we can speak of justice in such transactions of robbers,— I believe that Lepidus had a right to demand the evacuation

[9] Μηνᾶς, the same as Μηνόδωρος, not Maenas; the name is known from the Epistles of Horace (i. 7).—N.

[10] Dion Cassius, xlix. 18. Compare Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* v. 144; Strabo, iii. p. 141.

of Sicily; but Octavian surpassed him in resolution and dexterity. Lepidus did not enjoy the esteem or love of any man, not even of his soldiers. Octavian therefore went into the camp of Lepidus—the boldest thing he ever did—and commanded the soldiers to abandon their general. Octavian's scheme succeeded: he gained over the soldiers by the hope of great rewards, perhaps also because they were well-disposed towards the adopted son of Caesar, and Lepidus was forsaken by all the world. Octavian assigned to him Circeii[11] as his habitation, and took the province of Africa for himself; so that the whole of the western empire was now united under him. Lepidus led a sad but undisturbed life, with the title of Pontifex Maximus, until he died, several years afterwards.

Soon after this, the war of Actium broke out, the immediate cause of which was that Antony had divorced Octavia, who had gone as far as Athens to carry to her husband rich presents, troops, and provisions, for his campaign against Artavasdes. Antony did not receive her, although she was accompanied even by the children of Fulvia; but ordered her to give up to his officers what she had brought for him, to return to Rome, and not to live in his house there. While she was living at Rome as his wife, he sent her a letter in which he informed her that she was divorced; and he formally married his concubine, an occurrence which must have been most disgusting to the Romans.

LECTURE CIV.

THE last internal war, before the establishment of the Roman monarchy, began under circumstances which could leave no doubt as to what its issue would be. Antony had formerly been a greater general than Octavian; but that time was gone by, and the best officers now served under Octavian, who also had quite different nations from which he could reinforce his legions. If the war had been protracted, Antony might have reinforced himself, which he could not do by levying troops

[11] This place situated near the Pomptine marshes, is as gloomy and melancholy on the land-side as it is beautiful from the sea-side.—N.

among the unwarlike nations of the East. As far as the fleets were concerned, Antony seemed to have advantages over Octavian, for the countries round the eastern part of the Mediterranean possessed a proportionately greater number of good sailors than the nations of the West; and if the means which Antony had had at his command had been for ten years in the hands of an able and energetic man, they would have formed a great power; but he had neglected everything. The fleet of Octavian consisted of the remnants of the Pompeian fleet, and the ships which Agrippa had built for him. They were mostly small sailing vessels; whereas those of Antony were large, and some of them gigantic rowing galleys, provided with towers and several decks, so that they were more fit to exhibit a land fight than for manoeuvering on the water. Agrippa, whom we may properly call the admiral of Octavian, displayed an extraordinary activity in this war.

Antony was stationed at the entrance of the Ambracian gulf, near the ancient Corinthian colony of Actium, where he had assembled his army and fleet with the view of crossing over to Italy, if he should be successful at sea. The fleet of Octavian was stationed off the Thesprotian coast. The two armies faced each other near the entrance of the gulf of Prevesa, as the fleets did at the mouth of the Ambracian gulf. Agrippa made several isolated undertakings, and took Leucas and Patrae, in the rear of the enemy, and thus made it difficult for them to supply themselves with provisions; in consequence of which they suffered considerable distress. In the ensuing battle, Antony, with his numerous forces, might at least have disputed the victory for some time, although he could not probably have gained it, if Cleopatra and her Egyptian ships had not taken to flight with effeminate cowardice, and that at a moment when nothing was yet decided. But whether Antony thought it was Cleopatra's intention to sacrifice him, and thereby, and by the exercise of her charms, to make peace with Octavian, or whatever may have been his motive, at all events, he seemed quite to forget the battle, and followed her in a quick-sailing vessel. Her royal ship received him; but meantime his whole fleet, being deprived of the strongest ships, was destroyed by Agrippa. Everything was now lost. Antony was in despair, for it was clear that the war could not end in a peace; and that nothing short of the life of the vanquished could

satisfy the conqueror. Antony's anger with Cleopatra, whom he had followed to Alexandria, lasted for three days; but her magic power over him was so great that he became reconciled to her even now, and endeavoured to deceive her concerning his real position. He hoped that his land forces would be more successful, for they were attached to him[1], and in spite of all the offers that were made to them, they held out resolutely for six days after his departure, still believing that he would return, until at length they found themselves abandoned by Canidius, their commander. They now listened to the proposals of Octavian, and recognised him as imperator. Thus the war was at an end; and the Roman legions that were yet scattered about in the East surrendered to Octavian without any further opposition, except in a few cases, where resistance was continued from personal motives.

The battle of Actium, so famous in the history of the world, was fought on the 2d of September[2] of the year 721. Whatever we may think of Octavian himself, it cannot be denied that the victory of Actium was the happiest event that could have happened, and that people could not have prayed to heaven for a more fortunate issue of the war. Horace's expressions concerning the victory of Actium[3] are not of the kind which we have to regard with connivance or indulgence, for they are perfectly true and just. But eleven months yet passed away, before the war was quite at an end. After the battle of Actium, Octavian returned to Italy, where fresh disturbances had broken out, for the veterans were still very rebellious, and demanded fresh assignments of land. Agrippa in the meantime took possession of the eastern provinces; and it was not till the spring of the following year, that Octavian marched through Syria towards Pelusium, the *claustra* of Egypt. It is not improbable that Cleopatra had given secret orders for Pelusium to surrender[4], as the place

[1] Things had been different in the time of the successors of Alexander, when armies went over from one general to another. The troops of Antony, which in a moral point of view, were no better than bands of robbers, remained faithful to their commander.—N.

[2] This battle ought to have refuted those later writers, such as Gellius (v. 17.) and Macrobius (*Saturn* i. 15.), who could not see anything beyond what they found in their books, and who assert that no battle could be ventured upon on the day after the *calendae*, *nonae* and *idus*, without great misfortunes to Rome. There are hundreds of instances in which such men were unable to see with their own eyes.—N.

[3] See especially *Carm.* i. 37, and *Epod.* 9.

[4] Plutarch, *Anton.* 74.

admitted the invaders without resistance; for, as a vain woman, she may still have entertained a hope of winning Octavian as she had won Caesar. The only thing she dreaded seems to have been, lest the war should be protracted, and Octavian should thus come to Alexandria as an inexorable enemy. These circumstances render it very probable that Pelusium surrendered to the enemy by her command. Octavian however not only made his attack from Pelusium, but sent another army to march from Paraetonium in Libya towards the capital. This was possible only for a small army, for the country between Cyrene and Alexandria, through which the soldiers had to march from Paraetonium was a most inhospitable region, and contained no fortified places at all. The two Roman armies thus met at Alexandria. Antony still had a number of Roman soldiers, both cavalry and infantry, with whom he wanted to make a sally, but most of the soldiers employed in it went over to Octavian. Antony thus found himself abandoned by all, except a few who remained with him from despair, such as Cassius of Parma, one of the murderers of Caesar. He resolved to die, and died a cowardly and miserable death. The fatal wound which he inflicted upon himself did not produce an immediate effect, and some time elapsed before the loss of blood caused his death. Cleopatra had shut herself up in her palace with the most costly treasures of her kingdom. Octavian wished to take her alive, that he might carry her to Rome in triumph; for there was a report that she wished to die the death of Sardanapalus. On the 1st of August 722, Alexandria capitulated. The condition was that, on the following day, the gates should be thrown open to the Romans. Cleopatra kept the body of Antony, who died on the day of the capitulation, in her room, and she herself was wavering between the hope of conciliating Octavian and the feeling that she ought not to survive Antony. Proculeius, an officer of Octavian, who is honorably mentioned in one of the Odes of Horace[5], endeavoured to persuade her not to put an end to her life, and promised her safety. She was prevailed upon; but when she found that Octavian would not allow her to appear before him, when she saw that she would be spared only to adorn his triumph, and when all her requests to be left in possession of

[5] ii. 2, 5.

the kingdom which Antony had given her were either rejected or not answered at all, then, after having tried various poisons, or not venturing to apply them, she put a viper on her breast, and thus ended her existence.

The war was terminated on the 2nd of August, 722. The death of Antony had put an end to the civil war and the triumvirate, which had in fact ceased to exist some time before, when Lepidus was excluded. From this moment Octavian was sole master of the Roman world. A decree of the senate afterwards ordained, that in future *feriae Augustae*[6] should be celebrated on the first of August[7], and the month of Sextilis

[6] In several of the MSS. notes there seems to be a reference to the Fasti Praenestini; but as they do not contain the month of August, I suspect that the Calendarium Amiternum is meant (Orelli, *Inscript.* vol. ii. p. 397) where we read—Feriae ex S. C. Q(uod) E(o) D(ie) Caesar, Divi F. Rempublic (am) tristissim .... periculo liberat.

[7] These Feriae were celebrated with general solemnities and public entertainments, at which persons appeared decorated with garlands of flowers. They continued to be celebrated down to the time of the Empress Placidia, and even in that of Pope Leo the Great, under the name of *feriae Augustae.* The festival was indeed a political one, but was connected with libations and other religious observances, and the ancient rites and ceremonies were carefully preserved down to the latest times. Hence the festival Sancti Petri in Vincula*, (according to Beda and Biondo of Forli) was transferred to that day, and Christian Rome allowed it to be celebrated in a manner which was a complete continuation of the ancient *feriae Augustae:* the day remained as it had been before. The clients even at the present time go on that day to the houses of the patricians and receive presents. What I here call clients are persons who have a sort of claim to receive presents on certain occasions, just as we see them described in Juvenal; and such persons receive their presents usually on the first of January and the first of August. It is still customary with domestics at Rome to ask presents on those days, and persons are compelled to spend a considerable sum of money in that way. I have often been annoyed at it, until I found in the work of Biondo of Forli that it was a remnant of antiquity. The name Feraugusti or Feragosto occurs throughout the middle ages. Various other ancient rites and ceremonies have been continued in Christian Rome in this manner. Down to the eighteenth century, for instance, a carved figure of the Virgin Mary was carried from the city to the small river Almo and washed in it, just as was customary in ancient times with the statue of Cybele: throughout the middle ages, moreover, the statues of saints were carried about in procession from one church to another, and this was nothing but a continuation of ancient solemnities which we meet with both at Rome and in Greece. I might mention a great many other things which exist at Rome down to this day, and remind one of the pagan times. But many of these customs have lately been abolished, or have fallen into disuse.—N.

* In the church of S. Pietro in Vincula, on the Esquiline, in the baths of Trajan, there are preserved the chains with which the Apostle Peter was fettered at Rome, and also those which he wore at Jerusalem.

received the name of Augustus, as Quinctilis had received that of Julius. Octavian would have preferred to give his name to the month of September, in which he was born; but as his appointment to his first consulship, and the termination of the Civil War, fell both in the month of Sextilis, the latter received the name of Augustus.

It is my intention to conclude my History of Rome with the year 722; for here Rome's history is at an end, and assumes a totally different aspect. The history of Rome from that time onwards until the fall of the empire resolves itself into histories of the several emperors; and the ancients were quite right in so viewing and treating it, and in calling Octavian who now received the name of Augustus, the first emperor. I shall accordingly relate to you the history of each of the emperors, and give you an account of his government, his wars, and the like. But before I proceed to do so, I have to speak of the transition of Rome from a republican to a monarchical state, and of the institutions of the latter. To this I shall add a brief account of Roman literature down to the time of Augustus, and the history of Augustus, of his wars and of his family. The history of the empire will be much briefer in proportion than that of the republic; for in the latter we had to consider all the separate men who acted a prominent part, whereas under the empire we shall have to deal with the government on the one hand, and with the masses on the other. Most of the wars under the empire are of a kind which render detailed descriptions unnecessary: those of Drusus and Germanicus form of course an exception.

In accordance with my plan, I will now give you an outline of the manner in which Octavian established the Roman monarchy. He had already been invested with the consulship several times. His first consulship belongs to the year 709, the second which he received ten years later, was resigned soon after he had entered upon it. Two years later he obtained the third, and thenceforward he was consul uninterruptedly until the eleventh year. The number of all his consulships amounts to thirteen. Soon after the termination of the war of Actium he assumed the appearance of intending to resign his power; but every one knew that it was a mere farce, and that no one could take him at his word. All the armies had sworn allegiance to him and were dependent upon him, and except the

soldiers no citizen was in arms. Even if it had been possible, no sensible man could have wished him to lay down his power; for as it had been impossible to maintain the free constitution under far more favourable circumstances, and at a time which was far richer in eminent men, how could it have been possible now, if Octavian had resigned his power? Nothing is more probable than that some more unworthy person would have usurped it; new civil wars would then have been the consequence, and things would again have come to the point at which they now were. It was further evident that the present ruler was anxious to make the people forget his former actions; and nothing therefore was more natural for the senate than to request Octavian to keep possession of his power. To give you a chronological account of the succession in which the several powers of the state were transferred to Octavian, is, if not impossible, at least very difficult. The title of Imperator had already been given to him as a praenomen,—a peculiar and characteristic flattery. He was accordingly called Imperator Julius Caesar Octavianus instead of C. Julius Caesar Octavianus, and from that time Imperator remained a praenomen with the Roman monarchs, as we see on their coins. In the history of the later emperors, and even as early as the second century, this circumstance seems to have been forgotten, as the whole system of names underwent a change. In official documents, it is true, we usually read, for example, Imperator Antoninus Augustus, but otherwise we also find Imperator Marcus Antoninus Augustus. The senate seems to have positively tortured itself in devising flatteries for Octavian. He himself wished to assume Romulus as an agnomen, but this was thought ominous by some persons; and on the proposal of L. Munatius Plancus, who was as great a flatterer as the Greeks had been in the time of the Macedonian rulers, it was decreed that he should be honoured by the surname of Augustus instead, which the Greeks immediately translated into Σεβαστός, but which it is difficult to translate into any modern language.

With regard to his powers, the senate offered him the dictatorship, which, however, he declined; for he was superstitious, and may have dreaded the fate of the dictator Caesar, or the wretched death of Sulla; perhaps, however, his intention was only to temporise, and the acceptance of the dictatorship may have appeared to him too straightforward a mode of acting.

He was elected to the consulship every year, as long as he pleased. It was at first proposed to make him sole consul, but he not only declined this honour, but wanted to have two colleagues. The senate, however, refused this request, on the plea that one man standing by his side was already too much. He obtained the proconsular power over the whole of the Roman empire, with the exception of Rome itself; and he was empowered to give the administration of the provinces to whomsoever he pleased to appoint as his vicegerents. The censorship was likewise transferred to him, and with it the power of excluding persons from the senate and of calling others into it. The *tribunicia potestas* had been given to him before, and was afterwards prolonged for life. By virtue of it he had the power of annulling any decree of the senate, and of interfering in all the acts of all the magistrates; an appeal to him, moreover, was open from all the courts of justice; he had the right to convoke the senate, and to put any subject under consideration to the vote of the senators. This latter part of the tribunician power had arisen in the seventh century, and nobody ventured to doubt its legitimacy.[8] As long as Lepidus lived, Augustus left him the title of Pontifex Maximus, but after his death Augustus caused the pontificate to be transferred to himself. This office put at once into his hands all the ecclesiastical courts, and the whole superintendence of the ecclesiastical law. In the capacity of tribune and censor he also had the supreme control over the aerarium, so that, by an artificial accumulation, all the powers of the state, including the administrative powers of the consuls and praetors, were concentrated in his person.

LECTURE CV.

It was only for the sake of appearance that Augustus in making his new arrangements went back in everything to the ancient forms. Caesar had reserved to himself half the elections, and in the end he took all of them into his own hands; but Augustus

[8] Gellius, xiv. 7, 8.

restored to the comitia the right of electing the magistrates; though it was always a matter of course, that the *candidati Caesaris* could not be rejected. Horace and other poets of the time speak of the uncertainty of the popular elections, and of the *ambitio Campi*, in a manner which would be perfectly applicable to the republican times; and there is unquestionably some truth in those expressions, for Augustus did not probably take the trouble or exercise his power to dispose of all the offices of the state, and we have instances of the people carrying out its will in spite of that of the sovereign. Thus we read of the tumult of Egnatius Rufus, who claimed the praetorship immediately after the aedileship, in defiance of the person who acted in the name of Augustus in the comitia, and in defiance of the *leges annales*. In the same manner Egnatius Rufus obtained the consulship immediately after his praetorship, through the people's favour.[1] So far the appearance of liberty remained. The assemblies of the people were however on the whole confined to the elections of magistrates, and a plebiscitum cannot be seriously spoken of in the reign of Augustus. The decree of Sextus Pacuvius respecting the name of the month of Sextilis, in the form of a plebiscitum, is quite a different thing.[2] Leges were still passed in the time of Augustus; and in the Roman law-books we meet with several that were carried in the ancient form: that is, a resolution of the senate was brought before the centuries by the consuls, and was there passed as a lex. The lex Junia Norbana[3] might almost lead one to believe that this mode of making leges continued till the time of Tiberius; but afterwards leges, in the strict sense of the word, no longer occur.

Caesar had introduced into the senate a number of adventurers; and it had been still more disgraced in the time of the triumvirate, especially by Antony, when seats in it might be purchased for money. After Augustus had received the censorial power, he announced that those men, who were conscious that they would be better out of the senate, should withdraw from it, that they might not be expelled; adding that those who would withdraw, should be dealt with most leniently. About fifty senators took the hint; but as there were still some unworthy men left in the senate, Augustus excluded several more; but in order not to hurt their vanity too much, he left

[1] Vell. Paterc. ii. 91, foll. [2] Macrobius, *Saturn.* i. 12.
[3] Gaius, i. 3, 16, 17, 22; iii. 56.

them their outward distinctions, such as the *latus clavus*, and their honorary seats in the theatres: a great consolation for the wretched men! Augustus fancied that they intended to make an attempt upon his life; and this probably induced him to treat them considerately.[4] He raised the *census senatorus* which for some time, we know not how long, had been double the equestrian census, to a million sesterces[5], but behaved very generously in this respect—which however did not cost him much—for he provided from the public treasury the means to enable many a one whom he liked to retain his seat in the senate. The ordinary meetings of the senate had hitherto been regularly three times in every month, which is a surprisingly small number, but Augustus reduced it even to two meetings a month.[6] Extraordinary meetings, which the emperor might convoke at any time, do not occur in the reign of Augustus. During the months of September and October the senate had vacations.[7] No subjects could be discussed in the senate, except those which were brought before it by the consuls, who had the *jus relationis* which Augustus himself also possessed, and which subsequently became of such importance. He, himself, was *princeps senatus*[8], an honour in which the *jus relationis* had been implied in the early times of the republic, but afterwards it had disappeared, until it was restored by Augustus. From among the senate he chose by lot a sort of state-council or committee, which had to deliberate upon all subjects which were to be brought before the senate. Debates upon such subjects hardly ever took place; whatever was proposed appears to have been passed forthwith, the speeches being only phrases and compliments.

Augustus received the extraordinary powers with which he was thus invested, at first for ten, then for five, and then again for five, and lastly three times for ten years. At the beginning

[4] Sueton. *August.* 35.
[5] Dion Cassius, liv 17, 26; lv. 13; Sueton. *August.* 41.
[6] Dion Cassius, lv. 3. Sueton. *August.* 35.
[7] It is very interesting and amusing to trace the actual customs of modern Rome to ancient institutions. As an instance, I will mention here that the vacations in all the public offices at Rome still take place in October, which is considered to be a continuation of the regulation made by Augustus. Under the emperors all the courts had vacations in the autumn, a thing unknown in the time of the republic. The Roman Carnival too is an ancient institution, though it has no connexion with the Bacchanalia, as some have supposed.—N.
[8] Dion Cassius, liii. 1.

of the third decennium he died. He reserved for the senate, *pro forma*, a privilege which subsequently became its chief function. The senate had formerly been the supreme court of justice in crimes against the state; and this odious part of its functions Augustus left to it, being afraid of taking it upon himself. The senate had now nothing to do with taxation; Augustus alone had it in his power to diminish or increase the taxes throughout the empire. Italy itself was exempt from the land tax, like the baronial estates in many modern countries; but it had to pay various indirect taxes, and many others, as, for example, those on bequests and manumissions. Just as the hereditary statt-holder in Holland, who was captain-general and admiral-general, and often acted contrary to the intentions of the states-general, so Augustus was the commander of all the armies: he had 43, or, according to a more correct calculation, 47 legions[9], besides innumerable auxilia of the Roman armies, which, together with the legions, amounted to about 450,000 men. Over these forces the senate had not the least control, not even over the levying of the troops. The division of the provinces was made in such a manner that those in which no regular armies were kept, and therefore did not belong to the military state (Italy, as the country of the sovereign people was of course excepted from all these regulations), were assigned to the senate; whereas, those in which armies were stationed belonged to Augustus. The senate thus obtained Asia, Africa (so far as it did not belong to Juba), Gallia Narbonensis, Hispania Baetica, Achaia, Macedonia, Bithynia, Cyprus, Cyrene, and Crete[10]; while Augustus reserved for himself by far the larger and wealthier portion of the empire, all Spain, with the exception of Baetica, Gallia Lugdunensis and Aquitania, Raetia, Vindelicia, Dalmatia, Pannonia (Thrace was governed by a king), Moesia, Pontus (Cappadocia also was governed by a king), Cilicia, Syria, and Egypt. His provinces yielded an incomparably larger revenue than those of the senate, but it may nevertheless have been insufficient to maintain the armies which were stationed in fortified camps in those provinces. Two of the senatorial provinces were proconsular, the others propraetorian provinces. At first, no one could draw lots

[9] Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* v. 127. Compare Sueton. *August.* 47; Dion Cass. liii. 12, lv. 23, foll.; Strabo, xvii. p. 840.

[10] See a more detailed account in Strabo, xvii. in fin., and Dion Cass. liii. 12.

for such a province till five years after he had held the consulship or praetorship, which qualified him for undertaking the administration of such a province; but this was subsequently altered. Augustus made many salutary regulations to control the arbitrary proceedings of the governors of provinces, at least, so far as his own provinces were concerned, and probably also in those of the senate. Among other wise regulations, he introduced the custom of giving a fixed salary to the governors of provinces.[11] The governors of the emperor's provinces, who were taken indiscriminately from among the senators, consulars, praetorians, or equites, bore the title of *legati Augusti;* according to inscriptions and coins their official title was *legati pro praetore*, or *pro consule*, &c. The governors of the senatorial provinces held their office according to the ancient custom only for one year; but the *legati Augusti* held theirs for an indefinite period, of four, five, or even ten years; their posts were also more lucrative. These regulations were very beneficial to the provinces, although those governed by a vicegerent of the emperor were, on the whole, much better off than the senatorial provinces. But, although things went on improving, accusations of malversation in the senatorial provinces occur as late as the second century, probably in consequence of their governors not being so well paid as the *legati Augusti.* In reality, however, this arrangement about the provinces was only a farce, for which the subjects had to pay dearly.

Augustus also established a twofold aerarium, one for the senate, the other for the emperor; but whether the emperor had any control over that of the senate is not clear. This is one of the many questions which are yet obscure.

Among his precautionary measures, I may mention the lex Aelia Sentia, which put a stop to the disgraceful system of manumission, whereby the lowest slaves were incorporated with the citizens.[12] The Roman citizens were then widely diffused over various parts of the empire; the franchise was no longer confined to Italy, for the inhabitants of Gallia Narbonensis, for instance, of many towns in Spain, and of other countries, were in possession of it; such provincial citizens, however, could not become members of the senate, though there were exceptions, for some had been admitted into the senate even

[11] Dion Cassius, lii. 23, foll., liii. 15; Tacitus, *Agric.* 42.

[12] Sueton. *August.* 40; Dion Cassius, lv. 13; Gaius, i. 38, foll.

under Caesar, and still more under Augustus, especially from Provence, where Latin was spoken at an early time, and which was hence called *altera Italia*.[13] When therefore we find that the number of Roman citizens in the reign of Augustus amounted only to somewhat more than four millions, and remember that, independently of Italy, a great many Roman citizens lived in Sicily, Gaul, Spain, and Africa, and that that number included not merely the heads of families, but every free man from the age of seventeen upwards, the number must strike us as fearfully small, and one is startled at the reduced state of the population, which must have been the consequence of the civil wars.

The regulations respecting the police deserve praise. Up to this time, Rome had had no police except the very inefficient one of the plebeian aediles. The condition of Rome was dreadful; for ever since the time of Sulla and his proscriptions, no man's life was safe in the city, for there was in reality no police at all; we need only read Cicero's speeches for Cluentius, Milo, Sextius and Roscius of Ameria, to form a notion of the insecurity of life in those times. We read in Suetonius that the *grassatores*, the banditti of Rome, shewed themselves in the public streets with their knives, and that no one ventured to check them.[14] Augustus remedied the evil by suitable police regulations, and extirpated those banditti with resolution and firmness. The city of Rome and the whole Roman state are remarkable examples of what is the result, when old institutions are handed down to posterity without being modified according to circumstances. Goethe makes Mephistopheles say that then

> "Reason is changed to nonsense, good to evil."

And, indeed, the best things if they contain no vital principle, become absurdities, and are mere harbours for venomous vermin.

The division of the city into four regions still lasted as it had been made by Servius Tullius. The Aventine was a separate town, and several suburbs had sprung up on the banks and on the other side of the river. The four regions had, from ancient times, been subdivided into *vici*, and this division may

[13] Plin. *H. N.* iii. 4, 5. Comp. Dion Cassius, lii. 42; Tacitus, *Annal.* iii. 55, xi. 25.

[14] Sueton. *Caesar*, 72, *August.* 32, 43.

have been extended to the suburbs likewise. In such an ill-arranged state of things, the police of the aediles could not be of much avail. Now Augustus, without taking into consideration what was within and what without the pomoerium, or what belonged to the ancient city and what to the suburbs, divided the whole of Rome into fourteen regions, each with a separate local magistrate; and each region was subdivided into *vici*, at the head of each of which there was a *magister vici*. This judicious division was followed by happy consequences, for the maintenance of a regular police was now possible; and Rome, which had before been a den of robbers, became a safe place.[15] The Roman magistrates had originally been magistrates of a city; but they had gradually become the magistrates of an immense empire, and the ancient regulations necessarily lost their efficacy, since it became impossible for the magistrates to bestow the necessary care upon the city. The smallest colonies and municipia had their local magistrates; but the Roman senate and magistrates had seldom, or never, an opportunity of occupying themselves with the internal affairs of the city. There were, it is true, *magistratus minores*, but they possessed no authority: no man of eminence would have filled such offices, and they consequently fell into the hands of freedmen. Some years after the battle of Actium, Augustus established the office of *praefectus urbi*, in which the whole of the city administration was concentrated.[16] The office was bestowed at the discretion of the emperor: L. Piso held it for twenty years, and the extremely happy choice of the person, and the beneficial consequences of the institution, secured to Augustus the gratitude and attachment of the city.[17] He also established what we may call *gens d'armes*, under the name of *vigiles*, or *cohortes urbanae*, which had to assist in cases of fire, riots, and the like. It gave the people no offence that this body of men was kept in barracks within the city, and thus formed a sort of garrison which the emperor had in the city itself.

Augustus also instituted an office called the *praefectura aerarii*, to which he transferred the functions which had formerly been performed by the quaestors. It is probable that this praefectura was not confined to the emperor's own aerarium,

[15] Sueton. *August* 30; Dion Cassius, lv. 8.

[16] Dion Cassius, lii 21, Tacitus, *Annal.* vi. 11, foll.

[17] Vell. Paterc ii. 98; Sueton. *Tiber.* 42; Tacitus, *Annal.* vi. 10.

though I cannot express myself at all decisively upon the point; but we know, at least, that he appointed treasurers for his own aerarium, and that in it the other aerarium was subsequently merged. Under a specious pretext, he appointed *equites Romani* to this office, and not senators; for the latter, venal as they were, had immense pride.[18]

With regard to the courts of justice, he maintained the lex Julia, which had again given the *judicia* entirely to the *equites* but the *decuries*, or jury-lists, were much increased, and he also made a fourth list, or decury, for minor cases, to which persons of smaller fortunes than the *census equester* were admitted.

Italy had, as it were, by chance grown together into one state. In ancient times, it comprised only the south, and did not extend further north than the Tiber; but it had gradually been extended as far as the river Rubicon, which formed the boundary between it and Cisalpine Gaul, so that Etruria and Umbria were included in it. Augustus now gave Italy its natural extent, from the straits of Sicily to the foot of the Alps, and divided the whole of that country into a number of regions.[19] What was the meaning of these regions, and whether each of them had a praefect at its head, I cannot say. I have never been able to find anything to throw light upon the question, but I am inclined to believe that the division had reference only to the forty quaestors[20]; for I cannot conceive a division of that kind without a corresponding number of officers. I cannot find, in the reign of Augustus, or of his immediate successors, a trace of anything like the four consulars appointed by Hadrian in Italy[21], or like the *correctores* in the reign of Severus[22]; but I will not therefore deny that Augustus introduced something similar in his division. As far as I am aware, however, no traces of it occur either in books or in inscriptions relating to his reign, though they are numerous in later times.

Augustus had an enormous private property; he possessed entire principalities, and we may form some notion of his

[18] Sueton. August, 36; Dion Cassius, liii. 2, 32, 48; Tacitus, *Annal.* xiii. 29.

[19] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* iii. 6.

[20] The number of praetors was reduced by Augustus to ten.—N. (Vell. Paterc. ii. 89; Dion Cassius. liii 32.)

[21] Spartian. *Hadrian*, 21.

[22] Treb. Pollio, *Trig. Tyranni*, 24; Vopiscus, *Aurelian* 39; Eutrop. ix. 13; Aurel. Victor, *de Caesar.* 35.

wealth when we read in Josephus[23] the will of Herod, who left all his property to Augustus and his family. Dependent kings and tetrarchs often bequeathed to the emperors all that they possessed. The rest was the produce of his wars, and of the tributes derived from his provinces. His vicegerents who received these tributes were called *procuratores Caesaris*, and were usually taken from among the Roman equites, but never from the senators; freedmen of the emperors also sometimes obtained such an office, though perhaps this did not occur under Augustus. The emperors had such unlimited power in these provinces, that Augustus, for example, changed the whole registration of property in Gaul on his own responsibility, and without consulting any one, even for the sake of appearances. The soldiers too were wholly in his power, for they took their oath of allegiance to the emperor: they did the same, it is true, to the *imperium populi Romani*, but they were bound to and dependent on the emperor, as they had formerly been to the consuls, to whom no one was now bound. His fleets were stationed at Misenum and Ravenna.[24] The institution of the praetorian cohorts was nothing new, for *cohortes praetoriae* had existed from the earliest times, and were analogous to the *guides des généraux* whom we meet with in the history of the French Revolution. They occur in the Punic wars, and during the civil wars we find them on both sides. They had arisen out of the former *evocati*. Augustus had brought them back with him to Italy, and had founded twenty-eight military colonies, as a protection against any popular outbreak; in order to keep these veterans also in check, he formed the *cohortes praetoriae*, which in Italy gradually came to represent the armed Roman people of former times; for they were raised principally in those districts of Latium which had formed the nucleus of the Marian party. These cohorts were at first kept scattered over various parts of Italy, but they were gradually drawn nearer to Rome and there established the well-known *castra praetoria*. Their number was increased in the course of time, but under Augustus there may have been about 8,000.

Formerly the provincials were called upon to take up arms only when their country was in immediate danger; but henceforth cohorts were formed from among the subjects of all the

[23] *Antiquit. Jud.* xvii. 6, § 1.

[24] Sueton. *August.* 49.

imperial provinces, many of whom had the lesser franchise, and under the name of *auxilia*, may have amounted to half of the Roman armies. *Socii* are no longer mentioned. The formation of the legions at that time, as well as the places in which they were levied, are subjects buried in utter obscurity. The legions had to serve for the definite period of sixteen years, and after that they were still kept for a time under the *vexilla*, to be ready as a reserve in case of need; but on the expiration of this additional period, they were disbanded, and were to receive assignments of land. This system of assigning lands to the veterans was the work of Augustus, who also increased the pay of the soldiers. In the time of Caesar the ancient pay of 120 denarii, or 1,200 ases per annum, independently of the *donativa*, still existed. But Caesar doubled and Augustus trebled it, so that a Roman soldier now received an annual pay of 360 denarii, or about £9 of our money.[25] As the prices of all things had risen immensely in the time of Augustus, this pay was not very large for men who disposed of imperial crowns; but the great number of soldiers made it nevertheless a heavy burden to the state, which was scarcely able to bear it. Complaints about it occur in the time of Augustus, and are repeated by Tiberius, who was a ruler of great talent.

LECTURE CVI.

ROMAN literature attained its perfection in and through Cicero, in the same manner as that of Germany attained its perfection in Lessing. The period about the year 680 of the city, when Cicero was between thirty and forty years old, may be regarded as the time at which Roman literature reached its greatest height; the language itself too made a decided advance. Though the preceding period abounds in beautiful works, yet its productions are still imperfect; which is the case even with the works of Cicero himself. The language had before been vague and unsettled, and vulgarities were mixed up with things that were otherwise noble and beautiful; but

[25] Sueton. *Caes.* 26; Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 17, 26; Dion Cassius, lvii. 4.

this now ceased, the language assumed a definite character, and whatever was low or vulgar was rejected. The Latin of Cicero, that is, the language spoken in his time by men of education, is with the greatest justice recognised as the most perfect. If we possessed more works of the class to which Corn. Nepos' excellent life of Atticus belongs, we should find the language of Cicero in all of them. Latin prose had before been exceedingly weak, and sometimes diffuse and dry, but Cicero brought it to perfection. The influence of a great man often works unseen; and I have little doubt that Caesar's literary perfection may be traced to the influence of Cicero.

The age of Cicero was one which abounded in authors and men of talent and genius: among them there were many of whom little is now known, but who were nevertheless men of eminence. I do not, however, mean to say that all who then distinguished themselves in literature, really deserved to be reckoned among the classical writers, for some of them, especially those who were older than Cicero, belonged in reality to the preceding period. Such was the case in Germany with Winckelmann, who was somewhat older than Lessing, and who, so far as his style is concerned, belonged to the period previous to Lessing; that which succeeded had little or no influence upon him, although he lived amidst it. A man of the same kind was M. Terentius Varro: he had an extraordinary and well-deserved reputation for his immense reading, activity, and learning in Roman affairs (he was probably not so well acquainted with Greek literature), but in what we possess of his, he cannot be recognised as a contemporary of Cicero; there is in fact the same contrast between him and Cicero that there is between Mascov, Mosheim, or Reimarus and Lessing. The same was probably the case with P. Nigidius Figulus. The real bloom of Roman literature is represented by the men who were the younger contemporaries of Cicero, and whom he saw rise up around him. One of them was the orator M. Caelius Rufus, of whom we can ourselves form an opinion from his letters to Cicero, and whose language is perfectly equal to that of Cicero.[1] Curio's letters do not make the same impression upon me, but they are not of sufficient importance to enable us to form a decided opinion, and I attribute more weight to the judgment of Cicero, who entertained a high opinion of his

[1] See Niebuhr, *Kleine histor. und Philol. Schriften*, vol. ii. p. 252, foll.

talents. A contemporary of Caelius Rufus and Curio was C. Licinius Calvus, an orator and poet, who was likewise highly esteemed by Cicero. Quinctilian does not judge of him as favourably as he deserves, but Tacitus thinks that he was a classical writer both as an orator and as a poet[2]; he died at an early age. Sallust was considerably younger than Cicero, and of about the same age as Caelius Rufus, Curio, and Licinius Calvus; he survived Cicero, though he did not live to a very advanced age. He went his own way in literature, and was so much absorbed in the past, that the language and style of his contemporaries had little or no influence upon his own. He did not practise eloquence, but only wrote, and we cannot therefore wonder at the peculiar form of his works. As an historian he possesses all the qualities that can be looked for, and Rome might be proud even if it had no other historian than Sallust. The fact that Priscian ascribes archaisms to some of these men, does not detract from their merit.[3]

This period was properly the age of poetry: Lucretius, C. Licinius Calvus, and Catullus were contemporaries, though they were not all of the same age; they are the three greatest poets of that period. It is only now, after the cessation of the prejudice against didactic poetry, which attempted to exclude Lucretius from the list of poets, that his great talent and genius are recognised. Had he not unfortunately given himself up to the miserable system of philosophy which derives its name from Epicurus, he would have produced still greater things. The greatest poet that Rome ever had is Catullus, if we except perhaps some few of the earlier ones. He does not anxiously seek for forms or words; poetry with him is the same natural expression, the same natural language, as our

[2] There seems to be some confusion here. The passage of Quinctilian (x. ii. 115.) runs thus: "Inveni qui Calvum praeferrent omnibus, inveni qui Ciceroni crederent, cum nimia contra se calumnia verum sanguinem perdidisse: sed est et sancta et gravis oratio et custodita et frequenter vehemens quoque" Tacit. *Dial. de Orat.* 18 says. "Sunt enim (antiqui) horridi et impoliti et rudes et informes et quos utinam nulla parte imitatus esset Calvus vester, aut Caelius, aut ipse Cicero!" and "Legistis utique et Calvi et Bruti ad Ciceronem missas epistolas, ex quibus facile est deprehendere, Calvum quidem Ciceroni visum exsanguem et attritum — rursumque Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male audivisse tanquam solutum et enervem." In the extant writings of Cicero, there are too long passages, *Brut.* 82, *Epist. ad Fam.* xv. 21, where Calvus is mildly judged of, but not absolutely praised.

[3] Is not perhaps Seneca meant here? See Gellius, xii. 2.

common mode of expressing our thoughts is with us. He has the same perfections and excellencies as the lyric poets of Greece previously to the time of Sophocles, and he is their equal in every respect: he was a gigantic and extraordinary genius. It shews the greatest prejudice to say that he is not equal to the Greeks of the classic age. The other poets of his time, though unquestionably inferior to him, are still very important phenomena in Roman literature; and if we had the poems of C. Helvius Cinna; if we had any other poems of Valerius Cato besides those extant (his *Dirae* are after all very doubtful); if we had Valgius, and Ticida[4], we should read them all with great pleasure, which is saying more than can be said of any other period in the history of literature. The poetry of this period is composed with a strict observance of the Greek metres; the hexameter of the greater poems is perfectly Greek, and the caesurae are carefully attended to and correct; the smaller lyric poems are written in Greek metres, and the form is almost completely Greek. But in some minor points, such as the construction of the pentameter, the poets of this age still had their peculiarities, which they were loth to give up, and which are foreign to the Greeks. Furius Bibaculus was very charming; Varro Atacinus, the translator of Apollonius Rhodius, was by no means contemptible. Comedy had become quite extinct, and no works even of mediocrity are mentioned.

This flourishing period of Roman poetry ceases about the time of Caesar's and Cicero's death, and another generation now sprang up. The number of eloquent men henceforth is small. Among those who survived the blooming period I will mention Asinius Pollio, who was about thirty-three or thirty-four years old at the death of Caesar, so that his talents were perfectly developed at the time, but the period in which he distinguished himself as a writer and an orator falls somewhat later, that is, subsequently to the war of Brundusium, after which he entirely withdrew from public life. We may form an opinion upon him from the fragments preserved in Seneca, the father. His writings were very unequal; some parts are extremely good, especially when he wrote under the influence of passion, as for example against Cicero, towards whom he was unjust, and against the Pompeian party. He

[4] Weichert, *Poet. Lat. Rel.* p. 361, not. 20.

was wanting in benevolence, and was a man of a harsh and embittered nature. Munatius Plancus also was a talented orator, and A. Hirtius, who properly speaking belongs to the preceding period, was, as I have already remarked, a particularly elegant writer, although he spent his life in warlike pursuits. In the history of literature there are men such as Asinius Pollio, who stand between two distinct generations, and form a sort of mediators between them (one might call them *proventus*[5] or φορά); thus Klopstock, Kant and Winckelmann gave the character to their period in some respects, and Kästner, Gellert, Cramer and others, who are now almost forgotten in other respects; then followed the period of Goethe, to which belonged Voss, and Frederic Leopold Stolberg,— and between these periods stands Lessing, who exerted no influence upon those who were older than himself, but paved the way for a new generation, and gave it its character. I do not, of course, mean to place Asinius Pollio by the side of Lessing, but he stands in a similar manner between the periods of Cicero and Virgil; for we may well call Virgil the representative of his age.

In the period which followed that of Cicero, or the so-called Augustan age, prose writing became very insignificant. With the exception of Livy and Valerius Messala, in fact, it vanishes entirely. The cause of this phenomenon is well explained in the excellent dialogue "De Oratoribus," which critics have at length come to regard as a genuine work of Tacitus. Public eloquence necessarily ceased, and prose was cultivated and developed throughout antiquity by public speaking and oratory. As soon as oratory ceased, therefore, prose became poor. There was at that time no opportunity for free speaking. The Rostra and the Curia had become silent, and the orations that were now delivered were mere λόγοι ἐπιδεικτικοί, miserable signs of the times. The only subject for prose was history, which was written by Asinius Pollio and Livy. Messala, who was much younger than Asinius Pollio, and a contemporary of Horace, was the only man who distinguished himself as an orator; but I believe his personal excellence was greater than his talents.

The brilliant period of the two great poets of that time, Virgil and Horace, and of many of their contemporaries, falls

[5] Plin. *Epist.* i. 13

after the death of Caesar, and in the early part of Augustus' career. Horace's poetry is still lyric, but it gradually loses this character. It is much more carefully copied from the Greeks and in the time of Caesar; so that the licences and differences from the Greek form, which we find in the productions of the preceding period, vanish altogether. The Greek forms were now adopted as law. Roman poetry became only an imitation, and in a great measure a translation of the Greek into Latin; with the exception of a few cases, it avoided all ornament derived from archaic forms; all that was written was in perfect analogy and harmony with the language spoken by the educated and refined classes. Virgil, it is true, occasionally uses an ancient form, such as *olli*, *aulai*, but this occurs only in his Aeneid, and is admitted in conformity with a grammatical rule respecting epic poetry, similar to that which had been laid down by the Alexandrian grammarians for the epic language of the Greeks.

Virgil was born on the 15th of October, 682, and died on the 22nd of September, 733. I have often expressed my opinion respecting Virgil, and have declared that I am as opposed to the adoration with which the later Romans venerated him, as any fair judge can demand. He did not possess the fertility of genius nor the inventive powers which are required for his task. His Eclogues are anything but a successful imitation of the idyls of Theocritus; they could not, in fact, be otherwise than unsuccessful: their object is to create something which could not prosper in a Roman soil. The shepherds of Theocritus are characters of ancient Sicilian poetry; I do not believe that they were taken from Greek poems. Daphnis, for example, is a Sicilian not a Greek hero. The idyls of Theocritus grew out of popular songs, and hence his poems have a genuineness, truth, and nationality. Now Virgil, in transplanting that kind of poetry to the plains of Lombardy, peoples that country with Greek shepherds, with their Greek names and Greek peculiarities,—in short, with beings that never could exist there. His didactic poem on Agriculture is more successful; it maintains a happy medium, and we cannot well speak of it otherwise than in terms of praise. His Aeneid, on the other hand, is a complete failure: it is an unhappy idea from beginning to end; but this must not prevent us from acknowledging that it contains many exquisite passages. Virgil displays in it

a learning of which an historian can scarcely avail himself enough; and the historian who studies the Aeneid thoroughly, will ever find new things to admire. But no epic poem can be successful, if it is anything else than a living and simple narrative of a portion of some series of events which, as a whole, is known and interesting to the mass of a nation. I cannot understand how it is that, in manuals of Aesthetics, the views propounded on epic poetry, and the subjects fit for it, are still full of lamentable absurdities. It is really a ludicrous opinion, which a living historian has set forth somewhere, that an epic poem must be a failure if the subject is not old enough—as if it were necessary for it to lay by for some centuries to go through a kind of fermentation! The question is similar to that as to what subjects are fit for historical painting. Everthing is fit for it, which is known and capable of suggesting to the beholder the whole, of which it is only a part. This is the reason why Sacred History is so peculiarly fit for historical painting. Every one who sees, for example, a madonna or an apostle, immediately recollects all the particular circumstances connected with those personages; and this effect upon the beholder is still stronger, if he has lived some time surrounded by works of art. When Pietro of Albano or Domenichino paint mythological subjects, we scholars indeed know very well what the artist meant to express, and are vexed at his little inaccuracies; but the majority of people do not understand the meaning of the painting, they cannot connect a definite idea with it, and the subject contains nothing that is suggestive to them. Mythological subjects, therefore, are at present a hazardous choice for an artist; and however excellently they may be treated, they cannot compete with those taken from Sacred History. Mythological subjects were as much the common property of the ancients, as the Sacred History is the common property of Christian nations. A subject from modern history, if generally known, much talked of, and suitable in respect to the external forms connected with it, would be just as fit for artistic representation as any other. But our costumes are unfavourable to art. The ancients, however, very seldom represented historical subjects in works of art, although their costumes were not against it. The case of epic poetry is of the same kind. If a narrative which everybody knows, sings, or relates, is not treated as history in its details, and if we feel ourselves justified in choosing for our purpose, some portion of the whole, then any of its parts is a fit subject for epic poetry. Cyclic poetry relates whole histories continuously, and is of the same extent as history; but epic poetry takes up only one portion of a whole, which the poet relates just as if he had seen it. There cannot be a more unfortunate epic than Lucan's Pharsalia: it proceeds in the manner of annals, and the author wants to set forth prominently only certain events. There are passages in it like the recitative of an opera, and written in a language which is neither prose nor poetry. Virgil had not considered all the difficulties of his task, when he undertook it. He took a Latin history, and mixed it up with Greek traditions. If he had made use of the Roman national traditions, he would have produced a poem which would have had at least an Italian nationality about it. The ancient Italian traditions, it is true, had already fallen into oblivion, and Homer was at that time better known than Naevius; but still the only way to produce a living epic, would have been to base it upon the national Italian traditions. Virgil is a remarkable instance of a man mistaking his vocation: his real calling was lyric poetry; his small lyric poems, for instance, that on the villa of Syron[6], and the one commencing "Si mihi susceptum fuerit decurrere munus?" shew that he would have been a poet like Catullus, if he had not been led away by his desire to write a great Graeco-Latin poem. It is sad to think that his mistake, that is, the work which is his most complete failure, has been so much admired by posterity; and it is remarkable that Catullus' superiority to Virgil was not acknowledged till the end of the eighteenth century. The cause of Virgil being so much liked in the middle ages was that people did not or could not compare him with Homer, and that they fixed their attention upon the many particular beauties of the Aeneid. Jeremy Markland was the first who ventured openly to speak against Virgil; but he was decried for it, as if he had committed an act of high treason. It was surely no affectation in Virgil when he desired to have the Aeneid burnt; he had made that poem the task of his life, and in his last moments he had the feeling that he had failed in it. I rejoice that his wish was not carried into effect;

[6] H. Meyer, *Antholog. Veter. Latin. Epigrammat. et Poetarum.* No. 93, p. 23. Compare Niebuhr, vol. i. p. 198.

[7] H. Meyer, *l. c.* No. 85. p. 21.

but we must learn to keep our judgment free and independent in all things, and yet to honour and love that which is really great and noble in man. We must not assign to Virgil a higher place than he deserves, but what the ancients say of his personal character is certainly good and true. It may be that the tomb of Virgil on Mount Posilipo near Naples, which was regarded throughout the middle ages as genuine, is not the ancient original one, though I do not see why it should not have been preserved. It is adorned with a laurel tree, which has no doubt been often renewed. I have visited the spot with the feelings of a pilgrim; and the branch I plucked from the laurel tree, is as dear to me as a sacred relic, although it never occurs to me to place Virgil among the Roman poets of the first order.

LECTURE CVII.

HORACE was born on the 8th of December 687, and died on the 27th of November 744, in his fifty-seventh year. Venusia, his birth-place, was a Latin colony, established in the interval between the third Samnite war and that against Pyrrhus[1]; it remained faithful to Rome down to the time of the Social War, when it is mentioned among the revolted places.[2] Hence we may infer, that it had lost its Latin character, and had become rather assimilated to the nations of those districts, that is, it had become Lucanian and Oscan. Horace relates, by the way, that in his youth he went to school with the sons of the centurions[3], which is a hint suggesting that Venusia was at that time a military colony, probably one of those which had been established by Sulla, in consequence of its revolt in the Social War. Our knowledge of the place is very scanty, but from what Horace says of Ofellus, who farmed his former property from a soldier, we see that, when Horace wrote the second book of his Sermones, a new military colony must have been established there.[4] Horace's father was a *libertinus;* his surname Flaccus, however, if the father too bore it, would shew that he was not a foreigner, but of Italian extraction; and it is possible that the father's servitude may have consisted in nothing more than in his having been made a prisoner in the Social War, and in having been sold as a slave. In other cases, the sons of freedmen have different names. Horace's father gave his son a very liberal education. When Brutus arrived in Greece, Horace, then twenty-two years old, was at Athens, whither his father, though his means were limited, had sent him to be educated. Here he entered the army of Brutus with many other young Romans, and the extraordinary honour conferred upon him by Brutus, of making him a tribune, although he was the son of a freedman, excited the envy of others, as he himself intimates, but shews that Horace must have been a distinguished young man. There were at that time only six tribunes in each legion. After the battle of Philippi he, like many others, took to flight, perhaps under the protection of Messala, and went to Rome, the capital being always the safest place in times of revolution. He was introduced to Maecenas, who soon conceived an extraordinary attachment for him, and seems to have bestowed even greater favours upon him than upon Virgil. This benevolence of Maecenas was received by the poet with great gratitude. Maecenas made him a present of a small estate in the Sabine hills, where he lived happy, and with very few wants, especially in his more advanced age. His life by Suetonius is very interesting. Wieland, a man who is too much neglected among us, has, in his commentary on Horace's Epistles, said many beautiful things on the personal character of the poet; he has shewn how little Horace was a flatterer of Augustus, which cannot, unfortunately, be denied in the case of Virgil. He draws particular attention to the independence which Horace maintained towards Maecenas, and to the fact of his keeping aloof from the golden chains, and avoiding to bend under the yoke of the monarch, difficult as it was to do so, without appearing ungrateful. Augustus was much displeased at Horace not dedicating to him the first book of his Sermones; he could not conceal from himself the fact that Horace was one of those who, notwithstanding all the amends he had made, yet did not forget his earlier actions, and judged of him

[1] Compare vol. iii. p. 401, foll.

[2] (Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* i. 39, 42.) Appian's account of it is worthy of attention, being derived from very good sources.—N.

[3] *Satir.* i. 6, 73.

[4] Compare Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* iv. 3.

accordingly. Wieland further calls in the testimony of a letter of Augustus in Suetonius, in which the emperor complains of Horace's indifference, and says: "An vereris ne apud posteros infame tibi sit quod videaris familiaris nobis esse?" the poet declined to become the emperor's secretary. These facts speak clearly enough.

The Odes of Horace are not printed in our editions in their chronological order: some of them belong to a very early period, and perhaps to the time when he was staying at Athens; but of a great many of them it is impossible to determine the exact time at which they were written, though it may be confidently asserted, that most of them belong to the period preceding the war of Actium. The first three books, however, were not published till after that war. Among the Sermones there are some of a very early date, and the earliest of all is perhaps that on the entertainment of Nasidienus[5], whom I believe, with the Scholiast and Lambinus, to be Salvidienus Rufus; it is not probable that Horace should have ridiculed the man, who had become unfortunate, after his death, and this Sermo accordingly belongs, in all probability, to the first years after the battle of Philippi, about 710. The fourth book of the Odes and the second of the Epistles were written in the latter years of Horace's life.

With regard to Horace as a poet, he was formerly admired to extravagance; but for about thirty years, that is from about the commencement of the present century, when Roman literature began to be neglected, Horace has not had justice done to him. His imitations of the lyric poems of the Greeks are of exquisite beauty, and have much that is original. Sometimes, however, he is not quite successful; it is evident that occasionally he was seeking for a particular expression, but was satisfied with another which is neither the most precise, nor the most appropriate. This carelessness on the part of Horace has given rise to many of Bentley's emendations. Horace is, on the whole, a very amiable character, and there

[5] The ancient poets, as the scholiasts justly observe, in speaking of a person whose name they do not wish to mention, substitute another name of precisely the same prosody as the real one, so that the latter may be inserted without disturbing the metre. Thus we have Malthinus for Maecenas. Some one, I believe, has written on such disguised names in Horace.—N. (Niebuhr seems to allude here to Buttmann's essay, "Ueber das Geschichtliche und die Anspielungen im Horaz," in the "*Mythologus*," i. p. 297—346.)

are only two things in him which are disagreeable to my feelings. First, his disregard for the earlier poetry of his country, which he treats with contempt, as something old-fashioned. He was right in opposing the excessive enthusiasm for everything ancient, which endeavoured to crush all that was new; but his low estimation of the early Roman poets is unjust, and deserves censure. It is almost inconceivable how it was possible for him to mistake the great merits of Plautus, for example. There is much in Plautus that was offensive to him, because it was foreign to his age; many an expression also, which now appears to us noble, may in his time have become a vulgarism, and may therefore have displeased him. But what more than anything else produced this feeling in him, seems to have been vexation at those who ridiculously paraded their partiality for what was old-fashioned, and affected the most intense admiration of it, just as among us there exists an extravagant admiration of the middle ages. No one is more decidedly opposed than myself to an undue admiration of middle-age customs, and of the poetical productions of that time, whether they be the songs of the troubadours or the lay of the Nibelungen itself; but this is a very different thing from being unjust towards them. The second point which I have to censure in the poems of Horace,—though I am willing to excuse it, if I consider the circumstances of the time,—is the irony of the Epicurean philosophy with which he looks upon everything, as though in reality it were only a folly: he treats all subjects, even those which are most venerable, lightly, and tries to smile at everything. This tendency is a bad habit with him, and is painful to us. I think, however, that he would have been a different man, if he had lived in a happier age. He always appears kind and cordial, but somewhat constrained[6], whereas Catullus, in his wild and fanciful strains, and his loud laughter, as well as in his tears, speaks to our hearts. Horace, whose real sympathies were with Brutus, was resolved not to let his heart bleed, and consoled himself by looking at things in a manner which is painful to me. The late Count Frederic Leopold Stolberg says most truly, "when a real good is lost; it is often worth a great deal to retain the feeling of the loss." In such a case, no one should wish to divert his mind, or try

[6] Something analogous to the disposition of Horace is found in Menander, and the later Attic comedy in general.—N.

to forget his grief: the grief must be left alone, though not fostered artificially, for this is an evil; but when the heart is bleeding, one must let it bleed. The consequences of an opposite conduct are incalculably hurtful. To many a man, it has become the cause of the lowest degradation, that he *would* not carry about his grief with him. Horace, however, always remained a noble and highly amiable man notwithstanding; his fault was only that he formed a false conception of an unhappy period. He lived to nearly the age of fifty-seven.

Tibullus was a contemporary of Horace; but, while the latter was of very low origin, Tibullus was a Roman eques, although his property, I believe, had suffered much in the storms of the time. The year of his birth is unknown; and it is only from an epigram ascribed to Domitius Marsus, that we know him to have died soon after Virgil[7], though I do not know whether that epigram can be considered as genuine. The first two books of the poems that have come down to us under the name of Tibullus, are unquestionably genuine; but the third is certainly spurious. Lygdamus, the name given to himself by the author, at the end of the second elegy of this book, is not his real name, and I believe that we have here a case similar to the disguised names in Horace.[8] It is only from a spirit of party that scholars will not admit the soundness of the observation of Voss, who justly remarks that the character of the poems of the third is totally different from that of the preceding books; and those who will not admit their spuriousness, do not, in my opinion, possess either a competent knowledge of grammar or of metre. The fifth elegy of the third book contains a distich[9] which describes the birth-year of the writer as that in which Hirtius and Pansa were Consuls, 709; and as this is irreconcileable with the chronology of Tibullus, the lines have generally been rejected as an interpolation. But this is an altogether arbitrary proceeding founded on the assumption, which these very lines are opposed to, viz.—that Tibullus was the author of the third

[7] H. Meyer, *Anthолog. Veter. Lat. Epigr. et Poetar.* No. 122, p. 44.

Te quoque Virgilio comitem non aequa, Tibulle,
Mors juvenem campos misit in Elysios,
Ne foret, aut elegis molles qui fleret amores,
Aut caneret forti regia bella pede.

[8] Such is also the case with names of females; as e. g. the Cynthia of Propertius, and the Delia of Tibullus, whose real names are said to have been Hostia and Plania, respectively.—N.

[9] Verse 17, foll.

book: if we admit the correctness of the view on this point above stated, there will be no occasion to reject those lines. The fourth book also cannot belong to Tibullus. The panegyric upon Messala, with which it opens, is evidently written by a poor person, who required protection, and not by a Roman eques. Both the third and fourth books are the works of poets inferior to Tibullus. With regard to the smaller poems of the fourth book, such as those under the name of Sulpicia and Cerinthus, their language and versification differ greatly from those of Tibullus, and display greater energy and boldness than Tibullus possessed: they are the productions of a poet who was much superior to him. To me Tibullus is a disagreeable poet: doleful and weeping melancholy and sentimentality, such as we find them in Tibullus, are always unantique; they are the misunderstood tones of Mimnermus. I cannot bear them, and least of all in a Roman.

Cornelius Gallus was perhaps somewhat older than Horace, and a man of rank. He was also engaged in military life, and was appointed by Augustus governor of Egypt, in which capacity he abused his power in an unworthy manner. Virgil was very much attached to him, which shews that there must have been something amiable in his character. In the 4th book of the Georgics, Virgil introduced a eulogy on him, for which he afterwards substituted the episode about Aristaeus. Gallus was condemned for very bad actions, and afterwards made away with himself. He translated Euphorion, and wrote elegies of which only a single verse is extant. He must have been a poet of eminent talent; but all that has come down to us under his name is spurious, with the exception of a few fragments. The epithet *durior* which is given to him is commonly not well understood; I take it to mean that his language and versification had something of the earlier Roman poetry about them, which Quinctilian might well call harsh.

A contemporary of these men was L. Varius, of whom only a very few verses are extant, but whom the ancients place along with Horace and Virgil among the greatest poets, especially on account of his tragedy Thyestes. This subject however was an unfortunate one for a tragedy. I fear that his manner was too declamatory, and that his Thyestes bore the same relation to the ancient Attic tragedies that Virgil's Aeneid bears to the Homeric epics. This and all the later tragedies of the Romans were not, like

those of Pacuvius and Attius, imitations of Attic dramas, but were based upon the models of the Alexandrian period; for the tragedies of what was called the Pleias, were undoubtedly of very different character from the ancient Attic tragedies; we may form a tolerably correct notion of them by looking at the productions of Seneca, whose pieces are certainly not Roman inventions, but evidently imitations of foreign models, in which the lyric portions are confined to anapaests, and rarely contain simple strophes of four lines. If I had the choice, I would rather have Varius' poem "De Morte" than his tragedy.

These and some other men form the illustrious assemblage of the poets of that period and rarely has so great a number of such poets existed together in the history of the world. They were living at the time when Augustus made himself master of the republic. But now another generation gradually rose up, which constituted what may be properly called the Augustan age. It began with Propertius, whose poems are evidently written according to the models of the Alexandrian period; whereas the earlier lyric poets, with the exception perhaps of Virgil, who, in parts, followed the poets of Alexandria and Pergamus, had taken the ancient Greek lyrics for their models. It is impossible to determine the year in which Propertius was born, though it must have been somewhere about 700. He was a native of Umbria, and his great ambition was to become the Roman Callimachus or Philetas.

After him followed Ovid, who was born in 709, in the consulship of Hirtius and Pansa. Next to Catullus, he is the most poetical among the Roman poets. You must not believe that those poets were isolated phenomena, standing as it were in the air, and beyond the influence of contemporary events. Virgil was evidently intimidated; Horace was in a painful situation, for his heart was with Brutus; Tibullus, a man with a tender heart, was weighed down by what he saw around him; Propertius, too, had been influenced by the occurrences of his youth and the loss of his property, in consequence of the establishment of military colonies: his real enjoyment of life and his ease never returned afterwards. The full and unrestrained development of Catullus' genius was the result of the freedom which he enjoyed as a wealthy young man; his father must have been one of the most distinguished persons in the province of Cisalpine Gaul, and was connected with Caesar by

ties of hospitality. Ovid was born with one of the most happy temperaments that heaven can bestow upon a man. The calamities of the Perusinian war happened when he was an infant only three years old. At the time of the battle of Actium, which restored peace, he was thirteen years old, and he scarcely heard of the misfortunes which belonged to the time of his infancy. You yourselves must know how much influence the recollections of your boyhood have on the development of your temperaments and dispositions; and my own disposition is very different from what it would be if I were now a young man. The absence of all care and anxiety in Ovid, and his cheerfulness, resulted from the circumstances amid which he passed his youthful years. He was born at Sulmo. From his birth his life had been adorned with everything that wealth and rank could procure, and he was endowed with all that can adorn a man's body and soul. No one can have a greater talent or a greater facility for writing poetry than Ovid had: in this respect, he may take rank among the greatest poets. An unbiassed judge must recognise in all the productions of Schiller a sort of constraint and labour; while in the early poems of Goethe everything bears the impress of the greatest ease; the lyric poets of the Greeks are never laboured, and this is the kind of poetry in which every one feels at home, and as though the sentiments could not be expressed in any other way. Horace is much inferior to Ovid in this respect; there are only a few among his lyric poems of which we can say that they were composed with ease and facility. Ovid's *facilitas* is manifest everywhere. His personal faults which are visible also in his poetry, are well known, and do not require to be mentioned here. The cause of his unfortunate exile is a mystery which no human ingenuity will ever clear up, and concerning which an endless variety of absurd opinions are abroad. He was exiled to Tomi, and some persons censure him for his broken-heartedness; but I cannot help, on the contrary, admiring him for the freshness and activity which he preserved in his fearful exile among barbarians.

One of his contemporaries was Cornelius Severus, of whom we have a fragment, which confirms the opinion that he would have been a great epic poet if he had lived longer. He would have been infinitely superior to Lucan.

Pedo Albinovanus must likewise have been distinguished among the poets of that time; but, whether he is the author of the "Consolatio ad Liviam" on the death of her son Drusus is not so certain as is generally believed, though it is very possible.

Livy, of whom I have already spoken in the introductory lectures, was born in the consulship of Caesar, 693, and lived to see a considerable portion of the reign of Tiberius, attaining the age of seventy-five or seventy-seven.[10] History was then the only thing that was written in prose, for oratory had degenerated into miserable declamations, which contain nothing but detestable and sophistical perversities, and into mere legal pleadings. But of these productions I shall speak hereafter. Livy began writing his history when he was at the age of fifty, or even later; but he was still in full vigour and freshness. The unfavourable judgment of Asinius Pollio respecting him arose unquestionably from political party-feeling, for Pollio was annoyed at everything connected with the Pompeian party. Livy is not mentioned in the poems of Horace, and his fame, which was greater than that of any of his contemporaries, belongs to a later period. He was a rhetorician, and was perhaps at one time engaged in giving instructions in rhetoric; but it is just as probable that he lived in quiet independence. It was only his historical work that brought him into notice. One person even came from Gades for the sole purpose of seeing him.

LECTURE CVIII.

I FORGOT to mention among the contemporaries of Cicero and Caesar, the poet Decimus Laberius. He was the author of mimes which were evidently extempore compositions and very original. Laberius and P. Syrus are the most celebrated authors of this species of poetry, and the former was, according to the testimony of his contemporaries, a poet of great original merit. His productions must have resembled the Sermones of Horace, but they had little in common with dramatic poetry.

[10] According to the opinion expressed in the Introductory Lectures, he lived to the age of seventy-nine.

P. Syrus too enjoyed a great reputation. Comedy had become completely extinct. No comedy even of mediocrity is mentioned; and the Thyestes of Varius is the only instance of a tragedy at that time. Valgius too belongs to the age of Virgil.

The literary nullity of the Greeks at this period, if we compare the activity of the Romans, was still greater than the political weakness and impotence of Greece in contrast with Rome's power and dominion. We hear of no writers except rhetoricians and grammarians. They are not indeed to be treated with disrespect, but poetry seems to have become quite extinct, if we except a few insignificant writers of epigrams; but even in epigrammatic poetry there is scarcely any other period in the history of ancient literature that is as barren as this. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, distinguished both for talent and judgment, stands alone, and therefore we cannot wonder at the Romans of that time feeling themselves superior to the Greeks in literature; this feeling was, on the contrary, perhaps not so strong as it ought to have been. The Greek rhetoricians, who inundated Rome during the latter part of the reign of Augustus and under Tiberius, brought down literature very rapidly. There were indeed a few other writers, but we know little more of them than their names; the rhetoricians who gave the tone to literature, and brought about the so-called *argentea aetas*, were Greeks, and nearly all natives of western Asia, for ancient Greece itself was completely annihilated. For many centuries after the time of Polybius, Plutarch is the only native of Greece Proper that stands forth as a writer of importance; but Posidonius of Rhodes and Theophanes of Mitylene also are exceptions.

I shall now continue my account of Augustus, his family, and his wars. The numerous statues and busts of Augustus which are still extant quite confirm the statement of Suetonius, that he was an extremely handsome man.[1] His head is indeed so beautiful that I have often been tempted to get a cast made of it, although I detest his character; and he retained his *decora facies* until old age, as we see from the busts which represent him at the different periods of life. He was an active man and of no mean powers. The ancients state that the great defect in his character was his want of courage, a charge which is easily made, especially when there is some foundation for it,

[1] *August.* 79.

such as Augustus' conduct in the war of Philippi; but there are circumstances in which he showed undoubted courage, as in the war against Sext. Pompeius He was a bad general, and was not favoured by fortune either on the field of battle or in his domestic relations. I have already described to you his dishonesty and cruelty: but a redeeming feature in his character is that he was a friend to his friends, and even bore patiently from them things which others would not have brooked. Thus he acted towards Agrippa and Maecenas, to whom he was both grateful and faithful.

In his domestic relations he acted as a man without character or principle. He had been betrothed at first to Clodia, a step-daughter of M. Antony, but the connexion was dissolved, and he married Scribonia, who became by him the mother of the ill-famed Julia. He subsequently divorced her and married Livia Drusilla, the wife of Tiberius Claudius Nero, who was proscribed and attached to the cause of Brutus, and who seems to me to have been one of the better men of the Claudian family. He was obliged by Augustus to give up Livia, a woman of a fearful character; she was so ambitious to raise the members of her own family to power and influence, that she never scrupled to commit any crime, if she thought it a fit means to attain her ends. She contrived very gradually to acquire unlimited power over Augustus. Notwithstanding the strict moral laws of his censorship and his other measures, Augustus himself was a dissolute man; and Livia connived at his conduct, in order to establish her influence over him the more firmly. Her success was most complete, and the older she grew (she was his wife for nearly fifty years) the greater was the power she exercised over her imperial husband. She was exceedingly clever and intelligent, and, in her younger years, must have been a woman of extraordinary beauty. She worked perseveringly for a long series of years to secure the ascendancy to the members of her own family, and to isolate Augustus from his own relatives. She never bore Augustus any children, except a son who was still-born. So long as Octavia, the half-sister of Augustus, and the most honourable among the later ladies of Rome, lived and had any prospects for her son M. Marcellus, who was married to Augustus' daughter Julia, Livia seemed to stand in the back ground; but, as soon as Marcellus died, and Augustus gave Julia in

marriage to Agrippa, a man who, even before this, had raised himself so high that, if Augustus had not loved him he would have feared him, things assumed a different appearance. Julia had by Marcellus only a daughter.

Agrippa was considerably older than Augustus; he had accompanied him to Apollonia as a sort of tutor, and Caesar had probably intended to take him, together with his nephew, on his eastern expedition, as was the custom when young Romans of the age of seventeen entered upon their first campaign, as we see in the case of Lollius and C. Caesar. Previously to the time when he went to Apollonia nothing is mentioned about Agrippa, and he is said to have been descended from a very obscure family[2], and was probably born in some country place. In the wars of Caesar he is not mentioned. In his later years he displayed all the qualities of an experienced general, and much good may be said of him. The best period of the reign of Augustus was unquestionably that during which he had Agrippa by his side; that is, the first eighteen years, from the battle of Actium till the death of Agrippa,—and no writer charges Agrippa with having had any share in the early cruelties of Augustus. The new regulations of the state after the battle of Actium were made principally by Agrippa, and he rather than Augustus must be regarded as the author of all the wise and useful arrangements made during that period; many of his measures were very cunning, but all were certainly beneficial. All that Agrippa did is characterised by a certain grandeur. There is only one building which originated with him: his Pantheon is still standing, and furnishes an example of the greatness of his conceptions: it is the most splendid remnant of ancient Rome. He made roads and canals; built aqueducts and baths; and the whole arrangement of the Campus Martius with all its beauties, described with delight by Strabo[3], was the work of Agrippa. Great architectural works were his element. His ability as a military commander had been tried in the war against Sext. Pompeius, in the course of which he built fleets, and formed the Julian port near Baiae. He was conscious of his great powers: he never concealed that he was proud, for he laid claim to the highest honours, and was anything but humble

[2] Tacitus, *Annal.* i. 3; Vell. Paterc. ii. 96; Seneca, *Controv.* ii. 12.

[3] v. p. 235, foll.

or timid before Augustus, who promoted him thrice to the consulship. Agrippa died, I believe, in 740; Maecenas breathed his last in 744, in which year Horace also died.

The great Cilnius Maecenas shared the friendship of Augustus with Agrippa. He was descended from a noble Etruscan family of Arretium, where his ancestors must have been a sort of dynasts, whence Horace calls them *reges*.[4] They must have had the Roman franchise previously to the passing of the Julian law, for a Cilnius Maecenas is mentioned by Cicero[5] among the *equites splendidissimi* who opposed the tribune, M. Drusus, before the outbreak of the Social War. Horace's expression[6],

> Nec quod avus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus,
> Olim qui magnis regionibus imperitarent,

also seems to suggest that the ancestors of Maecenas, on his father's as well as his mother's side, held the highest magistracy at Arretium, at the time when Etruria was yet free. Maecenas himself never would rise above his equestrian rank, but he has nevertheless acquired a reputation as the patron and protector of Horace and Virgil, which will last for ever. We will rejoice that he did patronise such men, and will not inquire into his motives, a task which it is impossible to perform, and is often very ungracious; but Maecenas himself was a singular man, and an Epicurean in the worst sense of the word: he made an ostentatious display of his opinion that ease and comfort are the greatest blessings of human life. His own conduct was more than effeminate, and I can only describe it by saying that he was *morbidly* effeminate. We know from Horace that he was of a sickly constitution; but he would rather have spent a long life in illness and suffering, than lose the enjoyment of it by death.[7] He clung to life with a morbid attachment. There was also something childish and trifling in his character: he took a foolish pleasure in jewellery and precious stones, for which he was often ridiculed by Augustus, to whom however he was a very agreeable companion and a convenient person. He had a truly Epicurean contempt for all outward distinctions; he may have attached not a little importance to influence in the state; but the honours which

[4] (*Od.* i. 1, 1; iii. 25, 1.) The name of the Cilnii occurs very often on the monuments of Arretium.—N.
[5] *Pro Cluent.* 56.
[6] *Satir.* i. 6. 3, foll.
[7] Horat. *Od.* ii. 17, 1, foll.

Agrippa was anxious to obtain appeared to Maecenas as folly. Augustus however possessed in him a prudent counsellor[8], and on one occasion Maecenas acted in a manner which shewed that, after all, the man was better than his philosophy; for one day, during either the time of the Triumvirate or the Perusinian war, when Augustus was pronouncing one sentence of death after another from his tribunal, Maecenas sent him a note in which he said, "Do get up, you hangman."[9]

It has been justly observed by Tacitus, that so long as these two men, and Drusus, the younger son of Livia, were alive, the government of Augustus was in reality praiseworthy; but after their death matters became considerably worse. Augustus in his earlier years was often attacked by dangerous illnesses; one he fell into in Gaul; from another he was cured by Antonius Musa by means of cold baths; but in his later years his health became more settled: he was one of those men whose state of health does not assume a definite character until about their fiftieth year. At the time when M. Marcellus was yet a child, Augustus, who himself was very young, once, on being taken seriously ill, fancying that his end was near, gave his ring to Agrippa; in his will he made no arrangements for the succession. During the latter years of Marcellus' life, there was a misunderstanding between Augustus and Agrippa, the cause of which was probably the partiality which Augustus shewed for Marcellus. Agrippa withdrew in consequence to Mitylene. Whenever Velleius Paterculus chooses to give utterance to his thoughts—which in many cases he will not do, for he is a servile flatterer of Tiberius—few writers can say more in a few words, or give a briefer and yet more striking description of a man's character than he. Now he says of Agrippa, that he submitted to none but Augustus, *parendi, sed uni, scientissimus*.[10] He submitted to Augustus, but was haughty towards all who had risen later than himself. If Augustus had then died, Agrippa would undoubtedly have put aside young Marcellus, and Tiberius and Drusus, the sons of Livia.[11] The manner in which he was courted in the East during his stay at Mitylene, shews that he was generally looked upon as the future sovereign. After the premature death of Marcellus, at the age of twenty-three, in whom Rome appears

[8] Comp. Vell. Paterc. ii. 88
[9] Dion Cassius, lv. 7; Cedrenus, vol. ii. p. 301.
[10] ii. 79.
[11] Vell. Paterc. ii. 9

to have lost a great consolation, Agrippa was recalled to Rome and appointed praefect of the city; and in order to raise him still more, Augustus gave him his daughter Julia, the widow of Marcellus, for his wife. This alliance might have secured to Agrippa and his sons the succession to the empire; but the dissolute conduct of his wife, embittered his last years, though he did not complain of her, in order not to dissolve his connexion with the family of Augustus, who loved Julia tenderly until her disgraceful conduct became known to him. But Agrippa died before that event, and left three sons, Caius and Lucius Caesar, and Agrippa Postumus, and two daughters, Julia and Agrippina the latter of whom was afterwards married to Germanicus; she had the pride and the noble qualities of her father and the virtues of Octavia, and was altogether a venerable woman. Her two elder brothers Caius and Lucius had been adopted by Augustus even before Agrippa's death, and they thus grew up in the house of the emperor, Caius being destined to succeed Augustus. After the death of Agrippa, Augustus gave his daughter Julia, Agrippa's widow, in marriage to Tiberius Claudius Nero (afterwards the Emperor Tiberius) his eldest step-son by Livia. Tiberius had all the peculiarities of the Claudian family: he was exceedingly proud of his noble descent, and looked upon Augustus himself as in reality nothing but a municipal upstart of Velitrae, who had been adopted into the Julian family, which he certainly thought inferior to that of the Claudii; accordingly he regarded his own marriage with Julia as one of disparagement In addition to this he saw her dissolute life, which offended him deeply But the influence of his mother Livia and his fear of Augustus were so great, that all his objections to the marriage had been silenced. At this time no member of the family of Augustus yet ventured openly to complain of Julia, and Tiberius was for a long time not on good terms with Augustus. He therefore withdrew to Rhodes, and thus leaving the field to Agrippa's family, he remained absent from Rome for upwards of seven years. During his absence, the conduct of Julia became known; she was exiled by Augustus to Pandataria and cruelly treated. Tiberius now returned to Rome, but Augustus had taken such offence at his retirement from Italy, that Livia was unable for a long time to soothe his anger. Drusus, the younger brother of Tiberius, had died in Germany, even before Tiberius went to Rhodes, and Augustus now

employed C. and L. Caesar. L. Caesar had been sent to Gaul and Spain, to regulate the registration of landed property, and C. Caesar to Armenia. The latter executed some commission in Asia, and was afterwards treacherously wounded by an Asiatic, who had probably been hired for the purpose by the king of the Parthians. The wound could not be healed, and the general opinion of antiquity is, that it was poisoned by Livia.[12] This may be a prejudice, but is nevertheless very possible. A year before this event, L. Caesar had died at Marseilles; and the general belief which was probably true, was that he too had fallen a victim to the ambitious schemes of Livia. Tiberius on his return was thus at once placed at the head of the family of Augustus. Of Agrippa's children only Agrippa Postumus and Agrippina survived; Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus were adopted by Augustus at the same time, in the year 754: and from that moment Tiberius, who was soon afterwards invested with the tribunician power, was the declared successor of Augustus. Agrippa Postumus was then only a boy, and throughout his life remained an insignificant person, who was no obstacle in the way of Tiberius. Such was the state of Augustus' family during the latter years of his life.

LECTURE CIX.

It is well known that Augustus said he had found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble; and this was not, indeed, saying too much, for the number of buildings which he erected is enormous; their remains justify his expression, and he gave Rome quite a new character. His buildings were still in the ancient style, which afterwards disappeared. The three colossal columns which were formerly believed to have belonged to the temple of Jupiter Stator, have been shown by the intelligent Stefano Piali to be remnants of the curia Julia.

[12] Velleius Paterculus (ii. 102) might easily misrepresent an occurrence like this, on account of his obsequiousness to Tiberius; but the manner in which he speaks of C. Caesar, makes me conclude that he was not worth much, and that if he had returned and succeeded Augustus, the Roman empire would have been no better off than it was under Tiberius. — N

The Forum formerly called *forum Nervae* has been recognised even by Palladio, and among the moderns, by Hirt as the *Forum Augustum;* although the wall around it is constructed in so ancient a style that some persons have foolishly imagined that it was executed in the time of the kings. This grand and antique style continued down to the reign of the emperor Claudius, after which the only example of it is the Colosseum. Augustus himself built the Mausoleum, the innermost part of which still exists and is in fact indestructible. Agrippa built the gate of S. Lorenzo, the Pantheon, and, in the ancient grand Græco-Etruscan style which had long since disappeared in Greece, the theatre of Marcellus, on the site of which stands the Palazzo Savelli in which I lived for many years.[1] All the buildings that are called Augustan on the Palatine are very doubtful, and at least cannot be proved to be works of the Augustan age. The temple of Apollo has completely disappeared. Augustus was the first who used the marble of Carrara in building. In his reign a great many roads also were made both in Italy and in the provinces, as well as aqueducts, among which that in the neighbourhood of Narni is still to be seen; it is built upon arches, and of very excellent bricks, of a different kind from those which we use. All these architectural works were carried on and all this splendour displayed without oppressing the people; for the Romans, as I have already remarked, paid only some indirect taxes, and thus their city was embellished without any cost to them. We cannot therefore wonder at the extraordinary popularity of Augustus during the last years of his reign, especially if we further consider that the people looked forward with dark apprehensions to the time when Tiberius was to have the reins of government. Horace's words *Divis orte bonis* came from the heart, and the people sincerely prayed that Augustus might be spared.

All that now remains to be related about the reign of Augustus is the history of the wars which were carried on against foreign enemies. The first, which occurred during the interval between the peace of Brundusium and the battle of Actium, was the war against the Dalmatians. In this campaign, Augustus displayed more activity than in any other of his military undertakings. He himself was wounded,—for the first time in

[1] See the description of it in Niebuhr's Letters in the *Lebensnachrichten*, vol. ii. p. 284, foll., and p. 311, foll.

his life. The Dalmatians, whose country offers great difficulties to an invader, had their power on the coast severely shaken in this war.

Not long after the battle of Actium, the war against the Cantabri and Astures began. The country which these nations inhabited nearly corresponds to the district in the north of Spain which maintained its independence against the Moors, that is, Biscay, Asturias, the northern part of Gallicia, and the country about Leon. The inhabitants of those parts did not yet recognise the supremacy of Rome, and Augustus had set himself the task of extending the empire as far as the ocean, the Rhine, and the Danube, which he considered to be its natural boundaries. In the first year of the war he was detained in Gaul, partly by illness and partly by his engagements in regulating the affairs of the province. In Tarragona he was again taken ill, and the campaign was thereby delayed. The particulars of the war are not known[2], but in the third year the Cantabri and Astures were subdued, and were obliged to give hostages.[3] It is asserted by the Biscayans, that there still exist in Biscay ancient poems upon this war of Augustus, and William von Humboldt possesses a copy of them. I can, of course, judge of it only from his translation[4]; but I cannot adopt his opinion as to the genuineness of those poems; my conviction is that they are not more genuine than the poems of Ossian. In the earliest poetry of the Germans we find no allusions to the Romans; and how should traditions about such a war, which was by no means important to them, have been preserved among the Cantabri? The wars with the Moors were of far more importance to the inhabitants of those countries, and yet no poetical traditions about them have been preserved. At the time when Wittekind of Corvey wrote, the remembrance of the wars with the Romans had become

[2] Appian seems to have grown tired at the end of his book on the affairs of Spain. He mentions this war of Augustus only in general terms; but the real cause of his hurrying thus over these events seems to have been that he did not find any Greek authorities. Augustus himself must have given an account of the war in his Memoirs, for he too dabbled in literature; but his Memoirs must have been of little value, for they are scarcely ever referred to. He also tried his hand at poetry, but so far as we can judge from his letters, we may believe that he was a very bad author, and that all his productions were worthless and tasteless.—N.

[3] Dion Cassius, liii. 25, liv. 11; Sueton. *Aug.* 20, foll.

[4] Adelung's *Mithridates*, vol. iv. p. 351, foll.

completely effaced, and such was no doubt the case among the Cantabri also. After Augustus quitted Spain, the oppression and cruelty of the Roman governors excited the people again to rise against Rome; so that several more campaigns had to be made, before they were completely subdued. Augustus founded several colonies in Spain: some important towns in modern Spain owe their origin to him, such as Caesar Augusta (Saragossa), Julia Emerita (Merida down to the time of the Arabs, one of the largest towns), Pax Julia (Beja), Pax Augusta (Badajoz), and Legio (Leon).

About this time Tiberius, who had already advanced beyond the age of youth, had the command in Dalmatia, and reduced the inhabitants to submission. M. Crassus, a Roman governor, had before that time carried on a war in Moesia, repelled the Sarmatians beyond the Danube, and extended the empire as far as that river. Pannonia too submitted during Tiberius' Dalmatian campaign.

It was during the interval between the war against the Cantabri, and the Dalmatian expedition of Tiberius, that Augustus closed the temple of Janus. This temple had been closed only twice during the whole period of Rome's existence, once in the mythical age, under Numa, and the second time after the first Punic war, in the consulship of T. Manlius Torquatus (517).[5] Augustus is said to have closed it three times in his reign[6]; but this may be merely an inconsiderate statement of Suetonius.

It was either now, or even before going to Spain, that Augustus resolved to subdue the Alpine tribes, from the Salassi in the valley of Aosta to the mountain tribes of Raetia and Noricum. The latter country was governed by kings under the protection of Rome. The greater part of those tribes belonged to the Tuscan race of the Vindelicians and to the Raetians It is probable that the Raetians did not extend farther than the valley of the lower Inn, and I believe that the upper part of that river on the northern side of the Tyrolese Alps, as far as the Danube, was occupied by the Vindelicians, who belonged to the Liburnian race, like the Pannonians who were neither Illyrians nor Gauls, and are called by the Greeks, Paeonians; it is expressly stated that they had a language of

[5] Livy, i. 19; Varro, *De Ling. Lat*, vi. 165; Vell. Paterc. ii. 38; Orosius, iv. 12.
[6] Sueton. *Aug.* 22.

their own. The Helvetii had been subjects of Rome ever since the time of Caesar. Of the manner in which these Alpine nations were subdued by Tiberius and Drusus, we know little, for our accounts are very obscure and confused. Baron von Hormayr[7] has made a romance out of them; his intention is to impress upon the German and Italian Tyrolese the necessity of keeping together, which is indeed an important point, and the historian deserves praise for urging it: but it ought not to be based upon an arbitrary treatment of history; which in this case has in fact been of no avail. It is evident, however, that the war was carried on by the Romans according to a well-organised plan; that the attacks were made from Italy and Helvetia; that the Romans gradually penetrated into all the recesses of the Alps, even where there were no roads, but only foot-paths, as in the middle ages, and that the subjugation of the Alpine tribes was so complete that afterwards not even an attempt was made to shake off the Roman yoke.[8] In the course of this campaign, Augustus founded Augusta Vindelicorum (Augsburg), a colony of veterans, like all the others which he established during that period. As henceforth the veterans received the places where they had been stationed as permanent settlements, they gradually became regular and peaceable citizens. In the later times of the empire, the sons of such colonists had to perform certain military duties, the origin of which I do not know, nor do I believe that any information about it is to be found in ancient authors: they were the guardians of the frontiers, and were exempt from taxes, but they were obliged to be always ready to fight.

The German wars, which commenced in 740, were the consequence of the conquests in the Alps. The Sigambri seem before this time to have invaded the left bank of the Rhine in our neighbourhood; but they had been repelled by the Romans, who advanced as far as the Westerwald, though they did not make any conquests. In 740, the Romans attacked the Germans both on the Danube and on the lower Rhine. The fact that such attacks were never made on the upper Rhine, as far down as the river Lahn, shews that Suabia was not then a German country; it did not become one until the Alemanni

[7] In his *Geschichte von Tyrol*, i. p. 89, foll.
[8] A list of the Alpine tribes subdued in that campaign is preserved in Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* iii. 24), who took it from an inscription.

settled there. All we know about this war is vague and indefinite, and the account in Dion Cassius is unfortunately mutilated.[9] It may have been in these campaigns that, as my friend Roth conjectures, Domitius Ahenobarbus penetrated into Germany across the Elbe in Bohemia; for, in the subsequent invasions, we mostly find the Romans marching towards the Elbe from the lower Rhine. The war was conducted by Tiberius' younger brother, Nero Claudius Drusus, in three campaigns. He advanced from the lower Rhine across the Weser, as far as the Elbe, and subdued the Bructeri, Sigambri (who were then very renowned), Cherusci, and other tribes. The details of his campaign are not known, and localities are scarcely ever mentioned, since the Germans had no towns. Their only protection was the impassable nature of their country; for they had no fortified places; and, when they met the Romans in the open field, they were usually beaten, being unable to resist the military skill of the Romans. Their country was now ravaged; women and children were carried off into slavery, and the men were put to death like wild beasts; for, although Drusus was otherwise of a mild disposition, considering what the Romans then were, yet he was, like Varus, a great sinner (ἁλιτήριος) towards the Germans. He died in his camp, not without a suspicion of Tiberius having caused his death; but this may have been believed only on account of the hatred which Tiberius entertained against the family of his brother, especially against Germanicus. All that Tiberius could have feared was, that Drusus, like Germanicus, might indulge in the fair dream of restoring the republic.[10]

In 745, after the death of Drusus, Tiberius took the command; and his triumph over the Germans was followed by his withdrawal to Rhodes. During the seven years of his absence, few important events occurred, except that the Bructeri defeated the legate M. Lollius, destroyed his legion, and captured the standards. After the return of Tiberius, he received the command in Gaul, to complete the subjugation of Germany; he

[9] The late Abbé Morelli discovered in the Venetian MS of Dion Cassius, some fragments referring to this war, on which however they throw but little light. It is evident that the passages wanting in our editions were left out by the transcriber of the Venetian MS, from which all others are derived, in order to shorten his labour, and impose upon the purchaser. — N.

[10] A monument was erected to Drusus on the Rhine, and was for many generations a sacred spot to Romans and strangers; but its site is unknown. — N.

penetrated as far as the Elbe, and reduced the Sigambri, Bructeri, and Cherusci to obedience. On the Elbe, he was joined by the Roman fleet, which had been fitted out on the river Ems, or had come from the Rhine to the Ems. How it got up the Elbe cannot be explained; it may have gone up as far as Magdeburg; and yet the Roman gallies could not sail against the current like steam-boats. After this campaign, Tiberius left Germany, as his predecessors had done, and as many of his successors did after him; for the intention of the Romans was merely to crush the Germans, not to put themselves in possession of their country, which they can hardly have thought worth the trouble of occupying.

While the Germans north of the Thüringer Wald and about the Harz mountains were thus visited by the Romans, there existed in Bohemia the great kingdom of Maroboduus, who is a strange and mysterious phenomenon in the early history of Germany. It is expressly stated[11] that he had a large town (Roviasmum) for his capital, a regular army of 70,000 men, and 4,000 horsemen, a body-guard, and definite political institutions. Justus Möser is perfectly right in saying that the Germans, in the descriptions of the Romans, must not be conceived of as more uncivilised than the modern peasants of Westphalia, or lower Saxony. Their dwelling-houses, 1800 years ago, were, I believe, not different from the more common ones in our own days, and the habitations of their chiefs were the same as the buildings of the middle ages. The notion that the ancient Germans were savages is completely false; they were neither more nor less than uncultivated country-people, to whom life in towns was altogether unknown. Venantius Fortunatus in his poem to Radagunda, speaks of the ruined magnificence of her father's empire, and the brass-covered palaces of her ancestors, the kings of Thüringia. Möser has shewn clearly that there is no ground whatever for seeking information respecting our forefathers in the forests of North America, or the islands of the South Sea, and yet people seem at present again inclined to go back to their old notions. I do not mean to say that the habitations of the ancient Germans were the same in every respect as those of the present time, for in winter, e. g., they were no doubt obliged to have lights in the day-time, all the openings of the house being closed with

[11] Strabo, vii. p. 290. Compare Vell. Paterc. ii. 108, foll.

boards, as they had no glass windows; but this was the case in Rome itself; and similar houses still exist at Rome. I cannot indeed see why our ancestors of the fourteenth century should have been much more civilised than they were in the time of Augustus. Maroboduus, however, seems to have had a kingdom which was really in a state of civilisation, with feudal institutions which had arisen out of his conquest of Bohemia; for that country had before been inhabited by Boians, that is, Celts. Tiberius intended to attack him on two sides; he himself assembled his troops in Noricum and Vindelicia, and his legate, Sentius Saturninus, was to advance from the Rhine through the Hercynian and Thüringian forests. The Romans made great preparations, in constructing their roads through Germany.[12] In this campaign we meet with the first traces of the unhappy divisions which characterise the whole history of the Germans; the northern tribes would not assist Maroboduus, because he had not assisted them; he had allowed their power to be broken, so that in fact they hardly could assist him; they also mistrusted him, because they believed that it was his intention to make himself master over them, as he had over the Marcomanni.

While Tiberius was engaged in vigorous preparations, the Pannonians and Dalmatians revolted. This insurrection lasted for three years, and was one of the most formidable that the Romans had ever had to contend with. Maroboduus, who must have known that Tiberius had been preparing to wage war against him, remained inactive during the revolt of his southern neighbours. The Dacians and Getae too remained quiet, although they had formerly often crossed the Danube, and made inroads into the Roman dominion; thus Providence again assisted the Romans. If a general war had broken out, Rome might have been placed in a most perilous situation. Augustus was seized with great alarm and trembled at the danger, for no less than 200,000 enemies are said to have been in arms. Two men of the name of Bato, one a Dalmatian and the other a Pannonian, and a Pannonian of the name of Pinnes,

[12] We find, even at the present day, the wooden causeways or roads (*limites*) like the bridge over the Elbe at Hamburgh, which the Romans formed through the marshes of Holland and Westphalia. They extend over tracts of many miles, and served as roads for the Roman armies. The wood is now perfectly black, but otherwise it is still as fresh as if it had been laid down a few years ago.—N.

were the commanders of the insurgents. Velleius Paterculus[13], who fought in this war, praises the intelligence and civilisation of these tribes, especially the Pannonians; and states that nearly all of them had Roman customs, and spoke the Latin language.[14] In this war the insurgents spread as far as Macedonia. A Roman army, which came from Asia, was defeated; and it was only owing to the extraordinary bravery of the soldiers, who made up for the mistakes of their commanders, that the Romans ultimately conquered the enemy. The revolted nations at last separated, and Pinnes was treacherously delivered up into the hands of the Romans by eon of the Batos. Pannonia was the first that submitted again to the Romans, who seem to have concluded peace on terms very favourable to the rebels, in order to conciliate them. After the close of this war, Tiberius was at liberty to resume the war against Maraboduus, who well deserved a severe chastisement for having so miserably isolated himself; but another occurrence again prevented Tiberius from proceeding against him.

LECTURE CX.

MAROBODUUS had done nothing during the insurrection of the Pannonians and Dalmatians, although he must have known that preparations had been making against him. The whole of that part of Germany which lies between the Elbe, the Rhine, and the Westerwald, recognised the supremacy of Rome as early as the year 760; the Chauci and other tribes on the coasts of East Friesland and Oldenburg were as much subjects of Rome as the Bructeri and Cherusci in Westphalia. Quintilius Varus, who was descended from an ancient and illustrious patrician family, for his ancestors are mentioned in the earliest period of the republic, was a man of great ability, but of insatiable avarice. When he had the command of the army in

[13] ii. 110.

[14] I believe that the Pannonians and Romans were kindred nations, otherwise the facts above stated are hardly credible, as the dominion of Rome had been so recently established in Pannonia.—N. (See Vopiscus, *Aurelian.* 24.)

Germany, he conducted himself completely as if he had been governor in a Roman province, which knew only compulsion and fear; but Arminius[1], the Cheruscan, who had already distinguished himself in the Roman armies, probably in the Pannonian war, devised a skilful plan for entrapping him. As the Germans had no fortified towns, it was exceedingly difficult to keep off the Romans, or to prevent their crossing the frontiers. The German horses were bad, but their riders were superior to the Romans; they were, however, excelled by the Gauls, on account of the better horses and armour of the latter, who were such excellent horsemen that henceforth they formed the flower of the Roman armies, and most of the technical terms in horsemanship were borrowed from them. Cunning employed against tyranny is not wrong, so that I cannot despise the stratagem of Arminius, for the Germans had been attacked by the Romans in the most unjust manner. Arminius had not the means to make head against the enemy in an open and proud way, and he was obliged to have recourse to cunning, which, in his case, was certainly justifiable. Arminius had served with German horsemen in the Roman armies; he was quite master of the Latin language; he had obtained the Roman franchise, and the rank of an eques. By dint of the greatest perseverance, he and his comrades had succeeded in gaining the unlimited confidence of Varus, and contrived to lull him into security. Varus had his stationary camp in which he administered justice like a Roman governor in his province, and he made his judicial functions subservient to the purpose of enriching himself. His conduct was like that of the wicked governors in Switzerland. The Germans kept Varus engaged by fictitious quarrels among themselves, and made him believe that they felt very happy at the dawn of civilisation among them. The most profound peace seemed to be established, and many of the Roman soldiers were away from the camp on leave of absence.[2] While Varus was indulging in this feeling of security, the tribes of lower Saxony revolted, according to a preconcerted plan. Varus was induced to march towards

[1] His name probably was Armin, and contained the same root as Irmensul.—N.

[2] Roman soldiers generally purchased their leave of absence or exemption from service, just as was formerly done in the German armies, and then received only a portion of their pay, as was the case in France previously to the revolution. Many such soldiers may have been wandering about the country.—N.

the country of the insurgents, into which he penetrated a considerable distance. There were several *limites*, or wooden causeways, through the forests and marshes, running from the Rhine as far as the river Lippe, and through Westphalia to the river Weser. These roads were similar to the one between Saint Petersburg and Novgorod and Moscow. Varus was led by the conspirators to abandon these straight roads, and as he ventured deeper into the country, the revolt became general, and the Romans found themselves outwitted. Varus tried to retreat and reach the causeway, probably with a view to defending himself in the fortress of Aliso on the Lippe.[3] The question about the exact spot where the battle of Varus was fought is one of those which, in my opinion, can never be satisfactorily answered. The only sensible and practical mode of investigating the matter would be, to examine from what point a Roman road may have been made into the country of the Germans, and I imagine that Cologne was a convenient point to start from, but the difficulties were pretty nearly the same everywhere. It is infinitely more difficult to determine anything upon this point than to trace Hannibal's passage over the Alps.

On the first day, Varus was attacked on all sides, and at once lost a great part of his baggage. It was with the greatest difficulty that he formed a camp for the night, and fortified himself. On the following day, he was pressed still harder, but he continued his march. The terror and confusion in his columns were so great that in the evening when they were about to pitch their camp, the soldiers could hardly resist the attack. Varus was at last quite overcome by the consciousness of his hopeless situation and his responsibility; and he and several of his officers put an end to their lives. It was probably at that moment that Numonius Vala (apparently the person to whom Horace addressed his epistle[4]), separated the cavalry from the infantry, and endeavoured but unsuccessfully, to escape with his three squadrons (*alae*).[5] They too were overwhelmed, just as they deserved to be, for having abandoned

[3] Its exact situation is unknown. I think it is not improbable, however, that it may have been in the neighbourhood of the modern town of Hamm, as some historians maintain.—N.

[4] i 15.

[5] The cavalry of each legion (6000 foot) was called *ala*, and each *ala* amounted to 300 men.—N.

their companions. On the third day, the whole of the Roman army was annihilated; only a few escaping with their lives. The Germans took awful vengeance upon their oppressors; many of the Roman prisoners were sacrificed to the gods of the Germans, who offered human sacrifices for the purpose of ascertaining the future. Three legions with as many *alae* and ten cohorts were cut to pieces; but, owing to the unfortunate divisions among the Germans, they were unable to make that use of their victory which Arminius would otherwise undoubtedly have made. Many of the Roman castella however were taken and destroyed; and much else may have been done, which the Roman accounts of this catastrophe passed over in silence.

Nonius Asprenas, however, maintained himself with two legions on the western bank of the Rhine; the ever-recurring divisions among the Germans there, again prevented their progress, although the nations endeavoured to rise. L. Caedicius, the commander of Aliso, was in a desperate situation. There was no hope of mercy for him; and he defended himself, until, at length, he discovered an opportunity of forcing his way through the surrounding enemy. He reached the banks of the Rhine with the remnants of his brave garrison, and there was enabled to stop the progress of the enemy. As the victory was not followed up by the Germans, it afterwards gave rise to the unfortunate campaigns of revenge undertaken by Germanicus.

The news of this defeat came like a thunder-clap upon Augustus, who was one of those men who always fear the worst, and who had given sufficient proofs of his timidity during the revolt of the Pannonians. At Rome the worst consequences were apprehended: it was thought that the Germans would cross the Rhine, and that all Gaul would join them: a war in the Alps seemed on the eve of breaking out, and Augustus no doubt expected that Maroboduus also would begin to move. But that king who might now have gained imperishable fame, continued in disgraceful inactivity, the consequence of which was that he ended his life as a state prisoner at Ravenna. Augustus was anxious to make a general levy; but he encountered the greatest difficulties, on account of the general disinclination to serve in the armies, which had lately and in an inconceivable manner begun to spread over all Italy. Not one hundred years before,

in the wars of Marius, a man might with some reason have said, with Pompey, that it was only necessary to stamp his foot on the ground to call forth legions; but things had now become so much altered, and the unwillingness to serve went so far, that fathers mutilated the hands of their sons, in order to get them exempted from military service. The soldiers were taken from the lowest classes of society: freedmen were enlisted, and patrons were induced to set their able-bodied slaves free, on condition of their enlisting in the army. In former times, a slave who had given himself out as a freeman in order to be admitted into the army would have paid for his presumption with his life.

The merit of having stopped the course of the Germans belongs to Nonius Asprenas and Tiberius, who was hastily ordered to proceed to Gaul, and continued the work of averting the danger, by preventing the Germans from crossing over the left bank of the Rhine. Afterwards, Tiberius was called back to Rome, and Germanicus, the son of Drusus succeeded him in Gaul. He immediately prepared for an aggressive war; but Augustus did not live to see his success. I shall speak of his campaigns hereafter.

Augustus was now at a very advanced age. His health had greatly improved; and, during the last twenty-five years of his life, he was not ill at all, or but very slightly. He was now an old man, completely under the dominion of his wife, who became worse as she advanced in years. She surrounded him with those only whom she herself liked. Her feelings towards Drusus may really have been those of a step-mother; and it is quite certain that she entertained a mortal hatred against Germanicus, who had married Agrippina, and led an exemplary life with her at a time when all domestic feelings seem to have become extinct in every heart. Livia hated him, because he was attached to Agrippina and his children with his whole heart and soul. She bore an ill-will towards Tiberius' own son, Drusus, because he was on too friendly terms with his adopted brother Germanicus, although in other respects he had the character of his father. The defeat of Varus had thoroughly shaken Augustus. He was unhappy during the last years of his life, which we may regard as a retribution for the crimes of his earlier years. Tiberius was to set out to conduct a war in Illyricum, and Augustus intended to meet him at

Beneventum. He had latterly been in the habit of spending the summer in Capreae, in the bay of Naples, the most magnificent country in the world, in order to recover from his troubles and cares; and in that mild climate he preserved his life. Here he was taken ill, and died soon after at Nola, whither he had been carried, on the 19th of August, 765, fourteen years after the birth of our Saviour. Tacitus[5] says that many thought it a wonderful coincidence that he died on the same day of the year on which he had forced himself into his first consulship; and many speculations were made about his having obtained as many consulships as Marius and Valerius Corvus; but it is foolish to dwell upon such things. He died as secure in the possession of his dominion, as if he had been born on the throne, and gave the succession and his ring to Tiberius, who was already invested with tribunician power. No sensible man could doubt that he would take the reigns of government into his hands. I shall hereafter have occasion to mention the farce which Tiberius played on that occasion.

The body of Augustus was buried with the most extraordinary honours. The decuriones of the municipium of Nola carried it on their shoulders as far as Bovillae, where it was taken up by the Roman equites, and conveyed to the city. The funeral orations upon him were delivered in the *rostra vetera* and *nova* near the curia Julia by Tiberius and his son Drusus; whence afterwards all such speeches and proclamations of emperors were made from the *rostra nova*.

Augustus had at one time formed the plan of subduing Britain; but he afterwards gave it up. The extent of the Roman empire at the death of Augustus was as follows:—the frontier of the empire was in some parts beyond the Rhine, for Holland and a great portion of the country of the Frisians were under the dominion of Rome. With these exceptions, however, the Rhine up to the lake of Constance formed the boundary. The frontier then ran along the Danube as far as lower Moesia, in which the Romans were not yet masters of the banks of that river, which was often passed and re-passed by the Sarmatians; the frontier was further south, so that Tomi (Kustenji), where Ovid lived in exile, was not, properly speaking, within the boundaries of the empire. I believe that the *Vallum Trajanum*

[6] *Annal.* i. 9 : *multus hinc ipso de Augusto sermo, plerisque vana mirantibus, quod idem dies quondam accepti imperii princeps, et vitae supremus.*

(along the ancient branch of the Danube, the salt water near Peuce), which bears a name for which there is not the least authority, was probably made in the time of Augustus, that is, during the last campaign in those regions. The Sarmatians traversed the country to the north of it, without encountering any resistance. In the time of Trajan, even Moldavia and Wallachia, nay, the country as far as the Dniester, were under the dominion of Rome. The kingdom of Cappadocia in Asia Minor was a dependency of Rome. Armenia was in a sort of alliance, but likewise recognised the majesty of the Roman people. The Parthians had put off a great deal of their ancient pride; a number of Parthians lived at Rome as hostages, and Phraates had returned the Roman standards of the legions, which had been taken in the war with Crassus — an event mentioned by Virgil and Horace. It is not a very great exaggeration, therefore, to say that the Roman dominion extended as far as India, though in reality the Euphrates formed the eastern boundary of the empire. Syria, Egypt, Cyrene, Libya, Africa, and Numidia, with its capital Cirta, were Roman provinces. The kingdom of Numidia had been overthrown by Caesar; the learned Juba had received from Augustus, as a compensation, the western part of Algiers and Morocco, and the kingdom of Bocchus. The dominion of Rome extended as far as Fezzan. It would have been easy to extend it even into the countries about the Niger; and it is not impossible that, at times, those countries may have recognised the supremacy of Rome, at least by embassies and tribute, though we know nothing about the matter, except that there was a road for caravans leading to Fezzan and Cydamus. Garama in Fezzan[7] was inhabited by the Garamantes; and Roman ruins and inscriptions have lately been found there by the learned traveller, Ouseley. In the time of Augustus, we also find mention of a successful expedition against the Blemmyes in Dongola, and of another to Yemen, on the coast of Arabia, under Aelius Gallus, which however was a complete failure. The number of Roman citizens had been very much increased in the western provinces, and it was from these countries that the legions were raised.

The forces of the empire consisted of forty-seven legions, and a proportionate number of cohorts. The legions were not levied in Italy, except in cases of great necessity, the army being more

[7] In D'Anville's map there is a mistake here.—N.

and more formed of auxilia and cohorts. More than nine-tenths of the army certainly consisted of new citizens. The franchise, however, was then of little value, exemption from taxes being by no means always implied in it.

The civil legislation of Augustus, unlike that of Caesar, aimed at improving the moral condition of the nation. Caesar had intended to arrange the chaos of the Roman laws into one code; an undertaking like the civil legislation of Sir Robert Peel, which would have been very praiseworthy; for, however sad and dangerous it is to make new law-books, it is quite a different thing to bring existing laws into unity and harmony. The *lex Aelia Sentia* deserves great praise; but the legislation of Augustus was, on the whole, quite arbitrary: he wished to correct morals by fighting against the tendencies of the age. There was at that time a general disinclination to enter into a legal marriage, and Roman citizens lived to a very great extent in concubinage with slaves, so that the children were and remained slaves, or at the best became freedmen. The free population had, in consequence, decreased enormously, and this state of things was still extending. In the registers found at Pompeii, containing the names of the members of the trade corporations, among twenty persons, ten were freedmen, and only one in twenty, at the utmost, was an *ingenuus*. Now Augustus was quite right in trying to counteract such a system; but the manner in which he endeavoured to bring about an improvement, by the *Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea*, shews how impotent legislation is, when it attempts to turn back the current of the times. Its enactments about honour, the *jus trium liberorum*, and the like, were of no avail.[8]

LECTURE CXI.[1]

THE later portion of the history of the republic, though deeply disheartening, yet cannot but enlist our sympathies; it is the

[8] This Lecture concludes the course of the winter, 1828—29, and was delivered on the 1st of April, 1829.

[1] This and the following lecture contain some things which have been already stated in the preceding lectures; but the editor could not avoid the repetition without materially altering the form of the lectures, which he did not think himself justified in doing. The cause of the repetition is, that the remaining lectures, from the 111th to the end, were delivered at a later period than the preceding ones, viz. in the summer of 1829, and formed a distinct course by themselves, to which only one hour in every week was devoted, which will account for the greater condensation in the manner of treating the subject.—See he Preface.

end of a life conducted on a certain deliberate plan, and the unavoidable issue of the events which preceded it. In the history which now follows, things are different; for the history of the empire is no longer the continuation of that which was attractive and pleasing to us in the earlier history of Rome; and the people, who formerly awakened our greatest interest, now form a thoroughly corrupted mass. Force now decides everything; and the history itself is confined to an individual, ruling over upwards of a hundred millions of men, and to the few who, next to him, are the first in the state. The western parts of the Roman world preserved a feeble bond of unity in the language which was spoken by all persons of education, but which in the provinces degenerated into a jargon. In the East, Greek nationality was again established.

The whole history of the Roman empire is interesting only as a portion of the history of the world; but as a national or political history it is sad and discouraging in the highest degree. We see that things had come to a point at which no earthly power could afford any help; we now have the development of dead powers, instead of that of a vital energy. During the period subsequent to the Hannibalian war, there still existed in the republic, a vital power which could afford relief in critical moments; but it afterwards disappeared, and the constitution of the state seems to have become incapable of rising to a crisis; the soul had gradually withdrawn from the body, and at last left it a lifeless mass.

But the history of the Roman empire is nevertheless worth a careful study, and as far as practical application is concerned, it is even of greater importance than the history of the republic; for the theologian and jurist must be familiar with it, in order to understand their own respective departments and their history. It cannot therefore be a matter of wonder with us, that persons were formerly so much engaged in studying the history of the Roman emperors. At present it is too much neglected. I might have concluded these lectures with the reign of Augustus, to which I hope to carry my History of

Rome; but the consideration of its practical usefulness has induced me to relate to you the history of the emperors also, though the shortness of our time does not allow me to give you anything more than brief surveys and sketches. All that remains of the republican constitution are mere *simulacra* of what it once was.

If we had Tacitus complete, we should have the history of the early period of the empire in one of the greatest works of antiquity. His *Historiae* and *Annales* extended over the period from the death of Augustus to the beginning of the reign of Trajan. With regard to the manner in which the *Annales* were divided by their author, the common opinion, from which scarcely any one has ever ventured to differ, except in points of secondary importance, is that the *Annales* were completed with the sixteenth book. But this is to my mind an impossibility; and it seems to me highly probable that they consisted of twenty books, as I have stated elsewhere. Wherever we have Tacitus for our guide, it would be foolish to seek for any further light, but many parts of his *Annales* are wanting; and in those cases, we are unfortunately obliged to follow Dion Cassius and Suetonius. The work of the former is mutilated in the part relating to this period; and that of the latter is but a poor compensation for the loss of Tacitus' guidance: Suetonius did not know himself what he wanted to make of his work. His history is written in the form of biographies; and this idea is quite right; but he had no plan: he wanders about from one subject to another; in consequence of which his biographies are without a definite character. In the commencement of his *Annales*, Tacitus assumes that the previous history of Tiberius is known to his readers. What works he would have referred to as introductory to his history of that emperor cannot easily be ascertained; it may however have been the history of Seneca, the father of the philosopher Seneca, which was perhaps one of the best[2]; or the history written by Servilius Nonianus, who distinguished himself as an historian of that period.[3]

As therefore Tacitus does not give us an account of the early life of Tiberius, I shall endeavour to supply it.[4] He

[2] See Niebuhr's *Ciceronis, Livii, et Senecae Fragmenta*, p.104.

[3] Quintilian, x. 1. § 102; Pliny, *Epist.* i. 13.

[4] There are excellent materials for it in Velleius Paterculus, who, whatever we may think of his personal character, is one of the most ingenious writers of antiquity. He very much resembles, in his manner and affectation, the French historians of the 18th century, especially those of the time of Louis XV.; but apart from the bad features in his character, he was a man of great experience: he had seen much, and gives a good account of what he had seen. Where he had no occasion to distort the truth, he is trustworthy and is an excellent historical source: his narrative is uncommonly beautiful.—N.

was the elder son of Tiberius Claudius Nero and Livia Drusilla. His father had been quaestor of the dictator Caesar; but after Caesar's death he joined the party of the republicans, and in this he may have been in earnest. After the battle of Philippi (711) he declared for L. Antonius and Fulvia, when they caused the outbreak of the Perusinian war, since he could not expect to be pardoned by Augustus. When the war of Perusia terminated in the surrender of L. Antonius, Tiberius Claudius Nero fled with his family to Naples, and thence to Sext. Pompeius in Sicily. His son Tiberius, who was born in 710, acording to the Catonian aera, was then in his second year, and his life was in the greatest danger. As Pompeius did not receive them in the way that Claudius Nero had expected, he took refuge with Antony in Greece. Afterwards he returned with Antony to Italy, as an amnesty had been proclaimed in the peace of Brundusium for all those who were with Antony, which was followed by the general amnesty in the peace with Sext. Pompeius. Livia Drusilla was the daughter of a certain Livius Drusus, who was not connected by blood with the tribune and consul of that name, for his real name was Appius Claudius Pulcher, and he had been adopted by one Livius. Tiberius was thus connected with the Claudian family, both on his father's and his mother's side; and he inherited from both his parents the fearful character peculiar to the Claudii.

Soon after the return of Tib. Claudius Nero to Rome, he was compelled by Augustus to give up his wife Livia to him, She was at the time in a state of pregnancy, and gave birth to Drusus in the Palatium. Tiberius, as the step-son of the emperor, was educated as a young man of the highest rank, though nobody then thought of his becoming the successor of Augustus. Augustus hoped in vain to become a father by Livia; but he afterwards set his heart upon Marcellus, the husband of his daughter Julia, and then upon Julia's children by Agrippa. Tiberius had therefore no particular reasons for entertaining great expectations. His education was conducted

with great care; it was, according to the fashion of the time, completely Greek, and conducted by Greek grammarians and philosophers. He possessed extraordinary talents, and was exceedingly industrious.

He was employed in public business at a very early age; he first obtained the quaestura Ostiensis, and was then sent to Armenia. He shewed uncommon activity and ability in all he undertook; and, although no one seems to have looked upon him as the future master of the Roman empire, yet his personal character attracted considerable attention; for he distinguished himself both at the head of an army and in the civil administration. He was however very early a person of great dissimulation, with a strong inclination to vice, which he indulged in, but carefully endeavoured to conceal. He had scarcely any friend, and stood forth as a man of a reserved and dark nature, for he had no confidence in any one except his mother. He was particularly reserved towards those who stood between him and Augustus, such as Agrippa and young Marcellus. This mistrust, which was nourished as much by circumstances as by his own disposition, had the same unfortunate consequences for his character, as in the case of the emperor Paul I. of Russia, who always fancied that persons were plotting against his life. Tiberius was otherwise a man of very great talents; and he, his brother Drusus, and his nephew Germanicus, were unquestionably the greatest generals in the Roman empire at that time. Nature had done very much for him; he possessed a strong intellect, great wit, unwearied industry, a body of the happiest organization, and a beautiful and majestic figure. His statues are so beautiful that it is a real delight to look at them.[5] In addition to all this, Tiberius was an extremely good speaker.

After the death of Vipsanius Agrippa, about whose hostility towards Tiberius there can scarcely be a doubt, Livia and Augustus (who began more and more to rely upon him) concocted the plan of making Tiberius marry Julia, the widow of Agrippa, who was leading a highly dissolute life, and was really a shameless woman. Tiberius consented very reluctantly, although this marriage drew him so much nearer to Augustus,

[5] Augustus and Tiberius have the finest heads among all the Roman emperors; that of M. Aurelius is distinguished for its mild and benevolent expression. — N.

and at the same time increased the possibility of his succeeding his father-in-law. The sons of Agrippa by Julia, Caius and Lucius Caesar, whom Augustus had adopted, were as yet alive, and stood between Tiberius and the monarch. The loose conduct of his wife Julia brought upon him humiliations which his pride and haughtiness were unable to get over, and which made him ridiculous in the eyes of the world. He therefore tried to get out of the way, as he knew that remonstrances would not work any change in Julia's conduct.[6] Augustus refused to allow Tiberius to absent himself; but the latter carried his plan into effect notwithstanding, and went to Rhodes, a step which Augustus took so ill that, in spite of his great military services in the wars against the Raetians, Vindelicians, and Pannonians, he would not afterwards permit him to return to Rome. Seven years thus passed away, until, after the death of Caius and Lucius Caesar, Livia prevailed upon Augustus to allow Tiberius to come back. The monarch had, on many occasions, spoken of Tiberius with such indignation that even private persons thought they would please the emperor by treating Tiberius with contempt. Meantime, Augustus had sent Julia into exile; which however had not wrought any change in his feelings towards Tiberius; and it was only through the solicitations of Livia, who then exercised absolute sway over Augustus, that her son obtained permission to return. His brother Drusus had died many years before; and, soon after his arrival at Rome, Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus were adopted by Augustus; but not long afterwards, Agrippa was banished on account of his savage and intractable character.

It was now obvious to every one that Tiberius would be the successor of Augustus. He obtained the tribunician power, and on public occasions sat by the side of the emperor, who thus formally, though silently pointed him out as his successor. During the period which now followed, down to the death of his step-father, Tiberius served his country in various ways: he carried on great and difficult wars, as during the great insurrection of the Pannonians and Illyrians who were conquered by him. Afterwards he undertook the command in Germany,

[6] The intricacies of the family of Augustus very much resemble those of the families of Cosmo de Medici and Philip II.; for, in all these three cases, we find the members of the same family conspiring and plotting against one another with as much cunning and malignity, as though they had been born personal enemies. — N.

and thwarted the hopes which the Germans entertained in regard to the results of their victory over Varus. On the 19th of August, A.D. 19, Augustus died at Nola, whither Tiberius, who was on his way to Illyricum, was hastily called back by a messenger of his mother. Augustus had made a regular will, in which he had appointed Tiberius the heir of two-thirds of his property, whereas with his usual dissimulation he had made no provision respecting the government, as if he had had nothing to decide on that point. However, all the necessary precautions had been taken to secure the succession to Tiberius, and the praetorian cohorts were immediately called upon to take their oath of allegiance to him. He was cautious in the exercise of his tribunician authority, which was the symbol of the highest power, and by which he could assemble the senate, stop its proceedings and, in fact, exercise a complete command over it. After the body of Augustus had been carried to Rome and deposited in the Mausoleum, and Tiberius and his son Drusus had delivered the funeral orations, there remained for him but one more step to take, that is, to put himself in possession of the sovereignty. He was now in his fifty-sixth year, or at least at the close of the fifty-fifth. His conduct on that occasion shews us at once that remarkable dissimulation and cunning, which had been fostered by his fear of being plotted against. He was not timid on the field of battle; but he trembled at the thought of a secret enemy. He had by this time acquired a perfect mastery in dissembling his lusts, and his mistrust. He does not resemble Cromwell in other respects; but he was, like him, one of those characters who never express their real sentiments, for fear of being betrayed, or of saying more than they want to say. He was anxious to appear as a moral man, while in secret he abandoned himself to lusts and debaucheries of every kind. Fortunately such characters are met with oftener in ordinary life than among men of power and influence. In accordance with this character, Tiberius now played the farce which is so admirably but painfully described by Tacitus[7]: he declined accepting the imperium, and made the senate beg and intreat him to accept it for the sake of the public good. In the end Tiberius yielded, inasmuch as he compelled the senate to oblige him to undertake the government. This painful scene forms the beginning of Tacitus' Annals.

[7] *Annal.* i. 11, foll.

The early part of his reign is marked by insurrections among the troops in Pannonia and on the Rhine. Augustus had established regular garrisons in fortified camps on the frontiers of the empire, where the soldiers were stationed winter and summer, until they were old men. After having been in a legion for a certain number of years, they were to remain for a time under the *vexilla* as a sort of reserve, and then they were to become free. According to the system of Augustus, the old legion was then broken up, the men received settlements as military colonists, and a new legion was formed. This system was a great hardship both for the provinces and the soldiers, but was nevertheless admirable, inasmuch as it kept the men always in a condition to fight; but they were a terror to the provinces, which were plundered and ransacked by the officers as well as by the soldiers. Now those legions had been obliged to serve longer than the law required. This led them to break out in an open rebellion, which is beautifully described by Tacitus[8], to whose work I refer you. Drusus quelled the insurrection in Illyricum, and Germanicus that on the Rhine; but, notwithstanding this, it was in reality the government that was obliged to yield. The soldiers obtained favourable terms; the hardships of the service were lightened, and the advantages which they were to have as reserves were secured to them, although in after-times this last promise was often violated; their leaders, however, were put to death.

LECTURE CXII.

THE elections of magistrates had until then been held in the ancient forms, although those proceedings were a mere farce: but at the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were transferred to the senate, which elected the candidates in perfect conformity with the wishes of the sovereign; and popular elections ceased altogether. This measure produced in reality so little change, that Tacitus gives to it scarcely a passing word; for the Roman people consisted of a small number of persons

[8] *Annal.* i. 16, foll.

as early as the reign of Augustus, and they were the worst part of the nation; whereas the senate was a select body of citizens chosen from all Italy and other parts of the empire. But a more important change introduced by Tiberius was the drawing up of lists, according to which the provinces were assigned.

The reign of Tiberius, which lasted for twenty-three years, that is till A. D. 37, is by no means rich in events; the early period of it only is celebrated for the wars of Germanicus in Germany. I cannot enter into the detail of these wars, as our time is too limited; and I shall therefore pass over them, as well as every thing else for which I can refer you to Tacitus. The war of Germanicus was carried into Germany as far as the river Weser, and it is surprising to see that the Romans thought it necessary to employ such numerous armies against tribes which had no fortified towns. When such hosts of Romans arrived in Germany, the only refuge of the natives was to withdraw into their forests and the impassable districts. It is also remarkable that the Romans always committed the same mistake there, that is, they penetrated too far into the country, in the hope of making an imposing impression upon the enemy, and of thus inducing them to submit. They made military roads with bridges across the marshes in Overyssel, the lower territory of Münster and on the river Lippe into the heart of Germany. A more gradual but steady progress would have met with surer success; but the Romans do not appear to have thought it worth their while to conquer the country; for if they had got it, they would have gained nothing but a wilderness: the main cause of their not permanently occupying the country seems to have been that they would not, their only object being to protect the frontier of the empire. We may thank Heaven that they gave up the conquest, and that Tiberius, probably from his jealousy of Germanicus, called him back after his last brilliant feats. The Germans on the Weser had suffered a great defeat, but A. Caecina's forces were nearly destroyed. The manner in which the Germans conducted the war shews that the notions which some persons have of them are of the most perverse kind: they must have been sufficiently civilised to know how to form large armies, and to keep them together ready to fight, when an opportunity offered itself or necessity required it.

But Tiberius did everything to maintain peace; for he had a great dislike to giving his generals opportunities of distinguishing themselves, and he therefore gladly connived even at any blunder they might make: he even shut his eyes to the affront offered to him in Armenia and Parthia, when the king whom he had given to the Parthians was expelled. Hence the history of his reign after the German wars becomes more and more confined to the interior and to his family. He had an only son, Drusus, by his first wife Agrippina; and Germanicus, the son of his brother Drusus, was adopted by him. Drusus must have been a young man deserving of praise; but Germanicus was the adored darling of the Roman people, and with justice: he was the worthy son of a worthy father, the hero of the German wars. If it is true that Drusus longed to see Augustus restore the republic, it shews a great and noble soul, although the scheme itself was very fantastic. The republic could not have existed for a single year without a thorough reform of the constitution—a just punishment for the prodigious conquests it had made, and for the sins it had committed against the world. Germanicus had declined the sovereignty, which his legions had offered to him after the death of Augustus, and he remained faithful to his adopted father, although he certainly could not love him. Tiberius, however, had no faith in virtue, because he himself was destitute of it; he therefore mistrusted Germanicus, and removed him from his victorious legions. His mistrust was increased by the enthusiasm with which Germanicus was received in his triumph by all classes at Rome. Tiberius, who was conscious of his own vices and his tyranny, although he concealed them from the world, could not look otherwise than with hatred upon a noble character like that of Germanicus: he dreaded the contrast between himself and the pure virtue of the other. It may, however, have been as much anxiety for the good of his son, as the torment arising from this consciousness of moral inferiority to Germanicus, which induced Tiberius to confer upon the latter the commission which Agrippa had once held, to undertake the administration of the *res Orientis*, to superintend the eastern frontiers and provinces. On his arrival there he was received with the same enthusiasm as at Rome; but he died very soon afterwards, whether by a natural death or by poison, is a question upon which the ancients themselves are not agreed. I am, however,

inclined to believe, that his death was a natural one; for the statements brought forward against Piso refer to sorcery rather than to poison; of the former there seem to have been proofs, and superstition was then very prevalent[1], and a person who could resort to sorcery, would not be likely to attempt poison. Lichtenberg says somewhere, "When people cease to believe in God, they believe in ghosts." It is not indeed incredible that Piso may have attempted to murder Germanicus; but his conduct towards him under a prince like Tiberius is to me unaccountable and a perfect mystery. He was insolent indeed towards Germanicus, and must have believed that such behaviour would please Tiberius; but how could he mistake the character of Tiberius so much as not to see that Tiberius would sacrifice him, if the matter should ever come to be discussed? Even if the emperor had in his heart approved of the crime, yet he would have been obliged publicly to punish the criminal. In the time of Tacitus, these occurrences were already too remote, the most different reports were current about them, and the historian does not express himself decisively upon the point.[2] The crime of poisoning Germanicus might have been overlooked by Tiberius, but Piso's insulting and publicly reviling that prince was of itself a violation of the *majestas*, as Germanicus was the adopted son of Tiberius. But the most surprising thing was yet to come. When Germanicus was sent as Piso's successor, Piso, instead of at once giving up to him his province of Syria, refused to quit it, opposed the commands of Tiberius, and collected troops with the intention of marching to Rome. This is to me the most mysterious phenomenon in all Roman history, and is one of the instances in which secret intrigues, and the obscurity which hangs over the occurrences of a reigning family, defy all attempts at clearing them up. Piso and his wife Munatia Plancina, a daughter of the orator Munatius Plancus, were condemned, but they carried their secret with them to the grave. There were suspicions that Livia herself had given Piso secret instructions to poison Germanicus, as she had little to fear from the anger of Tiberius, and was wicked enough not to spare even her own grandson; but this was probably no more than a conjecture.

[1] See Tacitus, *Annal.* ii. 69, foll.; Dion Cassius, lvii. 18; Sueton. *Calig.* 1, foll.

[2] In the course of the eighteenth century we meet with two similar cases of suspected poison in the royal family of France. If we read the descriptions of the corpses, the crime seems very probable; but other circumstances are against it, and the truth has never been ascertained to this day. The one case is that of the Duke of Orleans, who is generally thought to have been incapable of such a crime, because, with all his vices, he possessed a certain frankness and straightforwardness; but I cannot say this of the detestable persons by whom he was surrounded. The second case is that of the Duke de Choiseul, who was charged with having poisoned the Dauphin, the son of Louis XV. The prince was a very pious and devout person: Choiseul, on the other hand, was a frivolous freethinker, and knew that he was hated by the Dauphin. It is therefore said that he wanted to get rid of the prince, that he might not prevent the abolition of the order of the Jesuits, and that after the demise of Louis XV. Choiseul might be sure of his post.—N.

The death of Piso was soon followed by the prosecutions for the *crimen majestatis*, that is, quite indefinable accusations against which no one could protect himself. Charges of this kind had occurred very seldom during the time of the republic; but even then had the most different meanings, and were properly speaking applicable to every thing. The prosecution was mostly directed against persons who, by their personal fault, had brought misfortunes upon the state. In the reign of Augustus, any offence against the person of the imperator had by some law with which we are not further acquainted, been made a *crimen majestatis*, as though it had been committed against the republic itself. This *crimen* in its undefined character was a fearful thing; for hundreds of offences might be made to come within the reach of the law concerning it. All these deplorable cases were tried by the senate, which formed a sort of condemning machine set in motion by the tyrant, just like the national convention under Robespierre. Many things were treated as a *crimen majestatis*, which had in reality nothing to do with it. Persons who dishonoured members of the emperor's family, for example, or those who committed adultery with the imperial princesses, were guilty of the *crimen majestatis*. In the early part of Tiberius' reign, these prosecutions occurred very rarely; but there gradually arose a numerous class of denouncers (*delatores*), who made it their business to bring to trial any one whom the emperor disliked. Tiberius himself acted the part of a neutral person in these proceedings; but the senate got by degrees into the fearful habit of condemning every one that was brought to trial, and of looking to nothing but the pleasure of the emperor. Such things, as I said before, did not often happen during the first nine years of the reign of Tiberius, and the

monarchy was then in a tolerably happy condition. Tiberius lived very retired, but with becoming dignity and moderation, and took great pains about the manner in which he appeared before the public. He treated the eminent men of the nation with distinction, and maintained a strict economy in the finances. Augustus, who had not been very economical, and at the end of his reign was even in financial difficulties, had made the accounts of the treasury known to the public, but Tiberius, who amassed enormous treasures, kept the accounts secret. The indirect taxes in Italy were increased and some new ones were imposed.

This state of things lasted as long as the aged Livia was alive; but even then far-sighted men were not without their apprehensions as to what would happen after her death, for, while Tiberius treated graciously those with whom he came in contact, he was open to nobody. He feared his mother to the very end of her life; but his attachment to her had ceased long before. She was a wicked and terrible woman, but still the great length of her life was fortunate for Rome, at least for those who had forgotten the old times. After her death, there was no one whom Tiberius had to fear, and he acted as he pleased. His virtues, which had been developed by his former activity, and had been kept somewhat alive by the authority of others whom he was obliged to please, and to whom he had to render an account of his actions, now became completely extinct. His dark and tyrannical nature got the upper hand: the hateful side of his character became daily more developed, and his only enjoyment was the indulgence of his detestable lust. An aged man who is in this condition sinks irrevocably into the basest and most abject state. Napoleon is reported to have said to a deputation of the Institute, that Tiberius was treated very unfairly, and that Tacitus had not done justice to him. Napoleon was very far from being a man of learning: his knowledge was of an extremely desultory kind; but I am nevertheless convinced that he was well acquainted with the military history of Rome. He must have said, or meant to say, "If persons form their notion of Tiberius from Tacitus alone, and regard him as a mere abject and contemptible sensualist, or as a tiger of cruelty, they have not got the right picture of him; for up to his fiftieth year, he was a great general and statesman." He possessed all the vices

which the ancients called *subdola;* they had till then been concealed, but now became manifest. So long as circumstances required the exercise of his higher and better faculties, he acted well, and appeared in a totally different character from that which he afterwards displayed.

His only friend was Aelius Sejanus, a man of equestrian rank, and the son of a citizen of Vulsinii, of the name of Seius Strabo. His character bore the greatest resemblance to that of his sovereign, who raised him to the office of praefectus praetorio. He must not, however, be looked upon merely with contempt; for Tacitus[3] characterises him as an excellent officer, and a man of great personal courage and power of will, but without any moral feeling or principle, for otherwise he could not have been the friend of Tiberius. It was with him alone that Tiberius felt at his ease; he alone knew how to make his master comfortable, and to convince him that he could follow his own inclinations with more impunity than he imagined. Sejanus was thus a very convenient person for Tiberius, and satisfied him by securing him against those whom he dreaded most, namely the members of his own family, and the few remaining nobles. Sejanus increased the number of the praetorian cohorts, and persuaded Tiberius to concentrate them in the neighbourhood of Rome, in the *castrum praetorianum*, which formed as it were the citadel outside the wall of Servius Tullius, but in the midst of the present city. The consequences of this measure render it one of the most important events in Roman history; for the praetorians now became the real sovereigns, and occupied a position similar to that which the Janissaries obtained in Algeria: they determined the fate of the empire until the reign of Diocletian; Rome thereby became a military republic, which was usually dormant, except when the succession had to be determined upon. Sejanus contrived to win the heart of Tiberius by raising his distrust of his own family to the highest pitch, and he himself aimed at nothing short of the succession as imperator. Drusus, the son of Tiberius, was still alive, and had children; three sons of Germanicus, and Claudius, the brother of Germanicus, were likewise still living; but the plan of Sejanus was to get rid of them all. With this view he seduced Livia or Livilla, the wife of Drusus, and a daughter of the elder

[3] *Annal.* iv. 1.

Drusus; and with her assistance poisoned her husband. The sons of Germanicus, with the exception of Caius, who was yet a child, were likewise despatched in a cruel manner. The influence of Sejanus over Tiberius increased every day, and he contrived to inspire his imperial friend with sufficient confidence to go to the island of Capreae. While Tiberius was there indulging in his lusts, Sejanus remained at Rome and governed as his vicegerent. The city saw the emperor only from time to time. Prosecutions were now instituted against all persons of any consequence at Rome; the time when Tiberius left the capital is the beginning of the fearful annals of his reign, for which he deserves to be held up to mankind as the very pattern of a tyrant. The lists of persons condemned to death contained all men of any importance, though all were not equally respectable. Much of the iniquity now perpetrated must be ascribed to Tiberius himself, but much also to Sejanus: the banishment of Agrippina was his work, but her last tortures and death belong to the period subsequent to the fall of Sejanus. His tyrannical proceedings continued for a number of years, until at length he himself incurred the suspicion of Tiberius, and that not without good reasons: for there can be no doubt that Sejanus, to say the least, was only waiting for the death of his master, in order to raise himself to the throne with the help of the practorians. Tiberius had conferred upon him such extraordinary favours and distinctions, that the same homage was paid to him as to the emperor himself.

But it now happened that a man still more abject than Sejanus found his way to the heart of Tiberius. Virtue and intellect could not have shaken Sejanus, but a man worse even than he, succeeded; this was Macro, who had none of the great qualities of Sejanus, but only analogous vices: he it was who brought about the downfall of Sejanus. Tiberius pretended to apprehend a conspiracy, in consequence of which he wished to return to Rome. He arrived, however, only in the neighbourhood of the city, convoked a meeting of the senate, and gave orders to arrest Sejanus. The plan was arranged with great cunning. The letter in which he sent this command to the senate was a *verbosa et grandis epistola;* while hearing it read the senators were prepared for something extraordinary, there being in it some hits at Sejanus. It concluded with the command to arrest him. Macro had been made *praefectus vigilum*, who were the gens-d'armes of the city, and had surrounded the senate-house with his troops. Sejanus was seized; and the senators, who had that same morning cringed before him, now rose, loudly declaring him guilty of the *crimen majestatis*, and insisted upon his immediate execution, fearing lest his praetorian cohorts should hear of what was going on. He was immediately strangled, and no one thought of avenging him. Tiberius' thirst for blood now satiated itself in the persecution of the followers and friends of Sejanus; but others too were persecuted. The butchery at Rome even increased; and those who had formerly been persecuted for being honest men were less safe after the fall of Sejanus than before. Macro ruled just as tyrannically, exercised the same influence over the disgusting old man, and was just as faithless to him as his predecessor had been. Caius Caesar, the son of Germanicus, commonly known by the name of Caligula, formed with Macro a connexion of the basest kind, and promised him the high post of *praefectus praetorio*, if he would assist him in getting rid of the aged monarch. Tiberius was at the time severely ill at a villa near cape Misenum. He fell into a state of lethargy, and everybody believed him to be dead. He came to life again however; on which he was suffocated, or at least his death was accelerated in some way, for our accounts differ on this point. Thus Tiberius died in the twenty-third year of his reign, A.D. 37, at the age of 78.

LECTURE CXIII.

GERMANICUS and Agrippina had left behind them six children, three sons and three daughters. Two of their sons, had been murdered in the reign of Tiberius; Caius, the youngest, who is known by his surname, Caligula, was the only survivor. He was not born at Treves or anywhere in our neighbourhood; Suetonius has satisfactorily proved from public documents that he was born at Antium[1]; but he was sent into the camp of his

[1] Sueton. *Calig.* 8.

father, whence the history of his childhood is connected with the countries of the Rhine and Moselle. After the death of his father he lived under the control of his adoptive grandfather Tiberius, who still preserved his intellect in the midst of his vices, and recognised in Caius at an early age the monster he really was. If there is anything to be said in his excuse, it is this: he could not conceal from himself that his life was threatened from his childhood, and it may be that constant fear and anxiety made him mad. This madness, however, was manifested in so malignant and execrable a manner, that the infamy of his nature cannot be doubted. In the lifetime of Tiberius, Caligula maintained himself by the greatest servility towards the emperor and every one else who was in possession of power and influence; this was, under the circumstances, the most prudent conduct he could pursue, and he managed things skilfully. Afterwards he formed a close alliance with Macro, and in conjunction with him, got rid of the aged Tiberius. Until then the public had seen little of him. He was a handsome young man, resembling his father, and in the bloom of life, for he was now only in his twenty-fifth year. His beauty may still be seen in his statutes. The resemblance of his features to those of his father, and the recollection of the noble character of the latter, procured him an enthusiastic welcome on his accession. His surname, Caligula, is one which I use as repugnantly as that of Caracalla; for no ancient writer, at least no contemporary, applied the name of Caracalla to M. Aurelius Antoninus Bassianus, the son of L. Septimius Severus. It is, like Caligula, a vulgar name. Caius Caesar was called Caligula in his youth by the soldiers; but the name is unworthy to be used in history.

Those who had come in close contact with him, at the court of Tiberius, had discovered in him a monstrous wickedness and dissimulation; but their number was very small; and his first actions after his accession were of such a kind, that the public was led to expect much good of him, so that the joyfulness at Rome and throughout the empire was really tumultuous. How long this lasted, is unknown. Suetonius is very minute in his account of Caligula, but he is an unantique writer, and delights in anecdotes and details; he has neither a general survey of his subject, nor the power of drawing up or following a definite plan. Hence his biographies are irregular and diffuse, and

contain frequent repetitions. But although he is a bad writer, he is a man of sense, who one can see wrote at a time when the classical form of written compositions was neglected or unknown. But I will not say more: suffice it to state, that Caligula was a real madman, and that the greatest amount of human wickedness cannot account for the acts which he committed; what Goethe's Faust says of Mephistopheles—

> Thou nature's mockery, born of filth and fire!

may justly be applied to the character of Caligula.[2] No one can take any pleasure in giving a detailed description of his actions. Some of my friends have expressed the opinion that Juvenal was an obscene man, on account of what he relates in his satires; but I do not think so. I believe that he was only indelicate: he is indignant at what he relates, and does not take pleasure in it. Suetonius, on the other hand, was undoubtedly infected with the vicious character of his age; for he evidently likes to dwell upon it. He is himself in doubt as to whether the wickedness of Caligula was the manifestation of a diabolical nature, or merely the result of his madness; but he mentions one circumstance which is decisive, viz., that he was scarcely able to sleep at night.[3] Christian VII. of Denmark had the same restlessness: he was often seen during the night standing at the windows of his palace without any covering, and was always wandering about. Sleep is intended much more to preserve the elasticity of the mind, and to be a balm for the reason of man, than to be a means of strengthening the body. Now imagine Caligula living in circumstances, none of which were adapted to exercise any beneficial influence upon his mind; if he had been a Christian, religion would have afforded some means for making an impression upon him; but there was nothing at Rome that could check his madness.

Rome was under the most complete military despotism. The soldiers were munificently rewarded; and if the senate or the people had risen against the tyrant, they would have been

[2] About twenty years ago there died a prince, Christian VII. of Denmark, in whose name the Government was well conducted for a number of years, so that his madness could do no harm. That prince had no opportunity of shewing his real character, which was the same combination of obscenity and cruelty as that of Caligula; and if he had lived in different circumstances, he would have acted like him. Such men are occasionally met with among the eastern princes, as among the Turks and Persians, but especially among the Tartars.—N.

[3] Sueton. *Calig.* 50.

sacrificed by the praetorians. The fate of Rome was like that of a place taken by barbarous and merciless Turks, and the condition of the empire was no better. Tiberius had left a treasury which contained nearly twenty millions sterling, if the calculation is right. This sum was squandered away by Caligula during the first years of his reign in the most senseless manner; and the fresh sums which were raised by confiscations were lavished in the same way.

With the Germans, a peace had been concluded after the wars of Germanicus, and it had now lasted for about twenty years; but its terms are not known. Caligula, however, could not deny himself the pleasure of undertaking a campaign ostensibly against the Germans; but he conducted it like a fool. This was, however, the least important among his senseless undertakings: a more gigantic one was the causeway or bridge which he caused to be made across the straits between Baiae and Puteoli. Traces of this useless and absurd structure are still visible in the harbour near Puzzuoli. His madness in ordering himself to be worshipped as a god, and the like, are well known.

After the empire had thus existed in despair for a period of four years, a conspiracy broke out among the officers of the praetorians, some of whom were obliged to be always about the emperor's person, and whom he insulted and ill-used. Their plan succeeded, and Caligula was murdered. This event excited great joy among the senators and people; and the fantastic hope of restoring the republic now revived. The consuls, who had been appointed by Caligula, were especially enthusiastic. They convoked the senate in the Capitol; and it was really believed that the republic might be restored. The senate quickly passed a sentence of disgrace upon Caligula; and during the first hours after his death the restoration of the republic was discussed with great joy. But difficulties soon appeared, and were followed by the conviction that the senate reckoned without their host, and that the praetorians had all the power in their hands: now the practorians insisted upon being governed by a monarch.

During the tumult Claudius had concealed himself for fear of being murdered by the soldiers; but he was dragged forth from his hiding-place, and led to the camp. He spent the night in the anguish of death; but the praetorians took their oath of allegiance to him, and regularly proclaimed him emperor, although the *cohortes urbanae*, which were always hostile towards the praetorians, had declared in favour of the republic; but they were unable to make head against the praetorians. The issue of the contest was so doubtful, that people were glad on the following day to recognise Claudius as emperor.

Claudius was an uncle of Caligula and a brother of Germanicus. It was almost a miracle that his life had been saved. He had never been adopted by Tiberius, though otherwise a succeeding emperor was, by a fiction, made the son of his predecessor; but things had already come to such a point, that this preliminary step was no longer considered necessary to establish a man's claims to the sovereignty. Claudius was now in his fiftieth year. Of Caligula we cannot speak otherwise than as of a monster; but Claudius deserves our deepest pity, although he did evil things, which shew that there was some bad element in his nature. But if we examine the history of his life, we shall find that his bad qualities were mainly the result of his misfortunes.

His mother Antonia, a daughter of the triumvir, M. Antony, called him a *portentum hominis*[4], and he was really an *ἀτέλεστον*, for there was something wanting in him, without which the human mind is not complete, although he was not devoid of talent. He is one of those phenomena in history which we may call psychological peculiarities. He had a great desire to acquire knowledge, was very industrious, of a retentive memory, and fond of science and literature; but he was deficient in judgment and reflection. He often said and did things which were really stupid; and it seemed as if he were covered with a thick crust, through which his better nature burst forth only occasionally. Suetonius' life of Claudius is very instructive. In describing his character, Suetonius uses two Greek words, which shew what nice observers of character the Greeks were. He says[5] that people were astonished at his *μετεωρια* and *ἀβλεψία*, referring to his want of tact and his thoughtlessness, which made him say things that were inappropriate, or the very reverse of what he ought to have said. In his early life, he had been ill-treated by his whole family, for his brother and sister were persons of great qualities, and possessed all the love and affection of the family, whereas every one was ashamed

[4] Sueton. *Claud.* 3. [5] *Claud.* 39.

of Claudius. The aged Augustus, who was very sensitive in regard to such things, would not allow him to appear before the public at all[6], and his grandmother, Livia, in particular treated him very roughly and cruelly. The unhappy young man felt the contempt with which he was treated very keenly; and I am convinced that, if he had been brought up as a private man, and treated with love, the evil part of his nature would never have been developed, and that he himself would have become an industrious and good-natured though weak-minded man, whom no one could have regarded as vicious. Among his bad features I must mention his very great cowardice, the result of the contempt in which he was held. He withdrew from everything, or whenever he attempted to come forward, his timidity overcame him, and he was obliged to retire. He sought and found full consolation in literary pursuits. It is my sorrowful duty thus to speak of this unhappy man, who is frequently, but unjustly, condemned as severely as other tyrants. Livy, the historian, of whose benevolent heart we can judge from his work, pitied Claudius, and endeavoured to encourage him in his literary pursuits, for Claudius was fond of history, and Livy cheered him on in his study of it.[7] As he possessed great knowledge, Claudius considered that he was called upon to write the history of the civil wars, subsequent to the death of Caesar, and he wrote it in so honest a manner, that his family was quite enraged at him. He afterwards wrote memoirs of the reign of Augustus, which his family allowed to pass, though they only despised them. He was thoroughly honest; but his want of judgment continually led him to do silly acts. In this manner he passed his life in great obscurity. Augustus refused to assign him any post on account of his dreadful awkwardness. Tiberius allowed him to live, because he thought him too insignificant a person, and even gave him the consulship. In his several marriages, too, Claudius was unhappy;[8] misfortune pursued him in all he undertook. He was of an affectionate disposition, and had a tender attachment to the women who disgraced and betrayed him.

[6] Sueton. *Claud.* 3, foll. [7] Sueton. *Claud.* 41.

[8] The conduct of females at that time was of the most dissolute kind. Augustus had exerted himself in vain to counteract their immorality, and even the licentious Tiberius had been zealous in opposing it. It was so bad that we can now scarcely form a notion of it.—N.

In this manner Claudius reached his fiftieth year, when Caligula was murdered, and he was raised to the throne. His conduct as emperor was at first rational and good: the childish scheme of restoring the republic was not avenged upon those who had entertained it, and he ordered a general *abolitio factorum dictorumque* to be proclaimed.[9] Only a few of the murderers of Caligula were put to death,—a measure which we cannot approve of, as those men had deserved well of the Roman world; but it was a sacrifice which had to be made to the soldiers. Claudius is the first emperor who, on his accession, gave donations to the soldiers, or at least to the praetorians. Even Caligula had undertaken the government without repeating the farce which Tiberius had acted, nor did Claudius imitate it. He reigned for nearly fourteen years, from A.D. 41 to 54; and during the first period of his government, which formed a refreshing contrast to that of Caligula, he made many good and useful regulations; if he had found an honest friend, in whom he could have trusted, his reign might have been happy and praiseworthy. But this was unfortunately not the case. He had always been confined within the walls of the palatium; he had lived with his wives only, and had tried to please them alone; besides them he had had no social intercourse, except with his slaves and freedmen, as the nobles despised him. But the unhappy prince, with his strong natural desire to open his heart to others, had no real friend. Had he not come to the throne, he would have remained harmless; but when he ascended it, he was surrounded by his freedmen, who acted the part of friends, just as at present the barber of Don Miguel is his confidant although in his case there is nothing to excuse such a connexion. Claudius himself was a better man, and had a more cultivated mind than Don Miguel. Many among his freedmen may not have been altogether contemptible persons; for Greek slaves were often very well educated in the houses of the Romans, when they had talent; and they were often extremely well informed. Polybus or Polybius was probably a man of good education, although he may have been very bad in a moral point of view, for Seneca condescended to dedicate one of his works to him.[10]

[9] Sueton. *Claud.* 11.

[10] The *Consolatio ad Polybium.* Compare Seneca, *De morte Drusi*, in fin.; Sueton. *Claud.* 28.

But Pallas and Narcissus, with whom Claudius was perhaps connected before he ascended the throne, were men of a different cast; they were downright wicked, and in their insatiable avarice they plundered the empire.

Through the influence of these persons and his wife Agrippina[11], the daughter of his brother, he was induced to adopt Domitius Nero, the son of Agrippina by her former husband, although Claudius himself had a son Britannicus, who might have become his successor. It was the influence of the same persons also that made his reign so disgraceful and unhappy. If we compare the number of innocent persons who fell as victims in this reign with the number executed under other rulers, it is not large indeed; but still, viewed absolutely, it is considerable, and the reign of Claudius was unhappy for Rome; for whenever Narcissus demanded a victim, Claudius was his ready tool, whence his life was an uninterrupted series of acts of degradation. On the other hand, however, works were executed in his reign, which would have done honour to a better age. I need only mention the great aqueduct, the *aqua Claudia*, the finest of all, which supplied Rome with water throughout the middle ages, and was built in the grand antique style. During the restoration of Rome in the 15th century, this aqueduct may have been restored. There is no doubt that the two largest arches known under the name of Porta maggiore, are his work. Another gigantic structure, which Augustus had thought impracticable, was the emissary or canal which carried the water of lake Fucinus into the river Liris. At first, a fault was committed in levelling, but it was soon remedied. Ruins of the vaults of this emissary still remain.

With regard to the wars of this reign, Claudius himself undertook an expedition against Britain; and he actually extended the Roman dominion. No one had been concerned about Britain since the expeditions of Julius Caesar; but Claudius himself led an army into the island and formed a Roman province there, which consisted of the south-eastern part of Britain, where colonies and municipia were soon established. From that part, Vespasian and his sons afterwards effected the conquest of England and Caledonia.

[11] She was a woman of the most dissolute character, and without a trace of modesty. She was very beautiful, but delighted in nothing so much as in intrigues; she had not inherited one of the virtues of her parents.—N.

The death of Claudius was unquestionably caused by poison, administered to him by Agrippina, who wanted to secure the succession for her son Nero; for she knew that Claudius repented of having adopted him, and would therefore appoint his own son Britannicus to succeed him. Claudius died scorned and despised. The unhappy man is seen in all his wretchedness in Seneca's work, "Ludus de morte Claudi Caesaris," erroneously called *ἀποκολοκύνθωσις*.

LECTURE CXIV.

EVEN the time of Augustus is the beginning of an almost complete barrenness in Roman literature, which presents a great contrast to the abundance of poets belonging to the time of the dictator Caesar. Poetry became altogether extinct; and we cannot mention a single poet who was a young man in the latter part of the reign of Augustus. I cannot undertake to account for the fact, but the same phenomenon has very often occurred in modern times, and we have witnessed it in the most recent period of the poetry of our own literature. The influence of Greek rhetoricians is visible even in the best age of Roman literature; and how little the most eminent writers after the time of Cicero, Caesar and Sallust, were free from it, is manifest in the history of Livy, which contains many passages which he would not have written, had he not studied in the school of the declaimers. But about the time of Augustus' death, and in the reign of Tiberius, the rhetoricians exercised a paramount influence upon all branches of literature, as we may see most distinctly in the "Suasoriae" and "Controversiae" of the elder Seneca. That period saw the full development of what is described in Tacitus' excellent dialogue, "De Oratoribus." The only object of that school was to produce effect by sophistical niceties, a bombastic phraseology, and high-flown words; thoughts and substance were considered as of secondary importance. The age of Seneca, among whose productions we still possess specimens of the hollow declamations of the time, was the fruit of those rhetorical schools.

Seneca, the father, belongs to another period. He very well remembered a better taste; and from what he wrote to his sons, we see how deeply taste had sunk in his time. He upbraided them with their fondness for the new style, although he himself was anything but free from it. He wrote his "Controversiae" when he was upwards of 80 years old. Seneca, the philosopher, is the most remarkable man of that time, and one of the few whose personal character possesses any interest. In order not to be unjust towards him, it is necessary to understand the whole literature of his age; then we shall see that he knew how to make something even out of that which was most perverse. The elder Pliny, though he had quite a different mind, belonged nevertheless to the same school, which constitutes what is commonly called the *argentea aetas* of Roman literature. This division of Roman literature is very foolish; it should be made in quite a different way. It is nonsense to put together such men as Tacitus, Seneca, and Pliny, who have no resemblance whatever to one another. This period of Roman literature begins as early as the reign of Augustus, and extends to that of Domitian, when the nonsense reached the highest pitch, but the works of the coryphaei of this latter period, such as Aufidius and others, are lost. Tacitus does not belong to this class, for the school of the earlier writers continues alongside of the new one.

Seneca was a highly ingenious man, which after all is the main thing, and his influence upon the literature of his country was very beneficial. I must say this the more, the less I like him. Dion Cassius' judgment of Seneca contains much that is true and correct; but he exaggerates in his censure[1], and is altogether unable to perceive that Seneca rises like a giant above all his contemporaries. In his affected and sentimental style he bears a remarkable resemblance to a French school, which may be traced to Rousseau and Buffon, and the faults of which would be quite unbearable, if it did not proceed from extremely ingenious men. There is an interesting work by Diderot[2], which shews us the great contrast between the manner in which the philosopher is viewed by the learned Diderot, and by Dion Cassius, the practical man of the world; Diderot's style is similar to that of Seneca, he too being under the influence of his age.

[1] lxi. 10. [2] Essai sur le règne de Claude et de Néron.—N.

Lucan belongs to the time of Nero, and his poetry proceeded from the school of Seneca. His example shews us how much more intolerable its tendency is in poetry than in prose. Bernardin de St. Pierre and Chateaubriand, are the offspring of a similar school; it would be more bearable if it did not venture upon anything but sentimental moralising, as in the case of the former; but Chateaubriand is a perfect *pendant* to the bad poet Lucan. This is not yet generally recognised indeed, but the opinion which now prevails in regard to his merits cannot continue. Nero, who was unquestionably a man of talent, belonged to the same intolerable school as Lucan, who maintained his place in public favour till a late period of the middle ages, and was read almost as much as Virgil. Scholars were divided into two schools, that of Virgil and that of Lucan. In prose the same tone was adopted in history; and Fabius Rusticus, who was so much read, wrote no doubt in the manner of Seneca. Quinctilian was the real restorer of good taste in literature, and he cannot in any way be classed among the writers of the *argentea aetas*.

The condition of Rome and the empire after the death of Claudius appeared to be tolerably good; it is certain that during the 80 years from the battle of Actium, the provinces with their great vitality, when they were not visited with destruction and ravages enjoyed material prosperity, and the towns became filled with large populations. The extortions of Caligula were indeed very hard; but still they did not impede the quiet development of the resources of the empire. After the wars, the population was certainly more than doubled; towns and deserted places again became peopled. Unhappy Greece however was a desert till the time of Trajan. Countries which had fallen into the hands of the farmers-general (who used them as pastures, prevented all cultivation, and did not restore the towns), became deserts, though they were gardens compared with what they were at the time of the battle of Actium. Italy too had not yet recovered from its former desolation. Agriculture was there carried on by slaves, by the introduction of whom the population was indeed restored, but in a very different way from what it was in the provinces, where it increased by *ingenui*. There is no exaggeration when Lucan says of Italy: *Rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus erat*. Marriage still continued to be disliked by most persons, although

it could be so easily dissolved. Men generally lived in concubinage with their female slaves; and their children were the offspring of such connexions, for which reason they are called in inscriptions *liberti*. The celebrated lex Julia and the lex Papia Poppaea, though necessary measures, were of little avail; for the state of morality among free women was still so dissolute, that an honest man generally found a more faithful friend and companion in his female slave than in a Roman lady of rank, and therefore considered it as a matter of conscience not to marry. The number of libertini and slaves thus increased to a prodigious extent, and was far greater than that of free-born persons. In addition to this, there were hosts of purchased slaves in the houses of the nobles. This, however, was not the case in the provinces, where the *parsimonia provincialis* still prevailed. Their population consisted of *ingenui;* and they, moreover, received new life and a supplementary population through the military colonies. Such soldiers, who were otherwise little better than robbers, might turn out quite honest people when they acquired a home of their own. The soldiers made the use of the Latin language more general: and this was a great good; for the languages of the subject-countries were mere jargon, and the provincials themselves wished to give them up, whereby their position did not become worse: their object was, and could be, no other than to become Romans. The military colonies probably did not exercise a very demoralising influence upon the provincials, since we find that the vital energy of the provinces became gradually restored, even in the midst of their military despots; and a governor against whom a charge was brought could not now purchase his acquittal; at least not under Tiberius, as had been so frequently the case during the latter period of the republic.

After the death of Claudius, Nero, then seventeen years old, ascended the throne; but whether Claudius had appointed him his successor in his will, or whether he had made any regulation in favour of Britannicus, is one of those questions on which we can form conjectures only. Nero was a pupil of Seneca and Burrus, and we have every reason for believing that he was a person of great natural talents, especially for music, art, and mechanics. The history of his reign is so well known, that to enumerate its events would be only repeating

that which is familiar to every one of you; and those who do not know the history may read it in Tacitus. At first his reign raised the most happy expectations; but, even then, the intelligent found it difficult to believe that they would be realised; they were convinced that the offspring of a viper must have the nature of a serpent. Nero was the son of Agrippina, the unworthy daughter of Germanicus, but the true sister of Caligula. Her husband, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, was no better than herself; and, after the birth of Nero, he himself said to his congratulating friends, that his and Agrippina's offspring could be nothing but a monster.[3] The whole of the Roman world shared this apprehension with him, and hence the general astonishment of the Romans during the first years of Nero's reign, when he conducted himself as the disciple of Seneca and Burrus. Burrus was a stern man and of a genuine virtue: he was an able warrior, and Nero appointed him *praefectus praetorio*. Seneca, on the other hand, was an accomplished man of the world, who occupied himself very much with virtue, and may have considered himself to be an ancient Stoic. He certainly believed that he was a most ingenious and virtuous philosopher; but he acted on the principle that, as far as he himself was concerned, he might dispense with the laws of morality which he laid down for others, and that he might give way to his natural propensities. The influence of these two men upon Nero produced decided effects during the first years of his reign. They had to counteract the evil influence of the courtezans by whom he was surrounded, no less than that of his mother Agrippina. Burrus acted from his desire to promote the public good; but Seneca may have been actuated by his knowledge that he was hated by Agrippina.

The fair dream of Nero's amiable character did not last long. His two guides were very soon got rid of. Things gradually took a different turn; and the licentiousness in which he had lived from his earliest youth, the influence of the beautiful but dissolute Poppaea Sabina, the wife of M. Salvius Otho, and the far more injurious influence of his mother, produced the complete degeneracy which we afterwards find in Nero. When this change began to shew itself, is uncertain. Burrus and Seneca endeavoured to counteract the evil influences

[3] Sueton. *Nero*, 6.

to which Nero was exposed, though from different motives. All this is described by Tacitus. I will not speak of Nero's degeneracy and his boundless profligacy; they are too well known, and his name alone is sufficient. He resolved to murder his mother, who had provoked him; and, after one attempt had failed, he carried his plan into effect. In this Seneca is said to have assisted him[4], on account of the personal enmity existing between him and Agrippina; and it is a fact that the speech on her death, which Nero ordered to be read in the senate, was the work of Seneca.[5]

It is well known that after the murder of Agrippina, Nero abandoned himself more and more to bloodshed, and delighted in it. Tacitus[6] does not consider it a well attested fact that Nero set fire to the city of Rome, and it may indeed have been no more than a report. The fact of his ascending the tower of Maecenas to look at the calamity, and, in tragic attire, singing at the same time the *Ἰλίου ἄλωσις* to the accompaniment of the lyre, merely shews his madness, but does not prove that he was the author of the fire; at any rate, however, it gave him pleasure to have an opportunity of rebuilding the city. This conflagration, which raged for six days and seven nights, is an important event in the history of Rome; for an immense number of monuments of every description, historical documents, works of art, and libraries perished.[7] More than half of Rome was destroyed, or at least greatly damaged; and after the catastrophe the city assumed an aspect totally different from what it had worn before. The new streets which were now built were made straight, and broader than before, and took different directions from the old ones. After the fire was over, Nero, with his usual unbounded extravagance, began restoring the city, and extorted the means from all parts of the empire. He built his so-called "golden palace," extending from the Palatine, where Hadrian afterwards built the temple of Venus and Roma[8], to what are called the baths of Titus (more correctly

[4] Tacitus, *Annal.* xiv. 7.

[5] Tacitus, *Annal.* xiv 11; Quinctilian, viii. 5, § 18.

[6] *Annal.* xv. 38. Comp. Sueton. *Nero*, 38.

[7] The great fire of Constantinople, under Leo Macellas (Basiliscus?), in the fifteenth century of our era, was in like manner most injurious in its consequences to Greek literature.—N.

[8] This name has been supplied here by conjecture; the name not being legible in the MS. notes. For the correctness of the conjecture, see *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*, vol. III. i. p. 104.

of Trajan). Vespasian afterwards caused it to be destroyed, on account of the recollections connected with it. Some of its walls may yet exist in the substructions of the baths of Titus. It was a magnificent piece of architecture, covered over with the most beautiful marble. We must conceive it to have been something like an oriental fairy palace. In the midst of the city, on the site now occupied by the Colosseum, Nero had a large pond dug out for the purpose of exhibiting naumachiae.[9] Soon after this event, Nero ordered Seneca to be executed; and the manly death of the philosopher somewhat atones for his former conduct. Bareas Soranus and Thrasea Paetus were likewise put to death. Arria, the wife of the latter, set her husband an example of a courageous death. The conspiracy of Calpurnius Piso, in which Seneca, perhaps with injustice, was said to have been an accomplice, was undertaken without the support of the army, and was merely a plot which had been concerted at court.

During the reign of Nero, the frontiers of the empire were no longer in the state of peace and tranquillity which they had enjoyed under Claudius. The Romans had established themselves in Britain, and had constituted a part of the island as a Roman province. This establishment of a province was the more oppressive to the natives, as, the country being poor, it was only by great extortions that anything of importance could be gained. The oppression led to an insurrection under the great British Queen Boadicea (according to Dion Cassius, Bunduica), a woman of a truly heroic character, in which the Roman armies were at first completely beaten. Their fortresses were destroyed, two of their towns were taken, and many Romans were taken prisoners: at last, however, the Britons were with great difficulty defeated by Suetonius Paulinus, and Boadicea put an end to her life. The Britons were compelled to submit; and preparations were now made for the conquest of all England, of which the Romans were already masters, except Yorkshire, Lancashire, and the northern counties. Anglesea was Roman.

Another war which occurred in the reign of Nero, is that of Corbulo against the Parthians in Armenia; where a younger branch of the Arsacidae was on the throne. Corbulo conducted it with uniform success; he took Artaxata and Tigranocerta;

[9] Martial, *De Spect.* ii. 5.

and the Parthian king, Vologaesus, was obliged to sue for peace. Tiridates, the last king of that family, was compelled to go to Rome, and consent to hold his kingdom as a fief of the Roman emperor; he was received at Rome in the most magnificent manner, and obtained the diadem from Nero. This visit

Tiridates to Rome is one of those occurrences, the remembrance of which was preserved by tradition even in the middle ages; for it is mentioned in the "Mirabilia Romae"; and it was said that Tiridates had brought to Rome, as presents, the statues of Castor and Pollux, works of Phidias and Praxiteles; but there is, of course, no foundation for this story. The reward which Corbulo received for his victories, was—death. He was an unambitious, faithful, and conscientious Roman, who kept his faith even to a Nero.[10] His bust was discovered about forty years ago, and shews noble features.

Nero went on from one act of madness to another. I am inclined to believe that his conduct was not all moral wickedness. There seems to have been hereditary insanity in the family; and there can be no doubt that he was mad, though not in the same degree as his uncle, Caligula. Many of his acts are merely contemptible. His travelling about in Greece, and taking part in the musical and poetical contests, would have been very harmless amusements; but while he flattered the Greeks, he robbed their country of the finest works of art. The praefectus praetorio, Tigellinus, who had succeeded Burrus, was then the most detestable among the persons who had influence over the emperor; but the insurrection of C. Julius Vindex and Sulpicius Galba delivered the world from him.

LECTURE CXV.

THE Roman world had borne Nero's tyranny for twelve years, when the first attempt was made to get rid of it. A previous conspiracy of Calpurnius Piso, in which Seneca had perished, was only a court conspiracy, in which the troops took no part. Nero had undertaken his journey to Greece from sheer vanity, for the homage of the Greeks was his highest ambition; but while

[10] Dion Cass. lxiii. 17; Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 76.

he was getting himself crowned everywhere as a victor in the public games, an insurrection broke out in Gaul, under a noble Aquitanian C. Julius Vindex[1] who had the rank of a Roman senator, and brought about the revolt by his wealth and influence. This insurrection was of a different nature from the one which had occurred in the reign of Tiberius, when the Gauls hoped to recover their independence; for now their only intention was, as Romans, to throw off the yoke of a tyrant which pressed down the Roman world, but not to separate Gaul from Rome itself. Vindex met with very great sympathy, and his influence spread from Aquitania as far as Besançon. The history of this time is in a deplorable condition; for the part of Tacitus' Annals, in which the detail of this insurrection was described, is lost, and we are confined to Xiphilinus' abridgment of Dion Cassius. Rome had yet its distinguished men: Corbulo had fallen shortly before, but T. Virginius Rufus, the commander of the German troops, was also a true patriot, and one of the few distinguished and disinterested persons that Rome then possessed. He met Vindex at Besançon; and fearing lest the insurrection, although its object was only the delivery of Rome, would lead to a dissolution of the empire, he concluded a truce, in which both generals agreed upon recognising the authority of the Roman senate. The German troops wanted to have Rufus for their emperor; but he declined the honour; a tumult however broke out between the two armies during these transactions, and Vindex fell a victim to it.

Spain was at that time very badly provided with troops, and had in reality only one legion, which, together with a number of veterans, who might be formed into a militia, was under the command of Servius Sulpicius Galba. While the events just described were taking place in Gaul, he was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers. He belonged to one of the most distinguished Roman families.[2] Little is known

[1] Nearly all the Gauls that are mentioned under the empire bear the gentile name of Julius,—just as in Asia many have the gentile name of Claudius—because they had obtained the *civitas* either from Julius Caesar or Augustus. This uniformity in the names has been the cause of much confusion, especially in the second century. Cn. Julius Agricola was indeed born in the Roman colony of Forum Julii; but I believe, nevertheless, that he belonged to a Gallic family, a circumstance which is not mentioned by Tacitus.—N.

[2] The praenomen Servius had already assumed the character of a real name

about Galba's character, and if we were confined in his history to the account in Suetonius, who had evidently no clear notion of characters, and merely relates lively and pleasant anecdotes; we should be in considerable difficulty to know what to think of him. The beginning of Tacitus' Historiae however throws some light upon him; and this much is clear, that Galba was esteemed by the army; that, in his younger years, he had been a distinguished general, and, considering what men then were, an unblemished governor of several provinces. But he had already attained his seventy-first year when he was called to the throne, and by this time he had come under the influence of unworthy persons, especially his own freedmen. This kind of petty courts of freedmen, which arose about and after the death of Nero, greatly contributed to the depravation of the character of the Romans. The exasperation against Nero had spread into the most distant provinces; it was shared by all, except certain horrible persons who were not few and who were pleased with his proceedings. When Galba was proclaimed emperor, he formed new legions out of the soldiers that he could muster in his province, both Romans and Italicans, and set out towards the Alps. According to the obscure accounts we have, it seems that he acted as if the Gauls were rebels against the majesty of the Roman senate, although they had risen under Vindex, only against the tyrant; hence he allowed his soldiers to plunder the towns in southern Gaul. Virginius Rufus and his army recognised him as emperor, and both crossed the Alps by different roads. Although Nero was surrounded by his praetorians, yet no one drew a sword in his defence, and he found himself forsaken by every body, even before the revolted armies arrived. The senate was roused from its state of servitude; it defied and despised the tyrant, as he deserved. He fled from his palace, concealed himself in the house of one of his freedmen, and with a reluctant hand inflicted a deadly wound upon himself. Many sentences of condemnation were passed upon him and his memory; but he nevertheless obtained an honourable burial, A.D. 68.

Galba now entered Rome; and if he had acted only with a

as much as Appius with the Claudii, and hence we sometimes find Servii Sulpicii with another praenomen before Servius, which is properly an error, but can be understood.—N.

little more liberality, things would have gone on well enough; but he offended all parties. He protected some of Nero's associates against public animadversion, while others were punished. He was miserly also: economy was certainly necessary, but he carried it too far. The troops were already accustomed to receive their donatives, and they had been promised very munificent ones by the friends of Galba; but he now gave them with a niggardly hand. The praetorians received none at all; he even showed them hatred and mistrust, and yet he dismissed his soldiers with the exception of a few whom he quartered in the city, although he must have known that his life was in the hands of those 10,000 praetorians. He ought to have disbanded them, and put to death their seditious leaders who had taken an active part in the horrors of Nero's reign; he should then have formed them into a new corps, or have abolished them altogether. But he placed himself in the same situation as the Bourbons, when they threw themselves into the hands of the army, which did not want them.

M. Salvius Otho, who, to the disgrace of those times, was the most powerful man in the city, had no illustrious ancestors, and was a dandy, a character which in antiquity displayed much worse features than in modern times. He had been the associate of Nero in many of his vices; and his success in life was the result of Nero's favour: but it is doubtful whether he also took part in the bloodshed in which Nero indulged. He was rich, and his manners were graceful, or what people call amiable: his conduct was of that popular kind, which exercised the greatest influence upon the disposition of the praetorian cohorts. These men seemed to think that Otho alone could make up for their Nero whose munificence they began to miss, and he contrived to strengthen them in this belief. Galba, in his short reign, had to contend with several insurrections; for the German troops, under A. Caecina and Fabius Valens on the upper Rhine, refused to recognise him; and in these difficulties he endeavoured to strengthen himself by adopting a young Roman of rank, Piso Licinianus, a person who had nothing to boast of, except his noble descent and his unblemished personal character. But Galba had lost the attachment of all rational men through his meanness, and the influence of his freedmen, Vinius, Laco, and Icelus, who in his name made the most shameful abuse of justice, and sold it for money. Galba

may be reckoned *inter bonos et malos principes*, and might perhaps have been a good prince altogether, had he not been prevented by the foibles of old age. Otho had calculated upon being adopted by the emperor; but the old soldier had too great a love of his country to think of such a thing. The disappointment led Otho to the deepest dissimulation, by which he succeeded in inducing the praetorians to recognise him as emperor, as soon as he called upon them to do so. The city was then quite open; they marched into it, and towards the Forum. Galba, who appeared with Piso, in the hope of making an imposing impression on the rebels, was cut down, before the German troops, who were stationed at Albano, had time to come to his assistance; and Otho was proclaimed emperor. Galba had ruled eight or nine months.

Unworthy as the senate then was, it yet abhorred Otho. The Germans on the frontier of the Rhine, in the mean time, proclaimed emperor, their commander, A. Vitellius, a man who was far more vulgar and vicious than Otho. It is superfluous to speak here of his brutal manners and his beastly voracity. It is inconceivable how Galba could have given him the command over the troops in Germany. He was now fifty-seven years old, and enjoyed a certain popularity which had been transferred to him from his father, L. Vitellius, who had been thrice consul and once censor in the reign of Claudius.[3] Vitellius, the father, must have been a good-natured man, but he had degraded himself by the basest flattery towards Claudius; he was, however, no one's enemy and hence was liked by the people. His son, on the other hand, had spent all his life in the basest vulgarities, and brutal sensuality. It may be that A. Caecina and Fabius Valens proclaimed him only with the view of stripping him of his dignity soon after, and of then seeing which of them might succeed him. Vitellius was lavish towards the soldiers, and ingratiated himself with the German legions by granting them everything they asked for, while the aged Galba gave them only that which was absolutely necessary. This army now quickly set out for Italy; and the speed with which they marched is a proof no less of the immense mobility of the Roman legions than of the excellence of the Roman roads. Otho formed an army. Vitellius was opposed on the frontiers by the legions of Moesia and Pannonia, which thought

[3] Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 9; Sueton. *Vitell.* 2.

it arrogant on the part of the German troops to force an emperor upon them. Accordingly they supported Otho, who could also calculate on the legions of the East, where no insurrections had yet taken place. Italy was the most defenceless part of the empire, for it contained few troops besides the praetorians; and Otho, with these cohorts, quickly marched to the north of Italy to meet the Germans. A. Caecina and Fabius Valens, however, descended from the Alps before Otho with his hastily collected forces arrived on the banks of the Po. In the first engagement, Otho was successful; and if he had endeavoured to protract the war, things might have turned out differently; for his treasury was much better stocked than that of his enemy, and he might have considerably reinforced himself. But he unfortunately resolved to fight a decisive battle at Bedriacum, in the neighbourhood of Cremona, and lost it completely. The question however was not yet quite settled; and, if Otho had withdrawn to the fortified places in the neighbourhood, he might still have had time to assemble a fresh army. But he would not continue the war. Instead of doing so, he put an end to his life, and advised his friends to become reconciled to the conqueror. This occurred on the ninety-fifth day after his elevation to the imperial throne, and in the thirty-seventh year of his age. The last act of Otho is praised by Suetonius[4], and other historians after him, as noble and virtuous; but I look upon it in a different light, and can see in it nothing but the action of a man who has sunk to the lowest stage of effeminacy, and is unable to struggle against difficulties, or to bear the uncertainty between fear and hope. Such characters are met with in the lower as well as the higher spheres of life; for there are many persons who would rather lose a great deal of money, than undertake the trouble of litigation. I look upon Otho's putting an end to his existence with the same contempt with which Juvenal regards it; and it is quite certain that Tacitus too, in reality, did not estimate Otho any higher than I do; for we must remember that a great historian, in describing a tragic event in a man's life, rises to a state of mental emotion which is very different from his moral judgment.

On his arrival in Rome, Vitellius took possession of the imperial palace, and assumed the appearance of intending to avenge the murder of Galba, against whom, however, he himself had in reality revolted; and accordingly he ordered

[4] *Otho*, 10, foll.

upwards of a hundred praetorians to be put to death. If we overlook his personal character, which was contemptible, things did not at first go on as badly as had been anticipated. Peace, however, was soon (A.D. 70) disturbed again; for the legions in Moesia thought it a great insult that an emperor had been set on the throne without their consent. They had been destined to come to the assistance of Otho, and now rose against Vitellius. They were roused and stimulated by the ambitious and enterprising Antonius Primus. At the same time, Vitellius was informed that the Syrian legions under T. Flavius Vespasianus, and the Parthian legions under the command of Mucianus, refused obedience to him. Those armies, however, were far away, and had enough to do in the East, the one against the Jews, the other against the Parthians; and could not go to Italy without exposing those parts of the empire to the invasion of the Parthians. Similar consequences might have followed the withdrawal of the troops from the Rhine and the Danube; and it is an unaccountable phenomenon that it was possible for the Romans to remove their troops from those frontiers, without any attempt being made by the Germans to cross the rivers and invade the Roman dominion. There are, it is true, some traces of treaties having been concluded with the Germans; but the mystery is, that those treaties were kept. As far as the country in our neighbourhood is concerned, we know little of the period subsequent to the reign of Caligula; but peaceful relations seem to have been established; and the Germans appear to have had no inclination to undertake a war. Although it was not till a later time that a ditch, with an earthen wall surmounted by palisades, was drawn from the river Sieg to the Altmühl, yet the country between the Upper Rhine and the Danube must have been under the dominion of Rome as early as the time of Vitellius.

T. Flavius Vespasianus, with all his faults, was the true restorer of the state, a fact which has never yet been sufficiently acknowledged. He did indeed things which are a stain on his character that can never be wiped off; but if we take him as he was, and consider what could be expected, we shall find great excuses for his faults. In the reign of Vitellius, he was engaged in the Jewish war; the Jews had risen as early as the reign of Claudius, in consequence of ill usage and usurpation. The war which thus arose, ended with the destruction of

Jerusalem. There are few wars which so much deserve the attention of posterity as this; and I should very much like to relate to you its history, on account of its fearful greatness, but our limited time does not allow me to follow my inclination. The history of the Jewish war can be made profitable only by a careful study in detail of the state of parties among the Jews, of their sentiments and the like—and these things belong to a history of the Jews rather than to Roman history. I refer those who wish to make themselves acquainted with it, to the work of Josephus, which, with all its offences against the correctness of the Greek idiom, is one of the most interesting histories that have come down to us from antiquity. The writings of Josephus deserve to be recommended to the study of every scholar and theologian; his history of the Jewish war is, next to Caesar's Commentaries, the most instructive work we possess, especially in regard to the tactics of the Romans and the art of besieging. Josephus was a Pharisee, and although he was unquestionably a better man than the majority of that sect, which is so severely characterised in the Gospels, yet the Pharisaic element was in him. Hence he is often untrue, and his Archaeology abounds in distortions of historical facts and in falsifications, which arise from his inordinate national pride. In his account of the Jewish war, he displays many of the peculiarities of an oriental writer, and wherever he deals in numbers, he shews his oriental love of exaggeration; some of his numbers are manifestly impossible, and you must not allow yourselves to be misled by them. His oriental nature is visible everywhere, notwithstanding his Greek education. It is remarkable how well he writes Greek, if we except some standing errors which constantly recur. His name in our manuscripts is Flavius Josephus, but his full name, which he undoubtedly derived from the emperor who made him his prisoner, and afterwards emancipated him and gave him the Roman franchise, was Titus Flavius Josephus.

When the insurrection against Vitellius broke out, Vespasian was engaged with a powerful army in Judaea, where the Jews offered a desperate and heroic resistance. He was descended from an obscure family; and as he himself possessed no vanity, no one took the trouble to invent illustrious ancestors for him, although Flavii occur in the early history of the republic. His grandfather, however, had somewhat risen from his obscurity.

Vespasian had at this time arrived at the age of sixty. During the frightful period of the reigns of Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, he was fortunate enough to escape; but he was obliged to put up with many unpleasant things, and at the time when the empire was reduced to a state of perfect servitude, he too had been under the necessity of acting the part of a slave, but had done it always with reluctance. He was a good general, and had gradually risen without any one being able to charge him with rapacity or cruelty,—a feature which deserves the greater admiration, as he is said to have been naturally fond of money. He had thus conducted himself with *innocentia*, at a time when there was neither a lack of good generals nor of wars in which they could develop their talents. His family belonged to the town of Nursia, the birthplace of Sertorius, among the high Sabine mountains. The *Nursina duritia* of which Fronto[5] speaks, must be applied to Sertorius and Vespasian. In the country about Nursia, the old Italian families had preserved their character as sturdy peasants. Vespasian was universally known and honoured in the Roman armies, for he had all the virtues of a general, and had not been affected by the vices of the higher classes among the Romans. Licinius Mucianus, the governor of Syria, on the other hand, belonged to the Licinii, one of the noblest families: he was also connected with the Mucii; but descent from an ancient family was at that time of no importance at Rome. Mucianus felt this, as well as that he was inferior to Vespasian (for he was effeminate). They were in fact very different from each other, and had formerly not been on good terms, but Mucianus now offered to the stern and severe Vespasian his hand in token of reconciliation, and readily assisted in raising him to the throne.

LECTURE CXVI.

MUCIANUS was a man of rank, and, without being wicked, had all the vices of his age. He had little ambition, and preferred being under an emperor to being emperor himself, which

[5] *Principia Historiae*, p. 242, ed. Niebuhr. Compare *Lectures* vol. II. Lect. lxxxviii. p. 399, foll.

dignity seems to have had no charms for him. Vespasian on the other hand, was free from the faults of the higher orders, and rather possessed the virtues peculiar to the lower classes. He had recognised Galba as emperor without any hesitation; but after Galba's death the thought occurred to him to seek the imperial dignity for himself, for he must have been conscious that he was fit for it, and that the attention of the Roman world was directed towards him. When, however, the insurrection against Vitellius broke out, Vespasian was not under the necessity of coming forward himself; for Antonius Primus, who placed himself at the head of the revolted legions of Moesia and Pannonia, marched into Italy, and conquered the generals of Vitellius in the neighbourhood of Cremona. At Rome too the insurrection had now broken out. T. Flavius Sabinus, the brother of Vespasian, who was praefect of the city, and Domitian, the younger son of Vespasian, were at Rome, and were looked upon by the Vitellian party as hostages for Vespasian. The conduct of Vitellius towards them was vacillating. The first movement irritated him; afterwards, on being terrified by the report of the battle near Cremona, he tried to capitulate, and was ready to surrender his power; but when he observed some symptoms which seemed to announce a change in his favour, he attempted to make Sabinus and Domitian his prisoners. They fled to the Capitol, which was taken and set on fire; and Sabinus was cut down during the massacre. Domitian escaped with great difficulty. Rome was in a state of perfect anarchy. At that time, an emperor resigning his throne could not save his life; because there were no convents as in the time of the Byzantine empire. The party of Vespasian, which was gradually formed, gained fresh strength every day; and the victorious army, under Antonius Primus, advanced irresistibly towards Rome, where the maddest excesses were committed on both sides. The city was quite defenceless, and fell into the hands of the conquerors. Vitellius was murdered after a reign of about eight months.

I believe that Domitian was at this time about twenty years old. He took the power into his own hands. His elder brother, Titus, was left by Vespasian in Judaea; and, as the latter did not arrive in Italy for some time, Domitian exercised the imperial power in his name. During his father's absence, he committed many acts of cruelty, from a desire to take vengeance

on his personal enemies, rather than to punish any real offences. You may read all these occurrences in Tacitus[1], whose account of them is the most perfect that one can wish for; but, unfortunately, it does not extend beyond the first year of Vespasian's reign. Vespasian had much in his character that was good, but the moral depravation was as great among his partizans as among those of Vitellius; just as, during the latter period of the Thirty-Years' war, when the Swedish generals, such as Banner and Torstenson, were no better than the French commanders or those of the imperial armies. The sad deeds of those small men are excellently described by Tacitus, who does not make any one of them his hero; whereas many historians allow themselves to be led away by the interest they take in a particular person.

Vespasian did not arrive at Rome till about the end of the summer A.D. 70; though Vitellius had been killed in the previous December, a circumstance which was not without unfortunate consequences. Rome was governed, during that time, by a dissolute and tyrannical young man; for Domitian already displayed the vices and passions which characterise his later years. Some of the senators, especially Helvidius Priscus, a man who was ill-suited to the age in which he lived, allowed themselves to be drawn into an improper opposition to the government[2], which was unfortunate, no less for them and for Vespasian, than for the empire.

While the armies were advancing from the frontiers to Italy, a state of feeling became developed in Gaul, of which some symptoms had appeared as early as the reign of Tiberius, when the Aedui had attempted a perfectly senseless revolt under Julius Sacrovir. What Gaul wanted was perfectly impracticable. Traces of this national Gallic feeling, which was now spreading, may be discerned even in the insurrection of Julius Vindex. People may praise Virginius Rufus as much as they like; but I believe that the thought of murdering Vindex arose from the knowledge that he was a Gaul, which places the act in a morally bad light. His death, far from pacifying the national feeling of the Gauls, was a fresh stimulus to it. The prosperity of Gaul must have been increasing ever since the time of Julius Caesar, especially in the south, as we may gather from Pliny's account of Gallia Narbonensis; and the same was

[1] *Hist* iii. 86, iv. 1, foll. [2] Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 5, foll.

probably the case in the northern parts of the country. We have certainly no adequate notion of the state of Gaul under the Romans; for all our knowledge of it is confined to what we learn from Strabo and Pliny, who speak only of single *civitates*, small towns not being mentioned at all; and the internal condition of the country is nowhere described. In history, Gaul is not mentioned, except by Tacitus at the beginning of the insurrection of Claudius Civilis. After that event, it again disappears from history until the end of the third century, when all we learn of it is contained in the meagre accounts of the writers of the "Historia Augusta," and the Itineraries, which are mostly confined to a few places on some high roads. Hence D'Anville's map of Gaul, which is otherwise most excellent, looks like a map of a country which has only just received some settlements, and is beginning to be brought into cultivation.[3] But this is the consequence merely of the scantiness of our information. Gaul, under the Romans, was a well-cultivated country, with a very large population; for, in many parts of France, we find most extensive ruins of towns which we cannot identify, except in a few instances by means of Itineraries. For instance, splendid ruins of a town with theatres and the like, were laid open a short time ago, in the neighbourhood of Montpellier; and there is only one Itinerary in which we find a badly-written name that may be applied to the place. Many accidental discoveries, which have been made in Valenciennes and Normandy, shew that there once existed in them towns of great extent and large population. In order to obtain a somewhat complete geography of Gaul, the documents of the Merovingian and Carlovingian periods ought to be carefully studied; and any one who would undertake such a work, would be well rewarded for his trouble. The towns, of which we now find the ruins, were certainly not built after the period of the Roman dominion; that was an age of destruction. They must have been founded at a much earlier time; and their names, so far as we can discover them, are ancient Latin or Gallic. Previously to the time of Julius Caesar, the prosperity of Gaul had been nearly destroyed in the Cimbrian war; and in the wars of Caesar, the country was again fearfully ravaged. But after them

[3] His maps of eastern countries are quite different; for there he possessed a very minute knowledge of some districts, from the Macedonian time down to the fifth and sixth century; whence the maps of Asia Minor and Syria are full of towns.—N.

there followed a period of more than a century, during which the country enjoyed profound peace, and recovered from its former devastations, though it was perhaps heavily taxed. The population of a country like France, which is so much blessed by nature, and enjoys such a mild climate, must have become doubled or trebled during that time, and must have acquired great wealth. The northern districts, though politically under the dominion of Rome, did not, in reality, belong to Gaul, and had very few towns. Our country here on the Rhine, which was occupied by Germans at the time of Caesar, and probably even much earlier, did not keep pace with the civilisation of Gaul, and was certainly not as wealthy. It very much resembled the rest of Germany: it had a numerous population, and many villages; but scarcely any towns. Its population has very unjustly been considered as Gallic. It has been entirely German ever since the time of Caesar, and probably even earlier. It never belonged to Gaul, and was connected with it only politically under the Romans. A frontier had there been formed between the Romans and Germans, either by a treaty or tacitly. The country of the Batavi between the Meuse and the Waal, the *insula Batavorum*, was under the dominion of Rome. It had Roman garrisons, but still had not yet adopted Roman civilisation; it was there that the insurrection of Claudius Civilis broke out. It spread all over the German provinces of the Roman empire and over Gaul, where the Lingones placed themselves at the head of it. This revolt was a very dangerous one; and the Germans on the eastern bank of the Rhine declared for it. But the success of the insurgents was checked by their want of unity, arising from their natural divisions; while some of them were zealous and others indolent, and all of them were more or less under the influence of petty jealousy, they had to fight against Roman generals who acted with great resolution. The Germans and Gauls, moreover, were not natural allies. Their objects were now the same indeed; but otherwise they were as foreign to each other as the Romans were to both of them: nay, it may be said, that the Romans were more akin to the Gauls than the Germans; for the noble Gauls had adopted the Latin language, and Roman manners were generally established among them. In what manner the insurrection ended we know not, for the "Historiae" of Tacitus breaks off before the close of the war, and at a moment when we can only see

that it is taking a different turn, and that the insurgents will probably be obliged to yield. The fact of their being actually subdued is seen from Xiphilinus' abridgment of Dion Cassius.[4] Before Vespasian's arrival at Rome, Domitian had marched against the insurgents, and had assumed the supreme command of the Roman armies in those countries; but he had no share in the conquest of the enemy, which was the merit of his father's generals.

Vespasian reigned upwards of nine years, and his government was thoroughly beneficial to the Roman world. As we are without the guidance of Tacitus, it is not easy to come to a definite conclusion as to Vespasian's personal character; for the pictures of character which Suetonius draws are very obscure, and are made with as little judgment as those we meet with in the "Scriptores Historiae Augustae." Suetonius was a man of great learning, and did not write badly, but he had no survey of his subjects, nor any historical talent. His description of the time in which he himself lived is even worse than those of previous periods, in which he had the works of others whom he could follow; and this circumstance is the best evidence that he had no vocation to write history.[5] If we compare the praise which he bestows upon Vespasian with what he relates of him, we are at a loss to see how he can have reconciled the two things in his own mind; but it seems that many of the circumstances which he relates ought to have been omitted, as they were nothing but unfounded reports. There are only a few points in Vespasian's character which we may take for certain: in regard to all the others we are left in the dark. It is a fact beyond all doubt that, considering the time in which he lived, Vespasian was an excellent, straight-forward, and just man, in a negative sense, for he did not make himself guilty of tyranny; and in his reign there

[4] lxvi. 3.

[5] I am inclined to think that Suetonius wrote his biographical history at a time when he was still very young, and before he obtained the office of private secretary to Hadrian (Spartian. *Hadrian*, 11); I have no doubt at all that his lives of the emperors were written previously to the publication of Tacitus' "Historiae," for otherwise the account of the anarchy after Nero's death, and the beginning of the reign of Vespasian could scarcely have been as bad as it is. Wherever we are confined to Suetonius as our source of information we are very badly off; and throughout the history of the emperors our materials are bad. If we had Dion Cassius, we should not have much reason for complaining, but unfortunately a great part of his work is lost, and we possess only the miserable abridgment which Xiphilinus made of it.—N.

occur but few cases of extortion, things which were then of every-day occurrence in the Roman empire. His moral conduct was as unblemished as one could expect in those times. After the death of his legitimate wife, Flavia Domitilla, he lived in a marriage of conscience with Caenis, a woman of low birth, with whom however he was happy, and who seems to have been a very estimable person. He was therefore what we may call a man of very good moral conduct. He had, further, a disgust for the gluttony and awfully vulgar extravagance, which had become customary among the Romans in culinary matters. The luxury of the wealthy was principally displayed in sumptuous repasts, on which they spent prodigious sums with a truly senseless prodigality. Vespasian himself had preserved his old simplicity; and during his reign he not only set a good example in this respect, but endeavoured to check the disgusting habits of the Romans by legal enactments, whereby, as Tacitus justly observes[6] he brought about a change in the mode of living among the Romans, which deserves to be mentioned in history. That contemptible gluttony had commenced at Rome during the latter period of the republic; but after the time of Vespasian it never rose again to such a height nor became so general as it had been before, for he destroyed it in its root, though Ammianus Marcellinus still records a few isolated instances which occurred in his time among wealthy and idle individuals.

Vespasian governed the empire with care and conscientiousness, and restored the finances. He showed no mistrust towards the governors of provinces; but at the same time protected the subjects against them whenever it was necessary. Vespasian was deficient in the feelings of a refined and educated man, and this was his and Rome's misfortune. He neglected altogether the higher and intellectual pursuits, and had a downright antipathy against persons of education, philosophers, and all those who were anything beyond practical men of business. Everything higher appeared to him superfluous and even as something hostile. Helvidius Priscus was, both personally and intellectually, one of the first men of Rome, and was distinguished as a Stoic philosopher[7]; but instead of recognising

[6] *Annal.* iii. 55.

[7] The Stoic philosophy at this time had turned into a kind of republicanism which was incompatible with existing circumstances. It abandoned itself to a petulance which produced very bad effects, and cannot be excused in any way.—N.

the good side of Vespasian's government, he abandoned himself to an opposition against it, for which I cannot see any sufficient reason, and which could produce none but evil consequences. The misfortune was that this conduct excited in Vespasian a bitter hostility towards him, in consequence of which he was put to death. The execution of Priscus is little better than a murder, in which Vespasian shed the noblest blood of the Roman state. But in other cases he did not stain his hands with blood; and where he had no such provocation, he was in reality a mild ruler. He was of a grateful disposition, and behaved with mildness towards Licinius Mucianus, many of whose actions he connived at. Antonius Primus was put to death, but he deserved it; for he had called forth the revolution which raised Vespasian to the throne, in the hope of ruling over him, but afterwards, finding himself disappointed, conspired against the emperor. Vespasian is charged by Suetonius with avarice; but we cannot say whether the charge is true. He is reported to have said that the state required for its maintenance *quadringenties millies*[8], that is, upwards of 280 millions sterling. But this statement seems to have been written down by Suetonius without a thought, and shews how unfit he was to be an historian. Even if we conceive the Roman state to have been at that time as flourishing as, for example, France or Italy is at the present day, it seems inconceivable, how such a sum could have been raised, considering the value which money then had. However the sum is altogether an impossible one; nor can we see what it could have been wanted for. The army consisted of only 400,000 men; and although the pay of the soldiers was now treble what it had been in earlier times, yet the sum above mentioned is far greater than would be required to support such a force. It is true, Vespasian spent much upon buildings, but building surely is not one of the real wants of a state. Vespasian raised not only structures which were absolutely necessary, but such as by their splendour adorned the empire; and whatever historians may say of his avarice, his incomparable architectural works, both at Rome and in the provinces, some of which, such as the Colosseum, and the Temple of Peace, will last for ever, cannot be reconciled with his alleged love of money.

[8] Sueton. *Vespas.* 16.

He died at the age of sixty-nine, after a reign of nine years, A.D. 79.

During his reign, the government had, in reality, been conducted by his son Titus; but I cannot say whether this was because Vespasian thought himself incapable of ruling over the empire, or because he had no inclination to do so. Titus had attained his thirty-second year when he returned from Jerusalem. It may be that many things which disgrace the reign of Vespasian must be put down to the account of Titus; for there seems to be no reason for doubting the statement that, previously to his accession, the general opinion was against him[9], whatever contrast his own reign may have presented to his former conduct. The feeling towards him afterwards completely changed; but this *amor et deliciae generis humani* is nevertheless a strange phenomenon. It seems to have been extremely easy to please the circle by whom he was surrounded; and as his real happiness consisted in possessing their favour, he tried to win it by munificent presents out of the well-stocked treasury which his father had left him, and the administration of which Vespasian had reserved for himself.

LECTURE CXVII.

THERE is scarcely any other emperor whose reign was so truly beneficial to the Roman world as that of Vespasian. At the time when Titus was the object of the greatest suspicion in the East, Vespasian's noble openness formed an exception to the general distrust. He continued to shew him confidence; and when Titus returned to Rome, Vespasian made him praefectus praetorio, and entrusted to him a considerable share in the government. This was by no means in the spirit of eastern princes who always feel the greatest mistrust towards their own sons. Titus, however, was far from popular during the lifetime of his father; and some acts of cruelty which were committed in the reign of Vespasian are ascribed to Titus. I will only mention the murder of Caecina, who had acted a prominent part among the friends of Vitellius, and was cut down by

[9] Sueton. *Tit.* 6.

Titus' command. This act, however, is said to have been justified by the evidence of a conspiracy against the house of Vespasian, which was discovered in Caecina's own hand-writing.[1] The apprehensions commonly entertained in regard to Titus were not verified; for after his accession a change took place in his whole conduct, and the prevailing features of his character during his short reign were kindness and benevolence, features which are in a prince valued more highly than all other virtues. A sovereign who is not kind, and does not flatter, stands much lower in the estimation of the *imperita multitudo* than one who neglects his duties. Such has been the case at all times, and, to some extent at least, it seems to have been the case with Titus. His father had been very economical, whereas Titus was generous and even lavish; the former had spent money only in raising great and costly works of architecture. He had restored Rome, changed many of the senseless buildings of Nero, especially the golden house, and built the Colosseum, the most gigantic edifice of ancient Rome. If we consider that it was intended as an amphitheatre, it makes a sad impression on the mind; but it was in accordance with the taste of the Roman populace. It was not dedicated however till the reign of Titus.[2] The extravagant sums which were spent upon it, and the proceedings that took place in it under the later emperors, make upon us the impression of something monstrous and revolting, which is very different from the idea of greatness. Goethe has made some excellent remarks upon it in his "Farbenlehre."[3] But such prodigality and amusements were not confined to the time of the emperors; they had begun towards the end of the republic. The contests of the Colosseum were cruel and disgusting, and even women were trained and fought as gladiators; but Titus' humanity did not exert itself in that direction.

[1] Sueton. *Tit.* 6.

[2] Sueton. *Tit.* 7; Dion Cass. lxvi. 25.

[3] *Nachgelass. Werke*, vol. xiii. p. 68. "The Romans had risen from the condition of a narrow, moral, comfortable and easy people, to that of rulers of the wide world, but without laying aside their own narrowness. And this may be regarded as the source of their love of luxury. Uneducated persons who acquire large property, naturally make a ridiculous use of it. Their pleasures, splendour and extravagance are always absurd and exaggerated. Hence that fondness for what is strange, extravagant and monstrous. Their theatres which were turned with the spectators in them, the second population of statues with which the city was crowded, are, like the later colossal pot in which the fish were to be kept entire, all of the same origin. Even the insolence and cruelty of their tyrants generally borders upon the absurd."

As far as foreign countries were concerned, the reign of Titus was perfectly quiet, and Rome was in the enjoyment of peace and comfort, only interrupted by a great fire, which lasted for three days and three nights, and by the eruption of mount Vesuvius, which caused the catastrophe of Herculaneum and Pompeii. Ever since the time of the Greek settlements, that volcano had been at rest; but now it began its eruptions. Never has the calamity of one generation been more obviously advantageous to a later one than the burial of those two towns.

The love of the Romans for Titus became the more decided, as they had reason to fear his younger brother Domitian, concerning whom there could be no mistake. He was a bad son, and a bad brother; he contemplated the murder of his father, but more especially that of his brother, who never attempted to avenge himself, but always treated Domitian with confidence.[4] But Domitian is nevertheless one of those men who are generally looked upon with too much contempt, because they are bad. There are bad persons in history who ought not, by any means, to be treated in that way. The charge of cowardice in war which is brought against him may be well founded, although there is no positive evidence of it; his falseness and cruelty however are both well attested. It is also true that, with all his boundless ambition, he did not accomplish anything to justify his pretensions, but he is nevertheless estimated too low; for he was a man of a cultivated mind and decided talent, and is of considerable importance in the history of Roman literature.[5] Rutgersius[6] has already remarked, and the proofs are manifest, that the paraphrase of Aratus, which is usually ascribed to Germanicus, is the work of Domitian. He delighted in the name of Caesar Germanicus, and assumed it, because it was more illustrious than the Flavian name; but from the manner in which he mentions his father[7], it is evident that he had not been adopted by Germanicus. I believe that the poem was written in the time of Titus; its subject is poor, but it is executed in a very respectable manner. Quinctilian is full of flatteries towards

[4] Dion Cass. lxvi. 26; Aurel. *Vict. De Caesar.* 11.

[5] Sueton. *Domit.* 2, 20; Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 86.

[6] *Variae Lectiones*, iii p. 276. Compare Grauert in the *Rheinisches Museum* vol. iv. p. 347, foll.

[7] In the beginning of his paraphrase of the "Phaenomena" of Aratus, Domitian says, that his father was sovereign, and was honoured with the apotheosis.—N.

Domitian[8], and in this case he had the misfortune, from cowardice, to act the part of a slave towards a despot. If Domitian really made the paraphrase, Quinctilian's exaggerated praise is the conduct of a servile man, though the blame does not attach so much to his personal character, as to a despotic court; and he surely did not praise a work which was quite bad, merely from servile flattery. Domitian's taste for Roman literature however produced its beneficial effects. He instituted the great pension for rhetoricians which Quinctilian, for example, enjoyed, and the Capitoline contest in which the prize poems were crowned.[9] During this period, Roman literature received a great impulse, to which Domitian himself must have contributed. Tacitus, the greatest historian, at least in Roman literature, was then a young man. The younger Pliny was growing to manhood; and however much we may blame him, there were many highly educated persons at the time who wrote in the same style as he. Statius too belongs to this period; and his little poems (Silvae) are among the most graceful productions of Roman literature.[10] Juvenal, a great genius, was likewise a contemporary of Domitian; he was a master of pure Latin, and hated the tyrant with justice. From Domitian's poem we see that he was opposed to the false taste of the time. He had offended Statius; but in this we perceive not so much partiality as a correct judgment.

The frugality in the mode of living at Rome, which had been restored by Vespasian, still continued, for Domitian too was not a squanderer of money. It was probably nothing but his cowardice that induced him to raise the original pay of his soldiers fourfold, that is to 480 denarii,—an enormous sum, for which he afterwards endeavoured to make up by reducing the number of troops, which was not suited to the circumstances of the empire.

Rome was involved in various wars during his reign. The eastern frontiers indeed enjoyed a profound peace; for the Parthian empire was in the condition into which such eastern monarchies always sink after a certain period of greatness, and

[8] See iv. 1. § 2, foll.; x. 1. § 91, foll.

[9] Sueton. *Domit.* 4.

[10] I strongly recommend the study of the Silvae, which are genuine poetry imprinted with the true character of the country; whence they make a most pleasing impression, especially when read in Italy. The Thebais of Statius, on the other hand, is an absurd poem and bombastic in the highest degree. It was certainly not by this poem that he gained the Capitoline prize.—N.

the Romans were left undisturbed in that quarter. On the northern boundaries of the empire, however, wars were waged on which some light is thrown by Tacitus' life of Agricola, which is one of the great master-pieces of ancient biography.[11] The Romans had gradually made progress in Britain, but Agricola was the first who penetrated to the north, beyond the two Friths, towards the Highlands of Scotland. He built a fleet with which he sailed round the coast and visited the Orkney islands. The time of these exploits is the glorious military epoch in the reign of Domitian.[12]

In his earliest youth, Domitian had been in Gaul during the insurrection of Civilis. As emperor, he carried on a war against the Chatti in the country about the river Main. If we believe the statements of the medals, which begin to be of importance at this period of Roman history, and the flatteries of Martial—who was likewise a man of great talent and enjoyed the favour of Domitian,—the emperor obtained the surname of Germanicus with perfect justice; but the historians are unanimous that those victories were not realities, though they cannot be wholly fictitious, for Roman armies did at that time carry on wars on the eastern bank of the Rhine, and not wholly without success;[13] but we cannot wonder at the Germans, who had only an untrained militia, not making a vigorous resistance against the Roman legions. In addition to this, the Germans were, as usual, suffering from their own internal divisions: the Cherusci demanded assistance against the Chatti, and the Lygii against the Suevi.[14] A war was also waged on the upper and middle Danube; and nations, which had for some time disappeared from history, are now mentioned again, and described as very powerful, such as the Marcomanni and Suevi, who were feebly united with Slavonic tribes, and that not in small numbers.

The most dangerous war of Domitian was that against the Dacians, a Thracian tribe, the same as the ancient Getae, which had pressed upon the Scythians as early as the time of

[11] The two best ancient biographies that have come down to us, are Tacitus' Agricola, and the life of Atticus by Corn. Nepos.—N.

[12] I refer to Agricola's circumnavigation of Scotland, the statue of Oceanus which, throughout the middle ages, lay at the entrance of the Forum Martium, (the so called Marforio, *Beschreib. d. Stadt Rom*, iii. 1. p. 138). A statue of the Rhine at Rome likewise belongs to the reign of Domitian.—N.

[13] Compare Frontinus, *Strateg.* i. 3. 10.

[14] Dion Cass. lxvii. 5.

Alexander the Great. Since the days of Diceneus, about the time of Augustus, they formed a great monarchy comprising Transylvania, the mountains of Moldavia, a part of the Banat, and perhaps the whole of Wallachia. The country was rich, on account of its mines and precious metals; and it is clear from the column of Trajan, that they are not to be considered as barbarians, but that they had a higher civilisation than the Germans. They had fortified towns, and lived in houses built of wood, such as are found at the present day in some parts of the Tyrol. Decebalus, who was king of the Dacians, was a man of great character, and worthy to rule over them in those dangerous times. Their form of government was not despotic; they had a well developed constitution, and an aristocracy[15], and were a free and brave nation. They had frequently harassed the Roman frontier since the time of Augustus, and had invaded Moesia, whenever Rome was weak. They do not, however, seem to have touched the Roman frontier in Pannonia; for the country between the Theiss and the Danube consisted of deep marshes. The country further down about Presburg was inhabited partly by Gallic, partly by German tribes. Our knowledge of Domitian's war against the Dacians is very confused; for Xiphilinus and Zonaras pass over its details altogether. This much, however, is clear, that, on one occasion, the Romans suffered a great defeat, and that the Dacians occupied Moesia. Such bold nations as ventured to wage war against the Romans, found in the end that Rome was a dangerous enemy if the war was protracted; and they preferred concluding an honourable peace to the risk of provoking Rome to exert all its powers against them. Hence Decebalus, after having carried on a glorious war, concluded a peace, on terms which seem to us humiliating. Domitian thus, after great losses, returned to Rome in triumph, and was enabled to assume the name of Dacicus.

After this campaign, the government of Domitian changed for the worse, and his cruel disposition now began to give itself free vent. Some persons had already been put to death on mere suspicions, or because Domitian disliked them. L. Antonius Saturninus, who hated Domitian, had caused the legions of Germania Superior, which embraced not only Alsatia, but

[15] The Dacians on the column of Trajan, who wear caps and long hair, are the nobles.—N.

Suabia, as far as the *limites*, to proclaim him emperor; but he was conquered by L. Appius Maximus, and paid for his attempt with his life. Caligula and Nero were monsters, the former being a madman, and the latter, who was not free from madness, being a degenerate specimen of mankind, whom Aristotle would have called a being *παρὰ φύσιν*, and in reference to whom we can scarcely speak of vice, for the laws of morality are applicable only to that which lies within the boundaries of human nature: there are vices which degrade man below his nature, and by which he becomes a real brute. But Domitian was not a brute, for his cruelty lay within the bounds of human nature; it was that of a thoroughly bad man, and arose from the human propensity to envy others and to delight in their misfortunes. His cruelty was not combined with avarice, two vices which in the east usually go hand in hand. Among the senators of that time there were men worthy of the friendship of Tacitus and Agricola, such as Junius Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio. The former had written the life of Paetus Thrasea, and the latter that of Helvidius Priscus. Their works were true, and were written with a heartfelt warmth, though they may not have been free from declamation. They contained, at any rate, more life and substance than the works of the Augustan age; and it was this circumstance that provoked the anger of Domitian.

Among the men of intellect whom I have just mentioned, there arose the detestable class of the *delatores*, who enriched themselves by blood, and the accounts of whom are among the most interesting portion of Pliny's letters. These men too must not be considered as merely contemptible; for they were not so much degraded in their intellectual as in their moral condition, and were at any rate not so despicable as the *delatores* under Tiberius. Some of them were distinguished for their declamations, and on the whole they were men of talent. They belonged to what was called good society, but their sentiments were of the most infamous kind; and they used their talents to crush the noblest and most distinguished persons. But in however bad a light the men of that time appear in the Satires of Juvenal, it cannot be denied that, in general, men were not so bad as they had been in the time of Tiberius; the women, on the other hand, were still as wanton and dissolute as ever. The long period of suffering had made men better. Under Tiberius a certain formality had been observed, and the emperor took no part in the proceedings of the delatores and the trials of the accused; but Domitian did not scruple to attend the trials in person. If you want to obtain a clear knowledge of these things, you must read what Pliny says of M. Regulus[16] and others of the same class. This latter period of Domitian's reign is one of the most fearful that occur in history, and Tacitus, who describes it most excellently in the introduction to his life of Agricola, says that people passed through it in dumb horror.

In this manner the last years of Domitian passed away. The last three were the most frightful. Had his rage been directed against good and noble persons only, he might have indulged it much longer, but he turned it against bad and infuriated men also,—against the officers of his praetorian guards, and against his wife Domitia, whom he had offended, and who offended him. The consequence was that a conspiracy was formed by the officers of his own court, to which he fell a victim in A.D. 96. Domitian built the Forum of the palace (Forum Palladium), which was thus called to distinguish it from the Forum of Augustus; and there he erected a number of government offices, tribunals, and the like. A portion of its walls and of the portico still exist as a memorial of those times. Many other splendid buildings were erected by him.

LECTURE CXVIII.

THE reigns of Nerva and Trajan belong to the comparatively most obscure portions of the history of the Roman empire, although the government of these two emperors was a period of delight to the Romans; one rich in literary productions, and of which many other monuments have come down to us. Tacitus evidently did not describe that period; for he says that he will reserve it for his old age, in order to excuse himself from writing contemporary history, which he certainly could not praise unconditionally. Trajan himself wrote

[16] Pliny, *Epist.* i. 5.

memoirs especially of his war against the Dacians; but no other writer of any importance has chosen that eventful period for his subject

M. Cocceius Nerva had already reached the age of sixty-four and was a venerable senator. How it was brought about, we know not; but he was proclaimed emperor, and received by the senate with great joy. The praetorians did not object to him, although he was not a man to their taste. He laid down the principles of his government, and remained faithful to them, but proceeded in his reforms with great caution, for he was old, and did not venture to undertake much, or to provoke the praetorians; hence he punished but few of the delatores who had been the curse of the nation in the reign of his predecessor: many of them escaped with impunity and were allowed to remain at Rome. This gave offence to men of honour, and evil-doers gained fresh courage. The feeling of present happiness was disturbed by the knowledge that those men were still alive and in office, so that the people still continued to stand in awe of them, as they might rise again at any time. The effect of this weakness on the part of Nerva was, that those who wished to continue the practices they had indulged in under Domitian employed their influence in the senate for that purpose, and acted without any scruples. Junius Mauricus therefore said, when the death of a delator was mentioned at a banquet given by the emperor, "Yes, but if he were alive, he would suffer no harm, but would be here among us."[1] Nerva, however, could not act otherwise. At length Casperius, the praefect of the city, who had held the same office under Domitian, called upon the soldiers to demand of Nerva the punishment of the murderers of Domitian. On his refusal, the soldiers seized the persons alluded to, two of whom were most fearfully ill-used: they then compelled Nerva to make a public declaration in the senate, that he approved of the execution of his predecessor's murderers.[2] He felt the disgrace of this act very keenly, and in order to strengthen himself, he had recourse to the same means as Galba, and adopted Trajan, who had then the command of the legions on the Rhine. By this adoption, Trajan became his declared successor, and Nerva's choice was certainly better than that of Galba.

[1] Plin. *Epist.* iv. 22.

[2] Aurel. Vict. *Imp. Rom. Epit.* 12.

M. Ulpius Nerva Trajanus was born in Spain, and was the son of a distinguished man. The southern parts of Spain and Gaul were already entirely Latinised, and were so completely Italian countries, that the inhabitants of the towns generally spoke the Latin language, just as West Prussia and Silesia are completely Germanised. One of the Spanish towns of this kind was Italica, in the neighbourhood of Seville, one of the earliest settlements in that part, which had been founded by the soldiers of the Scipios, who had spent many a year there, and at last settled and married Spanish women. The town was constituted as a colony, or as a municipium of the second class, and became great and flourishing. It was the birthplace of Trajan and Hadrian. Trajan's family was among the most distinguished in the place. His father had obtained high honours in the army as early as the time of Nero, and, enjoying general esteem, survived the elevation of his son for many years. The son attracted general attention, and was honoured even in the time of Domitian, so unfavorable to the manifestations of virtue. The emperor Nerva, in electing a successor, could not have made a happier choice; and it was received by the praetorians with joy and respect. Trajan was then at Rome; but he soon went to Germany, where he had his head quarters at Cologne. Our knowledge of Germany at that time is very defective; but it is surprising to see that the relations between the Germans and the Romans still continued to be peaceful. Arae Flaviae, the name of a place on the military road from the Main to Augsburg, proves that, probably under Domitian, the Romans had already taken possession of that *sinus imperii*. The fortified ditch which extended from the Westerwald across the river Lahn, Mount Taunus, the river Main, and as far as the Altmühl, existed probably as early as this time[1]; but whether it was or was not, all Germany south of that line, as well as the country in our neighbourhood, was under the dominion of Rome. Free German tribes existed only in Franconia, the upper Palatinate, Hesse, and Westphalia. In the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, Suabia was not yet subject to Rome; the Frisian tribes were subdued under Tiberius, but afterwards became free again. Under Nerva, there was a little war in Suabia, the

[3] Frontinus, (*Strateg*, i. 3, 10), expressly ascribes its construction to Domitian.

only trace of which exists in an inscription, in which mention is made of a *victoria Suevica*. The boundaries of the several tribes may be clearly seen from Tacitus' Germania. Nerva reigned only one year and a half, and died in his sixty-sixth year, A.D. 98.

The empire was now so firmly established, that Trajan, although he was at Cologne when Nerva died, could quietly enter upon his government there, without returning to Rome till the next year. Immediately after taking possession of the sovereign power, he showed his ability by attacking the villanous delatores, whom Nerva had spared: a few of them paid for their crimes with their lives; but the majority were banished to the barren islands of the Mediterranean. A still bolder step, was his arresting the most turbulent among the praetorians and putting the ringleaders to death. By these and similar measures, Trajan secured and strengthened his power. His reforms were mild, and affected individuals rather than the state. He must have introduced very excellent arrangements in the administration of the finances; for he was enabled to reduce the taxes, and to dispense with the increased burdens imposed upon country districts: nevertheless, after his reign, Hadrian still found it possible to reduce the public burdens enormously. But although Trajan thus diminished taxation, he still had means not only for carrying on expensive wars, but also for executing the most costly undertakings without falling into any financial embarrassment. The minute care which he bestowed upon the provinces, as well as the principles of his administration, may be seen in the tenth book of Pliny's letters. Good emperors controlled the arbitrary conduct of governors, by taking cognizance themselves of everything that happened. It was fortunate for him that his father, in the enjoyment of vigorous health, witnessed for many years the success of his son, and rejoiced in his glory. Such a beautiful family relation had never before been seen in the Roman world.

Trajan was married to Plotina, a very excellent woman, by whom, however, he had no children. The praise of this woman far outweighs the isolated stories which very much resemble mere pieces of scandal. She, and Trajan's sister, Marciana, are among the most estimable female characters in history; and the manifest improvement in the conduct of women about that time must undoubtedly be ascribed to the influence of those two

matrons. Ever since the time of Livia, the Roman empresses, with the exception of Vespasian's wife, who was a worthy woman (but as a freed woman could not appear in society), had encouraged and diffused the most unbounded licentiousness in the conduct of women; but the open shamelessness, which had till then been regarded as a necessary characteristic of females of the higher classes, now ceased.

Trajan's real inclinations were directed to war and great architectural works; and considering the circumstances of the empire, these inclinations, perhaps, ought not to be censured. By occupying the nations and armies, he gave a higher tone to his age; for if such a vast empire lives in the enjoyment of peace, it cannot but become torpid and lifeless. His wars therefore were beneficial to Rome at the time, but what could they lead to? It was necessary to go farther and farther, and this shows how unfortunate such a dominion over the world is. According to Roman feelings, Trajan had a just cause for undertaking the first war against the Dacians, for the peace which Domitian had concluded with them, and in which he had promised to pay a tribute, must have appeared to him as a disgrace to the empire; and he accordingly discontinued the payment. As Decebalus felt himself strong enough, he declared war in A.D. 101. It is probable that the plains of Moldavia and Bessarabia were inhabited by the Sarmatians, and governed by Decebalus. The war lasted for three years; when at length Trajan, by taking the capital of the enemy, compelled him to make peace. The terms of this peace are perfectly known to us from the column of Trajan. Decebalus was obliged to deliver up all Roman prisoners and deserters, and to pay a large sum of money—which cannot have been difficult for him, as Dacia is rich in silver—but still remained an independent prince in his kingdom. A few years afterwards, however, the war broke out afresh, for reasons which we may easily guess. The peace was oppressive; the heavy burdens imposed upon the Dacians were not thoroughly felt till after the conclusion of the peace, and the insolence of the Roman governors rendered the renewal of the war inevitable. The Dacians repented, and as Decebalus violated the peace and collected troops, Rome again declared war against him. Decebalus was killed, and in the second campaign Dacia was completely conquered, and changed into a Roman province; in which condition it remained until the

time of the Goths. Numbers of Roman colonies were established in the interior of the country, such as Colonia Ulpia in the capital Zarmizegethusa, but especially in Transylvania and the mountainous parts of Moldavia and Wallachia; for in the plains no traces of the Romans are found. Roman institutions struck such firm root there, that, after a period of about 150 years, when the Goths invaded Dacia, the population was completely Roman; and even to this day the Wallachians speak a language which is only a corrupt form of the Latin, and is spoken by all the Wallachians as far as Mount Pindus in Macedonia, and the countries between Epirus and Greece. This phenomenon, however, is a very puzzling one, and the Wallachians are a mysterious race. The Dacians, under the Romans, were a prosperous and truly civilised nation, which is attested, independently of many other things, by the numerous ruins and inscriptions still existing in their country.

The conquest of Dacia in A.D. 106, was followed by a few years of peace, which certainly did not make Trajan happy, and after which he gladly seized the first opportunity for fresh military enterprises and conquests. This was offered by Cosrhoes, the king of the Parthians, who had deposed Exodares, king of Armenia, which stood in an uncertain relation towards Rome and Parthia, of both of which it was a dependency, and had raised his own relative to the throne of that country. Trajan marched into Armenia, where he received the homage of Parthamasiris, who had been raised to the throne by the Parthians. With this he was satisfied, and the king, coming into Trajan's camp, received his kingdom as a fief (for thus it may be fitly called) from him. The war, however, was continued, and it is to be regretted that we have no accurate knowledge of it; for there can be no doubt that it is rich in great events. Nature placed immense difficulties in Trajan's way; and this much seems clear, that he made Armenia the basis of his operations, and advanced towards the lower Tigris. There he took not only Seleucia, but Ctesiphon, the capital of the king of kings, and advanced as far as the ocean, that is, the Persian Gulf; but here he stopped, either because he saw insurmountable difficulties in the way of carrying out his favourite scheme to subdue the whole Persian empire, or because it was with him as it has often been with other great generals, who carried on wars merely for the sake of conquest, and becoming tired, said to

themselves, "We will now make a pause, and resume our plans afterwards." It was such a thought that saved the world under Napoleon: he often felt sick of war, and wishing to spend a few months in Paris, he concluded peace, in the hope of renewing the war afterwards. He also took a pleasure in allowing his enemies to recover themselves, in order to defeat them afterwards with the greater glory. It was probably this feeling that prompted Trajan to grant peace to the Parthians, after he had raised a pretender, Parthamaspates, to the throne of Parthia. Such a cessation from war is neither the fruit of generosity, nor the result of a definite system. The Parthians, as individuals, do not deserve much esteem; for they were barbarians who had received their civilisation only through the Greek towns, and destroyed what they conquered; but afterwards, under the Sassanidae, Persia again rose to prosperity. The Parthians, at that time, had viceroys in different countries, and the king, with his court, travelled from one to the other, and was kept and fed by them; but his real capital was Ctesiphon.

After the conclusion of the peace with the Parthians, Trajan could not, for some time, make up his mind what to do. He had intended to complete the conquest of Arabia, and into that country, he now made an incursion, concerning which we have but scanty information; but from inscriptions and coins, as well as from circumstances which are not previously mentioned, we may regard it as certain, that he made Arabia Petraea, on the eastern coast of the Red Sea, down to the Bay of Acaba, nay, as far as Medina, a Roman province, and received the homage of the native tribes between the Euphrates and Syria. In concluding peace with the Parthians, he had obliged them to cede to him the supremacy of Osrhoëne, Mesopotamia, and Kurdistan. Edessa likewise was incorporated with the empire. He thus kept possession of a basis for future military operations, just as Napoleon did in similar circumstances; for he no doubt intended, if life should be spared to him, to extend the empire as far as India, or at least to leave the conquest to his successor.

The wars in the reign of Trajan extended as far as Nubia; that country, situated between Egypt and the Upper Cataract, came under the dominion of Rome, and continued to be so till the middle of the third century.[4] It is further probable

[4] See Niebuhr's *Inscriptiones Nubienses*, in his *Kleine historische u. philologische Schriften*, vol. ii. p. 186, foll.

that in his reign Fezzan, between Tripolis and the town of Bornu on the Niger, became Roman, as is attested by the inscriptions at Gharma.

Trajan could scarcely make up his mind to quit the East, and for a time he stayed in Cilicia; but while staying at Selinus, afterwards called Trajanopolis, he was taken ill, and died there in A.D. 117, at the age of sixty-one or sixty-four. His ashes were conveyed to Rome in a golden urn, and deposited under the great triumphal column. In the last months of his life, either he had actually adopted his cousin Hadrian, or Plotina merely spread a report to that effect, but, however this may be, the choice of Hadrian for his successor was certainly a most happy one, for Hadrian was a very able man; and although at a later period of his life, he committed evil deeds, they were the consequences of his bodily condition, which no one could foresee.

LECTURE CXIX.

THE architectural works of Trajan belong, not only to a topography of Rome, but to history in general; for they are equal to so many great military or other achievements. Apollodorus of Damascus was his great architect.[1] The *bas-reliefs* of Trajan represent the truly great things which he accomplished in the course of his reign: thus, for example, we see him giving a king to the Parthians, addressing his soldiers, his institution for orphans, his wars, his great edifices, and the like. In the early times of the republic, Roman art was of Etruscan excellence, and in the hands of Etruscans. Previously to the first Punic war, the art of painting also flourished at Rome: afterwards, there followed a period in which the Greeks served as models; but of this period, we cannot judge with certainty. In the time of Augustus, the style of architecture had still the character of

[1] I have had the pleasure of discovering his portrait in one of the bas-reliefs from Trajan's arch: he is a man dressed in the Greek fashion, presenting a drawing on a roll to the emperor, who is seated. It exists among the bas-reliefs of the arch of Constantine, the upper part of which has been most senselessly taken from the arch of Trajan.—N.

grandeur, but thenceforward the building material itself gradually began to be of greater consequence than style; for Augustus introduced the use of marble, and many edifices of his time were constructed of solid marble: all the columns in the temple of Mars Ultor are of marble. But Augustus also built many other great edifices of native stone; and this continued till the time of Claudius. But in the course of years, a taste for rare kinds of marble sprung up at Rome, and we hear of works made of Phrygian, Numidian, and other kinds of marble. This taste was senseless, and led people to regard the material of an architectural work as the main thing, while grandeur and beauty were neglected; but the very general use of marble did not begin till the reign of Nero, when Greek architecture became prevalent. All the existing buildings of Titus and Domitian, with the exception of the Colosseum, have something petty and trifling in their execution. Architecture, in their time, is evidently losing its character of grandeur and of art, in the true sense of the word.

In the reign of Trajan, however, art revived and rose to splendour and honour, which was owing to his Greek architect; for this emperor had taste, and having the treasures of an immense empire at his disposal, he never took into consideration whether what he built cost a few millions more or less. He made or completed several excellent roads, paved the Via Appia from Capua to Brundusium with basalt; for there is no doubt that, before his time, it had not been paved in that way.[2] He drained the Pomptine marshes as far as it was possible, built the harbour of Civita Vecchia, the ancient Centumcellae[3], and improved the ports of Ostia and Portus, at the mouth of the Tiber, as it was manifest that the river was gradually destroying them by its deposits. The baths at the springs of Civita Vecchia and the port and mole of Ancona, were likewise works of Trajan; the harbour was very extensive, and the mole was made to secure its duration, for the ancient Tyrrhenian sea-ports were destroyed, though no one knows at what time their destruction took place. Trajan also did much to secure the usefulness of the mineral springs of Italy; but his greatest buildings were at Rome, where I need only mention the *Forum Ulpium*, with the *Columna Cochlis*, which is 150 feet high. The Quirinal hill here formed a slope towards

[2] See vol. iii. p. 305, foll.

[3] Pliny, *Epist.* vi. 31.

the foot of the Capitoline; and, in order to obtain a level for the new forum, a large portion of the hill was taken down, a height of more than 140 feet, as is suggested by the inscription on the pedestal of Trajan's column, though I am not sure that I remember the exact number of feet.[4] The forum of Trajan was not, like the Forum Romanum, an open space, but like that of Augustus, a place where government offices and other public buildings were erected. These buildings, which are well known, comprised all the offices for the finances, formed, as it were, quite a new town of palaces, in the centre of which rose the column, which is surrounded by a spiral bas-relief of excellent workmanship, representing the events of Trajan's two wars against the Dacians. These bas-reliefs have suffered much from lightning, fire, and the hand of man; but they yet shew that, in the time of Trajan, the art of making reliefs was in a state of high perfection; and all the figures are exquisitely beautiful. The sculptures are important also in an antiquarian point of view, as they represent various kinds of armour, costumes, buildings, and other things which we should be altogether ignorant of, were it is not for these bas-reliefs. Inside of it there is a spiral staircase leading to the top, and under the column the ashes of the emperor were deposited in a vault. It was originally surmounted by a colossal bronze statue of Trajan, but this was taken down in barbarous times, and pope Sixtus V. erected in its place a statue of St. Peter, which still stands on the column. The railings which run round the top of it are modern, but the pillar is otherwise free from restoration. Near it were two enormous buildings, great parts of which have been laid open by the clearings which were undertaken by the French. They are constructed in the form of basilicae; we cannot, however, say whether they belonged to the Forum Ulpium or not. Their splendour is indescribable; among other things they contain ground floors of square slabs of the most beautiful Numidian marble. The Forum Ulpium was also adorned at two entrances with two triumphal arches surmounted by quadrigae, as we know only from coins. It may be that Constantine despoiled one of these arches, and used portions of it as ornaments for his own arch.

[4] 195 palms, according to Platner in Bunsen's *Beschreib. d. Stadt Rom.* iii. 1. p. 289. Ten palms are equal to 99 Parisian lines. Compare, however, Platner and Urlichs, *Beschreibung Roms.* p. 24, foll.

These and many other works shew the extremely flourishing condition of the arts at that time. They soon sank, however; for, although Hadrian erected great and costly buildings, such as the temple of Venus and Roma, he was a man without taste and followed his own caprices.[5] We have ruins of buildings erected under Antoninus Pius which are far less beautiful, and in the reign of M. Aurelius, the only branch of statuary which continued to flourish was the art of making bronze statues. The bronze statue of that emperor is excellent; the sculptures in marble on the arch of M. Aurelius, are not to be compared with those executed under Trajan. The ornaments on the triumphal arch of Severus are an example of the dreadful decay of the arts, though the statues of Severus are not quite so bad.[6] The Septizonium of that emperor was a colossal but tasteless building. There are people who charge the Christian religion with having destroyed ancient art; but the charge is utterly groundless, for ancient art had perished before Christianity was introduced.

The age of Trajan was equally great in literature. The first man we meet with is Tacitus. He stands quite alone, and belongs to no school; he is one of those mighty minds who exercise a great influence upon their age without being the creatures of it; for, though even the mightiest minds experience the influence of their age, which determines their course, and gives them opportunities for the display of their faculties, still it does not create them. It is in vain that we ask, who were his teachers? They may have been quite insignificant men, the school in which he was trained was the deep grief produced by the oppression of the times. His great soul was seized with grief in the reign of Domitian; and he recovered from it in the refreshing period of Nerva and Trajan. I, for my part, am convinced whatever people may urge against it, that the first edition of his life of Agricola was published in the latter part of Domitian's reign. I collect this from its

[5] Dion Cass. lxix. 4.

[6] Modern art fell off in a similar manner during the seventeenth century, if we compare the productions of that time with the Dutch paintings of the first half of the sixteenth century. Drawing was not neglected, for good drawings were produced even in the eighteenth century, the period of the greatest barbarism in painting. In the time of Severus, however, drawing, too, sank quite as low as sculpture, and even the proportions were forgotten.—N.

beginning, which is dreadfully corrupt.[7] He afterwards subjected the work to a revision, and added the preface. This life of Agricola shews all the greatness of the man: but he is struggling with a difficulty in expressing his sentiments; a difficulty which is perfectly natural, and is felt by all those who being full of thoughts and ideas have a dislike for diffuseness, and disdain to use words which are not necessary. It is only those who are unable to understand this feeling of writers like Sallust and Tacitus, that can have any doubt about the genuineness of their style. The origin of their peculiarities is, I repeat, an aversion to all exuberances of style. There is not a trace of affectation in these writers, for they have no other object than not to waste any words. This peculiar study of conciseness is most prominent in the earlier writings of Tacitus, the "Agricola" and "Germania;" for he did not wish to write large works, but only small essays, and yet to embody in them a complete description of his subjects, and to place the whole fulness of his thoughts before his reader. The "Historiae" is evidently the work of his life, and his most finished production; only the first five books are now extant, but they are sufficient to shew how much we have to lament the loss of the rest. In this work he passed through history in all its phases; he did not condense his accounts, but gave very minute narratives. I believe that, as is stated by St. Jerome, the "Historiae" really consisted of thirty books, which cannot be thought too much, if we consider the minuteness with which he relates the insurrection of Claudius Civilis, the life of Domitian, etc. After the completion of the "Historiae" he added the "Annales," to complete the history of the empire from its establishment and consolidation, after the close of the comedy of republican forms. He wrote the Annals in a very concise style, giving prominence to some portions only, while he passed over many points altogether. The nearer he came to the point at which the "Historiae" begins, the more minute he seems to have become; and he must have described the latter period of Nero's reign with the same vividness and minuteness which we see in the "Historiae." If we compare

[7] I have no doubt as to the correctness of my own emendation. — N. Instead of *laudati essent, capitale fuisse*, Niebuhr reads: *laudati capitales fuissent*, and in chap. i. *at mihi nuper* instead of *at mihi nunc*. See Niebuhr's *Kleine hist. u. philol. Schriften*, i. p. 331.

the works of Sallust and Tacitus with those of Livy, we perceive at once, from the wonderful symmetry of the former, how much superior these authors were to Livy, in the artistic construction of their works.[8] People speak of the heaviness and difficulties of Tacitus' style; but these difficulties are in reality not so great as those met with in reading Livy, who, wherever he argues and attempts to be brief and concise, is much more difficult than Tacitus. Livy's preface, for example, and the discussion about P. Cornelius Cossus in the fourth book, are among the most difficult passages in Latin prose, in which even men like Gronovius were unable to see their way clearly. Livy is confused in those and similar passages merely because he wanted to be brief; had he written pages on those points, he would have been clear enough; as in his parallel between Alexander the Great and the power of Rome, which is minute and written in a most admirable manner, though his opinion upon the question is worth nothing. Tacitus stands forth like Aeschylus and Sophocles, like many a lyric poet, and like Lessing in German prose. Such men have no equal; but his contemporaries were always ready to set up a number of others who, in their opinion, were men of no less extraordinary genius. This mode of looking at a great man has this comfort to his contemporaries, that in proportion as he is dragged down the others are raised; and the great genius does not, at least apparently, leave his contemporaries at too painful a distance.

It was owing to this feeling, that Pliny the younger was placed by the side of Tacitus. His letters are of great psychological interest. He was a most good-natured man, but extremely vain and conceited: before the public, he always shewed that he was perfectly conscious of being a classical writer; but in his letters to Tacitus, he displayed the greatest humility, and almost worshipped him in order to win his favour and to be praised by him, although there can be no doubt that in his private conversations with his friends, he censured Tacitus and pitied him for his defects. Such a humility is dishonest. He writes on one occasion[9] that the

[8] So long as Livy keeps to his beautiful narrative, and follows, for example, Ennius in his history of the Roman kings, he is unrivalled; but when he abandons himself to descriptions, as in the ninth book, he falls into absurdities, for he did not sift the materials out of which he had to construct his history. — N.

[9] *Epist.* vii. 20.

public mentioned himself and Tacitus always together, but that he himself did not deserve that honour. His vanity also displays itself in the detailed descriptions of his own beneficent institutions contained in such letters as were destined for the public. His letters however are, notwithstanding these things, very instructive in regard to the history of the age in which Pliny lived; and we cannot help recognising in their author a benevolent and extremely useful man, who devoted his large property to the public good, a very excellent governor of the provinces over which he was set, and a man of great talent and intellect. But the vanity with which he speaks of his own good qualities and generosity is truly childish. Pliny bears a striking resemblance to the Parisian writers of the eighteenth century, which may be traced even in particular phrases, as my late friend Spalding has correctly observed. Hence it is very easy to translate Pliny's letters into French, whereas in a German version they are quite unreadable. These letters shew that there were many persons of talent at that time, but none of them rose above a certain mediocrity; for which reason there appeared much less want of harmony in literature then than in times of great genius. When a nation has once passed through a period of great intellectual eminence, the literature of which has become the common property of subsequent ages, it feels easy and satisfied with what it possesses; but if in such circumstances a man like Tacitus springs up, and gives to his age a new life, his contemporaries feel reanimated, and men come forward and acquire a certain reputation, who would have been thought nothing of at any other time. In addition to this, the age was one of comfort and happiness after great oppression. But what such men were in the time of Tacitus may be inferred from one example, L. Annaeus Florus, who lived in the time of Trajan. The early history of Rome then lay at such a distance, that people wanted nothing more than some general notion of it. The work of Florus, which is quite in the spirit of the time and was written to supply this want, is extremely tasteless, and shews a carelessness and an ignorance of facts which are quite astonishing.

When the great light of Tacitus became extinct, complete darkness followed. Greek literature had died away a long time before the reign of Trajan; and we hear only now and

then of some few isolated authors. In the reign of Augustus, we meet with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, an excellent critic, rhetorician, and historian; and he was succeeded, under Tiberius, by Strabo, who was a highly practical man and of great historical talent; but, from his time down to the reign of Domitian, Greek literature was quite barren. Under Domitian it revived through the influence of the rhetoricians, who now assumed a different character. Dion Chrysostom of Prusa in Bithynia began his career, or was already flourishing, in the reign of Domitian: he was an author of uncommon talent, and it is much to be regretted that he belonged to the rhetoricans of that unfortunate age. It makes one sad to see him waste his brilliant oratorical powers on insignificant subjects. All his works are written in excellent and beautiful language, which is pure Attic Greek, and without affectation: it is clear, that he had made the classical language of Athens his own; and he handled it as a master. In all he wrote, he appears as man of a most amiable character, and free from the vanity of the ordinary rhetoricians, though one perceives the silent consciousness of his powers. He was an unaffected Platonic philosopher, and lived with his whole soul in Athens, which was to him a world, and which made him forget Rome, its emperor, and everything else. All this forms a very charming feature in his character. Whenever he touches upon the actual state of things in which he lived, he shews his master-mind. He was the first writer after Tiberius that greatly contributed towards the revival of Greek literature.

After him there followed Plutarch of Chaeronea, whose excellent and amiable character must be felt by every one. It does not require, indeed, much discernment to see his faults as an historian, and the weakness of his eclectic philosophy: but we are indebted to him for our knowledge of an infinite variety of things; and, however much we may see and know his faults, yet we can read his works with the highest pleasure. His language is not nearly so perfect as that of Dion Chrysostom.

The revival of Greek literature was the work of these two men; and, although they had no followers equal to themselves, still they form the beginning of a new era. The Alexandrian literature, properly so called, must be looked upon as terminated with the death of Eratosthenes, under Ptolemy Euergetes;

the period from Aristarchus to Dion is one which has no distinct character of its own. The Greek literature which prevailed at Rome in the time of Augustus was bad. Greek rhetoricians then flocked to Rome, just as in the last century French abbés flocked to Germany to teach their language; and they corrupted the Romans and spoiled their taste. Livy stands forth as one great man during that period. This state of things, namely a prevalence of Greek, though there was no longer any literature in it, remained to the detriment of Rome till the time of Seneca, sophistry alone keeping pace with the fashionable language. After Seneca, there were two schools in Roman literature, which existed contemporaneously —the school of Seneca and that of the Greek rhetoricians— until the appearance of Quinctilian, the restorer of a good and pure taste in Roman literature. From his age till the time of Tacitus, there was a new classical aera, which, however, did not last. Greek literature again revived, and made the same fascinating impression upon the Romans as it had on its first introduction at Rome. In the time of Hadrian it was so generally cultivated, that all persons of education wrote Greek. Under the Antonines every thing became Hellenised; taste underwent a change; and an archæological pleasure in what was antiquated and in imitating the Greeks, became quite prevalent.

LECTURE CXX.

HADRIAN was married to a daughter of Marciana, the sister of Trajan; and this was the cause of his elevation. Even if Plotina prepared for Trajan the form of Hadrian's adoption, she did no evil, for it had undoubtedly been Trajan's intention to make him his successor. The Romans of a later generation said that it was doubtful whether Hadrian should be reckoned among the good or the bad princes; and strong arguments may be urged on either side, for he committed acts of cruelty, which are a sad stain on his memory: but he also did much good, and if we excuse his cruelties by tracing them to the state of his mind during his last illness, it must be owned that his government

was more beneficial to the Roman world than that of any other ruler; and I therefore reckon him among the good sovereigns. No Roman emperor before him had looked upon himself as the real master of the world, but merely as the sovereign of Rome, or at most, of Italy. Trajan's cares too had been mainly devoted to Italy, and what was done in the provinces was, for the most part, of a military nature. Hadrian was the first who understood his real position.

His reign passed almost without any wars; and, if we except the insurrection of the Jews, we hear only of trifling military operations, that, for example, against the revolted Mauretanians, whom he reduced very speedily. He was the first emperor who adopted the system of giving subsidies to the nations on the frontiers, in order to induce them to remain quiet. Of Trajan's conquests he maintained Dacia only; his claims to Armenia were left undecided, and the possessions beyond the Tigris were given up. The insurrection of the Jews in Cyprus and Cyrene, where they were very numerous, was accompanied with very great violence. They had attempted it before, but the war was now carried on by Barcochba with furious rage and fanaticism, prompted by the consciousness that he would be subdued. The consequence was the total extermination of the unfortunate Jews in Palestine, with the exception of the Samaritans. The city of Jerusalem was restored as a military colony under the name of Aelia Capitolina[1], which name continued to be used even in the Christian centuries, and the Arabic writers still call it Ilia, or the Holy City, and not Jerusalem. No Jew was allowed to live in it, or even to approach it so near as to be able to see the summit of Mount Moriah. This war was the only shock which the Roman empire experienced in the reign of Hadrian; but it was, after all, of no great importance.

His reign, which lasted nearly twenty-two years, was thus free from any remarkable calamity; and, as it passed away in almost uninterrupted peace, it may be regarded as one of the happiest periods of the empire. His first noble act after his accession was the remission, to the amount of 900 millions sesterces of the arrears of taxes, which the subjects of Rome owed to the state.[2] But whether these arrears were remitted in

[1] Spartian. *Hadrian*, 13; Dion Cass. lxix. 2, foll.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 6.
[2] Dion Cass. lxix 8; Spartian. *Hadrian*, 7; Orelli, *Inscript. Lat.* n. 805.

favour of the subjects themselves or of the publicani, I cannot say.[3] Hadrian conferred great blessings on every part of the empire, and travelled through all the provinces, from the cataracts of the Nile to the frontiers of Scotland. There was probably not one province of his empire which he did not visit. In Britain, he erected the great bulwark against the Caledonians, from the Solway to the river Tyne: and the province of Britain now began to become Romanised, though the Gaelic and Cymric elements still continued to maintain themselves by the side of the Romans.

But it was more especially upon Athens and Greece in general that Hadrian bestowed his favours and benevolence; for he had an enthusiastic partiality for everything Greek. The number and the splendour of the buildings which he erected at Athens, reminded the people of the days of Pericles. He completed the Olympieum; built theatres and temples: and, in short, quite a new town, the town of Hadrian, rose by the side of Athens. He further shewed his tender attachment to that city by assuming the dignity of archon eponymus.

In this manner, the greater part of his reign passed away in a series of benevolent acts. During the latter years of his life, however, his health began to decline; and he sank into a state of melancholy, in which he endeavoured to obtain aid and support, by choosing a successor on the one hand, while on the other he allowed himself to be hurried, by fits of anger and mistrust, into acts of cruelty which disgrace his memory. If we consider what the Roman senators were at that time, and what claims and pretensions they made, we can hardly wonder that any prince, and even a very good and able one, should feel a strong hatred towards them. They were immensely rich, arrogant, and disagreeable; and their dignity had already become hereditary in their families. A young man, L. Aelius Verus, was now adopted by Hadrian, and destined to be his successor. Enormous sums were given on that occasion to the soldiers as a *congiarium*. Hadrian was unaccountably deceived in regard to the character of Verus, who, however, died before the emperor. Hadrian then adopted in his stead T. Antoninus Pius,

[3] The history of the financial affairs of Rome under the empire is not yet written: but it is a fine subject; and a person who would undertake to write upon it might arrive at very satisfactory results. What Savigny has written on the land-tax (in his Essay "Ueber die Römische Steuerverfassung" printed in the *Abhandl. der Berlin. Akademie* of the years 1822 and 23) is most excellent.—N.

a thoroughly spotless man, a grandson of Arrius Antoninus, the friend of the emperor Nerva.

It is one of the remarkable phenomena of the reign of Hadrian, that in it Roman jurisprudence received its first development as a science, and assumed the form in which we afterwards find it. A collection of laws was made under the title of "Edictum Perpetuum," by which the Roman legislation became confined to the edicts of the emperor; and the *responsa*, which had formerly been considered only as the opinions of the *sapientes*, now became real authorities in matters of law, when they were given in the name of the emperor. This "Edictum Perpetuum" forms an aera in the history of Roman jurisprudence. Some emperors before Hadrian, and even Augustus himself, had had a sort of state council; but it had always borne the character of something arbitrary, until Hadrian gave to the *consistorium principis* a stability and a regular organisation, of which it had formerly been destitute.[4] The praefectus praetorio, who hitherto had always been a military person, was now obliged to be a jurist, and was the princeps of this state council. This regulation, which, singularly enough, is completely oriental, was unquestionably made as early as the time of Hadrian. Henceforth, men like Ulpian, Papinian, and Paullus, may be looked upon as real ministers of justice.

The downward tendency of literature assumed under Hadrian a still more decided character than it had before exhibited. If we examine the inscriptions which were made in his time; for instance those on the tombs along the Appian road, we find in some extremely barbarous Latin; the grammatical forms are neglected, and the use of the cases is in utter confusion. I have seen one which is written in a true *lingua rustica*.[5] Such inscriptions occur, indeed, only here and there; and the books written during this period were composed in a correct language; but they shew, nevertheless the condition into which Rome had sunk by the decrease of its free population, the place of which was occupied by myriads of slaves and freedmen who spoke a *lingua vulgaris* or *rustica*, just as is the case with the language

[4] Spartian. *Hadrian*, 18; Dion Cass. lxix. 7.

[5] The phenomenon is analogous to that which we see, for example, in letters written by our common people, who are not only ignorant of orthography, but use vulgar and provincial expressions. In like manner, there are inscriptions in Egypt which are called Greek, but are entirely barbarous.—N.

of the black slaves in the West Indies and America. Under such circumstances, the great body of the population forms a jargon for itself, and throws off the shackles of grammatical laws.[6] In the desolate or secluded parts of Italy[7], where such people lived as colonists, that Latin jargon became first established, and the people gradually adopted the *lingua vulgaris*. Persons of rank continued to speak pure Latin; but they learned it as the English learn English in their colonies, after they have spoken the Creole dialect in their childhood. If men like Tacitus and Pliny learned the vulgar idiom in their childhood, they undoubtedly spoke only pure Latin among themselves; but correct Latin must with many persons have been something acquired, as the High-German is acquired in our days by every German of education.[8] The use of the vulgar language must have spread very quickly and widely. A language which is decaying or growing poor, must enrich itself from ancient books; hence the old Roman writers were now read chiefly on account of their language, and the more ancient they were, the greater was the value set upon them. This accounts for the fact of Ennius, Plautus, and Naevius being studied so much in those times: their works were more *piquant* also than those of the classical writers Horace, Virgil, and Seneca had probably despised those old authors; but now they rose again in favour. At this time Cicero was neglected, the preference being given to Cato and Gracchus. It was a strange change; but it can be easily accounted for.[9] Hadrian himself was a lover of antiquity, and his example contributed to this

[6] The Wends in the neighbourhood of Lüneburg, who were compelled to speak German, formed a jargon of German.—N.

[7] We can scarcely form a conception of the desolate condition of the more remote parts of Italy, even as early as the reign of Augustus —N.

[8] The German language has become much impoverished since the time of the Thirty-years' war, and any one who writes in high German, finds that words are wanting for things for which the common language of the people has good expressions, which however are not used in writing. This is felt more especially by persons born and brought up in Lower Saxony, for the people of Upper Germany speak nearly as they write.—N.

[9] We have seen a similar change of taste in our own country; for there was a time, at a very recent period of our literary history, when the early writers were regarded as the only models of perfection; when Walter von der Vogelweide, for example, was set up as the greatest poet, and the prose-writers of the sixteenth century, such as the historian Zacharias Theobald, as perfect models of good prose. I love those men as much as any one, but I am far from considering them as the models whom we should strive to imitate.— N.

restoration of the antique; but his extraordinary partiality for the Greeks contributed still more towards raising everything Greek in public estimation.

The Greek language had no doubt been kept more alive in Greece than the Latin in Italy, and the people of Athens probably still continued to speak pure Greek. Greece, however, was then poor in literary productions, and Hadrian's partiality for Greek writers, and the pensions he gave them unfortunately called forth too many: poets, especially, were thus brought into existence; the lyric Mesomedes, e.g., enjoyed a pension.

The pleasure which people at that time took in Roman archaeology and the ancient language, produced writers like A. Gellius, who is a curious example of them. His work must have been written in the reign of M. Aurelius. There is something pleasing about him, and a great deal may be learned from his work. I like him very much, but it is surprising to see how ignorant he is even of the actual state of things in which he lived; and this naturally excites our mistrust in regard to his knowledge of the earlier times, and with justice. He knows nothing of the Roman institutions; what he writes about them is most ridiculous, and shews his complete ignorance of the affairs of common life. He is one of those men who, as Goethe says in his Faust, "see the world scarce on a holiday." He does not possess the least knowledge of antiquity; and has no idea of law, nor of ordinary life. Respecting the colonies, for example, of which there existed hundreds in his time, he is perfectly ignorant, and gives the most ludicrous definition of them.[10] He is a writer of the same kind as Cornelius Fronto, the instructor of the emperor M. Aurelius, who made his illustrious pupil read merely for the sake of words, and trained him in the art of hunting after rare words, with which he was to produce effect. Earlier rhetoricians had endeavoured to attain the same end by subtle combinations and over-refinement of thought; but now effect was to be produced by rare and antique expressions, and the thoughts, though they were still trivial, were expressed in more simple and chaste forms than in the time of Seneca. Fronto's dislike to Seneca probably arose from a feeling that he was incapable of such refinement. So far those rhetoricians were rational enough. At a somewhat later period, there arose a peculiar

[10] See xvi. 11.

school called the African, which continued down to the time of Arnobius, about the middle of the 3rd century. The writers of this school combined refinement of thought with that of language, and thus separated themselves from the Roman school. They are spoken of as if they had written in a peculiar dialect, and it might therefore seem strange that the language of Apuleius and Tertullian, who were both Africans, and belonged to this school, has never been censured for any dialectic peculiarities. But the notion that their language has anything provincial in it is quite erroneous. Its only peculiarity is, that it abounds in words and expressions taken from the ancient Latin writers, which they collected and employed. This system was at the same period adopted to a certain extent in Greek literature also.[11] Apuleius and Tertullian, however, were both men of great talent; and Apuleius must, without any hesitation, be ranked among the first geniuses of his time. He has a remarkable liveliness and universality. His "Apologia," in which ancient words are not so much accumulated as in his "Metamorphoses" and "Florida," shews what an elegant writer he was, when he did not attempt to be too artificial. The works both of Apuleius and Tertullian are real store-houses of ancient Latin, though the hunting after ancient words was, with men like these, in reality no more than a fanciful whim. Some such archaeological curiosities and words which were then going out of use, occur even in the works of Sallust and Tacitus; but neither of them went anything like so far as the writers of Hadrian's time. It is not easy to ascertain what gave rise to the African school, and its peculiarity. But Carthage was then, next to Rome, the greatest city in the empire in which Latin was spoken; and this circumstance may give us some clue to understand this African school, for Carthage seems to have tried to rival Rome even in literature. The Latin taught and spoken at Carthage seems to have formed a contrast to the works produced at Rome, somewhat similar to that which exists between the style of the French writers of Geneva and that of Parisian authors. The whole country around Carthage spoke Punic, and at Madaura and Hippo all the people continued to do so down

[11] Hadrian himself shewed a delight in certain antique words. The "Lexiphanes" of Lucian is just such a hunter after ancient words, which he introduced into his language *à tort et à travers*.—N.

to a very much later period; which circumstance accounts for the facility with which Arabic was introduced into that country.[12]

Greek literature, in the meantime, continued to rise; and Hadrian's partiality for it elevated the eastern world in an extraordinary manner, but it also created pride, vanity and conceit. The Greek language spread farther and farther to the most distant regions, and the whole of the East looked upon itself as a Greek world. The genius of Lucian arose at this time. He was formerly very much overrated, but must not on that account be entirely thrown aside. He writes beautiful Attic Greek, though he had no doubt spoken the Syriac language until the age of manhood, and this is a point which deserves our admiration. The characteristic of the eastern world at that time is lightness and cheerfulness, while that of the west is heaviness and dulness. This peculiarity now led the eastern world no longer to look upon itself as subdued by the western nations; in addition to this, the Roman franchise had been given to millions of men, and was still spreading under every new emperor. This was a brilliant period of Greek literature, for besides Lucian there lived Galen, Pausanias, who has not indeed much talent, but is extremely important and useful to us, and Aelius Aristides, whose declamations must be disagreeable to every unprejudiced reader. The whole school of the Greek rhetoricians of that period who looked upon themselves as forming a second golden age of oratory, spoke and wrote after the models of the ancients, but, unfortunately, there is no substance in what they spoke and wrote. It was, generally speaking, with the literature of that time, as it was for a long period with our own, of which Goethe says, that down to the eighteenth century it had no substance. The same was the case with the Latin authors. Apuleius is ingenious where he has a good subject, as in The "Apologia," and in that mad book the "Metamorphoses;" for a real subject at once enables the author to give life and spirit to his work. Tertullian too produced some spirited and

[12] It is not improbable, that a thorough investigation of the very peculiar idiom of Tunis, which does not appear to be real Arabic, might throw some light upon the ancient Punic. It no doubt contains much Punic, and also many traces of Latin; the genitive case, for example, is indicated in that language by *de*, which is evidently derived from the Latin.—N. Compare *Lect* LIII. note 9.

substantial works: when, *e. g.*, he writes against the theatres, and has to treat of a reality, he shews that he is a great author and is very instructive; while Aristides, in his declamation on the battle of Leuctra, is trying to entertain his readers with idle and silly trash. Tertullian is one of those writers whom I can recommend to every one, not merely to theologians on account of his importance in ecclesiastical history, but to scholars also, who should devote more attention to the ecclesiastical fathers, in general, than they do, and thus follow the example of Scaliger, Hemsterhuys, Valckenaer, and others. We cannot acquire a thorough knowledge of the history of those times, without studying such writers as Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Athenagoras.

LECTURE CXXI.

HADRIAN'S name is immortalised chiefly by his architectural works. Among the great buildings of ancient Rome, none was more stupendous than his Mausoleum, the *moles Hadriani*.[1] We know from Procopius[2], that the emperor's statue which adorned it, was thrown down during the siege of Rome by the Goths. This Mausoleum, with all its inscriptions, continued to exist during the middle ages; but afterwards it was destroyed intentionally, until the destroyers grew weary of their work; but it is still the greatest building extant, and its gigantic masses shew its original beauty. At a distance of two miles from Tibur, stand even now the enormous ruins of Hadrian's villa, where statues of the most exquisite beauty have been brought to light. The strange outlines of this building still shew its peculiar beauty, which is now in some manner increased by the luxuriant vegetation that has overgrown the ruins. Certain plants which were kept in the gardens of the villa, and which do not occur in any other part of Italy, have become indigenous on that spot from the time of Hadrian.

With regard to Hadrian as an author, we have only a few verses of his, which have been preserved by Spartianus in his life of the

[1] Spartian. *Hadrian*, 9; Dion Cass. lxix. 23. [2] *Bell. Goth.* i. 22.

emperor[3], a doubtful epigram (I, myself, consider it genuine) upon his favourite horse Borysthenes[4], and a few other trifles. There are also some verses of his in the Greek Anthology; but all of them are somewhat strange and far-fetched, like everything he did. He was, however, the author of numerous poems.

Hadrian was succeeded in A.D. 138, by T. Antoninus Pius, whom he would not have adopted, if M. Aurelius Antoninus had been at a more advanced age; for Hadrian was very much attached to this boy, even when he was no more than six years old, a fact which speaks greatly in favour of Hadrian. The real name of M. Aurelius was M. Annius Verus; and Hadrian used to call him Verissimus, on account of his extraordinary veracity and great kindness. Had he been older, Hadrian would unquestionably have chosen him for his successor; but as it was, he adopted T. Antoninus Pius, the husband of a sister of M. Aurelius' father. I have already remarked that, before this time, Hadrian had adopted Aelius Verus, an unworthy man. It is strange that Hadrian could at the same time love a person like this Aelius Verus, and M. Aurelius, who was the very embodiment of human virtue; but we must believe that Hadrian's bad and sinful habits left him in the moments when he looked upon that innocent child. T. Antoninus Pius was married to Faustina, the sister of Annius Verus, the elder. The Roman names about this time are so confused, that it requires the greatest caution to avoid being misled. The family of T. Antoninus Pius originally belonged to Nemausus in the province of Gaul, whereas his two predecessors had been of Spanish extraction. It was by a mere fiction that Italy was still considered as the centre of the empire. The history of the reign of Antoninus Pius, which lasted more than twenty-two years, is extremely obscure[5]; we know infinitely less about this period than about the earliest times of the Roman republic; and I have, for instance, a much more accurate knowledge of the conquest of Rome by the Gauls, than of the history of this emperor. The personal character of Antoninus Pius was very good; he obtained the surname of Pius

[3] Spartian. *Hadrian*, 25.

[4] Meyer, *Antholog. Vet. Lat. Epigr. et Poem.* No. 211. vol i. p. 71.

[5] The seventieth book of Dion Cassius is lost, and was lost even at the time when Xiphilinus and Zonaras made their abridgments; and we are therefore almost confined to the miserable life in the "Historia Augusta."—N.

from the circumstance that, after the death of Hadrian, when the senate was in a state of vehement irritation against him, T. Antoninus nevertheless carried a decree which conferred divine honours upon the memory of Hadrian.[6]

His reign was not so undisturbed as that of Hadrian; for he had to wage some wars on the frontiers, and to contend with various insurrections, as, for instance, of the Britons, of the Mauretanians of mount Atlas, who still preserved their savage nature, and of the Jews[7], as well as against the hostility of the Parthians. These insurrections, shew that the provinces were oppressed by the governors; but such disturbances were after all of little importance, and the peace of Italy was not affected by them. This reign, however, was unfortunate on account of the fearful earthquakes which occurred in it, and destroyed Rhodes, Smyrna[8], and many other Ionian towns of Asia Minor, of which Aristides speaks. As we have so few documents concerning this period, we can in many instances form conjectures only. It may, however, be truly said, that Antoninus Pius was a benevolent man, and of an unblemished character; but that he was nevertheless only an ordinary man, and anything but a great prince. We have good grounds also for believing that the decay of the empire, which became visible in the reign of his successor, was prepared by him.

The golden age of jurisprudence had commenced under Hadrian, and advanced under Antoninus Pius, in the latter part of whose reign, the work of Gaius was undoubtedly written. Greek literature was then very rich; for Appian, the beginning of the works of Galen, Sextus Empiricus, and Sextus of Chaeronea, belong to that period. Manufactures had been in an extremely flourishing condition in Egypt, and especially at Alexandria, as early as the time of Hadrian; and they now continued to go on improving, especially linen, cotton, and glass manufactures. Mathematical studies, astronomy, and mathematical geography, were likewise thriving in Egypt.

Antoninus Pius was succeeded by M. Aurelius Antoninus. The wretched "Historia Augusta" has two contradictory accounts respecting the adoption of M. Aurelius. According to

[6] Spartian. *Hadrian*, 27; Aurel. Vict. *De Caesar.* 14; Dion Cass. lx. 1.

[7] Jul. Capitolin. *Antonin. Pius*, 5; Pausanias, viii. 43. 3.

[8] One of the orations of Aelius Aristides referred to these calamities.—N. See Philostratus, *Vit. Sophist.* ii. 9. 2.

the more generally received account, Antoninus adopted him and L. Aelius Verus Commodus, the son of Aelius Verus, at the same time; whereas, according to another statement, M. Aurelius was obliged to adopt Commodus.[9] The fact that Aurelius and Commodus are called *Divi fratres*, is, however, a strong argument in support of the former account. But it is strange to find that L. Aelius Verus, in a letter addressed to M. Aurelius[10], while speaking of Antoninus Pius, uses the words *avus meus*, and *pater tuus*. It may be that this curious adoption was made in such a manner that the adoptive father, Antoninus Pius, afterwards gave L. Aelius Verus as adoptive son to M. Aurelius, for such things often occurred.[11]

It is more delightful to speak of M. Aurelius than of any man in history; for, if there is any sublime human virtue, it is his. He was certainly the noblest character of his time; and I know no other man who combined such unaffected kindness, mildness, and humility, with such conscientiousness and severity towards himself. We can trace his history from his childhood, even in the biographies of the "Historia Augusta," and we possess innumerable busts of him, in which he is represented at the different periods of his life, from a boy ten years old down to his death. Any one who lives in Italy, may easily collect a complete series of such busts made in successive years; for every Roman of his time was anxious to possess his portrait. If there is anywhere an expression of virtue, it is in the heavenly features of M. Aurelius. Formerly, he was known only in his mature age from his own meditations, a golden book, though there are things in it which cannot be read without deep grief, for there we find this purest of men without happiness and joy. No one who reads his work, especially the first book, in which he goes through all the circumstances of his life, and thanks every one to whom he owes any obligation, can help loving him; the cases where he returns more than he owes, only shew his extremely amiable nature. But we now know him from his correspondence also with Cornelius Fronto, in the happy time

[9] Jul. Capitolin. *M. Anton. Phil.* 5; Spartian. *Aelius Verus*, 4. Compare Dion. Cass. lxix. 21, lxxi. 35.

[10] Vulcat. Gallic. *Avidius Cassius*, 1.

[11] The names of persons were changed at that time in the most arbitrary manner, and on the most trivial occasions. The elder Verus was properly called Commodus, and Antoninus was called Verus; but they exchanged their names, and the first-born son of Verus received the name of Commodus.—N.

of youth bordering upon manhood, in the full bloom of life, when he was very happy. Afterwards we find him depressed, and overwhelmed by the burdens of his office; but he never neglected any of his duties. We also know him as a noble husband, and father, and as an enthusiastic disciple of his teacher, who was infinitely his inferior. When M. Aurelius began to perceive this, he yet returned to him, in order not to neglect him or hurt his feelings; he caressed him, in fact, and asked his advice, although he did not need it.

His education was very remarkable for the care with which it was conducted, and the extent and high degree to which it was carried. He seized upon every branch of knowledge that was offered to him with the greatest eagerness. Cornelius Fronto, who enjoyed the greatest reputation among the Roman rhetoricians of the time, was his teacher in rhetoric. He instructed M. Aurelius in his own way, and as if he wanted to make a rhetorician of him. The Greek, Herodes Atticus, who was likewise one of his teachers, was more a man of the world than the old pedantic Fronto. M. Aurelius read immensely in the classical literature of both Greece and Rome, and was insatiable in acquiring knowledge. His studies up to his twentieth year were directed principally to grammar, rhetoric, and classical literature, which he made thoroughly his own. He acquired the Latin language and his style in the way in which most men at that time acquired them: he lived more with Plautus, Ennius, and Naevius, than with Virgil and Horace. In his twenty-second year, he became acquainted with Junius Rusticus, a Stoic philosopher, whom he looked upon as his guardian angel, but concerning whom we know nothing beyond what M. Aurelius himself says of him in his first book. Zeno himself may have been vastly inferior to Plato and Aristotle—an opinion in which I readily join—but the Stoic philosophy was at that time the only one of any importance. The Platonic philosophy was in a deplorable condition, and had sunk to a mere *θαυματουργία* and *θεουργία*; and although some men of that school had great talents, yet there were but few traces of good sense among them; all the Platonic philosophers of this time were nearly at the point where we afterwards find the New-Platonists. The Aristotelian philosophy was quite extinct. The Stoic philosophy was always able to bring about its own regeneration in a moral point of view. The truly great Epictetus had appeared among the Stoics as early as the reign of Domitian. Epictetus' greatness cannot be disputed; and it is impossible for any person of sound mind not to be charmed by his works, which were edited by Arrian. The latter, too, is an important man, both in history and philosophy, and one who recalled the good times of ancient Greece. But the new life which Epictetus infused into the Stoic philosophy, did not last long; for those who until then had been attached to the doctrines of the Stoics, now turned to New-Platonism, and the hearts which, while paganism was yet prevailing, were panting for a purer atmosphere, found peace afterwards in their faith in the Christian revelation.

The Stoic philosophy opened to M. Aurelius a completely new world. The letters of Fronto, which are otherwise childish and trifling, throw an interesting light upon young M. Aurelius' state of mind, at the time when he cast rhetoric aside and sought happiness in philosophy: not, indeed, in its dialectic subtleties, but in its faith in virtue and eternity. He bore the burdens of his exalted position in the manner in which, according to the precepts of pious men, we ought to take up our cross and bear it patiently. Actuated by this sentiment, M. Aurelius exerted all his powers for the good of the empire, and discharged all his duties, ever active, no less in the military than in the civil administration of the empire. He complains of want of time to occupy himself with intellectual pursuits; but then he consoles himself again with the thought, that he is doing his duty and fulfilling his mission. There certainly never was a prince so deeply and universally beloved by his people, that is, by half the world, as M. Aurelius. Syria and Egypt alone formed an exception; but those countries had never seen him. In Italy, and all the western parts of the empire, he was adored like a heaven-born ruler. At that time, men of the same age who were mutual friends, called each other *frater*, and younger persons used the term *pater* to their elders. The distance which usually exists between a sovereign and his subjects did not prevent Aurelius being addressed by the Romans who knew him as father or brother. During his whole reign, the senate felt itself restored to its former republican dignity as sovereign; for the emperor looked upon himself only as the servant of the republic, and upon the dignity of a senator as equal to his own.

This man, with all his excellencies and virtues, was not only

not happy, owing to the burdens that lay upon him, but an evil fate seemed to hover over him in all his relations. Symptoms of the misfortunes of the times already began to be visible. The long period of peace had destroyed the military discipline and the vigorous energy of the armies, and the whole of the Roman world had sunk into a state of languor. Sensuality, love of pleasure and idleness, were rapidly gaining the upper hand. The German nations were compelled by Slavonic tribes either to seek the protection of Rome, in case of her armies on the frontiers being strong enough, or to take refuge in her dominions. Such was the case with the Marcomanni, Quadi, Victovali, and various other tribes, which now crossed the Danube. In another part of the empire, the Parthians invaded Armenia, which was properly in a feudal relation both to Romans and to Parthians, took possession of the country, and thence made their attacks upon the Roman dominions. The legate Severianus, who was sent against the Parthians at the commencement of the reign of M. Aurelius, was cut off with one or two legions. At the outbreak of this war, M. Aurelius sent his adoptive brother, L. Verus, to the East, perhaps merely from the desire to afford him an opportunity of rendering a service to the state. But Verus remained at Antioch, and crossed the Euphrates only once. The Parthian war was, however, brought to a close, after four campaigns, by Statius Priscus, Avidius Cassius, and Martius Verus. The last three campaigns were very successful; and Cassius who penetrated deep into Asia, took Seleucia. A peace was then granted to the Parthians, the terms of which, however, we do not know.

Another source of M. Aurelius' unhappiness was his adoptive brother, L. Verus, who was as different from him as possible. He lived in luxury and dissoluteness, while Marcus observed towards himself an almost monastic severity. Verus was a true *pendant* to Caligula and Nero, with this difference, that he had no opportunity of shewing his cruel nature, for Marcus kept him in check as well as he could.

M. Aurelius was also unhappy with his wife Annia Faustina, the daughter of Antoninus Pius. He was more unhappy with her than he himself could know or see; but he loved her tenderly as the mother of his children. She was in no way worthy of such a husband; and the conduct of the best of men,

produced no effect upon her mind. He was, perhaps, fortunate enough to be under a delusion respecting her throughout his life; and he may have seen her in the light in which he wished to see her. It is, however, not impossible that her conduct may be described in our authorities in blacker colours than it really deserved, though her bad disposition cannot be denied.

At the time when Verus returned from Asia, after the conquest of Seleucia, Europe was visited by a pestilence, a calamity from which it had been free for centuries; for the last plague that had occurred, was that of the year U. C. 461; all that is mentioned in the interval refers to common epidemics.[12] But in A. D., 167. the real oriental plague was carried into Europe by the army returning from the Parthian war, and spread all over the western world, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, Gaul, etc.: Africa alone was perhaps not reached by it. This pestilence must have raged with incredible fury; and it carried off innumerable victims.[13] As the reign of M. Aurelius forms a turning point in so many things, and above all in literature and art, I have no doubt that this crisis was brought about by that plague. The plague at Athens in the beginning of the Peloponnesian war forms a similar turning point in the history of Attica, and a pestilence, in general, always draws a strong line of demarcation between the periods on the boundaries of which it occurs. The black death, for example, which raged in Germany in the year 1348, put a complete stop to our early literature, and the literature of Florence was manifestly affected in the same way. After the black death, the arts were for years at a perfect stand still. The ancient world never recovered from the blow inflicted upon it by the plague which visited it in the reign of M. Aurelius,

---

LECTURE CXXII.

THE happiness of the reign of M. Aurelius was thus disturbed by the plague, which was carried into Europe from the East,

[12] See vol. iii. p. 407, foll.

[13] Eutropius, viii. 12; Jul. Capitolin. *Verus*, 8; *M. Antonin.* 13.

and no less by the wars with the Germans. Ever since Augustus, the German tribes had attacked the Romans only on the frontiers. In the time of Tacitus, we see a peaceful relation established between the two nations, and some of the German tribes, such as the Hermunduri, even carried on an active commerce with the Romans. The *limes* (a wall with a ditch), ran from the river Main, commencing at the point where the Spessart mountain approaches nearest to the river, to where the Altmühl empties itself into the Danube, not far from Ratisbon. Franconia, Suabia and the Palatinate, east of the Rhine, were tributary to the Romans, who had good roads between Frankfort and Ratisbon. The ancient inhabitants of those southern parts were either all Gauls or at least overwhelmed by Gallic settlements; but the country was very thinly peopled, and only the Sigambri and Bructeri had taken part in the attempt of the nations west of the Rhine to shake off the Roman yoke, in the reign of Vespasian. The same may have been the case under Hadrian, who maintained peace by giving presents to the nations on the frontiers. In the reign of Antoninus Pius, we hear of a defensive war against the Chatti[1], which is the first symptom of a movement among the Germans; and this movement was evidently caused by the advance of the Slavonic nations from the East. In the reign of M. Aurelius, there was a general commotion among the Germans who were fleeing before their enemies, and threw themselves upon the Romans. The Marcomanni then stood forth most prominently among the Germans.[2] In the German, or, as it is usually called, the Marcomannian war, which now broke out, the Marcomanni, Quadi, Chatti and a number of other German tribes, and at the same time the Sarmatian tribes, which were otherwise hostile to the former, made their first and joint attacks upon the Roman frontier from Dacia to Gaul; they advanced into Rætia, and penetrated even as far as Aquileia.[3] The history of this war would be of great interest to us; but the extant accounts of it do not enable us to form a clear notion of it. Xiphilinus' abridgment of Dion

[1] J. Capitolin. *Anton. Pius*, 5, *M. Antonin Philos.* 8; Pausanias, viii. 43. 3.

[2] The name of the Marcomanni disappears in history soon after this war; they were either overwhelmed by Slavonic tribes, or their nation was broken up, and entered into different relations.—N.

[3] Lucian, *Alexand*, 48; J. Capitolin. *M. Antonin. Philos.* 14.

Cassius is in this part scarcely worth anything; and there are some important facts connected with this war, for a knowledge of which we are indebted to medals alone, which henceforth form a very good guide. This much, however, is clear, that the Marcomannian war was divided into two distinct periods, and that it was interrupted by a peace or a truce[4], in which the places taken by both parties were given up; the war broke out again with fresh fury in the last years of the reign of M. Aurelius. Many particulars of the war are represented in the excellent bas-reliefs on the Antonine column at Rome, though they are much damaged. There we see, for example, barbarian princes submitting to the emperor, or suing for mercy. We cannot believe that these are inventions of flattery; for Aurelius would not have tolerated flattery, and there can be no doubt that, during the last years of the war, the Romans were victorious, though not without the most extraordinary exertions, and that if M. Aurelius had lived longer, he would have made Marcomannia and Sarmatia Roman provinces.[5] But the war was interrupted by the insurrection of Avidius Cassius in Syria.

The history of this period is so extremely obscure, that we can say nothing with certainty of the descent of Avidius Cassius. According to some, he was a native of the island of Cyprus[6] or of Syria. According to others, he belonged to the Roman gens Cassia[7] either in the male line or by a woman of that gens who had married into his father's family. This is not impossible, even if he was of eastern origin. The former statement has something improbable about it; for it is not likely that natives of Greek provinces should have been raised to the highest offices in the Roman armies, as early as that time. In the countries where Latin was spoken, it made no difference where a man was born, whether he was a Spaniard, an African, or a Roman; but the case of orientals who spoke Greek was different. Avidius Cassius was a remarkable man, and was distinguished as a military commander. The Roman armies were at that time recruited from the military colonies and the

[4] J. Capitolin. *M. Antonin. Phil.* 12, 17; Eutropius, viii. 6. Compare Dion Cass. lxxi. 13, foll.

[5] J. Capitolin. *M. Antonin. Phil.* 24; Dion Cass. lxxi. 20.

[6] J. Capitolin. *M Antonin. Phil.* 25; Dion Cass. lxxi. 22.

[7] Vulcat. Gallicanus, *Avid. Cassius*, 1.

frontier countries; and their discipline had latterly fallen very much into decay. The soldiers had been greatly neglected during the long peace under Hadrian and the unwarlike reign of Antoninus Pius; for the legions usually remained where they were once stationed, which was a most imprudent system. It can hardly be conceived how Hadrian could tolerate such a thing. They thus became a sort of settled Janissaries on the frontiers; and instead of being kept in their camps, they generally took up their quarters in the towns of the provincials. In Syria, which is one of the most beautiful and magnificent countries in the world, with an admirable climate, and a fertile soil, the discipline of the Roman legions had been in a state of perfect dissolution, and the Parthians had been very successful in their attacks. They had, it is true, also suffered reverses; but their cavalry was excellent. Avidius Cassius, who had been entrusted with the command of those legions, had restored their discipline, and conquered the Parthians with them. The ancient system of changing the governors of provinces had likewise been neglected; and after the time of Hadrian, the *legati pro praetore* often remained at their posts all their lives, while the governors of the senatorial provinces were changed every year. Avidius Cassius had thus been in Syria for a long time; and throughout his province, as far as Egypt, he was extremely popular, and perhaps even more so with the natives than with the army. But, in his army too, the ablest men were attached to him, because he was a good general and maintained a *Cassiana severitas:* hence a part of his soldiers joined the provincials in proclaiming him emperor. It must be remembered in his excuse that there was at the time a report current in Syria, that M. Aurelius had died.[8] Had Avidius Cassius succeeded in obtaining the government of the empire, Rome would not have had to suffer under the disgraceful sway of Commodus, and much bloodshed would have been spared. The opinion that Avidius Cassius intended to restore the republic[9] is an absurdity, for such a notion could not have entered the head of a great general like him. The consequence of that measure would have been that the voluptuous senate, that is, the fine and fashionable gentlemen of the day, who were devoid of

[8] Vulcat. Gallicanus, *Avid. Cassius*, 7; Dion Cass. lxxi. 22.

[9] Alfieri, in one of his pieces, makes Pliny deliver a speech to Trajan, in which he calls upon him to restore the republic.

all great qualities, would have become the rulers of the world. I entertain a high opinion of Avidius Cassius, and am convinced that he intended to govern the empire according to the moral maxims of his predecessors. But about three months after he had assumed the imperial title, he was murdered by a centurion[10], a fact which shews that a part of the army was dissatisfied with his strict discipline. It had also become known in the meantime that M. Aurelius was not dead. The provincials reluctantly returned to their obedience to M. Aurelius. The report that Faustina, the wife of M. Aurelius, was compromised in the insurrection of Avidius Cassius was without any foundation, and is refuted by her own letters.[11] The letters of Faustina and Marcus are very interesting; but the Latin is fearfully bad. They contain some obsolete forms, as *rebellio* for *rebellis*, like the ancient *perduellio* for *perduellis*.

On receiving the news of the insurrection of Avidius Cassius, M. Aurelius had gone to the East; and the mildness of his character was manifested in his conduct towards the children of Avidius, and in the regulations which he made in the province. He did not punish the revolted provinces; although the senate advised him to do so. A son of Avidius was killed, but contrary to the wish of M. Aurelius, who had intended to save him. There are a couple of remarkable letters of Avidius Cassius[12], which I must mention in connexion with his insurrection. He there expresses his dissatisfaction, with the government of M. Aurelius, whom he calls *dialogista*, in a manner which cannot surprise us; for Avidius was a practical man of great ability, and he could not look with pleasure upon a sovereign who, with all his faithfulness in the discharge of his duties, filled his high post without pleasure, and had other things that lay nearer his heart. Avidius states that M. Aurelius was indeed an extremely good man; but that he was not able to form a correct judgment of the men around him, who, under the cloak of philosophy, oppressed and corrupted the subjects of the empire. In like manner, Julian was imposed upon by

[10] Vulcat. Gallicanus, *Avid. Cassius*, 7, foll; Dion Cass. lxxi. 27.

[11] (Vulcat. Gallicanus, *l. c.* 9, foll). There cannot be any worse historical sources than the writers of the "Historia Augusta." All of them, without exception, are persons of the greatest incapacity; for they put together things contradictory and impossible, without feeling the least uneasiness. It is impossible to keep the separate *Vitae* apart.—N.

[12] Vulcat. Gallicanus, *Avid. Cassius*, 14.

every one who called himself a philosopher; and so also are many modern princes by their Tartuffes. The fragments of Fronto, too, throw much light upon this state of things, and however small their value may be in a literary point of view, they are of great importance for the history of that time. It cannot be denied that M. Aurelius was weak, especially in his relation of husband and father. One example is sufficient to prove this. When Matidia had died and made a will, in which she left large legacies to persons of her household, and did not give to Faustina even her trinkets, Fronto allowed himself to be used as a tool by Faustina. A costly string of pearls, which Faustina had expected, had been given to a foster-child of Matidia, and Faustina induced Fronto to write to her husband to say that Matidia's will was a forgery[13], etc. Marcus answered him in a remarkable note to thank him for his advice. The result is not expressly mentioned, but it is clear that Matidia's will was declared void. This excessive weakness of Marcus in yielding to the wishes of Faustina, must have had its influence upon many persons.

In short, the internal condition of the empire was not good, and its external misfortunes were great. The population, which had been at such a low ebb in the time of Augustus, might have been restored in the course of two centuries, as was the case in Germany after the Thirty-Years' war; but the plague, which must have remained in Italy and in the west, had prevented this taking place. That the plague did not reach Africa, is clear from the expressions of Tertullian. It is the same pestilence which recurs in the reign of Commodus; there is no reason for believing it to be an exaggeration, when we read that 2,000 persons were buried at Rome every day, — a statement made by Dion Cassius, a Roman senator. In addition to this, the government of M. Aurelius, however excellent in many respects, was able neither to check the general dissolution, nor to put a stop to the acts of injustice which were committed by some of the governors of provinces. There can be no doubt that some of his virtues, and his indulgence towards the senate, were the cause of much evil. He died on the frontier of Marcomannia before the war against the barbarians was brought to a close, in March, A.D. 180, after a reign of nineteen years. His son, Commodus, then nineteen years old, was with him at

[13] Corn. Fronto, p. 101, foll. ed. Niebuhr.

the time. There is one thing for which M. Aurelius has often been censured, namely, the establishment of a regular court, which had not existed under any of his predecessors, who had appeared only as chief magistrates and chief commanders of the armies. But the court, which was gradually formed in his reign, cannot have been his work, for he judged of men according to their internal worth: it must have been created by his all-powerful wife, Faustina.

The age, however, was still one of considerable energy; for there were several very excellent commanders in the armies, such as Pescennius Niger in the East, L. Septimius Severus on the Illyrian frontier, and P. Helvius Pertinax, who was engaged in the internal administration, and afterwards became emperor. Claudius Severus, too, appears to have been still alive; an excellent man, if we may rely upon the opinion of M. Aurelius himself, who cannot well have been mistaken in this case.

Intellectual and literary pursuits were still carried on, especially in the East; but in the Latin parts of the empire, they were on the decline. A. Gellius wrote his work in the reign of M. Aurelius, and evidently not till after the death of Fronto, who died of the plague; that is, in the interval between A.D. 169, and the death of the emperor: it is certainly erroneous to place Gellius earlier. His "Noctes Atticae" are a complete specimen of the grammatical and rhetorical tendency of the age; and it is remarkable to see that existing institutions exercised no influence at all upon him.

Had M. Aurelius not been extremely weak, he could not have been deceived in the character of his son Commodus, and would have seen that he was quite unworthy to be placed at the head of the empire. Marcus ought to have known that Commodus, from his early youth, was a person of the coarsest vulgarity and without any virtue, and ought therefore to have adopted one of his distinguished generals. He might have done this the more easily, as the idea of an hereditary monarchy had scarcely taken root among the Romans, and became established only through him. This, however, he unfortunately did not do.

During the first years of the reign of Commodus things are said[19] to have gone on tolerably well, as the arrangements

[19] Herodian, i. 8.

made by his father were continued as a sort of tradition. But his nature, which was characterised by the lowest vulgarity, soon burst forth. He was a handsome man, and of athletic agility and strength[20], and this circumstance was in some measure the cause of his abandoning himself to the coarsest pleasures and the grossest sensuality. His greatest delight was to cultivate his skill in using the bow and throwing the javelin; and had he left the government in the hands of able men, things might still have been well; but he soon gave it up to the praefect Perennis, who ruled like an oriental despot. The consequence was an insurrection among the soldiers, in which Commodus abandoned his favourite to the fury of the populace. An attempt upon the life of the voluptuous tyrant himself was made soon afterwards by an assassin, Claudius Pompeianus, who is said to have been instigated by Lucilla, Commodus' own sister, but who declared himself to be an emissary of the senate.[21] This attempt excited the emperor's fury against the senators. He had insinuated himself into the good graces of the soldiers and the populace—the so-called *plebs urbana*—by his unbounded prodigality: his coins attest this *liberalitas Augusti* which was very often repeated, and in which he squandered away and exhausted the treasures of the empire. Antoninus Pius had left behind him a treasury containing about sixty-three millions sterling, 2,700 millions sesterces; but the wars of M. Aurelius had consumed it, and that emperor had sold even the valuables contained in the palace, that he might not be obliged to impose new taxes. Commodus had recourse even to murders in order to obtain more money to squander. It is just as repugnant to my feelings to enter into the details of the history of Commodus, as it was in the case of Caligula and Nero; it is so disgusting that it is almost impossible to dwell upon it. The only point of interest after the murder of Perennis is the fall of Cleander, a freedman, of whom, however, it is very doubtful whether he was actually praefectus praetorio or not[22]. The internal dissolution of the empire is visible in the struggle which took place on that occasion between the

[20] His own head, which he caused to be placed on a colossal statue of Sol, is still extant. It is a very beautiful head, with graceful but unmeaning features.—N.

[21] Lampridius, *Commod.* 4; Dion Cass. lxxii. 4; Herodian, *l. c.*

[22] Herodian, i. 13; Dion Cass. lxxii. 13; Lampridius, *Commod.* 17.

praetorian cohorts and the city cohorts. The latter supported the city against the praetorians, and gained the victory; Commodus was on the point of being murdered at Lanuvium[23], whither he had gone to escape from the plague, but his concubine, Marcia, and his sister Fadilla saved him, by informing him of his danger. In saving himself, Commodus sacrificed Cleander.

During the latter years of his life, Commodus' ambition was no longer confined to the hunting of wild beasts in the amphitheatre; he was anxious to display his skill as a gladiator also: he had before assumed the name of Hercules. His senseless decrees, for instance the one by which he declared Rome a *colonia Commodiana*, are nothing but the disgusting fancies and whims of a tyrant. He intended to crown his brutal cruelties on the first of January, A.D. 193, by putting to death the consuls elect, and then proceeding himself to the Capitol at once as consul and gladiator. The praefect, Laetus, and his concubine, Marcia, tried to dissuade him; but the only consequence was, that he resolved to avail himself of the opportunity for the purpose of proscribing his advisers. This plan, however, was betrayed by one of his dwarfs. Laetus, Eclectus, and Marcia, now endeavoured to rid themselves of the tyrant by poison; the drug threw him into a state of torpor, and then the conspirators sent a sturdy athlete to strangle him: a report was spread abroad that he had died suddenly of a paralytic stroke. His sister Lucilla and his nearest relatives had been put to death by him.

The senate now gave vent to its feelings, by cursing and disgracing the memory of the tyrant. The praetorians, on the other hand, murmured and were discontented, for they liked Commodus on account of his weakness; but Laetus proclaimed as emperor P. Helvius Pertinax, who was then about sixty years old. A better choice could not have been made: he had distinguished himself as a brave general, and although he was not among the great commanders, still he had been a good and honest one: he had given proofs of his integrity and zeal during his administration of the city, and was favourably known and esteemed. He had the virtues of M. Aurelius, without his weaknesses, and would have made a greater sovereign; for his whole energy would have been

[23] According to Herodian, i. 12, it was Laurentum.

devoted to the good of the state. The people rejoiced at his proclamation, but some of the senators were displeased at it, because he did not belong to the high nobility; and the soldiers agreed to his elevation only with reluctance.

LECTURE CXXIII.

PERTINAX, who had been proclaimed in the beginning of January, was murdered towards the end of March, A.D. 193 [1]. Now the common account is, that after his death, the praetorians offered the imperial dignity for sale to the highest bidder; but this is probably an exaggeration or misrepresentation. I cannot believe that Sulpicianus, the praefect of the city, and Didius Salvius Julianus bid against one another as at an auction. It is a well known fact, that every sovereign on his accession gave donatives to the praetorians to secure their favour; and I have not the least doubt that the bargain in this case was about the donative, and it is quite natural that the amount of the donative decided the issue. Sulpicianus, who was in the camp, addressed the soldiers at its gate; and Julianus did the same at the gates of the city: the former offered a donative of 20,000, and the latter of 25,000 sesterces to every praetorian; and Didius Julianus was accordingly proclaimed emperor by the praetorians after they had opened the gates to him.[2] Julianus here acted a part more miserable than his character would lead one to expect: his prospects of ascending the throne were as good as those of many others, and he was innocent of the death of Pertinax; but although himself a very rich and vain man, he made use of the treasures of the state to purchase the empire. He had been governor of Dalmatia, his administration of which had had not disgraced him, and in general we cannot say much against his personal character: but he now called forth the general indignation by attaching himself to the praetorians, the murderers of Pertinax, and by thus betraying to them

[1] J. Capitolin. *Pertinax;* Herodian, ii. 1, foll.; Dion Cass. lxxiii. 1, foll.
[2] Dion Cass. lxxiii. 11; Spartian. *Did. Julian.* 3.

the secret of their power and of the weakness of the government. In other respects, the charges that are made against his character are of a vague and general nature; but his history in Dion Cassius is unfortunately much mutilated. Herodian, who relates the events of this time, was a foreigner and a superficial rhetorician. Most of the particulars of Julianus' reign, some of which are of great importance, are contained in the "Historia Augusta," which is otherwise wretched beyond all conception. I can, however, refer you to Gibbon for the history of this and the subsequent periods, although there are some points in the "Historia Augusta" which even Gibbon has overlooked.

Clodius Albinus, the commander of the legions in Britain, had been ill disposed towards Commodus, although Commodus had proposed to him to adopt the title of Cæsar, if he should think it necessary to keep the troops in order: but Albinus had declined doing what he thought to be a mere trap set for him by the tyrant.[3] Even before the death of Commodus, however, he seems to have secured himself through the army, in case any attempt should be made against him. When Pertinax was raised to the throne, Albinus assumed a neutral conduct, for he declared neither for nor against him. After the death of Pertinax, the British and Gallic legions attached themselves to him, and proclaimed him emperor. About the same time the legions in the East proclaimed Pescennius Niger; and a third general, L. Septimius Severus, was proclaimed emperor by the legions in Germany and Pannonia. The senate was, on the whole, favourable to Albinus; the people and some of the senators, to Pescennius Niger; whereas Severus had comparatively few supporters at Rome. To Didius Julianus, or his cause, no one was attached; and the senate could not bear him, because he had made himself dependent upon the praetorians. Pescennius Niger could not advance, and lost time in making preparations, for Septimius Severus was in his way and acted with indefatigable energy, so that he arrived at Terni about three months after the death of Pertinax. No one drew his sword in the defence of Didius Julianus, and even the praetorians, when Severus approached, shewed scarcely any inclination to defend the emperor of their own

[3] J Capitolin. *Clod. Albinus,* 2, foll.

making.[4] The senate declared for Severus, who entered the city with his army, and terrified the people, but without committing any outrage. Didius Julianus, however, was put to death, which was an unnecessary act of cruelty, as no one rose to defend him. The praetorian guards were ordered to lay down their arms, and were dismissed in disgrace. Severus immediately prepared to set out for the East to attack Pescennius Niger.

Septimius Severus was an extremely remarkable man. He was a native of Leptis, an ancient Punic colony, in which a numerous Roman *conventus* had settled, as in so many other towns which were otherwise quite foreign. Severus was undoubtedly descended from a family belonging to that conventus.[5] Leptis was still so completely a Punic town, that the sister of Severus, on her arrival at Rome, could speak only broken Latin.[6] Those places in Africa had kept themselves quite distinct; and even in the towns, the predominant language was Punic. Severus himself, however, was well acquainted with Greek and Roman literature, and was a good writer in each. But we possess, unfortunately, only one letter concerning which there can be no doubt that it is his: it is exceedingly well written, and with great spirit[7], so that we have reason to lament the loss of his memoirs. At the time when he entered Rome as emperor, he was in his forty-seventh year, and had greatly distinguished himself in all circumstances, in the administration of provinces as well as in the command of armies. It is a peculiar feature in his character, that he was extremely partial to foreign religious rites, and to the arts of astrologers and soothsayers. We find in general that foreign religions were at that time spreading very much among the Romans; and this tendency was paving the way for the reception of Christianity also, which would otherwise have met with greater difficulties. Many people adopted it as they would have adopted any other theurgia, such as the Orphic; and hence Christianity now began to emerge from its obscurity, though it had not yet obtained

[4] The mutinous praetorians resembled the Janissaries also in their cowardice during the 17th and 18th centuries, until their dissolution.—N.

[5] Statius wrote a beautiful poem upon one Septimius Severus, who was no doubt one of the emperor's ancestors.—N. (*Silvae*, iv. 5.)

[6] Spartian. *Sept Severus*, 15.

[7] J. Capitolin. *Clod. Albinus*, 12. Compare c. 7, where another short letter said to have been addressed by him to Clod. Albinus is preserved.

any political importance. Severus himself, but more especially his wife, Julia Domna, a Syrian, was favourably disposed towards Christianity, though she confounded it with magic ceremonies. Unction was at that time often prescribed as a remedy in cases of illness, and Severus had once received it in a severe attack of illness; and as he attributed his recovery to the influence of the unction and to the prayer of the bishops, he afforded protection to Christianity by special regulations, which he sent to the governors of the provinces. He was an extremely handsome man, with a beautiful countenance, and a nobly-formed head; his venerable and noble physiognomy is still seen in his busts. The great charge which is brought against him is that of cruelty, of which it is impossible to acquit him. It was shewn more particularly after the fall of Clodius Albinus, when forty-one senators were put to death for having espoused the cause of Albinus. If the statement of Aelius Spartianus[8] is true, that women and children too were murdered, the crime is still more horrible; but Spartianus is a thoughtless and contemptible writer, and we cannot rely upon him.[9]

The war against Pescennius Niger is of a peculiar character. Avidius Cassius had been treated with so much favour at Antioch and Alexandria, that I cannot help suspecting, that the power of circumstances was already working towards the separation of the East from the West, which actually began under Diocletian, and was carried into effect by Theodosius. The Greek language also had become as generally prevalent throughout the East, as the Latin was throughout the West. In the reign of M. Aurelius, Pescennius Niger had acquired great reputation as an eminent general; and the strictness of his discipline among the troops was particularly esteemed by the emperor. But if we compare him with Severus, he was a man of a mild disposition, and was generally beloved. Severus crossed the Hellespont; and all his movements were brilliant and decisive. He first defeated one of his rival's generals, at Cyzicus, and then Pescennius Niger himself in the neighbourhood of Issus. Niger was killed, and all the eastern provinces submitted to the conqueror. Byzantium alone offered a desperate resist-

[8] *Severus*, 11.

[9] He is so rash in his assertions, that he takes Caracalla for a son of Severus by his first wife.—N.

ance, and held out for three years, until at length Severus, in his indignation, took and completely destroyed the town. The resistance of Byzantium is almost unaccountable; it is, however, not impossible that the Byzantines had so much offended the emperor, that they may have dreaded severe treatment; but they may also have been conscious of the importance of the site which their city occupied, and may have wished even then that it should be the capital of the eastern empire, for which nature herself seems to have destined it.

During this war, Severus had gained over his other competitor in Gaul, Clodius Albinus, who was a man below mediocrity in every respect. He was likewise a native of Africa, and claimed to be descended from the noble family of the Postumii; but Severus, in a letter addressed to the Roman senate[10], charges him with making false pretensions, and states that he was a mere African, and not even of Italian descent. At all events he was a person of little importance, as is evident from the fact of his being so easily duped; for when Severus offered him the dignity of Caesar, he was perfectly satisfied, and was taken in by the very improbable promise, that Severus, who had children, would make him his successor.[11] After the fall of Pescennius Niger, however, Severus spoke to him in a different tone; and either a real, or merely suspected attempt at assassinating Severus, induced the latter to declare war against Albinus. A battle was fought in the neighbourhood of Lyons, A.D. 197, with great efforts on both sides. From the meagre account we have of this engagement, we see that Britain, Gaul, and Spain, were already united under Albinus, and Severus gained the victory at a moment when he was on the point of losing it. Albinus was mortally wounded, and died under the hoofs of the horses. Severus made a most cruel use of this victory, without taking any trouble to conceal from the senate the bitterness of his feelings. Besides the forty-one senators, many eminent men from Gaul and Spain paid for their attachment to Albinus with their lives. The imprudence of the Roman senate in regard to Albinus is inconceivable: the senators must have considered the issue of the contest so uncertain, as to believe that the probability of success was greater on the side of Albinus than on that of Severus: a mistake for which they had to pay fearfully.

[10] J. Capitolin. *Clod. Albinus*, 12.

[11] Dion Cass. lxxiii. 15; Herodian, ii. 15; J. Capitolin. *Clod. Albinus*, 3, 7.

After Severus had obtained the undisputed possession of the empire, his government was not only glorious, but excellent and mild too. The German nations were quiet after the Marcomannian war; though we do not know what kept them so. But he made two expeditions against the Parthians: in the first he led his army into Adiabene, the country east of the Tigris, and Arabia, which, like Osroene, were in the condition of feudal kingdoms under the Persian supremacy; but according to the greater or lesser energy of the Parthian sovereigns, the rulers of those countries were more or less independent kings. Severus accordingly conducted the first campaign without being at war with the Parthians themselves. The second expedition, however, was directed against the Parthians. Severus took the flourishing city of Ctesiphon, which had been built by the Parthians opposite to Selcucia as a rival to the latter: the town was given up to the soldiers and plundered. It is strange that Severus did not make the country a Roman province; but the emperors were in a sad position, for they were almost compelled to carry on wars perpetually, as peace produced general effeminacy. Severus therefore merely concluded peace, gave back Babylon, but retained Adiabene, which became tributary to Rome. Mesopotamia, and all Arabia now recognised the supremacy of Rome; but the kings of those countries were left in possession of their kingdoms.

After this, Severus had to carry on another war in Britain. It is surprising to find that he thought it necessary to employ all the powers of the empire against the weak Caledonian barbarians. He was accompanied in this expedition by his two sons, Caracalla and Geta, both of whom were destined to become his successors. Caracalla, the elder, who was then twenty-two years old, already acted as the colleague of his father; and Geta, who was several years younger, had received the title of Caesar: he is the first who occurs in inscriptions with the title of *Nobilissimus*.[12] Before his death, Severus raised both his sons to the rank of Augustus, and bequeathed the empire to them.

Severus strangely declared himself the adopted son of M. Aurelius, and accordingly called himself *M. Aurelius Antoninus, M. Aurelii filius, T. Pii nepos, etc.* It cannot be

[12] Νοβι ἔσσιμος in the Byzantine writers is synonymous with Caesar.—N.

supposed that he intended to deceive anybody by this fictitious adoption, except perhaps the common people; but he probably assumed that name merely to intimate, that he was the legitimate sovereign of the empire. For the same reason he called his elder son M. Antoninus, his real name being M. Bassianus, which he took from his maternal grandfather.[13] He, as well as Geta, was the son of Julia Domna, a Syrian woman, whom Severus is said to have married on the recommendation of astrologers, who declared that her horoscope announced that she would become the mother of princes.[14] She was a person of great intellect, but of very loose conduct, for which, however, she afterwards did penance by what her maternal heart had to suffer from her own sons, who were anything but noble or praiseworthy. Geta excites our sympathy chiefly because he fell a victim to his brother; but it is by no means clear whether he was at all better than Caracalla, for the stories related about these two brothers prove very little. They hated each other from their childhood; but their hostility began to assume a fearful character soon after the death of their father, in A.D. 211, when they succeeded him in such a manner, that Geta, as the younger, was made in every respect inferior to his brother. Their natural hostility was thus fostered by their position, and increased by the evil disposition of Caracalla. The attempts of their mother to bring about a reconciliation, led to no results. The natural tendency of the Romans at that time was to a division of the empire, an idea to which Caracalla was quite alive. But as the eastern portion, which was to be given to Geta, was too small, the plan was abandoned on the

[13] In the Pandects he is called throughout *Antoninus Magnus*, *Divus Antoninus*, or *Imperator noster Antoninus*. He is also mentioned under the name of *Imperator Magnus*. Our historians state that the name of Caracallus (not Caracalla) was a nickname given to him by the people. Modern writers generally call him Caracalla; but in the Historia Augusta this name occurs only once, and that in the form Caracallus. I dislike it as much as the name Caligula; but to call him Antoninus would be a profanation of that name.—N.

[14] There has been discovered at Rome an amulet of finely wrought silver, with magic inscriptions, the seven-branched candlestick of Jerusalem, and the usual Christian monogram. The inscription is Greek mixed with barbarous and unintelligible forms. It contains, however, express allusions to Christianity, and states that whoever wore the amulet would be sure to please gods and men. It is an example of that curious mixture of Judaism, Christianity, and Paganism, which we so frequently meet with about the beginning of the third century. This amulet has not yet been described.—N.

advice of Julia[15], who now made other endeavours to establish peace between them. Caracalla agreed to her proposals, and the two brothers were to meet in their mother's room; but Caracalla's only object was to get his brother into a place where he could murder him. The unhappy young prince was accordingly assassinated in the arms of his mother, A.D. 212. From this time, Caracalla ruled alone, under the name of M. Antoninus, in accordance with his fictitious adoption. The disposition of the minds of persons at that time corresponded to the despotism under which they were suffering: it was of a quite oriental nature. People were not much affected by the murder of Geta: even Julia Domna, although Geta had been her favourite, did not change her conduct towards her elder son who had murdered him; and she appears to have looked upon Geta's death as an unavoidable stroke of fate.

It is to be regretted that we know so little of the political regulations introduced by Severus, for it is evident that he must have made great changes, especially in regard to Italy. I myself have no doubt that it was he who appointed a *corrector* for each region of Italy, although this office is not mentioned till after his time. I do not mean to say that in his reign each region actually had its *corrector*; several regions may have had one *corrector* in common, but the regulation was that each should have one. The nature of the office of these *correctores* is very obscure; but it is probable that they had or were to have legal jurisdiction in their respective districts. The manner in which justice was administered in Italy after the Julian law, is little known; it must have been attended with such practical inconveniences, that some remedy was absolutely necessary. This is a subject which still requires a thorough investigation, and a rich harvest is yet to be made. It will require much combination, but there are various things in the collections of laws as well as in inscriptions, which will be of great assistance. Traces of the fact, that the jurisdiction in the various districts of Italy was given as a commission to persons of rank and distinction, occur even before the time of Hadrian. This emperor himself divided Italy, with the exception of Rome, among four consulars[16], and it is my belief that he gave to the *praefectus urbi*

[15] Herodian, iv. 3.

[16] Spartianus, *Hadrian*, 22; J. Capitolin. *Antonin. Pius*, 2; Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* i. 38.

the jurisdiction over a district of 100 miles around the capital. Antoninus Pius, who was for a time appointed to this office, kept up the same system; but afterwards it was discontinued. After the reign of Severus, the *correctores* are regularly mentioned, and they must have been instituted by him. The question, as to what was the extent of the power of a *corrector* in his district, is a different and very uncertain one.

LECTURE CXXIV.

In A.D. 212, Caracalla became the sole master of the empire, and henceforth abandoned himself to the most reckless cruelties and extortions. His cruelty was of the same kind as that of Commodus; but his extortions were carried on even more systematically, for Commodus had confined himself to Rome, which he never quitted; but Caracalla committed his acts of extortion and fury just as much in the provinces which he visited as in the capital. It is a good remark of Gibbon's that the tyranny of the emperors was felt chiefly at Rome, less in Italy, and that the provinces had but seldom to suffer from it. Under good emperors the provinces were often worse off than under bad ones; but Caracalla unfortunately travelled from one province to another; he traversed the whole of the East; Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, were the scenes of wild bloodshed, and the population of those countries was driven to despair. His only care was to satisfy the soldiers. After disbanding the praetorians whom he had found on his accession, Severus had placed the new corps which he formed on a different footing. Whether they had before always remained in their praetorian camp and at Rome, or whether they had accompanied the emperors on their expeditions, I cannot say; but they were at all events very unwarlike. Severus raised their number to 30,000 or 40,000 men, whom he selected from the legions: they now received larger pay, and were also considered to be of higher rank than before.[1] In his reign, and in that of his son Caracalla, they did not all remain

[1] Dion Cass. lxxiv. 2; Herodian, iii. 15.

at Rome, but accompanied the emperors: accordingly we find them with Caracalla on his travels through the eastern provinces. Among the enormities which occurred during his progress, none was more horrible than the massacre of Alexandria. Having led the people out of their city, and lulled them into security, the emperor surrounded them with his soldiers, and ordered them to be cut down. The Alexandrines had imprudently provoked him, as they had provoked even the best of emperors.[2] Antioch and Alexandria were the seats of wit; and there seldom passed a day without some witty joke being made or placarded in the theatres: the one which had been made upon Caracalla alluded to his having murdered his brother, and he took bloody vengance for it.[3]

Caracalla gave the Roman franchise to all the subjects of the empire, and thus put an end to the *peregrinitas* throughout the Roman world. What induced him to do this was the imposition of a new tax, for which he probably wanted to make up by conferring the honour of citizenship upon all his subjects. This tax was the increase of the *vicesima hereditatum*, to a *decima*[4], which was imposed on Roman citizens only. But there still remained persons who were not Roman citizens; for Ulpian speaks[5] of *Latini colonarii* as still existing: it was only the *peregrinitas* that was abolished, but freedmen might have entered into a quite different relation. Caracalla raised the taxes to an unbearable height; and his only object in doing so was to win the favor of the soldiers, whom alone he thought worthy of his attention. Severus himself had said that an emperor who was sure of the soldiers had no reason to fear. This was a truth indeed, but a fearful one.

In many points, Caracalla resembled Commodus, such as his fondness for gladiatorial exhibitions and the like; but he was of smaller stature, and not so strong and handsome as Commodus. He had a strange partiality for Alexander the Great; if the bust of Alexander which we possess is not a forgery, there was some resemblance between Caracalla and the Macedonian conqueror; and it may have been this resemblance that gave rise to his foolish desire to imitate Alexander. The province of Macedonia was, for this reason, the only one in

[2] J. Capitolin. *M. Antonin. Philos.* 25.
[3] Herodian, iv. 9; Dion Cass. lxxvii. 23; Spartian. *Antonin. Carac.* 6.
[4] Dion Cass. lxxvii. 9. [5] xix. 4.

the empire on which he conferred real benefits: he further formed a phalanx of Macedonians, and even assumed the name of Magnus, so that we find him called Antoninus Magnus. The idea of overthrowing the Parthian empire was also suggested to him by the exploits of Alexander; and when he invaded that country, he was accompanied by his Macedonian phalanx. He shewed in all things a great partiality for what was Greek; and it is not improbable that this partiality was greatly attributable to his Syrian mother.

He made war upon the Parthians without the least provocation on their part. According to Herodian[6], he acted with monstrous treachery towards Artabanus, whom he tried to take prisoner during an interview to which he had invited him: he also murdered a number of Parthians. But the detail of all those occurrences is very doubtful. Severus had already taken possession of Osroene. The dynasty of its king, Abgarus, had occupied the throne at Edessa for three hundred years, whence the legend of one Abgarus writing a letter to our Saviour, in which he implored his assistance in an illness.[7] The present Abgarus was a vassal king of the Parthian empire, but subject to Rome; and Caracalla now expelled him from his kingdom, and changed Osroene into a Roman province. But, while serious preparations were there making for the Parthian war, Caracalla was murdered, A.D. 217, in a conspiracy headed by M. Macrinus, the praefectus praetorio, who saw that his own life was in danger. The soldiers, however, were indignant at the emperor's death; and had not Macrinus succeeded in deceiving them, he would not have escaped from their fury.

As, however, the army wanted a leader, M. Opilius Macrinus was proclaimed emperor. The testimony of Dion Cassius[8], his contemporary, and Herodian, that he had honourably discharged the duties of the high offices to which he had been appointed, is worth more than the opinions expressed in the "Historia Augusta.[9]" Whether, if he had lived longer, he would have been a praiseworthy sovereign, and would have conducted the government in a noble manner, would have depended upon his obtaining the mastery over the soldiers. The moral dissolution of the army had increased to a monstrous degree under Caracalla, who had connived at every thing it

[6] iv. 10, foll. Compare Dion Cass, lxxviii. 1. [7] Eusebius, *Hist. Eceles.* i. 13.
[8] lxxviii. 11. [9] J. Capitolin. *Opil. Macrin.* 2, foll.

did. In the reign of Severus, the soldiers had been kept in check: they trembled before him, and never thought of rising against him. Macrinus endeavoured to restore discipline among them: and, as he could not safely take from them what his predecessor had senselessly given them, he tried to diminish the expenditure, at least as far as he could. It appears to me probable that he disbanded whole legions as veterans: he then formed new legions, or recruited the old ones with new men, and enlisted them upon lower terms. But it was to be foreseen that the old soldiers would not tolerate this. Whether the state could afford what they wanted, was a question about which they gave themselves no concern, and they revolted. They would perhaps have chosen Maximinus as their leader, had not young Avitus been brought forward.

Julia Domna, the widow of Severus, had put an end to her life after the death of Caracalla, as she was condemned to solitude by Macrinus.[10] Her sister Maesa had likewise been removed from the court, and was now residing at Emesa. Both were the daughters of one Bassianus. Maesa had two daughters, Soaemis and Mamaea, both of whom were married in Syria. The names of their husbands are Roman. Soaemis was married to Sex. Varius Marcellus, who, notwithstanding his name, may have been a Syrian, though the high offices with which he was invested might incline us to believe that he was a Roman; and the younger, Mamaea, to Gessius Macrianus. Each of these two sisters had a son; Soaemis had also several daughters, and Mamaea at least one. The son of Soaemis was Avitus, the same who afterwards assumed the name of Aurelius Antoninus, and is better known under the name of Elagabalus or, as it is corrupted, Heliogabalus.[11] His real name was Avitus, or Bassianus; but people at that time assumed a new or dropped an old name for the most trifling reason. He was then, at the utmost, seventeen years old: he was a complete Syrian, both by education and through all his relations, and was priest of the god Elagabalus at Emesa, where meteors, which had once fallen from heaven, were worshipped as divinities. His grandmother Maesa and his mother Soaemis declared that he was the offspring of an adulterous intercourse between Caracalla

[10] J. Capitolin. *Opil. Macrin.* 9; Dion Cass. lxxviii. 30.
[11] The word *Helios* is introduced into the name without any reason, and has nothing to do with it.—N.

and Soaemis. Macrinus was imprudent enough to let this pass without taking any precautions. Maesa collected her immense riches at Emesa, and found numbers of soldiers ready to accept her bribes and enter into her schemes. Macrinus at first did not attach much importance to an affair conducted by a couple of women and a very insignificant young man. But Maesa unexpectedly succeeded in transferring to Elagabalus the partiality which the soldiers had felt for Caracalla, by promising them still greater advantages. The consequence was the defection of a great part of the army. If Macrinus had at that moment acted quickly and energetically, he would have gained the upper hand; for, in the battle which decided the question, a great number of the Roman soldiers, and even the praetorians, displayed more bravery and fidelity to Macrinus than had been anticipated. But Macrinus despaired too soon, and fled from the battle to Asia Minor with his son Antoninus Diadumenianus, who had already been raised to the rank of Caesar. Both were overtaken in Bithynia, and put to death A.D. 218, by the command of the young tyrant.

The name of Elagabalus is branded in history above all others; for Caligula and Nero, if compared with him, appear in a favourable light. Caligula was not so beastly as Elagabalus: and if Nero equalled him in this respect, still he was a man of some talent; whereas Elagabalus had nothing at all to make up for his vices, which are of such a kind that it is too disgusting even to allude to them. His reign was disgraced, not so much by cruelty, although some cruel acts occurred, as by his prodigious extortions, which he made to defray the expenses of the maddest luxuries. He had a passion for everything that degrades human nature, and was enthusiastic in increasing the lustre of his idol Elagabalus, whom he raised to the place of the Capitoline Jupiter as the supreme divinity of the Roman world, and in whose service he endeavoured to combine the religion of Syria with the obscenities of the Carthaginian worship. While he was leading his unspeakably disgusting life, he prepared his own ruin; for the soldiers began to despise him, notwithstanding all the advantages which he bestowed upon them. He would have been murdered as early as the year A.D. 221, if he had not adopted his cousin Alexianus, afterwards Alexander Severus, on the suggestion of his grandmother Maesa.

Alexander Severus, the son of Mamaea, was then about seventeen or, according to Herodian, only thirteen or fourteen years old.[12] His nature was completely the opposite of that of his cousin. He was a young man of noble character, and very much resembled M. Aurelius, with this difference, that the latter was a specimen of a noble European, the former of a noble Asiatic nature. He was born at Arca Caesarea in Phoenicia, and learned the Latin language at Rome, though he was always looked upon as a *Graeculus*, and not as a Roman.[13] It is impossible for a man to possess a better and purer will or a nobler heart than young Alexander Severus. The beautiful expression of youthful innocence which beamed in his countenance won even the hearts of the rude Roman soldiers, and they were attached to him with their whole hearts. Elagabalus soon regretted the adoption, and as he made attempts upon Alexander's life, a report of the latter's death caused an insurrection, which was quelled with great difficulty. Afterwards Alexander was honoured with still greater distinctions than before. Abject as Elagabalus was, he was quite conscious of his own depravity, and felt that it was impossible for him to be tolerated by the side of his cousin. He therefore formed a fresh plan for murdering him. But Alexander escaped, and, a fearful insurrection broke out, in which Elagabalus was cut down by the soldiers, A.D. 222. His body was dragged into the Tiber, and curses were pronounced upon his memory.

The reign of Alexander Severus, who was now proclaimed emperor, lasted thirteen years, till A.D. 235. We are somewhat in danger of representing his reign in too favourable a light; for Lampridius and others seem to have made him the subject of a sort of "Cyropaedia." His personal amiability and kindness, however, as well as his zealous endeavours to discharge his duties, cannot be denied; and these qualities form a strong contrast between him and most of his predecessors. M. Aurelius was the model he strove to imitate; but, weak as that emperor had been in regard to his wife Faustina, Alexander was still weaker towards his mother Mamaea, and his government was in reality her regency.

On the one hand we read of a great reduction of the taxes[14], while on the other we hear of great complaints of his mother's

[12] Lamprid. *Alex. Severus*, 60; Herodian, v. 3. [13] Lamprid. *Alex. Severus*, 3.
[14] Lamprid. *Alex. Severus*, 39.

avarice[15], which are contradictory things; for, although this avarice may have consisted in her collecting, according to the eastern fashion, treasures and jewels, yet the general complaints of his weakness towards his mother, are rather loud.

I have to mention a remarkable institution which belongs to this time. The state-council, which was formed in the reign of Hadrian, appears to have fallen into disuetude under Septimius Severus; but we now find it perfectly developed under Alexander Severus, when it formed a standing council conducting all business of importance; Domitius Ulpian, the great jurist, was the president of it, and at the same time commander of the praetorian guards. The descent of Ulpian's family from Tyre, which made him a countryman and perhaps a relative of the emperor, may have contributed in some measure to establish the connexion between him and Alexander Severus. But I do not believe that Ulpian himself was born at Tyre, as I have shown elsewhere; and those who assert this infer from his words more than they warrant.[16] If he had been a native of Syria, he could not have become such a perfect master of the Latin language, or of the Roman law. He must have been at Rome for a long time, which is not incompatible with his being a relation of the emperor.

Alexander had to struggle with insurmountable difficulties in his endeavours to promote the public good. The main difficulty, however, lay in the power of the soldiers, of whom he could not get rid. The mutinous character of the soldiers was now no longer confined to the praetorians, but had spread throughout the Roman armies, and there was no means by which the emperor could have obtained the mastery over them. If we may trust the anecdotes related of him, he displayed on many occasions great firmness, notwithstanding his natural gentleness; but he did not succeed in dangerous emergencies, and he was unable to save Ulpian. As Papinian had been murdered by Caracalla, so now Ulpian was murdered by the soldiers in the palace before the eyes of the emperor, who in vain endeavoured to protect him, and whose entreaties and humiliations were of no avail. He was scarcely able to punish Epagathus, the ringleader of the rebels.

[15] Lamprid. *Alex. Severus*, 14.

[16] *Digest.* 50. tit. 15. s. 1: est in Syria Phoenice splendidissima Tyriorum colonia, *unde mihi origo est.* Comp. Niebuhr, *Kleine hist. u. phil. Schriften*, vol. 1. p. 321.

M. Aurelius had been successful towards the end of his life; he had repelled the Marcomanni and made them wish for peace. Commodus had purchased their abstinence from hostilities, and under Septimius Severus we hear nothing of German wars. The Romans seem to have been in undisturbed possession of Germany as far as the *limes*. But the Germans now began to advance; and I believe that it was under Alexander Severus that they broke through the *limes*, for when at the close of his reign, he was obliged to go to Germany, the seat of the war was on the Rhine. The frontier wall, therefore, must have been broken through, and the Germans wished to take possession of the country west of the Rhine. Unfortunately scarcely any thing is known of the geography of those countries in ancient times[17]

Some years before the German war, a great revolution in the East had called for the presence of the emperor. This was the fall of the Parthian dynasty, an event which was most unfortunate for the Roman empire, but which it is not difficult to account for. It was only a repetition of what we frequently see in Asia. When a pastoral nation obtains the sovereignty of a cultivated country, as was often the case in Asia, it gradually loses its warlike character; it sinks down to a level with the subdued, and although it no longer excels them in bravery, it continues for a time to keep them in submission, as though it still possessed its former superiority. The Parthian empire was based on feudal principles, and the kingdoms of Media, Persia, Babylonia, and others, were, at least in the earlier times, vassal principalities, with dynasties of their own. Formerly the Parthians had been very formidable enemies to the Romans; but in the wars under M. Aurelius and Septimius Severus, their defeats by Priscus and Avidius Cassius had broken them down very much. The conquest of Ctesiphon (in A.D. 198), had been very easy, and that blow had probably shaken the Parthian empire so much that its subjects could begin to think of shaking off their yoke. We here have the very authentic history of Agathias as our guide.

[17] In many parts of Suabia we find traces of Roman fortresses, of which ancient geography tells us nothing; we are ignorant even of their names. —N.

LECTURE CXXV.

THE character of the Parthians must have become completely altered since they had adopted the manners and mode of living of the conquered people. Their excellent light cavalry for instance, is very rarely mentioned in the latter period of their history, which fact alone is to me a proof that they had lost their nationality. The most severe blow that had been inflicted upon the Parthian empire had been the taking of Ctesiphon; and the nations, which had till then patiently borne the Parthian yoke, now rose against their rulers. We usually consider this insurrection in the same light in which we look upon that of the Persians under the great Cyrus against the Medes, in which the inhabitants of Persia shook off the dominion of the Medes; but I believe that the cases are somewhat different; the difference between the Parthians and the other tribes, resembles that which now exists between a nomadic people and the inhabitants of towns; and those who now rose against the Parthians were, on the whole, probably the Tadjiks of the Iran race, that is, the inhabitants of the towns who occur throughout Persia under the name of the Tadjiks, who speak a peculiar idiom of their own, and whose abodes begin on the Oxus; whereas, in the time of Cyrus, the Medes and Persians were two essentially distinct nations, although in the course of time the former must have become completely Persians, for they now had the same language, and Irak Adjemi had probably preserved the language of the Medes.[1] Now in a struggle, the particulars of which are utterly unknown to us, the Persians succeeded in throwing off the yoke of the Parthians, who after this are no longer mentioned in history, nor do we know what became of them. The Persian empire was now restored and rose again, and several of their ancient institutions were revived. The Parthians had been barbarians; they had ruled over a nation far more civilised than themselves, and had oppressed them and their religion, offending against their worship of the elements by a foreign idolatry. The Persians who restored the kingdom were now governed by Ardshir, the son of Babek,

[1] An examination of this question would be very interesting.—N.

whom the Greeks call Artaxerxes or Artaxares, and who claimed to belong to the race of the Sassanidae[2]; the story of his being a son of Babek is very apocryphal.[3] Ardshir also restored the ancient fire-worship, but during the sway of the Parthians a great many new opinions and religious rites had been introduced among the Persians which it was not easy to eradicate, and hence the Byzantine writers are quite right in asserting that the later religion of the Persians was essentially different from that which had prevailed among them in the earlier times. Although Ardshir removed the monuments to Persepolis, yet this city was no longer the centre of the empire, which was henceforth at Ctesiphon in Media. Susa was then uninhabited, and Ecbatana had become an insignificant place. After having established the dominion of the Persians, Ardshir, in compliance with the wishes of the nation, which was elevated by the consciousness of having accomplished a great thing, laid claims to extensive countries then belonging to the Romans, the decline of whose power cannot have escaped him; and he demanded that they should give up to him all the countries as far as the Aegean and the Propontis, on the ground that Asia naturally belonged to the Persian empire as Europe belonged to the Romans.[4] To this demand the Romans answered by declaring war, and Alexander Severus went to the East. The state of our information respecting the issue of this war is a remarkable instance of the extent of our ignorance concerning those times. We have two contradictory accounts of the operations of Alexander Severus and their results. The one which Herodian[5] gives, and which is recommended by internal probability and precision, makes Alexander, after his arrival at Antioch, invade the enemy's country with three armies. The first marched from the north through Armenia, along the right bank of the Euphrates, the second was in Media, and the third was to keep up the communication between the two in Mesopotamia. The first of these armies, after having gained various advantages, was compelled by the difficulties of the country, to

[2] The expulsion of the Parthians and the restoration of the Persian empire by Ardshir, is represented in a bas-relief, which is still extant at Persepolis.—N.

[3] Agathias, ii. 27.

[4] Dion Cass. lxxx. 4; Herodian, vi. 2 and 4; Zonaras, xii, 15.

[5] vi. 5, foll.

retreat; the second was quite annihilated; and the third, which was commanded by the emperor himself, did not accomplish its object. This account is contradicted by an official document addressed by the emperor to the senate, in which he ascribes to himself the most complete victory[6], for which the senate granted him the honour of a triumph. Gibbon and Eckhel, the two most distinguished writers on the history of the Roman empire, are of different opinions upon this point; and I feel obliged to adopt that of Gibbon notwithstanding my great veneration for Eckhel.[7] The latter looks upon it as a moral impossibility that the emperor should have invented his report; but the vague and pompous phraseology of the document itself excites our suspicion, that the emperor only intended to gloss over his defeat. Herodian, moreover, lived so near the time of those events, and in the things which he knows he shews so much good sense, that his minute account cannot be set aside to make room for the emperor's bulletin. Alexander Severus returned to Rome in triumph, and must have concluded a peace with the Persians, since we find peace existing until the time of Gordian, and Maximinus is not known to have sought laurels on the eastern frontiers. Rome must on that occasion have lost many parts of her eastern possessions.

At the same time the movements of the barbarians in the north of Europe called for the emperor's presence, and even if Alexander had been successful against the Persians, he would have been obliged to quit Asia, and to take the field against the Germans. He accordingly marched from the East to the Rhine, but after having taken up his winter quarters there, he gave the army cause for complaint: the soldiers had to endure great hardships, and felt, as Herodian says, that they had no good guide. The minds of the soldiers, thus prepared for an insur-

[6] Lampridius, *Alexander Sever.* 56.

[7] Eckhel is a man of whom Germany may be proud. He occupies a very high rank on account both of his learning, and of the extraordinary power and soundness of his judgment. His merits have never yet been duly recognised. His excellent work "Doctrina Numorum Veterum" is of the highest value. The history of the emperors, and the critical investigations concerning chronology, although they form in reality only a subordinate part of the work, are of the highest excellence. His freedom from prejudice, his justice and love of truth, are qualities of the greatest importance in an historical inquirer. There are few men among modern scholars to whom I am so much indebted as to Eckhel.—N.

rection, were stimulated still more by Maximinus, the first really barbarian adventurer that was raised to the imperial throne. Up to that time all the Roman sovereigns had belonged to distinguished families, perhaps with the exception of Macrinus, in regard to whom this can neither be asserted nor denied. Pertinax, it is true, was not a noble by birth, but he had been gradually raised, and, at the time when he became emperor, was a man of high rank. Maximinus, on the other hand, was a mere adventurer, and had risen from the very lowest condition. He was a native of Thrace; his mother was an Alanian woman, and his father a Goth, so at least it was said, though perhaps merely *ad invidiam augendam*, a thing not at all impossible with the wretched authors of the "Historia Augusta.[8]" In the reign of Septimius Severus he had been a peasant, and had enlisted in the Roman army, where he was distinguished among the soldiers for his gigantic stature and herculean strength, and excited general admiration. His courage and valour accorded with his figure, and with them he combined all the qualities of a good subaltern officer. Septimius Severus raised him from one post to another; and Alexander Severus, whose attention was drawn towards him, promoted him to the command of a legion, the discipline of which was soon restored by Maximinus. This shews that he cannot, after all, have been an ordinary man; he must have had a true soldier's nature; a person who was able to make himself popular with a demoralised army, notwithstanding his strictness and cruelty, must have possessed some extraordinary qualities. He was the first Roman emperor who was altogether without a literary education; nor did he try to obtain that culture in which he was wanting; he did not even understand Greek;[9] for the Thracians were no longer Greeks, but Wallachians, and spoke a sort of vulgar Latin, though in the coast towns and in the large cities of the interior, such as Adrianople, Greek may still have been spoken. Maximinus had attracted the attention not only of the common soldiers, but of the court also, and that to such a degree that Alexander Severus contemplated giving his sister in marriage to a son of Maximinus, an amiable and refined young man, and he hesitated only on account of the father's rudeness.[10] Had this been done, it would undoubtedly

[8] J. Capitolin. *Maximin.* 1, foll. Comp. Herodian, vi. 8.

[9] J. Capitolin. *Maximin.* 9.

[10] J. Capitolin. *Maximin. Jun.* 3.

have been followed by happy consequences. While on the Rhine, Alexander, as I have already remarked, excited the discontent of the soldiers by his awkwardness and neglect, and the noble emperor, who certainly deserved a better fate, was murdered in A. D. 235, together with his mother, who accompanied him everywhere, in order to rule in his name.[11]

The year A. D. 235 was the beginning of a frightful period, after the mild and happy government of Alexander Severus. It is evident that Maximinus acted with a truly revolutionary hatred of all persons of refined manners and distinction, just like the terrorists in France. The senators, therefore, were the main objects of his hatred and persecutions, and that for no reason but because they were noble and wealthy persons. At that time, however, the senate was very far from being a venerable body of men, and I fear that the picture which Ammianus Marcellinus[12] draws of it is but too applicable to the period of which we are now speaking; but this is no excuse for cruelty. Maximinus disdained going to Rome, which was a blessing for the city; for had he gone thither he would undoubtedly have caused a massacre there like that of Caracalla at Alexandria.

There is no doubt that Maximinus carried on the war on the Rhine, and that on the upper and lower Danube, with success, though it may be questioned whether, he gained permanent possessions north of the *limes*. He delivered Dacia from the barbarians, and commenced a war against the Sarmatians. The history of those wars, as it has come down to us, is comprised in a few words[13], and our knowledge of that period is altogether scanty; we do not even know whether the Sarmatians inhabited the country on the lower or on the middle Danube. Maximinus spared no one; the first suspicion was enough for him to pronounce sentence of death upon a person. Such conduct led to general despair; and the consequence was an insurrection in Africa, which broke out in the provincial town of Thysdrus, where the agents of the tyrant were murdered, and two Romans of rank of the name of Gordian, father and son, both very able officers, were proclaimed Augustus and Caesar. Gordian, the father was already eighty years old.

[11] The history of Alexander Severus in the "Historia Augusta," is a panegyric full of falschood.- -N

[12] xiv. 6.

[13] Herodian, vii 1, foll.; J. Capitolin. *Maximin.* 12.

This insurrection, however, was of a very short duration, and Mauretania took no part in it. Capellianus, the governor of Mauretania, remained faithful to Maximinus; he therefore quickly assembled an army of Mauretanians,who had never been entirely subject to Rome, and uniting them with the cohorts under his command, he marched towards Carthage, where the Gordians were staying. Nothing was easier than to induce those mountaineers of Mauretania to join in an expedition, provided the hope of rich plunder was held out to them.[14] The two Gordians had not made proper use of their time, and although they had only a very inconsiderable army, yet the younger Gordian ventured to march out against the enemy. His untrained soldiers were defeated, and he and his father lost their lives. The fate of Carthage, as well as the whole course of the insurrection, is buried in obscurity. Eckhel has investigated the history of those occurrences, and the results at which he has arrived appear to me to be true: he has made out that events down to the death of Maximinus and Balbinus must be compressed into the short period from the beginning of March till the end of August. Gibbon's chronology of the same events contains impossibilities, and is certainly incorrect. Eckhel does not allow himself to be misled by detached historical testimonies; but there are still considerable difficulties, which may perhaps one day be cleared up by the help of monuments and coins; but until that is done we cannot do better than follow Eckhel.

The Roman senate had had the desperate courage to recognise the Gordians, a resolution of which one would scarcely have thought the cowardly and unwarlike nobles of that time capable. Twenty commissioners had been appointed by the senate to conduct the preparations against Maximinus[15], and the praetorian cohorts, which had remained at Rome, and seem to have been neglected by Maximinus, were gained over. The senate had further called upon all the provinces to rise against the tyrant. All Italy prepared for a desperate war, the towns were fortified, and the necessary preparations were going on, when intelligence of the unfortunate issue of the African

[14] The Mauretanians, as early as the time of the Antonines, had been in such a state of commotion, that they crossed the sea and ravaged Baetica in Spain.—N. (J. Capitolin. *M. Antonin. Phil.* 21.)

[15] J. Capitolin. *Gordian.* 10.

insurrection was brought to Rome. There was now no choice left, but to proceed in the path that had been struck into. The loss of Africa, however, was not of great importance. Two of the twenty commissioners, Maximus Pupienus and Caelius Balbinus, were now proclaimed emperors by the senate. Two sovereigns were elected in this instance, either because a want of two was felt, or because it was hoped that the absolute power conferred upon them would be moderated by being divided. But my conviction is, that there were two parties among the senators, one of which wanted to raise Maximus, the other Balbinus, to the imperial dignity, and that a compromise was made between them by electing both emperors. Balbinus, if at this time an inference may be draw from a name, was a man of noble birth, and probably belonged to the Caelii, his full name being Decimus Caelius Balbinus. The name of Maximus on coins is M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus; but the author of his life in the "Historia Augusta" is so ignorant that he does not know whether Maximus Pupienus was the name of one or of two persons.[16]

Balbinus remained at Rome, and Maximus, who marched out against Maximinus, fixed his head quarters at Ravenna. There he organised his army, but was wise enough not to go out to meet Maximinus. His plan was excellent: all the bridges on the rivers were broken down, and Aquileia was provided with a strong and numerous garrison. The population of that town made a desperate defence against the army of Maximinus, who besieged it; for they well knew what would be their fate if the place into which all the people from the neighbouring country had withdrawn, should be taken. Maximinus was determined to make Aquileia his head-quarters; but the siege was protracted. His soldiers suffered much from fever in those marshy districts, and had besides to struggle with a want of the necessaries of life. An insurrection accordingly broke out among them, in which Maximinus and his innocent son, who had till then been generally beloved, were murdered.[17] It is surprising to find that Maximinus had been married to a very amiable and gentle woman; his son,

[16] J. Capitolin. *Maxim. et Balbin.* 18; compare *Gordian,* 10.; *Maximin. Jun.* 7.

[17] Herodian, viii. 6; J. Capitolin. *Maximin.* 23.

Maximinus the younger, would probably have been one of the best emperors, if he had succeeded his father.

As regards the time at which Maximinus fell, the chronology set up by Tillemont and Gibbon is not possible. According to the common account, it appears as if Maximinus had carried on the war on the Danube for a whole year, while all Italy was in a state of insurrection. The course of events probably was that, after the senate had issued the circular against Maximinus, he was gradually deserted by one province after another; so that he was supported only by his army; and this circumstance accounts for his failures. A proof of his being deserted by the provinces is contained in a letter written previous to his death and addressed to Maximus and Balbinus by the consul Claudius Julianus, who states that all the legions had recognised them.[18]

It was owing to the unaccountable popularity of the Gordians that, when Maximus and Balbinus were proclaimed emperors, a grandson of old Gordian, probably through his daughter—was raised to the rank of Caesar. His grandfather Gordian, had borne the name of M. Antonius, although he had no connexion with the family of the triumvir M. Antony; he belonged however to one of the most illustrious among the ancient Roman families. After the fall of Maximinus, Maximus returned from Aquileia to Rome in triumph. The government of Maximus and Balbinus was praiseworthy, but it was very short. The soldiers were annoyed at the success and victory of the senate, and hated the two emperors, in the election of whom they had had no share. The consequence was that the two venerable old emperors were murdered by the soldiers in their palace, and young Gordian was raised to the throne.

LECTURE CXXVI.

AFTER the murder of the two noble princes, Maximus and Balbinus, the empire came into the hands of Gordian III., who was very young. His history is as obscure as that of the whole

[18] J. Capitolin. *Maxim. et Balbin.* 17.

period in general. He had a *praefectus praetorio*, or prime minister, who was certainly not a Roman, and whose real name is doubtful. In the "Historia Augusta" he is called Misitheus, which name is rejected by Casaubon; and Zosimus[1] mentions him under the name of Timesicles. Either this name or Timesitheus, which occurs in an inscription (but whether it refers to the same person is uncertain), is undoubtedly more correct than Misitheus[2]. Gordian was married to Furia Sabina Tranquillina, the daughter of Timesicles. His good fortune forsook him on the death of his father-in-law, who fell a victim to Philippus. In the reign of Gordian, the northern frontiers of the empire were in a state of commotion, as we must infer from some allusions in our authorities. But the occurrences in Persia, the king of which had taken possession of Mesopotamia, were of greater importance, and called for Gordian's presence in the East. If any confidence can be placed in the coins, we must believe that Gordian defeated the Persians, and gained the triumphal *insignia*, but still the war was not brought to a close, and he was obliged to prolong his stay in the East, where he was murdered by M. Julius Philippus, the praefect of the practorian guards.

M. Julius Philippus was a native of Bostra in Arabia Petraea. It is a mistake to speak of him as a Bedouin, for Bostra was a Roman colony, and a great number of its inhabitants must have been Romans. He is, indeed, called an Arab; but it does not follow from this, that he was an Arab in the strict sense of the word. If he had been a Bedouin, he could not have been enlisted in a Roman legion, but would have remained in the cohort of the Idumaeans[3] east of the Jordan. It is not impossible that he may have risen at Rome in the time of Alexander Severus and Julia Domna. He was the murderer of his harmless, benevolent, and amiable young sovereign, of whom we possess a charming bust, the genuineness of which cannot be doubted.[4] Philippus concluded a peace with the Persians, which was as honourable to the Romans as the circumstances would allow. However, the storm which threatened the empire drew nearer and nearer.

The reign of Philippus is remarkable, not only because he

[1] i 17. [2] Eckhel, *Doctrin. Num. Vet.* vii. p. 319.
[3] Other MS. notes have *Ituraei*.
[4] Bunsen, *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*, iii. 1. p. 203.

celebrated, with incredible splendour, the great secular festival of the thousandth year's existence of Rome, but because the ecclesiastical historians generally suppose that Philippus was a Christian, and that he was consequently the first Christian emperor.[5] Eckhel thinks that Philippus cannot have been a real Christian, as his coins bear too many pagan emblems. This, however, is the case also with the coins of Constantine the Great, whose notions of the Christian religion must have been extremely confused, and whose coins bear the emblem of the god of the sun. The statement that Philippus was a Christian, derives some support from the fact that Origen addressed to him letters concerning the Christian religion. We must also remember that Bostra was situated in the neighbourhood of Pella, the real seat of the Jewish Christians, where Christianity had taken firm root; we cannot therefore altogether reject the statement that he was a Christian. There is a tradition in the church that he did penance for the murder of his sovereign, and obtained absolution. The crime itself cannot have excluded him from the Christian community, though the absolution, if it was granted, was unjust. If we except the crime by which Philippus obtained the empire, his government deserves no blame; for he is not charged with any act of cruelty, nor with indulging in any vice. The secular games to celebrate the thousandth birthday of Rome must have been a highly interesting event for the Romans, but they were in themselves unchristian, or rather altogether pagan solemnities; Philippus, however, may not have received baptism, but have been merely a catechumen, in which capacity he might continue till the end of his life, and not receive baptism till just before his death, as a purification from all his sins. He reigned upwards of four years, from A.D. 243 to 248. Shortly before his death, the legions of Moesia and Pannonia made an insurrection, and proclaimed Marinus, an officer in the army, emperor, whom however they put to death soon afterwards[6], and Philippus then gave the command of those legions to Decius, who claimed, though certainly without reason, to be a descendant of the ancient Decii. His real name was C. Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius[7], and his alleged connexion with the Decii is nothing

[5] Orosius, vii. 20; Zonaras, xii. 19. [6] Zosimus, i. 20.
[7] At that time we frequently meet with persons bearing three or four gentile names at once, *praenomina* and *cognomina* being mixed up with them.—N.

but an invention, by which the genealogists of the time meant to pay him a compliment. Decius was a native of Illyricum; his birthplace was probably one of the military colonies which had been established there within the last two centuries, and by means of which the inhabitants of those districts had become completely Romanised. When Philippus raised Decius to the command of the revolted legions, Decius cautioned the emperor, and begged of him not to place him in a position in which he should probably be compelled to violate his faith; for the legions dreaded the punishment which they had deserved, and were not inclined to return to obedience. Philippus, however, insisted upon Decius undertaking the command, and the consequence was that the soldiers compelled Decius to accept the imperial dignity, and lead them to Italy. Even there he is said to have repeated his assurances of fidelity to Philippus; but a battle in the neighbourhood of Verona, in which Philippus fell, decided the matter.

The writers of the "Historia Augusta" and Zosimus, who is a passionate pagan, make Decius a hero, and I will not detract from the fame of a man of whom so much good is said. But he was the first, after a very long interval, who instituted a vehement persecution of the Christians, for which he is cursed by the ecclesiastical writers, as much as he is praised by the pagan historians. The cause of this persecution must, I think, be sought for in a feeling antagonistic to the tendency of his predecessor. The accounts of the number of those who were murdered are highly exaggerated, as Dodwell has justly pointed out; but the persecution of Decius was yet a very serious one; it interrupted the peace which, disturbed by a few trifling occurrences only, the Christian Church had long enjoyed. For one year and a half the episcopal see of Rome remained vacant; and Decius is reported to have said, that he would rather have a second emperor by his side, than have a bishop at Rome. This shews the extensive influence which Christianity had obtained as early as that time, although the Christians formed but a small portion of the whole population. Among the high Roman nobility there was perhaps not one Christian; but many persons of the middle classes had already embraced the new religion at Rome, Carthage, Alexandria, and especially at Antioch. In the East they were scattered very widely; in the West they chiefly existed in the large towns; in country districts there were

scarcely any. The greatest part of Gaul knew nothing of the Christian religion; which, according to all appearance, had taken root only in such towns as Arles, Marseilles, Lyons, and the like. The Acta of the martyrs at Lyons are quite authentic. In Spain, Christianity had probably not spread more than in Gaul; but in Africa its adherents were very numerous and zealous, at a comparatively early period. In Greece proper their number was small; but in the Ionic towns of Asia Minor it was very great.

I will here, at the middle of the third century, make a pause for the purpose of giving you some general views; for, at this epoch, a circumstance not previously observed begins to become apparent. The coins and inscriptions belonging to the early period of the empire are not numerous: most of the extant sepulchral inscriptions are referable to the time extending from the end of the first century down to the middle of the third; and by far the greater number of them commemorate the deaths of freedmen, so that the ratio of *libertini* to *ingenui* is nearly as ten to one. Most of the beautiful marble tombs of the great families have disappeared; they were destroyed and plundered during the middle ages, and the stones were used as building materials in the restoration of Rome. Nearly all the tombs extant belong to second or third-rate persons. After the beginning of the third century, the names of *ingenui* everywhere get into confusion. I do not remember a single tomb of a freedman, after the middle of that century: hence I infer that about that time a most important change took place in the state of the population. The importation of slaves must have ceased, occasioning an immense decrease in the number of persons in a household; and the *libertini* seem now to have become *coloni*. There must have been some connecting link between these two classes of men; but it will perhaps remain for ever impossible to ascertain its nature.

Senatorial provinces are mentioned as late as the time of Septimius Severus, but he is said to have taken them from the senate; after the middle of the third century we hear no more of them[8], and thus the way was paved for the regulations of Diocletian and Constantine.

Art in general had by this time sunk into a state of barbarism, as no one can deny who has examined the monuments.

[8] Vopiscus, *Florian*, 6, *Probus*, 13.

The art of making historical bas-reliefs, either separately or in series around pillars, had reached its height under Trajan, and continued to flourish under the Antonines, in whose reign some bas-reliefs were produced, which are excellent both in their conception and execution. I know of only one bas-relief belonging to the time of Antoninus Pius, in which, however, the decay of the art is quite manifest. Under M. Aurelius this art rose again. Architecture too was, in a certain way, at its height in the reign of Trajan; but under Hadrian it sank; for he had a corrupt taste, and patronised a corrupt style. The busts of M. Aurelius, and especially his magnificent equestrian statue in bronze, are of exquisite beauty. If the horse appears less so, it is merely because it belongs to a race which we do not consider beautiful, but it is nevertheless a work of great life and spirit. It must be acknowledged, that in the reign of M. Aurelius art in general had again risen very high; but this was its last revival. Even from the time of Trajan, art is only historical, and there is no subsequent monument of the plastic art of an ideal kind. Painting was completely at an end, as is expressly stated by Petronius: it had been decaying in the same proportion as mosaic had risen in favour, and the few paintings of that period still extant are horribly bad. We still possess some very beautiful busts of the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, and in the reign of the former beautiful statues also were produced; but the bas-reliefs on the triumphal arch of Severus are very bad, and those on the small arch of Severus, which the *argentarii* erected to him, are quite barbarous in their design. The revolution which then took place in art is very remarkable: the artistic eye, the taste, the sense of proportion, as well as technical skill, seem to have been lost all at once. After the time of Caracalla, we scarcely find one good bust, though they may have been good likenesses; all that are extant are barbarous, and have mis-shaped heads. The figures on coins too grow worse and worse.

Before I drew attention to the state of literature in the third century, people usually considered Roman literature as perfectly barbarous, even as early as the beginning of that century.[9] The height as well as the end of juristical

[9] See Niebuhr, "Zwei Klassische Lateinische Schriftsteller des dritten Jahrhunderts nach Christus," in his *Kleine Histor. und Philol. Schriften*, i. p. 305, foll.

literature falls in the first half of the third century, the period of Papinian and Ulpian, both of whom, *diversis virtutibus*, were men of the highest eminence in their department, and among thousands of others scarcely one can be placed by their side. Both are excellent also in their style; and if there are some trifling mistakes in the language, yet the plastic nature of their style is so thoroughly Roman that a modern jurist who is unable to think and write in Latin on his science has no excuse. With regard to Papinian and Ulpian every jurist ought to follow the precept which Horace gives in regard to the Greeks—*nocturna versate manu, versate diurna.* In the same manner as jurisprudence died away after their time, so had the great Attic oratory disappeared after the time of Demosthenes, and so also were Thucydides in Greece and Tacitus at Rome the last great historians. A considerable time afterwards there followed Hermogenianus and others, who were compilers. The scientific study of law was superseded more and more by the legislation of the imperial secretaries, whose laws were drawn up in an abominably bombastic style, which we may be thankful is somewhat curtailed in the *Codex*. If we look at the other branches of literature we first meet with Q. Curtius, for I am perfectly convinced that he lived in the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. In him we have an author who wrote an artificial language, that is, the language of Livy. The ingenious but obscene Petronius (who mentions Mamaea) lived somewhat later, under Alexander Severus, or perhaps even in the reign of Gordian. The excellent scholar Hadrian Valesius was the first who drew attention to the age of Petronius; the prelate Stephano Gradi at first passionately opposed the new theory, but afterwards gave a noble example of honesty by abandoning his opinion and completing the argument of his opponent. I have added some points which had been overlooked by those scholars, such as the passage about Mamaea, and a sepulchral inscription of the reign of Alexander Severus, which clearly bears upon the question. The language of Petronius, independently of the passages where he introduces persons speaking the vulgar idiom of the time (*lingua rustica*) may be taken as a specimen of the language as it was then spoken. Nothing but a total want of knowledge and perception of the Latin language, could have led people to place Petronius in the first century

of our aera. He is the greatest poetical genius that Roman literature can boast of after the time of Augustus; but we see how his talent confines itself to novel-writing and the poetry of ordinary life.

The barbarous character which commenced with the third century, gradually spread over all things in which taste can be displayed, even down to coins and inscriptions. The latter had formerly been made with great care, but there are some belonging to a time as early as the reign of Philippus, in which the lines are crooked and the letters of unequal sizes.

The reign of Decius would certainly have been much more praiseworthy, if we look at it with an impartial eye, but for his persecution of the Christians; history however acquaints us with many otherwise excellent men who had the misfortune to be cruel persecutors. In his reign the empire received a great shock from the German nations, which for the last seventy years had been tolerably quiet, with the exception of some disturbances on the Rhine in the reigns of Alexander Severus and Maximinus. In the time of Decius, the whole of the North seems to have been in a state of general commotion, and the Franks appeared on the Rhine. Respecting the question as to who the Franks were, it is impossible to come to a positive conclusion, and so much has been written upon it, that no one is likely to make any fresh discovery. I adopt the opinion which is now generally received, that the Sigambri on the right bank of the Rhine and other German tribes which dwelt on the banks of the Rhine and in Westphalia, assumed the name of Franks, and under this common appellation formed a state which was distinct from the Saxons. The Suabians too, who are sometimes called Suevi and sometimes Alemannians[10], now began to cross the Rhine. They occupied all the country between the eastern bank of that river and the Danube, and extended perhaps as far north as the river Main. The great shock, however, came from the Goths, whose migration took place in the reign of Decius. Concerning their migrations we are in the greatest darkness: did they migrate from south to north, as the Icelandic traditions state, or from north to south, according to the tradition of the Ostrogoths preserved in

[10] Alemannians is, like Franks, a name under which various originally distinct tribes are comprehended.—N.

Jornandes? To these questions no decisive answer can be given; all we can say is, that in the beginning of the third century a great Gothic empire existed in the south-east of Europe. Such an empire is also mentioned in the northern traditions; and it seems to be a common process of tradition to transfer things from one pole to another, and then to connect them.

LECTURE CXXVII.

THE invasion of the Goths, partly by land into Dacia, and partly from the Black Sea with their boats, resembles the attacks of the Russians upon Constantinople, in the 10th century, and was described in detail by Dexippus of Athens; but of his work we now possess only fragments in the Excerpta de Sententiis and de Legationibus, and a few in Syncellus[1]; it carried the history down to the reign of Claudius Gothicus, when the course of events, considering the circumstances, was beginning to take a favourable turn for Rome. We cannot describe these invasions in detail, and I should not like to venture with Gibbon to divide the Gothic invasion into three great separate expeditions. They overwhelmed the kingdom of Bosporus, and destroyed the cities on the North coast of Asia Minor, penetrating even as far as Cappadocia. In another expedition they conquered the Thracian Bosporus, which ever since the destruction of Byzantium had lain quite open. It is a proof of the complete torpor of the Roman empire, that no attempt was made to form a fleet, to oppose to the boats of the barbarians. The most flourishing cities of Bithynia, such as Chalcedon, Nicomedia, Prusa, and others, were plundered and destroyed by the Goths after the death of Decius; and they displayed during this invasion much more cruelty than their descendants in after-times. In the North, they had even before crossed the Danube, and, having advanced through the plains of Wallachia, laid siege to Nicopolis. There they were met by Decius, who relieved Nicopolis, and repelled the Goths. They then crossed Mount Haemus. They appear to have

[1] They are collected in vol. i. of the *Corpus Scriptorum Histor. Byzantinæ*, edited by I. Bekker and Niebuhr, 1829, 8vo.

conducted the war with great skill, for they succeeded in taking Philippopolis. But after this conquest, Decius again met them on Mount Haemus, and cut off their retreat. They then proposed to conclude a peace, on condition of obtaining a free departure, and of restoring the prisoners and booty. But Decius, who refused to enter into negotiations, drove them to despair; and he had to bear the same consequences as Frederik the Great experienced at Kunersdorf. The Goths were compelled to fight a decisive battle. Their army was drawn up in three divisions : the last of them had in its front a deep morass, like that which King Frederik crossed in the battle of Prague; the two other divisions had already been broken through ; and if Decius after this partial victory had taken a position which might have enabled him to disperse the defeated army, and by skilful manoeuvres to surround the division which still held out, he might have destroyed the whole Gothic army; and the fortune of the empire would have assumed a totally different aspect. But unfortunately, Decius, like Frederik the Great at Kunersdorf, wanted to rout the enemy by a vehement assault. He attacked the third line which was drawn up behind the morass on narrow paths and causeways ; but the valour and bravery of the legions was of no avail in that situation: the Romans were defeated, and Decius and his son did not survive the calamity, which occurred A.D. 251. The Goths, too, had suffered great loss, and they therefore agreed to conclude a peace with Gallus Trebonianus[2], who was now proclaimed emperor by the legions. He paid considerable sums of money to the Goths; but whether settlements in Dacia were conceded to them as early as that time is a question which I cannot decide.

After the restoration of peace Gallus returned to Rome. Hostilianus, a son or nephew of Decius[3], who had received the purple from the senate, was recognised by Gallus as his colleague in the empire; but Hostilianus died soon after. Gallus was despised on account of the humiliating peace which he had concluded with the Goths, and which had excited general indignation. Aemilius Aemilianus, the governor of Illyricum,

[2] Jornandes, *De Reb. Get.* 18; Ammian. Marcellinus, xxxi. 5; Zosimus, i. 23; Zonaras, xii. 20.

[3] The history of these times is so confused that it is impossible to say whether he was a son or a nephew of the late emperor. — N.

was set up against him in the East, and led an army into Italy. A decisive battle was fought near Spoleto, on the frontiers of Umbria and the country of the Sabines; and Gallus lost his life either in the battle or by the command of his conqueror.

In the meantime, P. Licinius Valerianus, whom Gallus had called to his assistance, had advanced with some German legions from Gaul to support him. He arrived too late to save, but early enough to avenge him. Aemilius was not more fortunate than Gallus had been, for he too was abandoned and probably murdered by his own soldiers.

Valerian now succeeded to the throne; and great were the expectations entertained of him. There have at all times been people unfortunate enough to have a reputation among their contemporaries which they were unable to sustain; and such was the case with Valerian, for his reign not only had a most deplorable end, but it was marked throughout with nothing but calamities. Decius had had the strange idea of restoring the censorship[4], for the purpose of correcting the morals of the Roman nobles. The choice of the censor was left to the senate, and Valerian had been appointed to the office; but as Decius fell so soon after, the new institution produced no effect. After his elevation to the imperial throne, Valerian chose his son, C. Publius Licinius Gallienus, as his colleague.[5] It was at that time highly necessary for an emperor to have an assistant able to exercise the powers of the empire at Rome, while he himself was engaged abroad, for the German nations now broke through the frontiers on all sides. In the North we meet with the Franks, Alemannians, and Goths, in separate hosts; while in the East, the Persians, under their king, Sapor, invaded Syria. We possess so incomplete a history of Valerian, that we cannot even say whether the catastrophe which put an end to his reign took place in the year A.D. 256 or 260.

On the lower Rhine, the Franks had formed a kingdom, which extended up the river as far as Coblenz; the Alemannians, or Suevi, had broken through the *limes*, and spread from

[4] Treb. Pollio, *Valerian.* i. foll.

[5] These men had no connexion with the ancient Licinian family, which stands forth so nobly in the history of the Roman republic as the defender of the rights of the plebeian order; for at this time names were assumed arbitrarily and without any regard to relationship. — N.

the country of the Lahn, as far as Switzerland.[6] The Goths invaded the Roman dominion from the Danube, Dniester, and Don, and came with swarms of boats out of the rivers of their own country into those of the Romans, the latter not being able to oppose them with a fleet. The ravages which the Goths made were like those made in the ninth and tenth centuries by the Normans, who likewise sailed up the large rivers and destroyed the towns on their banks. The Goths penetrated even into the interior of Achaia, the whole of which was plundered. Argos, Corinth and Athens were destroyed by fire and by the sword. It was on this occasion that Athens rose from the obscurity in which it had long been buried. A courageous band of Athenians, under the command of Dexippus, the historian, came forward and took up a position in the mountains. They were cut off from the city, which was taken. But the Athenians from their mountains surprised the Gothic fleet in Piraeeus, and took vengeance upon the formidable enemy in a manner which cannot be otherwise than pleasing to a friend of the city of Pallas Athene.[7] Dexippus must have been a very able man; but his historical work was a bad rhetorical composition. In this expedition of the barbarians into Greece, the Heruli and Peuci are also mentioned.[8]

While these things were going on, affairs took a still more unfortunate turn in the East, and were still more humiliating to the Romans; for Sapor had invaded Mesopotamia and Syria. The Emperor Valerian in person led the Roman army against this enemy; but—whether it was by treachery, by bad management, or by allowing himself to be ensnared, is uncertain, —in short, Valerian, like general Mack at Ulm, got into a highly unfortunate position, and was compelled to capitulate and thus become a prisoner. He is said to have been afterwards treated by the Persians with truly oriental cruelty. Whether he was actually skinned alive, or dragged out his existence in misery, cannot be decided, and was a disputed point among the ancients themselves. The Persians fell upon Syria and Cappadocia like a mountain torrent, and in the

[6] The Juthungi, who are mentioned only at this time, perhaps derived their name from the ruling dynasty of the Longobards, and it is probably only another name for that people; a name terminating in *ingi* or *ungi*, is a sign that the people bearing it derived its name from a dynasty.—N.

[7] Trebell. Pollio, *Gallienus*, 13; Dexippus, p. xiv. foll. ed. Bekker and Niebuhr.

[8] Zosimus, i. 42.

neighbourhood of Caesarea they nearly came in contact with the Goths, who were returning from Pontus. Antioch was taken and plundered, and its inhabitants suffered most severely; for all who escaped the sword were led away into slavery, with a barbarity resembling that which was exercised during the siege of Vienna by Soliman, when 200,000 men were driven away or butchered like cattle. The city was then set on fire. Such was the conduct of the Persians in Syria and also at Caesarea, which made a noble and brave defence before it fell. The towns on the frontier of Persia were, generally speaking, still fortified by walls; but in the interior, in Greece and Asia Minor, where no enemy was expected, the fortifications had everywhere been allowed to decay, or been pulled down for the sake of convenience; all Syria was thus inundated by the conquerors, and only a few fortified towns seem to have been able to maintain themselves.

One place in particular, situated in the midst of the desert, must be excepted; this place was Palmyra, which, unobserved by the rest of the ancient world, had gradually become an important commercial town. Its population consisted of Arabs and Syrians, and led on by Odenathus it now rose against Sapor. Odenathus is justly reckoned among the great men of the East: he defeated the rear of Sapor's army, and did not hesitate to make open war upon him. His power and influence appear to have extended far beyond the countries which were under the dominion of Rome, and included all the Saracen[9] towns in Arabia, whence he is called *princeps Saracenorum*. Odenathus must have assembled a great force, and there must also have been diversions on the eastern side of the Persian empire, of which we know nothing. The history of the Persians and of their relations to the Romans is very obscure, and still more so are their relations to other eastern nations. While Valerian was retained as a prisoner by the Persians, his son Gallienus is charged with having made no effort to effect his liberation; but it would have been a fearful sacrifice to give up provinces as a ransom for him.

The time when Valerian fell into the hands of the Persians is the beginning of the period of the so called Thirty Tyrants, a

[9] The name is derived from the Semitic *Shark*, that is, the East, and occurs long before the time of Mohammed. Yemen means the right hand, taking Mecca as the point from which the country is looked at.—N.

name which has long been exploded. We must not be too severe in judging of the occurrences which now took place in various parts of the empire; for Gallienus himself was an unworthy prince, who lived only to satisfy his lusts, and spent his time in the pursuit of pleasure, while the empire was suffering under the greatest misfortunes. He always remained in undisturbed possession of Italy, Raetia, and Noricum; all Greece, with scarcely any exception, likewise remained obedient to him, and in Africa his authority was thrown off only for a time in Egypt. Syria and the eastern provinces of Asia Minor recognised the dominion of Odenathus, and afterwards that of his great widow Zenobia. These sovereigns were in some measure recognised by Gallienus, who even triumphed for the victories of Odenathus. Gallienus reigned alone from A. D. 256 or 260 until A. D. 268.

M. Cassianus[10] Latinius Postumus, after having defeated the Franks, was master of the north-western parts of the empire and of Spain, as early as A. D. 257; and he remained in possession of Gaul, Spain, and Britain that is of the whole of the subsequent *Praefectura Gallica*. That great extent of country was torn away from the empire by Postumus, and was governed by independent and able sovereigns, who may be called emperors as well as Gallienus, although it may be contrary to Roman orthodoxy to do so. If we do not follow the writers of the fourth century with implicit faith, we may infer from the coins of Postumus that he was Augustus of that extensive empire. He maintained himself in it for upwards of nine years, and unless we consider his coins as a series of inconceivable fictions, we must also believe that he gained a number of brilliant victories over the Franks and Alemannians. There is no doubt that the latter had at that time made a predatory expedition, in which they penetrated even into Spain, but whether they were engaged in the service of any of the emperors, who then disputed the empire with one another, I cannot say. Postumus left behind him a brilliant reputation; but still the misfortunes of Gaul undoubtedly began in his time, for Autun was then destroyed, and lay in ruins till the reign of Diocletian. Spain also was ravaged by the barbarians as in the time of the Cimbrians. Postumus was at last murdered by his

[10] In some MS notes the name is Cassianius, which Eckhel considers the correct form.

soldiers, because after the defeat of the rebel Laelianus[11] at Mainz, he refused to give that town up to them for plunder. He was succeeded by Victorinus, a Gaul, whom I mention on account of his full name, M. Piauvonius Victorinus.[12] He was a brave general, but a dissolute man, and was murdered by a person whose wife he had seduced.[13] After him one Marius, a blacksmith, reigned for three days, and was then succeeded by a man of rank, C. Pesuvius Tetricus, a Gaul whose full name is found only on coins. He ruled over the whole of what was afterwards called the praefecture of Gaul[14], and was recognised as its sovereign.[15] He reigned till the time of Aurelian, when he voluntarily brought about the re-union of Gaul with the Roman empire.

Eckhel, I believe, is right in his opinion that the empire of Palmyra did not extend so far as is supposed by Tillemont and Gibbon, according to whom it embraced all western Asia and Egypt; but if it ever did extend so far, it can only have been at a later time, under Claudius Gothicus, and then with the consent of Rome. Our information concerning those times is principally derived from coins; they contain many things which are extremely puzzling and cannot be cleared up; but they are sufficient to shew how little reliance can be placed on the books which pretend to give a history of that period.

Usurpers rose at that time also in Illyricum, Egypt, Africa, Greece which was otherwise peaceful, Thessaly, and the East where Macrianus, the prefect of Valerian, usurped the purple, and took his two sons as his colleagues. But none of those usurpers were able to maintain themselves, and their power was of short duration. The empire was in reality divided into three great masses. The Gallic empire was the result of the tendency which had been manifested in Gaul ever since the time of Augustus and Tiberius, and which we do not

[11] Other MS. have *Aelianus*; both forms of the name actually occur.

[12] Eckhel, *Doctr. Num. Vet.* vii. p. 450.

[13] Trebell. Pollio, *Trigint. Tyr.* 5.

[14] The division into praefectures is not an arbitrary thing, but an arrangement suggested by the nature of circumstances, for the Gauls were Latinised Celts and Iberians. They had assumed the Latin character with great modifications, and differed from the Italians, whom they therefore considered as strangers. The praefecture of the East naturally comprised the countries in which Greek was spoken.—N.

[15] Treb. Pollio, *Trigint. Tyr.* 23.

meet with in any other part of the Roman empire. Spain was much more faithfully attached to Rome than Gaul. I have no doubt that Treves was the capital of the gallant princes, Postumus and Victorinus, though they often resided at Cologne.[16] The Porta Nigra at Treves was built about this time. It is a Roman gate with two basilicae, one on each side, and its whole style and structure shew that it cannot be assigned to an earlier date. Treves was a large place; indeed all the principal towns of Gaul, Spain, and Britain seem to have been very extensive, and to have possessed great buildings, which, however, were without real beauty, for taste had sunk very low.

Aureolus, the commander of the Illyrian legions, was proclaimed emperor by his troops, and marched from the Raetian frontier into Italy. Gallienus was besieged by him at Milan, and fell a victim to a conspiracy. He was cut down, probably by his own soldiers, A. D. 268; he had been a curse to the empire, and his death was its safety. He was succeeded by a great man, M. Aurelius Claudius Gothicus, whose name is rather surprising, but his surname of Gothicus was well deserved. In his reign the Goths again invaded the empire through the Bosporus, Propontis, and Hellespont. After having destroyed Cyzicus and ravaged the country of Moesia and the banks of the Danube as far as Byzantium, they appeared on the coast of Macedonia, and besieged Thessalonica, whence they proceeded to the interior of the country. When they were met by Claudius, they endeavoured to force their way back to the Danube; but their whole army was nearly destroyed by Claudius in the neighbourhood of Nissa, on the frontiers of Bulgaria and Servia. They were, however extremely numerous, being constantly joined by new swarms—among which Vandals also are mentioned—so that the war against them was not yet brought to a close. The three Gothic nations, the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, and Gepidae, to which we must now add the Vandals, were still formidable enemies; and while Claudius was making fresh preparations, he died in the midst of his career, at Sirmium, A. D. 270, either of the plague or of some other epidemic which had been occasioned by the devastations of the war.

[16] Neuwied is called in inscriptions Victoriensis, which is connected, I believe, with Victorinus and his mother Victoria.—N.

The plague seems at that time to have settled in Moesia, where great havoc was made by it among both the Romans and the Goths. Claudius was succeeded by L. Domitius Aurelianus.

LECTURE CXXVIII.

THE victory of Claudius Gothicus, though it did not bring the war to a close, had yet secured the safety of the empire. His early death was a misfortune to the state. The empire of Palmyra was evidently at peace with Rome, and protected the eastern frontier; but Tetricus, who was at the head of the Gallic empire, did not stand in the same relation to Rome, although circumstances were, at least on the whole, peaceful. Before his death, Claudius had recommended Aurelian, the most distinguished among his generals, as a fit successor, and both the army and the senate recognised him. During the five years of his reign (until A.D. 275) Aurelian accomplished great things, and became the real restorer of the Roman empire. Its condition was then such, that one might be inclined to refer to it a celebrated passage in the work of Q. Curtius[1], if it were possible that a person could at that time have written such elegant Latin as that of Curtius. But this is impossible, though Gibbon does not seem to have thought so, at least as far as the time of Gordian is concerned; for he supposes that the passage contains an allusion to Gordian. But the reference to Tyre[2] has a meaning only when taken as an allusion to the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla.

A happy restoration of the empire was brought about by Aurelian, and the history of his reign is delightful, like that of every period in which something that was decaying is restored; he was however by no means an ideal character. We are very far from being able to form a clear picture of that time, for the authorities we possess are much inferior even to those for the middle ages[3], and the history of the empire is far

[1] x. 9. Compare Niebuhr, *Kleine Histor. und Philol. Schriften*, i. p. 304, foll.

[2] iv. 4.

[3] I am not of the opinion of those who attach a very high value to the writers of the middle ages, though Eginhard, Wittekind of Corvey, and Lambertus of

less known to us than that of the republic, a fact which few persons seem to be aware of. We may indeed string together the scattered accounts, but that will never make a history, and, besides, the contradictions which they contain are quite monstrous. The only correct historical sources are the coins; and they again frequently contradict the written statements, so that it is utterly impossible to make up a genuine history. All that can be done has been accomplished by Gibbon, whose work will never be excelled.

Aurelian spent the five years of his reign in incredible activity: he had to march from one frontier to another, and to carry on wars upon wars of the most dangerous kind. It was a wise measure of his to conclude peace with the Goths, to whom he gave up Dacia, which seems to have been in a condition like that of Gaul in the fifth century. He removed the Roman colonies of that country, as well as the garrisons, which may still have been in the inaccessible parts of Transylvania. This sacrifice was necessary, for the population of Dacia had been so much reduced by the wars that it could scarcely have been maintained; whereas, those who left their abodes gave additional strength to Rome in Bulgaria where they were now settled.

The great Zenobia had cherished the idea of founding an Eastern empire: she was formidable to the Persians, and had perhaps a Syrian militia which made an imposing impression upon them, whereas the Romans were unwilling to put arms into the hands of their subjects on the frontier, and carried on the war with mercenaries. But when Aurelian marched against Zenobia she was conquered at Antioch and Emesa, in two great battles, which decided her fate. She withdrew to Palmyra, where she was besieged by Aurelian. Her defence of her capital does not come up to our expectations of her: she fled from the city, and fell into the hands of the Romans. Her conduct in captivity is still less in keeping with her former pride, for she sacrificed her best and wisest advisers, such as Longinus, as political seducers; and this act shews her true Asiatic nature. She may not, however, have been quite wrong in charging those men with having given her bad advice;

Aschaffenburg form exceptions, for they took the ancients as their models. But the chronicles enable us to restore the history of the 12th and 13th centuries much more satisfactorily than is possible with that of the Roman empire.

for it is not impossible that many men may at that time have entertained the idea of a Greek empire; and that a distinguished Greek like Longinus may have endeavoured to inspire her with this glorious idea, and thus have led her to ruin. The execution of Longinus is one of the cruelties which form a stain on the purple of Aurelian; but another and greater stain is the destruction of Palmyra and the massacre of its inhabitants: it is true they had revolted after his departure, but his vengeance was monstrous.

After having thus unexpectedly recovered the East and secured the peace with the Persians, which lasted until the time of Carus, Aurelian returned to Europe and re-united the West to his empire. Tetricus himself, whose life was not safe among his mutinous soldiers, and who wished to get out of the dangerous position which had been fatal to so many other emperors, came to meet Aurelian. A battle was fought in the neighbourhood of Chalons, in which the soldiers of Tetricus fought with greater determination and exasperation than ever. This proves how thoroughly national was the desire to be separated from Rome. The French look upon the ancient history of their country as if there had existed no nationality at all in the time of the Romans; and it is quite surprising that no French historian has either perceived or described that national feeling which was continually manifested in Gaul after the time of Caesar, and which broke forth in several insurrections.[4]

It was in the reign of Aurelian, though the exact time cannot be determined, that the German tribes crossed their boundaries. The Alemannians, Longobards (Juthungi), and Vandals, at least the first two, crossed the river Po, and threatened Rome. A decisive battle near Fanum Fortunae (Fano) on the Metaurus—near the place where Hasdrubal, the brother of Hannibal, had been defeated—saved Italy, and compelled the barbarians to return across the Alps.

Aurelian, like Napoleon, felt the natural want of *bella ex bellis serendi*, and he now resolved to lead his army against the Persians. But on his march, A.D. 275, he was murdered, it is said, at the instigation of his private secretary, who was on the point of being punished for some forgery he had committed.

[4] In like manner the French have overlooked the marked difference which exists between the literature of northern and of southern France.—N.

It is, however, not impossible that this is merely one of the many tales which were manufactured at the time, and by which the real perpetrators of the crime tried to turn away suspicion from themselves. There had been a conspiracy even before.

The army lamented his loss and was deeply moved at his death; and the soldiers were resolved that at least none of the nobles who had had a hand in his murder should derive any advantage from their crime. This resolution, if true, accounts for the strange fact that the army called upon the senate at Rome to appoint a successor. The senators at first declined, as they imagined that the demand of the army was merely a trap, or at least feared lest the soldiers might soon regret their step, and then abandon the emperor elected by the senate as a prey to another proclaimed by themselves. But the soldiers were so persevering in their request that—so at least the story runs, though it is certainly a scarcely credible one—eight months passed away without an emperor, until after repeated refusals on the part of the senate, and various exhibitions of modesty on both sides, M. Claudius Tacitus, who was then princeps senatus, was proclaimed emperor. Tacitus was great in everything that could distinguish a senator: he possessed immense property, of which he made a brilliant use; he was a man of unblemished character; possessed the knowledge of a statesman, and had in his youth shown great military skill. At his election, he promised the senate that he would always look upon himself as its servant, and the senators already abandoned themselves to dreams of a restoration of the republic and its freedom, and of the emperor being only the chief agent of the senate, which was to be all powerful. What was to become of the people was a question which never entered their heads: they looked upon themselves as the senate of Venice used to do. But that dream was of short duration. Tacitus after his elevation went to the army in Asia Minor. The statement that he was then seventy-five years old is founded upon the accounts of the later Greek writers, and is of no weight: to me at least it appears very doubtful, and the earlier writers say nothing about it. To elect a man of such an advanced age emperor would have been senseless, and something like the system of the Roman cardinals, who elect an aged pope in order to have themselves a greater chance of

becoming his successors. Such things may be done in an ecclesiastical state, but would have been the height of folly in a state like the Roman empire at that time, which required a military chief. Tacitus carried on the war against the Alani with success, although there still remained reasons for care and anxiety about those countries. He died at Tarsus, in A.D. 276, either of a disease or of weakness; it seems hardly probable that he was murdered.

His brother, M. Annius Florianus, now usurped the throne, but the legions refused to obey him, and M. Aurelius Probus was proclaimed emperor in his stead.[5] Probus is the most excellent among the Roman emperors of that period. Aurelian had been cruel, and known nothing except war; but Probus, who was equally great as a general, devoted his attention at the same time to rescuing the empire from the wretched condition in which he found it. He had to contend with various insurrections, but his arms were engaged principally against the Alani, Franks, Alemannians, and Sarmatians. He drove the Franks back into the marshes of Holland; the Alemannians were not only defeated, but Probus crossed the Rhine and recovered the whole country of Suabia, and is even said to have restored the ancient *limes*. It is believed that it was his intention to make Germany a Roman province, and that plan would have been far more practicable then than before, for the southern Germans had made such changes in their mode of living that they were no longer so foreign to the Romans as they had been two centuries earlier. Had Diocletian taken the same trouble, and established a Roman force in southern Germany, it would not by any means have been impossible to form that part of the country into a Roman province, for we find that the Germans, who had formerly hated living together in towns, began to inhabit regular villages or towns, on the river Neckar, as early as the reign of Valentinian. In northern Germany, on the other hand, things were different, for there the people still lived in separate farms, as at the present day in Westphalia. Probus exerted his wonderful activity in all directions. His reign lasted nearly six years, and his occupations were so great and numerous, that he had no time for enjoying his sovereignty. He only once celebrated a triumph at Rome,

[5] Zosimus, i. 64, foll, Vopiscus, *Probus;* Eutrop. ix. 17; Aurel. Victor, *Epitome*, 36 and 37, *De Caes.* 36 and 37.

like Aurelian, but he was extremely beloved, as we see from the coins of the time, on which we read not only *invicto imperatori nostro,* but *bono imperatori Probo.* However he became estranged from the soldiers, who had before loved and admired him, because he not only demanded of them the discharge of their military duties, but compelled them to perform other services also, which were indeed beneficial to the provinces and the empire in general, but were too much for the soldiers, whose yoke became intolerably heavy. We cannot, therefore, censure them for what they did. Probus, like Aurelian and Decius, was born in the country of the *limes Illyricus,* and was therefore anxious to restore agriculture in the neighbourhood of Sirmium, and to drain the marshes, which spoiled the otherwise excellent and fruitful country of Pannonia. For this purpose he compelled the soldiers to make canals and drains. It is not impossible that fever and other diseases may have begun to rage among them while they were engaged in those marshy districts; but in short, they were driven to despair: they murdered their emperor, A.D. 282, and afterwards lamented his death.

The legions now raised M. Aurelius Carus, the praefect of the praetorian guards, to the throne.[6] Our sources of information are so imperfect, that we cannot even say whether Carus was born at Rome, in Illyricum, or at Narbonne. In a letter of his still extant, he calls himself a Roman senator, but he was unquestionably a senator of Gaul. There was indeed a regulation, a senatus consultum passed in the reign of Gallienus, that no senator should have an army, but this must have been of a different nature from what it is commonly, and even by Gibbon, believed to have been: I believe that it merely referred to giving a senator a province with the imperium, and this practice accordingly ceased, except in the short reign of Tacitus: but the regulation did not forbid senators to hold the command of an army in general. Carus was one of those princes to whom war is everything. He led his army against the Persians, and this war is the last but one that Rome waged against Persia, and that produced permanent results. Carus is said to have recovered Seleucia and Ctesiphon, but our accounts are so untrustworthy that I cannot answer for the correctness of the

[6] Vopiscus, *Carus*; Aurel. Victor, *Epitome*, 38, *De Caesar.* 38; Eutrop. ix. 18; Zonaras, xii. 29, foll.

statement. However this may be, Persia had lost the power which it had possessed under Ardshir; and Bahram, the present king of the Persians, was so alarmed and terrified, that he was incapable of leading out his army against the Romans. Carus, therefore, penetrated far into the Persian empire. But a sudden death, caused, it is said, in his tent, by a flash of lightning, put an end to his victorious career, in A.D. 283. The received account of the death of Romulus is certainly a poetical tradition, and it is not true that he fell by a conspiracy of the senators; but whether Carus fell by the hands of a murderer, cannot be decided. After his death, it was impossible to induce the soldiers to advance any farther; for it was an ancient superstition that, when the praetorium was struck by lightning, it foreboded the destruction of the army itself.

Carus had two sons, Carinus and Numerianus, and the latter had accompanied his father in his Persian campaign. He had received a good education, but was not warlike, and appears to have been a man of refined and amiable character. His brother Carinus had remained behind at Rome, where he acted like a second Commodus. He fully deserves the charges which are brought against him, namely, that he was a dissolute and voluptuous tyrant. He made himself so odious that the army would not for a moment listen to his elevation to the throne. Numerianus died while marching westward; and Arrius Aper, the praefectus praetorio, kept his death secret, in order to secure the empire to himself. But when the death of Numerianus became known, the soldiers immediately proclaimed the Illyrian, C. Valerius Diocletianus, emperor, A.D. 284. He put Arrius Aper to death in the presence of the army, for he was superstitious, and had been told by some old woman that he should obtain the imperial throne, if he killed an *aper*. That oracle now became clear to him, and he killed Arrius Aper with his own hand.

Carinus collected the forces of the West, where the legions were still faithful to him. A great battle was fought in Moesia, which terminated in favor of Diocletian at the moment when he was on the point of losing it; at the same moment, Carinus was cut down by one of his own tribunes, whose wife he had dishonoured, and the army of Carinus at once recognised Diocletian as emperor, A.D. 285.

Diocletian was a most distinguished general, and was

conscious of it. His reign forms a great epoch in the history of the Roman empire. There is much in his plans that may be censured; but his success is a testimony to his ability, which is manifest throughout his reign, and in all he did. The period which begins with his accession is one of great recovery, though perhaps not of happiness, and lasted for nearly a century, from A.D. 286 to the battle of Adrianople, A.D. 378. During that period, the empire recovered greatly from its previous sufferings, notwithstanding many unfavourable circumstances: the government became secured to one dynasty, and the general introduction of Christianity was facilitated. The recovery was owing in some measure to the circumstance, that the fearful plague, which had so long ravaged the empire, had begun to decrease in the time of Probus. It had made its first appearance in the reign of M. Aurelius and L. Verus; it did not, however, then devastate all parts of the empire, for we see from Tertullian, that, in the reign of Septimius Severus, Africa was free from it. Even up to about the middle of the third century it had not become very important; but the real and fearful plague began in the reign of Decius, that is, from A. D. 249. During the ravages then made by the barbarians, it spread over all parts of the empire; it now also raged in Africa and Egypt, and became permanent. Claudius Gothicus died of the plague at Sirmium, A.D. 270; and under Gallienus and Valerian it raged so fearfully that 2000 persons are said to have been carried off at Rome in one day. Gibbon[7] quotes an interesting statement of Dionysius of Alexandria, which is preserved in Eusebius[8], but which Gibbon does not interpret quite correctly. Dionysius, who was then bishop of Alexandria, mentions that, after the cessation of the plague, the number of people at Alexandria, between the ages of fourteen and seventy, was not greater than the previous number of people between the ages of forty and seventy. Gibbon infers from this statement that above half of the inhabitants of Alexandria had perished; but the real proportion is nearly that of two to one, so that only one third of the population survived.

[7] *Hist. of the Decline and Fall*, chap. x. in fin.
[8] *Histor. Eccles.* vii. 21.

LECTURE CXXIX.

After the cessation of the plague the empire was suffering from general distress, and its condition was very much like that which succeeded the black death in the middle ages. When the calamity ceased, says Villani, the contemporary historian, people expected to have everything in abundance; but instead of this there prevailed general distress and famine, it being impossible to cultivate the fields. In addition to these consequences of the plague, the countries between the Danube and Gaul were overrun by swarms of barbarians. Talent and art had become extinct in the same degree as the world had become desolate. The pagans charged the Christians with being the cause of the decline of literature; and St. Cyprian, whose last writings belong to the first part of that period, makes no answer to the charge, for he knew well that such an answer would have produced no effect; his remarkable work against Demetrianus openly admits the gradual spread of barbarism. In the middle of the third century, intellectual culture still prevailed in the western parts of the empire; and we meet with a highly talented Roman poet. Jurisprudence then reached its highest logical development, and juristical works were written in an excellent style. But during the latter half of that century, the western world sank into manifest barbarity, which continued till the time of Constantine. The barbarous character of art had commenced as early as the time of Septimius Severus, and the only branch that still maintained itself in some degree was the art of making busts. The poem of Nemesianus on hunting (Cynegetica), and the Eclogae of Calpurnius, who lived under Macrinus, shew that poetry was then nothing more than verse-making. Prose did not exist at all. Arnobius, the author of the work "Adversus Gentes," is one of the earliest Christian writers in the Latin language. He is very interesting, and his learning is of considerable value to us; but there is nothing original about him. Lactantius, who lived in the time of Constantine, adopted completely the style of Cicero, whom he reproduced in form, just as Curtius had reproduced Livy. He is a very important writer, even if we look at him apart from his character as a theological author; but he is the only writer of that period

deserving of mention: his seventh book shows real imagination.

In the East, on the other hand, things were different, for there a new class of writers had sprung up. In the first and second centuries, men like Dion Chrysostom had endeavoured to reproduce the ancient Attic style and language, and persons tried thoroughly to understand Plato and Demosthenes; but this ceased in the third century, especially from the time of Ammonius, when the so-called New-Platonism was developed in Syria. In regard to intellectual power, the new school was certainly above the rhetoricians who preceded it, and who had had quite different objects; but the relation in which it placed itself towards Christianity introduced something positively untrue into the Platonic philosophy, which was now made to prop up paganism.

I can give you only a skeleton of the history which now follows, and such as every one ought to know by heart[1]. The accounts we have of Diocletian, are eminently hostile towards him; and very much exaggerated. His father is said to have been a slave, or at best a freedman,[2] but this must probably be understood to mean a *colonus*, that is, a serf on the Dalmatian frontier: he himself cannot possibly have been a slave; for if he had been, the Roman law, even as it stood at that time, would have prevented his being enlisted in a legion. The derivation of his name from Doclea, a town on the Dalmatian frontier, is probable enough. He had risen by his own merits; and his reputation had reached such a point, that it required only one step more to place him on the throne. Among the many charges which are brought against him, we find that of cowardice, which is as unjust in the case of Diocletian as in that of Napoleon[3]. He was on the whole a man of a mild character, but there are two points which

[1] In the time of our grand-fathers too much importance was attached to such a chronological skeleton of history; which, however, ought not to be neglected; every one should impress upon his memory the list of Roman emperors, together with the dates of their reigns.—N.

[2] Aurel. Victor, *Epitome*, 39; Eutrop. ix. 19; Zonaras, xii, 31.

[3] The charge of cowardice against Napoleon is highly unjust. It is true, he often wanted moral courage, as for example, on the 19th of Brumaire; but he certainly had the courage of a general. The cases which are referred to as instances of his cowardice are only those in which he had no desire to strike a blow, or where he would not place himself in a position in which he could neither have heard nor seen, and in which consequently he could not have discharged his duties as a general. In those cases his conduct was perfectly right; but he might have died at Waterloo, and his escape from that battle-field cannot so easily be excused.—N.

justify the charge of cruelty; first the manner in which he punished the insurrection of Alexandria, and secondly his persecution of the Christians, to which he was instigated in his old age by Galerius.

Diocletian had reigned about one year, when, without any apparent reason, he assumed his countryman M. Valerianus Maximianus as his colleague in the empire. Maximian was a rough and violent man, and he shed at Rome much noble blood—not noble in the moral sense of the word—quite like an oriental despot, because he coveted the riches of those whom he murdered (for he had not to revenge any political offence on the part of his victims), and because he hated the nobility. It appears that, at that time, it was a matter of course for the sons of the great and wealthy to enter the senate, and that the dignity remained hereditary in their families.

The many divisions of the empire, and the tendency of the East to become separated from the West, led Diocletian who was a man of uncommon intelligence, to the conviction, that all would be endangered if he should insist upon uniting those parts which had a natural tendency towards separation. He adopted therefore the apparently singular plan of separating the East from the West, and of governing the empire from two centres, though the whole empire was to remain one. This scheme succeeded so long as he reigned. Legislation, the consulship, and the high offices were to be common to both parts as before. Each part of the empire was to have its own Augustus, and two Caesars were to be appointed, who were to be the coadjutors of the emperors, and one of them was to succeed on the death of an Augustus. By this regulation he intended to prevent vacancies of the imperial throne, and the arbitrary elections by the soldiers. As there were two Augusti, the elder seems to have had the right of appointing the new Caesars. The countries which had already been united into one whole under Postumus and Tetricus, the *praefectura galliarum*, namely Gaul, Spain, Britain and Mauretania, were to be governed by a Caesar; Italy and Africa by an Augustus; the countries on the Danube, afterwards the prefecture of

Illyricum, viz, Pannonia and Moesia, by a Caesar; and the remaining part of the East by an Augustus. This idea of having two Augusti and two Caesars, of thereby keeping the empire united notwithstanding the apparent separation, and of thus securing a regular succession of emperors, is certainly an ingenious combination; but it did not answer its purposes. Diocletian's division of the empire itself is the basis of the subsequent four praefectures, two of which belonged to the Augusti and two to the Caesars. I must also mention that Diocletian introduced into his court the ceremonial system of the eastern monarchs, which enters very much into detail. Neither of the two emperors resided at Rome. Maximian made Milan his capital,—a place which is destined by nature to be a great city, and one which very easily recovers, even after the most severe calamities—and Diocletian had his court at Nicomedia. Constantine the Great was a very eminent man: he was not only a brave and skilful general, but altogether a great man, however much may be said against him. He had the eye of a great man and carried out his plans accordingly: the foundation of Constantinople alone sufficiently attests his greatness. Diocletian overlooked that spot, notwithstanding his vast acuteness.

The most important events of his reign are the insurrection of Carausius in Britain, a revolt in Egypt, and the war against the Persians, the most glorious that Rome had carried on for a very long time; and it may further be said that, after this period, Rome never again carried on a war so truly glorious as that under Diocletian. The first insurrection was made by Carausius, the admiral of the British fleet, which was stationed at Bononia (Boulogne) to keep in check the Franks and other people of the Netherlands and the coast of the German Ocean, who had already begun to act as pirates. Carausius, who resided at Boulogne, revolted, occupied Britain, and assumed the title of Augustus; he was even, for a time, recognised by Diocletian and Maximian as Augustus.[4] But he was murdered by his own soldiers; and Allectus, who then usurped the imperial power, was conquered by a general of the Caesar Constantius, and Britain was reunited with the empire. The suppression of the revolt in Egypt was accomplished by Diocletian himself: Alexandria surrendered after a long siege,

[4] Eutropius, ix. 22.

and the revenge which he took was fearful. Meanwhile, Galerius, the other Caesar, commenced the war against Persia, which was brought to a close in two campaigns. In the first, Galerius was defeated, and his arrogance humbled; but in the second he gained a complete victory, and routed the whole Persian army. The king of Persia was obliged to conclude peace, and recognised Armenia as a vassal kingdom of Rome. The king of Armenia received Azerbijan, with his capital of Tauris, which was taken from the Persians. Rome acquired the countries south of lake Van, and in the East as far as Mossul, that is, the countries between the Euphrates and Tigris, and even districts to the east of the latter river. These events occurred in A.D. 296, four years after the institution of the Caesars. I should like to give you a minute account of the persecution which Diocletian carried on against the Christians during the latter years of his reign, and also of the spreading of the Christian religion at that period; but our time does not allow of it and the subject itself is one concerning which it is better to say nothing at all than only little. I may, however, remark, that Diocletian and his advisers employed their violence in endeavouring to stem the current of opinion, to which a universally felt want gave strength, without intending to substitute for Christianity anything to satisfy that want in any other way. He attempted obstinately to crush that which was calculated to satisfy the wants of the people, and to compel them by his commands to adhere to the traditional forms. This led him to institute his cruel persecution; which, however, was not so terrible as we usually imagine. Dodwell is right in observing, that it was hardly a shadow of what Alba did in the Netherlands. But it was, at all events, an effort to turn or to stay the stream of opinion: when a people however is earnestly bent upon a thing the tendency cannot be stopped: extirpation or slavery alone can stop its progress.

Diocletian's reign lasted twenty years, from A.D. 285 to 305. Maximian was proclaimed in A.D. 286. On the first of May, A.D. 305, Diocletian, through his paramount influence, prevailed upon Maximian to resign together with himself the dignity of Augustus, in order that he might see the succession regulated according to his plan. But the results were similar to those which we have seen for the last forty years in Europe,

where constitutions have been drawn up which, when applied to life and actual circumstances, produced results far different from those which had been anticipated. Galerius and Constantius, both Illyrians, had been appointed Caesars in A.D. 292, the former for the East, the latter for the West. Galerius had been a common Illyrian soldier, and bore the name of Armentarius, from his having at one time been a cow-herd. Constantius[5] was a man of noble birth; his father was a man of rank in the diocese of Illyricum, and his mother a niece of the emperor Claudius Gothicus. Constantius was a man of refined education, manners, and sentiment, and altogether very different from Galerius. Both, however, were distinguished generals, though Galerius was rough and daring, while Constantius was distinguished by wisdom and foresight.

The resignation of sovereign power by Diocletian and Maximian was quite in accordance with the system which the former had set on foot. Constantius and Galerius now succeeded as Augusti, and the places of the Caesars became vacant. The Augusti might reside wherever they pleased; they were not bound either to Rome, to Milan, or to Nicomedia. Constantius therefore remained in his court at Treves; and in his place a Caesar was to be appointed to conduct the government of Italy and Africa. Galerius, without consulting his colleague, appointed the two Caesars, the men whom he selected for that dignity being both natives of Illyricum, where the Latin language was spoken in the most barbarous manner. Maximinus Daza, his nephew, a common soldier, was made Caesar of the East, Syria and Egypt being assigned to him. The Caesar of the West was Flavius Severus, whose authority extended over Italy and Africa. Galerius remained at Nicomedia, and reserved for himself Greece, Illyricum, and Asia Minor. He continued the persecution of the Christians with greater fury than Diocletian; but he too could effect nothing, and was in the end obliged to give way.

Diocletian and Constantius did not interfere with these proceedings, but the aged Maximian resolved to oppose them. He went from Lucania to Rome, resumed his dignity as

[5] His surname of Chlorus occurs only in the Byzantine writers, and is neither mentioned by earlier writers, nor does it appear on any coins. Nobody knows the origin of it. – N.

Augustus, and prevailed upon the senate to proclaim his son Maxentius as Caesar, instead of Severus. Constantius died soon after these occurrences in A.D. 306. at York; and the legions proclaimed his son Constantine (the Great) Augustus. Galerius, out of jealousy, refused to acknowledge him as such, treated him only as Caesar and made an attempt upon his life; raised Severus to the rank of Augustus, and instigated him against Maximian and Maxentius. Severus, however, died while attempting to invade Italy.

Constantine for the present brooked the degradation; he was the son of Constantius by his first and legitimate wife Helena, a woman of low birth, and a native of Roussillon, on the frontier between France and Spain. Diocletian had required Constantius and Galerius, on their elevation to the rank of Caesars, to divorce their wives, and to marry ladies of the families of the Augusti. Constantius accordingly married Theodora, a stepdaughter of Maximian, and Galerius Valeria, a daughter of Diocletian. At the time of his father's death, A.D. 306, Constantine was thirty-two years old. He was a truly distinguished man, and had acquired great reputation under Diocletian, so that the attention of the whole Roman world was drawn towards him. He was not a man of extensive literary acquirements, like some of his predecessors, but he was at the same time anything but a rude barbarian; he spoke Latin and Greek without being a learned man.

LECTURE CXXX.

WHILE Constantine did not interfere with what was going on in the south, and was satisfied with establishing his power in the three western provinces, Galerius undertook to avenge the death of Severus upon Maxentius, and advanced with an army into Italy as far as Narni. But he found himself so completely surrounded by the forces of the aged Maximian, met with so little support, and his army was so small, that he had no choice but to retreat. A peace was then brought about, the terms of which are not known. After the death of Severus, Galerius had given Illyricum to C. Valerius Licinius, on whom he also

conferred the title of Augustus; the East was assigned to Maximinus Daza, and Constantine likewise was now recognised as Augustus. The Roman world thus had six Augusti and no Caesars; but peace did not exist, and the ingenious combination of Diocletian had led to nothing.

Maximian had given his daughter Fausta in marriage to Constantine, who divorced his first wife Minervina. But the marriage with Fausta contributed little towards a good understanding. Hostilities however broke out first between Maximian and his son Maxentius, a man like Caracalla, who, besides many other vices, had an inclination to brutality and personal tyranny, and was devoid of any kindly or indulgent feeling, even towards his father. The claim of Maximian to conduct the affairs of the state was met by the son's demand that he should resign all power and retire to a private station. The praetorians, who had been raised by Maxentius from the obscurity into which they had been thrown by the regulations of Diocletian, now formed a party, which supported Maxentius, and joined him in his demand that Maximian should withdraw from public life. Maximian accordingly left Rome and went to Constantine, his son-in-law, in Gaul. He was received there with friendship, but either because he formed hostile plans against Constantine —which is not at all improbable—or for some other reason, Constantine became his enemy, and endeavoured to secure himself against any attacks on his part. Maximian, who could not maintain himself at Arles, fled to Marseilles. There he was besieged by Constantine, and sacrificed by his troops. He fell into the hands of his son-in-law, who at first quieted him with kind promises, but soon afterwards put him to death, under the pretence that he had formed a fresh conspiracy.

Shortly after these occurrences Galerius died, and a war then broke out between Constantine and Maxentius, which is memorable on account of its great results in history and also on account of the triumphal arch of Constantine, still extant, and Raphael's painting of the battle. Maxentius ruled over Italy as a tyrant, and the oppression of the people was increasing, as had been the case ever since the time when the empire was divided among many emperors, who were often at war with one another. That country had formerly been exempt from the land-tax, and paid only indirect taxes and a tax on inheritances. But Maxentius, although he possessed the wealthy

province of Africa, yet did not think his revenue large enough, and intended to impose upon Italy a land and poll tax. The people, unwilling to bear such a heavy burden, called in Constantine to assist them in resisting those measures. Constantine advanced with a considerable army; crossed mount Cenis, defeated the troops of Maxentius near Turin, and then directed his march towards the strongly fortified town of Verona. He besieged the place, defeated the army which was sent to its relief, and led his troops towards Rome along the Flaminian road. Maxentius met him near Ponte Molle, at a distance of three miles from the ancient Colline gate. There a decisive battle was fought, in which the whole army of Maxentius was routed: Maxentius himself perished in the Tiber.

Constantine took possession of Rome amid the joyous shouts of the people, and remained in Italy for some time. But a war soon broke out in the East between Licinius and Maximinus: the former had the European portions of Galerius' empire, the latter the Asiatic provinces and Egypt. A battle was fought near Heraclea in Thrace, which was gained by Licinius, though his army was greatly inferior to that of his opponent. Maximinus fled to Tarsus, where he surrendered at discretion, and was sentenced to death.

Of the six emperors two only, Constantine in the West, and Licinius in the East, were now surviving, and between them the empire was divided. But although Licinius had married Constantia, a sister of Constantine, peace did not long last between them. A war broke out in A.D. 314, in which Constantine conquered his enemy in two battles, near Cibalis, and in the plain of Mardia. Licinius now sued for peace, which he obtained on condition of giving up Illyricum, Greece, and Macedonia, so that henceforth his empire embraced Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. This eastern empire was of such an extent, and had, under favourable circumstances, such great internal resources, as no European monarchy can boast of. The peace lasted for nearly nine years, after which a fresh war commenced, A.D. 323. This war was the first since the battle of Actium in which the Roman sovereigns had a great navy at their command, for both Constantine and Licinius had large fleets. That of Constantine was under the command of Crispus, his first-born son by Minervina. The first encounter between the rival emperors was the

great battle of Adrianople, in which Constantine gained the victory by the superiority of his western troops over those of the East. Crispus conquered the fleet of Licinius, entered Asia, and there gained a second victory over the reserve of Licinius in the neighbourhood of Scutari. Licinius fled to Cilicia and there capitulated. Constantine promised that his life should be saved, but the promise was not kept: Licinius was put to death, and even his son, a harmless and promising boy, was executed. These are the first instances of Constantine's cruelty, of which no traces had appeared before.

In the year A.D. 324 the whole of the eastern provinces were recovered by the defeat of Licinius; and the outward unity of the Roman empire was restored. The remaining part of the reign of Constantine is not rich in events, and we hear of hostilities only against the Goths and Sarmatians. The latter appear to have then occupied the country from the Theiss as far as Moravia, the Goths ruled over Dacia. The dominion of the Sarmatians embraced several German tribes, which they had subdued. At a time of great danger arms had been restored to these Germans, but they afterwards availed themselves of the opportunity to recover their independence. The Sarmatians were thus obliged to seek the protection of the Romans. Constantine distributed the Germans in various provinces of the empire under the name of the Limigantes, and if we may trust the statement of Ausonius in his "Mosella," many of them received settlements on the banks of the Moselle. We may safely suppose that Constantine, like Diocletian, was master of the world from the wall in Scotland to Kurdistan and to mount Atlas in Africa. It is one of the dishonesties of the pagan writers towards the Christians that they do not mention the fact, that even Aurelian had ceded a large territory to the barbarians; in like manner they forgot what their favourite Diocletian had done. This is the dishonesty which we always meet with in factions, where no party is ever strictly true in its statements.

The recovery of the empire, which had commenced under Diocletian, proceeded under Constantine and his sons, and there were only two circumstances that weighed heavily on the people and were a clog to the progress of returning prosperity, viz. the system of taxation, which had been introduced by Diocletian, and was completed by Constantine, and the

system of the *indictiones*. Every province was rated at a fixed tax, which was distributed among the *capita* of the province. This tax was levied according to an arbitrary valuation. It often happened that several shares fell upon one *caput*, and on the other hand several *capita* had sometimes to bear only one share. What the amount for each *caput* was is not known, and cannot be ascertained. The tax was extremely heavy, but the state could not do without it. To this land and poll-tax several others were added[1]. They became more and more oppressive, as the expense of the armies became greater, owing to the increasing prevalence of the system of hiring mercenaries; and the money thus went to the barbarians. The value of all kinds of produce had evidently declined.

The thorough change of the coinage, which appears about this period, may with tolerable certainty be attributed to Constantine. In the earliest times the Romans had only copper coins, but afterwards silver also was introduced. In the third century of the Christian era, when the state was in great difficulty, bad silver coins had been issued, as in Prussia at the time of the Seven years' war. The gold coins remained unaltered. The state seems to have made its payments in bad silver, and to have required its subjects to pay gold in proportion to the old good silver coin. In the period of Constantine we hear chiefly of *aurei*; sesterces are no longer mentioned. *Aurei* had in the earlier times been chiefly used for the soldiers' pay, but are mentioned only rarely. The extreme badness of the silver money, of which all the collections of coins in Europe contain numerous specimens—during the period from Valerian to Probus we find nothing but bad silver—induced persons to forge it in great quantities and in various parts of the empire, as might easily be conceived[2]. This system of issuing bad silver coinage accounts for the otherwise very singular event in the reign of Aurelian, viz., the insurrection of the coiners (*monetarii*) at Rome, which was headed by Felicissimus, the master of the mint (*rationalis*[3]).

[1] Savigny's Essay *Ueber die Römische Steuerverfassung* is excellent, although the subject has not yet been satisfactorily examined.—N. See above *Lect.* cxx. p. 238, note 3.

[2] Many matrices and whole apparatuses of false coiners have been discovered in France, and all of them belong to this period. — N.

[3] Vospiscus, *Aurelian* 38.

Aurelian is said to have attempted to re-introduce good money; but the master of the mint seems to have made his profit out of the bad money, like Itzig and others, during the Seven years' war. Constantine changed the *aureus* so as to make it lighter, whereby he conferred a great benefit upon those who had to pay taxes: if he reduced it from 45 to 72 to the pound, it must have been a great relief to debtors and tax-payers.

If we examine the legislation of Constantine with an unbiassed mind, we must acknowledge that there are not a few among his laws which were very judicious and beneficial, though there are some also which must have been injurious. Among those who have written upon the history of Constantine, some are fanatic panegyrists, others are just as fanatic detractors; there are but very few who treat him with fairness. Gibbon judges of him with great impartiality, although he dislikes him. The exaggerated praise of oriental writers is quite unbearable, and makes one almost inclined to side with the opposite party. I cannot blame him very much for his wars against Maxentius and Licinius, because in their case he delivered the world from cruel and evil rulers. The murder of Licinius and that of his own son Crispus, however, are deeds which it is not easy to justify; but we must not be severer towards Constantine than towards others. Many judge of him by too high a standard, because they look upon him as a Christian; but I cannot regard him in that light. His religion must have been a strange compound indeed, something like the amulet which I described to you some time ago.[4] The man who had on his coins the inscription *Sol invictus*, who worshipped pagan divinities, consulted the *haruspices*, indulged in a number of pagan superstitions, and, on the other hand, built churches, shut up pagan temples, and presided at the council of Nicaea, must have been a repulsive phenomenon, and was certainly not a Christian. He did not allow himself to be baptised till the last moments of his life; those who praise him for this do not know what they are doing. He was a superstitious man, and mixed up his Christian religion with all kinds of absurd superstitions and opinions. When therefore certain oriental writers call him ἰσαπόστολος, they use words without reflection. To speak of him as a saint is a profanation of the word.

In some respects Constantine was not bad. In many features

[4] See above, p. 266, note 14.

of his character he resembled Hadrian, but he did not possess Hadrian's learning, for Constantine had received a very poor education, and was wholly deficient in literary culture. The resemblance between those two emperors becomes more apparent in the irritability of their later years, which led them to cruel measures and actions. Every one knows the miserable death of Constantine's son Crispus, who was sent into exile to Pola, and then put to death. If however people will make a tragedy of this event, I must confess that I do not see how it can be proved that Crispus was innocent. When I read of so many insurrections of sons against their fathers, there seems to me to be nothing improbable in supposing that Crispus, who was Caesar, and demanded the title of Augustus, which his father refused him, might have thought: "Well, if I do not make anything of myself, my father will not, for he will certainly prefer the sons of Fausta to me, the son of a repudiated woman." Such a thought, if it did occur to Crispus, must have stung him to the quick, and might easily have driven him into a conspiracy against his father. That a father should order his own son to be put to death is certainly repulsive to our feelings, but it is rash and inconsiderate to assert that Crispus was innocent. It appears to me highly probable that Constantine himself was quite convinced of his son's guilt: I infer this from his conduct towards the three step-brothers of Crispus, whom he always treated with the highest respect; his unity and harmony with his sons are in fact truly exemplary. It is related that Fausta was suffocated by Constantine's command, by the steam of a bath, but Gibbon[4] has raised some weighty doubts about this incredible and unaccountable act, for Fausta is said to have been alive after Constantine's death: in our accounts she is described as a second Phaedra. I cannot therefore attach any importance to the story.

In the meantime Constantine had founded a new Rome at Constantinople, in a most excellent situation. When he approached the end of his life he went back to the system of Diocletian, and divided the empire among his three sons, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans. Constantine obtained the praefecture of Gaul, Constans that of Italy and Illyricum, and Constantius the praefecture of the East. With his step-brothers, Constantius, Dalmatius and Hannibalianus, he lived in

[4] *Hist. of the Decline and Fall*, c. 18.

exemplary harmony. The two sons of his brother Julius Constantius were yet too young to have any share in the government; Dalmatius had two sons, Hannibalianus and Dalmatius, who were raised to the rank of Caesars; his third brother Hannibalianus had died without issue. Constantine carried these regulations into effect before his death, and honest as were his intentions in thus dividing the empire among his three sons and those of Dalmatius, the results of that measure were most unfortunate; but such is human foresight! He died in A.D. 337, not in his beloved city of Constantinople, which he had finished in A.D. 327, but at his country residence, in a healthy and pleasant district near Nicomedia.

LECTURE CXXXI.

PEOPLE seem to think it unaccountable that Constantine also appointed Dalmatius and Hannibalianus: he certainly did not do so because they had any claims to a share in the government, but in order that, if disputes should arise among his sons, they might be able to turn the balance in favour of one, so that at any rate his family might maintain itself on the throne. His wish, however, to promote concord was not realised. The causes of the insurrection which soon broke out are not clear, nor do we know how it happened that the regulations of his will were not observed. The accounts which we have of these affairs may be partially true but they have an apocryphal character. It is equally obscure how far Constantius was guilty: both pagans and orthodox Christians united in their hatred of him, and for this reason he perhaps appears to us worse than he really was; in short, a military insurrection broke out at Constantinople, the will of Constantine was declared a forgery, the brothers of Constantine and the two princes Dalmatius and Hannibalianus were murdered, and with them the praefect of the praetorians, Ablavius, besides many other friends of Constantine. A division of the empire was now made of the kind which we have already seen in the times of Aurelian and Diocletian: Constantine the

eldest brother, who was then twenty-one years old, obtained the West, Gaul, Spain, and Britain; Constans, twenty years old, received the praefecture of Italy with Illyricum; and Constantius, who was only seventeen years old, the praefecture of the East. Constantius soon became involved in a war with Sapor, king of Persia, which lasted from A.D. 337 to 361, and was unsuccessful from beginning to end. After a short time, Constantine and Constans likewise became involved in a war, Constantine requiring Constans to give up Africa in order to preserve the equilibrium of their power, because Constans possessed Illyricum and Dalmatia. Constantine (called *Junior* on coins) who seems to have had Raetia and Noricum, also invaded the empire of Constans from the frontiers of Noricum, but immediately suffered a decisive defeat and lost his life; Constans now took possession of the West, for which Constantius may have received a trifling compensation in Illyricum. Constans enjoyed his triumph for a few years, at the close of which vengeance was taken upon him for it. He was an unworthy prince; and of the three brothers, Constantius seems to have been the least objectionable, although he too was not good for much; he was completely under the influence of his *cubicularii* and eunuchs; for in accordance with the Persian custom, eunuchs occupied the first places at his court. Constans was an immoral and tyrannical man, and his conduct had excited great exasperation in Gaul where he resided. There was in that country a general, named Magnentius, of barbarian origin, who was so rude and ignorant, that he could probably neither read nor write. Such a person could not possibly have become a general during the second century; and this fact proves the complete state of barbarism into which every thing had sunk at that time. This Magnentius revolted at Autun: Constans took to flight, endeavouring to reach the sea, in order to embark for Africa; but he was overtaken and cut down by the horsemen of Magnentius at Illiberis (also called Helena) in Rousillon. Vetranio, another general in Illyricum, rose against Magnentius, endeavoured to form an alliance with Constantius, who received him kindly, and induced him to come to an interview, at which he was obliged to lay his diadem at the feet of Constantius, so that the latter was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers. On this occasion Constantius shewed no cruelty. He then marched against Magnentius

and, near Mursa the modern Essek in Slavonia, gained a victory over an army much superior in number to his own. Constantius appears to have acted very skilfully in that battle, after which Magnentius fled to Italy; but there all the people zealously took up the cause of Constantius; and after Magnentius had lost another battle in Gaul, nothing remained for him but to make away with himself. Constantius was now again sole emperor.

Meantime affairs in the East had become very much worse: of nine great battles in the war against the Persians, eight were decidedly unfavorable to the Romans, the only one in which they were tolerably successful being that fought at night in the neighbourhood of Singara, but the attack upon the hostile camp did not succeed. Constantius gave to his cousin Gallus the name of Constantius, together with the dignity of Caesar; he probably thought of adopting the children of his uncle as he himself had no issue. Julian and Gallus, the sons of Julius Constans, had by a lucky accident been safely carried to Constantinople, during the general confusion after Constantine's death; Julian was six years old, and his brother twelve, when their father was murdered: the fact that Constantius had no children had saved their lives. They were removed from the court and kept as prisoners in a castle of the ancient Cappadocian kings near Caesarea; they were not allowed to pass the boundaries of the district, but received a careful education, which in the case of Julian proved to be seed sown in a most fertile soil, but Gallus had no inclination whatever for study. In this manner they lived until Constantius set out for the war against Magnentius, in which he was occupied for two years: he then called forth Gallus, whom he seems to have adopted, raised him to the rank of Caesar, and gave him the command in the East when Sapor was carrying on the war sluggishly, being probably occupied on the Indian frontier and on the Oxus. Gallus made very bad use of his advantageous position; he and his wife Constantina, a daughter of the great Constantine, were equally rough and cruel, and the East suffered severely from their misgovernment. When Constantius had finished the war in the West, complaints were brought before him from the East. Gallus had murdered two commissioners of the emperor who had been sent to watch him. This act called

for punishment. He was invited to Constantinople, whither he proceeded without suspecting the danger that threatened him. In Thrace he was separated from his legions, which were in the meantime compelled to take the oath of allegiance to Constantius. Gallus was then arrested and brought to trial; and as he was not able to justify himself he was executed at Pola, where Crispus also had perished.

The emperor now (355) summoned to his court Julian, who is called by Christian writers the apostate (*παραβάτης*), while the few pagan authors, who lived at a later period, Eunapius, Zosimus, and Libanius, speak of him with the greatest enthusiasm, and cannot praise him sufficiently. He was then twenty-four years old. Constantius declared him Caesar; but Julian went to court with a heavy heart, expecting to be put to death. He was kindly received however; and the Empress Eusebia even became his protectress. They married him to the princess Helena who was probably much older than he. He had been set at liberty some time before, and been allowed to reside in Ionia and at Athens, the place after which his heart had always been longing. He was a thorough Greek, having always lived in Hellenised countries, so that Greek was his mother tongue, in which he thought and felt, whereas Latin was to him a foreign language. Constantius appointed him governor of Gaul, the condition of which he himself had rendered extremely deplorable; for in the war against Magnentius, he had, by way of making a diversion, given up the country to the Alemannians and Franks. Those tribes had made fearful use of this opportunity: Cologne, Mayence, Trèves, Tongres and all the towns in Roman Germany were devastated and burnt down; and the whole country fell into a state of desolation from which it did not recover. The Franks already occupied the northern parts of Brabant, the Alemannians were settled on both banks of the Rhine, and the Roman *limes* was completely lost. Although the forces under the command of Julian were very insufficient to liberate Gaul from these enemies, yet he performed his task extremely well. The discipline of the Romans was in a state of great decay, and the soldiers looked upon their enemies as personally superior to themselves. The intrigues at the court, too, though perhaps without any fault of Constantius, tended to frustrate Julian's undertaking. With the title of Caesar, he made five

campaigns against the Germans, gained brilliant victories over the Franks and Alemannians, and repeatedly crossed the Rhine, but never penetrated far into Germany. At the end of the war, he had recovered the *limes*, from Helvetia to the Lower Rhine; but he was obliged to leave the Franks in Belgium. They recognised the sovereignty of Rome, and furnished troops for which they were paid by the empire.

After these brilliant successes, by which Julian had gained the attachment of the soldiers and provincials, the intrigues at the court were revived against him: it was intended to take from him the most important part of his army, the soldiers composing which were to be directed to march towards the East. But they had become domiciled in the province, and had formed family connections there; for on the whole the armies rarely changed their stations: hence when they were ordered to march they were seized with despair, and, according to the statement of Julian and his followers, influenced by this feeling, they renounced Constantius, and proclaimed Julian emperor. Now, it is certainly possible that the movement may have originated with the soldiers, the contrary at least is not stated anywhere; but I cannot believe that he was so excessively conscientious as he himself pretends to have been, especially as, notwithstanding his other great qualities, Julian was very ostentatious. It is certain, however, that he made overtures to Constantius, and wanted to be his colleague as Augustus. Constantius was foolish enough not to accept the proposal, although he had no children; but preferred engaging in a civil war, while Sapor had already taken Singara and Amida, and was threatening the whole of the Eastern empire. Blood would have been shed, had not the opportune death of Constantius prevented it. He often resided with his court at Antioch: and while he was following his army on the march from that city to Constantinople, he died in Cilicia, before he encountered the approaching army of Julian. The reign of Constantius is chiefly remarkable for the Arian persecution of the *homoousii* and the orthodox party, especially of the great bishop, Athanasius, who, on that occasion, shewed extraordinary strength of character, and exercised the greatest influence upon the minds of a large population. The details of these events may be read in the ecclesiastical history of the truth-loving Abbé Fleury. His

reign is also remarkable for the Arian council of Rimini, which was directed against the council of Nice; but other councils, especially under Julian, soon overturned its decisions.

LECTURE CXXXII.

THE name of Julian will ever be memorable. He has sometimes been immensely overrated, and, on the other hand, most undeservedly depreciated. Distinguished men of very different characters have, within the last fifty years, been occupied with Julian's history: the first was Gibbon, who, notwithstanding his anti-christian sentiments, did not allow himself to be misguided, but clearly perceived Julian's weaknesses. Next came Eckhel, who, in his work on coins, shews such candour of judgment, that I can with confidence refer you to him. The last is Neander, whose treatise on Julian is excellent.

Julian was a man of extraordinary mind, as every one must feel who reads his writings. He was a true Attic, and since the time of Dion Chrysostomus, Greece had not produced such an elegant author; he stands far above Libanius. He was unquestionably a distinguished general, and a humane and fatherly governor of Gaul. His ability was also shewn in the manner in which he protracted his campaigns against Constantius, while he continued to fight against the barbarians, in order to prevent an open rupture between himself and his rival. His moral character was of the highest purity; he entirely subdued any sensual disposition; and his only happiness was to live in the world of thought. We must, however, acknowledge that his attempt to restore the pagan religion was a senseless undertaking, even irrespectively of the truth of Christianity. The pagan religion, in its truth, that is its popular belief, had long since become extinct. New Platonism, which properly aimed at monotheism, and was artificially decked out with oriental demonology and theology, with theurgy and theumaturgy, had taken its place: the ancient mythological fables were allegorised; people saw in Homer and the other ancient writers every thing except what the Greeks themselves had seen in

them. Had paganism still had a living tradition, it might have been able to struggle for existence: but this was now impossible. This artificial system, partly adopted from Christianity itself, was at best good for a few philosophers; with the exception of Julian, his advisers, and court philosophers, there were perhaps not five hundred, or at the utmost one thousand persons, who embraced it. In the provinces moreover, the emperor had many negative followers, who only opposed Christianity without believing in the rival doctrines. Julian's undertaking was thus a truly counter-revolutionary attempt: he wished to introduce into paganism a hierarchy, to institute a new paganism which was more akin to Gnosticism than to Hellenism: to the latter in fact, it was diametrically opposed. The impossibility of carrying this plan into effect, led Julian to commit acts of tyranny and fraud; but he was nevertheless unable to succeed. Christianity, it is true, had not yet been adopted by anything like the majority of the population, but it had taken firm root.

Prudentius's[1] verses on Julian, contain the most excellent sentiments, and reflect the greatest honour on both their author and their subject.

> . . . . . Ductor fortissimus armis,
> Conditor et legum celeberrimus, ore manuque
> Consultor patriae; . . . . : . . .
> Perfidus ille Deo, sed non et perfidus orbi.

The utter perversity of this undertaking was clearly the source of Julian's follies and tyranny; otherwise he was mild and indulgent. The late Count Stolberg was of opinion that the proceedings at the court of his uncle Constantius, which considered itself Christian, might be a sufficient excuse for him. Julian, with cruel scorn, forbade the Christians to read the classical authors in their schools, saying: "as you despise them, and will have nothing to do with the pagan gods, you shall not become acquainted with their literature." In many instances he shewed the greatest partiality, not only in cases where the pagans again took possession of their shut-up temples and temple-estates, but even in real disputes. Actual persecutions are out of the question; but religion became a source of misery.

Julian had set out on his march eastward before the death of Constantius; and after that event he continued his expedition. He staid for a year at Antioch, where his philosophical severity came in conflict with the frivolities and luxuries of the Antiochians. Ever since the time of Hadrian, it had been the fashion to let the beard grow: but Constantine and his sons had cut them off; and Julian too had been obliged to shave as long as he lived at the court: but, in Gaul, he again allowed his beard to grow, in imitation of the Greek philosophers; and for this reason he was now ridiculed by the Antiochians. From Libanius and John Chrysostomus, we see that the Antiochians were a contemptible people, and such as are to be found only in large cities. Julian was received by them with expressions of hatred; and it is not impossible that from the time of Constantius, there had existed in that city a party hostile to him. His simplicity, which was certainly ostentatious, was offensive to them. An additional cause of their aversion was the Christian religion, which was still confined to a small minority it is true; but it was active and vigorous, while the other party was weakened by divisions. Constantine's Christianity was unquestionably of a monstrous kind; he became a Christian, because in the empire of Galerius and Licinius, the Christians were most numerous, and the West was attached to Christianity, even in the time of his father. The nobles at Rome were still pagans; but many thousands of the lower classes had already been converted. Constantine had the advantage which leaders of exclusive bodies always enjoy, and this circumstance rendered powerful the party opposed to Julian. One of the most elegant works which Greek literature produced in the period of its second life, the "Misopogon", arose out of that discord. In it, as well as in the "Caesars", we see Julian witty and lively.

He now undertook the war against Persia, which, in the meantime, had probably been disturbed by other wars. His plan was well devised, but he had reckoned too much upon the success of all his operations. He wanted to march with his army along the Euphrates, so that provisions might always be procured from the river, then to lead his fleet through canals into the Tigris, and thus to strike a fatal blow at the heart of the enemy. His intention seems to have been to make Babylonia a Roman province. Procopius and Sebastianus were to march from Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, across the Tigris, and to join him in the plains of Armenia. He also

[1] *Apotheos.* 450

calculated that the Armenians, who in the latter years of Constantine the Great, or under Constantius, had been again deprived by Sapor of Aderbidjan, would advance towards Media. He appears, moreover, to have relied upon the Iberians, whom Sapor had again subdued. But in Armenia and Iberia, Julian's religious views proved an obstacle to his success. The Armenian rulers were Arsacidae and Christians, and hence hostile to the Persians, on account of the bigotry of the Magian religion, but still more hostile to the apostate. They would have been scarcely willing to assist him, even if they had been governed by a prince like Tiridates, who had greatly distinguished himself in the war of Galerius; but the prince who now sat upon the throne was pusillanimous. The Armenians, therefore, remained neutral; and the Iberians shewed themselves even hostile to the Romans. Procopius and Sebastianus met with immense difficulties in their undertaking, and neither of them was the man to overcome them. Julian went down the Euphrates, but he had begun his expedition too late. As the summer is extremely hot in that country, he ought to have set out in the middle of the winter, so as to arrive at Babylon at the beginning of spring — in March or April — for the summer begins there about the middle of April. But he did not commence his expedition till the month of March; and as he came down the Euphrates, his appearance produced the greatest consternation among the Persians. Two fortified towns submitted to him, and he arrived, without encountering any resistance, in the neighbourhood of Ctesiphon, where he expected to find Procopius and Sebastianus waiting for him. His movements, up to this point, were altogether excellent, and attest his skill as a general; but he had not imagined that Ctesiphon was so strongly fortified as it really was. These fortifications must have been made after the time of Carus; as the place had been taken by Trajan, Septimius Severus, and Carus. Julian became convinced that he could there effect nothing with his army; but this conviction came too late. He was right in not venturing to storm the city when the soldiers demanded it; but his immense blunder was not a military one. Sapor had repeatedly and most urgently asked for peace; but Julian probably wanted to destroy the Persian empire completely, that he might no longer be prevented by an Eastern war from directing all his forces against his enemies

in the West and North. The Persian empire was still, to a great extent, a feudal empire, so that a dissolution of it was certainly not impossible. But Julian ought to have been satisfied with the peace which he might have obtained. Aderbidjan would probably have been given up to him, and perhaps other countries also, though not Babylon; but he was revelling in dreams of success from which he was awakened eight days after the last ambassadors had quitted him. Sapor made great preparations for a desperate defence; and as Julian could effect nothing in the neighbourhood of Ctesiphon, and the army of Procopius did not arrive, he found himself under the necessity of retreating. It being impossible to draw the fleet up the river, he determined to destroy it, and to lead his army back across the mountains of Assyria. This retreat in a burning plain, surrounded by Persian cavalry, during the dog-days in the climate of Babylon, was an almost impracticable undertaking. Being constantly attacked by his enemies, Julian was obliged to leave behind all the wounded and the dead; every straggler died, and the Persians spoiled all the water. But the Romans might nevertheless have maintained themselves for five days longer, after which they would have reached the heights and been safe; but on the 26th July, Julian was mortally wounded, and hs death produced the greatest despondency. It is useless to investigate whether he was killed by a traitor or by an enemy. The joy of his domestic enemies was certainly greater than that of his foreign ones. As it was found necessary to elect a successor immediately; and as Sallustius, the prefect of the praetorians, unfortunately for the empire, declared that he was too old to accept the imperial dignity, the election fell upon Jovian. The latter obtained a peace by giving up Nisibis, and the five provinces east of the Tigris. On these terms, Sapor granted him a free retreat, and pledged himself to provide for his army.

LECTURE CXXXIII.

JOVIAN seems to have been a man of great mediocrity, of whom neither good nor bad can be said. He was a Christian,

and has acquired great renown by his edict granting unconditional liberty of conscience. After a reign of eighteen months, he died suddenly at Ancyra, while following his army towards the West. The reports that his death was unnaturally accelerated deserve no credit, any more than that he committed suicide by using a basin with burning charcoal.

After his death, there was again a difficulty respecting the election of a successor. His son was a child under age; and the consulship was then, for the first time, degraded by a child being entered in the Fasti. Sallustius again declined to become emperor, and thus Valentinian, an Illyrian, who had greatly distinguished himself in the Persian war, was raised to the throne in A.D. 365. It is singular that in all these elections we no longer find any trace of donatives: in the time of Probus they were reduced to one-tenth (20 aurei = £15), and now, in the fourth century, they disappear altogether. A few weeks after his accession, Valentinian took his brother Valens for his colleague, whereby he satisfied the demand for a second emperor, though the general wish was to see an able man on the throne, such a one perhaps as Dagalaiphus. Valentinian was a remarkable person, and one of those characters respecting which it is very difficult to give a brief opinion. He was a distinguished general, gave fresh support to the rapidly sinking state, gained brilliant trophies in a war against the Alemannians and Franks, and in another against the Sarmatians; he kept order in the empire, and made many useful laws and enactments. He himself was indeed a man without education, but he employed his influence to support knowledge and education, and inflicted severe punishment upon tyrannical governors and frivolous judges. He was cruel, however; and, where he was offended, or suspected a conspiracy, imposed no restraint upon that disposition. We may therefore take it for granted, that the nobles did not feel at ease under him, and that the people, on the other hand were attached to him. His brother Valens was not blood-thirsty, but inexorable and cruel, and just as cowardly as inexorable. His government did not produce the blessings which marked that of his brother; he was, moreover, a fanatic Arian, oppressing the Homoousii, or Athanasians, as much as he could, whence his government is deservedly represented in an odious light by the ecclesiastical historians. Valentinian too was an Arian, but always

conceded a just liberty in matters of faith, oppressing neither pagans nor Athanasians. The number of Christians increased from year to year. Manichaeism spread, at the expense, not of the orthodox, but of the old Gnostic sects, which latter were constantly decreasing. In relation to foreign countries, the empire was powerful: it was at peace with Persia, the aged Sapor being quiet. Valentinian had two sons, Gratian by his first wife, and Valentinian II. by the second, the latter being yet a child. Gratian was a charming boy, and his education was conducted with great care. Valentinian was a man of good sense, and felt that he was uneducated; but it is no wonder that he erred in the choice of a teacher, and imagined that in Ausonius he had an excellent master for Gratian, just as Antoninus had been mistaken in Fronto.

In A.D. 375, when Valentinian died, Gratian was seventeen years old, and really capable of undertaking the administration of the empire. During the first years, his government indeed answered all expectations; he exercised justice, was mild, and granted religious liberty. He took possession of the West and Italy, leaving the East to his uncle Valens. The latter was now placed in fearful circumstances, for the Goths who, after the time of Claudius and Aurelian, had settled in Dacia, invaded the Roman empire, under the command of Hermanric, whose memory is still preserved in the *Heldenbuch* and the Icelandic Sagas. The original of the lay of the Nibelungen was Gothic, from which it is a translation. Whether Hermanric belongs to the period to which Jornandes assigns him, is a different question; I believe, however, that he is much older, and an historical personage. There can be no doubt that at one time there existed in the south-east of Europe a large Gothic empire, which was destroyed by the Huns. I am convinced also, that Desguignes' account of the origin of the Huns is incorrect. They were a mighty nomadic people, of the Mongol race, quite different from the inhabitants of southern Asia and Europe. They appear to have been the same as the other nations of the table-land of Upper Asia.

The Goths were divided into three tribes,—Ostrogoths, Visigoths and Gepidae; they were any thing but an uncultivated people, and had *en masse* adopted the Christian religion, much earlier than the inhabitants of the Roman empire; at the time of their advance into which, the majority of them

were already attached to the Christian faith. It is certain that the Huns, from causes unknown to us, advanced towards the Danube, and pressed upon the Goths, the most numerous of whom were the Visigoths. The latter had a peculiar national civilisation; and already possessed an alphabet of their own which was invented by Ulphilas. They had long been in a peaceful relation to the Romans, to whom, being now unable to resist the Huns, they applied in their distress, begging that they would receive them into the empire. There can be no doubt that the true policy of the Romans would have been to exert all their powers to support and fight for them in their own country: but this plan was not thought of; and the only question deliberated on was whether they should be received or not. This was decided in the affirmative: they were admitted into the empire on condition that they should surrender their arms, and disperse in various parts of the empire. But this proved impossible. Dread of the Huns drove them onward; they threw themselves into boats and rafts to save their lives: the Roman detachments, which were to receive them, were not sufficiently numerous to perform that service; much dishonesty also was practised on that occasion; the Romans allowing themselves to be bribed to leave them their arms. In short, everything which should have been done was neglected; and whatever should have been avoided, was allowed to take place. The Goths were not dispersed, but permitted to remain together. At the same time, the Romans plundered and behaved cruelly towards them. They had been promised supplies of provisions until they should have formed settlements; but the Romans now availed themselves of this opportunity to extort enormous prices from them. The Goths endured all this with great forbearance. As yet only the tribe of the Visigoths were concerned in these proceedings, the Ostrogoths being still in their mountains. They must have been exceedingly wealthy, for the Romans extorted incredible sums. At length, however, they were provoked by this ill-treatment: an insurrection broke out at Marcianopolis (in the neighbourhood of Shumla) which soon became general. The Visigoths were commanded, not by kings, but by two judges, one of whom, Fritigern, was a truly great man, and carried on the war with resolution. The dreamy Romans had not imagined it possible that their crimes could be followed by

such consequences, when all at once the whole nation of the Goths was in arms and inundated Moesia and Thrace. They made unsuccessful attempts upon several cities, such as Philippopolis, but the open country was entirely given up to them. The fear and terror they occasioned were immense. The Ostrogoths soon followed, and advanced into the places abandoned by the Visigoths; but it must not be inferred that they acted in concert, for the Ostrogoths and Visigoths were in every respect essentially different nations.

Valens was now roused from his inactivity: he secured peace with Persia, and led the legions of the East against the enemy, calling in the aid of Gratian also from the West. The Goths were besieging Adrianople. Had Valens waited for Gratian's arrival, it might perhaps have been still possible to sustain the shock of those migrating nations. The Visigoths formed one great warlike mass of 200,000 men, capable of bearing arms; but had they not succeeded at Adrianople, the world would not have experienced the change which then came upon it. Valens, although he was anything but a warrior, prosecuted the war with a determination to run risks such as he should not have ventured upon. But he was jealous of Gratian, who was advancing very rapidly and had already gained a brilliant victory over the Alemannians. Instead of waiting a few weeks and then uniting with him, Valens ventured upon the attack alone, and the battle was completely lost: two-thirds of the Roman army were destroyed, and Valens himself was among the slain. The Goths now traversed the whole diocese of Illyricum and Thrace, and even approached the gates of Constantinople. The towns indeed could not be taken, but the open country from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, and the frontiers of Greece, was thoroughly ravaged. After this there follows a period of six years, the history of which is buried in complete darkness.

When Valens had fallen, Gratian saw the impossibility of defending the whole Roman world alone, and made Theodosius his colleague in the empire. This resolution does infinite credit to Gratian, and proves that he was capable of the feelings of a great man. Theodosius was the son of a most distinguished man, who in the early part of Gratian's reign, had, though innocent, been put to death, in consequence of a malicious accusation after he had recovered Britain and Africa. Theodosius was

a native of Spain, the province which had given birth to Trajan and Hadrian, to whom, however, he was not related. He was born in the neighbourhood of Valadolid, while Seville was the native place of the two earlier emperors. He bears the surname of Great with justice, for he accomplished great things; and if we overlook Majorian, whose evil star was too powerful for him, he was the last great emperor. One of his faults was a passionate and angry disposition, which, however, was intimately connected with his best qualities; but his chief fault was, that after great exertions he often abandoned himself entirely to inactivity, and in the administration of the empire, relied too much on many unworthy persons whom he honoured with his confidence.

LECTURE CXXXIV.

THE task which Theodosius had before him, was so vast that it makes one shudder to think of it. With the remaining forces of the eastern empire (for the West would give him no support), he was to repel the Goths; and he succeeded not only in putting a stop to their progress, but in disarming them by treaties of which we know nothing. In a series of campaigns he separated one tribe from the others, and split them up into so many parts, that they submitted to the supremacy of Rome. They appear, however, to have remained in the north of Illyricum, in Moesia and Servia, where they inhabited the country, while the towns remained Roman. The pure descendants of the ancient Goths exist in Illyricum even to this day. There they dwelt under Rome's sovereignty, and pledged themselves to serve the empire; for Theodosius stood in need of them for his wars, and Gothic troops in fact were always engaged in the Roman service. They were not tributary, however, but rather received a tribute under the name of pay. This arrangement became established, especially after the year A. D. 384, and continued until the death of Theodosius in A. D. 395.

The first war in which Theodosius was involved, arose from the misfortune of Gratian, who had lost the popularity which

he had at first enjoyed: he remained a good and amiable youth of unblemished character, but he ceased to rule, allowing business to take its course, and abandoning himself to the useless pleasures of the chase. He moreover surrounded himself with barbarians, preferring the Alani to his own countrymen, who were thereby led to revolt against him. In addition to this, there was an insurrection of the troops in Britain under Maximus. Gratian was murdered, and Maximus, on being proclaimed emperor, was acknowledged by all the West. Maximus was a mild prince, and shed blood only because he was urged on by the clergy to religious persecution. He offered his friendship to Theodosius who wisely accepted it. This friendship remained undisturbed for four years. Valentinian II (the child under the guardianship of his mother Justina), Maximus and Theodosius were now the three Augusti. But Maximus resolved to cross the Alps, and to deprive young Valentinian of his empire. The latter fled with his mother to Thessalonica, where they were received by Theodosius. The extraordinary beauty of the princess Galla induced him to take the family under his protection, and he accordingly led Valentinian back to Italy. Maximus was defeated near Aquileia, abandoned by his troops and killed, whereupon Theodosius gave the whole of the western empire to his brother-in-law Valentinian. The latter seemed to have all the good qualities of his father without his faults; but he was unfortunate. A Frankish general, Arbogastes, the commander of his army, assumed a position relatively to his master similar to that of a Frankish *major domus* towards his king. Valentinian resisted this, but by doing so, caused his own destruction. While staying at Vienne in Dauphiné, he was strangled by Arbogastes, who now put on the throne one Eugenius, who was *tribunus notariorum*, that is, according to our idea, something like a privy councillor, or courtier of rank. It was against this man that Theodosius led his army. The decisive battle was fought again near Aquileia (A. D. 394): in it Theodosius displayed all his talent as a general, on which subject we have the beautiful verses of Claudian[1]. He knew how to make use, for his objects, of the most different nations—Goths, Alani, and Huns—so that they were willing to devote themselves to his service. The elements also were favourable to him; for a tempest is said to have contributed to his success in the battle.

[1] Claudianus, *de tertio consul. Honorii*, 90.

The West was now gained for Theodosius, who was emperor of the whole Roman world. In his latter years, he had the weakness to give himself up entirely to a favorite Rufinus, who was his *praefectus praetorio*. This Rufinus was insatiably avaricious and blood-thirsty; so that even before Theodosius' death, he spread misery over the empire. The sovereign was a truly noble prince, and yet his subjects were ill-governed. Antioch had provoked the emperor; but Libanius and St. Chrysostomus prevailed upon him to forgive it. On another occasion, however, he allowed himself to be carried away by his passion, and was obliged to do penance. The separation of the empire had already become so natural, through the circumstances of the times, that Theodosius also determined to adopt it; but it was an unpardonable mistake that he divided it between his two sons, neither of whom were capable of carrying on the government, especially as Honorius was only eleven years old; for which reason, Theodosius appointed Stilicho his guardian. But the idea of an hereditary empire had already taken such firm root, that Theodosius implicitly trusted to Stilicho's preserving the empire for his son, just as in our times, a minister or a general would do.

During the period from Diocletian to Theodosius, Roman literature was in the most wretched condition. Ausonius is the only poet of that time, and he is incredibly bad: it is nothing but the reverence of the French scholars of the sixteenth century that has raised him to a somewhat elevated position; but he is in reality as bad as the worst poets of the middle ages. Prose, too, is extremely barren. About the middle of the fourth century, arose the epitomisers, especially Eutropius and Victor; and it is possible that the epitome of Livy also was made at that time. These epitomisers were men altogether without talent. Latin grammar, on the other hand, assumed the form in which it has come down to us. Donatus, the instructor of St. Jerome, is the real father of Latin grammar: Charisius does not belong to his school, but is independent; he is an encyclopaedist, who compiled the earlier works. Diomedes, too, is a writer of the fourth century; towards the end of which, we meet with Servius, who, in accordance with the character of his age, condensed into a small compass what he collected from his predecessors. The only work of his which has come down to us in its genuine form, is the commentary on the first two books of the Aeneid; that on the other books exists only in an abridgment, which was probably made in the seventh or eighth century. Festus, a similar author, who reduced the work of Verrius Flaccus into the form of a dictionary, is very useful to us, although he did not always understand Verrius. Nonius Marcellus lived probably somewhat later, but he belongs to the same school of grammarians, to which the impulse had been previously given. Macrobius, lastly, also belongs to the end of the fourth century.

LECTURE CXXXV.

A BETTER prose style began after the reign of Theodosius. Ammianus Marcellinus, a very talented writer, though not always correct, belongs to the time of Theodosius. He is particularly honest and noble-minded: he had served himself as a soldier, and was a man of experience, without which no one can be an historian. From the time of Alexander Severus to that of Diocletian, no one had written history in the Latin language; in the reign of the latter, at the beginning of the fourth century, we meet with the so-called *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, whose works are beneath all criticism: from that time till the reign of Theodosius, there is again a vacuum. Ammianus was a Greek of Antioch; and one can see, from his work, that he is a foreigner.

The rhetoricians continued as before. Marius Victorinus, bad as he is, formed an epoch. We may also mention the praefect Symmachus, who belonged to the school of the rhetoricians, and whose letters are altogether imitations of those of Pliny, but very barren in historical matter. His panegyric, too, belongs to a school which reminds us of that of Pliny. Panegyric writers in general now came to be in vogue, such as Eumenius, Pacatus and others. This is a sad branch of literature, from which we see that people had ceased to be ashamed to flatter.

Of poetry there is not a trace until the time of Theodosius, if we except the epigram on the obelisk of Constantius, and that upon Constantine, which was placarded as a pasquinade.

With Theodosius a new spirit appeared in Latin literature.

There now arose Claudian, a Greek of Alexandria, who in fact at first wrote in Greek. There are few examples of persons writing in a foreign language as correctly as he did; perhaps Goldoni[1] is the only author who can in this respect be compared to him. M. Aurelius also wrote very good Greek. Claudian's language leaves nothing to be desired; we see that his acquisition of the Latin language had been a task of love. He is a truly poetic genius, though after the fashion of the later Greek poets. He possesses an extraordinary command of mythological lore; his language has a beautiful flow and great elegance. Sometimes his style is luxuriant; but we read his poems with almost the same pleasure as we derive from those of Ovid. J. M. Gesner was extremely fond of him. After Claudian, there arose a peculiar school of poetry; for his influence was very great. Merobaudes, whose fragments I had the happiness to discover at St. Gallen, was one of his followers. Although he was a native of the western empire, yet his language contains much that deserves censure; he, however, was not a mere word-monger, but used language to express his feelings; he is quite an enthusiastic admirer of Aëtius. The same Merobaudes is, no doubt, the author of a very excellent and profound poem which is printed in Fabricius' " Poetae Christiani.[2] Another poem on the miracles of Christ, which is printed among those of Claudian, seems likewise to belong to him; for Claudian was a pagan, but Merobaudes a Christian. At the close of the century, we meet with Sidonius Apollinaris, whom Gesner justly calls a great mind. His Latinity is Gallic, containing traces of the romance language; and we see that the spoken language was widely different from that of literature: but it is evident that he was a man of very varied acquirements. There were at that time historians also, for the age was a stirring one and rich in materials, but most of their works have perished: a fragment of Renatus Profuturus[3], which is still extant gives us a very favorable notion of his ability. But the Christian writers who have not yet received the attention and study which they deserve, form quite a new literature. Of Lactantius, I have already spoken; he is very important: others, such as St. Ambrose, are less so as authors. St Jerome and

[1] Is not perhaps Galiani meant here?
[2] P. 765. Comp. Niebuhr's pref. to Merobaudes, p. 10.
[3] In Gregorius Turonensis, ii. 8, he is called Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus.

St. Augustine are two great men, or rather giants: what I know of them justifies me in giving them high praise. The literary and critical writings of St. Jerome are dry and barren; but in his other works he displays animation, elasticity of mind, learning to an immense extent, and wit which continues till his old age, and constitutes the predominant feature of his character. Had he not been an ecclesiastical writer, he *might* have shone by his wit in the same manner as Pascal did. St. Augustine possessed a truly philosophic mind; he is as much guided by a desire to form an unbiassed conviction as any other of the great philosophers: in addition to this, his language is very noble; he is not witty like St. Jerome, but he is eloquent, and in many passages excites our admiration. The last half of the fourth, and the whole of the fifth century, is the classical age of Christian literature. Sulpicius Severus' ecclesiastical history, is a masterly production. I may here also mention the poems of Caelius Sedulius and Claudius Mamertus. The great activity of the Gallic mind belongs to that century; for with all its distress, Gaul then had an excellent intellectual period. The writings of Salvianus, presbyter, or bishop of Marseilles, are very remarkable. He wrote on the government of God, and against avarice. The language is Gallican: his rhetorical tendency may be censured, but his works are extremely interesting on account of their political tendency, which is quite different from that which we find in Orosius. He describes all the misfortunes of the times; but, instead of indulging in canting exhortations, he fastens upon those who had neglected their duties in times of prosperity, and especially upon the wealthy; this political indignation against the rulers of the earth is quite singular. He has altogether a republican tendency, which is an interesting psychological and historical phenomenon. We see whither the eyes of the church were at that time directed: it had many republican elements of which Salvianus had a very clear perception. His real object is equality of property under the administration of elders. In point of time, Prudentius is the first of the Christian poets; but his productions are not above mediocrity. The greatest Christian poet is Pope Hilarius, to whom we must undoubtedly ascribe a poem which was formerly assigned to St. Hilarius, who cannot, however, have been its author, as it is clear from the dedication that it was com-

posed in the fifth century. It treats of the creation, is full of poetry, and is written quite in the style of Lucretius, whom Hilarius evidently intended to imitate. His language and prosody are not free from errors; but he is nevertheless a great poet. He was the friend of the great Pope Leo, by whom he was sent as ambassador to the furious council of Ephesus, in order to speak words of peace and conciliation. Pope Leo's writings too must be read by posterity; for he was a talented author and altogether a distinguished man.

Greek literature in the fourth century is entirely rhetorical; in the fifth it rises, and we meet with poets and historians. The latter begins with Eunapius, after whom there follows a succession of historians, as Priscus, Malchus, Candidus, and others. The philosophy of the new Platonists likewise continued its career; and in the fifth century, poetry also re-appears. The formation of the eastern empire was evidently followed by consequences salutary to literature.

Architecture had fallen into complete decay as early as the fourth century. Constantine's buildings are the most barefaced robberies. His arch is copied from that of Trajan; and all that belongs to his own age is contemptible. The place of painting was completely supplied by the art of working in mosaic, which at that time was really beautiful. In the chapel of Pope Hilarius, there are very fine mosaics; they were peculiar to the western countries; although there can be no doubt that the art originated at Alexandria. On the whole, ignorance and indifference to literature was ever on the increase, even in the higher classes; the remembrance of earlier times had become quite extinct.

On the death of Theodosius, Arcadius, one of his two sons, was eighteen years old, and Honorius, the other, eleven. The latter was entrusted to the guardianship of Stilicho, and Rufinus governed the East, which had been assigned to Arcadius.[4] Stilicho was certainly not of Roman origin, though it is impossible to decide the question as to his birth-place. In the wars of Theodosius he must have greatly distinguished himself, for he had risen to the rank of *magister utriusque militiae*, and Theodosius had given to him, in marriage, his own niece (his brother's daughter) Serena, whom he had adopted (the writers of that time call her *Regina*). Stilicho was complete

[4] Comp. Gothofredus' Prosopography of the Theodosian Code.

master of the West; but in the East, Arcadius, supported by Eutropius, endeavoured to get rid of the guidance of Rufinus; and the latter, who was trying to get his daughter married to Arcadius, was disappointed by a dexterous court intrigue; but his eyes were soon opened, and he continued in the exercise of unlimited power. Stilicho wanted to go to Constantinople, by availing himself of the pretext of leading back the troops of the East, which were still stationed in Italy; but Rufinus, being terrified, caused the emperor to issue a command that he was not to stir. Stilicho, dutifully, gave up the plan, and sent the troops to the East. They advanced: Rufinus, who was taken by surprise in the field of Mars, near Constantinople, was surrounded and murdered. Power was now transferred, mainly, to the hands of Eutropius the eunuch.

Alaric was advancing with his Visigoths from East to West: he had revolted against the Roman empire soon after the death of Theodosius, and carried the war into Greece. The feeble life which still existed in that country was now entirely destroyed; and the country became quite prostrate, as it had been under Decius and Gallienus; but I have no time to dwell upon the history of the East. Stilicho brought succours and defeated Alaric, who, however, escaped from his conqueror, and in the neighbourhood of Rhium crossed the Crissaean gulf with his booty, and went to Epirus. This shows that he was a great man. Soon afterwards, Alaric formed a reconciliation with the eastern empire, and was appointed *magister militum* in Illyricum, under which title he was, in reality, imperial prefect. How he obtained that dignity, how he lost it; and when Illyricum ceased to be in the hands of the Goths, and was reunited with the eastern empire, are questions to which history furnishes no answers. In general, the history of the migration of the nations at that time, if accurately examined, presents questions and phenomena, which defy all attempts to solve them. The history of that period is so imperfectly known, that it is impossible to form a decisive opinion upon the most important circumstances. The Ostrogoths, and perhaps also the Gepidae, likewise appear in Illyricum, in the reign of Valens. After the time of Attila, under the Emperor Marcian, they appear in two kingdoms on the Danube.[5] Where had they been during the intermediate

[5] The words "on the Danube," do not exist in the MS. notes, and have been inserted by conjecture.

period? Under Attila, it is said, they were in Pannonia; but in what part of Pannonia? for on the north of the Danube they cannot have been. The history is in utter confusion, and new materials cannot be looked for; but, I nevertheless believe, that by a careful and strict examination of the existing materials, many a question may yet be solved, which Gibbon and others have not put to themselves at all.

LECTURE CXXXVI.

ALARIC now appeared in the western empire, and it is not improbable that he was sent thither by the instigations of the East. Honorius and his court were then at Milan, which ever since the time of Maximian had frequently been the residence of the emperors, and had become a real capital. Milan, though very strongly fortified, was situated in a plain, and unable to protect Honorius: accordingly when Alaric advanced, from Aquileia, the emperor fled across the Alps. But when he had reached Asti in Piedmont, he was surrrounded by the Goths; there Stilicho came to his relief, bringing with him all the forces he had been able to muster, but they were chiefly barbarians. Valour had become extinct in Italy, just as literature and the creative mind in it had disappeared. The Italians were counted only by heads, and it had become altogether impossible to levy troops among them. The states of the church and Naples, even in our days, would not be able to withstand a determined army of 600 men; and a few thousand Algerians, if they knew this weakness, might overwhelm and ransack Rome. On Easter Sunday, Stilicho with his army attacked the Goths near Pollentia, in the territory of Montferrat, and was victorious. Fanaticism imputed it to him as a crime, that he had fought the battle on a sacred day. The Goths were not dispersed, but were obliged to think of a retreat. Alaric made a bold move in advance towards Rome, but Stilicho followed him. After a second unsuccessful engagement, Alaric concluded a convention, and withdrew from Italy. Honorius triumphed, and built a triumphal arch, which was still standing in the 14th century, but was then unfortunately broken down. Another monument of that period still exists, viz., the inscription on the Porta S. Lorenzo, in which the traces of Stilicho's name are still visible; and he is said to have restored the walls *egestis immensibus ruderibus*. Aurelian had fortified Rome; but after his time, the walls were in a very bad condition, and Stilicho now repaired them. There can be no doubt that the Monte Testaccio arose on that occasion, the walls having previously been buried in shells. It is a marsh filled up with shells.

Soon after Alaric had withdrawn to Illyricum, Italy was visited by a fresh disaster. Radagaisus, who is likewise said to have been a Goth, but who was unconnected with the Ostrogoths, advanced with an army of Suevi, Vandals and other nations, which were not yet Christians, and were accordingly much more cruel than the Goths. They invaded Italy from the Alps, traversing the unfortunate plains of Lombardy, and laid siege to Florence. There Stilicho again met them, and with extraordinary skill forced them back into the Apennines. It is hardly conceivable how those swarms allowed themselves so quietly to be driven into the mountains. Most of them perished in their distressing situation, but many surrendered and were sold as slaves in great numbers.

Italy was thus saved. The eastern empire, although at peace with Persia, did not take the least part in the dangers and misfortunes of the West. It had been necessary to draw the forces away from the Rhenish frontier and from Britain, whence Britain separated itself from the Roman empire. The troops on the Rhine were very much weakened, and unable to withstand the attacks of the Alemannians, Burgundians, Suevi, Vandals, and Alani. These nations crossed the Rhine in A.D. 407, and spread over Gaul, which was fearfully oppressed by the taxes which were levied by the barbarians. Its sufferings were aggravated by the system of solidary obligation, whereby each community was made answerable for the sums imposed upon it: in the first place, the decuriones, who were mostly selected from among the wealthy, were made responsible for the money, and if they were unable to pay it, they were subjected even to tortures, and were then left to collect it again as best they could. Hence many would rather be sold into slavery than accept such a dignity. There were very minute laws to compel people

to accept the office of decurio, and most of their regulations have reference to the excuses which were not to be considered valid. This burden, of which no remission was granted, stirred up the peasant wars as early as the third century, of which we find the first traces in the reign of Gallienus, and which after his time never ceased. The appearance of the Bagaudae (this is the name of those peasants), has very much occupied the attention of French antiquaries; they consisted of the inhabitants of entire districts which were in arms to resist the extortions of the government. The details of the distress now inflicted upon the Gauls by the barbarians are unknown. But the warlike spirit arose earlier there than in Italy. The inhabitants of Auvergne became truly warlike, and defended themselves against the attacks of their enemies. When Gaul was ransacked, those nations directed their steps towards Spain. The Suevi, Alani and Vandals evacuated Gaul entirely; the Burgundians remained behind in Bourgogne, Franche Comté, and Savoy, and afterwards also in Dauphiné: at that time they occupied the country of the Aequi and Sequani, and the western parts of Switzerland. The Suevi and Vandals in Spain were quite independent of the Roman empire, and always remained hostile; whereas the Burgundians, a small tribe in an extensive country, recognised the supremacy of Rome like that of a feudal sovereign, in gratitude for being permitted to form settlements in its dominions.

Stilicho was unable to save Gaul, and much censure was heaped upon him on that account; he excited mistrust in Honorius and at the court, as soon as his son Eucherius grew up to manhood. Honorius had been successively married to two daughters of Stilicho, Maria and Thermantia. Maria died without leaving any children, and as Thermantia too was not expected to become a mother, every body anticipated that Stilicho would make his son emperor. But it is by no means proved, that Stilicho aimed at the life of Honorius: it is much more probable, that if he had been let alone, he would have quietly waited till the death of Honorius, and then it would have been quite a matter of course, that Eucherius should have succeeded, for Stilicho was the pillar of the empire, and he alone made an imposing impression upon Alaric. Honorius now formed a conspiracy against Stilicho; just as Louis XIII. conspired against one of his subjects, and after having

previously caused an insurrection of the army, got him assassinated in his palace. Stilicho's friends were first murdered; he himself fled into a church, but was dragged forth from it and killed, together with his son. His widow, Serena, was sentenced to death by the infamous senate.

The murder of Stilicho was a pretext for Alaric again to invade Italy. Honorius took up his residence in the inaccessible town of Ravenna, which then, like Venice at present, was situated upon islands, being separated by lagoons from the mainland with which it was connected only by a neck of land. Alaric did not trouble himself with the siege of Ravenna, but marched on the Flaminian road towards Rome and blockaded it. The city soon began to suffer from the most fearful famine. People were murdered in order that their bodies might serve for food; and even children are said to have been eaten by their own parents. In addition to this there arose a plague, the necessary consequence of such circumstances. At last a capitulation was agreed to. It is not easy to see why Alaric entered into it; but he probably did so, because the summer had already commenced, so that his army too began to suffer from epidemics. Rome ransomed itself. Negotiations for peace were to be commenced between the court of Ravenna and Alaric; and the emperor was to appoint Alaric commander-in-chief of all the forces of the western empire. But these negotiations producing no results, Alaric returned to Rome a second time: the senate deserted Honorius; Alaric proclaimed Attalus, the praefectus praetorio, emperor, marched with him to Ravenna, and Honorius was so pusillanimous as to recognise Attalus as his colleague. Meantime reinforcements arrived in the port of Ravenna, Attalus fell into disgrace with Alaric, Honorius again broke off the negotiations, and Alaric returned to Rome a third time. The memorable and fearful destruction of Rome took place on the 24th August, A.D. 410. The Salarian gate which is still standing was opened to the Goths by treachery. Rome experienced many of the horrors of a city taken by storm; but little blood was shed, though many people were carried away into captivity. The Goths knew no measure in their lust and rapacity: the inhabitants were compelled by torture to disclose where they had concealed their treasures; the churches alone were not plundered. After the plunder had lasted for three days, the enemy began to evacuate the city, which the last of them quitted on the sixth

day. Alaric marched southward as far as Rhegium, wanting to cross over to Sicily, but he turned back. Two years after the taking of Rome, he died at Cosenza.[1] The command of his army was given to Athaulf, his brother-in-law: he was different from Alaric, and feeling an attachment to the Romans, he left Italy, and went to Languedoc. He ruled as an independent prince, and as an ally of Rome, over a country on both sides of the Pyrenees, comprising a part of Languedoc and Catalonia. He married Placidia, the sister of Honorius, who had been carried away a prisoner, and who now drew the bond of union between her husband and brother so closely, that it became an actual friendship. Athaulf had already led his troops to Spain, where he conquered the Vandals, Suevi, and Alani, and drove them into Asturia, Gallicia, and Lusitania; the provinces which he did not occupy himself, he restored to the Roman empire. He likewise did good service against a usurper, Jovinus, and his brother Sebastianus.

LECTURE CXXXVII.

WHILE Alaric was in Italy, an officer of the name of Constantine had been proclaimed Augustus by the soldiers in Britain, and had been recognised in Gaul. Another usurper, Gerontius, who had raised his friend Maximus to the throne, rose against him. An army of Honorius, under the command of Constantius, marched into Gaul, apparently to assist Constantine, which was very good policy. Constantius compelled Gerontius and Maximus, who were besieging Arles, to make away with themselves: in like manner, he afterwards continued the war against Constantine, and thus restored Gaul and Spain to the Romans. After Athaulf's death, he was rewarded for this service with the hand of Galla Placidia. The friendly relations between the Visigoths and Romans once more ceased, Singeric and Wallia having turned against the Romans; for the Visigoths were very jealous of their independence, and they now returned to their

[1] This is referred to in the excellent poem of Count Von Platen, entitled "*Das Grab im Busento.*"—N.

former condition. From this time forward, down to the invasion of Attila, Italy enjoyed peace, if we except the plundering devastation of the sea-coast by Genseric; but we may easily imagine how slow its progress towards recovery must have been. Honorius died in A.D. 423.

Placidia had borne two children to Constantius—Placidus Valentinian and Justa Grata Honoria, both of whom proved to be misfortunes for the empire. Constantius had forced Honorius to raise him to the rank of Augustus; but he died immediately afterwards, and even before Honorius. His son was only four years old at the time of Honorius' death, and accordingly could not succeed to the throne. Arcadius had previously died; and the government was nominally in the hands of his very youthful son, Theodosius II, who throughout his life remained in a state of dependence, his sister Pulcheria, in reality, holding the reins of government, which was a misfortune for the East. Galla Placidia fled with her children to Constantinople; but before succour came from that quarter, a usurper, John, the first emperor bearing a Christian name[2], took possession of the government, and ruled for two years. Theodosius, however, gave the crown to his cousin, the boy Valentinian III, and sent two armies to Italy under the command of two Isaurians, Ardaburius and Aspar. This undertaking did not at once succeed, the fleet being dispersed by a storm; but Aspar penetrated, without any difficulty, through Illyricum, which seems to have come again under the sovereignty of the emperor. John was abandoned by his troops, and Placidus[3] Valentinian proclaimed emperor.

His mother Placidia now ruled over the West, not indeed in such a manner as to deserve great praise; but after her death, about the middle of the century, when her son stood alone, matters became much worse. Rome was then richer in great men than in the times of the better emperors; we must mention in particular Bonifacius and Aëtius, neither of whom could supplant the other, without bringing about the downfall of the empire. The personal character of Bonifacius is little known, but he appears to have been an Italian; Aëtius was a Scythian,

[2] John, however, is not altogether a Christian name, for Johannes Lydus was certainly a pagan.

[3] The form *Placidius* is not supported by as good authority: on coins and monuments, we generally find *Placidus*.

that is a native of lower Moesia, from the district of Silistria, and descended from a Latin family, notwithstanding his Greek name. His father was a man of rank, and had lost his life by treachery or a tyrannical act of Alaric. The age of Aëtius cannot be accurately determined; at the time of his death he must have been between fifty and sixty, or even upwards of sixty; for when a young man he had been a hostage with Alaric and the Huns, to whom he was afterwards frequently employed as an ambassador. He made an imposing impression on them, by being equal to them in valour and yet having the advantages of a higher education. He was an extraordinary man whom the rulers ought to have let alone, as the Athenians should have done in the case of Alcibiades; but he was by no means of an unblemished character: he was unjust and hostile towards Bonifacius, a circumstance which brought great misery upon the empire. His influence with Placidia and Valentinian was unlimited, and thus he caused Bonifacius who was governor (*comes*) of Africa to be recalled and summoned to Ravenna, where the court was then residing. Bonifacius could not expect anything but that he would there be put to death, and accordingly formed the unfortunate resolution of inviting the Vandals, who were then in the west of Spain, to come to Africa. They came under Gonderic; and the devastation of Africa, from the straits of Gibraltar to Carthage was the consequence. No German tribe ever carried on war with such faithlessness and obstinacy. Before this time Africa had suffered little. They were supported by the Donatists who by terrible persecutions had been reduced to despair: they were in reality only rigorists who had separated in consequence of the election of a bishop under Diocletian: they were a rude sect, but noble fanatics, who were terribly ill-used. There is no doubt that their persecution was continued afterwards, and that the Arabs met with support among them: the oppressed found their deliverers in the barbarians. These events should be a lesson to those who are determined not to see the misfortune which is the result of intolerance, or, as it deserves to be called, injustice. This fearful persecution of the Donatists had even then lasted upwards of a hundred years. Genseric, who succeeded his brother Gonderic, took possession of the whole country, with the exception of a few places, in A.D. 429; the Moorish tribes

were left in peace and perfectly free, the dominion of the Vandals extending only over the territory of Tunis and the maritime towns. Bonifacius' eyes were now opened to the terrible misfortune which he had occasioned; and he in vain endeavoured to check the tide of events. He received the confidence of Placidia, who in this respect showed a noble mind; she sent him troops, which were however defeated in two decisive battles. After some years, a truce and peace were concluded, in which Rome gave up the greater part of Africa, except Carthage and some other places. This peace, however, was not kept by the faithless Genseric, who availing himself of the facilities it afforded him, made himself master of Carthage. Carthage was, next to Rome, the greatest city in the western empire, and stood to Rome in the same relation as Adrianople to Constantinople. Its circumference was immense; it was situated outside the ancient city, of the gardens of which it occupied the site. Salvianus of Marseilles describes what the place was, but he says that one ought rather to rejoice at than to lament its capture by the barbarians, for immorality had reached its highest point, and it is inconceivable how the city could call itself Christian. In earlier times, Christianity had indeed exercised a salutary influence upon many individuals, but since it had been adopted by the masses, the select community ceased to exist, and it no longer exercised any influence upon the morals of the bulk of the population. It is remarkable to see how, at that time, entire cities became Christian with the same frivolity with which they proclaimed a new ruler, the population remaining as thoroughly bad as it had been before. It was the greatest misfortune for the world and for Christianity, that Constantine made the latter become so quickly the universal religion; the hierarchy grew worse and worse: there still existed indeed popes like Leo the Great, but at the same time many bishops were worthless.

The Vandals sailed from Africa on plundering expeditions with their fleets to Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and the coasts of Italy; and this piracy inflicted new miseries on Italy, which had already somewhat recovered: many districts, it is true, had remained waste, and most of the inhabitants had surrendered themselves to the grandees as serfs. Another misfortune was, that most of the Roman nobles had their estates in Africa, and these families, the accounts of whose wealth sound quite fabulous, were ruined, for Genseric confiscated everything.

A new tempest now broke forth in another quarter; this was the Huns, who had formerly expelled the Goths. We have no distinct traces of their abodes in the time of Theodosius and his sons, but they probably lived in the country from the Don to Wallachia. In the early part of the reign of Theodosius we find them on the Danube, and they even advanced across the Theiss into Pannonia. Our accounts of all these occurrences are too miserable to enable us to see our way clearly. Desguigne's hypothesis that they came from China is wrong, as I have already remarked, and has been justly abandoned. The Huns now appear in Pannonia, the boundary of which must have been lost by the Romans. Bledas and Attila (Bledel and Etzel), the two sons[4] of Rugilas, appeared with a formidable power as kings of the Huns. Gibbon's description of Attila's power, however, is one of the weak parts of his work, for he believes that Attila's empire extended as far as China. It may have extended beyond the Don to the Volga. The German tribes did homage to him, as we see from our ancient poems; hence he spared them, and the poems do not speak ill of him. The main strength of his empire, as Frederik Schlegel has justly observed, consisted in the German tribes; though he himself, as Jornandes describes him, was a Mongol, and surrounded by Mongols; but that Mongolic tribe was comparatively weak, whence the Germans became free immediately after his death. Until the middle of the fifth century, Attila had directed his arms against the Eastern empire only, which he fearfully harassed by devastation, disgraceful peaces, and tribute. Servia, and the greater part of Bulgaria, were changed by him into a complete wilderness. The Huns were literally destroyers, fierce and blood-thirsty, and very different from the Goths. The Western empire was not in a condition to send assistance to the distressed East, being itself hard pressed by the Vandals. There existed at that time, even a kind of friendly relation between the Western empire and the Huns, manifested by the interchange of presents. Aëtius was exiled and had gone to the Huns; but he afterwards returned, and under their protection, established his power in the empire, until it was so firm that he no longer required them. He had restored the authority of Rome beyond all expectation. In Gaul, he had subdued the distant countries on the sea coast

[4] It should rather be *nepheus*.

which had made themselves independent. The frontier of the Rhine was also destroyed, but only in such a manner that the Franks occupied the country from Belgium to the Saone; and that the Burgundians, though they were governed by kings of their own, had to pay tribute to Rome. But Provence, a part of Dauphiné, Lower Languedoc, the country about the Lower Loire, Auvergne, and the north-west of Gaul, and also Spain on the Mediterranean, with the exception of Catalonia, were subject to Rome. The Visigoths occupied the south of Spain. No European country is so divided as the western empire then was; those countries were for the most part heaps of ruins, and reduced to the greatest misery; of which we may form some conception if we read the poems of Logau, referring to the period at the end of the Thirty-Years' war.

Attila was induced to march into Gaul, by a dispute with a Frankish dynasty. Aëtius there united against him the troops of the Visigoths, the ruling party of the Franks in Gaul, under Merovaeus and the Burgundians, with the feeble power of the empire. Nearly all his troops were barbarians, but they were guided by his spirit. Attila was besieging Orleans, which was on the point of falling into his hands, and would have been destroyed like the cities on the Rhine, when Aëtius and Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, came to its relief. Attila retreated into Champagne (*Campi Catalaunici*). The decisive battle, in the year A.D. 451, is incorrectly called the battle of Chalons. I consider this by no means accurate; for the *Campi Catalaunici* is Champagne, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to place the scene of the battle in the neighbourhood of Chalons. In that fearful battle, Attila led the barbarians of the East against the barbarians of the West, the Germans preponderating among the latter. Aëtius, however, had to fight, not only against greater numbers, but also against treachery: the Alani, stationed in the centre of the army, gave way, and the Huns broke into it. The Visigoths were on the point of being routed, and Theodoric was killed; but Thorismund, his heir, led the decisive attack; and Aëtius, too, in the end, conquered. The Huns were not defeated, but withdrew to their fortress of waggons; and as Aëtius did not venture to pursue them any farther, both belligerent parties retreated. The reported number of the slain and captured in that battle are quite incredible.

After the winter had passed away, Attila appeared in Italy,

where Aëtius could oppose to him only the weak and untrustworthy army of the country, which had become quite unwarlike. Aquileia, Padua, and other towns, were destroyed, and all who did not escape were murdered: many fled into the marshes, and this was the occasion of the foundation of Venice. The details related of the first tribunes of Venice and the like, are fabulous. Attila had been invited to come to Italy by the princess Honoria.

LECTURE CXXXVIII.

THE death of Attila, which soon followed, would perhaps have quieted Italy, had not Aëtius the only support of Rome, been killed at the same time. If Aëtius had wished it, he might have revolted long before, and usurped the throne; but he was satisfied with being acknowledged as the real sovereign of the empire. His title was *Patricius*, but in chronicles, he is also called *Dux Romanorum*. His younger son, Gaudentius, was betrothed to Eudoxia, the daughter of Valentinian; both were yet very young, and Aëtius no doubt thereby intended to secure the succession to Gaudentius. Valentinian, however, was not yet advanced in years, and apprehensive that he might be deprived of his government, if Aëtius' plan succeeded, he conspired against him. Aëtius unsuspectingly went to Rome; and having entered the imperial palace on the Palatine, Valentinian himself ran him through with his sword. It was no doubt customary at Rome, as it was at Constantinople, that no one should appear before the emperor armed. His son, too, and many of his friends, were murdered. I am inclined to believe that this event was the cause of Ricimer's rising: he at least appears soon after in Aëtius' place. Rome was now deprived of the great man who alone could secure the safety of the empire; for all the successors of Valentinian held their power only nominally. Valentinian completed the misery of the state by an outrage which he committed on the wife of Petronius Maximus, whom he treacherously enticed into the palace, for the purpose of satisfying his base lust. This deed roused the injured husband to form a conspiracy. Valentinian

was murdered in the field of Mars, and Petronius Maximus was proclaimed emperor.

Meantime the wife of the latter died, and he compelled Valentinian's widow, Eudoxia, to marry him; but she, who had loved her former husband, notwithstanding his dissoluteness, now brooded over the means of revenge. She invited Genseric to come to Rome, and take possession of the city. This conquest was so easy, that we can hardly conceive why he did not undertake it before, or repeat it afterwards: the influence of the empress is visible throughout. Genseric appeared; the clergy and senate went out to meet him, imploring his mercy, and he promised not to destroy the people. But, notwithstanding this, the rage of the soldiers was almost as unbridled as if the city had been taken by storm, except that not so much blood was shed. The city was plundered for fourteen days. All the silver and works of art in bronze were carried away; the gold plates and the gilt tiles on the Capitol; nay, everything of any value that could be moved, was conveyed to the ships of the Vandals stationed at Ostia Petronius himself was slain during the tumult, and the conquerors left Rome exhausted and lifeless. The senate did not venture to proclaim a new emperor.

At this moment, M. Maecilius Avitus, a very wealthy and highly educated nobleman, set himself up as emperor in Auvergne, and crossed the Alps. No one had really proclaimed him, but circumstances had become quite altered; the army in the provinces did not proclaim the emperor, but a peculiar custom had gradually arisen, according to which, in cases where there was no heir, the senate elected the emperor, the people sanctioned the election by acclamation, and the soldiers recognised it. Avitus, on his arrival in Rome, was acknowledged emperor; but Ricimer, a Suevian of royal descent, was now all powerful in the city. All the barbarians, who acted a prominent part at Rome, must not be looked upon as savages: they were Christians, and spoke and understood the *lingua vulgaris*, which already resembled the Italian more than the Latin; they were just as civilised as our ancestors in the middle ages. A few of them had a shadow of classical education, as Theodoric, the Visigoth, and the younger Alaric; but the case was quite different with Ricimer and his equals, who no doubt heartily despised the culture of the Romans.

Those Germans, unfortunately, were not one shade better than the effeminate Italians; they were just as faithless and cruel. Ricimer soon became faithless to Avitus, who took possession of the bishopric of Placentia; but soon quitted that place also, and seems to have died a natural death, in consequence of a disease which was brought on by the persecutions to which he was exposed.

Ricimer now raised to the place of Avitus a man of a character such as one would hardly expect to meet with in the time of Rome's decay. This was Majorian, apparently a native of Italy (A.D. 457). Unwarlike as the Italian people then were, they still produced distinguished generals, as we see in the case of Aëtius and Majorian. The latter certainly deserves the praise bestowed upon him by Procopius. Sidonius, the inscription on his tomb, his laws, the single traits which are related of him, all are unanimous in his praise. Procopius says that he excelled all Roman emperors; and he certainly was a man of high character and of very practical mind. He maintained his station for four years; and although he had by his side the faithless barbarian Ricimer, who had the main forces of the empire at his disposal, yet Majorian was lord and master. The Visigoths in Upper Languedoc and Catalonia acknowledged his personal greatness, and did homage to him and the majesty of the Roman empire, which he had restored. The Vandals were the plague of the empire: he intended therefore to undertake an expedition against them; for which he had made extraordinary preparations, being determined to come to no arrangement with them, but to destroy them. He would indeed have crushed them, had he not been thwarted by domestic treachery. It is evident that Ricimer betrayed him, and induced Genseric to cause a conflagration in the Roman fleet at Carthagena. Majorian, nevertheless, concluded an advantageous peace, which secured at least the coasts of Italy and Sicily. When he returned, a conspiracy was formed against him at the instigation of Ricimer: he was compelled to abdicate, and died a few days afterwards (A.D. 461).

Ricimer's unlimited power under a nominal emperor lasted until A.D. 467. During those seven years, the name of sovereign was borne by an utterly unknown emperor, Libius Severus. Ricimer had a mercenary army consisting of what are called *foederati*, which included all kinds of German tribes, and he

regarded Italy as his kingdom; but his own condition in which he had to protect Italy was dangerous, and he could not maintain it against Genseric. His power was limited. All that the Romans yet possessed in Gaul and Spain were under the command of the *magister militum*, Aegidius, a very distinguished man and a Roman, who made himself independent, ruling over Spain and a part of Gaul. Marcellinus, another commander, an old and faithful servant of Aëtius, set himself up as prince of Illyricum. After Severus' death, A.D. 465, Ricimer ruled alone, being confined to Italy, which country was still a prey to the Vandal pirates. Under these circumstances, Ricimer allowed the senate to apply to the Emperor Leo at Constantinople, with the request that he would appoint an emperor under his own supremacy and succour Italy.

Leo appointed Anthemius, a son-in-law of his predecessor Marcian, whom he was glad to get rid of, and sent him to the West with considerable forces, making preparations for a great undertaking against the Vandals. By the death of Aegidius the prefecture of Gaul had become reunited to Italy, and Marcellinus too had placed Illyricum again under the supremacy of the emperor. By an expedition made from Italy, Sardinia was taken from the Vandals; and Basiliscus, a general of the East and Leo's brother-in-law, led a great army against Carthage, while another was sent against Tripolis. The undertaking was hopeful, and its commencement successful; but Genseric, who always conquered by discovering the venal among his opponents, averted the decisive blow by cunning and fraud: there is even a suspicion that Basiliscus sold himself, and it is not impossible that Ricimer too was guilty; but however this may be, the expedition proved an utter failure. Ricimer and Anthemius now quarrelled with each other, although Anthemius had given his daughter in marriage to Ricimer. Thus the aid expected from the eastern empire occasioned a greater misfortune than that against which it had been besought. Ricimer took up his court at Milan, while Anthemius resided at Rome. Both were implacable enemies, and an attempt at a reconciliation led to nothing.

A new pretender, Olybrius, the husband of Valentinian's younger daughter, who, besides this claim, put forth those of the Anician family, now offered himself to Ricimer, who caused him to be proclaimed; but Anthemius refused to surrender

Rome, which was besieged by Ricimer for three months. At length Ricimer forced his way into the city by the bridge. It was taken by storm and experienced all the horrors of a conquered city. As the marriage of Ricimer with the daughter of Anthemius had been the last brilliant event for Rome, so this capture of the city was the most fearful calamity that had ever befallen it, more fearful even than the conquest by the Goths and Vandals. Pope Gelasius expresses himself very strongly respecting the horrible deeds of destruction which were perpetrated on that occasion. Anthemius himself was killed: Ricimer and Olybrius survived him only a few months. About this time there seem to have been epidemics, which are in fact mentioned.

Gundobald, king of the Burgundians, who had now become *patricius* and succeeded Ricimer, proclaimed Glycerius emperor. But the court of Constantinople sent against him Julius Nepos, likewise a noble Roman, who, with some assistance from Constantinople, took possession of Rome and Ravenna. Glycerius abdicated; but Orestes, a Roman of Noricum, who had risen into importance as early as the time of Attila, refused obedience to Nepos. After the withdrawal of Gundobald from Italy, Orestes became *patricius*, that is commander-in-chief. Although a native of Rome, he had been brought up among barbarians, and had adopted their language, manners, dress, and mode of living. For reasons with which we are not acquainted, he proclaimed as emperor his son Romulus, who had received his strange name from his maternal grandfather, a *Comes* Romulus in Noricum.

Even Nepos had given up the Roman possessions in Gaul, that he might be acknowledged by the Visigoths; and what he ceded to them was more than they could occupy. The people of Auvergne gave up the hopeless thought of resistance; but in the north of Gaul, between the Burgundians and Franks, a considerable part of the country was still Roman, though it had been separated from the body of the Roman empire as early as the death of Aegidius. It was now governed by Syagrius, and continued to be so ten years after the fall of the western empire, until Syagrius too was overpowered by Clovis. Romulus, who was not called Augustus, but Augustulus, was the last emperor. The barbarous nations stirred up by Odoacer, a German prince, rose against him; they not only claimed

their extravagant pay, but demanded the third part of the landed property as their feudal possession, as was the case with the Visigoths and Burgundians. As Orestes refused to grant this, they rebelled, and wishing to have a ruler of their own, they proclaimed Odoacer king. The latter defeated Orestes and his brother in two battles, and both lost their lives. When Odoacer came to Ravenna, Romulus surrendered to him; he was treated humanely, and was sent with an ample revenue to the Lucullianum in Campania. Whether he there died a natural death or not is unknown.

Thus ended the Roman empire.

Some buildings of the fifth century still exist; the magnificent church of St. Paul, though made up of parts stolen from other buildings, was nevertheless built in a grand style and very ingeniously constructed. The robbery is described in a *novella* of the Emperor Majorian, which forbade it. A hundred and fifty years ago, there still existed in the church of St. Agata de Goti, a piece of Mosaic, from which it was clear, that that church had been built and dedicated by Ricimer.

Although the Romans ceased to form a state, still the history of this nation did not yet become extinct; and even their literature continued to exist partly at Rome, partly at Ravenna. We still possess a number of small poems and inscriptions on tombs and churches, many of which are elegant and beautiful. One sees that the times were not yet barbarous, and Boëthius was worthy of the best ages of literature. Several of the Scholiasts still extant, such as Acron and Porphyrio, belong to the seventh and eighth centuries. The Roman law continued much more uninterruptedly than is commonly believed. An account of the continued influence of the Roman intellect would be very attractive and desirable.

THE END.

CONTENTS OF THE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES.

THE HISTORY OF ROME.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURES.

LECTURE I.

ANCIENT HISTORY may be divided into that which precedes the universal sovereignty of Rome, and which has many central points ; and the history of the Roman dominion, of which the central point is Rome extending its influence in all directions. Other nations, such as the Egyptians, did indeed exercise an intellectual power upon foreign peoples, but they were wanting in spirit. Others again, such as the barbarous nations of the Celtic race and other tribes, acquired importance merely by their mighty conquests. Greece ruled by her spirit; but Rome united all things—the greatest political perfection, power, and spirit ; and her influence became more lasting and inextinguishable than even that of Greece. It has continued down to the latest centuries, nay, even to our own day. Roman history can boast of the greatest characters, actions, and events ; it contains the complete development of the whole life of a nation ; such as is not found in the history of any other people. The development of Eastern history is altogether unknown to us. The Egyptians, from the first, appear divided into castes, that is, living under fixed forms, within which they continued throughout all the centuries of their existence. They remain unchangeable like their mummies. All the changes that we perceive in them are only the symptoms of decay. The growing up of the Roman people takes place almost before our eyes. They too, it is true, lived in fixed forms at a very early period; but their origin is not an impenetrable mystery to us. Other nations are, like the buds of flowers, yet enshrined in their leaves ; they grow up, but die away before they are unfolded, or unfold themselves only imperfectly, just as we see in

the case of individual men ; for of many thousands, a few only are not thwarted in their development. In modern history, the English alone have passed through the same perfect career of development as the Romans ; and in a cosmopolitan point of view therefore, the history of these two nations must always be the most important. I shall endeavour, with the help of God, to relate to you, in one course, the complete history of Rome, during its twelve saecula, which in the legend of Romulus, are prophetically stated as the period of Rome's duration. First I have to relate to you the history of the nation and city, and next, that of the empire and the mass of nations which acquired the name of Romans. The time I shall devote to my subject will, I believe, be sufficient; for it is not my intention to follow out my inquiries step by step, but only to give the results and conclusions to which I have come.

But before proceeding to the history, let us make ourselves acquainted with its sources. Here the first question which presents itself is, Is any credit due to the sources of the earliest history, previously to the rise of an historical literature ? In former times, and down to the eighteenth century, Roman history was treated with a full belief in its truth, that is, uncritically, the confusions and inconsistencies of its early periods being endured without uneasiness ; and such also was the case during a great part of the eighteenth century. In the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries scholars were occupied with the details of history,—chronology, numismatics, and the like. Eminent men, as Tillemont, Eckhel, and others, produced admirable works as far as the detail is concerned ; but it is only in our days, after scepticism had taken possession of the field, that history has been subjected to criticism. But, as is usually the case in such matters, these critical researches, after being once set on foot, have become the principal object in Roman history. This may be well for a time, but it must not always be so: there is too much of it already ; it is dwelt upon too much, and we must try to counteract this tendency *pro virili parte*.

You may expect, first, a view of the literature of Roman history ; secondly, results, and not researches, concerning the early portions of it ; and thirdly, the history of the later times, down to the period when the Roman world assumes a

different aspect ; and it will be my endeavour to render these later times as clear and distinct to you as I can.

I shall first speak of the historians of the commonwealth. They may be divided into great classes, though every thing cannot be classsified without taking some artificial or unnatural point of view. I have already said that there was a time when a simple and sincere belief in the authenticity of the ancient historians prevailed; when the history of Rome was read like that of the German emperors; and it would have been looked upon as a crime or frivolity, if any one had ventured to doubt the historical character of Roman history as transmitted by Livy. It is now incomprehensible to us how even very ingenious writers, men far above us, took the details of ancient history for granted, without feeling any doubt as to their credibility. Thus Scaliger believed the list of the kings of Sicyon to be as authentic and consistent as that of the kings of France. Men lived in a state of literary innocence, which continued after the revival of learning, so long as history was treated merely philologically, and was studied from books alone, and so long only could it last. For when, in the seventeenth century, in the Netherlands, England, France, and Germany, the human mind began to assert its rights, and men raised themselves above their books to that kind of learning which we find among the ancients, some few, though, not without great timidity, began to point out the incongruities and contradictions of Roman history which had been noticed indeed before, but had been passed over in reverential silence. Valla[1], who was so deeply imbued with the spirit of the ancients, that one of his writings was for a long time believed to be the work of an ancient Roman, was struck by the accounts of Livy, and was the first who proved that there were impossibilities in his narrative. His example was followed by Glareanus, whose remarks irritated Sigonius, and induced him to oppose the ingenious German, although Sigonius himself had no idea of historical criticism. At the conclusion of the sixteenth century, Pighius,

[1] It is one of my most pleasing recollections, that I discovered his tombstone, and induced the chapter of the Lateran to replace it in their church, of which he had been a canon. Italy was at that time far in advance of the rest of Europe: next followed the French, and a short time afterwards the Germans, to whom philology was resigned by the former. —N.

a native of the province of Cleves, in the Netherlands, had peculiar ideas about historical criticism, and exhibited prodigious learning in compiling; he was in possession of many good ideas, but did not carry them out successfully. Next came the investigations of Perizonius, which are masterly, and were followed by the sceptical works of Bayle and Beaufort: and here we see what always happens, when truth is not separated from falsehood, or when the separation is not carried on after it has been begun, and after the human mind has struck into such paths that it has become impossible to avoid the complete separation. In the eighteenth century Roman history could not possibly be believed with the intense faith of the sixteenth, when men viewed every thing Roman with as much interest and delight, as they looked on their dearest friends. So long as this was the case, Roman history might perfectly satisfy even the noblest minds without any critical investigations. But when the sphere of the human mind became extended, as in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Roman history could not possibly escape the general influence, since it came into contact with other sciences. Sigonius had felt great pleasure in inquiring, whether a man, whose name is otherwise unknown, had been tribune twice or three times: and and woe to us, if we treat these men with contempt, as if they had busied themselves with trifles! But men now began to turn their attention to what they could comprehend; they endeavoured to understand what they had before collected; reason began to assert its rights. Had Perizonius pursued the path he had struck into, had he not undertaken investigations of quite a different kind, had he been able to believe in the possibility of gaining positive results, matters would have been far better; but without faith no such results can be gained, as in life a man can accomplish nothing without faith. His successors did not proceed in the path which he had opened up; and those who attempted it had not the same extensive powers which he had possessed. The early history of Rome was thus known to be full of contradictions; and it could be demonstrated that statements of much greater authority overthrew the accounts given by Livy or Dionysius. Beaufort was a man of great talent, but had not sufficiently pursued philological studies: he belonged to that light class of sceptics, who feel no want of a positive conviction, and he went so

far as to reject the wheat with the chaff, and to assert that the first four centuries of Roman history deserved no credit. Abbé Pouilly had done the same before him in the "Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des belles Lettres"; but in a very rude manner. It was the age of extreme scepticism. Beaufort's undertaking had great influence upon the English and French writers, such as Hook and Ferguson, none of whom was able to enter into the matter so deeply as he had done. Scepticism, originating with Bayle and strengthened by Freret, now prevailed generally; and men grew ashamed of believing Roman history, as it was transmitted to them. This was an easy method of getting over its difficulties. Although Beaufort was not animated by the desire to examine his subject in a scientific and thorough manner, yet he forms an era in historical literature. It is remarkable that the most untenable statements, when not attacked by Beaufort, were never doubted; as, for instance, the seven kings of Rome, the chronology, &c.: the year of the foundation of the city was believed to be as firmly established as any thing could be. Men saw the mote, but not the beam, and were at last so much perplexed, that they believed without knowing why, and rejected what was very well established. After such a state of things a sound and healthy criticism must follow, or else the subject is lost.

In fact, it is Livy himself who has brought the early history of Rome into disrepute, not merely because he relates things contradictory and impossible, but because he states in the introduction to his sixth book, that a new era and a new life began in Roman history from the destruction of Rome by the Gauls; that, during the long period previous to this, history was handed down only by tradition, and that all written documents concerning the earlier times, were destroyed in the burning of the city. This statement is only half correct, or rather altogether false, and gives us quite an erroneous idea of the early history. In my next Lecture, I shall speak of the sources of Roman history previous to its literature. The first historian we meet with lived in the second Punic war, and yet what a minute account we have in Livy of the preceding times and of the wars with the Samnites! But of this to-morrow.

LECTURE II.

THAT even in the earliest period of Roman history, there was writing in Italy, and that therefore there might have been writers, cannot be doubted, for we have coins bearing the name of Sybaris, which is said to have been destroyed four years before the establishment of the commonwealth. Hence it cannot be questioned, that the art of writing was known among the Greeks of Italy: why not, then, among the Romans? Another question is, whether writing could be *common* among the Romans, and the answer to this must depend on another: namely, whether they were acquainted with the Egyptian papyrus; for before its introduction the art of writing cannot have been in very general use.[1] The census at Rome, which could not be taken without a great deal of writing, and required a minute system of book-keeping, is a proof that the art was extensively applied. We have, therefore, no reason to deny, that history might have been written at Rome previously to the banishment of the kings; and it would be arbitrary scepticism to doubt, that there existed written laws long before the time of the Decemvirs: their collection is ascribed to L. Papirius, who perhaps lived in the reign of the second Tarquin, though some refer him to the time of Tarquinius Priscus. The art of writing was therefore applied, in all probability, not merely to the purposes of common life, but even to books; and when Livy, speaking of the times previous to the burning of the city, says *per illa tempora literae rarae erant*[2], this is one of those notions, in which he was misled by opinions prevalent in his own age, and which are only partially true. Authors, in the modern sense of the word, that is, such as write for the purpose of being read by a public,—making collections of laws is a different thing,—

[1] The use of alphabetical writing is altogether very ancient. It sprang from three distinct places; viz., Egypt (or perhaps Ethiopia), Phoenicia, and Babylon, and all three are independent of one another. It is an established fact, that the art of writing was known in Europe before the time to which we assign Homer, for we have inscribed monuments of that early age. But the question whether Homer wrote his poems or not, is of quite a different nature.—N.

[2] vi. 1.

certainly did not exist at all in the earliest times; but when, in regard to a written literature (*literae*), Livy adds, *una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum*, he goes too far. We must not take a one-sided view of the origin of an historical literature: we have parallels to that of Rome in the history of our ancestors, and of other nations; for in Greece Chronographies and Toichographies—annals kept in temples by the priests—are mentioned by Polybius[3], and this practice continued down to his time. Analogous to these are our Annales Bertiniani, Fuldenses, and others, which sprang up at the end of the seventh century, and were continued throughout the period of the Carlovingians, until afterwards they gradually disappeared, for the same reasons which made them cease among the ancients. Such annals were composed of single unconnected lines: they would begin, for instance, with the thirteenth year of the reign of King Dagobert, and by the side of this date the events of the year were recorded in the briefest manner possible, e.g. *Saxones debellati*. These annals, too, were kept for the most part in churches; and, besides the names of the emperors, we usually find those of the bishops also. After the chronicles of the empire, there sprang up those of single towns. We find such annals at different times and among the most different nations; and, indeed, there is nothing more natural, than that a person should make such brief records to assist his own memory. Hence the custom of our ancestors to record in their Bibles every thing of importance which happened in their families; and the same interest which we feel in our families, the ancients felt in the state. Some small towns in Germany still continue to keep such annals: in short, the custom is a very ancient one; and we may therefore assume, that in Rome too they existed in great numbers, where they had not been accidentally destroyed. As the year received its name from the annual magistrates, it was necessary to preserve their names in the Fasti for all kinds of documents. This custom prevailed among the Romans from the earliest times down to the latest emperors; and no document was valid without the names of the consuls as the mark of its date. In these annals the banishment of the kings no doubt formed an era, a *regibus exactis;* they contained the

[3] v. 33: *οἱ τὰ κατὰ καιροὺς ἐν ταῖς χρονογραφίαις ὑπομνηματιζόμενοι πολιτικῶς εἰς τοὺς τοίχους.*

names of the consuls, together with the principal events of the year.[4]

The *Annales Maximi*, or, as they are more rarely called, the *Annales Pontificum*, belonged to this kind of annals: they were authentic and comprehensive documents, the object of which was to record whatever was deemed worthy of remembrance. Cicero and Servius say[5], that the pontifix entered the most important events in an *Album*[6], which was exhibited in his house, and where it may be supposed that many persons took copies for their own use; as in fact we know was done in the case of Cn. Flavius, who set up a copy of the Fasti in the Forum. Now Cicero says that these annals had been preserved from the commencement of the Roman state down to the pontificate of P. Mucius[7]; but this is a rash assertion, which we will not impute to him as an intentional misstatement. We must not, however, allow ourselves to be misled; for though the pontifical annals had doubtless been kept from very early times, it can be demonstrated that those of the most ancient periods existed as late as the time of Cicero. We cannot, in short, infer from his words, that in his time the Romans still possessed authentic annals, continued uninterruptedly from the beginning of the Roman state. Cicero does not by any means say this, but only states that it had been a custom observed from the beginning to record the events: he no where asserts that the records existed complete in his own day. Vopiscus says that they were kept from the death of Romulus, and accordingly began with Numa. This, however, is nothing but the opinion of an unlearned person: as the pontificate was traced to Numa, it was necessary to refer the annals to the same time.

It is certain, that the pontifical annals, such as they existed in later times, were not the ancient and original ones, but were restored and made up, as well as might be, and that it was only the constant use and regular continuation of them that established the belief that they were transmitted in their original form from time immemorial. These annals were kept

[4] See vol. i. p, 263. [5] *De Orat.* ii. 12; Servius on *Virg. Aen.* i. 373.

[6] *Album* is a table, or board, covered with gypsum (a proof of the difficulty of finding a suitable writing material), on which the contents of the public documents were painted. Such was the case also with the *edictum praetorium*, and many other documents.—N. [7] Mucius was consul, B.C. 133.

as long as there were pontiffs, for the pontiffs were the repositories of the laws and fixed the chronology, and thus were the natural keepers of historical records. But if annals had existed, which went back even no further than the earliest history of the commonwealth, and began from the banishment of the kings, it is inconceivable how they could have recorded the most absurd and contradictory things. Besides, would not Fabius have made use of them? Would not Livy have consulted them, where he says[8], that the battle of Regillus was placed by some in the year 255, and by others in the year 258?[9]

Thus if, on the one hand, we cannot doubt that the earliest history of Rome was founded on an authentic basis, on the other hand, we cannot believe that the pontifical annals were preserved from the remotest times. My own opinion is, that Livy made the above-mentioned mistake in the introduction to the sixth book, because he found no pontifical annals of an earlier date than the destruction of Rome by the Gauls, and thence drew the sweeping conclusion, that no annals existed, although many others may have escaped destruction; for example, those kept by private persons living on the Capitoline and others. We have, in fact, the most unexceptionable evidence that many very ancient annals were preserved[10]; but that the pontifical annals did not go beyond the burning of Rome by the Gauls[11], may be seen from the passage of Cicero, in which he speaks[12] of the eclipse of the sun, which happened fourteen or fifteen years before the destruction of the city, and on which Mr. Edward Heis of Cologne has written, at my suggestion, a beautiful and elaborate treatise.[13] This eclipse, which was visible in Gades at sunset, had been mentioned in the pontifical annals as quite a remarkable phenomenon, and was connected with the passage of the Gauls across the Alps, which took place about the same time. Now Cicero says, that the preceding eclipses were calculated backwards up to the one, during which Romulus was carried up to heaven. This calculating backward shows, that an attempt was made to supply the loss of actual observations. Such eclipses in-

[8] ii. 21. [9] Compare vol. i. p 556; vol. ii. p. 3. [10] Vol. ii. p. 2, foll.

[11] The house of the pontifex maximus was situated in the lower part of the city, and was probably destroyed. In the Gallic conflagration, not even the twelve tables were saved; how, then, could it have been possible to save those *Alba*?—N. [12] *De Re Publ.* i. 16. [13] Compare vol. i. p. 251, note 675.

fluenced the regulation of festivals, and were essential parts of the contents of the pontifical books[14]; they would therefore have been recorded, and not have been calculated backwards, if the *annales maximi* had been preserved. This is unsophisticated evidence of what I have said.

Servius says[15] that the annals were divided into eighty books. That this scholion does not exist in the Codex Fuldensis is no argument against its genuineness; for I do not see why any one should have fabricated such a statement. In the time of Cicero, specimens of these pontifical annals were in the hands of the public: they formed a part of the Roman literature. In the introduction to his work *De Legibus*, he says[16]: *post annales—quibus nihil potest esse* JUCUNDIUS. How they could be called *jucundi* is hardly comprehensible. All the manuscripts of the work *De Legibus* are but copies of one and the same, and were made in the fifteenth century, after 1420; and the reading of all is *jucundius*. Ursinus wished to change it into *jejunius*[17], others into *incomptius*. But an author like Cicero may sometimes use a bold expression which puzzles us, and he may have meant to say, that these annals were delightful to him, merely because they were historical records of great antiquity. Whether, however, this was actually his meaning in this passage, is a very doubtful point; but we can make no alteration.

From the passages in which Livy mentions the appointment of the magistrates[18] in very short sentences, we may form some idea of the character of these pontifical annals. I believe that the copy which he used did not begin till the year 460; otherwise I do not see why he did not always observe the same practice. These annals first recorded the names of the magistrates, and then the memorable events of the year, and the persons who had most distinguished themselves in it: I am convinced that according to their original plan they never entered into the details of battles or of other subjects. That which constitutes the real character of history they never possessed in any higher degree than the annals of the middle ages.

[14] Compare Cato in *Gellius*, ii. 28.

[15] On *Æn.* i. 373. [16] i. 2.

[17] In vol. i. p. 250, Niebuhr seems to have adopted the correction of Ursinus.

[18] For instance, at the conclusion of the tenth book, and in the third and fourth decads at the end of every year.—N.

It yet remains to be mentioned that Diomedes[19] says, that the *res gestae populi Romani* are recorded by the pontiffs and scribes (he uses the present tense). Although every thing, which such writers say, must not be subjected to a rigid criticism, still the expression is important: he cannot have wished to deceive, and must have known the truth. Now, when Cicero says that annals were kept only down to the time of P. Mucius, I believe that two kinds of annals must be distinguished. The old ones may have ceased then, and yet have been continued in some sense. It is possible that at the time of P. Mucius they were neglected as superfluous, for a literature had then sprung up among the Romans[20], and another mode of recording the events of the day was probably adopted about that time in the *Acta Diurna*.[21] Nevertheless, annals may in a certain sense still have been continued; at least similar annals may have been kept privately. I have been led to suppose this by the immensely important fragment of a Roman chronicle of the tenth century which was discovered by Pertz.[22] The author of it was Benedict, a monk of the monastery of Soracte. In this fragment, relating to the time of Pope John VIII., many *ostenta* are recorded, and, what is curious enough, in the genuine old language, as for example, *murus de coelo tactus est*. In many monasteries the annals of St. Hieronymus were continued, the most remarkable events of every year, such as the accession of an emperor, being entered in them. It is this fact, which induces me to consider the circumstance of Diomedes having used the present tense in the abovementioned passage, as one of great importance. In the work "De Origine Gentis Romanæ," first published by Andrew Schottus[23] as a work of Aurelius Victor, the pontifical annals are ridiculously adduced for the settlement of Æneas in Italy.[24] This work is an impudent fabrication[25] by a literary impostor of

[19] *iii.* 480. [20] Compare vol. i. p 250.

[21] The *Acta Diurna* are often called simply *Diurna*, from which the modern word journal has been formed. They were a kind of city newspaper, in which the Minutes of the proceedings of the senate also were published. Our system of book-keeping, called the Italian, was known among the Romans.—N. See vol. ii. p. 602, note 1319.

[22] Respecting this chronicle, see *Archiv fur die ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, v. p. 146. Pertz has since (1839) published it in his *Monum. Germ. Hist. Script.* tom. iii. p 695, foll. [23] Antwerp, 1579.

[24] In cap. 9. In the same book (c. 7) we find the pontifical annals also adduced for the arrival of Hercules in Italy. [25] Comp. vol. ii. p. 9, note 11.

the fifteenth or sixteenth century. He refers his readers to a number of books which did not exist, and, probably from sheer ignorance, attributes to Cato statements in direct contradiction to those which he actually made, and which we know from Servius.

These different annals were the only historical records of the earliest times that the Romans possessed; all the rest which are mentioned by Livy, the *libri magistratuum*, *libri legum*, etc., are Fasti, beginning with the time of the republic; they were no doubt very numerous, and of the same kind as the *Fasti Capitolini* and *Triumphales*, which are still extant, fragmentary, and in many places forged. These Fasti, which are still to be seen in the Capitol, where they were set up by Augustus, and which were drawn up by Varro or Atticus,—the so called Capitoline Fasti, which formerly stood in the Curia Julia, contained records of remarkable events only in some years. The Triumphal Fasti, which stood in another place in the same building, assuredly existed from very early times, and contained a record of every triumph, perhaps more detailed than in those which have come down to us. Livy's statements about booty which was taken, were no doubt derived from these triumphal Fasti. But it is singular that they are not mentioned till the year after he commenced making his extracts from the pontifical annals.

Another source of information about the earliest history of Rome, were the *commentarii pontificum*. These were a collection of legal cases from the ancient public and ceremonial law, and contained at the same time the decision of the pontiffs in cases belonging to their jurisdiction, resembling the decisions of the jurists in the Pandects. This collection formed the basis of that body of precedents, from which those who studied the law, derived their general principles.

Of the same kind were the *libri pontificum* and *libri augurales*. Our historians quote from them the formula customary in declarations of war, which Ancus is said to have first introduced; the *deditiones*, the formula *foederis*, the *provocationes ad populum* and the like, were, according to Cicero, likewise recorded in them. History has been enriched from these books, as if they contained authenticated historical facts.

Other materials for the annalists, were the *Laudationes funebres*, which are spoken of by Livy and by Cicero in his "Brutus;" from the latter it is clear, that there existed very

ancient specimens belonging to the period preceding the war of Pyrrhus. They were preserved in the atrium, beside the images of the ancestors, and were funeral orations delivered in the Forum by the nearest relatives of the deceased; at first they were of course simple and without any pretension. According to Cicero, the orator always dilated upon the history of the family and its ancestors, that is, the family of the deceased was always traced to the most remote ancestors. But both Livy and Cicero complain that from these laudations many falsifications had been transferred into Roman history; for the Romans, although in other respects truthful, possessed extraordinary vanity in all things connected with the state and their families, which they considered themselves bound to praise: hence those laudations not seldom contained forged victories and triumphs.

Such were the materials in existence when the first historians appeared. There were indeed also many laws and other documentary monuments, but they were dead treasures and noticed only by a few; for on the whole the Romans were too carelesss and unconcerned to avail themselves of such things. A remarkable instance of this is Livy himself, who among other things, is satisfied with stating[26] that he had heard from Augustus, that there was an inscription in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, without ever thinking of examining it himself in the Capitol, where assuredly he must have been often enough.

The annals, many of which must accordingly have existed in later times, constitute one source of Roman history, though we are, unable to fix the time when they commenced. But they are after all, only a dry and meagre skeleton of history. Along with them there existed a living historical tradition, comprehending all the details of the history of the past. Such a tradition may have consisted either of narratives transmitted from father to son, and was thus left wholly to memory,—that unsafe repository for historical facts,—or of written compositions. The latter were poetical tales or lays. Here we are entering upon a field, where scholars will never be able to agree so long as they take a one-sided view of the matter. Some believe that the subject of these lays arose out of poetical traditions, as is the case in the legends of Iceland and the

[26] iv. 20.

northern sagas: others deny that they are the origin of history, and adhere to the written history as it is transmitted to us. I remain unshaken in my conviction, that a great portion of Roman history arose out of songs—that is to say, a body of living popular poetry—which extended over the period from Romulus to the battle of Regillus, the heroic age of Rome. It is evident to me, that several portions of what is called the history of this period formed complete and true epic poems. If passages like that of Varro and of Cicero, in which the latter states from Cato[27], "that among the ancient Romans it was the custom at banquets for the praises of great men to be sung to the flute," have no authority, I really do not know what have any. The three inscriptions on the monuments of the Scipios, written in the Saturnian verse, may be regarded as specimens of ancient songs, as I have shown in my history of Rome. The story of Coriolanus, the embassy of his mother, his return and death among the Volscians, which cannot be reconciled with chronology, were the subject of an epic poem. The story of Curtius was another, which has been placed in a time, to which it cannot possibly belong. If persons *will* dispute the existence of such lays as that of the Horatii, I can point out verses in Livy from the lay of Tullus Hostilius and the Horatii; and although I cannot prove the existence of any verses in support of the lay of the Tarquins, I need only refer to the fact, that such stories are always related in a rhythmical form, and not in prose.[28] Surely those who invented such brilliant stories were not wanting in the *os rotundum* to give them a poetical form. Now, have these songs ever been stripped of their metrical form and resolved into prose? Into this point I will not enter: my conviction, which alone I have to express here, is, that at one time these lays had a poetical form. All that is really beautiful in Roman story arose out of poetry.

[27] *Tusc. Quaest.* iv. 2; vol. i. p. 254, foll.

[28] The traditions of the Sandwich Islanders, which have lately been made known, are highly interesting in this respect. They consist partly of narratives and partly of songs, which have been collected by missionaries.—N.

LECTURE III.

We often find that all the historical documents of a nation are lost, either in consequence of a general calamity or through the tyranny of individuals, and that attempts are afterwards made to restore them. Such was the case in China, when the ancient books were destroyed at the command of an emperor, and afterwards restored from the recollections of aged men, and with the assistance of astronomers who calculated the eclipses of the sun and moon.[1] Such was also the case in Rome, when the Sibylline books were restored, as far as was possible, after the Capitol had been burnt in the time of Sulla. There are many instances of the same kind, especially with regard to religious books; and a Jewish tradition relates the same thing of several books of the holy scriptures, which were restored after the destruction of the temple. We may account in a similar manner for the fabulous antiquity of the Egyptians. That the eighteenth dynasty of Manetho is historical, has been firmly established since the gigantic discovery of our age, which has taught us to read the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Previously to this dynasty, Egypt was ruled by the so-called Hycsos, under whom the ancient documents are said to have been lost. Notwithstanding this, however, we are told that seventeen dynasties preceded the historical one; and the Egyptians make the most extravagant claims to antiquity: all this is the consequence of such lost annals. The same want of criticism, which Roman history has experienced, meets us in the history of Egypt, and those who do not believe in Champollion's discovery have denied the historical character of the eighteenth dynasty, and rejected the whole history down to the time of Psammetichus as fabulous, merely because they did not see where else to stop. Sound criticism would say: the expulsion of the Hycsos is the boundary, and all that lies beyond is an historical forgery, made by one who attempted to restore the ancient history either at random, or from slender remains, or

[1] Schlosser, *Geschichte der alten Welt.* i. i. p. 78, says: Klaproth indeed states that these books were restored from the recollections of aged persons, but he has not stated whether he has any Chinese authority for it. Compare vol. i. p. 251.

who found pleasure in the exercise of his invention. Wherever in history we find numbers capable of being resolved into arithmetical proportions, we may say with the greatest certainty, that they are artificial arrangements to which the history has been adapted, as the philosopher exclaimed, when he saw mathematical diagrams in the sand, "I see traces of man." The course of human affairs is not directed by numerical proportions, and wherever they are found, we may according to a law, which Leibnitz would have laid down as an axiom, declare unhesitatingly, that there is an arrangement according to a certain plan. Such artificial arrangements we find in the Indian and Babylonian eras: long periods are divided according to certain numerical proportions. Such also is the case with the history of Rome from its foundation down to the burning of the city by the Gauls. For this period 360 years were assumed, which number was taken for granted by Fabius and Polybius, who copied it from a table (πίναξ).[2] Of these 360 years 240 were allotted to the kings, and 120 to the commonwealth. In all Roman institutions the numbers 3, 10, 30 and 12 play an important part; all numerical combinations connected with Rome arise out of multiples of three, which is most frequently multiplied by ten, as 30, 300, 3000. Such also is the number of the 360 houses at Athens in its ancient constitution. Of the 240 years assigned to the kings 120 is the half, and hence the middle of the reign of Ancus Martius, the fourth king, falls in 120. He is the creator of the plebeian order, and consequently 120 is the date of the origin of the plebeians, Thus we have three periods, each containing ten times twelve years: 120 years previously to the existence of the plebeian order, 120 with plebeians, and 120 without kings. How could it ever have happened that of seven kings the fourth should just fall in the middle of the period assigned them, and that this period should be divided into two halves by the middle of the reign of the fourth king[3]? Here is evidence for those who will judge with reason and without prejudice; even if there were not other circumstances in the history which involve impossibilities, such as the statement that Tarquinius Superbus was a grandson of Tarquinius Priscus.[4] For this whole period, then, down to the Gallic conquest, we have a made-up history

[2] Dionysius, i. 74. Compare vol i. p. 242, note 656.
[3] Compare vol. i. p. 252, foll. [4] Vol. i. p. 372, foll.

at least with regard to chronology. The restoration may indeed have been founded upon the scanty information gained from the pontiffs, and on the date of the eclipse of the sun mentioned by Cicero. No prodigies are mentioned by Livy before the burning of the city by the Gauls. It is true, they are not frequent during the first century after that event, but this only proves that he did not pay any especial attention to them till he had finished the tenth book, after which, and not till then, he had annals as his sources. Dionysius likewise describes no prodigies previously to the Gallic conquest.

Yesterday, I directed your attention to the fact, that the question concerning the sources of early Roman history has been considered from a false point of view. It is quite a matter of indifference, whether the ancient history existed in the form of poems or in prose, whether it was written or not, and whether those poems still existed at the time when historians began to compose their works or not. I will only remind you of what we have seen in our own literature, for those who have studied its history, know the various changes which our epic poems have undergone. Since we have become acquainted with the poem of Hildebrand and Hadubrand, first published by Eccard, and afterwards explained by W. Grimm[5], who shewed that it was part of an alliterative poem in a language which is not Franconian, but a modification of the Gothic, we see the threads of the whole cycle. It is much more ancient than the time of Charlemagne. In the tenth century a Latin paraphrase of it was made, which is very good considering the time. We know the lay of the Nibelungen only in the form which it received in the thirteenth century; but the original must be referred, as Schlegel has shewn very satisfactorily, to the frontiers of Suabia, and may have passed through various phases. Afterwards, we find the much more prosy paraphrase of it in the *Heldenbuch;* and at a still later period, we find the prose work, *Siegfried*, constructed out of the same materials; and in this last form, it has, for some centuries, always been in

[5] Niebuhr here refers to the fragment of the lay of Hildebrand, which was first published by Eccard in his *Franc. Orient.* i. p. 864, foll. It was for a long time believed to be a fragment of a prose work in the old idiom of Lower Germany, until its alliterative character was pointed out by the brothers Grimm in their edition of "Die beiden ältesten deutschen Gedichte aus dem achten Jahrhundert." Cassel, 1812.

the hands of the people. If the Nibelungen and all accounts of it were lost, and some critic discovered the ancient poem in the story of *Siegfried*, the case would be quite the same as what has actually happened in the history of Rome. The lay of the Horatii, of which we have three verses in Livy, stands precisely on the same footing as if we had nothing of the Nibelungen but the few lines preserved in Aventinus.[6] The three verses of the lay of the Horatii preserved in Livy are quite sufficient[7]; for the form of the lays, as I have said, is totally indifferent in investigating the origin of the history of Rome. Such lays exist for a considerable time along with the records of chronicles. The lays in Saxo-Grammaticus stand by the side of the Runic records; and he has combined them in such a manner that history is intermixed with poetical traditions, which cannot be reconciled with one another. I believe that Rhianus did not go to work arbitrarily in his description of the Messenian war, but composed his beautiful epic poem out of old Messenian popular lays. His work, like that of the Nibelungen, embraced a long period of time. What this poem related of the war with Sparta and of Aristomenes, is absolutely irreconcileable with the lists of the Spartan kings, which Pausanias found in ancient records, and with the contemporary songs of Tyrtæus. Tradition goes on forming and developing itself in such a peculiar and thriving manner, that it becomes more and more estranged from history. Long before the existence of a literature, however, there are men, who, endowed with all the requisites of an historian, write history in the form of chronicles and not unfrequently in the most brilliant manner. We have an instance of this in the history of Cologne. The chronicle of that city is one of the most splendid monuments of our literature[8]; and it is to be lamented that we have not any good edition of it, as there

[6] His real name was John Thurnmeyer; he wrote a chronicle in Latin (1566, in fol.) and afterwards translated it into German. But Niebuhr seems to be mistaken here in mentioning the Nibelungen instead of the Waltharius, which is a Latin poem of the tenth century, and from which Aventinus quotes the lines i. 9, foll. Aventinus often refers to the ancient heroic epics, though without quoting them verbatim. Comp. W. Grimm, *Deutsche Heldensage*, p. 302.

[7] See vol. i. p. 258.

[8] Of this chronicle Niebuhr speaks in several of his letters, but especially in one to Savigny. (*Lebensnachrichten*, vol ii. p. 370 and 373, where he calls the author of the poem mentioned below in our text, Gotthard Hagen, instead of Godefrit Hagen.)

are so many materials still in the Cologne archives, from which it might be completed. Some of the most beautiful portions of it may have been written as late as the fifteenth century. Now we find in this chronicle, among other things of the same kind, the poem of Godefrit Hagen on the feuds of the bishops; it is written by a contemporary and is exceedingly pleasing.[9] The writer of the chronicle, perhaps feeling the beauties of the poem, has made a paraphrase of it in prose, and incorporated it with the chronicle. In some passages the rhyme is still preserved and in others but slightly changed. The portion of the work, in which we have the poem reduced to perfect prose, forms a strange contrast to the chronicler's simple and meagre records of subsequent periods. Here then we have an instance, in times previous to the existence of a literature,—for the author who had made several other chronicles did not write for the public,—every thing is constantly changing its character. If we compare what the same chronicle relates on the same subject, perhaps from ecclesiastical records, we shall find that the two accounts are irreconciliable. The earliest history of Russia by Nestor, a monk of the eleventh century, whose work has been continued by various monks of the same convent and always in the strain and charac- of its first author, is an instance of a similar kind; I myself possess one of these chronicles of a late period. As for many of these chroniclers, no one knows who they are, nor will any body ever know, and yet if they had lived in a literary age they would have been honourably distinguished.

Such chronicles were undoubtedly written at Rome before the period of its historical literature, which sprang up when the Romans, such as Fabius, M. Cincius, and C. Acilius, began to write for the Greeks, in order to rescue their own history from the contempt with which it was looked upon by the latter. All the nations of antiquity exerted themselves to gain the respect of the Greeks; and it was not Alexander alone who said, "How much have I undertaken, Athenians, to gain your praise."[10] Hence the first Roman authors wrote in Greek, not in Latin; for their countrymen had their chronicles,

[9] A separate edition of the poem has been published by E. von Groote, Cologne, 1834, under the title, "*Des Meisters Godefrit Hagen, der Zeit Stadtschreibers, Reimchronik der Stadt Cöln aus dem dreizehnten Jahrhundert*," with notes and a vocabulary.

[10] Plutarch, *Alex.* c. 60.

which every one read for himself and which were written by persons who had no notion of literary fame.

Cicero says, that history had been falsified through the funeral laudations of great men, which were preserved in their families[11], and Livy speaks to the same effect[12]: these praises, however, were not always mere fabrications, but some were authentic documents of a very early date. The expulsion of the kings falls twenty-eight years before the invasion of Greece by Xerxes; and from that time we have innumerable literary monuments of the Greeks. When we read in Livy and Dionysius the account of the seven consulships of the Fabii[13], the battle of the Veientines, the history of Q. Fabius Maximus (in the last book of Livy's first decad), we have no other alternative but believing that we have before us either an extremely well-contrived fiction, or an historical narrative founded upon ancient documents belonging to the house of the Fabii. In the last books of Livy's first decad we have such accurate accounts of the campaigns against the Samnites, that I have no doubt but that either Q. Fabius Maximus himself wrote for his house the history of the wars in which he was engaged, because his house was of great historical importance; or that the Fabii possessed numerous documents relating to their early history.[14] This supposition becomes more probable, if we consider the great intellectual cultivation which we find among the Fabii. One of them, C. Fabius Pictor, was an excellent painter and produced a monument of the highest beauty even one hundred years before the Hannibalian war[15]; Q. Fabius Pictor, the historian wrote very beautiful Greek, for no one censures him for having written barbarous Greek. The Fabii seem to me to have been a learned family; and I believe they had their chronicles long before one of their number wrote a history in Greek.

Now, how did the Romans proceed when they first began to write the early periods of their history? The part previous to the establishment of the commonwealth was composed in accordance with the tables kept by the pontiffs, and these, as we have seen, were made up according to mere numerical combinations. These tables were taken, without any criticism,

[11] *Brutus*, 16. Compare *Cic. de Leg.* ii. 24.
[12] viii. 40. Compare Plutarch, *Numa*, c. 1.
[13] Vol. ii. p. 175, foll.
[14] Vol. ii. p. 8.
[15] Vol. iii. p. 356.

for authentic documents, and if any one, for instance in the fifth century, wanted to write a history of Rome for his house, he first had recourse to the annals. But at the same time he found the old songs of Romulus, the Tarquins, Coriolanus, Camillus and a number of others. The events they related he inserted where he thought they would fit, little concerned whether they would stand the test of an accurate examination or not, exactly as we find in the chronicle of Cologne. Such is the origin of the Roman chronicles before the time of their literature. The scepticism therefore is contemptible, which says that the Romans had no history before the time of Fabius. There were but few men, perhaps Fabius, or probably only Cincius Alimentus and M. Licinius Macer, who also searched the documents in the Capitol and the ancient lawbooks.

The Brazen Law Tables were probably carried away by the Gauls, as was done by the Vandals at a later period when they conquered the city; but there were many other legal documents in the Capitol and inaccessible to the Gauls. It is common to all nations to record old customs and traditional rights historically in the form of single cases, out of which they arose. In more ancient times, where authentic documents are wanting, the rules or laws resulting from individual cases are supplied from recollection. Such is the custom throughout the East. The Sunnah, or the Mohammedan code of laws, and the Talmud consist of such single cases; and the whole of the Koran, so far as the civil law is concerned, is of this description: a rule is never stated abstractedly, but explained by an account of single cases. We find the same character even in the Pentateuch; for where a rule is to be laid down as to the conditions on which daughters can inherit the property of their father, Moses merely adduces a precedent in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad.[16] It was the same with the Roman laws; a number of single cases was recorded in the old lawbooks[17], as in the case of the *judicium perduellionis*, which arose out of the story of Horatius who slew his sister.

The history of the Roman constitution back to the time of the kings was quite complete. It cannot have existed any where else but in the pontifical books (*commentarii pontificum*), from which Junius Gracchanus derived his information, who

[16] *Numbers*, xxxvi. See vol. i. p. 346.
[17] Vol. ii. p. 281, foll.

handed it down to Gaius, from whom again Lydus made his extracts. These accounts, when carefully examined, agree so perfectly with all historical facts, are so free from anything which might appear doubtful, and are so consistent with one another, that the results of my investigations must lead to the conviction, that we are able to trace the history of the Roman constitution back to the beginning of the commonwealth as accurately as one can wish, and even more perfectly than the history of many portions of the middle ages. The history of Rome gives a moral confirmation to what has been said by great men respecting the study of nature, that a superficial knowledge makes man atheistical, but that a profound one strengthens his belief in the existence of a God.

LECTURE IV.

LET no one imagine that the Romans were barbarians, before they adopted the civilisation of the Greeks: their works of art and their buildings prove the contrary. That people, which under its kings constructed such gigantic sewers, which had a painter like Fabius Pictor, which made a coffin like that of Scipio Barbatus, and, a hundred years before the Punic wars, produced a sculptor able to execute a work like the Capitoline she-wolf[1], must assuredly have attained to a high degree of intellectual culture, and cannot be conceived to have been without some kind of literature, though, of course, different from that of the Greeks. Form is something accidental; and Roman literature may have had its own peculiar beauties. There existed in the days of Cicero a poem of Appius Claudius the Blind[2], consisting of moral sentiments, of which I have discovered some fragments, and which is of far more ancient date than the beginning of what we now call Roman literature. Cicero despised the ancient literature of his country, and knew it only from hear-say. He was also acquainted with a speech against Pyrrhus, delivered by the same Appius[3]; and we may

[1] Compare vol. iii. p. 424.
[2] Cicero, *Tuscul*, iv. 2. Compare vol. iii. p. 312, foll.
[3] Cicero, *Brut.* 16. Compare vol. iii. p. 313.

be sure that, at a time when such speeches were written and preserved, historical composition was not neglected.

But the first work which may be regarded as a history, and indeed a contemporary one, though agreeably to the taste of the age in a metrical form, was the First Punic War by Naevius. If we had a history of this war like that of the Hannibalian war by Livy, we should undoubtedly look upon it as the greatest in ancient times. Its vastness and importance are by no means generally known: I hope one day to be able to put it in its true light. Naevius had served in it and described it, as Bernal Diaz did that of Cortez. Naevius wrote in the Saturnian verse, in the form of a poem, which is characteristic of the age; and he who judges from internal evidence must see, that he only did what all before him had done, and that the history of former days still continued to be familiar to the Romans through the medium of poetry. Godefrit Hagen likewise wrote in poetry on contemporary events, merely because no one was yet accustomed to German prose: prose works were written in Latin. The history of the conquest of Livonia by the German knights was described a short time after the event in a poem, which is not yet published.[4] Down to the thirteenth century all traditional history in Germany was transmitted in the form of poetry, and the same was the case with the early period of Roman history. Naevius assuredly wrote his work in the form in which he found so many historical events of the past described.

Concerning Naevius and his poems I shall here say but little. The year in which he brought his first play upon the stage, is uncertain; two passages of Gellius[5] contradict each other on this point; but we may suppose it to have been about the year 520, ten years after the conclusion of the first Punic war. Whether the piece which was then performed, or the great poem on the first Punic war, was the first he had written, is also uncertain. Naevius was a

[4] Niebuhr here alludes to the chronicle of Livonia, written at the end of the thirteenth century by Ditleb von Alnpeke, at Reval. The MS. of it exists at Heidelberg. Cod. 367, fol. 192, foll.

[5] In xvii. 21, Gellius says that Naevius appeared in the same year in which Sp. Carvilius Ruga divorced his wife, that is, the year 519; but in iv. 3, he places that divorce in the year 523, which thus produces a difference of four years in the time of Naevius' first appearance. Com. Ritschl, *Parerga Plautina*, tom. i. pp. 68-70.

Campanian, and it must be supposed that there then existed at Capua, a much more lively interest for literature than at Rome, where it was gradually developed out of popular poetry. Naevius wrote many plays. His poem on the Punic war was divided, Suetonius says[6], into seven books and was formerly written *continente scriptura*. The verses, though not distinguished originally (an experienced reader must have been able to make them out for himself), were afterwards probably marked by C. Octavius Lampadio, who also divided the work into books. The fragments we possess of this work, show that it was by no means devoid of high poetical merit. Servius, who had read Ennius, but seems never to have seen the work of Naevius (I believe that he merely knew it from old commentators), says that Virgil had borrowed the plan of the first books of the Æneid from Naevius.[7] Naevius treated of the destruction of Troy, of Dido and the landing of Æneas in Latium; and we may justly conclude that Naevius, like Virgil, represented the hostility between the Romans and Carthaginians, as having arisen from the reception which Æneas met with in Carthage, and from his unfaithfulness to Dido.[8] As Naevius did not place Æneas at so early a period as was done in the times of Virgil, the anachronism with which the latter has been charged, is groundless—blind enthusiasm will never be just towards Virgil, but only sound criticism,—and with old Naevius he made the arrival of Æneas coincide with the foundation of Carthage. There is yet an immense deal to be done by a commentator on the Æneid. In order to form a proper estimate of Virgil, we must observe that, without contradicting the historical statements, he very frequently withdraws into the old poetical traditions[9]: only learned scholars and good historians are fit to be his commentators. Thus Romulus is with him the actual grandson of Æneas; he does not make him descend from the Alban kings, but conceives him to be the son of Ilia, as the older Roman poets did.[10] I am also convinced that the shield of Æneas in Virgil had its model in Naevius, in whose poem Æneas or some other hero had a shield representing the wars of the giants.[11] I believe that Naevius gave a full account of the *semina odii et belli*, and that he went

[6] *De Illustr. Gram.* 2.
[7] Servius, *ad Aen.* i. 98, ii. 797, iii. 10.
[8] Vol. i. p. 191, foll.
[9] Vol. i. note 980.
[10] Servius, *ad Æn.* i. 273.
[11] Vol. i. p. 192.

through the early history of Rome: that he spoke of Romulus we know.[12]

It is well known, that Naevius drew misery upon himself, and it is said, was thrown into prison, on account of some verses, by which he had offended the proud Metelli[13]: but no one, I believe, has asked himself, how it was possible to throw a Roman citizen into a dungeon for having written some libellous verses. In addition to this, it is said that he wrote two plays while in prison.[14] But if one has been at Rome and seen those awful dungeons in the prison, which were considered by the ancients themselves as the entries of death for those who were to be executed, and into which no ray of light could penetrate, such an account must be incomprehensible. Yet I believe that the difficulty can be removed. We know that Naevius was a Campanian: we know that the greater number of the Campanians lost the Roman franchise, or at least all the advantages of it, on account of their insurrection in the second Punic war. We may therefore suppose, that Naevius being without friends and helpless[15] was given up for his offence to Metellus, as a *noxae deditus*, not to be kept in the state prison but in the house of Metellus himself, since there were prisons for debtors attached to many houses of the nobles. Insolvent debtors fell into the same condition of *noxae dediti*, and were kept *nervo et compedibus*.[16] The account of his death at Utica in the year 547 according to Cato, (or 549, according to Varro), as stated in the Chronicle of St. Hieronymus[17], is false, for Utica was then in the hands of the Carthaginians, and remained faithful to them to the last; and he would have been ill received, even if he had come as a *transfuga*. If he was expelled by the nobles, he certainly did not go to Africa, and we must reject this account the more, since Cicero says that Varro assigned a later date for his death.[18] The year of his death therefore was uncertain even at that time. There are incredible

[12] Servius, *ad Æn* i. 273.
[13] Gellius, iii. 3; the Pseudo-Asconius on *Cic. in Verr.* i. 10, p. 140, ed. Orelli, mentions the verse which gave offence to the Metelli: "*Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules*," and adds, "cui tunc Metellus consul iratus versu responderat senario hypercatalecto, qui et Saturnius dicitur:

Dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poëtae."

[14] Gellius, iii. 3. [15] Compare vol. ii. note 105. [16] Vol. i. p. 576, Gellius, xx. 1.
[17] P. 36. Compare Cicero, *Brut.* 15: "His consulibus (Cethego et Tuditano), *ut in veteribus commentariis scriptum est*, Naevius mortuus est." [18] *Brut.* 15.

contradictions in ancient authors respecting the literary men of the sixth century.

After the second Punic war, there were several Romans who wrote the history of their country in the Greek language. After the Macedonian period, the Greeks, in their historical works, began to draw attention also to the more distant nations; and this circumstance stirred up able men in those nations, who understood Greek, to write in that language the history of their own country, that it might be read by the Greeks. In southern Italy the Greek language had long been established. It would not be advisable indeed to assert that the Lucanian Ofellus was really the author of the works ascribed to him; but there must have been some reason for attributing them to him; and Aristoxenus, to whom all the existing accounts on this subject must be traced, knew that these people wrote Greek. The towns of Campania, Apulia, and other parts of southern Italy had Greek inscriptions and coins. The Alexandrian grammarians read Oscan accounts of Italy, but we must not believe that they were books written in Oscan; they were Greek books. In regard to Roman history, we have to mention especially Q. Fabius Pictor[19] and L. Cincius Alimentus, both belonging to very noble families. Q. Fabius was of a patrician gens and had once been sent on an embassy to Delphi; he was a great-grandson of C. Fabius Pictor, who had painted the temple of Salus; this painting, probably representing the victory of the consul Junius over the Aequians, continued to exist down to the time of the Emperor Claudius. Even that C. Fabius Pictor must have been familiar with the language and manners of the Greeks; for, according to Roman notions, painting was not a suitable occupation for a patrician. His son who was sent as ambassador to Alexandria, must likewise have been acquainted with Greek. The object of Fabius, the historian, was no doubt to counteract the contempt with which the Greeks regarded the Romans. He therefore wrote the history of Rome from its beginning. Whether he spoke of Æneas we cannot ascertain, but we have ample evidence of the manner in which he treated of the *primordia urbis*, of Romulus and Remus.[20] Of the earliest times, he gave, according

[19] Fabius wrote the history of his country 250 years after Herodotus: so much, then, is the historical literature of the Romans later than that of the Greeks.—N.

[20] Dionys. i. 79.

to Dionysius, only a brief outline; but as he advanced nearer the age in which he lived, his account became more minute.[21] This last feature he had in common with nearly all the Roman historians, except Cn. Gellius and Valerius Antias, who followed the opposite principle. Cato alone observed the right proportion. Fabius' real subject, however, was the second Punic war, with which he was contemporary; but he had likewise given a detailed account of the first war with the Carthaginians. We learn from Polybius[22] that he shewed great partiality to his countrymen and endeavoured to justify them in every thing; and when a man like Polybius passes such a censure, we may readily believe him. An indulgent treatment of one's country is just enough; but it was more than indulgence when he attempted to justify his Romans on every occasion.[23] The first history of the first Punic war had been written by Philinus of Agrigentum, and in a spirit very hostile to Rome, on account of the destruction of his own native city. Fabius now wrote in the opposite spirit, and perhaps exaggerated in the opposite direction. He probably carried his work to the end of the second Punic war, though there is nothing to prove this, for most of the quotations from his work, refer to the earliest period of Roman history.

The title of his work is nowhere mentioned, nor do we know into how many books it was divided, though it was held in an unusually high degree of estimation, and is very often referred to by Polybius, Livy, Diodorus Siculus, and Dionysius. We may be sure that we also possess a great many things borrowed from him, without acknowledgment. It is clear and certain that Diodorus, like Fabius, placed the foundation of Rome in Ol. 8. 1. Diodorus, it is true, contains only very meagre notices of Roman history in the several years, and they differ widely from Livy's statements; but they are by no means contemptible, and he can have derived them only from Fabius or Timæus, though the former is more probable, on account of the agreement which I have just mentioned. Appian, who gave an account of the second Punic war very different from that of Livy, mentions Q. Fabius as the ambassador sent to Delphi.[24] Appian knew little of Latin, and was not much of an investi-

[21] Dionys. i. 6.

[22] i. 14, iii. 8, 9.

[23] Vol. ii. p. 8.

[24] vii. 27, His words are: ἡ δὲ βουλὴ Κόϊντον μὲν Φάβιον, τὸν συγγραφέα τῶνδε τῶν ἔργων, εἰς Δελφοὺς ἔπεμπε. Compare Plutarch, *Fab. Max.* 18, Livy, xxii. 57.

gator; and as far as Dionysius of Halicarnassus went, he merely abridged him, as Zonaras abridged Dion Cassius, so that we may look upon him as representing Dionysius.[25] But for the end of the war against Pyrrhus and the beginning of the first Punic war, when he was no longer guided by Dionysius, he found and used the Greek work of Fabius down to the time when Polybius began. Now as his account of this period perfectly agrees with Zonaras who followed Dion Cassius, I have no doubt that Dion Cassius also based his narrative here upon that of Fabius. I don't mean to say that he used no other writers, but his acute eye must have recognised Fabius as his best authority.[26] All those precious and invaluable accounts of the early Roman constitution, which we find in Dion Cassius, may be referred to Fabius, and to him our gratitude is due. The expressiens of Dion in describing the civil history of Rome are so careful and accurate, that we cannot hesitate for a moment in assigning them to Fabius. Thus the *populus* is always called by him δῆμος, and the *plebs* πλῆθος or ὅμιλος.[27] Whoever reads the history of Dion Cassius and possesses an accurate knowledge of constitutional terms, will find that every thing is correct, whereas Dionysius makes dreadful mistakes.[28] Fabius then is not only the father of Roman history, but he also possessed the most perfect knowledge of the ancient constitution; and though his work is lost, we must acknowledge that we are greatly indebted to him for the information we derive from him respecting the constitution and its changes.[29] There have been some censorious critics who have considered it ridiculous, that we in the nineteenth century pretended to know the Roman constitution better than Livy and Dionysius in the reign of Augustus; but we only need refer them to the consular Dion Cassius and Q. Fabius; for we do not pretend to know it better than they did.

There is a literary difficulty about this remarkable man, which in my opinion can never be solved. It arises from an expression of Cicero's in his work "De Divinatione".[30] He there mentions a "Somnium Aeneae" from the Greek annals

[25] Vol iii. notes 353 and 844. [26] Vol. ii. p. 12.
[27] Vol. ii. p. 169, note 367. [28] Vol. ii. p. 13. [29] Vol. ii. p. 12.
[30] i. 21, It is true we have no good MS. of the work De Divinatione, but only a number of bad ones of the fifteenth century, which are all derived from one which is now lost, so that the praenomen Numerius might be a mistake, but I do not see how any one could have inserted such a praenomen.—N.

of a Numerius Fabius Pictor, of whom no mention is found any where else. The difficulty might indeed be solved very easily, since we know that at the time of Q. Fabius Pictor, whose praenomen Quintus is firmly established by the testimonies of Dionysius, Appian and Polybius, several other Romans wrote in the Greek tongue; why then should not a Numerius Fabius have likewise written in Greek? Is it not possible that his writings may have had merely an ephemeral existence like those of so many authors of our own day? To this class of writers must have belonged the senator Cn. Aufidius whose Greek work is mentioned by Cicero only[31] But in his work "De Oratore"[32] and in the introduction to the first book, "De Legibus," Cicero speaks of a Fabius Pictor as a writer of Latin Annals, and in the former of these passages he places him between Cato and Piso. None of the ancient authors, neither Livy, nor Polybius, nor any grammarian mentions Latin annals of Fabius Pictor. Gellius[33] indeed speaks of *Annales Fabii*, but without the addition *Pictoris*, and nothing is said as to whether this Fabius wrote in Latin or in Greek. I make this remark, because the passage of Gellius has been erroneously adduced to prove that Gellius knew a Fabius Pictor who was the author of Latin annals. There is indeed another Fabius Pictor[34] who wrote *de jure pontificio*[35], but his work had nothing to do with Roman history. Now are we to suppose that all other ancient authors overlooked Fabius, the Latin annalist, and that Cicero alone has preserved his name? My opinion is this. There was a Latin annalist of the name of Fabius Maximus Servilianus, whom Servius[36] and Dionysius[37] mention as an old annalist of great importance and who lived between Cato and Piso, which is exactly what Cicero says of Fabius Pictor. Cicero therefore, I believe, committed a mistake. "Every man," says Möser, "may err, and even the wisest sometimes in the most incredible manner." Cicero had perhaps merely cast a hasty glance at the annals—he had a dislike for these ancient books, and besides Cato, he had scarcely read any, certainly not in

[31] *Tuscul. Disput.* v. 38: "Cn. Aufidius praetorius et in senatu sententiam dicebat, et *Graecam scribebat historiam* et videbat in literis." [32] ii. 12. [33] v. 4.
[34] The surname Pictor alone occurs rarely, tho' we still find it in Appian.—N.
[35] Nonius, *s. v.* Picumnus. [36] *ad Aen.* i. 3.
[37] i. 7. Compare Macrob. *Saturn.* i. 16.

his more advanced years—which bore the title *Q. Fabii Annales*, and when he found a Fabius who lived between Cato and Piso, he added *Pictor*, a name with which he was familiar, where he ought to have added *Maximus*. Such a mistake most easily occurs when a person dictates.[38] We must also remember that Cicero did not possess a very extensive knowledge of the history of his country, in evidence of which I need only mention what everybody knows, that his repeated statement about the self-sacrifice of Decius, the grandson, is a mere fancy of his own.[39] Cicero not seldom blunders in the praenomen of a person; thus, contrary to all other authorities, he calls Virginia's father Decimus Virginius. The praenomen Numerius was moreover very common in the family of the Fabii, so that it may have been rather familiar to Cicero. Lastly Diodorus mentions the same dream of Aeneas, which is referred to by Cicero, and states that it is taken from Fabius.[40]

LECTURE V.

L. CINCIUS Alimentus[1], who, as we learn from Dionysius of Halicarnassus[2], wrote the history of Rome in Greek, was a contemporary of Q. Fabius Pictor. It is very instructive to examine such isolated statements, in order to form a correct estimate of their value; for without Dionysius we should not know that Cincius wrote in Greek. From two passages of Livy[3] we know only that Cincius wrote on the second Punic

[38] When a man speaks under great mental excitement, he may easily make a blunder; but when he dictates, it may happen still more easily. It has often happened to me, that in referring to a man I pronounced a wrong name, and did so repeatedly, until some one called my attention to it. Another instance of such a blunder occurs in a letter of Cicero to Atticus (vi. 2). He had called the citizens of Phlius Phliuntii, and Atticus reminded him that they were called Phliasii. Cicero replies, that the mistake had escaped him, and that he knew very well what he ought to have said. The principle of comparing the relations of ancient history with those of our own time, in order to form a more distinct notion of them, should also be followed in the explanation of ancient authors.—N.

[39] See vol. iii. p. 505. Cicero, *De Finib.* ii. 19, *Tuscul. Quaest.* i. 37.

[40] Diodor. *Fragm. ap. Syncell.* p. 366, ed. Dindorf. In Corte's edition of Sallust, the fragments of Fabius Pictor are printed along with those of Fabius Servilianus.—N.

[1] Compare vol. i., p. 272, foll. [2] i. 6. [3] xxi. 38, vii. 3.

war, but from Dionysius[4] we learn that he wrote a complete history of his country from the earliest down to his own time. He was a senator and praetor in the second Punic war, and was taken prisoner by the Carthaginians at the beginning of the war.[5] From these facts we see that he must have been a man of great personal merit; for although the Roman laws were at that time very severe towards prisoners of war, yet he rose to high offices. He tells us that he conversed with Hannibal, who gave him an account of his passage over the Alps: another proof of his personal importance and of his ability to speak Greek. Livy calls him *maximus auctor*, and considers his authority as decisive. Besides his history of Rome, he is said to have written in Latin, on chronology, on the consular power, and on the Roman calendar. There can be no doubt that the Greek and Latin works are the productions of the same author. Dionysius informs us that differing in this respect from the majority of his countrymen, he treated of the Roman antiquities as an independent and critical investigator.[6] How much Dionysius may have borrowed from him, cannot be ascertained. A fragment of his in Festus throws much light on the relation subsisting between the Romans and the Latins.

Not long after him (subsequent to the year 570), C. Acilius wrote Roman annals from the earliest times, down to the war with Antiochus. In one passage quoted from his work he speaks of Romulus, and Dionysius refers to him in regard to the restoration of the sewers. His work likewise was in Greek, and was afterwards translated into Latin by one Claudius who is otherwise unknown to us.[7] Acilius too seems to have been an important and respectable writer. Thus the literature of Rome was at that time essentially a Greek one.

There are some other Romans who, at a later time, wrote in Greek; but it is uncertain whether they wrote the entire history of their country, or only memoirs of their own time. We have mention of A. Postumius Albinus, a contemporary of the elder Cato (about 600), and Cn. Aufidius, a contemporary of Cicero's youth. It was probably about the beginning of the

[4] i. 6. [5] Livy, xxi. 38, xxvi. 23, 28, xxvii. 7, etc.

[6] A. Krause, *Vitae et Fragmenta veterum Historicorum Romanorum* p. 68, foll.

[7] Livy. xxv. 39, xxxv. 14; Cicero, *De Off.* iii. 32; Dionys. iii. 77; Plutarch, *Romul.* 21.

war with Perseus that Q. Ennius composed his poem under the strange name of *Annales;* but we cannot conceive that he should, like a chronicler, have described the events as they took place one year after another : he was a man of too much poetical genius to write such a foolish work, which would have been nothing more than a heap of *versus memoriales.* His poem was the first real imitation of the Greek; for those of the earlier Naevius had been composed in the ancient lyric manner. The number of fragments which are preserved, enables us to form a tolerably clear idea of the whole work; and if the more ancient references which we have, were more trust-worthy in numbers, we might even have an accurate knowledge of the proportion of its parts. But corrupt as a great many numbers in the ancient grammarians are, yet it is clear that the earliest times, the reputed arrival of the Trojans in Latium and the period of the kings, were contained in the first three books. The war with Pyrrhus may with great probability be assigned to the fifth.[8] I do not know whether the verse

Horrida Romuleum certamina pango duellum

which occurs in Merula's collection of the fragments, is genuine; but there can be no doubt that Ennius occupied himself very little with the internal struggles of the Romans, and according to the notions then prevalent upon epic poetry, he probably spoke only of the wars. The 225 years from the expulsion of the kings until the war of Pyrrhus, were contained in a single book Of the Samnite wars he probably gave only a brief sketch. If we examine the later books containing the events subsequent to the first Punic war, which according to Cicero[9] he passed over, we find passages which prove that the war against Hannibal was described very minutely. The account of it must have begun in the seventh book, and in the twelfth Ennius was still occupied with it. In the thirteenth he treated of the war with Antiochus, and in the fifteenth the Istrian war; so that the last six books comprised a period of only twenty-four years, for the whole work consisted of eighteen books.[10] In the eighteenth book Ennius

[8] Merula places this war in the sixth book, because he cannot believe that Ennius should have devoted only one book to the intervening period. But Ennius surely did not versify the consular Fasti, but treated only of the principal events.—N.

[9] *Brutus*, 19.

[10] We may take it for granted that Ennius himself made the division into eighteen books. The opinion that Q. Vargunteius made it, is founded on a wrong interpretation of a passage in Suetonius (*De illustr. Gram.* 2). I believe that Suetonius merely meant to say that Vargunteius made a critical recension and explanatory commentaries on Ennius, such as Lampadio had made on Naevius.—N.

himself intimated that in the year 578 he was still engaged in writing his work. The whole poem was wanting in symmetry, for in the early times, which were despatched very briefly, a great many things must have been passed over, like the first Punic war. Scipio and M. Fulvius Nobilior were praised by him very much in detail, and the poet accompanied the latter to the Aetolian war. The beautiful history of the kings in Livy may have been taken chiefly from Ennius. He was born according to Cato, in 513, at Rudiae in Calabria[11], and died in 583, at the age of seventy[12], having carried his poem nearly down to the time of his death.

The authorities which Ennius followed for the earliest times, were the *annales maximi*; for the kingly period, the ancient lays and the *commentarii pontificum*; for the middle age of Rome, he had Timaeus, Hieronymus, and Fabius; and of the later events, he was himself an eye-witness. He deserves censure for his vanity in putting himself on an equality with Homer, and for his bad hexameters. It is annoying to find him speak with contempt of the ancient poets; but there are, on the other hand, fragments of his which shew a truly poetical genius. He resembled Klopstock, who, like him, despised the ancient forms, without being so thoroughly acquainted with those of the Greeks as to be able to distinguish himself in their application. The fragments of Ennius were collected very carefully about the end of the sixteenth century, by Hieronymus Columna[13], who added a very prolific but instructive commentary. Some verses in this collection are taken from Claudius Sacerdos, whose work still exists in MS at Vienna.[14] This

[11] Cicero, *Tuscul. Quaest.* i. 1, *Brut.* 18; Varro, *ap. Gellium*, xvii. 21.

[12] Cicero, *Brut.* 20, *de Senect.* 5.

[13] Q. Enni, poetae vetustissimi quae supersunt fragmenta, ab Hieronymo Columna conquisita, disposita et explicata, Neapoli 1590. 4°. A reprint of this edition appeared at Amsterdam in 1707.

[14] (It is now published in Endlicher's *Analecta Grammatica.*) Hieronymus Columna and Natalis Comes both had the vanity to pretend that they had read authors which either did not exist at all, or were mentioned only by scholasts. Of the latter they may indeed have read more complete MSS than those which have come down to us.—N.

collection contains, with the exception of a few trifles, all that can be gathered from the ancient authors. Soon after Columna, a Dutchman, P. Merula, published a new edition of the fragments of Ennius[15], with many additions and a new arrangement. Among the additions, there are some passages which Columna had overlooked; but Merula says that he had gathered a number of verses from a work of L. Calpurnius Piso, a contemporary of Pliny, which bore the title "De continentia veterum poetarum." He adds, that Piso in this work compared the early poets with those of his own time, and the latter with one another; that the manuscript of it was at Paris, in the library of St. Victor, whence he feared it would be stolen. Now what circumstance could have led him to this strange apprehension, for which no reason is assigned? Another account states that the manuscript was formerly bound up together with a manuscript of Lucan, from which it had afterwards been cut away. Now there is indeed in the library of St. Victor, at Paris, a manuscript of Lucan, from which another has been torn off,—my friend, Immanuel Bekker, whose attention I had directed to it, saw it himself,—but this proves very little. It is not improbable that P. Merula, according to the fashion of the time, either in joke or in earnest, wanted to impose upon the public; but he was not able to write such perfect verses as would deceive a good scholar. At least, all those single verses which he assigns to Naevius and Ennius, and which he pretends to have derived from Piso, are suspicious to me, for they are wanting in rhythm, though I do not mean positively to assert that they are modern. They are hexameters, and indeed such as Ennius might have written; but they never carry with them that conviction of genuineness which is so strong in reference to the other fragments of Ennius, that we might almost swear and say—This cannot come from a modern author. My opinion, therefore, is, that we must not place too much confidence in those verses which are said to be taken from Piso. If Merula had a suspicion that the manuscript might be stolen, why did he not copy and publish it?

Not long after Ennius, whom we fairly reckon among the Roman historians, for many statements of his have been incorporated with history by subsequent writers, the history of Rome began to be written in Latin prose; and the first work we meet

[15] Q. Ennii fragmenta collegit et illustravit P. Merula, Lugd. Bat. 1595.

with, is the most important that was ever written on the history of ancient Italy; I mean the "Origines" of Cato. The form which he adopted in this work, shews great originality, and also that the Romans at that time began to entertain just views of their own history, and to follow the right way in writing it. Subsequent writers again lost sight of this, and became estranged from the early constitution of their country. Cato wrote the history not only of Rome, but of Italy. While he described the gradual increase of the Roman commonwealth, he seems to have given accounts of the nations of Italy as they successively came in contact with it.[16] The plan of the Origines, which consisted of seven books, is known from Nepos[17]; the first book contained the history of the kings; the second and third carried the history down to the complete subjugation of Italy; the fourth contained the first Punic war; the fifth, the second; and the sixth and seventh, the subsequent wars down to his own time, that is, to the praetorship of Ser. Galba. Cato was a very great man in every respect, and rose far above his age. His work is very often quoted, but there is only one quotation in Gellius which deserves the name of an excerpt; this is the passage about the tribune Caedicius, in the time of the second Punic war, and accordingly belongs to the fourth book. It shews Cato's peculiar manner, and how it was that Cicero, who in general is uncertain whether he should praise or blame Cato, yet distinguished him among all his contemporaries. He wrote his work at an advanced age, about the year 600. There is a curious prolepsis and parachronism in Livy, in the disputes about the Lex Oppia, where, in the year 561, the tribune, L. Valerius, appeals to Cato's Origines against him.[18] During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, people had such curious notions respecting everything written by Livy, that on account of this passage, they would not believe that Cato wrote his Origines at an advanced period of his life, and G. J. Vossius[19] thought it worth while to consider, whether C. Nepos was not speaking of a different work in saying that Cato wrote it as a *senex*. But Vossius was the first who thought that Livy might perhaps have spoken there in his own person, and have made a mistake.

[16] Compare vol. i., p. 8 and note 2; vol ii. p. 8. [17] *Cato*, c. 3.
[18] Livy, xxxiv. 5, makes L. Valerius say to Cato: Tuas adversus te Origines revolvam. [19] *De Histor. Lat.* i. 5.

Very little of the Origines is extant, but what we have is excellent. It is said that a philologer once tried to conjure up spirits in order to obtain from them ancient books which were lost; and if such a thing were possible, the first ancient work to be asked for would be the Origines of Cato; for if we had them and the history of Q. Fabius Pictor, we might dispense with all speculations concerning the early history of the nations of Italy. Cato's work was the only one of its kind in the whole range of Roman annals. In reading the descriptions which Livy gives of the wars against the Aequians and Volscians, we are extremely wearied by the intolerable sameness, which is even increased by his repeating the same things over again. The same character is generally, though with great injustice, ascribed to the Roman annalists: but Cato was anything but monotonous or wearisome.

A very short time after Cato and about the time of the destruction of Carthage, the history of Rome was written by L. Cassius Hemina[20], from whose work we have historical quotations in the grammarians. Several writers call him *antiquissimus auctor*, a name by which Piso and others are never mentioned. From many of his historical remarks I conclude that he wrote about Alba according to its ancient local chronology, and that he synchronised the earlier periods of Rome with the history of the Greeks, which is a circumstance of great importance. He began the history from the earliest times, and what no other annalist did, he treated of it before the foundation of Rome, whence we have many statements of his about Siculian towns in Latium. The archaeology of the towns seems to have been his principal object. There is only one fragment of some length which gives us some idea of his style, which is decidedly worse than that of Cato. The fourth book of his work bore the title *Bellum Punicum posterius*[21], from which we may infer that the last war against the Carthaginians had not broken out at the time when he wrote it. He even mentioned the secular festival of the year 607 according to Varro[22], which may indeed have been just at the end of his work, which, however, I believe consisted of more than four books, though I admit that the number of books into which it was divided, was not very great, at least,

[20] Compare vol. i p. 271, and vol. ii. p. 8.
[21] Priscian, vii., p. 767. ed. Putsch.
[22] Censorinus, *De Die Nat.* 17.

perhaps, five or six. Cassius Hemina was one of the old authorities who had derived his information from genuine sources.[23]

From this time forward, Roman histories were written by various persons, but an original treatment of the subject is henceforth out of the question. The Latin rhetoricians who now began to spring up, used the books which already existed as the foundations for their own works and only made additions from old chronicles which had been neglected by their predecessors.[24] How far this was the case with every particular writer, cannot indeed be ascertained, but on the whole we may acquiesce in this view. I do not think it necessary, to give you a complete list of these writers of the seventh century or to enter into an examination of their merits; my intention is merely to furnish you with an outline of the literature of the history of Rome, and I cannot therefore mention such writers as are in themselves of little or no importance. To this period belongs the Fabius Pictor, whom Cicero, as I remarked before, mentions in the "De Oratore." He was a learned author, and his work, entitled "Res Gestae" seems to have been a very minute history, as he spoke of the capture of Rome by the Gauls in his fourth book[25], but the number of its books is unknown. No fragment of any length is preserved. His praenomen was Servius or perhaps Sextus; for in his "Brutus," Cicero speaks of Ser. Fulvius, and then of Ser. Fabius, whom he calls *juris pontificii peritissimus*. But the books "De Oratore" and "Brutus," which seem to have such an excellent text, are corrupt in many small points, which have been smoothed over by a skilful copyist of the sixteenth century. Of the "De Oratore" only a single ancient MS. was found at Milan, and that is particularly illegible. With regard to the "Brutus" we are no better off; for no MS. is older than the year 1430. Hence no great reliance can be placed on the names in these books. One Heidelberg MS. has Serius Fabius, and it is probable that we must read Sextus, the praenomen Servius not occurring among the Fabii. It is not impossible that this Fabius may be the same as the Fabius Maximus Servilianus, who is mentioned in connection with a fragment

[23] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xiii. 13; xxix. 1.
[24] Compare vol. ii. p. 8, foll.
[25] Gellius, v. 4.

concerning the arrival of Aeneas, and who at least flourished at this time.

Cn. Gellius[26] also belongs to this period. He was a very prolix, uncritical and credulous writer, and only a second rate historian; he was no authority: but would to God that we possessed the works of these writers, for who can say whether or not many a valuable old chronicle had been used by them and incorporated in their works. His age is uncertain, though Vossius conjectures that he is the same as the Gellius against whom Cato Censorius delivered a speech; but the fragments which we have of his work do not seem to support that supposition: I rather suspect that he belongs to the second half of the seventh century, partly on account of his language, and partly because we find him already engaged in sophistical contrivances, whereby he endeavours to render the improbabilities of the ancient traditions more credible by small but dishonest changes. The numbers of the books referred to lead us to believe that the work entered into the most minute detail. Charisius refers to the 97th book, and that in the ancient Neapolitan MS. where the numbers are written in words; other references do not go beyond the 30th book.

After Pictor, Cicero mentions an annalist, Vennonius, from whose work we have only one passage preserved in Dionysius, referring to the history of the kings. We may therefore infer that he wrote annals from the foundation of the city. In that fragment he shows that he was a man without judgment; and Cicero judges unfavorably of his style also.

A writer about whose time and character I can speak with greater decision, is L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi Censorius[27], an opponent of C. Gracchus, and one of the pillars of the aristocratic party, but an honest man. His censorship falls in the time between the two Gracchi, and it may be that he wrote his history soon after the expiration of his office, but it is also possible that the surname Censorius was added afterwards. To judge from the extracts which Dionysius gives from him, he must have been a man of a peculiar character. Before him, historians had received the materials just as they were handed down to them by their predecessors, and had not cared whether that which was transmitted to them,

[26] Compare vol. ii. p. 9, note 11.

[27] Compare vol. i. pp. 235, 237; ii. p. 9, foll.; iii. p 319.

was possible or not. They had regarded the events of early Roman history as something belonging to a time which had no connexion whatever with their own age. Piso began to look at things in a different light: his object was to divest the ancient stories of all that appeared to him improbable or impossible, and to reconstruct out of the ancient traditions such a history as he thought consistent and in accordance with the natural course of things. This is the same mode of proceeding as has been unfortunately applied in our days to matters of the highest importance. Piso, for instance, calculates that L. Tarquinius Superbus could not possibly have been the son of Tarquinius Priscus, because he would then have been too old, when he came to the throne. Therefore Piso, without giving any further reasons for it, makes Tarquinius Superbus the grandson of Tarquinius Priscus.[28] He is surprised at the account that Tarpeia had a monument on the Capitol, and forgetting that she was a Sabine heroine to whom such a tomb might well be erected on the Capitol[29], just as Tatius had one on another hill, he discarded the history of her treachery.[30] He is unable to understand the difference between the Sabine and Latin Romans. He is the originator of falsifications in Roman history; his contrivances were dull and contemptible, but they ensnared Cn. Gellius. The Romans had an ancient legend about the lake Curtius into which Curtius was said to have thrown himself in consequence of an oracle. Piso destroyed this sublime story completely; for as he conceived that a battle could not have been fought on that spot at any other time but in the reign of Romulus, when the sewers did not yet exist, he supposed that some Sabine general of the name of Curtius had sunk in that marshy district together with his war-horse:[31] he never thinks of the fact that the whole army cannot stand where the general sinks. Such poor and contemptible interpretations are suggested by the same spirit which actuated some interpreters of the Holy Scriptures, forty or fifty years ago, who leave no letter untouched, and turn the narratives upside down in order to make out, as they fancy, an intelligible history; but in this case such a mode of proceeding is more unpardonable than in any other. In the same spirit and for

[28] Dionys. iv. 7. [29] Festus, *s. v.* Tarpeiae. [30] Dionys. ii. 40.

[31] Varro, *de Ling. Lat.* v. 148 ed. Muller. Compare vol. 1, p. 237.

the purpose of making out that the northern sagas are historical, the whole lay of the Nibelungen has been transformed into a war of the Burgundians, and connected with the accounts of Roman chronicles of the fifth century. But, fortunately, nobody believes these things. Such was the spirit of L. Calpurnius Piso, a remarkable man, but in a bad way: he may be regarded as the first author of forgeries in Roman history. The title of his work was *annales;* and he must have been an industrious man, for we see that he made use of good sources, such as Fasti and the like. The number of books into which his work was divided is uncertain; in the third, he spoke of Cn. Flavius (A.U. 450); in the seventh, of the year 516, and he must have carried the history down to his own time, as he mentioned the secular games of the year 607.

In the course of the same century several historical works were composed; but I do not speak of those who wrote only a history of their own time, but of those who composed a complete history of Rome. In Cicero's youth about the time when the books *ad Herennium* were written, that is, about the year 680, or rather somewhat earlier, near the time of Cicero's consulship, there were two men who wrote a general history of Rome, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius and Q. Valerius Antias. According to Velleius both were younger than Coelius Antipater, and elder contemporaries of Sisenna, and wrote after the time of Sulla. Quadrigarius is one of those authors who in later times, after the restoration of the earlier literature, were very much read. He and Cassius Hemina departed from the general rule of the annalists who commenced their works from the building of the city; for while Hemina began at an earlier period, Quadrigarius commenced his history with the destruction of Rome by the Gauls. We have some considerable fragments of his work from which this is clear; for in the numerous fragments of the first book much is mentioned that belongs to the Gallic war; and at the same time it contained the beginning of the Samnite wars, and even the battle of Caudium; one fragment even touches upon the end of the third Samnite war, and all this not in very brief words. Hence, as the book embraced such a rich period, he cannot have had space for the earlier history. Another fact supporting our opinion is the statement, that he declared that there existed no

documents older than the taking of Rome by the Gauls[32]; for I have no doubt that the Κλώδιός τις in Plutarch[33] is our Claudius Quadrigarius. We must therefore consider him as a man of a critical mind, who would not write about what, according to his conviction, was not historical. In the second or third book he spoke of Pyrrhus; in the fifth and sixth, of Hannibal; in the eighth, of Tiber. Gracchus, the father; in the thirteenth, of Metellus; in the nineteenth, of Marius; and there are quotations from the work up to the twenty-third book. His history extended down to Cicero's consulship. Fragments, from which we clearly see the great awkwardness of the language of those ancient annalists, in whom we find no trace of the periodic structure of sentences[34], occur in Gellius, and justify Cicero's judgment of the ancient writers. The chronicles of Cologne and Limburg are generally written in a much better style. Hence prose was little read before the time when Livy and Sallust wrote. Gellius thinks the ancient authors pleasing, which must be accounted for by the complete corruption of taste in his time, which had recourse sometimes to hot spices, sometimes to ice. To convince any one of the truth of this, let him read only the fragment from Claudius in Gellius.[35] The flourishing time of Roman literature was in the reign of Augustus, as that of French literature was in the reign of Louis XIV; but just because that was the first bloom, the thoughts and ideas were more simple, the language more calm and tranquil, and flowing in a certain broadness and fulness. Afterwards, *esprit* and wit became awakened, and everything was demanded and given in a more concise, refined, and pointed manner. Such was the character of the period down to Tacitus, just as was the case with the age of Louis XV. in France; but now, when the Romans carried everything to extremes, everything was to become still more pointed, still more refined, and still more witty; and thus they came to a style bordering upon that which is really tasteless and absurd. Gellius lived in that period; he was a very sensible man, and so disgusted with the tendency of his age, that he lost all feeling for the

[32] Compare vol. ii. p. 2, foll.

[33] *Numa*, c. 1.

[34] Periodic writing among the Romans does not begin till the time of Cato, and was particularly cultivated by C. Gracchus, who must, on the whole, be regarded as the father of Latin prose. The periodic style, like the hexameter, seems to have been engrafted upon the Latin language from the Greek.—N.

[35] ix. 13.

better literature which preceded his own age, and went back to the earliest times, which were more to his taste.

Q. Valerius Antias is the very opposite of Quadrigarius: of all the Roman historians he is the most untrue; in him we can point out manifest falsifications.[36] Livy[37] says that none surpassed him in exaggerations. He knew all the details of the earliest times most accurately, the numbers of the slain, prisoners, &c; he was always inclined to exaggerate, especially in regard to numbers. His fabrications have quite a different character from the earlier ones, the numbers in which were by no means invented for the purpose of deceiving; they only mention a round number, as *sexcenti*, *μύριοι* (*ter centum tonat*, in Virgil), to indicate an indefinite number. This poetical mixture of indefiniteness and apparent definiteness prevails everywhere in the Roman legends. Thus the thirty Sabine maidens are by no means a definite number, but only mean *many*. Valerius Antias, however, states their number to have been 547. In this manner he wrote an enormous work, which was particularly minute in the accounts of the later times; but notwithstanding all this, he was not able to produce an animated narrative, but related the single occurrences in a dry and dull manner. His work is quoted down to the seventy-fifth book; in the second, he spoke of Numa; and in the twelfth, of the tribune Tib. Gracchus. Fragments, from which we might judge of his style, do not exist.

One might be inclined to consider this Valerius to be a *gentilis* of the Maximi and Publicolae; and in a very loose sense, he may have been one, but he did not belong to the gens of the patrician Valerii. The L. Valerius Antias, who occurs in the Hannibalian war, was probably a citizen of Antium, and may have been one of the ancestors of our annalist.

It is surprising that Livy, although he repeatedly mentions the untrustworthiness of Valerius Antias, yet has in his first books passages which can have been taken from none but Valerius Antias.

[36] Compare vol. ii. p. 9.

[37] xxxvi. 38: in augendo eo non alius intemperantior est. Compare xxxviii. 23, xxxiii. 11.

LECTURE VI.

ALL these annalists had something extremely old-fashioned in their tone and language, which differed from that of the writers of the subsequent period, just as much as the German, written in the beginning of the eighteenth century, from that which became established about the time of the Seven Years' war.

At the end of the seventh century, after this series of pretty uniform writers, we find only one distinguished annalist, C. Licinius Macer.[1] He was the father of the orator and poet C. Licinius Calvus, and a contemporary of Catullus, with whom he flourished about the year 700; so that at the time of Cicero's consulship, Macer may have been beyond the prime of life. His tribuneship falls about the year 680, before the first consulship of Pompey. Licinius Macer was a remarkable man; and we are able to form an idea of the character of his work from what Livy and Dionysius quote from it. From the quotations in Livy we see that Macer did what only two writers had done before him, the one as an historian and the other as a writer on the constitution, for he derived his materials from documents which he sought and found.[2] Macer may have related a great many things which were passed over by his successors, merely because they could not reconcile them with the current accounts which they adopted or with their own preconceived notions; for Livy[3] says, in more than one place, that his statements did not agree with other annals. The treaty with Porsenna, referred to by Pliny, was probably mentioned by nobody but Licinius Macer.[4] Pliny speaks of him as if he had read him[5], and frequently names him among his authorities. Cicero is dissatisfied with him; and in the introduction to his work "de Legibus," he mentions him disrespectfully. He might be right to some extent; for Macer, although he deserved respect as a critical historian, may yet not have been equally distinguished as a writer, which is indeed

[1] Compare vol. ii. p. 10.

[2] Livy, iv. 7, 20, 23, vii. 9, ix. 38, 46, x. 9. Compare Dionys. ii. 52, iv. 6, v. 74, and passim.

[3] vii. 9, ix. 46, x. 9.

[4] Compare vol. i. p. 546, foll.

[5] *Hist. Nat.* xxxii. 3 and 5.

very probable. If we Germans, for instance, praise Mascov[6] as the first who wrote a history of Germany, we do not thereby mean to assert that his work possesses everything that is required of a history of Germany. But it may also be, that Cicero judged unfavourably of him, because he belonged to a different political party[7], for Macer took an active part in the restoration of the tribunician power. In the struggles which were then going on at Rome, every one thought the lesser evil to be on his own side: some conceived it to lie in the greater power of the government, and others in the full operation of popular freedom; just as is now the case in France, where a calm and unprejudiced spectator cannot join either of the parties unconditionally, or wish to see one gain the upper hand. In such circumstances, Cicero may, for a time, have confined his good wishes to one party, and been anxious to see the other completely suppressed. I consider the loss of the annals of Macer greatly to be deplored. Whether the speech of Macer among the fragments of Sallust's history was the report of an actual speech of Macer, or was written by Sallust under his name, is uncertain: at any rate, the great knowledge of the early constitution displayed in it, renders it worthy of Macer, and is not likely to have been possessed by Sallust. His work is quoted down to the sixteenth book; but of how many books it consisted is unknown; he probably began with the earliest times, and carried the history down to his own age.

C. Junius Gracchanus, the historian of the Roman constitution, derived his name from his friendship with the younger Gracchus. Both the Gracchi were men of very deep, intense, and warm feelings, and exercised an inspiring influence upon eminent persons; it is, therefore, no wonder that young and enthusiastic men were, as it were, charmed by them. Junius Gracchanus wrote a history of the Roman constitution, in which he gave a chronological account of its changes. The work seems to have been the only one of its kind; it is often quoted by Censorinus, Tacitus, Ulpian, and other jurists. He appears

[6] His history appeared in 1726 under the title: *Geschichte der Deutschen bis zu Anfang der Fränkischen Monarchie.* An English translation of it by Thomas Lediard appeared in 1738, London, 2 vols. 4to.

[7] Cicero, *ad Att.* i. 4; Plutarch, *Cic.* 9; Valer. Max. ix. 12, 7.

[8] Compare vol. ii. p. 10, foll, and note 251.

to have followed in his calculations the aera from the expulsion of the kings, which is adopted in particular by Lydus in his work "*De Magistratibus,*" who drew his information from Gaius' commentary on the twelve tables. Gaius again derived his materials from Gracchanus; for he himself did not possess the learning of Gracchanus, and where he is left to himself, he is very often wrong; but his collection is nevertheless extremely valuable. The sources referred to by Gracchanus were probably the ancient law-books, and certainly most authentic ones. I can say, with the fullest conviction, that all his statements were correct.

There is no quotation from Fenestella referring to the early times of Rome, whence I infer that he did not write the entire history of Rome.

Among the minor writers on Roman history, there occurs one Victor, to whom is assigned a work entitled "Origo gentis Romanae"; in it are quoted most of the earlier annalists, also the *annales maximi* (even for the arrival of Aeneas), Sex. Gellius, Domitius, Egnatius, M. Octavius, and many others whose very names are otherwise unknown. The work was first published by Andreas Schottus. Considering the resemblance of the book to that of Fulgentius, to the Scholiast on the Ibis, and other commentators of the time, who likewise refer to both known and unknown authors, we might be inclined to consider it a production of the fifth or sixth century of the Christian era; but the whole work is a fabrication of modern times; not, indeed, written by Schottus himself, but by one of the impostors who were so numerous about the end of the fifteenth century. The works ascribed to Messalla, Fenestella (*de magistratibus*), and others in the same collection, were forged at the same period. The impostor may have become acquainted with Octavius from the Scholiast on Horace, and have taken Sext. Gellius from Dionysius, who says—"I state what the Gellii and others have written." The quotations from Cato in this work are contradicted by the most conclusive evidence, which we possess in Servius and others concerning Cato.

This was the condition of Roman history in the time of Cicero. After the consulship of Cicero, while Caesar was in Gaul, Q. Aelius Tubero, a friend of Cicero, wrote Roman annals, which were likewise founded on authentic documents; though, unless he has been greatly wronged, he cannot be compared with

Macer in importance.[8] He accompanied Cicero as legate into Asia; he belonged to the party of the optimates, and was a very honest man. Livy quotes his work from the earliest times; and whatever is preserved of it, bears a character of great historical respectability, although we see that he was not acquainted with the ancient constitutional phraseology, and did not distinguish between the institutions of his own time and those of the earlier periods.

T. Pomponius Atticus wrote Roman annals, which seem to have been nothing more than chronological tables.[9] It was not an unusual thing, at that time, to draw up short historical outlines from the detailed narratives of others, as Cornelius Nepos did, after the example of Apollodorus. Thus sciences extend and become contracted again. The annals of Atticus seem to have been valuable; but as we never find them quoted, we may conclude that of many books of this kind, we know nothing.[10]

In the admirable introduction to the work "De Legibus," Cicero represents himself as being told by his friend Atticus, that his countrymen were looking to him for a history of Rome; and he seems to have done this, not from vanity, but because he thought it his duty to write such a work, and because many of his friends had actually expressed such a wish to him. To this suggestion, he replies in a manner which shews that he would have liked to undertake the task, but that at the same time he had never entertained any serious thought of doing it. But, however this may be, we may, without injuring his reputation, assert that had he ventured upon it, he would have attempted something which was beyond his powers. He was a stranger to the early history of his country[11]; he was more of a statesman than a scholar, and a man of an immensely active and indefatigable character. The task of writing a history of Rome would have required a series of studies for which he had no time. In his work, "De Re Publica," we have an opportunity of seeing how exceedingly little knowledge of the constitution he possessed when he began writing it. He does not

[8] See Livy, iv. 23; Sueton. *Caes.* 83; Gellius, x. 28, xiv. 7 and 8; Servius, *ad Aen.* ii. 15; Cicero, *ad Quint. Frat.* i. 1, *pro Planc.* 42, *pro Ligario*, 7, foll.

[9] C. Nepos, *Hannib.* 13, *Attic.* 18; Cicero, *Brut.* 3, 5, and 11, *Orat.* 34; Asconius *in Pison.*, p. 13, ed. Orelli.

[10] There are passages in which the work of Atticus is referred to, as those in C. Nepos and Asconius referred to above, and Ascon. in Cornel., p. 76, ed Orelli; but we have no quotations from it.

[11] Compare vol. i. note 1040.

seem to have made use of Junius Gracchanus, but to have derived the greater part of his information from Polybius, and perhaps from his friend Atticus.

There are many other writers whom I might mention, such as Antipater, Fannius, Polybius, Posidonius, Rutilius, Lucullus, Scaurus, and others, many of whom wrote in Greek.[12]

Sallust, as he himself says[13], found the history of his country unwarrantably neglected, although if it had been written, it would have thrown that of the Greeks into the shade. It would, indeed, have been a problem for a man who had the power of writing it; since the Romans had no history of their country, any more than we have one of Germany. Sallust, like Cicero, a man of great activity, had the necessary qualifications for writing it; but as a practical man he neither would nor could undertake the immense preparations it required, and he wisely chose separate portions of it, especially those in which Sisenna did not satisfy him.[14] Thus he wrote his Jugurthine war, the object of which was to show how the Roman world had sunk in every respect through the government of the oligarchs; and how the popular party was developing and gaining strength through the shameful abuse which the aristocratical party made of its victory. His "Historiae" began after the death of Sulla, and were intended to describe the reaction against the unreasonable institutions of the dictator, and the war against Sertorius. In his account of the conspiracy of Catiline who belonged to the party of Sulla, his object was to show what degenerate villains those aristocrats were, who called themselves *optimates* and *boni;* he suggests that their party had already lost its importance, and that their proceedings were no better than those of robbers. If Sallust had not been satisfied with the history of the other events which were described by Sisenna, namely the period between the Jugurthine war and the consulship of Lepidus, he would undoubtedly have written it himself. Much has already been done for Sallust; but there are yet many laurels to be gained.[15]

Owing to the great change in the Roman world under

[12] These authors were not mentioned by Niebuhr in his Lectures. The short notice here inserted was found among the few MS. leaves which were given to Dr. Isler, to be used in the preparation of the Lectures for publication.

[13] *Catiline*, 7

[14] *Jugurth.* 100.

[15] Respecting Niebuhr's opinion on the letters addressed to Caesar, which are commonly ascribed to Sallust, see vol. iii. p. 342, foll.

Augustus, the history of the Roman republic was closed like the temple of Janus. Every one had now gained the full conviction that no remedy could be expected from the forms of the law, but that it was necessary to keep the state together from without like a mass of heterogeneous things; and this conviction had, of course, its influence upon the historians of the age, for after such events history appears in quite a different light, and is written in a different manner. During this period there appeared many historians, just as had been the case in Greece after the fall of the Athenian state. After the death of Caesar, Diodorus Siculus wrote his work, but on such a plan, that the history of Rome formed only a secondary part of it. It is not improbable that Timaeus too, in his history of Italy and Sicily, had interwoven that of Rome, but only for the very early times. Diodorus entertained the idea which could occur to no one but a person devoid of judgment, of writing the whole of ancient history in a synchronistic form, at first in masses, and afterwards year by year down to the consulship of Caesar, when he entered upon his Gallic war. He concluded his work with the period previous to the outbreak of the civil war in order to avoid taking in his account the side of either party. This was, however, a suitable epoch, as he probably composed his work before the termination of the disturbances. From his introduction it is evident that he wrote his history after Caesar's death, for he there mentions that event, and calls Caesar *Divus*. Scaliger hit upon the unfortunate idea of inferring from a passage (i.68), that Diodorus did not write till the year 746, and consequently left unwritten the history of the fifty years immediately preceding his own time. This opinion passed from Scaliger into the work of Vossius "De Historicis Graecis et Latinis," and thence into Fabricius' "Bibliotheca Graeca." The passage states of the Olympiads, that they were a period of four years, called by the Romans *bissextum*; hence Scaliger infers, that he could not have written before the year 746, because in that year Augustus fixed the intercalation every four years. This interpretation is highly ingenious; but the passage is an interpolation, as has been observed by some of the earlier commentators, and by all the later ones, so that Wesseling even removed it from the text. The expression χρόνος for *year*, which there occurs, is modern Greek, just as *tempus* is used in the sense of *annus* after the fifth century.

Diodorus is an interpolated author; the falsifications were made at the time of the revival of letters, when MSS. were greatly in request and were dearly paid for. They consist chiefly of omissions. From the eleventh down to the twentieth book there are sometimes Fasti which do not agree at all with our Fasti; and it is often impossible to identify the names which occur in them. His accounts of the earliest times were probably taken from Fabius; where Polybius began, he seems to have used him also down to the year 608; he may, moreover, have availed himself of Posidonius, Rutilius, Sulla, and Lucullus.

We now come to the two great historians, who simultaneously composed their works on Roman history. In the introduction to his work, Dionysius gives a full account of himself and of the time at which he wrote. He came to Rome after the end of the civil war between Augustus and Antony, and remained there twenty-two years, which he spent in preparing his work. It was published in the year 743, according to Cato (745 according to Varro)[16], for it is evident that the passage to which I allude, is not to be understood of the time when he began writing, but of the time when he wrote his introduction and prefixed it to his work. He calls himself a son of Alexander of Halicarnassus, and he came to Rome in the capacity of a rhetorician. His rhetorical works, which belong to an earlier period than his history, surpass all others of the kind in excellence, with the exception of those of Aristotle: they are full of the most exquisite remarks and criticisms, the opinions of an amiable man of refined judgment, and we have therefore the more reason to lament that the texts are so much corrupted. I believe that it is Dionysius whom Strabo[17] mentions under the name of Caecilius; for if he obtained the Roman franchise, he must also have received the name of a Roman gens.[18] A Caecilius is mentioned in the lives of the ten orators which are ascribed to Plutarch[19], and some have been of opinion that this is the same Caecilius who was quaestor under Verres in Sicily and afterwards wanted to come forward as his accuser; but I suspect that the Caecilius in the lives of the ten orators is

[16] Dionys. i. 7.

[17] v p. 352, ed. Alm.

[18] Atticus too is mentioned under the name of Caecilius (Sueton. *Tiber.* c. 7), but this occurs seldom; and it is not likely that he should be meant.—N.

[19] P 832, E. Compare Plutarch, *Demosth.* 3.

likewise Dionysius, for what is attributed there to Caecilius is nothing else than what we find in Dionysius.[20] However, I am well aware that this is not a sufficient criterion, since the same things may have been said in books of different writers; but at all events it seems probable to me, that Dionysius was frequently called by his Roman name, as Josephus was often called Flavius.

He wrote his work in twenty books, comprising the history from the earliest times down to the beginning of the first Punic war. He did not proceed further, either because Polybius (whom he however disliked) began at that point, or because the much read history of Fabius formed a suitable continuation. The first ten books are complete; the eleventh is much mutilated, as several leaves have been torn away; but we possess extracts from the latter half of the work which were made by Constantinus Porphyrogenitus in his collections "De Vitiis et Virtutibus," and "De Legationibus." Besides these extracts, we have a collection of curious fragments which, under the title of ἐκλογαὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἁλικαρνασσέως, exist in several libraries, but are very much mutilated, and sometimes quite unintelligible[21]. Their existence had been mentioned by Montfaucon long before their publication by Mai.[22] They contain much valuable matter, but are in an awful condition, consisting mostly of unconnected sentences; they are perhaps remnants from lost books of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus. Dionysius himself made an abridgment of his work in five books, to which Mai erroneously refers those fragments. Of the first ten books there are more manuscripts than of any other ancient work, and some of them are very old: the Codex Chiggianus which belongs to the tenth century, and the Vatican manuscript of the eleventh century, are excellent. The eleventh book exists only in very few manuscripts, and these are of recent origin, not older than the fifteenth century. The division into books is observed in all of them, as it was in the ancient manuscripts which were made when works were no longer written on rolls, but in codices, and when several books of a voluminous work together formed one volume.[23] It is highly probable that the work of Dionysius, like that of Livy[24], was originally divided into decads. Hence the first volume of Dionysius which contains the first decad, is preserved, and of the second there seems to have existed a copy for a long time, for Photius still knew it; but only a few torn leaves were extant when pope Nicholas V. began to collect libraries. Hence the text of the extant portion of the eleventh book is far more corrupt than that of the preceding ten.

The Greek text of Dionysius was first published by Robert Stephens (Paris, 1546. fol.), but unfortunately from a very bad manuscript. Previously to that time Dionysius had been very generally read in a Latin translation which had been made by a Florentine, Lapus[25] Biragus (Treviso 1480), in the time of Sixtus IV[26] from a very excellent, probably a Roman manuscript. Lapus, however, was like so many others an unskilful translator[27], and very indifferently acquainted with Greek, like Petrus Candidus, Raphael Volaterranus, and Leonardus Aretinus; still the works of these men were received and read with great interest, until people discovered how very deficient and incorrect they were. H. Glareanus then corrected it and published a new edition of it at Basle (1532). He also made use of a MS., and he himself says that he corrected Lapus in six thousand places. This improved edition was likewise used very much; but as Glareanus had merely corrected Lapus,

[20] This supposition of Niebuhr's seems to be contradicted by Quinctilian (*iii.* 1. 16), who mentions Caecilius and Dionysius together as two distinct rhetoricians.

[21] Compare vol. ii. note 916; vol. iii. note 934.

[22] Mai has published them from a Milan MS. He has great merits, and I readily admit them; but he also has an unfortunate vanity, and in the present instance he never mentioned that the existence of these fragments had been noticed by Montfaucon, who had shown him the way. One of Mai's own countrymen, Ciampi (*Biblioth. Ital.* tom. viii. p. 225, foll.), has censured him for this want of candour; this, however, must not prevent our acknowledging our great obligations to him.—N.

[23] In this manner, the *Digestum Vetus* comprised in one volume twenty-five books, and the *Digestum Novum* formed a second volume, beginning with the twenty-sixth book; so also the Theodosian code.—N.

[24] It is an unfounded remark of Petrarch's, that the division into decads was not made by Livy himself—N.

[25] Lapus is a Florentine corruption of Jacobus.—N.

[26] This pope did a great deal for literature; he arranged and collected in his Vatican library all that could be gathered of ancient literature.—N.

[27] The translation of Herodian by Angelus Politianus is really excellent; but, generally speaking, the men of that age were not able to translate. Their works were nevertheless much read and often printed. To us they are of importance, in so far as they represent the manuscripts from which they translated; and Lapus' translation agrees almost throughout with the Vatican MS.—N.

Sigismund Gelenius of Cologne made an entirely new and far better translation, and it was not till after the publication of this new translation, which may likewise serve as a MS., that R. Stephens published the Greek text. In 1586, Frederik Sylburg gave to the world a second edition of Dionysius, which is the best that has appeared; a more useful one cannot be wished for. He availed himself of the translations of Lapus and Gelenius; but although he had a critical apparatus, and collations from Venetian and Roman manuscripts, though apparently not complete, yet he did not correct the text, which is greatly to be lamented, considering the excellent power of divination which he possessed. His notes are most masterly, and no other editor ever did for his author, what Sylburg did for Dionysius. The philological index added to this edition, is unequalled, and the historical one is almost perfect. Sylburg is a man of whom German philology may be proud, but his merits are not yet sufficiently recognised. Whoever has made himself acquainted with his works, must own that he is not inferior to any philologer, not even to the great J. Fr. Gronovius. He contributed very much to the Greek Thesaurus of Henry Stephens, but unfortunately we cannot ascertain which parts of the work belong to him. He also distinguished himself by what he did for the Etymologicum Magnum, Pausanias, and Clemens of Alexandria. His edition and translation of the Syntax of Apollonius are likewise very important.

LECTURE VII.

After the edition of Sylburg, which was published by Wechel at Frankfort, and is rare, a reprint was made at Leipzig in 1691, and more than a century passed before anything further was done for Dionysius, until the new edition[1] of Hudson

[1] London, 2 vols. fol. Hudson, being the friend of Dodwell, was looked upon in England as a great philologer, although England, at the time, possessed in Richard Bentley the greatest philologer that ever lived, but—*obstrepebant.* Bentley was a Whig and the Tories were bent upon keeping him down: the whole University of Oxford conspired against him, but to no purpose. They

in 1704. Hudson had the excellent Vatican manuscript, and gave a collation of it in his notes, but did not know what use to make of it. The edition is beautifully printed; but the notes of Sylburg are generally omitted, and sometimes given in a mutilated form. Although the edition of Sylburg is incomparably more useful to a scholar than that of Hudson, still the latter gained great celebrity in Germany. Strange prejudices were then afloat respecting editions of ancient authors, and as Clarke's Homer had been reprinted in Germany, so now Hudson's edition of Dionysius was thought worthy of being reprinted at Leipzig.[2] When the first volume was nearly printed, the publisher requested Reiske to correct the proof sheets, but Reiske was unable to do such a thing without making emendations. He had a very active mind, and an excellent talent for divination, but was too hasty.[3] He had read Dionysius only once before, and while he was correcting the proofs, he put into the text the readings of the Vatican manuscript as well as his own emendations, which are sometimes good, but sometimes very bad: an account of his emendations is given at the end. In D. G. Grimm's Synopsis nothing has been done for the criticism of Dionysius, who is still waiting for a competent editor; if I could obtain a collation of the Codex Chiggianus, I should like some time or other to undertake the office, and bring out a new edition.

The circumstance, that Dionysius in his rhetorical works shews himself to be a man of sound judgment, is calculated to win our confidence; and this impression is greatly enhanced by his stating that he spent twenty-two years upon his work, during which period he learned the Latin language, read the Roman annals and made himself acquainted with the Roman constitution in Rome itself. The first eleven books carry down the history only a little beyond the time of the decemvirs; but the whole work contained the history down to the first Punic

---

wanted to set up Hudson as a great philologer against him, though in reality he was but a poor bungler. He did not do the least for his *Geographi minores*, any more than Reiz did for Lucian. Reiz and Hudson were men of the same cast: they had the good fortune to hold eminent positions, and although stupid, they were trumpeted forth as wise men and great scholars —N.

[2] 1774—1777, 6 vols. 8vo.

[3] I honour Reiske as a friend of my father, and I cannot let an opportunity pass without praising him; but I cannot on this account conceal his defects. —N.

war, where Timaeus also stopped, and where Polybius began. Dionysius lived on terms of friendship with many distinguished Romans, and wrote with a feeling of real esteem for the greatness of the Roman people. He called his work *Archaeologia*, a name which does not seem to have been used before him. As in the eleven books still extant, he does not carry his history further than Livy does in his first three; as he has one whole book before he comes to the building of Rome; and as he has two more which contain the history of the kings down to the banishment of Tarquinius Superbus, the minute history of those early periods excites our mistrust in regard not only to his trustworthiness, but also to his judgment. It is not to be denied, that in this respect Dionysius had formed a plan which we cannot approve of; and even independently of his taking the history of the kings as historical, the attempt to write a pragmatical history from the earliest times is a blunder at which we sometimes cannot help smiling; but the longer and the more carefully the work is examined, the more must true criticism acknowledge that it is deserving of all respect, and the more will it be found a storehouse of most solid information. Before Roman history was treated critically, Dionysius was neglected, and his work was despised as a tissue of follies; and indeed if any one should wish to decry him, he would not find it very difficult, for there are passages in him, in which the most intolerable common-places, nay, things which are utterly false, are set forth in long rhetorical discussions. But leaving such things out of the question, I say, that we cannot value too highly the treasures we possess in him. Through him we become acquainted with a multitude of facts derived from the ancient law-books and annalists, though he may not have consulted them himself, and with institutions which are but too often referred by him to the kings as their authors: we owe it solely to him that we are not in utter darkness about these things, and about an infinite number of changes in the laws and constitution. The careful use which he made of his authorities, render him invaluable to us; sometimes even the foundations of his speeches are taken from ancient annalists; many circumstances at least, which were mentioned in them, and which he could not incorporate in the body of his history, are introduced in his speeches, which consequently, often

contain traces of a genuine tradition, though otherwise everything seems to be arbitrary in them. Thus in the speech of a patrician, said to have been delivered on the occasion of a popular tumult, we find the words "if all expedients fail, why should we not rather grant the isopolity to the Latins, than humble ourselves before the plebeians"? Now this isopolity was afterwards actually granted to the Latins in the peace, a fact which cannot be doubted, though it is not noticed by Dionysius. This therefore is one of the passages, where he inserted in a speech a statement which he found in the annalist's account of the peace. But the mistakes into which he fell, must be distinguished from the substance of the accounts which he collected. Having once lost the thread with which he might have found his way in the labyrinth, it was impossible for him not to go astray. This would not have happened to him, if he had understood the expressions of Fabius; but he knew nothing of the ancient mode of expressing constitutional relations, and was misled by the meaning which constitutional terms had assumed in his own days. He did not comprehend the happy distinction of Fabius between δῆμος (populus) and ὅμιλος (plebs), and he called the former πλῆθος, and the latter δῆμος.[4] Hence he often finds himself in a painful perplexity; and we see how, from mere ignorance, he torments himself with riddles, when he places the δῆμος in opposition to the δῆμος, and makes the tribunes disturb the assemblies of the people. But he is determined to find his way, and does not pass over anything, although it may cause him pain. That he is a rhetorician and not a statesman, is indeed but too manifest, and hence his judgment is deficient, though not absolutely bad, for he was an extremely intelligent man. His language is very good, and with a few exceptions it may be called perfectly pure. But what may be brought against him as a proof of his bad taste are his speeches, in which he imitated Thucydides in such a manner, that he made his heroes speak as if all of them were Athenians, and thus causes them to lose all their individuality of character. I read Dionysius at a very early age, and as a young man I studied his *primordia* of the early history of the Italian nations, till the exertion exhausted my strength; but few results were to be gained. I have gone through him more carefully and per-

[4] Compare vol. ii. notes 417 and 431, and p. 220, foll.

severingly than perhaps any one else: his faults did not escape me, and I thought him far inferior to Livy. I have been censured for wishing to find fault with him; but assuredly no one feels that respect, esteem, and gratitude towards him which I feel. The more I search, the greater are the treasures I find in him. In former times it was the general belief, that whatever Dionysius had more than Livy were mere fancies of his own; but with the exception of his speeches there is absolutely nothing that can be called invented: he only worked up those materials which were transmitted to him by other authorities. It is true that he made more use of Cn. Gellius and similar writers than of Cato; it is also true that he not unfrequently preferred those authors who furnished abundant materials to others who gave more solid and substantial information[5]—all this is true; but he is nevertheless undervalued, and has claims to an infinitely higher rank than that which is usually assigned to him. He worked with the greatest love of his subject, and did not, certainly, intend to introduce any forgery. He is not now, nor will he perhaps ever be, much read.

It was nearly about the time of the publication of Dionysius (743, according to Cato, or 745, according to Varro), that Livy began to write his history. It is my conviction that he did not begin earlier; and I here express it after mature consideration and scrupulous investigation. He was born at Patavium in 693 according to Cato, or 695 according to Varro, in the consulship of the great Caesar, and died in his eightieth year, in 772 according to Cato, or 774 according to Varro: that is, the twentieth year after the birth of Christ; so that he saw the early part of the reign of Tiberius. The only circumstances of his early life which we know, are, that he commenced his career as a rhetorician, and wrote on rhetoric.[6] But these early works were obscured and thrown into the shade by the deep impression which his history made upon his contemporaries. There are several reasons for believing that he began the composition of his history at a late period. The first decad of his historical work has been called a work of his youth, as if he had written it at the age of about thirty, or even earlier. But against this opinion the following reasons

[5] Compare vol. ii. p. 11.

[6] Quinctil. x. 1, 39, viii. 2, 18; Senec. *Epist.* 100; Sueton. *Claud.* 41.

must be adduced:—In speaking of Numa, he mentions Augustus as the founder and restorer of all temples[7], which cannot have been said before the year 730; the closing of the temple of Janus[8], and the building of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius.[9] He also mentions Caesar Augustus in the war of Cossus. Dodwell, a man who seldom hits the right point, is perfectly right here, when he observes that, from the manner in which Livy speaks of Spain, it must have been conquered by Augustus.[10] The ninth book was written after the campaigns of Drusus in Germany; for, in speaking of the Ciminian forest, he says, that at that time the roads through it were more impassable and horrible *quam nuper fueri Germanici saltus*[11], and Domitius Ahenobarbus and Drusus were the first who, in the year 740, threw the German forests open to the Romans. It might indeed be said that these passages were later additions, but it can easily be recognised whether a work is composed in one breath, or has been re-fashioned; and there can be no doubt that Livy's work belongs to the former class. To these facts we may also add the circumstance that Dionysius nowhere mentions Livy. If a work written in such a masterly manner as that of Livy had existed, we should be utterly unable to comprehend how Dionysius could have remained ignorant of it, or have overlooked it; nor could Dionysius have complained of the total neglect of the materials of Roman history. In Livy, on the other hand,—and that even in the last books of the first decad,—we find several traces of his having read Dionysius. From the Excerpts "De Legationibus," we know the manner in which Dionysius treated the Samnite war; and Livy's narrative of it cannot possibly have been derived from Roman annals, but must have been taken from Greek authorities, especially the account which he[12] gives of the manner in which Naples fell into the hands of the Romans, which Dionysius seems to have taken from a Neapolitan chronicle; Livy himself could not know this, and yet gives a detailed account of it; he must have had a Greek source, and this was certainly no other than Dionysius. It is also probable, that in his comparison of the power of Alexander the Great with that of the Romans[13], he followed a Greek writer who had done

[7] Livy, iv. 20. [8] Livy, i. 19. [9] Livy, i. 10. [10] *Annal. Vellei.* p. 19.
[11] Livy, ix. 36. Compare vol. iii p. 279, note 485. [12] viii. 22, foll.
[13] ix. 18, foll.

the same before him. The account of the war of Pyrrhus,and of the piratical expedition of Cleonymus[14] must likewise have been taken from a Greek writer, which I believe the more firmly, as in that narrative Livy calls the Sallentines, Messapians[15], probably not knowing that the latter was the Greek name for Sallentines. I therefore firmly believe that Dionysius had completed his work before Livy finished his first decad, and that the latter made use of Dionysius even before he wrote the eighth book. Nay, it is not impossible that the Greek work of Dionysius may have suggested to Livy the idea of writing the history of Rome in Latin. The liveliness and freshness of the style of Livy's work may indeed be said to be opposed to my supposition, that he wrote it at an advanced period of his life; but such things depend merely upon the personal character of the writer. Let no one say that I allow him too little time to complete his history; for as he was about fifty years old when Dionysius published his work, there still remained thirty years from the time he commenced his history until his death; and the work is not too extensive to be executed in the course of twenty-five years, especially if we take into consideration Livy's method of writing. It is moreover probable to me that he died before he had accomplished his object. We know it to be a fact that his work consisted of one hundred and forty-two books, and that the last of them ended with the death of Drusus. Here we perceive an evident want of symmetry, which with Livy and the ancients in general would be something incomprehensible. The whole plan of the work renders it manifest that it was intended to be divided into decads; the very word *decas* would not have been invented in later times. If we possessed the second decad, we should see still more clearly that it was Livy himself who made this division. The twentieth book, for instance, must have been of double the extent of the others; and this for no other reason but because he would not begin the second Punic war with the twenty-second book, in order that this war again might be brought to a close in the thirtieth, and that the thirty-first might open with the Macedonian war. He cannot therefore have intended

[14] x. 2.

[15] It is by a slip of the memory that Niebuhr here refers this Greek name to the account of the expedition of Cleonymus (x. 2.), for it occurs in the account of Alexander of Epirus (viii. 24.).

to close his work in the middle of a decad. The epitome at least extends only to the 142nd book; and we should therefore be obliged to suppose that at the end some books of the epitome are wanting, as two are actually wanting in the middle.

If we examine Livy's history with due attention to style and the mode of treating his subjects, we find it extremely unequal. The several decads are essentially different from one another; and the first book of the first decad differs materially from the other books of the same decad. The first book and some parts of the second Punic war are, perhaps, the most beautiful portions of the whole work, and show how unsurpassable he would have been, if he had written a more condensed history. The second Punic war is written with peculiar care, and contains passages of the most exquisite beauty. Throughout the first decad he is extremely eloquent, and many parts are very successfully worked up. The more Livy feels himself free from restraint, the more beautiful is his narrative. In the third decad, where he has to record the recurrence of the same or similar circumstances, he himself often grows weary, and writes without pleasure; but the descriptions of the battles of Trasimenus and Cannae are still excellent. This, however, is the turning point. From the thirty-first book onward all are far inferior; he uses more words than are needed, and we see traces of old age. In the fourth and fifth decads, which are much below the second, he gave for the most part a mere Latin paraphrase of Polybius, and he could not indeed have chosen a better guide: but it is evident that he is beginning to hurry onwards to other subjects, and here things happen to him which we scarcely ever meet with in the earlier books: he contradicts himself, his style becomes prolix, and he relates the same things over again. The style of the fragment belonging to the ninety-first book, which was discovered at Rome, is perfectly different from that of all the other extant parts of his work: repetitions are here so frequent in the small compass of four pages, and the prolixity is so great, that we should hardly believe it to belong to Livy, if we did not read at the beginning of the fragment: *Titi Livii liber* xci., and if sundry other things did not prove it to be his. Here we see the justice of the censures which the ancient grammarians passed upon him for his repetitions and tautologies.[16]

[16] Diomedes quotes a passage from Livy, which does not occur in the extant books, and which runs thus: *legati retro domum, unde venerant, redierunt.* N.—

Here we see how the great writer has grown old and become loquacious, a character so exquisitely portrayed by Cicero in his Cato Major, and which may have been very agreeable in personal intercourse with Livy. If we possessed the second decad, which was probably far better than the later ones, we should see manifest reasons to account for the loss of the latter; for as they were so much inferior to the first decads, they were never read in the schools of the grammarians, and consequently were very seldom or never copied. His preface is very characteristic: it is one of the worst parts of his work; whereas the introductions in the great practical historians, Thucydides, Sallust and Tacitus, are real master-pieces of composition. This may be accounted for by the fact, that Livy began his work without being conscious of any definite object; while the other historians sketched in bold outlines the results of their long meditations.

LECTURE VIII.

It is quite manifest, that at the time when Livy began his work, he was any thing but intimately acquainted with his subject, although, considering that the history of Rome was at that time extremely neglected, he may, comparatively speaking, have possessed a tolerable knowledge of it, for he had read several of the old books; but he had no mastery whatever over his subject. His reasons for undertaking the task were undoubtedly those which he states in his preface: his delight in history and its substance, and the consolation to be derived from its pages at a time when the Romans were recovering from the evils of their civil wars, and the rising generation required to be refreshed by being led back to the glorious times of old. He seems to have set to work immediately after he had formed the resolution, and with that enthusiastic delight which we generally feel the moment after

Similar tautologies, however, occur in the earlier decads also. In xxxvii. 21, we read: *inde retro, unde profecta erat, Elaeam redit;* in xxxviii. 16: *Leonorius retro, unde venerat, cum majore parte hominum repetit Byzantium*; and xl. 48: *Convertit, inde agmen retro, unde venerat, ad Alcen.*

[1] Compare vol. i. p. 3.

we have come to the determination to realise a grand idea. In the first part of his work, the history of the kings, he followed Ennius alone[2], whence his accounts are consistent in themselves, and not made up of contradictory or irreconcileable statements. But as he went on, he gradually began to use more authors, though their number always remained very limited. In Livy every thing stands isolated, whereas in Dionysius one thread runs through the whole work: Livy took no pains to write a learned or authentic history. Of the history of foreign countries he was quite ignorant; he could not have stated that the Carthaginians came to Sicily for the first time in the year 324, if he had known that fifty years before they had made their great expedition against that island; the expedition of Alexander of Epirus ought, according to him, to have lasted eighteen years; and he mistakes Heraclitus, Philip's ambassador to Hannibal, for the philosopher of that name.

We must suppose that Livy, like most of the ancient writers, dictated his history to a scribe or secretary, and the manner in which he worked seems to have been this: he had the events of one year read to him, and then dictated his own history of that year, so that he composed the work in portions, each comprising the events of one year, without viewing this year either in its connexion with the preceding or the subsequent one. Hence it often occurs that the end of a year appears at the same time as the conclusion of a series of events; and hence we also very often find that the events recorded in one year are irreconcileable with those of the year preceding. These inconsistences, however, are not unfrequently of very great use to us, since they sometimes give us interesting information concerning events about which there existed different accounts. At first Livy used only few annalists; taking one as his foundation, so that generally the events of any one year are not contradictory; Fabius[3], Valerius Antias[4], Tubero[5] and Quadrigarius are mentioned; but I doubt whether he had read the Origines of Cato, and I cannot say whether he made use of Quadrigarius for the period which followed immediately

[2] Compare vol. i. p. 346, foll. and p. 234.

[3] Livy, i. 44, 55; ii. 40; x. 37.

[4] Livy, x. 41, Compare vol. iii. p. 358, and above, p xlii.

[5] Livy, iv. 23, x. 9.

after the burning of the city by the Gauls. It seems probable to me that he did not employ the pontifical annals, until he reached nearly the end of the first decad. With Polybius he was unacquainted until after he had related the first half of the second Punic war; for had he known the incomparable, critical, and authentic account which Polybius gives of this war, he would not in the first period of it have followed Coelius Antipater who wrote the history of it *ex professo*, and who, although his narratives were written in a beautiful style, was a wretched historian. The whole description of the siege of Saguntum and of Hannibal's passage over the Alps, is probably taken from Coelius Antipater, and would have been very different, if he had used Polybius. During this period he does not seem to have made use even of Cincius Alimentus, but on reaching the time when he had to speak of Philip of Macedonia, his attention turned, or was turned by some one, to Polybius, whom he now translated into Latin throughout the fourth decad, whenever he had no annalist ready at hand to consult about the internal affairs of Rome. When Polybius failed him, he continued writing his history in the same manner, and followed his authors such as Posidonius, the memoirs of Rutilius, Sulla, and in the later times, perhaps, Asinius Pollio's history of the civil war, Theophanes and others, most uncritically, and gave what he found in them. Thus the further he advanced, the more he was obliged to enter into details, and the more also did he become conscious of his real calling; but unfortunately he grew old at the same time. Seneca in his seventh Suasoria has preserved Livy's description of the character of Cicero, which is excellent. If we compare with this his other narratives one by one, we see the greatness of his talent for narration—which is with us so much valued in writers of novels—the liveliness of his portraits, and his clear perception of character.[6] In these points he is a master of extraordinary powers; but he is altogether deficient in a clear survey or control over his subject: no great author, in fact, has this deficiency to such an extent as Livy. For an annalist a clear survey is not necessary; but in a work like that of Livy, it is a matter of the highest importance. He neither knew what he had written nor what he was going to write, but wrote at hazard. Thus he takes from one annalist an account, which presupposes

[6] Compare vol. I. p. 3.

circumstances quite different from those stated by himself. His list of the nations which revolted from the Romans immediately after the battle of Cannae[7] is exceedingly incorrect. It contains nations which did not revolt till several years later, and yet Livy represents their insurrection as the immediate consequence of the battle of Cannae. He shews his want of criticism in the manner in which, at the beginning of the second Punic war, he relates the tales of the siege of Saguntum and the passage of Hannibal across the Alps, which can have been copied only from Coelius Antipater. There are things stated in them which cannot possibly have happened. This want of survey is also the cause of his utter incapability of judging of events and of the persons concerned in them: he can never say whether persons acted wisely or foolishly, nor whether they were right or wrong. He had from his early youth belonged to the party of Pompey, that is, to that chaotic confusion which had formed itself out of the Roman constitution. At the time when Caesar crossed the Rubicon, Livy was not more than ten years old, and having no distinct notion of the state of things before this event, he pictured to himself the preceding period as a sort of golden age.[8] He seems to have been one of those men who never ask themselves whether the disease could have been avoided, and what would have been the result, if such a crisis had not taken place. It, is, however, quite natural that after Caesar's victories all noble minds should have been favorably disposed to Pompey, whose object apparently was to preserve the ancient customs and constitution; it is only we that can see that Caesar was the more beneficial of the two leaders. The false notions which Livy thus formed, are applied by him to persons and circumstances with which they have nothing to do. The tribunes, for instance, and all who are connected with them, are in his eyes seditious persons, and he speaks of them in the most revolting terms.[9] When Tarquinius Superbus intended to usurp the supremacy over the

[7] xxii. 61.

[8] We see the same thing in France. A friend of mine who is a decided royalist, and holds one of the highest offices in France, once told me that those noblemen who had been boys at the time of the revolution, were most enraged against its principles, and fancied that the previous period was the golden age of their order and its privileges.—N.

[9] Instances of this occur in iv. 35, 49; v. 2; vi. 27; and a great many other passages.

Latins, and Turnus Herdonius opposed him, which was no more than his duty, Livy[10] calls him *seditiosus facinorosusque homo, hisque artibus opes domi nactus*, and this merely because the man had courage enough to oppose a tyrant more powerful than himself. For such sentiments, Livy must have become proverbial, as one of that class of men whom the French call *Ultra:* he idolised the olden times. In this sense, Augustus called him a Pompeian[11], and it is a well-known anecdote that he forbade one of his grandsons to read Livy. The youth, however, secretly continued reading, and being surprised on one occasion tried to hide the book. But Augustus, who knew that his power was too well established to suffer any injury from a work written by a dreamy partizan of Pompey, allowed his grandson to go on reading Livy as much as he pleased.

One cannot speak of Livy without mentioning the *Patavinitas* which Asinius Pollio is said to have censured in him.[12] It is impossible to decide whether the reproach was meant against his history, or against the speeches which he had delivered as a rhetorician. Cicero distinguished between *urbanitas* as peculiar to men born and brought up at Rome, and the eloquence of men coming from the municipia, and it may be that Asinius Pollio on some occasion when he heard Livy speak, made some such remark, as: "One discovers in his dialect that he has not been brought up at Rome;" just as at Paris one often hears the remark, that it is easy to discover from a person's dialect that he is not a Parsian.[13] The charge cannot well have been applied to Livy's work, for his language is as perfect and as classical as any in Roman literature; and much as he differs from Cicero, yet he is not inferior to him in the grammatical correctness and purity of his language; but there may nevertheless have been certain nice shades in style, which we are no longer able to recognise. If we further consider that Asinius Pollio had been consul thirty-one years before Livy began writing his history, and that consequently he was some seventy years old when Livy wrote, I must own that it is almost inconceivable to me that Asinius Pollio should

[10] i. 50. [11] Tacitus, *Annal.* iv. 34. [12] Quinctil. viii. 1, 3.

[13] In reading a French work, I can always distinguish whether the author is, for example, a native of Paris or of Geneva; and a Frenchman can do this, of course, with still greater certainty. Every Frenchman must be able to recognise that Sismondi's works have something foreign about them.—N.

have known the work of Livy. I therefore consider this story as one of those numberless false anecdotes which we find in the works of Macrobius. There is indeed a statement that Asinius Pollio was still alive after the death of Caius Caesar[14]: but this is hardly credible; for if it had been the case, Pliny would undoubtedly have mentioned him among the *longaevi*.

I need not point out to you the beauties of Livy's style; you know them well enough. What is most fascinating in him, is his amiable character and his kindliness. The more one reads him, the more one forgives him his defects, and had we his last books in which he described the events of his own time, his frankness and candour would still more win our admiration and love. Few authors have exercised an influence like that of Livy. He forms an era in Roman literature; and after him, no attempt was made to write Roman annals. Quinctilian compares him with Herodotus; but this can apply only to the mildness of their narratives; since Livy is wanting in the very things which distinguish Herodotus: for no other author was so rich in recollections and ancient lore, so great an investigator, and such a master in observing and inquiring, as the latter. Livy's splendid talent shews itself in his conceptions of detail, and in narration. He had no idea of the early Roman constitution: even that which was established in his youth was not very well known to him. That which in the early institutions, bore the same name as in his own days, is always confounded by him with what actually existed. There are, on the other hand, statements which are inappropriate to his own time, but are quite correct, if applied to the earlier ages. His reputation was extraordinary; it is well known that one man came from Cadiz to Rome merely to see Livy[15]; and this reputation was not ephemeral; it lasted and became firmly established. Livy was regarded as *the* historian, and Roman history was learned and studied from him alone. He threw all his predecessors into the shade, and nearly all subsequent historians confined themselves to abridging his work, as

[14] This statement, which is found in M. Seneca, *Excerpt. Controv.* iv. does not refer to the emperor Caius (Caligula), but to Caius the son of Agrippa, whom Augustus had adopted. Seneca says. *mortuo in Syria Caio Caesare*, which can apply only to the latter. Asinius Pollio died in A.D. 5. (Hieron. *in Euseb. Chron. ad. ann.* MMXX), and cannot possibly have known Livy's work after its completion.

[15] Pliny, *Epist.* ii. 3.

Eutropius did. Livy was the *Stator* of the history of Rome. After him no one wrote a Roman history except in very brief outlines such as Florus; but even he used no sources beyond Livy, except in one passage in which he gives a different account from that of Livy. Others, as Orosius and Eutropius, had read absolutely no history but Livy's; and as regards Orosius it is not even quite certain whether he did not draw up his sketch from some other epitome of Livy. I for one believe that he did compile his history from some abridgment of Livy. The Greeks had no such historian.[16] Silius Italicus, the most wretched of all poets, made only a paraphrase of Livy. I once went through this poetaster very carefully; and the result of my examination was the conviction that he had taken everything from Livy.

Livy was read in the schools of the grammarians, and more especially, it would seem, the first and third decads. These schools, generally speaking, not only survived the seventh century at Rome, but continued to exist in some places, as at Ravenna, down to the eleventh. The principal prose works that were read and commented upon in these schools, were Livy and Cicero's orations against Catiline. It is, however, surprising, that all the manuscripts of the first decad of Livy depend upon one single original copy, which was written in the fourth century by Nicomachus for Symmachus and his family; but it is very bad. There exists no manuscript containing all the extant books of Livy: those in which we find the first, third, and fourth decads, do not contain the fourth entire; of the latter in fact, we have no manuscript older than the fourteenth century. From this we see, that in the middle ages, Livy was little read, the most trivial abridgments being thought sufficient. Of the first books, however, we have manuscripts as old as the tenth century. The literary history of a work ought not to be given without that of the text. The "Bibliotheca Latina" of Fabricius is deficient in this respect; and a work which shall combine the two is yet to be written. At the time of the revival of letters, persons again began to turn their attention to Livy; they found the first and third decads in a tolerable number of manuscripts, but the fourth only in a few, and these very mutilated ones. The fourth decad was not brought to light during the first period

[16] Compare vol. i. p. 4.

after the invention of the art of printing; but still we see from a novella of Francesco Sacchetti, that it was known and read during the fourteenth century, though several parts of it were wanting, such as the whole of the thirty-third book, and the latter parts of the fortieth, from chapter xxxvii, which was supplied in 1518 from a manuscript of Mainz, while the thirty-third book was still wanting. The last five books, from 41 to 45, were published in the edition of Basle of the year 1531, from a manuscript of the convent of Lorsch (codex Laurishamensis) written in the seventh or eighth century, which is now at Vienna. The first sixteen chapters of the thirty-third book were published at Rome in 1616 from a Bamberg manuscript. Göller of Cologne has lately compared this manuscript and published very valuable readings from it[17]. The codex Laurishamensis for the last five books also has been collated by Kopitar, who has published important various readings; but they still have many gaps.

Thus we have thirty books complete, and by far the greater part of the next five. After the work had gradually been completed thus far, great hopes were excited of discovering the whole. Everybody turned his attention to Livy and was anxious to make new discoveries, and many a one allowed himself to be imposed upon by the strangest tales and reports. In the time of Louis XIV especially, several adventurers came forward, and pretended to know where the missing books of Livy were to be found. Some said they existed in the Seraglio at Constantinople[18], others that they were to be found in Chios; and some even pretended to know that there existed a complete Arabic translation of Livy in the library of Fez. Some time ago, there was a report that a translation was found at Saragossa. But the Arabs never translated historians. We know that at one time there existed at Lausanne a manuscript containing the whole of the fifth decad, but it is now lost. A real discovery was made by Bruns, a countryman of mine, who resided at Rome in the years 1772 and 1773. Attention

[17] The work to which Niebuhr here alludes is entitled: "Livii, liber xxxiii. auctus atque emendatus, cum Fr. Jacobsii suisque notis ex cod. Bamberg. ed. F. Goller," 1812.

[18] It is true, that some books from the library of the Greek emperors were left behind at Constantinople at the time when the city was taken possession of by the Turks, but all of them probably perished in the great fire.—N.

had not been directed to palimpsests (*codices rescripti*). He found a manuscript which had originally belonged to the library of Heidelberg, perhaps a Codex Bobbianus, and which contained some portions of the vulgate of the Old Testament, but under it he discovered the words: *Marci Tullii oratio pro Roscio incipit feliciter.* He saw that the beginning was different from that of any of the extant orations of Cicero, and at first he thought that the beginning of the oration *pro Roscio comoedo* was lost. The original writing was not scratched out, but merely washed away, and any one who has some practice in the work can read such manuscripts without using any tincture He requested the talented Italian, Giovenazzi, to examine the manuscript with him. The latter saw that it was the speech for Roscius of Ameria, which was already known and printed, but paid no attention to the excellent readings it contained, nor to the fact that the preceding part of the little volume contained the lost speech *pro Rabirio perduellionis.* Afterwards, whilst they were turning over several pages, they observed some which were written in an unusually neat manner, and which both were admiring, when Bruns happened to see the words *Titi Livi liber nonagesimus primus.* They now read with incredible difficulty (for the means of bringing out the effaced characters distinctly were not known) a long fragment of Livy, with the exception of one part where the writing had been scratched away. The discovery of this part was reserved for me: I have completely read the fragment, and supplied what was not legible to my predecessors.[19]

LECTURE IX.

OUR text of Livy is very different in the different decads. As regards the first, you must recollect that all the manuscripts hitherto discovered depend solely on the copy of Nicomachus Dexter Flavianus; and at the end of the tenth book we read in the Florentine, the first Leyden and some other manuscripts,

[19] This fragment of the ninety-first book of Livy was edited by Niebuhr at Berlin in 1820, in his: *Cicero pro M. Fonteio et C. Rabirio oratt. fragm.*

Nicomachus Dexter emendavi ad exemplum parentis mei Clementiani. Victorianus emendabam Dominis Symmachis. These MSS., the text of which is accurately copied in the Codex Florentinus, are all bad. The English Manuscripts, such as the Harleian and Lovelian, offer some various readings, but they are of very recent date, and were made after the revival of letters, by scholars who treated the text very unceremoniously, whence the various readings are not of great value. It is unpardonable, that there are still so many manuscripts which have never been compared. One manuscript, the Codex from which Klockius made *excerpta* (Codex Clockianus), shows some very curious differences in its readings. It is not known where it now exists. It is altogether so singular that I have often doubted whether the extracts from it are trustworthy, and whether Klockius really had a MS. The palimpsests, of Verona agree on the whole with the Florentine manuscript, and present scarcely any remarkable difference. According to our present knowledge of MSS. therefore, we cannot hope to get beyond the recension of Nicomachus. Not one of the Paris manuscripts has yet been collated.

The text of the third decad is in a different condition; for here we have the excellent Codex Puteanus of which Gronovius made use, and which is much sounder than any manuscript of the first decad. For the fourth decad the Bamberg and Mainz manuscripts, and the *editio Ascensiana*, are the most valuable. The various readings in these are most numerous, but they have not yet been sufficiently collated and examined. The five books of the fifth decad depend entirely upon the one Vienna manuscript, the Codex Laurishamensis. Much is yet to be done for the text of Livy. The libraries of Italy contain many manuscripts; but we cannot look for much assistance from them, as the first editions of Livy which were published may generally be regarded as copies of them. The best MSS. of Latin authors are in general not those of Italy, but those of France and Germany. The texts which are commonly used in Italy are, for the most part, bad.

It is astonishing how little criticism has yet done for Livy; and yet he was one of the first on whom critical labours were bestowed. Even Laurentius Valla, a true scholar, before the invention of the art of printing, wrote brief scholia upon Livy, and an historical disquisition, whether Tarquinius Superbus

was a son or grandson of Tarquinius Priscus, which are reprinted in Drakenborch's edition of Livy. After him, M. Antonius Sabellicus of Venice wrote historical remarks upon Livy, which are not, however, of great importance considering his ability. Then came Glareanus, a very ingenious and able man, whose attention was particularly directed to the historical interpretation of his author, although we often find him engaged in endeavouring to restore the text. He found many incongruities, which he did not scruple to point out in his remarks. After him, many whose names are now forgotten, occupied themselves with restoring the text in the Aldine, Ascensian and Basle editions, and we can judge of them only by what they have done; but the name of Gelenius, who, probably, assisted in preparing the Basle edition, will not be forgotten. A short time after Glareanus, Sigonius of Modena wrote his scholia on Livy, which contain on the whole very good and valuable remarks; his criticisms are for the most part historical, and chiefly concerning names. In these scholia, we know not why, he constantly shows an ill feeliug towards Glareanus, and treats him in a very insulting manner. Glareanus, in an edition in which he caused Sigonius' notes to be reprinted, answered his charges as a man whose feelings were hurt, but with no ill-temper. Sigonius advanced indeed the critical treatment of Livy, but at the same time he made several arbitrary alterations, some of which have not yet been expunged from the text. His writings are very unequal, and, amongst much that is excellent, there are things which are utterly worthless and bad. In drawing up the Fasti he made use of Dionysius, whose work was then not yet printed. After him there followed a period of nearly 100 years, during which nothing was done for Livy, until at last J. Fr. Gronovius, who was descended from a Holstein family and was born at Hamburg, went to Holland. He might have given a new impulse to philology, which he found in a dying condition, if the age had been an impressible one; and the fruits of his exertions would have been splendid. His works are real treasures; he was one of the first men who conscientiously collated manuscripts, and he constituted the text of Livy in a masterly manner. What raises his Livy so far above those of all others, is his cautious circumspection and his astonishing grammatical and historical knowledge; he carries the prize away from all

that have ever written upon Livy. But in things connected with the constitution of Rome, he does not rank among the first; here he was often misled, especially in his opposition to Brissonius,—but no man is perfect. What his immediate successors, such as Klockius, whose conjectures are very unsuccessful, and Tanaquil Faber of Saussure did, is of but little importance. The work at last passed into the hands of two Dutchmen, or, properly speaking, Germans, Duker and Drakenborch, who occupy the first rank among all the scholars that have ever edited ancient authors. As some persons are great in poetry, and bad writers of prose, and *vice versâ*, so some were complete masters of the Greek language, but feeble in the Latin, and *vice versâ*. Thus Duker is deficient in his knowledge of the Greek language, and his notes on Thucydides are quite worthless; but his knowledge of Latin is profound. Drakenborch has not so much sagacity and ability; but with a limited intellect, he possesses good sense: he is of an exceedingly conscientious character, and never indulges in conjectures without the most careful examination of every point. The store of philological knowledge he has collected is astonishing, and his edition of Livy is an inexhaustible mine for those who wish to enter deeply into the study of the Latin language. The index to his notes is highly useful, but not perfect. He supplies a true model of the manner in which a work like his ought to be begun and completed: in the first parts of his work he often refers to the last books of his author, a proof of his having studied the whole thoroughly before he began writing. His materials are equally distributed over the whole work.

After Drakenborch, nothing was done for the criticism of Livy; Professor Walch[1], of Berlin, was the first who resumed the task. His emendations are beautiful, and it is greatly to be lamented that he has not given to the world an edition of Livy according to his plan. As little as there is left for a future critical editor of Virgil to add to what has been done already, so much is there yet to be done for Livy, especially for his first decad. It is not impossible that there may exist manuscripts which have not yet been discovered. The nations of southern Europe have done little or nothing for Livy.

[1] The work of G. L. Walch, to which Niebuhr here alludes, is entitled "Emendationes Livianae," Berlin, 1815.

Livy is an author who, like all those who form an epoch in literature, not only exercised a beneficial influence, but also an injurious one; for he became an authority, without being a critical writer. Roman history was studied from him alone; and the early historians sank into almost complete oblivion. The only known exception of Roman history being written independently of Livy, is that of Velleius Paterculus, who began with the mythical ages, and carried his history down to about the year of the city, 783. He divided his work into two books, the first of which ended with the destruction of Carthage; but, besides the history of Rome, it also comprised that of the earliest times of Greece. Unfortunately, the second book only is extant, and even that is incomplete; of the first, the whole of the early history is wanting: a loss which is very much to be lamented. Velleius is one of those authors who are in ill repute; and it cannot be denied that he was perverted by a sad age, in which he lost the independence of his mind: he cringed before the tyrant Sejanus, but we must not lose sight of the fact that he was more talented than his contemporaries; he is in the highest degree intellectual; his observations are exceedingly subtle. He is, moreover, completely master of his theme, and shews himself everywhere as a well-read writer, who is thoroughly initiated in his subject. He often reminds us of the writers of the age of Louis XV.

It is not quite certain whether Fabius Rusticus did not treat of the earliest history: in his time, he was perhaps the only man who could have written on it. All that was henceforth done in Roman history, consisted in epitomising, of which we possess several specimens.

There exist ancient tables of contents of all Livy's books, those of books 136 and 137 alone being wanting; they served as a sort of index for those who wished to find certain parts in the voluminous work. It is possible that they are nothing but lemmata which were written in the margin, and afterwards collected. This epitome very unjustly bears the name of Florus; the author is unknown, and it is certainly nothing but the production of some copyist. To us, however, it is invaluable; for there are many things of which we should be ignorant, were it not for this epitome.

The Roman history of Florus, in four books, which was written in the reign of Trajan, was well known and much

read, but is a very bad piece of composition, though, besides many utter misconceptions, it contains a few things which are useful. Florus may have derived his information from Livy; but there is one passage in which he differs from him, and from which we may infer that he read other authorities also.

Eutropius evidently followed Livy everywhere; but he is so wretched an author, that it is hardly possible to believe that he read Livy: whence I presume that he read only some intermediate work between that of Livy himself and the Epitome. Orosius seems to have read the same, for he, too, follows Livy entirely, but gives dates which do not occur in Livy. This is just in accordance with the ignorance of the man who changed the names of the consuls into the corresponding dates. That intermediate work must have been an abridgment, like that of Trogus Pompeius, by Justin. Orosius's only object was to comfort his contemporaries in their condition, by distortions and sophistries, and by describing the miseries of the early times. On many points, however, he is very important; but we must not allow ourselves to be misguided by him.

The influence which Livy exercised upon the Romans, and which put an end to all independent treatment of history, did not extend to the Greeks. The attention of the latter was more and more directed to Roman history, for they found in it materials for rhetorical and elegant composition.

When, therefore, the Romans ceased to write their own history, the Greeks began to undertake the task, though they did it from a different point of view, and on a more or less comprehensive plan. Among these I reckon Plutarch, who wrote under Trajan, although he composed only separate biographies. He had a definite moral object, and was a man of a noble and amiable mind; but he had neither a practical mind, nor one fit for speculation, but was made for quiet and cheerful contemplation, similar to Montaigne. He had an honest dislike for everything vulgar; and with this feeling he wrote, for himself and his friends, the parallel biographies of the most distinguished Romans and Greeks. He is just towards every one; he loves the Greeks, and esteems the Romans: whence his biographies are the most delightful reading. But his qualifications as an historian are of an inferior kind; for he is not a critic, and does not decide between two conflicting opinions, but sometimes follows the one and some-

times the other. In his lives of Pyrrhus and Camillus, we see that he followed Dionysius; in those of Marius and Sulla, Posidonius; and wherever we can ascertain his authorities, his accounts gain a much more important character for authenticity: the task of finding this out is yet far from having been accomplished. Plutarch, as he himself says, knew little of Latin; he was particularly unacquainted with its grammar: whence we sometimes, though rarely, meet with misapprehensions of his authorities.

Some thirty years after Plutarch, the work of Appian was written. He was a jurist of Alexandria; and during the reigns of Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius he lived at Rome, as the agent of his native city, and pleaded in the courts of justice. It cannot, however, be concluded from this, that he was well acquainted with the Latin language; for as Greek was held in the highest estimation by Hadrian, Appian was probably allowed to plead in Greek, especially for the *transmarini*, although he rather boasts of his knowledge of Latin. He was on terms of intimacy with Fronto, who asked and obtained for him the office of *procurator Caesaris*.[2] He accumulated wealth at Rome, and then returned to his native city; where, in his old age, he was highly esteemed by the Romans. There is a statement that his work on the history of Rome consisted of twenty-four books, comprising four on Egypt, in which he treated the history of the Lagidae with particular minuteness. It was not written according to a synchronistic system, but on the plan of Cato's Origines. The first book was called *βασιλική*, the second *Ἰταλική*, the third *Σαννιτική*, the fourth *Κελτική*, the fifth *Σικελική καὶ νησιωτική*, &c. The twenty-first book came down to the battle of Actium, and the twenty-second, entitled *Ἑκατονταετία*, comprised the history of one hundred years, from the battle of Actium down to the reign of Trajan; another book contained the Dacian and Illyrian wars; and another, Trajan's war against the Arabs. Appian was a compiler who knew well how to choose his authorities for the history of the early times. He chiefly followed Dionysius as as far as he went, so that in some measure he now makes up for the lost portion of the work of Dionysius.[3] In his history of the second Punic war, and perhaps in that of the first, too,

[2] M. Corn. Fronto, *Epist. ad. Antoninum Pium*, 9 p. 13. foll. ed. Niebuhr.

[3] Comp. vol. ii. p. 512, foll; vol. iii. p. 212. notes 353, 842 and 872.

he followed Fabius. Afterwards he used Polybius, and where he was left by this guide, he followed Posidonius. The sources which he used were very good, but he did not know how to use them: he is bold and ignorant, especially in geography. He believed, for example, that Britain lay quite close to the northern coast of Spain[4], and he places Saguntum on the northern bank of the Iberus.[5] Writers like him do best when they copy from others without thinking. Hence he is most correct when he thoughtlessly copies his authorities; but such compilers should not presume to give a condensed abridgment of the works of others. Of the whole work we possess only eleven books complete, viz. VI. *Ἰβηρική*; VII. *Ἀννιβαική*; VIII. *Λιβυκή*; XI. *Συριακὴ καὶ Παρθική*; XII. *Μιθριδάτειος*; XIII—XVII. *Ἐμφύλια*; and XXIII. *Δακική* or *Ἰλλυρική*. But what we possess under the name of *Παρθική*, as a part of the eleventh book, is spurious, as has been shewn most satisfactorily by Schweighäuser.[6] Of the *Ἰλλυρική*, at first only some fragments were published; the whole of it appeared for the first time complete in the edition of Tollius. Of the remaining books we have the "Eclogae De Legationibus" and "De Virtutibus et Vitiis," which have been put together by Ursinus and Valesius. The account of the Illyrian war yet awaits an able commentator, as Spaletti refused to allow Schweighäuser to make use of his collation. Excellent materials for a critical examination of the text of Appian are contained in the Latin translation made in 1472, by Petrus Candidus, at the command of the learned Pope Sixtus IV.; the Latin is barbarous, but the translation is faithful, and Schweighäuser has made good use of it. There are only three editions of Appian worth mentioning: the first by H. Stephens, the second by Tollius, and the third by Schweighäuser.

About eighty years after Appian, Dion Cassius, surnamed Cocceianus, wrote his work. He was born at Nicaea in Bithynia, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, and belonged to a family which was in possession of the Roman franchise, and stood very high. His father held most important offices; and it has been supposed, with great probability, that the ingenious orator, Dion Chryostom, was his grandfather on his mother's

[4] *De Reb. Hisp.* c. 1.

[5] *De Reb. Hisp.* c. 7. and 10.

[6] In his edition of Appian, vol. iii. p. 905, foll.

side.[7] He came to Rome as a young man, at a period when it was already common for the provincials of the East to obtain the highest offices, a distinction which had been enjoyed by those of the West at a much earlier time. The latter soon accommodated themselves to the Romans in language and dress; but the former did not submit to this necessity till later. In the eastern provinces men let their beards grow, as we see from the portrait of the sculptor Apollodorus, on the column of Trajan, the most ancient portrait of an artist. From the time of Hadrian, the Greeks were received at Rome very differently from what they had been before, as that emperor favoured them, and his example was followed by the Antonines. M. Aurelius even gave one of his daughters in marriage to a Greek of the name of Pompeianus.

At Rome Dion spent forty years, engaged in active business, and afterwards withdrew to Capua. It was not till he had reached the age of about forty, that he wrote a history of the reign of Commodus, which he dedicated to the emperor Severus, who received the work favorably, and encouraged him to write a complete history of Rome. If dreams stimulated him, as he himself says, to write the history of the Roman empire, they were certainly sent by good spirits, for he had a real vocation as an historian. He was raised to the consulship under Septimius Severus, and a second time under Alexander Severus, A.D. 229. He spent twelve years in collecting materials for his work, and ten more in composing it. If his statement is correct, the last books must have been a continuation of his work. According to the judicious calculation of J A. Fabricius, Dion must have been about seventy years old when he obtained his second consulship, and he probably lived to the age of nearly eighty. Being a statesman, he paid attention to many things which his predecessors had been unconcerned about. He must have been a perfect master of the Latin language; for he resided at Rome as a senator during a period of from thirty to forty years. He felt an interest in, and made himself thoroughly acquainted with, the political history of Rome, a thing which no rhetorician ever did. Livy, for instance, has no idea either of a state, or of tactics, and when, as in the eighth chapter of the eighth book, he speaks of battles, it is evident that he has no conception of

[7] Reimarus, *De vita et scriptis Dionis*, § 3.

the most ordinary rules of drawing up the legions in battle array: he had perhaps never seen a legion going through its exercises, and hence the arrangement which he describes is utterly impossible.[8] Dion, on the other hand, finds himself at home everywhere, in constitutional matters and the civil law, as well as in tactics.

He did not acquiesce in the information he gathered from Livy: he went to the sources themselves; he wrote the early period of Roman history quite independently of his predecessors, and only took Fabius for his guide.[9] The early constitution was perfectly clear to him, and when he speaks of it, he is very careful in his expressions. He has been accused of *κακοήθεια* and *ἐπιχαιρεκακία* in those parts of his work where he exposes the false pretensions of certain persons to political virtue; and it cannot indeed be denied that he was influenced by bitter feelings against feigned pretensions to virtue in a thoroughly corrupt age; but when in going through the history of the so-called English patriots in the reigns of George I. and George II., we hear their claims to patriotism, and afterwards learn how they hunt after and intrigue for offices; how, notwithstanding their loud assurances of their noble sentiments, they keep up a secret correspondence with the Pretender, and that when they obtain power they act just in the same manner as their predecessors, we see a state of things analogous to that of Rome in the time of Dion Cassius; and we cannot wonder at his speaking with indignation of such patriots, whose reputation was acquired by fraud and hypocrisy. Similar feelings existed in France, in the time of Louis XV. The case would be different if he showed a diabolical delight in proving that virtue did not exist; but when a man drags the mask from a villain, he does what is right; and this is all that Dion Cassius does. I believe indeed that he mistrusted many a man's sincerity, and judged harshly of him in consequence; but at the bottom of all this, there lies a view of human life, bitter indeed, yet sound; and amidst the corruption of his age he could not judge otherwise.[10] He was no friend of tyranny, as every page of his history shows if read with an unbiassed mind;

[8] Compare vol iii. p. 98, foll.

[9] Compare vol. ii. p. 12, vol. iii. p. 426; *Lebensnachrichten über B. G. Niebuhr*, iii. p. 187.

[10] Compare vol. iii. note 846.

but a man who, in such circumstances, insists upon destroying by force that which is wrong, only wastes his own strength.

What places Dion in a less advantageous light, is his style, which is neither eloquent nor beautiful. His language is full of peculiarities, some of which are real faults, and shew the degenerate state of the language. Examples of this may be seen in the Index of Reimarus. Dion wrote the vulgar Greek just as it was spoken at the time; and there is in him no affectation or elegance acquired artificially, as is the case with Pausanias. Hence the study of his language is very instructive. His history was, for a long time, very much read, and was a common source of information concerning the history of Rome. It was continued by an anonymous writer, as we know from the Excerpta de Legationibus, and carried down to the time of Constantine. Dion himself divided his work into eighty books and into decads. In the twelfth century of our era, when Zonaras wrote, there existed only the first twenty books, and from the thirty-sixth book to the end. In the tenth century, when Constantinus Porphyrogenitus ordered *excerpta* to be made from it, the whole work was still extant. In the eleventh century, a monk, of the name of Joannes Xiphilinus, made extracts from the latter portion of the work, from the thirty-sixth to the eightieth book, except that part containing the history of Antoninus Pius, and a portion of that of M. Aurelius. Whether Xiphilinus was not in possession of the first twenty books, or whether he merely passed them over, I cannot say; but I suspect that they did exist in the imperial library, as Zonaras, fifty years later, still used them; whence it is wrong to say that Xiphilinus is the cause of the loss of Dion's books. His MS, containing the history of Augustus, Tiberius and Claudius, was complete; whereas, at present, the Venetian MS of that part is full of gaps. The very late author of the *Lexicon Syntacticum*, edited by Bekker, probably had not seen the first thirty-five books, as he gives scarcely any extracts from them. We possess a fragment, which is believed to belong to the thirty-fifth book; but, according to Reimarus, it is in all probability a part of the thirty-sixth. The portion which we find complete, is from the thirty-seventh to the fifty-fourth book. The fifty-fifth and fifty-sixth books are mutilated, and those from fifty-seven to sixty still more so, and are full of gaps. Of the first twenty books, we have the abridgment made by

Zonaras, probably with additions derived from Plutarch; and of the books from the thirty-sixth to the eightieth, that of Xiphilinus, likewise mixed with other authorities; he had a complete copy of books fifty-five to sixty. Besides these, there are considerable fragments of the seventy-eighth, seventy-ninth, and eightieth books, in the Vatican library. The first of these fragments was published by Fulvius Ursinus, from a very old manuscript, which cannot have been made later than the eighth century. It is written in three columns, but is in such a mutilated state, that only the middle column is legible. Many other fragments are preserved in the Excerpta of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus "De Legationibus," "De Virtutibus et Vitiis," and "De Sententiis," and also a number of scattered fragments. It is surprising that Zonaras has not, like Xiphilinus, been printed in Reimarus' edition of Dion Cassius. Zonaras[11] was a practical man, and lived under Alexius Comnenus and Calojoannes Comnenus. He wrote a history from the creation of the world down to the death of Alexius Comnenus. The first part is made up of extracts from Josephus; the second contains the history of Rome from Dion Cassius; and the third was compiled from several authors, especially Cedrenus, Scylitzes, and others; the later books of Dion, he could not procure, although he took some trouble to do so. He was private secretary to the emperor, and commander of the imperial guards. His own judgment is extremely feeble; but still he is not a fool like many others: he is a sensible and learned man, but with limited intellectual powers. His extracts from Dion Cassius, though he does not name him as his authority, are of immense importance; he copied very faithfully, and especially in writing the history of times in which one might expect to find him in the greatest perplexities. But his extracts have been very little used; Freinsheim is almost the only man who availed himself of them for the periods on which the history of Livy is lost, and I was the first to draw attention to the importance of Zonaras. The *Excerpta de Sententiis* especially shew how accurately he copied from Dion.[12]

[11] Zonaras is a modern Greek name, and must therefore be pronounced Zónaras, not Zonáras; it is altogether wrong to pronounce the modern names according to the ancient Greek fashion.—N.

[12] In the early part of the history of Rome, Zonaras borrowed not only from Dion, but also from some lives of Plutarch, such as those of Romulus, Numa, Valerius Publicola; and it is probably this circumstance which led a singular

LECTURE X.

THE Abbé Morelli, an excellent philologer, and one of the most amiable and most learned men of the eighteenth century, while seeking to console himself for the fall of Venice in the year 1797, discovered in its library a manuscript of Dion Cassius, which had originally been complete, but through various circumstances, had suffered the greatest mutilations. This manuscript was the mother-manuscript for the books from fifty-five to sixty. There are many gaps in it which are not indicated by any marks; but all is written continuously as if nothing were wanting. This kind of deception on the part of Greek copyists who lived by their art, was not uncommon in the fifteenth century. Morelli collected these defective passages; from which we see that entire pages, or even quaternions are sometimes wanting. Through his discovery, we first become acquainted with the memorable expedition of Ahenobarbus to Germany, which had, until then, been unknown. It has not yet been noticed that in two books of Diodorus, one half is wanting in the manuscripts; in one instance a great part of the middle of a book is left out, as has been pointed out by Perizonius and others; but it is not always possible to point out the exact places in which these gaps exist; for such omissions are sometimes made so cleverly and cunningly, as to render it a matter of the greatest difficulty to hit upon the spot where they occur. Sometimes, however, copyists were more careless; they broke off in one passage and connected another with it in such a manner, that there was absolutely no sense in the passage thus made up; but then they knew that books were not always bought with a serious intention to read them.[1]

About the editions of Dion Cassius I shall say but little: the

Italian writer, Nicolaus Carminius Falco, to make the foolish assertion, that Dion had copied his history from Plutarch, and that the rest was founded on Zonaras! With this view of the matter, he made an announcement that he was going to publish a restoration of Dion Cassius. His ignorance was so great that in his announcement he wrote Βιβλία ὀκτογίντα, instead of βιβλία ὀγδοήκοντα.—N. (The first volume was actually published at Naples, 1747. fol.)

[1] The new fragments which Morelli discovered were published by him at Bassano, 1798, 8vo., and a reprint of them appeared at Leipzig, in 1818, 8vo.

best are, that of R. Stephens, the Basle edition (1558), and that of Fabricius and Reimarus. The text still requires a good deal of correction; and a comparison of the Venetian manuscript, of which Sturz in his edition (1824) has made, I believe, no use, would be extremely important. The remarks of Fabricius and Reimarus are of extraordinary historical value; but show little grammatical knowledge of the language. We must own that Fabricius was not a great philologer; and Reimarus, his son-in-law, though in other respects a man who deserves great admiration, was even inferior to him. The accentuation is horrible; but, although deficient in philological learning, Reimarus devoted himself with so much attention to the formation of the Greek index, that it is one of the most excellent we possess. He who wishes to study Dion Cassius, should read this index first. It was made, I believe, after the whole work was completed. Had Reimarus made the index before the completion of the work, his grammatical notes would have been of a different kind.[2]

After the time of Dion Cassius, the Greeks as well as the Romans confined themselves to making excerpta and compilations. The great works were neglected and lost in the middle ages; and although the first and third decads of Livy were read in schools for the *provectiores*, still as far as the study of the history of Rome is concerned, people were satisfied with Florus, Eutropius, Rufus, Victor and Orosius, whose sketches were, generally speaking, considered as the sources of Roman history, and were multiplied in innumerable copies down to the time of the revival of letters. Eutropius was even continued by Paul Warnefried and Sagar. Valerius Maximus also was much read as a collection of accounts of noble actions, though otherwise he is one of the most wretched authors. But although, after the fall of the western empire, there were yet some men at Rome and Ravenna who collected and read the old manuscripts which had escaped the destruction of the barbarians, still there were throughout the middle ages no general views, no idea of symmetry, and no striving after anything which did not present itself at once; people were satisfied with

[2] Philological indices are extremely useful to a scholar, and they enhance the value of an edition considerably. He who makes a philological index, is led to the consideration of an infinite number of questions and points, of which he would otherwise never have thought.—N.

what was well known, and this they treated with care, but they were unconcerned about that which was not known. These facts account for all the frailties of the middle ages. Had not the glossatores been in the same predicament, they might have obtained very different sources, from which they might have explained the laws of Justinian just as well as we do. I venture to assert, that no direct quotations from Livy are to be found after the time of Priscian, not even from those books of Livy which have come down to our time. Johannes Sarisberiensis alone forms an exception, but even he refers only to the books which are still extant. Those books of Livy which are now lost were probably never read by any one during the whole of the middle ages, except perhaps by some grammarians in Italy. In the fourteenth century, however, a new zeal arose among the Italians, and people again began to read Livy, as we see from a singular story of Francesco Sacchetti, which states that an eccentric citizen of Florence, who was engaged in building a house, was, on Saturday, at the time when his workmen came to receive their wages, so deeply absorbed in reading Livy's account of Cato, that he did not at once attend to them. While they were waiting, they began to quarrel with one another; on hearing which he hastened out, and inveighed against them as if they had been partizans of the Roman tribunes. Petrarch read the history of the second Punic war in Livy, and the Commentaries of Caesar, with a zeal and a passion, with which they had certainly not been read since the days of the great Boëthius, *i. e.* for a period of 800 years. He in vain desired to have more of Livy; it was perhaps he that discovered the Epitome. This zeal gradually dispelled the darkness and barbarism of the age. Few centuries can boast of a greater genius than St. Bernard; but he had not been able to effect anything against the reigning spirit of barbarism. In the fourteenth century, the Italians began to look upon themselves with pride as the direct descendants and heirs of the ancient Romans.[3] Ancient manuscripts were eagerly collected; and he who was so lucky as to find an author yet unknown or a fragment of another, was held in high estimation. The letters addressed to Poggius on this subject are really moving: he is zealous and anxious to make discoveries, and his contemporaries, such as Leonardus Aretinus, Bartholomaeus and others,

[3] Compare vol. ii. Pref. p. xxi.

felt the greatest delight in receiving copies of his books. Roman history was then read with incredible interest, but all kept to what was transmitted to them; a few only ventured to make some critical observations here and there, and began to see that it was impossible to understand Roman history with the means they had at their command. Thus originated the study of archaeology, which received a great impulse from Pomponius Laetus, who, however spoiled much, because he treated his subjects too carelessly. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the study of Roman antiquities made rapid progress; collections of inscriptions and ancient monuments were made in Italy and France, first by Mazocchi and some others. In Italy, scholars applied with the same zeal to the study of ancient jurisprudence, which, strange to say, did not flourish there, although the interpretation of the Roman law proceeded thence. Learned jurisprudence was then in the hands of the French, while the Italians devoted themselves to history and the critical examination of ancient authors for that purpose. Some began to make historical observations here and there. Glareanus, a man of strange character, but of refined judgment and great intellect, was the first who looked at Livy as an independent investigator. Sigonius, a layman of Modena, and Panvinius, an Augustin monk of Verona, acquired considerable reputation by an arrangement of the Fasti, and by their writings on Roman antiquities, in which field their merit is indescribable and their progress gigantic. They dwelt especially upon the age of Cicero and Caesar, for which contemporary writers furnish abundant materials; but they did not penetrate into the earliest periods of Roman history: they cultivated the tree but neglected the root. Both, though Panvinius more particularly, were but slightly acquainted with Greek literature, and their knowledge of Greek life was very imperfect. Archaeological and antiquarian knowledge was advanced by them in a brilliant manner; and the Fasti in particular are much indebted to Panvinius[4]; but they were deficient in practical knowledge: the living organism of a state was unknown to them, although in numerous respects they might have found their way more easily than foreigners, as many things still existed under their ancient names; but they did not perceive things clearly defined, and generally went wrong in their explanation

[4] See vol. ii. page 559, note 1239.

of details. Panvinius' Fasti are a splendid work, and his supplements to them deserve admiration, considering his resources. It was a piece of good fortune for him that fragments of the Capitoline Fasti, which yielded many results, were found during the building of a church. Several pieces also have been discovered in my own presence, from which useful hints may be derived in relation to times for which Livy is lost.

The Fasti have come down to us in several separate collections, and even for periods in which we are without Livy's guidance.

About the close of the sixteenth century Stephanus Pighius, of Campen in Overyssel[5], a man of great learning, first conceived the idea of restoring the history of Rome in the form of annals; his object being not merely to produce a supplement for the lost portion of Livy, but to subject the history of Livy himself to a critical examination. But the idea of his annals is a mistake. He dwells upon things of secondary importance. If the Fasti were preserved complete, they would be important only in so far as we might see, for instance, when the distinction between the patrician and plebeian aediles ceased to be observed, and in so far as we might form conclusions as to the age and life of certain persons from the time of their consulship or praetorship. When a young man, I endeavoured to learn the consular Fasti by heart, and I believe that Roman youths did frequently so learn them. Many Romans of good memory were able, for example, to state the year of the consulship of Scaevola and Crassus, or of other men, at any time. This would have been a useful exercise for a memory like that of a Scaliger or a Muretus. Pighius, of course, wished to restore the Fasti for the times for which they were lost; this he did as far as possible by collecting the scattered statements of the ancient writers; but where he had no authorities, he made up the Fasti of what seemed possible or probable to him, according to the *leges annales*. For example, when he wants a tribune of the people, he puts in the name of some plebeian quite at random and without any reason whatever; when he wants the

[5] He was secretary to Cardinal Granvella, and afterwards lived as a priest at Xanten on the Rhine, but he had spent many years in Italy. His commentary on Valerius Maximus, and his Hercules Prodicius, are highly respectable performances. The country of the lower Rhine had at that time several excellent scholars, such as Fr. Fabricius.—N.

name of an aedile, he takes the name of one whom he knows to have been consul afterwards; and in this manner he makes out whole lists of tribunes, aediles, etc.[6] It was not however, his intention to deceive, for he marked his supplements as such. This has been so little heeded that, until recently, there have been scholars who took the Fasti of Pighius for authentic records. G. J. Vossius transcribed many things on no authority except that of Pighius; and Professor Schubert of Königsberg, in his work on the Roman aediles, has introduced names of aediles which are simply copied from Pighius: but notwithstanding all this, he who writes on Roman history cannot dispense with the work of Pighius. He used inscriptions, and also made many ingenious combinations; it has often led me to the discovery, that combinations which I myself had made were wrong. Pighius died before he had completed his task, and the learned Jesuit, Andreas Schottus, of Antwerp, published the work with a continuation by himself, which is far inferior to what Pighius had written.

An account of the treatment of Roman history gives us a picture of the course of philology in general: in the fifteenth century it was scarcely awakened and uncritical; in the sixteenth, people penetrated rapidly and deeply into the spirit of antiquity, but without entirely securing the results. The fair period of philology however disappears about the beginning of the seventeenth century; and in Germany, where it had sprung up rather late, it was crushed by the Thirty years' war. It was combined with other studies: diligent and laborious works were produced, but they were without genius, and their philological substance was small. The school of Strasburg, however, still maintained its reputation. Towards the end of the Thirty years' war, John Freinsheim of Strasburg wrote his Supplements to the work of Livy.[7] This bold undertaking is executed very unequally.[8] As far as single facts are concerned, he left little unnoticed; but in a thorough comprehension of these ages; and in the arrangement of the materials relating to them he is deficient. He had no idea of the Roman state in either its military or its civil affairs, though he was

[6] Compare vol. ii. p. 559, and notes 1238 and 1297.

[7] The references in the original edition are printed very incorrectly, and the reprint in Drakenborch's edition of Livy is still worse, or at least just as bad as the original edition.—N.

[8] Compare vol. iii. note 847.

rather proud of his *prudentia civilis*. For the second decad, especially from the eleventh book to the fifteenth, and also for the books from forty-six to sixty, he had tolerably complete materials, and made vigorous and good use of them, whence those parts are more successful than the later books; but, as he advanced, he became more and more careless, and from the time of the Social war the work is altogether wretched. It is, however, notwithstanding this, indispensable for him who studies Roman history. Although Freinsheim was not a first-rate philologer; yet he and his countrymen, Boecler and Obrecht, are ornaments of Germany in those times. That he did not complete such a gigantic undertaking in an equal manner is pardonable enough; but the pretension to replace Livy is altogether a mistake peculiar to the age in which Freinsheim lived. After him, Livy was for a long time neglected.

About twenty years after Freinsheim, quite a different man began to write a work on Roman history, which is thoroughly classical; this was J. Perizonius' *Animadversiones Historicae*. He undertook a criticism of Roman history, or rather of some portions of it; but what he did do, is masterly in substance and excellent in form. It was he who first conceived the fruitful idea, that the history of Rome, like that of the Jewish nation, had arisen out of poetical lays; an idea which we cannot admire enough, if we consider the time at which Perizonius lived; and especially if we remember that he was a Dutchman, for such national lays do not exist all in the Netherlands. A Dane might much more easily have hit upon the thought, as Saxo Grammaticus, and the lays of the Edda would naturally lead to it. Perizonius had a mind free from prejudice, and possessed incredible philological learning, and a truly historical genius. His *animadversiones*, however, have not exercised that influence, which they ought to have had: they were only once reprinted, and then forgotten.

After the year 1684, scarcely anything was done for Roman history in a philological point of view. Bentley and J. M. Gessner, are almost the only distinguished scholars who arose during that sad condition of philology in the first half of the eighteenth century. Meantime a general intellectual culture began to spread more and more in Europe, which could not but exercise its influence upon the history of antiquity, as a part of universal history; and thus men, without possessing

any profound philological knowledge, began to occupy themselves with ancient history. One result of this was the little work of president Montesquieu, "Sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains, et de leur décadence," which, notwithstanding many misapprehensions, is an excellent book.

At the end of the seventeenth century, scepticism began to raise its head in Europe. It began with Bayle, and also laid hold of history: Bayle did not, however, aim at arriving at any well-established results, but was satisfied with pointing out the errors, in what until then had been regarded as historical. M. de Beaufort, a refugee, who had lived for a long time in England, and possessed a very intelligent mind, wrote on Roman history in this spirit. His work on Roman antiquities, however much there may be in it that deserves censure, is as a whole the best that has been written on the subject. He was convinced that the early history of Rome was mere poetry; and this conviction he expounded in his "Dissertation sur l'Incertitude des quatres premiers Siècles de l'Histoire Romaine;" which bears the impress of a well-read man of genius, who is not a philosopher, nor accustomed to strict critical investigation; but it displays that spirit of scepticism which only destroys without reconstructing; whence it met with great opposition. Notwithstanding this, however, it has been of service; and all that was written afterwards, was founded upon it.

The work which the good and worthy Rollin wrote from Livy, and the Supplements of Freinsheim, can scarcely be called a Roman history. But all that Rollin ever wrote is pervaded by such a noble and virtuous spirit, notwithstanding his want of judgment, that the French were perfectly right in putting his works into the hands of the young. His history of Rome is written in a readable and pleasing form; but no one in our days can have the patience to go through it. Rollin was deficient in learning, although he was not exactly unlearned; but he wrote uncritically, and was ignorant of the spirit of Roman history, which, on the whole, was written in those days as if its events had in reality never taken place.

Somewhat later than Rollin, Hooke[9], an Englishman, wrote a Roman history with which I am but little acquainted. The book is not much known in Germany, and does not even exist in our university-library. All I can say about him is,

[9] Compare vol. ii. note 201.

that he followed the views of Beaufort, and wrote a history of those times only in which he believed it to deserve credit. He does not enter into any of the deeper questions. Still less so does Ferguson, whose history of the Roman republic is a complete failure: he is an honest and ingenious writer, but unlearned; he was no scholar, and had not the remotest idea of the Roman consitution. His history does not really begin until the time of the Gracchi, when the accounts become more detailed. He wrote pragmatically and with a moral tendency. To those who want to acquire a knowledge of Roman history, the book is worth nothing. He who is not a scholar, may read it in order to prepare himself for a better understanding of the times of Cicero; but he will certainly do better to read Middleton's life of Cicero. The history of Rome written by Levesque is perfectly wretched: he quite agrees with Beaufort, that the whole of the early history consists of fables. From the period extending from the origin of Rome down to the first Punic war, he picks out only some isolated events, which he treats as historical; and this he does at random without giving any reasons, either to himself or to his readers. The book itself, as well as the spirit in which it is written, is bad. Micali's work, "Italia avanti il dominio de' Romani," is likewise a bad book. He was an unlearned man and biassed by a strange and passionate hatred of the ancient Romans; he makes up visionary histories of the Italian nations with the greatest levity. His hatred of the Romans is often quite unbearable. He wrote at the time of the French dominion in Italy, and rejoiced to have an opportunity of saying a variety of things against the supremacy of one nation over others; but he allowed himself to be led thereby into unreasonable zeal and unfairness towards the Romans.

LECTURE XI.

THE general tendency of philology in Germany necessarily led to a critical and searching treatment of the history of Rome. After many and very fluctuating periods, German philology has acquired, within the last forty years, a decided and definite character: just as certain arts or sciences arrive at a flourishing state, without its being at all possible for

us to trace them back to one particular starting point. Philology has been developed simultaneously by several minds which worked independently of one another. It was the character of the age, and the result of the whole development of our literature. Men like Lessing, who had eminent philological talents without possessing all the requisites of a philologer, and Winkelmann, may be said to be the real fathers of modern philology: the great movement of the time originated with them. In like manner, the efforts of Heyne and Ernesti, though they were imperfect, the revival of historical jurisprudence, the grammatical studies of Reiz, Wolf, Hermann, and the translations by Voss and others, contributed towards a critical study of Roman history. It is wonderful to see how very deficient the first attempts at better things often are, before a clear view of the object is gained. So it was with jurisprudence. During a long period before Savigny wrote, the attempts were of such a character, that if the great men of former ages, such as Cujacius, Duarenus, and Donellus, could have heard their successors, they would have been greatly disappointed and dissatisfied. The modern much more profound inquiries, also, could not always hit at once upon the truth, before the ways were fully cleared up. The mind was awakened, the language had been cultivated by Lessing and Goethe, time with its vast changes and revolutions diffused a general life, and a spirit of activity manifested itself everywhere. All this necessarily led to a fresh consideration of Roman history, especially as political institutions began to resemble those of the ancient Romans. It was especially this latter point that directed my attention to the living organism of the Roman state, and led me to the investigation of the causes of the vehement struggles recorded in Roman history. The consequence is, that that history is now no longer treated sceptically but critically; results have been gained to supply the place of fiction, and it has been shown what must be believed, and what must be rejected as fiction or forgery. We have, moreover, gained the conviction as to what must be believed in the early history of Rome in general, without venturing upon the fruitless attempts to explain everything in detail with chronological accuracy. These investigations in that immense labyrinth, connected as they are with ancient

times, could not be successful all at once; whoever undertook them, was biassed by many prejudices, and though he saw the goal, yet he naturally strayed on his road. It had thus become necessary not only faithfully and conscientiously to acquiesce in what had been discovered, but to take courage and try to solve the mysteries.

With regard to the ancients, it is my conviction that, on the whole, all information on matters of importance, as far as it is obtainable, has been obtained, and that it is time to abandon such investigations. It would be very unfortunate, if they continued to be the order of the day; not that I am afraid lest it should be possible to overturn the results to which the investigations concerning the institutions and constitutions of Rome have led us: they are as certain as if we had derived them directly from the original sources themselves. It is with ancient history as it was with the king who had forgotten his dream: we must not merely interpret what the ancients read, but re-discover what they read; and this may be done with confidence and success. But as our sources are limited in number, and as these sources have been completed by the results of investigation, there is nothing further that could be wished for, until better sources are discovered. There are other points also, concerning which further investigations cannot possibly be made. I entertain no fear of the results of my enquiries being ever overthrown: all that is still to be gained is of secondary importance, and there is nothing in the ancient sources which has not been found out already. To overthrow the results at which we have arrived, and ever and anon to make the same investigations over again, is an evil: we must make use of what has been gained. I wish that more attention was paid to the later times, for these are of such a nature that new discoveries may be made at every step: but in order to acquire a thorough knowledge of them, one must be well acquainted with the earlier forms and their changes; we must not believe that Roman history ceases to have any interest, where we have contemporary authorities, and that only those parts are interesting which must be made up by conjectures and combination. The history of Rome down to the end of the empire is one whole, which begins from the darkest ages, the sources of which are distorted and perverted, since we have them only at the third or fourth

hand; but their history may be restored by combination, comparison, and analogy; and Fabius, Gracchanus, and Macer must form the pillars of it. Scepticism here leads to nothing, and is highly injurious to the human mind. After these dark ages we come to the time where we have the statements of well-informed writers. The remaining part of Roman history from the time when it becomes historical, must likewise be investigated in order to obtain definite results; and when they are gained, we shall have to examine them calmly, and to make use of them.

The study of ancient history requires for its basis, a sound and profound philological knowledge, and a ready grammatical tact, to serve as a guard against groundless and fanciful etymologies; a well developed and matured judgment to distinguish between what is only possible or probable, and evident truth—a knowledge of human and political affairs, of social relations in general, and of occurrences which have taken place at different times and in different nations, according to the same or similar laws—but, above all things, *conscientiousness* and *candour*. We have to bear in mind what was said after the revival of letters by men of all creeds, that learning is the fruit of piety, in order that, by the sincerity of our hearts, by knowledge of ourselves, and by a conscientious walk in the sight of God, we may guard ourselves against the desire to appear what we are not, that we may never forgive ourselves the slightest deviation from the truth, and that we may never consider a result of our investigations which flatters our wishes as truth, so long as there is in our conscience the slightest feeling of its being wrong. But this is not the place to discuss these preparatory requirements of the student of history: they belong to a higher science which teaches us how to learn and to cultivate our minds, though they find a direct application in all historical matters, as veracity is but too often set aside, and appearance is all that is aimed at. Hypotheses which flatter the author or have a brilliant appearance are set forth as truths; and how many instances might not be mentioned in which writers have stolen the ideas of others and given them to the world as their own, in order to shine with them! This practice is unfortunately carried on in all its variations, from the most secret and hidden plagiarism to the most manifest robberies: for when conscience is once

seduced, it knows of no scruples. But the sin is always essentially the same. The ancients exhort us to be conscientious, and we ought to follow their counsel; we must feel that the reputation of past ages depends upon us, and that we commit a crime, if we impair that reputation by giving praise or censure where it is not deserved.

Every one must see that our own personal views and opinions can be of little avail in history, if they are not in accordance with things and relations which really existed. Hence we must have an accurate knowledge of the nature of the countries whose history we are studying, of the internal condition of a nation, of its political constitution, its religion, etc. If, therefore, Roman antiquities should at any future time be written and worked out into a definite and independent science, they must, like ancient geography, serve as an introduction to the study of Roman history. The earlier works on Antiquities contain much that is excellent in regard to those times for which we have contemporary authorities; the modern ones are very indifferent. As regards ancient geography, we still want a good chorography of ancient Italy. The work of Mannert can be recommended only with very great restrictions. Notwithstanding all that we may find fault with in the detail of the works of Cluverius, his "Italia Antiqua," and his "Sicilia, Sardinia, et Corsica Antiqua," are gigantic productions and excellent in the highest degree. But copies of them are so scarce and costly, that I can hardly consider them as works to refer you to. If we examine them from the point of view from which Cluverius worked, we shall find little to add to what he has written. What he says about the earliest nations of Italy, and his generalisations, are the weakest parts of the book; but the nature of the countries, if we make some allowance for the time in which he lived, is described in the most admirable manner.

The only map which I can recommend is that of D'Anville, though I do not mean to say that there are no faults at all in it. D'Anville was a genius who knew how to make use of everything, and who possessed the sagacity to discover very soon, whether the statements he had before him deserved credit or not. Proofs of this may be seen in his works on modern geography; for instance, in his geography of Africa, where he has achieved wonderful things, although he had only few more

resources than his predecessors. It is with him as with a talented artist, who produces greater effects by a simple apparatus than others with the most abundant materials. All the improvements in the instruments of sculptors have not enabled them to produce anything so perfect as the works of the Greeks, whose instruments were far more simple than ours. The maps of D'Anville are excellent, though some points might be made more exact; and those of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, cannot be surpassed in correctness. That of Greece is less perfect, especially Epirus and Macedonia; for there were at the time no maps except the bad Venetian ones, of which D'Anville himself complains, and the interior of the country was never visited by travellers. As regards the outlines of Greece, it is remarkable that D'Anville drew those of Peloponnesus from the Portulane maps, and some maps of the Mediterranean. Barbié du Bocage, his pupil, was a talented man, but he was in an unfavourable position, as he had a predecessor of such extraordinary genius. He remarked, for instance, that D'Anville had placed Patras thirty minutes too far north: but his discovery met with no favour, and he was obliged, twenty years later, to retract his observation, although it was correct. The only fault of any importance in D'Anville's map of Italy is in the south-east of Naples, where the country of the Sallentines is about twenty minutes further east than the site assigned to it by D'Anville. He had no other maps than the Venetian ones, in which the outlines of the coast are generally very exact; but the longitudes are mostly incorrect. If we compare his maps with those of his predecessors, such as Delisle, and others, we cannot sufficiently admire his genius, which produced quite a new creation; not that it had been his desire to find fault with previous productions, but he could not help discovering where his predecessors had worked hastily or carelessly. His map of Egypt is an extraordinary production, if we consider that he had no materials for it but the rude drawings of Arabian and Turkish maps. All that may be said against D'Anville's map of Italy refers to an imperfection which is only apparent, that it represents the state of the country only at one particular time. He made his division of Italy as it was in the time of Augustus, and refers all political relations to this time, unless he expressly marks out two distinct divisions, as he does in the case of Gaul. His division of Italy,

it is true, places him in contradiction with other divisions; but we must be on our guard, if we should feel inclined to censure him for it. According to Livy, Samnium, for instance, comprises a large district which D'Anville makes a part of Apulia, because he represents Italy according to the description of Pliny.[1]

I must caution you against the maps of Reichard.[2] His map of Italy, costs about six shillings, and none can be worse. He is quite an ignorant man, and has no idea of ancient geography. Places which never existed are marked in his map as towns of great importance. In the Roman Itineraries, the post-stages are mentioned, which were not towns, but merely points at which horses were changed. Places of this kind are, for instance, Sublanuvium and Subaricia (both places were situated on hills), which Reichard metamorphoses into large towns. A point at which a road branched out into two, was called *ad bivium*, and of this Reichard makes a considerable town, Ad Bivium, of the size of Praeneste, in Latium; Aquila, a town founded in the middle ages, bears a Roman name, and is therefore forthwith represented as an ancient Sabine town. Some places mentioned by Roman writers as belonging to the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, such as Politorium, Medullia, and Tellene, which were conquered by the Romans, and of which we can only conjecture in what direction they lay, are placed by Reichard at random, and on spots were they cannot have existed—a just punishment for falsehood. He makes the Volscians extend as far as the mouth of the Tiber, although no Roman author mentions that their territory extended farther than Antium. Numberless faults of this kind might be collected; but I have not been able to overcome the disgust which prevented my going through the whole. Reichard's atlas owes the favourable reception it has met with, only to the beauty with which the maps are executed, and to the audacity of its author. We must confess, that in geography, properly so called, we have no one who can be compared

[1] The reprint of D'Anville's Atlas published by Weigel at Nürnberg (1781—85) is beautiful and cheap. At Düsseldorf a School-Atlas has been published (1820, and a second edition in 1825), which gives the maps of D'Anville on a small scale. It is correct, and costs a mere nothing.—N.

[2] The Atlas of Christ. Theoph. Reichard, of which Niebuhr here speaks, is entitled "Orbis terrarum antiquus." It was published at Nürnberg, 1818—27, and consists of fifteen maps in folio.

with D'Anville. My father, who was certainly a competent judge in these matters, entertained the most sincere admiration for him. Major Rennell was a great man; but he did not possess the unerring tact of D'Anville, and always drew middle results. Further discoveries in Africa will show, for instance, that Rennell has assigned a wrong place to Timbuctoo, although D'Anville with fewer resources had given it its proper place.

LECTURE XII.

THE importance of the history of Rome is generally acknowledged, and will probably never be disputed. There may be persons who, in regard to ancient history in general, entertain fanciful opinions and underrate its value; but they will never deny the importance of Roman history. For many sciences it is indispensable as an introduction or a preparation. As long as the Roman law retains the dignified position which it now occupies, so long Roman history cannot lose its importance for the student of the law in general. A knowledge of the history of Rome, her laws and institutions, is absolutely necessary to a theologian who wishes to make himself acquainted with ecclesiastical history. There are indeed sciences which are in no such direct relation to Roman history, and to which it cannot therefore be of the same importance; but it is important in the history of human life in general, and whoever wishes, for instance, to acquire a knowledge of the history of diseases, must be intimately acquainted with Roman history, for without it many things will remain utterly obscure to him. Its immense importance to a philologer requires no explanation. If philologers are principally occupied with Roman literature, the Roman classics in all their detail must be as familiar to them as if they were their contemporaries; and even those whose attention is chiefly engaged by the literature of the Greeks cannot dispense with Roman history, or else they will remain one-sided, and confine themselves within such narrow limits as to be unable to gain a free point of view. Let Greek philology be ever so much a man's real

element, still he must know in what manner the Greeks ended, and what was their condition under the Roman dominion. The consequence of this necessity having never yet been duly recognised is, that the later periods of the history of Greece are still much neglected. If, on the other hand, we look at the history of a country by itself, as a science which, independently of all others, possesses sufficient intrinsic merits of its own, the history of Rome is not surpassed by that of any other country. The history of all nations of the ancient world ends in that of Rome, and that of all modern nations has grown out of that of Rome. Thus, if we compare history with history, that of Rome has the highest claims to our attention. It shows us a nation, which was in its origin small like a grain of corn: but this originally small population waxed great, transferred its character to hundreds of thousands, and became the sovereign of nations from the rising to the setting sun. The whole of western Europe adopted the language of the Romans, and its inhabitants looked upon themselves as Romans. The laws and institutions of the Romans acquired such a power and durability, that even at the present moment they still continue to maintain their influence upon millions of men. Such a development is without a parallel in the history of the world. Before this star all others fade and vanish. In addition to this, we have to consider the greatness of the individuals and their achievements, the extraordinary character of the institutions which formed the ground-work of Rome's grandeur, and those events which in greatness surpass all others: all this gives to Roman history importance and durability. Hence we find, that in the middle ages, when most branches of knowledge were neglected, the history of Rome, although in an imperfect form, was held in high honour. Whatever eminent men appear during the middle ages, they all shew a certain knowledge of Roman history, and an ardent love of Roman literature. The revival of letters was not a little promoted by this disposition in the minds of men: it was through the medium of Roman literature that sciences were revived in Europe, and the first restorers were distinguished for their enthusiastic love of Roman history and literature. Dante and Petrarch felt as warmly for Rome as the ancient Romans did. Throughout the middle ages, Valerius Maximus was considered the most important book next to the

Bible: it was the mirror of virtues, and was translated into all the languages of Europe. Rienzi, the tribune, is said to hav read all the works of the ancients. At the tables of the German knights stories used to be read aloud, which alternately related the events of the Old Testament and the heroic deeds of the Romans.[1] This partiality for Roman history continued after the revival of letters; and although it was often studied in an unprofitable manner, still every one had a dim notion of its surpassing importance and instructive character.[2]

[1] This book still exists at Königsberg, and is well worth being published; its language is excellent.—N.

[2] Here the Introduction breaks off; the remaining part of this lecture, which begins the history of Rome, is printed in vol. i. of the Lectures, containing the history of Rome from the earliest times to the beginning of the first Punic war.

INDEX.

☞ The Roman numerals followed by Arabic figures indicate the volumes of the Lectures, the Arabic figures the pages, and the letter *n* the notes. The Roman numerals, not followed by figures, refer to the Introductory Lectures.

J. Wertheimer & Co., Printers, Circus Place, London Wall.