

HISTORY
OF
ROMAN LITERATURE,

FROM
ITS EARLIEST PERIOD

TO
THE AUGUSTAN AGE.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

BY
JOHN DUNLOP,
AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF FICTION.

FROM THE LAST LONDON EDITION.

. VOL. I.

PUBLISHED BY
E. LITTELL, CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.
G. & C. CARVILL, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1827.

Page 1-2-3-4

1-2-3-4

*James Kay, Jun. Printer,
S. E. Corner of Race & Sixth Streets,
Philadelphia.*

PA6001

D85

1827

PREFACE.

THERE are few subjects on which a greater number of laborious volumes have been compiled, than the History and Antiquities of ROME. Everything connected with its foreign policy and civil constitution, or even with the domestic manners of its citizens, has been profoundly and accurately investigated. The mysterious origin of Rome, veiled in the wonders of mythological fable—the stupendous increase of its power, rendered yet more gigantic by the mists of antiquity—its undaunted heroes, who seem to us like the genii of some greater world—its wide dominion, extended over the whole civilized globe—and, finally, its portentous fall, which forms, as it were, the separation between ancient and modern times, have rendered its civil and military history a subject of prevailing interest to all enlightened nations. But, while its warlike exploits, and the principles of its political institutions, have been repeatedly and laboriously investigated, less attention, perhaps,

has been paid to the history of its literature, than to that of any other country, possessed of equal pretensions to learning and refinement; and, in the English language at least, no connected view of its Rise, its Progress, and Decline, has been as yet presented to us. When the battles of Rome have been accurately described, and all her political intrigues minutely developed—when so much inquiry and thought have been bestowed, not only on the wars, conquests, and civil institutions of the Romans, but on their most trivial customs, it is wonderful that so little has been done to exhibit the intellectual exertions of the fancy and the reason, of their most refined and exalted spirits.

It cannot, indeed, be denied, that the civil history of Rome, and her military operations, present our species in a lofty aspect of power, magnanimity, and courage—that they exhibit the widest range and utmost extent of the human powers in enterprize and resources—and that statesmen or philosophers may derive from them topics to illustrate almost every political speculation. Yet, however vast and instructive may be the page which unfolds the eventful history of the foreign hostilities and internal commotions of the Roman people, it can hardly be more interesting than the analogies between their literary attainments and the other circumstances of their condition;—the peculiarities of their literature, its peculiar origination, and the peculiar effects which it produced. The literature of a people may indeed, in one sense, be regarded as the most attractive feature of its history. It is at once the effect of leisure and refinement, and the means of increasing and perpetuating the civilization from which it springs. Literature, as a late writer has powerfully and eloquently demonstrated, pos-

PREFACE.

sesses an extensive moral agency, and a close connection with glory, liberty, and happiness* ; and hence the *history* of literature becomes associated with all that concerns the fame, the freedom, and the felicity of nations. "There is no part of history," says Dr Johnson, "so generally useful, as that which relates the progress of the human mind—the gradual improvement of reason—the successive advances of science—the vicissitudes of learning and ignorance, which are the light and darkness of thinking beings—the extinction and resuscitation of arts, and the revolutions of the intellectual world. If accounts of battles and invasions are peculiarly the business of princes, the useful or elegant arts are not to be neglected †." If, then, in the literary history of Rome, we do not meet with those dazzling events, and stupendous results, which, from their lustre and magnitude, still seem, as it were, placed at the summit of human affairs, we shall find in it more intelligence and order, in consequence of its progress being less dependent on passion and interest. The trophies, too, of the most absolute power, and the most unlimited empire, seem destined, as if by a moral necessity, to pass away: But the dominion which the writers of Rome exercise over the human mind, will last as long as the world, or at least as long as its civilization—

"Alas, for Tully's voice, and Virgil's lay,
And Livy's pictured page!—But these shall be
Her resurrection; all beside—decay †."

There are chiefly two points of view, in which literary history may be regarded as of high utility and importance. The

* Mad. de Staël, *De la Littérature*, Tom. I.

† *Rasselas*.

‡ *Childe Harold*, c. IV.

first is the consideration of the powerful effect of literature on the manners and habits of the people among whom it flourishes. It is noble, indeed, in itself, and its productions are glorious, without any relative considerations. An ingenious literary performance has its intrinsic merits, and would delight an enthusiastic scholar, or contemplative philosopher, in perfect solitude, even though he himself were the only reader, and the work the production of a Being of a different order from himself. But what renders literature chiefly interesting, is the influence which it exercises on the dignity and happiness of human nature, by improving the character, and enlarging the capacity, of our species. A stream, however grand or beautiful in itself, derives its chief interest from a consideration of its influence on the landscape it adorns; and, in this point of view, literature has been well likened to "a noble lake or majestic river, which imposes on the imagination by every impression of dignity and sublimity. But it is the moisture that insensibly arises from them, which, gradually mingling with the soil, nourishes all the luxuriance of vegetation, and fructifies and adorns the surface of the earth*."

Literature, however, has not in all ages denoted, with equal accuracy, the condition of mankind, or been equally efficacious in impelling their progress, and contributing to their improvement. In the ancient empires of the East, where monarchies were despotic, and priests the only scholars, learning was regarded by those who were possessed of it rather as a means of confirming an ascendancy over the vulgar, than of improving their condition; and they were more desirous to perpetuate the subjection, than contribute to the melioration of mankind. Ac-

* *Vindicia Gallica.*

ordingly, almost every trace of this confined and perverted learning has vanished from the world. In the freer states of antiquity, as the republics of Greece and Rome, letters found various outlets, by which their improving influence was imparted, more or less extensively, to the bulk of the citizens. Dramatic representations were among the most favourite amusements, and oratorical displays excited among all classes the most lively interest. Such public exhibitions established points of contact, from which light was elicited. The mind of the multitude was enriched by the contemplation of superior intellect, and mankind were, to a certain extent, united by the reception of similar impressions, and the excitement of similar emotions.

Still, however, the history of any part of ancient literature is, in respect of its influence on the condition of states, far less important than that of modern nations. From the high price and scarcity of books, a restriction was imposed on the diffusion of knowledge. "A bulwark existed between the body of mankind and the reflecting few. They were distinct nations inhabiting the same country; and the opinions of the one, speaking comparatively with modern times, had little influence on the other*." The learned, in those days, wrote only or chiefly for the learned and the great. They neither expected nor cultivated the approbation of the mass of mankind. An extensive and noisy celebrity was interdicted. It was only with the more estimable part of his species that the author was united by that sympathy which we term the Love of Fame. He was the head, not of a numerous, but of a select community. By

* *Vindiciae Gallicae.*

nothing short of the highest excellence could he hope for the approbation of judges so skilful, or expect an immortality so difficult to be preserved. While this may, perhaps, have contributed to the polish and perfection of literary works, it is obvious that the general influence of letters must have been less humanizing, and must have had less tendency to unite and assimilate mankind. Even philosophers, whose peculiar business was the instruction of their species, had no mode of disseminating or perpetuating their opinions, except by the formation of sects and schools, which created for the masters, pupils who were the followers of his creed, and the depositaries of his claims to immortality.

It is the invention of the art of printing which has at length secured the widest diffusion, and an unlimited endurance, to learning and civilization. As a stone thrown into the sea agitates (it has been said) more or less every drop in the expanse of ocean, so every thought that is now cast into the fluctuating but ceaseless tide of letters, will more or less affect the human mind, and influence the human condition, throughout all the habitable globe, and "to the last syllable of time."

It is this, and not the height to which individual genius has soared, that forms the grand distinction between ancient and modern literature. The triumph of modern literature consists not in the point of elevation to which it has attained, but in the extent of its conquests—the extent to which it has refined and quickened the mass of mankind. It would be difficult to adjust the intellectual precedence of Newton and Archimedes—of Bacon and Aristotle—of Shakspeare and Homer—of Thucydides and Hume : But it may be declared with certainty, that the people of modern nations, in consequence of literature be-

ing more widely diffused, have become more civilized and enlightened. The Indus and Orinoko, rolling amid woods and deserts their waste of waters, may seem superior to the Thames in the view of the mere admirer of the grandeur and magnificence of nature; but how inferior are they in the eye of the philosopher and historian!

With regard to the Romans, in particular, they are allowed to have been a civilized nation, powerfully constituted, and wisely governed, previous to the existence of any author in the Latin language. Their character was formed before their literature was created: their moral and patriotic dignity, indeed, had reached its highest perfection, in the age in which their literature commenced—the age of Lælius and Africanus. Except in the province of the drama, it always continued a patriotic attribute; and though intellectual improvement could not have facilitated the inroads of vice and guilty ambition, it certainly proved inadequate to stem the tide of moral corruption, to mitigate the sanguinary animosities of faction, or to retard the establishment of despotism.

Literary history is, *secondly*, of importance, as being the index of the character and condition of a people—as holding up a mirror, which reflects the manners and customs of remote or ancient nations. The less influence, however, which literature exercises, the less valuable will be its picture of life and manners. It must also be admitted, that from a separate cause, the early periods, at least, of Roman literature, possess not in this point of view any peculiar attractions. When literature is indigenous, as it was in Greece, where authors were guided by no antecedent system, and their compositions were shaped on no

other model than the objects themselves which they were occupied in delineating, or the living passions they portrayed, an accurate estimate of the general state of manners and feeling may be drawn from works written at various epochs of the national history. But, at Rome, the pursuit of literature was neither a native nor predominant taste among the people. The Roman territory was always a foreign soil for letters, which were not the produce of national genius, but were naturalized by the assiduous culture of a few individuals reared in the schools of Greece. Indeed, the early Roman authors, particularly the dramatic, who, of all others, best illustrate the prevalent ideas and sentiments of a nation, were mere translators from the Greek. Hence, those delineations, which at first view might appear to be characteristic national sketches, are in fact the draught of foreign manners, and the mirror of customs which no Roman adopted, or of sentiments in which, perhaps, no Roman participated.

Since, then, the literature of Rome exercised but a limited influence on the conduct of its citizens, and as it reciprocally reflects but a partial light on their manners and institutions, its history must, in a great measure, consist of biographical sketches of *authors*—of critical accounts of their *works*—and an examination of the *influence* which these works have exercised on modern literature. The *authors* of Rome were, in their characters, and the events of their lives, more interesting than the writers of any ancient or modern land. The authors who flourished during the existence of the Roman Republic, were Cato the Censor, Cicero, and Cæsar; men who (independently of their literary claims to celebrity) were unrivalled in their own age and country, and have scarcely been surpassed

in any other. I need not here anticipate those observations which the *works* of the Roman authors will suggest in the following pages. Though formed on a model which has been shaped by the Greeks, we shall perceive through that spirit of imitation which marks all their literary productions, a tone of practical utility, derived from the familiar acquaintance which their writers exercised with the business and affairs of life; and also that air of nationality, which was acquired from the greatness and unity of the Roman republic, and could not be expected in literary works, produced where there was a subdivision of states in the same country, as in Greece, modern Italy, Germany, and Britain. We shall remark a characteristic authority of expression, a gravity, circumspection, solidity of understanding, and dignity of sentiment, produced partly by the moral firmness that distinguished the character of the Romans, their austerity of manners, and tranquillity of temper, but chiefly by their national pride, and the exalted name of Roman citizen, which their authors bore. And, finally, we shall recognise that love of rural retirement which originated in the mode of life of the ancient Italians, and was augmented by the pleasing contrast which the undisturbed repose and simple enjoyments of rural existence presented to the bustle of an immense and agitated capital. In the last point of view that has been alluded to—the *influence* which these works have exercised on modern letters—it cannot be denied that the literary history of Rome is peculiarly interesting. If the Greeks gave the first impulse to literature, the Romans engraved the traces of its progress deeper on the world. “The earliest writers,” as has been justly remarked, “took possession of the most striking objects for description, and the most probable occurrences for

fiction, and left nothing to those that followed, but transcriptions of the same events, and new combinations of the same images*." The great author from whom these reflections are quoted, had at one time actually "projected a work, to show how small a quantity of invention there is in the world, and that the same images and incidents, with little variation, have served all the authors who have ever written†." Had he prosecuted his intention, he would have found the notion he entertained fully confirmed by the history both of dramatic and romantic fiction; he would have perceived the incapacity of the most active and fertile imagination greatly to diversify the common characters and incidents of life, which, on a superficial view, one might suppose to be susceptible of infinite combinations; he would have found, that while Plautus and Terence servilely copied from the Greek dramatists, even Ariosto scarcely diverged in his comedies from the paths of Plautus.

But whatever may be the advantages or imperfections of a literary subject in its own nature, it is evident that it can never be treated with effect or utility, unless sufficient materials exist for compilation. Unfortunately, there was no historian of Roman literature among the Romans themselves. Many particulars, however, with regard to it, as also judgments on productions which are now lost, may be collected from the writings of Cicero; and many curious remarks, as well as amusing anecdotes, may be gathered from the works of the latter Classics; as Pliny's *Natural History*, the *Institutes* of Quintilian, the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, and the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius.

* *Rasselas*.

† *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, Vol. IV.

Among modern authors who have written on the subject of Roman literature, the first place is unquestionably due to Tiraboschi, who, though a cold and uninteresting critic, is distinguished by soundness of judgment and labour of research. The first and second volumes of his great work, *Della Letteratura Italiana*, are occupied with the subject of Roman literature; and though not executed with the same ability as the portion of his literary history relating to modern Italy, they may safely be relied on for correctness of facts and references.

The recent French work of Schoell, entitled, *Histoire Abrégée de la Littérature Romaine*, is extremely succinct and unsatisfactory on the early periods of Roman literature. Though consisting of four volumes, the author, at the middle of the first volume of the book, has advanced as far as Virgil. It is more complete in the succeeding periods, and, like his *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, is rather a history of the decline, than of the progress and perfection of literature.

A number of German works; (chiefly, however, bibliographical,) have lately appeared on the subject of Roman literature. I regret, that from possessing but a recent and limited acquaintance with the language, I have not been able to draw so extensively as might have been wished from these sources of information.

The composition of the present volumes was not suggested by any of the works which I have mentioned on the subject of Roman literature; but by the perusal of an elegant, though somewhat superficial production, on "The Civil and Constitutional History of Rome, from its Foundation to the Age of

Augustus*." It occurred to me that a History of Roman *Literature*, during the same period, might prove not uninteresting. There are three great ages in the literary history of Rome—that which precedes the æra of Augustus—the epoch which is stamped with the name of that emperor—and the interval which commenced immediately after his death, and may be considered as extending to the destruction of Rome. Of these periods, the first and second run into each other with respect to dates, but the difference in their spirit and taste may be easily distinguished. Although Cicero died during the triumvirate of Octavius, his genius breathes only the spirit of the Republic; and though Virgil and Horace were born during the subsistence of the commonwealth, their writings bear the character of monarchical influence.

The ensuing volumes include only the first of these successive periods. Whether I shall hereafter proceed to investigate the history of the others, will depend on the reception which the present effort may obtain, and on other circumstances, which I am equally unable to anticipate:

MEANWHILE, I have made considerable alterations, and, I trust, improvements, in the present edition. These, however, are so much interwoven with the body of the work, that they cannot be specified—except some additional Translations from

* *Civil and Constitutional History of Rome, from its Foundation to the Age of Augustus*, by Henry Banks, Esq. M. P. ed. London, 1818, 2 vol. 8vo.

the *Fragments of the older Latin poets*—a *Dissertation on the Tachygraphy*, or short-hand writing of the Romans, introduced at the commencement of the Appendix—and a *Critical Account of Cicero's Dialogue De Republica*, which, though discovered, had not issued from the press when the former edition was published.

HISTORY
OR
ROMAN LITERATURE. &c.

Vol. 1.—C

“ Parva quoque, ut ferme principia omnia, et ea ipsa peregrina res
fuit.”

LIVR, lib. vii. c. 2.

HISTORY

OF

ROMAN LITERATURE, &c.

IN tracing the Literary History of a people, it is important not only to ascertain whence their first rudiments of knowledge were derived, but even to fix the origin of those tribes, whose cultivation, being superior to their own, acted as an incentive to literary exertion. The privilege, however, assumed by national vanity, *miscendi humana divinis*, has enveloped the antiquities of almost every country in darkness and mystery: But there is no race whose early history is involved in greater obscurity and contradiction than the first inhabitants of those Italian states, which finally formed component parts of the Roman republic. The origin of the five Saturnian, and twelve Etruscan cities, is lost in the mist of ages; and we may as well hope to obtain credible information concerning the monuments of Egypt or India, as to investigate their inscrutable antiquities. At the period when light is first thrown, by authentic documents, on the condition of Italy, we find it occupied by various tribes, which had reached different degrees of civilization, which spoke different dialects, and disputed with each other the property of the lands whence they drew their subsistence. All before that time is founded on poetical embellishment, the speculations of theorists, or national vanity arrogating to itself a Trojan, a Grecian, or even a divine original.

The happy situation of Italy, imbosomed in a sea, which washed not only the coast of all the south of Europe, but likewise the shores of Africa and Asia, afforded facilities for

communication and commerce with almost every part of the ancient world. It is probable, that a country gifted like this peninsula, with a fertile soil, incomparable climate, and unusual charms of scenery, attracted the attention of its neighbours, and sometimes allured them from less favoured settlements. "Il semble," says a recent French writer, "que les Dieux aient lancé l'Italie au milieu du vaste océan comme un Phare immense qui appelle les navigateurs des pays les plus éloignés"* . The customs, and even names, which were prevalent in Egypt, Phœnicia, and Greece, were thus introduced into Italy, and formed materials from which the framers of systems have constructed theories concerning its first colonization by the Egyptians, the Pelasgi, or whatever nation they chose. There is scarcely, however, an ancient history or document entitled to credit, and recording the arrival of a colony in Italy, which does not also mention that the new-comers found prior tribes, with whom they waged war, or intermixed.

The ample lakes and lofty mountains, by which Italy is intersected, naturally divided its inhabitants into separate and independent nations. Of these by far the most celebrated were the Etruscans. The origin of this remarkable people, called Tyrrhenians by the Greeks, and Thusci, or Etrusci, by the Latins, has been a subject of endless controversy among antiquarians; and, indeed, had perplexed the ancients no less than it has puzzled the moderns. Herodotus, the earliest authentic historian whose works are now extant, represents them as a colony of Lydians, who were themselves a tribe of the vagrant Pelasgi. In the reign of Atys, son of Menes, the Lydian nation being driven to extremity by famine, the king divided it into two portions, one of which was destined to remain in Asia, and the other to emigrate under the conduct of his son Tyrrhenus. The inhabitants who composed the latter division leaving their country, repaired to Smyrna, where they built vessels, and removed in search of new abodes. After touching on various shores, they penetrated into the heart of Italy, and at length settled in Umbria. There they constructed dwellings, and called themselves Tyrrhenians, from the name of their leader†. Some of the circumstances which Herodotus relates as having occurred previous to the emigration of the Lydian colony appear fabulous, as the invention of games, in order to appease the sensation of hunger, and the fasting every alternate day for a space of eighteen years; and it would, perhaps, be too much to assert, that before the Lydians, no other tribe had ever set foot in Umbria or

* *Voyage de Polycte, Lettre 2. 3 Tom. Paris, 1820.* † *Herod. Cliv. c. 94.*

Etruria. But the account of the departure of the colony is itself plausible, and its truth appears to be corroborated, if not confirmed, by certain resemblances in the language, religion, and pastimes of the Lydians, and of the ancient Etruscans*. The manners, too, and customs of the Lydians, did not differ essentially from those of the Greeks; and the princes of Lydia, like the sovereigns of Persia, being accustomed to employ Phœnician or Egyptian sailors, the colony of Lydians, which settled in Italy, might thus contain a mixture of such people, and present those appearances which have led some antiquarians to consider the Etruscans as Phœnicians or Egyptians, while others have regarded them as Greeks. The writers of antiquity, though varying in particulars, have followed, in general, the tradition delivered by Herodotus concerning the descent of the Etruscans. Cicero, Strabo†, Velleius Paterculus‡, Seneca, Pliny, Plutarch§, and Servius, all affirm that they came from Lydia; and to these may be added Catullus, who calls the lake Benacus *Lydia lacus undæ*, obviously because he considered the antient Etruscans, within whose extended territory it lay, as of Lydian origin. It is evident, too, that the Etruscans themselves believed that they had sprung from the Lydians, and that they inculcated this belief on others. Tacitus informs us, that, in the reign of Tiberius, a contest concerning their respective antiquity arose among eleven cities of Asia, which were heard by their deputies in presence of the Emperor. The Sardiens rested their claims on an alleged affinity to the Etruscans, and, in support of their pretensions, produced an ancient decree, in which that people declared themselves descended from the followers of Tyrrhenus, who had left their native country of Lydia, and founded new settlements in Italy||.

Hellanicus of Lesbos, a Greek historian, nearly contemporary with Herodotus, and quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, asserted that the Etruscans were a tribe of Pelasgi, not from Lydia, but from Greece, who being driven out of their country by the Hellenes, sailed to the mouth of the Po, and leaving their ships in that river, built the inland town of Cortona, whence advancing, they peopled the whole territory afterwards called Tyrrhenia¶.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus holds the account of those authors, who maintain that the Etruscans were descended from the Lydians, to be utterly fabulous, principally on the ground

* *Herculanensia*, Dissert. V. Lond. 1810.

† *Geograph.* Lib. V. c. 2.

‡ *Questiones Romanæ.*

¶ *Antiquitates Romanæ.* Lib. I. p. 22. Ed. Sylburg, 1586.

† *Histor. Roman.* Lib. I. c. 1.

|| *Annal.* Lib. IV. c. 55.

that Xantus, the chief historian of Lydia, says nothing of any colony having emigrated thence to Italy; and he is of opinion, that those also are mistaken, who, like Hellenicus of Lesbos, believed the Etruscans and Pelasgi to be the same people. He conceives them to have been Aborigines, or natives of the country, as they radically agreed with no other nation, either in their language or manner of life. He admits, however, that a tribe of Pelasgi passed from Thessaly to the mouth of the Po many ages previous to the Trojan war, and directing their course to the south, occupied a considerable portion of the heart of Italy. Soon after their arrival, they assisted the aboriginal Etruscans in their wars with the Siculi, whom they forced to seek refuge in Sicily, the seat of the ancient Sicani. Subsequent to this alliance, they were again dispersed in consequence of disease and famine; but a few still remained behind, and being incorporated with the original inhabitants, bestowed on them whatever in language or customs appeared to be common to the Etruscans, with other nations of Pelasgic descent*.

Several eminent writers among the moderns have partly coincided with Dionysius. Dempster seems to think that there was an indigenous population in Etruria, but that it was increased both by the Lydian emigration and by colonies of Pelasgi from Greece†. Bochart is nearly of the same opinion; only he farther admits of a direct intercourse between the Etruscans and Phœnicians, whence the former may have received many Oriental fables and customs. He denies, however, that there was any resemblance in the languages of these two people; and the Etruscan arts he believes to have been chiefly derived from Greece‡. The opinion of Bochart on these latter points is so much the more entitled to weight, as his prepossessions would have led him to maintain an opposite system could it have been plausibly supported. Gibbon also declares in favour of Dionysius; and, as to the relation of Herodotus, he says, "L'opinion d'Herodote, qui les fait venir de la Lydie, ne peut convenir qu'aux poetes"§. Several recent Italian writers likewise have maintained, that, previous to the arrival of any Lydian or Pelasgic colony, there existed what they term an indigenous population, by which they do not merely signify a population whose origin cannot

* *Antiquitates Romanae*. Lib. I. p. 22, &c.

† *De Etruria Regali*. Lib. I. Ed. Florent. 1723. 2 tom. fol.

‡ *Geographia Sacra, De Colonia Phœnicum*. Lib. I. tom. I. p. 562, &c *Opera*. Lugd. Bat. 1712.

§ *Miscellaneous Works*. Vol. IV. p. 184. Ed. 8vo. 1814.

be traced, since they hint pretty broadly, that Etruria had its Adam and Eve as much as Eden*.

Gorius derives every thing Etruscan from Egypt or Phœnicia. These countries he considers as the original seats of the Pelasgi, who, being driven out of them, settled in Achaia, Thrace, Arcadia, and Lydia, and from these regions gradually, and at different times, passed into Italy†.

A similar system has been adopted by Lord Monboddo.—From a resemblance in their letters and language to those of the Greeks, he believes the Etruscans to have been a very ancient colony of the roaming Pelasgi who left Arcadia in quest of new settlements. These Pelasgi, however, he maintains, were not themselves indigenous in Arcadia, as they issued originally from Egypt, where there was a district and a city of the name of Arcadia‡.

Mazzochi follows the oriental theory, but does not venture to determine from what eastern region the Etruscans emigrated. He merely affirms, that they spread from the east, under which term he includes regions very remote from each other—Assyria, Armenia, Canaan, and Egypt||. He also thinks that they came directly from the east, without having previously passed through Lydia or Arcadia: For, if they had, the monuments of these latter countries would exhibit (which they do not) still stronger remains of oriental antiquity than those of the Etruscans. This descent Mazzochi attempts to confirm by the most fanciful derivations of words and proper names of the Etruscan nation from the eastern languages, especially from the Hebrew and Syriac. Thus one of the most extensive plains in Italy, and the spot where, in all probability, the oriental colony first landed, is near the æstuary of the Po. This plain they naturally called Paddan, one of the names of the level Mesopotamia, and the appellation of the district soon came to be transferred to the river Padus or Po, by which it was bounded. It occurred to the author, however, that the Eridanus was the more ancient name of the Po; but this only furnishes him with a new argument. Eraz, it seems, signifies in Hebrew, a cedar, or any sort of resinous tree, and the orientals, finding a number of trees of this nature on the banks of the Po, and Z being a convertible letter with D, they could

* Miceli, *L'Italia avanti il Dominio dei Romani*. Ed. Firenz. 1810. Bossi, *Istoria d'Italia*. Ed. 1819.

† *Museum Etruscum*.

‡ *Origin and Progress of Language*, vol. V. book i. c. 8. See also Swinton, *De Lingua Etruria Vernacula*.

|| At the end of his Dissertation he alludes to a future work, in which he is to settle the particular district and time of the Etruscan emigration; but I do not know whether or not he ever accomplished this undertaking.

not fail to call the river, near which they grew in such abundance, the Eridanus*.

Bonarota has deduced the origin of the Etruscans from Egypt—a theory which has chiefly been grounded on the resemblance of the remains of their arts with the monuments of the ancient Egyptians†.

Máffeï brings them directly from Canaan, and supposes them to have been the race expelled from that region by the Moabites, or children of Lot. The river Arnon, (whence Arno,) flowed not far from that part of Canaan, where Lot and Abram first sojourned; one of its districts was called Etroth, (whence Etruria); and on the banks of the Arnon stood the city Ar, a syllable which is a frequent compound in Etruscan appellatives. The Etruscans erected their places of worship on hills or high places—they formed corporeal images of their divine beings like the idolatrous race from whom they sprung—but above all, their divinations and profession of augury, identified them with those original inhabitants of Canaan, of whom it is said, “that they harkened unto observers of times and unto diviners”‡.

By far the most voluminous, but at the same time one of the most fanciful writers concerning the Etruscans, is Guarnacci, who maintains, that they came directly from the east, and were stragglers who had been dispersed by Noah’s flood, or, at the very latest, by the confusion at Babel. The Umbri and Aborigines, according to him, were the same people, under a different denomination, as the Etruscans: They gradually spread themselves over all Italy, and some tribes of them, called, from their wandering habits, Pelasgi, at length emigrated to Greece and Lydia; so that, whatever similarity has been traced in the language, religion, manners, or arts, of the Greeks and Etruscans, is the consequence of the Etruscan colonization of Greece, and not, as is generally supposed, of Italy having been peopled by Pelasgic colonies from Arcadia or Peloponnesus§.

In general, the oriental system has been maintained in opposition to all other theories, chiefly on the ground that the Etruscans, like many eastern nations, wrote from right to left, and that, like the Hebrews, they often marked down only

* “Confesso ingenuamente,” says the author, “che questa Etimologia della voce Eridano mi è sempre piaciuta assai.”—*Dissertaz. sopra l’Origine de Terreni, nell’ Saggi di Dissert. dell’ Acad. Etrusca*. Tom. III. p. 1.

† *Supplem. ad Monument. Etrusc. Dempst.* c. 47. See also Riccobaldi del Bava, *Dissertaz. sopra l’Origine dell’ Etrusca Nazione*.

‡ Deuteronomy, c. 18, v. 14. *Ragionament. degl’ Itali primitivi. in Istoria Diplomatica*. Ed. Mantua, 1727.

§ *Origini Italiane*. 3 Tom. folio. Lucca, 1767-72.

the consonants, leaving the reader to supply the auxiliary vowels.

The oriental theory, in all its modifications, has been strenuously opposed by a number of learned Italian, French, and German antiquaries, who have contended for the northern and Celtic origin of the Etruscans, and have ridiculed the opinions of their predecessors as if they themselves were about to promulgate a more rational system. Bardetti, while he admits a colonization of Italy from foreign quarters, prior even to the Trojan war, maintains, that it was inhabited by a primitive population long before the landing of the Lydians or Pelasgi: That previous to the arrival of the latter tribe at the mouth of the Po, which happened 300 years before the siege of Troy, there had been no navigation to Italy from Egypt, or any other country: That, therefore, this primitive population must have come by land, and could have been no other than bands of Celts who were the immediate posterity of Japheth, and who, having originally settled in Gaul, descended to Italy from the Alps by Rhetium, Tirol, and Trent. Their first seats were the regions along the banks of the Po; the earliest tribes of their population were called Ligurians and Umbrians, and from them sprung the Etrurians, and all the other ancient nations of Italy*.

A system nearly similar has been followed by Pelloutier†, Freret‡, and Funccius§, and has been adopted, with some modifications, by Adelung, and also by Heyne||, who, however, admits that other tribes besides the Gallic race, may have contributed to the population of Etruria¶.

This theory, whether deducing the Etruscans from the Celts of Gaul or from the Teutonic tribes of Germany, is too often supported by remote and fanciful etymologies; and, so far as depends on authority, it chiefly rests on an ambiguous passage of the ancient historian Boccus, (quoted by Solinus,) where it is said, *Gallorum veterum propaginem Umbros esse*, and taken in connection with this, the assertion of Pliny, *Umbrorum gens antiquissima Italiæ existimatur**†.

* *De Primi Abitatori dell Italia*. Ed. Modena, 1769. 3 Tom. 4to.

† *Histoire des Celtes*. Paris, 1770.

‡ *Recherches sur l'Origine des Differens Peuples d'Italie*, in *l'Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*. Tom. XVIII.

§ *De Origine Latine Lingua*. Ed. 1720.

|| Heyne, *Opuscula Academica*, Tom. V. See also Court de Gebelin, *Monde Primitif*.

¶ Non enim Etruscorum stirpem ab una gente nec ab una turba deductam; sed temporum successu plurium populorum propagines in eum populum, qui tandem Etruscum nomen terris his allevit confluisse arbitror. *Nov. Comment. Soc. Reg. Gotting.* Tom. III.

*† *Nat. Hist.* Lib. III. c. 14. Ed. Hardouin.

The most learned and correct writer on the subject of the Etruscans is Lanzi. In his elaborate work*, (in which he has followed out and improved on a system first started by Ulivieri,) he does not pretend to investigate the origin of this celebrated race, though he seems to think that they were Lydians, augmented from time to time by tribes of the Pelasgi. But he has tried to prove that whatever may have been their descent, the religion, learning, language, and arts of the Etruscans must be referred to a Greek origin, and he refutes Gori and Caylus, who, deceived by a few imperfect analogies, ascribed them to the Egyptians. The period of Etruscan perfection in the arts, and formation of those vases and urns which we still admire, was posterior, he maintains, to the subjugation of Etruria by the Romans, and at a time when an intercourse with Greece had rendered the Etruscans familiar with models of Grecian perfection. As to the language, he does not indeed deny that all languages came originally from the east; and that many Greek words sprung from Hebrew roots; but there are in the Etruscan tongue, he asserts, such clear traces of Hellenism, particularly in the names of gods and heroes, that it is impossible to ascribe its origin to any other source. In particular, he attempts to show from the inscriptions on the Eugubian tables, that the Etruscan language was the Æolic Greek, since it has neither the monosyllables characteristic of northern tongues, nor the affixes and suffixes peculiar to oriental dialects†.

From whatever nation originally sprung, the Etruscans at an early period attained an enviable height of prosperity and power. Etruria Proper, or the most ancient Etruria, reached from the Arno to the Tiber, being nearly bounded all along by these rivers, from their sources to their junction with the Tyrrhenian sea. Soon, however, the Etruscans passed those narrow limits;—to the north, they spread their conquests over the Ligurians, who inhabited the region beyond the Arno, and to this territory the conquerors gave the name of New Etruria. To the south, they crossed the Tiber, made allies or tributaries of the Latins, and introduced among them many of their usages and rites. Having thus opened a way through Latium, they drove the Oscians from the fertile plains of Cam-

* Visconti, who has since become so celebrated by his *Iconographie Grecque et Romaine*, says in the *Approvazione* of the work of Lanzi, which he had perused in his official capacity,—“Il saggio di lingua Etrusca, che ho letto per commissione del Rmo. P. M. del S. P. A., mi è sembrato assolutamente il miglior libro che sia stato sinora scritto su questo difficile e vasto argomento.” This opinion, so early formed, has been confirmed by that of all writers who have subsequently touched on the subject

† *Saggio di Lingua Etrusca*. Rom. 1789. 3 Tom. 8vo.

pania, and founded the city of Capua, about fifty years before the building of Rome. Colonies, too, were sent out by them to spots beyond their immediate sway, till at length the Italian name was nearly sunk in that of the Etruscans. Their minds, however, were not wholly bent on conquest and political aggrandizement; their attention was also directed to useful institutions, and to the cultivation of the fine arts. The twelve confederated cities of Etruria were embellished with numberless monuments of architecture; wholesome laws were enacted, commerce was extended along all the shores of the Mediterranean: and, in short, by their means the general progress of civilization in Italy was prodigiously accelerated. The glory and prosperity of the Etruscans were at their height before Rome yet possessed a name. But their government, like that of all other republics, contained the seeds of decay. Each state had the choice of remaining as a commonwealth, or electing a king; but the Kings, or Lucumons, as they were usually called, were only the priests and presidents of the different cities of the confederation. There was no monarch of the whole realm; and it is the series of these Lucumons that has swelled the confused list of kings presented by Etruscan antiquaries. Each state had also the privilege of separately declaring war or concluding peace; and each appears, on all occasions, to have been more anxious for its own safety, than for the general interests of the union. Hence, rivalships and dissensions prevailed in the general assemblies of the twelve states. A confederate government, thus united by a link of political connection, almost as feeble as the Amphictyonic council of Greece, afforded no such compact resistance as could oppose an adequate barrier to the *unica vis* of the intrepid enemies with whom the Etruscans had now to contend. At sea they were assailed by the Syracusans and Carthaginians; the Umbrians retook several of their ancient possessions; they were forced to yield the plains which lie between the Alps and Apennines to the valour of the Gauls; and the Samnites expelled them from the yet more desirable and delicious regions of Campania.

While the Etruscans were thus again confined almost within the territory which still bears their name, and extends from the Tiber northward to the Apennines, a yet more formidable foe than any they had hitherto encountered appeared on the political theatre of Italy. It was Latium, which had the singular fortune to see one of its towns rise to the supreme dominion of Italy, and finally of the world. This city, which Dionysius of Halicarnassus represents as a respectable colony, fitted out from Alba under the escort of Romulus, and thence

supplied with money, provisions, and arms; but which was more probably composed of outlaws from the Equi, Marsi, Volsci, and other Latian tribes, had gradually acquired strength, while the power of the Etruscans had decayed. Enervated by opulence and luxury*, they were led to despise the rough unpolished manners of the Romans; but during centuries of almost incessant warfare, they were daily taught to dread their military skill and prowess. The fall of Veii was a tremendous warning, and they now sought to preserve their independence rather by stratagem than force of arms. At length, in an evil hour, they availed themselves of the difficulties of their enemy; and, while the rival republic was pressed on the south by the Samnites, they leagued with those northern hordes which descended from the Alps to the anticipated conquest of Rome. Before they had fully united with the Gauls, the Consul Dolabella annihilated, near the Lake Vadimona, the military population of Etruria, and the feeble remains of the nation received the imperious conditions of peace, dictated by the victors, which left them nothing but the shadow of a great name,—the glory of attending the Roman march to the conquest of the world, and the vestiges of arts destined to attract the curiosity and research of the latest posterity.

The vicinity of the Etruscans to Rome, from which their territories were separated only by the Tiber,—the alliance of their leader, Cœlius, with Romulus, and the habitation assigned them on the Cœlian Mount,—the accession to the Roman sovereignty of the elder Tarquin, who was descended from a Greek family which had fixed its residence in Etruria,—the settlement of a number of Etruscan prisoners, four years after the expulsion of the kings, in a street called the *Vicus Tuscus*, in the very heart of the city;—and, finally, the intercourse produced by the long period of warfare and political intrigue which subsisted between the rising republic and their more polished neighbours before they were incorporated into one state, would be sufficient to account for the Roman reception of the customs and superstitions of Etruria, as also for the interchange of literary materials. It does not seem that the hostility of rival nations prevents the reciprocal adoption of manners and literature. The romantic gallantry and learning of the Arabs in the south of Spain soon passed the limits of their splendid empire; and long before the conquest of Wales the Cambrian fables and traditions, concerning Arthur and his host of heroes were domesticated in the court

* Diodorus Siculus—Athenæus.

of England. Accordingly, we find that the Romans were indebted to the Etruscans for the form of the robes which invested their magistrates, the pomp that attended their triumphs, and even the music that animated their legions. The purple vest, the sceptre surmounted by an eagle, the curule chair, the fasces and lictors, were the ensigns and accompaniments of supreme authority among the Etruscans; while the triumphs and ovations, the combats of gladiators and Circensian games, were common to them and the Romans.

The simple and rustic divinities of Etruria and Latium were likewise the objects of Roman idolatry, long before the introduction of that more imposing and elegant mythology which had been embellished by the conceptions of Homer and the hand of Phidias. Saturn, the reformer of civil life, though afterwards confounded with the Kronos of the Greeks, was not of Greek origin. Janus, the *Deorum Deus* of the Salian verses, to whom the Romans offered their first sacrifices, and addressed their first prayers, and whom system-framers have identified with Noah*, the Indian Ganesa†, the Egyptian Oannes‡, and the Ion of the Scandinavians§, or have represented as a symbolic type of all things in nature, was truly an Italian God:—

“Nam tibi par nullum Græcia numen habet||.”

Faunus and Picus, Bona Dea and Marica, were Etruscan or Latian divinities of the Saturnian family. Italy was also filled with many local deities, in consequence of those wonderful natural phænomena which it so abundantly exhibited, and which its early inhabitants ascribed to invisible powers. A sulphuric lake was the residence of the Nymph Albunea, and the medicinal founts of Abano were the acknowledged abodes of a beneficent genius.—“Nullus lucus sine fonte, nullus fons non sacer, propter attributos illis deos, qui fontibus præesse dicuntur¶.” All nature was thus linked by a continued chain of consecrated existence, from the God of Thunder to the simple Faun. The Vacunia and Feronia of the Sabines were naturalized by Numa, and the Vejove of Etruria presided in Rome at the general council of the twelve greater gods, long before a knowledge of the Grecian Mars or Jupiter. In all their mythology we may remark the grave and austere charac-

* Guarnicci, *Origini Rakiche*.

† Sir William Jones, *On the Gods of Italy and India*.

‡ *Herculanensia*, Dissert. V.

§ *Hermes Scythicus*, p. 90.

|| Ovid. *Fast.* I. 90.

¶ Servius, ad *Æneid.* VII. 84.

ter of the ancient Italians*. Their deities resembled not the obscene and vicious gods of Greece. They presided over agriculture, the rights of property, conjugal fidelity, truth and justice; and in like manner in early Rome,

“Cana Fides et Vesta; Remo cum fratre Quirinus
Jura dabant.”——

Dionysius of Halicarnassus particularly points out the difference between the religion of the Greeks and the Romans. The latter, he informs us, “did not admit into their creed those impious stories told by the Greeks of the castration of their gods, or of destroying their own children, of their wars, wounds, bonds, and slavery, and such like things as are not only altogether unworthy of the divine nature, but disgrace even the human. They had no wailing and lamentations for the sufferings of their gods, nor like the Greeks, any Bacchic orgies, or vigils of men and women together in the temples. And if at any time they admitted such foreign pollutions, as they did with regard to the rites of Cybele and the Idæan goddess, the ceremonies were performed under the grave inspection of Roman magistrates; nor even now does any Roman disguise himself to act the mummeries performed by the priests of Cybele†”. Dionysius, who refers every thing to Greece, thinks that the early Roman was just the Greek religion purified by Romulus, to whom, in fact, his country was more indebted than to Numa for its sacred institutions. In reality, however, this superior purity of rites and worship was not occasioned by any such lustration of the Greek fables, but from their being founded on Italian, and not on Grecian superstitions.

But although the Etruscan mythology may have been more pure, and its rites more useful, than those of Greece, its fables were not so ingenious and alluring. *Ora*, the goddess of health and youth, was less elegant than *Hebe*; and even the genius of *Virgil*, who has chosen the Italian *Myths* for the machinery of the *Æneid*, could hardly bestow grace or dignity on the prodigy of the swarm of bees that hung in clusters from the *Laurentian Laurel*—on the story of the robber *Cacus* vomiting flames, the ships metamorphosed into nymphs, the sow which farrowed thirty white pigs, and thereby announced that the town of *Alba* would be built in thirty years, the puerile

* L'Olympe de Numa fut plus majestueux,
Mercure moins fripon, Mars moins voluptueux;
Jupiter brula moins d'une flamme adultere,
Venus meme reçut une culte plus severe.

De Lille. Imagination. Ch. vi.

† *Antiquitat. Roman. Lib. II. c. 19.*

fiction of the infancy of Camilla, or the hideous harpy which hovered round the head of Turnus, and portended his death. Accordingly, when the Romans were allured by the arts of Greece, the rude and simple traditions of Italian mythology yielded to the enticing and voluptuous fictions of a more polished people*. The tolerant spirit of Polytheism did not restrict the number of gods, and the ministers of superstition seemed always ready to reconcile the most discordant systems. Hence the poet interwove the national traditions with the Greek fables, and concentrated in one the attributes of different divinities. Thus, the Greek Kronos was identified with Saturn; the rustic deities, Sylvanus and Faunus, peculiar to Latium, being confounded with Pan, the Satyrs, and Silenus, were associated with the train of Bacchus; Portumnus was converted into Palemon—a deity whom the Greeks had received from Phœnicia; Bona Dea was transformed to Hecate, and Libitina to Proserpine; and the Camesnæ, or Camenæ, of the family of Janus, who prophesied in Saturnian verse on the summit of Mount Janiculum, were metamorphosed into Muses†. Hercules, Jupiter, and Venus, gods of power and pleasure, occupied, with their splendid temples, the place of the peaceful and pastoral deities of Numa. Still, however, the national religion was in some measure retained, and Apollo and Bacchus, in particular, continued to be decorated with the characteristic emblems of Etruria.

The Etruscans do not seem to have believed, like the Greeks, that they were possessed of those interpretations of passing events or revelations of futurity which were obtained by immediate inspiration, whether delivered from the hill of Dodona, or the Delphian shrine. Their divination was supposed to be the result of experience and observation; and though not destitute of divine direction or concurrence, depended chiefly on human contrivance. Among them peculiar families, like the tribe of Levi, the Peruvian Incas, and the descendants of Thor and Odin, were depositaries of the secrets and ceremonies of religion. Their prognostics were taken from the flight of birds‡, the entrails of animals, and observations on thunder.

* Beaufort is of opinion that the gradual introduction of the Greek mythology at Rome commenced as early as the reign of Tarquinius Priscus. *La République Romaine. Discours Préliminaire.* Ed. 1766. 2 Tom. 4to.

† Heyne, *Excurs.* V. lib. vii. ad *Æneid.*

‡ Bentley, however, is of opinion that the College of Augurs, whose divination was made from observations of birds, was of Roman institution, being founded by Numa, and that the skill and province of the Haruspices of Etruria reached to three things, *exta, fulgura, et ostenta*, entrails of cattle, thunders, and monstrous births, but did not include auguries from the flight of birds. "It often happened," he adds, "that this pack of Etruscan soothsayers gave their answers quite cross to what the

In the early ages of Rome, a band of Patrician youths was sent to Etruria, to be initiated in the mysteries of its religious rites*. The constant practice of consulting the gods on all enterprizes, public or private,—the belief, that prodigies manifested the will of heaven, and that the deities could be appeased, and their vengeance averted by expiations or sacrifices, were common to the Tuscan and Roman creeds. In short, the fervent spirit of Etrurian superstition passed undiminished to the Romans, who owed to its influence much of their valour, temperance, and patriotism. To this, Cicero in a great degree ascribes their political supremacy. The Romans, says he, were not superior in numbers to the Spaniards, in strength or courage to the Gauls, in address to the Carthaginians, in tactics to the Macedonians; but we surpass all nations in that prime wisdom by which we have learned that all things are governed and directed by the immortal gods.

To the same singular people from whom they derived their customs and superstitions, the Romans were much indebted for their majestic language. As their writers in a great measure owe their immortality to the lofty tones and commanding accents of the Latin tongue, it would be improper entirely to neglect its origin in entering on the literary history of Rome.

The supporters of the various systems with regard to the first peopling of Etruria, of course discover the elements of the Etruscan language in that of the different nations by whom they believe it to have been colonized. Lord Monboddo, for example, deduces both the Latin and Etruscan from the old Pelasgic; which language, he asserts, was first brought into Italy by a colony of Arcadians, seventeen generations before the Trojan war. He considers the Latin as the most ancient dialect of the Greek; and he remarks, that as it came off from the original stock earlier than the Doric, or Æolic, or any other Greek dialect now known, it has more of the roughness of the primitive Hebrew, from which he believes the Pelasgic to be derived†. Lanzi also thinks that both the Latin and Etruscan flowed from the Greek, and that the resemblance between the Etruscan and Latin was not occasioned by the derivation of the latter from the former, but was the necessary consequence of both having sprung from a common source.

It certainly is not easy to discover the primary elements of the Latin or any other language; but its immediate origin

Roman augurs had given, so that the two disciplines clashed."—(*Remarks on a late Discourse of Freethinking*, p. 241, Lond. 1737.)

* Valerius Maximus, Lib. I. c. i. Ed. 1538. Cicero, *De Divinatione*, Lib. I. c. 41. Ed. Schutz.

† *Origin, &c. of Language*. Part I. book iii. c. 11.

may easily be traced. The inscriptions on the most ancient monuments which have been discovered, from the Alps to Calabria, shew that, from the time of the Etruscan supremacy, there was an universal language in Italy, varied, indeed, by dialects, but announcing a common origin in the inflections of words and the forms of characters. The language of the Etruscans had been so widely spread by their conquests, that it might almost be regarded as the general tongue of Italy, and the Latian, Oscan, and Sabine idioms, were in a great measure the same with the Etruscan. From these the early Latin language was chiefly formed; and what little Greek existed in its original composition came through these languages from the Pelagic colonies, which in the remotest periods had intermixed with the Etruscans, and with the inhabitants of ancient Latium. "It is a great mistake," says Horne Tooke, "into which the Latin etymologists have fallen, to suppose that all the Latin must be found in the Greek, for the fact is otherwise. The bulk and foundation of the Latin language is Greek; but great part of the Latin is the language of our northern ancestors grafted on the Greek; and to our northern languages the etymologist must go for that part of the Latin which the Greek will not furnish*." This author is correct, in affirming that all the Latin cannot be found in the Greek; but he is far in error if he mean to maintain that any part of the Latin came directly from the language of the Celts, or that their uncouth jargon was grafted on the Greek. The northern tongues, however, whether Celtic or Slavonic, may have contributed to form those dialects of Italy which composed the original elements of the imperial language, and were exhibited in great variety of combinations for five centuries with little admixture of the Greek. The eminent grammarian is still farther mistaken in declaring that the foundation of the Latin language is Greek. That much of the Augustan Latin is derived from the Greek, is true. Gataker, who strenuously contends for the Greek origin of the whole Latin language, has, as a specimen, attempted to shew, that every word in the first five lines of Virgil's *Eclogues* is drawn from the Greek †; and though part of his etymologies are fanciful,

* *Discursions of Purley*. Part II. c. iv. Wakefield and Horne Tooke had undertaken in conjunction a division and separation of the Latin language into two parts, placing together, in one division, all that could be clearly shewn to be Greek, and in the other, all that could be clearly shewn to be of northern extraction, including, I presume, both Teutonic and Celtic originals. This design, we are informed, was frustrated "by the persecution of that virtuous and harmless good man, Mr Gilbert Wakefield."—*Divers. Purley*, II. 4. See also on the origin of the Latin Language, Ginguené *Hist. Littéraire d'Italie*, Tom. I.

† *De Novi Instrumenti Stylo*, c. 1. London, 1648.

yet in a very considerable portion of them he has been completely successful. But the case is totally different with the ancient remnants of the Latin language previous to the capture of Tarentum. In the song of the *Fratres Arvales*, the oldest specimen of the language extant, there seem to be only two words which have any analogy to the Greek—*sal* from *ἄλς* and *sta* from *ἰστῆμα*. That there was little Greek incorporated with the Latin during the first ages of the Republic, is evident from the circumstance, that the Latin inscriptions of a former period were unintelligible to the historian Polybius, and the most learned Romans of his age. Now, as he himself was a Greek, and as the most learned Romans, by his time, had become good Greek scholars, any Grecisms in the ancient inscriptions would have been perfectly intelligible. It is evident, therefore, that the difficulty arose from the words of the old Italian dialects occurring instead of the new Greek terms, suddenly introduced after the capture of Tarentum, and to which the Romans having by that time become habituated, could not understand the language of a preceding generation. Besides, when Rome was originally filled with Latian bands—when the Etruscans and Oscans were immediately beyond the walls of Rome,—when, as early as the time of Romulus, the Sabines were admitted within them,—when all the women then in Rome were Sabines, (from which it may be presumed that much of the conversation was carried on in the Sabine dialect,) and, above all, when the Romans, for many centuries, had little intercourse with any other people than the Italian nations, it is not to be supposed that they would borrow their colloquial language from the Celts, on the other side of the Alps, or the Greeks, from whom they were separated by the Adriatic Gulf, and who, as yet, had established only remote, insignificant, and scattered colonies, in Italy. Varro, too, has shewn the affinity between the Sabine and the Latin languages*. That the Oscan resembled the old Latin, is proved from its being constantly employed in the most popular dramatic representations at Rome, and from the circumstance that almost every word of its few relics which remain, is the root of some equivalent Latin term. Thus Akeru produced acerra—Anter, inter—Phaisnam, fanum—Tesaur, Thesaurus—Famel, famulus—Multa, mulcta—Solum, (totus,) solus—Facul, Facultas—Cael, cœlum—Embratur, imperator.† The copious admixture of Greek only took place

* *De Lingua Latina*, lib. IV. c. 10.

† Remondini, *Dissertaz. sopra una iscrizione Osca*, p. 49. ed. 1760, Genoa. Some writers have even asserted, that the Twelve tables were originally written in the Oscan dialect. Terrasson, *Hist. de la Jurisprudence Romaine*. Baron de Theis, *Voyage de Polycte*, let. 15.

after the taking of Tarentum, when the poets of Magna Græcia settled at Rome, and were imitated by native writers,

“ ——— Cum lingua Catonis et Enni
Sermonem patrium ditaverit, et nova rerum
Nomina protulerit.”

So far, then, from the Latin language being composed of Celtic grafted on the Greek, it appears to me to have been formed from the Greek, grafted on those various dialects of the Etruscan tongue, which prevailed in Italy at the period of the building of Rome.

It would have been singular, when the Romans derived so much from their Etruscan neighbours, if they had not also acquired a portion of those arts which were the chief boast of Etruria. Among the Etruscans, the arts certainly had not the imposing character they assumed in Egypt, or the elegance they exhibited in Greece*; but in their vases, tombs, and altars, which have recently been brought to light, we possess abundant proofs of their taste and ingenuity. In these—domestic occupations, marriages, spectacles, masquerades, contests in the Circus, equestrian exercises, the chase, triumphs, mysteries, funeral rites, Lares, Lamiæ, Lemures, and deities of every description,—in short, all ancient Etruria passes in review before the eye, which, in many instances, must admire the boldness of the attitudes, the elegance of the draperies, and justness of the proportions. The art of modelling, or sculpture, appears to have been that in which the Etruscans chiefly excelled. The statues of the first kings erected at Rome, in the reign of the elder Tarquin, were of their workmanship, as well as that of Horatius Cocles, and the equestrian statue of Clelia. The Jupiter of the Capitol was also Tuscan; and the four-wheeled chariot placed in his temple, received its last polish from Etruscan hands, under the first Roman consuls.

In the course of the 5th century of Rome, not fewer than 2000 Etruscan statues, which were probably little figures in bronze, were carried to that city from Volsinium, (now Bolsena,) which the Romans were accused of having besieged, in order to plunder it of these treasures. Architecture was unknown in Rome until the Tarquins came from Etruria: hence the works of the kings, some of which still remain, were

* It would be foreign to the object of this work to enter into the inquiry, whether the Etruscan arts were the result of indigenous taste and cultivation, or were derived from the Greeks. The latter proposition has been maintained by Winckelman and Lanzi—the former by Tiraboschi and Pignotti. (*Storia di Toscana*, T. 1. Ed. Pisa, 1816.)

built in the Etruscan style, with large and regular, but uncemented blocks*. The most ancient and stupendous architectural monuments of Rome, were executed by Etruscan artists. Theirs were the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, the Circus, and Cloaca Maxima, which showed such a wonderful anticipation of the future magnitude of Rome†, and which Livy pronounces equal to anything which had been produced by modern magnificence. Painting, too, was introduced at Rome from the Etruscans, about the middle of the fifth century, by one of the Fabian family, who had long resided in Etruria, and who himself painted in *fresco*, after his return, the interior of the Temple of Salus, and transmitted the surname of *Pictor* to his descendants.

The excellence to which the Etruscans had attained in sculpture and architecture, forms a presumption of their proficiency in those sciences which are essential to eminence in the arts. As not a vestige of their writings remains, it is impossible to judge of the merits of their literary compositions. I suspect, however, that, like the ancient Egyptians, they had made much less progress in literature than in arts or science. What books they had, were extant, and well known, at Rome; yet Cicero and other Latin writers, who have the Greek authors perpetually in their mouths, scarcely ever allude to any works of the Etruscans, except treatises on augury or divination; and the only titles of the books, recorded by Roman writers, are the *Libri Fatales*, *Libri Haruspicinæ*, *Sacra Acherontia*, *Fulgurales et Rituales Libri*. It is said, indeed, that the Etruscans cultivated a certain species of poetry, sung or declaimed during the pomp of sacrifices, or celebration of marriages‡. Such verses were first employed in Fescennia, a city of Etruria, whence the ancient nuptial hymns of the Romans were called Fescennine. It is evident, however, that these Etruscan songs, or hymns, were of the very rudest description, and probably never were reduced into writing. They were a kind of *impromptus*, composed of scurrilous jests, originally recited by the Italian peasants at those feasts of Ceres, which celebrated the conclusion of their harvests; and they resembled the verses described in the well-known lines of Horace—

* Forsyth's *Remarks on Italy*, p. 141.

† "La grandeur de Rome," says Montesquieu, "parût bientôt dans ses edifices publics. Les ouvrages qui ont donné, et qui donnent encore aujourd'hui la plus haute idée de sa puissance ont été faits sous les Rois. On commençoit déjà à bâtir la Ville éternelle." *Grandeur et Decadence des Romains*, c. 1.

‡ Dempster, *Etruria Regalis*, Lib. III. c. 80.

“ Agricola prisci, fortes, parvoque beati,
 Conditæ post frumenta, levantes tempore festo
 Corpus, et ipsum animum spe finis dura ferentem,
 Cum sociis operum pueris, et conjuge fida,
 Tellurem porco, Sylvanum lacte piabant,
 Floribus et vino Genium, memorem brevis ævi;
 Fescennina per hunc inventa licenta morem
 Versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit*.”

It appears, also, that some of the ancient rustic oracles and prophecies of the Etruscans, were delivered in a rugged sort of verse called Saturnian—a measure which was adopted from them by the earliest Latin poets—

“ Scripsere alii rem
 Versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant†.”

Censorinus informs us, on the authority of Varro, that this ancient people was not without its chroniclers and historians—*In Tuscis Historiis quæ octavo eorum sæculo scripta sunt*†. But this eighth century of the Etruscans, according to the chronology followed by Lanzi, would be as late as the sixth century of Rome§; and, besides, it is evident from the context of Censorinus, that these pretended *histories* were, in fact, mere registers of the foundations of cities, and the births and deaths of individuals. Varro also mentions Etruscan tragedies composed by Volumnius||. No date to his productions, however, is specified, and Lanzi is of opinion, that he did not write in Etruria till after the dramatic art had made considerable progress at Rome; and it certainly may at least be doubted, if, previous to that period, the Etruscan stage had ever reached higher than extemporary recitations, or pantomimic entertainments of music and dancing.

But whatever the literature of the Etruscans may have been, it certainly had no influence on the progress of learning among the Romans. Neither the intercourse of the two nations, nor the capture of Veii, though followed by the final subjugation of the Etruscans, was attended with any literary improvement on the part of their unpolished neighbours. In fact, few nations have been more completely illiterate than the Romans were, during five centuries, from the commencement of their history; and of all the nations which have figured in the annals of mankind, none certainly attained the same height of power and grandeur, and civil wisdom, with equal ignorance of literature or the fine arts. For the pretended acquaintance of the elder Brutus with the Pythagorean

* Horat. *Epist.* Lib. II. Ep. 1. † Ennius, *Annal.* ‡ *De Die Natali*, c. 5.
 § *Saggio di Ling. Etrusc.* Tom. II. p. 567. || *De Ling. Lat.* Lib. IV. c. 9.

philosophy, it would be difficult, I suspect, to find any better authority than the romance of Clelia; and the learned academy, which some writers* have found in Numa's College of Pontiffs, must be classed, I fear, with Vockerodt's literary societies, which existed before the flood †.

It is not difficult to account for this ignorance of the Romans during the first ages of their history. Rome was not, as has been asserted by Dionysius, a regular colony sent out from a well-regulated state, but was formed from a mixture of all kinds of people unacquainted with social life. It consisted of Romulus' own troop, and a confluence of banditti inured to lawless acts, and subsisting by rapine, who were called from their fastnesses by the proclamation of a bold, cunning, and hardy adventurer ‡. This desperate band would not be much softened or humanized by their union with the tribe of Sabines, who, in the time of Romulus, became incorporated with the state, if we may judge of Sabine civilization from the story of Tarpeia. Numa did much for the domestic melioration of his people: He subdivided them into classes, impressed their minds with reverence for religion, and encouraged agriculture; but there was no germ of literature which he could foster. For more than three centuries after his death, the persevering hostilities of neighbouring states, and the furious irruptions of the Gauls, scarcely allowed a moment of repose or tranquillity. The safety of Rome depended on its military preparations, and every citizen necessarily became a soldier. Learning and arts may flourish amid the wars and commotions of a mighty empire, because every individual is not essentially or actively involved in the struggle; but in a petty state, surrounded by foes, all are in some shape or other personally engaged in the conflict, and the result, perhaps, is viewed with intenser interest. The enemies of Rome were repeatedly at her gates, and once within her walls; and while the city thus resounded with martial alarms, literary leisure could neither be enjoyed nor accounted among the ingredients—

“Vitam quæ faciunt beatiforem.”

The exercise of arms, which commenced in order to preserve the new-founded city from destruction, was continued for the sake of conquest and dominion; so that the whole

* Origval, *Considerat. sur l'Origine et Progrès des Belles Lettres chez les Romains.*

† *Comment. de Erudit. Societat.*

‡ Romulus ut saxo locum circumdedit alto,
Cullibet huc, inquit, confuge tutus erit.

pride of the Romans was still placed in valour and military success. At the first formation of their theatre, they were propitiated by the address, *Belli duellatores optimi**. Whatever time could be snatched from warlike occupations, was devoted to agriculture. Each individual had two acres allotted to him, which he was obliged to till for the maintenance of his family. While thus labouring for subsistence, he had little leisure to cultivate literature or the arts, and could find no inclination for such pursuits. Indeed, he was not allowed the choice of his occupations. The law of Romulus which consigned as ignominious all sedentary employments to foreigners or slaves, leaving only in choice to citizens and freemen the arts of agriculture and arms, long continued in undiminished respect and observance. Romulus, says Dionysius, ordered the same persons to exercise the employments both of husbandmen and soldiers. He taught them the duty of soldiers in time of war, and accustomed them in time of peace to cultivate the land†.

During this period the Romans had nothing which can properly be termed, or which would now be considered as poetry—the shape in which literature usually first expands amongst a rude people. The verses which have come down to us under the character of Sibylline oracles, are not genuine. There probably at one time existed a few rude lines uttered by pretended prophetesses, and which were doubtless a political instrument, usefully employed in a state subject to popular commotions. The book delivered to Tarquin, and which was supposed to contain those ancient oracles, perished amid the conflagration in the Capitol, during the civil wars of Marius and Sylla. Even those collected in Greece, and the municipal states of Italy, in order to supply their place, and which were deposited in the temple of Apollo, on Mount Palatine, were burned by Stilicho in the reign of the Emperor Honorius. There is still extant, however, the hymn sung by the *Fratres Arvales*, a college of priests instituted by Romulus, for the purpose of walking in procession through the fields in the commencement of spring, and imploring from the gods a blessing on agriculture. Of a similar description were the rude Saturnian verses prescribed by Numa, and which were chaunted by the Salian priests, who carried through the streets those sacred shields, so long accounted the Palladium of Rome.

About the end of the fourth century from the building of the city, when it was for the first time afflicted with a plague, the Senate having exhausted without effect their own super-

* Plautus, *Captivi Prol.*

† *Antiquitat. Roman. lib. II.*

stitious ceremonies, and run over the whole round of supplications, decreed that *histrions* or players should be summoned from Etruria, in order to appease the wrath of the gods by scenic representations. These chiefly exhibited rude dances and gesticulations, performed to the sound of the flute*. There was no dialogue or song, but the pantomime did not consist merely of unmeaning gestures: It had a certain scope, and represented a connected plot or story†; but what kind of action or story was represented, is utterly unknown. This whimsical sort of expiation seems to have attracted the fancy of the Roman youths, who imitated the Etruscan actors; but they improved on the entertainment, by rallying each other in extemporary and jocular lines. The Fescennine verses, originally employed in Etruria at the harvest-homes of the peasants, were about the same period applied by the Romans to marriage ceremonies and public diversions.

There were also songs of triumph in a rude measure, which were sung by the soldiers at the ovations of their leaders. As early as the time of Romulus, when that chief returned triumphant to Rome after his victory over the Ceninenses and Antemnates, his soldiers followed him in military array, singing hymns in honour of their gods, and extemporary verses in praise of their commander‡. Of this description, too, were the Pæans, with which the victorious troops accompanied the chariot of Cincinnatus, after he subdued the Equi§, and with which they celebrated a spirited enterprize of Cossus, a tribune of the soldiers||. Sometimes these laudatory songs were seasoned with coarse jokes and camp jests, like those introduced at the triumph of C. Claudius, and of M. Livius¶.

The triumphal hymns were not altogether confined to the ceremony performed on the streets of Rome. Cicero informs us, on the authority of Cato's *Origines*, that at feasts and entertainments, it was usual for the guests to celebrate the praises of their native heroes to the sound of the flute*†. Valerius Maximus says, that the verses were sung by the older guests, in order to excite the youth to emulation††; and Varro,

* Livy. Lib. VII. c. 2. Sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu, ludiones ex Etruria acciti, ad tibicinis modos saltantes, haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant.

† Fogel, *Geschichte der Komisch. Litteratur*. Tom. IV. p. 82.

‡ Dionys. Halic. Lib. II. c. 34.

§ Livy, Lib. III. c. 29. Epulantesque, cum carmine triumphali et solennibus jocis, commissantium modo, currum secuti sunt.

|| Ibid. Lib. IV. c. 20. In eum milites carmina incondita, æquantas eum Romulo, canere.

¶ Ibid. Lib. XXVIII. c. 9.

*† *Tusc. Disput.* Lib. I. c. 2. and lib. IV. c. 2. *Brutus*, c. 19.

†† Lib. II. c. 1.

that they were chaunted by ingenuous youths*. The difference, however, between the two authors, is easily reconciled. The former speaks of the original composition of these ballads†, while Varro, though the passage is imperfect, seems to refer to a later period, when they were brought out anew for the entertainment of the guests. Valerius talks of them as poems or ballads of considerable extent. It was many generations, however, before the age of Cato, that this practice existed; and by the time of Cicero, these national and heroic productions, if they ever had been reduced to writing, were no longer extant‡. This is all that can be collected concerning these legends, from the ancient Roman writers, who had evidently very imperfect notions and information on the subject. Niebuhr, however, and M. Schlegel, seem as well acquainted with their contents as we are with Chevy Chase, and talk as if these precious relics were lying on their shelves, or as if they had been personally present at the festivals where they were recited. They expressed, it seems, feelings purely patriotic—they contained no inconsiderable admixture of the marvellous—but even the propensity for what was incredible was exclusively national in its character—and the Roman fablers indulged themselves in the creation of no wonders, which did not redound in some measure to the honour of their ancestors. They were founded on the oldest traditions concerning the kings and heroes of the infant city, and the establishment of the republican form of government. “The fabulous birth of Romulus,” says Schlegel, “the rape of the Sabine women, the most poetical combat of the Horatii and Curiatii, the pride of Tarquin, the misfortunes and death of Lucretia, and the establishment of liberty by the elder Brutus—the wonderful war with Porsenna, and steadfastness of Scævola, the banishment of Coriolanus, the war which he kindled against his country, the subsequent struggle of his feelings, and the final triumph of his patriotism at the all-powerful intercession of his mother;—these and the like circumstances, if they be examined from the proper point of view, cannot fail to be considered as relics and fragments of the ancient heroic traditions and heroic poems of the Romans§.” Niebuhr, not contented with insulated ballads, has

* *De Vita Populi Romani*, ap. Nonium, c. ii. sub voce, *Assa*.

† *Majores natu in conviviis ad tibias egregia superiorum opera, carmine comprehensa, pangobant.*

‡ Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 19. The passage rather seems to imply that they had been in writing, “*Utinam extarent illa carmina, quæ multis sæculis ante suam ætatem in epulis esse cantata a singulis convivis de clarorum virorum laudibus, in Originibus scriptum reliquit Cato*”!

§ *Lectures on Literature*, Lect. III.

imagined the existence of a grand and complete Epopee, commencing with the accession of Tarquinius Priscus, and ending with the battle of Regillus*. This is a great deal more information than Cicero or Varro could have afforded us on the subject.

However numerous or extensive these ballads may have been, they soon sunk into oblivion; and in consequence of the overpowering influence of Greek authors and manners, they never formed the groundwork of a polished system of national poetry. The manifold witcheries of the Odyssey, and the harmony of the noble Hexameter, made so entire a conquest of the fancy and ears of the Romans, as to leave no room for an imitation, or even an affectionate preservation, of the ancient poems of their country, and led them, as we shall soon see, exclusively to adopt in their stead, the thoughts, the recollections, and the poetry of the Greeks. Cicero, in his *Tusculan Disputations*, mentions a poem by Appius Claudius Cæcus, who flourished in the fifth century of Rome†; but he does not say what was the nature or subject of this production, except that it was Pythagorean; and this is the solitary authentic notice transmitted to us of the existence of any thing which can be supposed to have been a regular or continued poem, during the first five centuries that elapsed from the building of the city.

Since, then, we can discover, during this period, nothing but those feeble dawings of dramatic, satiric, and heroic poetry, which never brightened to a perfect day, the only history of Roman literature which can be given during the long interval, consists in the progress and improvement of the Latin language. In the course of these five centuries, it was extremely variable, from two causes.—1st, Although their policy in this respect afterwards changed, one of the great principles of aggrandizement among the Romans in their early ages, was incorporating aliens, and admitting them to the rights of citizens. Hence, there was a constant influx to Rome of stranger tribes; and the dissonance within its walls was probably greater than had yet been any where heard since the memorable confusion at Babel.—2d, The Latin was merely a spoken language, or at least had not received stability by literary composition—writing at that time being confined, (in consequence of the want of materials for it,) to treaties, or short columnar inscriptions. So remarkable was the fluctuation produced by these causes, even during a very short period, that Polybius, speaking of a treaty concluded

* *Römische Geschichte*. Berlin, 1811. 2 Tom. 8vo.

† Lib. IV. c. 2.

between the Carthaginians and Romans in the 245th Year of the City, during the Consulship of Publius Valerius and Marcus Horatius, declares, that the language used in it was so different from the Latin spoken in his time, that the most learned Romans could not explain its text*.

Of this changeable tongue, the earliest specimen extant, and which is supposed to be as ancient as the time of Romulus, is the hymn chaunted by the *Fratres Arvales*, the college of priests above-mentioned, who were called *Fratres*, from the first members of the institution being the sons of Acca Laurentia, the nurse of Romulus. This song was inscribed, during the time of the Emperor Heliogabalus†, on a stone, which was discovered on opening the foundations of the Sacristy at St Peter's, in the year 1778. It is in the following words:—

“ Enos Lares juvate,
Neve luerve Marmor sinis incurrere in pleoris.
Satur fufere Mars: limen sali sta berber:
Semones alternei advocapit cunctos.
Enos Marmor juvate,
Triumpe! triumpe!”

These words have been thus interpreted by Herman: “ Nos Lares juvate, neve luem Mamuri sinis incurrere in plures. Satur fueris Mars: limen (*i. e.* postremum) sali sta vervex: Semones alterni jam duo capit cunctos. Nos Mamuri juvato—Triumpe! Triumpe”‡! There are just sixteen letters used in the above inscription; and it appears from it, that at this early period the letter *s* was frequently used instead of *r*—that the final *e* was struck out, or rather, had not yet been added—the rich diphthong *ei* was employed instead of *i*, and the simple letter *p*, in words where *f* or *ph* came afterwards to be substituted.

Of the *Carmen Saliare*, sung by the Salian priests, appointed under Numa, for the protection of the *Ancilia*, or Sacred

* Lib. III. c. 22.

† Bossi, *Storia de Italia*, Tom. VI. p. 376.

‡ *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*, Lib. III. c. 9. Lanzi, (*Saggio di Ling. Etrusc.*) Schoell, (*Hist. Abrégée de la Littérature Romaine*, Tom. I. p. 42. *introduc.*) and Eustace (*Classical Tour in Italy*, Vol. III. p. 416.) give a somewhat different interpretation. Pleores, they render flores, and not plures, in which they seem right—Satur, fufere Mars, (you shall be full, O Mars!) they make Ator, or ador fieri, Mars, (Let there be food, O Mars!) which is evidently erroneous. The following will give some general notion of the import of the verses:—

Ye Lares, aid us! Mars, thou God of Might!
From murrain shield the flocks—the flowers from blight.
For thee, O Mars! a feast shall be prepared;
Salt, and a wether chosen from the herd:
Invite, by turn, each Demigod of Spring—
Great Mars, assist us! Triumph! Triumph sing!

Shields, there remain only a few words, which have been cited by Varro, who remarks in them, what has already been noticed with regard to the Hymn of the *Fratres Arvales*, that the letter *s* often occurs in words where his contemporaries placed *r*—as *Melios*, for *melior*—*Plusima*, for *plurima*—*Asena*, for *arena*—*Janitos*, for *janitor**. The *Carmen Saliare*, however, can scarcely be taken as a fair specimen of the state of the Roman language at the time it was composed. Among the nations adjacent to Rome, there were Salian priests, who had their hymns and solemn forms of invocation†, which are said to have been, in part at least, adopted by Numa‡. So that his *Carmen Saliare* probably approaches nearer to the Tuscan and Oscan dialects, than the Latin language did, even at that early period of the monarchy.

The fragments of a few laws, attributed to Numa, have been preserved by ancient juriconsults and grammarians, and restored by Festus, with much pains, to their proper orthography, which had not been sufficiently attended to by those who first cited passages from this *Regiam Majestatem* of the Romans. One of these laws, as restored by him, is in the following terms:—"Sei cuius hemonem lobsum dolo sciens mortei duit pariceidad estod. sei im imprudens se dolo malod occisit pro capited oceisei et nateis eiuis endo concioned arietem subcicotod," which law may be thus interpreted: "Si quis hominem liberum dolo sciens morti dederit paricida esto: Si eum imprudens, sine dolo malo, occiderit, pro capite occisi et natis ejus in concionem arietem subjicito." A law, ascribed to Servius Tullius, has been thus given by Festus:—"Sei parentem puer verberit ast oloe plorasit, puer diveis parentum sacer esto—sei nurus sacra diveis parentum esto,"—which means, "Si parentem puer verberet, at ille ploraverit, puer divis parentum sacer esto; si nurus, sacra divis parentum esto"§.

From the date of these *Leges Regiæ*, no specimen of the Latin language is now extant, till we come down to the Twelve Tables, enacted in the commencement of the fourth century of Rome. These celebrated institutions have descended to us in mutilated fragments, and their orthography has probably been in some respects modernised: yet they bear stronger marks of antiquity than the above-recited law of Servius Tullius, or even than those of Numa. The Latin writers themselves by whom they are quoted did not very well understand them, owing to the change which had taken place

* Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* Lib. VI. c. 1 and 3.

† Servius ad *Æneid.* Lib. VIII.

‡ Cannegieter, *Dissert. Philol. Jurid. ad legem Numæ.*

§ Funccius, *De Pueritia Latin. Ling.* c. III. § 6 and 8.

in the language. Accordingly, Cicero, and the early grammarians who cite them, have attempted rather to give the meaning than the precise words of the Decemvirs. Terrasson has endeavoured to bring them back to the old Oscan language, in which he supposes them to have been originally written; but his emendations are in a great measure conjectural, and his attempt is one of more promise than fulfilment. On the whole, they have been so much corrupted by modernising them, and by subsequent attempts to restore them to the ancient readings, that they cannot be implicitly relied on as specimens of the Roman language during the period in which they were promulgated. The laws themselves are very concise, and free from that tautology, which seems the characteristic of the enactments of nations farther advanced in refinement. The first law is, "S' in jus vocat queat," which is extremely elliptical in its expression, and means, "Si quis aliquem in jus vocet, vocatus eat." In some respects the language of the *Leges Regiæ*, and twelve tables, possesses a richness of sound, which we do not find in more modern Latin, particularly in the use of the diphthong *ai* for *æ*, as *vitai* for *vitæ*, and of the diphthong *ei* for *i*, as *sei* for *si*. Horace might perhaps be well entitled to ridicule the person,

‡ Sic fautor veterum, ut tabulas peccare vetantes,
 Quæ bisquinque viri sanxerunt, fœdera regum
 Vel Gabiis, vel cum rigidis æquata Sabinis,
 Pontificum libros, annosa volumina vatum,
 Dictitet Albano Musas in monte loquutas :"

Yet he would have done well to have considered, if, amid the manifold improvements of the Augustan poets, they had judged right in rejecting those rich and sonorous diphthongs of the *tabula peccare vetantes*, which still sound with such strength and majesty in the lines of Lucretius.

There is scarcely a vestige of the Latin language remaining during the two centuries which succeeded the enactment of the twelve tables. At the end of that long period, and during the first Punic war, a celebrated inscription, which is still extant, recorded the naval victory obtained by the Consul Duillius, in 492, over the Carthaginians. The column on which it was engraved, and which became so famous by the title of the *Columna Rostrata*, was, as Livy* informs us, struck down by lightning during the interval between the second and third Punic wars. It remained buried among the ruins of Rome, till, at length, in 1565, its base, which contained the

* Lib. XLII. c. 20.

inscription, was dug up in the vicinity of the Capitol. So much, however, was it defaced, that many of the letters were illegible. These have been restored in the following manner by the conjectures of the learned :

“C. D*. *exemet leciones maximosque magistratus novem castris exfociunt. Macellam pugnandod cepet enque eodem macistratu rem navebos marid* consol primos ceset clasesque navales primos ornavit cumque eis navebos claseis pœnicas omnes sumas copias Cartaciniensis præsentē dictatored olorum in altod marid pugnandod vicit tringintaque naveis cepet cum sociis septem triremosque naveis XX captum numei DCC. captom æs navaled prædad poplom†.*”

In modern Latin the above inscription would run thus.—
“Caius Duillius exemit: legiones, maximusque magistratus novem castris effugiunt. Macellam pugnando cepit; inque eodem magistratu, rem navibus mari Consul primus gessit, classesque navales primus ornavit; cumque iis navibus classes Punicas omnes summas copias Carthaginienses, præsentē dictatore illorum, in alto mari pugnando vicit: Tringintaque naves cepit cum sociis septem, triremosque naves decem. Captum nummi, captum aes navali præda, populo donavit.”

There are also extant two inscriptions, which were engraved on the tombstones of Lucius Scipio Barbatus and his son Lucius Scipio, of which the former was somewhat prior, and the latter a year subsequent to the date of the Duillian inscription. The epitaph on Barbatus was discovered in 1780, in the vault of the Scipian family, between the Via Appia and Via Latina. Mr Hobhouse informs us that it is inscribed on a handsome but plain sarcophagus, and he adds, “that the eloquent simple inscription becomes the virtues and fellow-countrymen of the deceased, and instructs us more than a chapter of Livy in the style and language of the Republican Romans”†:—

“Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus Gnavoid patre prognatus fortis vir sapiensque quouis forma virtutei parisuma fuit. Consol Censor Aidilis quei fuit apud vos Taurasia Cisauna Samnio cepit subicit omne Loucana opsidesque abducit.”

The above may be converted into modern Latin, as follows :

“C. L. Scipio Barbatus, Cneio patre prognatus, fortis vir sapiensque, cujus forma virtuti par fuit. Consul, Censor,

* The letters which have been supplied are here printed in Italics.

† Ciacconius, however, is of opinion that this is not precisely what was inscribed on the base of the column in the time of Duillius, for that the inscription, having been greatly effaced, was repaired, or rather engraved anew, after the time of Julius Cæsar. *In Colum. Rost. Explic.*

‡ *Illustrations of Childe Harold*, p. 169.

Ædilis qui fuit apud vos, Taurasiam, Cisaunam, Samnio cepit; subjecti omnem Lucaniam obsidesque abducit." The other Scipian epitaph had been discovered long before the above, on a slab which was found lying near the Porta Capena, having been detached from the family vault. Though a good many years later as to the date of its composition, the epitaph on the son bears marks of higher antiquity than that on the father:—

"Hunc oino ploirume consentiunt duonoro optumo fuisse viro Lucium Scipione. Filios Barbatu Consul Censor Ædilis hec fuit. Hec cepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe: dedit tempestatibus aide mereto;" which means, "Hunc unum plurimi consentiunt Romæ bonorum optimum fuisse virum Lucium Scipionem. Filius Barbatu, Consul, Censor, Ædilis hic fuit. Hic cepit Corsicam Aleriamque urbem: dedit tempestatibus ædem merito".

The celebrated Eugubian tables were so called from having been found at Eugubium (Gubbio) a city in ancient Umbria, near the foot of the Apennines, where they were dug up in 1444. When first discovered, they were believed to be in the Egyptian language; but it was afterwards observed that five of the seven tables were in the Etruscan character and language, or rather in the Umbrian dialect of that tongue, and the other two in Roman letters, though in a rustic jargon, between Latin and Etruscan, with such mixture of each, as might be expected from an increased intercourse of the nations, and the subjugation of the one by the other*. The two tables in the Latin character were written towards the close of the sixth century of Rome, and those in the Etruscan letters a short while previous. So little, however, was the Etruscan language fixed or understood, even in the middle of last century, when the Etruscan rage was at its height in Italy, that Bonarota believed that those tables contained treaties of the ancient Italian nations—Gori, an Oscan poem, and Maffei, legal enactments, till Passerius at length discovered that they consisted solely of ordinances for the performance of sacred rites and religious ceremonies†.

* This sort of rustic Latin has by some writers been supposed to be the origin of the modern Italian.

† *Omnino ad jura pontificalia pertinere videntur. In Dempsteri libros Paralipomena.* Ed. Luca, 1767. It was on these Eugubian tables that, in modern times, the alphabet of the Etruscan language was first found. At the earliest attempt it was very imperfect and contradictory; Maffei maintaining that these tables were in Hebrew, and Gori that they were in Greek characters; but at length in 1782, M. Bourguet, a Frenchman, by comparing the tables in the Roman with those in the Etruscan character, found that the former was a compendium of the latter, and that many words in the one corresponded with words in the other. Having got this key, he was enabled, by comparing word with word, and letter with letter, to form an alphabet, which, though not perfect, was much more complete than any previously pro-

On comparing the fragments of the *Leges Regiæ* with the Duillian and Scipian inscriptions, it does not appear that the Roman language, however greatly it may have varied, had either improved or approached much nearer to modern Latin in the fifth century than in the time of the kings. Short and mutilated as these laws and inscriptions are, they still enable us to draw many important conclusions with regard to the general state of the language during the existence of the monarchy, and the first ages of the republic. It has already been mentioned that the diphthong *ai* was employed where *æ* came to be afterwards substituted, as *aide* for *æde*; *ei* instead of *î*, as *castreis* for *castris*; and *oi* in place of *œ*, as *coilum* for *cœlum*. The vowel *e* is often introduced instead of *o*, as *hemo* for *homo*, while, on the other hand, *o* is sometimes used instead of *e*, as *vostrum* for *vestrum*; and Scipio Africanus is said to have been the first who always wrote the *e* in such words*. *U* is frequently changed into *o*, as *hunc* for *hunc*, sometimes into *ou*, as *abdoucit* for *abducit*, and sometimes to *oi*, as *oino* for *uno*. On the whole, it appears that the vowels were in a great measure used indiscriminately, and often, especially in inscriptions, they were altogether omitted, as *bne* for *benè*, though sometimes, again, an *e* final was added, as *face* for *fac*, *dice* for *dic*. As to the consonants,—*b* at the beginning of a word was *du*, as *duonorum* for *bonorum*, and it was *p* at the middle or end, as *opsides* for *obsides*. The letter *g* certainly does not appear in those earliest specimens of the Latin language—the hymn of the *Fratres Arvales*, and *Leges Regiæ*, where *c* is used in its place. Plutarch says, that this letter was utterly unknown at Rome during the space of five centuries, and was first introduced by the grammarian Spurius Carvilius in the year 540†. It occurs, however, in the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus, which was written at least half a century before that date; and, what is remarkable, it is there placed in a word where *c* was previously and subsequently employed, *Gnaivo* being written for *Cnæo*. The letter *r* was not, as has been asserted, unknown to the ancient Romans, but it was chiefly used in the beginning and end of words—*s* being employed instead of it in the middle, as *lases* for *lares*. Frequently the letters *m* and *s* were omitted at the end of words, especially, for the sake of euphony, when the following word began with a consonant—thus we have

duced, and was found to be the same with that of the Pelasgi, and not very different from the alphabet communicated to the Greeks by Cadmus. *Dissertaz. dell Accademia Etrusca*. T. I. p. 1. 1742.

* Quintilian, *Institut.* Lib. 1. c. 7.

† *Questiones Romanæ*.

‡ Festus, voce *Solitaurilia*.

Aleria cepit, for Aleriam cepit. The ancient Romans were equally careful to avoid a hiatus of vowels, and hence they wrote *sin* in place of *si in*. Double consonants were never seen till the time of Ennius*; and we accordingly find in the old inscriptions *sumas* for *summas*: *er* was added to the infinitive passive, as *darier* for *dari*, and *d* was subjoined to words ending with a vowel, as in *altod*, *marid*, *pucnandod*. It likewise appears that the Romans were for a long period unacquainted with the use of aspirates, and were destitute of the *phi* and *chi* sounds of the Greek alphabet. Hence they wrote *triumpe* for *triumphe*, and *pulcer* for *pulcher*†. We also meet with a good many words, particularly substantives, which afterwards became altogether obsolete, and some are applied in a sense different from that in which they were subsequently used. Finally, a difference in the conjugation of the same verb, and a want of inflection in nouns, particularly proper names of countries or cities, where the nominative frequently occurs instead of the accusative, show the unsettled state of the language at that early period†.

It is unnecessary to prosecute farther the history of Roman inscriptions, since, immediately after the erection of the Duilian column in 494, Latin became a written literary language; and although the diphthongs *ai* and *ei* were retained for more than a century longer, most of the other archaisms were totally rejected, and the language was so enriched by a more copious admixture of the Greek, that, while always inferior to that tongue, in ease, precision, perspicuity, and copiousness, it came at length to rival it in dignity of enunciation, and in that lofty accent which harmonized so well with the elevated character of the people by whom it was uttered.

This sudden improvement in language, as well as the equally sudden revolution in taste and literature by which it was accompanied, must be entirely and exclusively attributed to the conquest of Magna Græcia, and the intercourse opened to the Romans with the Greek colonies of Sicily. Their minds were, no doubt, in some measure prepared, during the five centuries which had followed the foundation of the city, for receiving the seeds of learning. The very existence of social life for so long a period must have in some degree reclaimed them from their native barbarism. Freed from hourly alarms excited by the attacks of foes whose territories

* Festus, voce *Solitaurlia*.

† For a fuller detail of these variations see Funccius *de Pueritia Ling. Lat.* c. 5. Id. *de Adolescentia Ling. Lat.* c. 7. and Terrasson, *Hist. de la Jurisprudence Romaine*. Part I. par. 8.

reached almost to the gates of the city, it was now possible for them to enjoy those pleasures which can only be relished in tranquillity; but their genius, I believe, would have remained unproductive and cold for half a millennium longer, had it not been kindled by contact with a more polished and animated nation, whose compositions could not be read without enthusiasm, or imitated without advantage.

However uncertain may be the story concerning the arrival of Cœnotrus in the south of Italy, the passage of the Pelasgi from Epirus to the Po, seventeen generations before the Trojan war, or the settlement of the Arcadian Evander in Latium, there can be no doubt, that, about the commencement of the Roman æra, the dissensions of the reigning families of Greece, the commotions which pervaded its realms, the suggestions of oracles, the uncertain tenure of landed property, the restless spirit of adventure, and seasons of famine, all co-operated in producing an emigration of numerous tribes, chiefly Dorians and Achæans of Peloponnesus, who founded colonies on the coasts of Asia, the Ægean islands, and Italy. In this latter country, (which seems in all ages to have been the resort and refuge of a redundant or unfortunate population,) the Greek strangers first settled in a southern district, then known by the ancient name of Iapygia, and since denominated Calabria. Serenity of climate, joined to the vigour of laws, simplicity of manners, and the energy peculiar to every rising community, soon procured these colonies an enviable increase of prosperity and power. They gradually drove the native inhabitants to the interior of the country, and formed a political state, which assumed the magnificent name of Magna Græcia—an appellation which was by degrees applied to the whole coast which bounds the bay of Tarentum. On that shore, about half a century after the foundation of Rome, arose the flourishing and philosophic town of Crotona, and the voluptuous city of Sybaris. These were the consolidated possessions of the Grecian colonies; but they had also scattered seats all along the western coast of the territory which now forms the kingdom of Naples.

As in most other states, corruption of manners was the consequence of prosperity and the cause of decay. Towards the close of the third century of Rome, Pythagoras had in some measure succeeded in reforming the morals of Crotona, while the rival state of Sybaris, like the Moorish Grenada, hastened to destruction, amid carousals and civil dissensions; and though once capable, as is said, (but probably with some exaggeration,) of bringing three hundred thousand soldiers

into the field*, it sunk, after a short struggle, under the power of Crotona. The other independent states were successively agitated by the violence of popular revolution, and crushed by the severity of despotism. As in the mother country, they had constant dissensions among themselves. This rivalry induced them to call in the assistance of the Sicilians—a measure which prepared the way for their subjection to the vigorous but detestable sway of the elder Dionysius, and of Agathocles. Tarentum, founded about the same time with Sybaris and Crotona, was the most powerful city of the Grecian colonies toward the conclusion of their political existence, and the last formidable rival to the Romans in Italy. Like the neighbouring states, it was chiefly ruined by the succour of foreign allies. Unsuccessfully defended by Alexander Molossus, oppressed by the Syracusan tyrants, and despoiled by Cleomenes of Sparta, neither the genius of Pyrrhus, nor the power of Carthage, could preserve it from the necessity of final submission to the Romans.

In all their varieties of fortune, the Grecian colonies had maintained the manners and institutions of the mother country, which no people ever entirely relinquish with the soil they have left. A close political connection also subsisted between them; and, about the year 300 of Rome, the Athenians sent to the assistance of Sybaris a powerful expedition, which, on the decay of that city, founded the town of Thurium in the immediate vicinity. This constant intercourse cherished and preserved the literary spirit of the colonies of Magna Græcia. Herodotus, the father of history, and Lysias, whose orations are the purest models of the simple Attic eloquence, were, in early youth, among the original founders of the colony of Thurium†, and the latter held a share in its government till an advanced period of life. The Eleatic school of philosophy was founded in Magna Græcia; and the impulse which the wisdom of Pythagoras had given to the mind, promoted also the studies of literature. Plato visited Tarentum during the consulship of Lucius Camillus and Appius Claudius‡, which was in the 406th year of Rome, and Zeuxis was invited from Greece to paint at Crotona the magnificent temple of Juno, which had been erected in that city§.

* This numeration, which rests on the authority of Diodorus Siculus, (Lib. XII.) and Strabo, (Lib. VI.) has been a subject of considerable discussion and controversy in modern times. (See Wallace on the numbers of Mankind, Hume's Essay on Populousness of Ancient Nations, and Gibbon's Miscellaneous Works, vol. III. p. 178.) In all MSS. of ancient authors, the numbers are corrupt and uncertain.

† Plutarch, *De Exilio*. Id. *Vit. decem. Orator*. Strabo, *Geog.* Lib. XIV.

‡ Cicero, *Cato Major, seu de Senectute*, c. 12.

§ Id. *Rhetoricorum*, Lib. II. c. 1.

History and poetry were cultivated with a success which did not dishonour the Grecian name. Lycus of Rhegium was the civil, and Glaucus of the same city was the literary historian of Magna Græcia. Orpheus of Crotona was the author of a poem on the expedition of the Argonauts, attributed to an elder Orpheus. The lyric productions of Ibicus of Rhegium rivalled those of Anacreon and Alcæus. Two hundred and fifty-five comedies, written by Alexis of Thurium, the titles of which have been collected by Meursius, and a few fragments of them by Stephens, are said to have been composed in the happiest vein of the middle comedy of the Greeks, which possessed much of the comic force of Aristophanes and Cratinus, without their malignity. In his *Meropis* and *Ancylis*, this dramatist is supposed to have carped at Plato; and his comedy founded on the life of Pythagoras, was probably in a similar vein of satire. Stephano, the son of Alexis, and who, according to Suidas, was the uncle of Menander, became chiefly celebrated for his tragedies; but his comedies were also distinguished by happy pictures of life, and uncommon harmony of versification.

War, which had so long retarded the progress of literature at Rome, at length became the cause of its culture. The Romans were now involved in a contest with the civilized colonies of Magna Græcia. Accordingly, when they garrisoned Thurium, in order to defend it against the Samnites, and when in 482 they obtained complete possession of Magna Græcia, by the capture of Tarentum, which presented the last resistance to their arms, they could not fail to catch a portion of Grecian taste and spirit, or at least to admire the beautiful creations of Grecian fancy. Many of the conquerors remained in Magna Græcia, while, on the other hand, all the inhabitants of its cities, who were most distinguished for literary attainments, fixed their residence at Rome.

The first Carthaginian war, which broke out in 489, so far from retarding the literary influence of these strangers, accelerated the steps of improvement. Unlike the former contests of the Romans, which were either with neighbouring states, or with barbarous nations who came to attack them in their own territories, it was not attended with that immediate danger which is utterly inconsistent with literary leisure. In its prosecution, too, the Romans for the first time carried their arms beyond Italy. Literature, indeed, was not one of those novelties in which the western part of Africa was fruitful, but, with the exception of Greece itself, there was no country where it flourished more luxuriantly than in Sicily; and that island, as is well known, was the principal scene of the first great strug-

gle between Rome and Carthage. None of the Grecian colonies shone with such splendour as Syracuse, a city founded by the Dorians of Corinth, in the 19th year of Rome. This capital had attained the summit both of political and literary renown long before the first Carthaginian war. Æschylus passed the concluding years of his life in Sicily, and wrote, it is said, his tragedy of *The Persians*, to gratify the curiosity of Hiero I. King of Syracuse, who was desirous to see a representation of the celebrated war which the Greeks had waged against Xerxes. Epicharmus, retained in the same elegant court, was the first who rejected, on the stage, the ancient mummeries of the satires, and composed dramas on that regular elaborate plan, which was reckoned worthy of imitation by Plautus—

“ Dicitur _____
Plautus ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi*.”

Dionysius, the tyrant, was also a patron of learning, and was himself a competitor in the fields of literature. Philistus, the historian, was the friend of the elder, and Plato of the younger Dionysius. Aristippus and Æschines passed some time in the court of these tyrants. Theocritus, and other poets of the Alexandrian constellation, resided in Sicily before they partook in Egypt of the splendid patronage of the Ptolemies. The Syracusans, who put to death so many of their Athenian prisoners in cold blood, and with frightful tortures, spared those of them who could recite the verses of Euripides. Scenic representations were peculiarly popular in Sicily: Its towns were crowded with theatres, and its dramatists were loaded with honours. The theatrical exhibitions which the Roman invaders of Sicily must have witnessed, and the respect there paid to distinguished poets, would naturally awaken literary emulation. During a contest of nearly twenty-four years between Rome and Carthage, Hiero II., King of Syracuse, was the zealous and strenuous ally of the Romans. At the conclusion of peace between these rival nations, in the year 512, part of Sicily was ceded to the Romans, and the intercourse which consequently arose with the inhabitants of this newly-acquired territory, laid the foundation of those studies, which were afterwards brought to perfection by the progress of time, and by direct communication with Greece itself†.

* Horat. *Epist.* Lib. II. ep. 1. v. 59.

† See *Mitth.* *Italia avanti il Domin. dei Romani.* Raoul-Rochette, *Hist. de l'Établissement des Colonies Grecques.* Heynè, *Opusc. Academ.* Nogarola, *Epist. de Baïis qui Græce scripserunt.* ap. Fabricius, *Supplem. ad Vossium De Histor. Lat.*

Accordingly, it is in the end of the fifth, and beginning of the sixth century, from the building of Rome, that we find among its inhabitants the earliest vestiges of literature. Poetry, as with most other nations, was the first of the liberal arts which was cultivated among the Romans; and dramatic poetry, founded on the school of Greece, appears to have been that which was earliest preferred. We have seen, indeed, that previous to this period, and in the year 392, when the city was afflicted with a plague, the Senate decreed that players should be summoned from Etruria to appease the wrath of the gods by scenic representations, and that the Roman youth imitated these expiatory performances, by rallying each other in extemporary verses. This by some has been considered as a dawning of the drama, since the characters probably bore a resemblance to the Arlequin and Scaramouch of the Italian farces. But

LIVIVS ANDRONICUS,

A native of Magna Græcia, was the first who attempted to establish at Rome a regular theatre, or to connect a dramatic fable, free from the mummeries, the *ballet*, and the melo-drama of the ancient satires*. Tiraboschi asserts, that when his country was finally subdued by the Romans, in 482, Livius was made captive and brought to Rome†. It is generally believed that he there became the slave, and afterwards the freedman of Livius Salinator, from whom he derived one of his names: these facts, however, do not seem to rest on any authority more ancient than the Eusebian Chronicle‡. The precise period of his death is uncertain; but in Cicero's Dialogue *De Senectute*, Cato is introduced saying, that he had seen old Livius while he was himself a youth§. Now Cato was born in 519, and since the period of youth among the Romans was considered as commencing at fifteen, it may be presumed that the existence of Livius was at least protracted till the year 534 of the city. It has been frequently said, that he lived till the year 546||, because Livy¶ mentions that a hymn composed by this ancient poet was publicly sung in that

* Ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere. Livy, Lib. VII. c. 2.

† Tiraboschi, *Stor. dell Letteratura Italiana*. Parte III. Lib. II. c. 1.

‡ Hieronym. in *Euseb. Chron.* p. 37. In Scaliger, *Thesaurus Temporum*, ed. Amstel. 1668.

§ Vidi etiam senem Livium, qui usque ad adolescentiam meam processit ætate. *De Senectute*, c. 14.

|| Signorelli, *Storia de Teatri*, Tom. II.

¶ Lib. XXVII. c. 37.

year, to avert the disasters threatened by an alarming prodigy; but the historian does not declare that it was written for the occasion, or even recently before.

The earliest play of Livius was represented in 513 or 514, about a year after the termination of the first Punic war. Osannus, a modern German author, has written a learned and chronological dissertation on the question, in which of these years the first Roman play was performed*; but it is extremely difficult for us to come to any satisfactory conclusion on a subject which, even in the time of Cicero, was one of doubt and controversy†. Like Thespis, and other dramatists in the commencement of the theatrical art, Livius was an actor, and for a considerable time the sole performer in his own pieces. Afterwards, however, his voice failing, in consequence of the audience insisting on a repetition of favourite passages, he introduced a boy who relieved him, by declaiming in concert with the flute, while he himself executed the corresponding gesticulations in the monologues, and in the parts where high exertion was required, employing his own voice only in the conversational and less elevated scenes‡. It was observed that his action grew more lively and animated, because he exerted his whole strength in gesticulating, while another had the care and trouble of pronouncing. "Hence," continues Livy, "the practice arose of reciting those passages which required much modulation of the voice, to the gesture and action of the comedian. Thenceforth the custom so far prevailed, that the comedians never pronounced anything except the verses of the dialogues||:" And this system, which one should think must have completely destroyed the theatric illusion, continued, under certain modifications, to subsist on the Roman stage during the most refined periods of taste and literature.

The popularity of Livius increasing from these performances, as well as from a propitiatory hymn he had composed, and which had been followed by great public success, a building was assigned to him on the Aventine hill. This edifice was partly converted into a theatre, and was also in-

* *Analecta Critica poësis Romanorum Scenica Reliquias Illustrantia*, c. 3. ed. Berlin, 1816.

† Est enim inter scriptores de numero annorum controversia. *Cicero, Brutus*, c. 18. Cicero, however, fixes on the year 514, following, as he says, the account of his friend Atticus.

‡ Livy, Lib. VII. c. 2. Quum sæpius revocatus vocem obtudisset, venit pedita, puerum ad canendum ante tūbicinem quum statuisset, canticum egisse, aliquanto magis vigente motu, quia nihil vocis usus impediēbat.

|| Inde ad manum cantari histrionibus coeptum, diverbiaque tantum ipsorum voci reflecta.—*Ibid.*

habited by a troop of players, for whom Livius wrote his pieces, and frequently acted along with them*.

It has been disputed whether the first drama represented by Livius Andronicus at Rome was a tragedy or comedy†. However this may be, it appears from the names which have been preserved of his plays, that he wrote both tragedies and comedies. These titles, which have been collected by Fabricius and other writers, are, *Achilles*, *Adonis*, *Ægisthus*, *Ajax*, *Andromeda*, *Antiopa*, *Centauri*, *Equus Trojanus*, *Helena*, *Hermione*, *Ino*, *Lydius*, *Protesilaodamia*, *Serenus*, *Tereus*, *Teucer*, *Virgo*‡. Such names also evince that most of his dramas were translated or imitated from the works of his countrymen of Magna Græcia, or from the great tragedians of Greece. Thus, Æschylus wrote a tragedy on the subject of Ægisthus: There is still an Ajax of Sophocles extant, and he is known to have written an Andromeda: Stobæus mentions the Antiopa of Euripides: Four Greek dramatists, Sophocles, Euripides, Anaxandrides, and Philæterus, composed tragedies on the subject of Tereus; and Epicharmus, as well as others, chose for their comedies the story of the Syrens.

Little, however, except the titles, remains to us, from the dramas of Livius. The longest passage we possess in connection, extends only to four lines. It forms part of a hymn to Diana, recited by the chorus, in the tragedy of *Ino*, and contains an animated exhortation to a person about to proceed to the chase:—

“ Et jam purpureo suras include cothurno,
Balthus et revocet volucres in pectore sinus;
Pressaque jam gravida crepitent tibi terga pharetra:
Dirige odorisequos ad cæca cubilia canesq̄.”

This passage testifies the vast improvement effected by Livius on the Latin Tongue; and indeed the polish of the language and metrical correctness of these hexameter lines, have of late led to a suspicion that they are not the production of a period so ancient as the age of Livius||, or at least that they

* Festus, voce *Scribas*. † Osannus, *Analecta Critica*, c. 8. *Bibliotheca Latina*, Tom. III. Lib. IV. c. 1.

§ “ Let the red buskin now your limbs invest,
And the loose robe be belted to your breast;
The rattling quiver let your shoulders bear—
Throw off the hounds which scent the secret lair.”

|| Jos. Scaliger, *Lectionibus Æsonianis*, where the lines are attributed to Lævius. ap. Sagittarius, *de Vita L. Andronici*, c. 8. Osannus, *Analecta Critica*, c. 2. p. 36. Some verses in the *Carmen de Arte Metrica* of Terentianus Maurus, are the chief authority for these hexameters being by Livius:—

“ Livius ille vetus Grajo cognomine, suæ
Inserit Inonis versu, puto, tale docimen,
Præmisso heroo subjungit namque *μυσογον*,
Hymno quando Chorus festo canit ore Trivium—
‘ Et jam purpureo,’ &c.

have been modernised by some later hand. With this earliest offspring of the Latin muse, it may be curious to compare a production from her last age of decrepitude. Nemesianus, in his *Cyngeticon*, has closely imitated this passage while exhorting Diana to prepare for the chase :

“ Sume habitus, arcumque manu ; pictamque pharetram
Suspende ex humeris ; sint aurea tela, sagittæ ;
Candida puniceis aptentur crura cothurnis :
Sit chlamys aurato multum subtemine lusa,
Corrugæque sinus gemmatis baltheus artet
Nexibus——”

As the above-quoted verses in the chorus of the *Ivo* are the only passage among the fragments of Livius, from which a connected meaning can be elicited, we must take our opinion of his poetical merits from those who judged of them while his writings were yet wholly extant. Cicero has pronounced an unfavourable decision, declaring that they scarcely deserved a second perusal*. They long, however, continued popular in Rome, and were read by the youths in schools even during the Augustan age of poetry. It is evident, indeed, that during that golden period of Roman literature, there prevailed a taste corresponding to our black-letter rage, which led to an inordinate admiration of the works of Livius, and to the bitter complaints of Horace, that they should be extolled as perfect, or held up by old pedants to the imitation of youth in an age when so much better models existed :

“ Non equidem insector, delendaque carmina Livii
Esse reor, memini quæ plagosum mihi parvo
Orbilium dictare ; sed emendata videri,
Pulchraque, et exactis minimum distantia, miror :
Inter quæ verbum emicuit si forte decorum, et
Si versus paulo concinnior unus et alter ;
Injuste totum ducit venditque poema.”

But although Livius may have been too much read in the schools, and too much admired in an age, which could boast of models so greatly superior to his writings, he is at least entitled to praise, as the inventor among the Romans of a species of poetry which was afterwards carried by them to much higher perfection. By translating the *Odyssey*, too, into Latin verse, he adopted the means which, of all others, was most likely to foster and improve the infant literature of his country—as he thus presented it with an image of the most

* Livianæ fabule non satis dignæ quæ iterum legantur. *Brutus*, c. 18.

† *Epist. Lib. II. Ep. 1. v. 69.*

pure and perfect taste, and at the same time with those wild and romantic adventures, which are best suited to attract the sympathy and interest of a half-civilized nation. This happy influence could not be prevented even by the use of the rugged Saturnian verse, which led Cicero to compare the translation of Livius to the ancient statues, which might be attributed to Dædalus*.

The Latin Odyssey commenced—

“Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum.”

There have also been three lines preserved by Festus, which are translated from the 8th Book, expressing the effects produced on the mind by a sea-storm—

————— “Namque nilum pejus
Macerat hemonem quamde mare sævom: vires quot
Sunt magnæ, tæpper confringent importunæ undæ†.”

From the æra in which the dramatic productions of Livius appeared, theatrical representations formed the object of a peculiar art. The more regular drama, founded on that of Magna Græcia, or Sicily, being divided into tragedy and comedy, became, in a great measure, the province of professional players or authors, while the Roman youths of distinction continued to amuse themselves with the *Fabulæ Atellanæ*, and *Exodia*, a species of satirical medley, derived from the ancient Etruscans, or from the Osci, the nature and progress of which I shall hereafter have occasion more particularly to examine.

CNEIUS NÆVIUS,

A native of Campania, was the first imitator of the regular dramatic works which had been produced by Livius Andronicus. He served in the first Punic war, and his earliest plays were represented at Rome in the year 519‡. The names of his tragedies, from which as few fragments remain as from those of Livius, are still preserved:—*Alcestis*, (from which there is yet extant a description of old age in rugged and barbarous verse)—*Danae*, *Dulorestes*, *Hesiona*, *Hector*, *Iphigenia*, *Lycurgus*, *Phænissæ*, *Protesilaus*, and *Telephus*. All

* *Brutus*, c. 18.

† ————— “Nought worse can be
For wearing out a man than the rough sea;
Even though his force be great, and heart be brave.
All will be broken by the vexing wave.”

‡ *Au. Gellius*, Lib. XVII. c. 21. Ed. Lugd. Bat. 1666.

these were translated, or closely imitated from the works of Euripides, Anaxandrides, and other Greek dramatists. Cicero commends a passage in the *Hector*, one of the above-mentioned tragedies*, where the hero of the piece, delighted with the praises which he had received from his father Priam, exclaims—

“—————Lætus sum
Laudari me abs te, pater, laudato viro†.”

Nævius, however, was accounted a better comic than tragic poet. Cicero has given us some specimens of his jests, with which that celebrated wit and orator appears to have been greatly amused; but they consist rather in unexpected turns of expression, or a play of words, than in genuine humour. One of these, recorded in the second Book *De Oratore*, has found its way into our jest-books; and though one of the best in Cicero, it is one of the worst of Joe Miller. It is the saying of a knavish servant, “that nothing was shut up from him in his master’s house”.—“Solum esse, cui domi nihil sit nec obsignatum, nec oclusum: Quod idem,” adds Cicero, “in bono servo dici solet, sed hoc iisdem etiam verbis.”

Unfortunately for Nævius, he did not always confine himself in his comedies to such inoffensive jests. The dramas of Magna Græcia and Sicily, especially those of Epicharmus, were the prototypes of the older Greek comedy; and accordingly the most ancient Latin plays, particularly those of Nævius, which were formed on the same school, though there be no evidence that they ridiculed political events, partook of the personal satire and invective which pervaded the productions of Aristophanes. If, as is related, the comedies of Nævius were directed against the vices and corporal defects of the Consuls and Senators of Rome, he must have been the most original of the Latin comic poets, and infinitely more so than Plautus or Terence; since although he may have parodied or copied the dramatic fables of the ancient Greek or Sicilian comedies, the spirit and colouring of the particular scenes must have been his own. The elder Scipio was one of the chief objects of his satiric representations, and the poetic severity with which Aristophanes persecuted Socrates or Euripides, was hardly more indecent and misdirected than the sarcasms of Nævius against the greatest captain, the most accomplished scholar, and the most virtuous citizen of his age.

* *Tuscul. Disput.* Lib. IV. c. 31.

† “————— My spirits, sire, are raised,
Thus to be praised by one the world has praised.”

Some lines are still extant, in which he lampooned Scipio on account of a youthful amour, in which he had been detected by his father—

“ Etiam qui res magnas manu sæpe gessit gloriose,
Cujus facta viva nunc vigent, qui apud gentes solus
Præstat, eum suus pater, cum pallio uno, ab amicâ abduxit.”

The conqueror of Hannibal treated these libels with the same indifference with which Cæsar afterwards regarded the lines of Catullus. Nævius, however, did not long escape with impunity. Rome was a very different sort of republic from Athens: It was rather an aristocracy than a democracy, and its patricians were not always disposed to tolerate the taunts and insults which the chiefs of the Greek democracy were obliged to endure. Nævius had said in one of his verses, that the patrician family of the Metelli had frequently obtained the Consulship before the age permitted by law, and he insinuated that they had been promoted to this dignity, not in consequence of their virtues, but the cruelty of the Roman fate :

“ Fato Metelli Romæ fiunt Consules.”

With the assistance of the other patricians, the Metelli retorted his sarcasms in a Saturnian stanza, not unlike the measure of some of our old ballads, in which they threatened to play the devil with their witty persecutor—

“ Et Nævio Poetæ,
Cum sæpe læderentur,
Dabunt malum Metelli,
Dabunt malum Metelli,
Dabunt malum Metelli.”

The Metelli, however, did not confine their vengeance to this ingenious and spirited satire, in the composition of which, it may be presumed that the whole Roman Senate was engaged. On account of the unceasing abuse and reproaches which he had uttered against them, and other chief men of the city, he was thrown into prison, where he wrote his comedies, the *Hariolus* and *Leontes*. These plays being in some measure intended as a recantation of his former invectives, he was liberated by the tribunes of the people*. He soon, however, relapsed into his former courses, and continued to persecute the nobility in his dramas and satires with such implacable dislike, that he was at length driven from Rome by their in-

* Au. Gellius. Lib. III. c. 3. Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, Lib. I. c. 2.

fluence, and having retired to Utica*, he died there, in the year 550, according to Cicero†; but Varro fixes his death somewhat later. Before leaving Rome, he had composed the following epitaph on himself, which Gellius remarks is full of Campanian arrogance; though the import of it, he adds, might be allowed to be true, had it been written by another‡;

“ Mortales immortales flere si foret fas,
Flerent divæ Camœnæ Nævium poetam;
Itaque postquam est Orcino traditus thesauro,
Oblitei sunt Romæ loquier Latina lingua.”

Besides his comedies and the above epitaph, Nævius was also author of the Cyprian Iliad, a translation from a Greek poem, called the *Cyrian Epic*. Aristotle, in the 23d chapter of his Poetics, mentions the original work, (ρα κυρεια,) which, he says, had furnished many subjects for the drama. Some writers, particularly Pindar, have attributed this Greek poem to Homer; and there was long an idle story current, that he had given it as a portion to his daughter Arsephone. Herodotus, in his second Book, concludes, after some critical discussion, that it was not written by Homer, but that it was doubtless the work of a contemporary poet, or one who lived shortly after him. Heyne thinks it most probable, that it was by a poet called Stasinus, a native of the island of Cyprus, and that it received its name from the country of its author||. Whoever may have written this Cyprian Epic, it contained twelve books, and was probably a work of amorous and romantic fiction. It commenced with the nuptials of Thetis and Peleus—it related the contention of the three goddesses on Mount Ida—the fables concerning Palamedes—the story of the daughters of Anius—and the love adventures of the Phrygian fair during the early period of the siege of Troy—and it terminated with the council of the gods, at which it was resolved that Achilles should be withdrawn from the war, by sowing dissension between him and Atides¶.

* Hieronym. *Chronicum Eusebianum*, p. 37, ut supra.

† Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 15. ‡ Au. Gellius, Lib. I. c. 24.

§ “ If blest immortals mortals might bemoan,
Each heavenly Muse would Nævius' loss deplore:
Soon as his spirit to the shades had flown,
In Rome the Roman tongue was heard no more.”

|| Heyne, *Excurs.* 1. ad Lib. II. *Æneid*.

¶ Id. ad *Æneid*. The Cyprian Iliad had long been almost universally ascribed to Nævius, and lines were quoted from it as his by all the old grammarians. Several modern German critics, however, think that it was the work of Lævius, a poet who lived some time after Nævius, since the lines preserved from the Cyprian Iliad are hexameters,—a measure not elsewhere used by Nævius, nor introduced into Italy, according to their supposition, before the time of Ennius. Osannus, *Asiatica Critica*, p. 36. Herman, *Elementa Doctrinæ Metricæ*, p. 210. Ed. Glasg. 1817.

A metrical chronicle, which chiefly related the events of the first Punic war, was another, and probably the last work of Nævius, since Cicero says, that in writing it he filled up the leisure of his latter days with wonderful complacency and satisfaction*. It was originally undivided; but, after his death, was separated into seven books†.—Although the first Punic war was the principal subject, as appears from its announcement,

“ Qui terræ Latii hemonēs tuserunt
Vires fraudesque Poinicas labor;”

yet it also afforded a rapid sketch of the preceding incidents of Roman history. It commenced with the flight of Æneas from Carthage, in a ship built by Mercury‡; and the early wars of the Romans were detailed in the first and second books. To judge by the fragments which remain, the whole work appears to have been full of mythological machinery. Macrobius informs us, that some lines of this production described the Romans tost by a tempest, and represented Venus complaining of the hardships which they suffered to Jupiter, who consoles her by a prospect of their future glory—a passage which probably suggested those verses in the first book of the Æneid, where Venus, in like manner, complains to Jupiter of the danger experienced by her son in a storm, and the god consoles her by assurances of his ultimate prosperity§. Cicero mentions, that Ennius, too, though he classes Nævius among the fauns and rustic bards, had borrowed, or, if he refused to acknowledge his obligations, had pilfered, many ornaments from his predecessor||. In the same passage, Cicero, while he admits that Ennius was the more elegant and correct writer, bears testimony to the merit of the older bard, and declares, that the Punic war of this antiquated poet afforded him a pleasure as exquisite as the finest statue that was ever formed by Myron. To judge, however, from the lines which remain, though in general too much broken to enable us even to divine their meaning, the style of Nævius in this

* *De Senectute*. c. 14.

† Suetonius, *De Illust. Grammat.*

‡ Servius, *Ad Æneid.* Lib. 1.

§ *Saturnalia*, Lib. VI. c. 2. Ed. Lugduni, 1560. I am anxious to take this opportunity of remarking, that the books and chapters of the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius are differently divided in different editions. The same observation applies to many of the books most frequently referred to in the course of this work, as Pliny's *Natural History*, Aulus Gellius, and Cicero. This difference in the division of chapters, I fear, has led to a suspicion with regard to the accuracy of a few of my references, which, however, have been uniformly verified on some edition or other, though I cannot pretend that I have always had access to the best.

|| *Brutus*, c. 19.

work was more rugged and remote from modern Latin than that of his own plays and satires, or the dramas of Livius Andronicus.

The whole, too, is written in the rough, unmodulated, Saturnian verse—a sort of irregular iambics, said to have been originally employed by Faunus and the prophets, who delivered their oracles in this measure. To such rude and unpolished verses Ennius alludes in a fragment of his Annals, while explaining his reasons for not treating of the first Punic war—

——— “ Scripsere alii rem
Versibus, quos olim Fauni, vatesque canebant;
Cum neque Musarum scopulos quisquam superarat,
Nec dicti studiosus erat.”

As this was the most ancient species of measure employed in Roman poetry, as it was universally used before the melody of Greek verse was poured on the Roman ear, and as, from ancient practice, the same strain continued to be repeated till the age of Ennius, by whom the heroic measure was introduced, it would not be suitable to omit some notice of its origin and structure in an account of Roman literature and poetry.

Several writers have supposed that the Saturnian measure was borrowed by the Romans from the Greeks*, having been used by Euripides, and particularly by Archilochus; but others have believed that it was an invention of the ancient Italians†. It was first employed in the Carmen Saliare, songs of triumph, supplications to the gods, or monumental inscriptions, and was afterwards, as we have seen, adopted in the works of Livius Andronicus and Nævius. In consequence of the fragments which remain of the Saturnian verses being so short and corrupted, it is extremely difficult to fix their regular measure, or reduce them to one standard of versification. Herman seems to consider a Saturnian line as having regularly consisted of two iambytes, an amphibrachys, and three trochaës—

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & \cup & - \\ | & | & | & | & | & | & | \\ \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup \end{array}$$

A dactyl, however, was occasionally admitted into the place of the first or second trochaë, and a spondee was not unfrequently introduced indiscriminately. It also appears that a

* Fortunatianus. Edit. Putsch. p. 2679. Bentley, *Dissert. on Phalaris*, p. 162. Hawkins, *Inquiry into the Nature of Latin Poetry*, p. 452. Ed. Lond. 1817.

† Merula, Ed. Ennii Fragm. p. 88. Herman, *Elementa Doct. Met.* p. 896.

Saturnian line was sometimes divided into two—the first line consisting of the two iamboes and amphibrachys, and the second of the trochaës, whence the Saturnian verse has been sometimes called iambic, and at others trochaic.

The Hexameter verse, which had been invented by the Greeks, was first introduced into Latium, or at least, was first employed in a work of any extent, by

ENNIUS,

—————“ Qui primus amœno
Detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
Per gentes Italas hominum quæ clara clueret.”

This poet, who has generally received the glorious appellation of the Father of Roman Song, was a native of Rudia, a town in Calabria, and lived from the year of Rome 515 to 585*. In his early youth he went to Sardinia; and, if Silius Italicus may be believed, he served in the Calabrian levies, which, in the year 538, followed Titus Manlius to the war which he waged in that island against the favourers of the Carthaginian cause†. After the termination of the campaign, he continued to live for twelve years in Sardinia‡. He was at length brought to Rome by Cato, the Censor, who, in 550, visited Sardinia, on returning as questor from Africa§. At Rome he fixed his residence on the Aventine hill, where he lived in a very frugal manner, having only a single servant maid as an attendant||. He instructed, however, the Patrician youth in Greek, and acquired the friendship of many of the most illustrious men in the state. Being distinguished (like Æschylus, the great father of Grecian tragedy) in arms as well as letters, he followed M. Fulvius Nobilior during his expedition to Ætolia in 564¶; and in 569 he obtained the freedom of the city, through the favour of Quintus Fulvius Nobilior, the son of his former patron, Marcus*†. He was also protected by the elder Scipio Africanus, whom he is said to have accompanied in all his campaigns:

* Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 18. *Id. De Senect.* c. 5. † Sil. Ital. Lib. XII.

‡ Aurelius Victor says he taught Cato Greek in Sardinia, (In prætura Sardiniam subegit, ubi ab Ennio Græcis literis institutus;) but this is inconsistent with what is related by Cicero, that Cato did not acquire Greek till old age. (*De Senectute*, c. 8.)

§ Cornelius Nepos, *In Vita Catonis*.

|| Hieron. *Chron. Euseb.* p. 37.

¶ Cicero, *Pro Archia*, c. 10. *Tusc. Disput.* Lib. I. c. 2.

*† Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 20.

“ Hæreat doctus lateri, castrisque solebat
Omnibus in medias Ennius ire tubas*.”

It is difficult, however, to see in what expeditions he could have attended this renowned general. His Spanish and African wars were concluded before Ennius was brought from Sardinia to Rome; and the campaign against Antiochus was commenced and terminated while he was serving under Fulvius Nobilior in *Ætolia*†. In his old age he obtained the friendship of Scipio Nasica; and the degree of intimacy subsisting between them has been characterised by the well-known anecdote of their successively feigning to be from home‡. He is said to have been intemperate in drinking§, which brought on the disease called *Morbus Articularis*, a disorder resembling the gout, of which he died at the age of seventy, just after he had exhibited his tragedy of *Thyestes*:

“ Ennius ipse pater dum pocula siccat iniqua,
Hoc vitio tales furtur meruisse dolores||.”

The evils, however, of old age and indigence were supported by him, as we learn from Cicero, with such patience, and even cheerfulness, that one would almost have imagined he derived satisfaction from circumstances which are usually regarded, as being, of all others, the most dispiriting and oppressive¶. The honours due to his character and talents were, as is frequently the case, reserved till after his death, when a bust of him was placed in the family tomb of the Scipios*†, who, till the time of Sylla, continued the practice of burying, instead of burning, their dead. In the days of Livy, the bust still remained near that sepulchre, beyond the *Porta Capena*, along with the statues of Africanus and Scipio Asiaticus.†† The tomb was discovered in 1780, on a farm situated between the *Via Appia* and *Via Latina*. The slabs, which have been since removed to the Vatican, bear several inscriptions, commemorating different persons of the Scipian family. Neither statues, nor any other memorial, then existed of Africanus

* Claudian, *de Laud. Stilichonis*, Lib. III. Præf.

† Müller thinks it was in Sardinia he served under Africanus. *Einleitung zu Xenias Lateinischen Schriftsteller*, Tom. I. p. 378. Ed. Dresden, 1747—51.

‡ Cicero, *De Orat.* Lib. II. c. 68.

§ Horat. *Epist.* Lib. I. Ep. 19. v. 7.

|| Ser. Sammonicus, *de Medicina*, c. 37.

¶ Annos septuaginta natus, ita ferebat duo, quæ maxima putantur onera, paupertatem et senectutem, ut illis pæne delectari videretur. *De Senectute*, c. 5.

*† Cicero, *pro Archia*, c. 9. Valerius Maximus, Lib. VIII. c. 15. § 1.

†† Lib. XXXVIII. c. 56.

himself, or of Asiaticus*; but a laurelled bust of Pepperino stone, which was found in this tomb, and which now stands on the Sarcophagus of Scipio Barbatus in the Vatican, is supposed to be that of Ennius†. There is also still extant an epitaph on this poet, reported to have been written by himself‡, stongly characteristic of that overweening conceit and that high estimation of his own talents, which are said to have formed the chief blemish of his character:—

“Aspicite, O cives, senis Enni imaginis formam :
Hic vestrum panxit maxuma facta patrum.
Nemo me lacrumis decoret, nec funera fletu
Faxit—cur? volito vivus per ora virūm§.”

The lines formerly quoted||, which were written by Nævius for his tomb-stone, express as high a sense of his own poetical merits as the above verses; but there is in them something plaintive and melancholy, quite different from the triumphant exultation in the epitaph of Ennius.

To judge by the fragments of his works which remain, Ennius greatly surpassed his predecessors, not only in poetical genius, but in the art of versification. By his time, indeed, the best models of Greek composition had begun to be studied at Rome. Ennius particularly professed to have imitated Homer, and tried to persuade his countrymen that the soul and genius of that great poet had revived in him, through the medium of a peacock, according to the process of Pythagorean transmigration. It is to this fantastic genealogy that Persius has alluded in his 6th satire:—

“Cor jubet hoc Enni, postquam destertuit esse
Mæonides Quintus, pavone ex Pythagoreo.”

From the following lines of Lucretius it would appear, that Ennius somewhere in his works had feigned that the shade of Homer appeared to him, and explained to him the nature and laws of the universe:—

“Etsi præterea tamen esse Acherusia Tempia
Ennius æternis exponit versibus edens ;
Quo neque permanent animæ, neque corpora nostra,

* Banks, *Civil History of Rome*, Vol. I. p. 357. Hobhouse, *Illustrations of Childe Harold*, p. 167.

† *Rome in the 19th Century*, Letter 36.

‡ Cicero, *Truscul. Disput.* Lib. I. c. 15.

§ “Romans, the form of Ennius here behold,
Who sung your fathers’ matchless deeds of old.
My fate let no lament or tear deplore,
I live in fame, although I breathe no more.”

|| See above, p. 61.

Sed quedam simulacra modis pallentia miris :
Unde, sibi exortam, semper florentis Homeri
Commemorat speciem, lacrimas effundere salsas
Cœpisse, et rerum naturam expandere dictis."

Accordingly, we find in the fragments of Ennius many imitations of the Iliad and Odyssey. It is, however, the Greek tragic writers whom Ennius has chiefly imitated; and indeed it appears from the fragments which remain, that all his plays were rather translations from the dramas of Sophocles and Euripides, on the same subjects which he has chosen, than original tragedies. They are founded on the old topics of Priam and Paris, Hector and Hecuba; and truly Ennius, as well as most other Latin tragedians, seems to have anticipated Horace's maxim—

"Rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus,
Quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus."

But although it be quite clear that all the plays of Ennius were translated, or closely imitated, from the Greek, there is occasionally some difficulty in fixing on the drama which was followed, and also in ascertaining whether there be any original passage whatever in the Latin imitation. This difficulty arises from the practice adopted by the Greek dramatists, of new modelling their tragedies. Euripides, in particular, sometimes altered his plays after their first representation, in order to accommodate them to the circumstances of the times, and to obviate the sarcastic criticisms of Aristophanes, who had frequently exposed whole scenes to ridicule. With such views, considerable changes were made on *Iphigenia in Aulis*, the *Hippolytus*, and *Medea*. Euripides is the author from whom Ennius has chiefly borrowed the fables of his tragedies; and when Sophocles and Euripides have treated the same subject, the latter poet has been uniformly preferred. Not one of the dramas of Ennius has been imitated from *Æschylus*. The reason of this is sufficiently obvious: The plays of *Æschylus* have little involution of plot, and are rather what we should now term dramatic sketches, than tragedies. The plots of Sophocles are more complex than those of *Æschylus*; but the tragedies of Euripides are the most involved of all. Now, it may be presumed, that a tragedy crowded with action, and filled with the bustle of a complicated fable, was best adapted to the taste of the Romans, because we *know* that this was their taste in comedy. Plautus combined two Greek comedies to form one Latin; and the representation of the *Hecyra* of Terence, the only Latin play formed on the

simple Greek model, was repeatedly abandoned by the people before it was concluded, for the sake of amusements of more tumult and excitement.

Of *Achilles*, which, in alphabetical order, is the first of the plays of Ennius, there are just extant seven lines, which have been preserved by Nonius and Festus; and from such remains it is impossible to know what part of the life or actions of the Grecian hero Ennius had selected as the subject of his plot. There were many Greek tragedies on the story of Achilles, of which, one by Aristarchus of Tegea, was the most celebrated, and is supposed to have been that from which Ennius copied.

Ajax. Sophocles was author of two tragedies founded on the events of the life of Ajax;—*Ajax Flagellifer*, and *Ajax Locrensis*. The first turns on the phrensy with which the Grecian hero was seized, on being refused the arms of Achilles, and it may be conjectured, from a single fragment, apparently at the very close of the tragedy by Ennius, and which describes the attendants raising the body of Ajax, streaming with blood, that this was the piece translated by the Roman poet.

Alcmæon. This play, of which the fable closely resembles the story of Orestes, has by some been attributed to the Latin poet Quintus Catulus. The transports of Alcmæon had been frequently exhibited on the Greek stage*. The drama of Ennius was taken from a tragedy of Euripides, which is now lost, but its subject is well known from the Thebaid of Statius. The soothsayer Amphiaraus, foreseeing that he would perish at the siege of Thebes, concealed himself from the crimps of those days; but his wife, Eryphile, who alone knew the place of his retreat, being bribed by the gift of a mantle and necklace, revealed the secret to one of the "Seven before Thebes," who compelled him to share in the expedition. Before death, the prophet enjoined his son, Alcmæon, to avenge him on his faithless wife. The youth, in compliance with this pious command, slew his mother, and was afterwards tormented by the Furies, who would only be appeased by a gift of the whole *paraphernalia* of Eryphile, which were accordingly hung up in their temple. As soon as their persecution ceased, he married the fair Calirrhoe, daughter of Achelous, and precipitately judging that the consecrated necklace would be better bestowed on his beautiful bride than on the beldames by whom he had so long been haunted, he contrived, on false pretences, to purloin it from the place where it was deposited; but the

* Alcmæon olim tragicorum pulpita lassavit cum furore suo. Barth. in Statium. Tom. II.

Furies were not to be so choused out of their perquisites, and in consequence of his rash preference, Alcmeon was compelled to suffer a renewed phrensy, and to undergo a fresh course of expiatory ceremonies*.

Alexander (Paris). The plot of this play hinges on the destruction of Troy. The passages which remain are a heavenly admonition to Priam on the crimes of his son, a lamentation for the death of Hector, and a prediction of Cassandra concerning the wooden horse. Planck, in his recent edition of the *Medea* of Ennius, while he does not deny that our poet may have written a tragedy with the title of *Alexander*, is of opinion that the fragments quoted as from this play in the editions of Ennius belong properly to his *Alexandra (Cassandra)*, to which subject they are perfectly applicable. This German critic has also collected a good many fragments belonging to the *Cassandra*, which had been omitted in Columna and Merula's editions of Ennius. The longest of these passages, delivered by Cassandra in the style of a prophecy, seems to refer to events previous to the Trojan war—the judgment of Paris, and arrival of Helen from Sparta.

Andromache. It is uncertain from what Greek writer this tragedy has been translated. It seems to be founded on the lamentable story of Andromache, who fell, with other Trojan captives, to the share of Neoptolemus, and saw her only son, Astyanax, torn from her embraces, to be precipitated from the summit of a tower, in compliance with the injunctions of an oracle. Among the fragments of this play, we possess one of the longest passages extant of the works of Ennius, containing a pathetic lamentation of Andromache for the fall and conflagration of Troy, with a comparison between its smoking ruins and former splendour. This passage Cicero styles, "Præclarum Carmen:"—"Est enim," he adds, "et rebus, et verbis, et modis lugubret†."

———"Quid petam

Præsidî aut exsequar? quo nunc aut exilio aut fugâ freta sum?

Arce et urbe orba sum; quo accidam? quo applicem?

Cui nec aræ patriæ domi stant; fractæ et disjectæ jacent;

Fana flammâ deflagrata; tostî alti stant parietes.

O Pater, O Patria, O Priami domus;

Septum altisono cardine templum:

Vidi ego te, adstante ope barbarica,

Tectis cælatis, laqueatis,

Auro, ebore instructum regifice.

* Those who wish more particulars concerning the necklace may consult Bayle, Art. *Calirrhoe*.

† *Tuscul. Disput.* Lib. III. c. 19.

Hæc omnia vidi inflammarî,
Priamò vi vitam evitari,
Jovis aram sanguine turpari*."

Andromache Molottus is translated from the *Andromache* of Euripides, and is so called from Molottus, the son of Neoptolemus and Andromache.

Andromeda. Livius Andronicus had formerly written a Latin play on the well-known story of Perseus and Andromeda, which was translated from Sophocles. The play of Ennius, however, on the same subject, was a version of a tragedy of Euripides, now chiefly known from the ridicule cast on it in the fifth act of Aristophanes' *Feasts of Ceres*. That Ennius' drama was translated from Euripides, is sufficiently manifest, from a comparison of its fragments with the passages of the Greek *Andromeda*, preserved by Stobæus.

Athamas. There is only one short fragment of this play now extant.

Cresphontes. Merope, believing that her son Cresphontes had been slain by a person who was brought before her, discovers, when about to avenge on him the death of her child, that she whom she had mistaken for the murderer is Cresphontes himself.

Dulorestes. Of this play there is only one line remaining, and of course it is almost impossible to ascertain from what Greek original it was borrowed. Even this single verse has by several critics been supposed to be falsely attributed to Ennius, and to belong, in fact, to the *Dulorestes* of Pacuvius†.

Erectheus. There is just enough of this play extant to have satisfied Columna, one of the editors of Ennius, that it was taken from a tragedy of the same name by Euripides. As told by Hyginus, the fable concerning Erectheus, King of Attica, was, that he had four daughters, who all pledged themselves not to survive the death of any one of their number. Eumolpus, son of Neptune, being slain at the siege of Athens, his father required that one of the daughters of Erectheus should be sacrificed to him in compensation. This having

- * "Where shall I refuge seek or aid obtain?
In flight or exile can I safety gain?—
Our city sacked—even scorched the walls of stone,
Our fanes consumed, and altars all o'erthrown.
O Father—country—Priam's ruined home;
O hallowed temple with resounding dome,
And vaulted roof with fretted gold illumed—
All now, alas! these eyes have seen consumed:
Have seen the foe shed royal Priam's blood,
And stain Jove's altar with the crimson flood."

† This subject is fully discussed in Eberhardt, *Zustand der Schönen Wissenschaften bei den Römern*, p. 88. Ed. Altona, 1801.

been accomplished, her sisters slew themselves as a matter of course, and Erechtheus was soon afterwards struck by Jupiter with thunder, at the solicitation of Neptune. The longest passage preserved from this tragedy is the speech of Colophonia, when about to be sacrificed to Neptune by her father.

Eumenides. This play, translated from Æschylus, exhibited the phrensy of Orestes, and his final absolution from the vengeance of the Furies.

Hectoris Lytrix vel Lustra, so called from λυω, *solvo*, turned on the redemption from Achilles by Priam, of the body of Hector. It appears, however, from the fragments, that the combat of Hector, and the brutal treatment of his corse by Achilles, had been represented or related in the early scenes of the piece.

Hecuba. This is a free translation from the Greek *Hecuba*, perhaps the most tragic of all the dramas of Euripides. From the work of Ennius, there is still extant a speech by the shade of Polydorus, announcing in great form his arrival from Acheron. This soliloquy, which is a good deal expanded from the original Greek, always produced a great sensation in the Roman theatre, and is styled by Cicero, *Grande Carmen**.—

“ Adsum, atque advenio Acherunte, vix via alta, atque ardua,
Per speluncas saxeis structas asperis pendentibus
Maxumeis; ubi rigida constat et crassa caligo inferum;
Unde animæ excitantur obscura umbra, aperto ostio
Alti Acheruntis, falso sanguine imagines mortuorum†.”

A speech of Hecuba, on seeing the dead body of Polydorus, and in which she reproaches the Greeks as having no punishment for the murder of a parent or a guest, seems to have been added by Ennius himself, at least it is not in the Greek original of Euripides. On the whole, indeed, the *Hecuba* of Ennius appears, so far as we can judge from the fragments, to be the least servile of his imitations. In Columna's edition of Ennius, an opportunity is afforded by corresponding quotations from the Greek *Hecuba*, of comparing the manner in which the Latin poet has varied, amplified, or compressed the thoughts of his original. In Euripides, Hecuba, while persuading Ulysses to intercede for Polixena, says—

* *Tuscul. Disput.* Lib. I. c. 16.

† “ I comê—retraced the paths profound that lead
Through rugged caves, from mansions of the dead:
Mid these huge caverns Cold and Darkness dwell,
And Shades pass through them from the gates of Hell—
When roused from rest, by blood of victims slain,
The Sorcerer calls them forth with rites obscene.”

“ Τὸ δ' ἀξίωμα, καὶ κακῶς λέγῃς, τὸ σὺν
Πίσσι. Λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούτων ἴων,
Καὶ ἅ ταν δοκούντων αὐτῶς, οὐ ταυτὸν σθένι.”

Ennius imitates this as follows :

“ Hæc tu, etsi perverse dices, facile Achivos flexeris;
Namque opulenti cum loquuntur pariter atque ignobiles,
Eadem dicta, eademque oratio æqua non æque valent.”

This has been copied by Plautus, and from him by Moliere in his *Amphitruon*—

“ Tous les discours sont des sottises
Partant d'un homme sans eclat;
Ce seroient paroles exquisées,
Si c'etoit un grand qui parlat.”

The last link in this chain of imitation, is Pope's well-known lines—

“ What woful stuff this madrigal would be,
In some starved hackney sonnetteer or me!
But let a lord once own the happy lines,
How the wit brightens, how the style refines !”

Iliona sive Polydorus.—Priam, during the siege of Troy, had entrusted his son Polydorus to the care of Polymnestor, King of Thrace, who was married to Iliona, daughter of Priam, and slew his guest, in order to possess himself of the treasure which had been sent along with him. The only passage of the play which remains, is one in which the shade of Polydorus calls on Hecuba to arise and bury her murdered son.

Iphigenia.—Ennius, as already mentioned, appears invariably to have translated from Euripides, in preference to Sophocles, when the same subject had been treated by both these poets. Sophocles had written a tragedy on the topic of the well-known *Iphigenia in Aulis* of Euripides; but it is the latter piece which has been adopted by the Roman poet.

Boeckius has shown, in a learned dissertation, that Euripides wrote two *Iphigenias in Aulis**. From the first, which has perished, Aristophanes parodied the verses introduced in his *Frogs*; and it was on this work that Ennius formed his Latin *Iphigenia*. The *Iphigenia* now extant, and published in the editions of Euripides, is a *recension* of the original drama, which was undertaken on account of the ridicule thrown on it by Aristophanes, and was not acted till after the death of

* *Græca Tragædiæ principum Æschyli, &c. num ea quæ supersunt genuina omnia sunt.* Ed. Hiedelberg, 1808.

its author. Boeckius, indeed, thinks, that it was written by the younger Euripides, the nephew of the more celebrated dramatist; hence some of the lines of Ennius, which, on comparison with the *Iphigenia* now extant, appear to us original, were probably translated from the first written *Iphigenia*. Such, perhaps, are the jingling verses concerning the disadvantages of idleness, which are supposed, not very naturally, to be sung while weather-bound in Aulis, by the Greek soldiers, who form the chorus of this tragedy instead of the women of Chalcis in the play of Euripides:—

“ Otio qui nescit uti, plus negoti habet,
 Quam quum est negotium in negotio;
 Nam cui quod agat institutum est, in illo negotio
 Id agit; studet ibi, mentem atque animum delectat suum.
 Otioso in otio animus nescit quid sibi velit.
 Hoc idem est; neque domi nunc nos, nec militiæ sumus:
 Imus huc, hinc illuc; quum illuc ventum est, ire illinc lubet.
 Incerte errat animus——*.”

Medea.—This play is imitated from the *Medea* of Euripides. Since the time of Paulus Manutius†, an idea has prevailed that Ennius was the author of two plays on the subject of *Medea*—one entitled *Medea*, and the other *Medea Exsul*, both imitated from Greek originals of Euripides. This opinion was formed in consequence of there being several passages of the *Medea* of Ennius, to which corresponding passages cannot be found in the *Medea* of Euripides, now extant; and it was confirmed by the grammarians sometimes quoting the play by the title *Medea*, and at others by that of *Medea Exsul*. Planck, however, in his recent edition of the fragments of the Latin tragedy, conjectures that there was only one play, and that this play was entitled by Ennius the *Medea Exsul*, which name was appropriate to the subject; but that when quoted by the critics and old grammarians, it was sometimes cited, as was natural, by its full title, at others simply *Medea*. The lines in the Latin play, to which parallel passages cannot be found in Euripides, he believes to be of Ennius' own invention. Osannus thinks, that neither the opinion of Manutius,

* “ Who knows not leisure to enjoy,
 Toils more than those whom toils employ;
 For they who toil with purposed end,
 Mid all their labours pleasure blend—
 But they whose time no labours fill,
 Have in their minds nor wish nor will:
 'Tis so with us, called far from home,
 Nor yet to fields of battle come—
 We hither haste, then thither go,
 Our minds veer round as breezes blow.”

† Comment. ad Cic. *Ep. ad Fam.* VII. 6. See also Scaliger, Vossius, &c.

VOL. I.—K

nor of Planck, is quite accurate. He believes that Euripides wrote a *Medea*, which he afterwards revised and altered, in order to obviate the satiric criticisms of Aristophanes. The Greek *Medea*, which we now have, he supposes to be compounded of the original copy and the recension,—the ancient grammarians having interpolated the manuscripts. Ennius, he maintains, employed the original tragedy; and hence in the Latin play, we now find translations of lines which were omitted both in the recension and in the compound tragedy, which is at present extant*.

The *Medea* of Ennius was a popular drama at Rome, and was considered one of the best productions of its author. Cicero asks, if there be any one such a foe to the Roman name, as to reject or despise the *Medea* of Ennius. From the romantic interest of the subject, *Medea* was the heroine of not less than four epic poems; and no fable, of Greek antiquity, was more frequently dramatized by the Latin poets. Attius, Varro, Ovid, and Seneca, successively imitated the tragedy of Ennius, and improved on their model.

Phoenix.—There were two persons of this name in mythological story. One the son of Agenor, and brother of Cadmus, who gave name to Phœnicia; the other the preceptor of Achilles, who accompanied that hero to the Trojan war. The only reason for supposing that the tragedy of Ennius related to this latter person is, that a play founded on some part of his life was written by Euripides, from whom the Roman poet has borrowed so much.

Telamon.—This play, of which no Greek original is known, seems to have been devoted to a representation of the misfortunes of Telamon, particularly the concluding period of his life, in which he heard of the death of his eldest son Ajax, and the exile of his second son Teucer. To judge from the fragments which remain, it must have been by far the finest drama of Ennius. He thus happily versifies the celebrated sentiment of Anaxagoras, and puts it into the mouth of Telamon, when he hears of the death of his son—

“Ego quom genui, tum moriturum scivi, et ei rei sustuli;
Præterea ad Trojam quom misi ad defendendam Græciam,
Scibam me in mortiferum bellum, non in epulas mittere†.”

Ennius being an inhabitant of *Magna Græcia*, probably held the Tuscan soothsayers and diviners in great contempt.

* Osannus, *Analecta Critica*, c. 5.

† “I rear’d him, subject to death’s equal laws,
And when to Troy I sent him in our cause,
I knew I urged him into mortal fight,
And not to feasts or banquets of delight.”

There is a long passage cited by the grammarians as from this tragedy, (but which, I think, must rather have belonged to his satires,) directed against that learned body, and calculated to give them considerable offence—

“ Non habeo denique nauci Marsum augurem,
 Non vicanos haruspices, non de circo astrologos,
 Non Isiacos conjectores, non interpretes somnium:
 Non enim sunt ii, aut scientia, aut arte divinei;
 Sed superstitiosi vates, impudentesque hariolei,
 Aut inertes, aut insanei, aut quibus egestas imperat:
 Qui sibi semitam non sapiunt, alteri monstrant viam;
 Quibus divitias pollicentur ab iis drachmam ipsi petunt:
 De his divitiis sibi deducant drachmam; reddant cætera*.”

There is a good deal of wit and archness in the two concluding lines, and the whole breathes a spirit of free-thinking, such as one might expect from the translator of Euhemerus. In another passage, indeed, but which, I presume, was attributed to an impious character, or one writhing under the stroke of recent calamity, it is roundly declared that the gods take no concern in human affairs, for if they did, the good would prosper, and the wicked suffer, whereas it is quite the contrary:

“ Ego Deum genus esse semper dixi, et dicam coelitem;
 Sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus;
 Nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis; quod nunc abest.†”

Telephus is probably taken from a lost play of Euripides, ridiculed by Aristophanes in his *Acharnenses*, from a scene of which it would seem that Telephus had appeared on the stage in tattered garments. The passages of the Latin play which remain, exhibit Telephus as an exile from his kingdom, wandering about in ragged habiliments. The lines of Horace, in his Art of Poetry, (a work which is devoted to the subject of the Roman drama,) are probably in allusion to this tragedy:

* “ For no Marsian augur (whom fools view with awe),
 Nor diviner nor star-gazer, care I a straw;
 The Egyptian quack, an expounder of dreams,
 Is neither in science nor art what he seems;
 Superstitious and shameless, they prowl through our streets,
 Some hungry, some crazy, but all of them cheats.
 Impostors! who vaunt that to others they'll show
 A path, which themselves neither travel nor know.
 Since they promise us wealth, if we pay for their pains,
 Let them take from that wealth, and bestow what remains.”

† “ Yes! there are gods; but they no thought bestow
 On human deeds—on mortal bliss or woe—
 Else would such ills our wretched race assail?
 Would the good suffer?—would the bad prevail?”

“*Telephus et Peleus, cum pauper et exsul, uterque Projicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba.*”

Thyestes.—The loose and familiar numbers in which the tragedy of *Telephus* was written, were by no means suitable to the atrocious subject of the Supper of *Thyestes*. Ennius accordingly has been censured by Cicero, in a passage of his *Orator*, for employing them in this drama.—“*Similia sunt quædam apud nostros; velut illa in Thyeste,*

‘*Quemnam te esse dicam! qui tarda in senectute,*

Et quæ sequuntur: quæ, nisi cum tibicen accesserit, orationi sunt solutæ simillima.” There can therefore be little doubt that the passage in Horace’s *Art of Poetry*, in which a tragedy on the subject of *Thyestes* is blamed as flat and prosaic, and hardly rising above the level of ordinary conversation in comedy, alluded to the work of Ennius—

“*Indignatur item privatis, ac prope socco Dignis carminibus, narrari cœna Thyestæ.*”

Yet this spiritless tragedy, was very popular in Rome, and continued to be frequently represented, till Varius treated the same subject in a manner, as we are informed by Quintilian, equal to the Greeks*.

It thus appears that Ennius has little claim to originality or invention as a tragic author. Perhaps it may seem remarkable, that a poet of his powerful genius did not rather write new plays, than copy servilely from the Greeks. But nothing is ever invented where borrowing will as well serve the purpose. Rome had few artists, in consequence of the facility with which the finest specimens of the arts were procured, by plundering the towns of Sicily and Greece. Now, at the period in which Ennius flourished, the productions of Grecian literature were almost as new to the Romans as the most perfectly original compositions. Thus, the dramatic works of Ennius were possessed of equal novelty for his audience as if wholly his own; while a great deal of trouble was saved to himself. The example, however, was unfortunate, as it communicated to Roman literature a character of servility, and of imitation, or rather of translation, from the Greek, which so completely pervaded it, that succeeding poets were most faultless when they copied most closely, and at length, when they abandoned the guides whom they had so long followed, they fell into declamation and bombast. Probably, had the compositions of

* *Instit. Orator. Lib. X. c. 1.*

Ennius been original, they would have been less perfect, than by being thus imitated, or nearly translated, from the master-pieces of Greece. But the literature of his country might ultimately have attained a higher eminence. The imitative productions of Ennius may be likened to those trees which are transplanted when far advanced in growth. Much at first appears to have been gained; but it is certain, that he who sets the seedling is more useful than the transplanter, and that, while the trees removed from their native soil lose their original beauty and luxuriance without increase in magnitude, the seedling swells in its parent earth to immensity of size—fresh, blooming, and verdant in youth, vigorous in maturity, and venerable in old age.

Nor, although Ennius was the first writer who introduced satiric composition into Rome, are his pretensions, in this respect, to originality, very distinguished. He adapted the ancient satires of the Tuscan and Oscan stage to the closet, by refining their grossness, softening their asperity, and introducing railleries borrowed from the Greek poets, with whom he was familiar. His satires thus appear to have been a species of *centos* made up from passages of various poems, which, by slight alterations, were humorously or satirically applied, and chiefly to the delineation of character: "Carmen," says Diomedes the grammarian, "quod ex variis poematibus constabat satira vocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius." The fragments which remain of these satires are too short and broken to allow us even to divine their subject. That entitled *Asotus* vel *Sotadicus*, is the representation of a luxurious, dissolute man, and was so termed from Sotades, a voluptuous Cretan poet. Quintilian also mentions, that one of his satires contained a Dialogue between Life and Death, contending with each other, a mode of composition suggested perhaps by the celebrated allegory of Prodicus. We are farther informed by Aulus Gellius, that he introduced into another satire, with great skill and beauty, Æsop's fable of the Larks*, now well known through the imitation of Fontaine†. The lark having built her nest among some early corn, feared that it might be reaped before her young ones were fit to take wing. She therefore desired them to report to her whatever conversation they might hear in the fields during her absence. They first informed her, that the husbandman had come to the spot, and desired his son to summon their neighbours and friends to assist in cutting the crop the next morning. The lark, on

* *Noctes Atticae*, Lib. II. c. 29.

† Lib. IV. Fab. 22. *L'Alouette et ses petits avec le maître d'un champ.*

hearing this, declares, that there is no occasion to be in any haste in removing. On the following day, it is again reported, that the husbandman had desired that his relations should be requested to assist him; and the lark is still of opinion that there is no necessity to hurry away. At length, however, the young larks relate, that the husbandman had announced that he would execute the work himself. On hearing this, the old lark said it was now time to be gone. She accordingly removed her younglings, and the corn was immediately cut down by the master. From this tale Ennius deduces as the moral;

“Hoc erit tibi argumentum semper in promptu situm;
Ne quid expectes amicos, quod tute agere possis.”

It is certainly much to be regretted that we possess so scanty fragments of these satires, which would have been curious as the first attempts at a species of composition which was carried to such perfection by succeeding Latin poets, and which has been regarded as almost peculiar to the Romans.

The great work, however, of Ennius, and of which we have still considerable remains, was his Annals, or metrical chronicles, devoted to the celebration of Roman exploits, from the earliest periods to the conclusion of the Istrian war. These Annals were written by our poet in his old age; at least, Aulus Gellius informs us, on the authority of Varro, that the twelfth book was finished by him in his sixty-seventh year*.

It may perhaps appear strange, that, when the fabulous exploits, the superstitions, the characters and the manners, of the heroic ages, were so admirably adapted for poetical imagery, and had been so successfully employed in Greece, the chief work of the Father of Roman Song should have been a sort of versified newspaper, like the *Henriade* of Voltaire, or the *Araucana* of Alonso de Ercilla: For in other countries poetry has been earliest devoted to the decoration of those marvels in which the *amantes mira Cæmænx* chiefly rejoice. In most lands, however, the origin of poetry was coeval with the rise of the nation, and every thing seems wondrous to an ignorant and timid race. The Greeks, in their first poetical age, peopled every grove and lake with fauns and naiads, or personified the primeval powers of nature. They sung the fables concerning their gods, and the exploits of heroes, in

* *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XVII. c. 21. Quibus consulibus natum esse Q. Ennium poetam, M. Varro, in primo *de Poetis* libro, scripsit: eumque quum septimum et sexagesimum annum ageret duodecimum Annalem scripsisse: idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere.

those ancient verses which have been combined in the Theogony attributed to Hesiod, and those immortal rhapsodies which have formed the basis of the Homeric poems. The marvellous vision of Dante was the earliest effort of the Italian muse; and some of the first specimens of verse in France and England were wild adventures in love or arms, interspersed with stories of demons and enchanters. But in Rome, though the first effort of the language was in poetry, five hundred years had elapsed from the foundation of the city before this effort was made. At that period, the Romans were a rude but rational race. The locks of Curius were perhaps uncombed; but though the Republic had as yet produced no character of literary elegance, she had given birth to Cincinnatus, and Fabricius, and Camillus. Her citizens had neither been rendered timid nor indolent by their superstitions, but were actively employed in agriculture or in arms. They were a less contemplative and imaginative race than the Greeks. Their spirit was indeed sufficiently warlike; but that peculiar spirit of adventure, (which characterised the early ages of Greece; and the middle ages of modern Europe,) had, if it ever existed, long ago ceased in Rome. By this time, the Roman armies were too well disciplined, and the system of warfare too regular, to admit a description of the picturesque combats of the Greek and Trojan charioteers. Poetry was thus too late in its birth to take a natural flight. In such circumstances, the bard, however rich or lofty might be his conceptions, would not listen to his own taste or inspiration, but select the theme which was likely to prove most popular; and the Romans, being a national and ambitious people, would be more gratified by the jejune relation of their own exploits, than by the *speciosa miracula* of the most sublime or romantic invention.

The Annals of Ennius were partly founded on those ancient traditions and old heroic ballads, which Cicero, on the authority of Cato's *Origines*, mentions as having been sung at feasts by the guests, many centuries before the age of Cato, in praise of the heroes of Rome*. Niebuhr has attempted to show, that all the memorable events of Roman history had been versified in ballads, or metrical chronicles, in the Saturnian measure, before the time of Ennius; who, according to him, merely expressed in the Greek hexameter, what his predecessors had delivered in a ruder strain, and then maliciously depreciated these ancient compositions, in order that he himself might be considered as the founder of Roman poetry†.

* See above, p. 40.

† *Romische Geschichte*, Tom. I. p. 179.

The devotion of the Decii, and death of the Fabian family,—the stories of Scævola, Cocles, and Coriolanus,—Niebuhr believes to have been the subjects of romantic ballads. Even Fabius Pictor, according to this author, followed one of these old legends in his narrative concerning Mars and the Wolf, and his whole history of Romulus. Livy, too, in his account of the death of Lucretia, has actually transcribed from one of these productions; since what Sextus says, on entering the chamber of Lucretia, is nearly in the Saturnian measure:—

“Tace, Lucretia, inquit, Sextus Tarquinius sum,
Ferrum in manu est, moriere si emiseris vocem*.”

But the chief work, according to Niebuhr, from which Ennius borrowed, was a romantic epopee, or chronicle, made up from these heroic ballads about the end of the fourth century of Rome, commencing with the accession of Tarquinius Priscus, and ending with the battle of Regillus. The arrival, says Niebuhr, of that monarch under the name of Lucumo—his exploits and victories—his death—then the history of Servius Tullius—the outrageous pride of Tullia—the murder of the lawful monarch—the fall of the last Tarquin, preceded by a supernatural warning—Lucretia—Brutus and the truly Homeric battle of Regillus—compose an epic, which, in poetical incident, and splendour of fancy, surpasses everything produced in the latter ages of Rome†. The battle of Regillus, in particular, as described by the annalists, bears evident marks of its poetical origin. It was not a battle between two hosts, but a struggle of heroes. As in the fights painted in the Iliad, the champions meet in single combat, and turn by individual exertions the tide of victory. The dictator Posthumus wounds King Tarquin, whom he had encountered at the first onset. The Roman knight Albutius engages with the Latin chief Mamilius, but is wounded by him, and forced to quit the field. Mamilius then nearly breaks the Roman line, but is slain by the Consul Herminius, which decides the fate of the day. After the battle of Regillus, all the events are not so completely poetical; but in the siege of Veii we have a representation of the ten years war of Troy. The secret introduction of the troops by Camillus into the middle of the city resembles the story of the wooden horse, and the Etruscan statue of Juno corresponds to the Trojan Palladium‡.

Any period of history may be thus exhibited in the form of an epic cycle; and, though there can be little doubt of the

* *Romische Geschichte*, Tom. I. p. 318.

† *Id.* Tom. I. p. 178.

‡ *Romische Geschichte*, Tom. I. p. 364, &c.

existence of ancient Saturnian ballads at Rome, I do not think that Niebuhr has adduced sufficient proof or authority for his magnificent epopee, commencing with the accession of Tarquin, and ending with the battle of Regillus. With regard to the accusation against Ennius, of depreciating the ancient materials which he had employed, it is founded on the contempt which he expresses for the verses of the Fauns and the Prophets. His obligations, if he owed any, he has certainly nowhere acknowledged, at least in the fragments which remain; and he rather betrays an anxiety, at the commencement of his poem, to carry away the attention of the reader from the Saturnian muses, and direct it to the Grecian poets,—to Pindus, and the nymphs of Helicon.

He begins his Annals with an invocation to the nine Muses, and the account of a vision in which Homer had appeared to him, and related the story of the metamorphosis already mentioned :—

“ Visus Homerus adesse poeta :
Hei mihi qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo !
Septingenti sunt, paulo plus vel minus, anni
Quom memini fieri me pavom.”

Ennius afterwards invokes a great number of the Gods, and then proceeds to the history of the Alban kings. The dream of the Vestal Virgin Ilia, which announced her pregnancy by Mars, and the foundation of Rome, is related in verses of considerable beauty and smoothness, by Ilia to her sister Eurydice.—

“ Talia commemorat lacrumans, exterrita somno ;
‘ Euridica prognata, pater quam noster amavit,
Vivens vita meum corpus nunc deserit omne.
Nam me visus homo polcer per amœna salicta
Et ripas raptare, locosque novos : ita sola
Post illa, germana soror, errare videbar ;
Tardaque vestigare, et quærere, neque posse
Corde capessere : semita nulla pedem stabilibat.
Exin compellare pater me voce videtur
Heis verbis—O gnata, tibi sunt antegerendæ
Ærumnæ ; post ex fluvio fortuna resistet.
Hæc pater eclatus, germana, repente recessit ;
Nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus :
Quamquam multa manus ad cœli cœrula Templa
Tendebam lacrumans, et blanda voce vocabam.
Vix ægro tum corde meo me somnus reliquit*.”

* “ ‘ Eurydice, my sister,’ thus she spoke,
When roused from sleep she, weeping, silence broke—
‘ Thou whom my father loved ! of life bereft,
Though yet alive, all sense this frame hath left.

In these lines there is considerable elegance and pathos; and the contest which immediately succeeds between Romulus and Remus for the sovereignty of Rome, is as remarkable for dignity and animation :

“ Curanteis magnâ cum curâ, concupienteis
Regnel, dant operam simul auspicio, augurioque :
Hinc Remus auspicio se devovet, atque secundam
Solutâ avem servat : at Romulus polcer in alto
Quærit Aventino, servans genus altivolantum.
Omnis cura vireis, uter esset Endoperator.
Exspectant, veluti consol, quom mittere signum
Volt, omneis avidei spectant ad carceris oras,
Qua mox emittat picteis ex faucibus currus.
Sic expectabat populus, atque ore timebat
Rebus, utrei magnei victoria sit data regnel.
Interea Sol albus recessit in infera noctis :
Exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux :
Et simul ex alto longe polcerrima præpes
Læva volavit avis : simul aureus exoritur sol.
Cedunt ter quatuor de cælo corpora sancta
Avium, præpetibus sese, polcreisque loceis dant.
Conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse priora,
Auspicio regni stabilita scamna, solumque*.”

A form endowed with more than mortal grace,
Mysterious led me, and with hurried pace,
'Mid ever varying scenes, as wild as new,
O'er banks and meads where pliant osiers grew.
Then left to wander pathless and alone,
I vainly sought thee amid scenes unknown.
My father called, his child forlorn address'd,
And in these words prophetic thoughts express'd :
' O Daughter, many sorrows yet abide,
Ere fortune's stream upbears thee on its tide.'
Thus spoke my father; but his form withdrew;
No longer offered to my eager view.
Though oft in vain with soothing voice I call,
And stretch my hands to heaven's cerulean hall.
Oppressed, and struggling, and with sick'ning heart,
At once the vision and my sleep depart.”

* “ With ceaseless care, eager alike to reign,
Both anxious watch some favouring sign to gain,
Remus with prescient gaze observes the sky
Apart, and marks where birds propitious fly.
His godlike brother on the sacred height,
Observant traced the soaring eagle's flight :
And now the anxious tribes expect from fate
The future monarch of their infant state ;
Even as the crowd await at festal games
The consul's signal, which the sports proclaims,
Their eyes directed to the painted goal,
Eager to see the rival chariots roll.
Meanwhile the radiant sun sinks down to night,
But soon he sheds again the yellow light ;
And while the golden orb ascends the sky,
The fowls of heaven on wing propitious fly.
Twelve sacred birds, which gods as omens send,
With flight precipitate on earth descend.
The sign, Quirinus knew, to him alone
Pressaged dominion, and the Roman throne.”

The reigns of the kings, and the contests of the republic with the neighbouring states previous to the Punic war, occupy the metrical annals to the end of the sixth book*, which concludes with the following noble answer of Pyrrhus to the Roman ambassadors, who came to ransom the prisoners taken from them by that prince in battle :—

“ Nec mi aurum posco, nec mi pretium dederitis ;
Nec cauponantes bellum, sed belligerantes ;
Ferro, non auro, vitam cernamus utrique,
Vosne velit, an me regnare Hera ; quidve ferat sors
Virtute experiamur ; et hoc simul accipe dictum :
Quorum virtutei belli fortuna pepercit,
Horumdem me libertatei parcere certum est :
Dono ducite, doque volentibus cum magnis Diis†.”

Cicero, in his *Brutus*, says, that Ennius did not treat of the first Punic war, as Nævius had previously written on that subject‡ ; to which prior work Ennius thus alludes :—

“ Scripsere alii rem,
Versibus, quos olim Faunei, vatesque canebant.”

P. Merula, however, who edited the fragments of Ennius, is of opinion, that this passage of Cicero can only mean that he had not entered into much detail of its events, as he finds several lines in the seventh book, which, he thinks, evidently apply to the first Carthaginian war, particularly the description of naval preparations, and the building of the first fleet with which the Carthaginians were attacked by the Romans. In some of the editions of Ennius, the character of the friend and military adviser of Servilius, generally supposed to be intended as a portrait of the poet himself§, is ranged under the seventh book :—

“ Hocce locutus vocat, quicum bene sæpe libenter
Mensam, sermonesque suos, rerumque suarum

* The Annals were not separated by Ennius himself into books ; but were so divided, long after his death, by the grammarian Q. Vargunteius.—(Suet. *de Illust. Gram.* c. 2.) The fragments of them are arranged under different books in different editions. In the passages quoted, I have followed the distribution in the edition of Merula, Lugd. Bat. 1574.

† “ Nor gift I seek, nor shall ye ransom yield ;
Let us not trade, but combat in the field :
Steel and not gold our being must maintain,
And prove *which* nation Fortune wills to reign.
Whom chance of war, despite of valour, spared,
I grant them freedom, and without reward.
Conduct them then, by all the mighty Gods !
Conduct them freely to their own abodes.”

‡ Cap. 19.

§ Gaddius, *de Script. Latinis non Ecclesiast.* Tom. 1. p. 171.

Comiter impertit; magna quum lapsa dies jam
 Parte fuisset de parvis summisque gerendis,
 Consilio, induforo lato, sanctoque senatu;
 Cui res audacter magnas, parvasque, jocumque
 Eloqueret, quæ tincta maleis, et quæ bona dictu
 Evomeret, si quid vellet, tutoque locaret.
 Quocum multa volup ac gaudia clamque palamque,
 Ingenium cui nulla malum sententia suadet,
 Ut faceret facinus; lenis tamen, haud malus; idem
 Doctus, fidelis, suavis homo, facundus, suoque
 Contentus, scitus, atque beatus, secunda loquens in
 Tempore commodus, et verborum vir paucorum.
 Multa tenens antiqua sepulta, et sæpe vetustas
 Quæ facit, et mores veteresque novosque tenentem
 Multorum veterum leges, divumque hominumque
 Prudentem, qui multa loquive, tacereve possit.
 Hunc inter pugnas compellat Servilius sic*.”

The eighth and ninth books of these Annals, which are much mutilated, detailed the events of the second Carthaginian war in Italy and Africa. This was by much the most interesting part of the copious subject which Ennius had chosen, and a portion of it on which he would probably exert all the force of his genius, in order the more to honour his friend and patron Scipio Africanus. The same topic was selected by Silius Italicus, and by Petrarch for his Latin poem *Africa*, which obtained him a coronation in the Capitol. “Ennius,” says the illustrious Italian, “has sung fully of Scipio; but, in the opinion of Valerius Maximus, his style is harsh and vulgar, and there is yet no elegant poem which has for its subject the glorious exploits of the conqueror of Hannibal.” None of the poets who have chosen this topic, have done full justice to the most arduous struggle in which two powerful nations had ever engaged, and which presented the most splendid display of military genius on the one hand, and heroic virtue on the other, that had yet been exhibited to the world. Livy’s histo-

* “His friend he called—who at his table fared,
 And all his counsels and his converse shared;
 With whom he oft consumed the day’s decline
 In talk of petty schemes, or great design,—
 To him, with ease and freedom uncontroled,
 His jests and thoughts, or good or ill, were told;
 Whate’er concerned his fortunes was disclosed,
 And safely in that faithful breast reposed.
 This chosen friend possessed a steadfast mind,
 Where no base purpose could its harbour find;
 Mild, courteous, learned, with knowledge blest, and sense;
 A soul serene, contentment, eloquence;
 Fluent in words or sparing, well he knew
 All things to speak in place and season due;
 His mind was amply graced with ancient lore,
 Nor less enriched with modern wisdom’s store:
 Him, while the tide of battle onward pressed,
 Servilius called, and in these words addressed.”

rical account of the second Punic war possesses more real poetry than any poem on the subject whatever.

The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth books of the Annals of Ennius, contained the war with Philip of Macedon. In the commencement of the thirteenth, Hannibal excites Antiochus to a war against the Romans. In the fourteenth book, the Consul Scipio, in the prosecution of this contest, arrives at Ilium, which he thus apostrophizes :

“ O patria ! O divum domus Ilium, et incluta bello
Pergama ! ”

Several Latin writers extol the elegant lines of Ennius immediately following, in which the Roman soldiers, alluding to its magnificent revival in Rome, exclaim with enthusiasm, that Ilium could not be destroyed ;

“ Quai neque Dardaneis campis potuere perire,
Nec quom capta capei, nec quom combusta cremari* ; ”

a passage which has been closely imitated in the seventh book of Virgil :

“ Num Sigels occumbere campis,
Num capti potuere capi ? num incensa cremavit
Troja viros ? ”

The fifteenth book related the expedition of Fulvius Nobilior to Ætolia, which Ennius himself is said to have accompanied. In the two following books he prosecuted the Istrian war ; which concludes with the following animated description of a single hero withstanding the attack of an armed host :—

“ Undique conveniunt, velut imber, tela Tribuno.
Configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo,
Ærate sonitant galeæ : sed nec pote quisquam
Undique nitendo corpus discernere ferro.
Semper abundanteis hastas frangitque, quatitque ;
Totum sudor habet corpus, moltumque laborat ;
Nec respirandi fit copia præpete ferro.
Istrei tela manu jacentes sollicitabant.
Occumbunt moltei leto, ferroque lapique,
Aut intra moeros, aut extra præcipi casu†.”

* “ Sacked, but not captive,—burned, yet not consumed ;
Nor on the Dardan plains to moulder doomed.”

† “ From every side the javelins as a shower
Rush, and unerring on the Tribune pour ;
Struck by the spears his helm and shield resound,
Though pierced his shield, no shaft inflicts a wound.
Their missile darts th' embattled Istrians throw,
But all are hurled in vain against their foe ;

The concluding, or eighteenth, book seems to have been in a great measure personal to the poet himself. It explains his motive for writing :—

—“ Omnes mortales sese laudari optant ;” —

and he seemingly compares himself to a Courser, who rests after his triumphs in the Olympic games :—

“ Sic ut fortis Equus, spatio qui sæpe supremo
Vicit Olumpiaco, nunc senio confectus quiescit*.”

Connected with his Annals, there was a poem of Ennius devoted to the celebration of the exploits of Scipio, in which occurs a much-admired description of the calm of Evening, where the flow of the versification is finely modulated to the still and solemn imagery :—

“ Mundus cœli vastus constitit silentio,
Et Neptunus sævus undeis asperis pausam dedit:
Sol equis iter repressit unguleis volantibus,
Constitere annis perennis—arbores vento vacant†.”

With this* first attempt at descriptive poetry in the Latin language, it may be interesting to compare a passage produced in the extreme old age of Roman literature, which also paints, by nearly the same images, the profound repose of Nature :—

—“ Tacet omne pecus, volucresque feræque,
Et simulant fessos curvata cacumina somnos ;
Nec trucibus fluvitis idem sonus ; occidit horror
Æquoris, et terris maria acclinata quiescunt.”

Horace, in one of his odes, strongly expresses the glory and honour which the Calabrian muse of Ennius had conferred on Scipio by this poem, devoted to his praise :

“ Non incendia Carthaginis impie,
Ejus qui domita nomen ab Africa

He pants, and sweats, and labours o'er the field,
The flying shafts no pause for breathing yield ;
Smote by his sword or sling, th' assailants fall
Within, or headlong thrust beyond the wall.”

* “ Even as the generous Steed, whose youthful force
Was oft victorious in th' Olympic course,
Unfit, from age, to triumph in such fields,
At length to rest his time-worn members yields.”

† “ O'er Heaven's wide arch a solemn silence reigned,
And the fierce Ocean his wild waves restrained ;
The Sun repressed his steeds' impetuous force ;
The winds were hushed ; the streams all stayed their course.”

Lucratus rediit, clarius indicant
Laudes quam Calabræ Pierides*."

The historical poems of Ennius appear to have been written without the introduction of much machinery or decorative fiction; and whether founded on ancient ballads, according to one opinion†, or framed conformably to historical truth, according to another‡, they were obviously deficient in those embellishments of imagination which form the distinction between a poem and a metrical chronicle. In the subject which he had chosen, Ennius wanted the poetic advantages of distance in place or of time. It perhaps matters little whether the ground-work of a heroic poem be historical or entirely fictitious, if free scope be given for the excursions of fancy. But, in order that it may sport with advantage, the event must be remote in time or in place; and if this rule be observed, such subjects as those chosen by Camoens or Tasso admit of as much colouring and embellishment as the *Faery Queen*. It is in this that Lucan and Voltaire have erred; and neither the soaring genius of the one, nor brilliancy of the other, could raise their themes, splendid as they were, from the dust, or steep the mind in those reveries in which we indulge on subjects where there is no visible or known bound to credulity and imaginings. Still the Annals of Ennius, as a national work, were highly gratifying to a proud ambitious people, and, in consequence, continued long popular at Rome. They were highly relished in the age of Horace and Virgil; and, as far down as the time of Marcus Aurelius, they were recited in theatres and other public places for the amusement of the people§. The Romans, indeed, were so formed on his style, that Seneca called them *populus Ennianus*—an Ennian race,—and said, that both Cicero and Virgil were obliged, contrary to their own judgment, to employ antiquated terms, in compliance with the reigning prejudice||. From his example, too, added to the national character, the historical epic became in future times the great poetical resource of the Romans, who versified almost every important event in their history. Besides the *Pharsalia* of Lucan, and *Punica* of Silius Italicus, which still survive, there were many works of this description which are now lost. Varro Attacinus chose as his subject Cæsar's war with the Sequani—Varius, the deeds of Augustus and Agrippa—Valgius Rufus, the battle of Actium—Albinovanus, the exploits of Germanicus—Cicero, those of Marius, and the events of his own consulship.

* Lib. IV. Ode 8.

† Niebuhr, *Romische Geschichte*.

‡ Vossius, *de Historicis Latinis*, Lib. I. c. 2.

§ Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XVIII. c. 5.

|| *Ibid.* Lib. XII. c. 2.

We have already seen Ennius's imitation of the Greeks in his tragedies and satires; and even in the above-mentioned historical poems, though devoted to the celebration of Roman heroes and subjects exclusively national, he has borrowed copiously from the Greek poets, and has often made his Roman consuls fight over again the Homeric battles. Thus the description of the combat of Ajax, in the 16th Book of the Iliad, beginning *Αίας δ' οὐκ ἔειπεν*, has suggested a passage, above quoted, from the fragments of the Istrian war; and the picture of a steed breaking from his stall, and ranging the pastures, is imitated from a similar description, in the 6th Book of the Iliad—

“Et tunc sicut Equus, qui de præsepibus actus,
Vincula sua magnæ animæ abruptit, et inde
Fert sese campi per cœrula, lætaque prata;
Celso pectore, sæpe jubam quassat simul altam:
Spiritus ex animâ calidâ spumas agit albas*.”

Homer's lines are the following :—

“Ὀς δ' ὅτε τις στατός ἵππος, ἀκρόστας ἐπι φάτιν
Δασμοὶ ἀπερρήξας θύμῃ κεδίοιο κροαιήνῃ,
Ἐισθῆς λουσθαὶ εὐρῆσις ποταμοῖο,
Κυδίων ὕλου δε καρή ἰχθῖ. ἀμφὶ δὲ χαίται
Ἦμας αἰσσοῦνται. ὃ δ' ἀγλαίφῃ πεπειθῆς.
Ῥιμφὰ ἰ γούνα φραγῖ μετα τ' ἕβια καὶ νομοὶ ἄπῃ†.”

In order to afford an opportunity of judging of Ennius's talents for imitation, I have subjoined from the two poets, who carried that art to the greatest perfection, corresponding passages, which are both evidently founded on the same Greek original—

“Qualis, ubi abruptis fugit præsepia vinculis,
Tandem liber, Equus, campoque potitus aperto;
Aut ille in pastus armentaue tendit equarum,
Aut, assuetus aquæ perfundi flumine noto,
Emicat, arrectisque fremit cervicibus alte
Luxurians; luduntque jubæ per colla, per armos‡.”

The other parallel passage is in Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered—

“Come Destrier, che dalle reggie stalle,
Ove al uso dell' arme si riserba,

* Even as the generous steed, with reins unbound,
Bursts from the stall, and scours along the ground,
With lofty chest he seeks the joyous plain,
And oft, exulting, shakes his crested mane;
The fiery spirit in his breast prevails,
And the warm heart in sprinkling foam exhales.”

† Iliad, Lib. VI. v. 506.

‡ Æneid, Lib. XI.

Fugge, e libero alfin, per largo calle
 Va tra gli armenti, o al fiume usato, o all' erba ;
 Scherzan sul collo i crini, e sulle spalle :
 Si scuote la cervice alta e superba :
 Suonano i pie nel corso, e par ch'avvampi,
 Di sonori nitriti empiedo i campi*."

To these parallel passages may be added a very similar, though perhaps not a borrowed description, from the earliest production of the most original of all poets, in which the horse of Adonis breaks loose during the dalliance of Venus with his master :—

" The strong-necked steed, being tied unto a tree,
 Breaketh his rein, and to her straight goes he.
 Imperiously he leaps, he neighs, he bounds,
 And now his woven girths he breaks asunder,
 The bearing earth with his hard hoof he wounds,
 Whose hollow womb resounds like heaven's thunder.
 His ears up-prick'd, his braided hanging mane,
 Upon his compass'd crest, now stands an end ;
 His nostrils drink the air, and forth again,
 As from a furnace, vapours doth he send.
 His eye which glisters scornfully, like fire,
 Shows his hot courage and his high desire."

The poem of Ennius, entitled *Phagetica*, is curious,—as one would hardly suppose, that in this early age, luxury had made such progress, that the culinary art should have been systematically or poetically treated. All that we know, however, of the manner in which it was prepared or served up, is from the *Apologia* of Apuleius. It was, which its name imports, a didactic poem on eatables, particularly fish, as Apuleius testifies.—“ Q. Ennii *edes phagetica*, quæ versibus scripsit, innumerabilia piscium genera enumerat, quæ scilicet curiose cognorat.” It is well known, that previous to the time of Ennius, this subject had been discussed both in prose and verse by various Greek authors†, and was particularly detailed in the poem of Arcestratus the Epicurean—

“ ————— The bard
 Who sang of poultry, venison, and lard,
 Poet and cook ————”

It appears from the following passage of Apuleius, that the work of Ennius was a digest of all the previous books on this subject,—“ Alios etiam multis versibus decoravit, et ubi gentium quisque eorum inveniatur, ostendit qualiter assus, aut jussulentus optime sapiat; nec tamen ab eruditis reprehendi-

* C. ix. st. 75.

† *Venus and Adonis*, p. 13. Shakespeare's Poems, Ed. 1773.

‡ *Voyage d'Anacharsis*. T. II. c. 25.

tur." The eleven lines which remain, and which have been preserved by Apuleius, mention the places where different sorts of fish are found in greatest perfection and abundance—

" Brundisii Sargus bonus est ; hunc, magnus erit si,
Surne : Apricum piscem scite, primum esse Tarenti ;
Surrentei fac emas Glaucum, &c.

Another poem of Ennius, entitled *Epicharmus*, was so called because it was translated from the Greek work of Epicharmus, the Pythagorean, on the Nature of Things, in the same manner as Plato gave the name of *Timæus* to the book which he translated from Timæus the Locrian. This was the same Epicharmus who invented Greek comedy, and resided in the court of Hiero of Syracuse. The fragments of this work of Ennius are so broken and corrupted, that it is impossible to follow the plan of his poem, or to discover the system of philosophy which it inculcated. It appears, however, to have contained many speculations concerning the elements of which the world was primarily composed, and which, according to him, were water, earth, air, and fire* ; as also with regard to the preservative powers of nature. Jupiter seems merely to have been considered by him as the air, the clouds, and the storm :

" Isteic is est Jupiter, quem dico, Græci vocant
Aera ; quique ventus est, et nubes, imber postea,
Atque ex imbre frigus ; ventus post fit, aer denuo :
Istec propter Jupiter sunt ista, quæ dico tibi,
Qui mortales urbeis, atque belluas omneis juvat†."

This system, which had been previously adopted by the Etruscans, and had been promulgated in some of the Orphic hymns, nearly corresponds with that announced by Cato, in Lucan's *Pharsalia*—

" Jupiter est quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris ;"

and is not far different from the Spinozism, in Pope's *Essay on Man*—

" Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glow in the stars, and blossoms in the trees ;

* Varro, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. I. c. 4. Ed. Gesner.

† This is the Jupiter whom all revere,
Whom I name Jupiter, and Greeks call Air :
He also is the Wind, the Clouds, the Rain ;
Cold, after Showers, then Wind and Air again :
All these are Jove, who social life maintains,
And the huge monsters of the wild sustains.

Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent."

Ennius, however, whose compositions thus appear to have been formed entirely on Greek originals, has not more availed himself of these writings than Virgil has profited by the works of Ennius. The prince of Latin Poets has often imitated long passages, and sometimes copied whole lines, from the Father of Roman Song. This has been shown, in a close comparison, by Macrobius, in his *Saturnalia**.

ENNIUS, Book 1.

"Qui cælum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum."

VIRGIL, Book 6.

"Axem humero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum."

ENNIUS, 1.

"Est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant."

VIRGIL, 1.

"Est locus Hesperiam Graii cognomine dicunt."

ENNIUS, 12.

"Unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem;
Non ponebat enim rumores ante salutem.
Ergo postque magisque viri nunc gloria claret."

VIRGIL, 6.

"Unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem."

ENNIUS.

"Quod per amœnam urbem leni fluit agmine flumen."

VIRGIL, 2.

"Inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Tybris."

ENNIUS, 1.

"Hei mihi qualis erat quantum mutatus ab illo."

VIRGIL, 2.

"Hei mihi qualis erat! quantum mutatus ab illo."

ENNIUS.

———"Postquam discordia tetra
Bellii ferratos postes portasque refregit."

VIRGIL, 7.

"Impulit ipsa manu portas, et cardine verso
Bellii ferratos rupit Saturnia postes."

* Lib. VI. c. 1. & 2.

† "He first restored the state by wise delay,
Heedless of what a censuring world might say;
Hence time has hallow'd his immortal name,
And, as the years succeed, still spreads his fame."

The line of Ennius, "Unus homo," &c. was applied, with an alteration of the word *cunctando* into *vigilando*, by Augustus, in a complimentary letter to Tiberius, on his good conduct in restoring affairs in Germany, after the unfortunate defeat of Varus. (Sueton. *in Tiberio*. c. 21.)

‡ It is of these two lines of Ennius that Horace says, the *disjecta membra poetæ*, that is, the poetical force and spirit, would remain, though the arrangement of the words were changed, and the measure of the verse destroyed; which, he admits, would not be the case with his own satires, or those of Lucilius.

In the longer passages, Virgil has not merely selected the happiest thoughts and expressions of his predecessor, but in borrowing a great deal from Ennius, he has added much of his own. He has thrown on common images new lights of fancy; he has struck out the finest ideas from ordinary sentiments, and expunged all puerile conceits and absurdities.

Lucretius and Ovid have also frequently availed themselves of the works of Ennius. His description of felling the trees of a forest, in order to fit out a fleet against the Carthaginians, in the seventh book, has been imitated by Statius in the tenth book of the *Thebaid*. The passage in his sixth satire, in which he has painted the happy situation of a parasite, compared with that of the master of a feast, is copied in Terence's *Phormio**. The following beautiful lines have been imitated by innumerable poets, both ancient and modern :

“ Jupiter hic risit, tempestatesque serenæ
Riserunt omnes risu Jovis omnipotentis.”

Near the commencement of his *Annals*, Ennius says,

“ Audire est operæ pretium, procedere recte
Qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere vultis;”

which solemn passage has been parodied by Horace, in the second satire of the first book :

“ Audire est operæ pretium, procedere recte
Qui mæchis non vultis, ut omni parte laborent.”

Thus it appears that Ennius occasionally produced verses of considerable harmony and beauty, and that his conceptions were frequently expressed with energy and spirit. It must be recollected, however, that the lines imitated by Virgil, and the other passages which have been here extracted from the works of Ennius, are very favourable specimens of his taste and genius. Sometimes poems, which have themselves been lost, and of which only fragments are preserved, in the citations of contemporary or succeeding authors, are now believed to have been finer productions than they perhaps actually were. It is the best passages which are quoted, and imitated, and are thus upborne on the tide of ages, while the grosser parts have sunk and perished in the flood. We are in this manner led to form an undue estimate of the excellence of

* Act. II. sc. 2.

† “The Olympian Father smiled; and for a while
Nature's calmed elements returned the smile.”

the whole, in the same manner as we doubtless conceive an exaggerated idea of the ancient magnificence of Persepolis or Palmyra, where, while the humble dwellings have mouldered into dust, the temples and pyramids remain, and all that meets the eye is towering and majestic. A few, however, even of the verses of Ennius which have been preserved, are very harsh, and defective in their mechanical construction; others are exceedingly prosaic, as,

“Egregie cordatus homo Catus Ælius Sextus;”

and not a few are deformed with the most absurd conceits, not so much in the idea, as in a jingle of words and extravagant alliteration. The ambiguity of the celebrated verse,

“Aio te Æacida Romanos vincere posse;”

may be excused as oracular, but what can be said for such lines as,

“Hand doctis dictis certantes sed maledictis.
O Tite;tute Tate tibi tanta tyranne tulisti.
Stultus est qui cupida cupiens cupienter cupit.”

This species of conceit was rejected by the good taste of subsequent Latin poets, even in the most degraded periods of literature; and I know no parallel to it, except in some passages of Sidney's *Arcadia*. Nothing can be a greater mistake, than to suppose that false taste and jingle are peculiar to the latter ages of poetry, and that the early bards of a country are free from *conceitti*.

On the whole, the works of Ennius are rather pleasing and interesting, as the early blossoms of that poetry which afterwards opened to such perfection, than estimable from their own intrinsic beauty. To many critics the latter part of Ovid's observation,

“Ennius ingenio maximus—arte rudis;”

has appeared better founded than the first. Scaliger, however, has termed him, “Poeta antiquus magnifico ingenio: Utinam hunc haberemus integrum, et amissemus Lucanum, Statium, Silium Italicum, et tous ces garçons la*.” Quintilian has happily enough compared the writings of Ennius to those sacred groves hallowed by their antiquity, and which we do not so much admire for their beauty, as revere with religious

* *Scaligerana*, p. 136. Ed. Cologne, 1695.

awe and dread*. Hence, if we cannot allow Ennius to be crowned with the poetical laurel, we may at least grant the privilege conceded to him by Propertius—

“ Ennius hirsutâ cingat sua tempora quercu.”

Politian, in his *Nutricia*, has recapitulated the events of the life of Ennius, and has given perhaps the most faithful summary of his character, both as a man and a poet—

“ Bella horrenda tonat Romanorumque triumphos,
Inque vicem nexos per carmina degerit annos:
Arte rudis, sed mente potens, parcissimus oris,
Pauper opum, fidens animi, morumque probatus,
Contentusque suo, nec bello ignarus et armis.”

But whatever may have been the merits of the works of Ennius, of which we are now but incompetent judges, they were at least sufficiently various. Epic, dramatic, satiric, and didactic poetry, were all successively attempted by him; and we also learn that he exercised himself in lighter sorts of verse, as the epigram and acrostic†. For ~~the~~ novelty and exuberance it is not difficult to account. The fountains of Greek literature, as yet untasted in Latium, were to him inexhaustible sources. He stood in very different circumstances from those Greek bards who had to rely solely on their own genius, or from his successors in Latin poetry, who wrote after the best productions of Greece had become familiar to the Romans. He was placed in a situation in which he could enjoy all the popularity and applause due to originality, without undergoing the labour of invention, and might rapidly run with success through every mode of the lyre, without possessing incredible diversity of genius.

Ennius
The above criticisms apply to the poetical productions of Ennius; but the most curious point connected with his literary history is his prose translation of the celebrated work of Euhemerus, entitled, ‘*Ἱερα Αναρχαία*. Euhemerus is generally supposed to have been an inhabitant of Messene, a city of Peloponnesus. Being sent, as he represented, on a voyage of discovery by Cassander, King of Macedon, he came to an island called Panchaia, in the capital of which, Panara, he found a temple of the Tryphilian Jupiter, where stood a column inscribed with a register of the births and deaths of many of the gods. Among these, he specified Uranus, his sons Pan and Saturn, and his daughters Rhea and Ceres; as also Jupiter, Juno, and Neptune, who were the offspring of Saturn. Ac-

* *Institut. Orat. Lib. X. c. 1.*

† Cicero, *De Dictione*, Lib. II. c. 54.

cordingly, the design of Euhemerus was to show, by investigating their actions, and recording the places of their births and burials, that the mythological deities were mere mortal men, raised to the rank of gods on account of the benefits which they had conferred on mankind,—a system which, according to Meiners and Warburton, formed the grand secret revealed at the initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries*. The translation by Ennius, as well as the original work, is lost; but many particulars concerning Euhemerus, and the object of his history, are mentioned in a fragment of Diodorus Siculus, preserved by Eusebius. Some passages have also been saved by St. Augustine; and long quotations, have been made by Lactantius, in his treatise *De Falsa Religione*. These, so far as they extend, may be regarded as the truest and purest sources of mythological history, though not much followed in our modern *Pantheons*.

Plutarch, who was associated to the priesthood, and all who were interested in the support of the vulgar creed, maintained, that the whole work of Euhemerus, with his voyage to Panchaia, was an impudent fiction; and, in particular, it was urged, that no one except Euhemerus had ever seen or heard of the land of Panchaia†: that the Panchaia Tellus had indeed been described in a flowery and poetical style, both by Diodorus Siculus and Virgil—

“Totaque thuriferis Panchaia pinguis arenis‡.”

but not in such a manner as to determine its geographical position.

The truth, however, of the relation contained in the work of Euhemerus, has been vindicated by modern writers; who have attempted to prove that Panchaia was an island of the Red Sea, which Euhemerus had actually visited in the course of his voyage§. But whether Euhemerus merely recorded what he had seen, or whether the whole book was a device and contrivance of his own, it seems highly probable that the translation of Ennius gave rise to the belief of many Roman philosophers, who maintained, or insinuated, their conviction of the mortality of the gods, and whose writings have been so frequently appealed to by Farmer, in his able disquisition on the prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits.

It is clear, that notwithstanding their observance of prodigies and religious ceremonies, there prevailed a considerable spirit of free-thinking among the Romans in the age of Ennius.

* *Divine Legation of Moses*.
‡ *Georg. Lib. II. v. 139.*

† *De Iside et Osiride*.
§ *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, Tom. XV.*

This is apparent, not merely from his translation of Euhemerus, and definition of the nature of Jupiter, in his *Epicharmus*, but from various passages in dramas adapted for public representation, which deride the superstitions of augurs and soothsayers, as well as the false ideas entertained of the worshipped divinities. Polybius, too, who flourished shortly after Ennius, speaks of the fear of the gods, and the inventions of augury, merely as an excellent political engine, at the same time that he reprehends the rashness and absurdity of those who were endeavouring to extirpate such useful opinions*.

The dramatic career which had been commenced by Livius Andronicus and Ennius, was most successfully prosecuted by

PLAUTUS,

who availed himself, still more even than his predecessors, of the works of the Greeks. The Old Greek comedy was excessively satirical, and sometimes obscene. Its subjects, as is well known, were not entirely fictitious, but in a great measure real; and neither the highest station, nor the brightest talents, were any security against the unrestrained invectives of the comic muse in her earliest sallies. Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes, were permitted to introduce on the stage the philosophers, generals, and magistrates of the state with their true countenances, and as it were in *propria persona*; a license which seems, in some measure, to have been regarded as the badge of popular freedom. It is only from the plays of Aristophanes that we can judge of the spirit of the ancient comedy. Its genius was so wild and strange, that it scarcely admits of definition: and can hardly be otherwise described, than as containing a great deal of allegorical satire on the political measures and manners of the Athenians, and parodies on their tragic poets.

When in Athens the people began to lose their political influence, and when the management of their affairs was vested in fewer hands than formerly, the oligarchical government restrained this excessive license; but while the poets were prohibited from naming the individuals whose actions they exposed, still they represented real characters so justly, though under fictitious appellations, that there could be no mistake with regard to the persons intended. This species of drama, which comprehends some of the later pieces of Aristophanes, —for example, his *Plutus*,—and is named the Middle comedy,

* Polyb. Lib. V.

was soon discovered to be as offensive and dangerous as the old. The dramatists being thus at length forced to invent their subjects and characters, comedy became a general yet lively imitation of the common actions of life. All personal allusion was dropped, and the Chorus, which had been the great vehicle of censure and satire, was removed. The new comedy was thus so different in its features from the middle or the old, that Schlegel has been induced to think, that it was formed on the model of the latest tragedians, rather than on the ancient comedy*. In the productions of Agathon, and even in some dramas of Euripides, tragedy had descended from its primeval height, and represented the distresses of domestic life, though still the domestic life of kings and heroes. Though Euripides was justly styled by Aristotle the most tragic of all poets, his style possessed neither the energy and sublimity of *Æschylus*, nor the gravity and stateliness of *Sophocles*, and it was frequently not much elevated above the language of ordinary conversation. His plots, too, like the *Rudens* of Plautus, often hinge on the fear of women, lest they be torn from the shrines or altars to which they had fled for protection; and what may be regarded as a confirmation of this opinion is, that Euripides, who had been so severely satirized by Aristophanes, was extravagantly extolled by Philémon, in his own age the most popular writer of the new comedy.

While possessing, perhaps, both less art and fire than the old satirical drama, produced in times of greater public freedom, the new comedy is generally reputed to have been superior in delicacy, regularity, and decorum. But although it represented the characters and manners of real life, yet in these characters and manners—to judge at least from the fragments which remain, and from the Latin imitations—there does not appear to have been much variety. There is always an old father, a lover, and a courtesan; as if formed on each other, like the Platonic and licentious lover in the Spanish romances of chivalry. “Their plots,” says Dryden, “were commonly a little girl, stolen or wandering from her parents, brought back unknown to the city,—there got with child by some one, who, by the help of his servant, cheats his father,—and when her time comes to cry Juno Lucina, one or other sees a little box or cabinet which was carried away with her, and so discovers her to her friends;—if some god do not prevent it, by coming down in a machine, and taking the thanks of it to himself. By the plot you may guess much of the cha-

* *Cours de Littérature Dramatique*, Tom. I.

acters of the persons; an old father, who would willingly before he dies see his son well married; a debauched son, kind in his nature to his mistress, but miserably in want of money; and a servant, or slave, who has so much art as to strike in with him, and help to dupe his father; a braggadocio captain; a parasite; a lady of pleasure. As for the poor honest maid, on whom the story is built, and who ought to be one of the principal actors in the play, she is commonly mute in it. She has the breeding of the old Elizabeth way: which was, for maids to be seen and not to be heard." Sometimes, however, her breeding appears in being heard and not seen; and Donatus remarks, that invocations of Juno behind the scenes were the only way in which the *severity* of the *Comœdia palliata* allowed young gentlewomen to be introduced. Were we to characterize the ancient drama by appellations of modern invention, it might be said, that the ancient comedy was what we call a comedy of character, and the modern a comedy of intrigue.

Nævius, while inventing plots of his own, had tried to introduce on the Roman stage the style of the *old* Greek comedy; but his dramas did not succeed, and the fate of their author deterred others from following his dangerous career. The government of Athens, which occupies a chief part in the old comedy, was the most popular of all administrations; and hence not only oratory but comedy claimed the right of ridiculing and exposing it. The first state in Greece became the subject of merriment. In one play, the whole body of the people was represented under the allegorical personage of an old dotting driveller; and the pleasantry was not only tolerated but enjoyed by the members of the state itself. Cleon and Lamachus could not have repressed the satire of Aristophanes, as the Metelli checked the invectives of Nævius. Under pretence of patriotic zeal, the Greek comic writers spared no part of the public conduct,—councils, revenues, popular assemblies, judicial proceedings, or warlike enterprizes. Such exposure was a restraint on the ambition of individuals,—a matter of importance to a people jealous of its liberties. All this, however, was quite foreign to the more serious taste, and more aristocratic government, of the Romans, to their estimation of heroes and statesmen, to their respect for their legitimate chiefs, and for the dignity even of a Roman citizen. The profound reverence and proud affection which they entertained for all that exalted the honour of their country, and their extreme sensibility to its slightest disgrace, must have interdicted any exhibition, in which its glory was humbled, or its misfortunes held up to mockery. They would not have laughed so

heartily at the disasters of a Carthaginian, as the Athenians did at those of a Peloponnesian or Sicilian war. The disposition which led them to return thanks to Varro, after the battle of Cannæ, that he had not despaired of the republic, was very different from the temper which excited such contumelious laughter at the promoters of the Spartan war, and the advisers of the fatal expedition to Syracuse*. When the Roman people were seriously offended, the Tarpeian rock, and not the stage, was the spot selected for their vengeance.

Accordingly, Plautus found it most prudent to imitate the style of the new comedy, which had been brought to perfection, about half a century before his birth, by Menander. All his comedies, however, are not strictly formed on this model, as a few partake of the nature of the middle comedy : not that, like Nævius, he satirized the senators or consuls ; but I have little doubt that many of his *dramatis personæ*, such as the miser and braggart captain, were originally caricatures of citizens of Athens. In borrowing from the Greek, he did not, like modern writers of comedy who wish to conceal their plagiarisms, vary the names of his characters, the scene of action, and other external circumstances, while the substance of the drama remained the same ; on the contrary, he preserved every circumstance which could tend to give his dramatic pieces a Greek air :—

“Atque hoc poete faciunt in comœdiis ;
Omnes res gestas esse Athenis autumant,
Quo illud vobis Græcum videatur magis.”

Plautus was the son of a freedman, and was born at Sarsina, a town in Umbria, about the year 525. He was called Plautus from his splay feet, a defect common among the Umbrians. Having turned his attention to the stage, he soon realized a considerable fortune by the popularity of his dramas ; but by risking it in trade, or spending it, according others, on the splendid dresses which he wore as an actor, and theatrical amusements being little resorted to, on account of the famine then prevailing at Rome, he was quickly reduced to such

* In this feature of their character the Athenians had a considerable resemblance to the French, during their most brilliant and courtly era. “Comment,” said a French courtier of the age of Louis XIV., on hearing of a good joke which had been uttered on occasion of a great national calamity ;—“Comment, ne serait on charmé des grands evenemens, des bouleversemens mêmes qui font dire de si jolis mots.”—“On suivit,” says Chamfort, “cette idée, on repassa les mots, les chansons, faites sur tous les desastres de la France. La chanson sur la bataille de Hochstet fut trouvée mauvaise, et quelques uns dirent à ce sujet : Je suis fâché de la perte de cette bataille ; la chanson ne vaut rien.”—*Maximes, Pensées, &c.* par Chamfort, p. 190.

necessity as forced him to labour at a hand-mill for his daily support* an employment which at Rome, was the ordinary punishment of a worthless slave. Many of his plays were written in these unfavourable circumstances, and of course have not obtained all the perfection which might otherwise have resulted from his knowledge of life, and his long practice in the dramatic art.

Of the performances of Plautus, the first, in that alphabetical order in which, for want of a better, they are usually arranged, is,

Amphitryon.—Personal resemblances are a most fertile subject of comic incidents, and almost all nations have had their *Amphitryon*. The Athenians in particular gladly availed themselves of this subject, as it afforded an opportunity of throwing ridicule on the dull Bœotians. It is not certain, however, from what Greek author the play of Plautus was taken. Being announced as a tragi-comedy, some critics† have conjectured that it was most probably imitated from an *Amphitryon* mentioned by Athenæus,‡ which was the work of Rhinton, a poet of Tarentum, who wrote mock-tragedies and tragi-comedies styled *Rhintonica* or *Hilarotragœdia*. M. Schlegel, however, alleges that it was borrowed from a play of Epicharmus the Sicilian. The subjects indeed of the ancient Greek comedy, particularly in the hands of Epicharmus, its inventor, were frequently derived from mythology. Even in its maturity, these topics were not renounced, as appears from the titles of several lost pieces of Aristophanes and his contemporaries. Such fabulous traditions continued sometimes to occupy the scenes of the middle comedy, and it was not till the new was introduced that the sphere of the comic drama was confined to the representation of private and domestic life. Euripides also is said to have written a play entitled *Alcmena*, on the story of *Amphitryon*, but how far Plautus may have been indebted to him for his plot cannot be now ascertained. It is probable enough, however, that some of the serious parts may have been copied from the *Alcmena* of Euripides. The catastrophe of Plautus's *Amphitryon* is brought about by a storm; and we learn from the *Rudens*, another play of Plautus, that a tempest was introduced by the Greek tragedian—

“ Non ventus fuit, verum Alcmena Euripidis.”

* Au. Gellius, *Noct. Att. Lib. III. c. 3.*

† Signorelli, *Storia di Teatri. Tom. II. p. 32.*

‡ Lib. III.

The Latin play is introduced by a prologue which is spoken by the God Mercury, and was explanatory to the audience of the circumstances preceding the opening of the piece, and the situation of the principal characters. The term *prologue* has been very arbitrarily used. In one sense it merely signified the induction to the dramatic action, which informed the spectator of what was necessary to be known for duly understanding it. Aristotle calls that part of a tragedy the prologue, which precedes the first song of the chorus.* In the Greek tragedies, the prologue was often a long introductory and narrative monologue. Sophocles, however, so *dialogued* this part of the drama, that it has no appearance of a contrivance to instruct, but seems a natural conversation of the *dramatis personæ*. Euripides, on the other hand, fell more into the style of the formal narrative prologue, since, before entering on the action or dialogue, one of the persons destined to bear a part in the drama frequently explained to the audience, in a continued discourse, what things seemed essential for understanding the piece. Sometimes, however, in the Greek tragedies, the speaker of this species of prologue is not a person of the drama. In general, these artificial prologues of explanatory narration are addressed directly to the spectators, and hence approach nearly to the prologue, in our acceptation of the term. The poets of the ancient comedy, as we see from Aristophanes, usually adopted, like Sophocles, the mode of explaining preliminary circumstances in the course of the action, whence it has been considered that the old Greek comedies have no prologue; and they certainly have none in the strict modern sense, though the method of Euripides has been employed to a certain degree in the *Wasps* and *Birds*, in the former of which Xanthias, interrupting the dialogue with Sosias, turns abruptly to the spectators, and unfolds the argument of the fable. The poets of the middle and new comedy, while departing from Aristophanes in many things, followed him in the form of the prologue; and, as they improved in refinement, interwove still closer the requisite exposition of the fable with its action. The Romans thus found among the Greeks, prologues in a continued narrative, and and prologues where the exposition was mixed with the action. From these models they formed a new species, peculiar to themselves, which is entirely separated from the action of the drama, and which generally contains an explanation of circumstances and characters, with such gentle recommendation of the piece as suited the purpose of the author. We shall

* Poet. XII.

find that the Latin prologues, dressed up in the form of narrative, sometimes preceded the dramatic induction of the action, and at other times, as in the *Miles Gloriosus*, followed it. The prologue of the *Mostellaria* is on the plan adopted by Aristophanes, and that of the *Cistellaria* is conformable to the practice of our own theatre. To other plays, such as the *Epidicus* and *Bacchides*, there were originally no prologues, but they were prefixed after the death of the author, in order to explain the reasons for bringing them forward anew. It thus appears that in his prologues Plautus approached nearer to Euripides than to those comic writers whom in his argument and all other respects he chiefly followed. The prologues of Terence, again, seldom announce the subject. In the manner of the Greeks, his induction is laid in the first scene of the play, and the prologues seem chiefly intended to acknowledge the Greek original of his drama, and to explain matters personal to himself. They rather resemble the choruses of Aristophanes, which in the *Wasps* and other plays directly address the audience in favour of the poet, and complain of the unjust reception which his dramas occasionally experienced.

In the prologue to the *Amphitryon*, Plautus calls his play a *tragi-comedy**; probably not so much that there is any thing tragical in the subject, (although the character of Alcmena is a serious one,) as, because it is of that mixed kind in which the highest as well as lowest characters are introduced. The plot is chiefly founded on the well-known mythological incident of Jupiter assuming the figure of Amphitryon, general of the Thebans, during his absence with the army, and by that means imposing on his wife Alcmena. The play opens while Jupiter is supposed to be with the object of his passion. Sosia, the servant of Amphitryon, who had been sent on before by his master, from the port to announce his victory and approach, is introduced on the stage, proceeding towards the palace of Amphitryon. While expressing his astonishment at the length of the night, he is met, in front of his master's house, by Mercury, who had assumed his form, and who, partly by blows and threats, and partly by leading him to doubt of his own identity, succeeds in driving him back. This gives Jupiter time to prosecute his amour, and he departs at dawn. The

* "Faciam ut commixta sit tragico comœdia;
Nam me perpetuo facere ut sit comœdia,
Reges quo veniant et Dii, non par arbitror.
Quid igitur? quoniam hic servus quoque partem habet,
Faciam sit, proinde ut dixi, tragi-comœdia."

improbable story related by Sosia is not believed by his master, who himself now advances towards his house, from which Alcmena comes forth, lamenting the departure of her supposed husband; but seeing Amphitryon, she expresses her surprise at his speedy return. The jealousy of Amphitryon is thus excited, and he quits the stage, in order to bring evidence that he had never till that time quitted his army. Jupiter then returns, and Amphitryon is afterwards refused access to his own house by Mercury, who pretends that he does not know him. At length Jupiter and Amphitryon are confronted. They are successively questioned as to the events of the late war by the pilot of the ship in which Amphitryon had returned. As Jupiter also stands this test of identity, the real Amphitryon is wrought up to such a pitch of rage and despair, that he resolves to wreak vengeance on his whole family, and is provoked even to utter blasphemies, by setting the gods at defiance. He is supposed immediately after this to have been struck down by lightning, as, in the next scene, Bromia, the attendant of Alcmena, rushes out from the house, alarmed at the tempest, and finds Amphitryon lying prostrate on the earth. When he has recovered, she announces to him that during the storm Alcmena had given birth to twins:—

“*Amph.* Ain’ tu Geminos? *Brom.* Geminos. *Amph.* Dii me servant.”

Jupiter then, *in propria persona*, reveals the whole mystery, and Amphitryon appears to be much flattered by the honour which had been paid him.

In this play the jealousy and perplexity of Amphitryon are well portrayed, and the whole character of Alcmena is beautifully drawn. She is represented as an affectionate wife, full of innocence and simplicity, and her distress at the suspicions of the real Amphitryon is highly interesting. The English translator of Plautus has remarked the great similarity of manners between her and Desdemona, while placed in similar circumstances. Both express indignation at being suspected, but love for their husbands makes them easily reconciled. The reader, however, feels that Amphitryon and Alcmena remain in an awkward situation at the conclusion of the piece. It must also be confessed, that the Roman dramatist has assigned a strange part to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, at whose festivals this play is said to have been usually performed; but, as Voltaire has remarked, “Il n’y a que ceux qui ne savent point combien les hommes agissent peu consequemment, qui puissent etre surpris, qu’on se moqua publiquement au theatre, des memes dieux qu’on adorait dans les temples.”

Mistakes are a most fruitful subject of comic incident, and never could there be such mistakes as those which arise from two persons being undistinguishable: but then, in order to give an appearance of verisimilitude on the stage, it was almost necessary that the play should be represented with masks, which could alone exhibit the perfect resemblance of the two Amphitryons and the two Sosias; and even with this advantage, such errors, in order to possess dramatic plausibility, must have been founded on some mythological tradition. The subject, therefore, is but an indifferent one for the modern stage. Accordingly, Ludovico Dolce, who first imitated this comedy in his play entitled *Marito*, has grossly erred in transporting the scene from Thebes to Padua, and assigning the parts of Jupiter and Amphitryon to Messer Muzio and Fabrizio, two Italian citizens, who were so similar in appearance, that the wife of one of them, though a sensible and virtuous woman, is deceived night and day, during her husband's absence, by the resemblance, and the deception is aided by the still more marvellous likeness of their domestics. In place of Jupiter appearing in the clouds, and justifying Alcmena, the Italian has introduced a monk, called Fra Girolamo, who is bribed to persuade the foolish husband that a spirit (Folletto) had one night transported him to Padua, during sleep, which satisfactorily accounts to him for the situation in which he finds his wife on his return home.

These absurdities have been in a great measure avoided in the imitation by Rotrou, who may be regarded as the father of the French drama, having first exploded the bad taste which pervades the pieces of Hardy. His comedy entitled *Les Deux Sosies*, is completely framed on the Amphitryon of Plautus, only the prologue is spoken by the inveterate Juno, who declaims against her rivals, and enumerates the labours which she has in store for the son of Alcmena.

But by far the most celebrated imitation of Plautus is the *Amphitryon* of Moliere, who has managed with much delicacy a subject in itself not the most decorous. He has in general followed the steps of the Roman dramatist, but where he has departed from them, he has improved on the original. Instead of the dull and inconsistent prologue delivered by Mercury, which explains the subject of the piece, he has introduced a scene between Mercury and Night, (probably suggested by the Dialogues of Lucian between Mercury and the Sun on the same occasion,) in which Mercury announces the state of matters while requesting Night to prolong her stay on earth for the sake of Jupiter. At the commencement of the piece, Plautus has made Sosia repeat to himself a very minute, though picturesque

account of the victory of the Thebans, as preparatory to a proper description of it to Alcmena. This Moliere has formed into a sort of dialogued soliloquy between Sosia and his Lantern, which rehearses the answers anticipated from Alcmena, till the discourse is at length interrupted by the arrival of Mercury, when the speaker has lost himself among the manœuvres of the troops. In the Latin *Amphitryon*, Mercury threatens Sosia, and he replies to his rodomontade by puns and quibbles, which have been omitted by the French poet, who makes the spectators laugh by the excessive and ridiculous terror of Sosia, and not by pleasantries inconsistent with his feelings and situation. Moliere has copied from Plautus the manner in which Sosia is gradually led to doubt of his own identity : his consequent confusion of ideas has been closely imitated, as also the ensuing scenes of the quarrel and reconciliation between Jupiter and Alcmena. He has added the part of Cleanthes, the wife of Sosia, suggested to him by a line put into the mouth of Sosia by Plautus—

“ Quid me expectatum non ree amicæ meæ venturum.”

It was certainly ingenious to make the adventures of the slave a parody on those of his master, and this new character produces an agreeable scene between her and Mercury, who is little pleased with the caresses of this antiquated charmer. On the other hand, the French dramatist has omitted the examination of the double Amphitryons, and nearly introduces them in the presence of two Thebans : Amphitryon brings his friends to avenge him, by assailing Jupiter, when that god appears in the clouds and announces the future birth of Hercules. Through the whole comedy, Moliere has given a different colour to the behaviour of Jupiter, from that thrown over it by Plautus. In the Latin play he assumes quite the character of the husband ; but with Moliere he is more of a lover and gallant, and pays Alcmena so many amorous compliments, that she exclaims,

“ Amphitryon, en vérité,
Vous vous moquez de tenir ce langage !”

Moliere evidently felt that Alcmena and Amphitryon were placed in an awkward situation, in spite of the assurances of Jupiter—

“ Alcmenes est toute a toi, quelque soin qu'on employe ;
Et ce doit a tes feux estre un objet bien doux,
De voir, que pour lui plaire, il n'est point d'autre voie,
Que de paraître son epoux.

Sosie. Le seigneur Jupiter sait dorer sa pilule.”

VOL. I.—O

In these, and several other lines, Moliere has availed himself of the old French play of Rotrou. The lively expression of Sosia,

“Le veritable Amphitryon est l'Amphitryon ou l'on dine,”

which has passed into a sort of proverb, has been suggested by a similar phrase of Rotrou's Sosia—

“Point point d'Amphitryon ou l'on ne dine point ;”

and the lines,

“J'etais venu, je vous jure,
Avant que je fusse arrivé,”

are nearly copied from Rotrou's

“J'etais chez-nous avant mon arrive ;”

and Sosia's boast, in the older French play,

“Il m'est conforme en tout—il est grand, il est fort,”

has probably suggested to Moliere the lines,

“Des pieds, jusqu' a la tete il est comme moi fait,
Beau, l'air noble, bienpris, les manieres charmantes.”

The *Amphitryon* of Moliere was published in 1668, so that Dryden, in his imitation of Plautus's *Amphitryon*, which first appeared in 1690, had an opportunity of also availing himself of the French piece. But, even with this assistance, he has done Plautus less justice than his predecessor. He has sometimes borrowed the scenes and incidents of Moliere ; but has too frequently given us ribaldry in the low characters, and bombast in the higher, instead of the admirable grace and liveliness of the French dramatist. His comedy commences earlier than either the French or Latin play. Phœbus makes his appearance at the opening of the piece. The first arrival of Jupiter in the shape of Amphitryon is then represented, apparently in order to introduce Phædra, the attendant of Alcmena, exacting a promise from her mistress, before she knew, who had arrived, that they should that night be bed-fellows as usual since Amphitryon's absence. To this Phædra, Dryden has assigned an amour with Mercury, to the great jealousy of Sosia's wife. Bromia ; and has mixed up the whole play with pastoral dialogues and *rondeaus*, to which, as he

informs us in his dedication, "the numerous choir of fair ladies gave so just an applause." The scenes of a higher description are those which have been best managed. The latest editor, indeed, of the works of Dryden, thinks that in these parts he has surpassed both the French and Roman dramatist. "The sensation to be expressed," he remarks, "is not that of sentimental affection, which the good father of Olympus was not capable of feeling; but love of that grosser and subordinate kind, which prompted Jupiter in his intrigues, has been expressed by none of the ancient poets in more beautiful verse, than that in which Dryden has clothed it, in the scenes between Jupiter and Alcmena." Milbourne, who afterwards so violently attacked the English poet, highly compliments him on the success of this effort of his dramatic muse—

"Not Phœbus could with gentler words pursue
His flying Daphne; not the morning dew
Falls softer, than the words of amorous Jove,
When melting, dying, for Alcmena's love."

The character, however, of Alcmena is, I think, less interesting in the English than in the Latin play. She is painted by Plautus as delighted with the glory of her husband. In the second scene of the second act, after a beautiful complaint on account of his absence, she consoles herself with the thoughts of his military renown, and concludes with an eulogy on valour, which would doubtless be highly popular in a Roman theatre during the early ages of the Republic—

———"Virtus præmium est optimum,
Virtus omnibus rebus anteit profecto.
Libertas, salus, vita, res, parentis,
Patria, et prognati tutantur, servantur:
Virtus omnia in se habet; omnia adsunt bona, quem pen' est virtus."

Dryden's Alcmena is represented as quite different in her sentiments: She exclaims, on parting with Jupiter,

"Curse on this honour, and this public fame!
Would you had less of both, and more of love!"

Lady M. W. Montague gives a curious account, in one of her letters, of a German play on the subject of Amphitryon, which she saw acted at Vienna.—"As that subject had been already handled by a Latin, French, and English poet, I was curious to see what an Austrian author could make of it. I understand enough of that language to comprehend the greatest part of it; and, besides, I took with me a lady that had the

goodness to explain to me every word. I thought the house very low and dark; but the comedy admirably recompensed that defect. I never laughed so much in my life. It began with Jupiter falling in love out of a peep-hole in the clouds, and ended with the birth of Hercules. But what was most pleasant was, the use Jupiter made of his metamorphosis; for you no sooner saw him under the figure of Amphitryon, but, instead of flying to Alcmena with the raptures Dryden puts into his mouth, he sends for Amphitryon's tailor, and cheats him of a laced coat, and his banker of a bag of money—a Jew of a diamond ring, and bespeaks a great supper in his name; and the greatest part of the comedy turns upon poor Amphitryon's being tormented by these people for their debts. Mercury uses Sosia in the same manner; but I could not easily pardon the liberty the poet had taken of larding his play with not only indecent expressions, but such gross words as I do not think our mob would suffer from a mountebank."

In nothing can the manners of different ages and countries be more distinctly traced, than in the way in which the same subject is treated on the stage. In Plautus, may be remarked the military enthusiasm and early rudeness of the Romans—in the *Marito* of L. Dolce, the intrigues of the Italians, and the constant interposition of priests and confessors in domestic affairs—in Dryden, the libertinism of the reign of Charles the Second—and in Moliere, the politeness and refinement of the court of Louis.

Astinaria, is translated from the Greek of Demophilus, a writer of the Middle comedy. The subject is the trick put on an ass-driver by two roguish slaves, in order to get hold of the money which he brought in payment of some asses he had purchased from their master, that they might employ it in supplying the extravagance of their master's son. The old man, however, is not the dupe in this play: On the contrary, he is a confederate in the plot, which was chiefly devised against his wife, who, having brought her husband a great portion, imperiously governed his house and family. By this means the youth is restored to the possession of a mercenary mistress, from whom he had been excluded by a more wealthy rival. The father stipulates, as a reward for the part which he had acted in this stratagem, that he also should have a share in the favours of his son's mistress; and the play concludes with this old wretch being detected by his wife, carousing at a nocturnal banquet, a wreath of flowers on his head, with his son and the courtesan. It would appear, from the concluding address to the spectators, that neither the moral sense of the author, nor of his audience, was very strong

or correct, as the bystanders on the stage, so far from condemning these abandoned characters, declare that the most guilty of the three had done nothing new or surprising, or more than what was customary :

“ *Grex. Hic senex, si quid, clam uxorem, suo animo fecit volup,
Neque novum, neque mirum fecit, nec secus quam alii solent :
Nec quisqua 'st tam in genio duro ; nec tam firmo pectore,
Quam ubi quicquam occasionis sit, sibi faciat bene.*”

Lucilius, while remarking in one of his fragments, that the Chremes of Terence had preserved a just medium in morals by his obliging demeanour towards his son, had ample grounds for observing, that the Demænetus of Plautus had run into an extreme—

“ *Chremes in medium, in summum ire Ademænetus*.*”

However exceptionable in point of morals, this play possesses much comic vivacity and interest of character. The courtesan and the slaves are sketched with spirit and freedom, and the rapacious disposition of the female dealer in slave-girls, is well developed.

It is curious that this immoral comedy should have been so frequently acted in the Italian convents. In particular, a translation in *terza rima* was represented in the monastery of St Stefano at Venice, in 1514†. It was not of a nature to be often imitated by modern writers, but Moliere, who has borrowed so many of the plots of other plays of Plautus, has extracted from this drama several situations and ideas. Cleæreta, in the third scene of the first Act of the *Asinaria*, gives, as her advice, to a gallant—

“ *Næque ille scit quid det, quid damni faciat : illi rei studet ;
Vult placere sese amicæ, vult mihi, vult pedissequæ,
Vult famulis, vult etiam ancillis ; et quoque catulo meo
Sublanditur novus amator.*”

In like manner, in the *Femmes Savantes*, Henriette, while counselling Clitandre to be complaisant, says—

“ *Un amant fait sa cour ou s'attache son cœur,
Il veut de tout le monde y gagner la faveur ;
Et pour n'avoir personne a sa flamme contraire,
Jusqu'au chien du logis il s'efforce de plaire.*”

Aulularia.—It is not known from what Greek author this play has been taken ; but there can be no doubt that it had

* *Sat. Lib. XXVIII.* † *Walker's Essay on the Revival of the Drama in Italy.*

its archetype in the Greek drama. The festivals of Ceres and Bacchus, which in their origin were innocent institutions, intended to celebrate the blessings of harvest and vintage, having degenerated by means of priestcraft, became schools of superstition and debauchery. From the adventures and intrigues which occurred at the celebration of religious mysteries, the comic poets of Greece frequently drew the incidents of their dramas*, which often turned on damsels having been rendered, on such occasions, the mothers of children, without knowing who were the fathers. In like manner, the intrigue of the *Aulularia* has its commencement in the daughter of Euclio being violated during the celebration of the mysteries of Ceres, without being aware from whom she had received the injury. The *Aulularia*, however, is principally occupied with the display of the character of a Miser. No vice has been so often pelted with the good sentences of moralists, or so often ridiculed on the stage, as avarice; and of all the characters that have been there represented, that of the miser in the *Aulularia* of Plautus, is perhaps the most entertaining and best supported. Comic dramas have been divided into those of intrigue and character, and the *Aulularia* is chiefly of the latter description. It is so termed from *Aula*, or *Olla*, the diminutive of which is *Aulula*, signifying the little earthen pot that contained a treasure which had been concealed by his grandfather, but had been discovered by Euclio the miser, who is the principal character of the play. The prologue is spoken by the *Lar Familiaris* of the house; and as the play has its origin in the discovery of a treasure deposited under a hearth, the introduction of this imaginary Being, if we duly consider the superstitions of the Romans, was happy and appropriate. The account given by the *Lar* of the successive generations of misers, is also well imagined, as it convinces us that Euclio was a genuine miser, and of the true breed. The household god had disclosed the long-concealed treasure, as a reward for the piety of Euclio's daughter, who presented him with offerings of frankincense and of wine, which, however, it is not very probable the miser's daughter could have procured, especially before the discovery of the treasure. The story of the precious deposit, of which the spectators could not possibly have been informed without this supernatural interposition, being thus related, we are introduced at once to the knowledge of the principal character, who, having found the treasure, employs himself in guarding it, and lives in continual apprehension, lest it should be dis-

* Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* Lib. II. c. 22.

covered that he possesses it. Accordingly, he is brought on the stage driving off his servant, that she may not spy him while visiting this hoard, and afterwards giving directions of the strictest economy. He then leaves home on an errand very happily imagined—an attendance at a public distribution of money to the poor. Megadorus now proposes to marry his daughter, and Euclio comically enough supposes that he has discovered something concerning his newly acquired wealth; but on his offering to take her without a portion, he is tranquillized, and agrees to the match. Knowing the disposition of his intended father-in-law, Megadorus sends provisions to his house, and also cooks, to prepare a marriage-feast, but the miser turns them out, and keeps what they had brought. At length his alarm for discovery rises to such a height, that he hides his treasure in a grove, consecrated to Sylvanus, which lay beyond the walls of the city. While thus employed, he is observed by the slave of Lyconides, the young man who had violated the miser's daughter. Euclio coming to recreate himself with the sight of his gold, finds that it is gone. Returning home in despair, he is met by Lyconides, who, hearing of the projected nuptials between his uncle and the miser's daughter, now apologizes for his conduct; but the miser applies all that he says concerning his daughter to his lost treasure. This play is unfortunately mutilated, and ends with the slave of Lyconides confessing to his master that he has found the miser's hoard, and offering to give it up as the price of his freedom. It may be presumed, however, that, in the original, Lyconides got possession of the treasure, and by its restoration to Euclio, so far conciliated his favour, that he obtained his daughter in marriage. This conclusion, accordingly, has been adopted by those who have attempted to finish the comedy in the spirit of the Latin dramatist. It is completed on this plan by Thornton, the English translator of Plautus, and by Antonius Codrus Urceus, a professor in the University of Bologna, who died in the year 1500. Urceus has also made the miser suddenly change his nature, and liberally present his new son-in-law with the restored treasure.

The restless inquietude of Euclio, in concealing his gold in many different places—his terror on seeing the preparations for the feast, lest the wine brought in was meant to intoxicate him, that he might be robbed with greater facility—his dilemma at being obliged to miss the distribution to the poor—are all admirable traits of extreme and habitual avarice. Even his recollection of the expense of a rope, when, in despair at the loss of his treasure, he resolves to hang himself, though a little

overdone, is sufficiently characteristic. But while the part of a confirmed miser has been comically and strikingly represented in these touches, it is stretched in others beyond all bounds of probability. When Euclio entreats his female servant to spare the cobwebs—when it is said, that he complains of being pillaged if the smoke issue from his house—and that he preserves the parings of his nails—we feel this to be a species of hoarding which no miser could think of or enjoy*.

In Sporta
 One of the earliest imitations of the *Aulularia* was, *La Sporta*, a prose Italian comedy, printed at Florence in 1543, under the name of Giovam-Battista Gelli, but attributed by some to Machiavel. It is said, that the great Florentine historian left this piece, in an imperfect state, in the hands of his friend Bernardino di Giordano of Florence, in whose house his comedies were sometimes represented, whence it passed into the possession of Gelli, a writer of considerable humour, who prepared it for the press; and, according to a practice not unfrequent in Italy at different periods, published it as his own production†. The play is called *Sporta*, from the basket in which the treasure was contained. The plot and incidents in Plautus have been closely followed, in so far as was consistent with modern Italian manners; and where they varied, the circumstances, as well as names, have been adapted by the author to the customs and ideas of his country. Euclio is called Ghirorgoro, and Megadorus, Lapo; the former being set up as a satire on avarice, the latter as a pattern of proper economy.

Case altered
 The principal plot of *The case is altered*, a comedy attributed to Ben Jonson, has been taken, as shall be afterwards shown, from the *Captivi* of Plautus; but the character of Jaques is

* A Latin prose comedy, entitled *Querulus seu Aulularia*, having been found in one of the most ancient MSS. of Plautus discovered in the Vatican, was by some erroneously attributed to that dramatist; though, in his prologue, its author quotes Cicero, and expressly declares, that he purposed to imitate Plautus! It was first edited in 1664 by Peter Daniel; and is now believed to have been written in the time of the Emperor Theodosius. In some respects it has an affinity to the genuine *Aulularia* of Plautus. The prologue is spoken by the *Lar Familiaris*; and a miser, called Euclio, on going abroad, had concealed a treasure, contained in a pot, in some part of his house. While dying, in a foreign land, he bequeathed to a parasite, who had there insinuated himself into his favour, one half of his fortune, on condition that he should inform his son Querulus, so called from his querulous disposition, of the place where his treasure was deposited. The parasite proceeds to the miser's native country, and attempts, though unsuccessfully, to defraud the son of the whole inheritance.

From a curious mistake, first pointed out by Archbishop Usher, in his *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, this drama was attributed to Gildas, the British Jeremiah, as Gibbon calls him; who entitled one of his complaints concerning the affairs of Britain, *Querulus*.—Vossius, *de Poet. Lat.* Lib. I. c. 6. § 9.

† Walker's *Essay on the Italian Drama*. p. 224.

more closely formed on that of Euclio, than any miser on the modern stage. Jaques having purloined the treasure of a French Lord Chamont, whose steward he had been, and having also stolen his infant daughter, fled with them to Italy. The girl, when she grew up, being very beautiful, had many suitors; whence her reputed father suspects it is discovered that he possesses hidden wealth, in the same manner as Euclio does in the scene with Megadorus. We have a representation of his excessive anxiety lest he lose this treasure—his concealment of it—and his examination of Juniper, the cobbler, whom he suspects to have stolen it; which corresponds to Euclio's examination of Strobilus. Most other modern dramatists have made their miser in love; but in the breast of Jaques all passions are absorbed in avarice, which is exhibited to us not so much in ridiculous instances of minute domestic economy, as in absolute adoration of his gold:

“ I'll take no leave, sweet prince, great emperor!
But see thee every minute, king of kings!”

It is thus he feasts his senses with his treasure: and the very ground in which it is hidden is accounted hallowed:

“ This is the palace, where the god of gold
Shines like the sun of sparkling majesty!”

But the most celebrated imitation of the *Aulularia* is Moliere's *Avare*, one of the best and most wonderful imitations ever produced. Almost nothing is of the French dramatist's own invention. Scenes have been selected by him from a number of different plays, in various languages, which have no relation to each other; but every thing is so well connected, that the whole appears to have been invented for this single comedy. Though chiefly indebted to Plautus, he has not so closely followed his original as in the *Amphitryon*. One difference, which materially affects the plots of the two plays and characters of the misers, is, that Euclio was poor till he unexpectedly found the treasure. He was not known to be rich, and lived in constant dread of his wealth being discovered. When any thing was said about riches, he applied it to himself; and when well received or caressed by any one, he supposed that he was ensnared. Harpagon, on the other hand, had amassed a fortune, and was generally known to possess it, which gives an additional zest to the humour, as we thus enter into the merriment of his family and neighbours; whereas the penury of Euclio could scarcely have appeared unreasonable to the bystanders, who were not in the secret of the acquired

VOL. I.—P

treasure. Moliere has also made his miser in love, or at least resolved to marry, and amuses us with his anxiety, in believing himself under the necessity of giving a feast to his intended bride; which is still better than Euclio's consternation at the supper projected by his intended son-in-law. Euclio is constantly changing the place where he conceals his casket; Harpagon allows it to remain, but is chiefly occupied with its security. The idea, however, of so much incident turning on a casket, is not so happily imagined in the French as in the Latin comedy; since, in the latter, it was the whole treasure of which the miser was possessed, and there was at that time no mode of lending it out safely and to advantage. Harpagon gives a collation, but orders the fragments to be sent back to those who had provided it; Euclio retains the provisions, which had been procured at another's expense. From the restraint imposed by modern manners, and the circumstance of Harpagon being known to be rich, Moliere has been forced to omit the amusing dilemmas in which Euclio is placed with regard to his attendance on the distributions to the poor. In recompense, he has wonderfully improved the scene about the dowry, as also that in which the miser applies what is said concerning his daughter to his lost treasure; and, on the whole, he has displayed the passion of avarice in more of the incidents and relations of domestic life than the Latin poet. Plautus had remained satisfied with exhibiting a miser, who deprived himself of all the comforts of life, to watch night and day over an unproductive treasure; but Moliere went deeper into the mind. He knew that avarice is accompanied with selfishness, and hardness of heart, and falsehood, and mistrust, and usury; and accordingly, all these vices and evil passions are amalgamated with the character of the French miser.

The *Aulularia* being a play of character, I have been led to compare the most celebrated imitations of it rather in the exhibition of the miserly character than in the incidents of the piece. Many of the latter which occur in the *Avare*, have not been borrowed from Plautus, yet are not of Moliere's invention. Thus he has added from the *Pedant Joué* of Cyrano Bergerac that part of the plot which consists in the love of the miser and his son for the same woman, as also that which relates to Valere, a young gentleman in love with the miser's daughter, who had got into his service in disguise, and who, when the miser lost his money, which his son's servant had stolen, was accused by another servant of having purloined it. Moliere's notion of the miser's prodigal son borrowing money from a usurer, and the usurer afterwards proving to be his father, is from *La Belle Plaideuse*, a comedy of Bois-Robert. In an

Italian piece, *Le Case Svaligiate*, prior to the time of Moliere, and in the harlequin taste, Scapin persuades Pantaloon that the young beauty with whom he is captivated returns his love, that she sets a particular value on old age, and dislikes youthful admirers, whence Pantaloon is induced to give his purse to the flatterer. Frosine attacks the vanity of Harpagon in the same manner, but he, though not unmoved by the flattery, retains his money. Moliere has availed himself of a number of other Italian dramas of the same description for scattered remarks and situations. The name of Harpagon has been suggested to him by the continuation of Codrus Urceus, where Strobilus says that the masters of the present day are so avaricious, that they may be called Harpies or Harpagons:

“ Tenaces nimium dominos nostra ætas
Tulit, quos Harpagones vocare soleo.”

I do not know where Moliere received the hint of the *denouement* of his piece. The conclusion of the *Aulularia*, as already mentioned, is not extant, but it could not have been so improbable and inartificial as the discovery of Valere and Marianne for the children of Thomas D'Alburci, who, under the name of Anselme, had courted the miser's daughter.

Shadwell, Fielding, and Goldoni, enjoyed the advantage of studying Moliere's Harpagon for their delineations of Goldingham, Lovegold, and Ottavio. In the miser of Shadwell there is much indecency indeed of his own invention, and some disgusting representations of city vulgarity and vice; but still he is hardly entitled to the praise of so much originality as he claims in his impudent preface.—“The foundation of this play,” says he, “I took from one of Moliere's, called *L'Avare*, but that having too few persons, and too little action for an English theatre, I added to both so much, that I may call more than half of this play my own; and I think I may say, without vanity, that Moliere's part of it has not suffered in my hands. Nor did I ever know a French comedy made use of by the worst of our poets that was not bettered by them. It is not barrenness of art or invention makes us borrow from the French, but laziness; and *this* was the occasion of my making use of *L'Avare*.”

Fielding's *Miser*, the only one of his comedies which does him credit, is a much more agreeable play than Shadwell's. The earlier scenes are a close imitation of Moliere, but the concluding ones are somewhat different, and the *denouement* is perhaps improved. Mariana is in a great measure a new character, and those of the servants are rendered more prominent and important than in the French original.

The miser Ottavio, in Goldoni's *Vero Amico*, is entirely copied from Plautus and Moliere. In the Italian play, however, the character is in a great measure episodal, and the principal plot, which gives its title to the piece, and corresponds with that of Diderot's *Fils Naturel*, has been invented by the Italian dramatist.

On the whole, Moliere has succeeded best in rendering the passion of avarice hateful: Plautus and Goldoni have only made it ridiculous. The profound and poetical avarice of Jaques possesses something plaintive in its tone, which almost excites our sympathy, and never our laughter; he is represented as a worshipper of gold, somewhat as an old Persian might be of the sun, and he does not raise our contempt by the absurdities of domestic economy. But Harpagon is thoroughly detestable, and is in fact detested by his neighbours, domestics, and children. All these dramatists are accused of having exhibited rather an allegorical representation of avarice, than the living likeness of a human Being influenced by that odious propensity. "Plautus," says Hurd, "and also Moliere, offended in this, that for the picture of the avaricious man they presented us with a fantastic unpleasing draught of the passion of avarice—I call it a fantastic draught, because it hath no archetype in nature, and it is farther an unpleasing one; from being the delineation of a simple passion, unmixed, it wants

‘The lights and shades, whose well accorded strife
Gives all the strength and colour of our life.’”

This may in general be true, as there are certainly few unmingled passions; but I suspect that avarice so completely engrosses the soul, that a simple and unmixed delineation of it is not remote from nature. "The Euclio of Plautus," says King, in his *Anecdotes*, "the Avare of Moliere, and Miser of Shadwell, have been all exceeded by persons who have existed within my own knowledge*."

Bacchides:—is so called from two sisters of the name of Bacchis, who are the courtezans in this play. In a prologue, which is supposed to be spoken by Silenus, mounted on an ass, it is said to be taken from a Greek comedy by Philemon. This information, however, cannot be implicitly relied on, as the prologue was not written in the time of Plautus, and is

* P. 106. Ed. 1819.—I have often wondered, that while the character of a Miser has been exhibited so frequently, and with such success, on the stage; it should scarcely have been well delineated, so far as I remember, in any novel of note, except, perhaps, in the person of Mr. Briggs, in *Cecilia*.

evidently an addition of a comparatively recent date. Some indeed have supposed that it was prefixed by Petrarch; but at all events the following lines could not have been anterior to the conquest of Greece by the Romans:—

“Samos quæ terra sit, nota est omnibus:
Nam maria, terras, montes, atque insulas
Vostre legiones reddidere pervias.”

The leading incident in this play—a master’s folly and inadvertence counteracting the deep-laid scheme of a slave to forward his interest, has been employed by many modern dramatists for the groundwork of their plots; as we find from the *Inavertito* of Nicolo Barbieri, surnamed Beltramo, the *Amant Indiscret* of Quinault, Moliere’s *Etourdi*, and Dryden’s *Sir Martin Mar-all*.

The third scene of the third act of this comedy, where the father of Pistoclerus speaks with so much indulgence of the follies of youth, has been imitated in Moliere’s *Fourberies de Scapin*, and the fifth scene of the fourth act has suggested one in *Le Marriage Interrompu**, by Cailhava. If it could be supposed that Dante had read Plautus, the commencement of Lydus’ soliloquy before the door of Bacchis, might be plausibly conjectured to have suggested that thrilling inscription over the gate of hell, in the third Canto of the *Inferno*—

“Pandite, atque aperite propere januam hanc Orci, obsecro!
Nam equidem haud aliter esse duco; quippe cui nemo advenit,
Nisi quem spes reliquere omnes—”

2671,

Per me si va nella città dolente:
Per me si va nell’eterno dolore:
Per me si va tra la perduta gente.

Lasciate ogni speranza, voi, che entrate.”

Captivi.—The subject and plot of the *Captivi* are of a different description from those of Plautus’ other comedies. No female characters are introduced; and, as it is said in the epilogue, or concluding address to the spectators,

Captivi

—“Ad pudicos mores facta hæc fabula est:
Neque in hac subagitationes sunt, ullave amatio,
Nec pueri suppositio, nec argenti circumductio;
Neque ubi amans adolescens scortum liberet, clam suum patrem.”

Though no females are introduced in it, the *Captivi* is the most tender and amiable of Plautus’ plays, and may be regarded

* Act II. sc. 7.

as of a higher description than his other comedies, since it hinges on paternal affection and the fidelity of friendship. Many of the situations are highly touching, and exhibit actions of generous magnanimity, free from any mixture of burlesque. It has indeed been considered by some critics as the origin of that class of dramas, which, under the title of *Comedies Larmoyantes*, was at one time so much admired and so fashionable in France*, and in which wit and humour, the genuine offspring of Thalia, are superseded by domestic sentiment and pathos.

Hegio, an Ætolian gentleman, had two sons, one of whom, when only four years old, was carried off by a slave, and sold by him in Elis. A war having subsequently broken out between the Elians and Ætoliens, Hegio's other son was taken captive by the Elians. The father, with a view of afterwards ransoming his son, by an exchange, purchased an Elian prisoner, called Philocrates, along with his servant Tyndarus; and the play opens with the master, Philocrates, personating his slave, while the slave, Tyndarus, assumes the character of his master. By this means Tyndarus remains a prisoner under his master's name, while Hegio is persuaded to send the true Philocrates, under the name of Tyndarus, to Elis, in order to effect the exchange of his son. The deception, however, is discovered by Hegio before the return of Philocrates; and the father, fearing that he had thus lost all hope of ransoming his child, condemns Tyndarus to labour in the mines. In these circumstances, Philocrates returns from Elis with Hegio's son, and also brings along with him the fugitive slave, who had stolen his other son in infancy. It is then discovered that Tyndarus is this child, who, having been sold to the father of Philocrates, was appointed by him to wait on his son, and had been gradually admitted to his young master's confidence and friendship.

There has been a great dispute among critics and commentators, whether the dramatic unities have been strictly observed in this comedy. M. De Coste, in the preface to his French translation of the *Captivi*, maintains, that the unities of place, and time, and action, have been closely attended to. Lessing, who translated the play into German, adopted the opinion of De Coste with regard to the observance of the unities, and he has farther pronounced it the most perfect comedy that, in his time, had yet been represented on the stage†. A German critic, whose letter addressed to Lessing is published in that

* Cailhava, *L'Art de la Comedie*, Liv. II. c. 9. Ed. Paris, 1772.

† *Bevtrage, zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters*.

author's works*, has keenly opposed these opinions, discussing at considerable length the question of the unities of action, time, and place, as also pointing out many supposed inconsistencies and improbabilities in the conduct of the drama. He objects, in point of verisimilitude, to the long and numerous *aparts*—the soliloquies of the parasite, which begin the first three acts,—the frequent mention of the market-places and streets of Rome, while the scene is laid in a town of Greece, —and the sudden as well as unaccountable appearance of Stalagmus, the fugitive slave, at the end of the drama. The most serious objection, however, is that which relates to the violation of the dramatic unity of time. The scene is laid in Calydon, the capital of *Ætolia*; and, at the end of the second act, Philocrates proceeds from that city to Elis, transacts there a variety of affairs, and returns before the play is concluded. Between these two places the distance is fifty miles; and in going from one to the other it was necessary to cross the bay of Corinth. It is therefore impossible (contends this critic,) that De Coste can be accurate in maintaining that the duration of the drama is only seven or eight hours. Allowing the poet, however, the greatest poetical license, and giving for his play the extended period of twenty-four hours, it is scarcely possible that the previous parts of the drama could have been gone through, and the long voyage accomplished, in this space of time. But it farther appears, that Plautus himself did not wish to claim this indulgence, and intended to crowd the journey and all the preceding dramatic incidents into twelve hours at most. He evidently means that the action should be understood as commencing with the morning: Hegio says, in the second scene of the first act,

“ Ego ibo ad fratrem, ad alios captivos meos,
Visum ne nocte hęc quippiam turbaverint;”

and it is evident that the action terminates with the evening meal, the preparations for which conclude the fourth act. To all this Lessing replied, that there was no reason to suppose that the scene was laid in Calydon, or that the journey was made to the town of Elis, and that it might easily have been accomplished within the time prescribed by the dramatic rule of unities, if nearer points of the *Ætolian* and *Eliau* territories be taken than their capitals.

Some of the characters in the *Captivi* are very beautifully drawn. Hegio is an excellent representation of a respectable

* *Samtliche Schriften*, Tom. XXII. p. 316.

rich old citizen: He is naturally a humane good-humoured man, but his disposition is warped by excess of paternal tenderness. There is not in any of the comedies of Plautus, a more agreeable and interesting character than Tyndarus; and no delineation can be more pleasing than that of his faithful attachment to Philocrates, by whom he was in return implicitly trusted, and considered rather in the light of a friend than a slave. In this play, as in most others of Plautus, the parasite is a character somewhat of an episodic description: He goes about prowling for a supper, and is associated to the main subject of the piece only by the delight which he feels at the prospect of a feast, to honour the return of Hegio's son. The parasites of Plautus are almost as deserving a dissertation as Shakspeare's clowns. Parasite, as is well known, was a name originally applied in Greece to persons devoted to the service of the gods, and who were appointed for the purpose of keeping the consecrated provisions of the temples. Diodorus of Sinope, as quoted by Athenæus*, after speaking of the dignity of the sacred parasites of Hercules, (who was himself a noted *gourmand*,) mentions that the rich, in emulation of this demi-god, chose as followers persons called parasites, who were not selected for their virtues or talents, but were remarkable for extravagant flattery to their superiors, and insolence to those inferiors who approached the persons of their patrons. This was the character which came to be represented on the stage. We learn from Athenæus†, that a parasite was introduced in one of his plays by Epicharmus, the founder of the Greek comedy. The parasite of this ancient dramatist lay at the feet of the rich, eat the offals from their tables, and drank the dregs of their cups. He speaks of himself as of a person ever ready to dine abroad when invited, and when any one is to be married, to go to his house without an invitation—to pay for his good cheer by exciting the merriment of the company, and to retire as soon as he had eat and drunk sufficiently, without caring whether or not he was lighted out by the slaves‡. In the most ancient comedies, however, this character was not denominated parasite, and was first so called in the plays of Araros, the son of Aristophanes, and one of the earliest authors of the middle comedy. Antiphanes, a dramatist of the same class, has given a very full description of the vocation of a parasite. The part, however, did not become

* Lib. VI. c. 9.

† Id. Lib. VI. c. 7.

‡ The best notion of the Greek parasite is to be got in the fragments of the Greek poets quoted by Athenæus, and in the Letters of Alciphron, a great number of which are supposed to be addressed by parasites to their brethren, and relate the particulars of the injurious treatment which they had received at the tables of the Great.

extremely common till the introduction of the new comedy, when Diphilus, whose works were frequently imitated on the Roman stage, particularly distinguished himself by his delineation of the parasitical character*. In the Greek theatre, the part was usually represented by young men, dressed in a black or brown garb, and wearing masks expressive of malignant gaiety. They carried a goblet suspended round their waists, probably lest the slaves of their patrons should fill to them in too small cups; and also a vial of oil to be used at the bath, which was a necessary preparation before sitting down to table, for which the parasite required to be always ready at a moment's warning†.

It was thus, too, that the character was represented on the Roman stage; and it would farther appear, that the parasites, in the days of Plautus, carried with them a sort of Joe Miller, as a manual of wit, with which they occasionally refreshed their vivacity. Thus the parasite, in the *Stichus*, says,

“Ibo intro ad libros, et discam de dictis melioribus;”

and again—

“Libros inspexi, tam confido, quam potest,
Me meum obtenturum ridiculis meis.”

The parasite naturally became a leading character of the Roman stage. In spite of the pride and boasted national independence of its citizens, the whole system of manners at Rome was parasitical. The connection between patron and client, which was originally the cordial intercourse of reciprocal services, soon became that of haughty superiority on the one side, and sordid adulation on the other. Every client was in fact the parasite of some patrician, whose litter he often followed like a slave, conforming to all his caprices, and submitting to all his insults, for the privilege of being placed at the lowest seat of the patron's table, and there repaying this indelicate hospitality by the most servile flattery. On the stage, the principal use of the parasite was to bring out the other characters from the canvass. Without Gnatho, and Thraso of Terence would have possessed less confidence; and without his flatterer, Pyrgopolinices would never have recollected breaking an elephant's thigh by a blow of his fist.

The parasite, in the *Captivi*, may be considered as a fair enough representative of his brethren in the other plays of

* Athenæus, Lib. VI. c. 17.

† Jul. Pollux, *Onomasticon*, Lib. IV. c. 18.

Plautus. He submits patiently to all manner of ignominious treatment*—his spirits rise and sink according as his prospects of a feast become bright or clouded—he speaks a great deal in soliloquies, in which he talks much of the jests by which he attempted to recommend himself as a guest at the feasts of the Great, but we are not favoured with any of these jests. In such soliloquies, too, he rather expresses what would justly be thought of him by others, than what even a parasite was likely to say of himself.

The parasite is not a character which has been very frequently represented on the modern stage. It is not one into which an Italian audience, who are indifferent to good cheer, would heartily enter. Accordingly, the parasite is not a common character in the native drama of Italy, and is chiefly exhibited in the old comedies of Ariosto and Aretine, which are directly imitated from the plays of Plautus or Terence; but even in them this character does not precisely coincide with the older and more genuine school of parasites. Ligurio, who is called the parasite in the *Mandragora* of Machiavel, rather corresponds to the intriguing slave than to the parasite of the Roman drama; or at least he resembles the more modern parasites, who, like the Phormio of Terence, ingratiate themselves with their patrons by serviceable roguery, rather than by flattery. Ipcrito, who, in Aretine's comedy of that name, is also styled the parasite, is a sort of Tartuffe, with charitable and religious maxims constantly in his mouth. He does not insinuate himself into the confidence of his patrons by a gaping admiration of their foolish sayings, but by extolling their virtues, and smoothing over their vices; and so far from being treated with any sort of contumely, he is held in high consideration, and interposes in all domestic arrangements.

It is still more difficult to find a true parasite on the English stage. Sir John Falstaff, though something of a parasite, is as original as he is inimitable. Lazarillo, the hungry courtier in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Woman Hater*, and Justice Greedy, in Massinger's *New Way to Pay Old Debts*, to whom Sir Giles Overreach gives the command of the kitchen, and absolute authority there, in respect of the entertainment, are rather epicures in constant quest of delicacies, than hungry parasites, who submit to any indignity for the sake of a meal. Lazarillo's whole intrigue consists of schemes for being invited to dine where there was an umbrana's head, and we are told that

* Huic denique manducanti barba vellitur; illi bibenti sedilia subtrahuntur; hic ligno aciesilli, ille fragili vitro pascitur.

— " He hath a courtly kind of hunger,
And doth hunt more for novelty than plenty ;"

and Justice Greedy's delight is placed in rich canary, a larded pheasant, or a red deer baked in puff paste. Mosca, in Ben Jonson's *Volpone*, who grasps at presents made to him by the legacy-hunters of his patron, and who at length attempts to defraud the patron himself, is a parasite of infinitely greater artifice and villainy than any of those in Plautus; and in the opinion of the late editor of Jonson, outweighs the aggregate merit of all Plautus's parasites. Colax, who, in the *Muses' Looking-Glass* of Randolph, chimes in with the sentiments of each character, approving, by an immense variety of subtle arguments, every extreme of vice and folly, appears to flatter all those allegorical representations of the passions exhibited in this drama, rather from courtesy than want. He tells us, indeed, that

" 'Tis gold gives Flattery all her eloquence ;"

but this part of his character is not brought prominently forward, nor is he represented as a glutton or epicure. Perhaps the character which comes nearest to the parasite of the *Captivi* is in a play not very generally known, the *Canterbury Guests*, by Ravenscroft.

But although it might be difficult to find a precise copy in modern times of the parasite of the *Captivi*, its principal plot has been repeatedly imitated, particularly in an old English drama, *The Case is altered*, supposed to have been written by Ben Jonson, and published in some editions of his works. Count Ferneze, a nobleman of Vicenza, and who corresponds to Hegio, lost a son called Camillo, when Vicenza was taken by the French. His other son, Paulo, is afterwards made prisoner by the same enemies. Chamont, the French general, and Camillo Ferneze, who, under the name of Gaspar, had entered into the French service, are taken prisoners by the Italians; and while in captivity they agree to change names, and apparent situations. Camillo, who passes for Chamont, is carefully retained in confinement at Vicenza, while that general is despatched by the Count Ferneze to procure the ransom of his son Paulo. The Count having subsequently detected the imposture, Camillo is put in fetters and ordered for execution. Chamont, however, returns with Paulo, whom he had now redeemed, and the Count afterwards discovers, by means of a tablet hanging round his neck, that the youth Camillo, whom he was treating with such severity, was the son whom he had lost during the sack of Vicenza.

Imitation
Captivi

The *Captivi* is also the foundation of *Les Captifs*, a comedy of Rotrou, where a father, afflicted by the captivity of a son, purchases all the slaves exposed to sale in Ætolia, in the hope of recovering his child. The interest and vivacity of the play, which is one of the best of its author, are supported by the pleasantries of a parasite, and a variety of ingenious incidents. Ginguené has mentioned, in the *Histoire Littéraire d'Italie*, that the *Captivi* must also have suggested the *Suppositi*, a comedy by the author of the *Orlando Furioso*. Ariosto, however, has made the incidents of the *Captivi* subservient to a love intrigue, and not to the deliverance of a prisoner. Whilst Erostrato, a young gentleman, acts the part of a domestic in the house of his mistress's father, his servant, Dulippo, personates his master, and studies in his place at the university of Ferrara. At the conclusion of the piece, Dulippo is discovered to be the son of an old and rich doctor of laws, who was the rival in love of Erostrato. There is a parasite in this play as in the *Captivi*, but the character of the doctor is new, and the scenes chiefly consist of the schemes which are laid by the master and servant to disappoint his views as to the lady of whom Erostrato is enamoured.

Casina. This play is so called from the name of a female slave, on whom, though she does not once appear on the stage, the whole plot of the drama hinges. It is said in the prologue to have been translated from Diphilus, a Greek writer of the new comedy, by whom it was called Κληρομαχοί, the Lot Drawers. Diphilus was a contemporary of Menander; he was distinguished by his comic wit and humour, and occasionally by the moral sententious character of his dramas, of which he is said to have written a hundred, and from which larger fragments have been preserved than from any Greek plays belonging to the new comedy. Notwithstanding what is said in the Delphine Plautus, it is evident from its terms, that the prologue could not have been prefixed by the dramatist himself, but must have been written a good many years after his death, on occasion of a revival of the *Casina*. It would appear from it that the plays of Plautus had rather gone out of fashion immediately after his death; but the public at length, tired with the new comedies, began to call for the reproduction of those of Plautus—

“ Nam, nunc novæ quæ prodeunt comœdiæ,
 Multo sunt nequiores, quam nummi novi.
 Nos postquam rumores populi intelleximus,
 Studiose expetere vos Plautinas fabulas,
 Antiquam ejus edimus comœdiam.”

From the same prologue it would seem that this play, when first represented, had surpassed in popularity all the dramatic productions of the time—

“Hæc quum primùm acta est, vicit omnes fabulas.”

It cannot, indeed, be denied, that, in the *Casina*, the unities of time and place are rigidly observed, and, in point of humour, it is generally accounted inferior to none of Plautus's dramas. The nature, however, of the subject, will admit only of a very slight sketch. The female slave, who gives name to the comedy, is beloved by her master, Stalino, and by his son, Euthynicus,—the former of whom employs Olympio, his bailiff in the country, and the latter his armour-bearer, Chalinus, to marry Casina, each being in hopes, by this contrivance, to obtain possession of the object of his affections. Cleostrata, Stalino's wife, suspecting her husband's designs, supports the interests of her son, and, after much dispute, it is settled, that the claims of the bailiff and armour-bearer should be decided by lot. Fortune having declared in favour of the former, Stalino obtains the loan of a neighbour's house for the occasion, and it is arranged, that its mistress should be invited for one evening by Cleostrata; but the jealous lady counteracts this plan by declining the honour of the visit. At length all concur in making a dupe of the old man. Chalinus is dressed up in wedding garments to personate Casina, and the play concludes with the mortification of Stalino, at finding he had been imposed on by a counterfeit bride.

The plan here adopted by Stalino for securing possession of Casina, is nearly the same with that pursued by the Count Almaviva, in Beaumarchais' prose comedy, *Le Mariage de Figaro*; where the Count, with similar intentions, plans a marriage between Suzanne and his valet-de-chambre, Figaro, but has his best-laid schemes invariably frustrated. The concluding part of the *Casina* has probably, also, suggested the whole of the *Marescalco*, a comedy of the celebrated Aretine, which turns on the projected nuptials of the character who gives name to the piece, and whose supposed bride is discovered, during the performance of the marriage ceremony, to be a page of the Duke of Mantua, dressed up in wedding garments, in a frolic of the Duke's courtiers, in order to impose on the Marescalco. Those scenes in the *Ragazzo* of Lodovico Dolce, where a similar deception is practised, and where Giacchetto, the disguised youth, minutely details the event of the trick of which he was made the chief instrument,

imitation.

have also been evidently drawn from the same productive origin.*

The closest imitation, however, of the *Casina*, is Machiavel's comedy *Clitia*. Many of its scenes, indeed, have been literally translated from the Latin, and the incidents are altered in very few particulars. The Stalino of Plautus is called Nicomaco, and his wife Sofronia: their son is named Cleandro, and the dependents employed to court Clitia for behoof of their masters, Eustachio and Pirro. The chief difference is, that the young lover, who is supposed to be absent in the *Casina*, is introduced on the stage by the Italian author, and the object of his affections is a young lady, brought up and educated by his parents, and originally intrusted to their care by one of their friends, which makes the proposal of her marrying either of the servants offered to her choice more absurd than in the Latin original. The bridal garments, too, are not assumed by one of the rival servants, but by a third character, introduced and employed for the purpose. This comedy of Machiavel, his *Mandragola*, and the renowned tale of Belfegor, were the productions with which that profound politician and historian, who established a school of political philosophy in the Italian seat of the Muses—who applied a fine analysis to the Roman history, and a subtler than Aristotle to the theory of government—attempted, as he himself has so beautifully expressed it,

“ Fare il suo tristo tempo piu soave ;
Perche altrove non have,
Dove voltare il viso,
Che gli è stato interciso
Mostrar con altre imprese altra virtute.”

Ullaria. *Cistellaria*, (the Casket.)—The prologue to this play is spoken by the god *Auxilium*, at the end of the first act. It explains the subject of the piece—compliments the Romans on their power and military glory—and concludes with exhorting them to overcome the Carthaginians, and punish them as they deserve. Hence it is probable, that this play was written during the second Punic war, which terminated in the year 552; and as Plautus was born in the year 525, it may be plausibly conjectured, that the *Cistellaria* was one of his earliest productions. This also appears from its greater rudeness when compared with his other plays, and from the shortness and simplicity of the plot. But though the argument is trite and sterile, it is enlivened by a good deal of comic

* See Act ii. sc. 2. and Act iv. sc. 1.

humour, particularly in the delineation of some of the subordinate characters. Like many others of Plautus's plays, it turns on the accidental recognition of a lost child by her parents, in consequence of the discovery of a casket, containing some toys, which had been left with her when exposed, and by means of which she is identified and acknowledged.

In ancient times these recognitions, so frequently exhibited on the stage, were not improbable. The customs of exposing children, and of reducing prisoners of war to slavery—the little connection or intercourse between different countries, from the want of inns or roads—and the consequent difficulty of tracing a lost individual—rendered such incidents, to us apparently so marvellous, of not unusual occurrence in real life. In Greece, particularly, divided as it was into a number of small states, and surrounded by a sea infested with pirates, who carried on a commerce in slaves, free-born children were frequently carried off, and sold in distant countries. By the laws of Athens, marriage with a foreigner was null; or, at least, the progeny of such nuptials were considered as illegitimate, and not entitled to the privileges of Athenian citizens. Hence, the recognition of the supposed stranger was of the utmost importance to herself and lover. In real life, this recognition may have been sometimes actually aided by ornaments and trinkets. Parents frequently tied jewels and rings to the children whom they exposed, in order that such as found them might be encouraged to nourish and educate them, and that they themselves might afterwards be enabled to discover them, if Providence took care for their safety*. Plots, accordingly, which hinged on such circumstances, were invented even by the writers of the old Greek comedy. One of the later pieces of Aristophanes, now lost, entitled *Coculus*, is said to have presented a recognition; and nearly the same sort of intrigue was afterwards employed by Menander, and, from his example, by Plautus and Terence. From imitation of the Greek and Latin comedies, similar incidents became common both in dramatic and romantic fiction. The pastoral romance of Longus hinges on a recognition of this species; and those elegant productions, in which the Italians have introduced the characters and occupations of rural life into the drama, are frequently founded on the exposure of children, who, after being brought up as shepherds by reputed fathers, are recognised by their real parents, from ornaments or tokens fastened to their persons when abandoned in infancy or childhood.

Authentic
Plot.

* Potter's *Antiquities of Greece*, Book IV. c. 14.

The *Cistellaria* has been more directly imitated in *Gli Incantesimi* of Giovam-Maria Cecchi, a Florentine dramatist of the sixteenth century. That part, however, of the plot which gives name to the piece, has been invented by the Italian author himself.

Curculio.—The subject of this play, turns on a recognition similar to that which occurs in the *Cistellaria*. It derives its title from the name of a parasite, who performs the part usually assigned by Plautus to an intriguing slave; and he is called *Curculio*, from a species of worm which eats through corn.

It is worthy of observation, that in the fourth act of this play, the Choragus, who was master of the Chorus, and stage-manager, or leader of the band, is introduced, expressing his fear lest he should be deprived of the clothes he had lent to *Curculio*, and addressing to the spectators a number of satirical remarks on Roman manners.

Vossius has noticed the inadvertency or ignorance of Plautus in this drama, where, though the scene is laid in Epidaurus, he sends the parasite to Caria, and brings him back in four days. This part of the comedy he therefore thinks has been invented by Plautus himself, since a Greek poet, to whom the geography of these districts must have been better known, would not have carried the parasite to so great a distance in so short a period.

Epidicus.—This play is so called from the name of a slave who sustains a principal character in the comedy, and on whose rogueries most of the incidents depend. Its most serious part consists in the discovery of a damsel, who proves to be sister to a young man by whom she has been purchased as a slave. The play has no prologue; but, at the beginning, a character is introduced, which the ancients called *persona protatica*,—that is, a person who enters only once, and at the commencement of the piece, for the sake of unfolding the argument, and does not appear again in any part of the drama. Such are *Sosia*, in the *Andria* of Terence, and *Davus*, in his *Phormio*. This is accounted rather an inartificial mode of informing the audience of the circumstances previous to the opening of the piece. It is generally too evident, that the narrative is made merely for the sake of the spectators; as there seldom appears a sufficient reason for one of the parties being so communicative to the other. Such explanations should come round, as it were, by accident, or be drawn involuntarily from the characters themselves in the course of the action.

The *Epidicus* is said to have been a principal favourite of

the author himself; and, indeed, one of the characters in his *Bacchides* exclaims,

“ Etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam æque ac me ipsum amo.”

But, though popular in the ancient theatre, the *Epidicus* does not appear to be one of the plays of Plautus which has been most frequently imitated on the modern stage. There was, however, a very early Italian imitation of it in the *Emilia*, a comedy of Luigi da Grotto, better known by the appellation of *Cieco D'Adria*, one of the earliest romantic poets of his country. The trick, too, of *Epidicus*, in persuading his master to buy a slave with whom his son was in love, has suggested the first device fallen on by Mascarelle, the valet in Moliere's *Etourdi*, in order to place the female slave *Celie* at the disposal of her lover, by inducing his master to purchase her.

Menæchmi—hinges on something of the same species of humour as the *Amphitryon*—a doubt and confusion with regard to the identity of individuals. According to the Delphin Plautus, it was taken from a lost play of Menander, entitled *Διδυμοί*; but other commentators have thought, that it was more probably derived from Epicharmus, or some other Sicilian dramatist.

In this play, a merchant of Syracuse had two sons, possessing so strong a personal resemblance to each other, that they could not be distinguished even by their parents. One of these children, called *Menæchmus*, was lost by his father in a crowd on the streets of Syracuse, and, being found by a Greek merchant, was carried by him to Epidamnum, (*Dyracchium*), and adopted as his son. Meanwhile the brother, (whose name, in consequence of this loss, had been changed to *Menæchmus*), having grown up, had set out from Syracuse in quest of his relative. After a long search he arrived at Epidamnum, where his brother had by this time married, and had also succeeded to the merchant's fortune. The amusement of the piece hinges on the citizens of Epidamnum mistaking the Syracusan stranger for his brother, and the family of the Epidamnian brother falling into a corresponding error. In this comedy we have also the everlasting parasite; and the first act opens with a preparation for an entertainment, which *Menæchmus* of Epidamnum had ordered for his mistress *Erotium*, and to which the parasite was invited. The Syracusan happening to pass, is asked to come in by his brother's mistress, and partakes with her of the feast. He also receives from her, in order to bear it to the embroiderer's, a robe which his brother had carried off from his wife, with the view of presenting it to this

mistress. Afterwards he is attacked by his brother's jealous wife, and her father; and, as his answers to their reproaches convince them that he is deranged, they send straightway for a physician. The Syracusan escapes; but they soon afterwards lay hold of the Epidamnian, in order to carry him to the physician's house, when the servant of the Syracusan, who mistakes him for his master, rescues him from their hands. The Epidamnian then goes to his mistress with the view of persuading her to return the robe to his wife. At length the whole is unravelled by the two *Menæchmi* meeting; when the servant of the Syracusan, surprised at their resemblance, discovers, after a few questions to each, that *Menæchmus* of Epidamnium is the twin-brother of whom his master had been so long in search, and who now agrees to return with them to Syracuse.

The great number of those Latin plays, where the merriment consists in mistakes arising from personal resemblances, must be attributed to the use of masks, which gave probability to such dramas; and yet, if the resemblance was too perfect, the humour, I think, must have lost its effect, as the spectators would not readily perceive the error that was committed.

imitations
Italian No play has been so repeatedly imitated as the *Menæchmi* on the modern stage, particularly the Italian, where masks were also frequently employed. The most celebrated Italian imitation of the *Menæchmi* is *Lo Ipocrito* of Aretine, where the twin-brothers, Liseo and Brizio, had the same singular degree of resemblance as the *Menæchmi*. Brizio had been carried off a prisoner in early youth during the sack of Milan, and returns to that city, after a long absence, in the first act of the play, in quest of his relations. Liseo's servants, and his parasite, *Lo Ipocrito*, all mistake Brizio for their patron, and his wife takes him to share an entertainment prepared at her husband's house, and also intrusts him with the charge of some ornaments belonging to her daughter; while, on the other hand, Brizio's servant mistakes Liseo for his master. The interest of the play arises from the same sort of confusion as that which occurs in the *Menæchmi*; and from the continual astonishment of those who are deceived by the resemblance, at finding an individual deny a conversation which they were persuaded he had held a few minutes before. The play is otherwise excessively involved, in consequence of the introduction of the amours and nuptials of the five daughters of Liseo. The plot of the Latin comedy has also been followed in *Le Moglie* of Cecchi, and in the *Lucidi* of Agnuolo Firenzuola; but the incidents have been, in a great measure, adapted by these dramatists to the manners of their native country.

Trissino, in his *Simillimi*, has made little change on his original, except adding a chorus of sailors; as, indeed, he has himself acknowledged, in his dedication to the cardinal, Alessandro Farnese. In *Gli due Gemelli*, which was long a favourite piece on the Italian stage, Carlini acted both brothers; the scenes being so contrived that they were never brought on the stage together—in the same manner as in our farce of *Three and the Deuce*, where the idea of giving different characters and manners to the three brothers, with a perfect personal resemblance, by creating still greater astonishment in their friends and acquaintances, seems an agreeable addition.

The *Menæchmi* was translated into English towards the end of the sixteenth century, by William Warner, the author of *Albion's England*. This version, which was first printed in 1595, and is entitled, "Menæchmi, a pleasaunt and fine conceited comedy, taken out of the most excellent wittie poet Plautus, chosen purposely, as least harmefull, yet most delightful," was unquestionably the origin of Shakspeare's *Comedy of Errors*. The resemblance of the two Antipholis', and the other circumstances which give rise to the intrigue, are nearly the same as in Plautus. Some of the mistakes, too, which occur on the arrival of Antipholis of Syracuse at Ephesus, have been suggested by the Latin play. Thus, the Syracusan, on coming to Ephesus, dines with his brother's wife. This lady had under repair, at the goldsmith's, a valuable chain, which her husband resolves to present to his mistress, but the goldsmith gives it to the Syracusan. At length the Ephesian is believed insane by his friends, who bring Doctor Pinch, a conjurer, to exorcise him. Shakspeare has added the characters of the twin Dromios, the servants of the Antipholis's, who have the same singular resemblance to each other as their masters, which has produced such intricacy of plot that it is hardly possible to unravel the incidents.

The *Comedy of Errors* is accounted one of the earliest, and is certainly one of the least happy efforts of Shakspeare's genius. I cannot agree with M. Schlegel, in thinking it better than the *Menæchmi* of Plautus, or even than the best modern imitation of that comedy—*Les Menechmes. ou Les Jumeaux*, of the French poet Regnard, which is, at least, a more lively and agreeable imitation. All the scenes, however, have been accommodated to French manners; and the plot differs considerably from that of Plautus, being partly formed on an old French play of the same title, by Rotrou, which appeared as early as 1636. One chief distinction is, that the Chevalier Menechme knows of the arrival of his brother from

English

French

the country, and knows that he had come to Paris in order to receive an inheritance bequeathed to him by his uncle, as also to marry a young lady of whom the Chevalier was enamoured. The Chevalier avails himself of the resemblance to prosecute his love-suit with the lady, and to receive the legacy from the hands of an attorney, while his brother is in the meantime harassed by women to whom the Chevalier had formerly paid addresses, and is arrested for his debts. It was natural enough, as in Plautus, that an infant, stolen and carried to a remote country, should have transmitted no account of himself to his family, and should have been believed by them to be dead; but this can with difficulty be supposed of Regnard's Chevalier, who had not left his paternal home in Brittany till the usual age for entering on military service, and had ever since resided chiefly at Paris. The Chevalier finds, from letters delivered to him by mistake, that his brother had come to town to receive payment of a legacy recently bequeathed to him: But, unless it was left to any one who bore the name of Menechme, it is not easy to see how the attorney charged with the payment, should have allowed himself to be duped by the Chevalier. Nor is it likely that, suspicious as the elder Menechme is represented, he should trust so much to his brother's valet, or allow himself to be terrified in the public street and open day into payment of a hundred louis d'or. It is equally improbable that Araminte should give up the Chevalier to her niece, or that the elder Menechme should marry the old maid merely to get back half the sum of which his brother had defrauded him. That all the adventures, besides, should terminate to the advantage of the Chevalier, has too much an air of contrivance, and takes away that hazard which ought to animate pieces of this description, and which excites the interest in Plautus, where the incidents prove fortunate or unfavourable indiscriminately to the two brothers.

In Plautus, the robe which Menæchmus of Epidamnium carries off from his wife, suffices for almost the whole intrigue. It alone brings into play the falsehood and avarice of the courtesan, the inclination of both the Menæchmi for pleasure, the gluttony of the parasite, and rage of the jealous wife: But in the French *Menechmes*,—trunks, letters, a portrait, promises of marriage, and presents, are heaped on each other, to produce accumulated mistakes. Regnard has also introduced an agreeable variety, by discriminating the characters of the brothers, between whom Plautus and Shakspeare have scarcely drawn a shade of difference. The Chevalier is a polished gentleman—very ingenious; but, I think, not very honest: His brother is blunt, testy, and impatient.

and not very wise. The difference, indeed, in their language and manners, is so very marked, that it seems hardly possible, whatever might be the personal resemblance, that the Cavalier's mistress could have been deceived. These peculiarities of disposition, however, render the mistakes, and the country brother's impatience under them, doubly entertaining—

“ Faudra-t-il que toujours je sois dans l'embarras
De voir une furie attachée à mes pas ? ”

And when assailed by Araminte, the old maid to whom his brother had promised marriage—

“ Esprit, demon, lutin, ombre, femme, ou furie,
Qui que tu sois, enfin laisse moi, je te prie. ”

When his brother is at last discovered, and indubitably recognized, he exclaims,

“ Mon frere en verité—Je m'en rejouis fort,
Mais j'avais cependant compté sur votre mort. ”

Boursault's comedy, *Les menteurs qui ne mentent point*, though somewhat different in its fable from the Latin *Menechmi*, is founded on precisely the same species of humour—the exact resemblance of the two Nicandres occasioning ludicrous mistakes and misunderstandings among their valets and mistresses.

The most recent French imitation of the play of Plautus is the *Menechmes Grecs*, by Cailhava, in which the plot is still more like the Latin comedy than the *Menechmes* of Regnard; but the characters are new. This piece has been extremely popular on the modern French stage.—“ Le public,” says Chenier, “ s'est empressé de rendre justice à la peinture piquante de mœurs de la Grece, à la verité des situations, au naturel du dialogue, au merite rare d'une gaité franche, qui ne degene pas en bouffonnerie*.”

Miles Gloriosus, (the Braggart Captain.) This was a character of the new Greek comedy, introduced and brought to perfection by Philemon and Menander. These dramatists wrote during the reigns of the immediate successors of Alexander the Great. At that period, his generals who had established sovereignties in Syria and Egypt, were in the practice of recruiting their armies by levying mercenaries in Greece. The soldiers who had thus served in the wars of the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies, were in the habit, when they re-

* *Tableau de la Littérature Françoise.*

turned home to Greece after their campaigns, of astonishing their friends with fabulous relations of their exploits in distant countries. Having been engaged in wars with which Athens had no immediate concern or interest, these partizans met with little respect or sympathy from their countrymen, and their lies and bravadoes having made them detested in Athenian society*, they became the prototypes of that dramatic character of which the constant attributes were the most absurd vanity, stupidity, profusion, and cowardice. This overcharged character, along with that of the slave and parasite, were transferred into the dramas of Plautus, the faithful mirrors of the new Greek comedy. The first act of the *Miles Gloriosus* has little to do with the plot: It only serves to acquaint us with the character of the Captain Pyrgopolinices; and it is for this purpose alone that Plautus has introduced the parasite, who does not return to the stage after the first scene. The boasts of this captain are quite extravagant, but they are not so gross as the flatteries of the parasite: indeed it is not to be conceived that any one could swallow such compliments as that he had broken an elephant's thigh with his fist, and slaughtered seven thousand men in one day, or that he should not have perceived the sarcasms of the parasite intermixed with his fulsome flattery. Previous, however, to the invention of gunpowder, more could be performed in war by the personal prowess of individuals, than can be now accomplished; and hence the character of the braggart captain may not have appeared quite so exaggerated to the ancients as it seems to us. One man of peculiar strength and intrepidity often carried dismay into the hostile squadrons, as Goliath defied all the armies of Israel, and, with a big look, and a few arrogant words, struck so great a terror, that the host fled before him.

Most European nations being imbued with military habits and manners for many centuries after their first rise, the part of a boasting coward was one of the broadest, and most obviously humorous characters, that could be presented to the spectators. Accordingly, the braggart Captain, though he has at length disappeared, was one of the most notorious personages on the early Italian, French, and English stage.

Tinca, the braggart Captain in *La Talanta*, a comedy by Aretine, is a close copy of Thraso, the soldier in Terence, the play being taken from the *Eunuchus*, where Thraso is a chief character. But Spampana, the principal figure in the *Farsa Satira Morale*, a dramatic piece of the fifteenth century, by

* Alciphron, *Epist.*

Venturino of Pesaro, was the original and genuine Capitano Glorioso, a character well known, and long distinguished in the Italian drama. He was generally equipped with a mantle and long rapier; and his personal qualities nearly resembled those of the Count di Culagna, the hero of Tassoni's mock heroic poem *La Secchia Rapita*:—

“ Quest' era un Cavalier bravo e galante,
Ch'era fuor de perigli un Sacripante,
Ma ne perigli un pezzo di polmone :
Spesso ammazzato avea qualche gigante,
E si scopriva poi, ch'era un cappone.”

This military poltroon long kept possession of the Italian stage, under the appellations of Capitan Spavento and Spezzafer, till about the middle of the sixteenth century, when he yielded his place to the Capitano Spagnuolo, whose business was to utter Spanish rodomontades, to kick out the native Italian Captain in compliment to the Spaniards, and then quietly accept of a drubbing from Harlequin. When the Spaniards had entirely lost their influence in Italy, the Capitano Spagnuolo retreated from the stage, and was succeeded by that eternal poltroon, Scaramuccio, a character which was invented by Tiberio Fiurilli, the companion of the boyhood of Louis XIV*.

In imitation of the Italian captain, the early French drama-^{French} tists introduced a personage, who patiently received blows while talking of dethroning emperors and distributing crowns. The part was first exhibited in *Le Brave*, by Baif, acted in 1567; but there is no character which comes so near to the Miles Gloriosus of Plautus, as that of Chasteaufort in *Cyrano Bergerac's Pedant Joué*. In general, the French captains have more rodomontade and solemnity, with less buffoonery, than their Italian prototypes. The captain Matamore, in *Corneille's Illusion Comique*, actually addresses the following lines to his valet:—

“ Il est vrai que je rêve, et ne saurois resoudre,
Lequel des deux je dois le premier mettre en poudre,
Du grand Sophi de Perse, ou bien du grand Mogol.”

And again—

“ Le seul bruit de mon nom renverse les murailles,
Defait les escadrons, et gagne les batailles ;
D'un seul commandement que je fais aux trois Parques,
Je depeuple l'état des plus heureux monarques.”

* Walker's *Essay on the Revival of the Drama in Italy*.

Corneille's *Matamore* also resembles the *Miles Gloriosus*, in his self-complacency on the subject of personal beauty, and his belief that every woman is in love with him. *Pygopolinices* declares—

“*Miserum esse pulchrum hominem nimis.*”

And in like manner, *Matamore*—

“*Ciel qui sais comme quoi j'en suis persecuté.
Un peu plus de repos avec moins de beauté.
Fais qu'un si long mepris enfin la desabuse.*”

Scarron, who was nearly contemporary with Corneille, painted this character in *Don Gaspard de Padille*, the *Fanfaron*, as he is called, of the comedy *Jodelet Duelliste*. Gaspard, however, is not a very important or prominent character of the piece. Jodelet himself, the valet of Don Felix, seems intended as a burlesque or caricature of all the braggarts who had preceded him. Having received a blow, he is ever vowing vengeance against the author of the injury in his absence, but on his appearance, suddenly becomes tame and submissive.

The braggart captains of the old English theatre have much greater merit than the utterers of these nonsensical rhapsodies of the French stage. Falstaff has been often considered as a combination of the characters of the parasite and *Miles Gloriosus*; but he has infinitely more wit than either; and the liberty of fiction in which he indulges, is perhaps scarcely more than is necessary for its display. His cheerfulness and humour are of the most characteristic and captivating sort, and instead of suffering that contumely with which the parasite and *Miles Gloriosus* are loaded, laughter and approbation attend his greatest excesses. His boasting speeches are chiefly humorous; jest and merriment account for most of them, and palliate them all. It is only subsequent to the robbery that he discovers the traits of a *Miles Gloriosus*. Most of the ancient braggarts bluster and boast of distant wars, beyond the reach of knowledge or evidence—of exploits performed in Persia and Armenia—of storms and stratagems—of falling pell-mell on a whole army, and putting thousands to the sword, till, by some open and apparent fact, they are brought to shame as cowards and liars; but Falstaff's boasts refer to recent occurrences, and he always preserves himself from degradation by the address with which he defies detection, and extricates himself from every difficulty. His character, however, in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, has some affinity to the captains of the Roman stage, from his being

constantly played on in consequence of his persuasion that women are in love with him. The swaggering Pistol in *King Henry IV.*, is chiefly characterized by his inflated language, and is, as Doll calls him, merely "a fustian rascal." Bessus, in Beaumont and Fletcher's *King and No King*, is said by Theobald to be a copy of Falstaff; but he has little or none of his humour. Bessus was an abusive wretch, and so much contemned, that no one called his words in question; but, afterwards, while flying in battle, having accidentally rushed on the enemy, he acquired a reputation for valour; and being now challenged to combat by those whom he had formerly traduced, his great aim is to avoid fighting, and yet to preserve, by boasting, his new character for courage. However fine the scene between Bessus and Arbaces, at the conclusion of the third act, the darker and more infamous shades of character there portrayed ought not to have been delineated, as our contemptuous laughter is converted, during the rest of the play, or, on a second perusal, into detestation and horror. Bobadil, in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*, has generally been regarded as a copy of the Miles Gloriosus; but the late editor of Jonson thinks him a creation *sui generis*, and perfectly original. "The soldiers of the Roman stage," he continues, "have not many traits in common with Bobadil. Pyrgopolinices, and other captains with hard names, are usually wealthy—all of them keep mistresses, and some of them parasites—but Bobadil is poor. They are profligate and luxurious—but Bobadil is stained with no inordinate vice, and is so frugal, that a bunch of radishes, and a pipe to close the orifice of his stomach, satisfy all his wants. Add to this, that the vanity of the ancient soldier is accompanied with such deplorable stupidity, that all temptation to mirth is taken away, whereas Bobadil is really amusing. His gravity, which is of the most inflexible nature, contrasts admirably with the situations into which he is thrown; and though beaten, baffled, and disgraced, he never so far forgets himself as to aid in his own discomfiture. He has no soliloquies, like Bessus and Parolles, to betray his real character, and expose himself to unnecessary contempt; nor does he break through the decorum of the scene in a single instance. He is also an admirer of poetry, and seems to have a pretty taste for criticism, though his reading does not appear very extensive; and his decisions are usually made with somewhat too much promptitude. In a word, Bobadil has many distinguishing traits, and, till a preceding braggart shall be discovered, with something more than big words and beating, to characterize him, it may not be amiss to allow Jonson the

credit of having depended on his own resources." The character of the braggart captain was continued in the Bernardo of Shadwell's *Amorous Bigot*, and Nol Bluff, in Congreve's *Old Bachelor*. These are persons who apparently would destroy every thing with fire and sword; but their mischief is only in their words, and they "will not swagger with a Barbary hen, if her feathers turn back with any show of resistance." The braggarts, indeed, of modern dramatists, have been universally represented as cowardly, from Spampana down to Captain Flash. But cowardice is not a striking attribute of the Miles Gloriosus of Plautus, at least it is not made the principal source of ridicule as with the moderns. We have instead, a vain conceit of his person, and his conviction that every woman is in love with him.

richerson of
 This feature in the character of the Miles Gloriosus, produces a principal part in the intrigue of this amusing drama, which properly commences at the second act, and is said, in a prologue there introduced, to have been taken from the Greek play *Αλαζων*. While residing at Athens, the captain had purchased from her mother a young girl, (whose lover was at that time absent on an embassy) and had brought her with him to his house at Ephesus. The lover's slave entered into the captain's service, and, seeing the girl in his possession, wrote to his former master, who, on learning the fate of his mistress, repaired to Ephesus. There he went to reside with Periplectomenes, a merry old bachelor, who had been a friend of his father, and now agreed to assist him in recovering the object of his affections. The house of Periplectomenes being immediately adjacent to that of the captain, the ingenious slave dug an opening between them; and the keeper, who had been intrusted by the captain with charge of the damsel, was thus easily persuaded by her rapid, and to him unaccountable, transition from one building to the other, that it was a twin sister, possessing an extraordinary resemblance to her, who had arrived at the house of Periplectomenes. Afterwards, by a new contrivance, a courtesan is employed to pretend that she is the wife of Periplectomenes, and to persuade the captain that she is in love with him. To facilitate this amour, he allows the girl, whom he had purchased at Athens, to depart with her twin sister and her lover, who had assumed the character of the master of the vessel in which she sailed. The captain afterwards goes to the house of Periplectomenes to a supposed assignation, where he is seized and beat, but does not discover how completely he had been duped, till the Athenian girl had got clear off with her lover.

This play must, in the representation, have been one of the

most amusing of its author's productions. The scenes are full of action and bustle, while the secret communication between the two houses occasions many lively incidents, and forms an excellent *jeu de theatre*.

With regard to the characters, the one which gives title to the play is, as already mentioned, quite extravagant; and no modern reader can enjoy the rodomontade of the *Miles Gloriosus*, or his credulity in listening with satisfaction to such monstrous tales of his military renown and amorous success. Flattery for potential qualities may be swallowed to any extent, and a vain man may wish that others should be persuaded that he had performed actions of which he is incapable; but no man can himself hearken with pleasure to falsehoods which he knows to be such, and which in the recital are not intended to impose upon others. Pleusides, the lover in this drama, is totally insipid and uninteresting, and we are not impressed with a very favourable opinion of his mistress from the account which is given of her near the beginning of the play:—

“ *Os habet, linguam, perfidiam, malitiam, atque audaciam,
Confidentiam, confirmatam, fraudolentiam:
Qui arguet se, eum contra vincat jurejurando suo.
Domi habet animum falsiloquum, falsificum, falsijurum.*”

The principal character, the one which is best supported, and which is indeed sustained with considerable humour, is that of *Periplectomenes*, who is an agreeable old man, distinguished by his frankness, jovial disposition, and abhorrence of matrimony. There is one part of his conduct, however, which I wish had been omitted, as it savours too much of cunning, and reminds us too strongly of *Ben Jonson's Volpone*. Talking of his friends and relations, he says—

— “ *Me ad se, ad prandium, ad cœnam vocat.
Ille miserimum se retur, minimum qui misit mihi.
Illi inter se certant donis; ego hæc mecum mussito:
Bona mea inhiant: certatim dona mittunt et munera.*”

I have often thought that the character of *Durazzo*, in *Mas-singer's Guardian*, was formed on that of *Periplectomenes*. Like him, *Durazzo* is a jovial old bachelor, who aids his nephew *Caldoro* in his amour with *Calista*. When the lover in *Plautus* apologizes to his friend for having engaged him in an enterprize so unsuitable to his years, he replies—

“ *Quid ais tu? itane tibi ego videor oppido Acheronticus,
Tam capularis; tamne tibi diu vita vivere?
Nam equidem haud sum annos natus præter quinquaginta et quatuor,
Clare oculis video, pernix sum manibus, sum pedes mobilis.*”

In like manner Durazzo exclaims—

“ My age ! do not use
That word again ; if you do, I shall grow young,
And swinge you soundly. I would have you know,
Though I write fifty odd, I do not carry
An almanack in my bones to predeclare
What weather we shall have ; nor do I kneel
In adoration at the spring, and fall
Before my doctor.”—

Periplectomenes boasts of his convivial talents, as also of his amorous disposition, and his excellence at various exercises—

“ Et ego amoris aliquantum habeo, humorisque meo etiam in corpore :
Nequedum exarui ex amœnis rebus et voluptariis.

Tum ad saltandum non Cinædus magis usquam saltat quam ego.”

This may be compared with the boast of Durazzo—

“ Bring me to a fence school,
And crack a blade or two for exercise ;
Ride a barbed horse, or take a leap after me,
Following my hounds or hawks, and, (by your leave,)
At a gamesome mistress, you shall confess
I'm in the May of my abilities.”

It may be perhaps considered as a confirmation of the above conjecture concerning Massinger's imitation of Plautus, that the cook in the *Guardian* is called Cario, which is also the name of the cook of Periplectomenes.

There is, however, a coincidence connected with this drama of Plautus, which is much more curious and striking than its resemblance to the *Guardian* of Massinger. The plot of the *Miles Gloriosus* is nearly the same with the story of the *Two Dreams* related in the *Seven Wise Masters*, a work originally written by an Indian philosopher, long before the Christian æra, and which, having been translated into Greek under the title of *Syntipas*, became current during the dark ages through all the countries of Europe, by the different names of *Dolopatios*, *Erastus*, and *Seven Wise Masters*,—the frame remaining substantially the same, but the stories being frequently adapted to the manners of different nations. In this popular story-book the tale of the *Two Dreams* concerns a knight, and a lady who was constantly confined by a jealous husband, in a tower almost inaccessible. Having become mutually enamoured, in consequence of seeing each other in dreams, the knight repaired to the residence of the husband, by whom he was hospitably received, and was at length allowed to build a habitation on his possessions, at no great distance from the

castle in which his wife was inclosed. When the building was completed, the knight secretly dug a communication under ground, between his new dwelling and the tower, by which means he enjoyed frequent and uninterrupted interviews with the object of his passion. At length the husband was invited to an entertainment prepared at the knight's residence, at which his wife was present, and presided in the character of the knight's mistress. During the banquet the husband could not help suspecting that she was his wife, and in consequence he repaired, after the feast was over, to the tower, where he found her sitting composedly in her usual dress. This, and his confidence in the security of the tower, the keys of which he constantly kept in his pocket, dispelled his suspicions, and convinced him that the Beauty who had done the honours of the knight's table, had merely a striking resemblance to his own lovely consort. Being thus gradually accustomed to meet her at such entertainments, he at last complied with his friend's request, and kindly assisted at the ceremony of the knight's marriage with his leman. After their union, he complacently attended them to the harbour, and handed the lady to the vessel which the knight had prepared for the elopement. This story also coincides with *Le Chevalier a la Trappe*, one of the *Fabliaux* of the Norman *Trouveurs**, with a tale in the fourth part of the Italian *Novellino* of Massuccio Salernitano, and with the adventures of the *Vieux Calender*, in Gueulette's *Contes Tartares*.

Mercator—is one of the plays for which Plautus was indebted to Philemon, the contemporary and the successful rival of Menander, over whom he usually triumphed by the theatrical suffrages, while contending for the prize of comedy. The Roman critics unanimously concur in representing these popular decisions as unjust and partial. But Quintilian, while he condemns the perverted judgment of those who preferred Philemon to Menander, acknowledges that he must be universally admitted to have merited the next place to his great rival.—“*Qui ut pravis sui temporis iudiciis Menandro sæpe prælatus est, ita consensu tamen omnium meruit credi secundus†.*”

An interesting account of Philemon is given in the *Observer*, by Cumberland, who has also collected the strange and inconsistent stories concerning the manner of his death. He is represented to us as having been a man of amiable character, and cheerful disposition, seldom agitated by those furious passions which distracted the mind of Menander. He lived

* *Le Grand, Contes et Fabliaux*, Tom. III. p. 157.

† *Quintil. Inst. Orat. Lib. X. c. 1.*

to the extraordinary age of a hundred and one, during which long period he wrote ninety comedies. Of these, the critics and grammarians have preserved some fragments, which are generally of a tender and sentimental, sometimes even of a plaintive cast. Apuleius, however, informs us, that Philemon was distinguished for the happiest strokes of wit and humour, for the ingenious disposition of his plots, for his striking and well managed discoveries, and the admirable adaptation of his characters to their situations in life*. To judge by the Latin Mercator, imitated or translated from the *Εμπροπος* of Philemon, it is impossible not to consider him as inferior to those other Greek dramatists from whom Plautus borrowed his *Amphitryon*, *Aulularia*, *Casina*, and *Miles Gloriosus*; yet it must be recollected, that those are the best comedies which suffer most by a transfusion into another language. The English Hypocrites and Misers would indeed be feeble records of the genius of Moliere. Of one point, however, we may clearly judge, even through the mist of translation. Notwithstanding what is said by Apuleius concerning the purity of Philemon's dramas, in none of the plays of Plautus is greater moral turpitude represented. A son is sent abroad by his father, with the view of reclaiming him from the dissolute course of life which he had followed. The youth, however, is so little amended by his travels, that he brings a mistress home in the ship with him. The father, seeing the girl, falls in love with her. His son, in order to conceal his passion, proposes to sell its object, but engages one of his acquaintances to purchase her for him. By some mismanagement, she is bought by a friend whom the father had employed for this purpose, and is carried, as had been previously arranged, to the purchaser's house. The friend's wife, however, being jealous of this inmate, her husband is obliged to explain matters for her satisfaction, and the old debauchee, in consequence, incurs, before the conclusion of the comedy, merited shame and reproach.

An old libertine may be a very fit subject for satire and ridicule, but in this play there is certainly too much latitude allowed to the debaucheries of youth. The whole moral of the drama is contained in three lines near the conclusion:—

“ Neu quisquam posthac prohibeto adolescentem filium
 Quin amet, et scortum ducat; quod bono fiat modo:
 Si quis prohibuerit, plus perdet clam, quam si prehibuerit palam.”

* Reperias, apud illum, multos sales, argumenta lepide inflexa, agnatos lucide explicatos, personas rebus competentes; joca non infra Soccum—seria non usque ad Cothurnum. Raræ apud illum corruptelæ; et uti errores concessi amores.—Apuleius, *Florida*. p. 563.

Nothing can be more ridiculous than the delays and trifling of the persons in this piece, under circumstances which must naturally have excited their utmost impatience. Examples of this occur in the scene which occupies nearly the whole of the first act, between Charinus and his slave Acanthio, and the equally tedious dialogue in the fifth act between Eutyclus and Charinus.

The *Mercator* of Plautus is the origin of *La Stiava*, an Italian comedy by Cecchi; and in the second scene of the second act, there are two lines which have a remarkable resemblance to the conclusion of the celebrated speech of Jaques, "All the world's a stage," in *As you Like it*.

"Senex cum extemplo est, jam nec sentit, nec sapit,
Aiunt solere eum rursum repuerascere."

Mostellaria,—which the English translator of Plautus has rendered the Apparition,—represents a young Athenian, naturally of a virtuous disposition, who, during the absence of his father on a trading voyage, is led into every sort of vice and extravagance, partly by his inordinate love for a courtesan, and partly by the evil counsels of one of his slaves, called Tranio. During an entertainment, which the youth is one day giving in his father's mansion, he is suddenly alarmed by the accounts which Tranio brings, of the unexpected return of the old man, whom he had just seen landing near the harbour. At the same time, however, the slave undertakes to prevent his entering the house. In prosecution of this design he there locks up his young master and his guests, and, on the approach of the old gentleman, gravely informs him that the house was now shut up, in consequence of being haunted by the apparition of an unfortunate man, long since murdered in it by the person from whom it had been last purchased. Tranio has scarcely prevailed on the father to leave the door of the dwelling, when they unluckily meet a money-lender, who had come to crave payment of a large debt from the profligate son; but the ingenious slave persuades the father, that the money had been borrowed to pay for a house which was a great bargain, and which his son had bought in place of that which was haunted. A new dilemma, however, arises, from the old gentleman's asking to see the house: Tranio artfully obtains leave from the owner, who being obliged to go to the Forum, nothing is said on this occasion with regard to the sale. He examines the house a second time along with the owner, but Tranio had previously begged him, as from motives of delicacy, to say nothing concerning his purchase; and

the whole passes as a visit, to what is called a Show-house. The old man highly approves of the bargain; but at length the whole deception is discovered, by his accidentally meeting an attendant of one of his son's companions, who is just going into the haunted house to conduct his master home from that scene of festivity. He has thus occasion to exercise all his patience and clemency in forgiveness of the son by whom he has been almost ruined, and of the slave by whom he had been so completely duped.

In this play, the character of the young man might have been rendered interesting, had it been better brought out; but it is a mere sketch. He is a grave and serious character, hurried into extravagance by bad example, evil counsel, and one fatal passion. A long soliloquy, in which he compares human life to a house, reminds us, in its tone of feeling and sentiment, of "All the world's a stage." The father seems a great deal too foolish and credulous, and the slave must have relied much on his weakness, when he ventured on such desperate expedients, and such palpable lies. Slaves, it will already have been remarked, are principal characters in many of the dramas of Plautus; and a curious subject of inquiry is presented in their insolence, effrontery, triumphant roguery, and habitual familiarity with their masters at one moment, while at the next they are threatened with the lash or crucifixion. In Athens, however, where the prototype of this character was found, the slave was treated by his master with much more indulgence than the Spartan Helot, or any other slaves in Greece. The masters themselves, who were introduced on the ancient stage, were not in the first ranks of society; and the vices which required the assistance of their slaves reduced them to an equality. Besides, an Athenian or Roman master could hardly be displeased with the familiarity of those who were under such complete subjection; and the striking contrast of their manners and situation would render their sallies as poignant as the spirited remarks of Roxalana in the seraglio of the Sultan. The character, too, gave scope for those jests and scurrilities, which seem to have been indispensable ingredients in a Roman comedy, but which would be unsuitable in the mouths of more dignified persons. They were, in fact, the buffoons of the piece, who avowed without scruple their sensual inclinations and want of conscience; for not only their impudence, but their frauds and deceptions, seem to have been highly relished by the spectators. It is evident that both the Greeks and Romans took peculiar pleasure in seeing a witty slave cheat a covetous master, and that the ingenuity of the fraud was always thought sufficient

atonement for its knavery. Perhaps this unfortunate class of men derived so few advantages from society, that they were considered as entitled, at least on the stage, to break through its ties. The character of a saucy and impudent slave had been already portrayed in the old Greek comedy. In the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, Carion, the slave of Chremylus, is the most prominent character, and is distinguished by freedom of remark and witty impudence. To these attributes there was added, in the new comedy, a spirit of roguery and intrigue; and in this form the character was almost universally adopted by the Latin dramatists. The slaves of Plautus correspond to the valets—the Crispins, and Merlins of the French theatre, whose race commenced with Merlin, in Scarron's *Marquis Ridicule*. They were also introduced in Moliere's earliest pieces, but not in his best; and were in a great measure dropped by his successors, as, in fact, they had ceased to be the spring of any important event or intrigue in the world. Indeed, I agree with M. Schlegel, in doubting if they could ever have been introduced as happily on the modern as the ancient stage. A wretch who was born in servitude, who was abandoned for life to the capricious will of a master, and was thus degraded below the dignity of man, might excite laughter instead of indignation, though he did not conform to the strictest precepts of honesty. He was placed in a state of warfare with his oppressor, and cunning became his natural arms.

The French dramatist who has employed the character of the intriguing valet to most advantage, is Regnard; to whom, among many other agreeable pieces, we are indebted for a delightful imitation of the *Mostellaria* of Plautus, entitled, *Le Retour Imprevu, comedie en prose, et en une acte*.

*Seneca.
Terence.*

In this play, the incidents of the *Mostellaria* have been in general adopted, though they have been somewhat transposed. We have the imposture of Merlin, who corresponds with Plautus's Tranio, as to the haunted house, and his subterfuge when the usurer comes to claim the money which he had lent. In place, however, of asking to see the new house, the father proposes to deposit some merchandise in it. Merlin then persuades him, that the lady to whom it formerly belonged, and who had not yet quitted it, was unfortunately deprived of reason, and, having been in consequence interdicted by her relations from the use of her property, the house had been exposed to sale. At the same time, the artful valet finds an opportunity of informing the real owner, that the old man had gone mad in consequence of having lost all his merchandise at sea. Accordingly, when they meet, neither of

them pays the smallest attention to what each considers the raving of the other. Instead of a courtesan, Regnard has introduced a young lady, with whom Clitandre is in love; but he has given her the manners rather of a courtesan, than a young lady. There is one incident mentioned in the *Mostellaria* which is omitted in the *Retour Imprevu*, and of which even Plautus has not much availed himself, though it might have been enlarged on, and improved to advantage: the old man mentions, that he had met the person from whom he had bought the haunted house, and that he had taxed him with the murder of his guest, whose apparition still walked, but that he had stoutly denied the charge.

Italian
English
The *Fantasma* of Ercole Bentivoglio, an Italian comedy of the sixteenth century, is formed on the same original as the *Retour Imprevu*. The *Mostellaria* has likewise suggested the plot of an old tragi-comedy by Heywood, printed in 1633, and entitled *The English Traveller*. Fielding's *Intriguing Chambermaid* is also derived from the *Mostellaria*, but through the medium of Regnard's comedy. Indeed, it may be considered as almost a translation from the French; except that the author has most absurdly assigned the part of the Latin Tranio, and French Merlin, to a chambermaid, whom he calls Mrs Lettice, and has added a great number of songs and *double entendres*.

It has been said, that the last act of Ben Johnson's *Alchemist*, where Face, in order to conceal the iniquities committed in his master's house during his absence, tries to persuade him, that it was shut up on account of being visited by an apparition, has been suggested by the *Mostellaria**; but, as there is no resemblance between the two plays in other incidents, we cannot be assured that the *Mostellaria* was at all in the view of the great English dramatist.

Persa.—In this play, which belongs to the lowest order of comedy, the characters are two slaves, a foot-boy of one of these slaves, a parasite, a pander, and a courtesan, with her waiting-maid. The manners represented are such as might be expected from this respectable group. The incidents are few and slight, hinging almost entirely on a deceit practised against the pander, who is persuaded to give a large sum for a free woman, whom the slaves had dressed up as an Arabian captive, and whom he was obliged to relinquish after having paid the money. The fable is chiefly defective from the trick of the slaves being intended to serve their own purposes.

* Müller, *Einleitung zu Kenntniss der alten Lateinischen Schriftsteller*, Tom. II. p. 38.

But such devices are interesting only when undertaken for the advantage of higher characters; a comedy otherwise must degenerate into farce.

Pœnulus, (the Carthaginian,) is one of the longest, and, I think, on the whole, the dullest of Plautus' performances. It turns on the discovery of a lost child, who had been stolen from her Carthaginian parents in infancy, and had been carried to Greece. In none of those numerous plays which turn on the recognition of lost children, has Plautus ever exhibited an affecting interview, or even hit on an expression of natural tenderness. The characters are either not brought on the stage at the conclusion, and we are merely told by some slave or parasite that the discovery had taken place; or, as in the instance of Hanno and his daughter in the present drama, the parties most interested teaze and torment each other with absurd questions, instead of giving way to any species of emotion. It is a high example, however, of the noble and generous spirit of the Romans, that Hanno, the Carthaginian introduced in this play, which was represented in the course of the Punic wars, is more amiable than almost any other character in Plautus. It is evident, from his quibbles and obscene jests, that the Latin dramatist adapted his plays to the taste of the vulgar; and if the picture of a villainous or contemptible Carthaginian could have pleased the Roman public, as the Jew of Malta gratified the prejudices of an English mob, Plautus would not have hesitated to accommodate himself to such feelings, and his Hanno would doubtless have appeared in those hateful colours in which the Jews, or in that ridiculous light in which the French, have usually been exhibited on the British stage.

The employment of different dialects, or idioms, which has been so great a resource of the modern comic muse, particularly on the Italian stage, had been early resorted to in Greece. Aristophanes, in one of his comedies, introduced the jargon of a woman of Lacedæmon, where the Doric dialect was spoken in its rudest form. Plautus, in a scene of the *Pœnulus*, has made his Carthaginian speak in his native language; and as the Carthaginian tongue was but little known in Greece, it may be presumed that this scene was invented by Plautus himself.

Those remains of the Punic language which have been preserved, (though probably a good deal corrupted,) are regarded as curious vestiges of philological antiquity, and have afforded ample employment for the critics, who have laboured to illustrate and restore them to the right readings. Commentators have found in them traces of all the ancient tongues,

Pœnulus

according to their own fancy, or some favourite system they had adopted. Joseph Scaliger considered them as little removed from the purity of original Hebrew*; and Pareus, in his edition of Plautus, printed them in Hebrew characters, as did Bochart, in his *Phaleg et Canaan*†. Others, from the resemblance of single letters, or syllables, have found in different words the Chinese, Ethiopian, Persian, or Coptic dialects‡. Plautus, it is well known, had considerable knowledge of languages. Besides writing his own with the greatest purity, he was well acquainted with Greek, Persian, and Punic. The editor of the Delphin Plautus has a notable conjecture on this point: He supposes that in the mill in which Plautus laboured, (as if it had been a large mill on the modern construction,) there was a Carthaginian, a Greek, and a Persian slave, from whom alternately he acquired a knowledge of these tongues in the hours of relaxation from work!

Pseudolus—is one of those plays of Plautus which hinge on the contrivance of a slave in behalf of his young master, who is represented at the commencement of the play, as in despair at not having money sufficient to redeem his mistress, just then sold by Ballio, a slave-dealer, to a Macedonian captain for twenty *minæ*. Fifteen of these had been paid, and the girl was to be delivered up to him as soon as he sent the remaining five, along with an impression of a seal-ring, which the captain had left behind as a pledge. *Pseudolus*, the slave, having encountered the captain's messenger, on his way to deliver a letter containing the token and the balance of the stipulated price, personates the pander's servant, and is in consequence intrusted with the letter. While the messenger is refreshing himself at a tavern, *Pseudolus* persuades one of his fellow-slaves to assume the character of the captain's emissary, and to present the credentials (which *Pseudolus* places in his possession) to the pander, who immediately acknowledges their authenticity, and, without hesitation, delivers up the girl in return. When the real messenger afterwards arrives, the slave-merchant treats him as an impostor hired by *Pseudolus*.

Next to the slave, the principal character in this comedy is that of the pander, which is sketched with the strong pencil

* *Epist.* 362.

† *Opera*, Vol. I. p. 721.

‡ See on this subject three German *Programmata* by M. Bellermann, published 1806, 7, 8; also Schoell, *Hist. Abregée de la Litter. Rom.* Tom. I. p. 123.—Col. Vallancey, in his *Essay on the Antiquity of the Irish Language*, (which attracted considerable attention on its first publication, and has been recently reprinted,) attempted to show the affinity between these Punic remains and the old Irish language,—both, according to him, having been derived from the Phœnician, which was itself a dialect of the Hebrew.

of a master, and is an admirable representation of that last stage of human depravity and wretchedness, in which even appearances cease to be preserved with the world, and there exists no longer any feeling or anxiety concerning the opinion of others. Calidorus, the lover of the girl, upbraids him for his breach of faith—

“Juravistine te illam nulli venditurum nisi mihi?”

Ballio. Fateor. *Cal.* Nempe conceptis verbis. *Bal.* Etiam consultis quoque.

Cal. Perjuravisti, sceleste. *Bal.* At argentum intro condidi:

Ego scelestus nunc argentum promere possum domo.”

M. Dacier, however, is of a different opinion with regard to the merit of this character. He thinks that the *Pseudolus*, though mentioned by Cato in Cicero's Dialogue *De Senectute*, as a finished piece which greatly delighted its author*, and though called, by one of his commentators, *Ocellus Fabularum Plauti*†, was chiefly in Horace's view when he spoke, in his *Epistles*, of Plautus' want of success in the characters of a young passionate lover, a parsimonious father, and a cunning pimp,—

—— “Aspice, Plautus

Quo pacto partes tutetur amantis ephebi,
Ut patris attenti, lenonis ut insidiosi.”

These three characters all occur in this comedy; and Dacier maintains that they are very poorly supported by the poet.— Calidorus is a young lover, but his character (says the critic,) is so cold and lifeless, that he hardly deserves the name. His father, Simo, corresponds as little to the part of the *Patris attenti*; for he encourages the slave to deceive himself, and promises him a recompense if he succeed in over-reaching the slave-merchant, and placing in the hands of his son the girl on whom he doated. Ballio, the slave-dealer, so far from sustaining the character *lenonis insidiosi*, who should deceive every one, very foolishly becomes the dupe of a lying valet‡.

The scene between Calidorus and the pander, from which some lines are extracted above, and that by which it is preceded, where Ballio gives directions to his slaves, seem to have suggested two scenes in Sir Richard Steele's comedy of the *Funeral*. The play has been more closely imitated by Baptista Porta, the celebrated author of the *Magia Naturalis* in *La Trappolaria*, one of the numerous plays with the com-

* C. 14.

† G. Dousa, *Centur. Lib. III. c. 2.*

‡ *Œuvres D'Horace, par Dacier*, Tom. IX. p. 98. Ed. 1727.

position of which he amused his leisure, after the mysteries and chimeras of his chief work had excited the suspicion of the court of Rome, and he was in consequence prohibited from holding those assemblies of learned men, who repaired to his house with their newly discovered secrets in medicine and other arts. His play, which was first printed at Bergamo in 1596, is much more complicated in its incidents than the Latin original. Trappola, the *Pseudolus* of the piece, feigns himself, as in Plautus, to be the pander's slave, and persuades a parasite to act the part of the pander himself: By this stratagem, the parasite receives from the captain's servant the stipulated money and tokens, but delivers to him in return his ugly wife Gabrina, as the Beauty he was to receive; and there follows a comical scene, produced by the consequent amazement and disappointment of the captain. The parasite then personates the captain's servant, and, by means of the credentials of which he had possessed himself, obtains the damsel Filesia, whom he carries to her lover. With this plot, chiefly taken from Plautus, another series of incidents, invented by the Italian dramatist, is closely connected. The father of the young lover, Arsenio, had left his wife in Spain; and also another son, who had married there, and exactly resembled his brother in personal appearance. Arsenio being ordered by his father to sail from Naples, where the scene is laid, for Spain, in order to convey home his relatives in that country, and being in despair at the prospect of this separation from his mistress, the father is persuaded, by a device of the cheat Trappola, that he had not proceeded on the voyage, as his brother had already arrived. Availing himself of his resemblance, Arsenio personates his Spanish brother, and brings his mistress as his wife to his father's house, where she remains protected, in spite of the claims of the captain and pander, till the whole artifice is discovered by the actual arrival of the old lady from Spain. Arsenio's mistress being then strictly questioned, proves to be a near connection of the family, who had been carried off in childhood by corsairs, and she is now, with the consent of all, united to her lover.

There is also a close imitation of the incidents of the *Pseudolus* in Moliere's *Etourdi*, which turns on the stratagems of a valet to place a girl in possession of his master Lelie. His first device, as already mentioned, was suggested by the Epidicus*; but this having failed, he afterwards contrives to get into the service of his master's rival, Leander, who, having purchased the girl from the proprietor, had agreed to send a

* See above, p. 129.

ring as a token, at sight of which she was to be delivered up. The valet receives the ring for this very purpose, carries it to the owner, and by such means is just on the point of obtaining possession of the girl, when his stratagem, as usual, is defeated by the *etourderie* of his master. This notion of the valet's best-laid plans being always counteracted, was probably suggested by the *Bacchides* of Plautus, where Mnesilochus repeatedly frustrates the well-contrived schemes of his slave Chrysalus; though, perhaps through the medium of the *Invertito* of the Italian dramatist, Nicolo Barbieri, printed in 1629, or Quinault's *Amant Indiscret*, which was acted four years before Moliere's *Etourdi*, and is founded on the same plan with that drama. In the particular incidents the *Etourdi* is compounded of the tricks of Plautus' slaves; but Moliere has shown little judgment in thus heaping them on each other in one piece. Such events might occur once, but not six or seven times, to the same person. In fact, the valet is more of an *Etourdi* than his master, as he never forewarns him of his plans; and we feel as we advance, that the play could not be carried on without a previous concert among the characters to connive at impossibilities, and to act in defiance of all common sense or discretion.

Rudens. — This play, which is taken from a Greek comedy of Diphilus, has been called *Rudens* by Plautus, from the rope or cable whereby a fisherman drags to shore a casket which chiefly contributes to the solution of the fable. In the prologue, which is spoken by Arcturus, we are informed of the circumstances which preceded the opening of the drama, and the situation in which the characters were placed at its commencement. Plautus has been frequently blamed by the critics for the fulness of his preliminary expositions, as tending to destroy the surprise and interest of the succeeding scenes. But I think he has been unjustly censured, even with regard to those prologues, where, as in that of the *Pænulus*, he has anticipated the incidents, and revealed the issue of the plot. The comedies of Plautus were intended entirely for exhibition on the public stage, and not for perusal in the closet. The great mass of the Roman people in his age was somewhat rude: They had not been long accustomed to dramatic representations, and would have found it difficult to follow an intricate plot without a previous exposition. This, indeed, was not necessary in tragedies. The stories of Agamemnon and CEdipus, with other mythical subjects, so frequently dramatized by Ennius and Livius Andronicus, were sufficiently known; and, as Dryden has remarked, "the people, as soon as they heard the name of CEdipus, knew as well as

Rudens

the poet that he had killed his father by mistake, and committed incest with his mother; that they were now to hear of a great plague, an oracle, and the ghost of Laius*." It was quite different, however, in those new inventions which formed the subjects of comedies, and in which the incidents would have been lost or misunderstood without some introductory explanation. The attention necessary to unravel a plot prevents us from remarking the beauties of sentiment or poetry, and draws off our attention from humour or character, the chief objects of legitimate comedy. We often read a new play, or one with which we are not acquainted, before going to see it acted. Surprise, which is everything in romance, is the least part of the drama. Our horror at the midnight murders of Macbeth, and our laughter at the falsehoods and facetiousness of Falstaff, are not diminished, but increased, by knowing the issue of the crimes of the one, and the genial festivity of the other. In fact, the sympathy and pleasure so often derived from our knowledge outweighs the gratification of surprise. The Athenians were well aware that Jocasta, in the celebrated drama of Sophocles, was the mother of Œdipus; but the knowledge of this fact, so far from abating the concern of the spectators, as Dryden supposes†, must have greatly contributed to increase the horror and interest excited by the representation of that amazing tragedy. The celebrated scene of *Iphigenia in Tauris*, between Electra and Orestes, the masterpiece of poetic art and tragic pathos, would lose half its effect if we were not aware that Orestes was the brother of Electra, and if this were reserved as a discovery to surprise the spectators. Indeed, so convinced of all this were the Greek dramatists, that, in many of their plays, as the *Hecuba* and *Hippolytus* of Euripides, the issue of the drama is announced at its commencement.

But, be this as it may, the prologue itself, which is prefixed to the *Rudens*, is eminently beautiful. Arcturus descends as a star from heaven, and opens the piece, somewhat in the manner of the Angel who usually delivers the prologue in the ancient Italian mysteries—of the Mercury who frequently recites it in the early secular dramas, and the Attendant Spirit in the Masque of Comus, who, by way of prologue, declares his office, and the mission which called him to earth. In a manner more consistent with oriental than with either Greek or Roman mythology, Arcturus represents himself as mingling with mankind during day, in order to observe their actions,

* *Essay on Dramatic Poetry.*

† *Essay on Dramatic Poetry.*

and as presenting a record of their good and evil deeds to Jupiter, whom the wicked in vain attempt to appease by sacrifice—

“ Atque hoc scelesti in animum inducunt suum,
Jovem se placare posse donis, hostiis :
Et operam et sumptum perdunt.”——

Arcturus having thus satisfactorily accounted for his knowledge of the incidents of the drama, proceeds to unfold the situation of the principal characters. *Dæmones*, before whose house in Cyrene the scene is laid, had formerly resided at Athens, where his infant daughter had been kidnapped, and had been afterwards purchased by a slave-merchant, who brought her to Cyrene. A Greek youth, then living in that town, had become enamoured of her, and having agreed to purchase her, the merchant had consented to meet him and fulfil the bargain at an adjacent temple. But being afterwards persuaded that he could procure a higher price for her in Sicily, the slave-dealer secretly hired a vessel, and set sail, carrying the girl along with him. The ship had scarcely got out to sea when it was overtaken by a dreadful tempest over which Arcturus is figured as presiding. The play opens during the storm, in a manner eminently beautiful and romantic—an excellence which none of the other plays of Plautus possess. *Dæmones* and his servant are represented as viewing the tempest from land, and pointing out to each other the dangers and various vicissitudes of a boat, in which were seated two damsels who had escaped from the ship, and were trying to gain the shore, which, after many perils, they at length reached. The decorations of this scene are said to have been splendid, and disposed in a very picturesque manner. Madame Dacier conjectures, “that at the farther end of the stage was a prospect of the sea, intersected by many rocks and cliffs, which projected considerably forward on the stage. On one side the city of Cyrene was represented as at a distance; on the other, the temple of Venus, with a court before it, in the centre of which stood an altar. Adjacent to the temple, and on the same side, was the house of *Dæmones*, with some scattered cottages in the back ground.” Pleusidippus, the lover, comes forward to the temple during the storm, and then goes off in search of Labrax, the slave-merchant, who had likewise escaped from the shipwreck. The damsels, whose situation is highly interesting, having now got on shore, appear among the cliffs, and after having deplored their misfortunes, they are received into the temple by the

VOL. I.—U

priestess of Venus, who reminds them, however, that they should have come clothed in white garments and bringing victims! Here they are discovered by the slave of Pleusidippus, who goes to inform his master. Labrax then approaches to the vicinity of the temple of Venus, and having discovered that the damsels who had saved themselves from the wreck were secreted there, he rushes in to claim and seize them. Thus far the play is lively and well conducted, but the subsequent scenes are too long protracted. They are full of trifling, and are more loaded than those of any other comedy of Plautus, with quaint conceits, the quibbling witticisms, and the scurrilities of slaves. The scene in which Labrax attempts to seize the damsels at the altar, and Dæmones protects them, is insufferably tedious, but terminates at length with the pander being dragged to prison. After this, the fisherman of Dæmones is introduced, congratulating himself on having found a wallet which had been lost from the pander's ship, and contained his money, as well as some effects belonging to the damsels. The ridiculous schemes which he proposes, and the future grandeur he anticipates in consequence of his good fortune, is an excellent satire on the fantastic projects of those who are elevated with a sudden success. Having been observed, however, by the servant of Pleusidippus, who suspected that this wallet contained articles by which Palæstra might discover her parents, a long contest for its possession ensues between them, which might be amusing in the representation, but is excessively tiresome in perusal. This may be also remarked of the scene where their dispute is referred to the arbitration of Dæmones, who apparently is chosen umpire for no other reason than because this was necessary to unravel the plot. Dæmones discovers, from the contents of the wallet, that Palæstra is his daughter. The principal interest being thus exhausted, the remaining scenes become more and more tedious. We feel no great sympathy with the disappointment of the fisherman, and take little amusement in the bargain which he drives with the pander for the restoration of the gold, or his stipulation with his master for a reward, on account of the important service he had been instrumental in rendering him.

This play has been imitated by Ludovico Dolce, in his comedy *Il Ruffiano*, which was published in 1560, and which, the author says in his prologue, was "*vestita di habito antico, e ridrizzato alla forma moderna.*" The *Ruffiano* is not a mere translation from the Latin: the language and names are altered, and the scenes frequently transposed. There is likewise introduced the additional character of the old man Lucretio,

father to the lover ; also his lying valet Tagliacozzo, and his jealous wife Simona. Lucretio comes from Venice to the town where the scene of the play is laid, to recover a son who has left home in quest of a girl in the possession of Secco the Ruffiano. The first act is occupied with the details of Lucretio's family misfortunes, and it is only in the commencement of the second act that the shipwreck and escape of the damsels are introduced, so that the play opens in a way by no means so interesting and picturesque as the *Rudens* of Plautus. The women having taken refuge in a church, Lucretio offers them shelter in his own house, which exposes them to the rage of his jealous wife Simona. By the assistance, however, of one of these girls, he discovers his lost son, who was her lover ; and the recognition of the damsel herself as daughter of Isidoro, who corresponds to the *Dæmones* of Plautus, is then brought about in the same manner as in the Latin original, and gives rise to the same tedious and selfish disputes among the inferior characters. Madame Riccoboni has also employed the *Rudens* in her comedy *Le Naufrage*.

Stichus—is so called from a slave, who is a principal character in the comedy. The subject is the continued determination of two ladies to persist in their constancy to their husbands, who, from their long absence, without having been heard of, were generally supposed to be dead. In this resolution they remain firm, in spite of the urgency of their fathers to make them enter into second marriages, till at length their conjugal fidelity is rewarded by the safe arrival of their consorts. It would appear that Plautus had not found this subject sufficient to form a complete play ; he has accordingly filled up the comic part of the drama with the carousal of Stichus and his fellow slaves, and the stratagems of the parasite Gelasimus, in order to be invited to the entertainments which the husbands prepared in honour of their return.

Trinummus—is taken from the *Thesaurus* of Philemon ; but Plautus has changed the original title into *Trinummus*—a jocular name given to himself by one of the characters hired to carry on a deception, for which he had received three pieces of money, as his reward. The prologue is spoken by two allegorical personages, Luxury, and her daughter Want, the latter of whom had been commissioned by her mother to take up her residence in the house of the prodigal youth Lesbonicus. The play is then opened by a Protatick person, as he is called, who comes to chide his friend Callicles for behaviour which appeared to him in some points incomprehensible ; in consequence of which the person accused explains his conduct at once to the spectators and his angry monitor. It seems Char-

mides, an Athenian, being obliged to leave his own country on business of importance, intrusted the guardianship of his son and daughter to his friend Callicles. He had also confided to him the management of his affairs, particularly the care of a treasure which was secreted in a concealed part of his dwelling. Lesbonicus, the son of Charmides, being a dissolute youth, had put up the family mansion to sale, and his guardian, in order that the treasure entrusted to him might not pass into other hands, had purchased the house at a low price. Meanwhile a young man, called Lysiteles, had fallen in love with the daughter of Charmides, and obtained the consent of her brother to his marriage. Her guardian was desirous to give her a portion from the treasure, but does not wish to reveal the secret to her extravagant brother. The person calling himself Trinummus is therefore hired to pretend that he had come as a messenger from the father—to present a forged letter to the son, and to feign that he had brought home money for the daughter's portion. While Trinummus is making towards the house, to commence performance of his part, Charmides arrives unexpectedly from abroad, and seeing this Counterfeit approaching his house, immediately accosts him. A highly comic scene ensues, in which the hireling talks of his intimacy with Charmides, and also of being entrusted with his letters and money; and when Charmides at length discovers himself, he treats him as an impostor. The entrance of Charmides into his house is the simple solution of this plot, of which the *nodus* is neither very difficult nor ingenious. This meagre subject is filled up with an amicable contest between Lesbonicus and his sister's lover, concerning her portion,—the latter generously offering to take her without dowry, and the former refusing to give her away on such ignominious terms.

The English translators of Plautus have remarked, that the art of the dramatist in the conduct of this comedy is much to be admired:—"The opening of it," they observe, "is highly interesting; the incidents naturally arise from each other, and the whole concludes happily with the reformation of Lesbonicus, and the marriage of Lysiteles. It abounds with excellent moral reflections, and the same may be said of it with equal justice as of the *Captives*:"—

'Ad pudicos mores facta est hæc fabula.'

On the other hand, none of Plautus' plays is more loaded with improbabilities of that description into which he most readily falls. Thus Stasimus, the slave of Lesbonicus, in order to save a farm which his master proposed giving as a portion to

his sister, persuades the lover's father that a descent to Acheron opened from its surface,—that the cattle which fed on it fell sick,—and that the owners themselves, after a short period, invariably died or hanged themselves. In order to introduce the scene between Charmides and the Counterfeit, the former, though just returned from a sea voyage and a long absence, waits in the street, on the appearance of a stranger, merely from curiosity to know his business ; and in the following scene the slave Stasimus, after expressing the utmost terror for the lash on account of his tarrying so long, still loiters to propound a series of moral maxims, inconsistent with his character and situation.

The plot of the *Dowry* of Giovamaria Cecchi is precisely the same with that of the *Trinummus* ; but that dramatist possessed a wonderful art of giving an air of originality to his closest imitations, by the happy adaptation of ancient subjects to Italian manners. The *Tresor Caché* of Destouches is almost translated from the *Trinummus*, only he has brought forward on the stage Hortense, the Prodigal's sister, and has added the character of Julie, the daughter of the absent father's friend, of whom the Prodigal himself is enamoured. In this comedy the character of the two youths are meant to be contrasted, and are more strongly brought out in the imitation, from both of them being in love. A German play, entitled *Schatz*, by the celebrated dramatist Lessing, is also borrowed from this Latin original. The scene, too, in *Trinummus*, between Charmides and the counterfeit messenger, has given rise to one in the *Suppositi* of Ariosto, and through that medium to another in Shakspeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, where, when it is found necessary for the success of Lucentio's stratagem at Padua, that some one should personate his father, the *pedant* is employed for this purpose. Meanwhile, the father himself unexpectedly arrives at Padua, and a comical scene in consequence passes between them.

Truculentus—is so called from a morose and clownish servant, who, having accompanied his master from the country to Rome, inveighs against the depraved morals of that city, and especially against Phronesium, the courtesan by whom his master had been enticed. His churlish disposition, however, is only exhibited in a single scene. On the sole other occasion on which he is introduced, he is represented as having become quite mild and affable. For this change no reason is assigned, but it is doubtless meant to be understood that he had meanwhile been soothed and wheedled by the arts of some courtesan. The characters, however, of the *Truculentus* and his rustic master, have little to do with the main plot of the drama,

which is chiefly occupied with the fate of the lovers, whom Phronesium enticed to their ruin. When she had consumed the wealth of the infatuated Dinarchus, she lays her snares for Stratophanes, the Babylonian captain, to whom she pretends to have borne a son, in order that she may prey on him with more facility. This drama is accordingly occupied with her feigned pregnancy, her counterfeited solicitude, and her search for a supposititious child, to which she persuades her dupe that she had given birth, but which afterwards proves to be the child of her former lover Dinarchus, by a young lady to whom he had been betrothed.

In the first act of this play an account is given of the mysteries of a courtesan's occupation, which, with a passage near the commencement of the *Mostellaria*, and a few fragments of Alexis, a writer of the middle comedy, gives us some insight into the practices by which they entrapped and seduced their lovers, by whom they appear to have been maintained in prodigious state and splendour. In a play of Terence, one of the characters, talking of the train of a courtesan, says,

“ Ducitur familia tota,
Vestispicæ, unctor, auri custos, fiabelliferæ, sandaligerulæ,
Cantrices, cistellatrices, nuncii, renuncii*.”

The Greek courtesan possessed attainments, which the more virtuous of her sex were neither expected nor permitted to acquire. On her the education which was denied to a spotless woman, was carefully bestowed. To sing, to dance, to play on the lyre and the lute, were accomplishments in which the courtesan was, from her earliest years, completely instructed. The habits of private life afforded ample opportunity for the display of such acquirements, as the charm of convivial meetings among the Greeks was thought imperfect, unless the enjoyments were brightened by a display of the talents which belonged exclusively to the Wanton. But though these refinements alone were sufficient to excite the highest admiration of the Greek youth, unaccustomed as they were to female society, and often procured a splendid establishment for the accomplished courtesan, some of that class embraced a much wider range of education; and having added to their attainments in the fine arts, a knowledge of philosophy and the powers of eloquence, they became, thus trained and educated, the companions of orators, statesmen, and poets. The arrival of Aspasia at Athens is said to have produced a change in the manners of that city, and to have formed a new and remark-

* *Heautontim.* Act III. sc. 2.

able epoch in the history of society. The class to which she belonged was of more political importance in Athens than in any other state of Greece; and though I scarcely believe that the Peloponnesian war had its origin in the wrongs of Aspasia, the Athenian courtezans, with their various interests, were often alluded to in grave political harangues, and they were considered as part of the establishment of the state. Above all, the comic poets were devoted to their charms, were conversant with their manners, and often experienced their rapacity and infidelity; for, being unable to support them in their habits of expense, an opulent old man, or dissolute youth, was in consequence frequently preferred. The passion of Menander for Glycerium is well known, and Diphilus, from whom Plautus borrowed his *Rudens*, consorted with Gnathena, celebrated as one of the most lively and luxurious of Athenian Charmers*. Accordingly, many of the plays of the new comedy derive their names from celebrated courtezans; but it does not appear, from the fragments which remain, that they were generally represented in a favourable light, or in their meridian splendour of beauty and accomplishments†. In the Latin plays, the courtezans are not drawn so highly gifted in point of talents, or even beauty, as might be expected; but it was necessary to paint them as elegant, fascinating, and expensive, in order to account for the infatuation and ruin of their lovers. The Greeks and Romans were alike strangers to the polite gallantry of Modern Europe, and to the enthusiastic love which chivalry is said to have inspired in the middle ages. Thus their hearts and senses were left unprotected, to become the prey of such women as the Phronesium of the *Truculentus*, who is a picture of the most rapacious and debauched of her class, and whose vices are neither repented of, nor receive punishment, at the conclusion of the drama. Dinarchus may be regarded as a representation of the most profligate of the Greek or Roman youth, yet he is not held up to any particular censure; and, in the end, he is neither reformed nor adequately punished. The portion, indeed, of the lady whom he had violated, and at last agrees to espouse, is threatened by her father to be diminished, but this seems merely said in a momentary fit of resentment.

This play, with all its imperfections, is said to have been a great favourite of the author‡; and was a very popular comedy at Rome. It has descended to us rather in a mutilated state, which may, perhaps, have deprived us of some fine sen-

* Athenæus, Lib. XIII. Aciphron's *Epist.*

† De Pauw, *Recherches Philosophiques sur les Grecs*, Vol. I. p. 188.

‡ Cicero, *de Senectute*, c. 14.

tences or witticisms, which the ancients had admired; for, as a French translator of Plautus has remarked. their approbation could scarcely have been founded on the interest of the subject, the disposition of the incidents, or the moral which is inculcated.

The character of Lolpoop, the servant of Belfond Senior, in Shadwell's *Squire of Alsatia*, has been evidently formed on that of the Truculentus, in this comedy. His part, however, as in the original, is chiefly episodical; and the principal plot, as shall be afterwards shown, has been founded on the *Adelphi* of Terence.

The above-mentioned plays are the twenty dramas of Plautus, which are still extant. But, besides these, a number of comedies, now lost, have been attributed to him. Aulus Gellius* mentions, that there were about a hundred and thirty plays, which, in his age, passed under the name of Plautus; and of these, nearly forty titles, with a few scattered fragments, still remain. From the time of Varro to that of Aulus Gellius, it seems to have been a subject of considerable discussion what plays were genuine; and it appears, that the best informed critics had come to the conclusion, that a great proportion of those comedies, which vulgarly passed for the productions of Plautus, were spurious. Such a vast number were probably ascribed to him, from his being the head and founder of a great dramatic school; so that those pieces, which he had perhaps merely retouched, came to be wholly attributed to his pen. As in the schools of painting, so in the dramatic art, a celebrated master may have disciples who adopt his principles. He may give the plan which they fill up, or complete what they have imperfectly executed. Many paintings passed under the name of Raphael, of which Julio Romano, and others, were the chief artists. "There is no doubt," says Aulus Gellius, "but that those plays, which seem not to have been written by Plautus, but are ascribed to him, were by certain ancient poets, and afterwards retouched and polished by him†." Even those comedies which were written in the same taste with his, came to be termed *Fabulæ Plautinæ*, in the same way as we still speak of *Æsopian fable*, and *Homeric verse*. "Plautus quidem," says Macrobius, "ea re clarus fuit, ut post mortem ejus, comœdiæ, quæ incertæ ferebantur, Plautinæ tamen esse, de jocorum copia, agnoscerentur‡." It is thus evident, that a sufficient number of jests stamped a dramatic piece as the production of Plautus in the

* *Noct. Att. Lib. III. c. 3.*
 † *Satur. Lib. II. c. 1.*

† *Noct. Att. Lib. III. c. 3.*

opinion of the multitude. But Gellius farther mentions, that there was a certain writer of comedies, whose name was Plautius, and whose plays having the inscription "Plauti," were considered as by Plautus, and were named Plautinæ from Plautus, though in fact they ought to have been called Plautianæ from Plautius. All this sufficiently accounts for the vast number of plays ascribed to Plautus, and which the most learned and intelligent critics have greatly restricted. They have differed, however, very widely, as to the number which they have admitted to be genuine. Some, says Servius, maintain, that Plautus wrote twenty-one comedies, others forty, others a hundred*. Gellius informs us, that Lucius *Ælius*, a most learned man, was of opinion that not more than twenty-five were of his composition†. Varro wrote a work, entitled *Questiones Plautinæ*, a considerable portion of which was devoted to a discussion concerning the authenticity of the plays commonly assigned to Plautus, and the result of his investigation was, that twenty-one were unquestionably to be admitted as genuine. These were subsequently termed Varronian, in consequence of having been separated by Varro from the remainder, as no way doubtful, and universally allowed to be by Plautus. The twenty-one Varronian plays are the twenty still extant, and the *Vidularia*. This comedy appears to have been originally subjoined to the Palatine MS. of the still existing plays of Plautus, but to have been torn off, since, at the conclusion of the *Truculentus*, we find the words "Vidularia incipit‡:" And Mai has recently published some fragments of it, which he found in an Ambrosian MS. Such, it would appear, had been the high authority of Varro, that only those plays, which had received his indubitable sanction, were transcribed in the MSS. as the genuine works of Plautus; yet it would seem that Varro himself had, on some occasion, assented to the authenticity of several others, induced by their style of humour corresponding to that of Plautus. He had somewhere mentioned, that the *Saturio* (the Glutton,) and the *Addictus*, (the Adjudged,) were written by Plautus during the period in which he laboured as a slave at the hand-mill. He was also of opinion, that the *Bœotia* was by Plautus; and Aulus Gellius concurs with him in this§, citing certain verses delivered by a hungry parasite, which, he says, are perfectly Plautinian, and must satisfy

* Nam Plautum alii dicunt scripisse Fabulas XXI. alii XL. alii C. Serv. *Ad Virg. Æneid.* Init.

† *Noct. Att. Lib. III. c. 8.*

‡ Fabricius, *Bib. Latina*, Lib. I. c. 1. Osannus, *Analecta Critica*, c. 8.

§ *Noct. Att. Lib. III. c. 3.*

every person to whom Plautus is familiar, of the authenticity of that drama. From this very passage, Osannus derives an argument unfavourable to the authenticity of the play. The parasite exclaims against the person who first distinguished hours, and set up the sun-dials, of which the town was so full. Now, Osannus maintains, that there were no sun-dials at Rome in the time of Plautus, and that the day was not then distributed into hours, but into much larger portions of time*. The *Nervolaria* was one of the disputed plays in the time of Au. Gellius; and also the *Fretum*, which Gellius thinks the most genuine of all†. Varro, in the first Book of his *Quæstiones Plautinæ*, gives the following words of Attius, which, I presume, are quoted from his work on poetry and poets, entitled *Didascalica*. "For neither were the *Gemini*, the *Leones*, the *Condalium*, the *Anus Plauti*, the *Bis Compressa*, the *Bæotia*, or the *Commorientes*, by Plautus, but by M. Aquilius." It appears, however, from the prologue to the *Adelphi* of Terence, that the *Commorientes* was written by Plautus, having been taken by him from a Greek comedy of Diphilus‡. In opposition to the above passage of Attius, and to his own opinion expressed in the *Quæstiones Plautinæ*, Varro, in his treatise on the Latin Language, frequently cites, as the works of Plautus, the plays enumerated by Attius, and various others; but this was probably in deference to common opinion, or in agreement with ordinary language, and was not intended to contradict what he had elsewhere delivered, or to stamp with the character of authenticity productions, which he had more deliberately pronounced to be spurious§.

From the review which has now been given of the comedies of Plautus, something may have been gathered of their general scope and tenor. In each plot there is sufficient action, movement, and spirit. The incidents never flag, but rapidly accelerate the catastrophe. Yet, if we regard his plays in the mass, there is a considerable, and perhaps too great, uniformity in their fables. They hinge, for the most part, on the love of some dissolute youth for a courtesan, his employment of a slave to defraud a father of a sum sufficient to supply his expensive pleasures, and the final discovery that his mistress is a free-born citizen. The charge against

* *Analect. Critic.* c. 8.

† *Noct. Att. Lib.* III. c. 2.

‡ *Sunapothneskontes* Diphili Comœdia 'st:
Eam Commorientes Plautus fecit Fabulam.

§ We have the opinions of Varro concerning the plays of Plautus only at second hand. The work in which they are delivered, is lost; but they are minutely reported in his *Attic Nights*, by Aulus Gellius.

Plautus of uniformity in his characters, as well as in his fables, has been echoed without much consideration. The portraits of *Plautus*, it must be remembered, were drawn or copied at a time when the division of labour and progress of refinement had not yet given existence to those various descriptions of professions and artists—the doctor, author, attorney—in short, all those characters, whose habits, singularities, and whims, have supplied the modern *Thalia* with such diversified materials, and whose contrasts give to each other such relief, that no caricature is required in any individual representation. The characters of *Alcmena*, *Euclio*, and *Periplectomenes*, are sufficiently novel, and are not repeated in any of the other dramas; but there is ample range and variety even in those which he has most frequently employed—the avaricious old man—the debauched young fellow—the knavish slave—the braggart captain—the rapacious courtesan—the obsequious parasite—and the shameless pander. On most of these parts some observations have been made, while mentioning the different comedies in which they are introduced. The severe father and thoughtless youth, are those in which he has best succeeded, or at least they are those with which we are best pleased. The captain always appears to us exaggerated, and the change which has taken place in society and manners prevents us, perhaps, from entering fully into the characters of the slave, the parasite, and pander; but in the fathers and sons, he has shown his knowledge of our common nature, and delineated them with the truest and liveliest touches. In the former, the struggles of avarice and severity, with paternal affection, are finely wrought up and blended. Even when otherwise respectable characters, they are always represented as disliking their wives, which was not inconsistent with the manners of a Grecian state, in which marriage was merely regarded as a duty; and was a feature naturally enough exhibited on the theatre of a nation, one of whose most illustrious characters declared in the Senate, as a received maxim, that Romans married, not for the sake of domestic happiness, but to rear up soldiers for the republic.

The Latin style of *Plautus* excels in briskness of dialogue, as well as purity of expression, and has been highly extolled by the learned Roman grammarians, particularly by *Varro*, who declares, that if the *Muses* were to speak Latin they would employ his diction*; but as *M. Schlegel* has remarked, it is necessary to distinguish between the opinion of philologists, and that of critics and poets. *Plautus* wrote at a period when

* *Ap. Quintilian, Inst. Orat. Lib. X. c. 1.*

his country as yet possessed no written or literary language. Every phrase was drawn from the living source of conversation. This early simplicity seemed pleasing and artless to those Romans, who lived in an age of excessive refinement and cultivation; but this apparent merit was rather accidental than the effect of poetic art. Making, however, some allowance for this, there can be no doubt that Plautus wonderfully improved and refined the Latin language from the rude form in which it had been moulded by Ennius. That he should have effected such an alteration is not a little remarkable. Plautus was nearly contemporary with the Father of Roman song—according to most accounts he was born a slave—he was condemned, during part of his life, to the drudgery of the lowest manual labour—and, so far as we learn, he was not distinguished by the patronage of the Great, or admitted into Patrician society. Ennius, on the other hand, if he did not pass his life in affluence, spent it in the exercise of an honourable profession, and was the chosen familiar friend of Cato, Scipio Africanus, Fulvius Nobilior, and Lælius, the most learned as well as polished citizens of the Roman republic, whose conversation in their unrestrained intercourse must have bestowed on him advantages which Plautus never enjoyed. But perhaps the circumstance of his Greek original, which contributed so much to his learning and refinement, and qualified him for such exalted society, may have been unfavourable to that native purity of Latin diction, which the Umbrian slave imbibed from the un-mixed fountains of conversation and nature.

The chief excellence of Plautus is generally reputed to consist in the wit and comic force of his dialogue; and, accordingly, the lines in Horace's *Art of Poetry*, in which he derides the ancient Romans for having foolishly admired the "*Plautinos sales*," has been the subject of much reprehension among critics*. That the wit of Plautus often degenerates into buffoonery, scurrility, and quibbles,—sometimes even into obscenity,—and that, in his constant attempts at merriment, he too often tries to excite laughter by exaggerated expressions, as well as by extravagant actions, cannot, in-

* "Immo illi proavi," says Camerarius, (*Dissert. de Comad. Plauti*), "merito, et recte, ac sapienter Plautum laudarunt et admirati fuerunt: tuque ad Græcitatam, omnia, quasi regulam, poemata gentis tuæ exigens, immerito, et perperam, atque incogitanter culpas."—(See also J. C. Scalliger and Lipsius, *Antiq. Lect. Lib. II. c. 1.*; Turnebus, *Advers.* xxv. 16.; Flor. Sabinus, *Adversus Calumniatores Plauti*, Basil, 1540.) Dan. Heinsius attempted to defend the sentiment of Horace, in his *Dissertation ad Horatii de Plauto et Terentio judicium*: printed at Amsterdam, 1618, with his edition of *Terence*; and was answered by Benedict Fioretti, in his *Apologia pro Plauto, opposita sævo judicio Horatiano et Heinsiano*.—See, finally, D. J. Tr. Dana, *De Virtute Comica Plauti*, in *Dissert. Philolog. Jenæ*, 1800.

deed, be denied. This, I think, was partly owing to the immensity of the Roman theatres, and to the masks and trumpets of the actors, which must have rendered caricature and grotesque inventions essential to the production of that due effect, which, with such scenic apparatus, could not be created, unless by overstepping the modesty of nature. It must be always be recollected, that the plays of Plautus were written solely to be represented, and not to be read. Even in modern times, and subsequently to the invention of printing, the greatest dramatists—Shakspeare, for example—cared little about the publication of their plays; and in every age or country, in which dramatic poetry has flourished, it has been intended for public representation, and has been adapted to the taste of a promiscuous audience. It is the most social of all sorts of composition; and he who aims at popularity or success in it, must leave the solitudes of inspiration for the bustle of the world.

The contemplative poet may find his delight, and his reward, in the mere effort of imagination, but the poet of the drama must seek them in the applause of the multitude. He must stoop to men—be the mover of human hearts—and triumph by the living and hourly passions of our nature. Now, in the days of Plautus, the smiles of the polite critic were not enough for a Latin comedian, because in those days there were few polite critics at Rome; he required the shouts and laughter of the multitude, who could be fully gratified only by the broadest grins of comedy. Accordingly, many of the jests of Plautus are such as might be expected from a writer anxious to accommodate himself to the taste of the times, and naturally catching the spirit of ribaldry which prevailed.

During the age of Plautus, and indeed long after it, the general character of Roman wit consisted rather in a rude and not very liberal satire, than a just and temperate ridicule, restrained within the bounds of decency and good manners. A favourite topic, for example, of ancient raillery, was corporal defects;—a decisive proof of coarseness of humour, especially as it was recommended by rule, and enforced by the authority of the greatest masters, as one of the most legitimate sources of ridicule.—“*Est deformitatis et corporis vitiorum satis bella materies ad jocandum,*” says Cicero, in his treatise *De Oratore**. The innumerable jests there recorded as having produced the happiest effects at the bar, are the most miserable puns and quibbles, coarse practical jokes, or personal reflections. The cause of this defect in elegance of wit and raillery, has been attributed by Hurd to the free and popular constitution of Rome. This, by placing all its citizens, at least

* Lib. II. c. 59.

during certain periods, on a level, and diffusing a general spirit of independence, took off those restraints of civility which are imposed by the dread of displeasing, and which can alone curb the licentiousness of ridicule. The only court to be paid was from the orators to the people, in the continual and immediate applications to them which were rendered necessary by the form of government. On such occasions, the popular assemblies had to be entertained with those gross banterers, which were likely to prove most acceptable to them. Design growing into habit, the orators, and after them the nation, accustomed themselves to coarse ridicule at all times, till the humour passed from the rostrum, or forum, to the theatre, where the amusement and laughter of the people being the direct and immediate aim, it was heightened to still farther extravagance. This taste, says Hurd, was also fostered and promoted at Rome by the festal license which prevailed in the seasons of the Bacchanalia and Saturnalia*. Quintilian thinks, that, with some regulation, those days of periodical license might have aided the cultivation of a correct spirit of raillery; but, as it was, they tended to vitiate and corrupt it. The Roman muse, too, had been nurtured amid satiric and rustic exhibitions, the remembrance of which was still cherished, and a recollection of them kept alive, by the popular *Exodia* and *Fabula Atellana*.

Such being the taste of the audience whom he had to please, and who crowded to the theatre not to acquire purity of taste, but to relax their minds with merriment and jest, it became the great object of Plautus to make his audience laugh; and for this he sacrificed every other consideration. "Nec quicquam," says Scaliger, "veritus est, modo auditorem excitaret risu." With this view, he must have felt that he was more likely to succeed by emulating the broader mirth of the old or middle comedy, than by the delicate railleries and exquisite painting of Menander. Accordingly, though he generally borrowed his plots from the writers of the new comedy, his wit and humour have more the relish of the old, and they have been classed by Cicero as of the same description with the drollery which enlivened its scenes†. The audience, for whom the plays of Plautus were written, could understand or enjoy only a representation of the manners and witticisms to which they were accustomed. To the fastidious critics of the

* Hurd's *Horace*. Gibbon's *Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. IV.

† "Duplex omnino est jocandi genus; unum illiberale, petulans, obscœnum, alterum elegans, urbanum, ingeniosum, facetum; quo genere non modo Plautus nos ter, et Atticorum antiqua comœdia, sed etiam Philosophorum Socraticorum libri sunt referti."—*De Officiis*, Lib. I. c. 29.

court of Augustus, an admirer of Plautus might have replied in the words of Antiphanes, a Greek dramatist of the middle comedy, who being commanded to read one of his plays to Alexander the Great, and finding that the production was not relished by the royal critic, thus addressed him: "I cannot wonder that you disapprove of my comedy, for he who could be entertained by it must have been present at the scenes it represents. *He must be acquainted with the public humours of our vulgar ordinaries*—have been familiar with the impure manners of our courtezans—a party in the breaking up of many a brothel—and a sufferer, as well as actor, in those unseemly riots. Of all these things you are not informed; and the fault lies more in my presumption in intruding them on your hearing, than in any want of fidelity with which I have portrayed them*."

Indeed, this practice of consulting the tastes of the people, if it be a fault, is one which is common to all comic writers. Aristophanes, who was gifted with far higher powers than Plautus, and who was no less an elegant poet than a keen satirist, as is evinced by the lyric parts of his *Frogs*, often prostituted his talents to the lowest gratifications of the multitude. Shakspeare regarded the drama as entirely a thing for the people, and treated it as such throughout. He took the popular comedy as he found it; and whatever enlargements or improvements he introduced on the stage, were still calculated and contrived according to the spirit of his predecessors, and the taste of a London audience. When, in Charles's days, a ribald taste became universal in England, "unhappy Dryden" bowed down his genius to the times. Even in the refined age of Louis XIV., it was said of the first comic genius of his country, that he would have attained the perfection of his art,

"*Si moins ami du peuple en ses doctes peintures,
Il n'eût point fait souvent grimacer ses figures,
Quitte, pour le bouffon, l'agréable et le fin,
Et, sans honte, a Terence allié Tabarin.*"

BOILEAU.

Lopez de Vega, in his *Arte de hacer Comedias*, written, in 1609, at the request of a poetical academy, and containing a code of laws for the modern drama, admits, that when he was about to write a comedy, he laid aside all dramatic precepts, and wrote solely for the vulgar, who had to pay for their amusement:

* Athenæus, Lib. XIII. c. 1.

“ Quando he de escribir una comedia,
Encierro los preceptos con seis llaves ;
Saco a Terencio y Plauto de mi studio
Para que no den voces, porque suele
Dar gritos la verdad en libros mudes ;
Y escribo por el arte que inventaron
Los que el vulgar aplauso pretendieron,
Porque como los paga el vulgo, es justo
Hablarle in necio para darle gusto.”

His indulgent conformity, however, to the unpolished taste of his age, ought not to be admitted as an excuse for the obscenities which Plautus has introduced. But though it must be confessed, that he is liable to some censure in this particular, he is not nearly so culpable as has been generally imagined. The commentators, indeed, have been often remarkably industrious in finding out allusions, which do not consist very clearly with the plain and obvious meaning of the context. The editor of the Delphin Plautus has not rejected above five pages from the twenty plays on this account ; and many passages even in those could hardly offend the most scrupulous reader. Some of the comedies, indeed, as the *Captivi* and *Trinummus*, are free from any moral objection ; and, with the exception of the *Casina*, none of them are so indelicate as many plays of Massinger and Ford, in the time of James I., or Ethelridge and Shadwell, during the reigns of Charles II. and his successor.

It being the great aim of Plautus to excite the merriment of the rabble, he, of course, was little anxious about the strict preservation of the dramatic unities ; and it was a more important object with him to bring a striking scene into view, than to preserve the unity of place. In the *Aulularia*, part of the action is laid in the miser's dwelling, and part in the various places where he goes to conceal his treasure : in the *Mostellaria* and *Truculentus*, the scene changes from the street to apartments in different houses.

But, notwithstanding these and other irregularities, Plautus so enchanted the people by the drollery of his wit, and the buffoonery of his scenes, that he continued the reigning favourite of the stage long after the more correct plays of Cæcilius, Afranius, and even Terence, were first represented.

CÆCILIUS,

who was originally a slave, acquired this name with his freedom, having been at first called by the servile appellation of

Stattius*. He was a native of Milan, and flourished towards the end of the sixth century of Rome, having survived Ennius, whose intimate friend he was, about one year, which places his death in 586. We learn from the prologue to the *Hecyra* of Terence, spoken in the person of Ambivivus, the principal actor, or rather manager of the theatre, that, when he first brought out the plays of Cæcilius, some were hissed off the stage, and others hardly stood their ground; but knowing the fluctuating fortunes of dramatic exhibitions, he had again attempted to bring them forward. His perseverance having obtained for them a full and unprejudiced hearing, they failed not to please; and this success excited the author to new efforts in the poetic art, which he had nearly abandoned in a fit of despondency. The comedies of Cæcilius, which amounted to thirty, are all lost, so that our opinion of their merits can be formed only from the criticisms of those Latin authors who wrote before they had perished. Cicero blames the improprieties of his style and language†. From Horace's Epistle to Augustus, we may collect what was the popular sentiment concerning Cæcilius—

“Vincere Cæcilius gravitate—Terentius arte.”

It is not easy to see how a comic author could be more grave than Terence; and the quality applied to a writer of this cast appears of rather difficult interpretation. But the opinion which had been long before given by Varro affords a sort of commentary on Horace's expression—“In argumentis,” says he, “Cæcilius palmam poscit; in ethesi Terentius.” By *gravitas*, therefore, as applied to Cæcilius, we may properly enough understand the grave and affecting plots of his comedies; which is farther confirmed by what Varro elsewhere observes of him—“*Pathe Trabea, Attilius, et Cæcilius facile moverunt.*” Velleius Paterculus joins him with Terence and Afranius, whom he reckons the most excellent comic writers of Rome—“*Dulcesque Latini leporis facetiæ per Cæcilium, Terentiumque, et Afranium, sub pari ætate, nituerunt*‡.

A great many of the plays of Cæcilius were taken from Menander; and Aulus Gellius informs us that they seemed agreeable and pleasing enough, till, being compared with their Greek models, they appeared quite tame and disgusting, and the wit of the original, which they were unable to imitate,

* Au. Gellius, *Noct. Att. Lib. IV. c. 20.*

† *Brutus*, c. 74. Cæcilium et Pacuvium male locutos videmus.

‡ *Histor. Roman. Lib. I. c. 17.*

totally vanished*. He accordingly contrasts a scene in the *Plocius* (or Necklace,) of Cæcilius, with the corresponding scene in Menander, and pronounces them to be as different in brightness and value as the arms of Diomed and Glaucus. The scenes compared are those where an old husband complains that his wife, who was rich and ugly, had obliged him to sell a handsome female slave, of whom she was jealous. This chapter of Aulus Gellius is very curious, as it gives us a more perfect notion than we obtain from any other writer, of the mode in which the Latin comic poets copied the Greeks. To judge from this single comparison, it appears that though the Roman dramatists imitated the incidents, and caught the ideas of their great masters, their productions were not entirely translations or slavish versions: A different turn is frequently given to a thought—the sentiments are often differently expressed, and sometimes much is curtailed, or altogether omitted.

AFRANIUS,

though he chose Roman subjects, whence his comedies were called *Togata*, was an imitator of the manner of Menander—

“Dicitur Afrani togæ convenisse Menandro.”

Indeed he himself admits, in his *Compitalia*, that he derived many even of his plots from Menander and other Greek writers—

“Fateor, sumpsi non a Menandro modo,
Sed ut quisque habuit, quod conveniret mihi;
Quod me non posse melius facere credidi.”

Cicero† calls Afranius an ingenious and eloquent writer. Ausonius, in one of his epigrams, talks “*facundi Afrani*.” He is also praised by Quintilian, who censures him, however, for the flagitious amours which he represented on the stage‡, on account of which, perhaps, his writings were condemned to

* *Noct. Attic.* Lib. II. c. 23.

† *Brutus*, c. 45. L. Afranius poeta, homo perargutus; in fabulis quidem etiam ut scitis, disertus.

‡ *Instit. Orat.* Lib. X. c. 1. To this charge Ausonius also alludes, though with little reprehension,

“Præter legitimi genitalia fœdera coctus,
Repperit obscænas veneres vitiosa libido;
Herculis heredi quam Lemnia suasit egestas,
Quam toga facundi scenis agitavit Afrani.”

Epigram. 71.

the flames by Pope Gregory I. The titles of forty-six of his plays have been collected by Fabricius, and a few fragments have been edited by Stephens. One of these, in the play entitled *Sella*, where it is said that wisdom is the child of experience and memory, has been commended by Aulus Gellius, and is plausibly conjectured* to have been introduced in a prologue spoken in the person of Wisdom herself—

“*Usus me genuit, mater peperit Memoria :
Sophtiam vocant me Græci ; vos Sapientiam.*”

The following lines from the *Vopiscum* have also been frequently quoted :

“*Si possent homines delinimentis capi,
Omnes haberent nunc amatores antus.
Ætas, et corpus tenerum, et morigeratio,
Hæc sunt venena formosarum mulierum†.*”

LUSCIUS LAVINIUS,

also a follower of Menander, was the contemporary and enemy of Terence, who, in his prologues, has satirized his injudicious translations from the Greek—

“*Qui bene, vertendo et eas describendo male,
Ex Græcis bonis, Latinas fecit non bonas‡.*”

In particular, we learn from the prologue to the *Phormio*; that he was fond of bringing on the stage frantic youths, committing all those excesses of folly and distraction which are supposed to be produced by violent love. Donatus has afforded us an account of the plot of his *Phasma*, which was taken from Menander. A lady, who, before marriage, had a daughter, the fruit of a secret amour with a person now living in a house adjacent to her husband's, made an opening in the wall of her own dwelling, in order to communicate with that in which her former paramour and daughter resided. That this entrance might appear a consecrated spot to her husband's family, she decked it with garlands, and shaded it with branches of trees. To this passage she daily repaired as if to pay her devotions, but in fact, to procure interviews with her

* Spence's *Polymetis*.

† “*Could men to love be lured by magic rites,
Each crone would with a lover sooth her nights :
A tender form, and youth, and gentle smiles,
Are the sweet potion which the heart beguiles.*”

‡ *Eumuchus, Prolog.*

illegitimate daughter. Her husband also had, by a former wife, a son, who dwelt in his father's house, and who, having one day accidentally peeped through the aperture, beheld the girl; and, as she was possessed of almost supernatural beauty, he was struck with awe, as at the sight of a Spirit or divinity, whence the play received the name of *Phasma*. The young man, discovering at length that she is a mortal, conceives for her a violent passion, and is finally united to her, with the consent of his father, and to the great satisfaction of the mother. There is another play of Menander, which has also been closely imitated by Luscius Lavinus. Plautus, we have seen, borrowed his *Trinummus* from the *Thesaurus* of Philemon. But Menander also wrote a *Thesaurus*, which has been copied by Lavinus. An old man, by his last will, had commanded, that, ten years after his death, his son should carry libations to the monument under which he was to be interred. The youth, having squandered his fortune, sold the ground on which this monument stood to an old miser. At the end of ten years, the prodigal sent a servant to the tomb with due offerings, according to the injunctions of his deceased father. The servant applied to the new proprietor to assist him in opening the monument, in which they discovered a hoard of gold. The miserly owner of the soil seized the treasure, and retained it on pretence of having deposited it there for safety during a period of public commotion. It is claimed, however, by the young man, who goes to law with him; and the plot of the comedy chiefly consists in the progress of the suit*—the dramatic management of which has been ridiculed by Terence, in the prologue to the *Eunuchus*, since, contrary to the custom and rules of all courts of justice, the author had introduced the defendant pleading his title to the treasure before the plaintiff had explained his pretensions, and entered on the grounds of his demand. Part of the old Scotch ballad, *The Heir of Linne*, has a curious resemblance to the plot of this play of Luscius Lavinus.

Turpilus, Trabea, and Attilius, were the names of comic writers who lived towards the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century, from the building of Rome. Of these, and other contemporary dramatists, it would now be difficult to say more than that their works have perished, and to repeat a few scattered incidental criticisms delivered by Varro or Cicero. To them probably may be attributed the *Baccharia*, *Cæcus*, *Cornicularia*, *Parasitus*, and innumerable other comedies, of which the names have been preserved by gramma-

* Donatus, *Comment. in Terent. Eunuch. Prolog.*

rians. Of such works, once the favourites of the Roman stage, few memorials survive, and these only to be found separate and imperfect in the quotations of scholiasts. Sometimes from a single play numerous passages have been preserved; but they are so detached, that they neither give us any insight into the fable to which they appertain, nor enable us to pronounce on the excellence of the dramatic characters. In general, they comprise so small a portion of uninterrupted dialogue, that we can scarcely form a judgment even of the style and manner of the poet, or of the beauty of his versification. All that is now valuable in these fragments is a few brief moral maxims, and some examples of that *vis comica*, which consists in an ingenious and forcible turn of expression in the original language.

It is not difficult to account for the vast number of dramatic productions which we thus see were brought forward at Rome in the early ages of the Republic. There are two ways in which literature may be supported,—By the patronage of distinguished individuals, as it was in the time of Mæcenas and the age of Lorenzo de Medici; or, By the encouragement of a great literary public, as it is now rewarded in modern Europe. But, in Rome, literature as yet had not obtained the protection of an emperor or a favourite minister; and previous to the invention of printing, which alone could give extensive circulation to his productions, a poet could hardly gain a livelihood by any means, except by supplying popular entertainments for the stage. These were always liberally paid for by the *Ædiles*, or other directors of the public amusements. To this species of composition, accordingly, the poet directed his almost undivided attention; and a prodigious facility was afforded to his exertions by the inexhaustible dramatic stores which he found prepared for him in Greece.

TRABEA.

The plays of Quintus Trabea, supposed to belong chiefly to the class called *Togalæ*, are frequently cited by the grammarians, and are mentioned with approbation by Cicero. He in particular commends the lines where this poet so agreeably describes the credulity and overweening satisfaction of a lover—

“ Tantâ lætitiâ auctus sum ut mihi non constem :
Nunc demum mihi animus ardet.
Lena, delinita argento, nutum observabit meum—
Quid velim quid studeam : adventens digito impellam januam ;

*Fores patebunt—de improvise Chrysis, ubi me aspexit,
Alacris obviam mihi veniet, complexum exoptans meum;
Mihi se dedet.—Fortunam ipsam antelbo fortunis meis*.”*

The name of Trabea was made use of in a well known deception practised on Joseph Scaliger by Muretus. Scaliger piqued himself on his faculty of distinguishing the characteristic styles of ancient writers. In order to entrap him, Muretus showed him some verses, pretending that he had received them from Germany, where they had been transcribed from an ancient MS. attributed to Q. Trabea—

“ Here, si querelis, ejulatu, fletibus,
Medicina fieret miseris mortalium,
Auro parandæ lachrymæ contra forent:
Nunc hæc ad minuenda mala non magis valent
Quam Nenia præficæ ad excitandos mortuos:
Res turbidæ consilium, non fletum, expetunt†.”

Scaliger was so completely deceived, that he afterwards cited these verses, as lines from the play of *Harpaxe*, by Q. Trabea, in the first edition of his Commentary on Varro's Dialogues *De Re Rustica*, in order to illustrate some obscure expression of his author—“ Quis enim,” says he, “ tam aversus a Musis, tamque humanitatis expers, qui horum publicatione offendantur.” Muretus, not content with this malicious trick, afterwards sent him some other verses, to which he affixed the name of Attius, expressing, but more diffusely, the same idea. Scaliger, in his next edition of Varro, published them, along with the former lines, as fragments from the *Enomaus*, a tragedy by Attius, and a plagiarism from Trabea—observing, at the end of his note, “ Fortasse de hoc nimis.” Muretus said nothing for two years; but, at the end of that period, he published a volume of his own Latin poems, and, along with them, under the title *Afficta Trabeæ*, both sets of verses which

* “ I swell with such gladness my brain almost turns,
And my bosom with thoughts of my happiness burns.
The portress compliant—the way cleared before—
A touch of my finger throws open the door:
Then, Chrysis—fair Chrysis, will rush to my arms,
Will court my caresses, and yield all her charms.
Such transport will seize me when this comes to pass,
I'll Fortune herself in good fortune surpass.”

† “ O, could complaints or tears avail
To cure those ills which life assail,
Even gold would not be price too dear
At which to win a healing tear.
But, since the tears by sorrow shed
Are vain as dirge to wake the dead,
In prudent care, and not in grief,
All human ills must find relief.”

he had thus palmed on Scaliger for undoubted remnants of antiquity. The whole history of the imposture was fully disclosed in a note: Both poems, it was acknowledged, were versions of a fragment, attributed by some to Menander, and by others to Philemon, beginning,—Εἰ τα δακρυα ἡμιν, κ.τ.λ. They have been also translated into Latin by Naugerius*.

The progress of time, the ravages of war, and the intervention of a period of barbarism, which have deprived us of so many dramatic works of the Romans, have fortunately spared six plays of

TERENCE,

which are perhaps the most valuable remains that have descended to us among the works of antiquity. This celebrated dramatist, the delight and ornament of the Roman stage, was born at Carthage, about the 560th year of Rome. In what manner he came or was brought thither is uncertain. He was, in early youth, the freedman of one Terentius Lucanus in that city, whose name has been perpetuated only by the glory of his slave. After he had obtained his freedom, he became the friend of Lælius, and of the younger Scipio Africanus†. His *Andria* was not acted till the year 587—two years, according to the Eusebian Chronicle, after the death of Cæcilius; which unfortunately throws some doubt on the agreeable anecdote recorded by Donatus, of his introduction, in a wretched garb, into the house of Cæcilius, in order to read his comedy to that poet, by whom, as a mean person, he was seated on a low stool, till he astonished him with the matchless grace and elegance of the *Andria*, when he was placed on the couch, and invited to partake the supper of the veteran dramatist. Several writers have conjectured, it might be to another than to Cæcilius that Terence read his comedy‡; or, as the *Andria* is not indisputably his first comedy, that it might be one of the others which he read to Cæcilius§. Supposing the Eusebian Chronicle to be accurate in the date which it fixes for the death of Cæcilius, it is just possible, that Terence may have written and read to him his *Andria* two

* *Carmina*, 45. Ed. 1718.

† Donatus, *Vit. Terent.*

‡ Tiraboschi, *Storr. Dell. Lett. Ital.* Part III. Lib. II. c. 1. Arnaud, *Gazette Littéraire*, 1766.

§ Goujet, *Bib. Franc.* Tom. IV. Sulzer relates this story of Terence and the edile Corius, to whose review the *Andria* had been subjected.—*Theorie der Schönen Künste*, Tom. IV. *Terenz.*

years previous to its representation. After he had given six comedies to the stage, Terence left Rome for Greece, whence he never returned. The manner of his death, however, is altogether uncertain. According to one report, he perished at sea, while on his voyage from Greece to Italy, bringing with him an hundred and eight comedies, which he had translated from Menander: according to other accounts, he died in Arcadia for grief at the loss of those comedies, which he had sent before him by sea to Rome. In whatever way it was occasioned, his death happened when he was at the early age of thirty-four, and in the year 594 from the building of the city.

Andria,—acted in 587, is the first in point of time, and is usually accounted the first in merit, of the productions of Terence. Like most of his other comedies, it has a double plot. It is compounded of the *Andrian* and *Perinthian* of Menander; but it does not appear, that Terence took his principal plot from one of those Greek plays, and the under-plot from the other. He employed both to form his chief fable; and added the characters, on which the under plot is founded, from his own invention, or from some third play now unknown to us.

At the commencement of the play, Simo, the father of Pamphilus, informs Sosia of his son's love for Glycerium. In consequence of a report of this attachment spreading abroad, Chremes refuses his daughter, who had previously been promised to Pamphilus in marriage: Simo, however, still pretends to make preparations for the nuptials, in order more accurately to ascertain the state of his son's affections. Charinus, the lover of Chremes' daughter, is in despair at the prospect of this union; but he is comforted by the assurances of Pamphilus, that he would do every thing in his power to retard it. By this time, Davus, the slave of Pamphilus, discovers, that it is not intended his master's marriage should in reality proceed; and, perceiving it is a pretext, he advises Pamphilus to declare that he is ready to obey his father's commands. Glycerium, meanwhile, gives birth to a child; but Simo believes, that her reported delivery was a stratagem of Davus, to deter Chremes from acceding to his daughter's marriage with Pamphilus. Simo, however, at length prevails on him to give his consent. Pamphilus is thus placed in a most perplexing dilemma with all parties. His mistress, Glycerium, and her attendants, believe him to be false; while Charinus thinks that he had deceived him; and, as he had given his consent to the marriage, he can form no excuse to his father or Chremes for not concluding it. Hence his rage

against Davus, and new stratagems on the part of the slave to prevent the nuptials. He contrives that Chremes should overhear a conversation between him and Mysis, Glycerium's attendant, concerning the child which her mistress bore to Pamphilus, and Chremes in consequence instantly breaks off from his engagement. In this situation, Crito arrives to claim heirship to Chrysis, the reputed sister of Glycerium. He discloses, that Glycerium having been shipwrecked in infancy, had been preserved by his kinsman, the father of Chrysis; and, from his detail, it is discovered, that she is the daughter of Chremes. There is thus no farther obstacle to her marriage with Pamphilus; and the other daughter of Chremes is of course united to Charinus.

The long narrative with which the *Andria*, like several other plays of Terence, commences, and which is a component part of the drama itself, is beautiful in point of style, and does not fail to excite our interest concerning the characters. We perceive the compassion and even admiration of Simo for Glycerium, and we feel that, if convinced of her respectable birth and character, he would have preferred her to all others, even to the daughter of Chremes. Glycerium, indeed, does not appear on the stage; but her actual appearance could scarcely have added to the interest which her hapless situation inspires. Simo is the model of an excellent father. He is not so easily duped by his slaves as most of the old men in Plautus; and his temper does not degenerate, like that of many other characters in the plays of Terence, either into excessive harshness, or criminal indulgence. His observations are strikingly just, and are the natural language of age and experience. Chremes, the other old man, does not divide our interest with Simo; yet we see just enough of his good disposition, to make us sympathize with his happiness in the discovery of a daughter. Pamphilus is rendered interesting by his tenderness for Glycerium, and respect for his father. Davus supports the character of a shrewd, cunning, penetrating slave; he is wholly devoted to the interests of Pamphilus, but is often comically deterred from executing his stratagems by dread of the lash of his old master. The part of Crito, too, is happily imagined: His apprehension lest he be suspected of seeking an inheritance to which he has no just title, and his awkward feelings on coming to claim the wealth of a kinswoman of suspicious character, are artfully unfolded. Even the gossip and absurd flattery of the midwife, Lesbia, is excellent. The poet has also shewn considerable address in portraying the character of Chrysis, who was supposed to be the sister of Glycerium, but had died

previous to the commencement of the action. In the first scene, he represents her as having for a long while virtuously struggled with adverse fortune, and having finally been precipitated into vice rather by pressure of poverty than depravity of will; and afterwards, in the pathetic account which Pamphilus gives of his last conference with her, we insensibly receive a pleasing impression of her character, and forget her errors for the sake of her amiable qualities. All this was necessary, in order to prevent our forming a disadvantageous idea of Glycerium, who had resided with Chrysis, but was afterwards to become the wife of Pamphilus, and to be acknowledged as the daughter of Chremes.

This play has been imitated in the *Andrienne* of Baron, the celebrated French actor. The Latin names are preserved in the *dramatis personæ*, and the first, second, and fifth acts, have been nearly translated from Terence. In the fourth, however, instead of the marriage being interrupted by Davus's stratagem, Glycerium, hearing a report of the falsehood of her lover, rushes on the stage, throws herself at the feet of Chremes, and prevails on him to break off the intended match between his daughter and Pamphilus. But, though the incidents are nearly the same, the dialogue is ill written, and is very remote from the graceful ease and simplicity of Terence.

Steele's *Conscious Lovers* is the best imitation of the *Andria*. The English play, it will be remembered, commences in a similar manner with the Latin comedy, by Sir John Bevil relating to an old servant, that he had discovered the love of his son for Indiana, an unknown and stranger girl, by his behaviour at a masquerade. The report of this attachment nearly breaks off an intended marriage between young Bevil and Lucinda, Sealand's daughter. Young Bevil relieves the mind of Myrtle, the lover of Lucinda, by assuring him that he is utterly averse to the match. Still, however, he pretends to his father, that he is ready to comply with his wishes; and, meanwhile, writes to Lucinda, requesting that she would refuse the offer of his hand. Myrtle, hearing of this correspondence having taken place, without knowing its import, is so fired with jealousy that he sends Bevil a challenge. Sealand, being still pressed by Sir John to bestow his daughter in marriage, waits on Indiana, in order to discover the precise nature of her relations with Bevil. She details to him her story; and, on his alluding to the probability of the projected nuptials being soon concluded, she tears off, in a transport of passion, a bracelet, by which Sealand discovers, that she is a daughter whom he had lost, and who, while

proceeding to join him in the East Indies, had been carried into a French harbour, where she first met with young Bevil.

An English translator of Terence remarks, "That Steele has unfolded his plot with more art than his predecessor, but is greatly his inferior in delineation of character. Simo is the most finished character in the Latin piece, but Sir John Bevil, who corresponds to him, is quite insignificant. Young Bevil is the most laboured character in the *Conscious Lovers*, but he is inferior to Pamphilus. His deceit is better managed by Terence than Steele. Bevil's supposed consent to marry is followed by no consequence; and his honest dissimulation, as he calls it, is less reconcilable to the philosophic turn of his character, than to the natural sensibility of Pamphilus. Besides, the conduct of the latter is palliated, by being driven to it by the artful instigations of Davus, who executes the lower part of the stratagems, whereas Bevil is left entirely to his own resources." Bevil, indeed, in spite of his refinement and formality, his admiration of the moral writers, and, "the charming vision of Mirza consulted in a morning," is a good deal of a *Plato-Scapin*. Indiana, who corresponds to Glycerium, is introduced with more effect than the ladies in the French plays imitated from Terence. Her tearing off her ornaments, however, in a fit of despair, at the conclusion, is too violent. It is inconsistent with the rest of her character; and we feel that she would not have done so, had not the author found that the bracelet was necessary for her recognition as the daughter of Sealand. The under plot is perhaps better managed in the English than in the Latin play. Myrtle sustains a part more essential to the principal fable than Charinus; and his character is better discriminated from that of Bevil than those of the two lovers in the *Andria*. The part of Cimberton, the other lover of Lucinda, favoured by Mrs Sealand, is of Steele's own contrivance; and of course, also, the stratagem devised by Bevil, in which Myrtle and Tom pretend to be lawyers, and Myrtle afterwards personates Sir Geoffry Cimberton, the uncle of his rival.

The *Andria* has also suggested those scenes of Moore's *Foundling*, which relate to the love of young Belmont, and the recognition of Fidelia as the daughter of Sir Charles Raymond.

Eunuchus.—Though, in modern times, the *Andria* has been the most admired play of Terence, in Rome the *Eunuchus* was by much the most popular of all his performances, and he received for it 8000 sesterces, the greatest reward which poet had ever yet obtained*. In the *Andria*, indeed,

* Donatus, *Vit. Terent.*

there is much grace and delicacy, and some tenderness ; but the *Eunuchus* is so full of vivacity and fire, as almost to redeem its author from the well-known censure of Cæsar, that there was no *vis comica* in his dramas.

The chief part of the *Eunuchus* is taken from a play of the same title by Menander ; but the characters of the parasite and captain have been transferred into it from another play of Menander, called *Kolax*. There was an old play, too, by Nævius, founded on the *Kolax* ; but Terence, in his prologue, denies having been indebted to this performance.

The scenes of the *Eunuchus* are so arranged, that the main plot is introduced by that which is secondary, and which at first has the appearance of being the principal one. Phædria is brought on the stage venting his indignation at being excluded from the house of the courtesan Thais, for the sake of Thraso, who is the sole braggart captain exhibited in the plays of our author. Thais, however, succeeds in persuading Phædria that she would admit Thraso only for two days, in order to obtain from him the gift of a damsel who had originally belonged to the mother of Thais, but after her death had been sold to the captain. Phædria, vying in gifts with Thraso, presents his mistress with an Ethiopian eunuch. The younger brother of Phædria, who is called Chærea, having accidentally seen the maid presented to Thais by Thraso, falls in love with her, and, by a stratagem of his father's slave Parmeno, he is introduced as the eunuch to the house of Thais, where he does not in all respects consistently support the character he had assumed. After Chærea had gone off, his adventure was discovered ; and Pythias, the waiting maid of Thais, in revenge for Parmeno's fraud, tells him that Chærea, having been detected, was about to be made precisely what he had pretended to be. Parmeno, believing this report, informs the father of Chærea, who instantly rushes into the house of Thais, (to which, by this time, his son had ventured to return,) and being there relieved from his sudden apprehension, he consents the more readily to the marriage of Chærea with the girl whom he had deluded, and who is now discovered to be an Athenian citizen, and the sister of Chremes. In this paroxysm of good humour, he also agrees that Phædria should retain Thais as his mistress. Thraso and his parasite, Gnatho, having been foiled in an attack on the house of Thais, enter into terms, and, at the persuasion of Gnatho, Thraso is admitted into the society of Phædria, and is allowed to share with him the favours of Thais.

There are thus, strictly speaking, three plots in the *Eunuchus*.

chus, but they are blended with inimitable art. The quarrel and reconciliation of *Thais* and *Phædrìa* promote the marriage of *Chærea* with *Pamphila*, the girl presented by *Thraso* to *Thais*. This gift again produces the dispute between *Phædrìa* and *Thais*, and gives room for the imposture of *Chærea*. It is unfortunate that the regard in which the ancient dramatists held the unity of place, interposed between the spectators and the representation of what would have been highly comical—the father discovering his son in the eunuch's habit in the house of *Thais*, the account of which has been thrown into narrative. At the conclusion *Thraso* is permitted, with consent of *Phædrìa*, to share the good graces of *Thais*; but, as has been remarked by *La Harpe** and *Colman*†, and as indeed must be felt by every one who reads the play, this termination is scarcely consistent with the manners of gentlemen, and it implies the utmost meanness in *Phædrìa* to admit him into his society, or to allow him a share in the favours of his mistress, merely that he may defray part of the expense of her establishment.

The drama, however, is full of vivacity and intrigue. Through the whole piece the author amuses us with his pleasantries, and in no scene discovers that his fund of entertainment is exhausted. Most of the characters, too, are happily sketched. Under *Thais*, *Menander* is supposed to have given a representation of his own mistress *Glycerium*. On the general nature of the parts of the parasite and braggart captain, something has been said while treating of the dramas of *Plautus*; but *Terence* has greatly refined and improved on these favourite characters of his predecessor. *Gnatho* is master of a much more delicate and artful mode of adulation than former flatterers, and supports his consequence with his patron, at the same time that he laughs at him and lives on him. He boasts, in the second scene of the second act, that he is the founder of a new class of parasites, who ingratiated themselves with men of fortune and shallow understandings, solely by humouring their fancies and admiring what they said, instead of earning a livelihood by submitting to blows, the ridicule of the company, and all manner of indignities, like the antiquated race of parasites whom *Plautus* describes as beaten, kicked, and abused at pleasure:—

“ Et hinc quidem, hercle, nisi qui colaphos perpeti
Potis parasitus, frangique aulas in caput,
Vel ire extra portam trigeminam ad saccum libet.”

* *Cours de Littérature.*

† *Colman's Terence.*

The new parasite, of whom Gnatho may be considered as the representative, had been delineated in the characters of Theophrastus, and has more resemblance to Shakspeare's Osrick, or to the class of parasites described by Juvenal as infesting the families of the Great in the latter ages of Rome*. Thraso, the braggart captain, in the *Eunuchus*, is ridiculous enough to supply the audience with mirth, without indulging in the extravagant bluster of Pyrgopolinices. A scene in the fourth act gives the most lively representation of the conceit and ridiculous vanity of this soldier, who, calling together a few slaves, pretends to marshal and draw them up as if they formed a numerous army, and assumes all the airs of a general. This part is so contrived, that nothing could have more happily tended to make him appear ridiculous though he says nothing extravagant, or beyond what might naturally be expected from the mouth of a coxcomb. One new feature in Thraso's character is his fondness for repeating his jests, and passion for being admired as a wit no less than a warrior. There is, perhaps, nowhere to be found a truer picture of the fond and froward passion of love, than that which is given us in the character of Phædria. Horace and Persius, when they purposely set themselves to expose and exaggerate its follies, could imagine nothing beyond it. The former, indeed, in the third satire of his second book, where he has given a picture of the irresolution of lovers, has copied part of the dialogue introduced near the commencement of the *Eunuchus*.

The love, however, both of Phædria and Chærea is more that of temperament than sentiment: Of consequence, the *Eunuchus* is inferior to the *Andria* in delicacy and tenderness; but there are not wanting passages which excel in these higher qualities. Addison has remarked†, that Phædria's request to his mistress, on leaving her for a few days, is inimitably beautiful and natural—

“ Egone quid velim ?
 Cum Milite isto præsens, absens ut sis ;
 Dies noctesque me ames : me desideres ;
 Me somnies : me expectes : de me cogites :
 Me speres : me te oblectes : mecum tota sis :
 Meus fac sis postremo animus, quando ego sum tuus.”

This demand was rather exorbitant, and Thais had some reason to reply—*Me miseram!*

There is an Italian imitation of the *Eunuchus* in *La Tantara*, a comedy by Aretine, in which the courtesan who gives

* Satir. III.

† Spectator, No. 170.

the name to the play corresponds with Thais, and her lover Orfinio to Phædria,—the characteristic dispositions of both the originals being closely followed in the copy. A youth, from his disguise supposed to be a girl, is presented to La Talanta by Tinca, the Thraso of the piece, who, being exasperated at the treatment he had received from the courtesan, meditates, like Thraso, a military attack on her dwelling-house; and, though easily repulsed, he is permitted at the conclusion, in respect of his wealth and bounty, to continue to share with Orfinio the favours of La Talanta.

There is more *lubricity* in the *Eunuchus* of Terence, than in any of his other performances; and hence, perhaps, it has been selected by Fontaine as the most suitable drama for his imitation. His *Eunuque*, as he very justly remarks in his advertisement prefixed, “ n’est qu’une mediocre copie d’un excellent original.” Fontaine, instead of adapting the incidents to Parisian manners, like Moliere and Regnard, in their delightful imitations of Plautus, has retained the ancient names, and scene of action. The earlier part is a mere translation from the Latin, except that the character of Thais is softened down from a courtesan to a coquette. The next deviation from the original is the omission of the recital by Chærea, of the success of his audacious enterprize—instead of which, Fontaine has introduced his Chærea professing honourable and respectful love to Pamphile. In the unravelling of the dramatic plot, the French author has departed widely from Terence. There is nothing of the alarm concerning Chærea given by Thais’ maid to Parmeno, and by him communicated to the father: The old man merely solicits Parmeno to prevail on his sons to marry:—

“ Il se veut desormais tenir clos et couvert,
Careaser, les pieds chauds, quelque Bru qui lui plaise,
Conter son jeune temps, et banqueter a son aise.”

This wish is doubly accomplished, by the discovery that Pamphile is of reputable birth, and by Phædria’s reconciliation with Thais. While making such changes on the conclusion, and accommodating it in some measure to the feelings of the age, I am surprised that the French author retained that part of the compact with Thraso, by which he is to remain in the society of Phædria merely to be fleeced and ridiculed.

The *Eunuchus* is also the origin of *Le Muët* by Bruyès and Palaprat, who laboured in conjunction, like our Beaumont and Fletcher, and who have made such alterations on the Latin drama as they thought advisable in their age and country. In this play, which was first acted in 1691, a young man, who

feigns to be dumb, is introduced as a page in a house where his mistress resided. But although an Ethiopian eunuch, which was an article of state among the ancients, may have attracted the fancy of Thais, it is not probable that the French countess should have been so desirous to receive a present of a dumb page. Those scenes in which the credulous father is made to believe that his son had lost the power of speech, from the effects of love and sorcery, and is persuaded, by a valet disguised as a doctor, that the only remedy for his dumbness is an immediate union with the object of his passion, are improbable and overcharged. The character of the parasite is omitted, and instead of Thraso we have a rough blunt sea captain, who had protected Zayde when lost by her parents.

The only English imitation of the *Eunuchus* is *Bellamira, or the Mistress*, an unsuccessful comedy by Sir Charles Sedley, first printed in 1687. In this play the scene lies in London, but there is otherwise hardly any variation in the incidents; and there is no novelty introduced, except Bellamira and Merryman's plot of robbing Dangerfield, the braggart captain of the piece, an incident evidently borrowed from Shakspeare's Henry IV.

Heautontimorumenos. The chief plot of this play, which I think on the whole the least happy effort of Terence's imitation, and which, of all his plays, is the most foreign from our manners, is taken, like the last-mentioned drama, from Menander. It derives its Greek appellation from the voluntary punishment inflicted on himself by a father, who, having driven his son into banishment by excess of severity, avenges him, by retiring to the country, where he partakes only of the hardest fare, and labours the ground with his own hands. The deep parental distress, however, of Menedemus, with which the play opens, forms but an inconsiderable part of it, as the son, Clinia, returns in the second act, and other incidents of a comic cast are then interwoven with the drama. The plan of Clitopho's mistress being brought to the house both of Menedemus and his neighbour Chremes, in the character of Clinia's mistress, has given rise to some amusing situations: but the devices adopted by the slave Syrus, to deceive and cheat the two old men, are too intricate, and much less ingenious than those of a similar description in most other Latin plays. One of his artifices, however, in order to melt the heart of Chremes, by persuading him that Clitopho thinks he is not his son, has been much applauded; particularly the preparation for this stratagem, where, wisely concluding that one would best contribute to the imposition who was himself de-

ceived, he, in the first place, makes Clitopho believe that he is not the son of his reputed father.

Terence himself, in his prologue, has called this play *double*, probably in allusion to the two plots which it contains. Julius Scaliger absurdly supposes that it was so termed because one half of the play was represented in the evening, and the other half on the following morning*. It has been more plausibly conjectured, that the original plot of the Greek play was simple, consisting merely of the character of the Self-tormentor Menedemus, the love of his son Clinia for Antiphila, and the discovery of the real condition of his mistress; but that Terence had added to this single fable, either from his own invention, or from some other Greek play, the passion of Clitopho for Bacchis, and the devices of the slave in order to extract money from old Chremes†. These two fables are connected by the poet with much art, and form a double intrigue, instead of the simple argument of the Greek original.

Diderot has objected strongly to the principal subject which gives name to this play, and to the character of the self-tormenting father. Tragedy, he says, represents individual characters, like those of Regulus, Orestes, and Cato; but the chief characters in comedy should represent a class or species, and if they only resemble individuals, the comic drama would revert to what it was in its infancy.—“Mais on peut dire,” continues he, “que ce pere là n'est pas dans la nature. Une grande ville fourniroit a peine dans un siecle l'exemple d'une affliction aussi bizarre.” It is observed in the *Spectator*‡, on the other hand, that though there is not in the whole drama one passage that could raise a laugh, it is from beginning to end the most perfect picture of human life that ever was exhibited.

There has been a great contest, particularly among the French critics, whether the unities of time and place be preserved in *Heautontimorumenos*. In the year 1640, Menage had a conversational dispute, on this subject, with the Abbé D'Aubignac, with whom he at that period lived on terms of the most intimate friendship. The latter, who contended for the strictest interpretation of the unities, first put his arguments in writing, but without his name, in his “Discours sur la troisieme comedie de Terence; contre ceux qui pensent qu'elle n'est pas dans les regles anciennes du poeme dramatique.” Menage answered him in his “Reponse au discours,” &c.; and, in 1650, he published both in his *Miscellanea*,

* *Poet. Lib. VI. c. 8.*

† Signorelli, *Storia de Teatri*, Tom. II. p. 129.

‡ No. 562.

without leave of the author of the *Discours*. This, and some disrespectful expressions employed in the *Reponse*, gave mortal offence to the Abbé, who, in 1655, wrote a reply to the answer, entitled "Terence Justifié, &c. contre les Erreurs de Maistre Gilles Menage, Avocat en Parlement." This designation of *Maistre*, proved intolerable to the feelings of Menage. Hearing that the tract was full of injurious expressions, he declared publicly and solemnly, that he never would read it; but being afterwards urged to peruse it by some good-natured friends, he consulted the casuists of the Sorbonne, and the College of Jesuits, on the point of conscience; and having at last read it with their approval, he wrote a full reply, which was not published till after the death of his opponent.

In these various tracts, it was maintained by the Abbé, that unity of time was most strictly preserved in the *Heautontimorumenos*, as a less period than twelve hours was supposed to pass during the representation, the longest space to which, by the rules of the drama, it could be legitimately prolonged. Of course he adduces arguments and citations, tending to restrict, as far as possible, the period of the dramatic action. In the third scene of the second act, it is said *vesperascit*, and in the first scene of the third act, *Luciscit hoc jam*. Now the Abbé, giving to the term *vesperascit* the signification, "It is already night," was of opinion, that the action commenced as late as seven or eight in the evening, when Menedemus returned to Athens from his farm; that the scene of the drama is supposed to pass during the Pithægia, or festivals of Bacchus, held in April, at which season not more than nine hours intervened between twilight and dawn; that the festival continued the whole night, and that none of the characters went to bed, so that the continuity of action was no more broken than the unity of time. Menage, on the other hand, contended that at least fifteen hours must be granted to the dramatic action, but that this extension implied no violation of the dramatic unities, which, according to the precepts of Aristotle, would not have been broken, even if twenty-four hours had been allotted. He successfully shews, however, that fifteen hours, at least, must be allowed. According to him, the play opens early in the evening, while Menedemus is yet labouring in his field. The festivals were in February; and he proves, from a minute examination, that the incidents which follow after it is declared that *luciscit*, must have occupied fully three hours. Some of the characters, he thinks, retired to rest, but no void was thereby left in the action, as the two lovers, Bacchis, and the slaves, sat

up arranging their amorous stratagems. Madame Dacier adopted the opinion of Aubignac, which she fortified by reference to a wood engraving in a very ancient MS. in the Royal Library, which represents Menedemus as having quit- ted his work in the fields, and as bearing away his implements of husbandry.

The poet being perhaps aware that the action of this comedy was exceptionable, and that the dramatic unities were not preserved in the most rigid sense of the term, has apparently exerted himself to compensate for these deficiencies by the introduction of many beautiful moral maxims: and by that purity of style, which distinguishes all his productions, but which shines, perhaps, most brightly in the *Heautontimorumenos*.

That part of the plot of this comedy, where Clitopho's mistress is introduced as Clinia's mistress, into the house of both the old men, has given rise to Chapman's comedy, *All Fools*, which was first printed in 1605, 4to., and was a favourite production in its day. In this play, by the contrivance of Rynaldo, the younger son of Marc Antonio, a lady called Gratiana, privately married to his elder brother Fortunio, is introduced, and allowed to remain for some time at the house of their father, by persuading him that she is the wife of Valerio, the son of one of his neighbours, who had married her against his parent's inclination, and that it would be an act of kindness to give her shelter, till a reconciliation could be effected. By this means Fortunio enjoys the society of his bride, and Valerio, her pretended husband, has, at the same time, an admirable opportunity of continuing his courtship of Bellonora, the daughter of Marc Antonio.

Adelphi.—The principal subject of this drama is usually supposed to have been taken from Menander's *Adelphoi*; but it appears that Alexis, the uncle of Menander, also wrote a comedy, entitled *Adelphoi*; so that perhaps the elegant Latin copy may have been as much indebted to the uncle's as to the nephew's performance, for the delicacy of its characters and the charms of its dialogue. We are informed, however, in the prologue, that the part of the drama in which the music girl is carried off from the pander, has been taken from the *Synapthnescontes* of Diphilus. That comedy, though the version is now lost, had been translated by Plautus, under the title of *Commorientes*. He had left out the incidents, however, concerning the music girl, and Terence availed himself of this omission to interweave them with the principal plot of his delightful drama—"Minus existimans laudis proprias scribere quam Græcas transferre."

The title, which is supposed to be imperfect, is derived from two brothers, on whose contrasted characters the chief subject and amusement of the piece depend. Demea, the elder, who lived in the country, had past his days in thrift and labour, and was remarkable for his severe penurious disposition. Micio, the younger brother, was, on the contrary, distinguished by his indulgent and generous temper. Being a bachelor, he had adopted *Æschinus*, his brother's eldest son, whom he brought up without laying much restraint on his conduct. Ctesipho, the other son of Demea, was educated with great strictness by his father, who boasted of the regular and moral behaviour of this child, which, as he thought, was so strongly contrasted with the excesses of him who had been reared under the charge of his brother. *Æschinus* at length carries off a music girl from the slave-merchant, in whose possession she was. Hence fresh indignation on the part of Demea, and new self-congratulation on the system of education he had pursued with Ctesipho: Hence, too, the deepest distress on the part of an unfortunate girl, to whom *Æschinus* had promised marriage; and also of her relations, at this proof of his alienated affections. At last, however, it is discovered that *Æschinus* had run off with the music girl, for the sake, and at the instigation, of his brother Ctesipho. The play accordingly concludes with the union of *Æschinus* and the girl to whom he was betrothed, and the total change of disposition on the part of Demea, who now becomes so complete a convert to the system of Micio, that he allows his son to retain the music girl as his mistress.

The plot of the *Adelphi* may thus be perhaps considered as double; but the interest which *Æschinus* takes in Ctesipho's amour, combines their loves so naturally, that they can hardly be considered as distinct or separate; and the details by which the plot is carried on, are managed with such infinite skill, that the intrigue of at least four acts of the *Adelphi* is more artfully conducted than that of any other piece of Terence. At the commencement of the play, Micio summons his servant Storax, whom he had sent to find out *Æschinus*; but as the servant does not appear, Micio concludes that the youth had not yet returned from the place where he had supped on the preceding evening, and is in consequence overwhelmed with all the tender anxiety of a father concerning an absent son. This alarm gives us some insight into the character of the young man, and explains the interest Micio takes in his welfare, without shewing too plainly the art and design of the author. His uneasiness, by naturally leading him to reflect on the situation of the family, and the doubtful part he had him-

self acted, brings in less awkwardly than usual one of those long soliloquies, in which the domestic affairs of the speaker are explained by him for the sake of the audience. Demea is then introduced, having just learned, on his arrival in the city, that *Æschinus* had carried off the music girl. His character and predominant feelings are finely marked in the account which he gives of this outrage, dwelling on every minute particular, and exaggerating the offences of *Æschinus*. This passage, too, acquires additional zest and relish, on a second perusal of the play, when it is known that the son so much commended is chiefly in fault. The grief of the mother of the girl, who was betrothed to *Æschinus*, and the honest indignation of her faithful old servant Geta, are highly interesting. The interview of Micio with his adopted son, after he had discovered the circumstances of this connection, is eminently beautiful. His delicate reproof for the young man's want of confidence, in not communicating to him the state of his heart—the touches of good humour, mildness, and affection, which may be traced in every line of Micio's part of the dialogue, as well as the natural bursts of passion, and ingenuous shame, in *Æschinus*, are perhaps more characteristic of the tender and elegant genius of Terence, than any other scene in his dramas. But the triumph of comic art, is the gradation of Demea's anger and distresses—his perfect conviction of the sobriety of his son, who, he is persuaded by Syrus, had shewn the utmost indignation at the conduct of *Æschinus*, and had gone to the country in disgust, when in fact he was at that moment seated at a feast—then his perplexity on not finding him at the farm, and his learning that *Æschinus*, having violated a free citizen, was about to be married to her, though she had no portion. Even his meeting Syrus intoxicated augments his rage, at the general libertinism and extravagance of the family. At length the climax of events is finally completed, by discovering that the music girl had been carried off for the sake of his favourite son, and by finding him at a carousal with his brother's dissolute family.

With this incident the fable naturally concludes, and it is perhaps to be regretted that Terence had not also ended the drama with the third scene of the fifth act, where Demea breaks in upon the entertainment. The conversion of Demea, indeed, with which the remaining scenes are occupied, grows out of the preceding events. He had met, during the course of the play, with many mortifications—his anger, complaints, and advice, had been all neglected and slighted—he had seen his brother loved and followed, and found himself stunned; but such a change in long-confirmed habits could

hardly have been effected in so short a period, or by a single lesson, however striking and important. His complaisance, too, is awkward, and his generosity is evidently about to run into profusion.

But if all this be an impropriety, what shall we say of the gross absurdity of Micio, a bachelor of sixty-five, marrying an old woman, the mother of Æschinus' bride, (and whom he had never seen but once,) merely out of complaisance to his friends, who seemed to have no motive in making the request, except that she was quite solitary, had nobody to care for her, and was long past child-bearing—

—“ Parere jam diu hæc per annos non potest :
Nec, qui eam respiciat, quisquam est ; sola est.”

Micio had all along been represented as possessed of so much judgment, good sense, and knowledge of the world, that this last piece of extravagance destroys the interest we had previously felt in the character. Donatus, who has given us some curious information in his excellent commentary on Terence, with regard to the manner in which he had altered his comedies from the original Greek, says, that in the play of Menander, the old Bachelor has no reluctance at entering into a state of matrimony.—“ Apud Menandrum, Senex de nuptiis non gravatur.” The English translator of Terence thinks, that the Latin poet, by making Micio at first express a repugnance to the proposed match, has improved on his model ; but it appears to me, that this only makes his unbounded complaisance more improbable and ridiculous. Indeed the incongruity and inconsistency of the concluding scenes of the *Adelphi*, have been considered so great, that a late German translator of Terence has supposed that they did not form a component part of the regular comedy, but were in fact the *Exodium*, a sort of afterpiece, in which the characters of the preceding play were usually represented in grotesque situations, and with overcharged colours*.

So much for the plot of the *Adelphi*, and the incidents by which the conclusion is brought about. With regard to the characters of the piece, Æschinus is an excellent delineation of the elegant ease and indifference of a fine gentleman. In one scene, however, he is represented as a lover, full of tenderness, and keenly alive to all the anxieties, fears, and emotions of the passion by which he is affected. In the parts of Demea and Micio, the author has violated the precept of Horace with regard to a dramatic character :

* Schmeider—Terenz. Halle, 1794.

—“*Servetur ad imam
Qualis ab incepto processerit, et sibi constet.*”

During four acts, however, the churlishness of Demea is well contrasted with the mildness of Micio, whose fondness and partiality for his adopted son are extremely pleasing. “One great theatrical resource,” says Gibbon, “is the opposition and contrast of characters which thus display each other. The severity of Demea, and easiness of Micio, throw mutual light; and we could not be so well acquainted with the misanthropy of Alceste, were it not for the fashionable complaisant character of Philinte*.” Accordingly, in the modern drama, we often find, that if one of the lovers be a gay companion, the other is grave and serious; like Frankly and Bellamy, in the *Suspicious Husband*, or Absolute and Faulkland in the *Rivals*. Yet in the *Adelphi*, the contrast, perhaps, is too direct, and too constantly obtruded on the attention of the audience. It has the appearance of what is called antithesis in writing, and, in the conduct of the drama, has the same effect as that figure in composition. Diderot, in his *Essay on Dramatic Poetry*, also objects to these two contrasted characters, that, being drawn with equal force, the moral intention of the drama is rendered equivocal; and that we have something of the same feeling which every one has experienced while reading the *Misanthrope* of Moliere, in which we can never tell whether Alceste or Philinte is most in the right, or, more properly speaking, farthest in the wrong.—“On droit,” continues he, “au commencement du cinquieme acte des *Adelphes*, que l’auteur, embarrassé du contraste qu’il avoit établi, a été contraint d’abandonner son but et de renverser l’interet de sa piece. Mais qu’est il arrivé: c’est qu’on ne scait plus a qui s’interessier; et qu’apres avoit été pour Micion contre Demea, on finit sans savoir pour qui l’on est. On desireroit presque un troisieme pere qui tint le milieu entre ces deux personnages, et qui en fit connoitre le vice.”

It is not unlikely, however, that this sort of uncertainty was just the intention of Terence, or rather of Menander. It was probably their design to show the disadvantages resulting from each mode of education pursued, and hence, by an easy inference, to point out the golden mean which ought to be preserved by fathers; for, if Demea be unreasonably severe, the indulgence of Micio is excessive, and his connivance at the disorders of Ctesipho, which he even assisted him to support, is as reprehensible, as the extraordinary sentiment which he utters at the commencement of the comedy:—

* *Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. IV. p. 140.

“ Non est flagitium, mihi crede, adolescentulum
Scortari, neque potare; non est: neque fores effringere.”

This, though the breaking doors was an ordinary piece of gallantry, is, it must be confessed, rather loose morality. But some of the sentiments in the drama are equally remarkable for their propriety, and the knowledge they discover of the feelings and circumstances of mankind; as,

“ Omnes, quibus res sunt minus secundæ, magis sunt, nescio quomodo,
Suspiciosi: ad contumeliam omnia accipiunt magis;
Propter suam impotentiam se semper credunt negligi.”

And afterwards,—

“ Ita vita ’et hominum, quasi, quum ludas tesseris;
Si illud, quod maxime opus est jactu, non cadit,
Illud, quod cecidit forte, id arte ut corrigas.

Nunquam ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad vitam fuit,
Quin res, ætas, usus, semper aliquid adportet novi,
Aliquid moneat, ut illa, quæ te acire credas, nescias;
Et quæ tibi putaris prima, in experiundo repudies.”

A play possessing so many excellencies as the *Adelphi*, could scarcely fail to be frequently imitated by modern dramatists. It has generally been said, that Moliere borrowed from the *Adelphi* his comedy *L’Ecole des Maris*, where the brothers Sganarelle and Ariste, persons of very opposite dispositions, bring up two young ladies intrusted to their care on different systems; the one allowing a proper liberty—the other, who wished to marry his ward, employing a constant restraint, which, however, did not prevent her from contriving to elope with a favoured lover. The chief resemblance consists in the characters of the two guardians—in some of the discussions, which they hold together on their opposite systems of management—and some observations in soliloquy on each other’s folly. Thus, for example, Demea, the severe brother in Terence, exclaims:

———“ O Jupiter,
Hancine vitam! hoscine mores! hanc dementiam!
Uxor sine dote veniet: intus Psaltria est:
Domus sumptuosa: adolescens luxu perditus:
Senex delirans. Ipsa, si cupiat, Salus,
Servare prorsus non potest hanc familiam*.”

In like manner, Sganarelle, the corresponding character in Moliere:—

* *Adelphi*. Act 4. sc. 7.

“Quelle belle famille! un vieillard insensé!
 Une fille maîtresse et coquette suprême!
 Des valets impudents! Non, la Sagesse même
 N'en viendrait pas à bout, perdrait sens et raison,
 A vouloir corriger une telle maison*.”

Indeed, were it not for the minute resemblance of particular passages, I would think it as likely, that Moliere had been indebted for the leading idea of his comedy to the second tale of the eighth night of Straparola, an Italian novelist of the sixteenth century, from whom he unquestionably borrowed the plot of his admirable comedy, *L'Ecole des Femmes*. The principal amusement, however, in the *Ecole des Maris*, which consists of Isabelle complaining to her guardian, Sganarelle, of her lover, Valere, has been suggested by the third novel, in the third day of Boccaccio's *Decameron*.

A much closer imitation of the *Adelphi* than the *Ecole des Maris* of Moliere may be found in the *Ecole des Peres*, by Baron, author of the *Andrienne*. The genius of this celebrated actor seems to have been constrained by copying from Terence, which has deprived his drama of all air of originality, while, at the same time, his alterations are such as to render it but an imperfect image of the *Adelphi*. It were, therefore, to be wished, that he had adhered more closely to the Roman poet, or, like Moliere, deviated from him still farther. His exhibition of Clarice and Pamphile, the mistresses of the two young men, on the stage, has no better effect than the introduction of Glycerium in his *Andrienne*. The characters of Telamon and Alcée are so altered, as to preserve neither the strength nor delicacy of those of Micio and Demea; while the change of disposition, which the severe father undergoes in the fifth act, has been neither rejected nor retained: He accedes to the proposals for his children's happiness, but his complaisance is evidently forced and sarcastic; and he ultimately, in a fit of bad humour, breaks off all connection with his family:

“J'abandonne les Brus, les Enfants, et le Frere;
 Je ne saurois déjà les souffrir sans horreur,
 Et je les donne tous au diable de bon cœur.”

Diderot had evidently his eye on the characters of Micio and Demea in drawing those of M. d'Orbesson and Le Com-mandeur, in his *Comédie Larmoyante*, entitled *Le Pere de Famille*. The scenes between the Pere de Famille and his son, St Albin, who had long secretly visited Sophie, an un-

* *Ecole des Maris*, Act 1. sc. 2.

known girl in indigent circumstances, seem formed on the beautiful dialogue, already mentioned, which passes between Micio and his adopted child.

The *Adelphi* is also the origin of Shadwell's comedy, the *Squire of Alsatia*. Spence, in his *Anecdotes*^{*}, says, on the authority of Dennis the critic, that the story on which the *Squire of Alsatia* was built, was a true fact. That the whole plot is founded on fact, I think very improbable, as it coincides most closely with that of the *Adelphi*. Sir William and Sir Edward Belfond are the two brothers, while Belfond senior and junior correspond to Æschinus and Ctesipho. The chief alteration, and that to which Dennis probably alluded, is the importance of the part assigned to Belfond senior; who, having come to London, is beset and cozened by all sorts of bankrupts and cheats, inhabitants of Alsatia, (Whitefriars,) and by their stratagems is nearly inveigled into a marriage with Mrs Termagant, a woman of infamous character, and furious temper. The part of Belfond junior is much less agreeable than that of Æschinus. His treatment of Lucia evinces, in the conclusion, a hard-hearted infidelity, which we are little disposed to pardon, especially as we feel no interest in his new mistress, Isabella. On the whole, though the plots be nearly the same, the tone of feeling and sentiment are very different, and the English comedy is as remote from the Latin original, as the grossest vulgarity can be from the most simple and courtly elegance. The *Squire of Alsatia*, however, took exceedingly at first as an occasional play. It discovered the cant terms, that were before not generally known, except to cheats themselves; and was a good deal instrumental towards causing the great nest of villains in the metropolis to be regulated by public authority†.

In Cumberland's *Choleric Man*, the chief characters, though he seems to deny it in his dedicatory epistle to Detraction, have also been traced after those of the *Adelphi*. The love intrigues, indeed, are different; but the parts of the half-brothers, Manlove and Nightshade, (the choleric-man,) are evidently formed on those of Micio and Demea; while the contrasted education, yet similar conduct, of the two sons of Nightshade, one of whom had been adopted by Manlove, and the father's rage on detecting his favourite son in an amorous intrigue, have been obviously suggested by the behaviour of Æschinus and Ctesipho.

The philanthropic speeches of Micio have been a constant

* Page 115.

† Spence's *Anec.* p. 115.

resource both to the French dramatists and our own, and it would be endless to specify the various imitations of his sentiments. Those of Kno'well, in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*, have a particular resemblance to them. His speech, beginning—

“There is a way of winning more by love*,”

is evidently formed on the celebrated passage in Terence,—

“Pudore et liberalitate liberos,” &c.

Hecyra—Several of Terence's plays can hardly be accounted comedies, if by that term be understood, dramas which excite laughter. They are in what the French call the *genre serieux*, and are perhaps the origin of the *comédie larmoyante*. The events of human life, for the most part, are neither deeply distressing nor ridiculous; and, in a dramatic representation of such incidents, the action must advance by embarrassments and perplexities, which, though below tragic pathos, are not calculated to excite merriment. Diderot, who seems to have been a great student of the works of Terence, thinks the *Hecyra*, or Mother-in-law, should be classed among the serious dramas. It exhibits no buffoonery, or tricks of slaves, or ridiculous parasite, or extravagant braggart captain; but contains a beautiful and delightful picture of private life, and those distresses which ruffle “the smooth current of domestic joy.” It was taken from a play of Apollodorus; but, as Donatus informs us, was abridged from the Greek comedy,—many things having been represented in the original, which, in the imitation, are only related. In the *Hecyra*, a young man, called Pamphilus, had long refused to marry, on account of his attachment to the courtesan Bacchis. He is at length, however, constrained by his father to choose a wife, whose gentleness and modest behaviour soon wean his affections from his mistress. Pamphilus being obliged to leave home for some time, his wife, on pretence of a quarrel with her mother-in-law, quits his father's house; and Pamphilus, on his return home, finds, that she had given birth to a child, of which he supposed that he could not have been the father. His wife's mother begs him to conceal her disgrace, which he promises; and affecting extraordinary filial piety, assigns as his reason for not bringing her home, the capricious behaviour of which she had been guilty towards his mother. That lady, in con-

* Act 1. sc. 1.

sequence, offers to retire to the country. Pamphilus is thus reduced to the utmost perplexity; and all plausible excuses for not receiving his wife having failed, his father suspects that he had renewed his intercourse with Bacchis. He, accordingly, sends for that courtesan, who denies the present existence of any correspondence with his son; and, being eager to clear the character as well as to secure the happiness of her former lover, she offers to confirm her testimony before the family of the wife of Pamphilus. During the interview which she in consequence obtains, that lady's mother perceives on her hand a ring which had once belonged to her daughter, and which Bacchis now acknowledges to have received from Pamphilus, as one which he had taken from a girl whom he had violated, but had never seen. It is thus discovered by Pamphilus, that the lady to whom he had offered this injury before marriage was his own wife, and that he himself was father of the child to whom she had just given birth.

The fable of this play is more simple than that of Terence's other performances, in all of which he had recourse to the expedient of double plots. This, perhaps, was partly the reason of its want of success on its first and second representations. When first brought forward, in the year 589, it was interrupted by the spectators leaving the theatre, attracted by the superior interest of a boxing-match, and rope-dancers. A combat of gladiators had the like unfortunate effect when it was attempted to be again exhibited, in 594. The celebrated actor, L. Ambivius, encouraged by the success which he had experienced in reviving the condemned plays of Cæcilius, ventured to produce it a third time on the stage*, when it received a patient hearing, and was frequently repeated. Still, however, most of the old critics and commentators speak of it as greatly inferior to the other plays of Terence. Bishop Hurd, on the contrary, in his notes on Horace, maintains, that it is the only one of his comedies which is written in the true ancient Grecian style; and that, for the genuine beauty of dramatic design, as well as the nice coherence of the fable, it must appear to every reader of true taste, the most masterly and exquisite of the whole collection. Some scenes are doubtless very finely wrought up,—as that between Pamphilus and his mother, after he first suspects the disgrace of his wife, and that in which it is revealed to him by his wife's mother. The passage in the second scene of the first act, containing the picture of an amiable wife, who has succeeded in effacing from the heart of her husband the love of a dissolute cour-

* *Prolog. in Hecyr. and Donati Comment.*

tezan, has been highly admired. But, notwithstanding these partial beauties, and the much-applauded simplicity of the plot, there is, I think, great want of skilful management in the conduct of the fable; and if the outline be beautiful, it certainly is not so well filled up as might have been expected from the taste of the author. In the commencement, he introduces the superfluous part of Philotis, (who has no concern in the plot, and never appears afterwards,) merely to listen to the narrative of the circumstances and situation of those who are principal persons in the drama. It is likewise somewhat singular, that Pamphilus, when told by the mother of the injury done to his wife, should not have remembered his own adventure, and thus been led to suspect the real circumstances. This communication, too, ought, as it probably did in the Greek original, to have formed a scene between Pamphilus and his wife's mother; but, instead of this, Pamphilus is introduced relating to himself the whole discourse which had just passed between them. At length, the issue of the fable is disclosed by another long soliloquy from the courtesan. Indeed, all the plays of Terence abound in soliloquies very inartificially introduced; and there is none of them in which he has so much erred in this way as in the *Hecyra*. The wife of Pamphilus, too, the character calculated to give most interest, does not appear at all on the stage; and the whole play is consumed in contests between the mother-in-law and the two fathers. The characters of these old men,—the fathers of Pamphilus and his wife,—so far from being contrasted, as in the *Adelphi*, have scarcely a shade of difference. Both are covetous and passionate; very ready to vent their bad humour on their wives and children, and very ready to exculpate them when blamed by others. The uncommon and delicate situation in which Pamphilus is placed, exhibits him in an interesting and favourable point of view. He wishes to conceal what had occurred, yet is scarcely able to dissemble. Parmeno, the slave of Pamphilus, a lazy inquisitive character, is humorously kept, through the whole course of the play, in continual employment, and total ignorance. Sostrata's mild character, and the excellent behaviour of Bacchis, show, that in this play, Terence had attempted an innovation, by introducing a good mother-in-law, and an honest courtesan, whose object was to acquire a reputation of not resembling those of her profession. It appears from the Letters of Alciphron and from Athenæus, that there actually was a Greek courtesan of the name of Bacchis, distinguished from others of her class, in the time of Menander, by disinterestedness, and comparative modesty of demeanour. This circumstance, added to the

fact of Menander having written a play, entitled *Glycerium*, (which was the name of his mistress,) leads us to believe, that the Greek comedies sometimes represented, not merely the general character of the courtesan, but individuals of that profession; and that probably the Bacchis of Apollodorus, and his imitator Terence, may have been the courtesan of this name, who rejected the splendid offers of the Persian Satrap, to remain the faithful mistress of the poor Meneclides*.

Phormio—like the last mentioned play, was taken from the Greek of Apollodorus, who called it *Epidicazomenos*. Terence named it *Phormio*, from a parasite whose contrivances form the groundwork of the comedy, and who connects its double plot. In this play two brothers had gone abroad, each leaving a son at home, one of whom was called Antipho, and the other Phædría, under care of their servant Geta. Antipho having fallen in love with a woman apparently of mean condition, in order that he might marry her, yet at the same time possess a plausible excuse to his father for his conduct, persuades Phormio to assume the character of her patron. Phormio accordingly brings a suit against Antipho, as her nearest of kin, and he, having made no defence, is ordained in this capacity, according to an Athenian law, to marry the supposed orphan. About the same time, Phædría, the other youth, had become enamoured of a music girl; but he had no money with which to redeem her from the slave merchant. The old men, on their return home, are much disconcerted by the news of Antipho's marriage, as it had been arranged between them that he should espouse his cousin. Phormio, at the suggestion of Geta, avails himself of this distress, in order to procure money for redeeming Phædría's music girl. He consents to take Antipho's wife home to himself, provided he gets a portion with her, which being procured, is immediately laid out in the purchase of Phædría's mistress. After these plots are accomplished, it is discovered that Antipho's wife is the daughter of his uncle, by a woman at Lemnos, with whom he had an amour before marriage, and that she had come to Athens during his absence in search of her father. This is found out at the end of the third act, but the play is injudiciously protracted, after the principal interest is exhausted, with the endeavours of the old men to recover the portion which had been given to Phormio, and the dread of Chremes lest the story of his intrigue at Lemnos should come to the knowledge of his wife. The play accordingly languishes after the discovery, notwithstanding all the author's attempts to

* Alciphron, *Epistole*.

support the interest of the piece by the force of pleasantry and humour.

The double plot of this play has been said to be united, by both hingeing on the part of the parasite. But this is not a sufficient union either in tragedy or comedy. I cannot, therefore, agree with Colman, "that the construction of the fable is extremely artful," or that "it contains a vivacity of intrigue perhaps even superior to that of the Eunuch, *particularly in the catastrophe*. The diction," he continues, with more truth, "is pure and elegant, and the first act as chastely written as that of the *Self-Tormentor* itself. The character of Phormio is finely separated from that of Gnatho, and is better drawn than the part of any parasite in Plautus. Nausistrata is a lively sketch of a shrewish wife, as well as Chremes an excellent draught of a hen-pecked husband, and more in the style of the modern drama than perhaps any character in ancient comedy, except the miser of Plautus. There are also some particular scenes and passages deserving of all commendation, as the description of natural and simple beauty in the person of Fannia, and that in which Geta and Phædrina try to inspire some courage into Antipho, overwhelmed by the sudden arrival of his father*."

It is curious that this play, which Donatus says is founded on passions almost too high for comedy, should have given rise to the most farcical of all Moliere's productions, *Les Fourberies de Scapin*, a celebrated, though at first an unsuccessful play, where, contrary to his usual practice, he has burlesqued rather than added dignity to the incidents of the original from which he borrowed. The plot, indeed, is but a frame to introduce the various tricks of Scapin, who, after all, is a much less agreeable cheat than Phormio: His deceptions are too palpable, and the old men are incredible fools. As in Terence, there are two fathers, Argante and Geronte, and during the absence of the former, his son Octave falls in love with and marries a girl, whom he had accidentally seen bewailing the death of her mother. At the same time, Leandre, the son of Geronte, becomes enamoured of an Egyptian, and Scapin, the valet of Octave, is employed to excuse to the father the conduct of his son, and to fleece him of as much money as might be necessary to purchase her. The first of these objects could not well be attained by Terence's contrivance of the law-suit; and it is therefore pretended that he had been forced into the marriage by the lady's brother, who was a bully, (Spadassin,) and to whom the father agrees to give a large

* Act 1. sc. 2.

sum of money, that he might consent to the marriage being dissolved. It is then discovered that the girl whom Octave had married is the daughter of Geronte, and the Egyptian is found out, by the usual expedient of a bracelet, to be the long lost child of Argante. Many of the most amusing scenes and incidents are also copied from Terence, as Scapin instructing Octave to regulate his countenance and behaviour on the approach of his father—his enumeration to the father of all the different articles for which the brother of his son's wife will require money, and the accumulating rage of Argante at each new *item*. Some scenes, however, have been added, as that where Leandre, thinking Scapin had betrayed him, and desiring him to confess, obtains a catalogue of all the *Fourberies* he had committed since he entered his service, which is taken from an Italian piece entitled *Pantalone, Padre di Famiglia*. He has also introduced from the *Pedant Joué* of Cyrano Bergerac, the device of Scapin for extorting money from Geronte, which consists in pretending that his son, having accidentally gone on board a Turkish galley, had been detained, and would be inevitably carried captive to Algiers, unless instantly ransomed. In this scene, which is the best of the play, the struggle between habitual avarice and parental tenderness, and the constant exclamation, "*Que diable alloit il faire dans cette galere du Turc.*" are extremely amusing. Boileau has reproached Moliere for having

" Sans honte à Terence allié Tabarin,"

in allusion to the scene where Scapin persuades Geronte that the brother, accompanied by a set of bullies, is in search of him, and stuffs him, for concealment, into a sack, which he afterwards beats with a stick. This is compounded of two scenes in the French farces, the *Piphagne* and the *Francisque* of Tabarin, and, like the originals from which it is derived, is quite farcical and extravagant:—

" Dans ce sac ridicule ou Scapin s'enveloppe,
Je ne reconnois plus l'auteur du Misanthrope*."

The chief improvement which Moliere has made on Terence is the reservation of the discovery to the end; but the double discovery is improbable. The introduction of Hyacinthe and Zerbinette on the stage, is just as unsuccessful as the attempt of Baron to present us, in his *Andrienne*, with a lady corresponding to Glycerium. Moliere's Hyacinthe is quite insipid

* Boileau.

and uninteresting, while Zerbinette retains too much of the Egyptian, and is too much delighted with the cheats of Scapin, to become the wife of an honest man.

From the above sketches some idea may have been formed of Terence's plots, most of which were taken from the Greek stage, on which he knew they had already pleased. He has given proofs, however, of his taste and judgment, in the additions and alterations made on those borrowed subjects; and I doubt not, had he lived an age later, when all the arts were in full glory at Rome, and the empire at its height of power and splendour, he would have found domestic subjects sufficient to supply his scene with interest and variety, and would no longer have accounted it a greater merit—"Græcas transferre quam proprias scribere."

Terence was a more rigid observer than his Roman predecessors of the unities of time and place. Whatever difference of opinion may be entertained with regard to the preservation of these unities in tragedy, since great results are often slowly prepared, and in various quarters, there can be no doubt that they are appropriate in comedy, which, moving in a domestic circle, and having no occasion to wander, like the tragic or epic muse, through distant regions, should bring its intrigue to a rapid conclusion. Terence, however, would have done better not to have adhered so strictly to unity of place, and to have allowed the scene to change at least from the street or portico in front of a house, to the interior of the dwelling. From his apparently regarding even this slight change as inadmissible, the most sprightly and interesting parts of the action are often either absurdly represented as passing on the street, though of a nature which must have been transacted within doors, or are altogether excluded. A striking example of the latter occurs in the *Eunuchus*, where the discovery of Chærea by his father in the eunuch's garb has been related, instead of being represented. Plautus, who was of bolder genius, varies the place of action, when the variation suits his great purpose of merriment and jest.

But though Terence has perhaps too rigidly observed the unities of time and place, in none of his dramas, with a single exception, has that of plot been adhered to. The simplicity and exact unity of fable in the Greek comedies would have been insipid to a people not thoroughly instructed in the genuine beauties of the drama. Such plays were of too thin contexture to satisfy the somewhat gross and lumpish taste of a Roman audience. The Latin poets, therefore, bethought themselves of combining two stories into one, and this junction, which we call the double plot, by affording the oppor-

tunity of more incidents, and a greater variety of action, best contributed to the gratification of those whom they had to please. But of all the Latin comedians, Terence appears to have practised this art the most assiduously. Plautus has very frequently single plots, which he was enabled to support by the force of drollery. Terence, whose genius lay another way, or whose taste was abhorrent from all sort of buffoonery, had recourse to the other expedient of double plots; and this, I suppose, is what gained him the popular reputation of being the most artful writer for the stage. The *Hecyra* is the only one of his comedies of the true ancient cast, and we know how unsuccessful it was in the representation*. In managing a double plot, the great difficulty is, whether also to divide the interest. One thing, however, is clear, that the part which is episodical, and has least interest, should be unravelled first; for if the principal interest be exhausted, the subsidiary intrigue drags on heavily. The *Andrian*, *Self-Tormentor*, and *Phormio*, are all faulty in this respect. On the whole, however, the plots of Terence are, in most respects, judiciously laid: The incidents are selected with taste, connected with inimitable art, and painted with exquisite grace and beauty.

Next to the management of the plot, the characters and manners represented are the most important points in a comedy; and in these Terence was considered by the ancients as surpassing all their comic poets.—“In argumentis,” says Varro, “Cæcilius palmam poscit, in ethesi Terentius.” In this department of his art he shows that comprehensive knowledge of the humours and inclinations of mankind, which enabled him to delineate characters as well as manners, with a genuine and apparently unstudied simplicity. All the inferior passions which form the range of comedy are so nicely observed, and accurately expressed, that we nowhere find a truer or more lively representation of human nature. He seems to have formed in his mind such a perfect idea both of his high and low characters, that they never for a moment forget their age or situation, whether they are to speak in the easy indifferent tone of polished society, or with the natural expression of passion. Nor do his paintings of character consist merely of a single happy stroke unexpectedly introduced: His delineations are always in the right place, and so harmonize with the whole, that every word is just what the person might be supposed to say under the circumstances in which he is placed:—

* Hurd's *Horace*, Vol. II.

"Contemplez de quel air un pere dans Terence,
 Vient d'un fils amoureux gourmander l'imprudance ;
 De quel air cet amant ecoute ses leçons,
 Et court chez sa maitresse oublier ces chansons :
 Ce n'est pas un portrait, un image semblable ;
 C'est un amant, un fils, un pere veritable."

The characters, too, of Terence are never overstrained by ridicule, which, if too much affected, produces creatures of the fancy, which for a while may be more diverting than portraits drawn from nature, but can never be so permanently pleasing. This constitutes the great difference between Plautus and Terence, as also between the new and old comedy of the Greeks. The old comedy presented scenes of uninterrupted gaiety and raillery and ridicule, and nothing was spared which could become the object of sarcasm. The dramatic school which succeeded it attracted applause by beauty of situation and moral sentiment. In like manner, Terence makes us almost serious by the interest and affection which he excites for his characters. * In the *Andria* we are touched with all Pamphilus' concern, we feel all his reflections to be just, and pity his perplexity. The characters of Terence, indeed, are of the same description with those of Plautus; but his slaves and parasites and captains are not so farcical, nor his panders and courtezans so coarse, as those of his predecessor. The slave-dealers in the *Adelphi* and *Phormio* are rather merchants greedy of gain than shameless agents of vice, and are not very different from Madame La Ressource, in Regnard's elegant comedy, *Le Joueur*. His courtezans, instead of being invariably wicked and rapacious, are often represented as good and beneficent. It was a courtezan who received the dying mother of the Andrian, and, while expiring herself, affectionately intrusted the orphan to the generous protection of Pamphilus. It is a courtezan who, in the *Eunuchus*, discovers the family of the young Pamphila, and, in the *Hecyra*, brings about the understanding essential to the happiness of all. From their mode of life, and not interposing much beyond their domestic circle, the manners of modest women were not generally painted with any great taste by the ancients; but Terence may perhaps be considered as an exception. Nausistrata is an excellent picture of a matron not of the highest rank or dignity, as is also Sostrata in the *Hecyra*.

The style of wit and humour must of course correspond with that of the characters and manners. Accordingly, the plays of Terence are not much calculated to excite ludicrous emotions, and have been regarded as deficient in comic force.

* Boileau.

His muse is of the most perfect and elegant proportions, but she fails in animation, and spirit. It was for this want of the *vis comica* that Terence was upbraided by Julius Cæsar, in lines which, in other respects, bear a just tribute of applause to this elegant dramatist:—

“Tu quoque tu in summis, O dimidiata Menander,
Poneris, et merito, puri sermonis amator:
Lenibus atque utinam scriptis adjuncta foret vis
Comica, ut æquato virtus polleret honore
Cum Græcis, neque in hæc despectus parte jaceres.
Unum hoc maceror, et doleo tibi deesse, Terenti.”

From the prologue to the *Phormio* we learn that a clamour had also been raised by his contemporaries against Terence, because his dialogue was insipid, and wanted that comic heightening which the taste of the age required:—

“Quas fecit fabulas,
Tenui esse oratione et scriptura levi.”

The plays of Terence, it must be admitted, are not calculated to excite immoderate laughter, but his pleasantries are brightened by all the charms of chaste and happy expression—thus resembling in some measure the humour with which we are so much delighted in the page of Addison, and which pleases the more in proportion as it is studied and contemplated. There are some parts of the *Eunuchus* which I think cannot be considered as altogether deficient in the *vis comica*, as also Demæa's climax of disasters in the *Adelphi*, and a scene in the *Andria*, founded on the misconceptions of Mysis.

The beauties of style and language, I suppose, must be considered as but secondary excellences in the drama. Were they primary merits, Terence would deserve to be placed at the head of all comic poets who have written for the stage, on account of the consummate elegance and purity of his diction. It is a singular circumstance, and without example in the literary history of any other country, that the language should have received its highest perfection, in point of elegance and grace, combined with the most perfect simplicity, from the pen of a foreigner and a slave. But it so happened, that the countryman of Hannibal, and the freedman of Terentius Lucanus, gave to the Roman tongue all those beauties, in a degree which the courtiers of the Augustan age itself did not surpass. Nor can this excellence be altogether accounted for by his intimacy with Scipio and Lælius, in whose families the Latin language was spoken with hereditary purity, since it could only have been the merit of his dramas which first

attracted their regard; and, indeed, from an anecdote above related, of what occurred while reading his *Andria* to a dramatic censor, it is evident that this play must have been written ere he enjoyed the sunshine of patrician patronage. For this *Ineffabilis amenitas*, as it is called by Heinsius, he was equally admired by his own contemporaries and by the writers in the golden period of Roman literature. He is called by Cæsar *puri sermonis amator*, and Cicero characterizes him as—

“Quicquid come loquens, ac omnia dulcia dicens.”

Even in the last age of Latin poetry, and when his pure simplicity was so different from the style affected by the writers of the day, he continued to be regarded as the model of correct composition. Ausonius, in his beautiful poem addressed to his grandson, hails him on account of his style, as the ornament of Latium—

“Tu quoque qui Latium lecto sermone, Terenti,
Comis, et adstricto percurris pulpita socco,
Ad nova vix memorem diverbia eoge senectam*.”

Among all the Latin writers, indeed, from Ennius to Ausonius, we meet with nothing so simple, so full of grace and delicacy—in fine, nothing that can be compared to the comedies of Terence for elegance of dialogue—presenting a constant flow of easy, genteel, unaffected discourse, which never subsides into vulgarity or grossness, and never rises higher than the ordinary level of polite conversation. Of this, indeed, he was so careful, that when he employed any sentence which he had found in the tragic poets, he stripped it of that air of grandeur and majesty, which rendered it unsuitable for common life, and comedy. In reading the dialogue of Simo in the *Andria*, and of Micio in the *Adelphi*, we almost think we are listening to the conversation of Scipio Africanus, and the *mitis sapientia Læli*. The narratives, in particular, possess a beautiful and picturesque simplicity. Cicero, in his treatise *De Oratore*, has bestowed prodigious applause on that with which the *Andria* commences. “The picture,” he observes, “of the manners of Pamphilus—the death and funeral of Chrysis—and the grief of her supposed sister, are all represented in the most delightful colours.”—Diderot, speaking of the style of Terence, says, “C’est une onde pure et transparente, qui coule toujours également, et qui ne prend de

* *Protrepticon. Eidyll. IV. v. 58.*

vitesse, que ce qu'elle en reçoit de la pente et du terrain. Point d'esprit, nul étalage de sentiment, aucune sentence qui ait l'air epigrammatique, jamais de ces définitions qui ne seroient placées que dans Nicole ou la Rochefoucauld."

As to what may be strictly called the poetical style of Terence, it has been generally allowed that he has used very great liberties in his versification*. Politian divided his plays (which in the MSS. resemble prose) into lines, but a separation was afterwards more correctly made by Erasmus. Priscian says, that Terence used more licenses than any other writer. Bentley, after Priscian, admitted every variety of Iambic and Trochaic measure; and such was the apparent number of irregular quantities, and mixture of different species of verse, that Westerhovius declares, that in order to reduce the lines to their original accuracy, it would be necessary to evoke Lælius and Scipio from the shades. Mr Hawkins, in his late Inquiry into the Nature of Greek and Latin poetry, has attempted to show that the whole doctrine of poetical licenses is contrary to reason and common sense; that no such deviation from the laws of prosody could ever have been introduced by Terence; and that where his verses apparently require licenses, they are either corrupt and ill-regulated, or may be reduced to the proper standard, on the system of admitting that all equivalent feet may come in room of the fundamental feet or measures. On these principles, by changing the situation of the quantities, by allowing that one long syllable may stand for two short, or *vice versa*, there will not be occasion for a single poetical license, which is in fact nothing less than a breach of the rules of prosody.

After having considered the plays of Plautus and of Terence, one is naturally led to institute a comparison between these two celebrated dramatists. People, in general, are very apt to judge of the talents of poets by the absolute merits of their works, without at all taking into view the relative circumstances of their age and situation, or the progress of improvement during the period in which they lived. No one recollects that Tasso's *Rinaldo* was composed in ten months, and at the age of seventeen; and, in like manner, we are apt to forget the difference between writing comedies while labouring at a mill, and basking in the Alban villa of Scipio or Lælius. The improvement, too, of the times, brought the works of Terence to perfection and maturity, as much as his own génius. It is evident, that he was chiefly desirous to recommend himself to

* See Blankenburg's *Zusätze zu Sulzer's Theorie der Schönen Wissenschaften*.

the approbation of a select few, who were possessed of true wit and judgment. and the dread of whose censure ever kept him within the bounds of correct taste; while the sole object of Plautus, on the other hand, was to excite the merriment of an audience of little refinement. If, then, we merely consider the intrinsic merit of their productions, without reference to the circumstances or situation of the authors, still Plautus will be accounted superior in that vivacity of action, and variety of incident, which raise curiosity, and hurry on the mind to the conclusion. We delight, on the contrary, to linger on every scene, almost on every sentence, of Terence. Sometimes there are chasms in Plautus's fables, and the incidents do not properly adhere—in Terence, all the links of the action depend on each other. Plautus has more variety in his exhibition of characters and manners, but his pictures are often overcharged, while those of Terence are never more highly coloured than becomes the modesty of nature. Plautus's sentences have a peculiar smartness, which conveys the thought with clearness, and strikes the imagination strongly, so that the mind is excited to attention, and retains the idea with pleasure; but they are often forced and affected, and of a description little used in the commerce of the world; whereas every word in Terence has direct relation to the business of life, and the feelings of mankind. The language of Plautus is more rich and luxuriant than that of Terence, but is far from being so equal, uniform, and chaste. It is often stained with vulgarity, and sometimes swells beyond the limits of comic dialogue, while that of Terence is *puro simillimus omni*. The verses of Plautus are, as he himself calls them, *numeri innumeri*; and Hermann declares, that, at least as now printed, *omni vitiorum genere abundant**. Terence attends more to elegance and delicacy in the expression of passion—Plautus to comic expression. In fact, the great object of Plautus seems to have been to excite laughter among the audience, and in this object he completely succeeded; but for its attainment he has sacrificed many graces and beauties of the drama. There are two sorts of humour—one consisting in words and action, the other in matter. Now, Terence abounds chiefly in the last species, Plautus in the first; and the pleasantries of the older dramatist, which were so often flat, low, or extravagant, finally drew down the censure of Horace, while his successor was extolled by that poetical critic as the most consummate master of dramatic art. "In short," says Crusius, "Plautus is more gay, Terence more chaste—the first

* *Element. Doct. Met. Lib. II. c. 14.*

has more genius and fire, the latter more manners and solidity. Plautus excels in low comedy and ridicule, Terence in drawing just characters, and maintaining them to the last. The plots of both are artful, but Terence's are more apt to languish, whilst Plautus's spirit maintains the action with vigour. His invention was greatest; Terence's, art and management. Plautus gives the stronger, Terence a more elegant delight. Plautus appears the better comedian of the two, as Terence the finer poet. The former has more compass and variety, the latter more regularity and truth, in his characters. Plautus shone most on the stage; Terence pleases best in the closet. Men of refined taste would prefer Terence; Plautus diverted both patrician and plebeian*."

Some intimations of particular plays, both of Plautus and Terence, have already been pointed out; but independently of more obvious plagiarisms, these dramatists were the models of all comic writers in the different nations of Europe, at the first revival of the drama. Their works were the prototypes of the regular Italian comedy, as it appeared in the plays of Ariosto, Aretine, Ludovico Dolce, and Battista Porta. In these, the captain and parasite are almost constantly introduced, with addition of the *pedante*, who is usually the pedagogue of the young *innamorato*. Such erudite plays were the only printed dramas (though the *Commedie dell'Arte* were acted for the amusement of the vulgar,) till the beginning of the 17th century, when Flaminio Scala first published his *Commedie dell'Arte*. The old Latin plays were also the models of the earliest dramas in Spain, previous to the introduction of the comedy of intrigue, which was invented by Lopez de Rueda, and perfected by Calderon. We find the first traces of the Spanish drama in a close imitation of the *Amphitryon*, in 1515, by Villalobos, the physician of Charles V., which was immediately succeeded by a version of Terence, by Pedro de Abril, and translations of the Portuguese comedies of Vasconcellos†, which were themselves written in the manner of Plautus. There is likewise a good deal of the spirit of Plautus and Terence in the old English comedy, particularly in the characters. A panegyrist on Randolph's *Jealous Lovers*, which was published in 1632, says, "that it

* "Plus est," says Erasmus, "exacti judicii in unâ comediâ Terentianâ quam in Plautinis omnibus;" (B. 28. Epist. 20.) Naugerius, in his fourth Epistle, has instituted a comparison between Plautus and Terence, much to the advantage of the latter, and has expressed himself in terms of strong indignation at the well-known verses of Volcatus Sedigitus, assigning the second place among the Latin comic poets to Plautus, and the sixth to Terence.

† *Hist. de la Littérature Espagnole*, traduite de l'Allemand de Bouterweck. Vol. I. p. 339. Ed. 1812.

should be conserved in some great library, that if through chance or injury of time, Plautus and Terence should be lost, their united merit might be recognized. For, in this play, thou hast drawn the pander, the gull, the jealous lover, the doating father, the shark, and the crust wife."

The consideration of the servile manner in which the dramatists, as well as novelists, of one country, have copied from their predecessors in another, may be adduced in some degree as a proof of the old philosophical aphorism, *Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu*; and also of the incapacity of the most active and fertile imagination, greatly to diversify the common characters and incidents of life. One would suppose, previous to examination, that the varieties, both of character and situation, would be boundless; but on review, we find a Plautus copying from the Greek comic writers, and, in turn, even an Ariosto scarcely diverging from the track of Plautus. When we see the same characters only in new dresses, performing the same actions, and repeating the same jests, we are tempted to exclaim, that everything is weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable, and are taught a lesson of melancholy, even from the Mask of Mirth.

While Plautus, Cæcilius, Afranius, and Terence, raised the comic drama to high perfection and celebrity, Pacuvius and Attius attempted, with considerable success, the noblest subjects of the Greek tragedies.

PACUVIUS,

who was the nephew of Ennius*, by a sister of that poet, was born at Brundisium, in the year 534. At Rome he became intimately acquainted with Lælius, who, in Cicero's treatise *De Amicitia*, calls Pacuvius his host and friend: He also enjoyed, like Terence, the intimacy of Scipio Africanus; but he did not profit so much as the comic writer by his acquaintance with these illustrious Romans for the improvement of his style. There is an idle story, that Pacuvius had three wives, all of whom successively hanged themselves on the same tree; and that lamenting this to Attius, who was married, he begged for a slip of it to plant in his own garden†; an anecdote which has been very seriously confuted by Annibal di Leo, in his learned Memoir on Pacuvius. This poet also employed himself in painting: he was one of the first of

* Plinius, *Hist. Nat. Lib.* XXXV. c. 4.

† This story is told of a Sicilian by Cicero, (*De Orat.* II.)

the Romans who attained any degree of eminence in that elegant art, and particularly distinguished himself by the picture which he executed for the temple of Hercules, in the *Forum Boarium**. He published his last piece at the age of eighty†; after which, being oppressed with old age, and afflicted with perpetual bodily illness, he retired, for the enjoyment of its soft air and mild winters, to Tarentum‡, where he died, having nearly completed his ninetieth year§. An elegant epitaph, supposed to have been written by himself, is quoted, with much commendation, by Aulus Gellius, who calls it *verecundissimum et purissimum*||. It appears to have been inscribed on a tombstone which stood by the side of a public road, according to a custom of the Romans, who placed their monuments near highways, that the spot where their remains were deposited might attract observation, and the departed spirit receive the valediction of passing travellers:

“Adolescens, tametsi properas, hoc te saxum rogat,
 Uti ad se aspicias; deinde, quod scriptum est, legas.
 Hic sunt poetæ Marcei Pacuviei sita
 Ossa. Hoc volebam nescius ne esses—Vale¶.”

Though a few fragments of the tragedies of Pacuvius remain, our opinion of his dramatic merits can be formed only at second hand, from the observations of those critics who wrote while his works were yet extant. Cicero, though he blames his style, and characterizes him as a poet *male loquutus**†, places him on the same level for tragedy as Ennius for epic poetry, or Cæcilius for comedy; and he mentions, in his treatise *De Oratore*, that his verses were by many considered as highly laboured and adorned.—“Omnes apud hunc ornati elaboratique sunt versus.” It was in this laboured polish of versification, and skill in the dramatic conduct of the scene, that the excellence of Pacuvius chiefly consisted; for so the lines of Horace have been usually interpreted,

* Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXV. c. 4.

† Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 68.

‡ *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XIII. c. 2.

§ Hieron. *Chron.* p. 39. ed. ut supra.

|| *Noct. Att.* Lib. I. c. 24.

¶ “O, youth! though haste should urge thee hence away,
 To read this stone thy steps one moment stay:
 That here Pacuvius’ bones are laid to tell
 I wished, that thou might’st know it—Fare thee well.”

Dr Johnson has laid it down as the first rule in writing epitaphs, that the name of the deceased should not be omitted; but it seems rather too much to occupy four lines with nothing but this information.

*† *Brutus*, c. 74.

where, speaking of the public opinion entertained concerning the different dramatic writers of Rome, he says,—

“ Ambigitur quoties uter utro sit prior : aufert
Pacuvius docti famam senis, Attius alti.”

And the same meaning must be affixed to the passage in Quintilian,—“ Virium tamen Attio plus tribuitur ; Pacuvium videri doctiorem, qui esse docti adfectant, volunt*.” Most other Latin critics, though on the whole they seem to prefer Attius, allow Pacuvius to be the more correct writer.

The names are still preserved of about 20 tragedies of Pacuvius—*Anchises, Antiopæ, Armorum Judicium, Atalanta, Chryses, Dulorestes, Hermione, Iliona, Medus, Medea, Niptra, Orestes et Pylades, Paulus, Peribœa, Tantalus, Teucer, Thyestes*. Of these the *Antiopæ* was one of the most distinguished. It was regarded by Cicero as a great national tragedy, and an honour to the Roman name.—“ Quis enim,” says he, “ tam inimicus pene nomini Romano est, qui Ennii Medeam, aut Antiopam Pacuvii, spernat, aut rejiciat ?” Persius, however, ridicules a passage in this tragedy, where *Antiopæ* talks of propping her melancholy heart with misfortunes, by which she means, (I suppose,) that she fortunately had so many griefs all around her heart, that it was well bolstered up, and would not break or bend so easily as it must have done, had it been supported by fewer distresses—

“ Sunt quos Pacuviusque et verrucosa moretur
Antiopæ, ærumnis cor luctificabile fulta.”

The *Armorum Judicium* was translated from Æschylus. With regard to the *Dulorestes*, (*Orestes Servus*,) there has been a good deal of discussion and difficulty. Nævius, Ennius, and Attius, are all said to have written tragedies which bore the title of *Dulorestes* ; but a late German writer has attempted, at great length, to show that this is a misconception ; and that all the fragments, which have been classed with the remains of these three dramatic poets, belong to the *Dulorestes* of Pacuvius, who was in truth the only Latin poet who wrote a tragedy with this appellation. What the tenor or subject of the play, however, may have been, he admits is difficult to determine, as the different passages, still extant, refer to very different periods of the life of *Orestes* ; which, I think, is rather adverse to his idea, that all these fragments were written by the same person, and belonged to the same tragedy, unless,

* *Inst. Orat. Lib. X. c. 1.*

indeed, Pacuvius had utterly set at defiance the observance of the celebrated unities of the ancient drama. On the whole, however, he agrees with Thomas Stanley, in his remarks on the *Chaphoræ* of Æschylus, that the subject of the *Chaphoræ*, which is the vengeance taken by Orestes on the murderers of his father, is also that of the *Dulorestes* of Pacuvius*. Some of the fragments refer to this as an object not yet accomplished:—

“ Utinam nunc maturescam ingenio, ut meum patrem
Ulisci queam.”——

The *Hermione* turned on the murder of Pyrrhus by Orestes at the instigation of Hermione. Cicero, in his Treatise *De Amicitia*, mentions, in the person of Lælius, the repeated acclamations which had recently echoed through the theatre at the representation of the *new play* of his friend Pacuvius, in that scene where Pylades and Orestes are introduced before the king, who, being ignorant which of them is Orestes, whom he had predetermined should be put to death, each insists, in order to save the life of his friend, that he himself is the real person in question. Delrio alleges that the *new play* here alluded to by Cicero was the *Hermione*; but that play, as well as the *Dulorestes*, related to much earlier events than the friendly contest between Pylades and Orestes, which took place at the court of Thoas, King of Tauris, and was the concluding scene in the dramatic life of Orestes, being long subsequent to the murder of his mother, his trial in presence of the Argives, or absolution at Athens before the Areopagus. Accordingly, Tiraboschi states positively that this *new play* of Pacuvius, which obtained so much applause, was his *Pylades et Orestes*†.

In the *Iliona*, the scene where the shade of Polydorus, who had been assassinated by the King of Thrace, appears to his sister Iliona, was long the favourite of a Roman audience, who seem to have indulged in the same partiality for such spectacles as we still entertain for the goblins in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*.

All the plays above mentioned were imitated or translated by Pacuvius from the Greek. His *Paulus*, however, was of his own invention, and was the first Latin tragedy formed on a Roman subject. Unfortunately there are only five lines of it extant, and these do not enable us to ascertain, which Ro-

* Eberhardt, *Zustand der Schönen Wissenschaften, bei den Römern*, p. 35. &c. Ed. Altona, 1801.

† *Stor. dell. Letterat. Ital.* Part III. Lib. II. c. 1. § 20.

man of the name of Paulus gave title to the tragedy. It was probably either Paulus Æmilius, who fell at Cannæ, or his son, whose story was a memorable instance of the instability of human happiness, as he lost both his children at the moment when he triumphed for his victory over Perseus of Macedon.

From no one play of Pacuvius are there more than fifty lines preserved, and these are generally very much detached. The longest passages which we have in continuation are a fragment concerning Fortune, in the *Hermione*—the exclamations of Ulysses, while writhing under the agony of a recent wound, in the *Niptra*, and the following fine description of a sea-storm introduced in the *Dulorestes*:—

“ Interea, prope jam occidente sole, inhorrescit mare ;
Tenebræ conduplicantur, noctisque et nimbûm occæcat nigror ;
Flamma inter nubes coruscat, cælum tonitru contremit,
Grando, mista imbi largifluo, subitâ turbine præcipitans cadit ;
Undique omnes venti erumpunt, sævi existunt turbines,
Fervet æstu Pelagus.”——

Such lines, however, as these, it must be confessed, are more appropriate in epic, or descriptive poetry, than in tragedy.

It does not appear that the tragedies of Pacuvius had much success or popularity in his own age. He was obliged to have recourse for his subjects to foreign mythology and unknown history. Iphigenia and Orestes were always more or less strangers to a Roman audience, and the whole drama in which these and similar personages figured, never attained in Rome to a healthy and perfect existence. Comedy, on the other hand, addressed itself to the feelings of all. There were prodigal sons, avaricious fathers, and rapacious courtizans, in Rome as well as in Greece*. But it requires a certain cultivation of mind and tenderness of heart to enjoy the representation of a regular tragedy. The plebeians thronged to the theatre for the sake of merriment, and the patricians were still too much occupied with the projects of their own ambition, to weep over the woes of Antigone or Electra.

Pacuvius, accordingly, had fewer imitators than Plautus. Indeed, for a long period he had none of much note, except

* “ Dum fallax servus, durus pater, improba lena
Vivent, dum meretrix blanda, Menandrus erit.”
OVID, *Amor.* Lib. I.

ATTIUS,

or Accius, as he is sometimes, but improperly, called, who brought forward his first play when thirty years old, in the same season in which Pacuvius, having reached the age of eighty, gave his last to the public*. Now, as Pacuvius would be eighty in 614, Attius, according to this calculation, must have been born in 584. It has been questioned, however, if he was born so early, since Valerius Maximus relates a story of his refusing to rise from his place on the entrance of Julius Cæsar into the College of Poets, because in that place they did not contest the prize of birth, but of learning†,—which disrespect, if he came into the world in 584, he could not have survived to offer to the dictator, Julius Cæsar, who was not born till 654. This collector of anecdotes, however, may probably allude either to some other poet of the name of Attius, or to some other individual of the Julian family, than the Julius Cæsar who subverted the liberties of his country. At all events it is evident, that Attius lived to extreme old age. If born in 584, he must have been 63 years old at the birth of Cicero, who came into the world in 647. Now, Cicero mentions not only having seen him, but having heard from his own mouth opinions concerning the eloquence of his friend D. Brutus, and other speakers of his time‡. Supposing this conversation took place even when Cicero was so young as seventeen, Attius must have lived at least to the age of eighty.

It is certain, that Attius had begun to write tragedies before the death of Pacuvius. Aulus Gellius relates, as a well-known anecdote, that Attius, while on his way to Asia, was detained for some time at Tarentum, whither Pacuvius had retired, and was invited to pass a few days with the veteran poet. During his stay he read to his host the tragedy of *Atreus*, which was one of his earliest productions. Pacuvius declared his verses to be high sounding and lofty, but he remarked that they were a little harsh, and wanted mellowness. Attius acknowledged the truth of the observation, which he said gave him much satisfaction; for that genius resembled apples, which when produced hard and sour, grow mellow in maturity, while those which are unseasonably soft do not become ripe, but rotten§. His expectations, however, were scarcely fulfilled, and the produce of his more advanced years was nearly as harsh as what he had borne in youth. He seems, nevertheless, to have

* Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 63.

† *Brutus*, c. 28.

‡ Lib. III. c. 7.

§ *Noct. Att. Lib. XIII. c. 2.*

entertained at all times a good opinion of his own poetical talents; for, though a person of diminutive size, he got a huge statue of himself placed in a conspicuous niche in the Temple of the Muses*. Nor does his vanity appear to have exceeded the high esteem in which he was held by his countrymen. Such was the respect paid to him, that a player was severely punished for mentioning his name on the stage†. Decius Brutus, who was consul in 615, and was distinguished for his victories in Spain, received him into the same degree of intimacy to which Ennius had been admitted by the elder, and Terence by the younger, Scipio Africanus; and such was his estimation of the verses of this tragedian, that he inscribed them over the entrance to a temple adorned by him with the spoils of enemies whom he had conquered‡. From the high opinion generally entertained of the force and eloquence of his tragedies, Attius was asked why he did not plead causes in the Forum; to which he replied, that he made the characters in his tragedies speak what he chose, but that, in the Forum, his adversaries might say things he did not like, and which he could not answer§.

Horace, in the same line where he celebrates the dramatic skill of Pacuvius, alludes to the loftiness of Attius,—

——“Aufert
Pacuvius docti famam senis—Attius alti;”

by which is probably meant sublimity both of sentiment and expression. A somewhat similar quality is intended to be expressed in the epithet applied to him by Ovid:—

“Ennius arte carens, animosique Attius oris,
Casurum nullo tempore nomen habent.”

It would appear from Ovid likewise, that he generally chose atrocious subjects for the arguments of his tragedies:—

“Nec liber indicium est animi, sed honesta voluptas,
Plurima mulcendis auribus apta ferens:
Attius esset atrox, conviva Terentius esset,
Essent pugnaces qui fera bella canunt||.”

By advice of Pacuvius, Attius adopted such subjects as had already been brought forward on the Athenian stage; and we accordingly find that he has dramatized the well-known sto-

* Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXIV. c. 5.

† *Rhetoric. ad Herennium*, Lib. I. c. 14, and Lib. II. c. 13.

‡ Cicero, *pro Archia*, c. 10. Valer. Maxim. Lib. VIII. c. 15.

§ Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* Lib. V. c. 13.

|| Ovid, *Trist.* Lib. II.

ries of *Andromache*, *Philoctetes*, *Antigone*, &c. There are larger fragments extant from these tragedies than from the dramatic works of *Ennius* or *Pacuvius*. One of the longest and finest passages is that in the *Medea*, where a shepherd discovering, from the top of a mountain, the vessel which conveyed the Argonauts on their expedition, thus expresses his wonder and admiration at an object he had never before seen :—

——“Tanta moles labitur
 Fremebunda ex alto, ingenti sonitu et spiritu
 Præ se undas volvit, vortices vi suscitât,
 Ruit prolapsa, pelagus respergit, refiat:
 Ita num interruptum credas nimum volvier,
 Num quod sublime ventis expulsum rapi
 Saxum, aut procellis, vel globosos turbines
 Existere ictos, undis concursantibus?
 Num quas terrestres pontus strages conciet;
 Aut forte Triton fuscina evertens specus,
 Subter radices penitus undanti in freto
 Molem ex profundo saxeam ad cœlum vomit?”

With this early specimen of Latin verse, it may be agreeable to compare a corresponding passage in one of our most ancient English poets. A shepherd, in Spenser's *Epilogue to the Shepherd's Calendar*, thus describes his astonishment at the sight of a ship :—

“For as we stood there waiting on the strand,
 Behold a huge great vessel to us came,
 Dancing upon the waters back to land,
 As if it scorn'd the danger of the same.

Yet was it but a wooden frame, and frail,
 Glued together with some subtle matter;
 Yet had it arms, and wings, and head, and tail,
 And life, to move itself upon the water.

Strange thing! how bold and swift the monster was!
 That neither cared for wind, nor hail, nor rain,
 Nor swelling waves, but thorough them did pass
 So proudly, that she made them roar again.

Among the shorter fragments of *Attius* we meet with many scattered sentiments, which have been borrowed by subsequent poets and moral writers. The expression, “*oderunt dum metuunt*,” occurs in the *Atreus*. Thus, too, in the *Armorum Judicium*,—

“Nam trophæum ferre me a forti pulchrum est viro;
 Si autem et vincar, vinci a tali, nullum est probrum.”

A line in the same play—

“Virtuti sis par—dispar fortunæ patris,”

has suggested to Virgil the affecting address—

“Disce, puer, virtutem ex me, verumque laborem;
Fortunam ex aliis:—”

This play, which turns on the contest of Ajax and Ulysses for the arms of Achilles, has also supplied a great deal to Ovid. The tragic poet makes Ajax say—

“Quid est cur componere ausis mihi te, aut me tibi.”

In like manner, Ajax, in his speech in Ovid—

———“Agimus, pro Jupiter, inquit,
Ante rates causam, et mecum confertur Ulysses!”

There are two lines in the *Philoctetes*, which present a fine image of discomfort and desolation—

“Contempla hanc sedem, in qua ego novem hiemes, saxo stratus, pertuli,
Ubi horifer aquilonis stridor gelidas molitur nives*.”

Most of the plays of Attius, as we have seen, were taken from the Greek tragedians. Two of them, however, the *Brutus* and the *Decius*, hinged on Roman subjects, and were both probably written in compliment to the family of his patron, Decius Brutus. The subject of the former was the expulsion of the Tarquins; but the only passage of it extant, is the dream of Tarquin, and its interpretation, which have been preserved by Cicero in his work *De Divinatione*. Tarquin's dream was, that he had been overthrown by a ram which a shepherd had presented to him, and that while lying wounded on his back, he had looked up to the sky, and observed that the sun, having changed his course, was journeying from west to east. The first part of this dream being interpreted, was a warning, that he would be expelled from his kingdom by one whom he accounted as stupid as a sheep; and the solar phenomenon portended a popular change in the government. The interpreter adds, that such strange dreams could not have occurred without the purpose of some special manifestation, but that no attention need be paid to those which merely present to us the daily transactions of life—

* “This dwelling of nine winters' grief behold,
Where stretch'd on rock my sad sojourn I hold.
Around the boisterous north-wind ceaseless blows,
And, while it rages, drifts the gelid snows.”

VOL. I.—2 C

"Nam quæ in vitâ usurpant homines, cogitant, curant, vident,
 Quæque agunt vigilantes, agitantque, ea si cui in somno accident,
 Minus mirum est——"

In his tragedies, indeed, Attius rather shows a contempt for dreams, and prodigies, and the science of augury—

"Nihil credo auguribus qui aures verbis divitant
 Alienas, suas ut auro locupletent domos."

The argument of Attius' other drama, founded on a Roman subject, and belonging to the class called *Prætextata*, was the patriotic self-devotion of Publius Decius, who, when his army could no longer sustain the onset of the foe, threw himself into the thickest of the combat, and was despatched by the darts of the enemy. There were at least two of the family of Decii, a father and son, who had successively devoted themselves in this manner—the former in a contest with the Latins, the latter in a war with the Gauls, leagued to the Etruscans, in the year of Rome 457. No doubt, however, can exist, that it was the son who was the subject of the tragedy of *Attius*—in the first place, because he twice talks of following the example of his father—

"—— Patrio
 Exemplo dicabo me, atque animam devotabo hostibus."

And again—

"Quibus rem summam et patriam nostram quondam adauctavit pater."

And; in the next place, he refers, in two different passages, to the opposing host of the Gauls—

——"Gallei, voce canora ac fremitu,
 Peragrant minitabiliter——
 Vim Gallicam obduc contra in acie."—

Horace, as is well known, bestowed some commendation on those dramatists who had chosen events of domestic history as subjects for their tragedies—

"Nec minimum meruere decus, vestigia Græca
 Ausi deserere, et celebrare domestica facta*."

Dramas taken from our own annals, excite a public interest, and afford the best, as well as easiest opportunity of attract-

* *Ars Poetica*, v. 286.

ing the mind, by frequent reference to our manners, prejudices, or customs. It may, at first view, seem strange, that the Romans, who were a national people, and whose epics were generally founded on events in their own history, should, when they did make such frequent attempts at the composition of tragedy, have so seldom selected their arguments from the ancient annals or traditions of their country. These traditions were, perhaps, not very fertile in pathetic or mournful incident, but they afforded subjects rich, beyond all others, in tragic energy and elevation; and even in the range of female character, in which the ancient drama was most defective, Lucretia and Virginia were victims as interesting as Iphigenia or Alcestis. The tragic writers of modern times have borrowed from these very sources many subjects of a highly poetical nature, and admirably calculated for scenic representation. The furious combat of the Horatii and Curatii, the stern patriotic firmness of Brutus, the internal conflicts of Coriolanus, the tragic fate of Virginia, and the magnanimous self-devotion of Regulus, have been dramatized with success, in the different languages of modern Europe. But those names, which to us sound so lofty, may, to the natives, have been too familiar for the dignity essential to tragedy. In Rome, besides the risk of offending great families, the Roman subjects were of too recent a date to have acquired that venerable cast, which the tragic muse demands, and time alone can bestow. They were not at sufficient distance to have dropped all those mean and disparaging circumstances, which unavoidably adhere to recent events, and in some measure sink the noblest modern transactions to the level of ordinary life. This seems to have been strongly felt by Sophocles and Euripides, who preferred the incidents connected with the sieges of Troy and of Thebes, rendered gigantic only by the mists of antiquity, to the real and almost living glories of Marathon or Thermopylæ. But the Romans had no families corresponding to the race of Atreus or Cædipus—they had no princess endowed with the beauty of Helen—no monarch invested with the dignity of Agamemnon—they had, in short, no epic cycle on which to form tragedies, like the Greeks, whose minds had been conciliated by Homer in favour of Ajax and Ulysses*. “The most interesting subjects of tragedies,” says Adam Smith†, “are the misfortunes of

* Torq. Baden, in a small tract, entitled *De Causis neglectæ apud Romanos tragediæ*, (Götting. 1790,) almost entirely attributes the deficiency of the Romans in tragedy to their want of a set of heroes, who were poetically consecrated by any epic productions, like those by which Homer had so highly elevated the Grecian chiefs.

† *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Part VI. c. 1.

virtuous and magnanimous kings and princes;" but the Roman kings were a detested race, for whose rank and qualities there was no admiration, and for whose misfortunes there could be no sympathy. Accordingly, after some few and not very successful attempts to dramatize national incidents, the Latin tragic writers relapsed into their former practice, as appears from the titles of all the tragedies which were brought out from the time of Attius to that of Seneca.

Hence it follows, that those remarks, which have been repeated to satiety with regard to the subjects of the Greek theatre, are likewise applicable to those of the Roman stage. There would be the same dignified misfortune displayed in noble and imposing attitudes—the same observance of the unities—the same dramatic phrensy, remorse, and love, proceeding from the vengeance of the gods, and exhibited in the fate of Ajax, Orestes, and Phædra—the same struggle against that predominant destiny, which was exalted even above the gods of Olympus, and by which the ill-fated race of Atreus was agitated and pursued. The Latin, like the Greek tragedies, must have excited something of the same feeling as the Laocoon or Niobe in sculpture; and, indeed, the moral of a large proportion of them seems to be comprised in the chorus of Seneca's *Edipus*—

"Fatis agimur—cedite fatis:
Non sollicitæ possunt curæ
Mutare ratî stamina fusi."

M. Schlegel is of opinion, that had the Romans quitted the practice of Greek translation, and composed original tragedies, these would have been of a different cast and species from the Greek productions, and would have been chiefly expressive of profound religious sentiments.—"La tragedie Grecque avoit montré l'homme libre, combattant contre la destinée; la tragedie Romaine eut présenté a nos regards l'homme soumis a la Divinité, et subjugué jusques dans ses penchans les plus intimes, par cette puissance infinie qui sanctifie les ames, qui les enchaîne de ses liens, et qui brille de toutes parts, a travers le voile de l'univers*." His reasons for supposing that this difference would have existed, are founded on the difference in the mythological systems of the two nations.—"L'ancienne croyance des Romains et les usages qui s'y rapportoient, renfermoient un sens moral, sérieux, philosophique, divinatoire et symbolique, qui n'existoit pas dans la religion des Grecs." There can be no doubt,

* *Cours de Littér. Dramat. Leçon. VIII.*

that the Romans were in public life, during the early periods or their history, a devotedly religious people. Nothing of moment was undertaken without being assured that the gods approved, and would favour the enterprise. The utmost order was observed in every step of religious performance. We see a consul leaving his army, on suspicion of some irregularity, to hold new auspices—an army inspired with sacred confidence and ardour, after appeasing the wrath of the gods, by expiatory lustrations—and a conqueror dedicating at his triumph the temple vowed in the moment of danger. But notwithstanding all this, it so happens, that a spirit of free-thinking is one of the most striking characteristics of the oldest class of Latin poets, particularly the tragedians, and in the fragments of those very plays which were founded on Roman subjects, there is everywhere expressed a bitter contempt for augury, and for the *sens divinatoire et symbolique*, which they evidently considered as quackery: and the dramatists do not seem to have much scrupled to declare that it was so, or the people to testify approbation of such sentiments. Even the almost impious lines of Ennius, that the gods take no concern in the affairs of mortals, were received, as we learn from Cicero, with vast applause.—“Noster Ennius, qui magno plausu loquitur, assentiente populo—Ego Deum genus*,” &c. It is probable, however, that a tragedy purely Roman would have been written in a different spirit from a Greek drama, because the manners of the two people had little resemblance, and because the Roman passion for freedom, detestation of tyranny, and feelings of patriotism, had strong shades of distinction from those of Greece. The self-devotion of the Decii and Curtius, was of a fiercer description than that of Leonidas: It was the headlong contempt, rather than the resolute sacrifice, of existence.

It was probably, too, from a slavish imitation of the Greek dramatists, that the Latin tragedies acquired what is considered one of their chief faults—the introduction of aphorisms and moral sentences, which were not confined to the chorus, the proper receptacle for them, (it being the peculiar office and character of the chorus to moralize,) but were spread over the whole drama in such a manner, that the characters appeared to be *vivendi preceptores* rather than *rei actores*. Quintilian characterizes Attius and Pacuvius as chiefly remarkable for this practice.—“Tragœdiæ scriptores Attius et Pacuvius, clarissimi gravitate sententiarum.” A question on this point is started by Hurd,—That since the Greek trage-

* *De Divinat.* Lib. II. c. 50.

dians moralized so much, how shall we defend Sophocles, and particularly Euripides, if we condemn Attius and Seneca? Brumoy's solution is, that the moral and political aphorisms of the Greek stage generally contained some apt and interesting allusion to the state of public affairs, easily caught by a quick intelligent audience, and not a dry affected moral without farther meaning, like most of the Latin maxims. In the age, too, of the Greek tragedians, there was a prevailing fondness for moral wisdom; and schools of philosophy were resorted to for recreation as well as for instruction. Moral aphorisms, therefore, were not inconsistent with the ordinary flow of conversation in those times, and would be relished by such as indulged in philosophical conferences, whereas such speculations were not introduced till late in Rome, and were never very generally in vogue.

On the whole, it may be admitted that the bold and animated genius of Rome was well suited to tragedy, and that in force of colouring and tragic elevation the Latin poets presented not a feeble image of their great originals; but unfortunately their judgment was uninformed, and they were too easily satisfied with their own productions. Strength and fire were all at which they aimed, and with this praise they remained contented. They were careless with regard to the regularity or harmony of versification. The discipline of correction, the curious polishing of art, which had given such lustre to the Greek tragedies, they could not bestow, or held the emendation requisite for dramatic perfection as disgraceful to the high spirit and energy of Roman genius* :

“ Turpem putat in scriptis metuitque lituram † .”

To originality or invention in their subjects, they hardly ever presumed to aspire, and were satisfied with gathering what they found already produced by another soil in full and ripened maturity.

It may perhaps appear strange that the Romans possessed so little original talents for tragedy, and indeed for the drama in general; but the genius of neighbouring nations, who had equal success in other sorts of poetry, has often been very different in this department of literature. The Spaniards could boast of Lopez de Vega, Cervantes, and Calderon, at a time when the Portuguese had no drama, and were contented with the exhibitions of strolling players from Castile. Scotland

* Hurd's *Horace*, Vol. II.

† Horat. *Epist.* Lib. II. Ep. 1. v. 67.

had scarcely produced a single play of merit in the brightest age of the dramatic glory of England—the age of Shakspeare, Massinger, and Jonson. While France was delighted with the productions of Racine, Corneille, and Moliere, the modern Italians, as if their ancestors' poverty of dramatic genius still adhered to them, though so rich and abundant in every other department of literature, scarcely possessed a tolerable play of their own invention, and till the time of Goldoni were amused only with the most slavish imitations of the Latin comedies, the buffooneries of harlequin, or tragedies of accumulated and unmitigated horrors, which excite neither the interest of terror nor of pity.

For all this it may not be easy completely to account; but various causes may be assigned for the want of originality in Roman tragedy, and indeed in the whole Roman drama. The nation was deficient in that milder humanity of which there are so many beautiful instances in Grecian history. From the austere patriotism of Brutus sacrificing every personal feeling to the love of country,—from the frugality of Cincinnatus, and parsimony of the Censor, it fell with frightful rapidity into a state of luxury and corruption without example. Even during the short period which might be called the age of refinement, it wanted a poetical public. To judge by the early part of their history, one would suppose that the Romans were not deficient in that species of sensibility which fits for due sympathy in theatrical incidents. Most of their great revolutions were occasioned by events acting strongly and suddenly on their feelings. The hard fate of Lucretia, Virginia, and the youth Publilius, freed them from the tyranny of their kings, decemvirs, and patrician creditors. On the whole, however, they were an austere, stately, and formal people; their whole mode of life tended to harden the heart and feelings, and there was a rigid uniformity in their early manners, ill adapted to the free workings of the passions. External indications of tenderness were repressed as unbecoming of men whose souls were fixed on the attainment of the most lofty objects. Pity was never to be felt by a Roman, but when it came in the shape of clemency towards a vanquished foe, and tears were never to dim the eyes of those whose chief pride consisted in acting with energy and enduring with firmness. This self-command, which their principles required of them,—this controul of every manifestation of suffering in themselves, and contempt for the expression of it in others, tended to exclude tragedy almost entirely from the range of their literature.

Any softer emotions, too, which the Roman people may have once experienced—any sentiments capable of being awakened

to tragic pathos, became gradually blunted by the manner in which they were exercised. They had, by degrees, been accustomed to take a barbarous delight in the most wanton displays of human violence, and brutal cruelty. Lions and elephants tore each other in pieces before their eyes; and they beheld, with emotions only of delight, crowds of hireling gladiators wasting their energy, valour, and life, on the guilty arena of a Circus. Gladiatorial combats were first exhibited by Decius and Marcus Brutus, at the funeral of their father, about the commencement of the Punic wars. The number of such entertainments increased with the luxury of the times; and those who courted popular favour found no readier way to gain it than by magnificence and novelty in this species of expense. Cæsar exhibited three hundred pairs of gladiators; Pompey presented to the multitude six hundred lions, to be torn in pieces in the Circus, besides harnessed bears and dancing elephants; and some other candidate for popular favour, introduced the yet more refined barbarity of combats between men and wild animals. These were the darling amusements of all, and chief occupations of many Romans; and those who could take pleasure in such spectacles, must have lost all that tenderness of inward feeling, and all that exquisite sympathy for suffering, without which none can perceive the force and beauty of a tragic drama. The extension, too, of the military power, and the increasing wealth and splendour of the Roman republic, accustomed its citizens to triumphal and gaudy processions. This led to a taste for what, in modern times, has been called *Spectacle*; and, instead of melting with tenderness at the woes of Andromache, the people demanded on the stage such exhibitions as presented them with an image of their favourite pastimes:—

“ Quatuor aut plures aulae premuntur in horas,
 Dum fugiunt equitum turmæ, peditumque catervæ :
 Mox trahitur manibus regum fortuna retortis ;
 Esseda festinant, pilenta, petorrita, naves :
 Captivum portatur ebur, captiva Corinthus*.”

This sort of show was not confined to the afterpiece or entertainment, but was introduced in the finest tragedies, which were represented with such pomp and ostentation as to destroy all the grace of the performance. A thousand mules pranced about the stage in the tragedy of *Clytemnestra*; and whole regiments, accoutred in foreign armour, were marshalled

* Horat. *Epist.* Lib. II. ep. 1.

in that of the *Trojan Horse**. This taste, so fatal to the genuine excellence of tragedy or comedy, was fostered and encouraged by the *Ædiles*, who had the charge of the public Shows, and, among others, of the exhibitions at the theatre. The *ædileship* was considered as one of the steps to the higher honours of the state; and those who held it could not resort to surer means of conciliating the favour of their fellow-citizens, or purchasing their future suffrages, than by sparing no expense in the pageantry of theatrical amusements.

The language, also, of the Romans, however excellent in other respects, was, at least in comparison with Greek, but ill suited to the expression of earnest and vivid emotion. It required an artful and elaborate collocation of words, and its construction is more forced and artificial than that of most other tongues. Hence passion always seemed to speak the language with effort; the idiom would not yield to the rapid transitions and imperfect phrases of impassioned dialogue.

Little attention, besides, was paid to critical learning, and the cultivation of correct composition. The Latin muse had been nurtured amid the festivities of rural superstition; and the impure mixture of licentious jollity had so corrupted her nature, that it long partook of her rustic origin. Even so late as the time of Horace, the tragic drama continued to be unsuccessful, in consequence of the illiberal education of the Roman youth; who, while the Greeks were taught to open all the mind to glory, were so cramped in their genius by the love of gain, and by the early infusion of sordid principles, that they were unable to project a great design, or conduct it to perfection. The consequence was, that the "*æруго et cura peculі*" had so completely infected the Roman dramatists, that lucre was the sole object of their pains. Hence, provided they could catch popular applause, and secure a high price from the magistrates who superintended theatrical exhibitions, they felt indifferent to every nobler view, and more worthy purpose:—

"Gessit enim nummum in loculos demittere; post hoc
Securus, cadat, an recto stet fabula talo†."

But, above all, the low estimation in which the art of poetry was held, must be regarded as a cause of its little progress during the periods of the republic: "Sero igitur," says Cicero, "a nostris, poetæ vel cogniti vel recepti. Quo minus igitur

* Cicero.—*Epistolæ familiæres*, Lib. VII. ep. 1. Ed. Schütz.

† Horat. *Epist.* Lib. II. 1.

honoris erat poetis, eo minora studia fuerunt.*" The earliest poets of Rome had not the encouragement of that court favour which was extended to Chaucer in England, to Marot and Ronsard in France, and to Dante by the petty princes of Italy. From Livius Andronicus to Terence, poetry was cultivated only by foreigners and freedmen. Scipio and Lælius, indeed, are said to have written some scenes in the plays of Terence; but they did not choose that anything of this sort should pass under their names. The stern republicans seem to have considered poetry as an art which captives and slaves might cultivate, for the amusement of their conquerors, or masters, but which it would be unsuitable for a grave and lofty patrician to practice. I suspect, the Romans regarded a poet as a tumbler or rope-dancer, with whose feats we are entertained, but whom we would not wish to imitate.

The drama in Rome did not establish itself systematically, and by degrees, as it did in Greece. Plautus wrote for the stage during the time of Livius Andronicus, and Terence was nearly contemporary with Pacuvius and Attius; so that everything serious and comic, good and bad, came at once, and if it was Grecian, found a welcome reception among the Romans. On this account every species of dramatic amusement was indiscriminately adopted at the theatre, and that which was most absurd was often most admired. The Græek drama acquired a splendid degree of perfection by a close imitation of nature; but the Romans never attained such perfection, because, however exquisite their models, they did not copy directly from nature, but from its representative and image.

Had the Romans, indeed, possessed a literature of their own, when they first grew familiar with the works of the Greek poets, their native productions would no doubt have been improved by the study and imitation of the masterpieces of these more accomplished foreigners; yet they would still have preserved something of a national character: But, unfortunately, when the Romans first became acquainted with the writings of the Greeks, they had not even sown the seeds of learning, so that they remained satisfied with the full-ripened produce imported from abroad. Several critics have indeed remarked in all the compositions of the Romans, and particularly in their tragedies, a peculiar severity and loftiness of thought; but they were all formed so entirely on a Greek model, that their early poetry must be regarded rather as the production of art than genius, and as a spark struck by contact and attrition.

* *Tuscul. Disput. Lib. I. c. 2.*

rather than a flame spontaneously kindled at the altar of the Muses.

In addition to all this, the Latin poet had no encouragement to invent. He was not required to look abroad into nature, or strike out a path for himself. So far from this being demanded, Greek subjects were evidently preferred by the public—

“Omnes res gestas Athenis esse autumant,
Quo vobis illud Græcum videatur magis*.”

All the works, then, which have been hitherto mentioned, and which, with exception of the *Annals* of Ennius, are entirely dramatic, belong strictly to what may be called the Greek school of composition, and are unquestionably the least original class of productions in the Latin, or perhaps any other language. But however little the early dramatists of Rome may have to boast of originality or invention, they are amply entitled to claim an unborrowed praise for the genuine purity of their native style and language.

The style and language of the dramatic writers of the period, on which we are now engaged, seem to have been much relished by a numerous class of readers, from the age of Augustus to that of the Antonines, and to have been equally abhorred by the poets of that time. We have already seen Horace's indignation against those who admired the *Carmen Saliare*, or the poems of Livius, and which appears the bolder and more surprising, as Augustus himself was not altogether exempt from this predilection†; and we have also seen the satire of Persius against his age, for being still delighted with the fustian tragedies of Attius and the rugged style of Pacuvius—

“Est nunc Brisei quem venosus liber Atti,
Sunt quos Pacuviusque, et verrucosa moeretur
Antiope, ærumnis cor luctificabile fulta.”

In like manner Martial, in his Epigrams, mimicking the obsolete phrases of the ancient dramatists—

Attonitusque legis territi frugiferi,
Attius et quicquid Pacuviusque vomunt.”

Such sentiments, however, as is evident from Horace's Epistle

* Plautus—*Menachmi*. Prolog.

† Delectabatur veteri comœdiâ, et sæpe eam exhibuit publicis spectaculis. Suetonius, in *August.* c. 89.

to Augustus, proceeded in a great measure from the modern poets being provoked at an admiration, which they thought did not originate in a real sense of the merit of these old writers, but in an envious wish to depreciate, by odious comparison, the productions of the day—

“Jam Saliare Numæ carmen qui laudat, et illud
Quod mecum ignorat, solus vult scire videri;
Ingeniis non ille favet, plauditque sepultis,
Nostra sed impugnat—nos, nostraque lividus odit.”

But although a great proportion of the public may, with malicious designs, have heaped extravagant commendations on the style of the ancient tragedians, there can be no doubt that it is full of vigour and richness; and if inferior to the exquisite refinement of the Augustan age, it was certainly much to be preferred to the obscurity of Persius, or the conceits of Martial. “A very imperfect notion,” says Wakefield, in one of his letters to Fox, “is entertained in general of the copiousness of the Latin language, by those who confine themselves to what are styled the Augustan writers. The old comedians and tragedians, with Ennius and Lucilius, were the great repositories of learned and vigorous expression. I have ever regarded the loss of the old Roman poets, particularly Ennius and Lucilius, from the light they would have thrown on the formations of the Latin language, and its derivation from the Æolian Greek, as the severest calamity ever sustained by philological learning*.” Sometimes, indeed, their words are uncouth, particularly their compound terms and epithets, in the formation of which they are not nearly so happy as the Greeks. Livius Andronicus uses *Odorisequos canes*—Pacuvius employs *Repandirostrum* and *Incurvicivium*. Such terms always appear incongruous and disjointed, and not knit together so happily as *Cyclops*, and other similar words of the Greeks.

The different classes into which the regular drama of this period may be reduced, is a subject involved in great contradiction and uncertainty, and has been much agitated in consequence of Horace’s celebrated line—

“Vel qui *Prætextas* vel qui docuere *Togatas*†.”

On the whole, it seems pretty evident, that the *regular* drama was divided into tragedy and comedy. A tragedy on a Greek subject, and in which Greek manners were preserved, as the

* *Correspondence*, &c. p. 205. Lond. 1818.

† *Ars Poetica*, v. 288.

Hecuba, Dulorestes, &c. was simply styled *Tragœdia*, or sometimes *Tragœdia Palliata*. Those tragedies again, in which Roman characters were introduced, as the Decius and Brutus of Attius, were called *Prætextata*, because the *Prætextata* was the habit worn by Roman kings and consuls. The comedy which adopted Greek subjects and characters, like those of Terence, was termed *Comœdia*, or *Comœdia Palliata*; and that which was clothed in Roman habits and customs, was called *Togata**. Afranius was the most celebrated writer of this last class of dramas, which were probably Greek pieces accommodated to Roman manners, since Afranius lived at a period when Roman literature was almost entirely imitative. It is difficult, no doubt, to see how an Athenian comedy could be bent to local usages foreign to its spirit and genius; but the Latin writers were not probably very nice about the adjustment; and the *Comœdia Togata* is so slightly mentioned by ancient writers, that we can hardly suppose that it comprehended a great class of national compositions. The *Tabernaria* was a comedy of a lower order than the *Comœdia Togata*: It represented such manners as were likely to be met with among the dregs of the Plebeians; and was so called from *Taberna*, as its scene was usually laid in shops or taverns. These, I think, are the usual divisions of the regular Roman drama; but critics and commentators have sometimes applied the term *Togata* to all plays, whether tragedies or comedies, in which Roman characters were represented, and *Palliata* to every drama of Greek origin.

There was, however, a species of irregular dramas, for which the Romans were not indebted to the Greeks, and which was peculiar to themselves, called *Fabulæ Atellanæ*. These entertainments were so denominated from Atella, a considerable town of the Oscans, now St Arpino, lying about two miles south from Aversa, between Capua and Naples,—the place now named Atella being at a little distance.

When Livius Andronicus had succeeded in establishing at Rome a regular theatre, which was formed on the Greek model, and was supported by professional writers, and professional actors, the free Roman youth, who were still willing, amid their foreign refinements, occasionally to revive the recollection of the old popular pastimes of their Italian ancestry, continued to amuse themselves with the satiric pieces introduced by the *Histrions* of Etruria, and with the Atellane Fables which Oscan performers had first made known at

* See Dubos, *Reflex. sur la Poésie*. Jul. Pollux, *Onomasticon*.

Rome*. The actors of the regular drama were not permitted to appear in such representations; and the Roman youths, to whom the privilege was reserved, were not, as other actors, removed from their tribe, or rendered incapable of military service†; nor could they be called on like them to unmask in presence of the spectators‡. It has been conjectured, that the popularity of these spectacles, and the privileges reserved to those who appeared in them, were granted in consequence of their pleasantries being so tempered by the ancient Italian gravity, that there was no admixture of obscenity or indecorum, and hence no stain of dishonour was supposed to be inflicted on the performers§.

The Atellane Fables consisted of detached scenes following each other, without much dramatic connection, but replete with jocular and buffoonery. They were written in the Oscan dialect, in the same way as the Venetian or Neapolitan jargons are frequently employed in the Italian comedies; and they differed from the Greek satiric drama in this, that the characters of the latter were Satyrs, while those of the Atellane fables were Oscan||. One of these was called Maccus, a grotesque and fantastic personage, with an immense head, long nose, and hump back, who corresponded in some measure to the clown or fool of modern pantomime, and whose appellation of Maccus has been interpreted by Lipsius as *Bardus*, *fatuus*, *stolidus*¶. In its rude but genuine form this species of entertainment was in great vogue and constant use at Rome. It does not appear that the Atellane fables were originally written out, or that the actors had certain parts prescribed to them. The general subject was probably agreed on, but the performers themselves filled up the scenes from their own art or invention*†. As the Roman language improved, and the provincial tongues of ancient Italy became less known, the Oscan dialect was gradually abandoned. Quintus Novius, who lived in the beginning of the seventh century of Rome, and whom Macrobius mentions as one of the most approved writers of Atellane Fables, was the author who chiefly con-

* Livy, Lib. VII. c. 2.

† Ibid.

‡ Jul. Pollux, *Onomasticon*. Festus ap. *Vossius de Poet. Lat. Lib. II. c. 35, § 8.*

§ Casaubon, *de Satyrica Poes.* Lib. II. c. 1. Signorelli, *Stor. de Teat.* Tom. II. p. 14. This, however, is not very likely. The deference was probably paid, because young patricians chose to act in the Atellanes: It could not otherwise have been thought more creditable to personate the clown or fool of a semi-barbarous race, than to perform the parts of Œdipus and Agamemnon.

|| Diomed. *de Poem. Gen.* Lib. III.

¶ *Epist. Quæst.* Lib. XI. *Quæst.* 22.

*† Du Bos, *Reflex. Critiques*, Tom. I. p. 154.

tributed to this innovation. He is cited as the author of the *Virgo Prægnans*, *Dotata*, *Gallinaria*, *Gemini*, and various others.

At length, in the time of Sylla, Lucius Pomponius produced Atellane Fables, which were written without any intermixture of the Oscan dialect, being entirely in the Latin language; and he at the same time refined their ancient buffoonery so much, by giving them a more rational cast, that he is called by Velleius Paterculus the inventor of this species of drama, and is characterized by that author as "sensibus celebrem, verbis rudem*." Pomponius was remarkable for his accurate observation of manners, and his genius has been highly extolled by Cicero and Seneca. The names of sixty-three of his pieces have been cited by grammarians, and from all these fragments are still extant. From some of them, however, not more than a line has been preserved, and from none of them more than a dozen. It would appear that the Oscan character of Maccus was still retained in many fables of Pomponius, as there is one entitled *Maccus* and others *Macci Gemini*, *Maccus Miles*, *Maccus Sequestris*, in the same manner as we say Harlequin footman, &c Pappo, or Pappus, seems also to have been a character introduced along with Maccus, and, I should think, corresponded to the Pantaloon of modern pantomime. Among the names of the Atellanes of Pomponius we find *Pappus Agricola*, and among those of Novius, *Pappus Præteritus*. This character, however, appears rather to have been of Greek than of Oscan origin; and was probably derived from Παιστος, the Silenus or old man of the Greek dramatic satire.

The improvements of Pomponius were so well received at Rome, that he was imitated by Mummius, and by Sylla himself, who, we are told by Athenæus, wrote several Atellane Fables in his native language†. In this new form introduced by Pomponius the Atellane dramas continued to enjoy great popularity in Rome, till they were in some measure superseded by the Mimes of Laberius and Publius Syrus.

Along with the Atellane Fables, the Roman youth were in the practice of acting short pieces called *Exodia*, which were interludes, or after-pieces, of a yet more loose, detached, and farcical description, than the Atellanes, being a continuation of the ancient performances originally introduced by the Histrions of Etruria‡. In these Exodia the actors usually wore the same masks and habits as in the Atellanes and tragedies§,

* Lib. II. c. 9.

† Lib. VI. c. 17.

‡ *Conferta fabellis potissimum Atellanis sunt.* Livy, Lib. VII. c. 2.

§ Sulzer, *Theorie der Schönen Künste*, Lib. I. p. 520.

and represented the same characters in a ludicrous point of view:—

“*Urbicus Exodio risum movet Atellane
Gestibus Autonoes. Hunc diligit Ælia pauper.**”

Joseph Scaliger, in his Commentary on Manilius, gives his opinion, that the *Exodia* were performed at the end of the principal piece, like our farces, and were so called as being the issue of the entertainment, which is also asserted by a scholiast on Juvenal†. But the elder Scaliger and Salmasius thought that the *exodium* was a sort of interlude, and had not necessarily any connection with the principal representation. The *Exodia* continued to be performed with much license in the times of Tiberius and Nero; and when the serious spirit of freedom had vanished from the empire, they often contained jocular but direct allusions to the crimes of the portentous monsters by whom it was scourged and afflicted.

It has been much disputed among modern critics, whether the

SATIRE

of the Romans was derived from the Greeks, or was of their own invention. The former opinion has been maintained by the elder Scaliger‡, Heinsius§, Vulpus||, and, among the most recent German critics, by Blankenburg¶, Conz, and Flogel*‡; the latter theory, which seems to have been that of the Romans themselves, particularly of Horace and Quintilian††, has been supported by Diomedes‡‡, Joseph Scaliger, Casaubon§†, Spanheim||†, Rigaltius¶†, Dacier**, and Dryden, and by Koenig†*, and Manso, among the Germans. Those who suppose that satire descended directly from the Greeks to the Romans, derive the word from *Satyrus*, the well-known mythological compound of a man and goat. Casaubon, on the other hand, and most of those who have followed him, deduce it from the adjective *Satura*, a Sabine word, originally signifying a medley, and, afterwards,—full or abundant. To

* Juvenal, *Sat.* VI.

† Exodiarius apud veteres in fine ludorum intrabat, quod ridiculus foret, ut, quid-
quid lachrymarum atque tristitiæ coegissent, ex tragicis affectibus, hujus spectaculi
risus detergeret.—*Ad Juvenal. Satir.* III. v. 175.

‡ *Poetices Libri.*

§ *De Sat. Horat.*

|| *De Sat. Latin.*

¶ *Ad. Sulzer.*

*‡ *Geschichte der komischen Litteratur.*

†† *Satira tota nostra est.*

‡‡ *Lib. III.*

§† *De Satir. Poes.*

||† *Dissertation sur les Césars de Julien.*

¶† *De Sat. Juvenalis.*

** *Pref. sur les Sat. d'Horace.*

†* *De Sat. Romaná.*

this word the substantive *Lanx* was understood, which meant the platter or charger whereon the first fruits of the earth were offered to Bacchus at his festivals,—

“Ergo rite suum Baccho dicemus honorem
Carminibus patriis, lancesque et liba feremus*.”

The term *Satura* thus came to be applied to a species of composition, originally written in various sorts of verse, and comprehending a *farrago* of all subjects,—

“Quicquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,
Gaudia, discursus†,” &c.

In the same way, laws were called *Leges Saturæ*, when they consisted of several heads and titles; and Verrius Flaccus calls a dish, which I suppose was a sort of *olla podrida*—*Satura* :—
“*Satura cibi genus ex variis rebus conditum.*” Dacier, however, though he agrees with Casaubon as to the Latin origin of satire, derives the term from Saturn; as he believes that it was at festivals in honour of that ancient god of Italy that those rustic impromptus, which gave rise to satire, were first recited.

Flögel, in his German *History of Comic Literature*, attempts to show, at considerable length, that Casaubon has attributed too much to the derivation of the word satire; since, though the term may be of Latin origin, it does not follow that the thing was unknown to the Greeks,—and that he also relies too much on the argument, that the satiric plays of the Greeks were quite different from the satire of the Romans, which may be true; while, at the same time, there are other sorts of Greek compositions, as the lyric satires of Archilochus and the *Silli*, which have a much nearer resemblance to the Latin didactic satire than any satirical drama.

In fact, the whole question seems to depend on what constitutes a sufficient alteration or variety from former compositions, to give a claim to invention. Now it certainly cannot be pretended, so far as we know, that *any* satiric productions of the Greeks had much resemblance to those of the Romans. The Greek satires, which are improperly so termed, were divided into what were called tragic and comic. The former were dramatic compositions, which had their commencement, like the regular tragedy, in rustic festivals to the honour of

* Virgil, *Georg.* Lib. II.

† Juvenal. *Satir.* Lib. I. We shall afterwards see reason to conclude, that the famous *Satura Menippeæ* of Varro seems not to have been *Satira*, but *Satura*, a hodge-podge, or medley.

Bacchus; and in which, characters representing Satyrs, the supposed companions of that god, were introduced, imitating the coarse songs and fantastic dances of rural deities. In their rude origin, it is probable that only one actor, equipped as a Satyr, danced or sung. Soon, however, a chorus appeared, consisting of the bearded and beardless Satyrs, Silenus, and Pappo Silenus; and Histrions, representing heroic characters, were afterwards introduced. The satiric drama began to flourish when the regular tragedy had become too refined to admit of a chorus, or accompaniment of Satyrs, but while these were still remembered with a sort of fondness, which rendered it natural to recur to the most ancient shape of the drama. In this state of the progress of the Greek stage, the satire was performed separately from the tragedy; and out of respect to the original form of tragedy, was often exhibited as a continuation or parody of the tragic *trilogy*, or three serious plays,—thus completing what was called the *tetralogia*. The scene of these satires was laid in the country, amid woods, caves, and mountains, or other such places as Satyrs were supposed to inhabit; and the subjects chosen were those in which Satyrs might naturally be feigned to have had a share or interest. High mythological stories and fabulous heroes were introduced, as appears from the names preserved by Casaubon, who mentions the *Hercules* of Astydamos, the *Alcmaeon* and *Vulcan* of Achæus,—each of which is denominated *σατυρικός*. These heroic characters, however, were generally parodied, and rendered fantastic, by the gross railleries of Silenus and the Fauns. The *Cyclops* of Euripides, which turns on the story of Ulysses in the cave of Polyphemus, is the only example entirely extant of this species of composition. Some fragments, however, remain of the *Lytiersa* of Sositheus, an author who flourished about the 130th Olympiad, which was subsequent to the introduction of the new Greek comedy. Lytiersa, who gives name to this dramatic satire, lived in Phrygia. He used to receive many guests, who flocked to his residence from all quarters. After entertaining them at sumptuous banquets, he compelled them to go out with him to his fields, to reap his crop or cut his hay; and when they had performed this labour, he mowed off their heads, with a scythe. The style of entertainment, it seems, did not prevent his house from being a place of fashionable resort. Hercules, however, put an end to this mode of wishing a good afternoon, by strangling the hospitable landlord, and throwing his body into the Mæander. It is evident, from the subject of this play, and of the *Cyclops*, that the tragic satires were a sort of fee-fa-fum performance, like

our after-pieces founded on the stories of *Blue Beard* and *Jack the Giant Killer*. They were generally short and simple in their plan: They contained no satire or ridicule against the fellow-citizens of the author, or any private individuals whatever; but there was a good deal of jeering by the characters at each other, and much buffoonery, revelling, and indecency, among the satiric persons of the chorus.

The Comic Satire began later than the Tragic, subsisted for some time along with it, and finally survived it. In Greece it was chiefly popular after the time of Alexander, and it also flourished in the court of the Egyptian Ptolemies. It was quite different from the Tragic Satire; the action being laid in cities, or at least not always amid rustic scenes. Private individuals were often satirized in it, and not unfrequently the tyrants or rulers of the state. When a mythic story was adopted, the affairs of domestic life were conjoined with the action, and it never was of the same enormous or bloody nature as the fables employed in the tragic satire, but such subjects were usually chosen as that of Amphytrion, Apollo feeding the flocks of Admetus, &c. Satyrs were not essential characters, and when they were introduced, private individuals were generally intended to be ridiculed, under the form of these rustic divinities. Gluttony, to judge from some fragments preserved by Athenæus, was one of the chief topics of banter and merriment. Timocles, who lived about the 114th Olympiad, was the chief author of comic satires. Lycophron, better known by his *Cassandra*, also wrote one called *Menedemus*, in which the founder of the Eretric school of philosophy was exposed to ridicule, under the character of Silenus, and his pupils under the masks of Satyrs.

Besides their dramatic satires, the Greeks had another species of poem called *Silli*, which were patched up like the *Cento Nuptialis* of Ausonius, from the verses of serious writers, and by such means turned to a different sense from what their original author intended. Thus, in the *Silli* attributed to Timon, a sceptic philosopher and disciple of Pyrrho, who lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the lines are copied from Homer and the tragic poets, but they are satirically applied to certain customs and systems of philosophy, which it was his object to ridicule. Some specimens of the *Silli* may be found in Diogenes Laertius; but the longest now extant is a passage preserved in Dio Chrysostom, exposing the mad attachment of the inhabitants of Alexandria to chariot races. To these *Silli* may be added the lyric or iambic satires directed against individuals, like those of Archilochus against Lycambes.

The Roman didactic satire had no great resemblance to

any of these sorts of Greek satire. It referred, as every one knows, to the daily occurrences of life,—to the ordinary follies and vices of mankind. With the Greek tragic satire it had scarce any analogy whatever; for it was not in dialogue, and contained no allusion to the mythological Satyrs who formed the chorus of the Greek dramas. To the comic satire it had more affinity; and those writers who have maintained the Greek origin of Roman satire have done little justice to their argument by not attending to the distinction between these two sorts of dramatic satire, and treating the whole question as if it depended on the resemblance to the tragic satire. In the comic satire, as we have seen, Satyrs were not always nor necessarily introduced. The subject was taken from ordinary life; and domestic vice or absurdity was stigmatized and ridiculed, as it was in the Roman satire, particularly during its earliest ages. Still, however, there was no incident or plot evolved in a Roman satire; nor was it written in dialogue, except occasionally, for the sake of more lively sarcasm on life and manners.

But though the Roman satire took a different direction, it had something of the same origin as the satiric drama of the Greeks. As the Grecian holidays were celebrated with oblations to Bacchus and Ceres, to whose bounty they owed their wine and corn, in like manner the ancient Italians propitiated their agricultural or rustic deities with appropriate offerings,

“*Tellurem porco—Sylvanum lacte piabant**;

but as they knew nothing of the Silenus, or Satyrs of the Greeks, a chorus of peasants, fantastically disguised in masks cut out from the barks of trees, danced or sung to a certain kind of verse, which they called Saturnian:—

“*Nec non Ausonii, Trojâ gens missa, coloni
Versibus incomtis ludunt, risuque soluto;
Oraque corticibus sumunt horrenda cavatis:
Et te, Bacche, vocant per carmina læta, tibi que
Oscilla ex altâ suspendunt mollia pinu†.*”

These festivals had usually the double purpose of worship and recreation; and accordingly the verses often digressed from the praises of Bacchus to mutual taunts and railleries, like those in Virgil's third eclogue, on the various defects and vices of the speakers.

Such rude lines, originally sung or recited in the Tuscan and Latian villages, at nuptials or religious festivals, were first

* *Horat. Epist. Lib. II. ep. 1.*

† *Georg. Lib. II. v. 385.*

introduced at Rome by *Histrions*, who, as already mentioned, were summoned from Etruria, in order to allay the pestilence which was depopulating the city. These *Histrions* being mounted on a stage, like our mountebanks, performed a sort of *ballet*, by dancing and gesticulating to the sound of musical instruments. The Roman youth thus learned to imitate their gestures and music, which they accompanied with railing verses delivered in extemporary dialogue.

The jeering, however, which had been at first confined to inoffensive raillery, at length exceeded the bounds of moderation, and the peace of private families was invaded by the unrestrained license of personal invective:—

“ *Libertasque recurrentes accepta per annos
Lusit amabiliter; donec jam sævus apertam
In rabiem cœpit verti jocus; et per honestas
Ire domos impune minax: doluere cruento
Dente lacessiti; fuit intactis quoque cura
Conditione super communi.*”——

This exposure of private individuals, which alarmed even those who had been spared, was restrained by a salutary law of the *Decemvirs*.—“*Si quis occentassit malum carmen, sive condidit, quod infamiam faxit flagitiumve alteri, fuste ferito.*”

Ennius, perceiving how much the Romans had been delighted with the rude satires poured forth in extemporary dialogue, thought it might be worth his pains to compose satires not to be recited but read. He preserved in them, however, the groundwork of the ancient pleasantry, and the venom of the ancient raillery, on individuals, as well as on general vices. His satires related to various subjects, and were written in different sorts of verses—hexameters being mingled with iambic and trochaic lines, as fancy dictated.

The satires of *Ennius*, which have already been more particularly mentioned, were imitated by *Pacuvius*, and from his time the word *satire* came to be applied at Rome only to poems containing either a playful or indignant censure on manners. This sort of composition was chiefly indebted for its improvement to

* *Horat. Epist. Lib. II. ep. 1.*

LUCILIUS,

A Roman knight, who was born in the year 605, at Suessa, a town in the Auruncian territory. He was descended of a good family, and was the maternal granduncle of Pompey the Great. In early youth he served at the siege of Numantia, in the same camp with Marius and Jugurtha, under the younger Scipio Africanus*, whose friendship and protection he had the good fortune to acquire. On his return to Rome from his Spanish campaign, he dwelt in a house which had been built at the public expense, and had been inhabited by Seleucus Philopater, Prince of Syria, whilst he resided in his youth as an hostage at Rome†. Lucilius continued to live on terms of the closest intimacy with the brave Scipio and wise Lælius,

“ Quin ubi se a vulgo et scenâ in secreta remorant
Virtus Scipiadæ et mitis sapientia Læti,
Nugari cum illo et discincti ludere, donec
Decoqueretur olus, soliti‡.” —

These powerful protectors enabled him to satirize the vicious without restraint or fear of punishment. In his writings he drew a genuine picture of himself, acknowledged his faults, made a frank confession of his inclinations, gave an account of his adventures, and, in short, exhibited a true and spirited representation of his whole life. Fresh from business or pleasure, he seized his pen while his fancy was yet warm, and his passions still awake,—while elated with success or depressed by disappointment. All these feelings, and the incidents which occasioned them, he faithfully related, and made his remarks on them with the utmost freedom:—

“ Ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim
Credebat libris; neque si male gesserat, usquam
Decurrens aliò, neque si bene: quo fit ut omnis
Votivâ pateat veluti descripta tabellâ
Vita senis§.” —

Unfortunately, however, the writings of Lucilius are so mutilated, that few particulars of his life and manners can be gleaned from them. Little farther is known concerning him, than that he died at Naples, but at what age has been much disputed. Eusebius and most other writers have fixed it at 45.

* Velleius Patere. *Histor.* Lib. II. 9.

† Aseon. Peditanus in *Comment. in Orat. Ciceronis cont. L. Pisonem.*

‡ Horat. *Sat.* Lib. II. 1. v. 71.

§ *Ibid.* v. 80.

which, as he was born in 605, would be in the 651st year of the city. But M. Dacier and Bayle* assert that he must have been much older, at the time of his death, as he speaks in his satires of the Licinian law against exorbitant expenditure at entertainments, which was not promulgated till 657, or 658.

Satire, more than any other species of poetry, is the offspring of the time in which it has its birth, and which furnishes it with the aliment whereon it feeds. The period at which Lucilius appeared was favourable to satiric composition. There was a struggle existing between the old and new manners, and the freedom of speaking and writing, though restrained, had not yet been totally checked by law. Lucilius lived amidst a people on whom luxury and corruption were advancing with fearful rapidity, but among whom some virtuous citizens were still anxious to stem the tide which threatened to overwhelm their countrymen. The satires of Lucilius were adapted to please these staunch "*laudatores temporis acti*," who stood up for ancient manners and discipline. The freedom with which he attacked the vices of his contemporaries, without sparing individuals,—the strength of colouring with which his pictures were charged,—the weight and asperity of the reproaches with which he loaded those who had exposed themselves to his ridicule or indignation,—had nothing revolting in an age when no consideration compelled to those forbearances necessary under different forms of society or government†. By the time, too, in which Lucilius began to write, the Romans, though yet far from the polish of the Augustan age, had become familiar with the delicate and cutting irony of the Greek comedies of which the more ancient Roman satirists had no conception. Lucilius chiefly applied himself to the imitation of these dramatic productions, and caught, it is said, much of their fire and spirit :

“Eupolis, atque Cratinus, Aristophanesque, pœtæ,
Atque alii, quorum comœdia prisca virorum est,
Si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus, aut fur,
Quod mœchus foret, aut sicarius, aut alioqui
Famosus, multæ cum libertate notabant.
Hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus,
Mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque.”—

The Roman language, likewise, had grown more refined in the age of Lucilius, and was thus more capable of receiving the Grecian beauties of style. Nor did Lucilius, like his prede-

Di ct. Hist. Lucil. G.

† Schoell, *Hist. Abrégée de la Littérature Romaine*, Tom. I.

‡ Horat. *Sat. Lib. I. Sat. 4. v. 1, &c.*

cessors, mix iambic with trochaic verses. Twenty books of his satires, from the commencement, were in hexameter verse, and the rest, with exception of the thirtieth, in iambics or trochaics. His object, too, seems to have been bolder and more extensive than that of his precursors, and was not so much to excite laughter or ridicule, as to correct and chastise vice. Lucilius thus bestowed on satiric composition such additional grace and regularity, that he is declared by Horace to have been the first among the Romans who wrote satire in verse:—

“*Primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem.*”

But although Lucilius may have greatly improved this sort of writing, it does not follow that his satires are to be considered as altogether of a different species from those of Ennius—a light in which they have been regarded by Casaubon and Rupert; “for,” as Dryden has remarked, “it would thence follow, that the satires of Horace are wholly different from those of Lucilius, because Horace has no less surpassed Lucilius in the elegance of his writing, than Lucilius surpassed Ennius in the turn and ornament of his.”

The satires of Lucilius extended to not fewer than thirty books; but whether they were so divided by the poet himself, or by some grammarian who lived shortly after him, seems uncertain: He was a voluminous author, and has been satirized by Horace for his hurried copiousness and facility:—

“*Nam fuit hoc vitiosus : In horâ sæpe ducentos,
Ut magnum, versus dictabat, stans pede in uno :
Garrulus, atque piger scribendi ferre laborem ;
Scribendi recte : nam ut multum, nil moror*.*”

Of the thirty books there are only fragments extant; but these are so numerous, that though they do not capacitate us to catch the full spirit of the poet, we perceive something of his manner. His merits, too, have been so much canvassed by ancient writers, who judged of them while his works were yet entire, that their discussions in some measure enable us to appreciate his poetical claims. It would appear that he had great vivacity and humour, uncommon command of language, intimate knowledge of life and manners, and considerable acquaintance with the Grecian masters. Virtue appeared in his draughts in native dignity, and he exhibited his distinguished friends, Scipio and Lælius, in the most amiable light. At the same time it was impossible to portray

* *Satir. Lib. I. Sat. 4. v. 9.*

anything more powerful than the sketches of his vicious characters. His rogue, glutton, and courtesan, are drawn in strong, not to say coarse colours. He had, however, much of the old Roman humour, that celebrated but undefined *urbanitas*, which indeed he possessed in so eminent a degree, that Pliny says it began with Lucilius in composition*, while Cicero declares that he carried it to the highest perfection†, and that it almost expired with him‡. But the chief characteristic of Lucilius was his vehement and cutting satire. Macrobius calls him “Acer et violentus poeta§;” and the well-known lines of Juvenal, who relates how he made the guilty tremble by his pen, as much as if he had pursued them sword in hand, have fixed his character as a determined and inexorable persecutor of vice. His Latin is admitted on all hands to have been sufficiently pure||; but his versification was rugged and prosaic. Horace, while he allows that he was more polished than his predecessors, calls his muse “pedestris,” talks repeatedly of the looseness of his measure, “Incomposito pede currere versus,” and compares his whole poetry to a muddy and troubled stream :—

“Cum flueret lutulentus erat quod tollere velles.”

Quintilian does not entirely coincide with this opinion of Horace; for, while blaming those who considered him as the greatest of poets, which some persons still did in the age of Domitian, he says, “Ego quantum ab illis, tantum ab Horatio dissentio, qui Lucilium fluere lutulentum, et esse aliquid quod tollere possis, putat¶.” The author of the books *Rhetoricorum*, addressed to Herennius, and which were at one time attributed to Cicero, mentions, as a singular awkwardness in the construction of his lines, the disjunction of words, which, according to proper and natural arrangement, ought to have been placed together, as—

“Has res ad te scriptas Luci misimus Æli.”

Nay, what is still worse, it would appear from Ausonius, that

* *Prof. Hist. Nat.*

† *Epist. Familiares*, Lib. IX. 15.

‡ Lucilius vir apprime lingue Latine sciens. (Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XVIII. c. 5. Horat. *Sat.* Lib. I. 10.

§ “Fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
Comis et urbanus; fuerit limatior idem
Quam rudis, et Græcis intacti carminis auctor :—
Quamque poetarum seniorum turba.”

¶ *Instit. Orat.* Lib. X. c. 1.

† *De Finibus*, Lib. I.

§ *Satur.* Lib. III. c. 16.

he had sometimes barbarously separated the syllables of a word—

“ Villa *Lascari*—mox potteris *aco*.
Resciso discas componere nomine versum ;
Lucill vatis sic imitator eris*.”

As to the learning of Lucilius, the opinions of antiquity were different ; and even those of the same author appear somewhat contradictory on this point. Quintilian says, that there is “ Eruditio in eo mira.” Cicero, in his treatise *De Finibus*, calls his learning *mediocris* ; though, afterwards, in the person of Crassus, in his treatise *De Oratore*, he twice terms him *Doctus*†. Dacier suspects that Quintilian was led to consider Lucilius as learned, from the pedantic intermixture of Greek words in his compositions—a practice which seems to have excited the applause of his contemporaries, and also of his numerous admirers in the Augustan age, for which they have been severely ridiculed by Horace, who always warmly opposed himself to the excessive partiality entertained for Lucilius during that golden period of literature—

“ At magnum fecit, quod verbis Græca Latinis
Miscuit :—O seri studiorum !”

It is not unlikely that there may have been something of political spleen in the admiration expressed for Lucilius during the age of Augustus, and something of courtly complaisance in the attempts of Horace to counteract it. Augustus had extended the law of the 12 tables respecting libels ; and the people, who found themselves thus abridged of the liberty of satirizing the Great by name, might not improbably seek to avenge themselves by an overstrained attachment to the works of a poet, who, living as they would insinuate, in better times, practised, without fear, what he enjoyed without restraint‡.

Some motive of this sort doubtless weighed with the Romans in the age of Augustus, since much of the satire of Lucilius must have been unintelligible, or at least uninteresting to them. Great part of his compositions appears to have been rather a series of libels than legitimate satire, being occupied with virulent attacks on contemporary citizens of Rome—

* Auson. in *Epist.* 5. ad Theonem.

† Lib. I. c. 16, and Lib. II. Caius Lucilius homo doctus et perurbanus.

‡ Gifford's *Juvenal*, Preface, p. xlii.

————— “Secuit Lucilius urbem,
Te Mute, te Lupe, et genuinum fregit in illos*.”

Douza, who has collected and edited all that remains of the satires of Lucilius, mentions the names of not fewer than sixteen individuals, who are attacked by name in the course even of these fragments, among whom are Quintus Opimius, the conqueror of Liguria, Cæcilius Metellus, whose victories acquired him the surname of Macedonianus, and Cornelius Lupus, at that time *Princeps Senatus*. Lucilius was equally severe on contemporary and preceding authors; Ennius, Pacuvius, and Attius, having been alternately satirized by him†. In all this he indulged with impunity‡; but he did not escape so well from a player, whom he had ventured to censure, and who took his revenge by exposing Lucilius on the stage. The poet prosecuted the actor, and the cause was carried on with much warmth on both sides before the Prætor, who finally acquitted the player§.

The confidence of Lucilius in his powerful patrons, Scipio and Lælius, inspired this freedom; and it appears, in fact, to have so completely relieved him from all fear or restraint, that he boldly exclaims—

—————“Cujus non audeo dicere nomen?
Quid refert dictis ignoscat Mutius, an non?”

It is chiefly to such support that the unbridled license of the old Roman satirists may be ascribed—

—————“Unde illa priorum
Scribendi quodcunque animo flagrante liberet
Simplicitas||.”

The harsh and uncultivated spirit of the ancient Romans also naturally led to this species of severe and personal castigation; and it was not to be expected that in that age they should have drawn their pictures with the delicacy and generality which Horace has given to Offellus.

Lucilius, however, did not confine himself to invectives on vicious mortals. In the first book of his satires, he appears to have declared war on the false gods of Olympus, whose plurality he denied, and ridiculed the simplicity of the people, who bestowed on an infinity of gods the venerable name of father, which should be reserved for one. Near the com-

* Persius, Sat. I.

† Horat. Sat. Lib. II. 1.

‡ Juvenal, Sat. Lib. I. v. 158.

† Au. Gellius, XVII. 21.

§ Rhetoric. ad Herennium, Lib. II. c. 13.

mencement of this book he represents an assembly of the gods deliberating on human affairs :

“ *Consilium summis hominum de rebus habebant.*”

And, in particular, discussing what punishment ought to be inflicted on Rutilius Lupus, a considerable man in the Roman state, but noted for his wickedness and impiety, and so powerful that it is declared—

“ *Si conjuret, populus vix totus satis est.*”

Jupiter expresses his regret that he had not been present at a former council of the gods, called to deliberate on this topic—

“ *Vellem concilio vestram, quod dicitis, olim,
Cælicolæ ; vellem, inquam, adfuissem priore
Concilio.*”

Jupiter having concluded, the subject is taken up by another of the gods, who, as Lactantius informs us, was Neptune* ; but being puzzled with its intricacy, this divinity declares it could not be explained, were Carneades himself (the most clear and eloquent of philosophers) to be sent up to them from Orcus :

“ *Nec si Carneadem ipsum ad nos Orcus remittat.*”

The only result of the solemn deliberations of this assembly is a decree, that each god should receive from mortals the title of father—

“ *Ut nemo sit nostram, quin pater optumus divum ;
Ut Neptunus pater, Liber, Saturnu' pater, Mars,
Janu' Quirinu' pater, nomen dicatur ad unum.*”

The third book contains an account of the inconveniences and amusements of a journey, performed by Lucilius, along the rich coast of Campania, to Capua and Naples, and thence all the way to Rhegium and the Straits of Messina. He appears particularly to have described a combat of gladiators, and the manifold distresses he experienced from the badness of the roads—

“ *Præterea omne iter hoc est labosum atque lutosum.*”

* *Divin. Instit. Lib. V. c. 15.*

Horace, in the fifth satire of his first book, has, in imitation of Lucilius, comically described a journey from Rome to Brundisium, and like him has introduced a gladiatorial combat. The fourth satire of Lucilius stigmatizes the luxury and vices of the rich, and has been imitated by Persius in his third book. Aulus Gellius informs us, that in part of his fifth satire he exposed, with great wit and power of ridicule, those literary affectations of using such words in one sentence as terminate with a similar jingle, or consist of an equal number of syllables. He has shown how childish such affectations are, in that passage wherein he complains to a friend that he had neglected to visit him while sick. In the ninth satire he ridicules the blunders in orthography, committed by the transcribers of MSS., and gives rules for greater accuracy. Of the tenth book little remains; but it is said to have been the perusal of it which first inflamed Persius with the rage of writing satires. The eleventh seems to have consisted chiefly of personal invectives against Quintus Opimius, Lucius Cotta, and others of his contemporaries, whose vices, or rivalry with his patron Scipio, exposed them to his enmity and vengeance. The sixteenth was entitled *Collyra*, having been chiefly devoted to the celebration of the praises of Collyra, the poet's mistress*. Of many of the other books, as the 12th, 13th, 18th, 21st, and four following, so small fragments remain, that it is impossible to conjecture the subject; for although we may see the scope of insulated lines, their matter may have been some incidental illustration, and not the principal subject of the satire. Even in those books, of which there are a greater number of fragments extant, they are so disjointed that it is as difficult to put them legibly together as the scattered leaves of the Sibyl; and the labour of Douza, who has been the most successful in arranging the broken lines, so as to make a connected sense, is by many considered as but a conjectural and philological sport. Those few passages, however, which are in any degree entire, show great force of satire; as for example, the following account of the life led by the Romans:—

“ Nunc vero a mane ad noctem, festo atque profesto,
 Totus item pariterque dies, populusque patresque
 Jactare indu foro se omnes, decedere nusquam,
 Uni se atque eidem studio omnes dedere et arti;
 Verba dare ut caute possint, pugnare dolose,
 Blanditiâ certare, bonum simulare virum se,
 Insidias facere, ut si hostes sint omnibus omnes.”

* Porphyrius, *In Horat. Lib. I. Ode 20.*

The verses in which our poet bitterly ridicules the superstition of those who adored idols, and mistook them for true gods, are written in something of the same spirit—

“Terricolæ Lamias, Fauni quas, Pompiliique
Instituere Numæ, tremit has, hic omnia ponit:
Ut pueri infantes credunt signa omnia ahenâ
Vivere, et esse homines; et sic isti omnia ficta
Vera putant: credunt signis cor inesse ahenis—
Pergula pictorum, veri nihil, omnia ficta*.”

On this passage Lactantius remarks, that such superstitious fools are much more absurd than the children to whom the satirist compares them, as the latter only mistake statues for men, the former for gods. There are two lines in the 26th book, which every nation should remember in the hour of disaster—

“Ut populus Romanus victus vi, et superatus præliis
Sæpe est multis; bello vero nunquam, in quo sunt omnia†.”

But the most celebrated and longest passage we now have from Lucilius, is his definition of *Virtus*—

“Virtus, Albine, est, pretium persolvere verum,
Quæ in versamur, quæ vivimus rebus, potesse:
Virtus est homini, scire id quod quæque habeat res;
Virtus, scire homini rectum, utile, quid sit honestum,
Quæ bona, quæ mala item, quid inutile, turpe, inhonestum;
Virtus, quærendæ rei finem scire modumque:
Virtus, divitiis præcium persolvere posse:
Virtus, id dare quod re ipsa debetur honori;
Hostem esse atque inimicum hominum morumque malorum,
Contra, defensorem hominum morumque bonorum,
Magnificare hos, his bene velle, his vivere amicum:
Commoda præterea patris sibi prima putare,
Deinde parentum, tertia jam postremaque nostra‡.”

* “They dread hobgoblins hatch'd in folly's brain,
The idle phantoms of old Numa's reign.
As infant children sculptured forms believe
To be live men—so they themselves deceive—
To whom vain forms of superstition's dream
Of Life and truth the real figures seem.
Fools! they as well might think there stirs a heart,
Of vital power, in images of art.”

† “In various fights the Roman arms have failed;
Still in the war the Roman power prevailed.”

‡ “Virtue, Albinus, is—A constant will
The claims of duty ably to fulfil—
Virtue is knowledge of the just, sincere,
The good, the ill, the useless, base, unfair.
What we should wish to gain, for what to pray,
This virtue teaches, and each vow to pay;
Honour she gives to whom it may belong,
But hates the base, and flies from what is wrong—

Lactantius has cavilled at the different heads of this definition*, and perhaps some of them are more applicable to what we call wisdom, than to our term virtue, which, as is well known, does not precisely correspond to the Latin *Virtus*.

If we possessed a larger portion of the writings of Lucilius, I have no doubt it would be found that subsequent Latin poets, particularly the satirists, have not only copied various passages, but adopted the plan and subjects of many of his satires. It has already been mentioned, that Horace's journey to Brundisium is imitated from that of Lucilius to Capua. His severity recommended him to Persius and Juvenal, who both mention him with respect. Persius, indeed, professes to follow him, but Juvenal seems a closer imitator of his manner. The jingle in the two following lines, from an uncertain book of Lucilius—

“ Ut me scire volo mihi conscius sum, ne
Damnum faciam. Scire hoc se nescit, nisi alios id scire scierit.”

seems to have suggested Persius' line—

“ Scire tuum nihil, nisi te scire hoc sciat alter.”

The verses, “Cujus non audeo dicere nomen,” &c. quoted above, are copied by Juvenal in his first satire, but with evident allusion to the works of his predecessor. A line in the first book—

“ Quis leget hæc? min' tu istud ais? nemo, Hercule, nemo,”

has been imitated by Persius in the very commencement of his satires—

“ O curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!
Quis leget hæc? min' tu istud ais? nemo, Hercule, nemo.”

Virgil's phrase, so often quoted, “Non omnia possumus omnes,” is in the fifth book of Lucilius—

“ Major erat natu; non omnia possumus omnes.”

Were the whole works of Lucilius extant, many more such imitations might be discovered and pointed out. It is not on

A bold protector of the just and pure,
She feels for such a friendship fond and sure—
Her country's good commands her warmest zeal,
Kindred the next, and latest private weal.”

* *Div. Instit.* Lib. VI. c. 5 and 6.

this account, however, that their loss is chiefly to be deplored. Had they remained entire, they would have been highly serviceable to philological learning. They would have informed us also of many incidents of Roman history, and would have presented us with the most complete draught of ancient Roman manners, and genuine Roman originals, which were painted from life, and at length became the model of the inimitable satires of imperial Rome.

Besides satirizing the wicked, under which category he probably classed all his enemies, Lucilius also employed his pen in praise of the brave and virtuous. He wrote, as we learn from Horace, a panegyric on Scipio Africanus, but whether the elder or younger is not certain:—

“Attamen et justum poteras et scribere fortem
Scipladam, ut sapiens Lucilius*.”

Lucilius was also author of a comedy entitled *Nummularia*, of which only one line remains; but we are informed by Porphyry, the scholiast on Horace, that the plot turned on Pythias, a female slave, tricking her master, Simo, out of a sum of money, with which to portion his daughter.

Lucilius was followed in his satiric career by Sævius Nicanor, the grammarian, who was the freedman of one Marcius, as we learn from the only line of his poetry which is extant, and which has been preserved by Suetonius, or whoever was the author of the work *De Illustribus Grammaticis*:—

“Sævius Nicanor Marci libertus negabit.”

Publius Terentius Varro, surnamed Atacinus, from the place of his birth, also attempted the Lucilian satire, but with no great success as we learn from Horace:—

“Hoc erat, experto frustra Varrone Atacino.”

He was more fortunate, it is said, in his geographical poems, and in that *De Bello Sequanico*†.

We may range among the satires of this period, the *Dira* of the grammarian, Valerius Cato, who, being despoiled of his patrimony, especially his favourite villa at Tusculum, during the civil wars of Marius and Sylla, in order to make way for the soldiery, avenged himself, by writing poetical imprecations on his lost property. This poem is sometimes inscribed

* Horat. *Sat.* Lib. II. 1.

† Concerning Varro Atacinus, see Wernsdorff, *Poet. Lat. Minor.* Tom. VI. p. 1885, &c. Ed. Altenburg, 1780.

Diræ is *Battarum*, which is inaccurate, as it gives an idea that Battarus is the name of the person who had got possession of the villa, and on whom the imprecations were uttered. There is not, however, a word of execration against any of those who had obtained his lands, except in so far as he curses the lands themselves, praying that they may become barren—that they may be inundated with rain—blasted with pestiferous breezes, and, in short, laid waste by every species of agricultural calamity. Joseph Scaliger thinks that Battarus was a river, and Nic. Heinsius that it was a hill. It seems evident enough from the poem itself, that Battarus was some well-known satiric or invective bard, whom the author invokes, in order to excite himself to reiterated imprecations* :—

“ Rursus et hoc iterum repetamus, Battare, carmen.”

The concluding part of the *Diræ*, as edited by Wernsdorff†, is a lamentation for the loss of a mistress, called Lydia, of whom the unfortunate poet had likewise been deprived. This, however, has been regarded by others as a separate poem from the *Diræ*. Cato was also author of a poem called *Diana*, and a prose work entitled *Indignatio*, in which he related the history of his misfortunes. He lived to an advanced age, but was oppressed by extreme poverty, and afflicted with a painful disease, as seems to be implied in the lines of his friend Furius Bibaculus, preserved in the treatise *De Illustribus Grammaticis* :—

“ Quem tres calculi, et selibra farris,
Racemi duo, tegula sub una,
Ad summam prope nutriunt senectam‡.”

The stream of Roman poetry appears to have suffered a temporary stagnation during the period that elapsed from the destruction of Carthage, which fell in 607, till the death of Sylla, in 674. Lucilius, with whose writings we have been engaged, was the only poet who flourished in this long interval. The satirical compositions which he introduced were not very generally nor successfully imitated. The race of dramatists had become almost extinct, and even the fondness for regular comedy and tragedy had greatly diminished. This

* Wernsdorff, *Poet. Lat. Minores, Praef.* Tom. III. p. LIV. &c.

† *Ibid.* p. 1.

‡ “ On half a pound three grains of barley bread,
With two small bunches of dried grapes, he fed,
And met old age beneath a paltry shed.”

was a pause, (though for a shorter period,) like that which was made in modern Italy, from the death of Petrarch till the rise of its bright constellation of poets, at the end of the 15th century. But the taste for literature which had been excited, and the luminous events which occurred, prevented either nation from being again enveloped in darkness. The ancient Romans could not be electrified by the fall of Carthage as their descendants were by the capture of Constantinople. But even the total subjugation of Greece, and extended dominion in Asia, were slower, at least in their influence on the efforts of poetry, than might have been anticipated from what was experienced immediately after the conquest of Magna Græcia. Any retrograde movement, however, was prevented by the more close and frequent intercourse which was opened with Greece. There, Athens and Rhodes were the chief allies of the Roman republic. These states had renounced their freedom, for the security which flattery and subservience obtained for them; but while they ceased to be considerable in power, they still continued pre eminent in learning. A number of military officers and civil functionaries, whom their respective employments carried to Greece—a number of citizens, whom commercial speculations attracted to its towns, became acquainted with and cherished Grecian literature. That contempt which the ancient and severe republicans had affected for its charms, gave place to the warmest enthusiasm. The Roman youth were instructed by Greeks, or by Romans who had studied in Greece. A literary tour in that country was regarded as forming an essential part in the education of a young patrician. Rhodes, Mitylene, and Athens, were chiefly resorted to, as the purest fountains from which the inspiring draughts of literature could be imbibed. This constant intercourse led to a knowledge of the philosophy and finest classical productions of Greece. It was thus that Lucretius was enabled to embody in Roman verse the whole Epicurean system, and Catullus to imitate or translate the lighter amatory and epigrammatic compositions of the Greeks. Both these poets flourished during the period on which we are now entering, and which extended from the death of Sylla to the accession of Augustus. The former of them,

TITUS LUCRETIVS CARUS,

was the most remarkable of the Roman writers, as he united the precision of the philosopher to the fire and fancy of the poet; and, while he seems to have had no perfect model

among the Greeks, has left a production unrivalled, (perhaps not to be rivalled,) by any of the same kind in later ages.

Of the life of Lucretius very little is known: He lived at a period abounding with great political actors, and full of portentous events—a period when every bosom was agitated with terror or hope, and when it must have been the chief study of a prudent man, especially if a votary of philosophy and the Muses, to hide himself as much as possible amid the shades. The year of his birth is uncertain. According to the chronicle of Eusebius, he was born in 658, being thus nine years younger than Cicero, and two or three younger than Cæsar. To judge from his style, he might be supposed older than either; but this, as appears from the example of Sallust, is no certain test, as his archaisms may have arisen from the imitation of ancient writers; and we know that he was a fond admirer of Ennius.

A taste for Greek philosophy had been excited at Rome for a considerable time before this era, and Lucretius was sent, with other young Romans of rank, to study at Athens. The different schools of philosophy in that city seem, about this period, to have been frequented according as they received a temporary fashion from the comparative abilities of the professors who presided in them. Cicero, for example, who had attended the Epicurean school at Athens, and became himself an Academic, intrusted his son to the care of Cratippus, a peripatetic philosopher. After the death of its great founder, the school of Epicurus had for some time declined in Greece; but at the period when Lucretius was sent to Athens, it had again revived under the patronage of L. Memmius, whose son was a fellow-student of Lucretius; as were also Cicero, his brother Quintus, Cassius, and Pomponius Atticus. At the time when frequented by these illustrious youths, the Gardens of Epicurus were superintended by Zeno and Phædrus, both of whom, but particularly the latter, have been honoured with the panegyric of Cicero. “We formerly, when we were boys,” says he, in a letter to Caius Memmius, “knew him as a profound philosopher, and we still recollect him as a kind and worthy man, ever solicitous for our improvement*.”

One of the dearest, perhaps the dearest friend of Lucretius, was this Memmius, who had been his school-fellow, and whom, it is supposed, he accompanied to Bithynia, when appointed to the government of that province†. The poem *De Rerum Natura*, if not undertaken at the request of Memmius, was doubtless much encouraged by him; and Lucretius, in a dedication

* *Epist. Famul.* Lib. XIII.

† Good's *Lucretius*, *Pref.* p. XXXVI.

expressed in terms of manly and elegant courtesy, very different from the servile adulation of some of his great successors, tells him, that the much desired pleasure of his friendship, was what enabled him to endure any toil or vigils—

“ Sed tua me virtus tamen, et sperata voluptas
Suavis amicitie, quemvis efferre laborem
Suadet, et inducit nocteis vigilare serenas.”

The life of the poet was short, but happily was sufficiently prolonged to enable him to complete his poem, though, perhaps, not to give some portions of it their last polish. According to Eusebius, he died in the 44th year of his age, by his own hands, in a paroxysm of insanity, produced by a philtre, which Lucilia, his wife or mistress, had given him, with no design of depriving him of life or reason, but to renew or increase his passion. Others suppose that his mental alienation proceeded from melancholy, on account of the calamities of his country, and the exile of Memmius,—circumstances which were calculated deeply to affect his mind*. There seems no reason to doubt the melancholy fact, that he perished by his own hand.

The poem of Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, which he composed during the lucid intervals of his malady, is, as the name imports, philosophic and didactic, in the strictest acceptation of these terms. Poetry, I think, may chiefly be considered as occupied in three ways.—1. As describing the passions of men, with the circumstances which give birth to them.—2. As painting images or scenery.—3. As communicating truth. Of these classes of poetry, the most interesting is the first, in which we follow the hero placed at short intervals in different situations, calculated to excite various sympathies in our heart, while our imagination is at the same time amused or astonished by the singularity of the incidents which such situations produce. Those poems, therefore, are the most attractive, in which, as in the *Odyssey* and *Orlando*, knights or warriors plough unknown seas, and wander in strange lands—where, at every new horizon which opens, we look for countries inhabited by giants, or monsters, or wizards of supernatural powers—where, whether sailing on the deep, or anchoring on the shore, the hero dreads—

“ Lest Gorgons, rising from infernal lakes,
With horrors armed, and curls of hissing snakes,
Should fix him, stiffened at the monstrous sight,
A stony image in eternal night.”

* “ Nam neque nos agere hoc patrii tempore iniquo
Possumus equo animo,” &c.—Lib. I. v. 42.

These are the themes of surest and most powerful effect : It is by these that we are most truly moved ; and it is the choice of such subjects, if ably conducted, which chiefly stamps the poet—

“ *Humane Dominum mentis, cordisque Tyrannum.*”

So strongly, indeed, and so universally, has this been felt, that in the second species of poetry, the *Descriptive*, our sympathy must be occasionally awakened by the actions or passions of human beings ; and, to ensure success, the poet must describe the effects of the appearance of nature on our sensations. “ In the poem of the *Shipwreck*,” says Lord Byron, “ is it the storm or the ship which most interests ?—Both much, undoubtedly ; but without the vessel, what should we care for the tempest* ?” Virgil had early felt, that without Lycoris, the *gelidi fontes* and *mollia prata* would seem less refreshing and less smooth—he had found that the grass and the groves withered at the departure, but revived at the return of Phyllis. The most soothing and picturesque of the incidents of a woodland landscape,—the blue smoke curling upwards from a cottage concealed by the trees, derives half its softening charm, by reminding us—

“ That in the same did'wonne some living wight.”

Of all the three species above enumerated, *Philosophical* poetry, which occupies the mind with minute portions of external nature, is the least attractive. Mankind will always prefer books which move to those which instruct—*ennui* being more burdensome than ignorance. In philosophic poetry, our imagination cannot be gratified by the desert isles, the boundless floods, or entangled forests, with all the marvels they conceal, which rise in such rapid and rich succession in the fascinating narrative of the sea tost Ulysses† ; nor can we there have our curiosity roused, and our emotions excited, by such lines as those with which Ariosto awakens the attention of his readers—

“ Non furo Iti duo miglia, che sonare
Odon la selva, che gli cinge intorno,
Con tal rumor et strepito che pare
Che tremi la foresta d' ogni intorno.”

* *Letter on Bowles's Structures on Pope.*

† “ Έβδον γαρ, σκοπῆν ἰς παλαιόσσαυ ἀνεῖθαι,
Νησον, τὴν περὶ πόντος ἀπείροτος ἰστοφρασηται·
Ἄυτη δὲ χθαμαλὴ κῆται, καπνὸν δ' ἰνὶ μισσῷ
Ἐδρακὸν ὀφθαλμοῖσι δια δρυμα πικτα καὶ ὕλην.”

Οδυσ. Κ.

Besides, as has been observed by Montesquieu, reason is sufficiently chained, though we fetter her not with rhyme; and, on the other hand, poetry loses much of its freedom and lightness, if clogged with the bonds of reason. The great object of poetry (according to a trite remark,) is to afford pleasure; but philosophic poetry affords less pleasure than epic, descriptive, or dramatic. The versifier of philosophic subjects is in danger of producing a work neither interesting enough for the admirers of sentiment and imagination, nor sufficiently profound for philosophers. He will sometimes soar into regions where many of his readers are unable to follow him, and, at other times, he will lose the suffrage of a few, by interweaving fictions amid the severe and simple truth.

It is the business of the philosopher to analyze the objects of nature. He must pay least attention to those which chiefly affect the sense and imagination, while he minutely considers others, which, though less striking, are more useful for classification, and the chief purposes he has in view. The poet, on the other hand, avoiding dry and abstract definitions, rather combines than analyzes, and dwells more on the sensible phænomena of nature, than her mysterious and scientific workings. Thus, what the botanist considers is the number of *stamina*, and their situation in a flower, while the Muse describes only its colours, and the influence of its odours—

“ She loves the rose, by rivers loves to dream,
Nor heeds why blooms the rose, why flows the stream—
She loves its colours, though she may not know,
Why sun-born Iris paints the showery bow.”

But though philosophic poetry be, of all others, the most unfavourable for the exertion of poetical genius, its degree of beauty and interest will, in a great measure, depend on what parts of his subject the poet selects, and on the extent and number of digressions of which it admits. It is evident, that the philosophic poet should pass over as lightly as may be, all dry and recondite doctrines, and enlarge on the topics most susceptible of poetical ornament. “Le Tableau de la Nature Physique,” says Voltaire, “est lui seule d’une richesse, d’une variété, d’une étendue à occuper des siècles d’étude; mais tous les détails ne sont pas favorable à la poésie. On n’exige pas du poete les meditations du physicien et les calculs de l’astronomie : c’est à l’observateur à déterminer l’attraction et les mouvemens des corps celestes; c’est au poete à peindre leur balancement, leur harmonie, et leurs immuables révolutions. L’un distinguera les classes nombreuses d’êtres organisés qui peuplent les élémens divers; l’autre décrira

d'un trait hardi, lumineux et rapide cette echelle immense et continue, ou les limites des regnes se confondent. Que le confident de la nature developpe le prodige de la greffe des arbres—c'est assez pour Virgile de l'exprimer en deux beaux vers—

“ Exiit ad cœlum ramis felicibus arbos,
Miraturque novas frondes et non sua poma*.”

With regard, again, to digressions, Racine, (le Fils) in speaking of didactic poetry, says there are two sorts of episodes which may be introduced into it, and which he terms episodes of narrative and of style, (*De Recit et de Style*.) meaning by the former the recital of the adventures of individuals, and by the latter, general reflections suggested by the subject†. Without some embellishment of this description, most philosophic poems will correspond to Quintilian's account of the poem of Aratus on astronomy, “Nulla varietas, nullus affectus, nulla persona, nulla cujusquam, est oratio‡.” From what has already been said concerning the extreme interest excited by the introduction of sentient beings, with all their perils around, and all their passions within them, it follows, that where the subject admits, episodes of the first class will best serve the purposes of poetry; and if the poet choose such dry and abstruse topics as cosmogony, or the generation of the world, he ought to follow the example of Silenus§, by embellishing his subject with tales of Hylas, and Philomela, and Scylla, and the gardens of the Hesperides—the themes which induce us to listen to the lay of the poet—

“ Cogere donec oves stabulis, numerumque referre,
Jussit, et invito processit Vesper Olympo.”

It is, however, with the second class of episodes—with declamations against luxury and vice—reflections on the beauty of virtue—and the delights of rural retirement, that Lucretius hath chiefly gemmed his verses.

The poem of Lucretius contains a full exposition of the theological, physical, and moral system of Epicurus. It has been remarked by an able writer, “that all the religious systems of the ancient Pagan world were naturally perishable, from the quantity of false opinions, and vicious habits, and ceremonies that were attached to them.” He observes even

* *Encyclopédie Methodique.*

† *Reflexions sur la Poésie. Œuvres, Tom. V.*

‡ *Inst. Orat. Lib. X. c. 1.*

§ *Virgil. Eclog. 6.*

of the barbarous Anglo Saxons, that, "as the nation advanced in its active intellect, it began to be dissatisfied with its mythology. Many indications exist of this spreading alienation, which prepared the northern mind for the reception of the nobler truths of Christianity*." A secret incredulity of this sort seems to have been long nourished in Greece, and appears to have been imported into Rome with its philosophy and literature. The more pure and simple religion of early Rome was quickly corrupted, and the multitude of ideal and heterogeneous beings which superstition introduced into the Roman worship led to its total rejection†. This infidelity is very obvious in the writings of Ennius, who translated Euhemerus' work on the Deification of Human Spirits, while Plautus dramatized the vices of the father of the gods and tutelary deity of Rome. The doctrine of materialism was introduced at Rome during the age of Scipio and Lælius‡; and perhaps no stronger proof of its rapid progress and prevalence can be given, than that Cæsar, though a priest, and ultimately Pontifex Maximus, boldly proclaimed in the senate, that death is the end of all things, and that beyond it there is neither hope nor joy. This state of the public mind was calculated to give a fashion to the system of Epicurus§. According to this distinguished philosopher, the chief good of man is pleasure, of which the elements consist, in having a body free from pain, and a mind tranquil and exempt from perturbation. Of this tranquility there are, according to Epicurus, as expounded by Lucretius, two chief enemies, superstition, or slavish fear of the gods, and the dread of death||. In order to oppose these two foes to happiness, he endeavours, in the first place, to shew that the world was formed by a fortuitous concurrence

* Turner's *History of the Anglo Saxons*, Vol. III. pp. 311, 356, ed. London, 1820, where proofs are given.

† Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* Lib. II. 7.

‡ "Neque enim assentior iis," says Lælius, in Cicero's Dialogue, *De Amicitia*, "qui hæc nuper disserere cœperunt, cum corporibus simul animos interire, atque omnia morte deleri." (c. 4.)

§ "Pascarum religionum metus," says Heyne, talking of the time of the civil wars of Sylla, "jam adeo dispulsus erat, ut ne ipsa quidem Loyole cohors immissa, novos terrores offundere animis potuisset." (*Opuscula*, Tom. IV.)

|| Lib. II. v. 43, 44, 45—60 It is well known what a clamour was excited against Epicurus, founded on the ambiguity of the word which has been translated pleasure, but which would be more accurately interpreted happiness. A similar outcry was, in later ages, raised by one of his opponents against Malebranche, who, like Epicurus, lived not merely temperately, but abstemiously. "Regis," (says Fontenelle,) "attaqua Malebranche sur ce qu'il avoit avance que *le plaisir rend heureux*. Ainsi malgré sa vie plus que philosophique et tres chrétienne il se trouva le protecteur de plaisirs. A la vérité la question devint si subtile et si metaphysique. que leurs plus grands partisans auroient mieux aimés y renoncer pour toute leur vie. que d'être obligés à les soutenir comme lui." *Eloges, Malebranche*.

of atoms, and that the gods, who, according to the popular theology, were constantly interposing, take no concern whatever in human affairs. We do injustice to Epicurus when we estimate his tenets by the refined and exalted ideas of a philosophy purified by faith, without considering the superstitious and polluted notions prevalent in his time. "The idea of Epicurus," (as is observed by Dr Drake,) "that it is the nature of gods to enjoy an immortality in the bosom of perpetual peace, infinitely remote from all relation to this globe, free from care, from sorrow, and from pain, supremely happy in themselves, and neither rejoicing in the pleasures, nor concerned for the evils of humanity—though perfectly void of any rational foundation, yet possesses much moral charm when compared with the popular religions of Greece and Rome. The felicity of their deities consisted in the vilest debauchery; nor was there a crime, however deep its dye, that had not been committed and gloried in by some one of their numerous objects of worship*." Never, also, could the doctrine, that the gods take no concern in human affairs, appear more plausible than in the age of Lucretius, when the destiny of man seemed to be the sport of the caprice of such a monster as Sylla.

With respect to the other great leading tenet of Lucretius and his master—the mortality of the soul, still greater injustice is done to the philosopher and poet. It is affirmed, and justly, by a great Apostle, that life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel; and yet an author who lived before this dawn is reviled because he asserts, that the natural arguments for the immortality of the soul, afforded by the analogies of nature, or principle of moral retribution, are weak and inconclusive! In fact, however, it is not by the truth of the system or general philosophical views in a poem, (for which no one consults it,) that its value is to be estimated; since a poetical work may be highly moral on account of its details, even when its systematic scope is erroneous or apparently dangerous. Notwithstanding passages which seem to

* *Literary Hours*, Vol. I. p. 11. Dr Drake wrote two essays, to announce and recommend the translation of Lucretius by his friend Mr Good. The latter, in his notes, displays a prodigious extent of reading in almost all languages; but neither of them is very accurate. Dr Drake, for example, remarks, "that the *Alieuticon* and *Cynogeticon* of Oppian, though conveying precepts in verse, can with scarce any probability be considered as furnishing a model for the philosophic genius of the Roman." (P. 3.) Oppian wrote towards the close of the second century of the Christian æra. Mr Good also makes Suetonius appeal for some fact to Athenæus. (Vol. I. p. 25.)

echo Spinosism, and almost to justify crime*, the *Essay on Man* is rightly considered as the most moral production of our most moral poet. In like manner, where shall we find exhortations more eloquent than those of Lucretius, against ambition and cruelty, and luxury and lust,—against all the dishonest pleasures of the body, and all the turbulent passions of the mind.

In versifying the philosophical system of Epicurus, Lucretius appears to have taken Empedocles as his model. All the old Grecian bards of whom we have any account prior to Homer, as Orpheus, Linus, and Musæus, are said to have written poems on the drier and most difficult philosophical questions, particularly the generation of the world. The ancients evidently considered philosophical poetry as of the highest kind, and its themes are invariably placed in the mouths of their divinest songsters†. Whether Lucretius may have been indebted to any such ancient poems, still extant in his age, or to the subsequent productions of Palæphatus the Athenian, Antiochus, or Eratosthenes, who, as Suidas informs us, wrote poems on the structure of the world, it is impossible now to determine; but he seems to have considerably availed himself of the work of Empedocles. The poem of that sumptuous, accomplished, and arrogant philosopher, entitled *Περὶ φύσεως*, and inscribed to his pupil Pausanias, was chiefly illustrative of the Pythagorean philosophy, in which he had been initiated. Aristotle speaks on the subject of the merits of Empedocles in a manner which does not seem to be perfectly consistent‡; but we know that his poem was sufficiently celebrated to be publicly recited at the Olympic games, along with the works of Homer. Only a few fragments of his writings remain; from which, perhaps, it would be as unfair to judge him, as to estimate Lucretius by extracts from the physical portions of his poem. Those who have collected the detached fragments of his production§, think that it had been

* As a specimen of rank Spinosism, we find—

“All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body Nature is, and God the soul;”—

and for an apparent justification of crime,—

“If plagues and earthquakes break not Heaven’s design,
Why, then, a Borgia or a Catiline.

In spite of pride, in erring reason’s spite,
One truth is clear,—Whatever is, is right.”

† Apollonius Rhodius, Lib. I. Virgil, *Æneid*, Lib. I.

‡ ap. Eichstadt. Lucret. p. lxxxvii. cf. cii. ed. Lips. 1801.

§ The fragments of Empedocles have been chiefly preserved by Simplicius, in a Greek commentary on Aristotle, written about the middle of the sixth century. This commentary, with the verses of Empedocles which it comprehended, was trans-

divided into three books; the first treating of the elements and universe,—the second of animals and man,—the third of the soul, as also of the nature and worship of the gods. His philosophical system was different from that of Lucretius; but he had discussed almost all the subjects on which the Roman bard afterwards expatiated. In particular, Lucretius appears to have derived from his predecessor his notion of the original generation of man from the teeming earth,—the production, at the beginning of the world, of a variety of defective monsters, which were not allowed to multiply their kinds,—the distribution of animals according to the prevalence of one or other of the four elements over the rest in their composition,—the vicissitudes of matter between life and inanimate substance,—and the leading doctrine, “mortem nihil ad nos pertinere,” because absolute insensibility is the consequence of dissolution*.

If Lucretius has in any degree benefited by the works of Empedocles, he has in return been most lavish and eloquent in his commendations. One of the most delightful features in the character of the Latin poet is, the glow of admiration with which he writes of his illustrious predecessors. His eulogy of the Sicilian philosopher, which he has so happily combined with that of the country which gave him birth, affords a beautiful example of his manner of infusing into everything a poetic sweetness, *Musæo contingens cuncta lepore*,—

“Quorum Agrigantius eum primis Empedocles est:
 Insula quem Triquetris terrarum gessit in oris:
 Quam fruitans circum magnis anfractibus, æquor
 Ionium glaucis aspergit virus ab undis,
 Angustoque fretu rapidum, mare dividit undis
 Æolis terrarum oras a finibus ejus:
 Hic est vasta Charybdis, et hic Ætneæ minantur
 Murmura, flammæ rursus se conligere iras,
 Faucibus eruptos iterum ut vis evomat igneis,
 Ad cælumque ferat flammæ fulgura rursus.
 Quæ, quum magna modis multis miranda videtur
 Gentibus humanis regio, visundaque fertur,
 Rebus optima bonis, multa munita virum vi;

lated into Latin in the thirteenth century; and at the revival of literature, the original Simplicius having disappeared, it was as happened to various other works retranslated from the Latin into Greek, and in this form was printed by Aldus, in 1526. Sturz published the *Remains of Empedocles* from this Aldine edition, with a great literary apparatus, at Leipsic, in 1805, but with some remodelling, to force them into accurate verse, which they had lost in their successive transmutations. Subsequent, however, to this attempt, Professor Peyron discovered, in the Ambrosian library at Milan, the original Greek of Simplicius, with the genuine verses of Empedocles, which have been reprinted at Leipsic, in 1810, from the Italian edition.

* Sturz, *Empedoclis Fragmenta*. Cicero, *De Finibus*, Lib. II.

Nil tamen hoc habuisse viro præclarior in se,
 Nec sanctum magis, et mirum, carumque, videtur.
 Carmina quin etiam divini pectoris ejus
 Vociferantur, et exponunt præclara reperta;
 Ut vix humanâ videatur stirpe creatus."—Lib. I. 717.

It was formerly mentioned, that Ennius had translated into Latin verse the Greek poem of Epicharmus, which, from the fragments preserved, appears to have contained many speculations with regard to the productive elements of which the world is composed, as also concerning the preservative powers of nature. To the works of Ennius our poet seems to have been indebted, partly as a model for enriching the still scanty Latin language with new terms, and partly as a treasury or storehouse of words already provided. Him, too, he celebrates with the most ardent and unfeigned enthusiasm:—

"Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus ameno
 Detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
 Per genteis Italas hominum quæ clara clueret.
 Et si præterea tamen esse Acherusia templa
 Ennius æternis exponit versibus edens;
 Quo neque permanent animæ, neque corpora nostra;
 Sed quædam simulacra modis pallentia miris;
 Unde, sibi exortam, semper florentis Homeri
 Commemorat speciem, lacrimas et fundere salsas
 Cœpisse, et RERUM NATURAM expandere dictis."—I. 122.

These writers, Empedocles and Ennius, were probably Lucretius' chief guides; and though the most original of the Latin poets, many of his finest passages may be traced to the Greeks. The beautiful lamentation,—

"Nam jam non domas accipiet te læta, neque uxor
 Optuma, nec dulcis occurrent oscula nati
 Præripere, et tacitâ pectus dulcedine tangunt,"—

is said to be translated from a dirge chaunted at Athenian funerals; and the passage where he represents the feigned tortures of hell as but the workings of a guilty and unquiet spirit, is versified from an oration of Æschines against Timarchus.

In the first and second books, Lucretius chiefly expounds the cosmogony, or physical part of his system—a system which had been originally founded by Leucippus, a philosopher of the Eleatic sect, and, from his time, had been successively improved by Democritus and Epicurus. He establishes in these books his two great principles,—that nothing can be made from nothing, and that nothing can ever be annihilated or return to nothing; and, that there is in the universe a void or space, in which atoms interact. These

atoms he believes to be the original component parts of all matter, as well as of animal life; and the arrangement of such corpuscles occasions, according to him, the whole difference in substances.

It cannot be denied, that in these two books particularly, (but the observation is in some degree applicable to the whole poem,) there are many barren tracts—many physiological, meteorological, and geological details—which are at once too incorrect for the philosophical, and too dry and abstract for the poetical reader. It is wonderful, however, how Lucretius contrives, by the beauty of his images, to give a picturesque colouring and illustration to the most unpromising topics. Near the beginning of his poem, for example, in attempting to prove a very abstract proposition, he says,—

“Præterea, quæ vere rosam, frumenta calore,
Vitis auctumno fondi suadente videmus.”

Thus, by the introduction of the rose and vines, bestowing a fragrance and freshness, and covering, as it were, with verdure, the thorns and briars of abstract discussion. In like manner, when contending that nothing utterly perishes, but merely assumes another form, what a lovely rural landscape does he present to the imagination!

———“Pereunt imbres, ubi eos pater Æther
In gremium matris Terræ præcipitavit:
At nitidæ surgunt fruges, rarique virescunt
Arboribus; crescunt ipsæ, fœtuque gravantur.
Hinc aliter porro nostrum genus atque ferarum;
Hinc lætas urbeis puerum florere videmus,
Frondiferasque novis avibus canere undique sylvas;
Hinc, fessæ pecudes, pingues per pabula læta,
Corpora deponunt, et candens lacteus humor
Uberibus manat distentis; hinc nova proles
Artubus infirmis teneras lasciva per herbas
Ludit, lacte mero mentis percussa novellas.”

“Whoever,” says Warton, “imagines, with Tully, that Lucretius had not a great genius*, is desired to cast his eye on two pictures he has given us at the beginning of his poem,—the first, of Venus with her lover Mars, beautiful to the last

* “To those,” says Warton, (*Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope*, Vol. II. p. 402, note, “that know the number of thoughts that breathe, and words that burn, in this animated writer, it seems surprising, that Tully could speak of him in so cold and tasteless a manner.” The opinion of Cicero, however, has been rendered unfavourable, only by the interpolation of the word *non*, contrary to the authority of all MSS. His words, in a letter to his brother Quintus, are “Lucretii poemata ut scribis ita sunt; multis luminibus ingenii, multæ tamen artis. (Lib. II. Epist. 11.)—The poems of Lucretius are as you write; with many beams of genius, yet also with much art.”

degree, and more glowing than any picture painted by Titian; the second, of that terrible and gigantic figure the Demon of Superstition, worthy the energetic pencil of Michael Angelo. I am sure there is no piece by the hand of Guido, or the Carracci, that exceeds the following group of allegorical personages :

“ It Ver, et Venus; et, veris prænuncius, ante
Pennatus graditur Zephyrus, vestigia propter,
Flora quibus Mater, prespargens ante viam,
Cuncta coloribus egregiis et odoribus opplet.”

In spite, however, of the powers of Lucretius, it was impossible, from the very nature of his subject, but that some portions would prove altogether unsusceptible of poetical embellishment. Yet it may be doubted, whether these intractable passages, by the charm of contrast, do not add, like deserts to Oases in their bosom, an additional deliciousness in proportion to their own sterility. The lovely group above-mentioned by Warton, are clothed with additional beauty and enchantment, from starting, as it were, like Armida and her Nymphs, from the mossy rind of a rugged tree. The philosophical analysis, too, employed by Lucretius, impresses the mind with the conviction, that the poet is a profound thinker, and adds great force to his moral reflections. Above all, his fearlessness, if I may say so, produces this powerful effect. Dryden, in a well-known passage, where he has most happily characterized the general manner of Lucretius, observes, “ If I am not mistaken, the distinguishing character of Lucretius—I mean, of his soul and genius—is a certain kind of noble pride, and positive assertion of his own opinions. He is everywhere confident of his own reason, and assuming an absolute command, not only over his vulgar readers, but even his patron, Memmius. . . . This is that particular dictatorship which is exercised by Lucretius; who, though often in the wrong, yet seems to deal *bona fide* with his reader, and tells him nothing but what he thinks. . . . He seems to disdain all manner of replies; and is so confident of his cause, that he is beforehand with his antagonists, urging for them whatever he imagined they could say, and leaving them, as he supposes, without an objection for the future. All this, too, with so much scorn and indignation, as if he were assured of the triumph, and need only enter into the lists.” Hence while, in other writers, the eulogy of virtue seems in some sort to partake of the nature of a sermon—to be a conventional language, and words of course—we listen to Lucretius as to one who will fearlessly speak out; who had shut his ears to

the murmurs of Acheron: and who, if he eulogizes Virtue, extols her because her charms are real. How exquisite, for example, and, at the same time, how powerful and convincing, his delineation of the utter worthlessness of vanity and pomp, contrasted with the pure and perfect delights of simple nature!

“ Si non aurea sunt juvenum simulacra per ades,
Lampadas igniferas manibus retinentia dextris,
Lumina nocturnis epulis ut suppeditentur,
Nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet;
Nec citharæ reboant laqueata aurataque tecta;
Quum tamen inter se, prostrati in gramine molli,
Propter aquæ rivum, sub ramis arboris altæ,
Non magnis opibus jucunde corpora curant:
Præsertim, quum tempestas arridet, et anni
Tempora conparant viridantes floribus herbas:
Nec calidæ citius decedunt corpore febres,
Textilibus si in picturis, ostroque rubenti,
Jaceris, quam si plebeâ in veste cubandum est.—II. 24.

The word *Præsertim*, in this beautiful passage, affords an illustration of what has been remarked above, that the kind of philosophical analysis employed by Lucretius gives great force to his moral reflections. He seems, as it were, to be weighing his words; and, which is the only solid foundation of just confidence, to be cautious of asserting anything which experience would not fully confirm. One thing very remarkable in this great poet is, the admirable clearness and closeness of his reasoning. He repeatedly values himself not a little on the circumstance, that, with an intractable subject, and a language not yet accommodated to philosophical discussions, and scanty in terms of physical as well as metaphysical science, he was able to give so much clearness to his argument*; which object it is generally admitted he has accomplished, with little or no sacrifice of pure Latinity†. As a proof at once of the perspicuity and closeness of his reasoning, and the fertility of his mind in inventing arguments, there might be given his long discussion, in the third book, on the materiality of the human soul, and its incapability of surviving the ruin of the corporeal frame. Never were the arguments for materialism marshalled with such skill—never were the

* “ Nec me animi fallit, Græcorum obscura reperta,
Difficile illustrare Latinis versibus esse;
Multa novis verbis præsertim quum sit agendum,
Propter egestatem linguæ et rerum novitatem.

Deinde, quod obscurâ de re tam lucida pango
Carmina, Musæo contingens cuncta lepore.”

† “ In Lucretio maxime puritas Latinæ linguæ, copiamque apparet.”—P. Victorius
Var. Lect. Lib. XVII. c. 16. “ Lucretius Latinitatis author optimus.”—Casaubon
Not. in Joham. cap. 5.

diseases of the mind, and the decay of memory and understanding, so pathetically urged, so eloquently expressed. The following quotation contains a specimen of the lucid and logical reasoning of this philosophic poet; and the two first verses, perhaps, after all that has been written, comprehend the whole that is metaphysically or physiologically known upon the subject :

“ Præterea, gigni pariter cum corpore, et unâ
 Crescere sentimus, pariterque senescere, mentem.
 Nam, velut infirmo pueri, teneroque, vagantur
 Corpore, sic animi sequitur sententia tenuis ;
 Inde, ubi robustis adolevit viribus ætas,
 Consilium quoque majus, et auctior est animi vis.
 Post, ubi jam validis quassatum est viribus ævi
 Corpus, et obtusis ceciderunt viribus artus,
 Claudicat ingenium, delirat linguaque mensque ;
 Omnia deficiunt, atque uno tempore desunt :
 Ergo, dissolvi quoque convenit omnem animâ
 Naturam, ceu fumus in altis aëris auras ;
 Quandoquidem gigni pariter, pariterque videmus
 Crescere ; et, ut docui, simul, ævo fessa, fatisci.”—III. 446.

Lucretius having, by many arguments, endeavoured to establish the mortality of the soul, proceeds to exhort against a dread of death. The fear of that “last tremendous blow,” appears to have harassed, and sometimes overwhelmed, the minds of the Romans*. To them, life presented a scene of high duties and honourable labours; and they contemplated, in a long futurity, the distant completion of their serious and lofty aims. They were not yet habituated to regard life as a banquet or recreation, from which they were cheerfully to rise, in due time, sated with the feast prepared for them; nor had they been accustomed to associate death with those softening ideas of indolence and slumber, with which it was the design of Lucretius to connect it. He accordingly represents it as a privation of all sense,—as undisturbed by tumult or terror, by grief or pain,—as a tranquil sleep, and an everlasting repose. How sublime is the following passage, in which, to illustrate his argument, that the long night before the grave can be no more painful than the eternity before our birth, he introduces the war with Carthage; and what a picture does it convey of the energy and might of the combatants!

“ Nil igitur Mors est, ad nos neque pertinet hilum,
 Quandoquidem natura animi mortalis habetur.

* “ Who combats bravely, is not therefore brave;
 He dreads a death-bed like a common slave.”

Et, velut ante acto nil tempore sensimus ægri,
 Ad configundum venientibus undique Pœnis;
 Omnia quum, belli trepido concussa tumultu,
 Horrida contremuere sub altis ætheris auris:
 In dubioque fuere, utrorum ad regna cadundum
 Omnibus humanis esset, terraque, marique.
 Sic, ubi non erimus, quum corporis atque animæ
 Discidium fuerit, quibus e sumus uniter apti;
 Scilicet haud nobis quidquam, qui non erimus tum,
 Accidere omnino poterit, sensumque movere:
 Non si terra mari miscetur, et mare cœlo."—III. 842.

From this admirable passage till the close of the third book there is an union of philosophy, of majesty, and pathos, which hardly ever has been equalled. The incapacity of the highest power and wisdom, as exhibited in so many instances, to exempt from the common lot of man, the farewell which we must bid to the sweetest domestic enjoyments, and the magnificent *prosopopœia* of Nature to her children, rebuking their regrets, and the injustice of their complaints, are altogether exceedingly solemn, and affecting, and sublime.

The two leading tenets of Epicurus concerning the formation of the world and the mortality of the soul, are established by Lucretius in the first three books. A great proportion of the fourth book may be considered as episodal. Having explained the nature of primordial atoms, and of the soul, which is formed from the finest of them, he announces, that there are certain images (*rerum simulacra*,) or effluvia, which are constantly thrown off from the surface of whatever exists. On this hypothesis he accounts for all our external senses; and he applies it also to the theory of dreams, in which whatever images have amused the senses during day most readily recur. Mankind being prone to love, of all the phantoms which rush on our imagination during night, none return so frequently as the forms of the fair. This leads Lucretius to enlarge on the mischievous effects of illicit love; and nothing can be finer than the various moral considerations which he enforces, to warn us against the snares of guilty passion. It must, however, be confessed, that his description of what he seems to consider as the physical evils and imperfect fruition of sensual love, forms the most glowing picture ever presented of its delights. But he has atoned for his violation of decorum, by a few beautiful lines on connubial happiness at the conclusion of the book:

"Nam facit ipsa suis interdum femina factis,
 Morigerisque modis et mundo corpore culta,
 Ut facile assuescat secum vir degere vitam.
 Quod super est, consuetudo concinnat amorem;
 Nam, leviter quamvis, quod crebro tunditur lectu,

Vincitur id longo spatio tamen, atque labascit:
 Nonne vides, etiam guttas, in saxa cadenteis,
 Humoris longo in spacio pertundere saxa?"—IV. 1273.

The principal subject of the fifth book—a composition unrivalled in energy and richness of language, in full and genuine sublimity—is the origin and laws of the visible world, with those of its inhabitants. The poet presents us with a grand picture of Chaos, and the most magnificent account of the creation that ever flowed from human pen. In his representation of primeval life and manners, he exhibits the discomfort of this early stage of society by a single passage of most wild and powerful imagery,—in which he describes a savage, in the early ages of the world, when men were yet contending with beasts for possession of the earth, flying through the woods, with loud shrieks, in a stormy night, from the pursuit of some ravenous animal, which had invaded the cavern where he sought a temporary shelter and repose:

——— "Sæcia ferarum
 Infestam miseris faciebant sæpe quietem;
 Ejectæque domo, fugiebant saxa tecta
 Setigeri suis adventu, validique leonis;
 Atque intempesta cedebant nocte, paventes,
 Hospitibus sævis instrata cubilia fronde."—V. 980.

One is naturally led to compare the whole of Lucretius' description of primeval society, and the origin of man, with Ovid's *Four Ages of the World*, which commence his *Metamorphoses*, and which, philosophically considered, certainly exhibit the most wonderful of all metamorphoses. In his sketch of the Golden Age, he has selected the favourable circumstances alluded to by Lucretius—exemption from war and sea voyages, and spontaneous production of fruits by the earth. There is also a beautiful view of early life and manners in one of the elegies of Tibullus*; and Thomson, in his picture of what he calls the "prime of days," has combined the descriptions of Ovid and the elegiac bard. Most of the poets, however, who have painted the Golden Age, and Ovid in particular, have represented mankind as growing more vicious and unhappy with advance of time—Lucretius, more philosophically, as constantly improving. He has fixed on connubial love as the first great softener of the human breast; and neither Thomson nor Milton has described with more tenderness, truth, and purity, the joys of domestic union. He follows the progressive improvement of mankind occasioned by their

* Lib. I. El. iii. v. 37.

subjection to the bonds of civil society and government; and the book concludes with an account of the origin of the fine arts, particularly music, in the course of which many impressive descriptions occur, and many delicious scenes are unfolded :

“ At liquidas avium voces imitauer ore
 Ante fuit multo, quam lævia carmina cantu
 Concelebrare homines possent, aureisque juvare.
 Et zephyri, cava per calamorum, sibila primum
 Agrestes docuere cava inflare cicutas.
 Inde minutatim dulces didicere querelas
 Tibia quas fundit, digitis pulsata canentum,
 Avia per nemora ac sylvas saltusque reperta,
 Per loca pastorum deserta, atque otia dia.”—V. 1378.

In consequence of their ignorance and superstitions, the Roman people were rendered perpetual slaves of the most idle and unfounded terrors. In order to counteract these popular prejudices, and to heal the constant disquietudes that accompanied them, Lucretius proceeds, in the sixth book, to account for a variety of extraordinary phænomena both in the heavens and on the earth, which, at first view, seemed to deviate from the usual laws of nature :—

“ Sunt tempestates et fulmina clara canenda.”

Having discussed the various theories formed to account for electricity, water-spouts, hurricanes, the rainbow, and volcanoes, he lastly considers the origin of pestilential and endemic disorders. This introduces the celebrated account of the plague, which ravaged Athens during the Peloponnesian war, with which Lucretius concludes this book, and his magnificent poem. “ In this narrative,” says a late translator of Lucretius, “ the true genius of poetry is perhaps more powerfully and triumphantly exhibited than in any other poem that was ever written. Lucretius has ventured upon one of the most uncouth and repressing subjects to the muses that can possibly be brought forward—the history and symptoms of a disease, and this disease accompanied with circumstances naturally the most nauseating and indelicate. It was a subject altogether new to numerical composition; and he had to strive with all the pedantry of technical terms, and all the abstruseness of a science in which he does not appear to have been professionally initiated. He strove, however, and he conquered. In language the most captivating and nervous, and with ideas the most precise and appropriate, he has given us the entire history of this tremendous pestilence. There is not, perhaps,

a symptom omitted, yet there is not a verse with which the most scrupulous can be offended. The description of the symptoms, and also the various circumstances of horror and distress attending this dreadful scourge, have been derived from Thucydides, who furnished the facts with great accuracy, having been himself a spectator and a sufferer under this calamity. His narrative is esteemed an elaborate and complete performance; and to the faithful yet elegant detail of the Greek historian, the Roman bard has added all that was necessary to convert the description into poetry."

In the whole history of Roman taste and criticism, nothing appears to us so extraordinary as the slight mention that is made of Lucretius by succeeding Latin authors; and, when mentioned, the coldness with which he is spoken of by all Roman critics and poets, with the exception of Ovid. Perhaps the spirit of free-thinking which pervaded his writings, rendered it unsuitable or unsafe to extol even his poetical talents. There was a time, when, in this country, it was thought scarcely decorous or becoming to express high admiration of the genius of Rousseau or Voltaire.

The doctrines of Lucretius, particularly that which impugns the superintending care of Providence, were first formally opposed by the Stoic Manilius in his *Astronomic* poem. In modern times, his whole philosophical system has been refuted in the long and elaborate poem of the Cardinal Polignac, entitled, *Anti-Lucretius, sive de Deo et Natura*. This enormous work, though incomplete, consists of nine books, of about 1300 lines each, and the whole is addressed to Quintius, an atheist, who corresponds to the Lorenzo of the *Night Thoughts*. Descartes is the Epicurus of the poem, and the subject of many heavy panegyrics. In the philosophical part of his subject, the Cardinal has sometimes refuted, at too great length, propositions which are manifestly absurd—at others, he has impugned demonstrated truths—and the moral system of Lucretius he throughout has grossly misunderstood. But he has rendered ample justice to his poetical merit; and, in giving a compendium of the subject of his great antagonist's poem, he has caught some share of the poetical spirit with which his predecessor was inspired:—

"Hic agitare velit Cytheriam inglorius artem :
 Hic myrtum floresque legat, quos tinxit Adonis
 Sanguine, dilectus Veneri puer; aut Helliconem,
 Et colles Baccho, partim, Phœboque sacros
 Incolat. Hic, placidi latebris in mollibus antri,
 Silenum recubantem, et amico nectare venas
 Inflatum stupeat titubanti voce canentem ;
 Et juvenum cæcos ignes, et vulnera dicat,

Et vacuæ, pulsus terroribus, otia vîde,
 Fœcundosque greges, et amœni gaudia ruris :
 Hæc et plura canens, avidè bibat ore diserto
 Pegasus lauces ; et nomen grande Poetæ,
 Non Sapientis, amet. Lauro insignire poetam
 Quis dubitet ? Primus viridanteis ipse coronas
 Imponam capiti, et meritas pro carmine laudes
 Ante alios dicam."——*

Entertaining this just admiration of his opponent, the Cardinal has been studious, while refuting his principles, to imitate as closely as possible the poetic style of Lucretius; and, accordingly, we find many noble and beautiful passages interspersed amid the dry discussions of the *Anti-Lucretius*. In the first book, there is an elegant comparison, something like that by Wolsey in *Henry VIII.*, of a man who had wantoned in the sunshine of prosperity, and was unprepared for the storms of adversity, to the tender buds of the fruit-tree blighted by the north-wind. The whole poem, indeed, is full of many beautiful and appropriate similes. I have not room to transcribe them, but may refer the reader to those in the first book, of a sick man turning to every side for rest, to a traveller following an *ignis fatuus*; in the second, motes dancing in the sun-beam to the atoms of Epicurus floating in the immensity of space; in the third, the whole philosophy of Epicurus to the infinite variety of splendid but fallacious appearances produced by the shifting of scenery in our theatres, (line 90,) and the identity of matter amid the various shapes it assumes, to the transformations of *Proteus*. The fourth book commences with a beautiful image of a traveller on a steep, looking back on his journey; immediately followed by a fine picture of the unhallowed triumph of Epicurus, and Religion weeping during the festival of youths to his honour. In the same book, there is a noble description of the river Anio, (line 1459,) and a comparison of the rising of sap in trees during spring to a fountain playing and falling back on itself (780—845). We have in the fifth book a beautiful argument, that the soul is not to be thought material, because affected by the body, illustrated by musical instruments (745). In the sixth book there occurs a charming description of the sensitive plant; and, finally, of a bird singing to his mate, to solace her while brooding over her young:—

"Haud secus in sylvis, ac frondes inter opacas,
 Ingenitum carmen modulatur musicus ales," &c.

* Lib. V. 24.

Almost all modern didactic poems, whether treating of theology or physics, are composed in obvious imitation of the style and manner of Lucretius. The poem of Aonius Palearius, *De Animi Immortalitate*, though written in contradiction to the system of Lucretius, concerning the mortality of the soul, is almost a cento made up from lines or half lines of the Roman bard; and the same may be said of that extensive class of Latin poems, in which the French Jesuits of the seventeenth century have illustrated the various phænomena of nature*.

Others have attempted to explain the philosophy of Newton in Latin verse; but the Newtonian system is better calculated to be demonstrated than sung—

“Omnia res ipsa negat—contenta doceri.”

It is a philosophy founded on the most sublime calculations; and it is in other lines and numbers than those of poetry, that the book of nature must now be written. If we attempt to express arithmetical or algebraical figures in verse, circumlocution is always required; more frequently they cannot be expressed at all; and if they could, the lines would have no advantage over prose: nay, would have considerable disadvantage, from obscurity and prolixity. All this is fully confirmed by an examination of the writings of those who have attempted to embellish the sublime system of Newton with the charms of poetry. If we look, for example, into the poem of Boscovich on Eclipses, or still more, into the work of Benedict Stay, we shall see, notwithstanding the advantage they possessed of writing in a language so flexible as the Latin, and so capable of inversion,

“The shifts and turns,
The expedients and inventions multiform,
To which the mind resorts in search of terms.”

The latter of these writers employs 36 lines in expressing the law of Kepler, “that the squares of the periodical times of the revolutions of the planets, are as the cubes of their mean distances from the sun.” These lines, too, which are considered by Stay himself, and by Boscovich, his annotator, as the triumph of the philosophic muse, are so obscure as to need a long commentary. Indeed, the poems of both these eminent men consist of a string of enigmas, whereas the principal and almost

* C. Nocet, *Iris* and *Aurora Borealis*—Le Febre, *Terra Motus*—Souciot, *Cometæ*—Malapertus, *De Ventis*. These, and many other poems of a similar description, are published in the *Poemata Didascalica*. § Tom. Paris, 1818.

† Cowper.

only ornament of philosophy is perspicuity. After all, only what are called the round numbers can be expressed in verse, and this is necessarily done in a manner so obscure and perplexed as ever to need a prose explanation.

With Lucretius and his subject it was totally the reverse. From the incorrectness of his philosophical views, or rather those of his age, much of his labour has been employed, so to speak, in embodying straws in amber. Yet, with all its defects, this ancient philosophy, if it deserve the name, had the advantage, that its indefinite nature rendered it highly susceptible of an embellishment, which can never be bestowed on a more precise and accurate system. Hence, perhaps, it may be safely foretold, that the philosophical poem of Lucretius will remain unrivalled; and also, that the prediction of Ovid concerning it will be verified—

“Carmina sublimis, tunc sunt peritura Lucreti
Exitio terras cum dabit una dies.”

The refutations and imitations of Lucretius, contained in modern didactic poems, have led me away from what may be considered as my proper subject, and I therefore return to those poets who were coeval with that author, with whose works we have been so long occupied. Of these the most distinguished was

CAIUS VALERIUS CATULLUS,

who was nearly contemporary with Lucretius, having come into the world a few years after him, and having survived him but a short period.

In every part of our survey of Latin Literature, we have had occasion to remark the imitative spirit of Roman poetry, and the constant analogy and resemblance of all the productions of the Latian muse to some Greek original. None of his poetical predecessors was more versed in Greek literature than Catullus; and his extensive knowledge of its beauties procured for him the appellation of *Doctus**. He translated

* Barthii *Adversaria*, l. 38. c. 7. Funceius, *de Virili Ætate*, Ling. Lat. c. 3. Some critics, however, are of opinion that he was called *Doctus* from the correctness and purity of his Latin style. “*Latinae puritatis custos fuit religioissimus, unde et docti cognomen meruit.*” (Car. Stephen. Müller, a German writer, has a notable conjecture on this subject. He says, we will come nearest the truth, if we suppose that Ovid, while mentioning Catullus, applied to him the epithet *doctus* merely to fill up the measure of a line, and that his successors took up the appellation on trust. —(*Einleit. zur Kenntniss der Lateinisch. Schriftsteller*, T. II. p. 265. Mr Elton thinks that the epithet did not mean what we understand by learned, but

many of the shorter and more delicate pieces of the Greeks; an attempt which hitherto had been thought impossible, though the broad humour of their comedies, the vehement pathos of their tragedies, and the romantic interest of the *Odyssey*, had stood the transformation. His stay in Bithynia, though little advantageous to his fortune, rendered him better acquainted than he might otherwise have been with the productions of Greece, and he was therefore, in a great degree, indebted to this expedition (on which he always appears to have looked back with mortification and disappointment) for those felicitous turns of expression, that grace, simplicity, and purity, which are the characteristics of his poems, and of which hitherto Greece alone had afforded models. Indeed, in all his verses, whether elegiac or heroic, we perceive his imitation of the Greeks, and it must be admitted that he has drawn from them his choicest stores. His Hellenisms are frequent—his images, similes, metaphors, and addresses to himself, are all Greek; and even in the versification of his odes we see visible traces of their origin. Nevertheless, he was the founder of a new school of *Latin* poetry; and as he was the first who used such variety of measures, and perhaps himself invented some*, he was amply

rather knowing and accomplished—what the old English authors signify by cunning, as cunning in music and the mathematics.—*Specimens of the Classics*.) This conjecture seems to be in some measure confirmed by Horace's application of the term *doctus* to the actor Roscius:—

“Quæ gravis Æsopus, quæ doctus Roscius egit.”

The recent translator of Catullus conceives that the title of learned never belonged peculiarly to him, but was merely conferred on him in common with all poets, as it is now bestowed on all lawyers.

* Catullus, in his miscellaneous poems, has employed not fewer than thirteen different sorts of versification.

1. That which is most frequently used is the Phalæcian hendecasyllable, consisting of a spondee, dactyl, and three trochees.

“Cui do | no lepi | dum no | vum li | bellum.”

This sort of measure has been adopted by Catullus in thirty-nine poems.

2. Trimeter iambus, consisting of six feet, which are generally all iambses.

“Ait | fuis | se na | vium | celer | rimus;”

but a spondee sometimes forms the first, third, and fifth feet. Four poems are in this measure—the fourth, twentieth, twenty-ninth, and fifty-second.

3. Choliambus or scazon, which is the same with the last mentioned, except that the concluding foot of the line is always a spondee.

“Fulse | re quon | dam can | didi | tibi | soles.”

This metre is used seven times, being employed in the eighth, twenty-second, thirty-first, thirty-seventh, thirty-ninth, forty-fourth, and fifty-ninth poems.

4. Trochaic Stesichian, consisting of six feet—choreus or spondee, a dactyl, a cretic, a choreus or spondee, a dactyl, and lastly a choreus.

“Alter | parva fe | rens manu | semper | munera | larga.”

This measure appears only in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth poems.

entitled to call the poetical volume which he presented to Cornelius Nepos, *Lepidum Novum Libellum*. The beautiful expressions, too, and idioms of the Greek language, which he has so carefully selected, are woven with such art into the texture of his composition, and so aptly figure the impassioned ideas of his amorous muse, that they have all the fresh and untarnished hues of originality.

This elegant poet was born of respectable parents, in the territory of Verona, but whether at the town so called, or on the peninsula of Sirmio, which projects into the Lake Benacus, has been a subject of much controversy. The former opinion has been maintained by Maffei and Bayle*, and the latter by Gyraldus†, Schoell‡, Fuhrmann§, and most modern writers.

5. Iambic tetrameter catalectic, formed of seven feet and a cæsura at the close of the line. It occurs in the twenty-fifth poem.

6. Choriambus. This also is employed but once, being used only in the thirtieth. It consists of five feet,—a spondee, three choriambi, and a pyrrhichius.

“Ventos | irrita fer | et nebulas | aerias | siatis.”

7. A sort of Phæcian, consisting of two spondees and three chorei.

“Quas vul | tu vi | di ta | men se | reno.”

But it sometimes consists of a spondee and four chorei. This measure is adopted in some lines of the fifty-fifth ode

8. Glyconian, generally made up of a spondee and two dactyles.

“Jam ser | vire Tha | lassio.”

but sometimes of a trochæus and two dactyles.

“Cinge | tempora | floribus.”

This sort of verse occurs, but mixed with other measures in the thirty-fourth ode, addressed to Diana, and also in the sixtieth.

9. Phærcæian, consisting of three feet, a trochæe, spondee, or iambus in the first place, followed by a dactyl and spondee.

Exer | ceto ju | ventam
Frige | rans Aga | nippe
Hymen | O Hyme | næe.

This is used in the thirty-fourth and sixtieth, mingled with glyconian verse.

10. Galliambic. This is employed only in the poem of Atys, which indeed is the sole specimen of the galliambic measure, in the Latin language. It consists of six feet, which are used very loosely and indiscriminately. The first seems to be at pleasure, an anapæst, spondee, or tribrachys; second, an iambus, tribrachys, or dactyl; third, iambus or spondee; fourth, dactyl or spondee; fifth, a dactyl, or various other feet; sixth, generally an anapæst, but sometimes an iambus.

“Super alta vectus Atys celeri rate maria.”

The remaining three species of measure employed by Catullus, are the sapphic stanza, used in the seventh and fifty-first odes; the hexameter lines, which we have in the epithalamium of *Peleus* and *Thetis*; and the pentameter lines, used alternately with the hexameters, and thereby constituting elegiac verse, which is employed in all the elegies of Catullus. Of these three measures, the structure is well known.—(Vulpius, *Diatribe de Metris Catulli*.)

* *Verona Illustrata*, Parte II. c. 1. *Dict. Hist. Art. Catullus*.

† *De Poet. Dial. x.*

‡ Schoell, *Hist. Abreg. de la Litt. Rom.* T. I. p. 310.

§ *Handbuch der Classischen Litt.* T. I. p. 137.

The precise period, as well as place, of the birth of Catullus, is a topic of debate and uncertainty. According to the Eusebian Chronicle, he was born in 666, but, according to other authorities, in 667* or 668. In consequence of an invitation from Manlius Torquatus, one of the noblest patricians of the state, he proceeded in early youth to Rome, where he appears to have kept but indifferent company, at least in point of moral character. He impaired his fortune so much by extravagance, that he had no one, as he complains,

“Fractum qui veteris pedem grabati
In collo sibi collocare possit.”

This, however, must partly have been written in jest, as his finances were always sufficient to allow him to keep up a delicious villa, on the peninsula of Sirmio, and an expensive residence at Tibur. With a view of improving his pecuniary circumstances, he adopted the usual Roman mode of re-establishing a diminished fortune, and accompanied Caius Memmius, the celebrated patron of Lucretius, to Bithynia, when he was appointed Prætor of that province. His situation, however, was but little meliorated by this expedition, and, in the course of it, he lost a beloved brother, who was along with him, and whose death he has lamented in verses never surpassed in delicacy or pathos. He came back to Rome with a shattered constitution, and a lacerated heart. From the period of his return to Italy till his decease, his time appears to have been chiefly occupied with the prosecution of licentious amours, in the capital or among the solitudes of Sirmio. The Eusebian Chronicle places his death in 696, and some writers fix it in 705. It is evident, however, that he must have survived at least till 708, as Cicero, in his Letters, talks of his verses against Cæsar and Mamurra as newly written, and first seen by Cæsar in that year†. The distracted and unhappy state of his country, and his disgust at the treatment which he had received from Memmius, were perhaps sufficient excuse for shunning political employments‡; but when we consider his taste and genius, we cannot help regretting that he was merely an idler, and a debauchee. He loved Clodia, (supposed to have been the sister of the infamous Clodius,) a beautiful but shameless woman, whom he has

* *Saxii Onomasticon*, T. I. p. 148.

† *Ep. ad Att.* XIII. 52.

‡ O blame not the bard, if he fly to the bowers,
Where Pleasure lies carelessly smiling at Fame;
He was born for much more, and in happier hours
His soul might have glowed with a holier flame.

MOORE.

celebrated under the name of Lesbia*, as comparing her to the Lesbian Sappho, her prototype in total abandonment to guilty love. He also numbered among his mistresses, Hypsithilla and Aufilena, ladies of Verona. Among his friends, he ranked not only most men of pleasure and fashion in Rome, but many of her eminent literary and political characters, as Cornelius Nepos, Cicero, and Asinius Pollio. His enmities seem to have been as numerous as his loves or friendships, and competition in poetry, or rivalry in gallantry, appears always to have been a sufficient cause for his dislike; and where an antipathy was once conceived, he was unable to put any restraint on the expression of his hostile feelings. His poems are chiefly employed in the indulgence and commemoration of these various passions. They are now given to us without any order or attempt at arrangement: They were distributed, indeed, by Petrus Crinitus, into three classes, lyric, elegiac, and epigrammatic,—a division which has been adopted in a few of the earlier editions; but there is no such separation in the best MSS., nor is it probable that they were originally thus classed by the author, as he calls his book *Libellum Singularem*; and they cannot now be conveniently reduced under these heads, since several poems, as the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis, are written in hexameter measure. To others, which may be termed occasional poems expressing to his friends a simple idea, or relating the occurrences of the day, in iambic or phalagian verse, it would be difficult to assign any place in a systematic arrangement. Under what class, for instance, could we bring the poem giving a detail of his visit to the house of the courtesan, and the conversation which passed there concerning Bithynia? The order, therefore, in which the poems have been arbitrarily placed by the latest editors and commentators, however immethodical, is the only one which can be followed, in giving an account of the miscellaneous productions of Catullus.

1. Is a modest and not inelegant dedication, by the poet, of the whole volume, to Cornelius Nepos, whom he compliments on having written a general history, in three books, an undertaking which had not previously been attempted by any Roman—

———“ Ausus es unus Italorum
Omne ævum tribus explicare chartis.”

2. *Ad Passerem Lesbiæ*. This address of Catullus to the favourite sparrow of his mistress, Lesbia, is well known, and,

* Apuleius, in *Apologia*.

has been always celebrated as a model of grace and elegance. Politian, Turnebus, and others, have discovered in this little poem an allegorical signification, which idea has been founded on a line in an epigram of Martial, *Ad Romam et Dindymum*—

“*Quæ si tot fuerint, quot ille dixit,
Donabo tibi passerem Catullij.*”

That by the *passer Catulli*, however, Martial meant nothing more than an agreeable little epigram, in the style of Catullus, which he would address to Dindymus as his reward, is evident from another epigram, where it is obviously used in this sense—

“*Sic forsan tener ausus est Catullus
Magno mittere passerem Maronij.*”

and also from that in which he compares a favourite whelp of Publius to the sparrow of Lesbia. That a real and feathered sparrow was in the view of Catullus, is also evinced by the following ode, in which he laments the death of this favourite of his mistress. The erroneous notion taken up by Politian, has been happily enough ridiculed by Sannazzarius, in an epigram entitled *Ad Pulicianum*—

“*At nescio quis Pulicianus,*” &c.

and Muretus expresses his astonishment, that the most grave and learned Benedictus Lampridius should have made this happy interpretation by Politian the theme of his *constant* conversation, “*Hanc Politiani sententiam in omni sermone approbare solitum fuisse.*” Why Lesbia preferred a sparrow to other birds, I know not, unless it was for those qualities which induced the widow of the Emperor Sigismund to esteem it more than the turtle-dove, and which so much excited the envy of the learned Scioppius, at Ingolstadt.

3. *Luctus in morte Passeris.* A lamentation for the death of the same sparrow—

“*Qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum,
Illuc unde negant redire quemquam:
At vobis male sit, malæ tenebræ
Orei, quæ omnia bella devoratis.*”

The idea in this last line was probably taken from Bion's

* *Centur. Miscell.* I. c. 6.

† *Lib.* IV. Ep. 14.

‡ *Muret. in Catull. Comment.*

† *Lib.* XI. Ep. 7.

§ *Lib.* I. Ep. 110.

¶ *Bayle, Diet. Hist. Art. Barbers*

celebrated *Idyllum*—the lamentation of Venus for the death of Adonis, where there is a similar complaint of the unrelenting *Orcus*—

“Το δὲ πᾶν καλὸν ἵς σε καταίρη.”

This poem on the death of Lesbia's sparrow has suggested many similar productions. Ovid's elegy, *In Mortem Psittaci**, where he extols and laments the favourite parrot of his mistress, Corinna, is a production of the same description; but it has not so much delicacy, lightness, and felicity of expression. It differs from it too, by directing the attention chiefly to the parrot, whereas Catullus fixes it more on the lady, who had been deprived of her favourite. Statius also has a poem on the death of a parrot, entitled *Psittacus Melioris*†; and Lotichius, a celebrated Latin poet, who flourished in Germany about the middle of the 16th century, has, in his elegies, a similar production on the death of a dolphin‡. Naugerius, *In Obitum Borgatti Catuli*, nearly copies the poem of Catullus—

“Nunc raptus rapido maloque fato,
Ad manes abiit tenebricosas,” &c.

It has been imitated closely, and with application to a sparrow, by Corrozet, Durant, and Monnoye, French poets of the 16th century—by Gacon and Richer, in the beginning, and R. de Juvigny, in the end, of the 18th century. In all these imitations, the idea of a departure to regions of darkness, whence no one returns, is faithfully preserved. Most of them are written with much grace and elegance; and this, indeed, is a sort of poetry in which the French remarkably excel.

4. *Dedicatio Phaseli*. This is the consecration to Castor and Pollux, of the vessel which brought the poet safe from Bithynia to the shores of Italy. By a figure, daring even in verse, he represents the ship as extolling its high services, and claiming its well-earned dedication to Castor and Pollux, gods propitious to mariners. From this poem we may trace the progress of Catullus's voyage: It would appear that he had embarked from Pontus, and having coasted Thrace, sailed through the Archipelago, and then into the Adriatic, whence the vessel had been brought probably up the course of the Po, and one of its branches, to the vicinity of Sirmio.

There have been nearly as many parodies of this poem, as

* *Amer. Lib. II. eleg. 6.*

† *Lib. II. eleg. 7.*

‡ *Sylv. II. 3.*

imitations of that last mentioned. The collector of the *Catalecta Virgilia*, has attributed to Virgil a satire on Ventidius, (under the name of Sabinus,) who, from a muleteer, became consul, in the reign of Augustus, and which is parodied from Catullus—

“Sabinus ille quem videtis hospites,” &c.

Another parody is a Latin poem, entitled *Lycoris*, by Adrien Valois, published at the end of the *Valesiana*, where a courtesan, retired from the world, is introduced, boasting of the various intrigues of her former life. Nicol Heinelius published not less than fifty parodies of this poem, in a small book entitled “*Phaselus Catulli, et ad eundem Parodiarum a diversis auctoribus scriptarum decades quinque; ex Bibliotheca Nic. Heinellii, Jurisconsulti, Lips. 1642.*” Scaliger has also translated the *Phaselus* of Catullus into Greek iambics.

5. *Ad Lesbiam*—

“Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus,
Rumoresque senum severiorum
Omnes unius aestimemus assis.
Soles occidere et redire possunt:
Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis lux,
Nox est perpetua una dormienda.
Da mihi basia mille, deinde centum.”

This sentiment, representing either the pleasure of conviviality, or delights of love, (and much more so as when here united,) in contrast with the gloom of death, possesses something exquisitely tender and affecting. The picture of joy, with Death in the distance, inspires a feeling of pensive morality, adding a charm to the gayest scenes of life, as the transientness of the rose enhances our sense of its beauty and fragrance; and as the cloud, which throws a shade over the horizon, sometimes softens and mellows the prospect. This opposition of images succeeds even in painting; and the Arcadian landscape of Poussin, representing the rural festivity of swains, would lose much of its charm if it wanted the monument and inscription. An example had been set of such contrasted ideas in many epigrams of the Greeks, and also in the Odes of Anacreon, who constantly excites himself and fellow-passengers to unrestrained enjoyment at every stage, by recalling to remembrance the irresistible speed with which they are hurried to the conclusion of their journey—

“Ὁ δ' Ἔρως χιτῶνα δίδου
 Ἵππερ ἀρχαῖος παπυρῶν,
 Μόθου μοι δεικνόμενῳ.
 Τροχὸς ἀρμάτων γὰρ οἶα
 Βεβήκας τρέχει κλισίῳ.
 Ὅλγῃ δὲ κισσομοσθα
 Κεῖσε, ὅστων λυθάνται.”

Od. IV.

“The ungodly,” says the *Wisdom of Solomon*, “reason with themselves, but not aright. Our life is short—our time is a very shadow that passeth away—and, after our end, there is no returning. Come on, therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present, and let us speedily use the creatures like as in youth. Let us fill ourselves with costly wine and ointments, and let no flower of the spring pass by us; let us crown ourselves with rose-buds, before they be withered. Let none of us go without his part of our voluptuousness; let us leave tokens of our joyfulness in every place: For this is our portion, and our lot in this*.”

Among the Latin poets no specimen, perhaps, exists so perfect of this voluptuous yet pensive morality or immorality, as the *Vivamus, mea Lesbia*, of Catullus.† It is a theme, too, in which he has been frequently followed, if not imitated, by succeeding poets—by Horace in particular, who, amid all the delights of love and wine, seldom allows himself to forget the closing scene of existence. Many of them too, like Catullus, have employed the argument of the certainty and speediness of death for the promotion of love and pleasure—

“Interea, dum fata sinunt, jungamus amores;
 Jam veniet tenebris Mors adopena caput†.”

And, in like manner, Propertius—

“Dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore;
 Nox tibi longa venit nec reditura dies.”

There is not much of this in the amatory or convivial poetry of the moderns. Waller has some traces of it; but a modern prose writer hath most beautifully, and with greater boldness than any of his predecessors, represented not merely the thoughts, but the actual image of mortality and decay, as exciting to a more full and rapid grasp at tangible enjoyments. Anastasius, while journeying amid the tombs of Scutari, breathing the damp deadly effluvia, and treading on a swelling soil, ready to burst with its festering contents, asks him-

* C. II.

† Tibullus, Lib. I. El. 1.

self,—“Shall I, creature of clay like those here buried—I, who travel through life as I do on this road, with the remains of past generations strewed around me—I, who, whether my journey last a few hours, more or less, must still, like those here deposited, in a short time rejoin the silent tenants of a cluster of tombs—be stretched out by the side of some already sleeping corpse—and be left to rest, for the remainder of time, with all my hopes and fears, all my faculties and prospects, consigned to a cold couch of clammy earth—Shall I leave the rose to blush along my path unheeded—the purple grape to wither unculled over my head ***? Far from my thoughts be such folly! Whatever tempts, let me take—whatever bears the name of enjoyment henceforth, let me, while I can, make my own*.”—The French writers, like Chaulieu and Gresset, who paint themselves as finding in philosophy and the Muses sufficient compensation for the dissatisfaction attending worldly pleasures, frequently urge the shortness of life, not as an argument for indulging in wantonness or wine, but for enjoying, to the utmost, the innocent delights of rural tranquillity—

“ Fontenay, lieu délicieux,
Ou je vis d'abord la lumière,
Bientôt au bout de ma carrière
Chez toi je joindrai mes ayeux.

“ Muses, qui dans ce lieu champêtre
Avec soin me fites nourrir—
Beaux arbres qui m'avez vu naître
Bientôt vous me verrez mourir:

“ Cependant du frais de votre ombre
Il faut sagement profiter,
Sans regret prêt a vous quitter
Pour ce Manoir terrible et sombre.”—*Chaulieu.*

The united sentiment of enjoying the delights of love, and beauties of nature, as suggested by the shortness of the period allotted for their possession, has been happily expressed by Mallet, in his celebrated song to the Scotch tune, *The Birks of Invermay*:

“ Let us, Amanda, timely wise,
Like *them* improve the hour that flies;
For soon the winter of the year,
And Age, life's winter, will appear.
At this thy living bloom must fade,
As that will strip the verdant shade:

* Vol. III. p. 14, 2d. ed.

Our taste of pleasure then is o'er—
The feathered songsters love no more :
And when they droop, and we decay,
Adieu, the shades of Invermay !”

It will not fail, however, to be remarked, that in the ode of Catullus, which has recalled these verses to our recollection, there is a double contrast, from comparing the long, dark, and everlasting sleep—the *μακρον, ἀνεσθητονα, νηγετον ὕπνον*, with the quick and constant succession of suns, by which we are daily enlightened—

“ Soles occidere et redire possunt :
Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis lux,
Nox est perpetua una dormienda.”

Poets, in all ages, have been fond of contrasting the destined course of human life with the reparation of the sun and moon, and with the revival of nature, produced by the succession of seasons. The image drawn from the sun, and here employed by Catullus, is one of the most natural and frequent. It has been beautifully attempted by several modern Latin poets. Thus by Lotichius—

“ Ergo ubi permensus cælum sol occidit, idem
Purpureo vestit lumine rursus humum :
Nos ubi decidimus, defuncti munere vitæ,
Urget perpetua lumina nocte sopor.”

And still more successfully by Jortin—

“ Hei mihi lege ratâ sol occidit atque resurgit.

Nos domini rerum—nos magna et pulchra minati,
Cum breve ver vitæ robustaque transiit ætas,
Deficimus ; neque nos ordo revolublis auras
Reddit in ætherias, tumuli nec claustra resolvit.”

Other modern Latin poets have chosen this ode as a sort of theme or text, which they have dilated into long poems. Of these, perhaps the most agreeable is a youthful production of Muretus—

“ Ludamus, mea Margari, et jocemur,” &c.

The most ancient French imitator is the old poet Baif, in a sort of Madrigal. He was followed by Ronsard, Bellay, Pellisson, La Monnoye, and Dorat. The best imitation, I think, is that by Simon, which I shall give at full length, once for all, as a fair specimen of the French mode of imitating the lighter poems of Catullus—

VOL. I.—2 I.

“ Vivens, O ma Julie!
 Jurons d'aimer toujours :
 Le printemps de la vie
 Est fait pour les amours.
 Si l'austère vieillesse
 Condamne nos desirs,
 Laissons lui sa sagesse,
 Et gardons nos plaisirs.

“ L'Astre dont la lumière
 Nous dispense les jours,
 Au bout de sa carrière
 Recommence son cours.
 Quand le temps, dans sa rage,
 A flétri les appas,
 Les roses du bel âge
 Ne refleurissent pas.

“ D'une pudeur farouche
 Fuis les déguisemens ;
 Viens donner à ma bouche
 Cent baisers ravissans—
 Mille autres—Pose encore
 Sur mes lèvres de feu
 Tes lèvres que j'adore—
 Mourons à ce doux jeu.

“ De nos baisers sans nombre
 Le feu rapide et doux
 S'échappe comme l'ombre,
 Et passe loin de nous :
 Mais le sentiment tendre
 D'un heureux souvenir,
 Dans mon cœur vient reprendre,
 La place du plaisir.”

7. *Ad Lesbiam.* His mistress had asked Catullus how many kisses would satisfy him, and he answers that they must be as numerous as the sands of the sea—

“ Aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox,
 Furtivos hominum vident amores.”

These two lines seem to have been in the view of Ariosto, in the 14th canto of the *Orlando*—

“ E per quanti occhi il ciel le furtive opre
 Degli amatori, a mezza notte, scopre.”

Martial likewise imitates, and refers to this and to the 5th poem of Catullus, in the 34th epigram of the 6th book—

“ Basia da nobis, Diadumene, pressa : quot ? inquis—
 Oceani fluctus me numerare jubes ;
 Et maris Ægæi sparsas per littora conchas,
 Et quæ Cæcropio monte vagantur apes.
 Nolo quot arguto dedit exorata Catullo
 Lesbia : pauca cupit, qui numerare potest.”

The verses of Catullus have been also imitated in Latin by Sannazarius, by Joannes Secundus, of course, in his *Basia*, and by almost all the ancient amatory poets of France.

8. *Ad Seipsum*. This is quite in the Greek taste: About a third of the Odes of Anacreon are addressed Εἰς σεαυτὸν. Catullus here playfully, yet feelingly, remonstrates with himself, for still pursuing his inconstant Lesbia, by whom he had been forsaken.

9. *Ad Veranium*. This is one of the most pleasing of the shorter poems. Catullus congratulates his friend Veranium on his return from Spain, and expresses his joy in terms more touching and natural than anything in the 12th Satire of Juvenal, or the 36th Ode of the 1st Book of Horace, which were both written on similar occasions.

10. *De Varri Scorto*. Catullus gives an account of a visit which he paid at the house of a courtesan, along with his friend Varrus, and relates, in a lively manner, the conversation which he had with the lady on the subject of the acquisitions made by him in Bithynia, from which he had lately returned. There seems here a hit to have been intended against Cæsar, of whose conduct in that country some scandalous anecdotes were afloat. The epigram, however, appears chiefly directed against those cross-examiners, who are not to be put off with indefinite answers, and in whose company one must be constantly on guard. In fact, the lady detects Catullus making an unfounded boast of his Bithynian acquisitions, and he accordingly exclaims,

“ Sed tu insulsa male, et molesta vivis,
Per quam non licet esse negligentem.”

11. *Ad Furium et Aurelium*. This ode commences in a higher tone of poetry than any of the preceding. Catullus addresses his friends, Furius and Aurelius, who, he is confident, would be ready to accompany him to the most remote and barbarous quarters of the globe—

“ Furi et Aureli, comites Catulli,
Sive in extremos penetrabit Indos,
Littus ut longe resonante Eoâ
Tunditur undâ.”

This verse was no doubt in the view of Horace, in the sixth Ode of the second Book, where he addresses his friend Septimius, and adopts the elegant and melodious Sapphic stanza employed by Catullus—

“ Septimi, Gades aditure mecum, et
 Cantabrum indoctum juga ferre nostra, et
 Barbaras Syrtes, ubi Maura semper
 Æstuat unda.”

Horace, however, has closed his ode with a few lines, perhaps the most beautiful and tender in the whole circle of Latin poetry, and which strike us the more, as pathos is not that poet's peculiar excellence—

“ Ille te mecum locus et beati,” &c.

Catullus, on the other hand, after preserving an elevated strain of poetry for four stanzas, concludes with requesting his friends to deliver a ridiculous message to his mistress, who

“ Nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem,
 Qui illius culpa cecidit; velut prati
 Ultimi flos, prætereunte postquam
 Tactus aratro est.”

This last most beautiful image has been imitated by various poets. Virgil has not disdained to transfer it to his Æneid—

“ Purpureus veluti cum flos succisus aratro
 Languescit moriens*.”

Fracastoro has employed the same metaphor with hardly less elegance in his consolatory epistle to Turri, on the loss of his child—

———— “ Jacet ille velut succisus aratro
 Flos tener, et frustra non audit tanta gementem;”

and Ariosto has introduced it in the eighteenth canto of the Orlando—

“ Come purpureo fior languendo muore
 Che 'l vomere al passar tagliato lassa.”

13. *Ad Fabullum*. Our poet invites Fabullus to supper, on condition that he will bring his provisions along with him—

———— “ Nam tui Catulli
 Plenus sacculus est aranearum.”

* Lib. IX. v. 435.

On his own part, he promises only a hearty welcome, and the most exquisite ointments. In the poetry of social kindness and friendship, Catullus is eminently happy; and we regret to find that this tone, which has so much prevailed in the preceding odes, subsequently changes into bitter and gross invective.

The thirteen following poems are chiefly occupied with vehement and indelicate abuse of those friends of the poet, Furius and Aurelius, who were men of some quality and distinction, but had wasted their fortunes by extravagance and debauchery. In a former ode, we have seen him confident that they would readily accompany him to the wildest or remotest quarters of the globe: But he had subsequently quarrelled with them, partly because they had stigmatized his verses as soft and effeminate; and, in revenge for this affront, he upbraids them with their poverty and vices. Of these thirteen poems, the last, addressed to Furius, is a striking picture of the sheltered situation of a villa. In the common editions, the description refers to the villa of Catullus himself, but Muretus thinks, it was rather meant to be applied to that of Furius:

“Furi, villula vostra non ad Austri,” &c.

27. *Ad Pocillatorem puerum.* This address, in which Catullus calls on his cupbearer to pour out for him copious and unmixed libations of Falernian, is quite in the spirit of Anacreon: it breathes all his easy and joyous gaiety, and the enthusiasm inspired by the grape.

28. *Ad Veranium et Fabullum—*

“Pisonis comites cohors inanis,” &c.

Catullus condoles with these friends on account of the little advantage they had reaped from accompanying the Prætor Piso to his province—comparing their situation to the similar circumstances in which he had himself been placed with Memmius in Bithynia.

There is a parody on this piece of Catullus by the celebrated Huet, Bishop of Avranches—

“Bocharti comites cohors inanis,” &c. •

In his youth, Huet had accompanied Bochart to Sweden, on the invitation of Queen Christina, and appears to have been as little gratified by his northern expedition, as Catullus by his voyage to Bithynia.

29. *In Cæsarem.* Julius Cæsar, while yet but the general of the Roman republic, had been accustomed, during his stay in the north of Italy, to lodge at the house of the father of Catullus in Verona. Notwithstanding the intimacy which in consequence subsisted between Cæsar and his father, Catullus lampooned the former on more than one occasion. In the present epigram, he pours on him an unmeasured abuse, chiefly for having bestowed the plunder of Britain and Gaul on his favourite, the infamous Mamurra, who appropriated the public money, and the spoils of whole nations, to support his boundless extravagance. There is a story which has become very common on the authority of Suetonius, that Cæsar invited Catullus to supper on the day on which he first read some satirical verses of the poet against himself and Mamurra, and that he continued to lodge with his father as before*. It appears that on one occasion, when some scurrilous verses by Catullus were shown to him, he supped with Cicero at his villa near Puteoli. On the 19th, he staid at the house of Philippus till one in the afternoon, but saw nobody; he then walked on the shore across to Cicero's villa—bathed after two o'clock, and heard the verses on Mamurra read, at which he never changed countenance†. Now, this was in the year 708, after the civil war had been ended, by the defeat and death of the younger Pompey in Spain. It is most likely that this 29th epigram was the one which was read to him at Cicero's villa; and the 57th epigram, also directed against Cæsar and Mamurra, is probably that concerning which the above anecdote is related by Suetonius. Though it stands last of the two in the works of Catullus, it was evidently written before the 29th. He talks in it of Cæsar and Mamurra, as of persons who were still on a footing of equality—in the other, he speaks of their dividing the spoils of the provinces, Gaul, Britain, Pontus, and Spain. The coolness and indifference which Cæsar showed with regard to the first epigram written against him, and the forgiveness he extended to its author, encouraged Cicero, who was a gossip and newsmonger, or those who attended him, to read to him another of the same description while bathing at the Puteolan Villa.

31. *Ad Sirmionem Peninsulam.* This heart-soothing invocation, which is perhaps the most pleasing of all the productions of Catullus, is addressed to the peninsula of Sirmio, in

* Valerium Catullum, a quo sibi versiculis de Mamurrâ perpetua stigmata imposita non dissimulaverat, satisfaciendam, eadem die adhibuit cœnæ, hospitioque patris ejus, sicut consueverat, uti perseveravit.—Sueton. *In Cæsar.* c. 73.

† Cicero, *Epist. ad Attic.* XIII. 52. Inde ambulavit in littore. Post horam viii. in balneum; tum audivit de Mamurrâ; vultum non mutavit; unctus est; accubuit.

the territory of Verona, on which the principal and favourite villa of our poet was situated. Sirmio was a peninsular promontory, of about two miles circumference, projecting into the Benacus, now the Lago di Garda—a lake celebrated by Virgil as one of the noblest ornaments of Italy, and the praises of which have been loudly re-echoed by the modern Latin poets of that country, particularly by Fracastoro, who dwelt in its vicinity, and who, while lamenting the untimely death of his poetical friend, Marc Antonio del Torri, beautifully represents the shade of Catullus, as still nightly wandering amidst these favourite scenes—

“Te ripæ flere Athesis; te voce vocare
Auditæ per noctem umbræ, manesque Catulli,
Et patrios mulcere novâ dulcedine lucos*.”

Vestiges of the magnificent house supposed to have belonged to Catullus, are yet shown on this peninsula. Its ruins, which lie near the borders of the lake, still give the idea of an extensive palace. There are even now, as we are informed by travellers†, sufficient remains of mason-work, pilasters, vaults, walls, and subterraneous passages, to assist the imagination in representing to itself what the building was when entire, at least in point of extent and situation. The length of the whole construction, from north to south, is about 700 feet, and the breadth upwards of 300. The ground on which it stood does not appear to have been level, and the fall to the west was supplied by rows of vaults, placed on each other, the top of which formed a terrace. On the east, the structure had been raised on those steep and solid rocks which lined the shore; on the front, which was to the north, and commanded a magnificent view of the lake, an immense portico seems to have projected from the building: under the ruins, there are a number of subterraneous vaults, one of which ran through the middle of the edifice, and along its whole length‡.

The peninsula on which the villa of Catullus was situated, is not surpassed in beauty or fertility by any spot in Italy. “Sirmione,” says Eustace§, “appears as an island, so low and so narrow is the bank that unites it to the mainland. The promontory spreads behind the town, and rises into a hill entirely covered with olives. Catullus,” he continues, “undoubtedly inhabited this spot, and certainly he could not have chosen a more delightful retreat. In the centre of a magni-

* *Symphis*, Lib. I. † Colt Hoare's Continuat. of Eustace's Travels.

‡ Henin, *Journal du Siège de Peschiera*.

§ *Classical Tour*, Vol. I. c. 5. 8vo edition.

ficent lake, surrounded with scenery of the greatest variety and majesty, secluded from the world, yet beholding from his garden the villas of his Veronese friends, he might have enjoyed alternately the pleasures of retirement and society; and daily, without the sacrifice of his connexions, which Horace seemed inclined to make in a moment of despondency, he might have contemplated the grandeur and agitation of the ocean, without its terrors and immensity. Besides, the soil is fertile, and its surface varied; sometimes shelving in a gentle declivity, at other times breaking in craggy magnificence, and thus furnishing every requisite for delightful walks and luxurious baths; while the views vary at every step, presenting rich coasts or barren mountains, sometimes confined to the cultivated scenes of the neighbouring shore, and at other times bewildered and lost in the windings of the lake, or in the recesses of the Alps. In short, more convenience and more beauty are seldom united*." No wonder, then, that Catullus, jaded and disappointed by his expedition to Bithynia, should, on his return, have exclaimed with transport, that the spot was not to be matched in the wide range of the world of waters; or that he should have unloaded his mind of its cares, in language so perfect, yet simple, that it could only have flowed from a real and exquisite feeling. No poem in the Latin language expresses tender feelings more tenderly, and home feelings more naturally, than the Invocation to Sirmio, in which the verses soothe and refresh us somewhat

* In the year 1797, Buonaparte, who was at that time commander-in-chief of the army of Italy, visited in person this spot, which, during the life of Catullus, had been his retreat and sanctuary, even from the despotism of Cæsar. While travelling from Milan to Perseriano, to conclude the treaty of Campo Formio, he turned off from the road, between Brescia and Peschiera, to visit the peninsula of Sirmio. About two years afterwards, the French officers employed at the siege of Peschiera, which is eight miles distant from Sirmio, gave a brilliant *f-te champ tre* in this classic retirement, in honour of Catullus, as soon as their military operations against Peschiera had been brought to a successful conclusion. General St Michel, who had conducted them, invited all the Polish officers who were present at the siege, and some of the inhabitants of Sirmio—particularly the dramatic poet, Anelli. During the repast, this bard, and the French generals, Lacombe and St Michel, sung and recited in turn verses of their own composition; and which flowed spontaneously, it is said by one who was present, from the inspiration of scenes so rich in poetic remembrances. The toasts were—*The Memory of Catullus*, the most elegant of Latin poets—*Buonaparte*, who honours great men amid the tumult of arms—who celebrated Virgil at Mantua, and paid homage to Catullus, by visiting the peninsula of Sirmio—*General Miollis*, the protector of sciences and fine arts in Italy. The festivities were here unpleasantly interrupted by the arrival of all the uninvited inhabitants of Sirmio, who came to complain of having been pillaged by the detachment of French troops which had replaced the Austrian garrison. General Chasseloup received them with his accustomed urbanity; and, from respect to Catullus, the troops were marched from that canton to another district, which had not yet been plundered, and had not the good fortune to have been the residence of a licentious poet.—(Henin, *Jour. Historique des Operat. Militaires des Sieges de Peschiera.*)

in the manner we suppose Catullus himself to have been, by the trees that shaded the promontory, and by the waters of the lake below—

“ Quam te libenter, quamque lætus invito !
 Vix me ipse credens Thyniam, atque Bithynos
 Liquisse campos, et videre te in tuto.
 O quid solutis est beatius curis ?
 Cum mens onus reponit, ac peregrino
 Labore fessl venimus larem ad nostrum,
 Desideratoque acquiescimus lecto.
 Hoc est, quod unum est pro laboribus tantis.
 Salve, O venusta Sirmio, atque hero gaude.”

These lines show that the most refined and tender feelings were as familiar to the bosom of Catullus as the grossest. Nothing can be more delicate than his description of the emotions of one, who, after many wanderings and vicissitudes of fortune, returns to his home, and to the scenes beloved in youth or infancy: Nothing can be more beautiful than his invocation to the peninsula—his fond request that the delightful promontory, and the waters by which it was surrounded, should join in welcoming him home; and, above all, his heartfelt expression of delight at the prospect of again reclining on his accustomed couch.

It appears to me, however, that the beauty and the pathos of the poem is in some degree injured by the last verse,—

“ Ridete quicquid est domi cachinnorum,”

which introduces the idea of obstreperous mirth, instead of that tone of tenderness which pervades the preceding lines of the ode. One would almost suppose, as probably has happened in some other cases, that a verse had been subjoined to this which properly belonged to a different ode, where mirth, and not tenderness, prevailed.

The modern Latin poets of Italy frequently apostrophize their favourite villas, in imitation of the address to Sirmio. Flaminius, in a poem, *Ad Agellum suum*, has described his attachment to his farm and home, and the first lines of it rival the tender and pleasing invocation of Catullus. Some of the subsequent lines are written in close imitation of the Roman poet—

—“ Jam libebit in cubiculo
 Molles inire somnulos.
 Gaudete, fontes rivulique limpidi.”

As also the whole of his address to the same villa, commencing—

“*Umbrae frigidulae, arborum susurri.*”

One of the most pleasing features in the works of the modern Latin poets of Italy, is the descriptions of their villas, their regret at leaving them, or their invitations to friends to come and witness their happiness. Hence Fracastoro's villa, in the vicinity of Verona, Ambra, and *Pulcherrima Mergellina*, are now almost esteemed classic spots, like Tusculum or Tibur.

The invocation to the peninsula of Sirmio was evidently written soon after the return of Catullus from Bithynia; and his next poem worth noticing is a similar address to his villa near Tibur. The thought, however, in this poem, is very forced and poor. Catullus having been invited by his friend Sextius, according to a common custom at Rome, to be one of a party assembled at his house for the purpose of hearing an oration composed by their host, had contracted such a cold from its frigidity, that he was obliged to leave Rome, and retire to this seat, in order to recover from its effects. For his speedy restoration to health, he now gives thanks to his salubrious villa. This residence was situated on the confines of the ancient Latian and Sabine territories, and the villas there, as we learn from this ode, were sometimes called Tibur-tine, from the town of Tibur, and sometimes Sabine. from the district where they lay; but the former appellation, it seems, was greatly preferred by Catullus. As long as the odes of Horace survive, the

“*Domus Albunæ resonantis,
Et præceps Anio, et Tiburni lucus, et uda
Mobilibus pomaria rivis,*”

will be remembered as forming one of the most delightful retreats in Italy, and one which was so agreeable to its poet, that he wished that of all others it might be the shelter and refuge of his old age. From the present aspect of Tivoli, the charm of the villas at the ancient Tibur may be still appreciated. “We ascended,” says Eustace, “the high hill on which Tivoli stands, passing through groves of olives, till we reached the summit. This town, the Tibur of the ancients, stands in a delightful situation, sheltered by Monte Catillo, and a semicircular range of Sabine mountains, and commanding, on the other side, an extensive view over the Campagna, bounded by the sea, Rome, Mount Soracte, and the pyramidal hills of Monticelli and Monte Rotondo, the ancient

Eretum. But the pride and ornament of Tivoli are still, as anciently, the falls and the windings of the Anio, now Tevereone. This river having meandered from its source through the vales of Sabina, glides gently through Tivoli, till, coming to the brink of a rock, it precipitates itself in one mass down the steep, and then boiling for an instant in its narrow channel, rushes headlong through a chasm in the rock into the caverns below.* * * To enjoy the scenery to advantage, the traveller must cross the bridge, and follow the road which runs at the foot of the classic Monte Catillo, and winds along the banks of the Anio. As he advances he will have on his left the steep banks covered with trees, shrubs, and gardens, and on his right the bold but varying swells of the hills shaded with groves of olives. These sunny declivities were anciently interspersed with splendid villas, the favourite abodes of the most luxurious and refined Romans. They are now replaced by two solitary convents, but their site, often conjectural or traditionary, is sometimes marked by scanty vestiges of ruins, and now and then by the more probable resemblance of a name*." Eustace does not particularly mention the farm or villa of Catullus. In the travels, however, which pass under the name of M. Blainville, written in the beginning of last century, we are informed, that a monastery of the religious order of Mount Olivet was then established on the spot where formerly stood the Tiburtine villa of Catullus† M. de Castellan fixes on the same spot, on account of its situation between the Sabine and Tiburtine territory. "D'ailleurs," continues he, "il n'est pas d'endroit plus retiré, mieux garanti des vents, que cet angle rentrant de la vallée, entouré de tous côtés par de hautes montagnes; ce qui est encore un des caracteres du local choisi par notre poëte, qui pretendoit y être à l'abri de tout autre vent que de celui qui l'expose à la vengeance de sa maitresse‡." It would appear from Forsyth's Travels, that a spot is still fixed on as the site of the residence of Catullus. "The villa of Catullus," he says, "is easily ascertained by his own minute description of the place, by excavated marbles, and by the popular name of Truglia." This spot, which is close to the church of St Angelo in Piavola, is on the opposite side of the Anio from Tibur, about a mile north from that town, and on the north side of Monte Catillo, or what might be called the back of that hill, in reference to the situation of Tibur. The Anio

* *Classical Tour*, Vol. II. c. 7.

† *Travels through Holland, &c. but especially Italy*, Vol. II. chap. 39.

‡ *Lettres sur l'Italie*, Tom. II. let. 36. Paris, 1819.

divides the ancient Latian from the Sabine territory, and the villa of Catullus was on the Sabine side of the river, but was called Tiburtine from the vicinity of Tibur*.

The Romans, and particularly the Roman poets, as if the rustic spirit of their Italian ancestry was not altogether banished by the buildings of Rome, appear to have had a genuine and exquisite relish for the delights of the country. This feeling was not inspired by fondness for field-sports, since, although habituated to violent exercises, the chase never was a favourite amusement among the Romans, and they preferred seeing wild animals baited in the amphitheatre, to hunting them down in their native forests. The country then was not relished as we are apt to enjoy it, for the sake of exercise or rural pastimes, but solely for its amenity and repose, and the mental tranquillity which it diffused. With them it seems to have been truly,

“The relish for the calm delight
Of verdant vales and fountains bright;
Trees that nod on sloping hills,
And caves that echo tinkling rills.”

* Nibby, in his *Viaggio Antiquario ne contorni di Roma*, (Ed. 1819. 2 Tom. Svo., in opposition to all previous authority, has denied that this was the site of the villa of Catullus, which he has removed to a spot due east from Tibur, between the Acque Albule and Ponte Lucano. His opinion, however, is rested on the 26th poem of Catullus, of which he has totally misunderstood the meaning,—

“Furi, Villula nostra non ad Austri
Flatus opposita est, nec ad Favoni,
Nec sævi Boreæ, aut Apeliotæ;
Verum ad millia quindecim et ducentos—
O ventum horribilem atque pestilentem.”

Nibby strangely supposes that the fourth line of the above verses means that the villa is 15 miles 200 paces from Rome, and, therefore, that it cannot be at St Angelo in Piavola, the distance of which from Rome is not 15 miles 200 paces.—“Questi versi,” says he, “non solo non sono così decisivi per situarla precisamente a St Angelo, piu tosto che in altri luoghi di questi contorni; ma assolutamente la escludono, poichè la stabiliscono quindici miglia, e duecento passi vicino a Roma.”—T. I. p. 166.

Now, in the first place, according to Muretus and the best commentators, this ode does not at all refer to the villa of Catullus, but of Furius, whom he addresses, since the correct reading in the first line is not *Villula nostra*, but *Vostra*. Allowing, however, that it should be *nostra*, it is quite impossible to extort from the fourth line any proof that the villa was 15 miles 200 paces from Rome. Translated *verbatim*, it is as follows:—“Furius, our (your) villa is not exposed or liable to the blasts of Auster or Favonius, or the sharp Boreas, or the Apeliot wind, but to fifteen thousand and two hundred—O horrible and pestilent wind!” Now, the question is, to what 15,000,200 is the villa exposed? (*opposita*). Every commentator whom I have consulted, supplies sesterces, or other pieces of money; that is to say, it was mortgaged or pledged for that sum, which would sweep it away more effectually than any wind. Nibby’s interpretation, that it is not exposed to Auster or Boreas, &c. but is 15 miles 200 paces distant from Rome, is not many miles, or even paces, distant from absolute nonsense; and, moreover, quindecim millia, is not good Latin for 15 miles.

Love of the country among the Romans thus became conjoined with the idea of a life of pastoral tranquillity and retirement,—a life of friendship, liberty, and repose,—free from labour and care, and all turbulent passions. Scenes of this kind delight and interest us supremely, whether they be painted as what is desired or what is enjoyed. We feel how natural it is for a mind with a certain disposition to relaxation and indolence, when fatigued with the bustle of life, to long for security and quiet, and for those sequestered scenes in which they can be most exquisitely enjoyed. There is much less of this in the writings of the Greeks, who were originally a seafaring and piratical, and not, like the Italians, a pastoral people. It is thus that, even in their highest state of refinement, the manners and feelings of nations bear some affinity to their original rudeness, though that rudeness itself has been imperceptibly converted into a source of elegance and ornament.

34. *Seculare carmen ad Dianam.* This is the first strictly lyric production of Catullus which occurs, and there are only three other poems of a similar class. In Greece, the public games afforded a noble occasion for the display of lyric poetry, and the sensibility of the Greeks fitted them to follow its highest flights. But it was not so among the Romans. They had no solemn festivals of assembled states: Their active and ambitious life deadened them to the emotions which lyric poetry should excite; and the gods, whose praises form the noblest themes of the Æolian lyre, were with them rather the creatures of state policy, than of feeling or imagination.

45. *De Acme et Septimio.* Here our poet details the mutual blandishments and amorous expressions of Acme and Septimius, with the approbation bestowed on them by Cupid. This amatory effusion has been freely translated by Cowley:—

“ Whilst on Septimius’ panting breast,
Meaning nothing less than rest,” &c.

49. *Ad M. Tullium.* In this poem, which is addressed to Cicero as the most eloquent of the Romans, Catullus modestly returns the orator thanks for some service he had rendered him.

51. *Ad Lesbiam.* This is the translation of the celebrated ode of Sappho, which has been preserved to us by Longinus, Φαινεσαι μοι κρηος, &c. The fourth stanza of the original Greek has not been translated, but in its place a verse is inserted in all the editions of Catullus, containing a moral reflection, which one would hardly have expected from this dissolute poet:

“ Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est;
Otio exultas, nimiumque gestis;
Otium reges prius et beatas
Perdidit urbes.”

This stanza is so foreign from the spirit of high excitement in which the preceding part of the ode is written, that Maffei suspected it had belonged to some other poem of Catullus; and Handius, in his *Observationes Criticae*, conjectures that the fourth stanza, which Catullus translated from the original Greek, having been lost, and a chasm being thus left, some idle librarian or scholiast of the middle ages had interpolated these four lines of misplaced morality, that no gap might appear in his manuscript*. It is not impossible, however, that this verse may have been intended to express the answer of the poet's mistress.

Many amatory poets have tried to imitate this celebrated ode; but most of them have failed of success. Boileau has also attempted this far-famed fragment; but although he has produced an elegant enough poem, he has not expressed the vehement passion of the Greek original so happily as Catullus. How different are the rapidity and emotion of the following stanza,

"Lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus
Flamma dimanat, sonitu suo pte
Tintinant aures—geminâ teguntur
Lumina nocte,"

from the languor of the corresponding lines of the French poet!

"Une nuage confus se repand sur ma vue,
Je n'entend plus, je tombe en de douces langueurs,
Et passe, sans haleine, interdite, perdue;
Un frisson me saisit—je tremble, je me meurs."

These lines give us little idea of that furious passion of which Longinus says the Greek ode expresses all the symptoms. Racine has been much more happy than Boileau in his imitation of Sappho. Phædra, in the celebrated French tragedy which bears the name of that victim of love, thus paints the effects of the passion with which she was struck at her first view of Hippolytus:—

"Athènes me montra mon superbe ennemi:
Je le vis, je rougis, je palis à sa vue—
Un trouble s'leva dans mon ame éperdue,
Mes yeux ne voyoient plus, je ne pouvois parler;
Je sentis tout mon cœur et transir et brûler."

On this passage Voltaire remarks, "Peut on mieux imiter Sappho? Ces vers, quoique imites, coulent de source; chaque

* *Obscrv. Crit. in Catulli Carmina.*

† Acte I. sc. 3.

mot trouble les ames sensibles, et les penetre; ce n'est point une amplification; c'est le chef d'œuvre de la nature et de l'art*." A translation by De Lille, which has a very close resemblance to that of Boileau, is inserted in the delightful chapter of the *Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis*, which treats of Lesbos and Sappho. Philips, it is well known, attempted a version of the lyric stanzas of Sappho, which was first printed with vast commendation in the 229th Number of the Spectator, where Addison has also remarked, "that several of our countrymen, and Dryden in particular, seem very often to have copied after this ode of Sappho, in their dramatic writings, and in their poems upon love."

58. *Ad Cæliam de Lesbia.* In this ode, addressed to one of her former admirers, Catullus gives an account, both tender and pathetic, of the debaucheries and degraded condition of Lesbia, to his passion for whom, he had attributed such powerful effects in the above imitation of Sappho.

61. *In Nuptias Juliae et Manlii.* We come now to the three celebrated epithalamiums of Catullus. The first is in honour of the nuptials of Julia and Manlius, who is generally supposed to have been Aulus Manlius Torquatus, an intimate friend of the poet, and a descendant of one of the most noble patrician families in Rome. This poem has been entitled an Epithalamium in most of the ancient editions, but Muretus contends that this is an improper appellation, and that it should be inscribed *Carmen Nuptiale*. "An epithalamium," he says, "was supposed to be sung by the virgins when the bride had retired to the nuptial chamber, whereas in this poem an earlier part of the ceremony is celebrated and described." This earlier part, indeed, occupies the greater portion of the poem, but towards the conclusion the bride is represented as placed in the chamber of her husband, which may justify its ordinary title:

"Jam hæc venias, Marite;
Uxor in thalamo est tibi," &c.

In this bridal song the poet first addresses Hymen; and as the bride was now about to proceed from her paternal mansion to the house of her husband, invokes his aid in raising the nuptial hymn. He then describes the bride:—

"Floridis velut enitens
Myrtus Asia ramulis;

* *Dict. Philos. Art. Amplification.*

Quos Hamadryades Deæ
Ludicrum sibi roscido
Nutriunt humore."

A similar image is frequent with other poets, and has been adopted by Pontanus* and Naugerius†.

The praises of Hymen follow next:—

" Nil potest sine te Venus,
Fama quod bona comprobet,
Commodi capere: at potest
Te volente. Quis huic Deo
Compararier ausit ?

Nulla quit sine te domus
Liberos dare, nec parens
Stirpe jungier: at potest
Te volente. Quis huic Deo
Compararier ausit ?"

Claudian, in his epithalamium on the nuptials of Palladius and Celerina, and the German poet Lotichius, extol Hymen in terms similar to those employed in the first of the above stanzas: and the advantages he confers, alluded to in the second, have been beautifully touched on by Milton, as also by Pope, in his chorus of youths and virgins, forming part of the Duke of Buckingham's intended tragedy—*Brutus*:

" But Hymen's kinder flames unite,
And burn for ever one,
Chaste as cold Cynthia's virgin light,
Productive as the sun.

" O source of every social tye,
United wish and mutual joy,
What various joys on one attend !
As son, as father, brother, husband, friend."

Catullus now proceeds to describe the ceremonies with which the bride was conveyed to the house of her husband, and was there received. He feigns that he beholds the nuptial pomp and retinue approaching, and encourages the bride to come forth, by an elegant compliment to her beauty; as also, by reminding her of the fair fame and character of her intended husband. As she approaches, he intimates the freedom of the ancient Fescennine verses, which were first sung at marriage festivals.

The bride being at length conducted to her new habitation, the poet addresses the bridegroom, and shuts up the married pair: But before concluding, in reference to Torquatus, one

* Ad Fauniam.

† *Genethliacon pueri nobilis.*

of the husband's names, he alludes, with exquisite delicacy and tenderness, to the most-wished-for consequence of this happy union :—

“ Torquatus, volo, parvulus
Matris e gremio sua
Porrigena teneras manus,
Dulce rideat ad patrem,
Semihante labello.”

The above verse has been thus imitated in an Epithalamium on the marriage of Lord Spencer, by Sir William Jones, who pronounces it a picture worthy the pencil of Domenichino :

“ And soon to be completely blest,
Soon may a young Torquatus rise,
Who, hanging on his mother's breast,
To his known sire shall turn his eyes,
Outstretch his infant arms a while,
Half ope his little lips and smile.”

And thus by Leonard, in his pastoral romance of *Alexis*, where, however, he has omitted the *semihante labello*, the finest feature in the picture :—

“ Quel tableau ! quand un jeune enfant,
Pench. sur le sein de sa mère,
Avec un sourire innocent
Etendra ses mains vers son père.”

This nuptial hymn has been the model of many epithalamiums, particularly that of Jason and Creusa, sung by the chorus in Seneca's *Medea*, and of Honorius and Maria, in Claudian. The modern Latin poets, particularly Justus Lipsius, have exercised themselves a great deal in this style of composition; and most of them with evident imitation of the work of Catullus. It has also been highly applauded by the commentators; and more than one critic has declared that it must have been written by the hands of Venus and the Graces —“Veneris et Gratiarum manibus scriptum esse.” I wish, however, they had excepted from their unqualified panegyrics the coarse imitation of the Fescennine poems, which leaves on our minds a stronger impression of the prevalence and extent of Roman vices, than any other passage in the Latin classics. Martial, and Catullus himself elsewhere, have branded their enemies; and Juvenal, in bursts of satiric indignation, has reproached his countrymen with the most shocking crimes. But here, in a complimentary poem to a patron and

intimate friend, these are jocularly alluded to as the venial indulgences of his earliest youth.

62. *Carmen Nuptiale*. Some parts of this epithalamium have been taken from Theocritus, particularly from his eighteenth Idyl, where the Lacedæmonian maids, companions of Helen, sing before the bridal-chamber of Menelaus*. This second nuptial hymn of Catullus may be regarded as a continuation of the above poem, being also in honour of the marriage of Manlius and Julia. The stanzas of the former were supposed to be sung or recited in the person of the poet, who only exhorted the chorus of youths and virgins to commence the nuptial strain. But here these bands contend, in alternate verses; the maids descanting on the beauty and advantages of a single life, and the lads on those of marriage.

The young men, companions of the bridegroom, are supposed to have left him at the rising of the evening star of love:—

————— “ Vesper Olympo
Expectata diu vix tandem lumina tollit.

• • • • •
Hesperè, qui cælo lucet jucundior ignis ?”

These lines appear to have been imitated by Spenser in his Epithalamium—

“ Ah ! when will this long weary day have done !
Long though it be, at last I see it gloom,
And the bright evening star, with golden crest,
Appear out of the east ;
Fair child of beauty, glorious lamp of love,
How cheerfully thou lookest from above !”

The maids who had accompanied the bride to her husband's house, approached the youths who had just left the bridegroom, and they commence a very elegant contention concerning the merits of the star, which the chorus of virgins is pleased to characterize as a cruel planet. They are silenced, however, by the youths hinting that they are not such enemies to Hesper as they pretend to be. Then the maids, draw a beautiful, and, with Catullus, a favourite comparison between an unblemished virgin, and a delicate flower in a garden :

“ Ut flos in septis secretus nascitur hortis,
Ignotus pecori, nullo convulsus aratro,
Quem mulcent auræ, firmat sol, educat imber ;

* See also Moschus, Idyl 7.

Multi illum pueri, multas optavere puellas.
 Idem cum tenui captus defloruit ungui,
 Nulli illum pueri, nullas optavere puellas.
 Sic virg. dum intacta manet, tum cara quis; sed
 Cum castum amisit, polluto corpore, florem,
 Nec pueris jucunda manet, nec cara puellis."

To the sentiment delineated by this image, the youths reply by one scarcely less beautiful, emblematical of the happiness of the married state; and as this was a theme in which the maidens were probably not unwilling to be overcome, they unite in the last stanza with the chorus of young men, in recommending to the bride to act the part of a submissive spouse.

Few passages in Latin poetry have been more frequently imitated, and none more deservedly, than the above-quoted verses of Catullus, who certainly excels almost all other writers, in the beauty and propriety of his similes. The greatest poets have not disdained to transplant this exquisite flower of song. Perhaps the most successful imitation is one by the Prince of the romantic bards of Italy, in the first canto of his *Orlando*, and which it may be amusing to compare with the original:

" La Verginella è simile alla rosa,
 Che in bel giardin su la nativa spina,
 Mentre sola, e sicura si riposa,
 Nè gregge, nè pastor se le avvicina;
 L'aura soave, e l'alba rugiadosa,
 L'acqua, la terra al suo favor s'inchina:
 Giovini vaghi, e donne innamorate,
 Amano averne e seni, e temple ornate.

Ma non si tosto dal materno stelo
 Rimossa viene, e dal suo ceppo verde;
 Che quanto avea dagli uomini, e dal cielo,
 Favor, grazia, e bellezza tutto perde.
 La vergine, che il fior, di che più zelo,
 Che de begli occhi, e della vita, aver dè,
 Lascia altrui corre, il pregio, ch'avea dinanti,
 Perde nel cor de tutti gli altri amanti."

The reader may perhaps like to see how this theme has been managed by an old *French* poet nearly contemporary with Ariosto:

" La jeune vierge est semblable à la rose,
 Au beau jardin, sur l'épine native,
 Tandis que sûre et seulette repose,
 Sans que troupeau ni berger y arrive;
 L'air doux l'échauffe, et l'Aurore l'arrose,
 La terre, l'eau par sa faveur l'avive;
 Mais jeunes gens et dames amoureuses,

De la cueillir ont les mains envieuses ;
La terre et l'air, qui la soulaient nourrir,
La quittent lors et la laissent flétrir*."

It is evident that Ariosto has suggested several things to the French poet, as he has also done to the imitators in our own language, in which the simile has been frequently attempted, but not with much success. Ben Jonson has translated it miserably, substituting doggerel verse for the sweet flow of the Latin poetry, and verbal antithesis and conceit for that beautiful simplicity of idea which forms the chief charm of the original :

"Look how a flower that close in closes grows,
Hid from rude cattle, bruised by no plows," &c.

One of the best of the numerous English imitations is that in the *Lay of Iolante*, introduced in Bland's *Four Slaves of Cythera* :

"A tender maid is like a flow'ret sweet,
Within the covert of a garden born ;
Nor flock nor hind disturb the calm retreat,
But on the parent stalk it blooms untorn,
Refresh'd by vernal rains and gentle heat,
The balm of evening, and the dews of morn :
Youths and enamoured maidens vie to wear
This flower—their bosoms grace, or twined around their hair.

"No sooner gathered from the vernal bough,
Where fresh and blooming to the sight it grew,
Than all who marked its opening beauty blow,
Forsake the tainted sweet, and faded hue.
And she who yields, forgetful of her vow,
To one but newly loved, another's due,
Shall live, though high for heavenly beauty prized,
By youths unhonoured, and by maids despised."

One of the lines in the passage of Catullus,

"Multi illum pueri—multæ optavere puellæ,"

and its converse,

"Nulli illum pueri—nullæ optavere puellæ,"

have been copied by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*†, and applied to Narcissus,

"Multi illum pueri, multæ cupiere puellæ.
Sed fuit in tenerâ tam dura superbia formâ,
Nulli illum juvenes, nullæ tetigere puellæ."

* Gohorry.

† Lib. III.

The origin of the line,

“Nec pueris jucunda manet, nec cara puellis,”

may be traced to a fragment of the Greek poet Mimnermus :

“ Ἄλλ’ ἰχθῆρος μὲν παῖσιν, ἀτιμάρτος δὲ γυναιξίν.”

63. *De Ati*.—The story of Atis is one of the most mysterious of the mythological emblems. The fable was explained by Porphyry; and the Emperor Julian afterwards invented and published an allegory of this mystic tale. According to them, the voluntary emasculation of Atis was typical of the revolution of the sun between the tropics, or the separation of the human soul from vice and error. In the literal acceptance in which it is presented by Catullus, the fable seems an unpromising and rather a peculiar subject for poetry: indeed, there is no example of a similar event being celebrated in verse, except the various poems on the fate of Abelard. It is likewise the only specimen we have in Latin of the Galliambic measure; so called, because sung by Galli, the effeminate votaries of Cybele. The Romans, being a more sober and severe people than the Greeks, gave less encouragement than they to the celebration of the rites of Bacchus, and have poured forth but few dithyrambic lines. The genius of their language and of their usual style of poetry, as well as their own practical and imitative character, were unfavourable to the composition of such bold, figurative, and discursive strains. They have left no verses which can be strictly called dithyrambic, except, perhaps, the nineteenth ode of the second book of Horace, and a chorus in the *Œdipus* of Seneca. If not perfectly dithyrambic, the numbers of the *Atis* of Catullus are, however, strongly expressive of distraction and enthusiasm. The violent bursts of passion are admirably aided by the irresistible torrent of words, and by the cadence of a measure powerfully denoting mental agony and remorse. In this production, now unexampled in every sense of the word, Catullus is no longer the light agreeable poet, who counted the kisses of his mistress, and called on the Cupids to lament her sparrow. His ideas are full of fire, and his language of wildness: He pours forth his thoughts with an energy, rapidity, and enthusiasm, so different from his usual tone, and, indeed, from that of all Latin poets, that this production has been supposed to be a translation from some ancient Greek dithyrambic, of which it breathes all the passion and poetic phrensy. The employment of long compound epithets, which constantly recur in the *Atis*,—

“ Ubi cerva sylviculturalix, ubi aper nemostrivagus,”—

is also a strong mark of imitation of the Greek dithyrambics; it being supposed, that such sonorous and new-invented words were most befitting intoxication or religious enthusiasm*. Anacreon, in his thirteenth ode, alludes to the lamentations and transports of Atis, as to a well-known poetical tradition:

“ Ὅτι μὲν καλὴν Κυβέβην
Τὸν ἡμίθλυτον Ἄττιν
Ἐν ὕρσι βωντα,
Λεγασσι ἑμμανταί.”

Atis, it appears from the poem of Catullus, was a beautiful youth, probably of Greece, who, forsaking his home and parents, sailed with a few companions to Phrygia, and, having landed, hurried to the grove consecrated to the great goddess Cybele,—

“ Aditque opaca sylvis redimita loca Deæ.”

There, struck with superstitious phrensy, he qualified himself for the service of that divinity; and, snatching the musical instruments used in her worship, he exhorted his companions, who had followed his example, to ascend to the temple of Cybele. At this part of the poem, we follow the new votary of the Phrygian goddess through all his wild traversing of woods and mountains, till at length, having reached the temple, Atis and his companions drop asleep, exhausted by fatigue and mental distraction. Being tranquillized in some measure by a night's repose, Atis becomes sensible of the misery of his situation; and, struck with horror at his rash deed, he returns to the sea-shore. There he casts his eyes, bathed in tears, over the ocean homeward; and comparing his former happiness with his present wretched condition, he pours forth a complaint unrivalled in energy and pathos. Gibbon talks of the different emotions produced by the transition of Atis from the wildest enthusiasm to sober pathetic complaint for his irretrievable loss†; but, in fact, his complaint is not soberly pathetic—to which the Galliambic measure would be little suited: it is, on the contrary, the most impassioned expression of mental agony and bitter regret in the wide compass of Roman literature:

* Aristotle, *Rhetor.* Lib. III. c. 3.

† *Decline and fall of the Rom. Emp.* c. 23.

"Abero foro, palestrâ, stadio et gymnasiis?
 Miser, ah miser! querendum est etiam atque etiam, anime:
 Ego puber, ego adolescens, ego ephebus, ego puer;
 Ego gymnasii fui flos, ego eram decus olei;
 Mihi januæ frequentes, mihi limina tepida,
 Mihi floridis corollis redimita domus erat,
 Linquendum ubi esset, orto mihi Sole, cubiculum.
 Egone Deum ministra et Cybeles famula ferar?
 Ego Mænas, ego mei pars, ego vir sterilis ero?
 Ego viridis algida Idæ nive amicta loca colam?
 Ego vitam agam sub altis Phrygiæ columinibus,
 Ubi cerva sylvicultrix, ubi aper nemorivagus?
 Jam jam dolet quod egi, jam jamque pœnitet."

One is vexed, that the conclusion of this splendid production should be so puerile. Cybele; dreading the defection and escape of her newly acquired votary, lets loose a lion, which drives him back to her groves,—

"Ubi semper omne vitæ spatium famula fuit."

Muretus attempted a Latin Galliambic Address to Bacchus in imitation of the measure employed in the *Atis* of Catullus, and he has strenuously tried to make his poem resemble its model by an affected use of uncouth compound epithets. Pigna, an Italian poet, has adopted similar numbers in a Latin poem, on the metamorphosis of the water nymph, Pitys, who was changed into a fir-tree, for having fled from the embraces of Boreas. In many of the lines he has closely followed Catullus; but it seems scarcely possible that any modern poet could excite in his mind the enthusiasm essential for the production of such works. Catullus probably believed as little in *Atis* and *Cybele* as Muretus, but he lived among men who did; and though his opinions might not be influenced, his imagination was tinged with the colours of the age.

Atis is the name of one of the tragic operas of Quinault, which, I believe, was the most popular of his pieces except *Armide*; but it has little reference to the classic story of the votary of *Cybele*. The French *Atis* is a vehement and powerful lover, who elopes with the nymph *Sangaride* on the wings of the Zephyrs, which had been placed by *Cybele*, who was herself enamoured of the youth, at the disposal of *Atis*. It seems a poor production in itself, (how different from the operas of *Metastasio*!) but it was embellished by splendid scenery, and the music of *Lulli*, adapted to the chorus of *Phrygians*, and *Zephyrs*, and *Dreams*, and *Streams*, and *Corybantes*.

64. *Epithalamium Pelei et Thetidis*.—This is the longest and most elaborate of the productions of Catullus. It displays much accurate description, as well as pathetic and im-

passioned incident. Catullus was a Greek scholar, and all his commentators seem determined that his best poems should be considered as of Greek invention. I do not believe, however, that the whole of this epithalamium was taken from any one poet of Greece, as the *Coma Berenices* was from Callimachus; but the author undoubtedly borrowed a great deal from various writers of that country. Hesiod wrote an Epithalamium, Ἐῖς Πηλεῖα καὶ Θέτιν*, some fragments of which have been cited by Tzetzes, in his *prolegomena* to Lycophron's *Cassandra*; and judging from these, it appears to have suggested several lines of the epithalamium of Catullus. The adornment, however, and propriety of its language, and the usual practice of Catullus in other productions, render it probable, that he has chiefly selected his beauties from the Alexandrian poets. Valckenar, in his edition of Theocritus, (1779,) has shown, that the Idyls of Theocritus, particularly the *Adoniazusi*, have been of much service to our Latin poet; and a late German commentator has pointed out more than twenty passages, in which he has not merely imitated, but actually translated, Apollonius Rhodius†.

The proper subject of this epithalamium is the festivals held in Thessaly in honour of the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis; but it is chiefly occupied with a long episode, containing the story of Ariadne. It commences with the sailing of the ship Argo on the celebrated expedition to which that vessel has given name. The Nereids were so much struck with the unusual spectacle, that they all emerged from the deep; and Thetis, one of their number, fell in love with Peleus, who had accompanied the expedition, and who was instantly seized with a reciprocal passion. Little is said as to the manner in which the courtship was conducted, and the poet hastens to the preparations for the nuptials. On this joyful occasion, all the inhabitants of Thessaly flock to its capital, Pharsalia. Every thing in the royal palace is on a magnificent scale; but the poet chiefly describes the *stragula*, or coverlet, of the nuptial couch, on which was depicted the concluding part of the story of Theseus and Ariadne. Ariadne is represented as standing on the beach, where she had been abandoned, while asleep, by Theseus, and gazing in fixed despair at the departing sail of her false lover. Never was there a finer picture drawn of complete mental desolation. She was incapable of exhibiting violent signs of grief: She neither beats her bosom, nor bursts into tears; but the diadem which had compressed her locks—the light mantle which had floated around her form—the veil

* Fabricius, *Bib. Lat.*

† Mitscherlichius, in *Lect. ad Catull.*

which had covered her bosom—all neglected, and fallen at her feet, were the sport of the waves which dashed the strand, while she herself, regardless and stupified with horror at her frightful situation, stood like the motionless statue of a Bacchante,—

“Saxea ut effigies Bacchantis prospicit Evœ;
Non flavo retinens subtilem vertice mitram;
Non contacta levi velatum pectus amictu,
Non tereti strophio luctantes vincta papillas;
Omnia quæ toto delapsa e corpore passim
Ipsius ante pedes fluctus salis alludebant.”

The above passage is thus imitated by the author of the elegant poem *Ciris*, which has been attributed to Virgil, and is not unworthy of his genius :

“Infelix virgo tota bacchatur in urbe :
Non styrace Idæo fragrantés picta capillos,
Coguita non teneris pedibus Sicyonia servans,
Non niveo retinens baccata monilla collo.”—v. 167.

Catullus, leaving Ariadne in the attitude above described, recapitulates the incidents, by which she had been placed in this agonizing situation. He relates, in some excellent lines, the magnanimous enterprize of Theseus—his voyage, and arrival in Crete : He gives us a picture of the youthful innocence of Ariadne, reared in the bosom of her mother, like a myrtle springing up on the solitary banks of the Euphrates, or a flower whose blossom is brought forth by the breath of spring. The combat of Theseus with the Minotaur is but shortly and coldly described. It is obvious that the poet merely intended to raise our idea of the valour of Theseus, so far as to bestow interest and dignity on the passion of Ariadne, and to excuse her for sacrificing to its gratification all feelings of domestic duty and affection. Having yielded and accompanied her lover, she was deserted by him, in that forlorn situation, her deep sense of which had changed her to the likeness of a Bacchante sculptured in stone. Her first feelings of horror and astonishment had deprived her of the power of utterance ; but she at length bursts into exclamations against the perfidy of men, and their breach of vows, which

—“Cuncta aerii discernunt irrita venti.
Jam jam nulla viro juranti femina credat,
Nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles :
Qui, dum aliquid cupiens animus prægestit apicel,
Nil metuunt jurare, nihil promittere parcunt.
Sed simul ac cupidæ mentis satiata libido est,
Dicta nihil metuere, nihil perjuriam curant.”

This passage has been obviously imitated by Ariosto, in his *Orlando*—

“ Donne, alcuna di voi mai più non sia
Che a parole d'amante abbia a dar fede.
L'amante per aver quel che desia,
Senza curar che Dio tutto ode e vede,
Avviluppa promesse, e giuramenti,
Che tutti spargon poi per l'aria i venti.”

After indulging in such general reflections, Ariadne complains of the cruelty and ingratitude of Theseus in particular, whom she thus apostrophizes—

“ Quenam te genuit solà sub rupe leena ?
Quod mare conceptum spumantibus expuit undis ?
Quæ Syrtis, quæ Scylla, vorax quæ vasta Charybdis !”

These lines seem to have been suggested by the address of Patroclus to Achilles, near the commencement of the sixteenth book of the *Iliad*—

“ ———'Οὐκ ἀρα σοι γὰρ πατήρ ἐν ἰσπότη Πηλεΐς,
'Οὐδὲ θετικὴ μητὴρ γλαυκῆ δι σε τιτὸς θαλάσσης,
Πατρὸς δ' ἠλιβατοῦ, ὅτι τοι τοῖς ἰσθμῶ ἀπηνής.”

Catullus, having put the expression of this idea in the mouth of a princess abandoned by her lover, it became a sort of *Formula* for deserted heroines among subsequent poets. Thus Ovid, in the eighth book of his *Metamorphoses*—

“ Non genitrix Europa tibi est, sed inhospita Syrtis,
Armenis tigres, austroque agitata Charybdis ;”

and thus Virgil makes Dido address *Æneas*—

“ Nec tibi Diva parens, generis nec Dardanus auctor,
Perfide, sed duris genuit te cautibus horrens
Caucasus, Hyrcanæque admōrunt ubera tigres.”

Tasso, who was a great imitator of the Latin poets, attributes from the lips of Armida, a similar genealogy to Rinaldo—

“ Nè te Sofia produsse, e non sei nato
Dell' Azzio sangue tu. Te l'onda insana
Del mar produsse, e 'l Caucaso gelato,
E le mamme allatar de tigre Ircana.”

Boileau had happily enough parodied those rodomontades in the earlier editions of the *Lutrin*; but the passage has been omitted in all those subsequent to that of 1683—

“ Non, ton père à Paris ne fut point boulanger,
Et tu n’es point du sang de Gervais, l’horloger ;
Ta mère ne fut point la maîtresse d’une coche :
Caucase dans ses flancs te forma d’une roche,
Une tigresse affreuse en quelque antre écarté,
Te fit sucer son lait avec sa cruauté.”

I do not think the circumstances in which Armida pours forth her reproaches are judiciously selected. The Ariadne of Catullus vents her complaints when her betrayer is beyond reach of hearing, and Dido, though in his presence, before he had taken his departure: But Armida runs after, and overtakes Rinaldo, in which there is something degrading. She expresses, however, more tenderness and amorous devotedness amid her revilings, than any of her predecessors—

“ Struggi la fede nostra ; anch’io t’affretto ;
Che dico nostra ? Ah non più mia : fedele
Sono a te solo, idolo mio crudele !”

When she has ended her complaints of the cruelty and ingratitude of Theseus, Ariadne expresses a very natural wish, that the ship Argo had never reached her native shores—

“ Jupiter Omnipotens, utinam ne tempore primo
Gnosia Cecropiæ tetigissent littora puppæ.”

Thus, apparently, imitated by Virgil—

“ Felix, heu nimium felix ! si littora tantum
Nunquam Dardaniæ tetigissent nostra carinæ.”

But both these passages, it is probable, were originally drawn from the beginning of the Medea of Euripides—

“ Εἰθ’ ὦφελ’ Ἀργεὺς μὴ διαπτασθῆαι σκαφὸς
Κολλῶν ἐς αἰὲν κινεῖται συμπληγάδας.”

Catullus proceeds with a much closer imitation of Euripides—

“ Nunc quo me referam ? quali spe perdita nitar ?
An patriæ auxiliū sperem, quemne ipsa reliqui ?”

which is almost translated from the Medea—

“ Νῦν ποῖ τραπῆμαι ; ποῦτα πρὸς πατρός δόμος
“Οὐς σοὶ προῖσα καὶ πατρῶν ἀφικομην.”

The grief and repentance of Ariadne are at length followed by a sense of personal danger and hardship; and her pathetic

soliloquy terminates with execrations on the author of her misfortunes, to which—

“ Annuit invicto celestium numine rector ;
Quo tunc et tellus, atque horrida contremuerunt
Æquora, concussitque micantia sidera mundus,”

an image probably derived from the celebrated description in the *Iliad*—*Ἡ καὶ κραιπνήσιν*, &c. This promise of Jupiter was speedily accomplished, in the well-known and miserable fate of *Ægeus*, the father of *Theseus*.

We are naturally led to compare with Catullus, the efforts of his own countrymen, particularly those of Ovid and Virgil, in portraying the agonies of deserted nymphs and princesses. Both these poets have borrowed largely from their predecessor. Ovid has treated the subject of *Ariadne* not less than four times. In the epistle of *Ariadne* to *Theseus*, he has painted, like Catullus, her disordered person—her sense of desertion, and remembrance of the benefits she had conferred on *Theseus*: But the epistle is a cold production, chiefly because her grief is not immediately presented before us; and she merely tells that she had wept, and sighed, and raved. The minute detail, too, into which she enters, is inconsistent with her vehement passion. She recollects too well each heap of sand which retarded her steps, and the thorns on the summit of the mountain. Returning from her wanderings, she addresses her couch, of which she asks advice, till she becomes overpowered by apprehension for the wild beasts and marine monsters, of which she presents her false lover with a faithful catalogue. The simple ideas of Catullus are frequently converted into conceits, and his natural bursts of passion, into quibbles and artificial points. In the eighth book of the *Metamorphoses*, the melancholy part of *Ariadne's* story is only recalled, in order to introduce the transformation of her crown into a star. In the third book of the *Fasti*, she deplores the double desertion of *Theseus* and *Bacchus*. It is in the first book of the *Art of Love*, that Ovid approaches nearest to Catullus, particularly in the sudden contrast between the solitude and melancholy of *Ariadne*, and the revelry of the *Bacchanalians*. Some of Virgil's imitations of Catullus have been already pointed out: But part of the complaint of *Dido* is addressed to her betrayer, and contains a bitterness of sarcasm, and eloquence of reproof, which neither Catullus nor Ovid could reach.

The desertion of *Olimpia* by *Bireno*, related in the tenth canto of the *Orlando Furioso*, has, in its incidents at least, a

strong resemblance to the poem of Catullus. Bireno, Duke of Zealand, while on a voyage from Holland to his own country, touches on Frisia; and, being smit with love for Olimpia, daughter of the king, carries her off with him; but, in the farther progress of the voyage, he lands on a desert island, and, while Olimpia is asleep, he leaves her, and sets sail in the darkness of night. Olimpia awakes, and, finding herself alone, hurries to the beach, and then ascends a rock, whence she descries, by light of the moon, the departing sail of her lover. Here, and afterwards while in her tent, she pours forth her complaints against the treachery of Bireno. In the details of this story, Ariosto has chiefly copied from Ovid; but he has also availed himself of several passages in Catullus. As Ariosto, in his story of Olimpia, principally chose Ovid for his model, so Tasso, in that of Armida, seems chiefly to have kept his eye on Virgil and Catullus. But Armida is not like Ariadne, an injured and innocent maid, nor a stately queen, like Dido; but a voluptuous and artful magician,

—————“ Che nella doglia amara
Già tutte non obblia l'arte e le frodi.”

It has been mentioned, that the desertion of Ariadne was represented on one compartment of the coverlet of the nuptial couch of Peieus—on another division of it, the story of Bacchus and Ariadne was exhibited. The introduction of Bacchus and his train closes the episode with an animated picture, and forms a pleasing contrast to the melancholy scenes that precede it: At the same time, the poet, delicately breaking off without even hinting at the fair one's ready acceptance of her new lover, leaves the pity we feel for her abandonment unweakened on the mind.

65. *Ad Ortalum*. This is the first of the elegies of Catullus, and indeed the earliest of any length or celebrity which had hitherto appeared in the Latin language. Elegies were originally written by the Greeks in alternate hexameter and pentameter lines, “versibus impariter junctis.” This measure, which was at first appropriated to deplore misfortunes, particularly the loss of friends, was soon employed to complain of unsuccessful love, and, by a very easy transition, to describe the delights of gratified passion:

—————“ Querimonia primùm,
Post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos.”

Matters were in this state in the age of Mimnermus, who was contemporary with Solon, and was the most celebrated elegiac

poet of the Greeks. Hence, from his time every poem in that measure, whatever was the subject, came to be denominated elegy. The mixed species of verse, however, was always considered essential, so that the complaint of Bion on the death of Adonis, or that of Moschus on the loss of Bion, is hardly accounted such, being written in a different sort of measure. In the strict acceptance of the term, scarcely any Greek elegy has descended to us entire, except perhaps a few lines by Callimachus on the death of Heraclitus.

This elegy of Catullus may be considered as a sort of introduction to that which follows it. Hortalus, to whom it is addressed, had requested him to translate from Callimachus the poem *De Coma Berenices*. He apologizes for the delay which had taken place in complying with the wishes of his friend, on account of the grief he had experienced from the premature death of his brother, for whom he bursts forth into this pathetic lamentation :—

“Nunquam ego te, vitā frater amabilior,
Aspiciam posthac; at certe semper amabo,
Semper mœsta tuā carmina morte canam;
Qualia sub densis ramorum concinit umbris
Daulias, absumpti fata gemens Ityli.”

This simile is taken from the 19th book of the *Odyssey*—

“Ὡς δ' ὅτε Πανδαρὸς κερν, χλωρὸς ἀνδρῶν,
Καλὸν αἰδέσσει, ἴαρος νιὸν ἰσταμένοιο,
Δουδραὼν ἐν πεταλοῖσιν καθέζομεν πικνοῖσιν
Παῖδ' ὀλοφύρομεν Ἴτυλον φίλον,”

and it appears in turn to have been the foundation of Virgil's celebrated comparison :—

“Qualis populeā mœrens Philomela sub umbrā
Amisso queritur fœtus,” &c.

This simile has been beautifully varied and adorned by Moschus* and Quintus Calaber†, among the Greeks; and among the modern Italians by Petrarch, in his exquisite sonnet on the death of Laura :—

“Qual Rossignuol che si soave piagne,” &c.

and by Naugerius, in his ode *Ad Auroram*,

“Nunc ab umbroso simul esculeto,
Daulias late queritur : querelas
Consonum circa nemus, et jocosa reddit imago.”

* *Eidul. IV. v. 21.*

† *Lib. XII. v. 489.*

66. *De Coma Berenices*, is the poem alluded to in the former elegy: it is translated from a production of Callimachus, of which only two distichs remain, one preserved by Theon, a scholiast, on Aratus, and the other in the *Scholía* on Apollonius Rhodius*.

Callimachus was esteemed by all antiquity as the finest elegiac poet of Greece, or at least as next in merit to Mimnermus. He belonged to the poetic school which flourished at Alexandria from the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus to that of Ptolemy Physcon, and which still sheds a lustre over the dynasty of the Lagides, in spite of the crimes and personal deformities with which their names have been sarcastically associated.

After the partition of the Greek empire among the successors of Alexander, the city to which he had given name became the capital of the literary world; and arts and learning long continued to be protected even by the most degenerate of the Ptolemies. But the school which subsisted at Alexandria was of a very different taste and description from that which had flourished at Athens in the age of Pericles. In Egypt the Greeks became a more learned, and perhaps a more philosophical people, than they had been in the days of their ancient glory at home; but they were no longer a nation, and with their freedom their whole strength of feeling, and peculiar tone of mind, were lost. Servitude and royal munificence, with the consequent spirit of flattery which crept in, and even the enormous library of Alexandria, were injurious to the elastic and native spring of poetic fancy. The Egyptian court was crowded with men of erudition, instead of such men of genius as had thronged the theatre and *Agora* of Athens. The courtly *literati*, the academicians, and the librarians of Alexandria, were distinguished as critics, grammarians, geographers, or geometers. With them poetry became a matter of study, not of original genius or invention, and consequently never reached its highest flights. Though not without amenity and grace, they wanted that boldness, sublimity, and poetic enthusiasm by which the bards of the Greek republics were inspired. When, like Apollonius Rhodius, they attempted poetry of the highest class, they rose not above an elegant mediocrity; or when they attained perfection, as in the instance of Theocritus, it was in the inferior and more delicate branches of the art. Accordingly, these erudite and ornate poets chiefly selected as the subjects of their muse didactic topics of astronomy and physics, or ob-

* Muretus, *Comment. in Catull.*

scure traditions derived from ancient fable. Lycophron immersed himself in such a sea of fabulous learning, that he became nearly unintelligible, and all of them were marked with the blemishes of affectation and obscurity, into which learned poets are most apt to fall. Among the pleiad of Alexandrian poets, none had so many of the faults and beauties of the school to which he belonged as Callimachus. He was conspicuous for his profound knowledge of the ancient traditions of Greece, for his poetic art and elegant versification, but he was also noted for deficiency of invention and original genius:—

“Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe,
Quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet*.”

The poem of Catullus has some faults, which may be fairly attributed to his pedantic model—a certain obscurity in point of diction, and that ostentatious display of erudition, which characterized the works of the Alexandrian poets. The Greek original, however, being lost, except two distichs, it is impossible to institute an accurate comparison; but the Latin appears to be considerably more diffuse than the Greek. One distich, which is still extant in the *Scholia* on Apollonius, has been expanded by Catullus into three lines; and the following preserved by Theon has been dilated into four:—

“Ἡ δὲ Κωνὸν μ' ἴβλεψεν ἐν ἄστρῳ τῶν Βερηνικῆς
Βαστραχόν, ὃν κείνη παρὰ ἴθυσ ἔθετο.”

“Idem me ille Conon caelesti lumine vidit
E Bereniceo vertice cæsariem,
Fulgentem clare; quam multis illa Deorum,
Lævia protendens brachia, pollicita est.”

Here the three words τῶν Βερηνικῆς Βαστραχόν have been extended into “E Bereniceo verti cæsariem fulgentem,” and the single word ἴθυσις has formed a whole Latin line,

“Lævia protendens brachia, pollicita est†.”

The Latin poem, like its Greek original, is in elegiac verse, and is supposed to be spoken by the constellation called *Coma Berenices*. It relates how Berenice, the queen and sister of Ptolemy, (Euergetes,) vowed the consecration of her

* Ovid, *Amor. Lib. I. el. 15, v. 14.*

† Müller, *Einleitung*, T. II. p. 261.

locks to the immortals, provided her husband was restored to her, safe and successful, from a military expedition on which he had proceeded against the Assyrians. The king having returned according to her wish, and her shorn locks having disappeared, it is supposed by one of those fictions which poetry alone can admit, that Zephyrus, the son of Aurora, and brother of Memnon, had carried them up to heaven, and thrown them into the lap of Venus, by whom they were set in the sky, and were soon afterwards discovered among the constellations by Conon, a court astronomer. In order to relish this poem, or to enter into its spirit, we must read it imbued as it were with the belief and manners of the ancient Egyptians. The locks of Berenice might be allowed to speak and desire, because they had been converted into stars, which, by an ancient philosophic system, were supposed to be possessed of animation and intelligence. Similar honours had been conferred on the crown of Ariadne and the ship of Isis, and the belief in such transformations was at least of that popular or traditional nature which fitted them for the purposes of poetry. The race, too, of the Egyptian Ptolemies, traced their lineage to Jupiter, which would doubtless facilitate the reception of the locks of Berenice among the heavenly orbs. Adulation, however, it must be confessed, could not be carried higher; the beautiful locks of Berenice, though metamorphosed into stars, are represented as regretting their former happy situation, and prefer adorning the brow of Berenice, to blazing by night in the front of heaven, under the steps of immortals, or reposing by day in the bosom of Tethys:—

“ Non his tam lætor rebus, quam me abfore semper,
Abfore me a dominæ vertice disrucior.”

But though the poem of Callimachus may have been seriously written, and gravely read by the court of Ptolemy, the lines of Catullus often approach to something like pleasantry or *persiflage* :

“ Invita, O Regina, tuo de vertice cessi . . .
Sed qui se ferro postulet esse parem ?
Ille quoque eversus mons est, quem maximum in oris
Progenies Phthiæ clara supervehitur ;
Quum Medi properare novum mare, quumque juvenus
Per medium classi barbara navit Athon.
Quid facient crines, quum ferro talia cedant ?”

These lines seem intended as a sort of mock-heroic, and remind us strongly of the *Rape of the Lock* :

VOL. I.—2 P

“Steel could the labours of the gods destroy,
 And strike to dust the imperial towers of Troy;
 Steel could the works of mortal pride confound,
 And hew triumphal arches to the ground.
 What wonder, then, fair nymph! thy hairs should feel
 The conquering force of unresisted steel?”

The *Coma Earini* of Statius*, is a poem of the same description as the *Coma Berenices*. It is written in a style of sufficiently elegant versification; but what in Callimachus is a courtly, though perhaps rather extravagant compliment, is in Statius a servile and disgusting adulation of the loathsome monster, whose vices he so disgracefully flattered. Antonino Sebastiani, a Latin poet of modern Italy, has imitated Catullus, by celebrating the locks of a princess of San-Severino. The beauty and virtues of his heroine had excited the admiration of earth, and the love of the gods, but with these the jealousy of the goddesses. By their influence, a malady evoked from Styx threatens the life of the princess, and occasions the loss of her hair. The gods, indignant at this base conspiracy, commission Iris to convey the fallen locks to the sky, and to restore to the princess, along with health, her former freshness and beauty.

68. *Ad Manlium*. The principal subject of this elegy, is the story of Laodamia: The best parts, however, are those lines in which the poet laments his brother, which are truly elegiac—

“Tu, mea, tu moriens, fregisti commoda, frater;
 Tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus;
 Omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra,
 Quæ tuus in vita dulcis aiebat amor:
 Quoju8 ego interitu tota de mente fugavi
 Hæc studia, atque omnes delicias animi.”

Catullus seems to have entertained a sincere affection for his brother, and to have deeply deplored his loss; hence he generally writes well when touching on this tender topic. Indeed, the only remaining elegy of Catullus, worth mentioning, is that entitled *Inferiæ ad Fratris Tumulum*, which is another beautiful and affectionate tribute to the memory of this beloved youth. Vulpius had said, in a commentary on Catullus, that his brother died while accompanying him in his expedition with Memmius to Bithynia. This, however, is denied by Ginguené, who quotes two lines from the *Inferiæ*—

“Multas per gentes, et multa per æquora vectus,
 Adveni has miseræ, frater, ad inferias.”

* *Sylva*, Lib. III.

in order to show that the poet was at a distance at the time of his brother's death, and celebration of his funeral rites. It is possible, however, that these lines may refer to some subsequent pilgrimage to his tomb, or, what is most probable, his brother may have died at Troy, while Catullus was in Bithynia.

None of the remaining poems of Catullus, though written in elegiac verse, are at all of the description to which we now give the name of elegy. They are usually termed epigrams, and contain the most violent invectives on living characters, for the vices in which they indulged, and satire the most unrestrained on their personal deformities; but few of them are epigrams in the modern acceptation of the word. An epigram, as is well known, was originally what we now call a device or inscription, and the term remained, though the thing itself was changed*. A Greek anthology consisting of poems which expressed a simple idea—a sentiment, regret, or wish, without point or double meaning, had been compiled by Meleager before the time of Catullus; and hence he had an opportunity of imitating the style of the Greek epigrams, and occasionally borrowing their expressions, though generally with application to some of his enemies at Rome, whom he wished to hold up to the derision or hatred of his countrymen. Most of these poems were called forth by real occurrences, and express, without disguise, his genuine feelings at the time: His contempt, dislike, and resentment, all burst out in poetry. So little is known concerning the circumstances of his life, or the history of his enmities or friendships, that some of the lighter productions of Catullus are nearly unintelligible, while others appear flat and obscure; and in none can we fully relish the felicity of expression or allusion.

These epigrams of Catullus are chiefly curious and valuable, when considered as occasional or extemporaneous productions, which paint the manners, as well as echo the tone of thought and feeling, which at the time prevailed in fashionable society at Rome. What chiefly obtrudes itself on our attention, is the gross personal invective, and indecency of these compositions, so foreign from anything that would be tolerated in modern times. The art of rendering others satisfied with themselves, and consequently with us—the practice of dissembling our feelings, at first to please, and then by habit,—the custom, if not of flattering our foes, at least of meeting those we dislike, without reviling them, were talents unknown in the ancient

* Facile intelligimus, mansisse vocem, mutatâ significatione et potestate vocis. Vavassor, *De Epigrammate*, c. 3.

republic of Rome. The freedom of the times was accompanied by a frankness and sincerity of language, which we would consider as rude. Even the best friends attacked each other in the Senate, and before the various tribunals of justice, in the harshest and most unmeasured terms of abuse. Philip of Macedon, in an amicable interview with the Roman general Flaminius, who was accounted the most polite man of his day, apologized for not having returned an immediate answer to some proposition which had been made to him, on the ground that none of those friends, with whom he was in the habit of consulting, were at hand when he received it; to which Flaminius replied, that the reason he had no friends near him was, that he had assassinated them all. Matters were little better in the days of Catullus. At the time he flourished, everything was made subservient to political advancement; and what we should consider as the most inexcusable offences, were forgotten, or at least forgiven, as soon as the interests of ambition required. Accordingly, no person seems to have blamed the bitter invectives of Catullus; and none of his contemporaries were surprised or shocked at the unbridled freedom with which he reviled his enemies. He was merely considered as availing himself of a privilege, which every one was entitled to exercise. In his days, ridicule and raillery were oftener directed by malice than by wit: But the Romans thought no terms unseemly, which expressed the utmost bitterness of private or political animosity, and an excess of malevolence was received as sufficient compensation for deficiency in liveliness or humour. As little were the Romans offended by the obscene images and expressions which Catullus so frequently employed. Such had not yet been proscribed in the conversation of the best company. "Among the ancients," says Porson, in his review of Brunck's *Aristophanes**, "plain speaking was the fashion; nor was that ceremonious delicacy introduced, which has taught men to abuse each other with the utmost politeness, and express the most indecent ideas in the most modest language. The ancients had little of this: They were accustomed to call a spade, a spade—to give everything its proper name. There is another sort of indecency which is infinitely more dangerous, which corrupts the heart without offending the ear." Hence the Muse of light poetry thought not of having recourse to the circumlocutions or suggestions of modern times. Nor did Catullus suffer in his reputation, either as an author or man of fashion, from the impurities by which his poems

* *Tracts*, p. 13.

were poisoned. All this would have been less remarkable in the first age of Roman literature, as indelicacy of expression is characteristic of the early poetry of almost every nation. The French epigrams of Regnier, and his contemporaries Motin and Berthelot, are nearly as gross as those of Catullus; but at the close of the Roman republic, literature was far advanced; and if it be true, that as a nation grows corrupted its language becomes pure, the words and expressions of the Romans, in these last days of liberty, should have been sufficiently chaste. The obscenities of Catullus, however, it must be admitted, are oftener the sport of satire, than the ebullitions of a voluptuous imagination. His sarcastic account of the debaucheries of Lesbia, is more impure than the pictures of his enjoyment of her love.

No subject connected with the works of Catullus is more curious than the different sentiments, which, as we have seen, he expresses with regard to this woman. His conflict of mind breathes into his poetry every variety of passion. We behold him now transported with love, now reviling and despising her as sunk in the lowest abyss of shame, and yet, with this full knowledge of her abandoned character, her blandishments preserve undiminished sway over his affections. "At one time," says a late translator of Catullus, "we find him upbraiding Lesbia bitterly with her licentiousness, then bidding her farewell for ever; then beseeching from the gods resolution to cast her off; then weakly confessing utter impotence of mind, and submission to hopeless slavery; then, in the epistle to Manlius, persuading himself, by reason and example, into a contented acquiescence in her falsehoods, and yet at last accepting with eagerness, and relying with hope, on her proffered vow of constancy. Nothing can be more genuine than the rapture with which he depicts his happiness in her hours of affection; nor than the gloomy despair with which he is overwhelmed, when he believes himself resolved to quit her for ever." And all this, he wrote and circulated concerning a Roman lady, belonging, it is believed, to one of the first and most powerful families of the state!

Lesbia, as formerly mentioned, is universally allowed to be Clodia, the sister of the turbulent Clodius; but there has been a great deal of discussion and dispute, with regard to the identity of the other individuals against whom the epigrams are directed. Justus Lipsius* has written a dissertation with regard to Vettius and Cominius. The former he supposes to be the person mentioned in Cicero's Letters to Atticus, and

* *Var. Lect. Lib. III. c. 5.*

by Suetonius, as having been suborned by Cæsar, to allow himself to be seized with a weapon on his person, and to confess that he had been employed by the Chiefs of the Senate to assassinate Pompey—a device contrived by Cæsar, in order to set Pompey and the Senate at variance. Cominius was an accuser by profession, and impeached C. Cornelius, whom Cicero defended*. Lipsius believes Alphenus to be Pompey, and thinks that the epigram, directed against him, is supposed to be written in the person of Cicero. He is of opinion that the poet durst not venture to mention Pompey's name, and therefore designed him by an assumed one; but the epigrams on Julius Cæsar prove that Catullus was neither so scrupulous nor timid. The greatest number, however, and the most cutting of the epigrams, are aimed at Gellius, his successful rival in the affections of Lesbia—

—— “Quem Lesbia malit,
Quam te cum totâ gente, Catulle, tuâ.”

There were two persons of this name at Rome in the time of Catullus—an uncle and nephew. The first was a notorious profligate, who had wasted his patrimony, and afterwards headed mobs in the Forum for hire†. The nephew was equally dissolute. After the death of Cæsar, he conspired to assassinate Cassius in the midst of his army, and, having been pardoned, deserted to Antony. One of the various crimes of which he was suspected, identifies him as the Gellius branded by our poet, and whose vices were so great—

—— “Quantum non ultima Tethys,
Non genitor nympharum abluit Oceanus.”

This idea, by the way, of crimes of such crimson dye that they cannot be washed out by the wide world of waters, seems to have been originally derived from some verses of the chorus in the *Choephoræ* of Æschylus—

——“ποροι τε παντες εν μιας ιδε
βαποντες τον χειρομυσιν
φονοι καθαροντες ιουσαν αταν.”

The great successor of Æschylus expressed the same idea, in different language, in the *Œdipus Tyrannus*—

“Οιμαι γαρ ουτ' αν Ιστρον ουτε Θασσιν αν
Νιψαι καθαρομα παιδε στυγαν, ισα
Κυθου.”

* *Brutus*, c. 78.

† *Cicero, Orat. pro Sextio*, c. 51.

Seneca, imitating Catullus, in his *Hercules Furens*, says—

———“ Arctoum licet
Mæotis in me gelida transfundat mare,
Et tota Thetis per meas currat manus,
Hærebit altum facinus.”———

There is a remarkable resemblance betwixt this idea and a well-known passage in *Macbeth*:

“ Will all great Neptune’s ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand ? ”———

Much dispute has existed with regard to the comparative merit of the epigrammatic productions of Catullus, and those of Martial, who sharpened the Latin epigram, and endeavoured to surprise, by terminating an ordinary thought with some word or expression, which formed a *point*. Of the three great triumvirs of Latin literature, Joseph Scaliger, Lipsius, and Muretus, the last considers Catullus as far superior to his successor, as the wit of a gentleman to that of a scoffer and buffoon, while the two former award the palm to Martial. Their respective merits are very well summed up by Vavassor. —“ Catullum quidem, puro ac simplici candore, et nativa quadam, minimeque adscita, excellere venustate formæ, quæ accedat quam proxime ad Græcos. Martialem acumine, quod proprium Latinorum, et peculiare tunc fieri cœpit, valere; adeoque Catullum toto corpore epigrammatis esse conspicuum, Martialem clausula præcipue, atque ultimo fine, in quo relinquat, cum delectatione, aculeum spectari*.”

There can, I think, be no doubt, that, as an epigrammatist, Martial is infinitely superior to Catullus; but it is not on his epigrams that the fame of Catullus rests: He owes his reputation to about a dozen pieces, in which every word, like a note of music, thrills on the heart-strings. It is this felicitous selection of the most appropriate and melodious expressions, which seem to flow from the heart without study or premeditation, which has rendered him the most *graceful* of poets:—

———“ Ce naïf agrément,
Ce ton de cœur, ce neglig. charmant,
Qui le rendit le poète *des Graces*†.”

Few poets, besides, have shown more freshness in their conceptions—more truth and nature in their delineations of amatory passion—more heartfelt tenderness in grief—and

* *De Ludicrâ Dictione.*

† Gresset.

none, certainly, ever possessed a more happy art of embellishing trivial incidents, by the manner in which he treated them. Indeed, the most exquisite of his productions, in point of grace and delicacy, are those which were called forth by the most trifling occasions; while, at the same time, his Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis proves, that he was by no means deficient in that warmth of imagination, energy of thought, and sublimity of conception, which form the attributes of perfection in those bards who tread the higher paths of Parnassus. Catullus is a great favourite with all the early critics and commentators of the 16th century. The elder Scaliger alone has pronounced on him a harsh and unmerited sentence: "Catullo," says he, "docti nomen quare sit ab antiquis attributum, neque apud alios comperi, neque dum in mentem venit mihi. Nihil enim non vulgare est in ejus libris: ejus autem syllabæ cùm duræ sint, tum ipse non raro durus; aliquando vero adeo mollis, ut fluat, neque consistat. Multa impudica, quorum pudet—multa languida, quorum miseret—multa coacta, quorum piget*." In conclusion, the reader may, perhaps, like to hear the opinion of the pure and saintly Fenelon, concerning this obscene pagan.—"Catulle, qu'on ne peut nommer sans avoir horreur de ses obscenitéz, est au comble de la perfection pour une simplicité passionnée—

'Odi et amo: quare id faciam fortasse requiris.
Nescio; sed fieri sentio, et excrucior.'

Combien Ovide et Martial, avec leurs traits ingénieux et façonnés, sont ils au dessus de ces paroles négligées, ou le cœur saisi parle seul dans un espèce de désespoir."

The different sorts of poetry which Catullus, though not their inventor, first introduced at Rome, were cultivated and brought to high perfection by his countrymen. Horace followed, and excelled him in Lyric compositions. The elegiac measure was adopted with success by Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius, and applied by them to the expression of amatory sentiments, which, if they did not reach the refinement, or pure devotedness of the middle ages†, were less gross than those of Catullus.

* *Poetic. Lib. VI. c. 7.*

† There is more tenderness and delicacy in a single love-verse of an old Troubadour, than in all the amatory compositions of the Greeks and Romans. What is there in Anacreon or Ovid, to compare to these verses of Thibault, King of Navarre?—

"Las! Si j'avois pouvoir d'oublier,
Sa beaulté—son bien dire,
Et son très doux regarder,
Finirois non martyre.

In his epigrammatic compositions, Catullus was imitated by several of his own contemporaries, most of whom also ranked in the number of his friends. Their works, however, have almost entirely perished. Quintus Lutatius Catulus, who is praised as an orator and historian by Cicero*, has left two epigrams—one, *Ad Theotimum*, translated from Callimachus, the name Theotimus being merely substituted for that of Cephissus—and the other, *Ad Roscium Puerum*, addressed to the celebrated actor in his youth, and quoted by Cicero in his treatise, *De Naturâ Deorum*†—

“Constiteram, exorientem Auroram forte salutans;
Cum subito a levâ Roscius exoritur.
Pace mihi liceat, Coelestes, dicere vestrâ;
Mortalis visus pulchrior esse deo‡.”

This epigram formed a theme and subject of poetical contest among the French *beaux esprits* of the 17th century, who vied with each other in sonnets and madrigals, entitled *La Belle Matineuse*, written in imitation of the above verses. One will suffice as a specimen—

LA BELLE MATINEUSE.

“Le silence régnait sur la terre et sur l'onde,
L'air devenait serein, et l'Olympe vermeil,
Et l'amoureux Zéphyr affranchi du sommeil
Ressuscitait les fleurs d'une haleine féconde.
L'Aurore déployait l'or de sa tresse blonde,
Et semait de rubis le chemin du soleil.
Enfin ce Dieu venait au plus grand appareil,
Qu'il fût jamais venus pour éclairer le monde.
Quand la jeune Phillis au visage riant,
Sortant de son palais, plus clair que l'Orient,
Fit voir une lumière et plus vive et plus belle.
Sacré flambeau de jour, n'en soyez point jaloux;
Vous parûtes alors aussi peu devant elle,
Que les feux de la nuit avoient fait devant vous.”

From a vast collection of Italian sonnets on the same subject, I select one by Annibal Caro, the celebrated translator of Virgil—

“Mais las! Comment oublier
Sa beauté, son bien dire,
Et son très doux regarder!
Mieux aime mon martyr.”

* *Brutus*, c. 85.

† “Hic illi, (Catulo) Deo pulchrior,” says Cicero, “at erat, sicut hodie est, perversissimis oculis.” Lib. I. c. 28.

‡ “I stood, and to the Dawn my vows addressed,
When Roscius rose refulgent in the west.
Forgive, ye Powers! A mortal seemed more bright,
Than the bright god who darts the shafts of light.”

" Eran l'aer tranquillo, e l'onde chiare,
Sospirava Favonio, e fuggia Clori,
L'alma Ciprigna nnoanzi ai primi alberi
Ridendo empia d'amor la terra e 'l mare.

" La rugiadosa Aurora in ciel più rare
Facea le stelle; e di più bel colori
Sparsa le nubi, e i monti; uacia già fuori
Febo, qual più lucente in Delfo appare.

" Quando altra Aurora un più vezzoso ostello
Aperse, e lampeggiò sereno, e puro
Il Sol, che sol m'abbaglia, e mi disface.

" Volsimi, e 'n contro a lei mi parve oscuro,
(Santi lumi del ciel, con vostra pace)
L'Oriente, che dianzi ora si bello."

Licinius Calvus was equally distinguished as an orator and a poet. In the former capacity he is mentioned with distinction by Cicero; but it was probably his poetical talents that procured for him the friendship of Catullus, who has addressed to him two Odes, in which he is commemorated as a most delightful companion, from whose society he could scarcely refrain. Calvus was violently enamoured of a girl called Quintilia, whose early death he lamented in a number of verses, none of which have descended to us. There only remain, an epigram against Pompey, satirizing his practice of scratching his head with one finger, and a fragment of another against Julius Cæsar*. The sarcasm it contains would not have been pardonable in the present age; but the dictator, hearing that Calvus had repented of his petulance, and was desirous of a reconciliation, addressed a letter to him, with assurances of unshaken friendship†. The fragments of his epigrams which remain, do not enable us to judge for ourselves of his poetical merits. He is classed by Ovid among the licentious writers‡; but he is generally mentioned along with Catullus, which shows that he was not considered as greatly inferior to his friend—

" Nil præter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum."

Pliny, in one of his letters, talking of his friend Pompeius Saturnius, mentions, that he had composed several poetical pieces in the manner of Calvus and Catullus§; and Augurinus, as quoted by Pliny in another of his epistles, says,

* Sueton. *In Jul. Cæsare*, c. 49.

† Ovid. *Tristia*, Lib. II.

‡ *Ibid.* c. 73.

§ *Epist.* Lib. I. ep. 16.

"Canto carmina versibus minutis
His olim quibus et meus Catullus,
Et Calvus—"

VALERIUS ÆDITUUS,

Of Valerius Ædituus, another writer of epigrams and amorous verses in the time of Catullus, little is known; but the following lines by him, to a slave carrying a torch before him to the house of his mistress, have been quoted by Aulus Gellius—

"Quid faculam præfers, Phileros, qua nil opus nobis?
Ibimus, hoc lucet pectore flamma satis.
Istam nam potis est vis sæva extinguere venti,
Aut imber cælo candidus præcipitans:
At contra, hunc ignem Veneris, nisi si Venus ipsa,
Nulla 'st quæ possit vis alia opprimere†."

Aulus Gellius has also preserved the following verses of Porcius Licinius—

"Custodes ovium, teneræque propaginis agnæm,
Quæris ignem?—Ite huc: quæritis? ignis homo est.
Si digito attingero, incendam silvam simul omnem,
Omne pecus: flamma 'st omnia quæ video‡."

During the period in which the works of Lucretius and Catullus brought the Latin language to such perfection, the drama, which we have seen so highly elevated in the days of the Scipios, had sunk into a state of comparative degradation. National circumstances and manners had never been favourable to the progress of the dramatic art at Rome; but, subsequently to the conquest of Carthage, the increasing size and magnificence of the Roman theatres, some of which held not less than 60,000 people, required splendid spectacles, or extravagant buffoonery, to fill the eye, and catch the attention of a crowded, and often tumultuous assembly.

Accordingly, in the long period from the termination of the

* *Epist.* Lib. IV. ep. 27.

† "Why Phileros, a torch before me bear?—
A heart on fire all other light may spare.
That feeble flame can ill resist the power
Of the keen tempest and the headlong shower;
But *this* still glows whatever storms may drench,
What Venus kindles, she alone can quench."

‡ "Ye guardians of the tender flock, retire,
Why seek ye flames, when man himself is fire?
Whate'er I touch bursts forth in sudden blaze,
And the woods kindle with my scorching gaze."

Punic wars till the Augustan age, there scarcely appeared a single successor to Plautus or Pacuvius. That the pieces of the ancient tragic or comic writers still continued to be occasionally represented, is evident from the immense wealth amassed, in the time of Cicero, by Æsopus and Roscius, who never, so far as we know, condescended to appear, except in the regular drama; but a new tragedy or comedy was rarely brought out. This deficiency in the fund of entertainment and novelty, in the province of the legitimate drama, was supplied by the **MIMES**, which now became fashionable in Rome.

Though resembling them in name, the Latin Mimes differed essentially from the Greek Μίμοι, from which they derived their appellation. The Greek Mimes, of which Sophron of Syracuse was the chief writer, represented a single adventure taken from ordinary life, and exhibited characters without any gross caricature or buffoonery. The fifteenth Idyl of Theocritus is said to be written in the manner of the Greek Mimes*; and, to judge from it, they were not so much actions as conversations with regard to some action which was supposed to be going on at the time, and is pointed out, as it were, by the one interlocutor to the other, or an imitation of the action, whence their name has been derived. They resembled detached or unconnected scenes of a comedy, and required no more gesticulation or mimetic art, than is employed in all dramatic representations. On the other hand, mimetic gestures of every species, except dancing, were essential to the Roman Mimes, as also the exhibition of grotesque characters, which had often no prototypes in real life. The Mimes of the Romans, again, differed from their pantomime in this, that, in the former, most of the gestures were accompanied by recitation, whereas the pantomimic entertainments, carried to such perfection by Pylades and Bathyllus, were *ballets*, often of a serious, and never of a ludicrous or grotesque description, in which everything was expressed by dumb show, and in which dancing constituted so considerable a part of the amusement, that the performers danced a poem, a chorus, or whole drama, (*Canticum saltabant*.)

It is much more difficult to distinguish the Mimes from the *Fabulæ Atellanæ*, than from the Pantomimes or Greek *Mimi*; and indeed they have been frequently confounded†. It appears, however, that the characters represented in the Atellane dramas were chiefly provincial, while those introduced in the

* Sulzer, *Theorie*, Tom. I. *Comœdie*.

† "Non ignoro," says Salmastius, in his Notes to Vopiscus' Life of Aurelian, "quid distent Atellanæ et Mimi; recentiores, tamen, confundisse videntur." F. Vopiscus. *Vit. Aurel.* c. 42. ap. *Histor. August. Script.*

Mimes were the lowest class of citizens at Rome. Antic gestures, too, were more employed in the Mimes than the Atellane fables, and they were more obscene and ludicrous: "Toti," says Vossius, "erant ridiculi." The Atellanes, though full of mirth, were always tempered with something of the ancient Italian severity, and consisted of a more liberal and polite kind of humour than the Mimes. In this respect Cicero places the Mimes and Atellane fables in contrast, in a letter to Papyrius Pætus, where he says, that the broad jests in which his correspondent had indulged, immediately after having quoted the tragedy of Œnomaus, reminds him of the modern method of introducing, at the end of such graver dramatic pieces, the buffoonery of the Mimes, instead of the more delicate humour of the old Atellane farces*.

These Mimes, (which, with the Atellane fables, and regular tragedy and comedy, form the four great branches of the Roman drama,) were represented by actors, who sometimes wore masks, but more frequently had their faces stained like our clowns or mountebanks. There was always one principal actor, on whom the jests and ridicule chiefly hinged. The second, or inferior parts, were entirely subservient to that of the first performer: They were merely introduced to set him off to advantage, to imitate his actions, and take up his words—

" Sic iterat vocés, et verba cadentia tollit ;
Ut puerum sævo credas dictata magistro
Reddere, vel partes mimum tractare secundas."

Some writers have supposed, that a Mime was a sort of *monodrame*, and that the *partes secundæ*, here alluded to by Horace, meant the part of the actor who gesticulated †, while the other declaimed, or that of the declaimer ‡. It is quite evident, however, from the context of the lines, that Horace refers to the inferior characters of the Mime§. I doubt not that the chief performer assumed more than one character in the course of the piece||, in the manner in which the Admirable Crichton is recorded to have performed at the court of Mantua¶; but there were also subordinate parts in the Mime—a fool or a parasite, who assisted in carrying on the jests or tricks of his principal:—"C. Volumnius," says Festus, "qui

* Cicero, *Epist. Familiar.* Lib. IX. ep. 16.

† Flögel, *Geschichte der komisch. Litter.* T. IV. p. 101. Müller, *Einleitung.*

‡ Donatus, *Præf. in Terent.*

§ Hoffmanni, *Lexicon, voce Mimus.* Ziegler, *De Mimis Romanorum*, p. 21, ed. Gotting. 1789.

|| Manilius, *De Astronomic.* Lib. V. v. 472.

¶ Tytler's *Life of Crichton*, p. 45. 1st ed.

ad tibicinem saltârit, secundarum partium fuerit, qui, fere omnibus Mimis, parasitus inducatur* ;” and to the same purpose Petronius Arbiter,—

“Grex agit in scenâ Mimum—Pater ille vocatur,
Filius hic, nomen Divitiis ille tenet.”

The performance of a Mime commenced with the appearance of the chief actor, who explained its subject in a sort of prologue, in order that the spectators might fully understand what was but imperfectly represented by words or gestures. This prolocutor, also, was generally the author of a sketch of the piece; but the actors were not confined to the mere outline which he had furnished. In one view, the province of the mimetic actor was of a higher description than that of the regular comedian. He was obliged to trust not so much to memory as invention, and to clothe in extemporaneous effusions of his own, those rude sketches of dramatic scenes, which were all that were presented to him by his author. The performers of Mimes, however, too often gave full scope, not merely to natural unpremeditated gaiety, but abandoned themselves to every sort of extravagant and indecorous action. The part written out was in iambic verse, but the extemporary dialogue which filled up the scene was in prose, or in the rudest species of versification. Through the course of the exhibition, the want of refinement or dramatic interest was supplied by the excellence of the mimetic part, and the amusing imitation of the peculiarities or personal habits of various classes of society. The performers were seldom anxious to give a reasonable conclusion to their extravagant intrigue. Sometimes, when they could not extricate themselves from the embarrassment into which they had thrown each other, they simultaneously rushed off the stage, and the performance terminated †.

The characters exhibited were parts taken from the dregs of the populace—courtezans, thieves, and drunkards. The Sannio, or Zany, seems to have been common to the Mimes and Atellane dramas. He excited laughter by lolling out his tongue, and making asses' ears on his head with his fingers. There was also the Panniculus, who appeared in a party-coloured dress, with his head shaved, feigning stupidity or folly, and allowing blows to be inflicted on himself without

* Festus in *Salva res est*.

† *Satyricon*, c. 80. See also Suetonius, *Caligula*, c. 57.

‡ “Mimi ergo est jam exitus,” says Cicero, “non Fabulæ: In quo, cum clausula non invenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus; deinde scabella concrepant, auleum tollitur.”—*Orat. pro Calio*, c. 27.

cause or moderation. That women performed characters in these dramas, and were often the favourite mistresses of the great, is evident from a passage in the Satires of Horace, who mentions a female Mime, called Origo, on whom a wealthy Roman had lavished his paternal inheritance*. Cornelius Gallus wrote four books of *Flegies* in praise of a Mime called Cytheris, who, as Aurelius Victor informs us, was also beloved by Antony and Brutus—"Cytheridam Mimam, cum Antonio et Gallo, amavit Brutus." It appears from a passage in Valerius Maximus, that these Mimæ were often required to strip themselves of their clothes in presence of the spectators†.

As might be expected from the characters introduced, the Mimes were appropriated to a representation of the lowest follies and debaucheries of the vulgar. "Argumenta," says Valerius Maximus, "majore ex parte, stuprorum continent actus." That they were in a great measure occupied with the tricks played by wives on their husbands, (somewhat, probably, in the style of those related by the Italian novelists,) we learn from Ovid; who, after complaining in his *Tristia* of having been undeservedly condemned for the freedom of his verses, asks—

"Quid si scripsissem Mimos obscena jocantes?
Qui semper juncti crimen amoris habent;
In quibus assidue cultus procedit adulter,
Verbaque dat stulto callida nupta viro‡."

We learn from another passage of Ovid that these were by much the most popular subjects,—

"Cumque fefellit amans aliqua novitate maritum,
Plauditur, et magno palma favore datur."

The same poet elsewhere calls the Mimes, "Imitantes turpia Mimos;" and Diomedes defines them to be "Sermonis cujuslibet, motusque, sine reverentiâ, vel factorum turpium cum lasciviâ imitatio, ita ut ridiculum faciant."

These Mimes were originally represented as a sort of after-piece, or interlude to the regular dramas, and were intended to fill up the blank which had been left by omission of the Chorus. But they subsequently came to form a separate and fashionable public amusement, which in a great measure superseded all other dramatic entertainments. Sylla (in whom the gloomy temper of the tyrant was brightened by the talents of a mimic and a wit) was so fond of Mimes, that he gave the

* Sat. Lib. I. 2. v. 55.

‡ *Tristia*, Lib. II. v. 497.

† I. lib. II. c. 5.

actors of them many acres of the public land* ; and we shall soon see the high importance which Julius Cæsar attached to this sort of spectacle. It appears, at first view, curious, that the Romans—the most grave, solid, and dignified nation on earth, the *gens togata*, and the *domini rerum*—should have been so partial to the exhibition of licentious buffoonery on the stage. But, perhaps, when people have a mind to divert themselves, they choose what is most different from their ordinary temper and habits, as being most likely to amuse them. “Strangely,” says Isaac Bey, while relating his adventures in *France*, “was my poor Turkish brain puzzled, on discovering the favourite pastime of a nation reckoned the merriest in the world. It consisted in a thing called tragedies, whose only purpose is to make you cry your eyes out. Should the performance raise a single smile, the author is undone †.”

The popularity and frequent repetition of the Mimes came gradually to purify their grossness ; and the writers of them, at length, were not contented merely with the fame of amusing the Roman populace by ribaldry. They carried their pretensions higher ; and, while they sometimes availed themselves of the licentious freedom to which this species of drama gave unlimited indulgence, they interspersed the most striking truths and beautiful moral maxims in these ludicrous and indecent farces. This appears from the Mimes of DECIMUS LABERIUS and PUBLIUS SYRUS, who both flourished during the dictatorship of Julius Cæsar.

LABERIUS.

In earlier periods, as has been already mentioned, the writer was also the chief representer of the Mime. Laberius, however, was not originally an actor, but a Roman knight of respectable family and character, who occasionally amused himself with the composition of these farcical productions. He was at length requested by Julius Cæsar to appear on the stage after he had reached the age of sixty, and act the Mimes, which he had sketched or written †. Aware that the entreaties of a perpetual dictator are nearly equivalent to commands, he reluctantly complied ; but in the prologue to the first piece which he acted, he complained bitterly to the audience of the degradation to which he had been subjected—

* Athenæus, *Deipnos*. Lib. VI.

† Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, Lib. II. c. 7.

† *Anastasius*, Vol. II. p. 385. 2d ed.

"Ego, bis trecentis annis actis, sine notâ,
 Eques Romanus lare egressus meo,
 Domum revertar Mimus. Nimirum hoc die
 Uno plus vixi mihi, quam vivendum fuit.
 Fortuna, immoderata in bono æque atque in malo,
 Si tibi erat libitum, literarum laudibus
 Floris cacumen nostræ sanæ frangere,
 Cur cum vigebam membris præviridantibus,
 Satisfacere populo, et tali cum poteram viro,
 Non flexibilem me concurvâsti ut caperes?
 Nunc me quò dejicis? quid ad scenam affero,
 Decorem formæ, an dignitatem corporis?
 Animi virtutem, an vocis jucundæ sonum?
 Ut hedera serpens vires arboreas necat;
 Ita me vetustas amplexu annorum enecat*."

The whole prologue, consisting of twenty-nine lines, which have been preserved by Macrobius, is written in a fine vein of poetry, and with all the high spirit of a Roman citizen. It breathes in every verse the most bitter and indignant feelings of wounded pride, and highly exalts our opinion of the man, who, yielding to an irresistible power, preserved his dignity while performing a part which he despised. It is difficult to conceive how, in this frame of mind, he could assume the jocund and unrestrained gaiety of a Mime, or how the Roman people could relish so painful a spectacle. He is said, however, to have represented the feigned character with inimitable grace and spirit. But in the course of his performance he could not refrain from expressing strong sentiments of freedom and detestation of tyranny. In one of the scenes he personated a Syrian slave; and, while escaping from the lash of his master, he exclaimed,

"Porro, Quirites, libertatem perdidimus;"

and shortly after, he added,

* "For threescore years since first I saw the light,
 I lived without reproach—A ROMAN KNIGHT.
 As such I left my sacred home; but soon
 Shall there return an actor and buffoon.
 Since stretch'd beyond the point where honour ends,
 One day too long my term of life extends.
 Fortune, extreme alike in good and ill,
 Since thus to blast my fame has been thy will;
 Why didst thou not, ere spent my youthful race,
 Bend me yet pliant to this dire disgrace?
 While power remain'd, with yet unbroken frame,
 HIM to have pleased, and earn'd the crowd's acclaim:
 But now why drive me to an actor's part,
 When nought remains of all the actor's art;
 Nor life, nor fire, which could the scene rejoice,
 Nor grace of form, nor harmony of voice?
 As fades the tree round which the ivy twines,
 So in the clasp of age my strength declines."

VOL. I.—2 R

“Necesse est multos timeat, quem multi timent,”

on which the whole audience turned their eyes to Cæsar, who was present in the theatre*.

It was not merely to entertain the people, who would have been as well amused with the representation of any other actor; nor to wound the private feelings of Laberius, that Cæsar forced him on the stage. His sole object was to degrade the Roman knighthood, to subdue their spirit of independence and honour, and to strike the people with a sense of his unlimited sway. This policy formed part of the same system which afterwards led him to persuade a senator to combat among the ranks of gladiators. The practice introduced by Cæsar became frequent during the reigns of his successors; and in the time of Domitian, the Fabii and Mamerci acted as *planipedes*, the lowest class of buffoons, who, barefooted and smeared with soot, capered about the stage in the intervals of the play for the amusement of the rabble!

Though Laberius complied with the wishes of Cæsar, in exhibiting himself on the stage, and acquitted himself with ability as a mimetic actor, it would appear that the Dictator had been hurt and offended by the freedoms which he used in the course of the representation, and either on this or some subsequent occasion bestowed the dramatic crown on a Syrian slave, in preference to the Roman knight. Laberius submitted with good grace to this fresh humiliation; he pretended to regard it merely as the ordinary chance of theatric competition, as he expressed to the audience in the following lines:—

“Non possunt primi esse omnes omni in tempore.
Summum ad gradum cum claritatis veneris,
Consistes ægre: et citius quam ascendas, decides.
Cecidi ego—cadet qui sequitur.”—

Laberius did not long survive this double mortification: he retired from Rome, and died at Puteoli about ten months after the assassination of Cæsar†.

The titles and a few fragments of forty-three of the *Mimes* of Laberius are still extant; but, excepting the prologue, these remains are too inconsiderable and detached to enable us to judge of their subject or merits. It would appear that he occasionally dramatized the passing follies or absurd oc-

* Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, Lib. II. c. 7.

† “All are not always first—few have been known
To rest long on the summit of renown.
In fame we faster fall than we ascend:
I fall—who follows, thus his course must end.”

‡ *Chron. Euseb. ad Olymp.* 184.

currences of the day: for Cicero, writing to the lawyer Trebonius, who expected to accompany Cæsar from Gaul to Britain, tells him he had best return to Rome quickly, as a longer pursuit to no purpose would be so ridiculous a circumstance, that it would hardly escape the drollery of that arch fellow Laberius; and what a burlesque character, he continues, would a British lawyer furnish out for the Roman stage*! The only passage of sufficient length in connection to give us any idea of his manner, is a whimsical application of a story concerning the manner in which Democritus put out his eyes—

“Democritus Abderites, physicus philosophus,
Clypeum constituit contra exortum Hyperionis;
Oculos effodere ut posset splendore æreo.
Ita, radiis solis aciem effodit luminis,
Malis bene esse ne videret civibus.
Sic ego, fulgentis splendore pecuniæ,
Volo elucidicare exitum ætatis meæ,
Ne in re bonâ esse videam nequam filium†.”

According to Aulus Gellius, Laberius has taken too much license in inventing words; and that author also gives various examples of his use of obsolete expressions, or such as were employed only by the lowest dregs of the people‡. Horace seems to have considered an admiration of the Mimes of Laberius as the consummation of critical folly§. I am far, however, from considering Horace as an infallible judge of true poetical excellence. He evidently attached more importance to correctness and terseness of style, than to originality of genius or fertility of invention. I am convinced he would not have admired Shakspeare: He would have considered Addison and Pope as much finer poets, and would have included Falstaff, and Autolycus, and Sir Toby Belch, the clowns and the boasters of our great dramatist, in the same censure which he bestows on the *Plautinos sales* and the Mimes

* *Epist. Famil. Lib. VII. ep. 11.*

† “Democritus, the philosophic sage
Of Abdera, deep read in Nature’s page,
Opposed a brazen shield of polish bright
To full-orbed Phœbus’ mid-day shafts of light,
That the round mirror, having caught the rays,
Might blast his vision with the dazzling blaze;
Thus his extinguished eyes could ne’er behold
The wicked prosper. O that thus my gold
Might, with the lustre of its yellow light,
Dine through my closing years these orbs of sight,
Whose darkness would not see a thriftless son
Waste the fair fortune which his fathers won!”

‡ *Noct. Attic. Lib. XVI. c. 7.*

§ *Satir. Lib. I. 10.*

of Laberius. Probably, too, the freedom of the prologue, and other passages of his dramas, contributed to draw down the disapprobation of this Augustan critic, as it already had placed the dramatic wreath on the brow of

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

The celebrated Mime, called Publius Syrus, was brought from Asia to Italy in early youth, in the same vessel with his countryman and kinsman, Manlius Antiochus, the professor of astrology, and Staberius Eros, the grammarian, who all, by some desert in learning, rose above their original fortune. He received a good education and liberty from his master, in reward for his witticisms and facetious disposition. He first represented his Mimes in the provincial towns of Italy, whence, his fame having spread to Rome, he was summoned to the capital, to assist in those public spectacles which Cæsar afforded his countrymen, in exchange for their freedom*. On one occasion, he challenged all persons of his own profession to contend with him on the stage; and in this competition he successively overcame every one of his rivals. By his success in the representation of these popular entertainments, he amassed considerable wealth, and lived with such luxury, that he never gave a great supper without having sow's udder at table—a dish which was prohibited by the censors, as being too great a luxury even for the table of patricians†.

Nothing farther is known of his history, except that he was still continuing to perform his Mimes with applause at the period of the death of Laberius.

We have not the names of any of the Mimes of Publius; nor do we precisely know their nature or subject,—all that is preserved from them being a number of detached sentiments or maxims, to the number of 800 or 900, seldom exceeding a single line, but containing reflections of unrivalled force, truth, and beauty, on all the various relations, situations, and feelings of human life—friendship, love, fortune, pride, adversity, avarice, generosity. Both the writers and actors of Mimes were probably careful to have their memory stored with common-places and precepts of morality, in order to introduce them appropriately in their extemporaneous performances. The maxims of Publius were interspersed through his dramas, but being the only portion of these productions now remaining,

* Macrobius, *Saturnal.* Lib. II. c. 7.

† *Plin. Hist. Nat.* Lib. VIII. c. 51.

they have just the appearance of thoughts or sentiments, like those of Rochefoucauld. His Mimes must either have been very numerous, or very thickly loaded with these moral aphorisms. It is also surprising that they seem raised far above the ordinary tone even of regular comedy, and appear for the greater part to be almost stoical maxims. Seneca has remarked that many of his eloquent verses are fitter for the buskin than the slipper*. How such exalted precepts should have been grafted on the lowest farce, and how passages, which would hardly be appropriate in the most serious sentimental comedy, were adapted to the actions or manners of gross and drunken buffoons, is a difficulty which could only be solved had we fortunately received entire a larger portion of these productions, which seem to have been peculiar to Roman genius.

The sentiments of Publius Syrus now appear trite. They have become familiar to mankind, and have been re-echoed by poets and moralists from age to age. All of them are most felicitously expressed, and few of them seem erroneous, while at the same time they are perfectly free from the selfish or worldly-minded wisdom of Rochefoucauld, or Lord Burleigh.

* " Amicos res optimæ parant, adversæ probant.
 Miserrima fortuna est quæ inimico caret.
 Ingratus unus miseris omnibus nocet.
 Timidus vocat se cautum, parcum sordidus.
 Etiam oblivisci quid scis interdum prodest.
 In nullum avarus bonus, in se pessimus.
 Cuius dolori remedium est patientia.
 Honestus rumor alterum est patrimonium.
 Tam deest avaro quod habet quam quod non habet.
 O vita misero longa—felici brevis !"

This last sentiment has been beautifully, but somewhat diffusely expressed by Metastasio :

" Perchè tarda è mai la morte
 Quando è termine al martir ?
 A chi vive in lieta sorte
 E sollecito il morir."—*Artaserse*.

The same idea is thus expressed by La Bruyere : " La vie est courte pour ceux qui sont dans les joyes du monde : Elle ne paroît longue qu'à ceux qui languissent dans l'affliction. Job se plaint de vivre long temps, et Salomon craint de mourir trop jeune." La Bruyere, indeed, has interspersed a vast number of the maxims of the Roman Mime in his writings,—expanding, modifying, or accommodating them to the manners of his age

* Ep. viii.

and country, as best suited his purpose. One of them only, he quotes to reprehend :

“ *Ita amicum habeas, posse ut fieri inimicum putes.*”

This sentiment, which Publius had borrowed from the Greeks, and which is supposed to have been originally one of the sayings of Bias, has been censured by Cicero, in his beautiful treatise *De Amicitia*, as the bane of friendship. It would be endless to quote the lines of the different Latin poets, particularly Horace and Juvenal, which are nearly copied from the maxims of Publius Syrus. Seneca, too, has availed himself of many of his reflections, and, at the same time, does full justice to the author from whom he has borrowed. Publius, says he, is superior in genius both to tragic and comic writers : Whenever he gives up the follies of the Mimes, and that language which is directed to the crowd, he writes many things not only above that species of composition, but worthy of the tragic buskin*.

Cneius Matius, also a celebrated writer of Mimes, was contemporary with Laberius and Publius Syrus. Some writers have confounded him with Caius Matius, who was a correspondent of Cicero, and an intimate friend of Julius Cæsar. Ziegler, though he distinguishes him from Cicero's correspondent, says, that he was the same person as the friend of Cæsar†.

Aulus Gellius calls Matius a very learned man, (*homo eruditus et impense doctus*;) and frequently quotes him for obsolete terms and forms of expression‡. Like other writers of Mimes, he indulged himself a good deal in this sort of phraseology, but his diction was considered as agreeable and highly poetical§.

The Mimes of Matius were called Mimiambi, because chiefly written in iambics ; but not more than a dozen lines have descended to us. The following verses have been praised for elegance and a happy choice of expressions—

“ *Quapropter edulcare convenit vitam,
Curasque acerbis sensibus gubernare ;
SINUQUE amicam recipere frigidam caldo
Columbatimque labra conserens labris||.*”

* Senec. *Epist.*

† *De Mimis Romanorum*, p. 66.

‡ *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XV. c. 25. Lib. X. c. 24.

§ Terent. Maurus, *De Metris* ; Ziegler, *De Mimis Rom.* p. 66 and 67.

|| “ *Tis fit that we the means employ,
To sweeten life, and life enjoy.
Let pleasure lay your cares to rest,
And clasp the fair one to your breast,
Give and receive the melting kiss,
Like doves in hours of amorous bliss.*”

The age of Laberius, P. Syrus, and Matius, was the most brilliant epoch in the history of the actors of Mimes. After that period, they relapsed into a race of impudent buffoons; and, in the reign of Augustus, were classed, by Horace, with mountebanks and mendicants*. Pantomimic actors, who did not employ their voice, but represented everything by gesticulation and dancing, became, under Augustus, the idols of the multitude, the minions of the great, and the favourites of the fair. The *Mimi* were then but little patronized on the stage, but were still admitted into convivial parties, and even the court of the Emperors, to entertain the guests†, like the *Histrions*, *Jongleurs*, or privileged fools, of the middle ages; and they were also employed at funerals, to mimic the manners of the deceased. Thus, the *Archimimus*, who represented the character of the avaricious *Vespasian*, at the splendid celebration of his obsequies, inquired what would be the cost of all this posthumous parade; and on being told that it would amount to ten millions of sesterces, he replied, that if they would give him a hundred thousand, they might throw his body into the river‡. The audacity, however, of the *Mimes* was carried still farther, as they satirized and insulted the most ferocious Emperors during their lives, and in their own presence. An actor, in one of these pieces which was performed during the reign of *Nero*, while repeating the words "*Vale pater, vale mater*," signified by his gestures the two modes of drowning and poisoning, in which that sanguinary fiend had attempted to destroy both his parents§. The *Mimi* currently bestowed on *Commodus* the most opprobrious appellation||. One of their number, who performed before the enormous *Maximin*, reminded the audience, that he who was too strong for an individual, might be massacred by a multitude, and that thus the elephant, lion, and tiger, are slain. The tyrant perceived the sensation excited in the Theatre, but the suggestion was veiled in a language unknown to that barbarous and gigantic *Thracian*¶.

The *Mimes* may be traced beyond the age of *Constantine*, as we find the fathers of the church reprehending the immorality and licentiousness of such exhibitions*†. Tradition is never so faithful as in the preservation of popular pastimes; and accordingly, many of those which had amused the Romans

* *Satir. Lib. I. 2.*

† *Vopiscus. Vit. Aurel. c. 42.*

‡ *Suetonius, In Vespas. c. 19.*

§ *Id. In Nerone, c. 29.*

|| *Appellatus est a Mimis quasi obstupratus.—Lampridius, Vit. Commodi. c. 3.*

¶ *Jul. Capitolinus. In Maximin. c. 9.*

*† *Tertullian, De Spectac. c. 17.—Lactantius, Div. Inst. Lib. VI. c. 20.—Walker on the Italian Drama, p. 3.*

survived their dominion. The annual celebration of Carnival prolonged the remembrance of them during the dark ages. Hence, the Mimes, and the Atellane fables formerly mentioned, became the origin of the Italian pantomimic parts introduced in the *Commedie dell' arte*, in which a subject was assigned, and the scenes were enumerated; but in which the dialogue was left to the extemporary invention of the actors, who represented buffoon characters in masks, and spoke the dialect of different districts. "As to Italy," says Warburton, in an account given by him of the Rise and Progress of the Modern Stage, "the first rudiments of its theatre, with regard to the matter, were profane subjects, and with regard to the form, a corruption of ancient Mimes and Atellanes."—Zanni is one of the names of the Harlequin in the Italian comedies; and Sannio, as we learn from ancient writers, was a ridiculous personage, who performed in these Latin farces, with his head shaved*, his face bedaubed with soot†, and clothed in party-coloured garments—a dress universally worn by the ancient Italian peasantry during the existence of the Roman Republic‡. The lowest species of mimic actors were called *planipedes*, because they performed without sock or buskin, and generally barefooted, whence Harlequin's flat unsho'd feet. A passage of Cicero, in which he speaks of the Sannio, seems almost intended to describe the perpetual and flexible motion of the limbs, the ludicrous gestures, and mimetic countenance of Harlequin. "Quid enim," says he, "potest tam ridiculum quam Sannio esse? qui ore, vultu, imitandis motibus, voce, denique corpore ridetur ipso§." Among the Italians, indeed, this character soon degenerated into a booby and glutton, who became the butt of his more sharp-sighted companions. In France, Harlequin was converted into a wit,—sometimes even a moralist; and with us he has been transformed into an expert magician, who astonishes by sudden changes of the scene: But none of these was his original, or native character, which, as we have seen, corresponded to the Sannio of the Mimes and Atellane fables. In the year 1727, a bronze figure of high antiquity, and of which Quadrio gives an engraving||, was found at Rome; and it appears from it, that the modern Pollicinella of Naples is a lineal descendant of the *Mimus Ilbus* of the Atellanes¶. Ficoroni, who, in his work *Larve Sceniche*, compares his immense collection of Roman masks with the

* *Rasis capitibus*. Vossius, *Institut. Poetic.* Lib. II. c. 82. § 4.

† Diomed. *De Orat.* Lib. III.

‡ Celsus, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. I. c. 8.

§ *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 61.

|| *Storia D' Ogni Poesia*, Tom. V. p. 220.

¶ Riccoboni, *Hist. de Theatre Italien.* Tom. I. p. 21.

modern Italian characters, was possessed of an onyx, which represented a Mime with a long nose and pointed cap, carrying a bag of money in one hand, and two brass balls in the other, which he sounded, as is supposed, like castanets when he danced. These appendages correspond to the attributes which distinguished the Italian dancer of Catania, known by the name of *Giangorgolo*. Another onyx exhibits a figure resembling that of *Pantalone*. It is also evident from the Antiques collected by *Ficoroni*, that the Roman *Mimi* were fond of representing caricatures of foreign nations, as we find among these ancient figures the attires of the oriental nations, and the garb of old Gaul—a species of exhibition in which the *Commedia dell' arte* also particularly delighted.

These *Commedie dell' arte* were brought to the highest pitch of comic and grotesque perfection by *Ruzzante*, an Italian dramatist, who both wrote and performed a number of them about the middle of the sixteenth century, and who, in addition to *Zany* and *Pollicinella*, peopled the stage with a new and enlivening crowd of mimetic characters. There appears to be something so congenial to the Italian taste in these exhibitions, that they long maintained their ground against the regular dramas, produced by the numerous successors of *Trissino* and *Bibbiena*, and kept supreme possession of the Italian stage, till at length *Goldoni*, by introducing beauties which were incongruous with the ancient masks, gradually refined the taste of his audience, made them ashamed of their former favourites, and then, in some of his pieces, ventured to exclude from the stage the whole grotesque and gesticulating family of *Harlequin*.

Having said so much (and, I fear, too much) of the Mimes, and other departments of the Roman drama, it would not be suitable to conclude without some notice, I. of the mechanical construction of the theatre where the dramatic entertainments were produced; and, II. of the actors' declamation, as also of the masks and other attributes of the characters which were chiefly represented.

I. Such was the severity of the ancient republican law, that it permitted no places of amusement, except the circus, where games were specially privileged from having been instituted by *Romulus*, and exhibited in honour of the gods. Satiric and dramatic representations, however, as we have seen, gradually became popular; and, at length, so increased

in number and importance, that a *Theatre* was required for their performance.

The subject of the construction of the Roman theatre is attended with difficulty and confusion. While there are still considerable remains of amphitheatres, scarcely any ruins or vestiges of theatres exist. The writings of the ancients throw little light on the topic; and there is much contradiction, or at least apparent inconsistency, in what has been written, in consequence of the alterations which took place in the construction of theatres in the progress of time.

Those stages, which were erected in the earliest periods of the Roman republic, for the exhibitions of dancers and histrions, were probably set up according to the Etruscan mode, in places covered with boughs of trees, (*Nemorosa palatia*,) in tents or booths, or, at best, in temporary and moveable buildings—perhaps not much superior in dignity or accommodation to the cart of Thespis.

But, though the Etruscan histrions probably constructed the stage on which they were to perform, according to the fashion of their own country, the Greek was the model of the regular Roman theatre, as much as the pieces of Euripides and Menander were the prototypes of the Latin tragedies and comedies. The remains of a playhouse believed to be Etruscan, were discovered at Adria about the middle of the seventeenth century. But there was a wider difference between it and the Roman theatre, than between the Roman and the Greek. The Greeks had a large orchestra, and a very limited stage—the Romans, a confined orchestra, and extensive stage; while in the Adrian theatre, the orchestra was larger even than in the Greek*.

The first regular theatre at Rome was that constructed for Livius Andronicus on the Aventine Hill. This building, however, was but temporary, and probably existed no longer than the distinguished dramatist and actor for whose accommodation it was erected. In the year 575, M. *Æmilius Lepidus* got a theatre constructed adjacent to the temple of Apollo†; but it also was one of those occasional buildings, which were removed after the series of dramatic exhibitions for which they had been intended were concluded. A short while before the commencement of the third Punic war, a playhouse, which the censors were fitting up with seats for the convenience of the spectators, was thrown down by a decree of the senate,

* *Dissert. dell'Academ. Etrusc.* Tom. III.

† Livy, Lib. XL. c. 51. *Theatrum et proscenium ad Apollinis ædem Jovis in Capitolio, columnasque circa poliendas albo locavit.*

as prejudicial to public morals; and the people continued for some time longer to view the representations standing, as formerly*. At length, M. Æmilius Scaurus built a theatre capable of containing 80,000 spectators, and provided with every possible accommodation for the public. It was also adorned with amazing magnificence, and at almost incredible expense. Its stage had three lofts or stories, rising above each other, and supported by 360 marble columns. The lowest floor was of marble—the second was incrustated with glass; and the third was formed of gilded boards or planks. The pillars were thirty-eight feet in height; and between them were placed bronze statues and images, to the number of not fewer than 3000. There was besides an immense superfluity of rich hangings of cloth of gold; and painted tablets, the most exquisite that could be procured, were disposed all around the *pulpitum* and *scenæ*†.

Curio, being unable to rival such profuse and costly decoration, distinguished himself by a new invention, which he introduced at the funeral entertainments given by him in honour of his father's memory. He constructed two large edifices of wood adjacent to each other, and suspended on hinges so contrived that the buildings could be united at their centre or separated, in such a manner as to form a theatre or amphitheatre, according to the nature of the exhibition. In both these fabrics he made stage plays be acted in the early part of the day—the semicircles being placed back to back, so that the declamation, music, and applauses, in the one, did not reach the other; and, then, having wheeled them round in the afternoon, so that, by completing the circle, they formed an amphitheatre, he exhibited combats of gladiators‡. All these changes were performed without displacing the spectators, who seem to have fearlessly trusted themselves to the strength of the machinery, and skill of the artist.

The theatres of Scaurus and Curio, though they far surpassed in extent and sumptuous decoration all the permanent theatres of modern times; yet, being built of wood, and being only destined for a certain number of representations during certain games or festivals, were demolished when these were concluded. The whole furnishings and costly materials of the theatre of Scaurus were immediately removed to his private villa, where they were burned, it is said, by his servants,

* Livy, *Epitom.* Lib. XLVIII. Quum locatum a censoribus theatrum exstrueretur; P. C. Nasica auctore, tanquam inutile, et nociturum publicis moribus, ex senatusconsulto destructum est: populusque aliquandiu stans ludos spectavit.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXVI. c. 15.

‡ *Ibid.*

in a transport of indignation at the extravagant profusion of their master*.

Pompey was the first person who erected a permanent theatre of stone. After the termination of the Mithridatic war, he made a coasting voyage along the shores and islands of Greece. In the whole of his progress he showed the attention of a liberal and cultivated mind to monuments of art. The theatre of Mitylene particularly pleased him, both in its outward form, and interior construction. He carried away with him a model of this building, that he might erect at Rome a theatre similar to it†, but on a larger scale. The edifice which he built on the plan of this theatre, after his return to Rome, was situated in the field of Flora, near the temple of Venus Victrix, and held just one half of the number of spectators which the playhouse of Scæurus contained‡. It was completed during Pompey's second consulship, in the year 698. On the day on which it was opened, Æsopus, the great tragic actor, appeared for the last time in one of his favourite characters, but his strength and voice failed him, and he was unable to finish the part.

The construction of this theatre was speedily followed by the erection of others. But all the Roman theatres which were built towards the close of the republic, and commencement of the empire, were formed, in most respects, on the model of the Greek theatre, both in their external plan and interior arrangement. They were oblong semicircular buildings, forming the half of an amphitheatre; and were thus rounded at one end, and terminated on the other by a long straight line. The interior was divided into three parts—1. The place for the spectators; 2. The orchestra; and, 3. The stage§.

1. The universal passion of the Roman people for all sorts of exhibitions, rendered the places from which they were to view them a matter of competition and importance. Originally there were no seats in the theatres, and the senators stood promiscuously with the people; yet, such in those days was the reverence felt by the plebeians for their dignified superiors, that, notwithstanding their rage for spectacles, they never pushed before a senator||. It was in the year 559, during the consulship of the elder Scipio Africanus with Sempronius Longus, that the former carried a law, by which separate places were assigned to the senators¶. This regu-

* Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXVI. c. 15.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXVI. c. 15.

‡ Alexander ab Alexandro, *Dies Geniales*, Lib. V. c. 16.

¶ *Ibid.*

§ Plutarch, *In Pompeio*.

¶ Vitruvius, Lib. V. c. 6.

lation was renewed from time to time, as circumstances of political confusion removed the line of distinction which had been drawn. Scipio lost much of his popularity by this aristocratic innovation, and is said to have severely repented of the share he had taken in it*. By the law of Scipio, part of the orchestra, (which, in the Greek theatre, was occupied by the chorus,) was appropriated to the senators. The knights and plebeians, however, continued to sit promiscuously for more than 100 years longer; but at length, in 685, a regulation of the tribune, Roscius Otho, allotted to the knights, tribunes, and persons of a certain *census*, fourteen rows of circular benches immediately behind the orchestra. This was a still more unpopular measure than that introduced by the edict of Africanus. Otho, during the consulship of Cicero, having entered the theatre, was hissed by the multitude, while Roscius was acting one of his principal parts; but Cicero presently called them out to the temple of Bellona, where he delivered a harangue, which appeased their fury and reconciled them to the tribune†. Henceforth the senators held undisputed possession of the orchestra; and the knights, with the better classes, retained the fourteen rows of seats immediately surrounding it.

The seats for the senators, arranged in the orchestra, were straight benches, placed at equal distances from each other, and were not fixed‡. The other benches, which were assigned to the knights and people, were semicircularly disposed around the circumference of the theatre, and spread from the orchestra to the rounded end of the building. The extremities of the seats joined the orchestra, and they were carried one above another, sloping, till they reached the remotest part, and ascended almost to the ceiling. Thus the benches which were lowest and most contiguous to the orchestra, described a smaller circumference than those which spread more towards the outer walls of the theatre§. Over the higher tier of seats a portico was constructed, the roof of which ranged with the loftiest part of the scene, in order that the voice expanding equally, might be carried to the uppermost seats, and thence to the top of the building||. The benches, which were gently raised above each other, were separated into three sets or tiers; each tier, at least in most theatres, consisting of seven benches. According to some

* Alexander ab Alexandro, *Dies Geniales*, Lib. V. c. 16.

† Schütz, *ad Fragment. Oper. Ciceronis*, Tom. XVI.

‡ Wilkins' *Vitruvius*, Vol. II. p. 185.

§ *Ibid.* Lib. V. c. 8.

|| *Ibid.* Lib. V. c. 7.

writers, the separation of these tiers was a passage, or gallery, which went quite round them for facility of communication; according to others, it was a belt, or precinction, which was twice the height, and twice the breadth of the seats*. It would appear, however, from a passage in Vitruvius, that both a raised belt, and a gallery or corridore, surrounded each tier of seats†. One of the precinctions formed the division between the places of the knights and those of the people‡. In a different and angular direction, the tiers and ranges of seats were separated by stairs, making so many lines in the circumference of the seats, and leading from the orchestra to the doors of the theatre. The benches were cut by the stairs into the form of wedges. The steps of the stairs were always a little lower than the seats; but the number of stairs varied in different theatres. Pompey's theatre had fifteen, that of Marcellus only seven§. As luxury increased at Rome, these stairs were bedewed with streams of fragrant water, for the purposes of coolness and refreshment. At the top of each flight of steps were doors called *vomitoria*, which gave egress from the theatre, and communicated directly with the external stair-cases||.

In the ancient temporary Roman theatres, the body of the building, or place where the spectators sat, was open at top to receive the light. But Quintus Catulus, during the entertainments exhibited at his dedication of the Capitol, introduced the luxury of canvass, which was drawn partially or completely over the theatre at pleasure¶. This curtain was at first of simple unornamented woof, and was merely used as a screen from the sun, or a protection from rain; but, in process of time, silken hangings of glossy texture and splendid hues waved from the roof, flinging their gorgeous tints on the *proscenium* and spectators:—

“ Et vulgo faciunt id lutea russaque vela,
Et ferrugina, quum, magnis intenta theatris,
Per malos vulgata trabesque, tremantia fluctant.
Namque ibi consessum caveai subter, et omnem
Scenalem speciem, patrum, matrumque, deorumque,
Inficiunt, coguntque suo fluitare colore*†.”

2. *The Orchestra* was a considerable space in the centre of the theatre, part of which was allotted for the seats of the

* Montfaucon, *L'Antiquité dévoilée*, Liv. II. c. 1.

† Lib. V. c. 3.

‡ Montfaucon, Liv. II. c. 3.

§ Montfaucon, Liv. II. c. 1.

|| Ibid. and Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, Lib. VI. c. 4.

¶ Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XIX. c. 1.

*† Lucretius, Lib. IV.

senators. The remainder was occupied by those who played upon musical instruments, whose office it was, in the performance both of tragedies and comedies, to give to the actors and audience the tone of feeling which the dramatic parts demanded. In tragedies, the music invariably accompanied the Chorus. It was not, however, confined to the Chorus; but appears to have been also in the monologues, and perhaps in some of the most impassioned parts of the dialogue; for Cicero tells of Roscius, that he said, when he grew older, he would make the music play slower, that he might the more easily keep up with it*. I do not, however, believe, that comedy was a musical performance throughout: Mr Hawkins, after quoting a number of authorities to this purpose, concludes, "that comedy had no music but between the acts, except, perhaps, occasionally in the case of marriages and sacrifices, if any such were represented on the stage†."

Every play had its own musical prelude, which distinguished it from others, and from which many of the audience at once knew what piece was about to be performed‡. The chief musical instruments employed in the theatre were the *tibiæ*, or flutes, with which the comedies of Terence are believed to have been represented. The *Andria* is said to have been acted, "Tibiis paribus, dextris et sinistris;"—the *Eunuch*, "Tibiis duabus dextris;"—the *Heautontimorumenos*, on its first appearance, "Tibiis imparibus;" on its second, "Duabus dextris;"—the *Adelphi*, "Tibiis sarranis;"—the *Hecyra*, "Tibiis paribus,"—and the *Phormio*, "Tibiis imparibus." It thus appears, that the theatrical flutes were classed as "dextræ et sinistræ," and also as "pares et impares," and that there were likewise "Tibiæ Serranæ," or "Sarranæ," to which, it is believed, the Phrygiæ were opposed. There has been much dispute, however, as to what constituted the distinction between these different sets of pipes. Scaliger thinks, that the "Tibiæ dextræ et sinistræ" were formed by cutting the reed into two parts; that portion which was next to the root making the left, and that next to the top the right flute,—whence the notes of the former were more grave, and those of the latter more acute§. Mad. Dacier, however, is of opinion, that flutes were denominated right and left from the valves, in playing, being stopped with the right or left hand. There is

* *De Oratore*, Lib. I. c. 60.

† Hawkins' *Inquiry into Greek and Latin Poetry*, § xiii.

‡ Cicero, *Academica*, Lib. II. c. 7.—"Primo inflatu tibiae, Antiocham esse aiunt, aut Andromacham."

§ *Poet.* Lib. I. c. 20.—See also Theophrastus ap. Bartholinus, *De Tibiis Veterum*, Lib. I. c. 4, and Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XVI. c. 86.

still more difficulty with regard to the "Tibiæ pares et impares." Some persons conjecture, that the Tibiæ pares were a set of two or more pipes of the same pitch in the musical scale, and Impares such as did not agree in pitch*. The opinion, that flutes were called Pares when they had an even, and Impares when an odd number of valves, is not inconsistent with this notion; nor with that adopted by Dempster†, that the difference depended on their being equal or unequal distances between the valves. It may be also reconciled with the idea of Salmasius, that when the same set of flutes were employed, as two right or two left, a play was said to be acted Tibiis paribus; and, when one or more right with one or more left were used, it was announced as performed Tibiis imparibus. This idea, however, of Salmasius, is inconsistent with what is said as to the *Andria* being acted with equal flutes right and left; unless, indeed, we suppose, with Mad. Dacier, that this is to be understood of different representations, and that the flutes were of the same description at each performance, but were sometimes a set of right, and at other times a set of left flutes.

As to the Tibiæ Serranæ, some have supposed that they were so called from Serra, since they produced the sharp grating sound occasioned by a saw‡; some, that they were denominated Sarranæ from Sarra, a city in Phœnicia, where such flutes are believed to have been invented§; and others, that they derived their name from Sero to lock; because in these flutes, there were valves or stops which opened and shut alternately||. It is only farther known, that the Tibiæ Serranæ belonged to the class called Pares, and the Phrygiæ, to which they were opposed, to that styled Impares.

All flutes, of whatever denomination, were extremely simple in the commencement of the dramatic art at Rome. Their form was plain, and they had but few notes. In progress of time, however, they became more complex, and louder in their tones¶.

Several chorded instruments were also used in the orchestra, as the lyre and harp, and in later times an hydraulic organ was introduced. This instrument, which is described in the *Organon* of Pub. Optatianus, emitted a sound which was produced from air created by the concussion of water. Cornelius Severus, in his poem of *Ætna*, alludes to it, under the name of *Cortina*—

* Hawkins' *Inquiry into Lat. Poet.* p. 184.

† *Antiquitates Romanae.*

‡ Turnebus, *Advers.* Lib. XXVIII. c. 34.

§ Servius ap. Bartholin. *De Tibiis Veter.*

|| Hawkins' *Inquiry*, p. 137.

¶ Horat. *Art. Poet.* v. 202.

“ Carmineque irriguo magni Cortina Theatri
 Imparibus numerosa modis canit arte regentis,
 Quæ tenuem impellens animam subremigat undam*.”

3. *The Stage.* The front area of the stage was a little elevated above that part of the orchestra where the musicians were placed, and was called the *Proscenium*. On the proscenium a wooden platform, termed the *pulpitum*, was raised to the height of five feet†. This the actors ascended to perform their characters; and here all the dramatic representations of the Romans were exhibited‡, except the Mimes, which were acted on the lower floor of the proscenium. Certain architectural proportions were assigned to all these different parts of the theatre.

The whole space or area behind the pulpitum was called the *Scena*, because the scenery appropriate to the piece was there exhibited. “The three varieties of scenes,” says Vitruvius, “are termed tragic, comic, and satyric, each of which has a style of decoration peculiar to itself. In the tragic scene columns are represented, with statues, and other embellishments suitable to palaces and public buildings. The comic scene represents the houses of individuals, with their balconies and windows arranged in imitation of private dwellings. The satyric is adorned with groves, dens, and mountains, and other rural objects.” The rigid adherence of the ancients to the unity of place, rendered unnecessary that frequent shifting of scenes which is required in our dramas. When the side scenes were changed, the frames, or painted planks, were turned by machinery, and the scene was then called *versatilis*, or revolving: When it was withdrawn altogether, and another brought forward, it was called *ductilis*, or, sliding. There were also trapdoors in the floor of this part of the theatre, by which ghosts and the Furies ascended when their presence was required; and machines were disposed above the scene, as also at its sides, by which gods and other superior beings were suddenly brought upon the stage.

At the bottom of the scene, or end most remote from the spectators, there was a curtain of painted canvass, which was first used after the tapestry of Attalus had been brought to Rome§. It was dropped when the play began, remained down during the performance, and was drawn up when the

* v. 296. On the subject of the Hydraulicon, see Wernsdorff, *Poet. Lat. Min.* Tom. II. p. 394; and Busby's *History of Music*.

† Vitruvius, Lib. V. c. 6. Montfaucon, Liv. II. c. 1.

‡ Ibid.

§ Stephens, *De Theatris*.

representation concluded. This was certainly the case during the existence of the republic; but I imagine that an alteration took place in the time of the emperors, and that the curtain, being brought more forward on the scene, was then, as with us, raised at the commencement, and dropped at the end of the piece:—

“Mox ubi ridendas inclusit pagina partes,
Vera redit facies, dissimulata perit*.”

At each side of the *scena* there were doors called *Hospitalia*, by which the actors entered and made their exits.

That part of the theatre which comprehended the stage and scene was originally covered with branches of trees, which served both for shelter and ornament. It was afterwards shut in with planks, which were painted for the first time in the year 654. About the same period the scene was enriched with gold and silver hangings, and the proscenium was decorated with columns, statues, and altars to the god in whose honour, or at whose festival, the stage plays were represented.

II. In turning our attention to the *actors* who appeared on the *pulpitum* of the Roman stage, the point which first attracts our notice is that supposed separation of the dramatic labour, by which one performer gesticulated while the other declaimed. This division, however, did not take place at all in comedy, or in the ordinary dialogue (*Diverbia*) of tragedy; as is evinced by various passages in the Latin authors, which show that *Æsopus*, the chief tragic actor, and *Roscius*, the celebrated comedian, both gesticulated and declaimed. Cicero informs us, that *Æsopus* was hissed if he was in the least degree hoarse†; and he also mentions one remarkable occasion, on which, having returned to the stage after he had long retired from it, his voice suddenly failed him just as he commenced an adjuration in the part he represented‡. This evinces that *Æsopus* declaimed; and the same author affords us proof that he gesticulated: For, in the treatise *De Divinatione*, he introduces his brother *Quintus*, declaring, that he had himself witnessed in *Æsopus* such animation of countenance, and vehemence of gesture, that he seemed carried beside himself

* *Pet. Arbiter, Satyric. c. 80.*

† *Æsopum, si paulum irrauserit, explodi. De Oratore, Lib. I. c. 60.*

‡ *Noster Æsopus, jurare quum cepisset, vox eum defecit in illo loco “Si sciens fallo.” Epist. Famil. Lib. VII. ep. 1. Ed. Schütz.*

by some irresistible power*. Roscius, indeed, is chiefly talked of for the gracefulness of his gestures†, but there are also passages which refer to the modulation of his voice‡. It may perhaps, however, be said, that the above citations only prove that the same actor gesticulated in some characters, and declaimed in others; it seems, however, much more probable that Æsopus went through the whole dramatic part, than that he appeared in some plays merely as a gesticulating, and in others as a declaiming, performer.

There was thus no division in the ordinary dialogue, or *di-verbium*, as it was called, and it was employed only in the monologues, and those parts of high excitement and pathos, which were declaimed somewhat in the tone of *recitativo* in an Italian opera, and were called *Cantica*, from being accompanied either by the flutes or by instrumental music. That one actor should have recited, and another performed the corresponding gestures in the scenes of a tragedy, and that, too, in parts of the highest excitement, and in which theatric illusion should have been rendered most complete, certainly appears the most incongruous and inexplicable circumstance in the history of the Roman Drama. This division did not exist on the Greek stage, but it commenced at Rome as early as the time of Livius Andronicus, who, being *encored*, as we call it, in his monologues, introduced a slave, who declaimed to the sound of the flute, while he himself executed the corresponding gesticulations§. To us nothing can seem at first view more ridiculous, and more injurious to theatric illusion, than one person going through a dumb show or pantomime, while another, who must have appeared a supernumerary on the pulpitum, recited, with his arms across, the corresponding verses, in tones of the utmost vehemence and pathos||. It must,

* Vidi in Æsopo familiari tuo, tantum ardorem vultuum atque motuum, ut eum vis quedam abstraxisset a sensu mentis videretur. c. 87.

† Cicero, *pro Archia*, c. 8. Valer. Maxim. Lib. VIII. c. 7.

‡ Cicero, *De Legibus*, Lib. I. c. 4.

§ Livy, Lib. VII. c. 2.

|| I at one time was inclined to think that the reciting actor was concealed behind the pulpitum, which was elevated on the stage about the height of a man, and hence that the spectators saw only the gesticulating actor. If this plan was actually adopted, the representation may have been conducted without any apparent incongruity or violation of the scenic illusion. In Lord Gardenstoun's "*Travelling Memorandums*," we have an account of a play which he saw acted at Paris, where, in order to elude a privilege, the actors who appeared on the stage did not speak one word. "Their lips," continued his lordship, "move, and they go on with corresponding action and attitudes. But every word of the play is uttered with surprising propriety and character by persons behind the scenes. The play was nearly over before this singularity was discovered to me and others of our party. The whole was so strangely managed, that we could have sworn the visible actors

however, be recollected, that the Roman theatres were larger and worse lighted than ours ; that the mask prevented even the nearest spectators from perceiving the least motion of the lips, and they thus heard only the words without knowing whether they proceeded from him who recited or gestured ; and, finally, that these actors were so well trained, that they agreed precisely in their respective parts. We are informed by Cicero, that a comedian who made a movement out of time was as much hissed as one who mistook the pronunciation of a word or quantity of a syllable in a verse*. Seneca says, that it is surprising to see the attitudes of eminent comedians on the stage overtake and keep pace with speech, notwithstanding the velocity of the tongue†.

So much importance was attached to the art of dramatic gesticulation, that it was taught in the schools ; and there were instituted motions as well as natural. These artificial gestures, however, of arbitrary signification, were chiefly employed in pantomime, where speech not being admitted, more action was required to make the piece intelligible : And it appears from Quintilian, that comedians who acted with due decorum, never, or but very rarely, made use of instituted signs in their gesticulation‡. The movements suited to theatrical declamation were subdivided into three different sorts. The first, called *Emmelia*, was adapted to tragic declamation ; the second, *Cordax*, was fitted to comedies ; and the third, *Sicinnis*, was proper to satiric pieces, as the Mimes and *Exodia*§.

The recitation was also accounted of high importance, so that the player who articulated took prodigious pains to improve his voice, and an almost whimsical care to preserve it||. Nearly a third part of Dubos' once celebrated work on Poetry and Painting, is occupied with the theatric declamation of the Roman actors. The art of framing the declamation of dramatic pieces was, he informs us, the object of a particular study, and indeed profession, at Rome. It was composed and signified in notes, placed over each verse of the play, to direct the tones and inflection of voice which were to be observed in recitation. There were a certain number of accents in the

were also the speakers." (Vol. I. p. 24.) I have not, however, been able to discover any ancient authority, from which it can be inferred that the representation of a Roman play was conducted in this manner by the reciting actor being placed either behind the scenes or pulpitem ; and all authorities concur as to this strange division of dramatic labour, at least in the monologues of tragedies.

* Cicero, *Paradox.* III. c. 2.

† *Epist.* 121.

‡ *Inst. Orat.* Lib. XI. c. 3.

§ Athenæus, Lib. I. Dubos, *Reflexions sur la Poésie*, Lib. III. c. 14.

|| Cicero, *De Oratore*, Lib. I.

Latin language, and the composer of a declamation marked each syllable requiring to be accented, the grave or the acute accent which properly belonged to it, while on the remaining syllables, he noted, by means of conventional marks, a tone conformable to the tenor of the discourse. The declamation was thus not a musical song, but a recitation subject to the direction of a noted melody. Tragic declamation was graver and more harmonious than comic, but even the comic was more musical and varied than the pronunciation used in ordinary conversation*. This system, it might be supposed, would have deprived the actors of much natural fire and enthusiasm, from the constraint to which they were thus subjected; but the whole dramatic system of the ancients was more artificial than ours, and something determinate and previously arranged, as to quantities and pauses, was perhaps essential to enable the gesticulating actor to move in proper concert with the reciter. The whole system, however, of noted declamation, is denied by Duclos and Racine, who think it impossible that accented tones of passion could be devised or employed†.

Both the actor who declaimed, and he who gesticulated, wore *masks*; and, before concluding the subject of the Roman theatre, it may not be improper to say a few words concerning this singular dramatic contrivance, as also concerning the attire of the performers.

From the opportunity which they so readily afforded, of personally satirizing individuals, by representing a caricatured resemblance of their features, masks were first used in the old Greek comedy, which assumed the liberty of characterizing living citizens of Athens. It is most probable, however, that the hint of dramatic masks was given to the Romans by the Etruscans‡. That they were employed by the histrions of that latter nation, can admit of no doubt. The actors represented on the Etruscan vases are all masked, and have caps on their heads§. We also know, that in some of the satirical exhibitions of the ancient Italians, they wore masks made of wood:

“Nec non Ausonii, Trojâ gens missa, coloni
Versibus incomptis ludunt, risuque soluto:
Oraque corticibus sumunt horrenda cavatis||.”

* Quintil. *Instil. Orat.* Lib. II. c. 10.

† *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, T. 21.

‡ Bonarota, *Addit. ad Dempster. Etruria Regalis*, § 36.

§ *Dissert. dell' Acad. Etrusc.* T. III.

|| *Virgil. Georg.* Lib. II.

Originally, and in the time of L. Andronicus, the actors on the Roman stage used only caps or beavers*, and their faces were daubed and disguised with the lees of wine, as at the commencement of the dramatic art in Greece. The increased size, however, of the theatres, and consequent distance of the spectators from the stage, at length compelled the Roman players to borrow from art the expression of those passions which could no longer be distinguished on the living countenance of the actor.

Most of the Roman masks covered not merely the face, but the greater part of the head†, so that the beard and hair were delineated, as well as the features. This indeed is implied in one of the fables of Phædrus, where a fox, after having examined a tragic mask, which he found lying in his way, exclaims, "What a vast shape without brains‡!"—An observation obviously absurd, if applied to a mere vizard for the face, which was not made, and could not have been expected, to contain any brains. Addison, in his *Travels in Italy*, mentions, that, in that country, he had seen statues of actors, with the *larva* or mask. One of these was not merely a vizard for the face; it had false hair, and came over the whole head like an helmet. He also mentions, however, that he has seen figures of Thalia; sometimes with an entire head-piece in her hand, and a friz running round the edges of the face; but at others, with a mask merely for the countenance, like the modern vizards of a masquerade.

The masks of the regular theatre were made of chalk, or pipe-clay, or terra cotta. A few were of metal, but these were chiefly the masks of the Mimes. The chalk or clay masks were so transparent and artfully prepared, that the play of the muscles could be seen through them; and it appears that an opening was frequently left for the eyes, since Cicero informs us expressly, that in parts of high pathos or indignation, the actor's eyes were often observed to sparkle under the vizard§. From a vast collection of Roman masks engraved in the work of Ficoroni, *De Larvis Scenicis*, it appears that most of them represented features considerably distorted, and enlarged beyond the natural proportions. A wide and gaping mouth is one of their chief characteristics. The mask being in a great measure contrived to prevent the dispersion of the

* Berger, *Comment. de Personis*, Lib. II. sect. 9.

† Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. V. c. 7.

‡ Lib. I. Fab. 7. "O quanta species, inquit," &c.

§ *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 47.

voice, the mouth was so formed, and was so incrustated with metal, as to have somewhat the effect of a speaking-trumpet—hence the Romans gave the name of *persona* to masks, because they rendered the articulation of those who wore them more distinct and sonorous*. There are, however, a few figures in the work of Ficoroni, carrying in their hands masks which are not unnaturally distorted, and which have, in several instances, a resemblance to the actor who holds them. M. Boindin, on the authority of a passage in Lucian's *Dialogue on Dancing*, thinks that these less hideous masks were employed by dancers, or pantomimic actors, who, as they did not speak, had no occasion for the distended mouth†.

Roscius, who had some defect in his eyes, is said to have been the first actor who used the Greek mask‡; but it was not invariably worn even by him, as appears from a passage of Cicero.—“All,” says that author, “depends upon the face, and all the power of the face is centred in the eyes. Of this our old men are the best judges, for they were not lavish of their applause even to Roscius in a mask§.”

The different characters who chiefly appeared on the Roman stage—the father, the lover, the parasite, the pander, and the courtesan, were distinguished by their appropriate masks. A particular physiognomy was considered as so essential to each character, that it was thought, that without a proper mask, a complete knowledge of the personage could not be communicated. “In tragedies,” says Quintilian, “Niobe appears with a sorrowful countenance—and Medea announces her character by the fierce expression of her physiognomy—stern courage is painted on the mask of Hercules, while that of Ajax proclaims his transport and phrensy. In comedies, the masks of slaves, pimps, and parasites—peasants, soldiers, old women, courtesans, and female slaves, have each their particular character||.” Julius Pollux, in his *Onomasticon*, has given a minute description of the mask appropriate to every dramatic character¶. His work, however, was written

* *Noct. Attic.* Lib. V. c. 7.

† *Mem. de l'Academ. des Inscriptions*, &c. Tom. IV.

‡ Athenus, Lib. XIV. Pitiscus, Lexicon, voce *Persona*. Berger, *Comment. De Personis*, c. II. § 9.

§ *De Oratore*, Lib. III. c. 59. “Nostris illi senes personatum ne Roscium quidem magnopere laudabant.” This passage, however, is of somewhat doubtful interpretation. It may mean that these old men, having been accustomed to the natural countenance, did not applaud even so great an actor as Roscius, because he was invariably masked: or it may signify, that they did not greatly admire him when masked, and only applauded him when he appeared in his natural aspect. As some authorities say that Roscius invariably used the mask, the former interpretation may, perhaps, appear the most probable.

|| *Institut. Orator.* Lib. XI. c. 8.

¶ Lib. IV. c. 19.

in the reign of the Emperor Commodus, and his observations are chiefly formed on the practice of the Greek theatre, so that there may have been some difference between the various masks he describes, and those of the Roman stage, towards the end of the republic. The matron, virgin, and courtesan, he informs us, were particularly distinguished from each other by the manner in which their hair was arranged and braided. The mask of the parasite had brown and curled hair: That of the braggart captain had black hair, and a swarthy complexion*; and it farther appears from the engravings of masks in Ficoroni, that he had a distended or inflated countenance. The masks, likewise, distinguished the severe from the indulgent father—the Micio from the Demea—and the sober youth from the debauched rake†. If, in the course of the comedy, the father was to be sometimes pleased, but sometimes incensed, one of the brows of his vizard was knit, and the other smooth; and the actor was always careful, during the course of the representation, to turn to the spectators, along with the change of passion, the profile which expressed the feeling predominant at the time‡. Julius Pollux has also described the dresses suited to each character: The youth was clad in purple, the parasite in black, slaves in white, the pander in party-coloured garments, and the courtesan in flowing yellow robes§.

It would introduce too long discussion, were I to enter on the much-agitated question concerning the advantages and disadvantages of masks in theatric representations. The latter are almost too apparent to be enlarged on or recapitulated. It is obvious to remark, that though masks might do very well for a Satyr and Cyclops, who have no resemblance to human features, they are totally unsuitable for a flatterer, a miser, or the like characters, which abound in our own species, in whom the expression of countenance is more agreeable even than the action, and forms a considerable part of the histrionic art. Could we suppose that a vizard represented ever so naturally the general humour of a character, it can never be assimilated with the variety of passions incident to each person, in the whole course of a play. The grimace may be proper on some occasions, but it is too fixed and steady to agree with all. In consequence, however, of the great size of the ancient theatres, there was not so much lost by the concealment of the living

* *Onomasticon*, Lib. IV. c. 19. See also Scaliger, *Poet.* Lib. I. c. 14, 15, 16

† *Quintil. Institut. Orator.* Lib. XI. c. 3.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Onomasticon*, Lib. IV. c. 18. See also Stephens, *De Theatris.*

countenance, as we are apt at first to suppose. It was impossible that those alterations of visage, which are hidden by a mask, could have been distinctly perceived by one-tenth of the 40,000 spectators of a Roman play. The feelings portrayed in the ancient drama were neither so tender nor versatile as those in modern plays, and the actors did not require the same flexibility of features—there were fewer flashes of joy in sorrow, fewer gleams of benignity in hatred. Hercules, the Satyrs, the Cyclops, and other characters of superhuman strength or deformity, were more frequently introduced on the ancient than the modern stage, and, by aid of the mask, were more easily invested with their appropriate force or ugliness. By means, too, of these masks, the dramatists introduced foreign nations on the stage with their own peculiar physiognomy, and among others, the *Rufi persona Batavi*. Their use, besides, prevented the frequenters of the theatre from seeing an actor, far advanced in years, play the part of a young lover, since the vizard, under which the performer appeared, was always, to that extent at least, agreeable to the character he assumed. In addition to all this, by concealing the mouth it prevented the spectators from observing whence the sound issued, and thus palliated the absurdity of one actor declaiming, and the other beating time, as it were by gestures. Finally, as the tragic actor was elevated by his *cothurnus*, or buskin, above the ordinary stature of man, it became necessary, in order to preserve the due proportions of the human form, that his countenance also should be enlarged to corresponding dimensions.

I shall here close the first Volume of the HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE, in which I have treated of the Origin of the Romans—the Progress of their Language, and the different Poets by whom their Literature was illustrated, till the era of Augustus. At that period Virgil beautifully acknowledges the superiority of the Greeks in statuary, oratory, and science; but he might, with equal justice, (and the avowal would have come from him with peculiar propriety,) have confessed that the Muses loved better to haunt Pindus and Parnassus, than Soracte or the Alban Hill. From the days of Ennius downwards, the literature and poetry of the Romans was, with exception, perhaps, of satire, and some dramatic entertainments

Vol. I.—2 U

of a satiric description, wholly Greek—consisting merely of imitations, and, in some instances, almost of translations from that language. We may compare it to a tree transplanted in full growth to an inferior soil or climate, and which, though still venerable or beautiful, loses much of its verdure and freshness, sends forth no new shoots, is preserved alive with difficulty, and, if for a short time neglected, shrivels and decays.

END OF VOLUME I.

*James Kay, Jun. Printer,
S. E. Corner of Race & Sixth Streets,
Philadelphia.*

HISTORY
OF
ROMAN LITERATURE, &c.

*James Kay, Jun. Printer,
S. E. Corner of Race & Sixth Streets,
Philadelphia.*

HISTORY

OF

ROMAN LITERATURE, &c.

HISTORY

OF

ROMAN LITERATURE, &c.

IN almost all States, poetical composition has been employed and considerably improved before prose. First, because the imagination expands sooner than reason or judgment; and, secondly, because the early language of nations is best adapted to the purposes of poetry, and to the expression of those feelings and sentiments with which it is conversant.

Thus, in the first ages of Greece, verse was the ordinary written language, and prose was subsequently introduced as an art and invention. In like manner, at Rome, during the early advances of poetry, the progress of which has been detailed in the preceding volume, prose composition continued in a state of neglect and barbarism.

The most ancient prose writer, at least of those whose works have descended to us, was a man of little feeling or imagination, but of sound judgment and inflexible character, who exercised his pen on the subject of *Agriculture*, which, of all the peaceful arts, was most highly esteemed by his countrymen.

The long winding coast of Greece, abounding in havens, and the innumerable isles with which its seas were studded, rendered the Greeks, from the earliest days, a trafficking, seafaring, piratic people: And many of the productions of their oldest poets, are, in a great measure, addressed to what may be called the maritime taste or feeling which prevailed among their countrymen. This sentiment continued to be cherished as long as the chief literary state in Greece preserved

the sovereignty of the seas—compelled its allies to furnish vessels of war, and trusted to its naval armaments for the supremacy it maintained during the brightest ages of Greece. In none either of the Doric or Ionian states, was agriculture of such importance as to exercise much influence on manners or literature. Their territories were so limited, that the inhabitants were never removed to such a distance from the capital as to imbibe the ideas of husbandmen. In Thessaly and Lacedæmon, agriculture was accounted degrading, and its cares were committed to slaves. The vales of Bœotia were fruitful, but were desolated by floods. Farms of any considerable extent could scarcely be laid down on the limited, though lovely isles of the Ægean and Ionian seas. The barren soil and mountains of the centre of Peloponnesus confined the Arcadians to pasturage—an employment bearing some analogy to agriculture, but totally different in its mental effects, leading to a life of indolence, contemplation, and wandering, instead of the industrious, practical, and settled habits of husbandmen. Though the Athenians breathed the purest air beneath the clearest skies, and their long summer was gilded by the brightest beams of Apollo, the soil of Attica was sterile and metallic; while, from the excessive inequalities in its surface, all the operations of agriculture were of the most difficult and hazardous description. The streams were overflowing torrents, which stripped the soil, leaving nothing but a light sand, on which grain would scarcely grow. But it was with the commencement of the Peloponnesian war that the exercise of agriculture terminated in Attica. The country being left unprotected, owing to the injudicious policy of Pericles, was annually ravaged by the Spartans, and the husbandmen were forced to seek refuge within the walls of Athens. In the early part of the age of Pericles, the Athenians possessed ornamented villas in the country; but they always returned to the city in the evening*. We do not hear that the great men in the early periods of the republic, as Themistocles and Aristides, were farmers; and the heroes of its latter ages, as Iphicrates and Timotheus, chose their retreats in Thrace, the islands of the Archipelago, or coast of Ionia.

A picture, in every point of view the reverse of this, is presented to us by the *Agreste Latium*. The ancient Italian mode of life was almost entirely agricultural and rural; and with exception, perhaps, of the Etruscans, none of the Italian states were in any degree maritime or commercial. Italy was well adapted for every species of agriculture, and was

* *Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis*, T. II. c. 20.

most justly termed by her greatest poet, *magna parens frugum*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, Strabo†, and Pliny‡, talk with enthusiasm of its fertile soil and benignant climate. Where the ground was most depressed and marshy, the meadows were stretched out for the pasturage of cattle. In the level country, the rich arable lands, such as the Campanian and Capuan plains, extended in vast tracts, and produced a profusion of fruits of every species, while on the acclivities, where the skirts of the mountains began to break into little hills and sloping fields, the olive and vine basked on soils famed for Messapian oil, and for wines of which the very names cheer and revive us. The mountains themselves produced marble and timber, and poured from their sides many a delightful stream, which watered the fields, gladdened the pastures, and moistened the meads to the very brink of the shore. Well then might Virgil exclaim, in a burst of patriotism and poetry which has never been surpassed,—

" Sed neque Medorum sylvæ, ditissima terra,
Nec pulcher Ganges, atque auro turbidus Hermus,
Laudibus Italiæ certent; non Bactra, neque Indi,
Totaque thuriferis Panchara pinguis arenis.
Hic ver assiduum, atque alienis mensibus æstas;
Bis gravidæ pecudes, bis pomis utilis arbor.

• • • • •
Salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus!'"

One would not suppose that agricultural care was very consistent, at least in a small state, with frequent warfare. But in no period of their republic did the Romans neglect the advantages which the land they inhabited presented for husbandry. Romulus, who had received a rustic education, and had spent his youth in hunting, had no attachment to any peaceful arts, except to rural labours; and this feeling pervaded his legislation. His Sabine successor, Numa Pompilius, who well understood and discharged the duties of sovereignty, divided the whole territory of Rome into different cantons. An exact account was rendered to him of the manner in which these were cultivated; and he occasionally went in person to survey them, in order to encourage those farmers whose lands were well tilled, and to reproach others with their want of industry||. By the institution, too, of various religious festivals, connected with agriculture, it came to be regarded with a sort of sacred reverence. Ancus Martius, who trod in the

* *Antiquitat. Rom.* Lib. I.

† *Geograph.* Lib. VI.

‡ *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XVIII. c. 11.; XXXVII. c. 12.

§ *Virgil, Georg.* Lib. II.

|| *Plutarch, in Numa.*

steps of Numa, recommended to his people the assiduous cultivation of their lands. After the expulsion of the kings, an Agrarian law, by which only seven acres were allotted to each citizen, was promulgated, and for some time rigidly enforced. Exactness and economy in the various occupations of agriculture were the natural consequences of such regulations. Each Roman having only a small portion of land assigned to him, and the support of his family depending entirely on the produce which it yielded, its culture necessarily engaged his whole attention.

In these early ages of the Roman commonwealth, when the greatest men possessed but a few acres, the lands were laboured by the proprietors themselves. The introduction of commerce, and the consequent acquisition of wealth, had not yet enabled individuals to purchase the estates of their fellow-citizens, and to obtain a revenue from the rent of land rather than from its cultivation.

The patricians, who, in the city, were so distinct from the plebeian orders, were thus confounded with them in the country, in the common avocations of husbandry. After having presided over the civil affairs of the republic, or commanded its armies, the most distinguished citizens returned, without repining, to till the lands of their forefathers. Cincinnatus, who was found at labour in his fields by those who came to announce his election to the dictatorship, was not a singular example of the same hand which held the plough guiding also the helm of the state, and erecting the standard of its legions. So late as the time of the first Carthaginian war, Regulus, in the midst of his victorious career in Africa, asked leave from the senate to return to Italy, in order to cultivate his farm of seven acres, which had been neglected during his absence*. Many illustrious names among the Romans originated in agricultural employments, or some circumstances of rustic skill and labour, by which the founders of families were distinguished. The Fabii and Lentuli were supposed to have been celebrated for the culture of pulses, and the Asinii and Vitellii for the art of rearing animals. In the time of the elder Cato, though the manual operations were performed for the most part by servants, the great men resided chiefly on their farms†; and they continued to apply to the study and practice of agriculture long after they had carried the victorious arms of their country beyond the confines of Italy. They did not, indeed, follow agriculture as their sole avocation; but they prose-

* Livy, *Epitome*, Liv. XVIII. Valer. Maxim. Lib. IV. c. 4. § 6.

† Cicero, *De Senectute*, c. 16.

cuted it during the intervals of peace, and in the vacations of the Forum. The art being thus exercised by men of high capacity, received the benefit of all the discoveries, inventions, or experiments suggested by talents and force of intellect. The Roman warriors tilled their fields with the same intelligence as they pitched their camps, and sowed corn with the same care with which they drew up their armies for battle. Hence, as a modern Latin poet observes, dilating on the expression of Pliny, the earth yielded such an exuberant return, that she seemed as it were to delight in being ploughed with a share, adorned with laurels, and by a ploughman who had earned a triumph:—

“ Hanc etiam, ut perhibent, sese formabat ad artem,
 Cùm domito Fabius Dictator ab hoste redibat :
 Non veritus, medio dederat qui jura Senatu,
 Ferre idem arboribusque suis, terræque colendæ,
 Victricesque manus ruri præstare serendo.
 Ipsa triumphales tellus experta colonos,
 Atque ducum manibus quondam versata suorum,
 Majores fructus, majora arbusta ferebat*.”

Nor were the Romans contented with merely labouring the ground: They also delivered precepts for its proper cultivation, which, being committed to writing, formed, as it were, a new science, and, being derived from actual experience, had an air of originality rarely exhibited in their literary productions. Such maxims were held by the Romans in high respect, since they were considered as founded on the observation of men who had displayed the most eminent capacity and knowledge in governing the state, in framing its laws, and leading its armies.

These precepts which formed the works of the agricultural writers—the *Rusticæ rei scriptores*—are extremely interesting and comprehensive. The Romans had a much greater variety than we, of grain, pulse, and roots; and, besides, had vines, olives, and other plantations, which were regarded as profitable crops. The situation, too, and construction of a villa, with the necessary accommodation for slaves and workmen, the wine and oil cellars, the granaries, the repositories for preserving fruit, the poultry yard, and aviaries, form topics of much attention and detail. These were the appertenancies of the *villa rustica*, or complete farm-house, which was built for the residence only of an industrious husbandman, and with a view towards profit from the employments of agriculture. As luxury, indeed, increased, the villa was adapted to the

* *Rapin, Hortorum, Lib. IV.*

accommodation of an opulent Roman citizen, and the country was resorted to rather for recreation than for the purpose of lucrative toil. What would Cato the Censor, distinguished for his industry and unceasing attention to the labours of the field, have thought of the following lines of Horace?

“O rus, quando ego te aspiciam? quandoque licebit
Nunc veterum libris, nunc somno et inertibus horis,
Ducere sollicitæ jucunda oblivis vitæ?”

It was this more refined relish for the country, so keenly enjoyed by the Romans in the luxurious ages of the state, that furnished the subject for the finest passages and allusions in the works of the Latin poets, who seem to vie with each other in their praises of a country life, and the sweetness of the numbers in which they celebrate its simple and tranquil enjoyments. The Epode of Horace, commencing,

“Beatus ille, qui procul negotiis,”

which paints the charms of rural existence, in the various seasons of the year—the well-known passages in *Virgil's Georgics*, and those in the second book of *Lucretius*, are the most exquisite and lovely productions of these triumvirs of Roman poetry. But the ancient prose writers, with whom we are now to be engaged, regarded agriculture rather as an art than an amusement, and a country life as subservient to profitable employment, and not to elegant recreation. In themselves, however, these compositions are highly curious; they are curious, too, as forming a commentary and illustration of the subjects,

“Quas et facundi tractavit Musa Maronis.”

It is likewise interesting to compare them with the works of the modern Italians on husbandry, as the *Liber Ruralium Commodorum* of Crescenzo, written about the end of the thirteenth century,—the *Coltivazione Toscana* of Davanzati, —Vittorio's treatise, *Degli Ulivi*,—and even Alamanni's poem *Coltivazione*, which closely follows, particularly as to the situation and construction of a villa, the precepts of Cato, Varro, and Columella. The plough used at this day by the peasantry in the Campagna di Roma, is of the same form as that of the ancient Latian husbandmen*; and many other points of resemblance may be discovered, on a perusal of the

* Bonstetten, *Voyage dans le Latium*, p. 274.

most recent writers on the subject of Italian cultivation*. Dickson, too, who, in his *Husbandry of the Ancients*, gives an account of Roman agriculture so far as connected with the labours of the British farmer, has shown, that, in spite of the great difference of soil and climate, many maxims of the old Roman husbandmen, as delivered by Cato and Varro, corresponded with the agricultural system followed in his day in England.

Of the distinguished Roman citizens who practised agriculture, none were more eminent than Cato and Varro; and by them the precepts of the art were also committed to writing. Their works are original compositions, founded on experience, and not on Grecian models, like so many other Latin productions. Varro, indeed, enumerates about fifty Greek authors, who, previous to his time, had written on the subject of agriculture; and Mago, the Carthaginian, composed, in the Punic language, a much-approved treatise on the same topic, in thirty-two books, which was afterwards translated into Latin by desire of the senate. But the early Greek works, with the exception of Xenophon's *Economics*, and the poem of Hesiod called *Works and Days*, have been entirely lost; the tracts published in the collection entitled *Geoponica*, being subsequent to the age of Varro.

MARCUS PORCIUS CATO,

better known by the name of Cato the Censor, wrote the earliest book on husbandry which we possess in the Latin language. This distinguished citizen was born in the 519th year of Rome. Like other Romans of his day, he was brought up to the profession of arms. In the short intervals of peace he resided, during his youth, at a small country-house in the Sabine territory, which he had inherited from his father. Near it there stood a cottage belonging to Manius Curius Dentatus, who had repeatedly triumphed over the Sabines and Samnites, and had at length driven Pyrrhus from Italy. Cato was accustomed frequently to walk over to the humble abode of this renowned commander, where he was struck with admiration at the frugality of its owner, and the skilful management of the farm which was attached to it. Hence it became his great object to emulate his illustrious neighbour, and adopt him as his model†. Having made an estimate of his house, lands, slaves,

* J. C. L. Sismondi, *Tableau de l'Agriculture Toscane, and Chateauxvieux, Lettres Ecrites d'Italie*, Paris, 1816. 2 Tom.

† Plutarch, in *Cato*.

and expenses, he applied himself to husbandry with new ardour, and retrenched all superfluity. In the morning he went to the small towns in the vicinity, to plead and defend the causes of those who applied to him for assistance. Thence he returned to his fields; where, with a plain cloak over his shoulders in winter, and almost naked in summer, he laboured with his servants till they had concluded their tasks, after which he sat down along with them at table, eating the same bread, and drinking the same wine*. At a more advanced period of life, the wars, in which he commanded, kept him frequently at a distance from Italy, and his forensic avocations detained him much in the city; but what time he could spare was still spent at the Sabine farm, where he continued to employ himself in the profitable cultivation of the land. He thus became by the universal consent of his contemporaries, the best farmer of his age, and was held unrivalled for the skill and success of his agricultural operations†. Though everywhere a rigid economist, he lived, it is said, more hospitably at his farm than in the city. His entertainments at his villa were at first but sparing, and seldom given; but as his wealth increased, he became more nice and delicate. "At first," says Plutarch, "when he was but a poor soldier, he was not difficult in anything which related to his diet; but afterwards, when he grew richer, and made feasts for his friends, presently, when supper was done, he seized a leathern thong, and scourged those who had not given due attendance, or dressed anything carelessly‡." Towards the close of his life, he almost daily invited some of his friends in the neighbourhood to sup with him; and the conversation at these meals turned not chiefly, as might have been expected, on rural affairs, but on the praises of great and excellent men among the Romans§.

It may be supposed, that in the evenings after the agricultural labours of the morning, and after his friends had left him, he noted down the precepts suggested by the observations and experience of the day. That he wrote such maxims for his own use, or the instruction of others, is unquestionable; but the treatise *De Re Rustica*, which now bears his name, appears to have been much mutilated, since Pliny and other writers allude to subjects as treated of by Cato, and to opinions as delivered by him in this book, which are nowhere to be found in any part of the work now extant.

In its present state, it is merely the loose unconnected journal of a plain farmer, expressed with rude, sometimes with

* Plutarch, in *Cato*.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XIV. c. 4; Lib. XVI. c. 39.

‡ Plutarch, in *Cato*.

§ *Ibid.*

almost oracular brevity ; and it wants all those elegant topics of embellishment and illustration which the subject might have so naturally suggested. It solely consists of the driest rules of agriculture, and some receipts for making various kinds of cakes and wines. Servius says, it is addressed to the author's son ; but there is no such address now extant. It begins rather abruptly, and in a manner extremely characteristic of the simple manners of the author : " It would be advantageous to seek profit from commerce, if that were not hazardous ; or by usury, if that were honest : but our ancestors ordained, that the thief should forfeit double the sum he had stolen, and the usurer quadruple what he had taken, whence it may be concluded, that they thought the usurer the worst of the two. When they wished highly to praise a good man, they called him a good farmer. A merchant is zealous in pushing his fortune, but his trade is perilous and liable to reverses. But farmers make the bravest men, and the stoutest soldiers. Their gain is the most honest, the most stable, and least exposed to envy. Those who exercise the art of agriculture, are of all others least addicted to evil thoughts."

Our author then proceeds to his rules, many of which are sufficiently obvious. Thus, he advises, that when one is about to purchase a farm, he should examine if the climate, soil, and exposure be good : he should see that it can be easily supplied with plenty of water,—that it lies in the neighbourhood of a town,—and near a navigable river, or the sea. The directions for ascertaining the quality of the land are not quite so clear or self-evident. He recommends the choice of a farm where there are few implements of labour, as this shews the soil to be easily cultivated ; and where there are, on the other hand, a number of casks and vessels, which testify an abundant produce. With regard to the best way of laying out a farm when it is purchased, supposing it to be one of a hundred acres, the most profitable thing is a vineyard ; next, a garden, that can be watered ; then a willow grove ; 4th, an olive plantation ; 5th, meadow-ground ; 6th, corn fields ; and, lastly, forest trees and brushwood. Varro cites this passage, but he gives the preference to meadows : These required little expense ; and, by his time, the culture of vines had so much increased in Italy, and such a quantity of foreign wine was imported, that vineyards had become less valuable than in the days of the Censor. Columella, however, agrees with Cato : He successively compares the profits accruing from meadows, pasture, trees, and corn, with those of vineyards ; and, on an estimate, prefers the last.

When a farm has been purchased, the new proprietor should

perambulate the fields the day he arrives, or, if he cannot do so, on the day after, for the purpose of seeing what has been done, and what remains to be accomplished. Rules are given for the most assiduous employment without doors, and the most rigid economy within. When a servant is sick he will require less food. All the old oxen and the cattle of delicate frame, the old wagons, and old implements of husbandry, are to be sold off. The sordid parsimony of the Censor leads him to direct, that a provident *paterfamilias* should sell such of his slaves as are aged and infirm; a recommendation which has drawn down on him the well-merited indignation of Plutarch*. These are some of the duties of the master; and there follows a curious detail of the qualifications and duties of the *villicus*, or overseer, who, in particular, is prohibited from the exercise of religious rites, and consultation of augurs.

It is probable that, in the time of Cato, the Romans had begun to extend their villas considerably, which makes him warn proprietors of land not to be rash in building. When a landlord is thirty-six years of age he may build, provided his fields have been brought into a proper state of cultivation. His direction with regard to the extent of the villa is concise, but seems a very proper one;—he advises, to build in such a manner that the villa may not need a farm, nor the farm a villa. Lucullus and Scævola both violated this golden rule, as we learn from Pliny; who adds, that it will be readily conjectured, from their respective characters, that it was the farm of Scævola which stood in need of the villa, and the villa of Lucullus which required the farm.

A vast variety of crops was cultivated by the Romans, and the different kinds were adapted by them, with great care, to the different soils. Cato is very particular in his injunctions on this subject. A field that is of a rich and genial soil should be sown with corn; but, if wet or moist, with turnips and raddish. Figs are to be planted* in chalky land; and willows in watery situations, in order to serve as twigs for tying the vines. This being the proper mode of laying out a farm, our author gives a detail of the establishment necessary to keep it up;—the number of workmen, the implements of husbandry, and the farm-offices, with the materials necessary for their construction.

He next treats of the management of vineyards and olives; the proper mode of planting, grafting, propping, and fencing: And he is here naturally led to furnish directions for making and preserving the different sorts of wine and oil; as also to

* In Cato.

specify how much of each is to be allowed to the servants of the family.

In discoursing of the cultivation of fields for corn, Cato enjoins the farmer to collect all sorts of weeds for manure. Pigeons' dung he prefers to that of every animal. He gives orders for burning lime, and for making charcoal and ashes from the branches or twigs of trees. The Romans seem to have been at great pains in draining their fields; and Cato directs the formation both of open and covered drains. Oxen being employed in ploughing the fields, instructions are added for feeding and taking due care of them. The Roman plough has been a subject of much discussion: Two sorts are mentioned by Cato, which he calls *Romanicum*, and *Campanicum*—the first being proper for a stiff, and the other for a light soil. Dickson conjectures, that the *Romanicum* had an iron Share, and the *Campanicum* a piece of timber, like the Scotch plough, and a sock driven upon it. The plough, with other agricultural implements, as the *crates*, *rastrum*, *ligo*, and *sarculum*, most of which are mentioned by Cato, form a curious point of Roman antiquities.

The preservation of corn, after it has been reaped, is a subject of much importance, to which Cato has paid particular attention. This was a matter of considerable difficulty in Italy, in the time of the Romans; and all their agricultural writers are extremely minute in their directions for preserving it from rot, and from the depredations of insects, by which it was frequently consumed.

A great part of the work of Cato is more appropriate to the housewife than the farmer. We have receipts for making all sorts of cakes and puddings, fattening hens and geese, preserving figs during winter; as also medical prescriptions for the cure of various diseases, both of man and beast. *Mala punica*, or pomegranates, are the chief ingredient, in his remedies, for Diarrhœa, Dyspepsia, and Stranguary. Sometimes, however, his cures for diseases are not medical recipes, but sacrifices, atonements, or charms. The prime of all is his remedy for a luxation or fracture.—“Take,” says he, “a green reed, and slit it along the middle—throw the knife upwards, and join the two parts of the reed again, and tie it so to the place broken or disjointed, and say this charm—‘Daries, Dardaries, Astataries, Dissunapiter.’ Or this—‘Huat, Hanat, Huat, Ista, Pista, Fista, Domiabo, Damnaustra.’ This will make the part sound again*.”

The most remarkable feature in the work of Cato, is its

* C. 160.

total want of arrangement. It is divided, indeed, into chapters, but the author, apparently, had never taken the trouble of reducing his precepts to any sort of method, or of following any general plan. The hundred and sixty-two chapters, of which his work consists, seem so many rules committed to writing, as the daily labours of the field suggested. He gives directions about the vineyard, then goes to his corn-fields, and returns again to the vineyard. His treatise was, therefore, evidently not intended as a regular or well-composed book, but merely as a journal of incidental observations. That this was its utmost pretensions, is farther evinced by the brevity of the precepts, and deficiency of all illustration or embellishment. Of the style, he of course would be little careful, as his *Memoranda* were intended for the use only of his family and slaves. It is therefore always simple,—sometimes even rude; but it is not ill adapted to the subject, and suits our notion of the severe manners of its author, and character of the ancient Romans.

Besides this book on agriculture, Cato left behind him various works, which have almost entirely perished. He left a hundred and fifty orations*, which were existing in the time of Cicero, though almost entirely neglected, and a book on military discipline†, both of which, if now extant, would be highly interesting, as proceeding from one who was equally distinguished in the camp and forum. A good many of his orations were in dissuasion or favour of particular laws and measures of state, as those entitled—“*Ne quis iterum Consul fiat—De bello Carthaginiensi*,” of which war he was a vehement promoter—“*Suasio in Legem Voconiam,—Pro Lege Oppia*,” &c. Nearly a third part of these orations were pronounced in his own defence. He had been about fifty times accused‡, and as often acquitted. When charged with a capital crime, in the 85th year of his age, he pleaded his own cause, and betrayed no failure in memory, no decline of vigour, and no faltering of voice§. By his readiness, and pertinacity, and bitterness, he completely wore out his adversaries||, and earned the reputation of being, if not the most eloquent, at least the most stubborn speaker among the Romans.

Cato's oration in favour of the Appian law, which was a sumptuary restriction on the expensive dresses of the Roman

* Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 17.

† Vegetius, *Lib. I. c. 8.*

‡ Plutarch, in *Cato*.

§ Valerius Maximus, *Lib. VIII. c. 7.* Valerius says, he was in his 86th year; but Cato did not survive beyond his 85th. Cicero, in *Bruto*, c. 20. Pliny, *Hist. Nat. Lib. XIX. c. 1.*

|| Livy, *Lib. XXXIX. c. 40.*

matrons, is given by Livy*. It was delivered in opposition to the tribune Valerius, who proposed its abrogation, and affords us some notion of his style and manner, since, if not copied by the historian from his book of orations, it was doubtless adapted by him to the character of Cato, and his mode of speaking. Aulus Gellius cites, as equally distinguished for its eloquence and energy, a passage in his speech on the division of spoil among the soldiery, in which he complains of their unpunished peculation and licentiousness. One of his most celebrated harangues was that in favour of the Rhodians, the ancient allies of the Roman people, who had fallen under the suspicion of affording aid to Perseus, during the second Macedonian war. The oration was delivered after the overthrow of that monarch, when the Rhodian envoys were introduced into the Senate, in order to explain the conduct of their countrymen, and to deprecate the vengeance of the Romans, by throwing the odium of their apparent hostility on the turbulence of a few factious individuals. It was pronounced in answer to those Senators, who, after hearing the supplications of the Rhodians, were for declaring war against them; and it turned chiefly on the ancient, long-tryed fidelity of that people,—taking particular advantage of the circumstance, that the assistance rendered to Perseus had not been a national act, proceeding from a public decree of the people. Tiro, the freedman of Cicero, wrote a long and elaborate criticism on this oration. To the numerous censures it contains, Aulus Gellius has replied at considerable length, and has blamed Tiro for singling out from a speech so rich, and so happily connected, small and insulated portions, as objects of his reprehensive satire. All the various topics, he adds, which are enlarged on in this oration, if they could have been introduced with more perspicuity, method, and harmony, could not have been delivered with more energy and strength†.

Both Cicero and Livy have expressed themselves very fully on the subject of Cato's orations. The former admits, that his "language is antiquated, and some of his phrases harsh and inelegant: but only change that," he continues, "which it was not in his power to change—add number and cadence—give an easier turn to his sentences—and regulate the structure and connection of his words, (an art which was as little practised by the older Greeks as by him,) and you will find no one who can claim the preference to Cato. The Greeks themselves acknowledge, that the chief beauty of composition results from the frequent use of those forms of expression,

* Lib. XXXIV. c. 2.

† *Nact. Attic. Lib. VII. c. 9.*

which they call tropes, and of those varieties of language and sentiment, which they call figures; but it is almost incredible with what copiousness, and with what variety, they are all employed by Cato*." Livy principally speaks of the facility, asperity, and freedom of his tongue†. Aulus Gellius has instituted a comparison of Caius Gracchus, Cato, and Cicero, in passages where these three orators declaimed against the same species of atrocity—the illegal scourging of Roman citizens; and Gellius, though he admits that Cato had not reached the splendour, harmony, and pathos of Cicero, considers him as far superior in force and copiousness to Gracchus‡.

Of the book on Military Discipline, a good deal has been incorporated into the work of Vegetius; and Cicero's orations may console us for the want of those of Cato. But the loss of the seven books, *De Originibus*, which he commenced in his vigorous old age, and finished just before his death, must ever be deeply deplored by the historian and antiquary. Cato is said to have begun to inquire into the history, antiquities, and language of the Roman people, with a view to counteract the influence of the Greek taste, introduced by the Scipios; and in order to take from the Greeks the honour of having colonized Italy, he attempted to discover on the Latin soil the traces of ancient national manners, and an indigenous civilization. The first book of the valuable work *De Originibus*, as we are informed by Cornelius Nepos, in his short life of Cato, contained the exploits of the kings of Rome. Cato was the first author who attempted to fix the era of the foundation of Rome, which he calculated in his *Origines*, and determined it to have been in the first year of the 7th Olympiad. In order to discover this epoch, he had recourse to the memoirs of the Censors, in which it was noted, that the taking of Rome by the Gauls, was 119 years after the expulsion of the kings. By adding this period to the aggregate duration of the reigns of the kings, he found that the amount answered to the first of the 7th Olympiad. This is the computation followed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in his great work on Roman antiquities. It is probably as near the truth as we can hope to arrive; but even in the time of Cato, the calculated duration of the reigns of the kings was not founded on any ancient monuments then extant, or on the testimony of any credible historian. The second and third books treated of the origin of the different states of Italy, whence the whole work has received the name of *Origines*. The fourth and

* *Brutus*, c. 17.

† *Noct. Attic.* Lib. X. c. 8.

‡ Lib. XXXIX. c. 40.

fifth books comprehended the history of the first and second Punic wars; and in the two remaining books, the author discussed the other campaigns of the Romans till the time of Ser. Galba, who overthrew the Lusitanians.

In his account of these later contests, Cato merely related the facts, without mentioning the names of the generals or leaders; but though he has omitted this, Pliny informs us that he did not forget to take notice, that the elephant which fought most stoutly in the Carthaginian army was called Surus, and wanted one of his teeth*. In this same work he incidentally treated of all the wonderful and admirable things which existed in Spain and Italy. Some of his orations, too, as we learn from Livy, were incorporated into it, as that for giving freedom to the Lusitanian hostages; and Plutarch farther mentions, that he omitted no opportunity of praising himself, and extolling his services to the state. The work, however, exhibited great industry and learning, and, had it descended to us, would unquestionably have thrown much light on the early periods of Roman history and the antiquities of the different states of Italy. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, himself a sedulous inquirer into antiquities, bears ample testimony to the research and accuracy of that part which treats of the origin of the ancient Italian cities. The author lived at a time which was favourable to this investigation. Though the Samnites, Etruscans, and Sabines, had been deprived of their independence, they had not lost their monuments or records of their history, their individuality and national manners. Cicero praises the simple and concise style of the *Origines*, and laments that the work was neglected in his day, in consequence of the inflated manner of writing which had been recently adopted; in the same manner as the tumid and ornamented periods of Theopompus had lessened the esteem for the concise and unadorned narrative of Thucydides, or as the lofty eloquence of Demosthenes impaired the relish for the extreme attic simplicity of Lysias†.

In the same part of the dialogue, entitled *Brutus*, Cicero asks what flower or light of eloquence is wanting to the *Origines*—"Quem florem, aut quod lumen eloquentiæ non habent?" But on Atticus considering the praise thus bestowed as excessive, he limits it, by adding, that nothing was required to complete the strokes of the author's pencil but a certain lively glow of colours, which had not been discovered in his age.—"Intelliges, nihil illius lineamentis, nisi eorum pigmentorum, quæ inventa nondum erant, florem et calorem defuisse‡."

* *Hist. Nat. Lib. VIII. c. 5.*

† *Brutus, c. 17.*

‡ *Brutus, c. 87.*

The pretended fragments of the *Origines*, published by the Dominican, Nanni, better known by the name of Annius Viterbiensis, and inserted in his *Antiquitates Variæ*, printed at Rome in 1498, are spurious, and the imposition was detected soon after their appearance. The few remains first collected by Riccobonus, and published at the end of his *Treatise on History*, (Basil, 1579,) are believed to be genuine. They have been enlarged by Ausonius Popma, and added by him, with notes, to the other writings of Cato, published at Leyden in 1690.

Any rudeness of style and language which appears either in the orations of Cato, or in his agricultural and historical works, cannot be attributed to total carelessness or neglect of the graces of composition, as he was the first person in Rome who treated of oratory as an art*, in a tract entitled *De Oratore ad Filium*.

Cato was also the first of his countrymen who wrote on the subject of medicine†. Rome had existed for 500 years without professional physicians‡. A people who as yet were strangers to luxury, and consisted of farmers and soldiers, (though surgical operations might be frequently necessary,) would be exempt from the inroads of the "grisly troop," so much encouraged by indolence and debauchery. Like all semi-barbarous people, they believed that maladies were to be cured by the special interposition of superior beings, and that religious ceremonies were more efficacious for the recovery of health than remedies of medical skill. Deriving, as they did, much of their worship from the Etruscans, they probably derived from them also the practice of attempting to overcome disease by magic and incantation. The Augurs and Aruspices were thus the most ancient physicians of Rome. In epidemic distempers the Sibylline books were consulted, and the cures they prescribed were superstitious ceremonies. We have seen that it was to free the city from an attack of this sort that scenic representations were first introduced at Rome. During the progress of another epidemic infliction a temple was built to Apollo§; and as each periodic pestilence naturally abated in course of time, faith was confirmed in the efficacy of the rites which were resorted to. Every one has heard of the pomp wherewith Esculapius was transported under the form of a serpent, from Epidaurus to an islet in the Tiber, which was thereafter consecrated to that divine physician. The apprehension of diseases raised temples to Febris and Tussis, and

* Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* Lib. III. c. 1.

† Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXV. c. 2.

‡ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXV. c. 2.

§ Livy, Lib. IV. c. 25.

other imaginary beings belonging to the painful family of death, in order to avert the disorders which they were supposed to inflict. It was perceived, however, that religious professions and lustrations and *lectisterniums* were ineffectual for the cure of those complaints, which, in the 6th century, luxury began to exasperate and render more frequent at Rome. At length, in 534, Archagatus, a free-born Greek, arrived in Italy, where he practised medicine professionally as an art, and received in return for his cures the endearing appellation of *Carnifex**. But though Archagatus was the first who practised medicine, Cato was the first who wrote of diseases and their treatment as a science, in his work entitled *Commentarius quo Medetur Filio, Servis, Familiaribus*. In this book of domestic medicine—duck, pigeons, and hare, were the foods he chiefly recommended to the sick†. His remedies were principally extracted from herbs; and colewort, or cabbage, was his favourite cure‡. The recipes, indeed, contained in his work on agriculture, show that his medical knowledge did not exceed that which usually exists among a semi-barbarous race, and only extended to the most ordinary simples which nature affords. Cato hated the compound drugs introduced by the Greek physicians—considering these foreign professors of medicine as the opponents of his own system. Such, indeed, was his antipathy, that he believed, or pretended to believe, that they had entered into a league to poison all the barbarians, among whom they classed the Romans.—“Jurarunt inter se,” says he, in a passage preserved by Pliny, “barbaros necare omnes medicina: Et hoc ipsum mercede faciunt, ut fides iis sit, et facile disperdant§.” Cato, finding that the patients lived notwithstanding this detestable conspiracy, began to regard the Greek practitioners as impious sorcerers, who counteracted the course of nature, and restored dying men to life, by means of unholy charms; and he therefore advised his countrymen to remain steadfast, not only by their ancient Roman principles and manners, but also by the venerable unguents and salubrious balsams which had come down to them from the wisdom of their grandmothers. Such as they were, Cato’s old medical saws continued long in repute at Rome. It is evident that they were still esteemed in the time of Pliny, who expresses the same fears as the Censor, lest hot baths and potions should render his countrymen effeminate, and corrupt their manners||.

* Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXIX. c. 1.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XX. c. 9.

‡ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXIX. c. 1.

† Plutarch, in *Cato*.

§ Ibid. Lib. XXIX. c. 1.

Every one knows what was the consequence of Cato's dislike to the Greek philosophers, who were expelled the city by a decree of the senate. But it does not seem certain what became of Archagatus and his followers. The author of the *Diogene Moderne*, as cited by Tiraboschi, says that Archagatus was stoned to death*, but the literary historian who quotes him doubts of his having any sufficient authority for the assertion. Whether the physicians were comprehended in the general sentence of banishment pronounced on the learned Greeks, or were excepted from it, has been the subject of a great literary controversy in modern Italy and in France†.

Aulus Gellius‡ mentions Cato's *Libri questionum Epistolicarum*, and Cicero his *Apophthegmata*§, which was probably the first example of that class of works which, under the appellation of *Ana*, became so fashionable and prevalent in France.

The only other work of Cato which I shall mention, is the *Carmen de Moribus*. This, however, was not written in verse, as might be supposed from the title. Precepts, imprecations, and prayers, or any set *formulae* whatever, were called *Carmina*. I do not know what maxims were inculcated in this *carmen*, but they probably were not of very rigid morality, at least if we may judge from the "Sententia Dia Catonis," mentioned by Horace :

"Quidam notus homo cum exiret fornice, Mactæ
Virtute esto, inquit sententia dia Catonis||."

* *Stor. del. Let. Ital.* Part. III. Lib. III. c. 5. § 5.

† See Spon, *Recherches Curieuses d'Antiquité*. Diss. 27. Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* art. Porcius, Rem. H.

In what degree of estimation medicine was held at Rome, and by what class of people it was practised, were among the *questiones veratæ* of classical literature in our own country in the beginning and middle of last century. Dr Mead, in his *Oratio Herveiana*, and Spon, in his *Recherches d'Antiquité*, followed out an idea first suggested by Casaubon, in his animadversions on Suetonius, that physicians in Rome were held in high estimation, and were frequently free citizens; that it was the surgeons who were the *servile pecus*; and that the erroneous idea of physicians being slaves, arose from confounding the two orders. These authors chiefly rested their argument on classical passages, from which it appears that physicians were called the friends of Cicero, Cæsar, and Pompey. Middleton, in a well known Latin dissertation, maintains that there was no distinction at Rome between the physician, surgeon, and apothecary, and that, till the time of Julius Cæsar at least, the art of medicine was exercised only by foreigners and slaves, or by freedmen, who, having obtained liberty for their proficiency in its various branches, opened a shop for its practice.—*De Medicorum apud veteres Romanos degentium Conditione Dissertatio. Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. IV. See on this topic, Schlager, *Histor. litis, De Medicorum apud veteres Romanos degentium Conditione. Helmst.* 1740.

‡ *Noct. Attic.* Lib. VII. c. 10.

§ *De Officiis*, Lib. I. c. 29. Multa sunt multorum facete dicta: ut ea, que a sene Catone collecta sunt, que vocant apophthegmata.

|| *Sat.* Lib. I. 2.

Misled by the title, some critics have erroneously assigned to the Censor the *l. isticha de Moribus*, now generally attributed to Dionysius Cato, who lived, according to Scaliger in the age of Commodus and Septimius Severus*.

The work of

MARCUS TERENTIUS VARRO,

On agriculture, has descended to us more entire than that of Cato on the same subject; yet it does not appear to be complete. In the early times of the republic, the Romans, like the ancient Greeks, being constantly menaced with the incursions of enemies, indulged little in the luxury of expensive and ornamental villas. Even that of Scipio Africanus, the rival and contemporary of Cato the Censor, and who in many other respects anticipated the refinements of a later age, was of the simplest structure. It was situated at Liternum, (now Patria,) a few miles north from Cumae, and was standing in the time of Seneca. This philosopher paid a visit to a friend who resided in it during the age of Nero, and he afterwards described it in one of his epistles with many expressions of wonder and admiration at the frugality of the great Africanus†. When, however, the scourge of war was removed from their immediate vicinity, agriculture and gardening were no longer exercised by the Romans as in the days of the Censor, when great crops of grain were raised for profit, and fields of onions sown for the subsistence of the labouring servants. The patricians now became fond of ornamental gardens, fountains, terraces, artificial wildernesses, and grottos, groves of laurel for shelter in winter, and oriental planes for shade in summer. Matters, in short, were fast approaching to the state described in one of the odes of Horace—

* For Cato's family, see Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XIII. c. 19.

† We have many minute descriptions of the villas of luxurious Romans, from the time of Hortensius to Pliny, but there are so few accounts of those in the simpler age of Scipio, that I have subjoined the description of Seneca, who saw this mansion precisely in the same state it was when possessed and inhabited by the illustrious conqueror of Hannibal. "Vidi villam structam lapide quadrato, murum circumdatum sylvae, turres quoque in propugnaculum villae utrimque subrectas. Cisternam edificis et viridibus subditam, quæ sufficere in usum exercitus posset. Balneolum angustum, tenebrososum ex consuetudine antiquâ. Magna ergo me voluptas subit contemplantem mores Scipionis et nostros. In hoc angulo ille Carthaginis horror, cui Roma debet quod tantum semel capta est, abluebat corpus laboribus rusticis fessum; exercebat enim opera se, terramque, ut mos fuit prisca, ipse subigebat. Sub hoc ille tecto tam sordido stetit—hoc illum pavementum tam vile sustinuit." *Senec. Epist.* 86.

"Jam pauca aratro jugera regie,
 Moles relinquent : undique latius
 Extenta visentur Lucrino
 Stagna lacu : platanusque coelebs
 Evincet ulmos : tum violaria, et
 Myrtus, et omnis copia narium,
 Spargent olivetis odorem
 Fertilibus domino priori.
 Tum spisa ramis laurea fervidos
 Excludet ictus. Non ita Romuli
 Præscriptum, et intonsi Catonis
 Auspiciis, veterumque normâ*."

Agriculture, however, still continued to be so respectable an employment, that its practice was not considered unworthy the friend of Cicero and Pompey, nor its precepts undeserving to be delivered by one who was indisputably the first scholar of his age—who was renowned for his profound erudition and thorough insight into the laws, the literature, and antiquities of his country,—and who has been hailed by Petrarch as the third great luminary of Rome, being only inferior in lustre to Cicero and Virgil:—

" Qui' vid' io nostra gente aver per duce
 Varrone, il terzo gran lume Romano,
 Che quanto 'l miro più, tanto più luce†."

Varro was born in the 637th year of Rome, and was descended of an ancient senatorial family. It is probable that his youth, and even the greater part of his manhood, were spent in literary pursuits, and in the acquisition of that stupendous knowledge, which has procured to him the appellation of the most learned of the Romans, since his name does not appear in the civil or military history of his country, till the year 680, when he was Consul along with Cassius Varus. In 686, he served under Pompey, in his war against the pirates, in which he commanded the Greek ships†. To the fortunes of that Chief he continued firmly attached, and was appointed one of his lieutenants in Spain, along with Afranius and Petreius, at the commencement of the war with Cæsar. Hispania Ulterior was specially confided to his protection, and two legions were placed under his command. After the surrender of his colleagues in Hither Spain, Cæsar proceeded in person against him. Varro appears to have been little qualified to cope with such an adversary. One of the legions deserted in his own sight, and his retreat to Cadiz, where he had meant to retire,

* Lib. II.

† *Trionfo della Fama*, c. 8.

‡ Varro, *De Re Rusticâ*, Lib. II. præcem.

having been cut off, he surrendered at discretion, with the other, in the vicinity of Cordova*. From that period he despaired of the salvation of the republic, or found, at least, that he was not capable of saving it; for although, after receiving his freedom from Cæsar, he proceeded to Dyracchium, to give Pompey a detail of the disasters which had occurred, he left it almost immediately for Rome. On his return to Italy he withdrew from all political concerns, and indulged himself during the remainder of his life in the enjoyment of literary leisure. The only service he performed for Cæsar, was that of arranging the books which the Dictator had himself procured, or which had been acquired by those who preceded him in the management of public affairs†. He lived during the reign of Cæsar in habits of the closest intimacy with Cicero; and his feelings, as well as conduct, at this period, resembled those of his illustrious friend, who, in all his letters to Varro, bewails, with great freedom, the utter ruin of the state, and proposes that they should live together, engaged only in those studies which were formerly their amusement, but were then their chief support. "And, should none require our services for repairing the ruins of the republic, let us employ our time and thoughts on moral and political inquiries. If we cannot benefit the commonwealth in the forum or the senate, let us endeavour, at least, to do so by our studies and writings; and, after the example of the most learned among the ancients, contribute to the welfare of our country, by useful disquisitions concerning laws and government." Some farther notion may be derived from another letter of Cicero, written in June, 707. "Nothing," says he, "raises your character higher in my esteem, than that you have wisely retreated into harbour—that you are enjoying the happy fruits of a learned leisure, and employed in pursuits, which are attended with more public advantage, as well as private satisfaction, than all the ambitious exploits, or voluptuous indulgences, of these licentious victors. The contemplative hours you spend at your Tusculan villa, are, in my estimation, indeed, what alone deserves to be called life‡."

Varro passed the greatest portion of his time in the various villas which he possessed in Italy. One of these was at Tusculum, and another in the neighbourhood of Cumæ. The latter place had been among the earliest Greek establishments in Italy, and was long regarded as pre-eminent in power and

* Cæsar, *Comment. de Bello Civili*, Lib. II. c. 17, &c.

† Suetonius; in *Jul. Cæs.* c. 44.

‡ *Epist. Fam.* Lib. IX. Ep. 6. Ed. Schütz.

population. It spread prosperity over the adjacent coasts; and its oracle, Sibyl, and temple, long attracted votaries and visitants. As the Roman power increased, that of Cumæ decayed; and its opulence had greatly declined before the time of Varro. Its immediate vicinity was not even frequently selected as a situation for villas. The Romans had a well-founded partiality for the coasts of Puteoli, and Naples, so superior in beauty and salubrity to the flat, marshy neighbourhood of Cumæ. The situation of Varro's other villa, at Tusculum, must have been infinitely more agreeable, from its pure air, and the commanding prospect it enjoyed.

Besides immense flocks of sheep in Apulia, and many horses in the Sabine district of Reate*, Varro had considerable farms both at his Cuman and Tusculan villas, the cultivation of which, no doubt, formed an agreeable relaxation from his severe and sedentary studies. He had also a farm at a third villa, where he occasionally resided, near the town of Casinum, in the territory of the ancient Volsci†, and situated on the banks of the Cassinus, a tributary stream to the Liris. This stream, which was fifty-seven feet broad, and both deep and clear, with a pebbly channel, flowed through the middle of his delightful domains. A bridge, which crossed the river from the house, led directly to an island, which was a little farther down, at the confluence of the Cassinus with a rivulet called the Vinius‡. Along the banks of the larger water there were spacious pleasure-walks which conducted to the farm; and near the place where they joined the fields, there was an extensive aviary§. The site of Varro's villa was visited by Sir R. C. Hoare, who says, that it stood close to Casinum, now St Germano: Some trifling remains still indicate its site; but its memory, he adds, will shortly survive only in the page of the historian||.

After the assassination of Cæsar, this residence, along with almost all the wealth of Varro, which was immense, was forcibly seized by Marc Antony¶. Its lawless occupation by that profligate and blood-thirsty triumvir, on his return from his dissolute expedition to Capua, is introduced by Cicero into one of his Philippics, and forms a topic of the most eloquent and bitter invective. The contrast which the orator draws between the character of Varro and that of Antony—between the noble and peaceful studies prosecuted in that delightful residence by the rightful proprietor, and the shameful debau-

* *De Re Rustica*, Lib. II.

† See Castell's *Villas of the Ancients*.

|| *Classical Tour in Italy*.

‡ Cicero, *Philipp.* II. c. 40.

§ *De Re Rustica*, Lib. III. c. 5.

¶ Appian, *De Bello Civili*, Lib. IV. 47

cheries of the wretch by whom it had been usurped, forms a picture, to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in ancient or modern oratory.—“How many days did you shamefully revel, Antony, in that villa? From the third hour, it was one continued scene of drinking, gambling, and uproar. The very roofs were to be pitied. O, what a change of masters! But how can he be called its master? And, if master—gods! how unlike to him he had dispossessed! Marcus Varro made his house the abode of the muses, and a retreat for study—not a haunt for midnight debauchery. Whilst he was there, what were the subjects discussed—what the topics debated in that delightful residence? I will answer the question—The rights and liberties of the Roman people—the memorials of our ancestors—the wisdom resulting from reason combined with knowledge. But whilst you, Antony, was its occupant, (for you cannot be called its master,) every room rung with the cry of drunkenness—the pavements were swimming with wine, and the walls wet with riot.”

Antony was not a person to be satisfied with robbing Varro of his property. At the formation of the memorable triumvirate, the name of Varro appeared in the list of the proscribed, among those other friends of Pompey whom the clemency of Cæsar had spared. This illustrious and blameless individual had now passed the age of seventy; and nothing can afford a more frightful proof of the sanguinary spirit which guided the councils of the triumvirs, than their devoting to the dagger of the hired assassin a man equally venerable by his years and character, and who ought to have been protected, if not by his learned labours, at least by his retirement, from such inhuman persecution. But, though doomed to death as a friend of law and liberty, his friends contended with each other for the dangerous honour of saving him. Calenus having obtained the preference, carried him to his country-house, where Antony frequently came, without suspecting that it contained a proscribed inmate. Here Varro remained concealed till a special edict was issued by the consul, M. Plancus, under the triumviral seal, excepting him and Messala Corvinus from the general slaughter*.

But though Varro thus passed in security the hour of danger, he was unable to save his library, which was placed in the garden of one of his villas, and fell into the hands of an illiterate soldiery.

After the battle of Actium, Varro resided in tranquillity at Rome till his decease, which happened in 727, when he was

* Berwick's *Lives of Asin. Pollio, M. Varro, &c.*

ninety years of age. The tragical deaths, however, of Pompey and Cicero, with the loss of others of his friends,—the ruin of his country,—the expulsion from his villas,—and the loss of those literary treasures, which he had stored up as the solace of his old age, and the want of which would be doubly felt by one who wished to devote all his time to study,—must have cast a deep shade over the concluding days of this illustrious scholar. His wealth was restored by Augustus, but his books could not be supplied.

It is not improbable, that the dispersion of this library, which impeded the prosecution of his studies, and prevented the composition of such works as required reference and consultation, may have induced Varro to employ the remaining hours of his life in delivering those precepts of agriculture, which had been the result of long experience, and which needed only reminiscence to inculcate. It was some time after the loss of his books, and when he had nearly reached the age of eighty, that Varro composed the work on husbandry, as he himself testifies in the introduction. "If I had leisure, I might write these things more conveniently, which I will now explain as well as I am able, thinking that I must make haste; because, if a man be a bubble of air, *much more* so is an old man, for now my eightieth year admonishes me to get my baggage together before I leave the world. Wherefore, as you have bought a farm, which you are desirous to render profitable by tillage, and as you ask me to take this task upon me, I will try to advise you what must be done, not only during my stay here, but after my departure." The remainder of the introduction forms, in its ostentatious display of erudition, a remarkable contrast to Cato's simplicity. Varro talks of the Syrens and Sibyls,—invokes all the Roman deities, supposed to preside over rural affairs,—and enumerates all the Greek authors who had written on the subject of agriculture previous to his own time.

The first of the three books which this agricultural treatise comprehends, is addressed, by Varro, to Fundanius, who had recently purchased a farm, in the management of which he wished to be instructed. The information which Varro undertakes to give, is communicated in the form of dialogue. He feigns that, at the time appointed for rites to be performed in the sowing season, (*sementivis feriis*.) he went, by invitation of the priest, to the temple of Tellus. There he met his father-in-law, C. Fundanius, the knight Agrius, and Agrasius, a farmer of imposts, who were gazing on a map of Italy, painted on the inner walls of the temple. The priest, whose duty it was to officiate, having been summoned by the edile

to attend him on affairs of importance, they were awaiting his return; and, in order to pass the time till his arrival, Agrasius commences a conversation, (suggested by the map of Italy,) by inquiring at the others present in the temple, whether they, who had travelled so much, had ever visited any country better cultivated than Italy. This introduces an eulogy on the soil and climate of that favoured region, and of its various abundant productions,—the Apulian wheat, the Venafrian olive, and the Falernian grape. All this, again, leads to the inquiry, by what arts of agricultural skill and industry, aiding the luxuriant soil, it had reached such unexampled fecundity. These questions are referred to Licinius Stolo, and Tremellius Scrofa, who now joined the party, and who were well qualified to throw light on the interesting discussion—the first being of a family distinguished by the pains it had taken with regard to the Agrarian laws, and the second being well known for possessing one of the best cultivated farms in Italy. Scrofa, too, had himself written on husbandry, as we learn from Columella; who says, that he had first rendered agriculture eloquent. This first book of Varro is accordingly devoted to rules for the cultivation of land, whether for the production of grain, pulse, olives, or vines, and the establishment necessary for a well-managed and lucrative farm; excluding from consideration what is strictly the business of the grazier and shepherd, rather than of the farmer.

After some general observations on the object and end of agriculture, and the exposition of some general principles with regard to soil and climate, Scrofa and Stolo, who are the chief prolocutors, proceed to settle the size, as also the situation of the villa. They recommend that it should be placed at the foot of a well-wooded hill, and open to the most healthful breeze. An eastern exposure seems to be preferred, as it will thus have shade in summer, and sun in winter. They farther advise, that it should not be placed in a hollow valley, as being there subject to storms and inundations; nor in front of a river, as that situation is cold in winter, and unwholesome in summer; nor in the vicinity of a marsh, where it would be liable to be infested with small insects, which, though invisible, enter the body by the mouth or nostrils, and occasion obstinate diseases. Fundanius asks, what one ought to do who happens to inherit such a villa; and is answered, that he should sell it for whatever sum it may bring; and if it will bring nothing, he should abandon it. After this follow the subjects of enclosure—the necessary implements of husbandry—the number of servants and oxen required—and the soil in which different crops should be sown. We have then

a sort of calendar, directing what operations ought to be performed in each season of the year. Thus, the author recommends draining betwixt the winter solstice and approach of the zephyrs, which was reckoned to be about the beginning of February. The sowing of grain should not be commenced before the autumnal equinox, nor delayed after the winter solstice; because the seeds which are sown previous to the equinox spring up too quickly, and those sown subsequent to the solstice scarcely appear above ground in forty days. A taste for flowers had begun to prevail at Rome in the time of Varro; he accordingly recommends their cultivation, and points out the seasons for planting the lily, violet and crocus.

The remainder of the first book of Varro is well and naturally arranged. He considers his subject from the choice of the seed, till the grain has sprung up, ripened, been reaped, secured, and brought to market. The same course is followed in treating of the vine and the olive. While on the subject of selling farm-produce to the best advantage, the conversation is suddenly interrupted by the arrival of the priest's freedman, who came in haste to apologize to the guests for having been so long detained, and to ask them to attend on the following day at the obsequies of his master, who had been just assassinated on the public street by an unknown hand. The party in the temple immediately separate.—“*De casu humano magis querentes, quam admirantes id Romæ factum.*”

The subject of agriculture, strictly so called, having been discussed in the first book, Varro proceeds in the second, addressed to Niger Turranus, to treat of the care of flocks and cattle, (*De Re Pecuaris*). The knowledge which he here communicates is the result of his own observations, blended with the information he had received from the great pasturers of Epirus, at the time when he commanded the Grecian ships on its coast, in Pompey's naval war with the pirates. As in the former book, the instruction is delivered in the shape of dialogue. Varro being at the house of a person called Cossinius, his host refuses to let him depart till he explain to him the origin, the dignity, and the art of pasturage. Our author undertakes to satisfy him as to the first and second points, but as to the third, he refers him to Scrofa, another of the guests, who had the management of extensive sheep-walks in the territory of the Brutii. Varro makes but a pedantic figure in the part which he has modestly taken to himself. His account of the origin of pasturage is nothing but some very common-place observations on the early stages of society; and its dignity is proved from several signs of the zodiac being

called after animals, as also some of the most celebrated spots on the globe,—Mount Taurus, the Bosphorus, the *Ægean* sea, and Italy, which Varro derives from Vitulus. Scrofa, in commencing his part of the dialogue, divides the animals concerning which he is to treat into three classes: 1. the lesser; of which there are three sorts—sheep, goats, and swine; 2. the larger; of which there are also three—oxen, asses, and horses; and, lastly, those which do not themselves bring profit, but are essential to the care of the others—the dog, the mule, and the shepherd. With regard to all animals, four things are to be considered in purchasing or procuring them—their age, shape, pedigree, and price. After they have been purchased, there are other four things to be attended to—feeding, breeding, rearing, and curing distempers. According to this methodical division of the subject, Scrofa proceeds to give rules for choosing the best of the different species of animals which he has enumerated, as also directions for tending them after they have been bought, and turning them to the best profit. It is curious to hear what were considered the good points of a goat, a hog, or a horse, in the days of Pompey and Cæsar; in what regions they were produced in greatest size and perfection; what was esteemed the most nutritive provender for each; and what number constituted an ordinary flock or herd. The qualities specified as best in an ox may perhaps astonish a modern grazier; but it must be remembered, that they are applicable to the capacity for labour, not of carrying beef. Hogs were fed by the Romans on acorns, beans, and barley; and, like our own, indulged freely in the luxury of mire, which, Varro says, is as refreshing to them as the bath to human creatures. The Romans, however, did not rear, as we do, a solitary ill-looking pig in a sty, but possessed great herds, sometimes amounting to the number of two or three hundred.

From what the author records while treating of the pasturage of sheep, we learn that a similar practice prevailed in Italy. with that which at this day exists in Spain, in the management of the Merinos belonging to the *M:sta*. Flocks of sheep, which pastured during the winter in Apulia, were driven to a great distance from that region, to pass the summer in Samnium; and mules were led from the champaign grounds of Rosea, at certain seasons, to the high Gurgurian mountains. With much valuable and curious information on all these various topics, there are interspersed a great many strange superstitions and fables, or what may be called vulgar errors, as that swine breathe by the ears instead of the mouth or nostrils—that when a wolf gets hold of a sow, the first thing he does is to

plunge it into cold water, as his teeth cannot otherwise bear the heat of the flesh—that on the shore of Lusitania, mares conceive from the winds, but their foals do not live above three years—and what is more inexplicable, one of the speakers in the dialogue asserts, that he himself had seen a sow in Arcadia so fat, that a field-mouse had made a comfortable nest in her flesh, and brought forth its young.

This book concludes with what forms the most profitable part of pasturage—the dairy and sheep-shearing.

The third book, which is by far the most interesting and best written in the work, treats *de villicis pastionibus*, which means the provisions, or moderate luxuries, which a plain farmer may procure, independent of tillage or pasturage,—as the poultry of his barn-yard—the trouts in the stream, by which his farm is bounded—and the game, which he may enclose in parks, or chance to take on days of recreation. If others of the agricultural writers have been more minute with regard to the construction of the villa itself, it is to Varro we are chiefly indebted for what lights we have received concerning its appertenancies, as warrens, aviaries, and fish-ponds. The dialogue on these subjects is introduced in the following manner:—At the comitia, held for electing an Edile, Varro and the Senator Axius, having given their votes for the candidate whom they mutually favoured, and wishing to be at his house to receive him on his return home, after all the suffrages had been taken, resolved to wait the issue in the shade of a *villa publica*. There they found Appius Claudius, the augur, whom Axius began to rally on the magnificence of his villa, at the extremity of the Campus Martius, which he contrasts with the profitable plainness of his own farm in the Reatine district. “Your sumptuous mansion,” says he, “is adorned with painting, sculpture, and carving; but to make amends for the want of these, I have all that is necessary to the cultivation of lands, and the feeding of cattle. In your splendid abode, there is no sign of the vicinity of arable lands, or vineyards. We find there neither ox nor horse—there is neither vintage in the cellars, nor corn in the granary. In what respect does this resemble the villa of your ancestors? A house cannot be called a farm or a villa, merely because it is built beyond the precincts of the city.” This polite remonstrance gives rise to a discussion with regard to the proper definition of a villa, and whether that appellation can be applied to a residence, where there is neither tillage nor pasturage. It seems to be at length agreed, that a mansion which is without these, and is merely ornamental, cannot be called a villa; but that it is properly so termed, though there be neither tillage nor pastu-

rage, if fish-ponds, pigeon-houses, and bee-hives, be kept for the sake of profit; and it is discussed whether such villas, or agricultural farms, are most lucrative.

Our author divides the *Villaticæ pastiones* into poultry, game, and fish. Under the first class, he comprehends birds, such as thrushes, which are kept in aviaries, to be eaten, but not any birds of game. Rules and directions are given for their management, of the same sort with those concerning the animals mentioned in the preceding book. The aviaries in the Roman villas were wonderfully productive and profitable. A very particular account is given of the construction of an aviary. Varro himself had one at his farm, near Casinum, but it was intended more for pleasure and recreation than profit. The description he gives of it is very minute, but not very distinct. The pigeon-house is treated of separately from the aviary. As to the game, the instructions do not relate to field-sports, but to the mode of keeping wild animals in enclosures or warrens. In the more simple and moderate ages of the republic, these were merely hare or rabbit warrens of no great extent; but as wealth and luxury increased, they were enlarged to the size of 40 or 50 acres, and frequently contained within their limits goats, wild boars, and deer. The author even descends to instructions with regard to keeping and fattening snails and dormice. On the subject of fish he is extremely brief, because that was rather an article of expensive luxury than homely fare; and the candidate, besides, was now momentarily expected. Fish-ponds had increased in the same proportion as warrens, and in the age of Varro were often formed at vast expense. Instances are given of the great depth and extent of ponds belonging to the principal citizens, some of which had subterraneous communications with the sea, and others were supplied by rivers, which had been turned from their course. At this part of the dialogue, a shout and unusual bustle announced the success of the candidate whom Varro favoured: on hearing this tumult, the party gave up their agricultural disquisitions, and accompanied him in triumph to the Capitol.

This work of Varro is totally different from that of Cato on the same subject, formerly mentioned. It is not a journal, but a book; and instead of the loose and unconnected manner in which the brief precepts of the Censor are delivered, it is composed on a plan not merely regular, but perhaps somewhat too stiff and formal. Its exact and methodical arrangement has particularly attracted the notice of Scaliger.—“Unicum Varronem inter Latinos habemus, libris tribus de Re Rustica, qui vere ac μεθοδικως philosophatus sit. Immo nullus

est Græcorum qui tam bene, inter eos saltem qui ad nos pervenerunt*." Instead, too, of that directness and simplicity which never deviate from the plainest precepts of agriculture, the work of Varro is embellished and illustrated by much of the erudition which might be expected from the learning of its author, and of one acquainted with fifty Greek writers who had treated of the subject before him. "Cato, the famous Censor," says Martyne, "writes like an ancient country gentleman of much experience: He abounds in short pithy sentences, intersperses his book with moral precepts, and was esteemed a sort of oracle. Varro writes more like a scholar than a man of much practice: He is fond of research into antiquity, and inquires into the etymology of the names of persons and things. Cato, too, speaks of a country life, and of farming, merely as it may be conducive to gain. Varro also speaks of it as of a wise and happy state, inclining to justice, temperance, sincerity, and all the virtues, which shelters from evil passions, by affording that constant employment, which leaves little leisure for those vices which prevail in cities, where the means and occasions for them are created and supplied."

There were other Latin works on agriculture, besides those of Cato and Varro, but they were subsequent to the time which the present volumes are intended to embrace. Strictly speaking, indeed, even the work of Varro was written after the battle of Actium: the knowledge, however, on which its precepts were founded, was acquired long before. The style, too, is that of the Roman republic, not of the Augustan age. I have therefore considered Varro as belonging to the period on which we are at present engaged.

Indeed, the history of his life and writings is almost identified with the literary history of Rome, during the long period through which his existence was protracted. But the treatise on agriculture is the only one of his multifarious works which has descended to us entire. The other writings of this celebrated polygraph, as Cicero calls him†, may be divided into philological, critical, historical, mythological, philosophic, and satiric; and, after all, it would probably be necessary, in order to form a complete catalogue, to add the convenient and comprehensive class of miscellaneous.

The work *De Lingua Latina*, though it has descended to us incomplete, is by much the most entire of Varro's writings, except the Treatise on Agriculture. It is on account of this

* *Sealigerana prima*, p. 144.

† Πολυγραφεατος. *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. III. Ep. 18.

philological production, that Aulus Gellius ranks him among the grammarians, who form a numerous and important class in the History of Latin Literature. They were called *grammatici* by the Romans—a word which would be better rendered philologers than grammarians. The grammatic science, among the Romans, was not confined to the inflections of words or rules of syntax. It formed one of the great divisions of the art of criticism, and was understood to comprehend all those different inquiries which philology includes—embracing not only grammar, properly so called, but verbal and literal criticism, etymology, the explication and just interpretation of authors, and emendation of corrupted passages. Indeed the name of grammarian (*grammaticus*) is frequently applied by ancient authors* to those whom we should now term critics and commentators, rather than grammarians.

It will be readily conceived that a people, who, like the first Romans, were chiefly occupied with war, and whose relaxation was agriculture, did not attach much importance to a science, of which the professed object was, teaching how to speak and write with propriety. Accordingly, almost six hundred years elapsed before they formed any idea of such a study†. Crates Mallotes, who was a contemporary of Aristarchus, and was sent as ambassador to Rome, by Attalus, King of Pergamus, towards the end of the sixth century‡, was the first who excited a taste for grammatical inquiries. Having accidentally broken his leg in the course of his embassy, he employed the period of his convalescence in receiving visitors, to whom he delivered lectures, containing grammatic disquisitions: and he also read and commented on poets hitherto unknown in Rome§. These discussions, however, probably turned solely on Greek words, and the interpretation of Greek authors. It is not likely that Crates had such a knowledge of the Latin tongue, as to give lectures on a subject which requires minute and extensive acquaintance with the language. His instructions, however, had the effect of fixing the attention of the Romans on their own language, and on their infant literature. Men sprung up who commented

* Cicero, *De Divinat.* Lib. I. c. 18. Seneca, *Epist.* 98.

† Suetonius, *De Illust. Grammat.* c. 1.

‡ Suetonius (*De Illust. Gram.*) says, that he was sent by Attalus, at the moment of the death of Ennius. Now, Ennius died in 585, at which time Eumenes reigned at Pergamus, and was not succeeded by Attalus till the year 595; so that Suetonius was mistaken, either as to the year in which Crates came to Rome, or the king by whom he was sent—I rather think he was wrong in the latter point; for, if Crates was the first Greek rhetorician who taught at Rome, which seems universally admitted, he must have been there before 593, in which year the rhetoricians were expressly banished from Rome, along with the philosophers.

§ Suetonius, c. 2.

on, and explained, the few Latin poems which at that time existed. C. Octavius Lampadius illustrated the Punic War of Nævius; and also divided that poem into seven books. About the same time, Q. Vargunteius lectured on the Annals of Ennius, on certain fixed days, to crowded audiences. Q. Philocomus soon afterwards performed a similar service for the Satires of his friend Lucilius. Among these early grammarians, Suetonius particularly mentions Ælius Precogninus and Servius Clodius. The former was the master of Varro and Cicero; he was also a rhetorician of eminence, and composed a number of orations for the Patricians, to whose cause he was so ardently attached, that, when Metellus Numidicus was banished in 654, he accompanied him into exile. Serv. Clodius was the son-in-law of Lælius, and fraudulently appropriated, it is said, a grammatical work, written by his distinguished relative, which shows the honour and credit by this time attached to such pursuits at Rome. Clodius was a Roman knight; and, from his example, men of rank did not disdain to write concerning grammar, and even to teach its principles. Still, however, the greater number of grammarians, at least of the verbal grammarians, were slaves. If well versed in the science, they brought, as we learn from Suetonius, exorbitant prices. Luctatius Daphnis was purchased by Quintus Catulus for 200,000 pieces of money, and shortly afterwards set at liberty. This was a strong encouragement for masters to instruct their slaves in grammar, and for them to acquire its rules. Sævius Nicanor, and Aurelius Opilius, who wrote a commentary, in nine books, on different writers, were freedmen, as was also Antonius Gniphos, a Gaul, who had been taught Greek at Alexandria, whither he was carried in his youth, and was subsequently instructed in Latin literature at Rome. Though a man of great learning in the science he professed, he left only two small volumes on the Latin language—his time having been principally occupied in teaching. He taught first in the house of the father of Julius Cæsar, and afterwards lectured at home to those who chose to attend him. The greatest men of Rome, when far advanced in age and dignity, did not disdain to frequent his school. Many of his precepts, indeed, extended to rhetoric and declamation, the arts, of all others, in which the Romans were most anxious to be initiated. These were now taught in the schools of almost all grammarians, of whom there were, at one time, upwards of twenty in Rome. For a long while, only the Greek poets were publicly explained, but at length the Latin poets were likewise commented on and illustrated. About the same period, the etymology of Latin words began

to be investigated: *Ælius Gallus*, a jurisconsult quoted by Varro, wrote a work on the origin and proper signification of terms of jurisprudence, which in most languages remain unvaried, till they have become nearly unintelligible; and *Ælius Stilo* attempted, though not with perfect success, to explain the proper meaning of the words of the Salian verses, by ascertaining their derivations*.

The science of grammar and etymology was in this stage of progress and in this degree of repute at the time when Varro wrote his celebrated treatise *De Lingua Latina*. That work originally consisted of twenty-four books—the first three being dedicated to Publius Septimius, who had been his quæstor in the war with the pirates, and the remainder to Cicero. This last dedication, with that of Cicero's *Academica* to Varro, has rendered their friendship immortal. The importance attached to such dedications by the great men of Rome, and the value, in particular, placed by Cicero on a compliment of this nature from Varro, is established by a letter of the orator to Atticus—"You know," says he, "that, till lately, I composed nothing but orations, or some such works, into which I could not introduce Varro's name with propriety. Afterwards, when I engaged in a work of more general erudition, Varro informed me, that his intention was, to address to me a work of considerable extent and importance. Two years, however, have passed away without his making any progress. Meanwhile, I have been making preparations for returning him the compliment‡." Again, "I am anxious to know how you came to be informed that a man like Varro, who has written so much, without addressing anything to me, should wish me to pay him a compliment‡." The *Academica* were dedicated to Varro before he fulfilled his promise of addressing a work to Cicero; and it appears, from Cicero's letter to Varro, sent along with the *Academica*, how impatiently he expected its performance, and how much he importuned him for its execution.—"To exact the fulfilment of a promise," says he, "is a sort of ill manners, of which the populace themselves are seldom guilty. I cannot, however, forbear—I will not say, to demand, but remind you, of a favour, which you long since gave me reason to expect. To this end, I have sent you four admonitors, (the four books of the *Academica*,) whom, perhaps, you will not consider as extremely modest§." It is curious, that when Varro did at length come forth with his

* Court de Gebelin, *Monde Primitif*, T. VI. Disc. Prelim. p. 12.

† *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. XIII. Ep. 12.

‡ *Ibid.* Lib. XIII. Ep. 18.

§ *Epist. Famil.* Lib. IX. Ep. 8.

dedication, although he had been highly extolled in the *Academica*, he introduced not a single word of compliment to Cicero—whether it was that Varro dealt not in compliment, that he was disgusted with his friend's insatiable appetite for praise, or that Cicero was considered as so exalted that he could not be elevated higher by panegyric.

We find in the work *De Lingua Latina*, which was written during the winter preceding Cæsar's death, the same methodical arrangement that marks the treatise *De Re Rustica*. The twenty-four books of which it consisted, were divided into three great parts. The first six books were devoted to etymological researches, or, as Varro himself expresses it, *quemadmodum vocabula essent imposita rebus in lingua Latina*. In the first, second, and third books, of this division of his work, all of which have perished, the author had brought forward what an admirer of etymological science could advance in its favour—what a depreciator might say against it; and what might be pronounced concerning it without enthusiasm or prejudice.—“*Quæ contra eam dicentur, quæ pro ea, quæ de ea.*” The fragments remaining of this great work of Varro, commence at the fourth book, which, with the two succeeding books, is occupied with the origin of Latin terms and the poetical licenses that have been taken in their use: He first considers the origin of the names of places, and of those things which are in them. His great division of places is, into heaven and earth—*Cælum* he derives from *cavum*, and that, from *chaos*; *terra* is so called *quia teritur*. The derivation of the names of many terrestrial regions is equally whimsical. The most rational are those of the different spots in Rome, which are chiefly named after individuals, as the Tarpeian rock, from Tarpeia, a vestal virgin slain by the Sabines—the Cælian Mount, from Cælius, an Etrurian chief, who assisted Romulus in one of his contests with his neighbours. Following the same arrangement with regard to those things which *are in* places, he first treats of the immortals, or gods of heaven and earth. Descending to mortal things, he treats of animals, whom he considers as in three places—air, water, and earth. The creatures inhabiting earth he divides into men, cattle, and wild beasts. Of the appellations proper to mankind, he speaks first of public honours, as the office of Prætor, who was so called, “*quod præiret exercitui.*” We have then the derivations both of the generic and special names of animals. Thus, *Armenta* (quasi *aramenta*) is from *aro*, because oxen are used for ploughing; *Lepus* is quasi *Levipēs*. The remainder of the book is occupied with those words which relate to food, clothing, and various sorts

of utensils. Of these, the derivation is given, and it is generally far-fetched. But of all his etymologies, the most whimsical is that contained in his book of Divine Things, where he deduces *fur* from *furvus*, (dusky,) because thieves usually steal during the darkness of night*.

The fifth book relates to words expressive of time and its divisions, and to those things which are done in the course of time. He begins with the months and days consecrated to the service of the gods, or performance of accustomed rites. Things which happen during the lapse of time, are divided into three classes, according to the three great human functions of thought, speech, and act. The third class, or actions, are performed by means of the external senses; the mention of which introduces the explication of those terms which express the various operations of the senses; and the book terminates with a list of vocables derived from the Greek. These two books relate the common employment of words. In the sixth, the author treats of poetic words, and the poetic or metaphoric use of ordinary terms, of which he gives examples. Here he follows the same arrangement already adopted—speaking first of places, and then of time, and showing, as he proceeds, the manner in which poets have changed or corrupted the original signification of words.

Such is the first division of the work of Varro, forming what he himself calls the etymological part. He admits that it was a subject of much difficulty and obscurity, since many original words had become obsolete in course of time, and of those which survived, the meaning had been changed or had never been imposed with exactness. The second division, which extended from the commencement of the seventh to the end of the twelfth book, comprehended the accidents of words, and the different changes which they undergo from declension, conjugation, and comparison. The author admits but of two kinds of words—nouns and verbs, to which he refers all the other parts of speech. He distinguishes two sorts of declensions, of which he calls one arbitrary, and the other natural or necessary; and he is thenceforth alternately occupied with analogy and anomaly. In the seventh book he discusses the subject of analogy in general, and gives the arguments which may be adduced against its existence in nouns proper: In the eighth, he reasons like those who find analogies everywhere. Book ninth treats of the analogy and anomaly of verbs, and with it the fragment we possess of Varro's treatise terminates. The three other books, which completed the second part, were

* Aulus Gellius, Lib. I. c. 18.

of course occupied with comparison and the various inflections of words.

The third part of the work, which contained twelve books, treated of syntax, or the junction of words, so as to form a phrase or sentence. It also contained a sort of glossary, which explained the true meaning of Latin vocables.

This, which may be considered as one of the chief works of Varro, was certainly a laborious and ingenious production; but the author is evidently too fond of deriving words from the ancient dialects of Italy, instead of recurring to the Greek, which, after the capture of Tarentum, became a great source of Latin terms. In general, the Romans, like the Greeks before them, have been very unfortunate in their etymologies, being but indifferent critics, and inadequately informed of everything that did not relate to their own country. Blackwell, in his *Court of Augustus*, while he admits that the sagacity of Varro is surprising in the use which he has made of the knowledge he possessed of the Sabine and Tuscan dialects, remarks, that his work, *De Lingua Latina*, is faulty in two particulars; the first, arising from the author having recourse to far-fetched allusions and metaphors in his own language, to illustrate his etymology of words, instead of going at once to the Greek. The second, proceeding from his ignorance of the eastern and northern languages, particularly the Aramean and Celtic*; the former of which, in Blackwell's opinion, had given names to the greater number of the gods, and the latter, to matters occurring in war and rustic life.

It is not certain whether the *Libri De Similitudine Verborum*, and those *De Utilitate Sermonis*, cited by Priscian and Charisius as philological works of Varro, were parts of his great production, *De Lingua Latina*, or separate compositions. There was a distinct treatise, however, *De Sermone Latino*, addressed to Marcellus, of which a very few fragments are preserved by Aulus Gellius.

The critical works of this universal scholar, were entitled, *De Proprietate Scriptorum—De Poetis—De Poematis—Theatrales, sive de Actionibus Scenicis—De Scenicis Originibus—De Plautinis Comædiis—De Plautinis Quæstionibus—De Compositione Satirarum—Rhetoricorum Libri*. These works are praised or mentioned by Gellius, Nonius Marcellus, and Diomedes; but almost nothing is known of their contents.

Somewhat more may be gathered concerning Varro's *mythological* or *theological* works, as they were much studied, and

* See also as to the Celtic derivations, Court de Gebelin, *Monde Primitif*. Disc. Prelim. T. VI. p. 23.

very frequently cited by the early fathers, particularly St Augustine and Lactantius. Of these the chief is the treatise *De Cultu Deorum*, noticed by St Augustine in his seventh book, *De Civitate Dei*, where he says that Varro considers God to be not only the soul of the world, but the world itself. In this work, he also treated of the origin of hydromancy, and other superstitious divinations. Sixteen books of the treatise *De Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum Antiquitatibus*, addressed to Julius Cæsar, as Pontifex Maximus, related to theological, or at least what we might call ecclesiastical subjects. He divides theology into three sorts—mythic, physical, and civil. The first is chiefly employed by poets, who have feigned many things contrary to the nature and dignity of the immortals, as that they sprung from the head, or thigh, or from drops of blood—that they committed thefts and impure actions, and were the servants of men. The second species of theology is that which we meet with in the books of philosophers, in which it is discussed, whether the gods have been from all eternity, and what is their essence, whether of fire, or numbers, or atoms. Civil, or the third kind of theology, relates to the institutions devised by men, for the worship of the Gods. The first sort is most appropriate to the stage; the second to the world; the third to the city. Varro was a zealous advocate for the physical explication of the mythological fables, to which he always had recourse, when pressed by the difficulties of their literal meaning*. He also seems to have been of opinion that the images of the gods were originally intended to direct such as were acquainted with the secret doctrines, to the contemplation of the real gods, and of the immortal soul with its constituent parts†. The first book of this work, as we learn from St Augustine, was introductory. The three following treated of the ministers of religion, the Pontiffs, Augurs, and Sibyls; in mentioning whom, he relates the well-known story of her who offered her volumes for sale to Tarquinius Priscus. In the next ternary of chapters, he discoursed concerning places appointed for religious worship, and the celebration of sacred rites. The third ternary related to holidays; the fourth to consecrations, and to private as well as public sacrifices; and the fifth contained an enumeration of all the deities who watch over man, from the moment when Janus opens to him the gates of life, till the dirges of Nænia conduct him to the tomb. The whole universe, he says, in conclusion, is divided into heaven

* Jupiter, Juno, Saturnus, Vulcanus, Vesta, et alii plurimi quos Varro conatur ad mundi partes sive elementa transferre. (*St August. Civit. Dei*, Lib. VIII. c. 5.)

† Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* Lib. I. c. 6.

and earth; the heavens, again, into æther and air; earth, into the ground and water. All these are full of souls, mortal in earth and water, but immortal in air and æther. Between the highest circle, of heaven and the orbit of the moon, are the ethereal souls of the stars and planets, which are understood, and in fact seem, to be celestial deities; between the sphere of the moon and the highest region of tempests, dwell those aerial spirits, which are conceived by the mind though not seen by the eye—departed heroes, Lares, and Genii.

This work, which is said to have chiefly contributed to the splendid reputation of Varro, was extant as late as the beginning of the fourteenth century. Petrarch, to whom the world has been under such infinite obligations for his ardent zeal in discovering the learned works of the Romans, had seen it in his youth. It continued ever after to be the object of his diligent search, and his bad success was a source to him of constant mortification. Of this we are informed in one of the letters, which that enthusiastic admirer of the ancients addressed to them as if they been alive, and his contemporaries. "Nullæ tamen exstant," says he to Varro, "vel admodum laceræ, tuorum operum reliquæ; licet divinarum et humanarum rerum libros, ex quibus sonantius nomen habes, puerum me vidisse meminerim, et recordatione torqueor, summis, ut aiunt, labiis gustatæ dulcedinis. Hos alicubi forsitan latitare suspicor, eaque, multos jam per annos, me fatigat cura, quoniam longâ quidem ac sollicitâ spe nihil est laboriosius in vitâ.

Plutarch, in his life of Romulus, speaks of Varro as a man of all the Romans most versed in history. The *historical* and political works are the *Annales Libri—Bellî Punici Secundi Liber—De Initiis Urbis Romanæ—De Gente Populi Romani—Libri de Familiis Trojanis*, which last treated of the families that followed Æneas into Italy. With this class we may rank the *Hebdomadum, sive de Imaginibus Libri*, containing the panegyrics of 700 illustrious men. There was a picture of each, with a legend or verse under it, like those in the children's histories of the Kings of England. That annexed to the portrait of Demetrius Phalereus, who had upwards of 300 brazen statues erected to him by the Athenians, is still preserved:—

"Hic Demetrius æneis tot aptus est
Quot luces habet annus absolutus."

There were seven pictures and panegyrics in each book, whence the whole work has been called *Hebdomades*. Varro had adopted the superstitious notions of the ancients concern-

ing particular numbers, and the number seven seems specially to have commanded his veneration. There were in the world seven wonders—there were seven wise men among the Greeks—there were seven chariots in the Circensian games—and seven chiefs were chosen to make war on Thebes: All which he sums up with remarking, that he himself had then entered his twelfth period of seven years, on which day he had written seventy times seven books, many of which, in consequence of his proscription, had been lost in the plunder of his library. It appears from Ausonius, that the tenth book of this work was occupied with pictures and panegyrics of distinguished architects, since, in his *Eidyllium*, entitled *Mosella*, he observes, that the buildings on the banks of that river would not have been despised by the most celebrated architects; and that those who planned them might well deserve a place in the tenth book of the *Hebdomas* of Varro:—

“ Forsan et insignes hominumque operumque labores
Hic habuit decimo celebrata volumine Marci
Hebdomas.”——

It is evident, however, from one of the letters of Symmachus, addressed to his father, that though this was a professed work of panegyric, Varro was very sparing and niggardly of his praise even to the greatest characters: “ Ille Pythagoram qui animas in æternitatem primus asseruit; ille Platonem qui deos esse persuasit; ille Aristotelem qui naturam bene loquendi in artem redegit; ille pauperem Curium sed divitibus imperantem; ille severos Catones, gentem Fabiam, decora Scipionum, totumque illum triumphalem Senatumparcâ laude perstrinxit.” Varro also wrote an eulogy on Porcia, the wife of Brutus, which is alluded to by Cicero in one of his letters to Atticus. Among his notices of celebrated characters, it is much to be regretted that the *Liber de Vita Sua*, cited by Charisius, has shared the same fate as most of the other valuable works of Varro. The treatise entitled, *Sisenna, sive de Historia*, was a tract on the composition of history, inscribed to Sisenna, the Roman historian, who wrote an account of the civil wars of Marius and Sylla. It contained, it is said, many excellent precepts with regard to the appropriate style of history, and the accurate investigation of facts. But the greatest service rendered by Varro to history was his attempt to fix the chronology of the world. Censorinus informs us that he was the first who regulated chronology by eclipses. That learned grammarian has also mentioned the division of three great periods established by Varro. He did not determine whether the earliest

of them had any beginning, but he fixed the end of it at the Ogygian deluge. To this period of absolute historical darkness, he supposed that a kind of twilight succeeded, which continued from that flood till the institution of the Olympic games, and this he called the fabulous age. From that date the Greeks pretend to digest their history with some degree of order and clearness. Varro, therefore, looked on it as the break of day, or commencement of the historical age. The chronology, however, of those events which occurred at the beginning of this second period, is as uncertain and confused as of those which immediately preceded it. Thus, the historical æra is evidently placed too high by Varro. The earliest writers of history did not live till long after the Olympian epoch, and they again long preceded the earliest chronologers. Timæus, about the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was the first who digested the events recorded by these ancient historians, according to a computation of the Olympiads*. Preceding writers, indeed, mention these celebrated epochs, but the mode of reckoning by them was not brought into established use for many centuries after the Olympic æra. Arnobius farther informs us, that Varro calculated that not quite 2000 years had elapsed from the Ogygian flood to the consulship of Hirtius and Pansa. The building of Rome he placed two years higher than Cato had done in his *Origines*, founding his computation on the eclipse which had a short while preceded the birth of Romulus; but unfortunately this eclipse is not attested by contemporary authors, nor by any historian who could vouch for it with certainty. It was calculated a long time after the phenomenon was supposed to have appeared, by Tarrutius Firmanus, the judicial astrologer, who amused himself with drawing horoscopes. Varro requested him to discover the date of Romulus's birth, by divining it from the known events of his life, as geometrical problems are solved by analysis; for Tarrutius considered it as belonging to the same art, (and doubtless the conclusions are equally certain,) when a child's nativity is given to predict its future life, and when the incidents of life are given to cast up the nativity. Tarrutius, accordingly, having considered the actions of Romulus, and the manner of his death, and having combined all the incidents, pronounced that he was conceived in the first year of the second Olympiad, on the 23d of the Egyptian month Choiak, on which day there had been a total eclipse of the sun.

Pompey, when about to enter for the first time on the office of Consul, being ignorant of city manners and senatorial

* Bolingbroke, *Use and Study of History*, Lett. 3.

forms, requested Varro to frame for him a written commentary or manual, from which he might learn the duties to be discharged by him when he convened the Senate. This book, which was entitled *Isagogicum de Officio Senatus habendi*, Varro says, in the letters which he wrote to Oppianus, had been lost. But in these letters he repeated many things on the subject, as what he had written before had perished*.

The *philosophical* writings of Varro are not numerous; but his chief work of that description, entitled *De Philosophia Liber*, appears to have been very comprehensive. St Augustine informs us that Varro examined in it all the various sects of philosophers, of which he enumerated upwards of 280. The sect of the old Academy was that which he himself followed, and its tenets he maintained in opposition to all others. He classed these numerous sects in the following curious manner: All men chiefly desire, or place their happiness in, four things—pleasure—rest—these two united, (which Epicurus, however, termed pleasure,) or soundness of body and mind. Now, philosophers have contended that virtue is to be sought after for the sake of obtaining one or other of these four; or, that some one of these four is to be sought after for the sake of virtue; or, that they and virtue also are to be sought after for their own sake, and from these different opinions each of the four great objects of human desire being sought after with three different views, there are formed twelve sects of philosophers. These twelve sects are doubled, in consequence of the different opinions created by the considerations of social intercourse—some maintaining that the four great desires should be gratified for our own sake, and others, that they should be indulged only for the sake of our neighbours. The above twenty-four sects become forty-eight, from each system being defended as certain truth, or as merely the nearest approximation to probability—twenty-four sects maintaining each hypothesis as certain, and twenty-four as only probable. These again were doubled, from the difference of opinion with regard to the suitable garb and external habit and demeanour of philosophers.

We have now got ninety-six sects by a very strange sort of computation, and all these are to be tripled, according to the different opinions entertained concerning the best mode of spending life—in literary leisure, in business, or in both†.

Varro having followed the sect of the old Academy, in preference to all others, proceeded to refute the principles of

* Au. Gellius, Lib. XIV. c. 7.

† St Augustine, *De Civitat. Dei*, Lib. XIX. c. 1.

the sects he had enumerated. He cleared the way, by dismissing, as unworthy the name of philosophical, all those sects whose differences did not turn on what is the supreme final good; for there is no use in philosophizing, unless it be to make us happy, and that which makes us happy is the final good. But those who dispute, for example, whether a wise man should follow virtue, tranquillity, &c. partly for the sake of others, or solely for his own, do not dispute concerning what is the final good, but whether that good should be shared. In like manner, the Cynic does not dispute with regard to the supreme good, but in what dress or habit he who follows the supreme good should be clad. So also as to the controversy concerning the uncertainty of knowledge. The number of sects were thus reduced to the twelve with which our author set out, and in which the whole question relates to what is the final good. From these, however, he abstracted the sects which place the final good in pleasure, rest, or the union of both—not that he altogether disdained these, but he thought they might be included in soundness of body and mind, or what he called the *prima Natura*. There are thus only three questions which merit full discussion. Whether these *prima Natura* should be desired for the sake of virtue, or virtue for their sake, or if they and virtue also should be desired for their own sake.

Now, since in philosophy we seek the supreme felicity of man, we must inquire what man is. His nature is compounded of soul and body. Hence the *summum bonum* necessarily consists in the *prima Natura* or perfect soundness of mind and body. These, therefore, must be sought on their own account; and under them may be included virtue, which is part of soundness of mind, being the great director and prime former of the felicity of life.

Such were the doctrines of the old Academy, which Varro was also introduced as supporting in Cicero's *Academica*.—"I have comprehended," says that illustrious orator and philosopher, in a letter to Atticus, "the whole Academic system in four books, instead of two, in the course of which Varro is made to defend the doctrines of Antiochus*. I have put into his mouth all the arguments which were so accurately collected by Antiochus against the opinion of those who contend that there is no certainty to be attained in human knowledge. These I have answered myself. But the part assigned to Varro in the debate is so good, that I do not think the cause which I support appears the better."

* Antiochus of Ascalon, a teacher of the old Academy.

I am not certain under what class Varro's *Novem libri Disciplinarum* should be ranked, as it probably comprehended instructive lessons in the whole range of arts and sciences. One of the chapters, according to Vitruvius, was on the subject of architecture. Varro was particularly full and judicious in his remarks on the construction and situation of Roman villas, and seems to have laid the foundation for what Palladius and Columella subsequently compiled on that interesting topic. Another chapter was on arithmetic; and Fabricius mentions, that Vetranius Maurus has declared, in his *Life of Varro*, that he saw this part of the work, *De Disciplinis*, at Rome, in the library of the Cardinal Lorenzo Strozzi.

Varro derived much notoriety from his *satirical* compositions. His *Tricarenus*, or *Tricipitina*, was a satiric history of the triumvirate of Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus. Much pleasantry and sarcasm were also interspersed in his books entitled *Logistorici*; but his most celebrated production in that line was the satire which he himself entitled *Menippean*. It was so called from the cynic Menippus of Gadara, a city in Syria, who, like his countryman Meleager, was in the habit of expressing himself jocularly on the most grave and important subjects. He was the author of a *Symposium*, in the manner of Xenophon. His writings were interspersed with verses, parodied from Homer and the tragic poets, or ludicrously applied, for the purpose of burlesque. It is not known, however, that he wrote any professed satire. The appellation, then, of *Menippean*, was given to his satire by Varro, not from any production of the same kind by Menippus, but because he imitated his general style of humour. In its external form it appears to have been a sort of literary anomaly. Greek words and phrases were interspersed with Latin; prose was mingled with verses of various measures; and pleasantry with serious remark. As to its object and design, Cicero introduces Varro himself explaining this in the *Academica*. After giving his reasons for not writing professedly on philosophical subjects, he continues,—“In those ancient writings of ours, we, imitating Menippus, without translating him, have infused a degree of mirth and gaiety along with a portion of our most secret philosophy and logic, so that even our unlearned readers might more easily understand them, being, as it were, invited to read them with some pleasure. Besides, in the discourses we have composed in praise of the dead, and in the introductions to our antiquities, it was our wish to write in a manner worthy of philosophers, provided we have attained the desired object.” From what Cicero afterwards says in this dialogue, while addressing himself to Varro, it would appear, that he

had indeed touched on philosophical subjects in his *Menippean* satire, but that, learned as he was, his object was more to amuse his readers than instruct them: "You have entered on topics of philosophy in a manner sufficient to allure readers to its study, but inadequate to convey full instruction, or to advance its progress."

Many fragments of this *Menippean* satire still remain, but they are much broken and corrupted. The heads of the different subjects, or chapters, contained in it, amounting to near one hundred and fifty, have been given by Fabricius in alphabetical order. Some of them are in Latin, others in Greek. A few chapters have double titles; and, though little remains of them but the titles, these show what an infinite variety of subjects was treated by the author. As a specimen, I subjoin those ranged under the letter A. Aborigines,—Περὶ Ἀνθρώπων φύσεως,—De Admirandis, vel Gallus Fundanius,—Agatho,—Age modo,—Ἄπει διβυη, vel περὶ Αἰρέσεων,—Ajax Stramentitius,—Ἄλλος ἕντος Ἡρακλῆς,—Andabatæ,—Anthropopolis,—περὶ Ἀρχῆς, seu Marcopolis,—περὶ Ἀρχαίρεσιων, seu Serranus,—περὶ Ἀρσενῆς κρησεως,—περὶ Ἀφροδισίων, seu vinalia,—Armorum iudicium,—περὶ Ἀρσενότητος, seu Triphallus,—Autumedus,—Mæonius,—Baizæ, &c.*

There is a chapter concerning the duty of a husband, (*De officio Mariti*), in which the author observes, that the errors of a wife are either to be cured or endured: He who extirpates them makes his wife better, but he who bears with them improves himself. Another is inscribed, "You know not what a late evening, or supper, may bring with it," (*Nescis quid vesper serus vehat.*) In this chapter he remarks, that the number of guests should not be less than that of the Graces, or more than that of the Muses. To render an entertainment perfect, four things must concur—agreeable company, suitable place, convenient time, and careful preparation. The guests should not be loquacious or taciturn. Silence is for the bed-chamber, and eloquence for the Forum, but neither for a feast. The conversation ought not to turn on anxious or difficult subjects, but should be cheerful and inviting, so that utility may be combined with a certain degree of pleasure and allurement. This will be best managed, by discoursing of those things which relate to the ordinary occurrences or affairs of life, concerning which one has not leisure to talk in the Forum, or while transacting business. The master of the feast should rather be neat and clean than splendidly attired; and if he introduce reading into the entertainment, it should be so

* Fabricius, *Biblioth. Latin.* Lib. I. c. 7.

selected as to amuse, and to be neither troublesome nor tedious*. A third chapter is entitled, *περὶ ἰσομακῶν*; and treats of the rarer delicacies of an entertainment, especially foreign luxuries. Au. Gellius has given us the import of some verses, in which Varro mentioned the different countries which supplied the most exquisite articles of food. Peacocks came from Samos; cranes from Melos; kids from Ambracia; and the best oysters from Tarentum†. Part of the chapter *περὶ σκῆπτρον* was directed against the Latin tragic poets.

What remains of the verses interspersed in the *Menippean* satire, is too trifling to enable us to form any accurate judgment of the poetical talents of Varro.

The style of satire introduced by Varro was imitated by Lucius Annæus Seneca, in his satire on the deification of Claudius Cæsar, who was called on earth Divus Claudius. The *Satyricon* of Petronius Arbiter, in which that writer lashed the luxury, and avarice, and other vices of his age, is a satire of the Varronian species, prose being mingled with verse, and jest with serious remark. Such, too, are the Emperor Julian's *Symposium of the Cæsars*, in which he characterizes his predecessors; and his *Μεταωυραν*, directed against the luxurious manners of the citizens of Antioch.

Besides the works of Varro above-mentioned, there is a miscellaneous collection of sentences or maxims which have been attributed to him, though it is not known in what part of his numerous writings they were originally introduced. Barthius found seventeen of these sentences in a MS. of the middle age, and printed them in his *Adversaria*. Schneider afterwards discovered, in the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais, a monk of the thirteenth century, a much more ample collection of them, which he has inserted in his edition of the *Scriptores rei Rusticæ*‡. They consist of moral maxims, in the style of those preserved from the Mimes of Publius Syrus, and had doubtless been culled as flowers from the works of Varro, at a time when the immense garden of taste and learning, which he planted, had not yet been laid waste by the hand of time, or the spoiler§.

* Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic. Lib. XIII. c. 11.*

† *Ibid. Lib. VII. c. 16.*

‡ Tom. I. p. 241.

§ It was long believed, that Pope Gregory the First had destroyed the works of Varro, in order to conceal the plagiarisms of St Augustine, who had borrowed largely from the theological and philosophic writings of the Roman scholar. This, however, is not likely. That illustrious Father of the Christian Church is constantly referring to the learned heathens, without any apparent purpose of concealment; and he extols him in terms calculated to attract notice to the subject of his eulogy. Nor did St Augustine possess such meagre powers of genius, as to require him to build up the city of the true God from the crumbling fragments of Pagan temples.

Though the above list of the works of Varro is far from complete, a sufficient number has been mentioned to justify the exclamation of Quintilian,—“*Quam multa, immo pene omnia tradidit Varro!*” and the more full panegyric of Cicero, —“*His works brought us home, as it were, while we were foreigners in our own city, and wandering like strangers, so that we might know who and where we were; for in them are laid open the chronology of his country,—a description of the seasons,—the laws of religion,—the ordinances of the priests,—domestic and military occurrences,—the situations of countries and places,—the names of all things divine and human,—the breed of animals,—moral duties,—and the origin of things*.*”

Nor did Varro merely delight and instruct his fellow-citizens by his writings. By his careful attention in procuring the most valuable books, and establishing libraries, he provided, perhaps, still more effectually than by his own learned compositions, for the progressive improvement and civilization of his countrymen. The formation of either private or public libraries was late of taking place at Rome, for the Romans were late in attending to literary studies. Tiraboschi quotes a number of writers who have discovered a library in the public records preserved at Rome†, and in the books of the Sibyls‡. But these, he observes, may be classed with the library which Madero found to have existed before the flood, and that belonging to Adam, of which Hilscherus has made out an exact catalogue§. From Syracuse and Corinth the Romans brought away the statues and pictures, and other monuments of the fine arts; but we do not learn that they carried to the capital any works of literature or science. Some agricultural books found their way to Rome from Africa, on the destruction of Carthage; but the other treasures of its libraries, though they fell under the power of a conqueror not without pretensions to taste and erudition, were bestowed on the African princes in alliance with the Romans||.

Paulus Emilius is said by Plutarch to have allowed his sons to choose some volumes from the library of Perseus, King of Macedon¶, whom he led captive to Rome in 585. But the honour of first possessing a library in Rome is justly due to Sylla; who, on the occupation of Athens, in 667, acquired the library of Apellicon, which he discovered in the temple of

* *Academ. Poster. Lib. I. c. 3.*

† Morhof, *Polyhistor. Tom. I. Lib. I. Falsterus, Hist. Rei Liter. ap. Roman.*

‡ Middendorp, *De Academ. Lib. III.*

§ Tiraboschi, *Stor. dell Lett. Ital. Part III. Lib. III. c. 8.*

|| Plin. *Hist. Nat. Lib. XVIII. c. 3.*

¶ Plutarch, in *Paul. Emil.*

Apollo. This collection, which contained, among various other books, the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, was reserved to himself by Sylla from the plunder; and, having been brought to Rome, was arranged by the grammarian Tyrannio, who also supplied and corrected the mutilated text of Aristotle*. Engaged, as he constantly was, in domestic strife or foreign warfare, Sylla could have made little use of this library, and he did not communicate the benefit of it to scholars, by opening it to the public; but the example of the Dictator prompted other commanders not to overlook the libraries, in the plunder of captured cities, and books thus became a fashionable acquisition. Sometimes, indeed, these collections were rather proofs of the power and opulence of the Roman generals, than of their literary taste or talents. A certain value was now affixed to manuscripts; and these were, in consequence, amassed by them, from a spirit of rapacity, and the principle of leaving nothing behind which could be carried off by force or stratagem. In one remarkable instance, however, the learning of the proprietor fully corresponded to the literary treasures which he had collected. Lucullus, a man of severe study, and wonderfully skilled in all the fine arts, after having employed many years in the cultivation of literature, and the civil administration of the republic, was unexpectedly called, in consequence of a political intrigue, to lead on the Roman army in the perilous contest with Mithridates; and, though previously unacquainted with military affairs, he became the first captain of the age, with little farther experience, than his study of the art of war, during the voyage from Rome to Asia. His attempts to introduce a reform in the corrupt administration of the Asiatic provinces, procured him enemies, through whose means he was superseded in the command of the army, by one who was not superior to him in talents, and was far inferior in virtue. After his recall from Pontus, and retreat to a private station, he offered a new spectacle to his countrymen. He did not retire, like Fabricius and Cincinnatus, to plough his farm, and eat turnips in a cottage—he did not, like Africanus, quit his country in disgust, because it had unworthily treated him; nor did he spend his wealth and leisure, like Sylla, in midnight debauchery with buffoons and parasites. He employed the riches he had acquired during his campaigns in the construction of delightful villas, situated on the shore of the sea, or hanging on the declivities of hills. Gardens and spacious porticos, which he adorned with all the elegance of painting

* *Id. in Sylla.*

and sculpture, made the Romans ashamed of their ancient rustic simplicity. These would doubtless be the objects of admiration to his contemporaries; but it was his library, in which so many copies of valuable works were multiplied or preserved, and his distinguished patronage of learning, that claim the gratitude of posterity. "His library," says Plutarch, "had walks, galleries, and cabinets belonging to it, which were open to all visitors; and the ingenious Greeks resorted to this abode of the muses to hold literary converse, in which Lucullus delighted to join them*." Other Roman patricians had patronized literature, by extending their protection to a favoured few, as the elder Scipio Africanus, to Ennius, and the younger to Terence; but Lucullus was the first who encouraged all the arts and sciences, and promoted learning with princely munificence.

But the slave Tyrannio vied with the most splendid of the Romans in the literary treasures he had amassed. A native of Pontus, he was taken prisoner by Lucullus, in the course of the war with Mithridates; and, having been brought to Rome, he was given to Muræna, from whom he received freedom†. He spent the remainder of his life in teaching rhetoric and grammar. He also arranged the library of Cicero at Antium‡, and taught his nephew, Quintus, in the house of the orator§. These various employments proved so profitable, that they enabled him to acquire a library of 30,000 volumes||. Libraries of considerable extent were also formed by Atticus and Cicero; and Varro was not inferior to any of his learned contemporaries, in the industry of collecting and transcribing manuscripts, both in the Greek and Latin language.

The library of Varro, however, and all the others which we have mentioned, were private—open, indeed, to literary men, from the general courtesy of the possessors, but the access to them still dependent on their good will and indulgence. Julius Cæsar was the first who formed the design of establishing a great public library; and to Varro he assigned the task of arranging the books which he had procured. This plan, which was rendered abortive by the untimely fate of Cæsar, was carried into effect by Asinius Pollio, who devoted part of the wealth he had acquired from the spoils of war, to the construction of a magnificent gallery, adjacent to the Temple

* Plutarch, in *Lucullo*.

† *Ibid*.

‡ *Epist. ad Attic. Lib. IV. Ep. 4 and 8.*

§ *Epist. ad Quint. Frat. Lib. II. Ep. 4.* According to some writers, it was a younger Tyrannio, the disciple of the elder, who arranged Cicero's library, and taught his nephew.—Mater, *Ecole d'Alexandrie*, Tom. I. p. 179.

|| Suidas, *Lexic.*

of Liberty, which he filled with books, and the busts of the learned. Varro was the only living author who, in this public library, had the honour of an image*, which was erected to him as a testimony of respect for his universal erudition. He also aided Augustus with his advice, in the formation of the two libraries which that emperor established, and which was part of his general system for the encouragement of science and learning. When tyrants understand their trade, and when their judgment is equal to their courage or craft, they become the most zealous and liberal promoters of the interests of learning; for they know that it is for their advantage to withdraw the minds of their subjects from political discussion, and to give them, in exchange, the consoling pleasures of imagination, and the inexhaustible occupations of scientific curiosity.

Were I writing the history of Roman arts, it would be necessary to mention that Varro excelled in his knowledge of all those that are useful, and in his taste for all those that are elegant. He was the contriver of what may be considered as the first hour clock that was made in Rome, and which measured time by a hand entirely moved by mechanism. That he also possessed a Museum, adorned with exquisite works of sculpture, we learn from Pliny, who mentions, that it contained an admirable group, by the statuary Archelaus, formed out of one block of marble, and representing a lioness, with Cupids sporting around her—some giving her drink from a horn; some in the attitude of putting socks on her paws, and others in the act of binding her. The same writer acquaints us, that, in the year 692, Varro, who was then Curule Ædile, caused a piece of painting, in fresco, to be brought from Sparta to Rome, in order to adorn the Comitium—the whole having been cut out entire, and enclosed in cases of wood. The painting was excellent, and much admired; but what chiefly excited astonishment, was that it should have been taken from the wall without injury, and transported safe to Italy†.

I fear I have too long detained the reader with this account of the life and writings of Varro; yet it is not unpleasing to dwell on such a character. He was the contemporary of Marius and Sylla, of Cæsar and Pompey, of Antony and Octavius, these men of contention and massacre; and amid the convulsions into which they threw their country, it is not ungrateful to trace the *Secretum Iter*, which he silently pursued through a period unparalleled in anarchy and crimes. Uninterrupted, save for a moment, by strife and ambition, he

* Plin. *Hist. Nat. Lib.* VII. c. 80.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat. Lib.* XXXV. c. 14.

prosecuted his literary labours till the extreme term of his prolonged existence. "In eodem enim lectulo," says Valerius Maximus, with a spirit and eloquence beyond his usual strain of composition—"In eodem enim lectulo, et spiritus ejus, et egregiorum operum cursus extinctus est."

NIGIDIUS FIGULUS

was a man much resembling Varro, and next to him was accounted the most learned of the Romans*. He was the contemporary of Cicero, and one of his chief advisers and associates in suppressing the conspiracy of Catiline†. Shortly afterwards he arrived at the dignity of Prætor, but having espoused the part of Pompey in the civil wars, he was driven into banishment on the accession of Cæsar to the supreme power, and died in 709, before Cicero could obtain his recall from exile‡. He was much addicted to judicial astrology; and ancient writers relate a vast number of his predictions, particularly that of the empire of the world to Augustus, which he presaged immediately after the birth of that prince§.

Nigidius vied with Varro in multifarious erudition, and the number of his works—grammar, criticism, natural history, and the origin of man, having successively employed his pen. His writings are praised by Cicero, Pliny, Aulus Gellius, and Macrobius; but they were rendered almost entirely unfit for popular use by their subtlety, mysteriousness, and obscurity||—defects to which his cultivation of judicial astrology, and adoption of the Pythagorean philosophy, may have materially contributed. Aulus Gellius gives many examples of the obscurity, or rather unintelligibility, of his grammatical writings¶. His chief work was his Grammatical Commentaries, in thirty books, in which he attempted to show, that names and words were fixed not by accidental application, but by a certain power and order of nature. One of his examples, of terms being rather natural than arbitrary, was taken from the word *Vos*, in pronouncing which, he observed, that we use a certain motion of the mouth, agreeing with what the word itself expresses: We protrude, by degrees, the tips of our lips, and thrust forward our breath and mind towards those with whom we are engaged in conversation. On the other hand, when we say *nos*, we do not pronounce it with a broad and expan-

* Au. Gellius, Lib. IV. c. 9.

† Chron. Euseb.

|| Au. Gellius, Noct. Attic. Lib. XIX. c. 14.

† Plutarch, in Cicero.

§ Suetonius, in August. c. 84.

¶ Ibid.

ded blast of the voice, nor with projecting lips, but we restrain our breath and lips, as it were, within ourselves. The like natural signs accompany the utterance of the words *tu* and *ego*—*tibi* and *mihī*. Nigidius also wrote works, entitled *De Animalibus*, *De Ventis*, *De Lixis*, and a great many treatises on the nature of the gods. All these have long since perished, except a very few fragments, which have been collected and explained by Janus Rutgersius, in the third book of his *Variæ Lectiones*, published at Leyden in 1618; 4to. In this collection he has also inserted a Greek translation of another lost work of Nigidius, on the presages to be drawn from thunder. The original Latin is said to have been taken from books which bore the name of the Etruscan Tages, the supposed founder of the science of divination. The Greek version was executed by Laurentius, a philosopher of the age of Justinian, and his translation was discovered by Meursius, about the beginning of the seventeenth century, in the Palatine library. It is a sort of Almanack, containing presages of thunder for each particular day of the year, and beginning with June. If it thunder on the 13th of June, the life or fortunes of some great person are menaced—if on the 19th of July, war is announced—if on the 5th of August, it is indicated that those women, with whom we have any concern, will become somewhat more reasonable than they have hitherto proved†.

With Varro and Nigidius Figulus, may be classed Tiro, the celebrated freedman of Cicero, and constant assistant in all his literary pursuits. He wrote many books on the use and formation of the Latin language, and others on miscellaneous subjects, which he denominated *Pandectas*‡, as comprehending every sort of literary topic.

Quintus Cornificius, the elder, was also a very general scholar. He composed a curious treatise on the etymology of the names of things in heaven and earth, in which he discovered great knowledge, both of Roman antiquities, and the most recondite Grecian literature. It was here he introduced an explication of Homer's dark fable, where Jupiter and all the gods proceed to feast for twelve days in Ethiopia. The work was written in 709, during the time of Cæsar's last expedition to Spain, and was probably intended as a supplement to Varro's treatise on a similar topic. •

* Au. Gellius, Lib. X. c. 4.

† See farther, with regard to Nigidius Figulus, Bayle, *Dict. Histor. Art. Nigidius*, and *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, Tom. XXIX. p. 190.

‡ Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. XIII. c. 9.

HISTORY.

From our supposing that those things which affected our ancestors may affect us, and that those which affect us must affect posterity, we become fond of collecting memorials of prior events, and also of preserving the remembrance of incidents which have occurred in our own age. The historic passion, if it may be so termed, thus naturally divides itself into two desires—that of indulging our own curiosity, and of relating what has occurred to ourselves or our contemporaries.

Monuments accordingly have been raised, and rude hymns composed, for this purpose, by people who had scarcely acquired the use of letters. Among civilized nations, the passion grows in proportion to the means of gratifying it, and the force of example comes to be so strongly felt, that its power and influence are soon historically employed.

The Romans were, in all ages, particularly fond of giving instruction, by every sort of example. They placed the images of their ancestors in the Forum and the vestibules of their houses, so that these venerable forms everywhere met their eyes; and by recalling the glorious actions of the dead, excited the living to emulate their forefathers. The virtue of one generation was thus transfused, by the magic of example, into those by which it was succeeded, and the spirit of heroism was maintained through many ages of the republic—

“ Has olim virtus crevit Romana per artes :
 Namque foro in medio stabant spirantia signa
 Magnanimam heroum ; hic Decios, magnosque Camillos
 Cernere erat : vivax heroum in imagine virtus,
 Invidiamque ipsais factura nepotibus, acrl
 Urgebat stimulo Romanum in prælia robur.”

History, therefore, among the Romans, was not composed merely to gratify curiosity, or satiate the historic passion, but also to inflame, by the force of example, and urge on to emulation, in warlike prowess. An insatiable thirst of military fame—an unlimited ambition of extending their empire—an unbounded confidence in their own force and courage—an impetuous overbearing spirit, with which all their enterprises were pursued, composed, in the early days of the Republic, the characteristics of Romans. To foment, and give fresh

* Griflet, *De Arte Regnandi*.

vigour to these, was a chief object of history.—“I have recorded these things,” says an old Latin annalist, after giving an account of Regulus, “that they who read my commentaries may be rendered, by his example, greater and better.”

Accordingly, the Romans had journalists or annalists, from the earliest periods of the state. The Annals of the Pontiffs were of the same date, if we may believe Cicero, as the foundation of the city*; but others have placed their commencement in the reign of Numa†, and Niebuhr not till after the battle of Regillus, which terminated the hopes of Tarquin‡. In order to preserve the memory of public transactions, the Pontifex Maximus, who was the official historian of the Republic, annually committed to writing, on wooden tablets, the leading events of each year, and then set them up at his own house for the instruction of the people§. These Annals were continued down to the Pontificate of Mucius, in the year 629, and were called *Annales Maximi*, as being periodically compiled and kept by the Pontifex Maximus, or *Publici*, as recording public transactions. Having been inscribed on wooden tablets, they would necessarily be short, and destitute of all circumstantial detail; and being annually formed by successive Pontiffs, could have no appearance of a continued history. They would contain, as Lord Bolingbroke remarks, little more than short minutes or memoranda, hung up in the Pontiff's house, like the rules of the game in a billiard room: their contents would resemble the epitome prefixed to the books of Livy, or the Register of Remarkable Occurrences in modern Almanacks.

But though short, jejune, and unadorned, still, as records of facts, these annals, if spared, would have formed an inestimable treasure of early history. The Roman territory, in the first ages of the state, was so confined, that every event may be considered as having passed under the immediate observation of the sacred annalist. Besides, the method which, as Cicero informs us, was observed in preparing these Annals, and the care that was taken to insert no fact, of which the truth had not been attested by as many witnesses as there were citizens at Rome, who were all entitled to judge and make their remarks on what ought either to be added or retrenched, must have formed the most authentic body of history that could be desired. The memory of transactions which were yet recent, and whose concomitant circumstances every one could remember, was therein transmitted to posterity. By these means,

* *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 18.

† *Vopiscus, Vit. Taciti. Imp.*

‡ *Böhmische Geschichte*, Tom. I. p. 367.

§ Cicero, *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 13.

the Annals were proof against falsification, and their veracity was incontestably fixed.

These valuable records, however, were, for the most part, consumed in the conflagration of the city, consequent on its capture by the Gauls—an event which was to the early history of Rome what the English invasion by Edward I. proved to the history of Scotland. The practice of the Pontifex Maximus preserving such records was discontinued after that eventful period. A feeble attempt was made to revive it towards the end of the second Punic war; and, from that time, the custom was not entirely dropped till the Pontificate of Mucius, in the year 629. It is to this second series of Annals, or to some other late and ineffectual attempt to revive the ancient Roman history, that Cicero must allude, when he talks of the Great Annals, in his work *De Legibus**, since it is undoubted that the pontifical records of events previous to the capture of Rome by the Gauls, almost entirely perished in the conflagration of the city†. Accordingly, Livy never cites these records, and there is no appearance that he had any opportunity of consulting them; nor are they mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the long catalogue of records and memorials which he had employed in the composition of his *Historical Antiquities*. The books of the Pontiffs, some of which were recovered in the search made to find what the flames had spared, are, indeed, occasionally mentioned. But these were works explaining the mysteries of religion, with instructions as to the ceremonies to be observed in its practical exercise, and could have been of no more service to Roman, than a collection of breviaries or missals to modern history.

Statues, inscriptions, and other public monuments, which aid in perpetuating the memory of illustrious persons, and transmitting to posterity the services they have rendered their country, were accounted, among the Romans, as the most honourable rewards that could be bestowed on great actions; and virtue, in those ancient times, thought no recompense more worthy of her than the immortality which such monuments seemed to promise. Rome having produced so many examples of a disinterested patriotism and valour, must have been filled with monuments of this description when taken by the Gauls. But these honorary memorials were thrown down along with the buildings, and buried in the ruins. If any escaped, it was but a small number; and the greatest part of

* Lib. I. c. 2.

† Quæ in Commentariis Pontificum aliisque publicis privatisque erant monumentis, incensâ urbe, plerumque interiit. Livy, Lib. VI. c. 1.

those that were to be seen at Rome in the eighth century of the city, were founded on fabulous traditions which proved that the loss of the true monuments had occasioned the substitution of false ones. Had the genuine monuments been preserved at Rome, even till the period when the first regular annals began to be composed, though they would not have sufficed to restore the history entirely, they would have served at least to have perpetuated incontestably the memory of various important facts, to have fixed their dates, and transmitted the glory of great men to posterity.

On what then, it will be asked, was the Roman history founded, and what authentic records were preserved as materials for its composition? There were first the *Leges Regiæ*. These were diligently searched for, and were discovered along with the Twelve Tables, after the sack of the city: And all those royal laws which did not concern sacred matters, were publicly exposed to be seen and identified by the people*, that no suspicion of forgery or falsification might descend to posterity. These precautions leave us little room to doubt that the *Leges Regiæ*, and Laws of the Tables, were preserved, and that they remained as they had been originally promulgated by the kings and decemvirs. Such laws, however, would be of no greater service to Roman history, than what the *Regiam Majestatem* has been to that of Scotland. They might be useful in tracing the early constitution of the state, the origin of several customs, ceremonies, public offices, and other points of antiquarian research, but they could be of little avail in fixing dates, ascertaining facts, and setting events in their true light, which form the peculiar objects of civil history.

Treaties of peace, which were the pledges of the public tranquillity from without, being next to the laws of the greatest importance to the state, much care was bestowed, after the expulsion of the Gauls, in recovering as many of them as the flames had spared. Some of them were the more easily restored, from having been kept in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, which the fury of the enemy could not reach†. Those which had been saved, continued to be very carefully preserved, and there is no reason to suspect them of having been falsified. Among the treaties which were rescued from destruction, Horace mentions those of the Kings, with the Gabii and the Sabines (*Fœdera Regum*†). The former was that concluded by Tarquinius Superbus, and which, Dionysius

* Livy, Lib. VI. c. 1.

† Polybius, Lib. III. c. 22, 26.

‡ *Epist.* Lib. II. Ep. 1.

of Halicarnassus informs us, was still preserved at Rome in his time, in the temple of Jupiter Fidius, on a buckler made of wood, and covered with an ox's hide, on which the articles of the treaty were written in ancient characters*. Dionysius mentions two treaties with the Sabines—the first was between Romulus and their king Tatius†; and the other, the terms of which were inscribed on a column erected in a temple, was concluded with them by Tullus Hostilius, at the close of a Sabine war‡. Livy likewise cites a treaty made with the Ardeates§; and Polybius has preserved entire another entered into with the Carthaginians, in the year of the expulsion of the kings||. Pliny has also alluded to one of the conditions of a treaty which Porsenna, the ally of Tarquin, granted to the Roman people¶. Now these leagues with the Gabii, Sabines, Ardeates, and one or two with the Latins, are almost the only treaties we find anywhere referred to by the ancient Latin historians; who thus seem to have employed but little diligence in consulting those original documents, or drawing from them, in compiling their histories, such assistance as they could have afforded. The treaties quoted by Polybius and Pliny, completely contradict the relations of the Latin annalists; those cited by Polybius proving, in opposition to their assertions, that the Carthaginians had been in possession of a great part of Sicily about a century previous to the date which Livy has fixed to their first expedition to that island; and those quoted by Pliny, that Porsenna, instead of treating with the Romans on equal terms, as represented by their historians, had actually prohibited them from employing arms,—permitting them the use of iron only in tilling the ground*†.

The *Libri Linteï* (so called because written on linen) are cited by Livy after the old annalist Licinius Macer, by whom they appear to have been carefully studied. These books were kept in the temple of Juno Moneta, but were probably of less importance than the other public records, which were inscribed on rolls of lead. They were obviously a work of no great extent, since Livy, who appeals to them on four different occasions in the space of ten years, just after the degradation of the decemvirs, had not quoted them before, and never refers to them again. There also appear to have been different copies of them which did not exactly agree, and Livy seems

* Lib. IV. p. 257. ed. Sylburg, 1586.

† Lib. III. p. 174.

‡ Lib. III. c. 22.

*† *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXIV. c. 14.

† Lib. II. p. 111.

§ Lib. IV. c. 7.

¶ *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXIV. c. 14.

far from considering their authority as decisive even on the points on which reference is made to them*.

The *Memoirs of the Censors* were journals preserved by those persons who held the office of Censor. They were transmitted by them to their descendants as so many sacred pledges, and were preserved in the families which had been rendered illustrious by that dignity. They formed a series of eulogies on those who had thus exalted the glory of their house, and contained a relation of the memorable actions performed by them in discharge of the high censorial office with which they had been invested†. Hence they must be considered as part of the *Family Memoirs*, which were unfortunately the great and corrupt sources of early Roman history.

It was the custom of the ancient families of Rome to preserve with religious care everything that could contribute to perpetuate the glory of their ancestry, and confer honour on their lineage. Thus, besides the titles which were placed under the smoky images of their forefathers, there were likewise tables in their apartments on which lay books and memoirs recording, in a style of general panegyric, the services they had performed for the state during their exercise of the employments with which they had been dignified‡.

Had these Family Memoirs been faithfully composed, they would have been of infinite service to history; and although all other monuments had perished, they alone would have supplied the defect. They were a record, by those who had the best access to knowledge, of the high offices which their ancestors had filled, and of whatever memorable was transacted during the time they had held the exalted situations of Prætor or Consul: Even the dates of events, as may be seen by a fragment which Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites from them, were recorded with all the appearance of accuracy. Each set of family memoirs thus formed a series of biographies, which, by preserving the memory of the great actions of individuals, and omitting nothing that could tend to their illustration, comprehended also the principal affairs of state, in which they had borne a share. From the fragments of the genealogical book of the Porcian family, quoted by Aulus Gellius, and the abstract of the Memoirs of the Claudian and Livian families, preserved by Suetonius, in the first chapters of his Life of Tiberius, we may perceive how important such memoirs would have been, and what light they would have thrown on history, had they possessed the stamp of fidelity. But unfor-

* Livy, Lib. IV. c. 23.

† Dionys. Halic. Lib. I. p. 60.

‡ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXV. c. 2.

unately, in their composition more regard was paid to family reputation than to historical truth. Whatever tended to exalt its name was embellished and exaggerated. Whatever could dim its lustre was studiously withdrawn. Circumstances, meanwhile, became peculiarly favourable for these high family pretensions. The destruction of the public monuments and annals of the Pontiffs, gave ample scope for the vanity or fertile imagination of those who chose to fabricate titles and invent claims to distinction, the falsity of which could no longer be demonstrated. "All the monuments," says Plutarch, "being destroyed at the taking of Rome, others were substituted, which were forged out of complaisance to private persons, who pretended to be of illustrious families, though in fact they had no relation to them*." So unmercifully had the great families availed themselves of this favourable opportunity, that Livy complains that these private memoirs were the chief cause of the uncertainty in which he was forced to fluctuate during the early periods of his history. "What has chiefly confounded the history," says he, "is each family ascribing to itself the glory of great actions and honourable employments. Hence, doubtless, the exploits of individuals and public monuments have been falsified; nor have we so much as one writer of these times whose authority can be depended on†." Those funeral orations on the dead, which it was the custom to deliver at Rome, and which were preserved in families as carefully as the memoirs, also contributed to augment this evil. Cicero declares, that history had been completely falsified by these funeral panegyrics, many things being inserted in them which never were performed, or existed—False triumphs, supernumerary consulships, and forged pedigrees‡.

Connected with these prose legends, there were also the old heroic ballads formerly mentioned, on which the annals of Ennius were in a great measure built, and to which may be traced some of those wonderful incidents of Roman history, chiefly contrived for the purpose of exalting the military achievements of the country. Many things which of right belong to such ancient poems, still exist under the disguise of an historical clothing in the narratives of the Roman annalists. Niebuhr, the German historian of Rome, has recently analysed these legends, and taken much from the Roman history, by detecting what incidents rest on no other foundation than their chimerical or embellished pictures, and by shewing how

* *In Numæ.*

† Lib. VIII. c. 40.

‡ *His laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum est facta mendosior. Multa enim scripta sunt in iis, quæ facta non sunt—falsi triumphi, plures consulatus, genera etiam falsa. Brutus, c. 16.*

incidents, in themselves unconnected, have by their aid been artificially combined. Such, according to him, were the stories of the birth of Romulus, of the treason of Tatia, the death of the Fabii, and the incidents of an almost complete *Epopée*, from the succession of Tarquinius Priscus to the battle of Regillus. These old ballads, being more attractive and of easier access than authentic records and monuments, were preferred to them as authorities; and even when converted into prose, retained much of their original and poetic spirit. For example, it was feigned in them that Tullus Hostilius was the son of Hostus Hostilius, who perished in the war with the Sabines, which, according to chronology, would make Tullus at least eighty years old when he mounted the throne; but it was thought a fine thing to represent him as the son of a genuine Roman hero, who had fallen in the service of his country. Niebuhr, probably, as I have already shown, has attributed too much to these old heroic ballads, and has assigned to them an extent and importance of which there are no adequate proofs. But I strongly suspect that the heroic or historical poems of Ennius had formed a principal document to the Roman annalists for the transactions during the Monarchy and earlier times of the Republic. and had been appealed to, like Ferdousi's *Shad-Nameh*, for occurrences which were probably rather fictions of fancy than events of history.

The Greek writers, from whom several fables and traditions were derived concerning the infancy of Rome, lived not much higher than the age of Fabius Pictor, and only mention its affairs cursorily, while treating of Alexander or his successors. Polybius, indeed, considers their narratives as mere vulgar traditions*, and Dionysius says they have written some few things concerning the Romans, which they have compiled from common reports, without accuracy or diligence. To them have been plausibly attributed those fables, concerning the exploits of Romans, which bear so remarkable an analogy to incidents in Grecian history†. Like to these in all respects are the histories which some Romans published in Greek concerning the ancient transactions of their own nation.

We thus see that the authentic materials for the early history of Rome were meagre and imperfect—that the annals of the Pontiffs and public monuments had perished—that the *Leges Regiæ*, Twelve Tables, and remains of the religious or ritual books of the Pontiffs, could throw no great light on history, and that the want of better materials was supplied by false,

* Lib. III. c. 20.

† *L'Evesque, Hist. Critique de la Republique Romaine, T. I.*

and sometimes incredible relations, drawn from the family traditions—“*ad ostentationem scenæ gaudentis miraculis aptiora quàm ad fidem**.” The mutilated inscriptions, too, the scanty treaties, and the family memoirs, became, from the variations in the language, in a great measure unintelligible to the generation which succeeded that in which they were composed. Polybius informs us, that the most learned Romans of his day could not read a treaty with the Carthaginians, concluded after the expulsion of the kings. Hence, the documents for history, such as they were, became useless to the historian, or, at least, were of such difficulty, that he would sometimes mistake their import, and be, at others, deterred from investigation.

When all this is considered, and also that Rome, in its commencement, was the dwelling of a rude and ignorant people, subsisting by rapine—that the art of writing, the only sure guardian of the remembrance of events, was little practised—that critical examination was utterly unknown; and that the writers of no other nation would think of accurately transmitting to posterity events, which have only become interesting from the subsequent conquests and extension of the Roman empire, it must be evident, that the materials provided for the work of the historian would necessarily be obscure and uncertain.

The great general results recorded in Roman history, during the first five centuries, cannot, indeed, be denied. It cannot be doubted that Rome ultimately triumphed over the neighbouring nations, and obtained possession of their territories; for Rome would not have been what we know it was in the sixth century, without these successes. But there exists, in the particular events recorded in the Roman history, sufficient internal evidence of its uncertainty, or rather falsehood; and here I do not refer to the lying fables, and absurd prodigies, which the annalists may have inserted in deference to the prejudices of the people, nor to the almost incredible daring and endurance of Scævola, Cocles, or Curtius, which may be accounted for from the wild spirit of a half-civilized nation, and are not unlike the acts we hear of among Indian tribes; but I allude to the total improbability of the historic details concerning transactions with surrounding tribes, and the origin of domestic institutions. How, for example, after so long a series of defeats, with few intervals of prosperity interposed, could the Italian states have possessed resources sufficient incessantly to renew hostilities, in which they were

* Livy, Lib. V. c. 21.

always the aggressors? And how, on the other hand, should the Romans, with their constant preponderance of force and fortune, (if the repetition and magnitude of their victories can be depended on,) have been so long employed in completely subjugating them? The numbers slain, according to Livy's account, are so prodigious, that it is difficult to conceive how the population of such moderate territories, as belonged to the independent Italian communities, could have supplied such losses. We, therefore, cannot avoid concluding, that the frequency and importance of these campaigns were magnified by the consular families indulging in the vanity of exaggerating the achievements of their ancestors*. Sometimes these campaigns are represented as carried on against the whole nation of Volsci, Samnites, or Etruscans, when, in fact, only a part was engaged; and, at other times, battles, which never were fought, have been extracted from the family memoirs, where they were drawn up to illustrate each consulate; for what would a consul have been without a triumph or a victory? It would exceed my limits were I to point out the various improbabilities and evident inconsistencies of this sort recorded in the early periods of Roman history. With regard, again, to the domestic institutions of Rome, everything (doubtless for the sake of effect and dignity) is represented as having at once originated in the refined policy and foresight of the early kings. The division of the people into tribes and *curiæ*—the relations of patron and client—the election of senators—in short, the whole fabric of the constitution, is exhibited as a preconcerted plan of political wisdom, and not (as a constitution has been in every other state, and must have been in Rome) the gradual result of contingencies and progressive improvements, of assertions of rights, and struggles for power.

The opinion entertained by Polybius of the uncertainty of the Roman history, is sufficiently manifest from a passage in the fourth book of his admirable work, which is written with all the philosophy and profound inquiry of Tacitus, without any of his apparent affectation.—“The things which I have undertaken to describe,” says he, “are those which I myself have seen, or such as I have received from men who were eye-witnesses of them. For, had I gone back to a more early period, and borrowed my accounts from the report of persons who themselves had only heard them before from others, as it would scarcely have been possible that I should myself be able to discern the true state of the matters that were then transacted, so neither could I have written anything concerning

* Bankes, *Civil History of Rome*, Vol. I.

them with confidence." What, indeed, can we expect to know with regard to the Kings of Rome, when we find so much uncertainty with regard to the most memorable events of the republic, as the period of the first creation of a dictator and tribunes of the people? The same doubt exists in the biography of illustrious characters. Cicero says, that Coriolanus, having gone over to the Volsci, repressed the struggles of his resentment by a voluntary death; "for, though you, my Atticus," he continues, "have represented his death in a different manner, you must pardon me if I do not subscribe to the justness of your representations*." Atticus, I presume, gave the account as we now have it, that he was killed in a tumult of the Volsci, and Fabius Pictor had written that he lived till old age†. Of the reliance to be placed on the events between the death of Coriolanus and the termination of the second Punic war, we may judge from the uncertainty which prevailed with regard to Scipio Africanus, a hero, of all others, the most distinguished, and who flourished, comparatively, at a recent period. Yet some of the most important events of his life are involved in contradiction and almost hopeless obscurity.—"Cicero," says Berwick, in his *Memoirs of Scipio*, "speaks with great confidence of the year in which he died, yet Livy found so great a difference of opinion among historians on the subject, that he declares himself unable to ascertain it. From a fragment in Polybius, we learn, that, in his time, the authors who had written of Scipio were ignorant of some circumstances of his life, and mistaken in others; and, from Livy, it appears, that the accounts respecting his life, trial, death, funeral, and sepulchre, were so contradictory, that he was not able to determine what tradition, or whose writings, he ought to credit."

But, although the early events of Roman history were of such a description, that Cicero and Atticus were not agreed concerning them—that Polybius could write nothing about them with confidence; and that Livy would neither undertake to affirm nor refute them, every vestige of Roman antiquity had not perished. Though the annals of the Pontiffs were destroyed,—those who wrote, who kept, and had read them, could not have lost all recollection of the facts they recorded. Even from the family memoirs, full of falsehoods as they were, much truth might have been extracted by a judicious and acute historian. The journals of different rival families must often have served as historical checks on each other, and much real information might have been gathered, by compar-

* *Brutus*, c. 11.

† *Livy*, Lib. II. c. 40.

ing and contrasting the vain-glorious lies of those family-legends*.

Such was the state of the materials for Roman history, in the middle of the sixth century, from the building of the city, at which time regular annals first began to be composed; and notwithstanding all unfavourable circumstances, much might have been done, even at that period, towards fixing and ascertaining the dates and circumstances of previous events, had the earliest annalist of Rome been in any degree fitted for this difficult and important task; but, unfortunately,

QUINTUS FABIUS PICTOR,

who first undertook to relate the affairs of Rome from its foundation, in a formal and regular order, and is thence called by Livy *Scriptorum antiquissimus*, appears to have been wretchedly qualified for the labour he had undertaken, either

* The question concerning the authenticity or uncertainty of the Roman history, was long, and still continues to be, a subject of much discussion in France.—“At Paris,” said Lord Bolingbroke, “they have a set of stated paradoxical orations. The business of one of these was to show that the history of Rome, for the four first centuries was a mere fiction. The person engaged in it proved that point so strongly, and so well, that several of the audience, as they were coming out, said, the person who had set that question had played booty, and that it was so far from being a paradox, that it was a plain and evident truth.”—SPENCE’S *Anecdotes*, p. 197. It was chiefly in the *Memoires de l’Academie des Inscriptions*, &c. that this literary controversy was plied. M. de Pouilly, in the Memoirs for the year 1722, produced his proofs and arguments against the authenticity. He was weakly opposed, in the following year, by M. Sallier, and defended by M. Beaufort, in the Memoirs of the Academy, and at greater length in his *Dissert. sur l’Incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l’Hist. Romaine*, (1738,) which contains a clear and conclusive exposition of the state of the question. The dispute has been lately renewed in the Memoirs of the Institute, in the proceedings of which, for 1815, there is a long paper, by M. Levesque, maintaining the total uncertainty of the Roman history previous to the invasion of the Gauls; while the opposite side of the question has been strenuously espoused by M. Larcher. This controversy, though it commenced in France, has not been confined to that country. Hooke and Gibbon have argued for the certainty, *Miscell. Works*, Vol. IV. p. 40., and Cluverius for the uncertainty, of the Roman history, (*Ital. Antiq.* Lib. III. c. 2.) Niebuhr, the late German historian of Rome, considers all before Tullus Hostilius as utterly fabulous. The time that elapsed from his accession to the war with Pyrrhus, he regards as a period to be found in almost every history, between mere fable and authentic record. Beck, in the introduction to his German translation of Ferguson’s Roman Republic, *Ueber die Quellen der ältesten Römischen Geschichte und ihren Werth*, has attempted to vindicate the authenticity of the Roman history to a certain extent; but his reasonings and citations go little farther than to prove, what never can be disputed, that there is much truth in the general outline of events—that the kings were expelled—that the Etruscans were finally subdued; and that consuls were created. He admits, that much rested on tradition; but tradition, he maintains, is so much interwoven with every history, that it cannot be safely thrown away. The remainder of the treatise is occupied with a feeble attempt to show, that more monuments existed at Rome after its capture by the Gauls, than is generally supposed, and that Fabius Pictor made a good use of them.

in point of fidelity or research : and to his carelessness and inaccuracy, more even than to the loss of monuments, may be attributed the painful uncertainty, which to this day hangs over the early ages of Roman history.

Fabius Pictor lived in the time of the second Punic war. The family received its *cognomen* from Caius Fabius, who, having resided in Etruria, and there acquired some knowledge of the fine arts, painted with figures the temple of *Salus*, in the year 450*. Pliny mentions having seen this piece of workmanship, which remained entire till the building itself was consumed, in the reign of the Emperor Claudius. The son of the painter rose to the highest honours of the state, having been Consul along with Ogulnius Gallus, in the year 485. From him sprung the historian, who was consequently grandson of the first Fabius Pictor. He was a provincial quæstor in early youth, and in 528 served under the Consul Lucius Æmilius, when sent to repel a formidable incursion of the Gauls, who, in that year, had passed the Alps in vast hordes. He also served in the second Punic war, which commenced in 534, and was present at the battle of Thrasymene. After the defeat at Cannæ, he was despatched by the senate to inquire from the oracle of Delphos, what would be the issue of the war, and to learn by what supplications the wrath of the gods might be appeased†.

The Annals of Fabius Pictor commenced with the foundation of the city, and brought down the series of Roman affairs to the author's own time—that is, to the end of the second Punic war. We are informed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that for the great proportion of events which preceded his own age, Fabius Pictor had no better authority than vulgar tradition‡. He probably found, that if he had confined himself to what was certain in these early times, his history would have been dry, insipid, and incomplete. This may have induced him to adopt the fables, which the Greek historians had vented concerning the origin of Rome, and to insert whatever he found in the family traditions, however contradictory or uncertain. Dionysius has also given us many examples of his improbable narrations—his inconsistencies—his negligence in investigating the truth of what he relates as facts—and his inaccuracy in chronology. “I cannot refrain,” says he, when speaking of the age of Tarquinius Priscus, “from blaming Fabius Pictor for his little exactness in chronology§;” and it appears from various other passages, that all the ancient his-

* Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXV. c. 4.

† Hankins, *De Romanar. Rerum Scriptor.* Pars I. c. 1.

‡ Lib. VII.

§ Lib. IV. p. 234.

tory of Fabius which was not founded on hearsay, was taken from Greek authors, who had little opportunity of being informed of Roman affairs, and had supplied their deficiency in real knowledge, by the invention of fables. In particular, as we are told by Plutarch*, he followed an obscure Greek author, Diocles the Peparethian, in his account of the foundation of Rome, and from this tainted source have flowed all the stories concerning Marr, the Vestal, the Wolf, Romulus, and Remus.

It is thus evident, that no great reliance can be placed on the history given by Fabius Pictor, of the events which preceded his own age, and which happened during a period of 500 years from the building of the city; but what must be considered as more extraordinary and lamentable, is, that although a senator, and of a distinguished family, he gave a prejudiced and inaccurate account of affairs occurring during the time he lived, and in the management of which he had some concern. Polybius, who flourished shortly after that time, and was at pains to inform himself accurately concerning all the events of the second Punic war, apologizes for quoting Fabius on one occasion as an authority. "It will perhaps be asked," says he, "how I came to make mention of Fabius: It is not that I think his relation probable enough to deserve credit: What he writes is so absurd, and has so little appearance of truth, that the reader will easily remark, without my taking notice of it, the little reliance that is to be placed on that author, whose inconsistency is palpable of itself. It is, therefore, only to warn such as shall read his history, not to judge by the title of the book, but by the things it contains—for there are many people, who, considering the author more than what he writes, think themselves obliged to believe everything he says, because a senator and contemporary†." Polybius also accuses him of gross partiality to his own nation, in the account of the Punic war—allowing to the enemy no praise; even where they deserved it, and uncandidly aggravating their faults‡. In particular, he charges him with falsehood in what he has delivered, with regard to the causes of the second contest with the Carthaginians. Fabius had alleged, that the covetousness of Hannibal, which he inherited from Asdrubal, and his desire of ultimately ruling over his own country, to which he conceived a Roman war to be a necessary step, were the chief causes of renewing hostilities, to which the Carthaginian government was totally averse. Now, Po-

* *In Romulo.*

† Lib. I.

‡ Lib. III. c. 9.

lybius asks him, if this were true, why the Carthaginian Senate did not deliver up their general, as was required, after the capture of Saguntum; and why they supported him, during fourteen years' continuance in Italy, with frequent supplies of money, and immense reinforcements*.

The sentiments expressed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, concerning Fabius Pictor's relation of events, in the early ages of Rome, and those of Polybius†, on the occurrences of which he was himself an eye-witness, enable us to form a pretty accurate estimate of the credit due to his whole history. Dionysius having himself written on the antiquities of Rome, was competent to deliver an opinion as to the works of those who had preceded him in the same undertaking; and it would rather have been favourable to the general view which he has adopted, to have established the credibility of Fabius. We may also safely rely on the judgment which Polybius has passed, concerning this old annalist's relation of the events of the age in which he lived, since Polybius had spared no pains to be thoroughly informed of whatever could render his own account of them complete and unexceptionable.

The opinion which must now be naturally formed from the sentiments entertained by these two eminent historians, is rather confirmed by the few and unconnected fragments that remain of the Annals of Fabius Pictor, as they exhibit a spirit of trifling and credulity quite unworthy the historian of a great republic. One passage is about a person who saw a magpie; another about a man who had a message brought to him by a swallow; and a third concerning a party of *loup-garous*, who, after being transformed into wolves, recovered their own figures, and, what is more, got back their cast-off clothes, provided they had abstained for nine years from preying on human flesh!

* Lib. III. c. 8.

† Ernesti has attempted, but I think unsuccessfully, to support the authenticity of the Annals of Fabius against the censures of Polybius, in his dissertation, entitled, *Pro Fabii Fide adversus Polybium*, inserted in his *Opuscula Philologica*, Leipsic, 1746—Lugd. Bat. 1764. He attempts to show, from other passages, that Polybius was a great detractor of preceding historians, and that he judged of events more from what was probable and likely to have occurred, than from what actually happened, and that no historian could have better information than Fabius. To the interrogatories which Polybius puts to Fabius, with regard to the causes assigned by him as the origin of the second Punic war, Ernesti replies for him, that the Senate of Carthage could no more have taken the command from Hannibal in Spain, or delivered him up, than the Roman Senate could have deprived Cæsar of his army, when on the banks of the Rubicon; and as to the support which Hannibal received while in Italy, it is answered, that it was quite consistent with political wisdom, and the practice of other nations, for a government involuntarily forced into a struggle, by the disobedience or evil counsels of its subjects, to use every exertion to obtain ultimate success, or extricate itself with honour, from the difficulties in which it had been reluctantly involved.

Such were the merits of the earliest annalist of Rome, whom all succeeding historians of the state copied as far as he had proceeded, or at least implicitly followed as their authority and guide in facts and chronology. Unfortunately, his character as a senator, and an eye-witness of many of the events he recorded, gave the stamp of authenticity to his work, which it did not intrinsically deserve to have impressed on it. His successors accordingly, instead of giving themselves the pains to clear up the difficulties with which the history of former ages was embarrassed, and which would have led into long and laborious discussions, preferred reposing on the authority of Fabius. They copied him on the ancient times, without even consulting the few monuments that remained, and then contented themselves with adding the transactions subsequent to the period which his history comprehends. Thus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus* informs us that Cincius, Cato the Censor, Calpurnius Piso, and most of the other historians who succeeded him, implicitly adopted Fabius' story of the birth and education of Romulus; and he adds many glaring instances of the little discernment they showed in following him on points where, by a little investigation, they might have discovered how egregiously he had erred. Even Livy himself admits, that his own account of the second Punic war was chiefly founded on the relations of Fabius Pictor†.

This ancient and dubious annalist was succeeded by Scribonius Libo, and by Calpurnius Piso. Libo served under Ser. Galba in Spain, and on his return to Rome impeached his commander for some act of treachery towards the natives of that province. Piso was Consul along with Mucius Scævola in 620, the year in which Tib. Gracchus was slain. Like Fabius, he wrote Annals of Rome, from the beginning of the state, which Cicero pronounces to be *exiliter scripti*‡: But although his style was jejune, he is called a profound writer, *gravis auctor*, by Pliny§; and Au. Gellius says, that there is an agreeable simplicity in some parts of his work—the brevity which displeased Cicero appearing to him *simplicissima suaritas et rei et orationis*||. He relates an anecdote of Romulus, who, being abroad at supper, drank little wine, because he was to be occupied with important affairs on the following day. One of the other guests remarked, “that if all men did as he, wine would be cheap.”—“No,” replied Romulus, “I

* Lib. I. p. 64.

† Fabium æqualem temporibus hujusce belli potissimum auctorem habui. Lib. XXII. c. 7.

‡ Brutus, c. 27.

§ Hist. Nat. Lib. XI. 53.

|| Noct. Attic. Lib. XI. c. 14.

have drunk as much as I liked, and wine would be dearer than it is now if every one did the same." This annalist first suggested Varro's famous derivation of the word Italy, which he deduced from *Vitulus*. He is also frequently quoted by Plutarch and Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. Niebuhr thinks, that of all the Roman annalists he is chiefly responsible for having introduced into history the fables of the ancient heroic ballads†.

About the same time with Piso, lived two historians, who were both called Caius Fannius, and were nearly related to each other. One of them was son-in-law of Lælius, and served under the younger Scipio at the final reduction of Carthage. Of him Cicero speaks favourably, though his style was somewhat harsh‡; but his chief praise is, that Sallust, in mentioning the Latin historians, while he gives to Cato the palm for conciseness, awards it to Fannius for accuracy in facts§. Heeren also mentions, that he was the authority chiefly followed by Plutarch in his lives of the Gracchi||.

Cælius Antipater was contemporary with the Gracchi, and was the master of Lucius Crassus, the celebrated orator, and other eminent men of the day. We learn from Valerius Maximus, that he was the authority for the story of the shade of Tiberius Gracchus having appeared to his brother Caius in a dream, to warn him that he would suffer the same fate which he had himself experienced¶; and the historian testifies that he had heard of this vision from many persons during the lifetime of Caius Gracchus. The chief subject of Antipater's history, which was dedicated to Lælius, consisted in the events that occurred during the second Punic war. Cicero says, that he was for his age *Scriptor luculentus**†; that he raised himself considerably above his predecessors, and gave a more lofty tone to history; but he seems to think that the utmost

* He also probably suggested to Sallust a phrase which has given much scandal in so grave a historian. Cicero says, in one of his letters, *Epist. Famil. Lib. IX. Ep. 22.*, "At vero Piso, in annalibus suis, queritur, adolescentes peni deditos esse."

† *Römische Geschichte*, Tom. I. p. 245.

As his account of Roman affairs was written in Greek, I omit in the list of Latin annalists Lucius Cincius Alimentus, who was contemporary with Fabius, having been taken prisoner by Hannibal during the second Punic war. But though his history was in Greek, he wrote in Latin a biographical sketch of the Sicilian Rhetorician Gorgias Leontinus, and also a book, *De Re Militari*, which has been cited by Au. Gellius, and acknowledged by Vegetius as the foundation of his more elaborate Commentaries on the same subject.

‡ *Brutus*, c. 26.

§ The passage is a fragment from the first book of Sallust's lost history. Mar. Victorinus in *prim. Ciceronis de Inventione*.

|| *De Fontibus et Auctoritate Vitarum Parallel. Plutarchi*, p. 184. Gotteng. 1820.

† Lib. I. c. 7.

*† *Brutus*, c. 26.

praise to which he was entitled, is, that he excelled those who preceded him, for still he possessed but little eloquence or learning, and his style was yet unpolished. Valerius Maximus, however, calls him an authentic writer, (*certus auctor**;) and the Emperor Hadrian thought him superior to Sallust, consistently with that sort of black-letter taste which led him to prefer Cato the Censor to Cicero, and Ennius to Virgil†.

Sempronius Asellio served as military tribune under the younger Scipio Africanus, in the war of Numantia‡, which began in 614, and ended in 621, with the destruction of that city. He wrote the history of the campaigns in which he fought under Scipio, in Spain, in at least 40 books, since the 40th is cited by Charisius. His work, however, was not written for a considerable time after the events he recorded had happened: That he wrote subsequently to Antipater, we have the authority of Cicero, who says "that Cœlius Antipater was succeeded by Asellio, who did not imitate his improvements, but relapsed into the dulness and unskilfulness of the earliest historians§." This does not at all appear to have been Asellio's own opinion, as, from a passage extracted by Aulus Gellius from the first book of his Annals, he seems to have considered himself as the undisputed father of philosophic history||.

Quintus Lutatius Catulus, better known as an accomplished orator than a historian, was Consul along with Marius in the year 651, and shared with him in his distinguished triumph over the Cimbrians. Though once united in the strictest friendship, these old colleagues quarrelled at last, during the civil war with Sylla; and Catulus, it is said, in order to avoid the emissaries despatched by the unrelenting Marius, to put him to death, shut himself up in a room newly plastered, and having kindled a fire, was suffocated by the noxious vapours. He wrote the history of his own consulship, and the various public transactions in which he had been engaged, particularly the war with the Cimbrians. Cicero¶, who has spoken so disadvantageously of the style of the older annalists, admits that Catulus wrote very pure Latin, and that his language had some resemblance to the sweetness of Xenophon.

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius composed Annals of Rome in twenty-four books, which, though now almost entirely lost, were in existence as late as the end of the 12th century, being referred to by John of Salisbury in his book *De Nugis Curialibus*. Some passages, however, are still preserved,

* Lib. I. c. 7.

† Æl. Spartianus, in *Hadriano*.

‡ Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. II. c. 18.

§ *De Legibus*, Lib. I. c. 2.

¶ Lib. V. c. 18.

† *Brutus*, c. 35.

particularly the account of the defiance by the gigantic Gaul, adorned with a chain, to the whole Roman army, and his combat with Titus Manlius, afterwards surnamed Torquatus, from this chain which he took from his antagonist. "Who the enemy was," says Au. Gellius, "of how great and formidable stature, how audacious the challenge, and in what kind of battle they fought, Q. Claudius has told with much purity and elegance, and in the simple unadorned sweetness of ancient language*."

There is likewise extant from these Annals the story of the Consul Q. Fabius Maximus making his father, who was then Proconsul, alight from his horse when he came out to meet him. We have also the letter of the Roman Consuls, Fabricius and Q. Emilius, to Pyrrhus, informing him of the treachery of his confidant, Nicias, who had offered to the Romans to make away with his master for a reward. It merits quotation, as a fine example of ancient dignity and simplicity.—"Nos, pro tuis injuriis, continuo animo, strenue commoti, inimiciter tecum bellare studemus. Sed communis exempli et fidei ergo visum est, uti te salvum velimus; ut esset quem armis vincere possimus. Ad nos venit Nicias familiaris tuus, qui sibi pretium a nobis peteret, si te clam interfecisset: Id nos negavimus velle; neve ob eam rem quidquam commodi expectaret: Et simul visum est, ut te certiores faceremus, nequid ejusmodi, si accidisset, nostro consilio putares factum: et, quid nobis non placet, pretio, aut premio, aut dolis pugnare."—The Annals of Quadrigarius must at least have brought down the history to the civil wars of Marius and Sylla, since, in the nineteenth book, the author details the circumstances of the defence of the Piræus against Sylla, by Archelaus, the prefect of Mithridates. As to the style of these annals, Aulus Gellius reports, that they were written in a conversational manner†.

Quintus Valerius Antias also left Annals, which must have formed an immense work, since Priscian cites the seventy-fourth book. They commenced with the foundation of the city; but their accuracy cannot be relied on, as the author was much addicted to exaggeration. Livy, mentioning, on the authority of Antias, a victory gained by the Proconsul Q. Minucius, adds, while speaking of the number of slain on the part of the enemy, "Little faith can be given to this author, as no one was ever more intemperate in such exaggerations;" and Aulus Gellius mentions a circumstance which he had affirmed, contrary to the records of the Tribunes, and the

* *Noct. Attic. Lib. IX. c. 13.*

† *Noct. Attic. Lib. XIII. c. 28.*

authors of the ancient Annals*. This history also seems to have been stuffed with the most absurd and superstitious fables. A nonsensical tale is told with regard to the manner in which Numa procured thunder from Jupiter; and stories are likewise related about the conflagration of the lake Thrasimene, before the defeat of the Roman Consul, and the flame which played round the head of Servius Tullius in his childhood. It also appears from him, that the Romans had judicial trials, as horrible as those of the witches which disgraced our criminal record. Q. Nævius, before setting out for Sardinia, held *Questions* of incantation through the towns of Italy, and condemned to death, apparently without much investigation, not less than two thousand persons. This annalist denies, in another passage, the well-known story of the continence of Scipio, and alleges that the lady whom he is generally said to have restored to her lover, was "*in deliciis amoribusque usurpata*†." His opinion of the moral character of Scipio seems founded on some satirical verses of Nævius, with regard to a low intrigue in which he was detected in his youth. But whatever his private amours may have been, it does not follow that he was incapable of a signal exertion of generosity and continence in the presence of his army, and with the eyes of two great rival nations fixed upon his conduct.

Licinius Macer, father of Licin. Calvus, the distinguished poet and orator formerly mentioned‡, was author of Annals, entitled *Libri Rerum Romanarum*. In the course of these he frequently quotes the *Libri Lintei*. He was not considered as a very impartial historian, and, in particular, he is accused by Livy of inventing stories to throw lustre over his own family.

L. Cornelius Sisenna was the friend of Macer, and coeval with Antias and Quadrigarius; but he far excelled his contemporaries, as well as predecessors, in the art of historical narrative. He was of the same family as Sylla, the dictator, and was descended from that Sisenna who was Prætor in 570. In his youth he practised as an orator, and is characterized by Cicero as a man of learning and wit, but of no great industry or knowledge in business. In more advanced life he was Prætor of Achaia, and a friend of Atticus. Vossius says his history commenced after the taking of Rome by the Gauls, and ended with the wars of Marius and Sylla. Now, it is possible that he may have given some sketch of Roman affairs from the burning of the city by the Gauls, but it is evident he

* Ibid. Lib. VII. c. 19.

† See above, Vol. I. p. 522.

‡ *Noct. Attic. Lib. VI. c. 8.*

§ *Brutus, c. 68.*

had touched slightly on these early portions of the history, for though his work consisted of twenty, or, according to others, of twenty-two books, it appears from a fragment of the second, which is still preserved, that he had there advanced in his narrative as far as the Social War, which broke out in the year 663. The greater part, therefore, I suspect, was devoted to the history of the civil wars of Marius; and indeed Vel-leius Paternus calls his work *Opus Belli Civilis Sullani**. The great defect of his history consisted, it is said, in not being written with sufficient political freedom, at least concerning the character and conduct of Sylla, which is regretted by Sallust in a passage bearing ample testimony to the merits of Sisenna in other particulars.—“L. Sisenna,” says he, “optume et diligentissime omnium, qui eas res dixere persecutus, parum mihi libero ore locutus videtur†.” Cicero, while he admits his superiority over his predecessors, adds, that he was far from perfection‡, and complains that there was something puerile in his Annals, as if he had studied none of the Greek historians but Clitarchus§. I have quoted these opinions, since we must now entirely trust to the sentiments of others, in the judgment which we form of the merits of Sisenna; for although the fragments which remain of his history are more numerous than those of any other old Latin annalist, being about 150, they are also shorter and more unconnected. Indeed, there are scarcely two sentences anywhere joined together.

The great defect, then, imputed to the class of annalists above enumerated, is the meagerness of their relations, which are stripped of all ornament of style—of all philosophic observation on the springs or consequences of action—and all characteristic painting of the actors themselves. That they often perverted the truth of history, to dignify the name of their country at the expense of its foes, is a fault common to them with many national historians—that they sometimes exalted one political faction or chief to depreciate another, was almost unavoidable amid the anarchy and civil discord of Rome—that they were credulous in the extreme, in their relations of portents and prodigies, is a blemish from which their greater successors were not exempted: The easy faith of Livy is well known. Even the philosophic Tacitus seems to give credit to those presages, which darkly announced the fate of men and empires; and Julius Obsequens, a grave writer in the most enlightened age of Rome, collected in one

* Lib. II. c. 9.

† *Brutus*, c. 68.

‡ *Jugurtha*, c. 96.

§ *De Legibus*, Lib. I. c. 2.

work all the portents observed from its foundation to the age of Augustus.

The period in which the ancient annalists flourished, also produced several biographical works; and these being lives of men distinguished in the state, may be ranked in the number of histories.

Lucius Æmilius Scaurus, who was born in 591, and died in 666, wrote memoirs of his own life, which Tacitus says were accounted faithful and impartial. They are unfortunately lost, but their matter may be conjectured from the well-known incidents of the life of Scaurus. They embraced a very eventful period, and were written without any flagrant breach of truth. We learn from Cicero, that these memoirs, however useful and instructive, were little read, even in his days, though his contemporaries carefully studied the *Cyropædia*; a work, as he continues, no doubt sufficiently elegant, but not so connected with our affairs, nor in any respect to be preferred to the merits of Scaurus*.

Rutilius Rufus, who was Consul in the year 649, also wrote memoirs of his own life. He was a man of very different character from Scaurus, being of distinguished probity in every part of his conduct, and possessing, as we are informed by Cicero, something almost of sanctity in his demeanour. All this did not save him from an unjust exile, to which he was condemned, and which he passed in tranquillity at Smyrna. These biographical memoirs being lost, we know their merits only from the commendations of Livy†, Plutarch‡, Velleius Paterculus§, and Valerius Maximus||. As the author served under Scipio in Spain—under Scævola in Asia, and under Metellus in his campaign against Jugurtha, the loss of this work is severely to be regretted.

But the want of Sylla's Memoirs of his own Life, and of the affairs in which he had himself been engaged, is still more deeply to be lamented than the loss of those of Scaurus or Rutilius Rufus. These memoirs were meant to have been dedicated to Lucullus, on condition that he should arrange and correct them¶. Sylla was employed on them the evening before his death, and concluded them by relating, that on the

* *Brutus*, c. 29. Some persons have supposed that Cicero did not here mean Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, but a life of Cyrus, written by Scaurus. This, indeed, seems at first a more probable meaning than that he should have bestowed a compliment apparently so extravagant on the Memoirs of Scaurus; but his words do not admit of this interpretation.—“Præclaram illam quidem, sed neque tam rebus nostris aptam, nec tamen Scauri laudibus anteponebam.”

† Lib. VII.

‡ *In Mario*.

§ Lib. II. c. 13.

|| Lib. II. c. 5. Lib. VI. c. 4.

¶ Plutarch, *in Lucullo*.

preceding night he had seen in a dream one of his children, who had died a short while before, and who, stretching out his hand, showed to him his mother Metella, and exhorted him forthwith to leave the cares of life, and hasten to enjoy repose along with them in the bosom of eternal rest. "Thus," adds the author, who accounted nothing so certain as what was signified to him in dreams, "I finish my days, as was predicted to me by the Chaldeans, who announced that I should surmount envy itself by my glory, and should have the good fortune to fall in the full blossom of my prosperity*." These memoirs were sent by Epicadus, the freedman of Sylla, to Lucullus, in order that he might put to them the finishing hand. If preserved, they would have thrown much light on the most important affairs of Roman history, as they proceeded from the person who must, of all others, have been the best informed concerning them. They are quoted by Plutarch as authority for many curious facts, as—that in the great battle by which the Cimbrian invasion was repelled, the chief execution was done in that quarter where Sylla was stationed; the main body, under Marius, having been misled by a cloud of dust, and having in consequence wandered about for a long time without finding the enemy†. Plutarch also mentions that, in these Commentaries, the author contradicted the current story of his seeking refuge during a tumult at the commencement of the civil wars with Marius, in the house of his rival, who, it had been reported, sheltered and dismissed him in safety. Besides their importance for the history of events, the Memoirs of Sylla must have been highly interesting, as developing, in some degree, the most curious character in Roman history. "In the loss of his Memoirs," says Blackwell, in his usual inflated style, "the strongest draught of human passions, in the highest wheels of fortune and sallies of power, is for ever vanished‡." The character of Cæsar, though greater, was less incomprehensible than that of Sylla; and the mind of Augustus, though unfathomable to his contemporaries, has been sounded by the long line of posterity; but it is difficult to analyse the disposition which inspired the inconsistent conduct of Sylla. Gorged with power, and blood, and vengeance, he seems to have retired from what he chiefly coveted, as if surfeited; but neither this retreat, nor old age, could mollify his heart; nor could disease, or the approach of death, or the remembrance of his past life, disturb his tranquillity. No part of his existence was more strange than its termination; and nothing can be more

* Plutarch, *In Sylla*.—Appian.

† *In Mario*.

‡ *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus*, Vol. I.

singular than that he, who, on the day of his decease, caused in mere wantonness a provincial magistrate to be strangled in his presence, should, the night before, have enjoyed a dream so elevated and tender. It is probable that the Memoirs were well written, in point of style, as Sylla loved the arts and sciences, and was even a man of some learning, though Cæsar is reported to have said, on hearing his literary acquirements extolled, that he must have been but an indifferent scholar who had resigned a dictatorship.

The characteristic of most of the annals and memoirs which I have hitherto mentioned, was extreme conciseness. Satisfied with collecting a mass of facts, their authors adopted a style which, in the later ages of Rome, became proverbially meagre and jejune. Cicero includes Claudius Quadrigarius and Asellio in the same censure which he passes on their predecessors, Fabius Pictor, Piso, and Fannius. But though, perhaps, equally barren in style, much greater trust and reliance may be placed on the annalists of the time of Marius and Sylla than of the second Punic war.

Some of these more modern annalists wrote the History of Rome from the commencement of the state; others took up the relation from the burning of Rome by the Gauls, or confined themselves to events which had occurred in their own time. Their narratives of all that passed before the incursion of the Gauls, were indeed as little authentic as the relations of Fabius Pictor, since they implicitly followed that writer, and made no new researches into the mouldering monuments of their country. But their accounts of what happened subsequently to the rebuilding of Rome, are not liable to the same suspicion and uncertainty; the public monuments and records having, from that period, been duly preserved, and having been in greater abundance than those of almost any other nation in the history of the world. The Roman authors possessed all the auxiliaries which aid historical compilation—decrees of the senate, chiefly pronounced in affairs of state—leagues with friendly nations—terms of the surrender of cities—tables of triumphs, and treaties, which were carefully preserved in the treasury or in temples. There were even rolls kept of the senators and knights, as also of the number of the legions and ships employed in each war; but the public despatches addressed to the Senate by commanders of armies, of which we have specimens in Cicero's Epistles, were the documents which must have chiefly aided historical composition. These were probably accurate, as the Senate, and people in general, were too well versed in military affairs to have been easily deluded, and legates were often commissioned by them

to ascertain the truth of the relations. The immense multitude of such documents is evinced by the fact, that Vespasian, when restoring the Capitol, found in its ruins not fewer than 3000 brazen tablets, containing decrees of the Senate and people, concerning leagues, associations, and immunities to whomsoever granted, from an early period of the state, and which Suetonius justly styles, *instrumentum imperii pulcherrimum ac vetustissimum**. Accordingly, when the later annalists came to write of the affairs of their own time, they found historical documents more full and satisfactory than those of almost any other country. But, in addition to these copious sources of information, it will be remarked, that the annalists themselves had often personal knowledge of the facts they related. It is true, indeed, that historians contemporary with the events which they record, are not always best qualified to place them in an instructive light, since, though they may understand how they spring out of prior incidents, they cannot foresee their influence on future occurrences. Of some things, the importance is overrated, and of others undervalued, till time, which has the same effect on events as distance on external objects, obscures all that is minute, while it renders the outlines of what is vast more distinct and perceptible. But though the reach of a contemporary historian's mind may not extend to the issue of the drama which passes before him, he is no doubt best aware of the detached incidents of each separate scene and act, and most fitted to detail those particulars which posterity may combine into a mass, exhibiting at one view the grandeur and interest of the whole. Now, it will have been remarked from the preceding pages, that all the Roman annalists, from the time of Fabius Pictor to Sylla, were Consuls and Prætors, commanders of armies, or heads of political parties, and consequently the principal sharers in the events which they recorded. In Greece, there was an earlier separation than at Rome, between an active and a speculative life. Many of the Greek historians had little part in those transactions, the remembrance of which they have transmitted. They wrote at a distance, as it were, from the scene of affairs, so that they contemplated the wars and dissensions of their countrymen with the unprejudiced eye of a foreigner, or of posterity. This naturally diffuses a calm philosophic spirit over the page of the historian, and gives abundant scope for conjecture concerning the motives and springs of action. The Roman annalists, on the other hand, wrote from perfect knowledge and remembrance; they were the persons who had plan-

* *In Vespasiano*, c. 8.

ned and executed every project; they had fought the battles they described, or excited the war, the vicissitudes of which they recorded. Hence the facts which their pages disclosed, might have borne the genuine stamp of truth, and the analysis of the motives and causes of actions might have been absolute revelations. Yet, under these, the most favourable circumstances for historic composition, prejudices from which the Greek historians were exempt, would unconsciously creep in: Writers like Sylla or Æmilius Scaurus, had much to extenuate, and strong temptations to set down much in malice*.

Nor is it always sufficient to have witnessed a great event in order to record it well, and with that fulness which converts it into a lesson in legislation, ethics, or politics. Now, the Roman annals had hitherto been chiefly a dry register of facts, what Lord Bolingbroke calls the *Nuntia Vetustatis*, or Gazette of Antiquity. A history properly so termed, and when considered as opposed to such productions, forms a complete series of transactions, accompanied by a deduction of their immediate and remote causes, and of the consequences by which they were attended,—all related, in their full extent, with such detail of circumstances as transports us back to the very time, makes us parties to the counsels, and actors, as it were, in the whole scene of affairs. It is then alone that history becomes the *magistra vitæ*; and in this sense

SALLUST

has been generally considered as the first among the Romans who merited the title of historian. This celebrated writer was born at Amiternum, in the territory of the Sabines, in the year 668. He received his education at Rome, and, in his early youth, appears to have been desirous to devote himself to literary pursuits. But it was not easy for one residing in the capital to escape the contagious desire of military or political distinction. At the age of twenty-seven, he obtained the situation of Quæstor, which entitled him to a seat in the Senate, and about six years afterwards he was elected Tribune of the people. While in this office, he attached himself to the fortunes of Cæsar, and along with one of his colleagues in the tribunate, conducted the prosecution against Milo for the murder of Clodius. In the year 704, he was excluded from the Senate, on pretext of immoral conduct, but more probably

* Malheureux sort de l'histoire! Les spectateurs sont trop peu instruits, et les acteurs trop intéressés pour que nous puissions compter sur les recits des uns ou des autres.—Gibbon's *Miscell. Works*, Vol. IV.

from the violence of the patrician party, to which he was opposed. Aulus Gellius, on the authority of Varro's treatise, *Pius aut de Pace*, informs us that he incurred this disgrace in consequence of being surprised in an intrigue with Fausta, the wife of Milo, by the husband, who made him be scourged by his slaves*. It has been doubted, however, by modern critics, whether it was the historian Sallust who was thus detected and punished, or his nephew, Crispus Sallustius, to whom Horace has addressed the second ode of the second book. It seems, indeed, unlikely, that in such a corrupt age, an amour with a woman of Fausta's abandoned character, should have been the real cause of his expulsion from the Senate. After undergoing this ignominy, which, for the present, baffled all his hopes of preferment, he quitted Rome, and joined his patron, Cæsar, in Gaul. He continued to follow the fortunes of that commander, and, in particular, bore a share in the expedition to Africa, where the scattered remains of Pompey's party had united. That region being finally subdued, Sallust was left by Cæsar as Prætor of Numidia; and about the same time he married Terentia, the divorced wife of Cicero. He remained only a year in his government, but during that period he enriched himself by despoiling the province. On his return to Rome, he was accused by the Numidians, whom he had plundered, but escaped with impunity, by means of the protection of Cæsar, and was quietly permitted to betake himself to a luxurious retirement with his ill-gotten wealth. He chose for his favourite retreat a villa at Tibur, which had belonged to Cæsar; and he also built a magnificent palace in the suburbs of Rome, surrounded by delightful pleasure-grounds, which were afterwards well known and celebrated by the name of the Gardens of Sallust. One front of this splendid mansion faced the street, where he constructed a spacious market-place, in which every article of luxury was sold in abundance. The other front looked to the gardens, which were contiguous to those of Lucullus, and occupied the valley between the extremities of the Quirinal and Pincian Hills†. They lay, in the time of Sallust, immediately beyond the walls of Rome, but were included within the new wall of Aurelian. In them every beauty of nature, and every embellishment of art, that could delight or gratify the senses, seem to have been assembled. Umbrageous walks, open parterres, and cool porticos, displayed their various attractions. Amidst shrubs and flowers of every hue and odour, interspersed with statues of the most exquisite workmanship, pure streams of

* *Noct. Att. Lib. XVII. c. 18.*

† Nardini, *Roma Antica. Lib. IV. c. 7.*

water preserved the verdure of the earth and the temperature of the air; and while, on the one hand, the distant prospect caught the eye, on the other, the close retreat invited to repose or meditation*. These gardens included within their precincts the most magnificent baths, a temple to Venus, and a circus, which Sallust repaired and ornamented. Possessed of such attractions, the Sallustian palace and gardens became, after the death of their original proprietor, the residence of successive emperors. Augustus chose them as the scene of his most sumptuous entertainments. The taste of Vespasian preferred them to the palace of the Cæsars. Even the virtuous Nerva, and stern Aurelian, were so attracted by their beauty, that, while at Rome, they were their constant abode. "The palace," says Eustace, "was consumed by fire on the fatal night when Alaric entered the city. The temple, of singular beauty, sacred to Venus, was discovered about the middle of the sixteenth century, in opening the grounds of a garden, and was destroyed for the sale of the materials: Of the circus little remains, but masses of walls that merely indicate its site; while statues and marbles, found occasionally, continue to furnish proofs of its former magnificence†." Many statues of exquisite workmanship have been found on the same spot; but these may have been placed there by the magnificence of the imperial occupiers, and not of the original proprietor.

In his urban gardens, or villa at Tibur, Sallust passed the close of his life, dividing his time between literary avocations and the society of his friends—among whom he numbered Lucullus, Messala, and Cornelius Nepos.

Such having been his friends and studies, it seems highly improbable that he indulged in that excessive libertinism which has been attributed to him, on the erroneous supposition that he was the Sallust mentioned by Horace, in the first book of his Satires‡. The subject of Sallust's character is one which has excited some investigation and interest, and on which very different opinions have been formed. That he was a man of loose morals is evident; and it cannot be denied that he rapaciously plundered his province, like other Roman governors of the day. But it seems doubtful if he was that monster of iniquity he has been sometimes represented. He was extremely unfortunate in the first permanent notice taken of his character by his contemporaries. The decided enemy of Pompey and his faction, he had said of that celebrated chief, in his general history, that he was a man "oris probi, animo

* Stewart's *Sallust*, Essay I.

† *Classical Tour*, Vol. II. c. 6.

‡ *Sat. Lib. I. Sat. 2.*

inverecundo." Lenæus, the freedman of Pompey, avenged his master, by the most virulent abuse of his enemy*, in a work, which should rather be regarded as a frantic satire than an historical document. Of the injustice which he had done to the life of the historian we may, in some degree, judge, from what he said of him as an author. He called him, as we learn from Suetonius, "Nebulonem, vitâ scriptisque monstrosum: præterea, priscorum Catonisque ineruditissimum furem." The life of Sallust, by Asconius Pedianus, which was written in the age of Augustus, and might have acted, in the present day, as a corrective, or palliative, of the unfavourable impression produced by this injurious libel, has unfortunately perished; and the next work on the subject now extant, is a professed rhetorical declamation against the character of Sallust, which was given to the world in the name of Cicero, but was not written till long after the death of that orator, and is now generally assigned by critics, to a rhetorician, in the reign of Claudius, called Porcius Latro. The calumnies invented or exaggerated by Lenæus, and propagated in the scholiastic theme of Porcius Latro, have been adopted by Le Clerc, professor of Hebrew at Amsterdam, and by Professor Meisner, of Prague†, in their respective accounts of the Life of Sallust. His character has received more justice from the prefatory Memoir and Notes of De Brösses, his French translator, and from the researches of Wieland in Germany.

From what has been above said of Fabius Pictor, and his immediate successors, it must be apparent, that the art of historic composition at Rome was in the lowest state, and that Sallust had no model to imitate among the writers of his own country. He therefore naturally recurred to the productions of the Greek historians. The native exuberance, and loquacious familiarity of Herodotus, were not adapted to his taste; and simplicity, such as that of Xenophon, is, of all things, the most difficult to attain: He therefore chiefly emulated Thucydides, and attempted to transplant into his own language the vigour and conciseness of the Greek historian; but the strict imitation, with which he has followed him, has gone far to lessen the effect of his own original genius.

The first book of Sallust was the *Conspiracy of Catiline*. There exists, however, some doubt as to the precise period of its composition. The general opinion is, that it was written immediately after the author went out of office as Tribune of the People, that is, in the year 703: And the composition of the *Jugurthine War*, as well as of his general history, are fixed

* Suetonius, *De Grammaticis*.

† *Leben des Sallust*.

by Le Clerc between that period and his appointment to the Prætorship of Numidia. But others have supposed that they were all written during the space which intervened between his return from Numidia, in 708, and his death, which happened in 718, four years previous to the battle of Actium. It is maintained by the supporters of this last idea, that he was too much engaged in political tumults previous to his administration of Numidia, to have leisure for such important compositions—that, in the introduction to Catiline's Conspiracy, he talks of himself as withdrawn from public affairs, and refutes accusations of his voluptuous life, which were only applicable to this period; and that, while instituting the comparison between Cæsar and Cato, he speaks of the existence and competition of these celebrated opponents as things that had passed over—"Sed meâ memoriâ, ingenti virtute, diversis moribus, fuere viri duo, Marcus Cato et Caius Cæsar." On this passage, too, Gibbon in particular argues, that such a flatterer and party tool as Sallust would not, during the life of Cæsar, have put Cato so much on a level with him in the comparison instituted between them. De Brosses agrees with Le Clerc in thinking that the Conspiracy of Catiline at least must have been written immediately after 703, as Sallust would not, subsequently to his marriage with Terentia, have commemorated the disgrace of her sister, for she, it seems, was the vestal virgin whose intrigue with Catiline is recorded by our historian. But whatever may be the fact as to Catiline's Conspiracy, it is quite clear that the Jugurthine War was written subsequent to the author's residence in Numidia, which evidently suggested to him this theme, and afforded him the means of collecting the information necessary for completing his work.

The subjects chosen by Sallust form two of the most important and prominent topics in the history of Rome. The periods, indeed, which he describes, were painful, but they were interesting. Full of conspiracies, usurpations, and civil wars, they chiefly exhibit the mutual rage and iniquity of embittered factions, furious struggles between the patricians and plebeians, open corruption in the senate, venality in the courts of justice, and rapine in the provinces. This state of things, so forcibly painted by Sallust, produced the Conspiracy, and even in some degree formed the character of Catiline: But it was the oppressive debts of individuals, the temper of Sylla's soldiers, and the absence of Pompey with his army, which gave a possibility, and even prospect of success to a plot which affected the vital existence of the commonwealth, and which, although arrested in its commencement, was one of those violent shocks which hasten the fall of a state. The

History of the Jugurthine War, if not so important or menacing to the vital interests and immediate safety of Rome, exhibits a more extensive field of action, and a greater theatre of war. No prince, except Mithridates, gave so much employment to the arms of the Romans. In the course of no war in which they had ever been engaged, not even the second Carthaginian, were the people more desponding, and in none were they more elated with ultimate success. Nothing can be more interesting than the account of the vicissitudes of this contest. The endless resources, and hair-breadth escapes of Jugurtha—his levity, his fickle faithless disposition, contrasted with the perseverance and prudence of the Roman commander, Metellus, are all described in a manner the most vivid and picturesque.

Sallust had attained the age of twenty-two when the conspiracy of Catiline broke out, and was an eyewitness of the whole proceedings. He had therefore, sufficient opportunity of recording with accuracy and truth the progress and termination of the conspiracy. Sallust has certainly acquired the praise of a veracious historian, and I do not know that he has been detected in falsifying any fact within the sphere of his knowledge. Indeed there are few historical compositions of which the truth can be proved on such evidence as the Conspiracy of Catiline. The facts detailed in the orations of Cicero, though differing in some minute particulars, coincide in everything of importance, and highly contribute to illustrate and verify the work of the historian. But Sallust lived too near the period of which he treated, and was too much engaged in the political tumults of the day, to give a faithful account, unvarnished by animosity or predilection; he could not have raised himself above all hopes, fears, and prejudices, and therefore could not in all their extent have fulfilled the duties of an impartial writer. A contemporary historian of such turbulent times would be apt to exaggerate through adulation, or conceal through fear, to instil the precepts not of the philosopher but partizan, and colour facts into harmony with his own system of patriotism or friendship. An obsequious follower of Cæsar, he has been accused of a want of candour in varnishing over the views of his patron; yet I have never been able to persuade myself that Cæsar was deeply engaged in the conspiracy of Catiline, or that a person of his prudence should have leagued with such rash associates, or followed so desperate an adventurer. But the chief objection urged against Sallust's impartiality, is the feeble and apparently reluctant commendation which he bestows on Cicero, who is now acknowledged to have been the principal actor in detecting and

frustrating the conspiracy. Though fond of displaying his talent for drawing characters, he exercises none of it on Cicero, whom he merely terms "homo egregius et optumus Consul," which was but cold applause for one who had saved the commonwealth. It is true, that, in the early part of the history, praise, though sparingly bestowed, is not absolutely withheld. The election of Cicero to the Consulship is fairly attributed to the high opinion entertained of his capacity, which overcame the disadvantage of his obscure birth. The mode adopted for gaining over one of Catiline's accomplices, and fixing his own wavering and disaffected colleague,—the dexterity manifested in seizing the Allobrogian deputies with the letters, and the irresistible effect produced, by confronting them with the conspirators, are attributed exclusively to Cicero. It is in the conclusion of these great transactions that the historian withholds from him his due share of applause, and contrives to eclipse him by always interposing the character of Cato, though it could not be unknown to any witness of the proceedings that Cato himself, and other senators, publicly hailed the Consul as the Father of his country, and that a public thanksgiving to the gods was decreed in his name, for having preserved the city from conflagration, and the citizens from massacre*. This omission, which may have originated partly in enmity, and partly in disgust at the ill-disguised vanity of the Consul, has in all times been regarded as the chief defect, and even stain, in the history of the Catilinarian conspiracy.

Although not an eye-witness of the war with Jugurtha, Sallust's situation as Prætor of Numidia, which suggested the composition, was favourable to the authority of the work, by affording opportunity of collecting materials and procuring information. He examined into the different accounts, written as well as traditionary, concerning the history of Africa†, particularly the documents preserved in the archives of King Hiempsal, which he caused to be translated for his own use, and which proved peculiarly serviceable for his detailed description of the continent and inhabitants of Africa. He has been accused of showing, in this history, an undue partiality towards the character of Marius, and giving, for the sake of his favourite leader, an unfair account of the massacre at

* Banks, *Civil Hist. of Rome*, Vol. II.

† The authors of the *Universal History* suppose that these books were Phœnician and Punic volumes, carried off from Carthage by Scipio, after its destruction, and presented by him to Micipsa; and they give a curious account of these books, of which some memory still subsists, and which they conjecture to have formed part of the royal collection of Numidia.

Vacca. But he appears to me to do even more than ample justice to Metellus, as he represents the war as almost finished by him previous to the arrival of Marius, though it was, in fact, far from being concluded.

Veracity and fidelity are the chief, and, indeed, the indispensable duties of an historian. Of all the *ornaments* of historic composition, it derives its chief embellishment from a graceful and perspicuous style. That of the early annalists, as we have already seen, was inelegant and jejune; but style came to be considered, in the progress of history, as a matter of primary importance. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that so much value was at length attached to it, since the ancient historians seldom gave their authorities, and considered the excellence of history as consisting in fine writing, more than in an accurate detail of facts. Sallust evidently regarded an elegant style as one of the chief merits of an historical work. His own style, on which he took so much pains, was carefully formed on that of Thucydides, whose manner of writing was in a great measure original, and, till the time of Sallust, peculiar to himself. The Roman has wonderfully succeeded in imitating the vigour and conciseness of the Greek historian, and infusing into his composition something of that dignified austerity, which distinguishes the works of his great model; but when I say that Sallust has imitated the conciseness of Thucydides, I mean the rapid and compressed manner in which his narrative is conducted,—in short, brevity of idea, rather than language. For Thucydides, although he brings forward only the principal idea, and discards what is collateral, yet frequently employs long and involved periods. Sallust, on the other hand, is abrupt and sententious, and is generally considered as having carried this sort of brevity to a vicious excess. The use of copulatives, either for the purpose of connecting his sentences with each other, or uniting the clauses of the same sentence, is in a great measure rejected. This omission produces a monotonous effect, and a total want of that flow and that variety, which are the principal charms of the historic period. Seneca accordingly talks of the “*Amputatæ sententiæ, et verba ante expectatum cadentia**,” which the practice of Sallust had rendered fashionable. Lord Monboddò calls his style incoherent, and declares that there is not one of his short and uniform sentences which deserves the name of a period; so that supposing each sentence were in itself beautiful, there is not variety enough to constitute fine writing.

* Senec. *Epist.* 114.

It was, perhaps, partly in imitation of Thucydides, that Sallust introduced into his history a number of words almost considered as obsolete, and which were selected from the works of the older authors of Rome, particularly Cato the Censor. It is on this point he has been chiefly attacked by Pollio, in his letters to Plancus. He has also been taxed with the opposite vice, of coining new words, and introducing Greek idioms; but the severity of judgment which led him to imitate the ancient and austere dignity of style, made him reject those sparkling ornaments of composition, which were beginning to infect the Roman taste, in consequence of the increasing popularity of the rhetoric schools of declamation, and the more frequent intercourse with Asia. On the whole, in the style of Sallust, there is too much appearance of study, and a want of that graceful ease, which is generally the effect of art, but in which art is nowhere discovered. The opinion of Sir J. Checke, as reported by Ascham in his *Schoolmaster*, contains a pretty accurate estimate of the merits of the style of Sallust. "Sir J. Checke said, that he could not recommend Sallust as a good pattern of style for young men, because in his writings there was more art than nature, and more labour than art; and in his labour, also, too much toil, as it were, with an uncontented care to write better than he could—a fault common to very many men. And, therefore, he doth not express the matter lively and naturally with common speech, as ye see Xenophon doth in Greek, but it is carried and driven forth artificially, after too learned a sort, as Thucydides doth in his orations. 'And how cometh it to pass,' said I, 'that Cæsar's and Cicero's talk is so natural and plain, and Sallust's writing so artificial and dark, when all the three lived in one time?'—'I will freely tell you my fancy herein,' said he; 'Cæsar and Cicero, beside a singular prerogative of natural eloquence given unto them by God, were both, by use of life, daily orators among the common people, and greatest councillors in the Senate-house; and therefore gave themselves to use such speech as the meanest should well understand, and the wisest best allow, following carefully that good council of Aristotle, *Loquendum ut multi; sapiendum ut pauci*. But Sallust was no such man.'"

Of all departments of history, the delineation of character is that which is most trying to the temper and impartiality of the writer, more especially when he has been contemporary with the individuals he portrays, and in some degree engaged in the transactions he records. Five or six of the characters drawn by Sallust have in all ages been regarded as master-pieces: He has seized the delicate shades, as well as the pro-

minent features, and thrown over them the most lively and appropriate colouring. Those of the two principal actors in his tragic histories are forcibly given, and prepare us for the incidents which follow. The portrait drawn of Catiline conveys a vivid idea of his mind and person,—his profligate untameable spirit, infinite resources, unwearied application, and prevailing address. We behold, as it were, before us the deadly paleness of his countenance, his ghastly eye, his unequal troubled step, and the distraction of his whole appearance, strongly indicating the restless horror of a guilty conscience. I think, however, it might have been instructive and interesting had we seen something more of the atrocities perpetrated in early life by this chief conspirator. The historian might have shown him commencing his career as the chosen favourite of Sylla; and the instrument of his monstrous cruelties. The notice of the other conspirators is too brief, and there is too little discrimination of their characters. Perhaps the outline was the same in all, but each might have been individuated by distinctive features. The parallel drawn between Cato and Cæsar is one of the most celebrated passages in the history of the conspiracy. Of both these famed opponents we are presented with favourable likenesses. Their defects are thrown into shade; and the bright qualities of each different species which distinguished them, are contrasted for the purpose of showing the various merits by which men arrive at eminence.

The introductory sketch of the genius and manners of Jugurtha is no less able and spirited than the character of Catiline. We behold him, while serving under Scipio, as brave, accomplished, and enterprising; but imbued with an ambition, which, being under no control of principle, hurried him into its worst excesses, and rendered him ultimately perfidious and cruel. The most singular part of his character was the mixture of boldness and irresolution which it combined; but the lesson we receive from it, lies in the miseries of that suspicion and that remorse which he had created in his own mind by his atrocities, and which rendered him as wretched on the throne, or at the head of his army, as in the dungeon where he terminated his existence. The portraits of the other principal characters, who figured in the Jugurthine War, are also well brought out. That of Marius, in particular, is happily touched. His insatiable ambition is artfully disguised under the mask of patriotism,—his cupidity and avarice are concealed under that of martial simplicity and hardihood; but, though we know from his subsequent career the hypocrisy of his pretensions, the character of Marius is presented to us in a more favourable light than that in which it can be viewed on a survey of his

whole life. We see the blunt and gallant soldier, and not that savage whose innate cruelty of soul was just about to burst forth for the destruction of his countrymen. In drawing the portrait of Sylla, the memorable rival of Marius, the historian represents him also such as he appeared at that period, not such as he afterwards proved himself to be. We behold him with pleasure as an accomplished and subtle commander, eloquent in speech, and versatile in resources; but there is no trace of the cold-blooded assassin, the tyrant, buffoon, and usurper.

In general, Sallust's painting of character is so strong, that we almost foresee how each individual will conduct himself in the situation in which he is placed. Tacitus attributes all the actions of men to policy,—to refined, and sometimes imaginary views; but Sallust, more correctly, discovers their chief springs in the passions and dispositions of individuals. "Salluste," says St Evremond, "donne autant au naturel, que Tacite à la politique. Le plus grand soin du premier est de bien connoître le génie des hommes; les affaires viennent après naturellement, par des actions peu recherchées de ces mêmes personnes qu'il a peintes."

History, in its original state, was confined to narrative; the reader being left to form his own reflections on the deeds or events recorded. The historic art, however, conveys not complete satisfaction, unless these actions be connected with their causes,—the political springs, or private passions, in which they originated. It is the business, therefore, of the historian, to apply the conclusions of the politician in explaining the causes and effects of the transactions he relates. These transactions the author must receive from authentic monuments or records, but the remarks deduced from them must be the offspring of his own ingenuity. The reflections with which Sallust introduces his narrative, and those he draws from it, are so just and numerous that he has by some been considered as the father of philosophic history. It must always, however, be remembered, that the proper object of history is the detail of national transactions,—that whatever forms not a part of the narrative is episodical, and therefore improper, if it be too long, and do not grow naturally out of the subject. Now, some of the political and moral digressions of Sallust are neither very immediately connected with his subject, nor very obviously suggested by the narration. The discursive nature and inordinate length of the introductions to his histories have been strongly censured. The first four sections of Catiline's Conspiracy have indeed little relation to that topic. They might as well have been prefixed to any other history, and

much better to a moral or philosophic treatise. In fact, a considerable part of them, descanting on the fleeting nature of wealth and beauty, and all such adventitious or transitory possessions, is borrowed from the second oration of Isocrates. Perhaps the eight following sections are also disproportioned to the length of the whole work; but the preliminary essay they contain, on the degradation of Roman manners and decline of virtue, is not an unsuitable introduction to the conspiracy, as it was this corruption of morals which gave birth to it, and bestowed on it a chance of success. The preface to the Jugurthine War has much less relation to the subject which it is intended to introduce. The author discourses at large on his favourite topics the superiority of mental endowments over corporeal advantages, and the beauty of virtue and genius. He contrasts a life of listless indolence with one of honourable activity; and, finally, descants on the task of the historian as a suitable exercise for the highest faculties of the mind.

Besides the conspiracy of Catiline and the Jugurthine War, which have been preserved entire, and from which our estimate of the merits of Sallust must be chiefly formed, he was author of a civil and military history of the republic, in five books, entitled, *Historia rerum in Republica Romana Gestarum*. This work, inscribed to Lucullus, the son of the celebrated commander of that name, was the mature fruit of the genius of Sallust, having been the last history he composed. It included, properly speaking, only a period of thirteen years,—extending from the resignation of the dictatorship by Sylla, till the promulgation of the Manilian law, by which Pompey was invested with authority equal to that which Sylla had relinquished, and obtained, with unlimited power in the east, the command of the army destined to act against Mithridates. This period, though short, comprehends some of the most interesting and luminous points which appear in the Roman Annals. During this interval, and almost at the same moment, the republic was attacked in the east by the most powerful and enterprising of the monarchs with whom it had yet waged war; in the west, by one of the most skilful of its own generals; and in the bosom of Italy, by its gladiators and slaves. This work also was introduced by two discourses—the one presenting a picture of the government and manners of the Romans, from the origin of their city to the commencement of the civil wars, the other containing a general view of the dissensions of Marius and Sylla; so that the whole book may be considered as connecting the termination of the Jugurthine war, and the breaking out of Catiline's conspiracy. The loss of this

valuable production is the more to be regretted, as all the accounts of Roman history which have been written, are defective during the interesting period it comprehended. Nearly 700 fragments belonging to it have been amassed, from scholiasts and grammarians, by De Brosses, the French translator of Sallust; but they are so short and unconnected, that they merely serve as land-marks, from which we may conjecture what subjects were treated of, and what events were recorded. The only parts of the history which have been preserved in any degree entire, are four orations and two letters. Pomponius Lætus discovered the orations in a MS. of the Vatican, containing a collection of speeches from Roman history. The first is an oration pronounced against Sylla by the turbulent Marcus Æmilius Lepidus; who, (as is well known,) being desirous, at the expiration of his year, to be appointed a second time Consul, excited, for that purpose, a civil war, and rendered himself master of a great part of Italy. His speech which was preparatory to these designs, was delivered after Sylla had abdicated the dictatorship, but was still supposed to retain great influence at Rome. He is accordingly treated as being still the tyrant of the state; and the people are exhorted to throw off the yoke completely, and to follow the speaker to the bold assertion of their liberties. The second oration, which is that of Lucius Philippus, is an invective against the treasonable attempt of Lepidus, and was calculated to rouse the people from the apathy with which they beheld proceedings that were likely to terminate in the total subversion of the government. The third harangue was delivered by the Tribune Licinius: It was an effort of that demagogue to depress the patrician, and raise the tribunitial power, for which purpose he alternately flatters the people, and reviles the Senate. The oration of Marcus Cotta is unquestionably a fine one. He addressed it to the people, during the period of his Consulship, in order to calm their minds, and allay their resentment at the bad success of public affairs, which, without any blame on his part, had lately, in many respects, been conducted to an unprosperous issue. Of the two letters which are extant, the one is from Pompey to the Senate, complaining, in very strong terms, of the deficiency in the supplies for the army which he commanded in Spain against Sertorius; the other is feigned to be addressed from Mithridates to Arsaces, King of Parthia, and to be written when the affairs of the former monarch were proceeding unsuccessfully. It exhorts him, nevertheless, with great eloquence and power of argument, to join him in an alliance against the Romans: for this purpose, it places in a strong point of view their unprin-

cipléd policy, and ambitious desire of universal empire—all which could not, without this device of an imaginary letter by a foe, have been so well urged by a national historian. It concludes with showing the extreme danger which the Parthians would incur from the hostility of the Romans, should they succeed in finally subjugating Pontus and Armenia. The only other fragment, of any length, is the description of a splendid entertainment given to Metellus, on his return, after a year's absence, to his government of Farther Spain. It appears, from several other fragments, that Sallust had introduced, on occasion of the Mithridatic war, a geographical account of the shores and countries bordering on the Euxine, in the same manner as he enters into a topographical description of Africa, in his history of the Jugurthine war. This part of his work has been much applauded by ancient writers for exactness and liveliness; and is frequently referred to, as the highest authority, by Strabo, Pomponius Mela, and other geographers.

Besides his historical works, there exist two political discourses, concerning the administration of the government, in the form of letters to Julius Cæsar, which have generally, though not on sufficient grounds, been attributed to the pen of Sallust*.

As Sallust has obviously imitated, and, in fact, resembles Thucydides, so has

JULIUS CÆSAR,

in his historical works, been compared to Xenophon, the first memoir writer among the Greeks. Simplicity is the characteristic of both, but Xenophon has more rhetorical flow and sweetness of style, and he is sometimes, I think, a little mawkish; while the simplicity of Cæsar, on the other hand, borders, perhaps, on severity. Cæsar, too, though often circumstantial, is never diffuse, while Xenophon is frequently prolix, without being minute or accurate. "In the Latin work," says Young, in his *History of Athens*, "we have the commentaries of a general vested with supreme command, and who felt no anxiety about the conduct or obedience of his army—in the Greek, we possess the journal of an officer in subordinate rank, though of high estimation. Hence the

* It is curious into what gross blunders the most learned and accurate writers occasionally fall. Fabricius, speaking of these letters, says, "Dux orationes sive epistolæ potius) de Rep. ordinandâ ad Cæsarem missæ, cum in Hispanias proficisceretur contra Petreium et Afranium, victo Cn. Pompeio."—*Bibliothec. Latinæ*. Lib. I. c. 9.

speeches of the one are replete with imperatorial dignity, those of the other are delivered with the conciliatory arts of argument and condescension. Hence, too, the mind of Xenophon was absorbed in the care and discipline of those under his command; but thence we are better acquainted with the Greek army than with that of Cæsar. Cæsar's attention was ever directed to those he was to attack, to counteract, or to oppose—Xenophon's to those he was to conduct. For the same reason, Xenophon is superficial with respect to any peculiarities of the nations he passed through; while in Cæsar we have a curious, and well-authenticated detail, relative to the Gauls, the Britons, and every other enemy. The comparison, however, holds in this, that Cæsar, like Xenophon, was properly a writer of Memoirs. Like him, he aimed at nothing farther than communicating facts in a plain familiar manner; and the account of his campaign was only drawn up as materials for future history, not having leisure to bestow that ornament and dress which history requires." In the opinion of his contemporaries, however, and all subsequent critics, he has rendered desperate any attempt to write the history of the wars of which he treats. "Dum voluit," says Cicero, "alios habere parata, unde sumerent, qui vellent scribere historiam, sanos quidem homines a scribendo deterruit." A similar opinion is given by his continuator Hirtius,—“Adeo probantur omnium judicio ut prærepta, non præbita, facultas scriptoribus videatur.”

Cæsar's Commentaries consist of seven books of the Gallic, and three of the civil wars. Some critics, however, particularly Floridus Sabinus*, deny that he was the author of the books on the latter war, while Carrio and Ludovicus Caduceus doubt of his being the author even of the Gallic war,—the last of these critics attributing the work to Suetonius. Hardouin, who believed that most of the works now termed classical, were forgeries of the monks in the thirteenth century, also tried to persuade the world, that the whole account of the Gallic campaigns was a fiction, and that Cæsar had never drawn a sword in Gaul in his life. The testimony, however, of Cicero and Hirtius, who were contemporary with Cæsar,—of many authentic writers, who lived after him, as Suetonius, Strabo, and Plutarch,—and of all the old grammarians, must be considered as settling the question; for if such evidence is not implicitly trusted, there seems to be an end of all reliance on ancient authority.

Though these Commentaries comprehend but a small extent

* *Lectiones Subsecivæ*, Lib. I. c. 3. Lib. II. c. 2.

of time, and are not the general history of a nation, they embrace events of the highest importance, and they detail, perhaps, the greatest military operations to be found in ancient story. We see in them all that is great and consummate in the art of war. The ablest commander of the most martial people on the globe records the history of his own campaigns. Placed at the head of the finest army ever formed in the world, and one devoted to his fortunes, but opposed by military skill and prowess only second to its own, he, and the soldiers he commanded, may be almost extolled in the words in which Nestor praised the heroes who had gone before him:—

“Καρτισοὶ δὲ κενεὶ ἐπιχθονίῳ τράφει ἀνδρῶν,
Καρτισοὶ μὲν ἴσαν καὶ καρτισοῖς ἰμαχοῦντο,”—

for the Gauls and Germans were among the bravest and most warlike nations then on earth, and Pompey was accounted the most consummate general of his age. No commander, it is universally admitted, ever had such knowledge of the mechanical part of war: He possessed the complete empire of the sea, and was aided by all the influence derived from the constituted authority of the state.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the whole Commentaries, is the account of the campaign in Spain against Afranius and Petreius, in which Cæsar, being reduced to extremities for want of provisions and forage, (in consequence of the bridges over the rivers, between which he had encamped, being broken down,) extricated himself from this situation, after a variety of skilful manœuvres, and having pursued Pompey's generals into Celtiberia, and back again to Lerida, forced their legions to surrender, by placing them in those very difficulties from which he had so ably relieved his own army.

It is obvious that the greater part of such Commentaries must be necessarily occupied with the detail of warlike operations. The military genius of Rome breathes through the whole work, and it comprehends all the varieties which warfare offers to our interest, and perhaps, undue admiration—pitched battles, affairs of posts, encampments, retreats, marches in face of the foe through woods and over plains or mountains, passages of rivers, sieges, defence of forts, and those still more interesting accounts of the spirit and discipline of the enemies' troops, and the talents of their generals. In his clear and scientific details of military operations, Cæsar is reckoned superior to every writer, except, perhaps, Polybius. Some persons have thought he was too minute, and that, by describing every evolution performed in a battle, he has rendered his

relations somewhat crowded. But this was his principle, and it served the design of the author.

As he records almost nothing at which he was not personally present, or heard of from those acting under his immediate directions, he possessed the best information with regard to everything of which he wrote*. In general, when he speaks of himself, it is without affectation or arrogance. He talks of Cæsar as of an indifferent person, and always maintains the character which he has thus assumed; indeed, it can hardly be conceived that he had so small a share in the great actions he describes, as appears from his own representations. With exception of the false colours with which he disguises his ambitious projects against the liberties of his country, everything seems to be told with fidelity and candour. Nor is there any very unfair concealment of the losses he may have sustained: he ingenuously acknowledges his own disaster in the affair at Dyrrachium; he admits the loss of 960 men, and the complete frustration of his whole plan for the campaign. When he relates his successes, on the other hand, it is with moderation. There is the utmost caution, reserve, and modesty, in his account of the battle of Pharsalia; and one would hardly conceive that the historian had any share in the action or victory. He in general acknowledges, that the events of war are beyond human control, and ascribes the largest share of success to the power of fortune. The rest he seems willing to attribute to the valour of his soldiers, and the good conduct of his military associates. Thus he gives the chief credit and glory of the great victory over Ariovistus to the presence of mind displayed by Crassus, who promptly made the signal to a body of men to advance and support one of the wings which was overpowered by the multitude of the enemy, and was beginning to give way. He does not even omit to do justice to the distinguished and generous valour of the two centurions, Pulfio and Varenus, or of the centurion Sextius Baculus, during the alarming attack by the Sicambri. On the other hand, when he has occasion to mention the failure of his friends, as in relating Curio's defeat and death in Africa, he does it with tenderness and indulgence. Of his enemies, he speaks without insult or contempt; and even in giving his judgment upon a great military question, though he disapproves Pompey's mode of waiting for the attack at Pharsalia, his own reasons

* Asinius Pollio, however, as we learn from Suetonius, thought that the Commentaries were drawn up with little care or accuracy, that the author was very credulous as to the actions of others, and that he had very hastily written down what regarded himself, with the intention, which he never accomplished, of afterwards revising and correcting.—Sueton. *in Cæsar*. c. 56.

for a contrary opinion are urged with deference and candour. The confident hopes which were entertained in Pompey's camp—the pretensions and disputes of the leading senators, about the division of patronage and officers, and the confiscations which were supposed to be just falling within their grasp, furnished him with some amusing anecdotes, which it must have been difficult to resist inserting; nor can we wonder, that while all the preparations for celebrating the anticipated victory with luxury and festivity, were matters of ocular observation, he should have devoted some few passages in his Commentaries, to recording the vanity and presumption of such fond expectations. Labienus, who had deserted him, and Scipio, who gave him so much trouble, by rekindling the war, are those of whom he speaks with the greatest rancour, in relating the cruelty of the former, and the tyrannical ingenious rapacity of the latter*.

Whatever concerns the events of the civil war could not easily have been falsified or misrepresented. So many enemies, who had been eye-witnesses of everything, survived that period, that the author could scarcely have swerved from the truth without detection. But in his contests with the Gauls, and Germans, and Britons, there was no one to contradict him. Those who accompanied him were devoted to his fame and fortunes, and interested like himself in exalting the glory of these foreign exploits. That he has varnished over the real motives, and also the issue, of his expedition to Britain has been frequently suspected. The reason he himself assigns for the undertaking is, that he understood supplies had been thence furnished to the enemy, in almost all the Gallic wars; but Suetonius asserts, that the information he had received of the quantity and size of the pearls on the British coast, was his real inducement. Fourteen short chapters in the fourth book of the Gallic war, relate his first visit, and his hasty return; and sixteen in the fifth, detail his progress in the following summer. These chapters have derived importance from containing the earliest authentic memorials of the inhabitants and state of this island; and there has, of course, been much discussion on the genuine though imperfect notices they afford. Various tracts, chiefly published in the *Archæologia*, have topographically followed the various steps of Cæsar's progress, particularly his passage across the Thames, and have debated the situation of the Portus Iccius, from which he embarked for Britain.

Cæsar's occasional digressions concerning the manners of

* Bankses, *Civil Hist. of Rome*, Vol. II.

the Gauls and Germans, are also highly interesting and instructive, and are the only accounts to be at all depended on with regard to the institutions and customs of these two great nations, at that remote period. In Gaul he had remained so long, and had so thoroughly studied the habits and customs of its people for his own political purposes, that whatever is delivered concerning that country, may be confidently relied on. His intercourse with the German tribes was occasional, and chiefly of a military description. Some of his observations on their manners—as their hospitality, the continence of their youth, and the successive occupation of different lands by the same families—are confirmed by Tacitus; but in other particulars, especially in what relates to their religion, he is contradicted by that great historian. Cæsar declares that they have no sacrifices, and know no gods, but those, like the Sun or Moon, which are visible, and whose benefits they enjoy*. Tacitus informs us, that their chief god is Mercury, whom they appease by human victims; that they also sacrifice animals to Hercules and Mars; and adore that Secret Intelligence, which is only seen in the eye of mental veneration†. The researches of modern writers have also thrown some doubts on the accuracy of Cæsar's German topography; and Cluverius, in particular, has attempted to show, that he has committed many errors in speaking both of the Germans and Batavians‡.

As the Commentaries of Cæsar do not pretend to the elaborate dignity of history, the author can scarcely be blamed if he has detailed his facts without mingling many reflections or observations. He seldom inserts a political or characteristic remark, though he had frequent opportunities for both, in describing such singular people as the Gauls, Germans, and Britons. But his object was not, like Sallust or Tacitus, to deduce practical reflections for the benefit of his reader, or to explain the political springs of the transactions he relates. His simple narrative was merely intended for the gratification of those Roman citizens, whom he had already persuaded to favour his ambitious projects; yet even they, I think, might have wished to have heard something more of what may be called the military motives of his actions. He tells us of his

* Neque Druides habent, qui rebus divinis præsent; neque sacrificiis student. Deorum numero eos solos ducunt, quos cernunt, et quorum opibus aperte juvantur—Solem, et Vulcanum, et Lunam: reliquos ne famâ quidem acceperunt. Lib. VI. c. 21.

† Deorum maximè Mercurium colunt, cui, certis diebus, humanis quoque hostiis, litare fas habent. Herculem ac Martem concessis animalibus placant. . . . Lucos ac nemora consecrant, deorumque nominibus appellant Secretum illud, quod solâ reverentia vident. *De Mor. Germ.* c. 9.

‡ *Germ. Antiqua*, Lib. I. c. 3.

marches, retreats, and encampments, but seldom sufficiently explains the grounds on which these warlike measures were undertaken—how they advanced his own plans, or frustrated the designs of the enemy. More insight into the military views by which he was prompted, would have given additional interest and animation to his narrative, and afforded ampler lessons of instruction.

No person, I presume, wishes to be told, for the twentieth time, that the style of Cæsar is remarkable for clearness and ease, and a simplicity more truly noble than the pomp of words. Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of his style, is its perfect equality of expression. There was, in the mind of Cæsar, a serene and even dignity. In temper, nothing appeared to agitate or move him—in conduct, nothing diverted him from the attainment of his end. In like manner, in his style, there is nothing swelling or depressed, and not one word occurs which is chosen for the mere purpose of embellishment. The opinion of Cicero, who compared the style of Cæsar to the unadorned simplicity of an ancient Greek statue, may be considered as the highest praise, since he certainly entertained no favourable feelings towards the author; and the style was very different from that which he himself employed in his harangues, or philosophical works, or even in his correspondence. “Nudi sunt,” says he, “recti, et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tanquam veste detracto.” This exquisite purity was not insensibly obtained, as the Lælian and Mucian Families are said to have acquired it, by domestic habit and familiar conversation, but by assiduous study and thorough knowledge of the Latin language*, and the practice of literary composition, to which Cæsar had been accustomed from his earliest youth†.

But, however admirable for its purity and elegance, the style of Cæsar seems to be somewhat deficient, both in vivacity and vigour. Walchius, too, has pointed out a few words, which he considers not of pure Latinity, as *ambactus*, a term employed by the Gauls and Germans to signify a servant—also *Ancorarii funes*, a word nowhere else used as an adjective—*Antemittere* for *premittere*, and *summo magistratu prætorat* for *magistratu*‡. The use of such words as *collabefieret*, *contabulatio*, *detrimentosum*, *explicitius*, *materiari*, would lead us to suspect that Cæsar had not *always* attended to the rule which he so strongly laid down in his book, *De Analogia*,

* *Brutus*, c. 72.

† † See Plutarch *In Cæsare*, where it is related that Cæsar wrote verses and speeches, and read them to the pirates by whom he was taken prisoner, on his return to Rome from Bithynia, where he had sought refuge from the power of Sylla.

‡ *Hist. Critic. Ling. Lat.* p. 587.

to avoid, as a rock, every unusual word or expression. *Bergerus*, in an immense quarto, entitled *De Naturali ulchritudine Orationis*, has at great length attempted to show that Cæsar had anticipated all the precepts subsequently delivered by *Longinus*, for reaching the utmost excellence and dignity of composition. He points out his conformity to these rules, in what he conceives to be the abridgments, amplifications, transitions, gradations,—in short, all the various figures and ornaments of speech, which could be employed by the most pedantic rhetorician; and he also critically examines those few words and phrases of questionable purity, which are so thinly scattered through the Commentaries.

Mankind usually judge of a literary composition by its intrinsic merit, without taking into consideration the age of the author, the celerity with which it was composed, or the various circumstances under which it was written; and in this, perhaps, they act not unjustly, since their business is with the work, and not with the qualities of the author. But were such things to be taken into view, it should be remembered, that these Memoirs were hastily drawn up during the tumult and anxiety of campaigns, and were jotted down from day to day, without care or premeditation. “*Ceteri*,” says *Hirtius*, the companion of Cæsar’s expeditions, and the continuator of his Commentaries,—“*Ceteri quam bene atque emendate; nos etiam quam facile atque celeriter eos perscripserit scimus.*”

The Commentaries, *De Bello Gallico*, and *De Bello Civili*, are the only productions of Cæsar which remain to us. Several ancient writers speak of his *Ephemeris*, or Diary; but it has been doubted whether the work, so termed by *Plutarch*, *Servius*, *Symmachus*, and several others, be the same book as the Commentaries, or a totally different production. The former opinion is adopted by *Fabricius*, who thinks that *Ephemeris*, or *Ephemerides*, is only another name for the Commentaries, which in fact may be considered as having been written in the manner and form of a diary. He acknowledges, that several passages, cited by *Servius*, as taken from these *Ephemerides*, are not now to be found in the Commentaries; but then he maintains that there are evidently defects (*lacunæ*) in the latter work; and he conjectures that the words quoted by *Servius* are part of the lost passages of the Commentaries. This opinion is followed by *Vossius*, who cites a sort of Colophon at the end of one of the oldest MSS. of the Commentaries, which he thinks decisive of the question, as it shows that the term *Ephemeris* was currently applied to them.—“*C. J. Cæsaris, P. M. Ephemeris rerum Gestarum Belli Gallici, Lib. VIII. explicit feliciter.*”

Bayle, in his Dictionary, has supported the opposite theory. He believes the *Ephemeris* to have been a journal of the author's life. He admits, that a passage which Plutarch quotes as from the *Ephemeris*, occurs also in the fourth book of the Commentaries; but then he maintains, that it was impossible for Cæsar not to have frequently mentioned the same thing in his Commentaries and Journal, and he thinks, that had Plutarch meant to allude to the former, he would have called them, not *Ephemeris*, but *ἡμερησία*, as Strabo has termed them. Besides, Polyænus mentions divers warlike stratagems, as recorded by Cæsar, which are not contained in the Commentaries, and which, therefore, could have been explained only in the separate work *Ephemeris*.

There are still some fragments remaining of the letters which Cæsar addressed to the Senate and his friends, and also of his orations, which were considered as inferior only to those of Cicero. Of his rhetorical talents, something may be hereafter said. It appears that his qualities as an orator and historian, were very different, since vehemence and the power of exciting emotion, (conciatio,) are mentioned as the characteristics of his harangues. Some of them were delivered in behalf of clients, and on real business, in the Forum; but the two orations entitled *Anticatones* were merely written in the form and manner of accusations before a judicial tribunal. These rhetorical declamations, which were composed about the time of the battle of Munda, were intended as an answer to the laudatory work of Cicero, called *Laus Catonis*. The author particularly considered in them the last act of Cato at Utica, and has raked up all the vices and defects of his character, whether real or imputed, public or private,—his ambition, affectation of singularity, churlishness, and avarice; but as the *Anticatones* were seasoned with lavish commendations of Cicero, whose panegyric on Cato they were intended to confute, the orator felt much flattered with the dictatorial incense, and greatly admired the performances in which it was offered,—“*Collegit vitia Catonis, sed cum maximis laudibus meis**.”

These two rival works were much celebrated at Rome; and both of them had their several admirers, as different parties and interests disposed men to favour the subject, or the author of each. It seems also certain, that they were the principal cause of establishing and promoting that veneration which posterity has since paid to the memory of Cato; for his name being thrown into controversy in that critical period of the

* *Epist. ad Attic. Lib. XII. ep. 40.*

fate of Rome, by the patron of liberty on one side, and its oppressor on the other, it became a kind of political test to all succeeding ages, and a perpetual argument of dispute between the friends of freedom, and the flatterers of power*. The controversy was taken up by Brutus, the nephew, and Fabius Gallus, an admirer of Cato: it was renewed by Augustus, who naturally espoused the royal side of the question, and by Thraseas Pætus, who ventured on this dangerous topic during the darkest days of imperial despotism.

Cæsar's situation as Pontifex Maximus probably led him to write the *Auguralia* and *Libri Auspicioꝝ*, which, as their names import, were books explaining the different auguries and presages derived from the flight of birds. To the same circumstance we may attribute his work on the motions of the stars, *De Motu Siderum*, which explains what he had learned in Egypt on that subject from Sosigenes, a peripatetic philosopher of Alexandria, and in which, if we may credit the elder Pliny, he prognosticated his own death on the ides of March †.

The composition of the works hitherto mentioned naturally enough suggested itself to a high-priest, warrior, and politician, who was also fond of literature, and had the same command of his pen as of his sword. But it appears singular, that one so much occupied with war, and with political schemes for the ruin of his country, should have seriously employed himself in writing formal and elaborate treatises on grammar. There is no doubt, however, that he composed a work, in two books, on the analogies of the Latin tongue, which was addressed to Cicero, and was entitled, like the preceding work of Varro on the same subject, *De Analogia*. It was written, as we are informed by Suetonius, while crossing the Alps, on his return to the army from Hither Gaul, where he had gone to attend the assemblies of that province †. In this book, the great principle established by him was, that the proper choice of words formed the foundation of eloquence §; and he cautioned authors and public speakers to avoid as a rock every unusual word or unwonted expression ||. His declensions, however, of some nouns, appear, at least to us, not a little strange—as *turbo, turbonis*, instead of *turbinis* ¶; and likewise his inflections of verbs,—as, *mordeo, memordi; pungo, pepugi; spondeo, spepondi** †. He also treated of derivatives; as we are informed, that he derived *ens* from the verb *sum, es, est*; and of rules of grammar,— as that the dative and ablative singular

* Middleton's *Life of Cicero*, Vol. II. p. 347, 2d ed.

† *Hist. Nat. Lib. XVIII. c. 26.*

§ Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 72.

¶ *Charisius*, Lib. I.

† Sueton. *In Cæsar*. c. 56.

|| Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic. Lib. I. c. 10.*

*† Au. Gellius, Lib. VII. c. 9.

of neuters in *e* are the same, as also of neuters in *or*, except *far* and *jubar*. It appears that he even descended to the most minute consideration of orthography and the formation of letters; Thus, he was of opinion, that the letter *V* should be formed like an inverted *F*,—thus *ꝛ*,—because it has the force of the *Æolic* digamma. Cassiodorus farther mentions, that, in the question with regard to the use of the *u* or *i* in such words as *maxumus* or *maximus*, Cæsar gave the preference to *i*; and, from such high authority, this spelling was adopted in general practice.

It has been said, that Cæsar also made a collection of apophthegms and anecdotes, in the style of our modern *Annals*; but Augustus prevented these from being made public. That emperor likewise, in a letter to Pompeius Macrus, to whom he had given the charge of arranging his library, prohibited the publication of several poetical effusions of Cæsar's youth. These are said to have consisted of a tragedy on the subject of *Œdipus*, and a poem in praise of *Hercules**. Another poem, entitled *Iter* was written by him in maturer age. It is said, by Suetonius, to have been composed when he reached Farther Spain, on the twenty-fourth day after his departure from Rome†; and it may therefore be conjectured to have been a poetical relation of the incidents which occurred during that journey, embellished, perhaps, with descriptions of the most striking scenery through which he passed. Two epigrams, which are still extant, have also been frequently attributed to him; one on the dramatic character of Terence, already quoted‡, and another on a Thracian boy, who, while playing on the ice, fell into the river Hebrus,—

“*Thrax puer, astricto glacie dum luderet Hebro,*” &c.

But this last is, with more probability, supposed by many to have been the production of Cæsar Germanicus.

There were also several useful and important works accomplished under the eye and direction of Cæsar, such as the graphic survey of the whole Roman empire. Extensive as their conquests had been, the Romans hitherto had done almost nothing for geography, considered as a science. Their knowledge was confined to the countries they had subdued, and them they regarded only with a view to the levies they could furnish, and the taxations they could endure. Cæsar was the first who formed more exalted plans. *Æthicus*, a writer of the fourth century, informs us, in the preface to his *Cosmographia*.

* Sueton. *In Cæsar*. c. 56.

‡ See above, Vol. I. p. 204.

† *Ibid*.

that this great man obtained a *senatusconsultum*, by which a geometrical survey and measurement of the whole Roman empire was enjoined to three geometers. Xenodoxus was charged with the eastern, Polyclethus with the southern, and Theodotus with the northern provinces. Their scientific labour was immediately commenced, but was not completed till more than thirty years after the death of him with whom the undertaking had originated. The information which Cæsar had received from the astronomer Sosigenes in Egypt, enabled him to alter and amend the Roman calendar. It would be foreign from my purpose to enter into an examination of this system of the Julian year, but the computation he adopted has been explained, as is well known, by Scaliger and Gassendi* ; and it has been since maintained, with little farther alteration than that introduced by Pope Gregory XIII. When we consider the imperfection of all mathematical instruments in the time of Cæsar, and the total want of telescopes, we cannot but view with admiration, not unmixed with astonishment, that comprehensive genius, which, in the infancy of science, could surmount such difficulties, and compute a system, that experienced but a trifling derangement in the course of sixteen centuries.

Although Cæsar wrote with his own hand only seven books of the Gallic campaigns, and the history of the civil wars till the death of his great rival, it seems highly probable, that he revised the last or eighth book of the Gallic war, and communicated information for the history of the Alexandrian and African expeditions, which are now usually published along with his own Commentaries, and may be considered as their supplement, or continuation. The author of these works, which nearly complete the interesting story of the campaigns of Cæsar, was Aulus Hirtius, one of his most zealous followers, and most confidential friends. He had been nominated Consul for the year following the death of his master; and, after that event, having espoused the cause of freedom, he was slain in the attack made by the forces of the republic on Antony's camp, near Modena.

The eighth book of the Gallic war contains the account of the renewal of the contest by the states of Gaul, after the surrender of Alesia, and of the different battles which ensued, at most of which Hirtius was personally present, till the final pacification, when Cæsar, learning the designs which were forming against him at Rome, set out for Italy.

* See also Blondellus, *Hist. du Calendrier Romain*. Paris, 1682, 4to; Bianchinus, *Dissert. de Calendario et Cyclo Cæsaris*, Rom. 1703, folio; and Court de Gebelin, *Monde Primitif*. T. IV.

Cæsar, in the conclusion of the third book of the Civil War, mentions the commencement of the Alexandrian war. Hirtius was not personally present at the succeeding events of this Egyptian contest, in which Cæsar was involved with the generals of Ptolemy, nor during his rapid campaigns in Pontus against Pharnaces, and against the remains of the Pompeian party in Africa, where they had assembled under Scipio, and being supported by Juba, still presented a formidable appearance. He collected, however, the leading events from the conversation of Cæsar*, and the officers who were engaged in these campaigns. He has obviously imitated the style of his master; and the resemblance which he has happily attained, has given an appearance of unity and consistence to the whole series of these well-written and authentic memoirs. It appears that Hirtius carried down the history even to the death of Cæsar, for in his preface addressed to Balbus, he says, that he had brought down what was left imperfect from the transactions at Alexandria, to the end, not of the civil dissensions, to a termination of which there was no prospect, but of the life of Cæsar†.

This latter part, however, of the *Commentaries of Hirtius*, has been lost, as it seems now to be generally acknowledged that he was not the author of the book *De Bello Hispanico*, which relates Cæsar's second campaign in Spain, undertaken against young Cneius Pompey, who, having assembled, in the ulterior province of that country, those of his father's party who had survived the disasters in Thessaly and Africa, and being joined by some of the native states, presented a formidable resistance to the power of Cæsar, till his hopes were terminated by the decisive battle of Munda. Dodwell, indeed, in a Dissertation on this subject, maintains, that it was originally written by Hirtius, but was interpolated by Julius Celsus, a Constantinopolitan writer of the 6th or 7th century. Vossius, however, whose opinion is that more commonly received, attributes it to Caius Oppius‡, who wrote the *Lives of Illustrious Captains*, and also a book to prove that the *Ægyptian Cæsario* was not the son of Cæsar. Oppius was Cæsar's confidential friend, and companion in many of his enterprizes; and it was to him, as we are informed by Suetonius, that Cæsar gave up the only apartment at an inn, while they were travel-

* Mihi non illud quidem accidit, ut Alexandrino atque Africano bello interesserem: quæ bella tamen ex parte nobis Cæsaris sermone sunt nota. *De Bell. Gall.* Lib. VIII.

† Imperfecta ab rebus gestis Alexandria confeci, usque ad exitum, non quidem civilis dissensionis, cujus finem nullum videmus, sed vitæ Cæsaris. *De Bell. Gall.*

‡ *De Hist. Lat.* Lib. I. c. 13.

ling in Gaul, and lay himself on the ground, and in the open air*.

A fragment has been added at the end of this book, on the Spanish war, by Jungerman, from a MS. of Petavius. Vossius thinks that this fragment was taken from the Commentaries, called those of Julius Celsus, on the Life of Cæsar, published in 1473. These Commentaries, however, were the work of a Christian writer; but Julius Celsus, a Constantinopolitan of the 6th century, already mentioned, having revised the Commentaries of Cæsar, the work on his life came, (from the confusion of names, or perhaps from a fiction devised, to give the stamp of authority,) to be attributed to Julius Celsus, who was contemporary with Cæsar, and was reported to have written a history of his campaigns; just in the same way as a fabulous life of Alexander, produced in the middle ages, passes to this day under the name of Callisthenes, the historiographer of the Macedonian monarch.

There is no other historian of the period on which we are now engaged, of whose works even any fragments have descended to us. Atticus, however, wrote *Memoirs of Rome* from the earliest periods, and also memoirs of its principal families, as the Junian, Cornelian, and Fabian,—tracing their origin, enumerating their honours, and recording their exploits. At the same time Luceius composed *Histories of the Social War*, and of the *Civil Wars of Sylla*, which were so highly esteemed by Cicero, that he urges him in one of his letters to undertake a history of his consulship, in which he discovered and suppressed the conspiracy of Catiline†. From a subsequent letter to Atticus we learn that Luceius had promised to accomplish the task suggested to him‡. It is probable, however, that it never was completed,—his labour having been interrupted by the civil wars, in which he followed the fortunes of Pompey, and was indeed one of his chief advisers in adopting the fatal resolution of quitting Italy.

The *Annals of Procilius*, which appeared at this period, may be conjectured to have comprehended the whole series of Roman history, from the building of the city to his own time; since Varro quotes him for the account of Curtius throwing himself into the gulf§, and Pliny refers to him for some remarks with regard to the elephants which appeared at Pompey's African triumph||.

Brutus is also said to have written epitomes of the meagre and barren histories of Fannius and Antipater. That he should

* Sueton. *In Cæsar*. c. 72.

† Lib. IV. Ep. 6.

‡ *Hist. Nat.* Lib. VIII. c. 2.

† *Epist. Famil.* Lib. V. Ep. 12.

§ *De Ling. Lat.* Lib. IV.

have thought of abridging narratives so proverbially dry and jejune, seems altogether inexplicable.

The works of an historian called Cæcina have also perished, and if we may trust to his own account of them, their loss is not greatly to be deplored. In one of his letters to Cicero he says, "From much have I been compelled to refrain, many things I have been forced to pass over lightly, many to curtail, and very many absolutely to omit. Thus circumscribed, restricted, and broken as it is, what pleasure or what useful information can be expected from the recital*?"

We have thus traced the progress of historical composition among the Romans, from its commencement to the time of Augustus. There is no history so distinguished and adorned as the Roman, by illustrious characters; and the circumstances which it records produced the greatest as well as most permanent empire that ever existed on earth. The interest of the early events, and the value of the conclusions to be drawn from them, are much diminished by their uncertainty. Subsequently, however, to the second Punic war, the Roman historians were, for the most part, themselves engaged in the affairs of which they treat, and had therefore, at least, the most perfect *means* of communicating accurate information. But this advantage, which, in one point of view, is so prodigious, was attended with concomitant evils. Lucian, in his treatise, *How History ought to be Written*, says, that the author of this species of composition should be abstracted from all connection with the persons and things which are its subjects; that he should be of no country and no party; that he should be free from all passion, and unconcerned who is pleased or offended with what he writes. Now, the Roman historians of the era on which we are engaged were the slaves of party or the heads of factions; and even when superior to all petty interests or prejudices, they still show plainly that they are Romans. None of them stood impartially aloof from their subject, or supplied the want of historians of Carthage and of Gaul, by whom their narratives might be corrected, and their colouring softened.

Of all the arts next to war, Eloquence was of most importance in Rome; since, if the former led to the conquest of foreign states, the latter opened to each individual a path to empire and dominion over the minds of his fellow citizens†.

* *Epist. Famil. Lib. VI. Ep. 7.*

† "Duz sunt artes," says Cicero, "quæ possunt locare homines in amplissimo gradu dignitatis: una imperatoris, altera oratoris boni: Ab hoc enim pacis ornamenta retinentur; ab illo belli pericula repellantur." *Orat. pro Muræna*, c. 14.

Without this art, wisdom itself, in the estimation of Cicero, could be of little avail for the advantage or glory of the commonwealth*.

During the existence of the monarchy, and in the early age of the republic, law proceedings were not numerous. Many civil suits were prevented by the absolute dominion which a Roman father exercised over his family; and the rigour of the decemviral laws, in which all the proceedings were extreme, frequently concussed parties into an accommodation; while, at the same time, the purity of ancient manners had not yet given rise to those criminal questions of bribery and peculation at home, or of oppression and extortion in the provinces, which disgraced the closing periods of the commonwealth, and furnished themes for the glowing invective of Cicero and Hortensius. Hence there was little room for the exercise of legal oratory; and whatever eloquence may have shone forth in the early ages of Rome, was probably of a political description, and exerted on affairs of state.

From the earliest times of the republic, history records the wonderful effects which Junius Brutus, Publicola, and Appius Claudius; produced by their harangues, in allaying seditions, and thwarting pernicious counsels. Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives us a formal speech, which Romulus, by direction of his grandfather, made to the people after the building of the city, on the subject of the government to be established†. There are also long orations of Servius Tullius; and great part of the Antiquities of Dionysius is occupied with senatorial debates during the early ages of the republic. But though the orations of these fathers of Roman eloquence were doubtless delivered with order, gravity, and judgment, and may have possessed a masculine vigour, well calculated to animate the courage of the soldier, and protect the interests of the state, we must not form our opinion of them from the long speeches in Dionysius and Livy, or suppose that they were adorned with any of that rhetoric art with which they have been invested by these historians. A nation of outlaws, destined from their cradle to the profession of arms,—taught only to hurl the spear or javelin, and inure their bodies to other martial exercises,—with souls breathing only conquest,—and regarded as the enemies of every state till they had become its masters, could have possessed but few topics of illustration or embellishment, and were not likely to cultivate any species of rhetorical refinement. To convince by solid arguments when

* Ratio ipsa in hanc sententiam ducit, ut existimem sapientiam sine eloquentia parum prodesse civitatibus. *Rhetoricorum*, Lib. I. c. 1.

† Lib. II.

their cause was good, and to fill their fellow-citizens with passions corresponding to those with which they were themselves animated, would be the great objects of an eloquence supplied by nature and unimproved by study. Quintilian accordingly informs us, that though there appeared in the ancient orations some traces of original genius, and much force of argument, they bore, in their rugged and unpolished periods, the signs of the times in which they were delivered.

With exception of the speech of Appius Claudius to oppose a peace with Pyrrhus, there are no harangues mentioned by the Latin critics or historians as possessing any charms of oratory, previously to the time of Cornelius Cethegus, who flourished during the second Punic war, and was Consul about the year 550. Cethegus was particularly distinguished for his admirable sweetness of elocution and powers of persuasion, whence he is thus characterized by Ennius, a contemporary poet, in the 9th book of his *Annals* :

“ Additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti
Ore Cethegus Marcus, Tuditano collega ;
Flos delibatus populi, suadaeque medulla.”

The orations of Cato the Censor have been *already* mentioned as remarkable for their rude but masculine eloquence. When Cato was in the decline of life, a more rich and copious mode of speaking at length began to prevail. Ser. Galba, by the warmth and animation of his delivery, eclipsed Cato and all his contemporaries. He was the first among the Romans who displayed the distinguishing talents of an orator, by embellishing his subject,—by digressing, amplifying, entreating, and employing what are called topics, or common-places of discourse. On one occasion, while defending himself against a grave accusation, he melted his judges to compassion, by producing an orphan relative, whose father had been a favourite of the people. When his orations, however, were afterwards reduced to writing, their fire appeared extinguished, and they preserved none of that lustre with which his discourses are said to have shone when given forth by the living orator. Cicero accounts for this from his want of sufficient study and art in composition. While his mind was occupied and warmed by the subject, his language was bold and rapid ; but when he took up the pen, his emotion ceased, and the periods fell languid from its point ; “which,” continues he, “never happened to those who, having cultivated a more studied and polished style of oratory, wrote as they spoke. Hence the mind of Lælius yet breathes in his writings, though the force of Galba has failed.” It appears, however, from an anecdote recorded by

Cicero, that Galba was esteemed the first orator of his age by the judges, the people, and Lælius himself.—Lælius, being intrusted with the defence of certain persons suspected of having committed a murder in the Silian forest, spoke for two days, correctly, elegantly, and with the approbation of all, after which the Consuls deferred judgment. He then recommended the accused to carry their cause to Galba, as it would be defended by him with more heat and vehemence. Galba, in consequence, delivered a most forcible and pathetic harangue, and after it was finished, his clients were absolved as if by acclamation*. Hence Cicero surmises, that though Lælius might be the more learned and acute disputant, Galba possessed more power over the passions; he also conjectures, that the former had more elegance, but the latter more force; and he concludes, that the orator who can move or agitate his judges, farther advances his cause than he who can instruct them.

Lælius is also compared by Cicero with his friend, the younger Scipio Africanus, in whose presence, this question concerning the Silian murder was debated. They were almost equally distinguished for their eloquence; and they resembled each other in this respect, that they both invariably delivered themselves in a smooth manner, and never, like Galba, exerted themselves with loudness of speech or violence of gesture†; but their style of oratory was different,—Lælius affecting a much more ancient phraseology than that adopted by his friend. Cicero himself seems inclined most to admire the rhetoric of Scipio; but he says, that, being so renowned a captain, and mankind being unwilling to allow supremacy to one individual, in what are considered as the two greatest of arts, his contemporaries for the most part awarded to Lælius the palm of eloquence.

The intercourse which was by this time opening up with Greece, and the encouragement now afforded to Greek teachers, who always possessed the undisputed privilege of dictating the precepts of the arts, produced the same improvement in oratory that it had effected in every branch of literature. Marcus Emilius Lepidus was a little younger than Galba or Scipio, and was Consul in 617. From his orations, which were extant in the time of Cicero, it appeared that he was the first who, in imitation of the Greeks, gave harmony and sweetness to his periods, or the graces of a style regularly polished and improved by art.

Cicero mentions a number of other orators of the same age

* *Brutus*, c. 22.

† *De Orat. Lib. I. c. 60.*

with Lepidus, and minutely paints their peculiar styles of rhetoric. We find among them the names of almost all the eminent men of the period, as Emilius Paulus, Scipio Nasica, and Mucius Scævola. The importance of eloquence for the purposes of political aggrandizement, is sufficiently evinced, from this work of Cicero, *De Claris Oratoribus*, since there is scarcely an orator mentioned, even of inferior note, who did not at this time rise to the highest offices in the state.

The political situation of Rome, and the internal inquietude which now succeeded its foreign wars, were the great promoters of eloquence. We hear of no orators in Sparta or Crete, where the severest discipline was exercised, and where the people were governed by the strictest laws. But Rhodes and Athens, places of popular rule, where all things were open to all men, swarmed with orators. In like manner, Rome, when most torn with civil dissensions, produced the brightest examples of eloquence. Cicero declares, that wisdom without eloquence was of little service to the state* ; and from the political circumstances of the times, that sort of oratory was most esteemed which had most sway over a restless and ungovernable multitude. The situation of public affairs occasioned those continual debates concerning the Agrarian Laws, and the consequent popularity acquired by the most factious demagogues. Hence, too, those frequent impeachments of the great—those ambitious designs of the patricians—those hereditary enmities in particular families—in fine, those incessant struggles between the Senate and plebeians, which, though all prejudicial to the commonwealth, contributed to swell and ramify that rich vein of eloquence, which now flowed so profusely through the agitated frame of the state. During the whole period previous to the actual breaking out of the civil wars, when the Romans turned the sword against each other, and the mastery of the world depended on its edge, oratory continued to open the most direct path to dignities. The farther a Roman citizen advanced in this career, so much nearer was he to preferment, so much the greater his reputation with the people ; and when elevated to the dignified offices of the state, so much the higher his ascendancy over his colleagues.

The Gracchi were the genuine offspring, and their eloquence the natural fruits of these turbulent times. Till their age, oratory had been a sort of *Arcanum imperii*,—an instrument of government in the power of the Senate, who used every precaution to retain its exclusive exercise. It was the

* *Rhetoric. seu De Inventione*, Lib. I. c. 1.

great bulwark that withstood the tide of popular passion, and weakened it so as not to beat too high or strongly on their own order and authority. The Gracchi not only broke down the embankment, but turned the flood against the walls of the Senate itself. The interests of the people had never yet been espoused by men endued with eloquence equal to theirs. Cicero, while blaming their political conduct, admits that both were consummate orators; and this he testifies from the recollection of persons still surviving in his day, and who remembered their mode of speaking. Indeed, the wonderful power which both brothers exercised over the people is a sufficient proof of their eloquence. Tiberius Gracchus was the first who made rhetoric a serious study and art. In his boyhood, he was carefully instructed in elocution by his mother Cornelia: he also constantly attended the ablest and most eloquent masters from Greece, and, as he grew up, he bestowed much time on the exercise of private declamation. It is not likely, that, gifted as he was by nature, and thus instructed, the powers of eloquence should long have remained dormant in his bosom. At the time when he first appeared on the turbulent stage of Roman life, the accumulation of landed property among a few individuals, and the consequent abuse of exorbitant wealth, had filled Italy with slaves instead of citizens—had destroyed the habits of rural industry among the people at large, and leaving only rich masters at the head of numerous and profligate servants, gradually rooted out those middle classes of society which constitute the strength, the worth, and the best hopes of every well-regulated commonwealth. It is said, that while passing through Etruria on his way to Numantia, Tiberius Gracchus found the country almost depopulated of freemen, and thence first formed the project of his Agrarian law, which was originally intended to correct the evils arising from the immense landed possessions of the rich, by limiting them to the number of acres specified in the ancient enactments*, and dividing the conquered territories among the poorer citizens. Preparatory to its promulgation, he was wont to assemble the people round the rostrum, where he pleaded for the poor, in language of which we have a specimen in Plutarch: “The wild-beasts of Italy have their dens to retire to—their places of refuge and repose; while the brave men who shed their blood in the cause of their country, have nothing left but fresh air and sunshine. Without houses, without settled habitations, they wander from place to place with their wives and children; and their commanders do but

* Plutarch, *In Tiber. Graccho.*

mock them, when, at the head of their armies, they exhort their soldiers to fight for their sepulchres and altars. For, among such numbers, there is not one Roman who has an altar which belonged to his ancestors, or a tomb in which their ashes repose. The private soldiers fight and die to increase the wealth and luxury of the great; and they are styled sovereigns of the world, while they have not a foot of ground they can call their own*." By such speeches as these, the people were exasperated to fury, and the Senate was obliged to have recourse to Octavius, who, as one of the tribunes, was the colleague of Gracchus, to counteract the effects of his animated eloquence. Irritated by this opposition, Gracchus abandoned the first plan of his law, which was to give indemnification from the public treasury to those who should be deprived of their estates, and proposed a new bill, by which they were enjoined forthwith to quit those lands which they held contrary to previous enactments. On this subject there were daily disputes between him and Octavius on the rostrum. Finding that his plans could not otherwise be accomplished, he resolved on the expedient of deposing his colleague; and thenceforth, to the period of his death, his speeches (one of which is preserved by Plutarch) were chiefly delivered in persuasion or justification of that violent measure.

Caius Gracchus was endowed with higher talents than Tiberius, but the resentment he felt on account of his brother's death, and eager desire for vengeance, led him into measures which have darkened his character with the shades of the demagogue. At the time of his brother's death he had only reached the age of twenty. In early youth, he distinguished himself by the defence of one of his friends named Vettius, and charmed the people by the eloquence which he exerted. He appears soon afterwards to have been impelled, as it were, by a sort of destiny, to the same political course which had proved fatal to his brother, and which terminated in his own destruction. His speeches were all addressed to the people, and were delivered in proposing laws, calculated to increase their authority, and lessen that of the Senate,—as those for colonizing the public lands, and dividing them among the poor; for regulating the markets, so as to diminish the price of bread, and for vesting the judicial power in the knights. A fragment of his speech, *De Legibus promulgatis*, is said to have been recently discovered, with other classical remains, in the Ambrosian Library. Aulus Gellius also quotes from this harangue, a passage, in which the orator complained that some respect-

* Plutarch, *In Tiber. Graccho.*

able citizens of a municipal town in Italy had been scourged with rods by a Roman magistrate. Gellius praises the conciseness, neatness, and graceful ease of the narrative, resembling dramatic dialogue, in which this incident was related. Similar, but only similar qualities, appear in his accusation of the Roman legate, who, while travelling to Asia in a litter, caused a peasant to be scourged to death, for having asked his slaves if it was a corpse they were carrying. "The relation of these events," says Gellius, "does not rise above the level of ordinary conversation. It is not a person complaining or imploring, but merely relating what had occurred;" and he contrasts this tameness with the energy and ardour with which Cicero has painted the commission of a like enormity by Verres*.

Though similar in many points of character and also in their political conduct, there was a marked difference in the style of eloquence, and forensic demeanour, of the two brothers. Tiberius, in his looks and gestures, was mild and composed—Caius, earnest and vehement; so that when they spoke in public, Tiberius had the utmost moderation in his action, and moved not from his place: whereas Caius was the first of the Romans, who, in addressing the people, walked to and fro in the rostrum, threw his gown off his shoulder, smote his thigh, and exposed his arm bare†. The language of Tiberius was laboured and accurate, that of Caius bold and figurative. The oratory of the former was of a gentle kind, and pity was the emotion it chiefly raised—that of the latter was strongly impassioned, and calculated to excite terror. In speaking, indeed, Caius was often so hurried away by the violence of his passion, that he exalted his voice above the regular pitch, indulged in abusive expressions, and disordered the whole tenor of his oration. In order to guard against such excesses, he stationed a slave behind him with an ivory flute, which was modulated so as to lead him to lower or heighten the tone of his voice, according as the subject required a higher or a softer key. "The flute," says Cicero, "you may as well leave at home, but the meaning of the practice you must remember at the bar‡."

In the time of the Gracchi, oratory became an object of assiduous and systematic study, and of careful education. A youth, intended for the profession of eloquence, was usually introduced to one of the most distinguished orators of the city,

* *Noct. Attic.* Lib. X. c. 8.

† Plutarch, *In Tib. Graccho.*

‡ *De Orator.* Lib. III. c. 60. Plutarch and Cicero's accounts of the eloquence of C. Gracchus, seem not quite consistent with what is delivered on the subject by Gellius.

whom he attended when he had occasion to speak in any public or private cause, or in the assemblies of the people, by which means he heard not only him, but every other famous speaker. He thus became practically acquainted with business and the courts of justice, and learned the arts of oratoric conflict, as it were, in the field of battle. "It animated," says the author of the dialogue *De Causis Corruptæ Eloquentiæ*,—"it animated the courage, and quickened the judgment of youth, thus to receive their instructions in the eye of the world, and in the midst of affairs, where no one could advance an absurd or weak argument, without being exposed by his adversary, and despised by the audience. Hence, they had also an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the various sentiments of the people, and observing what pleased or disgusted them in the several orators of the Forum. By these means they were furnished with an instructor of the best and most improving kind, exhibiting not the feigned resemblance of eloquence, but her real and lively manifestation—not a pretended but genuine adversary, armed in earnest for the combat—an audience ever full and ever new, composed of foes as well as of friends, and amongst whom not a single expression could fall but was either censured or applauded."

The minute attention paid by the younger orators to all the proceedings of the courts of justice, is evinced by the fragment of a Diary, which was kept by one of them in the time of Cicero, and in which we have a record, during two days, of the various harangues that were delivered, and the judgments that were pronounced*.

Nor were the advantages to be derived from fictitious oratorical contests long denied to the Roman youth. The practice of declaiming on feigned subjects, was introduced at Rome about the middle of its seventh century. The Greek rhetoricians, indeed, had been expelled, as well as the philosophers, towards the close of the preceding century; but, in the year 661, Plotius Gallus, a Latin rhetorician, opened a declaiming school at Rome. At this period, however, the declamations generally turned on questions of real business, and it was not till the time of Augustus, that the rhetoricians so far prevailed, as to introduce common-place arguments on fictitious subjects.

The eloquence which had originally been cultivated for seditious purposes, and for political advancement, began now to be considered by the Roman youth as an elegant accomplishment. It was probably viewed in the same light that we

* Funccius, *De Viris Ætate Lat. Ling. c. 1. § 24.*

regard horsemanship or dancing, and continued to be so in the age of Horace—

“ Namque, et nobilis, et decens,
Et pro sollicitis non tacitus reis,
Et centum puer artium,
Latè signa feret militiæ sum*.”

Under all these circumstances it is evident, that in the middle of the seventh century oratory would be neglected by none; and in an art so sedulously studied, and universally practised, many must have been proficient. It would be endless to enumerate all the public speakers mentioned by Cicero, whose catalogue is rather extensive and dry. We may therefore proceed to those two orators, whom he commemorates as having first raised the glory of Roman eloquence to an equality with that of Greece—Marcus Antonius, and Lucius Crassus.

The former, surnamed *Orator*, and grandfather of the celebrated triumvir, was the most employed patron of his time; and, of all his contemporaries, was chiefly courted by clients, as he was ever willing to undertake any cause which was proposed to him. He possessed a ready memory, and remarkable talent of introducing everything where it could be placed with most effect. He had a frankness of manner which precluded any suspicion of artifice, and gave to all his orations an appearance of being the unpremeditated effusions of an honest heart. But though there was no apparent preparation in his speeches, he always spoke so well, that the judges were never sufficiently prepared against the effects of his eloquence. His language was not perfectly pure, or of a constantly sustained elegance, but it was of a solid and judicious character, well adapted to his purpose—his gesture, too, was appropriate, and suited to the sentiments and language—his voice was strong and durable, though naturally hoarse—but even this defect he turned to advantage, by frequently and easily adopting a mournful and querulous tone, which, in criminal questions, excited compassion, and more readily gained the belief of the judges. He left, however, as we are informed by Cicero, hardly any orations behind him†, having resolved never to publish any of his pleadings, lest he should be convicted of maintaining in one cause something which was inconsistent with what he had alleged in another‡.

The first oration by which Antony distinguished himself,

* Lib. IV. Od. 1.

† Valer. Maxim. Lib. VII. c. 3.

‡ Cicero, *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 2.

was in his own defence. He had obtained the quæstorship of a province of Asia, and had arrived at Brundisium to embark there, when his friends informed him that he had been summoned before the Prætor Cassius, the most rigid judge in Rome, whose tribunal was termed the rock of the accused. Though he might have pleaded a privilege, which forbade the admission of charges against those who were absent on the service of the republic, he chose to justify himself in due form. Accordingly, he returned to Rome, stood his trial, and was acquitted with honour*.

One of the most celebrated orations which Antony pronounced, was that in defence of Norbanus, who was accused of sedition, and a violent assault on the magistrate, Æmilius Cæpio. He began by attempting to show from history, that seditions may sometimes be justifiable from necessity; that without them the kings would not have been expelled, or the tribunes of the people created. The orator then proceeded to insinuate, that his client had not been seditious, but that all had happened through the just indignation of the people; and he concluded with artfully attempting to renew the popular odium against Cæpio, who had been an unsuccessful commander†.

What Cicero relates concerning Antony's defence of Aquilius, is an example of his power in moving the passions, and is, at the same time, extremely characteristic of the manner of Roman pleading. Antony, who is one of the speakers in the dialogue *De Oratore*, is introduced relating it himself. Seeing his client, who had once been Consul and a leader of armies, reduced to a state of the utmost dejection and peril, he had no sooner begun to speak, with a view towards melting the compassion of others, than he was melted himself. Perceiving the emotion of the judges when he raised his client from the earth, on which he had thrown himself, he instantly took advantage of this favourable feeling. He tore open the garments of Aquilius, and showed the scars of those wounds which he had received in the service of his country. Even the stern Marius wept. Him the orator then apostrophized; imploring his protection, and invoking with many tears the gods, the citizens, and the allies of Rome. "But whatever I could have said," remarks he in the dialogue, "had I delivered it without being myself moved, it would have excited the derision, instead of the sympathy, of those who heard me‡."

* Valer. Maxim. Lib. III. c. 7; and Lib. VI. c. 8.

† *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 28, 29, 48, 49.

‡ *Id.* Lib. II. c. 47.

Antony, in the course of his life, had passed through all the highest offices of the state. The circumstances of his death, which happened in 666, during the civil wars of Marius and Sylla, were characteristic of his predominant talent. During the last proscription by Marius, he sought refuge in the house of a poor person, whom he had laid under obligations to him in the days of his better fortune. But his retreat being discovered, from the circumstance of his host procuring for him some wine nicer than ordinary, the intelligence was carried to Marius, who received it with a savage shout of exultation, and, clapping his hands for joy, he would have risen from table, and instantly repaired to the place where his enemy was concealed; but, being detained by his friends, he immediately despatched a party of soldiers, under a tribune, to slay him. The soldiers having entered his chamber for this purpose, and Antony suspecting their errand, addressed them in terms of such moving and insinuating eloquence, that his assassins burst into tears, and had not sufficient resolution to execute their mission. The officer who commanded them then went in, and cut off his head*, which he carried to Marius, who affixed it to that rostrum, whence, as Cicero remarks, he had ably defended the lives of so many of his fellow-citizens†; little aware that he would soon himself experience, from another Antony, a fate similar to that which he deploras as having befallen the grandsire of the triumvir.

Crassus, the forensic rival of Antony, had prepared himself in his youth, for public speaking, by digesting in his memory a chosen number of polished and dignified verses, or a certain portion of some oration which he had read over, and then delivering the same matter in the best words he could select‡. Afterwards, when he grew a little older, he translated into Latin some of the finest Greek orations, and, at the same time, used every mental and bodily exertion to improve his voice, his action, and memory. He commenced his oratorical career at the early age of nineteen, when he acquired much reputation by his accusation of C. Carbo; and he, not long afterwards, greatly heightened his fame, by his defence of the virgin Licinia. Another of the best speeches of Crassus, was that addressed to the people in favour of the law of Servilius Cæpio, restoring in part the judicial power to the Senate, of which they had been recently deprived, in order to vest it solely in the body of knights. But the most splendid of all the appearances of Crassus, was one that proved the immediate cause of his death, which happened in 662, a short while

* Plutarch, *In Mario*, Valerius Maximus, Lib. VIII. c. 9.

† Cicero, *De Oratore*, Lib. III. c. 3.

‡ *Id.* Lib. I. c. 33.

before the commencement of the civil wars of Marius and Sylla; and a few days after the time in which he is supposed to have borne his part in the dialogue *De Oratore*. The Consul Philippus had declared, in one of the assemblies of the people, that some other advice must be resorted to, since, with such a Senate as then existed, he could no longer direct the affairs of the government. A full Senate being immediately summoned, Crassus arraigned, in terms of the most glowing eloquence, the conduct of this Consul, who, instead of acting as the political parent and guardian of the Senate, sought to deprive its members of their ancient inheritance of respect and dignity. Being farther irritated by an attempt on the part of Philippus, to force him into compliance with his designs, he exerted, on this occasion, the utmost efforts of his genius and strength; but he returned home with a pleuritic fever, of which he died in the course of seven days. This oration of Crassus, followed as it was by his almost immediate death, made a deep impression on his countrymen; who, long afterwards, were wont to repair to the senate-house, for the purpose of viewing the spot where he had last stood, and fallen, as it may be said, in defence of the privileges of his order.

Crassus left hardly any orations behind him, and he died while Cicero was still in his boyhood; yet that author, having collected the opinions of those who had heard him, speaks with a minute and apparently perfect intelligence of his mode of oratory. He was what may be called the most ornamental speaker that had hitherto appeared in the Forum. Though not without force, gravity, and dignity, these were happily blended with the most insinuating politeness, urbanity, ease, and gaiety. He was master of the most pure and accurate language, and of perfect elegance of expression, without any affectation, or unpleasant appearance of previous study. Great clearness of exposition distinguished all his harangues, and, while descanting on topics of law or equity, he possessed an inexhaustible fund of argument and illustration. In speaking, he showed an uncommon modesty, which went even the length of bashfulness. When a young man, he was so intimidated at the opening of a speech, that Q. Maximus, perceiving him overwhelmed and disabled by confusion, adjourned the court, which the orator always remembered with the highest sense of gratitude. This diffidence never entirely forsook him; and, after the practice of a long life at the bar, he was frequently so much agitated in the exordium of his discourse, that he was observed to grow pale, and to tremble in every part of his frame*. Some persons considered

* Cicero, *De Orat.* Lib. I. c. 26, 27.

Crassus as only equal to Antony; others preferred him as the more perfect and accomplished orator: Antony chiefly trusted to his intimate acquaintance with affairs and ordinary life: He was not, however, so destitute of knowledge as he seemed; but he thought the best way to recommend his eloquence to the people, was to appear as if he had never learned anything*. Crassus, on the other hand, was well instructed in literature, and showed off his information to the best advantage. Antony possessed the greater power of promoting conjecture, and of allaying or exciting suspicion, by opposite and well-timed insinuations; but no one could have more copiousness or facility than Crassus, in defining, interpreting, and discussing, the principles of equity. The language of Crassus was indisputably preferable to that of Antony; but the action and gesture of Antony were as incontestably superior to those of Crassus.

Sulpicius and Cotta, who were both born about 630, were younger orators than Antony or Crassus, but were for some time their contemporaries, and had risen to considerable reputation before the death of the latter and assassination of the former. Sulpicius lived for some years respected and admired; but, about the year 665, at the first breaking out of the dissensions between Sylla and Marius, being then a tribune of the people, he espoused the part of Marius. Plutarch gives a memorable account of his character and behaviour at this conjuncture, declaring that he was second to none in the most atrocious villainies. Alike unrestrained in avarice and cruelty, he committed the most criminal and enormous actions without hesitation or reluctance. He sold by public auction the freedom of Rome to foreigners—telling out the purchase-money on counters erected for that purpose in the Forum! He kept 3000 swordsmen in constant pay, and had always about him a company of young men of the equestrian order, ready on every occasion to execute his commands; and these he styled his anti-senatorian band†. Cicero touches on his crimes with more tenderness; but says, that when he came to be tribune, he stript of all their dignities those with whom, as a private individual, he had lived in the strictest friendship‡. Whilst Marius kept his ground against his rival, Sulpicius transacted all public affairs, in his capacity of tribune, by violence and force of arms. He decreed to Marius the command in the Mithridatic war: He attacked the Consuls with his band while they were holding an assembly of the people in the Tem-

* Cicero, *De Orat.* Lib. II. c. 1.

† *De Oratore*, Lib. III. c. 3.

‡ Plutarch, *In Sylla*.

ple of Castor and Pollux, and deposed one of them*. **Marius**, however, having been at length expelled by the ascendancy of **Sylla**, **Sulpicius** was betrayed by one of his slaves, and immediately seized and executed. "Thus," says **Cicero**, "the chastisement of his rashness went hand in hand with the misfortunes of his country; and the sword cut off the thread of that life, which was then blooming to all the honours that eloquence can bestow†."

Cicero had reached the age of nineteen, at the period of the death of **Sulpicius**. He had heard him daily speak in the Forum, and highly estimates his oratoric powers‡. He was the most lofty, and what **Cicero** calls the most tragic, orator of Rome. His attitudes, deportment, and figure, were of supreme dignity—his voice was powerful and sonorous—his elocution rapid; his action variable and animated.

The constitutional weakness of **Cotta** prevented all such oratorical vehemence. In his manner he was soft and relaxed; but every thing he said was sober and in good taste, and he often led the judges to the same conclusion to which **Sulpicius** impelled them. "No two things," says **Cicero**, "were ever more unlike than they are to each other. The one, in a polite, delicate manner, sets forth his subject in well-chosen expressions. He still keeps to his point; and, as he sees with the greatest penetration what he has to prove to the court, he directs to that the whole strength of his reasoning and eloquence, without regarding other arguments. But **Sulpicius**, endued with irresistible energy, with a full strong voice, with the greatest vehemence, and dignity of action, accompanied with so much weight and variety of expression, seemed, of all mankind, the best fitted by nature for eloquence."

It was supposed that **Cotta** wished to resemble **Antony**, as **Sulpicius** obviously imitated **Crassus**; but the latter wanted the agreeable pleasantry of **Crassus**, and the former the force of **Antony**. None of the orations of **Sulpicius** remained in the time of **Cicero**—those circulated under his name having been written by **Canutius** after his death. The oration of **Cotta** for himself, when accused on the **Varian** law, was composed, it is said, at his request by **Lucius Ælius**; and, if this be true, nothing can appear to us more extraordinary, than that so accomplished a speaker as **Cotta** should have wished any of the trivial harangues of **Ælius** to pass for his own.

The renown, however, of all preceding orators, was now about to be eclipsed at Rome; and **Hortensius** burst forth in

* *Plutarch, in Sylla.*

‡ *Brutus, c. 89.*

† *De Oratore, Lib. III. c. 8.*

eloquence at once calculated to delight and astonish his fellow-citizens. This celebrated orator was born in the year 640, being thus ten years younger than Cotta and Sulpicius. His first appearance in the Forum was at the early age of nineteen—that is, in 659; and his excellence, says Cicero, was immediately acknowledged, like that of a statue by Phidias, which only requires to be seen in order to be admired*. The case in which he first appeared was of considerable responsibility for one so young and inexperienced, being an accusation, at the instance of the Roman province of Africa, against its governors for rapacity. It was heard before Scævola and Crassus, as judges—the one the ablest lawyer, the other the most accomplished speaker, of his age; and the young orator had the good fortune to obtain their approbation, as well as that of all who were present at the trial†. His next pleading of importance was in behalf of Nicomedes, King of Bithynia, in which he even surpassed his former speech for the Africans‡. After this we hear little of him for several years. The imminent perils of the Social War, which broke out in 663, interrupted, in a great measure, the business of the Forum. Hortensius served in this alarming contest for one year as a volunteer, and in the following season as a military tribune§. When, on the re-establishment of peace in Italy in 666, he returned to Rome, and resumed the more peaceful avocations to which he had been destined from his youth, he found himself without a rival||. Crassus, as we have seen, died in 662, before the troubles of Marius and Sylla. Antony, with other orators of inferior note, perished in 666, during the temporary and last ascendancy of Marius, in the absence of Sylla. Sulpicius was put to death in the same year, and Cotta driven into banishment, from which he was not recalled until the return of Sylla to Rome, and his election to the dictatorship in 670. Hortensius was thus left for some years without a competitor; and, after 670, with none of eminence but Cotta, whom also he soon outshone. His splendid, warm, and animated manner, was preferred to the calm and easy elegance of his rival. Accordingly, when engaged in a cause on the same side, Cotta, though ten years senior, was employed to open the case, while the more important parts were left to the management of Hortensius¶. He continued the undisputed sovereign of the Forum, till Cicero returned from his quæstorship in Sicily, in 679, when the talents of that orator first

* *Brutus*, c. 63.† *De Oratore*, Lib. III. c. 61.‡ *Ibid.*† *Ibid.*§ Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 89.¶ *Ibid.*

displayed themselves in full perfection and maturity. Hortensius was thus, from 666 till 679, a space of thirteen years, at the head of the Roman bar; and being, in consequence, engaged during that long period, on one side or other, in every cause of importance, he soon amassed a prodigious fortune. He lived, too, with a magnificence corresponding to his wealth. An example of splendour and luxury had been set to him by the orator Crassus, who inhabited a sumptuous palace in Rome, the hall of which was adorned with four pillars of Hymettian marble, twelve feet high, which he brought to Rome in his ædileship, at a time when there were no pillars of foreign marble even in public buildings*. The court of this mansion was ornamented by six lotus trees, which Pliny saw in full luxuriance in his youth, but which were afterwards burned in the conflagration in the time of Nero. He had also a number of vases, and two drinking-cups, engraved by the artist Mentor, but which were of such immense value that he was ashamed to use them†. Hortensius had the same tastes as Crassus, but surpassed him and all his contemporaries in magnificence. His mansion stood on the Palatine Hill, which appears to have been the most fashionable situation in Rome, being at that time covered with the houses of Lutatius Catulus, Æmilius Scaurus, Clodius, Catiline, Cicero, and Cæsar‡. The residence of Hortensius was adjacent to that of Catiline; and though of no great extent, it was splendidly furnished. After the death of the orator, it was inhabited by Octavius Cæsar§, and formed the centre of the chief imperial palace, which increased from the time of Augustus to that of Nero, till it covered a great part of the Palatine Mount, and branched over other hills. Besides his mansion in the capital, he possessed sumptuous villas at Tusculum, Bauli, and Laurentum, where he was accustomed to give the most elegant and expensive entertainments. He had frequently peacocks at his banquets, which he first served up at a grand augural feast, and which, says Varro, were more commended by the luxurious, than by men of probity and austerity||. His olive plantations he is said to have regularly moistened and bedewed with wine; and, on one occasion, during the hearing of an important case, in which he was engaged along with Cicero, begged that he would change with him the previously arranged order of pleading, as he was obliged to go to the country to pour wine on a favourite *platanus*, which grew near his Tus-

* Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XVII. c. 1.

† Nardini, *Roma Antica*, Lib. VI. c. 15.

|| Varro, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. III. c. 6.

† Ibid. Lib. XXXIII. c. 11.

§ Sueton. in *Augusto*, c. 72.

culan villa*. Notwithstanding this profusion, his heir found not less than 10,000 casks of wine in his cellar after his death†. Besides his taste for wine, and fondness for plantations, he indulged a passion for pictures and fish-ponds. At his Tusculan villa, he built a hall for the reception of a painting of the expedition of the Argonauts, by the painter Cydias, which cost the enormous sum of a hundred and forty-four thousand sesterces‡. At his country-seat, near Bauli, on the sea shore, he vied with Lucullus and Philippus in the extent of his fish-ponds, which were constructed at immense cost, and so formed that the tide flowed into them§. Under the promontory of Bauli, travellers are yet shown the *Piscina Mirabilis*, a subterraneous edifice, vaulted and divided by four rows of arcades, and which is supposed by some antiquarians to have been a fish-pond of Hortensius. Yet such was his luxury, and his reluctance to diminish his supply, that when he gave entertainments at Bauli, he generally sent to the neighbouring town of Puteoli to buy fish for supper||. He had a vast number of fishermen in his service, and paid so much attention to the feeding of his fish, that he had always ready a large stock of small fish to be devoured by the great ones. It was with the utmost difficulty he could be prevailed on to part with any of them; and Varro declares, that a friend could more easily get his chariot mules out of his stable, than a mullet from his ponds. He was more anxious about the welfare of his fish than the health of his slaves, and less solicitous that a sick servant might not take what was unfit for him, than that his fish might not drink water which was unwholesome¶. It is even said, that he was so passionately fond of a particular lamprey, that he shed tears for her untimely death*†.

The gallery at the villa, which was situated on the little promontory of Bauli, and looking towards Puteoli, commanded one of the most delightful views in Italy. The inland prospect towards Cumæ was extensive and magnificent. Puteoli was seen along the shore at the distance of 30 *stadia*, in the direction of Pompeii; and Pompeii itself was invisible only from its distance. The sea view was unbounded; but it was enlivened by the numerous vessels sailing across the bay, and the ever changeful hue of its waters, now saffron, azure, or purple, according as the breeze blew, or as the sun ascended or declined††.

* Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, Lib. III. c. 18.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XIV. c. 14.

§ Varro, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. III. c. 8.

¶ Ibid.

†† Cicero, *Academica*, Lib. II. c. 25, 81, 83.

‡ Ibid. Lib. XXV. c. 11.

|| Ibid. Lib. III. c. 17.

*† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. IX. c. 55.

Hortensius possessed another villa in Italy, which rivalled in its sylvan pomp the marine luxuries of Bauli. This mansion lay between Ostia and Lavinium, (now Pratica,) near to the town of Laurentum, so well remembered from ancient fable and poetry, as having been the residence of King Latinus, at the time of the arrival of Æneas in Italy, and at present known by the name of Torre di Paterno. The town of Laurentum was on the shore, but the villa of Hortensius stood to the north-east at some distance from the coast,—the grounds subsequently occupied by the villa of the younger Pliny intervening between it and Laurentum, and also between it and the Tuscan sea. Around were the walks and gardens of patrician villas; on one side was seen the town of Laurentum, with its public baths; on the other, but at a greater distance, the harbour of Ostia. Near the house were groves, and fields covered with herbs—beyond were hills clothed with woods. The horizon to the north-east was bounded by magnificent mountains, and beyond the low maritime grounds, which lay between the port of Ostia and Laurentum, there was a distant prospect of the Tuscan sea*.

Hortensius had here a wooded park of fifty acres, encompassed with a wall. This enclosure he called a nursery of wild beasts, all which came for their provender at a certain hour, on the blowing of a horn—an exhibition with which he was accustomed to amuse the guests who visited him at his Laurentian villa. Varro mentions an entertainment, where those invited supped on an eminence, called a *Triclinium*, in this sylvan park. During the repast, Hortensius summoned his Orpheus, who, having come with his musical instruments, and being ordered to display his talents, blew a trumpet, when such a multitude of deer, boars, and other quadrupeds, rushed to the spot from all quarters, that the sight appeared to the delighted spectators as beautiful as the courses with wild animals in the great Circus of the Ædiles†!

The eloquence of Hortensius procured him not only all this wealth and luxury, but the highest official honours of the state. He was Ædile in 679, Prætor in 682, and Consul two years afterwards. The wealth and dignities he had obtained, and the want of competition, made him gradually relax from that assiduity by which they had been acquired, till the increasing fame of Cicero, and particularly the glory of his consulship, stimulated him to renew his exertions. But his habit of labour had been in some degree lost, and he never again recovered

* Bonstetten, *Voyage dans le Latium*, p. 152—160. Nibby, *Viaggio Antiquario ne contorni di Roma*, T. II.

† Varro, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. III. c. 18.

his former reputation. Cicero partly accounts for this decline, from the peculiar nature and genius of his eloquence*. It was of that showy species called Asiatic, which flourished in the Greek colonies of Asia Minor, and was infinitely more florid and ornamental than the oratory of Athens, or even Rhodes, being full of brilliant thoughts and of sparkling expressions. This glowing style of rhetoric, though deficient in solidity and weight, was not unsuitable in a young man; and being farther recommended by a beautiful cadence of periods, met with the utmost applause. But Hortensius, as he advanced in life, did not prune his exuberance, or adopt a chaster eloquence; and this luxury, and glitter of phraseology, which, even in his earliest years, had occasionally excited ridicule or disgust among the graver fathers of the senatorial order, being totally inconsistent with his advanced age and consular dignity, which required something more serious and composed, his reputation diminished with increase of years; and though the bloom of his eloquence might be in fact the same, it appeared to be somewhat withered†. Besides, from his declining health and strength, which greatly failed in his latter years, he may not have been able to give full effect to that showy species of rhetoric in which he indulged. A constant toothache, and swelling in the jaws, greatly impaired his power of elocution and utterance, and became at length so severe as to accelerate his end—

“Ægrescunt teneræ fauces, quum frigoris atri
 Vis subit, vel quum ventis agitabilis ær
 Vertitur, atque ipsas flatus gravis inficit auras,
 Vel rabidus clamor fracto quum forte sonore
 Planum radit iter. Sic est Hortensius olim
 Absumptus: caussis etenim confectus agendis
 Obtulit, quum vox, domino vivente, periret,
 Et nondum extincti moreretur lingua disertij.”

A few months, however, before his death, which happened in 703, he pleaded for his nephew, Messala, who was accused of illegal canvassing, and who was acquitted, more in consequence of the astonishing exertions of his advocate, than the justice of his cause. So unfavourable, indeed, was his case esteemed, that however much the speech of Hortensius had been admired, he was received on entering the theatre of Curio on the following day, with loud clamour and hisses, which were the more remarked, as he had never met with similar

* Cicero, *Brutus*, c. 95.

† Varro, *De Re Rustica*. Cicero, *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. V. Ep. 2.

‡ Særen. Samonicus, *De Medicina*, c. 15.

treatment in the whole course of his forensic career*. The speech, however, revived all the ancient admiration of the public for his oratorical talents, and convinced them, that had he always possessed the same perseverance as Cicero, he would not have ranked second to that orator. Another of his most celebrated harangues was that against the Manilian law, which vested Pompey with such extraordinary powers, and was so warmly supported by Cicero. That against the sumptuary law proposed by Crassus and Pompey, in the year 683, which tended to restrain the indulgence of his own taste, was well adapted to Hortensius' style of eloquence; and his speech was highly characteristic of his disposition and habits of life. He declaimed, at great length, on the glory of Rome, which required splendour in the mode of living followed by its citizens†. He frequently glanced at the luxury of the Consuls themselves, and forced them at length, by his eloquence and sarcastic declamation, to relinquish their scheme of domestic retrenchment.

The speeches of Hortensius, it has been already mentioned, lost part of their effect by the orator's advance in years, but they suffered still more by being transferred to paper. As his chief excellence consisted in action and delivery, his writings were much inferior to what was expected from the high fame he had enjoyed; and, accordingly, after death, he retained little of that esteem, which he had so abundantly possessed during his life‡. Although, therefore, his orations had been preserved, they would have given us but an imperfect idea of the eloquence of Hortensius; but even this aid has been denied us, and we must, therefore, now chiefly trust for his oratorical character to the opinion of his great but unprejudiced rival. The friendship and honourable competition of Hortensius and Cicero, present an agreeable contrast to the animosities of *Æschines* and *Demosthenes*, the two great orators of Greece. It was by means of Hortensius that Cicero was chosen one of the college of Augurs—a service of which his gratified vanity ever appears to have retained an agreeable recollection. In a few of his letters, indeed, written during the despondency of his exile, he hints a suspicion that Hortensius had been instrumental in his banishment, with a view of engrossing to himself the whole glory of the bar§; but this mistrust ended with his recall, which Hortensius, though originally he had advised him to yield to the storm, urged on with all the influence of which he was possessed. Hortensius also appears to have been free from every feeling of jealousy or envy, which in him was still

* Cicero, *Epist. Familiares*, Lib. VIII. Ep. 2.

† *Dio. Cassius*, Lib. XXXIX.

‡ *Quint. Inst. Orat.* Lib. XI. c. 8.

§ *Epist. ad Atticum*, Lib. III. Ep. 9, &c.

more creditable, as his rival was younger than himself, and yet ultimately forced him from the supremacy. Such having been their sentiments of mutual esteem, Cicero has done his oratoric talents ample justice—representing him as endued with almost all the qualities necessary to form a distinguished speaker. His imagination was fertile—his voice was sweet and harmonious—his demeanour dignified—his language rich and elegant—his acquaintance with literature extensive. So prodigious was his memory, that, without the aid of writing, he recollected every word he had meditated, and every sentence of his adversary's oration, even to the titles and documents brought forward to support the case against him—a faculty which greatly aided his peculiarly happy art of recapitulating the substance of what had been said by his antagonists or by himself*. He also originally possessed an indefatigable application; and scarcely a day passed in which he did not speak in the Forum, or exercise himself in forensic studies or preparation. But, of all the various arts of oratory, he most remarkably excelled in a happy and perspicuous arrangement of his subject. Cicero only reproaches him, and that but slightly, with showing more study and art in his gestures than was suitable for an orator. It appears, however, from Macrobius, that he was much ridiculed by his contemporaries, on account of his affected gestures. In pleading, his hands were constantly in motion, whence he was often attacked by his adversaries in the Forum for resembling an actor; and, on one occasion, he received from his opponent the appellation of *Dionysia*, which was the name of a celebrated dancing girl†. *Æsop* and *Roscius* frequently attended his pleadings, to catch his gestures, and imitate them on the stage‡. Such, indeed, was his exertion in action, that it was commonly said that it could not be determined whether people went to hear or to see him§. Like *Demosthenes*, he chose and put on his dress with the most studied care and neatness. He is said, not only to have prepared his attitudes, but also to have adjusted the plaits of his gown before a mirror, when about to issue forth to the Forum; and to have taken no less care in arranging them, than in moulding the periods of his discourse. He so tucked up his gown, that the folds did not fall by chance, but were form-

* As a proof of his astonishing memory, it is recorded by *Seneca*, that, for a trial of his powers of recollection, he remained a whole day at a public auction, and when it was concluded, he repeated in order what had been sold, to whom, and at what price. His recital was compared with the clerk's account, and his memory was found to have served him faithfully in every particular. *Senec. Prof. Lib. I. Controv.*

† *Aulus Gellius, Noct. Attic. Lib. I. c. 5.*

‡ *Valerius Maximus, Lib. VIII. c. 10.*

§ *Ibid.*

ed with great care, by means of a knot artfully tied, and concealed in the plies of his robe, which apparently flowed carelessly around him*. Macrobius also records a story of his instituting an action of damages against a person who had jostled him, while walking in this elaborate dress, and had ruffled his toga, when he was about to appear in public with his drapery adjusted according to the happiest arrangement†—an anecdote, which, whether true or false, shows, by its currency, the opinion entertained of his finical attention to everything that concerned the elegance of his attire, or the gracefulness of his figure and attitudes. He also bathed himself in odoriferous waters, and daily perfumed himself with the most precious essences‡. This too minute attention to his person, and to gesticulation, appears to have been the sole blemish in his oratorical character; and the only stain on his moral conduct, was his practice of corrupting the judges of the causes in which he was employed—a practice which must be, in a great measure, imputed to the defects of the judicial system at Rome; for, whatever might be the excellence of the Roman laws, nothing could be worse than the procedure under which they were administered§.

* Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, Lib. III. c. 18.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Meiners, *Decadence des Mœurs chez les Romains*.

§ Hortensius was first married to a daughter of Q. Catulus, the orator, who is one of the speakers in the *Dialogue De Oratore*. (Cicero, *De Oratore*, Lib. III. c. 61.) He afterwards asked, and obtained from Cato, his wife Marcia; who, having succeeded to a great part of the wealth of Hortensius on his death, was then taken back by her former husband. (Plutarch, *In Catone*.) By his first wife, Hortensius had a son and daughter. In his son Quintus, he was not more fortunate than his rival, Cicero, in his son Marcus. Cicero, while Proconsul of Cilicia, mentions, in one of his letters, the ruffian and scandalous appearance made by the younger Hortensius at Laodicea, during the shows of gladiators.—“I invited him once to supper,” says he, “on his father’s account; and, on the same account, only once.” (*Epist. Ad Attic.* Lib. VI. Ep. 3.) Such, indeed, was his unworthy conduct, that his father at this time entertained thoughts of disinheriting him, and making his nephew, Messala, his heir; but in this intention he did not persevere. (Valer. Maxim. Lib. V. c. 9.) After his father’s death, he joined the party of Cæsar, (Cicero, *Epist. Ad Attic.* Lib. X. Ep. 16, 17, 18, by whom he was appointed Proconsul of Macedonia; in which situation he espoused the side of the conspirators, subsequently to the assassination of Cæsar. Cicero, *Philipp.* X. c. 5 and 6.) By order of Brutus, he slew Caius Antonius, brother to the Triumvir, who had fallen into his hands; and, being afterwards taken prisoner at the battle of Philippi, he was slain by Marc Antonius, by way of reprisal, on the tomb of his brother. (Plutarch, *In M. Bruto*.)

Hortensia, the daughter, inherited something of the spirit and eloquence of her father. A severe tribute having been imposed on the Roman matrons by the Triumvirs, Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus, she boldly pleaded their cause before these noted extortioners, and obtained some alleviation of the impost. (Valer. Maxim. Lib. VIII. c. 3.)

Quintus, the son of the orator, left two children, Q. Hortensius Corbion, and M. Hortensius Hortalus. The former of these was a monster of debauchery; and is mentioned by his contemporary, Valerius Maximus, among the most striking examples of those descendants who have degenerated from the honour of their ances-

Hortensius has received more justice from Cicero than another orator, Licinius Calvus, who, for a few years, was also considered as his rival in eloquence. Calvus has already been mentioned as an elegant poet; but Seneca calls his competition with Cicero in oratory, *iniquissimam litem*. His style of speaking was directly the reverse of that of Hortensius: he affected the Attic taste in eloquence, such as it appeared in what he conceived to be its purest form—the orations of Lysias. Hence that correct and slender delicacy at which he so studiously aimed, and which he conducted with great skill and elegance; but, from being too much afraid of the faults of redundance and unsuitable ornament, he refined and attenuated his discourse till it lost its raciness and spirit. He compensated, however, for his sterility of language, and diminutive figure, by his force of elocution, and vivacity of action. “I have met with persons,” says Quintilian, “who preferred Calvus to all our orators; and others who were of opinion, that the too great rigour which he exercised on himself, in point of precision, had debilitated his oratorical talents. Nevertheless, his speeches, though chaste, grave, and correct, are frequently also vehement. His taste of writing was Attic; and his untimely death was an injury to his reputation, if he designed to add to his compositions, and not to retrench them.” His most celebrated oration, which was against the unpopular Vatinius, was delivered at the age of twenty. The person whom he accused, overpowered and alarmed, interrupted him, by exclaiming to the judges, “Must I be condemned because he is eloquent?” The applause he obtained in this case may be judged of from what is mentioned by Catullus, of some one in the crowd clapping his hands in the middle of his speech, and exclaiming, “O what an eloquent little darling*!” Calvus survived only ten years after this period,

tors. Lib. III. c. 5.) This wretch, not being likely to become a father, and the wealth of the family having been partly settled on the wife of Cato, partly dissipated by extravagance, and partly confiscated in the civil wars, Augustus Cæsar, who was a great promoter of matrimony, gave Hortensius Hortalus a pecuniary allowance to enable him to marry, in order that so illustrious a family might not become extinct. He and his children, however, fell into want during the reign of his benefactor's successor. Tacitus has painted, with his usual power of striking delineation, that humiliating scene, in which he appeared, with his four children, to beg relief from the Senate; and the historian has also recorded the hard answer which he received from the unrelenting Tiberius. Perceiving, however, that his severity was disliked by the Senate, the Emperor said, that, if they desired it, he would give a certain sum to each of Hortalus's male children. They returned thanks; but Hortalus, either from terror or dignity of mind, said not a word; and, from this time, Tiberius showing him no favour, his family sunk into the most abject poverty: (Tacit. *Annal.* Lib. II. c. 37 and 38.) And such were the descendants of the orator with the park, the plantations, the ponds, and the pictures!

* Catull. *Curm.* 53.

having died at the early age of thirty. He left behind him twenty-one books of orations, which are said to have been much studied by the younger Pliny, and were the models he first imitated*.

Calvus, though a much younger man than Cicero, died many years before him, and previous to the composition of the dialogue *Brutus*. Most of the other contemporaries, whom Cicero records in that treatise on celebrated orators, were dead also. Among an infinite variety of others, he particularly mentions Marcus Crassus, the wealthy triumvir, who perished in the ill-fated expedition against the Parthians; and who, though possessed but of moderate learning and capacity, was accounted, in consequence of his industry and popular arts, among the chief forensic patrons. His language was pure, and his subject well arranged; but in his harangues there were none of the lights and flowers of eloquence,—all things were expressed in the same manner, and the same tone.

Towards the conclusion of the dialogue, Cicero mentions so many of his predeceased contemporaries, that Atticus remarks, that he is drawing up the dregs of oratory. Calidius, indeed, seems the only other speaker who merits distinguished notice. He is characterized as different from all other orators,—such was the soft and polished language in which he arrayed his exquisitely delicate sentiments. Nothing could be more easy, pliable, and ductile, than the turn of his periods; his words flowed like a pure and limpid stream, without anything hard or muddy to impede or pollute their course; his action was genteel, his mode of address sober and calm, his arrangement the perfection of art. “The three great objects of an orator,” says Cicero, while discussing the merits of Calidius, “are to instruct, delight, and move. Two of these he admirably accomplished. He rendered the most abstruse subject clear by illustration, and enchained the minds of his hearers with delight. But the third praise of moving and exciting the soul must be denied him; he had no force, pathos, or animation†.” Such, indeed, was his want of emotion, where it was most appropriate, and most to be expected, that, while pleading his own cause against Q. Gallius for an attempt to poison him, though he stated his case with elegance and perspicuity, yet it was so smoothly and listlessly detailed, that Cicero, who spoke for the person accused, argued, that the charge must be false and an invention of his own, as no one could talk so calmly, and with such indifference, of a recent attempt which threatened his own existence‡.

* Pliny, *Epist.* Lib. I. ep. 2.

† *Brutus*, c. 80.

‡ *Ibid.*

These were the most renowned orators who preceded the age of Cicero, or were contemporaries with him; and before proceeding to consider the oratorical merits of him by whom they have been all eclipsed, at least in the eye of posterity, it may be proper, for a single moment, to remind the reader of the state of the Roman law,—of the judicial procedure, and of the ordinary practice of the Forum, at the time when he commenced and pursued his brilliant career of eloquence.

The laws of the first six kings of Rome, called the *Leges Regiæ*, chiefly related to sacred subjects,—regulations of police,—divisions of the different orders in the state,—and privileges of the people. Tarquinius Superbus having laid a plan for the establishment of despotism at Rome, attempted to abolish every law of his predecessors which imposed control on the royal prerogative. About the time of his expulsion*, the Senate and people, believing that the disregard of the laws was occasioned by their never having been reduced in writing, determined to have them assembled and recorded in one volume; and this task was intrusted by them to Sextus Papyrius, a patrician. Papyrius accordingly collected, with great assiduity, all the laws of the monarchs who had governed Rome previously to the time of Tarquin. This collection, which is sometimes called the *Leges Regiæ*, and sometimes the Papyrian Code, did not obtain that confirmation and permanence which might have been expected. Many of the *Leges Regiæ* were the result of momentary emergencies, and inapplicable to future circumstances. Being the ordinances, too, of a detested race, and being in some respects but ill adapted to the genius and temper of a republican government, a great number of them soon fell into desuetude†. The new laws promulgated immediately after the expulsion of the kings, related more to those constitutional modifications which were rendered necessary by so important a revolution, than to the civil rights of the citizen. In consequence of the dissensions of the patricians and plebeians, every *Senatusconsultum* proceeding from the deliberations of the Senate was negated by the *veto* of the Tribunes, while the Senate, in return, disowned the authority of the *Plebiscita*, and denied the right of the Tribunes to propose laws. There was thus a sort of legal interregnum at Rome; at least, there were no fixed rules to which all classes were equally subjected: and the great body

* According to some authorities it was a short while before, and according to others a short while after, the expulsion of Tarquin.

† “Exactis deinde regibus leges hæc exoleverunt; iterumque cepit populus Romanus incerto magis jure et consuetudine ali, quam per latam legem.”—POMPONIUS LÆTUS, *De Leg.* II. § 8.

of the people were too often the victims of the pride of the patricians and tyranny of the consular government. In this situation, C. Terentius Arsa brought forward the law known by the name of *Terentilla*, of which the object was the election by the people of ten persons, who should compose and arrange a body of laws for the administration of public affairs, as well as decision of the civil rights of individuals according to established rules. The Senate, who maintained that the dispensation of justice was solely vested in the supreme magistrates, contrived, for five years, to postpone execution of this salutary measure; but it was at length agreed, that, as a preparatory step, and before the creation of the Decemvirs, who were to form this code, three deputies should be sent to Greece, and the Greek towns of Italy, to select such enactments as they might consider best adapted to the manners and customs of the Roman people.

The delegates, who departed on this embassy towards the close of the year 300, were occupied two years in their important mission. From what cities of Greece, or Magna Græcia, they chiefly borrowed their laws, has been a topic of much discussion, and seems to be still involved in much uncertainty*; though Athens is most usually considered as having been the great fountain of their legislation.

On the return of the deputies to Rome, the office of Consul was suppressed, and ten magistrates, called Decemvirs, among whom these deputies were included, were immediately created. To them was confided the care of digesting the prodigious mass of laws which had been brought from Greece. This task they accomplished with the aid of Hermodorus, an exile of Ephesus, who then happened to be at Rome, and acted as their interpreter. But although the importation from Greece formed the chief part of the twelve tables, it cannot be supposed that the ancient laws of Rome were entirely superseded. Some of the *Leges Regiæ*, which had no reference to monarchical government, as the laws of Romulus, concerning the *Patria potestas*, those concerning parricides, the removal of landmarks, and insolvent debtors, had, by tacit consent, passed into consuetudinary law; and all those which were still in observance were incorporated in the Decemviral Code; in the same manner as the institutions of the heroic ages of Greece formed a part of the laws of Solon and Lycurgus.

Before a year had elapsed from the date of their creation, the Decemvirs had prepared ten books of laws; which, being

* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, c. 44.

engraved on wooden or ivory tables, were presented to the people, and received the sanction of the Senate, and ratification of the *Comitia Centuriata*. Two supplementary tables were soon afterwards added, in consequence of some omissions which were observed and pointed out to the Decemvirs. In all these tables the laws were briefly expressed. The first eight related to matters of private right, the ninth to those of public, and the tenth to those of religious concern. These ten tables established very equitable rules for all different ranks, without distinction; but in the two supplemental tables some invidious distinctions were introduced, and many exclusive privileges conferred on the patricians.

On the whole, the Decemvirs appear to have been very well versed in the science of legislation. Those who, like Cicero* and Tacitus, possessed the Twelve Tables complete, and who were the most competent judges of how far they were adapted to the circumstances and manners of the people, have highly commended the wisdom of these laws. Modern detractors have chiefly objected to the sanguinary punishments they inflicted, the principles of the law of retaliation which they recognized, and the barbarous privileges permitted to creditors on the persons of their debtors. The severer enactments, however, of the Twelve Tables, were evidently never put in force, or so soon became obsolete, that the Roman laws were at length esteemed remarkable for the mildness of their punishments—the penalties of scourging, or death, being scarcely in any case inflicted on a Roman citizen.

The tables on which the Decemviral Code had been inscribed, were destroyed by the Gauls at the sack of the city; but such pains were taken in recovering copies, or making them out from recollection, that the laws themselves were almost completely re-established.

It might reasonably have been expected that a system of jurisprudence, carefully extracted from the whole legislative wisdom of Italy and Greece, should have restored in the commonwealth that good order and security which had been overthrown by the uncertainty of the laws, and the disputes of the patricians and plebeians. But the event did not justify the well-founded expectation. The ambition and lawless passions of the chief Decemvir had rendered it necessary for him and his colleagues to abdicate their authority before they had settled with sufficient precision how their enactments were to be put in practice or enforced. It thus became essential to introduce certain *formulae* called *Legis Actiones*, in order

* *De Legibus*, Lib. II. c. 28. *De Oratore*, Lib. I. c. 42.

at the mode of procedure might not remain arbitrary and uncertain. These, consisting chiefly of certain symbolical gestures, adapted to a legal claim or defence, were prepared by Claudius Cœcus about the middle of the fifth century of Rome, but were intended to be kept private among the pontiffs and patrician Jurisconsults, that the people might not have the benefit of the law without their assistance. Cl. Flavius, however, a secretary of Claudius, having access to these formularies, transcribed and communicated them to the people about the middle of the fifth century of Rome. From this circumstance they were called the *Jus civile Flavianum*. This discovery was so disagreeable to the patricians, that they devised new legal forms, which they kept secret with still more care than the others. But in 553, Sextus Ælius Catus divulged them again, and in consequence, these last prescripts obtained the name of *Jus Ælium*, which may be regarded as the last part and completion of the Decemviral laws; and it continued to be employed as the form of process during the whole remaining period of the existence of the commonwealth.

As long as the republic survived, the Twelve Tables formed the foundation of the Roman law, though they were interpreted and enlarged by such new enactments as the circumstances of the state demanded*. Thus the *Lex Aquilia* and *Alinia* were mere modifications of different heads of the twelve tables. Most of the new laws were introduced in consequence of the increase of empire and luxury, and the conflicting interests of the various orders in the state. Laws, properly so called, were proposed by a superior magistrate, as the Consul, Dictator, or Prætor, with consent of the Senate; they were passed by the whole body of the people, patricians and plebeians, assembled in the *Comitia Centuriata*, and bore ever after the name of the proposer.

The *Plebiscita* were enacted by the plebeians in the *Comitia Tributa*, apart from the patricians, and independently of the sanction of the Senate, at the *rogation* of their own Tribunes, instead of one of the superior magistrates. The patricians generally resisted these decrees, as they were chiefly directed against the authority of the Senate, and the privileges of the higher orders of the state. But, by the *Lex Hortia*, the same weight and authority were given to them as to laws properly so termed, and thenceforth they differed only in name, and the manner in which they were enacted.

* "Decem tabularum leges," says Livy, "nunc quoque, in hoc immenso aliarum super aliis acervatarum legum cumulo, fons omnis publici privateque est juris."

A *Senatusconsultum* was an ordinance of the Senate on those points concerning which it possessed exclusive authority; but rather referred to matters of state, as the distribution of provinces, the application of public money, and the like, than to the ordinary administration of justice.

The patricians, being deprived by the Twelve Tables of the privilege of arbitrarily pronouncing decisions, as best suited their interests; and being frustrated in their miserable attempts to maintain an undue advantage in matters of form, by secreting the rules of procedure held in courts of justice, they had now reserved to them only the power of interpreting to others the scope and spirit of the laws. Till the age, at least, of Augustus, the civil law was completely unconnected and dissipated; and no systematic, accessible, or authoritative treatise on the subject, appeared during the existence of the republic*. The laws of the Twelve Tables were extremely concise and elliptical; and it seems highly probable that they were written in this style, not for the sake of perspicuity, but to leave all that required to be supplied or interpreted in the power of the Patricians†. The changes, too, in the customs and language of the Romans, rendered the style of the Twelve Tables less familiar to each succeeding generation; and the ambiguous passages were but imperfectly explained by the study of legal antiquarians. It was the custom, likewise, for each successive Prætor to publish an edict, announcing the manner in which justice was to be distributed by him—the rules which he proposed to follow in the decision of doubtful cases; and the degree of relief which his equity would afford from the precise rigour of ancient statutes. This annual alteration in forms, and sometimes even in the principles of law, introduced a confusion, which persons engrossed with other occupations could not unravel. The obscurity of old laws, and fluctuating jurisdiction of the Prætors, gave rise to that class of men called Jurisconsults, whose business it was to explain legal difficulties, and reconcile statutory contradictions. It was the relation of patron and client, which was coeval almost with the city itself, and was invested with a sacred, inviolable character, that gave weight to the *dicta* of those who, in some measure, came in place of the ancient patrons, and usually belonged to the patrician order.—“On the public days of market or assembly,” says Gibbon, “the masters of the art were seen walking in the Forum, ready to impart the needful advice to the meanest of their fellow-citizens, from

* Cicero, *De Oratore*, Lib. II. c. 33.

† Saint Prix, *Hist. du Droit Romain*, p. 23. Ed. Paris, 1621.

whose votes, on a future occasion, they might solicit a grateful return. As their years and honours increased, they seated themselves at home on a chair or throne, to expect with patient gravity the visits of their clients, who, at the dawn of day, from the town and country, began to thunder at their door. The duties of social life, and incidents of judicial proceedings, were the ordinary subject of these consultations; and the verbal or written opinions of the jurisconsults were framed according to the rules of prudence and law. The youths of their own order and family were permitted to listen; their children enjoyed the benefit of more private lessons; and the Mucian race was long renowned for the hereditary knowledge of the civil law*." Though the judges and prætors were not absolutely obliged, till the time of the emperors, to follow the recorded opinions of the Jurisconsults, they possessed during the existence of the republic a preponderating weight and authority. The province of legislation was thus gradually invaded by these expounders of ancient statutes, till at length their recorded opinions, the *Responsa Prudentum*, became so numerous, and of such authority, that they formed the greatest part of the system of Roman jurisprudence, whence they were styled by Cicero, in his oration for Cæcina, *Jus Civile*.

It is perfectly evident, however, that the civil law was neither much studied nor known by the *orators* of the Senate, and Forum. Cicero, in his treatise *De Oratore*, informs us, that Ser. Galba, the first speaker of his day, was ignorant of law, inexperienced in civil rights, and uncertain as to the institutions of his ancestors. In his *Brutus* he says nearly the same thing of Antony and Sulpicius, who were the two greatest orators of their age, and who, he declares, knew nothing of public, private, or civil law. Antony in particular, always expressed a contempt for the study of the civil law†. Accordingly, in the dialogue *De Oratore*, he is made to say, "I never studied the civil law, nor have I been sensible of any loss from my ignorance of it in those causes which I was capable of managing in our courts‡." In the same dialogue, Scævola says, "The present age is totally ignorant of the laws of the Twelve Tables, except you, Crassus, who, led by curiosity, rather than from its being any province annexed to eloquence, studied civil law under me." In his oration for Muræna, Cicero talks lightly of the study of the civil law, and treats his opponent with scorn on account of his knowledge of its words of

* *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, c. 44.

† Cicero, *De Orat.* Lib. I. c. 57.

‡ *Ibid.* Lib. I. c. 58.

style and forms of procedure*. With exception, then, of Crassus, and of Scævola, who was rather a jurisconsult than a speaker, the orators of the age of Cicero, as well as those who preceded it, were uninstructed in law, and considered it as no part of their duty to render themselves masters, either of the general principles of jurisprudence, or the municipal institutions of the state. Crassus, indeed, expresses his opinion, that it is impossible for an orator to do justice to his client without some knowledge of law, particularly in questions tried before the Centumviri, who had cognizance of points with regard to egress and regress in property, the interests of minors, and alterations in the course of rivers; and he mentions several cases, some of a criminal nature, which had lately occurred at Rome, where the question hinged entirely on the civil law, and required constant reference to precedents and authorities. Antony, however, explains how all this may be managed. A speaker, for example, ignorant of the mode of drawing up an agreement, and unacquainted with the forms of a contract, might defend the rights of a woman who has been contracted in marriage, because there were persons who brought everything to the orator or patron, ready prepared,—presenting him with a brief, or memorial, not only on matters of fact, but on the decrees of the Senate, the precedents and the opinions of the jurisconsults. It also appears that there were solicitors, or professors of civil law, whom the orators consulted on any point concerning which they wished to be instructed, and the knowledge of which might be necessary previous to their appearance in the Forum. In this situation, the harangue of the orator was more frequently an appeal to the equity, common sense, or feelings of the judge, than to the laws of his country. Now, where a pleader addresses himself to the equity of his judges, he has much more occasion, and also much more scope, to display his eloquence, than where he must draw his arguments from strict law, statutes, and precedents. In the former case, many circumstances must be taken into account; many

* It must be admitted, however, that Cicero, in other passages of his works, has given the study of civil law high encomiums, particularly in the following beautiful passage delivered in the person of Crassus: "Senectuti vero celebrandæ et orandæ quid honestius potest esse per fugium, quam juris interpretatio? Equidem mihi hoc subsidium jam inde ab adolescentiâ comparavi, non solum ad causarum usum forensem, sed etiam ad decus atque ornamentum senectutis; ut cum me vires (quod fere jam tempus adventat) deficere coepissent, ab solitudine domum meam vindicarem." (*De Oratore*, Lib. I. c. 45.) Schultingius, the celebrated civilian, in his dissertation *De Jurisprudentiâ Ciceronis*, tries to prove, from various passages in his orations and rhetorical writings, that Cicero was well versed in the most profound and nice questions of Roman jurisprudence, and that he was well skilled in international law, as Grotius has borrowed from him many of his principles and illustrations, in his treatise *De Jure Belli et Pacis*.

personal considerations regarded; and even favour and inclination, which it belongs to the orator to conciliate, by his art and eloquence, may be disguised under the appearance of equity. Accordingly, Cicero, while speaking in his own person, only says, that the science of law and civil rights should not be neglected; but he does not seem to consider it as essential to the orator of the Forum, while he enlarges on the necessity of elegance of language, the erudition of the scholar, a ready and popular wit, and a power of moving the passions*.

That these were the arts to which the Roman orators chiefly trusted for success in the causes of their clients, is apparent from the remains of their discourses, and from what is said of the mode of pleading in the rhetorical treatises of Cicero. "Pontius," says Antony, in the dialogue so often quoted, "had a son, who served in the war with the Cimbri, and whom he had destined to be his heir; but his father, believing a false report which was spread of his death, made a will in favour of another child. The soldier returned after the decease of his parent; and, had you been employed to defend his cause, you would not have discussed the legal doctrine as to the priority or validity of testaments; you would have raised his father from the grave, made him embrace his child, and recommend him, with many tears, to the protection of the Centumviri."

Antony, speaking of one of his own most celebrated orations, says, that his whole address consisted, 1st, in moving the passions; 2d, in recommending *himself*; and that it was thus, and not by convincing the understanding of the judges, that he baffled the impeachment against his clients†. Valerius Maximus has supplied, in his eighth book, many examples of unexpected and unmerited acquittals, as well as condemnations, from bursts of compassion and theatrical incidents. The wonderful influence, too, of a ready and popular wit in the management of causes, is apparent from the instances given in the second book *De Oratore* of the effects it had produced in the Forum. The jests which are there recorded, though not very excellent, may be regarded as the finest flowers of wit of the Roman bar. Sometimes they were directed against the opposite party, his patron, or witnesses; and, if sufficiently impudent, seldom failed of effect.

That the principles and precepts of the civil law were so little studied by the Roman orators, and hardly ever alluded to in their harangues, while, on the other hand, the arts of persuasion, and wit, and excitement of the passions, were all-pow-

* *De Oratore*, Lib. I.

† *Ibid.* Lib. II. c. 49.

erful, and were the great engines of legal discussion, must be attributed to the constitution of the courts of law, and the nature of the judicial procedure, which, though very imperfect for the administration of justice, were well adapted to promote and exercise the highest powers of eloquence. It was the forms of procedure—the description of the courts before which questions were tried—and the nature of these questions themselves*—that gave to Roman oratory such dazzling splendour, and surrounded it with a glory, which can never shine on the efforts of rhetoric in a better-regulated community, and under a more sober dispensation of justice.

The great exhibitions of eloquence were, 1st, In the civil and criminal causes tried before the Prætor, or judges appointed under his eye. 2d, The discussions on laws proposed in the assemblies of the people. 3d, The deliberations of the Senate.

The Prætor sat in the Forum, the name given to the great square situated between Mount Palatine and the Capitol, and there administered justice. Sometimes he heard causes in the Basilicæ, or halls which were built around the Forum; but at other times the court of the Prætor was held in the area of the Forum, on which a tribunal was hastily erected, and a certain space for the patron, client, and witnesses, was railed off, and protected from the encroachment of surrounding spectators. This space was slightly covered above for the occasion with canvass, but being exposed to the air on all sides, the court was an open one, in the strictest sense of the term†.

From the time of the first Punic war there were two Prætors, to whom the cognizance of *civil* suits was committed,—the *Prætor urbanus* and *Prætor peregrinus*. The former tried the causes of citizens according to the Roman laws; the latter judged the cases of allies and strangers by the principles of natural equity; but as judicial business multiplied, the number of Prætors was increased to six. The Prætor was the chief judge in all questions that did not fall under the immediate cognizance of the assemblies of the people or the Senate. Every action, therefore, came, in the first instance, before the Prætor; but he decided only in civil suits of importance: and if the cause was not of sufficient magnitude for the immediate investigation of his tribunal, or hinged entirely on matters of fact, he appointed one or more persons to judge of it. These

* “An non pudeat, certam creditam pecuniam periculis postulare, aut circa stillidiam affici?”—Quint. *Instit. Orat. Lib. VIII. c. 3.*

† Polletus, *Historia Fori Romani, op. Supplement. ad Grævii et Gronov. antiquitat. T. I. p. 351.*

were chosen from a list of *judices selecti*, which was made up from the three orders of senators, knights, and people. If but one person was appointed, he was properly called a *judex*, or *arbiter*. The *judex* determined only such cases as were easy, or of small importance; and he was bound to proceed according to an express law, or a certain form prescribed to him by the Prætor. The *arbiter* decided in questions of equity which were not sufficiently defined by law, and his powers were not so restricted by the Prætor as those of the ordinary *judex*. When more persons than one were nominated by the Prætor, they were termed *Recuperatores*, and they settled points of law or equity requiring much deliberation. Certain cases, particularly those relating to testaments or successions, were usually remitted by the Prætor to the *Centumviri*, who were 105 persons, chosen equally from the thirty-five tribes. The Prætor, before sending a case to any of those, whom I may call by the general name of judges, though, in fact, they more nearly resembled our jury, made up a *formula*, as it was called, or issue on which they were to decide; as, for example, "If it be proved that the field is in possession of Servilius, give sentence against Catulus, unless he produce a testament, from which it shall appear to belong to him."

It was in presence of these judges that the patrons and orators, surrounded by a crowd of friends and retainers, pleaded the causes of their clients. They commenced with a brief exposition of the nature of the points in dispute. Witnesses were afterwards examined, and the arguments on the case were enforced in a formal harangue. A decision was then given, according to the opinion of a majority of the judges. The *Centumviri* continued to act as judges for a whole year; but the other *judices* only sat till the particular cause was determined for which they had been appointed. They remained, however, on the numerous list of the *judices selecti*, and were liable to be again summoned till the end of the year, when a new set was chosen for the judicial business of the ensuing season. The Prætor had the power of reversing the decisions of the judges, if it appeared that any fraud or gross error had been committed. If neither was alleged, he charged himself with the duty of seeing the sentence which the judges had pronounced carried into execution. Along with his judicial and ministerial functions, the Prætor possessed a sort of legislative power, by which he supplied the deficiency of laws that were found inadequate for many civil emergencies. Accordingly, each new Prætor, as we have already seen, when he entered on his office, issued an edict, announcing the supplementary code which he intended to follow. Every Prætor had a to-

tally different edict; and, what was worse, none thought of adhering to the rules which he had himself traced; till at length, in the year 686, the Cornelian law, which met with much opposition, prohibited the Prætor from departing in practice from those principles, or regulations, he had laid down in his edict.

Capital trials, that is, all those which regarded the life or liberty of a Roman citizen, had been held in the *Comitia Centuriata*, after the institution of these assemblies by Servius Tullius; but the authority of the people had been occasionally delegated to Inquisitors, (*Quæstiores*.) in points previously fixed by law. For some time, all criminal matters of consequence were determined in this manner: But from the multiplicity of trials, which increased with the extent and vices of the republic, other means of despatching them were necessarily resorted to. The Prætors, originally, judged only in civil suits; but in the time of Cicero, and indeed from the beginning of the seventh century, four of the six Prætors were nominated to preside at criminal trials—one taking cognizance of questions of extortion—a second of peculation—a third of illegal canvass—and the last, of offences against the state, as the *Crimen majestatis*, or treason. To these, Sylla, in the middle of the seventh century, added four more, who inquired into acts of public or private violence. In trials of importance, the Prætor was assisted by the counsel of select judges or jurymen, who originally were all chosen from the Senate, and afterwards from the order of Knights; but in Cicero's time, in consequence of a law of Cotta, they were taken from the Senators, Knights, and Tribunes of the treasury. The number of these assessors, who were appointed for the year, and nominated by the Prætor, varied from 300 to 600; and from them a smaller number was chosen by lot for each individual case: Any Roman citizen might accuse another before the Prætor; and not unfrequently the young patricians undertook the prosecution of an obnoxious magistrate, merely to recommend themselves to the notice or favour of their countrymen. In such cases there was often a competition between two persons for obtaining the management of the impeachment, and the preference was determined by a previous trial, called *Divinatio*. This preliminary point being settled, and the day of the principal trial fixed, the accuser, in his first speech, explained the nature of the case,—fortifying his statements as he proceeded by proofs, which consisted in the voluntary testimony of free citizens, the declarations of slaves elicited by torture, and written documents. Cicero made little account of the evidence of slaves; but the art of extracting truth from a free

witness—of exalting or depreciating his character—and of placing his deposition in a favourable light, was considered among the most important qualifications of an orator. When the evidence was concluded, the prosecutor enforced the proofs by a set speech, after which the accused entered on his defence.

But though the cognizance of crimes was in ordinary cases delegated to the Prætors, still the Comitia reserved the power of judging; and they actually did judge in causes, in which the people, or tribunes, who dictated to them, took an interest, and these were chiefly impeachments of public magistrates, for bribery or peculation. It was not understood, in any case, whether tried before the whole people or the Prætor, that either party was to be very scrupulous in the observance of truth. The judges, too, were sometimes overawed by an array of troops, and by menaces. Canvassing for acquittal and condemnation, were alike avowed, and bribery, at least for the former purpose, was currently resorted to. Thus the very crimes of the wretch who had plundered the province intrusted to his care, afforded him the most obvious means of absolution; and, to the wealthy peculator, nothing could be more easy than an escape from justice, except the opportunity of accusing the innocent and unprotected. "Foreign nations," says Cicero, "will soon solicit the repeal of the law, which prohibits the extortions of provincial magistrates; for they will argue, that were all prosecutions on this law abolished, their governors would take no more than what satisfied their own rapacity, whereas now they exact over and above this, as much as will be sufficient to gratify their patrons, the *Prætor and the judges*; and that though they can furnish enough to glut the avarice of one man, they are utterly unable to pay for his impunity in guilt*."

The organization of the judicial tribunals was wretched, and their practice scandalous. The Senate, Prætors, and Comitia, all partook of the legislative and judicial power, and had a sort of reciprocal right of opposition and reversal, which they exercised to gratify their avarice or prejudices, and not with any view to the ends of justice. But however injurious this system might be to those who had claims to urge, or rights to defend, it afforded the most ample field for the excursions of eloquence. The Prætors, though the supreme judges, were not men bred to the law—advanced in years—familiarized with precedents—secure of independence—and fixed in their stations for life. They were young men of lit-

* In *Verrem*, Act. I. c. 14.

the experience, who held the office for a season, and proceeded through it, to what were considered as the most important situations of the republic. Though their procedure was strict in some trivial points of preliminary form, devised by the ancient Jurisconsults, they enjoyed, in more essential matters, a perilous latitude. On the dangerous pretext of equity, they eluded the law by various subtilities or fictions; and thus, without being endued with legislative authority, they abrogated ancient enactments according to caprice. It was worse when, in civil cases, the powers of the Prætor were intrusted to the judges; or when, in criminal trials, the jurisdiction was assumed by the whole people. The inexperience, ignorance, and popular prejudices of those who were to decide them, rendered litigations extremely uncertain, and dependent, not on any fixed law or principle, but on the opinions or passions of tumultuary judges, which were to be influenced and moved by the arts of oratory. This furnished ample scope for displaying all that interesting and various eloquence, with which the pleadings of the ancient orators abounded. The means to be employed for success, were conciliating favour, rousing attention, removing or fomenting prejudice, but, above all, exciting compassion. Hence we find, that in the defence of a criminal, while a law or precedent was seldom mentioned, every thing was introduced which could serve to gain the favour of the judges, or move their pity. The accused, as soon as the day of trial was fixed, assumed an apparently neglected garb; and although allowed, whatever was the crime, to go at large till sentence was pronounced, he usually attended in court surrounded by his friends, and sometimes accompanied by his children, in order to give a more piteous effect to the lamentations and exclamations of his counsel, when he came to that part of the oration, in which the fallen and helpless state of his client was to be suitably bewailed. Piso, justly accused of oppression towards the allies, having prostrated himself on the earth in order to kiss the feet of his judges, and having risen with his face defiled with mud, obtained an immediate acquittal. Even where the cause was good, it was necessary to address the passions, and to rely on the judge's feelings of compassion, rather than on his perceptions of right. Rutilius prohibited all exclamations and entreaties to be used in his defence: He even forbade the accustomed and expected excitement of invocations, and stamping with the feet; and "he was condemned," says Cicero, "though the most virtuous of the Romans, because his counsel was compelled to plead for him as he would have done in the republic of Plato." It thus ap-

pears, that it was dangerous to trust to innocence alone, and the judges were the capricious arbiters of the fate of their fellow-citizens, and not (as their situation so urgently required) the inflexible interpreters of the laws of their exalted country.

But if the manner of treating causes was favourable to the exertions of eloquence, much also must be allowed for the nature of the questions themselves, especially those of a criminal description, tried before the Prætor or people. One can scarcely figure more glorious opportunities for the display of oratory, than were afforded by those complaints of the oppressed and plundered provinces against their rapacious governors. From the extensive ramifications of the Roman power, there continually arose numerous cases of a description that can rarely occur in other countries, and which are unexampled in the history of Britain, except in a memorable impeachment, which not merely displayed, but created such eloquence as can be called forth only by splendid topics, without which rhetorical indignation would seem extravagant, and attempted pathos ridiculous.

The spot, too, on which the courts of justice assembled, was calculated to inspire and heighten eloquence. The Roman Forum presented one of the most splendid spectacles that eye could behold, or fancy conceive. This space formed an oblong square between the Palatine and Capitoline hills, composed of a vast assemblage of sumptuous though irregular edifices. On the side next the Palatine hill stood the ancient Senate-house, and Comitium, and Temple of Romulus the Founder. On the opposite quarter, it was bounded by the Capitol, with its ascending range of porticos, and the temple of the tutelar deity on the summit. The other sides of the square were adorned with basilicæ, and piazzas terminated by triumphal arches; and were bordered with statues, erected to the memory of the ancient heroes or preservers of their country*. Having been long the theatre of the factions, the politics, the intrigues, the crimes, and the revolutions of the capital, every spot of its surface was consecrated to the recollection of some great incident in the domestic history of the Romans; while their triumphs over foreign enemies were vividly called to remembrance by the Rostrum itself, which stood in the centre of the vacant area, and by other trophies gained from vanquished nations:—

“Et cristæ caput, et portarum ingentia claustra,
Spiculaque, clipei que, erepta que rostra carinis†.”

* Nardini, *Roma Antica*, Lib. V. c. 2, &c.

† Virg. *Æneid*. Lib. VII.

A vast variety of shops, stored with a profusion of the most costly merchandize, likewise surrounded this heart and centre of the world, so that it was the mart for all important commercial transactions. Being thus the emporium of law, politics, and trade, it became the resort of men of business, as well as of those loiterers whom Horace calls *Forenses*. Each Roman citizen, regarding himself as a member of the same vast and illustrious family, scrutinized with jealous watchfulness the conduct of his rulers, and looked with anxious solicitude to the issue of every important cause. In all trials of oppression or extortion, the Roman multitude took a particular interest,—repairing in such numbers to the Forum, that even its spacious square was hardly sufficient to contain those who were attracted to it by curiosity; and who, in the course of the trial, were in the habit of expressing their feelings by shouts and acclamations, so that the orator was ever surrounded by a crowded and tumultuary audience. This numerous assembly, too, while it inspired the orator with confidence and animation, after he had commenced his harangue, created in prospect that anxiety which led to the most careful preparation previous to his appearance in public. The apprehension and even trepidation felt by the greatest speakers at Rome on the approach of the day fixed for the hearing of momentous causes, is evident from many passages of the rhetorical works of Cicero. The Roman orator thus addressed his judges with all the advantages derived both from the earnest study of the closet, and the exhilaration imparted to him by unrestrained and promiscuous applause.

2. Next to the courts of justice, the great theatre for the display of eloquence, was the Comitia, or assemblies of the people, met to deliberate on the proposal of passing a new law, or abrogating an old one. A law was seldom offered for consideration but some orator was found to dissuade its adoption; and as in the courts of justice the passions of the judges were addressed, so the favourers or opposers of a law did not confine themselves to the expediency of the measure, but availed themselves of the prejudices of the people, alternately confirming their errors, indulging their caprices, gratifying their predilections, exciting their jealousies, and fomenting their dislikes. Here, more than anywhere, the many were to be courted by the few—here, more than anywhere, was created that excitement which is most favourable to the influence of eloquence, and forms indeed the element in which alone it breathes with freedom.

3. Finally, the deliberations of the Senate, which was the great council of the state, afforded, at least to its members,

the noblest opportunities for the exertions of eloquence. This august and numerous body consisted of individuals who had reached a certain age, and who were possessed of a certain extent of property, who were supposed to be of unblemished reputation, and most of whom had passed through the annual magistracies of the state. They were consulted upon almost everything that regarded the administration or safety of the commonwealth. The power of making war and peace, though it ultimately lay with the people assembled in the *Comitia Centuriata*, was generally left by them entirely to the Senate, who passed a decree of peace or war previous to the suffrages of the *Comitia*. The Senate, too, had always reserved to itself the supreme direction and superintendance of the religion of the country, and the distribution of the public revenue—the levying or disbanding troops, and fixing the service on which they should be employed—the nomination of governors for the provinces—the rewards assigned to successful generals for their victories, and the guardianship of the state in times of civil dissension. These were the great subjects of debate in the Senate, and they were discussed on certain fixed days of the year, when its members assembled of course, or when they were summoned together for any emergency. They invariably met in a temple, or other consecrated place, in order to give solemnity to their proceedings, as being conducted under the immediate eye of Heaven. The Consul, who presided, opened the business of the day, by a brief exposition of the question which was to be considered by the assembly. He then asked the opinions of the members in the order of rank and seniority. Freedom of debate was exercised in its greatest latitude; for, though no senator was permitted to deliver his sentiments till it came to his turn, he had then a right to speak as long as he thought proper, without being in the smallest degree confined to the point in question. Sometimes, indeed, the Conscript Fathers consulted on the state of the commonwealth in general; but even when summoned to deliberate on a particular subject, they seem to have enjoyed the privilege of talking about anything else which happened to be uppermost in their minds. Thus we find that Cicero took the opportunity of delivering his seventh Philippic when the Senate was consulted concerning the Appian Way, the coinage, and Luperici—subjects which had no relation to Antony, against whom he inveighed from one end of his oration to the other, without taking the least notice of the only points which were referred to the consideration of the senators*. The resolution of the major-

* "*Parvis de rebus,*" says he, "*sed fortasse necessarius consulimur, Patres con-*

ity was expressed in the shape of a decree, which, though not properly a law, was entitled to the same reverence on the point to which it related; and, except in matters where the interests of the state required concealment, all pains were taken to give the utmost publicity to the whole proceedings of the Senate.

The number of the Senate varied, but in the time of Cicero, it was nearly the same as the British House of Commons; but it required a larger number to make a quorum. Sometimes there were between 400 and 500 members present; but 200, at least during certain seasons of the year, formed what was accounted a full house. This gave to senatorial eloquence something of the spirit and animation created by the presence of a popular assembly, while at the same time the deliberative majesty of the proceedings required a weight of argument and dignity of demeanour, unlooked for in the Comitia, or Forum. Accordingly, the levity, ingenuity, and wit, which were there so often crowned with success and applause, were considered as misplaced in the Senate, where the consular, or prætorian orator, had to prevail by depth of reasoning, purity of expression, and an apparent zeal for the public good.

It was the authority of the Senate, with the calm and imposing aspect of its deliberations, that gave to Latin oratory a somewhat different character from the eloquence of Greece, to which, in consequence of the Roman spirit of imitation, it bore, in many respects, so close a resemblance. The power of the Areopagus, which was originally the most dignified assembly at Athens, had been retrenched amid the democratic innovations of Pericles. From that period, everything, even the most important affairs of state, depended entirely, in the pure democracy of Athens, on the opinion, or rather the momentary caprice of an inconstant people, who were fond of pleasure and repose, who were easily swayed by novelty, and were confident in their power. As their precipitate decisions thus often hung on an instant of enthusiasm, the orator required to dart into their bosoms those electric sparks of eloquence which inflamed their passions, and left no corner of the mind fitted for cool consideration. It was the business of the speaker to allow them no time to recover from the shock, for its force would have been spent had they been permitted to occupy themselves with the beauties of style and diction. "Applaud not the orator," says Demos-

scripti. De Appiâ viâ et de monetâ Consul—De Lupercis tribunus plebis refert. Quorum rerum etsi facilis explicatio videtur, tamen animus aberrat a sententiâ, suspensus curis majoribus."—C. 1.

thenes, at the end of one of his Philippics, "but do what I have recommended. I cannot save you by my words, you must save yourselves by your actions." When the people were persuaded, every thing was accomplished, and their decision was embodied in a sort of decree by the orator. The people of Rome, on the other hand, were more reflective and moderate, and less vain than the Athenians; nor was the whole authority of the state vested in them. There was, on the contrary, an accumulation of powers, and a complication of different interests to be managed. Theoretically, indeed, the sovereignty was in the people, but the practical government was intrusted to the Senate. As we see from Cicero's third oration, *De Lege Agraria*, the same affairs were often treated at the same time in the Senate and on the Rostrum. Hence, in the judicial and legislative proceedings, in which, as we have seen, the feelings of the judges and prejudices of the vulgar were so frequently appealed to, some portion of the senatorial spirit pervaded and controlled the popular assemblies, restrained the impetuosity of decision, and gave to those orators of the Forum, or Comitia, who had just spoken, or were to speak next day in the Senate, a more grave and temperate tone, than if their tongues had never been employed but for the purpose of impelling a headlong multitude.

But if the Greeks were a more impetuous and inconstant, they were also a more intellectual people than the Romans. Literature and refinement were more advanced in the age of Pericles than of Pompey. Now, in oratory, a popular audience must be moved by what corresponds to the feelings and taste of the age. With such an intelligent race as the Greeks, the orator was obliged to employ the most accurate reasoning, and most methodical arrangement of his arguments. The flowers of rhetoric, unless they grew directly from the stem of his discourse, were little admired. The Romans, on the other hand, required the excitation of fancy, of comparisons, and metaphors, and rhetorical decoration. Hence, the Roman orator was more anxious to seduce the imagination than convince the understanding; his discourse was adorned with frequent digressions into the field of morals and philosophy, and he was less studious of precision than of ornament.

On the whole, the circumstances in the Roman constitution and judicial procedure, appear to have wonderfully conspired to render

CICERO

an accomplished orator. He was born and educated at a period when he must have formed the most exalted idea of his country. She had reached the height of power, and had not yet sunk into submission or servility. The subjects to be discussed, and characters to be canvassed, were thus of the most imposing magnitude, and could still be treated with freedom and independence. The education, too, which Cicero had received, was highly favourable to his improvement. He had the first philosophers of the age for his teachers, and he studied the civil law under Scævola, the most learned jurisconsult who had hitherto appeared in Rome. When he came to attend the Forum, he enjoyed the advantage of daily hearing Hortensius, unquestionably the most eloquent speaker who had yet shone in the Forum or Senate. The harangues of this great pleader formed his taste, and raised his emulation, and, till near the conclusion of his oratorical career, acted as an incentive to exertions, which might have abated, had he been left without a competitor in the Forum. The blaze of Hortensius's rhetoric would communicate to his rival a brighter flame of eloquence than if he had been called on to refute a cold and inanimate adversary. Still, however, the great secret of his distinguished oratorical eminence was, that notwithstanding his vanity, he never fell into the apathy with regard to farther improvement, by which self-complacency is so often attended. On the contrary, Cicero, after he had delivered two celebrated orations, which filled the Forum with his renown, so far from resting satisfied with the acclamations of the capital, abandoned, for a time, the brilliant career on which he had entered, and travelled, during two years, through the cities of Greece, in quest of philosophical improvement and rhetorical instruction.

With powers of speaking beyond what had yet been known in his own country, and perhaps not inferior to those which had ever adorned any other, he possessed, in a degree superior to all orators, of whatever age or nation, a general and discursive acquaintance with philosophy and literature, together with an admirable facility of communicating the fruits of his labours, in a manner the most copious, perspicuous, and attractive. To this extensive knowledge, by which his mind was enriched and supplied with endless topics of illustration—to the lofty ideas of eloquence, which perpetually revolved in his thoughts—to that image which ever haunted his breast, of

such infinite and superhuman perfection in oratory, that even the periods of Demosthenes did not fill up the measure of his conceptions*, we are chiefly indebted for those emanations of genius, which have given, as it were, an immortal tongue to the now desolate Forum and ruined Senate of Rome.

*The first oration which Cicero pronounced, at least of those which are extant, was delivered in presence of four judges appointed by the Prætor, and with Hortensius for his opponent. It was in the case of Quintius, which was pleaded in the year 672, when Cicero was 26 years of age, at which time he came to the bar much later than was usual, after having studied civil law under Mucius Scævola, and having further qualified himself for the exercise of his profession by the study of polite literature under the poet Archias, as also of philosophy under the principal teachers of each sect who had resorted to Rome. This case was undertaken by Cicero, at the request of the celebrated comedian Roscius, the brother-in-law of Quintius; but it was not of a nature well adapted to call forth or display any of the higher powers of eloquence. It was a pure question of civil right, and, in a great measure, a matter of form; the dispute being whether his client had forfeited his recognisances, and whether his opponent Nævius had got legal possession of his effects by an edict which the Prætor had pronounced, in consequence of the supposed forfeiture. But even here, where the point was more one of dry legal discussion than in any other oration of Cicero, we meet with much invective, calculated to excite the indignation of the judges against the adverse party, and many pathetic supplications, interspersed with high-wrought pictures of the distresses of his client, in order to raise their sympathy in his favour.

Pro Sext. Roscio. In the year following that in which he pleaded the case of Quintius, Cicero undertook the defence of Roscius of Ameria, which was the first public or criminal trial in which he spoke. The father of Roscius had two mortal enemies, of his own name and district. During the proscriptions of Sylla, he was assassinated one evening at Rome, while returning home from supper; and, on pretext that he was in the list proscribed, his estate was purchased for a mere nominal price by Chrysogonus, a favourite slave, to whom Sylla had given freedom, and whom he had permitted to buy the property of Roscius as a forfeiture. Part of the valuable lands thus acquired, were made over by Chrysogonus to the Roscii. These new proprietors, in order to secure themselves in the possession, hired Erucius, an informer and prosecutor

* *Oration*, c. 39.

by profession, to charge the son with the murder of his father, and they, at the same time, suborned witnesses, in order to convict him of the parricide. From dread of the power of Sylla, the accused had difficulty in prevailing on any patron to undertake his cause; but Cicero eagerly embraced this opportunity to give a public testimony of his detestation of oppression and tyranny. He exculpates his client, by enlarging on the improbability of the accusation, whether with respect to the enormity of the crime charged, or the blameless character and innocent life of young Roscius. He shows, too, that his enemies had completely failed in proving that he laboured under the displeasure of his father, or had been disinherited by him; and, in particular, that his constant residence in the country was no evidence of this displeasure—a topic which leads him to indulge in a beautiful commendation of a rural life, and the ancient rustic simplicity of the Romans. But while he thus vindicates the innocence of Roscius, the orator has so managed his pleading, that it appears rather an artful accusation of the two Roscii, than a defence of his own client. He tries to fix on them the guilt of the murder, by showing that they, and not the son, had reaped all the advantages of the death of old Roscius, and that, availing themselves of the strict law, which forbade slaves to be examined in evidence against their masters, they would not allow those who were with Roscius at the time of his assassination, but had subsequently fallen into their own possession, to be put to the torture. The whole case seems to have been pleaded with much animation and spirit, but the oration was rather too much in that florid Asiatic taste, which Cicero at this time had probably adopted from imitation of Hortensius, who was considered as the most perfect model of eloquence in the Forum; and hence the celebrated passage on the punishment of parricide, (which consisted in throwing the criminal, tied up in a sack, into a river,) was condemned by the severer taste of his more advanced years. “Its intention,” he declares, “was to strike the parricide at once out of the system of nature, by depriving him of air, light, water, and earth, so that he who had destroyed the author of his existence might be excluded from those elements whence all things derived their being. He was not thrown to wild beasts, lest their ferocity should be augmented by the contagion of such guilt—he was not committed naked to the stream, lest he should contaminate that sea which washed away all other pollutions. Everything in nature, however common, was accounted too good for him to share in; for what is so common as air to the living, earth to the dead, the sea to those who float, the shore to those who are

cast up. But the parricide lives so as not to breathe the air of heaven, dies so that the earth cannot receive his bones, is tossed by the waves so as not to be washed by them, so cast on the shore as to find no rest on its rocks." This declamation was received with shouts of applause by the audience; yet Cicero, referring to it in subsequent works, calls it the exuberance of a youthful fancy, which wanted the control of his sounder judgment, and, like all the compositions of young men, was not applauded so much on its own account, as for the promise it gave of more improved and ripened talents*. This pleading is also replete with severe and sarcastic declamation on the audacity of the Roscii, as well as the overgrown power and luxury of Chrysogonus; the orator has even hazarded an insinuation against Sylla himself, which, however, he was careful to palliate, by remarking, that through the multiplicity of affairs, he was obliged to connive at many things which his favourites did against his inclination.

Cicero's courage in defending and obtaining the acquittal of Roscius, under the circumstances in which the case was undertaken, was applauded by the whole city. By this public opposition to the avarice of an agent of Sylla, who was then in the plenitude of his power, and by the energy with which he resisted an oppressive proceeding, he fixed his character for a fearless and zealous patron of the injured, as much as for an accomplished orator. The defence of Roscius, which acquired him so much reputation in his youth, was remembered by him with such delight in his old age, that he recommends to his son, as the surest path to true honour, to defend those who are unjustly oppressed, as he himself had done in many causes, but particularly in that of Roscius of Ameria, whom he had protected against Sylla himself, in the height of his authority†.

Immediately after the decision of this cause, Cicero, partly on account of his health, and partly for improvement, travelled into Greece and Asia, where he spent two years in the assiduous study of philosophy and eloquence, under the ablest teachers of Athens and Asia Minor. Nor was his style alone formed and improved by imitation of the Greek rhetoricians: his pronunciation also was corrected, by practising under Greek masters, from whom he learned the art of commanding his voice, and of giving it greater compass and variety than it had hitherto attained‡. The first cause which he pleaded after his return to Rome, was that of Roscius, the celebrated

* *Orator*, c. 30. *spe et expectatione laudati*.

† *De Officiis*, Lib. II. c. 14.

‡ *Brutus*, c. 91.

comedian, in a dispute, which involved a mere matter of civil right, and was of no peculiar interest or importance. All the orations which he delivered during the five following years, are lost, of which number were those for Marcus Tullius, and L. Varenus, mentioned by Priscian as extant in his time. At the end of that period, however, and when Cicero was now in the thirty-seventh year of his age, a glorious opportunity was afforded for the display of his eloquence, in the prosecution instituted against Verres, the Prætor of Sicily, a criminal infinitely more hateful than Catiline or Clodius, and to whom the Roman *republic*, at least, never produced an equal in turpitude and crime. He was now accused by the Sicilians of many flagrant acts of injustice, rapine, and cruelty, committed by him during his triennial government of their island, which he had done more to ruin than all the arbitrary acts of their native tyrants, or the devastating wars between the Carthaginians and Romans.

In the advanced ages of the republic, extortion and violence almost universally prevailed among those magistrates who were exalted abroad to the temptations of regal power, and whose predecessors, by their moderation, had called forth in earlier times the applause of the world. Exhausted in fortune by excess of luxury, they now entered on their governments only to enrich themselves with the spoils of the provinces intrusted to their administration, and to plunder the inhabitants by every species of exaction. The first laws against extortion were promulgated in the beginning of the seventh century. But they afforded little relief to the oppressed nations, who in vain sought redress at Rome; for the decisions there depending on judges generally implicated in similar crimes, were more calculated to afford impunity to the guilty, than redress to the aggrieved. This undue influence received additional weight in the case of Verres, from the high quality and connections of the culprit.

Such were the difficulties with which Cicero had to struggle, in entering on the accusation of this great public delinquent. This arduous task he was earnestly solicited to undertake, by a petition from all the towns of Sicily, except Syracuse and Messina, both which cities had been occasionally allowed by the plunderer to share the spoils of the province. Having accepted this trust, so important in his eyes to the honour of the republic, neither the far distant evidence, nor irritating delays of all those guards of guilt with which Verres was environed, could deter or slacken his exertions. The first device on the part of the criminal, or rather of his counsel, Hortensius, to defeat the ends of justice, was an

attempt to wrest the conduct of the trial from the hands of Cicero, by placing it in those of Cæcilius*, who was a creature of Verres, and who now claimed a preference to Cicero, on the ground of personal injuries received from the accused, and a particular knowledge of the crimes of his pretended enemy. The judicial claims of these competitors had therefore to be first decided in that kind of process called *Divinatio*, in which Cicero delivered his oration, entitled *Contra Cæcilium*, and shewed, with much power of argument and sarcasm, that he himself was in every way best fitted to act as the impeacher of Verres.

Having succeeded in convincing the judges that Cæcilius only wished to get the cause into his own hands, in order to betray it, Cicero was appointed to conduct the prosecution, and was allowed 110 days to make a voyage to Sicily, in order to collect information for supporting his charge. He finished his progress through the island in less than half the time which had been granted him. On his return he found that a plan had been laid by the friends of Verres, to procrastinate the trial, at least till the following season, when they expected to have magistrates and judges who would prove favourable to his interests. In this design they so far succeeded, that time was not left to go through the cause according to the ordinary forms and practice of oratorical discussion in the course of the year: Cicero, therefore, resolved to lose no time by enforcing or aggravating the several articles of charge, but to produce at once all his documents and witnesses, leaving the rhetorical part of the performance till the whole evidence was concluded. The first oration, therefore, against Verres, which is extremely short, was merely intended to explain the motives which had induced him to adopt this unusual mode of procedure. He accordingly exposes the devices by which the culprit and his cabal were attempting to pervert the course of justice, and unfolds the eternal disgrace that would attach to the Roman law, should their stratagems prove successful. This oration was followed by the deposition of the witnesses, and recital of the documents, which so clearly established the guilt of Verres, that, driven to despair, he submitted, without awaiting his sentence, to a voluntary exile†. It therefore appears, that of the six orations against Verres, only one was pronounced. The other five, forming the series of harangues

* Cæcilius was a Jew, who had been domiciled in Sicily; whence Cicero, playing on the name of Verres, asks, "Quid Judæo cum Verre?" (a boar.)

† He ultimately, however, met with a well-merited and appropriate fate. Having refused to give up his Corinthian vases to Marc Antony, he was proscribed for that sake, and put to death by the rapacious Triumvir.

which he intended to deliver after the proof had been completed, were subsequently published in the same shape as if the delinquent had actually stood his trial, and was to have made a regular defence.

The first of these orations, which to us appears rather foreign to the charge, but was meant to render the proper part of the accusation more probable, exposes the excesses and malversations committed by Verres in early life, before his appointment to the Prætorship of Sicily—his embezzlement of public money while Quæstor of Gaul—his extortions under Dolabella in Asia, and, finally, his unjust, corrupt, and partial decisions while in the office of *Prætor Urbanus* at Rome, which, forming a principal part of the oration, the whole has been entitled *De Pratura Urbana*. In the following harangue, entitled *De Jurisdictione Siciliensi*, the orator commences with an elegant eulogy on the dignity, antiquity, and usefulness of the province, which was not here a mere idle or rhetorical embellishment, but was most appropriately introduced, as nothing could be better calculated to excite indignation against the spoiler of Sicily, than the picture he draws of its beauty; after which, he proceeds to give innumerable instances of the flagrant sale of justice, offices, and honours, and, among the last, even of the priesthood of Jupiter. The next oration is occupied with the malversations of Verres concerning grain, and the new ordinances, by which he had contrived to put the whole corps of the island at the disposal of his officers. In this harangue the dry statements of the prices of corn are rather fatiguing; but the following oration, *De Signis*, is one of the most interesting of his productions, particularly as illustrating the history of ancient art. For nearly six centuries Rome had been filled only with the spoils of barbarous nations, and presented merely the martial spectacle of a warlike and conquering people. Subsequently, however, to the campaigns in *Magna Græcia*, Sicily, and Greece, the Roman commanders displayed at their triumphs costly ornaments of gold, pictures, statues, and vases, instead of flocks driven from the Sabines or Volsci, the broken arms of the Samnites, and empty chariots of the Gauls. The statues and paintings which Marcellus transported from Syracuse to Rome, first excited that cupidity which led the Roman provincial magistrates to pillage, without scruple or distinction, the houses of private individuals, and temples of the gods*. Marcellus and Mummius, however, despoiled only hostile and conquered countries. They had made over their

* Livy, Lib. XXV. c. 40.

plunder to the public, and, after it was conveyed to Rome, devoted it to the embellishment of the capital; but subsequent governors of provinces having acquired a taste for works of art, began to appropriate to themselves those masterpieces of Greece, which they had formerly neither known nor esteemed. Some contrived plausible pretexts for borrowing valuable works of art from cities and private persons, without any intention of restoring them; while others, less cautious, or more shameless, seized whatever pleased them, whether public or private property, without excuse or remuneration. But though this passion was common to most provincial governors, none of them ever came up to the full measure of the rapacity of Verres, who, allowing much for the high colouring of the counsel and orator, appears to have been infected with a sort of disease, or mania, which gave him an irresistible propensity to seize whatever he saw or heard of, which was precious either in materials or workmanship. For this purpose he retained in his service two brothers from Asia Minor, on whose judgment he relied for the choice of statues and pictures, and who were employed to search out everything of this sort which was valuable in the island. Aided by their suggestions, he seized tapestry, pictures, gold and silver plate, vases, gems, and Corinthian bronzes, till he literally did not leave a single article of value of these descriptions in the whole island. The chief objects of this pillage were the statues and pictures of the gods, which the Romans regarded with religious veneration; and they, accordingly, viewed such rapine as sacrilege. Hence the frequent adjurations and apostrophes to the deities who had been insulted, which are introduced in the oration. The circumstances of violence and circumvention, under which the depredations were committed, are detailed with much vehemence, and at considerable length. Some description is given of the works of sculpture; and the names of the statuarys by whom they were executed, are also frequently recorded. Thus, we are told that Verres took away from a private gentleman of Messina the marble Cupid, by Praxiteles: He sacrilegiously tore a figure of Victory from the temple of Ceres—he deprived the city Tyndaris of an image of Mercury, which had been restored to it from Carthage, by Scipio, and was worshipped by the people with singular devotion and an annual festival. Some of the works of art were openly carried off—some borrowed under plausible pretences, but never restored, and others forcibly purchased at an inadequate value. If the speech *De Signis* be the most curious, that *De Supplicitiis* is incomparably the finest of the series of *Verrine* orations. The

subject afforded a wider field than the former for the display of eloquence, and it presents us with topics of more general and permanent interest. Such, indeed, is the vehement pathos, and such the resources employed to excite pity in favour of the oppressed, and indignation against the guilty, that the genius of the orator is nowhere more conspicuously displayed—not even in the Philippics or Catilinarian harangues. It was now proved that Verres had practiced every species of fraud and depredation, and on these heads no room was left for defence. But as the duties of provincial Prætors were twofold—the administration of the laws, and the direction of warlike operations—it was suspected that the counsel of Verres meant to divert the attention of the judges from his avarice to his military conduct and valour. This plea the orator completely anticipates. His misconduct, indeed, in the course of the naval operations against the pirates, forms one of the chief topics of Cicero's bitter invective. He demonstrates that the fleet had been equipped rather for show than for service; that it was unprovided with sailors or stores, and altogether unfit to act against an enemy. The command was given to Cleomenes, a Syracusan, who was ignorant of naval affairs, merely that Verres might enjoy the company of his wife during his absence. The description of the sailing of the fleet from Syracuse is inimitable, and it is so managed that the whole seems to pass before the eyes. Verres, who had not been seen in public for many months, having retired to a splendid pavilion, pitched near the fountain of Arethusa, where he passed his time in company of his favourites, amidst all the delights that arts and luxury could administer, at length appeared, in order to view the departure of the squadron; and a Roman Prætor exhibited himself, standing on the shore in sandals, with a purple cloak flowing to his heels, and leaning on the shoulder of a harlot! The fleet, as was to be expected, was driven on shore, and there burned by the pirates, who entered Syracuse in triumph, and retired from it unmolested. Verres, in order to divert public censure from himself, put the captains of the ships to death; and this naturally leads on to the subject which has given name to the oration,—the cruel and illegal executions, not merely of Sicilians, but Roman citizens. The punishments of death and torture usually reserved for slaves, but inflicted by Verres on freemen of Rome, formed the climax of his atrocities, which are detailed in oratorical progression. After the vivid description of his former crimes, one scarcely expects that new terms of indignation will be found; but the expressions of the orator become more glowing, in proportion as Verres grows more daring in

his guilt. The sacred character borne over all the world by a Roman citizen, must be fully remembered, in order to read with due feeling the description of the punishment of Gavius, who was scourged, and then nailed to a cross, which, by a refinement in cruelty, was erected on the shore, and facing Italy, that he might suffer death with his view directed towards home and a land of liberty. The whole is poured forth in a torrent of the most rapid and fervid composition; and had it actually flowed from the lips of the speaker, we cannot doubt the prodigious effect it would have had on a Roman audience, and on Roman judges. In the oration *De Signis*, something, as we have seen, is lost to a modern reader, by the diminished reverence for the mythological deities; and, in like manner, we cannot enter fully into the spirit of the harangue *De Supplicis*, which is planned with a direct reference to national feeling, to that stern decorum which could not be overstepped without shame, and that adoration of the majesty of Rome, which invested its citizens with inexpressible dignity, and bestowed on them an almost inviolable nature. Hence the appearance of Verres in public, in a long purple robe, is represented as the climax of his enormities, and the punishment of scourging inflicted on a Roman citizen is treated (without any discussion concerning the justice of the sentence) as an unheard-of and unutterable crime. Yet even those parts least attractive to modern readers, are perfect in their execution; and the whole series of orations will ever be regarded as among the most splendid monuments of Tully's transcendent genius.

In the renowned cause against Verres, there can be no doubt that the orator displayed the whole resources of his vast talents. Every circumstance concurred to stimulate his exertions and excite his eloquence. It was the first time he had appeared as an accuser in a public trial—his clients were the injured people of a mighty province, rivalling in importance the imperial state—the inhabitants of Sicily surrounded the Forum, and an audience was expected from every quarter of Italy, of all that was exalted, intelligent, and refined. But, chiefly, he had a subject, which, from the glaring guilt of the accused, and the nature of his crimes, was so copious, interesting, and various, so abundant in those topics which an orator would select to afford full scope for the exercise of his powers, that it was hardly possible to labour tamely or listlessly in so rich a mine of eloquence. Such a wonderful assemblage of circumstances never yet prepared the course for the triumphs of oratory; so great an opportunity for the exhibition of forensic art will, in all probability, never again occur. Suf-

lice it to say, that the orator surpassed by his workmanship the singular beauty of his materials; and instead of being overpowered by their magnitude, derived from the vast resources which they supplied the merit of an additional excellence, in the skill and discernment of his choice.

The infinite variety of entertaining anecdotes with which the series of pleadings against Verres abounds—the works of art which are commemorated—the interesting topographical descriptions—the insight afforded into the laws and manners of the ancient Sicilians—the astonishing profusion of ironical sallies, all conspire to dazzle the imagination and rivet the attention of the reader; yet there is something in the idea that they were not actually delivered, which detracts from the effect of circumstances which would otherwise heighten our feelings. It appears to us even preposterous to read, in the commencement of the second oration, of a report having been spread that Verres was to abandon his defence, but that there he sat braving his accusers and judges with his characteristic impudence. The exclamations on his effrontery, and the adjurations of the judges, lose their force, when we cannot help recollecting that before one word of all this could be pronounced, the person against whom they were directed as present had sneaked off into voluntary exile. Whatever effect this recollection may have had on the ancients, who regarded oratory as an art, and an oration as an elaborate composition, nothing can be more grating or offensive to the taste and feelings of a modern reader, whose idea of eloquence is that of something natural, heart-felt, inartificial, and extemporaneous.

The Sicilians, though they could scarcely have been satisfied with the issue of the trial, appear to have been sufficiently sensible of Cicero's great exertions in their behalf. Blainville, in his Travels, mentions, that while at Grotta Ferrata, a convent built on the ruins of Cicero's Tusculan Villa, he had been shown a silver medal, unquestionably antique, struck by the Sicilians in gratitude for his impeachment of Verres. One side exhibits a head of Cicero, crowned with laurel, with the legend *M. T. Ciceroni*—on the reverse, there is the representation of three legs extended in a triangular position, in the form of the three great capes or promontories of Sicily, with the motto,—“*Prostrato Verre Trinacria.*”

Pro Fonteio. It is much to be regretted, that the oration for Fonteius, the next which Cicero delivered, has descended to us incomplete. It was the defence of an unpopular governor, accused of oppression by the province intrusted to his administration; and, as such, would have formed an interesting contrast to the accusation of Verres.

Pro Cæcina. This was a mere question of civil right, turning on the effect of a Prætorian edict.

Pro Lege Manilia. Hitherto Cicero had only addressed the judges in the Forum in civil suits or criminal prosecutions. The oration for the Manilian law, which is accounted one of the most splendid of his productions, was the first in which he spoke to the whole people from the rostrum. It was pronounced in favour of a law proposed by Manilius, a tribune of the people, for constituting Pompey sole general, with extraordinary powers, in the war against Mithridates and Tigranes, in which Lucullus at that time commanded. The chiefs of the Senate regarded this law as a dangerous precedent in the republic; and all the authority of Catulus, and eloquence of Hortensius, were directed against it. It has been conjectured, that in supporting pretensions which endangered the public liberty, Cicero was guided merely by interest, since an opposition to Pompey might have prevented his own election to the consulship, which was now the great object of his ambition. His life, however, and writings, will warrant us in ascribing to him a different, though perhaps less obvious motive. With the love of virtue and the republic, which glowed so intensely in the breast of this illustrious Roman, that less noble passion, the immoderate desire of popular fame, was unfortunately mingled. "Fame," says a modern historian, "was the prize at which he aimed; his weakness of bodily constitution sought it through the most strenuous labours—his natural timidity of mind pursued it through the greatest dangers. Pompey, who had fortunately attained it, he contemplated as the happiest of men, and was led, from this illusion of fancy, not only to speak of him, but really to think of him," (till he became unfortunate,) "with a fondness of respect bordering on enthusiasm. The glare of glory that surrounded Pompey, concealed from Cicero his many and great imperfections, and seduced an honest citizen, and finest genius in Rome, a man of unparalleled industry, and that generally applied to the noblest purposes, into the prostitution of his abilities and virtues, for exalting an ambitious chief, and investing him with such exorbitant and unconstitutional powers, as virtually subverted the commonwealth*."

In defending this pernicious measure, Cicero divided his discourse into two parts—showing, first, that the importance and imminent dangers of the contest in which the state was engaged, required the unusual remedy proposed—and, secondly, that Pompey was the fittest person to be intrusted with the conduct

* Gillies, *History of Greece*, Part II. T. IV. c. 27.

of the war. This leads to a splendid panegyric on that renowned commander, in which, while he does justice to the merits of his predecessor, Lucullus, he enlarges on the military skill, valour, authority, and good fortune of this present idol of his luxuriant imagination, with all the force and beauty which language can afford. He fills the imagination with the immensity of the object, kindles in the breast an ardour of affection and gratitude, and, by an accumulation of circumstances and proofs, so aggrandizes his hero, that he exalts him to something more than mortal in the minds of his auditory; while, at the same time, every word inspires the most perfect veneration for his character, and the most unbounded confidence in his integrity and judgment. The whole world is exhibited as an inadequate theatre for the actions of such a superior genius; while all the nations, and potentates of the earth, are in a manner called as witnesses of his valour and his truth. By enlarging on these topics, by the most solemn protestations of his own sincerity, and by adducing examples from antiquity, of the state having been benefited or saved, by intrusting unlimited power to a single person, he allayed all fears of the dangers which it was apprehended might result to the constitution, from such extensive authority being vested in one individual—and thus struck the first blow towards the subversion of the republic!

Pro Cluentio. This is a pleading for Cluentius, who, at his mother's instigation, was accused of having poisoned his stepfather, Oppianicus. Great part of the harangue appears to be but collaterally connected with the direct subject of the prosecution. Oppianicus, it seems, had been formerly accused by Cluentius, and found guilty of a similar attempt against his life; but after his condemnation, a report became current that Cluentius had prevailed in the cause by corrupting the judges, and, to remove the unfavourable impression thus created against his client, Cicero recurs to the circumstances of that case. In the second part of the oration, which refers to the accusation of poisoning Oppianicus, he finds it necessary to clear his client from two previous charges of attempts to poison. In treating of the proper subject of the criminal proceedings, which does not occupy above a sixth part of the whole oration, he shows that Cluentius could have had no access or opportunity to administer poison to his father, who was in exile; that there was nothing unusual or suspicious in the circumstances of his death; and that the charge originated in the machinations of Cluentius' unnatural mother, against whom he inveighs with much force, as one hurried along blindfold by guilt—who acts with such folly that no one can ac-

count her a rational creature—with such violence that none can imagine her to be a woman—with such cruelty, that none can call her a mother. The whole oration discloses such a scene of enormous villainy—of murders, by poison and assassination—of incest, and subornation of witnesses, that the family history of Cluentius may be regarded as the counterpart in domestic society, of what the government of Verres was in public life. Though very long, and complicated too, in the subject, it is one of the most correct and forcible of all Cicero's judicial orations; and, under the impression that it comes nearer to the strain of a modern pleading than any of the others, it has been selected by Dr Blair as the subject of a minute analysis and criticism*.

De Lege Agraria contra Rullum. In his discourse *Pro Lege Manilia*, the first of the deliberative kind addressed to the assembly of the people, Cicero had the advantage of speaking for a favourite of the multitude, and against the chiefs of the Senate; but he was placed in a very different situation when he came to oppose the Agrarian law. This had been for 300 years the darling object of the Roman tribes—the daily attraction and rallying word of the populace—the signal of discord, and most powerful engine of the seditious tribunate. The first of the series of orations against the Agrarian law, now proposed by Rullus, was delivered by Cicero in the Senate-house, shortly after his election to the consulship: The second and third were addressed to the people from the rostrum. The scope of the present Agrarian law was, to appoint Decemvirs for the purpose of selling the public domains in the provinces, and to recover from the generals the spoils acquired in foreign wars, by which a fund might be formed for the purchase of lands in Italy, particularly Campania—to be equally divided among the people. Cicero, in his first oration, of which the commencement is now wanting, quieted the alarms of the Senate, by assuring them of his resolution to oppose the law with his utmost power. When the question came before the people, he did not fear to encounter the Tribunes on their own territory, and most popular subject; he did not hesitate to make the rabble judges in their own cause, though one in which their passions, interests, and prejudices, and those of their fathers, had been engaged for so many centuries. Conscious of his superiority, he invited the Tribunes to ascend the rostrum, and argue the point with him before the assembled multitude; but the field was left clear to his argument and eloquence, and by alternately flat-

* *Lectures on Rhetoric, &c.* Vol. II. Lect. XXVIII.

tering the people, and ridiculing the proposer of the law, he gave such a turn to their inclinations, that they rejected the proposition as eagerly as they had before received it.

But although the Tribunes were unable to cope with Cicero in the Forum, they subsequently contrived to instil suspicions into the minds of the populace, with regard to his motives in opposing the Agrarian law. These imputations made such an impression on the city, that he found it necessary to defend himself against them, in a short speech to the people. It has been disputed, whether this third oration was the last which Cicero pronounced on occasion of this Agrarian law. In the letters to Atticus, while speaking of his consular orations, he says, "that among those sent, was that pronounced in the Senate, and that addressed to the people, on the Agrarian law*." These are the first and second of the speeches, which we now have against Rullus; but he also mentions, that there were two *apospasmata*, as he calls them, concerning the Agrarian law. Now, what is at present called the third, was probably the first of these two, and the last must have perished.

Pro Rabirio. About the year 654, Saturninus, a seditious Tribune, had been slain by a party attached to the interests of the Senate. Thirty-six years afterwards, Rabirius was accused of accession to this murder, by Labienus, subsequently well known as Cæsar's lieutenant in Gaul. Hortensius had pleaded the cause before the Duumvirs, Caius and Lucius Cæsar, by whom Rabirius being condemned, appealed to the people, and was defended by Cicero in the Comitia. The Tribune, it seems, had been slain in a tumult during a season of such danger, that a decree had been passed by the Senate, requiring the Consuls to be careful that the republic received no detriment. This was supposed to sanction every proceeding which followed in consequence; and the design of the popular party, in the impeachment of Rabirius, was to attack this prerogative of the Senate. Cicero's oration on this contention between the Senatorial and Tribunitial power, gives us more the impression of prompt and unstudied eloquence than most of his other harangues. It is, however, a little obscure, partly from the circumstance that the accuser would not permit him to exceed half an hour in the defence. The argument seems to have been, that Rabirius did not kill Saturninus; but that even if he had slain him, the action was not merely legal, but praiseworthy, since all citizens had been required to arm in aid of the Consuls.

* Lib. II. Ep. 1.

It was believed, that in spite of the exertions of Cicero, Rabirius would have been condemned, had not the Prætor Metellus devised an expedient for dissolving the Comitia, before sentence could be passed. The cause was neither farther prosecuted at this time, nor subsequently revived; the public attention being now completely engrossed by the imminent dangers of the Catilinarian Conspiracy, which was discovered during the Consulship of Cicero.

Contra Catilinam. The detection and suppression of that nefarious plot, form the most glorious part of the political life of Cicero; and the orations he pronounced against the chief conspirator, are still regarded as the most splendid monuments of his eloquence. It was no longer to defend the rights and prerogatives of a municipal town or province, nor to move and persuade a judge in favour of an unfortunate client, but to save his country and the republic, that Cicero ascended the Rostrum. The conspiracy of Catiline tended to the utter extinction of the city and government. Cicero, having discovered his design, (which was to leave Rome and join his army, assembled in different parts of Italy, while the other conspirators remained within the walls, to butcher the Senators and fire the capital,) summoned the Senate to meet in the Temple of Jupiter Stator, with the intention of laying before it the whole circumstances of the plot. But Catiline having unexpectedly appeared in the midst of the assembly, his audacity impelled the consular orator into an abrupt invective, which is directly addressed to the traitor, and commences without the preamble by which most of his other harangues are introduced. In point of effect, this oration must have been perfectly electric. The disclosure to the criminal himself of his most secret purposes—their flagitious nature, threatening the life of every one present—the whole course of his villainies and treasons, blazoned forth with the fire of incensed eloquence—and the adjuration to him, by flying from Rome, to free his country from such a pestilence, were all wonderfully calculated to excite astonishment, admiration, and horror. The great object of the whole oration, was to drive Catiline into banishment; and it appears somewhat singular, that so dangerous a personage, and who might have been so easily convicted, should thus have been forced, or even allowed, to withdraw to his army, instead of being seized and punished. Catiline having escaped unmolested to his camp, the conduct of the Consul in not apprehending, but sending away this formidable enemy, had probably excited some censure and discontent; and the second Catilinarian oration was in consequence delivered by Cicero, in an assembly of the people, in

order to justify his driving the chief conspirator from Rome. A capital punishment, he admits, ought long since to have overtaken Catiline, but such was the spirit of the times, that the existence of the conspiracy would not have been believed, and he had therefore resolved to place his guilt in a point of view so conspicuous, that vigorous measures might without hesitation be adopted, both against Catiline and his accomplices. He also takes this opportunity to warn his audience against those bands of conspirators who still lurked within the city, and whom he divides into various classes, describing, in the strongest language, the different degrees of guilt and profligacy by which they were severally characterized.

Manifest proofs of the whole plot having been at length obtained, by the arrest of the ambassadors from the Allobroges, with whom the conspirators had tampered, and who were bearing written credentials from them to their own country, Cicero, in his third oration, laid before the people all the particulars of the discovery, and invited them to join in celebrating a thanksgiving, which had been decreed by the Senate to his honour, for the preservation of his country.

The last Catilinarian oration was pronounced in the Senate, on the debate concerning the punishment to be inflicted on the conspirators. Silanus had proposed the infliction of instant death, while Cæsar had spoken in favour of the more lenient sentence of perpetual imprisonment. Cicero does not precisely declare for any particular punishment; but he shows that his mind evidently inclined to the severest, by dwelling on the enormity of the conspirators' guilt, and aggravating all their crimes with much acsimony and art. His sentiments finally prevailed; and those conspirators, who had remained in Rome, were strangled under his immediate superintendence.

In these four orations, the tone and style of each of them, particularly of the first and last, is very different, and accommodated with a great deal of judgment to the occasion, and to the circumstances under which they were delivered. Through the whole series of the Catilinarian orations, the language of Cicero is well calculated to overawe the wicked, to confirm the good, and encourage the timid. It is of that description which renders the mind of one man the mind of a whole assembly, or a whole people*.

* Wolf, in the preface to his edition of the Oration for Marcellus, mentions having seen a scholastic declamation, entitled, *Oratio Catilinae, in M. Ciceronem*. It concludes thus,—“ Me consularem patricium, civem et amicum reipublicæ a faucibus inimici consulis eripite; supplicem atque insontem pristinae claritudini, omnium civium gratiæ, et benevolentia vestra restitute. Amen.”

Pro Muræna.—The Comitia being now held in order to choose Consuls for the ensuing year, Junius Silanus and Muræna were elected. The latter candidate had for his competitor the celebrated jurisconsult Sulpicius Rufus; who, being assisted by Cato, charged Muræna with having prevailed by bribery and corruption. This impeachment was founded on the Calpurnian law, which had lately been rendered more strict, on the suggestion of Sulpicius, by a *Senatusconsultum*. Along with this accusation, the profligacy of Muræna's character was objected to, and also the meanness of his rank, as he was but a knight and soldier, whereas Sulpicius was a patrician and lawyer. Cicero therefore shows, in the first place, that he amply merited the consulship, from his services in the war with Mithridates, which introduces a comparison between a military and forensic life. While he pays his usual tribute of applause to cultivated eloquence, he derides the forms and phraseology of the jurisconsults, by whom the civil law was studied and practised. As to the proper subject of the accusation, bribery in his election, it seems probable that Muræna had been guilty of some practices which, strictly speaking, were illegal, yet were warranted by custom. They seem to have consisted in encouraging a crowd to attend him on the streets, and in providing shows for the entertainment of the multitude; which, though expected by the people, and usually overlooked by the magistrates, appeared heinous offences in the eye of the rigid and stoical Cato. Aware of the weight added to the accusation by his authority, Cicero, in order to obviate this influence, treats his stoical principles in the same tone which he had already used concerning the profession of Sulpicius. In concluding, he avails himself of the difficulties of the times, and the yet unsuppressed conspiracy of Catiline, which rendered it unwise to deprive the city of a Consul well qualified to defend it in so dangerous a crisis.

This case was one of great expectation, from the dignity of the prosecutors, and eloquence of the advocates for the accused. Before Cicero spoke, it had been pleaded by Hortensius, and Crassus the triumvir; and Cicero, in engaging in the cause, felt the utmost desire to surpass these rivals of his eloquence. Such was his anxiety, that he slept none during the whole night which preceded the hearing of the cause; and being thus exhausted with care, his eloquence on this occasion fell short of that of Hortensius*. He shows, however, much delicacy and art in the manner in which he manages the attack on the philosophy of Cato, and profession of Sulpicius,

* Funccius, *De Viril. Ætat. Ling. Lat. Pars II. c. 2.*

both of whom were his particular friends, and high in the estimation of the judges he addressed*.

Pro Valerio Flacco.—Flaccus had aided Cicero in his discovery of the conspiracy of Catiline, and, in return, was defended by him against a charge of extortion and peculation, brought by various states of Asia Minor, which he had governed as Pro-prætor.

Pro Cornelio Sylla.—Sylla, who was afterwards a great partizan of Cæsar's, was prosecuted for having been engaged in Catiline's conspiracy; but his accuser, Torquatus, digressing from the charge against Sylla, turned his raillery on Cicero; alleging, that he had usurped the authority of a king; and asserting, that he was the third foreign sovereign who had reigned at Rome after Numa and Tarquin. Cicero, therefore, in his reply, had not only to defend his client, but to answer the petulant raillery by which his antagonist attempted to excite envy and odium against himself. He admits that he was a foreigner in one sense of the word, having been born in a municipal town of Italy, in common with many others who had rendered the highest services to the city; but he repels the insinuation that he usurped any kingly authority; and being instigated by this unmerited attack, he is led on to the eulogy of his own conduct and consulship,—a favourite subject, from which he cannot altogether depart, even when he enters more closely into the grounds of the prosecution.

For this defence of Cornelius Sylla, Cicero privately received from his client the sum of 20,000 sesterces, which chiefly enabled him to purchase his magnificent house on the Palatine Hill.

Pro Archia.—This is one of the orations of Cicero on which he has succeeded in bestowing the finest polish, and it is perhaps the most *pleasing* of all his harangues. Archias had been his preceptor, and, after having obtained much reputation by his Greek poems, on the triumphs of Lucullus over Mithridates, and of Marius over the Cimbri, was now attempting to celebrate the consulship of Cicero; so that the orator, in pleading his cause, expected to be requited by the praises of his muse.

This poet was a native of Antioch, and, having come to Italy in early youth, was rewarded for his learning and genius with the friendship of the first men in the state, and with the citizenship of Heraclea, a confederate and enfranchised town of Magna Græcia. A few years afterwards, a law was

* Aonius Palearius wrote a declamation in answer to this speech, entitled, *Contra Murenam*.

enacted, conferring the rights of Roman citizens on all who had been admitted to the freedom of federate states, provided they had a settlement in Italy at the time when the law was passed, and had asserted the privilege before the Prætor within sixty days from the period at which it was promulgated. After Archias had enjoyed the benefit of this law for more than twenty years, his claims were called in question by one Gracchus, who now attempted to drive him from the city, under the enactment expelling all foreigners who usurped, without due title, the name and attributes of Roman citizens. The loss of records, and some other circumstances, having thrown doubts on the legal right of his client, Cicero chiefly enlarged on the dignity of literature and poetry, and the various accomplishments of Archias, which gave him so just a claim to the privileges he enjoyed. He beautifully describes the influence which study and a love of letters had exercised on his own character and conduct. He had thence imbibed the principle, that glory and virtue should be the darling objects of life, and that to attain these, all difficulties, or even dangers, were to be despised. But, of all names dear to literature and genius, that of poet was the most sacred: hence it would be an extreme of disgrace and profanation, to reject a bard who had employed the utmost efforts of his art to make Rome immortal by his muse, and had possessed such prevailing power as to touch with pleasure even the stubborn and intractable soul of Marius.

The whole oration is interspersed with beautiful maxims and sentences, which have been quoted with delight in all ages. There appears in it, however, perhaps too much, and certainly more than in the other orations, of what Lord Monboddo calls *concinnity*. "We have in it," observes he, speaking of this oration, "strings of antitheses, the figure of like endings, and a perfect similarity of the structure, both as to the grammatical form of the words, and even the number of them*." The whole, too, is written in a style of exaggeration and immoderate praise. The orator talks of the poet Archias, as if the whole glory of Rome, and salvation of the commonwealth, depended on his poetical productions, and as if the smallest injury offered to him would render the name of Rome execrable and infamous in all succeeding generations.

Pro Cn. Plancio.—The defence of Plancius was one of the first orations pronounced by Cicero after his return from banishment. Plancius had been Quæstor of Macedon when Cicero came to that country during his exile, and had received

* *Origin and Progress of Language, Book IV.*

him with honours proportioned to his high character, rather than his fallen fortunes. In return for this kindness, Cicero undertook his defence against a charge, preferred by a disappointed competitor, of bribery and corruption in suing for the ædileship.

Pro Sextio.—This is another oration produced by the gratitude of Cicero, and the circumstances of his banishment. Sextius, while Tribune of the people, had been instrumental in procuring his recall, and Cicero requited this good office by one of the longest and most elaborate of his harangues. The accusation, indeed, was a consequence of his interposition in favour of the illustrious exile; for when about to propose his recall to the people, he was violently attacked by the Clodian faction, and left for dead on the street. His enemies, however, though obviously the aggressors, accused him of violence, and exciting a tumult. This was the charge against which Cicero defended him. The speech is valuable for the history of the times; as it enters into all the recent political events in which Cicero had borne so distinguished a part. The orator inveighs against his enemies, the Tribune Clodius, and the Consuls Gabinius and Piso, and details all the circumstances connected with his own banishment and return, occasionally throwing in a word or two about his client Sextius.

Contra Vatinius.—Vatinius, who belonged to the Clodian faction, appeared, at the trial of Sextius, as a witness against him. This gave Cicero an opportunity of interrogating him; and the whole oration being a continued invective on the conduct of Vatinius, poured forth in a series of questions, without waiting for an answer to any of them, has been entitled, *Interrogatio*.

Pro Cælio.—Middleton has pronounced this to be the most entertaining of the orations which Cicero has left us, from the vivacity of wit and humour with which he treats the gallantries of Clodia, her commerce with Cælius, and in general the gaieties and licentiousness of youth.

Cælius was a young man of considerable talents and accomplishments, who had been intrusted to the care of Cicero on his first introduction to the Forum; but having imprudently engaged in an intrigue with Clodia, the well-known sister of Clodius, and having afterwards deserted her, she accused him of an attempt to poison her, and of having borrowed money from her in order to procure the assassination of Dio, the Alexandrian ambassador. In this, as in most other prosecutions of the period, a number of charges, unconnected with the main one, seem to have been accumulated, in order to

give the chief accusation additional force and credibility. Cicero had thus to defend his client against the suspicions arising from the general libertinism of his conduct. He justifies that part of it which related to his intercourse with Clodia, by enlarging on the loose character of this woman, whom he treats with very little ceremony; and, in order to place her dissolute life in a more striking point of view, he conjures up in fancy one of her grim and austere ancestors of the Clodian family reproaching her with her shameful degeneracy. All this the orator was aware would not be sufficient for the complete vindication of his client; and it is curious to remark the ingenuity with which the strenuous advocate of virtue and regularity of conduct palliates, on this occasion, the levities of youth,—not, indeed, by lessening the merits of strict morality, but by representing those who withstand the seductions of pleasure as supernaturally endued.

This oration was a particular favourite of one who was long a distinguished speaker in the British Senate. "By the way," says Mr Fox, in a letter to Wakefield, "I know no speech of Cicero more full of beautiful passages than this is, nor where he is more in his element. Argumentative contention is what he by no means excels in; and he is never, I think, so happy as when he has an opportunity of exhibiting a mixture of philosophy and pleasantry; and especially when he can interpose anecdotes and references to the authority of the eminent characters in the history of his country. No man appears, indeed, to have had such real respect for authority as he; and therefore, when he speaks upon that subject, he is always natural and in earnest; and not like those among us, who are so often declaiming about the wisdom of our ancestors, without knowing what they mean, or hardly ever citing any particulars of their conduct, or of their *dicta**."

De Provinciis Consularibus. The government of Gaul was continued to Cæsar, in consequence of this oration, so that it may be considered as one of the immediate causes of the ruin of the Roman Republic, which it was incontestibly the great wish of Cicero to protect and maintain inviolate. But Cicero had evidently been duped by Cæsar, as he formerly had nearly been by Catiline, and as he subsequently was by Octavius, Pollio, and every one who found it his interest to cajole him, by proclaiming his praises, and professing ardent zeal for the safety of the state. So little had he penetrated the real views of Cæsar, that we find him asking the Senate, in this oration, what possible motive or inducement Cæsar

* *Correspondence*, p. 85.

could have to remain in the province of Gaul, except the public good. "For would the amenity of the regions, the beauty of the cities, or civilization of the inhabitants, detain him there—or can a return to one's native country be so distasteful?"

Pro Cornelio Balbo.—Balbus was a native of Cadiz, who having been of considerable service to Pompey, during his war in Spain, against Sertorius, had, in return, received the freedom of Rome from that commander, in virtue of a special law, by which he had obtained the power of granting this benefit to whom he chose. The validity of Pompey's act, however, was now questioned, on the ground that Cadiz was not within the terms of that relation and alliance to Rome, which could, under any circumstances, entitle its citizens to such a privilege. The question, therefore, was, whether the inhabitants of a federate state, which had not adopted the institutions and civil jurisprudence of Rome, could receive the rights of citizenship. This point was of great importance to the municipal towns of the Republic, and the oration throws considerable light on the relations which existed between the provinces and the capital.

In Pisonem.—Piso having been recalled from his government of Macedon, in consequence of Cicero's oration, *De Provinciis Consularibus*, he complained, in one of his first appearances in the Senate, of the treatment he had received, and attacked the orator, particularly on the score of his poetry, ridiculing the well known line,

"Cedant arma togæ—concedat laurea linguæ."

Cicero replied in a bitter invective, in which he exposed the whole life and conduct of his enemy to public contempt and detestation. The most singular feature of this harangue is the personal abuse and coarseness of expression it contains, which appear the more extraordinary when we consider that it was delivered in the Senate-house, and directed against an individual of such distinction and consequence as Piso. Cicero applies to him the opprobrious epithets of *bellua*, *furia*, *carnifex*, *furcifer*, &c.; he banters him on his personal deformities, and upbraids him with his ignominious descent on one side of the family, while, on the other, he had no resemblance to his ancestors, except to the sooty complexion of their images.

Pro Milone.—When Milo was candidate for the Consulship, the notorious demagogue Clodius supported his competitors, and during the canvass, party spirit grew so violent, that the

two factions often came to blows within the walls of the city. While these dissensions were at their height, Clodius and Milo met on the Appian Way—the former returning from the country towards Rome, and the latter setting out for Lanuvium, both attended by a great retinue. A quarrel arose among their followers, in which Clodius was wounded and carried into a house in the vicinity. By order of Milo, the doors were broken open; his enemy dragged out, and assassinated on the highway. The death of Clodius excited much confusion and tumult at Rome, in the course of which the courts of justice were burned by a mob. Milo having returned from the banishment into which he had at first withdrawn, was impeached for the crime by the Tribunes of the people; and Pompey, in virtue of the authority conferred on him by a decree of the Senate, nominated a special commission to inquire into the murder committed on the Appian Way. In order to preserve the tranquillity of the city, he placed guards in the Forum, and occupied all its avenues with troops. This unusual appearance, and the shouts of the Clodian faction, which the military could not restrain, so discomposed the orator, that he fell short of his usual excellence. The speech which he actually delivered, was taken down in writing, and is mentioned by Asconius Pedianus as still extant in his time. But that beautiful harangue which we now possess, is one which was retouched and polished, as a gift for Milo, after he had retired in exile to Marseilles.

In the oration, as we now have it, Cicero takes his exordium from the circumstances by which he was so much, though, as he admits, so causelessly disconcerted; since he knew that the troops were not placed in the Forum to overawe, but to protect. In entering on the defence, he grants that Clodius was killed, and by Milo; but he maintains that homicide is, on many occasions, justifiable, and on none more so than when force can only be repelled by force, and when the slaughter of the aggressor is necessary for self-preservation. These principles are beautifully illustrated, and having been, as the orator conceives, sufficiently established, are applied to the case under consideration. He shows, from the circumstantial evidence of time and place—the character of the deceased—the retinue by which he was accompanied—his hatred to Milo—the advantages which would have resulted to him from the death of his enemy, and the expressions proved to have been used by him, that Clodius had laid an ambush for Milo. Cicero, it is evident, had here the worst of the cause. The encounter appears, in fact, to have been accidental; and though the servants of Clodius may, perhaps, have been the assailants,

Milo had obviously exceeded the legitimate bounds of self defence. The orator accordingly enforces the argument, that the assassination of Clodius was an act of public benefit, which, in a consultation of Milo's friends, was the only one intended to have been advanced, and was the sole defence adopted in the oration which Brutus is said to have prepared for the occasion. Cicero, while he does not forego the advantage of this plea, maintains it hypothetically, contending that *even if* Milo had openly pursued and slain Clodius as a common enemy, he might well boast of having freed the state from so pernicious and desperate a citizen. To add force to this argument, he takes a rapid view of the various acts of atrocity committed by Clodius, and the probable situation of the Republic, were he to revive. When the minds of the judges were thus sufficiently prepared he ascribes his tragical end to the immediate interposition of the providential powers, specially manifested by his fall near the temple of Bona Dea, whose mysteries he had formerly profaned. Having excited sufficient indignation against Clodius, he concludes with moving commiseration for Milo, representing his love for his country and fellow-citizens,—the sad calamity of exile from Rome,—and his manly resignation to whatever punishment might be inflicted on him.

The argument in this oration was perhaps as good as the circumstances admitted; but we miss through the whole that reference to documents and laws, which gives the stamp of truth to the orations of Demosthenes. Each ground of defence, taken by itself, is deficient in argumentative force. Thus, in maintaining that the death of Clodius was of no benefit to Milo, he has taken too little into consideration the hatred and rancour mutually felt by the heads of political factions: but he supplies his weakness of argument by illustrative digressions, flashes of wit, bursts of eloquence, and appeals to the compassion of the judges, on which he appears to have placed much reliance*. On the whole, this oration was accounted, both by Cicero himself and by his contemporaries, as the finest effort of his genius; which confirms what indeed is evinced by the whole history of Roman eloquence, that the judges were easily satisfied on the score of reasoning, and attached more importance to pathos, and wit, and sonorous periods, than to fact or law.

Pro Rabirio Postumo.—This is the defence of Rabirius, who was prosecuted for repayment of a sum which he was

* Jenisch, *Parallel der beiden größten Redner des Alterthum*, p. 124; ed. Berlin, 1821.

supposed to have received, in conjunction with the Proconsul Gabinius, from King Ptolemy, for having placed him on the throne of Egypt, contrary to the injunctions of the Senate.

Pro Ligario.—This oration was pronounced after Cæsar, having vanquished Pompey in Thessaly, and destroyed the remains of the Republican party in Africa, assumed the supreme administration of affairs at Rome. Merciful as the conqueror appeared, he was understood to be much exasperated against those who, after the rout at Pharsalia, had renewed the war in Africa. Ligarius, when on the point of obtaining a pardon, was formally accused by his old enemy Tubero, of having borne arms in that contest. The Dictator himself presided at the trial of the case, much prejudiced against Ligarius, as was known from his having previously declared, that his resolution was fixed, and was not to be altered by the charms of eloquence. Cicero, however, overcame his prepossessions, and extorted from him a pardon. The countenance of Cæsar, it is said, changed, as the orator proceeded in his speech; but when he touched on the battle of Pharsalia, and described Tubero as seeking his life, amid the ranks of the army, the Dictator became so agitated, that his body trembled, and the papers which he held dropped from his hand*.

This oration is remarkable for the free spirit which it breathes, even in the face of that power to which it was addressed for mercy. But Cicero, at the same time, shows much art in not overstepping those limits, within which he knew he might speak without offence, and in seasoning his freedom with appropriate compliments to Cæsar, of which, perhaps, the most elegant is, that he forgot nothing but the injuries done to himself. This was the person whom, in the time of Pompey, he characterized as *monstrum et portentum tyrannum*, and whose death he soon afterwards celebrated as *divinum in rempublicam beneficium!*

The oration of Tubero against Ligarius, was extant in Quintilian's time, and probably explained the circumstances which induced a man, who had fought so keenly against Cæsar at Pharsalia, to undertake the prosecution of Ligarius.

Pro Rege Dejotaro.—Dejotarus was a Tetrarch of Galatia, who obtained from Pompey the realm of Armenia, and from the Senate the title of King. In the civil war he had espoused the cause of his benefactors. Cæsar, in consequence, deprived him of Armenia, but was subsequently reconciled to him, and, while prosecuting the war against Pharnaces, visited him in his original states of Galatia. Some time after-

* Plutarch, *In Cicero*.

wards, Phidippus, the physician of the king, and his grandson Castor, accused him of an attempt to poison Cæsar, during the stay which the Dictator had made at his court. Cicero defended him in the private apartments of Cæsar, and adopted the same happy union of freedom and flattery, which he had so successfully employed in the case of Ligarius. Cæsar, however, pronounced no decision on the one side or other.

Philippica.—The remaining orations of Cicero are those directed against Antony, of whose private life and political conduct they present us with a full and glaring picture. The character of Antony, next to that of Sylla, was the most singular in the Annals of Rome, and in some of its features bore a striking resemblance to that of the fortunate Dictator. Both were possessed of uncommon military talents—both were imbued with cruelty which makes human nature shudder—both were inordinately addicted to luxury and pleasure—and both, for men of their powers of mind and habits, had apparently, at least, a strange superstitious reliance on destiny, portents, and omens. Yet there were strong shades of distinction even in those parts of their characters in which we trace the closest resemblance: The cruelty of Sylla was more deliberate and remorseless—that of Antony, more regardless and unthinking—and amid all the atrocities of the latter, there burst forth occasional gleams of generosity and feeling. But then Sylla was a man of much greater discernment and penetration—a much more profound and successful dissembler—and he was possessed of many refined and elegant accomplishments, of which the coarser Antony was destitute. Sylla gratified his voluptuousness, but Antony was ruled by it. The former indulged in pleasure when within his grasp, but ease, power, and revenge, were his great and ultimate objects: The chief aim of the latter, was the sensual pleasure to which he was subservient. Sylla would never have been the slave of Cleopatra, or the dupe of Octavius. Hence the wide difference between the destiny of the triumphant Dictator, whose chariot rolled on the wheels of Fortune to the close of his career, and the sad fate of Antony. Yet that very fate has mitigated the abhorrence of posterity, and weakness having been added to wickedness, has unaccountably palliated, in our eyes, the faults of the soft Triumvir, now more remembered as the devoted lover of Cleopatra, than as the chief promoter of the Proscriptions.

The Philippics against Antony, like those of Demosthenes, derive their chief beauty from the noble expression of just indignation, which indeed composes many of the most splendid and admired passages of ancient eloquence. They were all

pronounced during the period which elapsed between the assassination of Cæsar, and the defeat of Antony at Modena. Soon after Cæsar's death, Cicero, fearing danger from Antony, who held a sort of military possession of the city, resolved on a voyage to Greece. Being detained, however, by contrary winds, after he had set out, and having received favourable intelligence from his friends at Rome, he determined to return to the capital. The Senate assembled the day after his arrival, in order, at the suggestion of Antony, to consider of some new and extraordinary honours to the memory of Cæsar. To this meeting Cicero was specially summoned by Antony, but he excused himself on pretence of indisposition, and the fatigue of his journey. He appeared, however, in his place, when the Senate met on the following day, in absence of Antony, and delivered the first of the orations, afterwards termed *Philippics*, from the resemblance they bore to those invectives which Demosthenes poured forth against the great foe of the independence of Greece. Cicero opens his speech by explaining the motives of his recent departure from Rome—his sudden return, and his absence on the preceding day—declaring, that if present, he would have opposed the posthumous honours decreed to the usurper. His next object, after vindicating himself, being to warn the Senate of the designs of Antony, he complains that he had violated the most solemn and authentic even of Cæsar's laws; and at the same time enforced, as ordinances, what were mere jottings, found, or pretended to have been found, among the Dictator's *Memoranda*, after his death.

Antony was highly incensed at this speech, and summoned another meeting of the Senate, at which he again required the presence of Cicero. These two rivals seem to have been destined never to meet in the Senate-house. Cicero, being apprehensive of some design against his life, did not attend; so that the Oration of Antony, in his own justification, which he had carefully prepared in intervals of leisure at his villa, near Tibur, was unanswered in the Senate. The second *Philippic* was penned by Cicero in his closet, as a reply to this speech of Antony, in which he had been particularly charged with having been not merely accessory to the murder of Cæsar, but the chief contriver of the plot against him. Some part of Cicero's oration was thus necessarily defensive, but the larger portion, which is accusatory, is one of the severest and most bitter invectives ever composed, the whole being expressed in terms of the most thorough contempt and strongest detestation of Antony. By laying open his whole criminal excesses from his earliest youth, he exhibits one continued scene of debauch-

ery, faction, rapine, and violence ; but he dwells with peculiar horror on his offer of the diadem to Cæsar, at the festival of the Lupercalia—his drunken debauch at the once classic villa of Terentius Varro—and his purchase of the effects that belonged to the great Pompey—on which last subject he pathetically contrasts the modesty and decorum of that renowned warrior, once the Favourite of Fortune, and darling of the Roman people, with the licentiousness of the military adventurer who now rioted in the spoils of his country. In concluding, he declares, on his own part, that in his youth he had defended the republic, and, in his old age, he would not abandon its cause.—“The sword of Catiline I despised ; and never shall I dread that of Antony.” This oration is adorned with all the charms of eloquence, and proves, that in the decline of life Cicero had not lost one spark of the fire and spirit which animated his earlier productions. Although not delivered in the Senate, nor intended to be published till things were actually come to an extremity, and the affairs of the republic made it necessary to render Antony’s conduct and designs manifest to the people, copies of the oration were sent to Brutus, Cassius, and other friends of the commonwealth : hence, it soon got into extensive circulation, and, by exciting the vengeance of Antony, was a chief cause of the tragical death of its author.

The situation of Antony having now become precarious, from the union of Octavius with the party of the Senate, and the defection of two legions, he abruptly quitted the city, and placing himself at the head of his army, marched into Cisalpine Gaul, which, since the death of Cæsar, had been occupied by Decimus Brutus, one of the conspirators. The field being thus left clear for Cicero, and the Senate being assembled, he pronounced the third Philippic, of which the great object was to induce it to support Brutus, by placing an army at the disposal of Octavius, along with the two Consuls elect, Hirtius and Pansa. He exhorts the Senate to this measure, by enlarging on the merits of Octavius and Brutus, and concludes with proposing public thanks to these leaders, and to the legions which had deserted the standard of Antony.

From the Senate, Cicero proceeded directly to the Forum, where, in his fourth Philippic, he gave an account to the people of what had occurred, and explained to them, that Antony, though not nominally, had now been actually declared the enemy of his country. This harangue was so well received by an audience the most numerous that had ever listened to his orations, that, speaking of it afterwards, he declares he would have reaped sufficient fruit from the exertions of his

whole life, had he died on the day it was pronounced, when the whole people, with one voice and mind, called out that he had twice saved the republic*.

Brutus being as yet unable to defend himself in the field, withdrew into Modena, where he was besieged by Antony. Intelligence of this having been brought to Rome, Cicero, in his fifth Philippic, endeavoured to persuade the Senate to proclaim Antony an enemy of his country, in opposition to Calenus, who proposed, that before proceeding to acts of hostility, an embassy should be sent for the purpose of admonishing Antony to desist from his attempt on Gaul, and submit himself to the authority of the Senate. After three days' successive debate, Cicero's proposal would have prevailed, had not one of the Tribunes interposed his negative, in consequence of which the measure of the embassy was resorted to. Cicero, nevertheless, before any answer could be received, persisted, in his sixth and seventh Philippics, in asserting that any accommodation with a rebel such as Antony, would be equally disgraceful and dangerous to the republic. The deputies having returned, and reported that Antony would consent to nothing which was required of him, the Senate declared war against him—employing, however, in their decree, the term tumult, instead of war or rebellion. Cicero, in his eighth Philippic, expostulated with them on their timorous and impolitic lenity of expression. In the ninth Philippic, pronounced on the following day, he called on the Senate to erect a statue to one of the deputies, Servius Sulpicius, who, while labouring under a severe distemper, had, at the risk of his life, undertaken the embassy, but had died before he could acquit himself of the commission with which he was charged. The proposal met with considerable opposition, but it was at length agreed that a brazen statue should be erected to him in the Forum, and that an inscription should be placed on the base, importing that he had died in the service of the republic.

The Philippics, hitherto mentioned, related chiefly to the affairs of Cisalpine Gaul, the scene of the contest between D. Brutus and Antony. A long period was now elapsed since the Senate had received any intelligence concerning the chiefs of the conspiracy, Marcus Brutus and Cassius, the former of whom had seized on the province of Macedonia, while the latter occupied Syria. Public despatches, however, at length arrived from M. Brutus, giving an account of his successful proceedings in Greece. The Consul Pansa having communicated the contents at a meeting of the Senate, and having

* *Philip. VI. c. 1.*

proposed for him public thanks and honours, Calenus, a creature of Antony, objected, and moved, that as what he had done was without lawful authority, he should be required to deliver up his army to the Senate, or the proper governor of the province. Cicero, in his tenth Philippic, replied, in a transport of eloquent and patriotic indignation, to this most unjust and ruinous proposal, particularly to the assertion by which it was supported, that veterans would not submit to be commanded by Brutus. He thus succeeded in obtaining from the Senate an approbation of the conduct of Brutus, a continuance of his command, and pecuniary assistance.

About the same time accounts arrived from Asia, that Dolabella, on the part of Antony, had taken possession of Smyrna, and there put Trebonius, one of the conspirators, to death. On receiving this intelligence, a debate arose concerning the choice of a general to be employed against Dolabella, and Cicero, in his eleventh Philippic, strenuously maintained the right of Cassius, who was then in Greece, to be promoted to that command. In the twelfth and thirteenth, he again warmly and successfully opposed the sending a deputation to Antony. All further mention of pacification was terminated by the joyful tidings of the total defeat of Antony before Modena, by the army under Octavius, and the Consuls Hirtius and Pansa—the latter of whom was mortally wounded in the conflict. The intelligence excited incredible joy at Rome, which was heightened by the unfavourable reports that had previously prevailed. The Senate met to deliberate on the despatches of the Consuls communicating the event. Never was there a finer opportunity for the display of eloquence, than what was afforded to Cicero on this occasion; of which he most gloriously availed himself in the fourteenth Philippic. The excitation and tumult consequent on a great recent victory, give wing to high flights of eloquence, and also prepare the minds of the audience to follow the ascent. The success at Modena terminated a long period of anxiety. It was for the time supposed to have decided the fate of Antony and the Republic; and the orator, who thus saw all his measures justified, must have felt the exultation, confidence, and spirit, so favourable to the highest exertions of eloquence. This, with the detestable character of the conquered foe,—the wounds of Pansa, who was once suspected by the Republic, but by his faithful zeal had gradually obtained its confidence, and at length sealed his fidelity with his blood,—the rewards due to the surviving victors,—the honours to be paid to those who had fallen in defence of their country,—the thanksgivings to be rendered to the immortal gods,—all afforded topics of tri-

umph, panegyric, and pathos, which have been seldom supplied to the orator in any age or country. In extolling those who had fallen, Cicero dwells on two subjects; one appertaining to the glory of the heroes themselves, the other to the consolation of their friends and relatives. He proposes that a splendid monument should be erected, in common to all who had perished, with an inscription recording their names and services; and in recommending this tribute of public gratitude, he breaks out into a funeral panegyric, which has formed a more lasting memorial than the monument he suggested.

This was the last Philippic and last oration which Cicero delivered. The union of Antony and Octavius soon after annihilated the power of the Senate; and Cicero, like Demosthenes, fell the victim of that indignant eloquence with which he had lashed the enemies of his country:—

“Eloquio sed uterque perit orator; utrumque
Largus et exundans letho dedit ingenii fons.
Ingenio manus est et corvix cæsa, nec unquam
Sanguine caudicis maduerunt rostra pusilli*.”

Besides the complete orations above mentioned, Cicero delivered many, of which only fragments remain, or which are now entirely lost. All those which he pronounced during the five years intervening between his election to the Quæstorship and the Ædileship have perished, except that for M. Tullius, of which the exordium and narrative were brought to light at the late celebrated discovery by Mai, in the Ambrosian library at Milan. Tullius had been forcibly dispossessed (*vi armata*) by one of the Fabii of a farm he held in Lucania; and the whole Fabian race were prosecuted for damages, under a law of Lucullus, whereby, in consequence of depredations committed in the municipal states of Italy, every family was held responsible for the violent aggressions of any of its tribe. A large fragment of the oration for Scæurus forms by far the most valuable part of the discovery in the Ambrosian library. The oration, indeed, is not entire, but the part we have of it is tolerably well connected. The charge was one of provincial embezzlement, and in the exordium the orator announces that he was to treat, 1st, of the general nature of the accusation itself; 2d, of the character of the Sardinians; 3d, of that of Scæurus; and, lastly, of the special charge concerning the corn. Of these, the first two heads are tolerably entire; and that in which he exposes the faithless character of the Sardinians, and thus shakes the cred-

* Juvenal, *Satir.* X. v. 118.

ibility of the witnesses for the prosecution is artfully managed. The other fragments discovered in the Ambrosian library consist merely of detached sentences, of which it is almost impossible to make a connected meaning. Of this description is the oration *In P. Clodium*; yet still, by the aid of the Commentary found along with it, we are enabled to form some notion of the tenor of the speech. The well-known story of Clodius finding access to the house of Cæsar, in female disguise, during the celebration of the mysteries of Bona Dea, gave occasion to this invective. A sort of altercation had one day passed in the Senate between Cicero and Clodius, soon after the acquittal of the latter for this offence, which probably suggested to Cicero the notion of writing a connected oration, inveighing against the vices and crimes of Clodius, particularly his profanation of the secret rites of the goddess, and the corrupt means by which he had obtained his acquittal. In one of his epistles to Atticus, Cicero gives a detailed account of this altercation, which certainly does not afford us a very dignified notion of senatorial gravity and decorum.

Of those orations of Cicero which have entirely perished, the greatest loss has been sustained by the disappearance of the defence of Cornelius, who was accused of practices against the state during his tribuneship. This speech, which was divided into two great parts, was continued for four successive days, in presence of an immense concourse of people, who testified their admiration of its bright eloquence by repeated applause*. The orator himself frequently refers to it as among the most finished of his compositions†; and the old critics cite it as an example of genuine eloquence. "Not merely," says Quintilian, "with strong, but with shining armour did Cicero contend in the cause of Cornelius." We have also to lament the loss of the oration for C. Piso, accused of oppression in his government—of the farewell discourse delivered to the Sicilians, (*Quum Quæstor Lilybæo discederet*), in which he gave them an account of his administration, and promised them his protection at Rome—of the invective pronounced in the Senate against Metellus, in answer to a harangue which that Tribune had delivered to the people concerning Cicero's conduct, in putting the confederates of Catiline to death without trial; and, finally, of the celebrated speech *De Proscriptorum Liberis*, in which, on political grounds, he opposed, while admitting their justice, the claims of the children of those whom Sylla had proscribed and disqualified from holding

* Quintil. *Instit. Orat. Lib. V.*

† *Orator*, c. 67, 70.

any honours in the state, and who now applied to be relieved from their disabilities. The success which he obtained in resisting this demand, is described in strong terms by Pliny: "Te orante, proscriptorum liberos honores petere puduit*." A speech which is now lost, and which, though afterwards reduced to writing, must have been delivered extempore, afforded another strong example of the persuasiveness of his eloquence. The appearance of the Tribune, Roscius Otho, who had set apart seats for the knights at the public spectacles, having one day occasioned a disturbance at the theatre, Cicero, on being informed of the tumult, hastened to the spot, and, calling out the people to the Temple of Bellona, he so calmed them by the magic of his eloquence, that, returning immediately to the theatre, they clapped their hands in honour of Otho, and vied with the knights in giving him demonstrations of respect†. One topic which he touched on in this oration, and the only one of which we have any hint from antiquity, was the rioters' want of taste, in creating a tumult, while Roscius was performing on the stage‡. This speech, the orations against the Agrarian law, and that *De Proscriptorum Liberis*, have long been cited as the strongest examples of the power of eloquence over the passions of mankind: And it is difficult to say, whether the highest praise be due to the orator, who could persuade, or to the people, who could be thus induced to relinquish the most tempting expectations of property and honours, and the full enjoyment of their favourite amusements.

In the age of that declamation which prevailed at Rome from the time of Tiberius to the fall of the empire, it was the practice of rhetoricians to declaim on similar topics with those on which Cicero had delivered, or was supposed to have delivered, harangues. It appears from Aulus Gellius§, that in the age of Marcus Aurelius doubts were entertained with regard to the authenticity of certain orations circulated as productions of Cicero. He was known to have delivered four speeches almost immediately after his recall from banishment, on subjects closely connected with his exile. The first was addressed to the Senate||, and the second to the people, a few days subsequently to his return¶; the third to the college of Pontiffs, in order to obtain restitution of a piece of ground on the Palatine hill, on which his house had formerly stood, but had been demolished, and a temple erected on the spot, with a view, as he feared, to alienate it irretrievably from the proprietor, by thus consecrating

* *Hist. Nat.* Lib. VII. c. 30.

† *Macrob.* *Saturnal.* Lib. III. c. 14.

‡ *Dio Cassius*, XXXIX. c. 9.

§ *Plutarch*, *In Cicero*.

¶ *Noct. Attic.* Lib. I. c. 7.

|| *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. IV. Ep. 1.

it to religious purposes*. The fourth was pronounced in consequence of Clodius declaring that certain menacing prodigies, which had lately appeared, were indubitably occasioned by the desecration of this ground, which the Pontiffs had now discharged from religious uses. Four orations, supposed to have been delivered on those occasions, and entitled, *Post Reditum in Senatu, Ad Quirites post Reditum, Pro domo sua ad Pontifices, De Haruspicum Responsis*, were published in all the early editions of Cicero, without any doubts of their authenticity being hinted by the commentators, and were also referred to as genuine authorities by Middleton in his Life of Cicero. At length, about the middle of last century, the well-known dispute having arisen between Middleton and Tunstall, concerning the letters to Brutus, Markland engaged in the controversy; and his remarks on the correspondence of Cicero and Brutus were accompanied with a "Dissertation on the Four Orations ascribed to M. T. Cicero," published in 1745, which threw great doubts on their authenticity. Middleton made no formal reply to this part of Markland's observations; but he neither retracted his opinion nor changed a word in his subsequent edition of the Life of Cicero.

Soon afterwards, Ross, the editor of Cicero's *Epistola Familiaris*, and subsequently Bishop of Exeter, ironically showed, in his "Dissertation, in which the defence of P. Sulla, ascribed to Cicero, is clearly proved to be spurious, after the manner of Mr Markland," that, on the principles and line of argument adopted by his opponent, the authenticity of any one of the orations might be contested. This *jeu d'esprit* of Bishop Ross was seriously confuted in a "Dissertation, in which the Objections of a late Pamphlet to the Writings of the Ancients, after the manner of Mr Markland, are clearly Answered; and those Passages in Tully corrected, on which some of the Objections are founded.—1746." This dissertation was printed by Bowyer, and he is generally believed to have been the author of it†. In Germany, J. M. Gesner, with all the weight attached to his opinion, and *Thesaurus*, strenuously defended these orations in two prelections, held in 1753 and 1754, and inserted in the 3d volume of the new series of the Transactions of the Royal Academy at Gottingen, under the title *Cicero Restitutus*, in which he refuted, one by one, all the objections of Markland.

* *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. IV. Ep. 2.

† See Nichol's *Literary Anecdotes*. Harles, also, seems to suppose that Bishop Ross was in earnest:—"Orationem pro Sulla spuriam esse audacter pronunciauit vir quidam doctus in—A Dissertation, in which the defence of P. Sulla, &c. is proved to be spurious."—HARLES, *Introduct. in Notitiam Literat. Rom.* Tom. II. p. 158.

After this, although the Letters of Brutus were no longer considered as authentic, literary men in all countries—as De Brosses, the French Translator of Sallust, Ferguson, Saxius, in his *Onomasticon*, and Rhunkenius—adopted the orations as genuine. Ernesti, in his edition of Cicero, makes no mention of the existence of any doubts respecting them; and, in his edition of Fabricius*, alludes to the controversy concerning them as a foolish and insignificant dispute. A change of opinion, however, was produced by an edition of the four orations which Wolfius published at Berlin in 1801, to which he prefixed an account of the controversy, and a general view of the arguments of Markland and Gesner. The observations of each, relating to particular words and phrases, are placed below the passages as they occur, and are followed by Wolf's own remarks, refuting, to the utmost of his power, the opinions of Gesner, and confirming those of Markland. Schütz, the late German editor of Cicero, has completely adopted the notions of Wolf; and by printing these four harangues, not in their order in the series, but separately, and at the end of the whole, along with the discarded correspondence between Cicero and Brutus, has thrown them without the classical pale as effectually as Lambinus excluded the once recognized orations, *In pace*, and *Antequam iret in Exilium*. In the fourth volume of his new edition of the works of Cicero now proceeding in Germany, Beck has followed the opinion of Wolf, after an impartial examination of the different arguments in his notes, and in an *excursus criticus* devoted to this subject.

Markland and Wolf believe, that these harangues were written as a rhetorical exercise, by some declaimer, who lived not long after Cicero, probably in the time of Tiberius, and who had before his eyes some orations of Cicero now lost, (perhaps those which he delivered on his return from exile,) from which the rhetorician occasionally borrowed ideas or phrases, not altogether unworthy of the orator's genius and eloquence. But, though they may contain some insulated Ciceronian expressions, it is utterly denied that these orations can be the continued composition of Cicero. The arguments against their authenticity are deduced, *first*, from their matter; and, *secondly*, from their style. These critics dwell much on the numerous thoughts and ideas inconsistent with the known sentiments, or unsuitable to the disposition of the author,—on the relation of events, told in a different manner from that in which they have been recorded by him in his undoubted works,—and, finally, on the gross ignorance shown of the laws.

* *Bib. Lat. Lib. I. c. 8.*

institutions, and customs of Rome, and even of the events passing at the time. Thus it is said, in one of these four orations, that, on some political occasion, all the senators changed their garb, as also the Prætors and Ædiles, which proves, that the author was ignorant that all Ædiles and Prætors were necessarily senators, since, otherwise, the special mention of them would be superfluous and absurd. What is still stronger, the author, in the oration *Ad Quirites post reditum*, refers to the speech in behalf of Gabinius, which was not pronounced till 699. three years subsequently to Cæsar's recall; whereas the real oration, *Ad Quirites*, was delivered on the second or third day after his return. With regard to the style of these harangues, it is argued, that the expressions are affected, the sentences perplexed, and the transitions abrupt; and that their languor and want of animation render them wholly unworthy of Cicero. Markland particularly points out the absurd repetition of what the declaimer had considered Ciceronian phrases,—as, “Aras, focos, penates—Deos immortales—Res incredibiles—Esse videatur.” Of the orations individually he remarks, and justly, that the one delivered by Cicero in the Senate immediately after his return, was known to have been prepared with the greatest possible care, and to have been committed to writing before it was pronounced; while the fictitious harangue which we now have in its place, is at all events, quite unlike anything that Cicero would have produced with elaborate study. The second is a sort of compendium of the first, and the same ideas and expressions are slavishly repeated; which implies a barrenness of invention, and sterility of language, that cannot be supposed in Cicero. Of the third oration he speaks, in his letters to Atticus, as one of his happiest efforts*; but nothing can be more wretched than that which we now have in its stead,—the first twelve chapters, indeed, being totally irrelevant to the question at issue.

The oration for Marcellus, the genuineness of which has also been called in question, is somewhat in a different style from the other harangues of Cicero; for, though entitled *Pro Marcello*, it is not so much a speech in his defence, as a panegyric on Cæsar, for having granted the pardon of Marcellus at the intercession of the Senate. Marcellus had been one of the most violent opponents of the views of Cæsar. He had recommended in the Senate, that he should be deprived of the province of Gaul: he had insulted the magistrates of one of Cæsar's new-founded colonies; and had been present at Pharsalia on the side of Pompey. After that battle he retired to Mitylene, where he was obliged to remain, being one of the

* Lib. IV. Ep. 2.

few adversaries to whom the conqueror refused to be reconciled. The Senate, however, one day when Cæsar was present, with an united voice, and in an attitude of supplication, having implored his clemency in favour of Marcellus, and their request having been granted, Cicero, though he had resolved to preserve eternal silence, being moved by the occasion, delivered one of the most strained encomiums that has ever been pronounced.

In the first part he extols the military exploits of Cæsar ; but shows, that his clemency to Marcellus was more glorious than any of his other actions, as it depended entirely on himself, while fortune and his army had their share in the events of the war. In the second part he endeavours to dispel the suspicions which it appears Cæsar still entertained of the hostile intentions of Marcellus, and takes occasion to assure the Dictator that his life was most dear and valuable to all, since on it depended the tranquillity of the state, and the hopes of the restoration of the commonwealth.

This oration, which Middleton declares to be superior to anything extant of the kind in all antiquity, and which a celebrated French critic terms, "Le discours le plus noble, le plus pathétique, et en même tems le plus patriotique, que la reconnaissance, l'amitié, et la vertu, puissent inspirer à une ame élevée et sensible," continued to be not only of undisputed authenticity, but one of Cicero's most admired productions, till Wolf, in the preface and notes to a new edition of it, printed in 1802, attempted to show, that it was a spurious production, totally unworthy of the orator whose name it bore, and that it was written by some declaimer, soon after the Augustan age, not as an imposition upon the public, but as an exercise,—according to the practice of the rhetoricians, who were wont to choose, as a theme, some subject on which Cicero had spoken. In his letters to Atticus, Cicero says, that he had returned thanks to Cæsar *pluribus verbis*. This Middleton translates a *long speech* ; but Wolf alleges it can only mean a few words, and never can be interpreted to denote a full oration, such as that which we now possess for Marcellus. That Cicero did not deliver a long or formal speech, is evident, he contends, from the testimony of Plutarch, who mentions, in his life of Cicero, that, a short time afterwards, when the orator was about to plead for Ligarius, Cæsar asked, how it happened that he had not heard Cicero speak for so long a period,—which would have been absurd if he had heard him, a few months before, pleading for Marcellus. Being an extemporary effusion, called forth by an unforeseen occasion, it could not (he continues to urge) have been pre-

pared and written beforehand ; nor is it at all probable, that, like many other orations of Cicero, it was revised and made public after being delivered. The causes which induced the Roman orators to write out their speeches at leisure, were the magnitude and public importance of the subject, or the wishes of those in whose defence they were made, and who were anxious to possess a sort of record of their vindication. But none of these motives existed in the present case. The matter was of no importance or difficulty ; and we know that Marcellus, who was a stern republican, was not at all gratified by the intervention of the senators, or conciliated by the clemency of Cæsar. As to internal evidence, deduced from the oration, Wolf admits, that there are interspersed in it some Ciceronian sentences ; and how otherwise could the learned have been so egregiously deceived ? but the resemblance is more in the varnish of the style than in the substance. We have the words rather than the thoughts of Cicero ; and the rounding of his periods, without their energy and argumentative connection. He adduces, also, many instances of phrases unusual among the classics, and of conceits which betray the rhetorician or sophist. His extolling the act of that day on which Cæsar pardoned Marcellus as higher than all his warlike exploits, would but have raised a smile on the lips of the Dictator ; and the slighting way in which the cause of the republic and Pompey are mentioned, is totally different from the manner in which Cicero expressed himself on these delicate topics, even in presence of Cæsar, in his authentic orations for Deiotarus and Ligarius.

It is evident, at first view, that many of Wolf's observations are hypercritical ; and that in his argument concerning the encomiums on Cæsar, and the overrated importance of his clemency to Marcellus, he does not make sufficient allowance for Cicero's habit of exaggeration, and the momentary enthusiasm produced by one of those transactions,

—————"Quæ, dum geruntur,
Percellunt animos."————

Accordingly, in the year following that of Wolf's edition, Olaus Wormius published, at Copenhagen, a vindication of the authenticity of this speech. To the argument adduced from Plutarch, he answers, that some months had elapsed between the orations for Marcellus and Ligarius, which might readily be called a long period, by one accustomed to hear Cicero harangue almost daily in the Senate or Forum. Besides, the phrase of Plutarch, *λεγοντος* may mean pleading

for some one, which was not the nature of the speech for Marcellus. As to the motive which led to write and publish the oration, Cicero, above all men, was delighted with his own productions, and nothing can be more probable than that he should have wished to preserve the remembrance of that memorable day, which he calls in his letters, *diem illam pulcherrimam*. It was natural to send the oration to Marcellus, in order to hasten his return to Rome, and it must have been an acceptable thing to Cæsar, thus to record his fearlessness and benignity. With regard to the manner in which Pompey and the republican party are talked of, it is evident, from his letters, that Cicero was disgusted with the political measures of that faction, that he wholly disapproved of their plan of the campaign, and foreseeing a renewal of Sylla's proscriptions in the triumph of the aristocratic power, he did not exaggerate in so highly extolling the humanity of Cæsar.

The arguments of Wormius were expanded and illustrated by Weiske, *In Commentario perpetuo et pleno in Orat. Ciceronis pro Marcello*, published at Leipsic, in 1805*, while, on the other hand, Spalding, in his *De Oratione pro Marcello Disputatio*, published in 1808, supported the opinions of Wolfius.

The controversy was in this state, and was considered as involved in much doubt and obscurity, when Aug. Jacob, in an academical exercise, printed at Halle and Berlin, in 1813, and entitled *De Oratione quæ inscribitur pro Marcello, Ciceroni vel abjudicata vel adjudicata. Quæstio novaque conjectura*, adopted a middle course. Finding such dissimilarity in the different passages of the oration, some being most powerful, elegant, and beautiful, while others were totally futile and frigid, he was led to believe that part had actually flowed from the lips of Cicero, but that much had been subsequently interpolated by some rhetorician or declaimer. He divides his whole treatise into four heads, which comprehend all the various points agitated on the subject of this oration: 1. The testimony of different authors tending to prove the authenticity or spuriousness of the production: 2. The history of the period, with which every genuine oration must necessarily concur: 3. The genius and manner of Cicero, from which no

* "Cum Appendice De Oratione, quæ vulgo fertur, M. T. Ciceronis pro Q. Ligario," in which the author attempts to abjudicate from Cicero the beautiful oration for Ligarius, which shook even the soul of Cæsar, while he has translated into his own language the two wretched orations, *Post Reditum*, and *Ad Quirites*, insisting on the legitimacy of both, and enlarging on their truly classical beauties! In his Preface, he has pleasantly enough parodied the arguments of Wolf against the oration for Marcellus, ironically showing that they came not from that great scholar, but from a *pseudo* Wolf, who had assumed his name.

one of his orations could be entirely remote: 4. The style and phraseology, which must be correct and classical. In the prosecution of his inquiry in these different aspects of the subject, the author successively reviews the opinions and judgments of his predecessors, sometimes agreeing with Wolf and his followers, at other times, and more frequently, with their opposers. He thinks that the much-contested phrase *pluribus verbis*, may mean a long oration, as Cicero elsewhere talks of having pleaded for Cluentius, *pluribus verbis*, though the speech in his defence consists of 68 chapters. Besides, Cicero only says that he had *returned thanks* to Cæsar, *pluribus verbis*. Now, the whole speech does not consist of thanks to Cæsar, being partly occupied in removing the suspicions which he entertained of Marcellus. With regard to encomiums on Cæsar, which Spalding has characterized as abject and fulsome, and totally different from the delicate compliments addressed to him in the oration for Deiotarus or Ligarius, Jacob reminds his readers that the harangues could have no resemblance to each other, the latter being pleadings in behalf of the accused, and the former a professed panegyric. Nor can any one esteem the eulogies on Cæsar too extravagant for Cicero, when he remembers the terms in which the orator had formerly spoken of Roscius, Archias, and Pompey.

Schütz, the late German editor of Cicero, has subscribed to the opinion of Wolf, and has published the speech for Marcellus, along with the other four doubtful harangues at the end of the genuine orations.

But supposing that these five contested speeches are spurious, a sufficient number of genuine orations remain to enable us to distinguish the character of Cicero's eloquence. Ambitious from his youth of the honours attending a fine speaker, he early travelled to Greece, where he accumulated all the stores of knowledge and rules of art, which could be gathered from the rhetoricians, historians, and philosophers, of that intellectual land. While he thus extracted and imbibed the copiousness of Plato, the sweetness of Isocrates, and force of Demosthenes, he, at the same time, imbued his mind with a thorough knowledge of the laws, constitution, antiquities, and literature, of his native country. Nor did he less study the peculiar temper, the jealousies, and enmities of the Roman people, both as a nation and as individuals, without a knowledge of which, his eloquence would have been unavailing in the Forum or Comitia, where so much was decided by favouritism and cabal. By these means he ruled the passions and deliberations of his countrymen with almost resistless sway—

upheld the power of the Senate—stayed the progress of tyranny—drove the audacious Catiline from Rome—directed the feelings of the state in favour of Pompey—shook the strong mind of Cæsar—and kindled a flame by which Antony had been nearly consumed. But the main secret of his success lay in the warmth and intensity of his feelings. His heart swelled with patriotism, and was dilated with the most magnificent conceptions of the glory of Rome. Though it throbbed with the fondest anticipations of posthumous fame, the momentary acclaim of a multitude was a chord to which it daily and most readily vibrated; while, at the same time, his high conceptions of oratory counteracted the bad effect which this exuberant vanity might otherwise have produced. Thus, when two speakers were employed in the same cause, though Cicero was the junior, to him was assigned the peroration, in which he surpassed all his contemporaries; and he obtained this pre-eminence not so much on account of his superior genius or knowledge of law, as because he was more moved and affected himself, without which he would never have moved or affected his judges.

With such natural endowments, and such acquirements, he early took his place as the refuge and support of his fellow-citizens in the Forum, as the arbiter of the deliberations of the Senate, and as the most powerful defender from the Rostrium of the political interests of the commonwealth.

Cicero and Demosthenes have been frequently compared. Suidas says, that one Cicilus, a native of Sicily, whose works are now lost, was the first to institute the parallel, and they have been subsequently compared, in due form, by Plutarch and Quintilian, and, (as far as relates to sublimity,) by Longinus, among the ancients; and among the moderns, by Herder, in his *Philosophical History of Man*, and by Jenisch, in a German work devoted to the subject*. Rapin, and all other French critics, with the exception of Fenelon, give the preference to Cicero.

From what has already been said, it is sufficiently evident that Cicero had not to contend with any of those obstructions from nature which Demosthenes encountered; and his youth, in place of being spent like that of the Greek orator, in remedying and supplying defects, was unceasingly employed in pursuit of the improvements auxiliary to his art. But if Cicero derived superior advantages from nature, Demosthenes possessed other advantages, in the more advanced progress of his country in refinement and letters, at the era in which he ap-

* *Paral. der Beyden Größten Redner des Altherthums.*

peared. Greek literature had reached its full perfection before the birth of Demosthenes, but Cicero was, in a great measure, himself the creator of the literature of Rome, and no prose writer of eminence had yet existed, after whom he could model his phraseology. In other external circumstances, they were placed in situations not very dissimilar. But Cicero had a wider, and perhaps more beautiful field, in which to expatiate and to exercise his powers. The wide extent of the Roman empire, the striking vices and virtues of its citizens, the memorable events of its history, supplied an endless variety of great and interesting topics; whereas many of the orations of Demosthenes are on subjects unworthy of his talents. Their genius and capacity were in many respects the same. Their eloquence was of that great and comprehensive kind, which dignifies every subject, and gives it all the force and beauty it is capable of receiving. "I judge Cicero and Demosthenes," says Quintilian, "to be alike in most of the great qualities they possessed. They were alike in design, in the manner of dividing their subject, and preparing the minds of the audience; in short, in every thing belonging to invention." But while there was much similarity in their talents, there was a wide difference in their tempers and characters. Demosthenes was of an austere, harsh, melancholy disposition, obstinate and resolute in all his undertakings: Cicero was of a lively, flexible, and wavering humour. This seems the chief cause of the difference in their eloquence; but the contrasts are too obvious, and have been too often exhibited to be here displayed. No person wishes to be told, for the twentieth time, that Demosthenes assumes a higher tone, and is more serious, vehement, and impressive, than Cicero; while Cicero is more insinuating, graceful, and affecting: That the Greek orator struck on the soul by the force of his argument, and ardour of his expressions; while the Roman made his way to the heart, alternately moving and allaying the passions of his hearers, by all the arts of rhetoric, and by conforming to their opinions and prejudices.

Cicero was not only a great orator, but has also left the fullest instructions and the most complete historical details on the art which he so gloriously practised. His precepts are contained in the dialogue *De Oratore* and the *Orator*; while the history of Roman eloquence is comprehended in the dialogue entitled, *Brutus, sive De Claris Oratoribus*.

In his youth, Cicero had written and published some undigested observations on the subject of eloquence; but consi-

dering these as unworthy of the character and experience he afterwards acquired, he applied himself to write a treatise on the art which might be more commensurate to his matured talents. He himself mentions several Sicilians and Greeks, who had written on oratory*. But the models he chiefly followed, were Aristotle, in his books of rhetoric†; and Isocrates, the whole of whose theories and precepts he has comprehended in his rhetorical works. He has thrown his ideas on the subject into the form of dialogue or conference, a species of composition, which, however much employed by the Greeks, had not hitherto been attempted at Rome. This mode of writing presented many advantages: By adopting it he avoided that dogmatical air, which a treatise from him on such a subject would necessarily have worn, and was enabled to instruct without dictating rules. Dialogue, too, relieved monotony of style, by affording opportunity of varying it according to the characters of the different speakers—it tempered the austerity of precept by the cheerfulness of conversation, and developed each opinion with the vivacity and fulness naturally employed in the oral discussion of a favourite topic. Add to this, the facility which it presented of paying an acceptable compliment to the friends who were introduced as interlocutors, and its susceptibility of agreeable description of the scenes in which the persons of the dialogue were placed—a species of embellishment, for which ample scope was afforded by the numerous villas of Cicero, situated in the most beautiful spots of Italy, and in every variety of landscape, from the Alban heights to the shady banks of the Liris, or glittering shore of Baiæ. As a method of communicating knowledge, however, (except in discussions which are extremely simple, and susceptible of much delineation of character,) the mode of dialogue is, in many respects, extremely inconvenient. “By the interruptions which are given,” says the author of the life of Tasso, in his remarks on the dialogues of that poet,—“By the interruptions which are given, if a dialogue be at all dramatic—by the preparations and transitions, order and precision must, in a great degree, be sacrificed. In reasoning, as much brevity must be used as is consistent with perspicuity; but in dialogue, so much verbiage must be employed, that the scope of the argument is generally lost. The replies, too, to the objections of the opponent, seem rather arguments *ad hominem*, than possessed of the value of abstract truth; so that the reader is perplexed and bewildered, and concludes the inquiry, beholding one of the characters puzzled, indeed, and perhaps subdued, but not

* *Brutus*, c. 12, &c.

† *Epist. Famil. Lib. I. Ep. 9.*

at all satisfied that the battle might not have been better fought, and more victorious arguments adduced."

The dialogue *De Oratore* was written in the year 698, when Cicero, disgusted with the political dissensions of the capital, had retired, during part of the summer, to the country: But, according to the supposition of the piece, the dialogue occurred in 662. The author addresses it to his brother in a dedication, strongly expressive of his fondness for study; and, after some general observations on the difficulty of the oratoric art, and the numerous accomplishments requisite to form a complete orator, he introduces his dialogue, or rather the three dialogues, of which the performance consists. Dialogue writing may be executed either as direct conversation, in which none but the speakers appear, and where, as in the scenes of a play, no information is afforded except from what the persons of the drama say to each other; or as the recital of the conversation, where the author himself appears, and after a preliminary detail concerning the persons of the dialogue, and the circumstances of time and place in which it was held, proceeds to give an account of what passed in the discourse at which he had himself been present, or the import of which was communicated to him by some one who had attended and borne his part in the conference. It is this latter method that has been followed by Cicero, in his dialogues *De Oratore*. He mentions in his own person, that during the celebration of certain festivals at Rome, the orator Crassus retired to his villa at Tusculum, one of the most delightful retreats in Italy, whither he was accompanied by Antony, his most intimate friend in private life, but most formidable rival in the Forum; and by his father-in-law, Scævola, who was the greatest jurisconsult of his age, and whose house in the city was resorted to as an oracle, by men of the highest rank and dignity. Crassus was also attended by Cotta and Sulpicius, at that time the two most promising orators of Rome, the former of whom afterwards related to Cicero (for the author is not supposed to be personally present) the conversation which passed among these distinguished men, as they reclined on the benches under a planetree, that grew on one of the walks surrounding the villa. It is not improbable, that some such conversation may have been actually held, and that Cicero, notwithstanding his age, and the authority derived from his rhetorical reputation, may have chosen to avail himself of the circumstance, in order to shelter his opinions under those of two ancient masters, who, previously to his own time, were regarded as the chief organs of Roman eloquence.

Crassus, in order to dissipate the gloom which had been oc-

casioned by a serious and even melancholy conversation, on the situation of public affairs, turned the discourse on oratory. The sentiments which he expresses on this subject are supposed to be those which Cicero himself entertained. In order to excite the two young men, Cotta and Sulpicius, to prosecute with ardour the career they had so successfully commenced, he first enlarges on the utility and excellence of oratory; and then, proceeding to the object which he had principally in view, he contends that an almost universal knowledge is essentially requisite to perfection in this noble art. He afterwards enumerates those branches of knowledge which the orator should acquire, and the purposes to which he should apply them: he inculcates the necessity of an acquaintance with the antiquities, manners, and constitution of the republic—the constant exercise of written composition—the study of gesture at the theatre—the translation of the Greek orators—reading and commenting on the philosophers, reading and criticizing the poets. The question hence arises, whether a knowledge of the civil law be serviceable to the orator? Crassus attempts to prove its utility from various examples of cases, where its principles required to be elucidated; as also from the intrinsic nobleness of the study itself, and the superior excellence of the Roman law to all other systems of jurisprudence. Antony, who was a mere practical pleader, considered philosophy and civil law as useless to the orator, being foreign to the real business of life. He conceived that eloquence might subsist without them, and that with regard to the other accomplishments enumerated by Crassus, they were totally distinct from the proper office and duty of a public speaker. It is accordingly agreed, that on the following day Antony should state his notions of the acquirements appropriate to an orator. Previous to the commencement of the second conversation, the party is joined by Catulus and Julius Cæsar, (grand-uncle to the Dictator,) two of the most eminent orators of the time, the former being distinguished by his elegance and purity of diction, the latter by his turn for pleasantry. Having met Scævola, on his way from Tusculum to the villa of Lælius, and having heard from him of the interesting conversation which had been held, the remainder of which had been deferred till the morrow, they came over from a neighbouring villa to partake of the instruction and entertainment. In their presence, and in that of Crassus, Antony maintains his favourite system, that eloquence is not an art, because it depends not on knowledge. Imitation of good models, practice, and minute attention to each particular case, which should be scrupulously examined in all its bearings, are laid down by him as the foun-

dations of forensic eloquence. The great objects of an orator being, in the first place, to recommend himself to his clients, and then to prepossess the audience and judges in their favour, Antony enlarges on the practice of the bar, in conciliating, informing, moving, and undeceiving those on whom the decision of causes depends; all which is copiously illustrated by examples drawn from particular questions, which had occurred at Rome in cases of proof, strict law, or equity. The chief weight and importance is attributed to moving the springs of the passions. Among the methods of conciliation and prepossession, humour and drollery are particularly mentioned. Cæsar being the oratorical wit of the party, is requested to give some examples of forensic jests. Those he affords are for the most part wretched quibbles, or personal reflections on the opposite parties, and their witnesses. The length of the dissertation, however, on this topic, shows the important share it was considered as occupying among the qualifications of the ancient orator.

Antony having thus explained the mechanical part of the orator's duty, it is agreed, that in the afternoon Crassus should enter on the embellishments of rhetoric. In the execution of the task assigned him, he treats of all that relates to what may be called the ornamental part of oratory—pronunciation, elocution, harmony of periods, metaphors, sentiments, action, (which he terms the predominant power in eloquence,) expression of countenance, modulation of voice, and all those properties which impart a finished grace and dignity to a public discourse.

Cicero himself highly approved of this treatise on Oratory, and his friends regarded it as one of his best productions. The style of the dialogue is copious, without being redundant, as is sometimes the case in the orations. It is admirable for the diversity of character in the speakers, the general conduct of the piece, and the variety of matter it contains. It comprehends, I believe, everything valuable in the Greek works on rhetoric, and also many excellent observations, suggested by the author's long experience, acquired in the numerous causes, both public and private, which he conducted in the Forum, and the important discussions in which he swayed the counsels of the Senate. As a composition, however, I cannot consider the dialogue *De Oratore* altogether faultless. It is too little dramatic for a dialogue, and occasionally it expands into continued dissertation; while, at the same time, by adopting the form of dialogue, a rambling and desultory effect is produced in the discussion of a subject, where, of all others, method and close connection were most desirable. There is also

frequently an assumed liveliness of manner, which seems forced and affected in these grave and consular orators.

The dialogue entitled *Brutus, sive De Claris Oratoribus*, was written, and is also feigned to have taken place, after Cæsar had attained to sovereign power, though he was still engaged in the war against Scipio in Africa. The conference is supposed to be held among Cicero, Atticus, and Brutus, (from whom it has received its name,) near a statue of Plato, which stood in the pleasure-grounds of Cicero's mansion, at Rome.

Brutus having experienced the clemency of the conqueror, whom he afterwards sacrificed, left Italy, in order to amuse himself with an agreeable tour through the cities of Greece and Asia. In a few months he returned to Rome, resigned himself to the calm studies of history and rhetoric, and passed many of his leisure hours in the society of Cicero and Atticus. The first part of the dialogue, among these three friends, contains a few slight, but masterly sketches, of the most celebrated speakers who had flourished in Greece; but these are not so much mentioned with an historical design, as to support by examples the author's favourite proposition, that perfection in oratory requires proficiency in all the arts. The dialogue is chiefly occupied with details concerning Roman orators, from the earliest ages to Cicero's own time. He first mentions such speakers as Appius Claudius and Fabricius, of whom he knew nothing certain, whose harangues had never been committed to writing, or were no longer extant, and concerning whose powers of eloquence he could only derive conjectures, from the effects which they produced on the people and Senate, as recorded in the ancient annals. The second class of orators are those, like Cato the Censor, and the Gracchi, whose speeches still survived, or of whom he could speak traditionally, from the report of persons still living who had heard them. A great deal of what is said concerning this set of orators, rests on the authority of Hortensius, from whom Cicero derived his information*. The third class are the deceased contemporaries of the author, whom he had himself seen and heard; and he only departs from his rule of mentioning no living orator at the special request of Brutus, who expresses an anxiety to learn his opinion of the merits of Marcellus and Julius Cæsar. Towards the conclusion, he gives some account of his own rise and progress, of the education he had received, and the various methods which he had practised in order to reach those heights of eloquence he had attained.

* *Epist. ad Attic. Lib. XII. Ep. 5, &c.*

This work is certainly of the greatest service to the history of Roman eloquence; and it likewise throws considerable light on the civil transactions of the republic, as the author generally touches on the principal incidents in the lives of those eminent orators whom he mentions. It also gives additional weight and authority to the oratorical precepts contained in his other works, since it shows, that they were founded, not on any speculative theories, but on a minute observation of the actual faults and excellencies of the most renowned speakers of his age. Yet, with all these advantages, it is not so entertaining as might be expected. The author mentions too many orators, and says too little of each, which gives his treatise the appearance rather of a dry catalogue, than of a literary essay, or agreeable dialogue. He acknowledges, indeed, in the course of it, that he had inserted in his list of orators many who possessed little claim to that appellation, since he designed to give an account of all the Romans, without exception, who had made it their study to excel in the arts of eloquence.

The *Orator*, addressed to Brutus, and written at his solicitation, was intended to complete the subjects examined in the dialogues, *De Oratore*, and *De Claris Oratoribus*. It contains the description of what Cicero conceived necessary to form a perfect orator,—a character which, indeed, nowhere existed, but of which he had formed the idea in his own imagination. He admits, that Attic eloquence approached the nearest to perfection; he pauses, however, to correct a prevailing error, that the only genuine Atticism is a correct, plain, and slender discourse, distinguished by purity of style, and delicacy of taste, but void of all ornaments and redundancy. In the time of Cicero, there was a class of orators, including several men of parts and learning, and of the first quality, who, while they acknowledged the superiority of his genius, yet censured his diction as not truly Attic, some calling it loose and languid, others tumid and exuberant. These speakers affected a minute and fastidious correctness, pointed sentences, short and concise periods, without a syllable to spare in them—as if the perfection of oratory consisted in frugality of words, and the crowding of sentiments into the narrowest possible compass. The chief patrons of this taste were Brutus and Licinius Calvus. Cicero, while he admitted that correctness was essential to eloquence, contended, that a nervous, copious, animated, and even ornate style, may be truly Attic; since, otherwise, Lysias would be the only Attic orator, to the exclusion of Isocrates, and even Demosthenes himself. He accordingly opposed the system of these ultra-

Attic orators, whom he represents as often deserted in the midst of their harangues ; for although their style of rhetoric might please the ear of a critic, it was not of that sublime, pathetic, or sonorous species, of which the end was not only to instruct, but to move an audience,—whose excitement and admiration form the true criterions of eloquence.

The remainder of the treatise is occupied with the three things to be attended to by an orator,—what he is to say, in what order his topics are to be arranged, and how they are to be expressed. In discussing the last point, the author enters very fully into the collocation of words, and that measured cadence, which, to a certain extent, prevails even in prose ;—a subject on which Brutus wished particularly to be instructed, and which he accordingly treats in detail.

This tract is rather confusedly arranged ; and the dissertation on prosaic harmony, though curious, appears to us somewhat too minute in its object for the attention of an orator. Cicero, however, set a high value on this production ; and, in a letter to Lepta, he declares, that whatever judgment he possessed on the subject of oratory, he had thrown it all into that work, and was ready to stake his reputation on its merits*.

The *Topica* may also be considered as another work on the subject of rhetoric. Aristotle, as is well known, wrote a book with this title. The lawyer, Caius Trebatius, a friend of Cicero, being curious to know the contents and import of the Greek work, which he had accidentally seen in Cicero's Tusculan library, but being deterred from its study by the obscurity of the writer, (though it certainly is not one of the most difficult of Aristotle's productions,) requested Cicero to draw up this extract, or commentary, in order to explain the various *topics*, or common-places, which are the foundation of rhetorical argument. Of this request Cicero was some time afterwards reminded by the view of Velia, (the marine villa of Trebatius,) during a coasting voyage which he undertook, with the intention of retiring to Greece, in consequence of the troubles which followed the death of Cæsar. Though he had neither Aristotle nor any other book at hand to assist him, he drew it up from memory as he sailed along, and finished it before he arrived at Rhegium, whence he sent it to Trebatius†.

This treatise shows, that Cicero had most diligently studied Aristotle's *Topics*. It is not, however, a translation, but an extract or explanation of that work ; and, as it was addressed to a lawyer, he has taken his examples chiefly from the civil law of the Romans, which he conceived Trebatius would un-

* *Epist. Famil. Lib. VI. Ep. 18.*

† *Ibid. Lib. VII. Ep. 19.*

derstand better than illustrations drawn, like those of Aristotle, from the philosophy of the Greeks.

It is impossible sufficiently to admire Cicero's industry and love of letters, which neither the inconveniences of a sea voyage, which he always disliked, nor the harassing thoughts of leaving Italy at such a conjuncture, could divert from the calm and regular pursuit of his favourite studies.

The work *De Partitione Rhetorica*, is written in the form of a dialogue between Cicero and his son; the former replying to the questions of the latter concerning the principles and doctrine of eloquence. The tract now entitled *De Optimo genere Oratorum*, was originally intended as a preface to a translation which Cicero had made from the orations of *Æschines* and *Demosthenes* in the case of *Ctesipho*, in which an absurd and trifling matter of ceremony has become the basis of an immortal controversy. In this preface he reverts to the topic on which he had touched in the *Orator*—the mistake which prevailed in Rome, that Attic eloquence was limited to that accurate, dry, and subtle manner of expression, adopted in the orations of *Lysias*. It was to correct this error, that Cicero undertook a free translation of the two master-pieces of Athenian eloquence; the one being an example of vehement and energetic, the other of pathetic and ornamental oratory. It is probable that Cicero was prompted to these repeated inquiries concerning the genuine character of Attic eloquence, from the reproach frequently cast on his own discourses by *Brutus*, *Calvus*, and other sterile, but, as they supposed themselves, truly Attic orators, that his harangues were not in the Greek, but rather in the Asiatic taste,—that is, nerveless, florid, and redundant.

It appears, that in Rome, as well as in Greece, oratory was generally considered as divided into three different styles—the Attic, Asiatic, and Rhodian. *Quintilian*, at least, so classes the various sorts of oratory in a passage, in which he also shortly characterizes them by those attributes from which they were chiefly distinguishable. "Mihi autem," says he, "orationis differentiam fecisse et dicentium et audientium naturæ videntur, quod *Attici* limati quidem et emuncti nihil inane aut redundans ferebant. *Asiana* gens, tumidior alioquin et jactantior, vaniore etiam dicendi gloria inflata est. Tertium mox qui hæc dividebant adjecerunt genus *Rhodium*, quod velut medium esse, atque ex utroque mixtum volunt*." *Brutus* and *Licinius Calvus*, as we have seen, affected the slender, polished, and somewhat barren conciseness of Attic eloquence.

* *Inst. Orat. Lib. XII. c. 10.*

The speeches of Hortensius, and a few of Cicero's earlier harangues, as that for Sextus Roscius, afforded examples of the copious, florid, and sometimes tumid style of Asiatic oratory. The latter orations of Cicero, refined by his study and experience, were, I presume, nearly in the Rhodian taste. That celebrated school of eloquence had been founded by Æschines, the rival of Demosthenes, when, being banished from his native city by the influence of his competitor, he had retired to the island of Rhodes. Inferior to Demosthenes in power of argument and force of expression, he surpassed him in copiousness and ornament. The school which he founded, and which subsisted for centuries after his death, admitted not the luxuries of Asiatic diction; and although the most ornamental of Greece, continued ever true to the principles of its great Athenian master. A chief part of the two years during which Cicero travelled in Greece and Asia was spent at Rhodes, and his principal teacher of eloquence at Rome was Molo the Rhodian, from whom he likewise afterwards received lessons at Rhodes. The great difficulty which that rhetorician encountered in the instruction of his promising disciple, was, as Cicero himself informs us, the effort of containing within its due and proper channel the overflowings of a youthful imagination*. Cicero's natural fecundity, and the bent of his own inclination, preserved him from the risk of dwindling into ultra-Attic slenderness; but it is not improbable, that from the example of Hortensius and his own copiousness, he might have swelled out to Asiatic pomp, had not his exuberance been early reduced by the seasonable and salutary discipline of the Rhodian.

Cicero, in his youth, also wrote the *Rhetorica, seu de Inventione Rhetorica*, of which there are still extant two books, treating of the part of rhetoric that relates to invention. This is the work mentioned by Cicero, in the commencement of the treatise *De Oratore*, as having been published by him in his youth. It is generally believed to have been written in 666, when Cicero was only twenty years of age, and to have originally contained four books. Schütz, however, the German editor of Cicero, is of opinion, that he never wrote, or at least, never published, more than the two books we still possess.

A number of sentences in these two books of the *Rhetorica, seu de Inventione*, coincide with passages in the *Rhetoricum ad Herennium*, which is usually published along with the works of Cicero, but is not of his composition. Purgold thinks

* *Brutus*, c. 91. *Is dedit operam (si modo id consequi potuit) ut nimis redundantes nos juvenili quâdam dicendi impunitate et licentiâ reprimeret, et quasi extra ripas diffuentes coerceret.*

that the *Rhetor. ad Herennium* was published first, and that Cicero copied from it those corresponding passages*. It appears, however, a little singular, that Cicero should have borrowed so largely, and without acknowledgment, from a recent publication of one of his contemporaries. To account for this difficulty some critics have supposed, that the anonymous author of the *Rhetor. ad Herennium* was a rhetorician, whose lectures Cicero had attended, and had inserted in his own work notes taken by him from these prelections, before they were edited by their author†. Some, again, have imagined, that Cicero and the anonymous author were fellow-students under the same rhetorician, and that both had thus adopted his ideas and expressions; while others believe, that both copied from a common Greek original. But then, in opposition to this last theory, it has been remarked, that the Latin words employed by both are frequently the same; and there are the same references to the history of Rome, and of its ancient native poets, with which no Greek writer can be supposed to have had much acquaintance.

Who the anonymous author of the *Rhetor. ad Herennium* actually was, has been the subject of much learned controversy, and the point remains still undetermined. Priscian repeatedly cites it as the work of Cicero; whence it was believed to be the production of Cicero by Laurentius Valla, George of Trebizond, Politian, and other great restorers of learning in the fifteenth century; and this opinion was from time to time, though feebly, revived by less considerable writers in succeeding periods. It seems now, however, entirely abandoned; but, while all critics and commentators agree in *abjudicating* the work from Cicero, they differ widely as to the person to whom the production should be assigned. Aldus Manutius, Sigonius, Muretus, and Riccobonus, were of opinion, that it was written by Q. Cornificius the elder, who was Cæsar's Quæstor during the civil war, and subsequently his lieutenant in Africa, of which province, after the Dictator's death, he kept possession for the republican party, till he was slain in an engagement with one of the generals of Octavius. The judgment of these scholars is chiefly founded on some passages in Quintilian, who attributes to Cornificius several critical and philological definitions which coincide with those introduced in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Gerard Vossius, however, has adopted an opinion, that if at all written by a

* *Observat. Critic. in Sophoc. et Ciceron.* Lips. 1802.

† Fuhrmann, *Handbuch der Classisch. Literat.*

person of that name, it must have been by the younger Cornificius*, who was born in 662, and, having followed the party of Octavius, was appointed Consul by favour of the Triumvirate in 718. Raphael Regius also seems inclined to attribute the work to Cornificius the son†. But if the style be considered too remote from that of the age of Cicero, to be ascribed to any of his contemporaries, he conceives it may be plausibly conjectured to have been the production of Timolaus, one of the thirty tyrants in the reign of Gallienus. Timolaus had a brother called Herenianus, to whom his work may have been dedicated, and he thinks that *Timolaus ad Herenianum* may have been corrupted into *Tullius ad Herennium*. J. C. Scaliger attributes the work to Gallio, a rhetorician in the time of Nero‡—an opinion which obtained currency in consequence of the discovery of a MS. copy of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, with the name of Gallio prefixed to it§.

Sufficient scope being thus left for new conjectures, Schütz, the German editor of Cicero, has formed a new hypothesis on the subject. Cicero's tract *De Inventione* having been written in his early youth, the period of its composition may be placed about 672. From various circumstances, which he discusses at great length, Schütz concludes that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* was the work which was first written, and consequently previous to 672. Farther, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* must have been written subsequently to 665, as it mentions the death of Sulpicius, which happened in that year. The time thus limited corresponds very exactly with the age of M. Ant. Gniphio, who was born in the year 640; and him Schütz considers as the real author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. This he attempts to prove, by showing, that many things which Suetonius relates of Gniphio, in his work *De Claris Rhetoribus*, agree with what the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* delivers concerning himself in the course of that production. It is pretty well established, that both Gniphio and the anonymous author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* were free-born, had good memories, understood Greek, and were voluminous authors. It is unfortunate, however, that these characteristics, except the first, were probably common to almost all rhetoricians; and Schütz does not allude to any of the more particular circumstances mentioned by Suetonius, as that Gniphio was a Gaul by birth, that he studied at Alexandria,

* *De Nat. et Const. Rhetor.* c. 13.

† *Dissert. Utrum ars Rhetorica ad Herennium Ciceroni falso inscribitur.*

‡ *De Re Poet.* Lib. III. c. 81. and 34.

§ See P. Burmanni Secund. *In Praef. ad Rhetoric. ad Herennium.* Also Fabricius, *Bib. Lat. Lib. I. c. 8.*

and that he taught rhetoric in the house of the father of Julius Cæsar.

† Cicero, who was unquestionably the first orator, was as decidedly the most learned philosopher of Rome; and while he eclipsed all his contemporaries in eloquence, he acquired, towards the close of his life, no small share of reputation as a writer on ethics and metaphysics. His wisdom, however, was founded entirely on that of the Greeks, and his philosophic writings were chiefly occupied with the discussion of questions which had been agitated in the Athenian schools, and from them had been transmitted to Italy. The disquisition respecting the certainty or uncertainty of human knowledge, with that concerning the supreme good and evil, were the inquiries which he chiefly pursued; and the notions which he entertained of these subjects, were all derived from the Portico, Academy, or Lyceum.

The leading principles of the chief philosophic sects of Greece flowed originally from Socrates—

———"From whose mouth issued forth
Mellifluous streams, that watered all the schools
Of Academics, Old and New*;"

and who has been termed by Cicero† the perennial source of philosophy, much more justly than Homer has been styled the fountain of all poetry. Though somewhat addicted to them from education and early habit, Socrates withdrew philosophy from those obscure and intricate physical inquiries, in which she had been involved by the founders and followers of the Ionic school, and from the subtle paradoxical hypotheses of the sophists who established themselves at Athens in the time of Pericles. It being his chief aim to improve the condition of mankind, and to incline them to discharge the several duties of the stations in which they had been placed, this moral teacher directed his examinations to the nature of vice and virtue, of good and evil. To accomplish the great object he had in view, his practice was to hazard no opinion of his own, but to refute prevalent errors and prejudices, by involving the pretenders to knowledge in manifest absurdity, while he himself, as if in contrast to the presumption of the sophists, always professed that he knew nothing. This confession of ignorance, which amounted to no more than a general acknowledgment

* *Paradise Regained.*

† *De Orat. Lib. I. c. 10. Ab illo fonte et capite Socrate.*

of the imbecility of the human understanding, and was merely designed to convince his followers of the futility of those speculations which do not rest on the firm basis of experience, or to teach them modesty in their inquiries, and diffidence in their assertions, having been interpreted in a different sense from that in which it was originally intended, gave rise to the celebrated dispute concerning the certainty of knowledge.

The various founders of the philosophic sects of Greece, imbibed that portion of the doctrines of Socrates which suited their own tastes and views, and sometimes perverted his high authority even to dogmatical or sophistical purposes. It is from Plato we have derived the fullest account of his system; but this illustrious disciple had also greatly extended his knowledge by his voyages to Egypt, Sicily, and Magna Græcia. Hence in the Academy which he founded, (while, as to morals, he continued to follow Socrates,) he superadded the metaphysical doctrines of Pythagoras; in physics, which Socrates had excluded from philosophy, he adopted the system of Heraclitus; and he borrowed his dialectics from Euclid of Megara. The recondite and *isoteric* tenets of Pythagoras—the obscure principles of Heraclitus—the superhuman knowledge of Empedocles, and the sacred *Arcana* of Egyptian priests, have diffused over the page of Plato a majesty and mysticism very different from what we suppose to have been the familiar tone of instruction employed by his great master, of whose style at least, and manner, Xenophon probably presents us with a more faithful image.

In Greece, the heads of sects were succeeded in their schools or academies as in a domain or inheritance. Speusippus, the nephew of Plato, continued to deliver lectures in the Academy, as did also four other successive masters, Xenocrates, Polemo, Crates, and Crantor, all of whom retained the name of Academics, and taught the doctrines of their master without mixture or corruption. But on the appointment of Xenocrates to the chair of the Academy, Aristotle, the most eminent of Plato's scholars, had betaken himself to another Gymnasium, called the Lyceum, which became the resort of the Peripatetics. The commanding genius of their founder enlarged the sphere of knowledge and intellect, devised the rules of logic, and traced out the principles of rhetorical and poetical criticism: But the sect which he exalted to unrivalled celebrity, though differing in name from the contemporary Academics, coincided with them generally in all the principal points of physical and moral philosophy, and particularly in those concerning which the Romans chiefly inquired. "Though they

differed in terms," says Cicero, "they agreed in things*, and those persons are grossly mistaken who imagine that the old Academics, as they are called, are any other than the Peripatetics." Accordingly, we find that both believed in the superintending care of Providence, the immortality of the soul, and a future state of reward and punishment. The supreme good they placed in virtue, with a sufficiency of the chief external advantages of nature, as health, riches, and reputation. Such enjoyments they taught, when united with virtue, make the felicity of man perfect ; but if virtuous, he is capable of being happy, (though not entirely so,) without them.

Plato, in his mode of communicating instruction, and promulgating his opinions, had not strictly adhered to the method of his master Socrates. He held the concurrence of memory, with a recent impression, to be a criterion of truth, and he taught that opinions might be formed from the comparison of a present with a recollected perception. But his successors, both in the Academy and Lyceum, departed from the Socratic method still more widely. They renounced the maxim, of affirming nothing ; and instead of explaining everything with a doubting reserve, they converted philosophy, as it were, into an art, and formed a system of opinions, which they delivered to their disciples as the peculiar tenets of their sect. They inculcated the belief, that our knowledge has its origin in the senses—that the senses themselves do not judge of truth, but the mind through them beholds things as they really are—that is, it perceives the ideas which always subsist in the same state, without change ; so that the senses, through the medium of the mind, may be relied on for the ascertainment of truth. Such was the state of opinions and instruction in the Academy when Arcesilaus, who was the sixth master of that school from Plato, and in his youth had heard the lessons of Pyrrho the sceptic, resolved to reform the dogmatic system into which his predecessors had fallen, and to restore, as he conceived, in all its purity, the Socratic system of affirming nothing with certainty. This founder of the New, or Middle Academy as it is sometimes called, denied even the certain truth of the proposition that we know nothing, which Socrates had reserved as an exception to his general principle. While admitting that there is an actual certainty in the nature of things, he rejected the evidence both of the senses and reason as positive testimony ; and as he denied that there existed any infallible criterion of truth or falsehood, he maintained that no wise man ought to

* *Academ. Lib. II. c. 5.*

give any proposition whatever the sanction of his assent. He differed from the Sceptics or Pyrrhonists only in this, that he admitted degrees of probability, whereas the Sceptics fluctuated in total uncertainty.

As Arcesilaus renounced all pretensions to the certain determination of any question, he was chiefly employed in examining and refuting the sentiments of others. His principal opponent was his contemporary, Zeno, the founder of the stoical philosophy, which ultimately became the chief of those systems which flourished at Rome. The main point in dispute between Zeno and Arcesilaus, was the evidence of the senses. Arcesilaus denied that truth could be ascertained by their assistance, because there is no criterion by which to distinguish false and delusive objects from such as are real. Zeno, on the other hand, maintained that the evidence of the senses is certain and clear, provided they be perfect in themselves, and without obstacle to prevent their effect. Thus, though on different principles, the founder of the Stoics agreed with the Peripatetics and old Academicians, that there existed certain means of ascertaining truth, and consequently that there was evident and certain knowledge. Arcesilaus, though he did not deny that truth existed, would neither give assent nor entertain opinions, because appearances could never warrant his pronouncing on any object or proposition whatever. Nor did the Stoics entertain opinions; but they refrained from this, because they thought that everything might be perceived with certainty.

Arcesilaus, while differing widely from the teachers of the old Platonic Academy in his ideas as to the certainty of knowledge, retained their system concerning the supreme good, which, like them, he placed in virtue, accompanied by external advantages. This was another subject of contest with Zeno, who, as is well known, placed the supreme good in virtue alone,—health, riches, and reputation, not being by him accounted essential, nor disease, poverty, and ignominy, injurious to happiness.

The systems promulgated in the old and new Academy, and the stoical Portico, were those which became most prevalent in Rome. But the Epicurean opinions were also fashionable there. The philosophy of Epicurus has been already mentioned while speaking of Lucretius. Moschus of Phœnicia, who lived before the Trojan war, is said to have been the inventor of the Atomic system, which was afterwards adopted and improved by Leucippus and Democritus, whose works, as Cicero expresses it, were the source from which flowed the

streams that watered the gardens of Epicurus*. To the evidence of the senses this teacher attributed such weight, that he considered them as an infallible rule of truth. The supreme good he placed in pleasure, and the chief evil in pain. His scholars maintained, that by pleasure, or rather happiness, he meant a life of wisdom and temperance; but a want of clearness and explicitness in the definition of what constituted pleasure, has given room to his opponents for alleging that he placed consummate felicity in sensual gratification.

It was long before a knowledge of any portion of Greek philosophy was introduced at Rome. For 600 years after the building of the city, those circumstances did not arise in that capital which called forth and promoted philosophy in Greece. The ancient Romans were warriors and agriculturists. Their education was regulated with a view to an active life, and rearing citizens and heroes, not philosophers. The *Campus Martius* was their school; the tent their Lyceum, and the traditions of their ancestors, and religious rites, their science,—they were taught to act, to believe, and to obey, not to reason or discuss. Among them a class of men may indeed have existed not unlike the seven sages of Greece—men distinguished by wisdom, grave saws, and the services they had rendered to their country; but these were not philosophers in our sense of the term. The wisdom they inculcated was not sectarian, but resembled that species of philosophy cultivated by Solon and Lycurgus, which has been termed political by Brucker, and which was chiefly adapted to the improvement of states, and civilization of infant society. At length, however, in the year 586, when Perseus, King of Macedon, was finally vanquished, his conqueror brought with him to Rome the philosopher Metrodorus, to aid in the instruction of his children†. Several philosophers, who had been retained in the court of that unfortunate monarch, auguring well from this incident, followed Metrodorus to Italy; and about the same time a number of Achæans, of distinguished merit, who were suspected to have favoured the Macedonians, were summoned to Rome, in order to account for their conduct. The younger Scipio Africanus, in the course of the embassy to which he was appointed by the Senate, to the kings of the east, who were in alliance with the republic, having landed at Rhodes, took under his protection the Stoic philosopher Panætius‡, who was a native of that island, and carried him back to Rome, where

* *De Natur. Deor.* Lib. I. c. 43.

† *Pliny, Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXV. c. 11.

‡ *Mem. de l'Institut. Royale*, Tom. XXX.

he resided in the house of his patron. Panætius afterwards went to Athens, where he became one of the most distinguished teachers of the Portico*, and composed a number of philosophical treatises, of which the chief was that on the Duties of Man.

444 But though the philosophers were encouraged and cherished by Scipio, Lælius, Scævola, and others of the more mild and enlightened Romans, they were viewed with an eye of suspicion by the grave Senators and stern Censors of the republic. Accordingly, in the year 592, only six years after their first arrival in Rome, the philosophers were banished from the city by a formal decree of the Senate†. The motives for issuing this rigorous edict are not very clearly ascertained. A notion may have been entertained by the severer members of the commonwealth, that the established religion and constitution of Rome might suffer by the discussion of speculative theories, and that the taste for science might withdraw the minds of youth from agriculture and arms. This dread, so natural to a rigid, laborious, and warlike people, would be increased by the degraded and slavish character of the Greeks, which, having been an accompaniment, might be readily mistaken for a consequence, of their progress in philosophy. As most of the philosophers, too, had come from the states of a hostile monarch, the Senate may have feared, lest they should inspire sentiments in the minds of youth, not altogether patriotic or purely republican.

“ Sed vetuere patres quod non potuere vetare.”

Though driven from Rome, many of the Greek philosophers took up their residence in the municipal towns of Italy. By the intercession likewise of Scipio Africanus, an exception was made in favour of Panætius and the historian Polybius, who were permitted to remain in the capital. The spirit of inquiry, too, had been raised, and the mind had received an impulse which could not be arrested by any senatorial decree, and on which the slightest incident necessarily bestowed an accelerated progress.

The Greek philosophers returned to Rome in the year 598, under the sacred character of ambassadors, on occasion of a political complaint which had been made against the Athenians, and from which they found it necessary to defend them-

* Cicero styles him Princeps Stoicorum, (*De Divin.* Lib. II. c. 47.) and eruditissimum hominem, et pæne divinum. (*Pro Muræna*, c. 31.)

† Censuerunt ut M. Pomponius Prætor animadverteret uti e republicâ fideque suâ videretur Romæ ne essent. (*Au. Gellius, Noct. Attic.* Lib. XV. c. 11.)

selves. Notwithstanding the disrespect with which philosophers had recently been treated in Italy, the Athenians resolved to dazzle the Romans by a grand scientific embassy. The three envoys chosen were at that time the heads of the three leading sects of Greek philosophers,—Diogenes, the Stoic, Critolaus, the Peripatetic, and Carneades of Cyrene, who now held the place of Arcesilaus in the new Academy. Besides their philosophical learning, they were well qualified by their eloquence, (a talent which had always great influence with the Romans,) to persuade and bring over the minds of men to their principles. Such, indeed, were their extraordinary powers of speaking and reasoning, that it was commonly said at Rome that the Athenians had sent orators, not to persuade, but to compel*. During the period of their embassy at Rome they lectured to crowded audiences in the most public parts of the city. The immediate effect of the display which these philosophic ambassadors made of their eloquence and wisdom, was to excite in the Roman youth an ardent thirst after knowledge, which now became a rival in their breasts to the love of military glory†. Scipio Lælius, and Furius, showed the strongest inclination for these new studies, and profited most by them; but there was scarcely a young patrician who was not in some degree attracted by the modest simplicity of Diogenes, the elegant, ornamental, and polished discourse of Critolaus, or the vehement, rapid, and argumentative eloquence of Carneades‡. The principles inculcated by Diogenes, who professed to teach the art of reasoning, and of separating truth from falsehood, received their strongest support from the jurisconsults, most of whom became Stoics; and in consequence of their responses, we find at this day that the stoical philosophy exercised much influence on Roman jurisprudence, and that many principles and divisions of the civil law have been founded on its favourite maxims. Of these philosophic ambassadors, however, Carneades was the most able man, and the most popular teacher. “He was blessed,” says Cicero, “with a divine quickness of understanding and command of expression§.” “In his disputations, he never defended what he did not prove, and never attacked what he did not overthrow||.” By some he has been considered and termed the founder of a third Academy, but there appears to be no solid ground for such a distinction. In his lectures, which chiefly turned on ethics, he agreed with both

* Ælian, *Histor. Var.* Lib. III. c. 17.

† Au. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* Lib. VII. c. 14.

§ *De Oratore*, Lib. III. c. 18.

† Plutarch, *In Catone.*

|| *Ibid.* Lib. II. c. 38.

Academies as to the supreme good, placing it in virtue and the primary gifts of nature. Like Arcesilaus, he was a zealous advocate for the uncertainty of human knowledge, but he did not deny, with him, that there were truths, but only maintained that we could not clearly discern them*. The sole other difference in their tenets, is one not very palpable, mentioned by Lucullus in the *Academica*. Arcesilaus, it seems, would neither assent to anything nor opine. Carneades, though he would not assent, declared that he would opine; under the constant reservation, however, that he was merely opinionating, and that there was no such thing as positive comprehension or perception†. In this, Lucullus, who was a follower of the *old Academy*, thinks Carneades the most absurd and inconsistent of the two. Carneades succeeded to the old dispute between the Academics and Stoics, and in his prelections he combated the arguments employed by Chrysippus‡, in his age the chief pillar of the Portico, as Arcesilaus had formerly maintained the controversy with Zeno, its founder. He differed from the Pyrrhonists, by admitting the real existence of good and evil, and by allowing different degrees of probability§, while his sceptical opponents contended that there was no ground for embracing or rejecting one opinion more than another. Carneades was no less distinguished by his artful and versatile talents for disputation, than his vehement and commanding oratory. But his extraordinary powers of persuasion, and of maintaining any side of an argument, for which the academical philosophy peculiarly qualified him, were at length abused by him, to the scandal of the serious and inflexible Romans. Thus, we are told, that he one day delivered a discourse before Cato, with great variety of thought and copiousness of diction, on the advantages of a rigid observance of the rules of justice. Next day, in order to fortify his doctrine of the uncertainty of human knowledge, he undertook to refute all his former arguments||. It is likely that his attack on justice was a piece of pleasantry, like Erasmus' *Encomium of Folly*; and many of his audience were captivated by his ingenuity; but the Censor immediately insisted, that the affairs which had brought these subtle ambassadors to Rome, should be forthwith despatched by the Senate, in order that they might be dismissed with all possible expedition¶. Whether

* Hæc in philosophiâ ratio contra omnia disserendi, nullamque rem aperto judicandi, profecta a Socrate, repetita ab Arcesilao, confirmata a Carneade, usque ad nostram viguit ætatem. *De Nat. Deor.* Lib. I. c. 5.

† *Academ. Prior.* Lib. II. c. 48.

‡ *Valer. Max.* Lib. VIII. c. 7.

§ *Academ. Prior.* Lib. II. c. 31.

|| *Quintil. Inst. Orat.* Lib. XII. c. 1. *Lactant. Institut.* Lib. V. c. 14.

¶ *Plutarch, In Catone.* *Plin. Hist. Nat.* Lib. VII. c. 30.

Cato entertained serious apprehensions, as is alleged by Plutarch, that the military virtues of his country might be enfeebled, and its constitution undermined, by the study of philosophy, may, I think, be questioned. It is more probable that he dreaded the influence of the philosophers themselves on the opinions of his fellow-citizens, and feared lest their eloquence should altogether unsettle the principles of his countrymen, or mould them to whatever form they chose. Lactantius, too, in a quotation from Cicero's treatise *De Republica*, affords what may be considered as an explanation of the reason why Carneades' lecture against justice was so little palatable to the Censor, and probably to many others of the Romans. One of the objections which he urged against justice, or rather against the existence of a due sense of that quality, was, that if such a thing as justice were to be found on earth, the Romans would resign their conquests, and return to their huts and original poverty*. Cato likewise appears to have had a considerable spirit of personal jealousy and rivalry; while, at the same time, his national pride led him to scorn all the arts of a country which the Roman arms had subdued.

Carneades promulgated his opinions only in his eloquent lectures; and it is not known that he left any writings of importance behind him†. But his oral instructions had made a permanent impression on the Roman youth, and the want of a written record of his principles was amply supplied by his successor Clitomachus, who was by birth a Carthaginian, and was originally called Asdrubal. He had fled from his own country to Athens during the siege of Carthage, by the Romans, in the third Punic war‡; and in the year 623 he went from Greece to Italy, to succeed Carneades in the school which he had there established. Clitomachus was a most voluminous author, having written not less than four ample treatises on the necessity of withholding the assent from every proposition whatever. One of these tracts was dedicated to Lucilius, the satiric poet§, and another to the Consul Censorinus. The essence of the principles which he maintained in these works, has been extracted by Cicero, and handed down to us in a passage inserted in the *Academica*. It is there said, that the resemblances of things are of such a nature that some of them appear probable, and others not; but this is no sufficient ground for supposing that some objects may be correctly perceived, since many falsities are probable, whereas no falsity can be accurately perceived or

* *Divin. Institut.* Lib. V. c. 16.
 † *Diog. Laert. in Clitomacho.*

‡ Plutarch, *De Fortitud. Alexandri.*
 § Cicero, *Academtc. Prior.* Lib. II. c. 82.

known : The Academy never attempted to deprive mankind of the use of their senses, by denying that there are such things as colour, taste, and sound; but it denied that there exists in these qualities any criterion or characteristic of truth and certainty. A wise man, therefore, is said, in a double sense, to withhold his assent; in one sense, when it is understood that he absolutely assents to no proposition; in another, when he suspends answering a question, without either denying or affirming. He ought never to assent implicitly to any proposition, and his answer should be withheld until, according to *probability*, he is in a condition to reply in the affirmative or negative. But as Cicero admits, that a wise man, who, on every occasion, suspends his assent, may yet be impelled and moved to action, he leaves him in full possession of those motives which excite to action, together with a power of answering in the affirmative or negative to certain questions, and of following the probability of objects; yet still without giving them his assent*.

Clitomachus was succeeded by Philo of Larissa, who fled from Greece to Italy, during the Mithridatic war, and revived at Rome a system of philosophy, which by this time began to be rather on the decline. Cicero attended his lectures, and imbibed from them the principles of the new Academy, to which he ultimately adhered. Philo published two treatises, explanatory of the doctrines of the new Academy, which were answered in a work entitled *Sosus*, by Antiochus of Ascalon, who had been a scholar of Philo, but afterwards abjured the innovations of the new Academy, and returned to the old, as taught by Plato and his immediate successors,—uniting with it, however, some portion of the systems of Aristotle and Zenon†. In his own age, Antiochus was the chief support of the original principles of the Academy, and was patronized by all those at Rome, who were still attached to them, particularly by Lucullus, who took the philosopher along with him to Alexandria, when he went there as Quæstor of Egypt.

In the circumstances of Rome, the first steps towards philosophical improvement, were a general abatement of that contempt which had been previously entertained for philosophical studies—a toleration of instruction—the power of communicating wisdom without shame or restraint, and its cordial reception by the Roman youth. This proficiency, which necessarily preceded speculation or invention, had already taken place. Partly through the instructions of Greek philo-

* *Academic. Prior. Lib. II. c. 32.*

† *Mater, Ecole d'Alexandrie, Tom. II. p. 131.*

sophers who resided at Rome, and partly by means of the practice which now began to prevail, of sending young men for education to the ancient schools of wisdom, philosophy made rapid progress, and almost every sect found followers or patrons among the higher order of the Roman citizens.

From the earliest times, however, till that of Cicero, Greek philosophy was chiefly inculcated by Greeks. There was no Roman who devoted himself entirely to metaphysical contemplation, and who, like Epicurus, Aristotle, and Zeno, lounged perpetually in a garden, paced about in a Lyceum, or stood upright in a portico. The Greek philosophers passed their days, if not in absolute seclusion, at least in learned leisure and retirement. Speculation was the employment of their lives, and their works were the result of a whole age of study and reflection*. The Romans, on the other hand, regarded philosophy, not as the business of life, but as an elegant relaxation, or the means of aiding their advancement in the state. They heard with attention the ingenious disputes agitated among the Greeks, and perused their works with pleasure; but with all this taste for philosophy, they had not sufficient leisure to devise new theories. The philosophers of Rome were Scipio, Cato, Brutus, Lucullus—men who governed their country at home, or combated her enemies abroad. They had, indeed, little motive to invent new systems, since so many were presented to them, ready formed, that every one found in the doctrines of some Greek sect, tenets which could be sufficiently accommodated to his own disposition and situation. In the same manner as the plunder of Syracuse or Corinth supplied Rome with her statues and pictures, and rendered unnecessary the exertions of native artists; and as the dramas of Euripides and Menander provided sufficient materials for the Roman stage; so the Garden, Porch, and Academy, furnished such variety of systems, that new inventions or speculations could easily be dispensed with. The prevalence, too, of the principles of that Academy, which led to doubt of all things, must have discouraged the formation of new and original theories. Nor were even the Greek systems, after their introduction into Italy, classed and separated as they had been in Greece. Most of the distinguished men of Rome, however, in the time of Cicero, were more inclined to one school than

* Dans la Grèce, après ces épreuves, commençoit enfin la vie champêtre dans les jardins du Lycée ou de l'Académie, où l'on entreprenoit un cours de philosophie, que les véritables amateurs avoient l'art singulier de ne jamais finir. Ils restoient toute leur vie attachés à quelque chef de secte comme Metrodore à Epicure, mourroient dans les écoles, et étoient ensuite enterrés à l'ombre de ces mêmes arbres, sous lesquels ils avoient tant médité. (De Pauw, *Recherches Philosophiques sur les Grecs*, T. II.)

another, and they applied the lessons of the sect which they followed with more success, perhaps, than their masters, to the practical purposes of active life. The jurisconsults, chief magistrates, and censors, adopted the Stoical philosophy, which had some affinity to the principles of the Roman constitution, and which they considered best calculated for ruling their fellow-citizens, as well as meliorating the laws and morals of the state. The orators who aspired to rise by eloquence to the highest honours of the republic, had recourse to the lessons of the new Academy, which furnished them with weapons for disputation; while those who sighed for the enjoyment of tranquillity, amid the factions and dangers of the commonwealth, retired to the Gardens of Epicurus. But while subscribing to the leading tenets of a sect, they did not strive to gain followers with any of the spirit of sectarianism; and it frequently happened, that neither in principle nor practice did they adopt all the doctrines of the school to which they chiefly resorted. Thus Cæsar, who was accounted an Epicurean, and followed the Epicurean system in some things, as in his belief of the materiality and mortality of the soul, doubtless held in little reverence those ethical precepts, according to which,

—“*Nihil in nostro corpore prosunt,
Nec fama, neque nobilitas, nec gloria regni.*”

Lucretius was a sounder Epicurean, and gave to the precepts of his master all the dignity and grace which poetical embellishment could bestow. But Atticus, the well-known friend and correspondent of Cicero, was perhaps the most perfect example ever exhibited of genuine and practical Epicurism.

The rigid and inflexible Cato, was, both in his life and principles, the great supporter of the Stoical philosophy—conducting himself, according to an expression of Cicero, as if he had lived in the polity of Plato, and not amid the dregs of Romulus. The old Academy boasted among its adherents Lucullus, the conqueror of Mithridates—the Lorenzo of Roman arts and literature—whose palaces rivalled the porticos of Greece, and whose library, with its adjacent schools and galleries, was the resort of all who were distinguished for their learning and accomplishments. Whilst Quæstor of Macedonia, and subsequently, while he conducted the war against Mithridates, Lucullus had enjoyed frequent opportunities of conversing with the Greek philosophers, and had acquired such a relish for philosophical studies, that he devoted to

them all the leisure he could command*. At Rome, his constant companion was Antiochus of Ascalon, who, though a pupil of Philo, became himself a zealous supporter of the old Academy; and accordingly, Lucullus, who favoured that system, often repaired to his house, to partake in the private disputations which were there carried on against the advocates for the new or middle Academy. The old Academy also numbered among its votaries Varro, the most learned of the Romans, and Brutus, who was destined to perform so tragic a part on the ensanguined stage of his country.

Little was done by these eminent men to illustrate or enforce their favourite systems by their writings. Even the productions of Varro were calculated rather to excite to the study of philosophy, than to aid its progress. The new Academy was more fortunate in the support of Cicero, who has asserted and vindicated its principles with equal industry and eloquence. From their first introduction, the doctrines of the new Academy had been favourably received at Rome. The tenets of the dogmatic philosophers were so various and contradictory, were so obstinately maintained, and rested on such precarious foundations, that they afforded much scope and encouragement to scepticism. The plausible arguments by which the most discordant opinions were supported, led to a distrust of the existence of absolute truth, and to an acquiescence in such probable conclusions, as were adequate to the practical purposes of life. The speculations, too, of the new Academy, were peculiarly fitted to the duties of a public speaker, as they left free the field of disputation, and habituated him to the practice of collecting arguments from all quarters, on every doubtful question. Hence it was that Cicero addicted himself to this sect, and persuaded others to follow his example. It has been disputed, if Cicero was really attached to the new Academic system, or had merely resorted to it as being best adapted for furnishing him with oratorical arguments suited to all occasions. At first, its adoption was subsidiary to his other plans. But, towards the conclusion of his life, when he no longer maintained the place he was wont to hold in the Senate or the Forum, and when philosophy formed the occupation "with which existence was just tolerable, and without which it would have been intolerable†," he doubtless became convinced that the principles of the new Academy, illustrated as they had been by Carneades and Philo, formed the soundest system which had descended to mankind from the schools of Athens.

* Cicero, *Academ. Prior.* Lib. II. c. 4.

VOL. II.—2 C

† *Epist. Familiares.*

The attachment, however, of Cicero to the Academic philosophy, was free from the exclusive spirit of sectarianism, and hence it did not prevent his extracting from other systems what he found in them conformable to virtue and reason. His ethical principles, in particular, appear Eclectic, having been, in a great measure, formed from the opinions of the Stoics. Of most Greek sects he speaks with respect and esteem. For the Epicureans alone, he seems (notwithstanding his friendship for Atticus) to have entertained a decided aversion and contempt.

The general purpose of Cicero's philosophical works, was rather to give a history of the ancient philosophy, than dogmatically to inculcate opinions of his own. It was his great aim to explain to his fellow-citizens, in their own language, whatever the sages of Greece had taught on the most important subjects, in order to enlarge their minds and reform their morals; while, at the same time, he exercised himself in the most useful employment which now remained to him—a superior force having deprived him of the privilege of serving his country as an orator or Consul.

Cicero was in many respects well qualified for the arduous but noble task which he had undertaken, of naturalizing philosophy in Rome, and exhibiting her, according to the expression of Erasmus, on the Stage of life. He was a man of fertile genius, luminous understanding, sound judgment, and indefatigable industry—qualities adequate for the cultivation of reason, and sufficient for the supply of subjects of meditation. Never was philosopher placed in a situation more favourable for gathering the fruits of an experience employed on human nature and civil society, or for observing the effects of various qualities of the mind on public opinion and on the actions of men. He lived at the most eventful crisis in the fate of his country, and in the closest connection with men of various and consummate talents, whose designs, when fully developed by the result, must have afforded on reflection, a splendid lesson in the philosophy of mind. But this situation, in some respects so favourable, was but ill calculated for revolving abstract ideas, or for meditating on those abstruse and internal powers, of which the consequences are manifested in society and the transactions of life. Accordingly, Cicero appears to have been destitute of that speculative disposition which leads us to penetrate into the more recondite and original principles of knowledge, and to mark the internal operations of thought. He had cultivated eloquence as clearing the path to political honours, and had studied philosophy, as the best auxiliary to eloquence. But the contem-

plative sciences only attracted his attention, in so far as they tended to elucidate ethical, practical, and political subjects, to which he applied a philosophy which was rather that of life than of speculation.

In the writings of Cicero, accordingly, everything deduced from experience and knowledge of the world—every observation on the duties of society, is clearly expressed, and remarkable for justness and acuteness. But neither Cicero, nor any other Roman author, possessed sufficient subtlety and refinement of spirit, for the more abstruse discussions, among the labyrinths of which the Greek philosophers delighted to find a fit exercise for their ingenuity. Hence, all that required research into the ultimate foundation of truths, or a more exact analysis of common ideas and perceptions—all, in short, that related to the subtleties of the Greek schools, is neither so accurately expressed, nor so logically connected.

In theoretic investigation, then,—in the explication of abstract ideas—in the analysis of qualities and perceptions, Cicero cannot be regarded as an inventor or profound original thinker, and cannot be ranked with Plato and Aristotle, those mighty fathers of ancient philosophy, who carried back their inquiries into the remotest truths on which philosophy rests. Where he does attempt fixing new principles, he is neither very clear nor consistent; and it is evident, that his general study of all systems had, in some degree, unsettled his belief, and had better qualified him to dispute on either side with the Academics, than to examine the exact weight of evidence in the scale of reason, or to exhibit a series of arguments, in close and systematic arrangement, or to deduce accurate conclusions from established and certain principles. His philosophic dialogues are rather to be considered as popular treatises, adapted to the ordinary comprehension of well-informed men, than profound disquisitions, suited only to a Portico or Lyceum. They bespeak the orator, even in the most serious inquiries. Elegance and fine writing, their author appears to have considered as essential to philosophy; and historic, or even poetical illustration, as its brightest ornament. The peculiar merit, therefore, of Cicero, lay in the happy execution of what had never been before attempted—the luminous and popular exposition of the leading principles and disputes of the ancient schools of philosophy, with judgments concerning them, and the application of results, deduced from their various doctrines to the peculiar manners or employments of his countrymen. Hence, though it may be honouring Cicero too highly, to term his works, with Gibbon, a Repository of Reason, they are at least a Miscellany of

Philosophic Information, which has become doubly valuable, from the loss of the writings of many of those philosophers, whose opinions he records; and though the merit of originality rests with the Greek schools, no compositions transmitted from antiquity present so concise and comprehensive a view of the opinions of the Greek philosophers*.

That the mind of Cicero was most amply stored with the learning of the Greek philosophers, and that he had the whole circle of their wisdom at his command, is evident, from the rapidity with which his works were composed—having been all written, except the treatise *De Legibus*, during the period which elapsed from the battle of Pharsalia till his death; and the greater part of them in the course of the year 708.

It is justly remarked by Goerenz, in the introduction to his edition of the book *De Finibus*†, and assented to by Schütz‡, that it seems scarcely possible, that those numerous philosophical works, which are asserted to have been composed by Cicero in the year 708, could have been begun and finished in one year; and that such speed of execution leads us to suppose, that either the materials had been long collected, or that the productions themselves were little more than versions. In his *Academica*, Cicero remarks,—“Ego autem, dum me ambitio, dum honores, dum causæ, dum reipublicæ non solum cura, sed quædam etiam procuratio multis officiis implicatum et constrictum tenebat, hæc inclusa habebam; et, ne obsolescerent, renovabam, quum licebat, legendo. Nunc vero et fortunæ gravissimo percussus vulnere, et administratione reipublicæ liberatus, doloris medicinam a philosophiâ peto, et otii oblectationem hanc, honestissimam judico.” It is not easy to determine, as Schütz remarks, whether, by the expression “hæc inclusa habebam,” Cicero means merely the writings of philosophical authors, or treatises and materials for treatises by himself. “We ought, however,” proceeds Schütz, “the less to wonder that Cicero composed so many works in so short a time, when we read the following passage in a letter to Atticus, written in July 708—‘De linguâ Latinâ securi es animi, dices, qui talia conscribis! *δρωγαρα* sunt; minore labore fiunt: verba tantum affero, quibus abundo;’ which words, according to Gronovius, imply, that the philosophic writings of Cicero are little more than versions from the Greek.”

In the laudable attempt of naturalizing philosophy at Rome,

* Garve, *Anmerk. zu Büchern von den Pflichten*. Breslau, 1819. Schoell, *Hist. Abregée de la Littérat. Romaine*.

† P. XII.

‡ *Ciceron. Opera*, Tom. XIII. p. 15.

§ *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. XII. Ep. 52.

the difficulty which Lucretius had encountered, in embodying in Latin verse the precepts of Epicurus,—

“ Propter egestatem lingue rerumque novitatem,”

must have been almost as powerfully felt by Cicero. Philosophy was still little cultivated among the Romans; and no people will invent terms for thoughts or ideas with which it is little occupied. One of his letters to Atticus is strongly expressive of the trouble which he had in interpreting the philosophic terms of Greece in his native tongue*. Thus, for example, he could find no Latin word equivalent to the *ἐποχή*, or that withholding of assent from all propositions, which the new Academy professed. The language of the Greeks had been formed along with their philosophy. Their terms of physics had their origin in the ancient Theogonies, or the speculations of the Milesian sage; and Plato informs us, that one might make a course of moral philosophy in travelling through Attica and reading the inscriptions engraved on the tombs, pillars, and monuments, erected in the earliest ages near the public ways and centre of villages†. Hence, in Greece, words naturally became the apposite signs of speculative and moral ideas; but in Rome, a foreign philosophy had to be inculcated in a tongue which was already completely formed, which was greatly inferior in flexibility and precision to the Greek; and which, though Cicero certainly used some liberties in this respect, had too nearly reached maturity, to admit of much innovation. Its words, accordingly, did not always precisely express the subtle notions signified in the original language, whence there was often an appearance of obscurity in the idea, and of a defect in conclusions, drawn from premises which were indefinite, or which differed by a shade of meaning from those established in Greece.

Aware of this difficulty, and conscious, perhaps, that he possessed not precision and originality of thinking sufficient to recommend a formal treatise, Cicero adopted the mode of writing in dialogues, in which rhetorical diffuseness, and looseness of definition, might be overlooked, and in which ample scope would be afforded for the ornaments of language.

It was by oral discourse that knowledge was chiefly communicated at the dawn of science, when books either did not exist, or were extremely rare. In the Porch, in the Garden, or among the groves of the Academy, the philosopher conferred with his disciples, listened to their remarks, and replied

* *Epist. Lib. XIII. Ep. 21.*

† *Dialog. Hipparchus.*

to their objections. Socrates, in particular, was accustomed thus to inculcate his moral lessons; and it was natural for the scholars, who recorded them, to follow the manner in which they had been disclosed. Of these disciples, Plato, who was the most distinguished, readily adopted a form of composition, which gave scope to his own fertile and poetical imagination; while, at the same time, it enabled him more accurately to paint his great master. One of his chief objects, too, was to represent the triumph of Socrates over the Sophists; and if a writer wish to cover an opponent with ridicule, perhaps no better mode could be devised, than to set him up as a man of straw in a dialogue. As argumentative victory, or the embarrassment of the antagonist of Socrates, was often all that was aimed at, it was unnecessary to be very scrupulous about the means, and, considered in this view, the agreeable irony of that philosopher—the address with which, by seeming to yield, he ensnares the adversary—his quibbles—his subtle distinctions, and perplexing interrogatories, display consummate skill, and produce considerable dramatic effect; while, at the same time, the scenery and circumstances of the dialogue are often described with a richness and beauty of imagination, which no philosophic writer has as yet surpassed*.

When Cicero, towards the close of his long and meritorious life, employed himself in transferring to Rome the philosophy of Greece, he appears to have been chiefly attracted by the diffusive majesty of Plato, whose intellectual character was in many respects congenial to his own. His dialogues in so far resemble those of Plato, that the personages are real, and of various characters and opinions; while the circumstances of time and place are, for the most part, as completely fictitious as in his Greek models. Yet there is a considerable difference in the manner of Cicero's Dialogues, from those of the great founder of the Academy. Plato ever preserved something of the Socratic method of giving birth to the thoughts of others—of awakening, by interrogatories, the sense of truth, and supplanting errors. But Cicero himself, or the person who speaks his sentiments, always takes the lead in the conference, and gives us long, and often uninterrupted dissertations. His object, too, appears to have been not so much to cover his adversaries with ridicule, or even to prevail in the argument, as to pay a complimentary tribute to his numerous and illustrious friends, or to recall, as it were, from the tomb, the departed heroes and sages of his country.

In the form of dialogue, Cicero has successively treated of Law, Metaphysics, Theology, and Morals.

* *Black's Life of Tusso*, Vol. II.

De Legibus.—Of this dialogue there are only three books now extant, and even in these considerable chasms occur. A conjecture has been recently hazarded by a learned German, in an introduction to a translation of the dialogue, that these three books, as we now have them, were not written by Cicero, but that they are mere excerpts taken from his lost writings, by some monk or father of the church*. There are few works, however, in which more genuine marks of the master-hand of Cicero may be traced, than in the tract *De Legibus*; and the connection between the different parts is too closely preserved, to admit of the notion that it has been made up in the manner which this critic supposes. Another conjecture is, that it formed part of the third, fourth, and fifth books of Cicero's lost treatise *De Republica*. This surmise, however, was highly improbable, since Cicero, in the course of the work *De Legibus*, refers to that *De Republica* as a separate production, and it is now proved to be chimerical by the discovery of Mai. The dialogue *De Legibus*, however, seems to have been drawn up as a kind of supplement to that *De Republica*, being intended to point out what laws would be most suitable to the perfect republic, which the author had previously described†.

As to the period of composition, it thus manifestly appears to have been written subsequently to the dialogue *De Republica*; and it is evident, from his letters to his brother Quintus, that the work *De Republica* was begun in 699, and finished in 700‡, so that the dialogue *De Legibus* could not have been composed before that year. It is further clear, that it was written after the year 701, since he obviously alludes in it to the murder of Clodius,—boasting that his chief enemy was now not only deprived of life, but wanted sepulture, and the accustomed funeral obsequies§. Now, it is well known that Clodius was slain in 701, and that his dead body was dragged naked by a lawless mob into the Forum, where it was consumed amid the conflagration raised in the Senate-house. It is equally evident that the treatise *De Legibus* was written before that *De Finibus*, composed in 708, since, in the former work, the author alludes to the questions which we find discussed in the latter, as controversies which he is one day to take up||. But it is demonstrable that the dialogue *De Legibus* was written even previous to the battle of Pharsalia, which was fought in 705, since the author talks in it of Pompey as of

* Hulsemann, *Ueber die Principien und den Geist der Gesetze*. Leipsic, 1802.

† Quæque de optimâ republicâ sentiremus, in sex libris ante diximus; accommodabimus hoc tempore leges ad illum, quem probamus civitatûs statum. *De Legib.* Lib. III. c. 2.

‡ *Epist. ad Quint. Frat.* Lib. II. Ep. 14. Lib. III. Ep. 5 and 6.

§ *De Legib.* Lib. II. c. 17.

|| *Ibid.* Lib. I. c. 20.

a person still alive, and in the plenitude of glory*. Chapman, in his dissertation *De Ætate Librorum de Legibus*, subjoined to Tunstall's Latin letter to Middleton, concerning the epistles to Brutus, thinks that it was not written till the year 709. He is of opinion, that what is said of Pompey, and the allusions to the murder of Clodius, as to a recent event, were only intended to suit the time in which the dialogue takes place: But then it so happens, that no historical period whatever is assigned by the author of the dialogue, as the date of its actual occurrence. Chapman also maintains, that this is the only mode of accounting for the work *De Legibus* not being mentioned in the treatise *De Divinatione*, where Cicero's other philosophical productions are enumerated. The reason of this omission, however, might be, that the work *De Legibus* never was made public by the author; and, indeed, with exception of the first book, the whole is but a sketch or outline of what he intended to write, and is far from having received the polish and perfection of those performances which he circulated himself.

The discussion *De Legibus* is carried on, in the shape of dialogue, by Cicero, his brother Quintus, and Atticus. Of these Cicero is the chief interlocutor. The scene is laid amid the walks and pleasure-grounds of Cicero's villa of Arpinum, which lay about three miles from the town of that name, and was situated in a mountainous but picturesque region of the ancient territory of the Samnites, now forming part of the kingdom of Naples. This house was the original seat of the family of Cicero, who was born in it during the life of his grandfather, while it was yet small and humble as the Sabine cottage of Curius or Cincinnatus; but his father had gradually enlarged and embellished it, till it became a spacious and elegant mansion, where, as his health was infirm, he passed the greater part of his life in literary retirement†. Cicero was thus equally attracted to this villa by the many pleasing and tender recollections with which it was associated, and by the amenity of the situation, which was the most retired and delightful, even in that region of enchanting landscape. It was closely surrounded by a grove, and stood not far from the confluence of the Fibrenus with the Liris. The former stream, which murmured over a rocky channel, was remarkable for its clearness, rapidity, and coolness; and its sloping verdant banks were shaded with lofty poplars‡. "Many streams," says Mr Kelsall, one of our latest Italian tourists, "which are celebrated in story and song, disappoint the traveller,—

* *Hominis Amicisissimi, Cn. Pompeii, laudes Illustrabit. Lib. I. c. 3.*

† *De Legibus, Lib. II. c. 1.*

‡ *Ibid. Lib. I. c. 5.*

'Dumb are their fountains, and their channels dry,'—

but, in the course of long travels, I never met with so abundant and lucid a current as the Fibrenus; the length of the stream considered, which does not exceed four miles and a half. It flows with great rapidity, and is about thirty or thirty-five feet in width near the Ciceronian isles. It is generally fifteen and even twenty in depth; 'largus et exundans,' like the genius of him who had so often trodden its banks. The water even in the intensest heats, still retains its icy coldness; and, although the thermometer was above 80° in the shade, the hand, plunged for a few seconds into the Fibrenus, caused a complete numbness*." Near to the house, the Fibrenus was divided into equal streams by a little island, which was fringed with a few plane-trees, and on which stood a portico†, where Cicero often retired to read or meditate, and composed some of his sublimest harangues. Just below this islet, each branch of the stream rushed by a sort of cascade, into the cerulean Liris‡, on which the Fibrenus bestowed additional freshness and coolness, and after this union received the name of the more noble river§. The epithet *taciturnus*, applied to the Liris by Horace, and *quietus*, by Silius Italicus, must be understood only of the lower windings of its course. No river in Italy is so noisy as the Liris about Arpino and Cicero's villa; for the space of a mile and a half after receiving the Fibrenus, it formed no less than six cascades, varying in height from three to twenty feet||. This spot, embellished with all the ornaments of hills and valleys, and wood and water-falls, was one of Cicero's most favourite retreats. When Atticus first visited it, he was so charmed, that, instead of wondering as before that it was such a favourite residence of his friend, he expressed his surprise that he ever retired elsewhere¶; declaring, at the same time, his contempt of the marble pavements, arched ceilings, and artificial canals of magnificent villas, compared with the tranquillity and natural beauties of Arpinum. Cicero, indeed, appears at one time to have thought of the island, formed by the Fibrenus, as the place most suitable for the monument which he intended to raise to his beloved daughter Tullia*†.

The situation of this villa was close to the spot where now

* *Excursion from Rome to Arpino*, p. 89. Ed. Geneva, 1820.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXI. c. 2.

‡ "Ceruleus nos Liris amat."—*Martial*, Lib. XIII. Ep. 83. See also Lucan, Lib. II.

§ *De Legibus*, Lib. II. c. 2.

|| Kelsall, *Excursion*, p. 116.

¶ *De Legibus*, Lib. II. c. 1.

*† *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. XII. Ep. 13.

stands the city of Sora*. "The Liris," says Eustace, "still bears its ancient name till it passes Sora, when it is called the Garigliano. The Fibrenus, still so called, falls into it a little below Sora, and continues to encircle the island in which Cicero lays the scene of the dialogue *De Legibus*. Arpinum, also, still retains its name†." Modern travellers bear ample testimony to the scenery round Sora being such as fully justifies the fond partiality of Cicero, and the admiration of Atticus. "Nothing," says Mr Kelsall, "can be imagined finer than the surrounding landscape. The deep azure of the sky, unvaried by a single cloud—Sora on a rock at the foot of the precipitous Apennines—both banks of the Garigliano covered with vineyards—the *fragor aquarum*, alluded to by Atticus in the work *De Legibus*—the coolness, rapidity, and ultramarine hue of the Fibrenus,—the noise of its cataracts—the rich turquoise colour of the Liris—the minor Apennines round Arpino, crowned with umbrageous oaks to their very summits, present scenery hardly elsewhere to be equalled, certainly not to be surpassed, even in Italy‡." The spot where Cicero's villa stood, was, in the time of Middleton, possessed by a convent of monks, and was called the villa of St Dominic. It was built in the year 1030, from the fragments of the Arpine villa!

"Art, Glory, Freedom, fail—but Nature still is fair."

The first conference, *De Legibus*, is held in a walk on the banks of the Fibrenus; the other two in the island which it formed, and which Cicero called Amalthea, from a villa belonging to Atticus in Epirus. These three books are all that are now extant. It appears, however, that, at the commencement of the fifth dialogue, the sun having then passed the meridian, and its beams striking in such a direction that the speakers were no longer sheltered from its rays by the young plane-trees, which had been recently planted, they left the island, and descending to the banks of the Liris, finished their discourse under the shade of the alder-trees, which stretched their branches over its margin§.

* *Classic Tour through Italy*, by Sir R. C. Hoare, Vol. I. p. 293.

† *Classical Tour*, Vol. II. c. 9.

‡ *Classical Excursion from Rome to Arpino*, p. 99. Cicero always considered the citizens of Arpinum as under his particular protection and patronage; and it is pleasant to find, that its modern inhabitants still testify, in various ways, due veneration for their illustrious townsman. Their theatre is called the *Teatro Tulliano*, of which the drop-scene is painted with a bust of the orator; and even now, workmen are employed in building a new town-hall, with niches, destined to receive statues of Marius and Cicero.

§ Macrob. *Saturnal*. Lib. VI. c. 4.

An ancient oak, which stood in Cicero's pleasure-grounds, led Atticus to inquire concerning the augury which had been presented to Marius, a native of Arpinum, from that very oak, and which Cicero had celebrated in a poem devoted to the exploits of his ferocious countryman. Cicero hints, that the portent was all a fiction; which leads to a discussion on the difference between poetry and history, and the poverty of Rome in the latter department. As Cicero, owing to the multiplicity of affairs, had not then leisure to supply this deficiency, he is requested by his guests, to give them, in the meanwhile, a dissertation on Laws—a subject with which he was so conversant, that he could require no previous preparation. It is agreed, that he should not treat of particular or arbitrary laws,—as those concerning *Stillicide*, and the forms of judicial procedure—but should trace the philosophic principles of jurisprudence to their remotest sources. From this recondite investigation he excludes the Epicureans, who decline all care of the republic, and bids them retire to their gardens. He entreats that the new Academy should be silent, since her bold objections would soon destroy the fair and well-ordered structure of his lofty system. Zeno, Aristotle, and the immediate followers of Plato, he represents as the teachers who best prepare a citizen for performing the duties of social life. Then he professes chiefly to follow; and, in conformity with their system, he announces in the first book, which treats of laws in general, that man being linked to a supreme God by reason and virtue, and the whole species being associated by a communion of feelings and interests, laws are alike founded on divine authority and natural benevolence.

According to this sublime hypothesis, the whole universe forms one immense commonwealth of gods and men, who participate of the same essence, and are members of the same community. Reason prescribes the law of nature and nations; and all positive institutions, however modified by accident or custom, are drawn from the rule of right which the Deity has inscribed on every virtuous mind. Some actions, therefore, are just in their own nature, and ought to be performed, not because we live in a society where positive laws punish those who pay no regard to them, but for the sake of that equity which accompanies them, independently of human ordinances. These principles may be applicable to laws in a certain sense; but, in fact, it is rather moral right and justice than laws that the author discusses—for bad or pernicious laws he does not admit to be laws at all. To do justice, to love mer-

cy, and to worship God with a pure heart, were, doubtless, laws in his meaning, (that is, they were right,) previous to their enactment, and no human enactment to the contrary could abrogate them. His principles, however, apply to laws in this sense, and not to arbitrary civil institutions.

Having, in the first discourse, laid open the origin of laws, and source of obligations, he proceeds, in the remaining books, to set forth a body of laws conformable to his own plan and ideas of a well-ordered state;—announcing, in the first place, those which relate to religion and the worship of the gods; secondly, such as prescribe the duties and powers of magistrates. These laws are, for the most part, taken from the ancient government and customs of Rome, with some little modification calculated to obviate or heal the disorders to which the republic was liable, and to give its constitution a stronger bias in favour of the aristocratic faction. The species of instruction communicated in these two books, has very little reference to the sublime and general principles with which the author set out. Many of his laws are arbitrary municipal regulations. The number of the magistrates, the period of the duration of their offices, with the suffrages and elections in the Comitia, were certainly not founded in the immutable laws of God or nature; and the discussion concerning them has led to the belief, that the second and third books merely comprehended a collection of facts, from which general principles were to be subsequently deduced.

At the end of the third book it is mentioned, that the executive power of the magistracy, and rights of the Roman citizens, still remain to be discussed. In what number of books this plan was accomplished, is uncertain. Macrobius, as we have seen, quotes the fifth book*; and Goerenz thinks it probable there were six,—the fourth being on the executive power, the fifth on public, and the sixth on private rights.

What authors Cicero chiefly followed and imitated in his work *De Legibus*, has been a celebrated controversy since the time of Turnebus. It seems now to be pretty well settled, that, in substance and principles, he followed the Stoics; but that he imitated Plato in the style and dress in which he arrayed his sentiments and opinions. That philosopher, as is well known, after writing on government in general, drew up a body of laws adapted to that particular form of it which he had delineated. In like manner, Cicero chose to deliver his sentiments, not by translating Plato, but by imitating his manner

* *Saturnal.* Lib. VI. c. 4.

in the explication of them, and adapting everything to the constitution of his own country. The Stoic whom he principally followed, was probably Chrysippus, who wrote a book *Περί Νομῶν**, some passages of which are still extant, and exhibit the outlines of the system adopted in the first book *De Legibus*. What of general discussion appears in the third book is taken from Theophrastus, Dio, and Panætius the Stoic.

De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum.—This work is a philosophical account of the various opinions entertained by the Greeks concerning the Supreme Good and Extreme Evil, and is by much the most subtle and difficult of the philosophic writings of Cicero. It consists of five books, of that sort of dialogue, in which, as in the treatise *De Oratore*, the discourse is not dramatically represented, but historically related by the author. The constant repetition of “said I,” and “says he,” is tiresome and clumsy, and not nearly so agreeable as the dramatic form of dialogue, where the names of the different speakers are alternately prefixed, as in a play. The whole is addressed to Marcus Brutus in an Introduction, where the author excuses his study of philosophy, which some persons had blamed as unbecoming his character and dignity. The conference in the first two books is supposed to be held at Cicero’s Cuman villa, which was situated on the hills of old Cumæ, and commanded a prospect of the Campi Phlegræi, the bay of Puteoli, with its islands, the Portus Misenus the harbour of the Roman fleet, and Baiæ, the retreat of the most wealthy patricians. Here Cicero received a visit from Lucius Torquatus, a confirmed Epicurean, and from a young patrician, Caius Triarius, who is a mute in the ensuing colloquy. Torquatus engages their host in philosophical discussion, by requesting to know his objections to the Epicurean system. These Cicero states generally; but Torquatus, in his answer, confines himself to the question of the Supreme Good, which he placed in pleasure. This tenet he supports on the principle, that, of all things, Virtue is the most pleasurable; that we ought to follow its laws, in consequence of the serenity and satisfaction arising from its practice; and that honourable toil, or even pain, are not always to be avoided, as they often prove necessary means towards obtaining the most exquisite gratifications. Cicero, in his refutation, which is contained in the second book, gives rather a different representation of the philosophy of Epicurus, from his great poetic contemporary Lucretius. The term *ἡδονή*, (*voluptas*,) used by Epicurus to express his Supreme Good, can only, as Cicero maintains, mean sensual

* *Diogenes Laertius*, Lib. VII.

enjoyment, and can never be so interpreted as to denote tranquillity of mind. But supposing virtue to be cultivated merely as productive of pleasure, or as only valuable because agreeable—a cheat, who had no remorse or conscience, might enjoy the *summum bonum* in defrauding a rightful owner of his property; and no act would thus be accounted criminal, if it escaped the brand of public infamy. On the other hand, if pain be accounted the Supreme Evil, how can any man enjoy felicity, when this greatest of all misfortunes may at any moment seize him!

In the third and fourth books, the scene of the dialogue is changed. In order to inspect some books of Aristotelian philosophy, Cicero walks over to the villa of young Lucullus, to whom he had been appointed guardian, by the testament of his illustrious father. Here he finds Cato employed in perusing certain works of Stoical authors; and a discussion arises on that part of the Stoical system, relating to the Supreme Good, which Cato placed in virtue alone. Cicero, in his answer to Cato, attempts to reconcile this tenet with the doctrines of the Academic philosophy, which he himself professed, by showing that the difference between them consisted only in the import affixed to the term *good*—the Academic sect assigning a pre-eminence to virtue, but admitting that external advantages are good also in their decree. Now, the Stoics would not allow them to be good, but merely valuable, eligible, or preferable; so that the sects could be reconciled in sentiments, if the terms were a little changed. The Academical system is fully developed in the fifth book, in a dialogue held within the Academy; and, at the commencement, the associations which that celebrated, though then solitary spot, was calculated to awaken are finely described. "I see before me," says Piso, "the perfect form of Plato, who was wont to dispute in this very place: These gardens not only recall him to my memory, but present his very person to my senses—I fancy to myself that here stood Speusippus—there Xenocrates—and here, on this bench, sat his disciple Polemo. To me, our ancient Senate-house seems peopled with the like visionary forms; for often when I enter it, the shades of Scipio, of Cato, and of Lælius, and, in particular, of my venerable grandfather, rise up to my imagination." Here Piso, who was a great Platonist, gives an account, in the presence of Cicero and Cicero's brother Quintus, of the hypothesis of the old Academy concerning moral good, which was also that adopted by the Peripatetics. According to this system, the *summum bonum* consists in the highest improvement of all the mental and bodily faculties. The perfection, in short, of everything

consistent with nature, enters into the composition of supreme felicity. Virtue, indeed, is the highest of all things, but other advantages must also be valued according to their worth. Even pleasures become ingredients of happiness, if they be such as are included in the *prima natura*, or primary advantages of nature. Cicero seems to approve this system, and objects only to one of the positions of Piso, That a wise man must be always happy. Our author thus contrasts with each other the different systems of Greek philosophy, particularly the Epicurean with the Stoical tenets; and hence, besides, refuting them in his own person, he makes the one baffle the other, till he arrives at what is most probable, the utmost length to which the middle or new Academy pretended to reach. The chief part of the work *De Finibus*, is taken from the best writings of the different philosophers whose doctrines he explains. The first book closely follows the tract of Epicurus, Κυριων δοξων. Cicero's second book, in which he refutes Epicurism, is borrowed from the stoic Chrysippus, who wrote ten books Of the beautiful, and of pleasure, (Περὶ τῆ καλῆ καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς,) wherein he canvassed the Epicurean tenets concerning the Supreme Good and Evil. His third book is derived from a treatise of the same Chrysippus, entitled Περὶ ἐσλων*. The fourth, where he refutes the Stoics, is from the writings of Polemo, who, following the example of his master Xenocrates, amended the Academic doctrines, and nearly accommodated them on this subject of Good and Evil to the opinions of the ancient Peripatetics. Some works of Antiochus of Ascalon, who, in the time of Cicero, was the head of the old Academy, supplied the materials for the concluding dialogue.

The work *De Finibus* was written in 708, and though begun subsequently to the *Academica*, was finished before it. The period, however, of the three different conferences of which it consists, is laid a considerable time before the date of its publication. It is evident that the first dialogue is supposed to be held in 703, since Torquatus, the principal speaker, who perished in the civil war, is mentioned as *Prætor Designatus*, and this prætorship he bore in the year 704. The following conference is placed subsequently, at least, to the death of the great Lucullus, who died in 701. The last dialogue is carried more than thirty years back, being laid in 674, when Cicero was in his twenty-seventh year, and was attending the lessons of the Athenian philosophers. For this change, the reason seems to have been, that as Piso was the fittest person whom the author could find to support the doctrines of the

* *Diog. Laert. Lib. VII.*

old Academy, and as he had renounced his friendship during the time of the disturbances occasioned by the Clodian faction, it became necessary to place the conference at a period when they were fellow-students at Athens. The critics have observed some anachronisms in this last book, in making Piso refer to the other two dialogues, of which he had no share, and could have had no knowledge, as being held at a later period than that of the conference he attended.

Academica.—This work is termed *Academica*, either because it chiefly relates to the Academic philosophy, or because it was composed at the villa of Puteoli, where a grove and portico were called by Cicero, from an affected imitation of the Athenians, his Academy*. There evidently existed what may be termed two editions of the *Academica*, neither of which we now possess perfect—what we have being the second book of the first edition, and the first of the second. In the first edition, the speakers were Cicero himself, Catulus, Lucullus, and Hortensius. The first book was inscribed Catulus, and the second Lucullus, these persons being the chief interlocutors in their respective divisions. The first dialogue, or Catulus, was held in the villa of that senator. Every word of it is unfortunately lost, but the import may be gathered, from the references to it in the Lucullus, or second book, which is still extant. It appears to have contained a sketch of the history of the old and the new Academy, and then to have entered minutely into the doctrines and principles of the latter, to which Catulus was attached. Catulus explained them as they had been delivered by Carneades, whose lectures his father had attended, and in his old age imparted their substance to his son. He refuted the philosophy of Philo, where that writer differed from Carneades, (which, though of the new Academy, he did in some particulars,) and also the opinions of Antiochus, who followed the old Academy. Hortensius seems to have made a short reply, but the more ample discussion of the system of the old Academy was reserved for Lucullus. Previous, however, to entering on this topic, our philosophers pass over from the Cuman villa of Catulus to that of Hortensius, at Bauli, one of the many magnificent seats belonging to that orator, and situated a little above the luxurious Baiæ, in the direction towards Cumæ, on an inlet of the Bay of Naples. Here they had resolved to remain till a favourable breeze should spring up, which might carry Lucullus to his Neapolitan, and Cicero to his Pompeian villa. While awaiting this opportunity, they repaired to an open gallery, which looked towards

* Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. XXXI. c. 3.

the sea, whence they descried the vessels sailing across the bay, and the ever changeful hue of its waters, which appeared of a saffron colour under the morning beam, but became azure at noon, till, as the day declined, they were rippled by the western breeze, and empurpled by the setting sun*. Here Lucullus commenced his defence of the old Academy, and his disputation against Philo, according to what he had learned from the philosopher Antiochus, who had accompanied him to Alexandria, when he went there as Quæstor of Egypt. While residing in that city, two books of Philo arrived, which excited the philosophic wrath of Antiochus, and gave rise to much oral discussion, as well as to a book from his pen, entitled *Sosus*, in which he attempted to refute the doctrines so boldly promulgated by Philo. Lucullus was thus enabled fully and faithfully to detail the arguments of the chief supporter and reviver in those later ages of the old Platonic Academy. His discourse is chiefly directed against that leading principle of the new Academy, which taught that nothing can be known or ascertained. Recurring to nature, and the constitution of man, he confirms the faith we have in our external senses, and the mental conclusions deduced from them. To this Cicero replies, from the writings of Clitomachus, and of course enlarges on the delusion of the senses—the false appearances we behold in sleep, or while under the influence of phrensy, and the uncertainty of everything so fully demonstrated by the different opinions of the great philosophers, on the most important of all subjects, the Providence of the Gods—the Supreme Good and Evil, and the formation of the world.

These two books, the *Catulus* and *Lucullus*, of which, as already mentioned, the last alone is extant, were written after the termination of the civil wars, and a copy of them sent by Cicero to Atticus. It occurred, however, to the author soon afterwards, that the characters introduced were not very suitable to the subjects discussed, since *Catulus* and *Lucullus*, though both ripe scholars, and well-educated men, could not, as statesmen and generals, be supposed to be acquainted with all the *minutiae* of philosophic controversy contained in the books bearing their names. While deliberating if he should not rather put the dialogue into the lips of Cato and Brutus, he received a letter from Atticus, acknowledging the present of his work, but mentioning that their common friend, Varro, was displeased to find that none of his treatises were addressed to him, or inscribed with his name. This intimation, and the

* *Academ. Prior. Lib. II. c. 33.*

incongruity of the former characters with the subject, determined the author to dedicate the work to Varro, and to make him the principal speaker in the dialogue*. This change, and the reflection, perhaps, on certain defects in the arrangement of the old work, as also the discovery of considerable omissions, particularly with regard to the tenets of Arcesilaus, the founder of the new academy, induced him to remodel the whole, to add in some places, to abridge in others, and to bestow on it more lustre and polish of style. In this new form, the *Academica* consisted of four books, a division which was better adapted for treating his subject: But of these four, only the first remains. The dialogue it contains is supposed to be held during a visit which Atticus and Cicero paid to Varro, in his villa near Cumæ. His guests entreat him to give an account of the principles of the old Academy, from which Cicero and Atticus had long since withdrawn, but to which Varro had continued steadily attached. This first book probably comprehends the substance of what was contained in the *Catulus* of the former edition. Varro, in complying with the request preferred to him, deduces the origin of the old Academy from Socrates; he treats of its doctrines as relating to physics, logic, and morals, and traces its progress under Plato and his legitimate successors. Cicero takes up the discourse when this historical account is brought down to Arcesilaus, the founder of the new Academy. But the work is broken off in the most interesting part, and just as the author is entering on the life and lectures of Carneades, who introduced the new Academy at Rome. Cicero, however, while he styles it the new Academy, will scarcely allow it to be new, as it was in fact the most genuine exposition of those sublime doctrines which Plato had imbibed from Socrates. The historical sketch of the Academic philosophy having been nearly concluded in the first book, the remaining books, which are lost, contained the disputatious part. In the second book the doctrines of Arcesilaus were explained; and from one of the few short fragments preserved, there appears to have been a discussion concerning the remarkable changes that occur in the colour of objects, and the complexion of individuals, in consequence of the alterations they undergo in position or age, which was one of Arcesilaus' chief arguments against the certainty of evidence derived from the senses. The third and fourth books probably contained the doctrines of Carneades and Philo, with Varro's refutation of them, according to the principles of Antiochus. From a fragment of

* *Epist. Famil. Lib. IX. Ep. 8.*

the third book, preserved by Nonius, it appears that the scene of the dialogue was there transferred to the banks of the Lucrine lake, which lay in the immediate vicinity of Varro's Cuman villa*.

These four books formed the work which Cicero wished to be considered as the genuine and improved *Academics*. The former edition, however, which he had sent to Atticus, had gone abroad, and as he could not recall it, he resolved to complete it, by prefixing an introductory eulogy of Catulus to the first, and of Lucullus to the second book,—extolling, in particular, the incredible genius of the latter, which enabled him, though previously inexperienced in the art of war, merely by conversation and study, during his voyage from Romé, to land on the coast of Asia, with the acquirements of a consummate commander, and to extort the admission from his antagonist, Mithridates, who had coped with Sylla, that he was the first of warriors.

This account of the two editions of the *Academics*, which was first suggested by Talæus†, has been adopted by Goerenz‡; and it appears to me completely confirmed by the series of Cicero's letters to Atticus, contained in the 13th book of his *Epistles*. It is by no means, however, unanimously assented to by the French and German commentators. Lambinus, seeing that Nonius quoted, as belonging to the fourth book of the *Academica*, passages which we find in the Lucullus, or second book of the first edition, considered and inscribed it as the fourth of the new edition, instead of the second of the old, in which he was followed by many subsequent editors; but this is easily accounted for, since the new edition, being remodelled on the old, many things in the last or second book of the old edition would naturally be transferred to the fourth or last of the new, and be so cited by those grammarians who wrote when the whole work was extant. Ranitz denies that there ever were two editions of the *Academica* made public, or preserved, and that, so far from the last three books being lost, the Lucullus contains the whole of these three, but from the error of transcribers they have been run into each other§. This critic is right, indeed, in the notion he entertains, that Cicero wished the first edition of the *Academica* to be destroyed, or to fall into oblivion, but it does not follow that

* Et utros nunc sedemus ad Lucrinum, pisciculosque exultantes videmus. *De propriet. Serm.* c. 1. 335. voc. *exultare*.

† *Epist. Dedicat. ad Prælect. in Cic. Acad.*

‡ *Introduct. in Academic.* Ed. Lips. 1810.

§ Nec esse, nec dici posse novum opus, ac penitus mutatum; sed tantummodo correctum, magis politum, et quoad formam et dictionem, hic et illic, splendidius mutatum. *De Lib. Cic. Academ. Comment.*

either of these wishes was accomplished; and indeed it is proved, from Cicero's own letters, that the older edition had passed into extensive circulation.

Tusculana Disputationes, are so called by Cicero, from having been held at his seat near Tusculum—a town which stood on the summit of the Alban hill, about a mile higher up than the modern Frascati, and communicated its name to all the rural retreats in its neighbourhood. This was Cicero's chief and most favourite villa. "It is," says he, "the only spot in which I completely rest from all my uneasiness, and all my toils."—"It stood," says Eustace, "on one of the *Tumul*i, or beautiful hills grouped together on the Alban Mount. It is bounded on the south by a deep dell, with a streamlet that falls from the rock, then meanders through the recess, and disappears in its windings. Eastward rises the lofty eminence, once crowned with Tusculum—Westward, the view descends, and passing over the Campagna, fixes on Rome, and the distant mountains beyond it.—On the south, a gentle swell presents a succession of vineyards and orchards; and behind it towers the summit of the Alban Mount, once crowned with the temple of Jupiter Latiaris. Thus Cicero, from his portico, enjoyed the noblest and most interesting view that could be imagined to a Roman and a Consul; the temple of the tutelary divinity of the empire, the seat of victory and triumph, and the theatre of his glorious labours,—the Capital of the World*." A yet more recent traveller informs us, that "the situation of the ancient Tusculum is delightful. The road which leads to it is shaded with umbrageous woods of oak and ilex. The ancient trees and soft verdant meadows around it, almost remind us of some of the loveliest scenes of England; and the little brook that babbles by, was not the less interesting from the thought, that its murmurs might perchance have once soothed the ear of Cicero†."

The distance of Tusculum from Rome, which was only four leagues, afforded Cicero an easy retreat from the fatigues of the Senate and Forum. Being the villa to which he most frequently resorted, he had improved and adorned it beyond all his other mansions, and rendered its internal elegance suitable to its majestic situation. It had originally belonged to Sylla, by whom it was highly ornamented. In one of its apartments there was a painting of his victory near Nola, during the Mar-sic war, in which Cicero had served under him as a volunteer. But its new master had bestowed on this seat a more classical

* *Classical Tour*, Vol. II. c. 8.

† *Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. III. Let. 93.

and Grecian air. He had built several halls and galleries in imitation of the schools and porticos of Athens, which he termed *Gymnasia*. One of these, which he named the *Academia*, was erected at a little distance from the villa, on the declivity of the hill facing the Alban Mount*. Another *Gymnasium*, which he called the *Lyceum*, stood higher up the hill than the *Academy*: It was adjacent to the villa, and was chiefly designed for philosophical conferences. Cicero had given a general commission to Atticus, who spent much of his time in Greece, to purchase any elegant or curious piece of Grecian art, in painting or sculpture, which his refined taste might select as a suitable ornament for his Tusculan villa. He, in consequence, received from his friend a set of marble *Mercuries*, with brazen heads, with which he was much pleased; but he was particularly delighted with a sort of compound emblematical figures called *Hermathenæ* and *Hermeraclæ* representing Mercury and Minerva, or Mercury and Hercules, jointly on one base; for, Hercules being the proper deity of the *Gymnasium*. Minerva of the *Academy*, and Mercury common to both, they precisely suited the purpose for which he desired them to be procured. One of these *Minerval Mercuries* pleased him so wonderfully, and stood in such an advantageous position, that he declared the whole *Academy* at *Tusculum* appeared to have been contrived in order to receive it†. So intent was he on embellishing this Tusculan villa with all sorts of Grecian art, that he sent over to Atticus the plans and devices for his ceilings, which were of stucco-work, in order to bespeak various pieces of sculpture and painting to be inserted in the compartments; as also the covers for two of his wells or fountains, which, by the custom of those times, were often formed after some elegant pattern, and adorned with figures in relief‡.

La Grotta Ferrata, a convent of Basilian friars, is now, according to Eustace, built on the site of Cicero's Tusculan villa. Nardini, who wrote about the year 1650, says, that there had been recently found, among the ruins of *Grotta Ferrata*, a piece of sculpture, which Cicero himself mentions in one of his *Familiar Epistles*. In the middle of last century, there yet remained vast subterranean apartments, as well as a great circumference and extent of ruins§. But these, it would appear, have been still farther dilapidated since that period. "Scarce

* *De Finibus*, Lib. III. and IV. Kelsall, *Excursion from Rome to Arpino*, p. 198.

† *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. I. Ep. 1.

‡ Middleton's *Life of Cicero*, Vol. I. p. 142.

§ Blainville's *Travels*, Vol. II.

a trace," says Eustace, "of the ruins of Tusculum is now discoverable: Great part remained at the end of the 10th century, when a Greek monk from Calabria demolished it, and erected on the site, the monastery of Grotta Ferrata. At each end of the portico is fixed in the wall a fragment of basso relievo. One represents a philosopher sitting with a scroll in his hand, in a thinking posture—in the other, are four figures supporting the feet of a fifth of colossal size, supposed to represent Ajax. These, with the beautiful pillars which support the church, are the only remnants of the decorations and furniture of the ancient villa. '*Conjiciant*,' says an inscription near the spot, '*quæ et quanta fuerunt*.'*"

When Cæsar had attained the supremacy at Rome, and Cicero no longer gave law to the Senate, he became the head of a sort of literary or philosophical society. Filelfo, who delivered public lectures at Rome, on the Tusculan Disputations, attempted to prove that he had stated meetings of learned men at his house, and opened a regular Academy at Tusculum†. This notion was chiefly founded on a letter of Cicero to Pætus, where he says that he had followed the example of the younger Dionysius, who, being expelled from Syracuse, taught a school at Athens. At all events, it was his custom, in the opportunities of his leisure, to carry some friends with him from Rome to the country, where the entertainments they enjoyed were chiefly speculative. In this manner, Cicero; on one occasion, spent five days at his Tusculan villa; and after

* Eustace, *Classical Tour*, Vol. II. c. 8. Grotta Ferrata was long considered both by travellers (Addison, *Letters on Italy*, Blainville, *Travels*, &c.) and antiquarians (Calmet, *Hist. Univers.* Cluverius, *Ralic. Antiq.*) as the site of Cicero's Tusculan villa. The opinion thus generally received, was first deliberately called in question by Zuzzeri, in a dissertation published in 1746, entitled *Sopra un' antica Villa scoperta sopra Frascati nell' appartenenze della nuova villa dell' collegio Romano*. This writer places the site close to the villa and convent of Ruffinella, which is higher up the hill than Grotta Ferrata, lying between Frascati and the town of Tusculum. He was answered by Cardoni, a monk of the Baailian order of Grotta Ferrata, in his *Disceptatio Apologetica de Tusculano Ciceronis*, Romæ, 1757. Cardoni chiefly rests his argument on a passage of Strabo, where that geographer says, that the *Tusculan hill* is fertile, well watered, and surrounded with beautiful villas. Now Cardoni, referring this passage (which applies to the Tusculan hill in general) solely to the Tusculan villa, argues somewhat unfairly, that Strabo's description answers to Grotta Ferrata, but not to Ruffinella. (p. 8, &c.) Nibby in his *Viaggio Antiquario*, supports the claims of Ruffinella, on the authority of a passage in Frontinus, which he interprets with no greater candour or success. (T. II. p. 41.) With exception of Eustace, however, all modern travellers, whose works I have consulted, declare in favour of Ruffinella. "At the convent of Ruffinella, says Forsyth, farther up the hill than Grotta Ferrata, his (Cicero's) name was found stamped on some ancient tiles, which should ascertain the situation of a villa in preference to any moveable."—*Remarks on Italy*, p. 281. See also *Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. III. Letter 92, and Kelsall's *Classical Excursion*, p. 192.

† Alex. ab Alexandro, *Dies Geniales*, Lib. I. c. 28. Rosmini, *Vita di Filelfo*, T. III. p. 59. Ed. Milan, 1808, 3 Tom. 8vo.

employing the morning in declamation and rhetorical exercises, retired in the afternoon with his friends to the gallery, called the Academy, which he had constructed for the purpose of philosophical conference. Here Cicero daily offered to maintain a thesis on any topic proposed to him by his guests; and the five dialogues thus introduced, were, as we are informed by the author, afterwards committed to writing, nearly in the words which had actually passed*. They were completed early in 709, and, like so many of his other works, are dedicated to Brütus—each conference being at the same time furnished with an introduction expatiating on the excellence of philosophy, and the advantage of naturalizing the wisdom of the Greeks, by transfusing it into the Latin language. In the first dialogue, entitled *De Contemnenda Morte*, one of the guests, who is called the *Auditor* through the remainder of the performance, asserts, that death is an evil. This proposition Cicero immediately proceeds to refute, which naturally introduces a disquisition on the immortality of the soul—a subject which, in the pages of Cicero, continued to be involved in the same doubt and darkness that had veiled it in the schools of Greece.

It is true, that in the ancient world some notion had been entertained, and by a few some hope had been cherished, that we are here only in the infancy of our existence, and that the grave might be the porch of immortality, and not the goal of our career. The natural love that we have for life, amidst all its miseries—the grief that we sometimes feel at being torn from all that is dear to us—the desire for posterity and for posthumous fame—the humiliating idea, that the thoughts which wander through eternity, should be the operations of a being destined to flutter for a moment on the surface of the earth, and then for ever to be buried in its bosom—all, in short, that is selfish, and all that is social in our nature, combined in giving importance to the inquiry, If the thinking principle was to be destroyed by death, or if that great change was to be an introduction to a future state of existence. Having thus a natural desire for the truth of this doctrine, the philosophers of antiquity anxiously devised arguments, which might justify their hopes. Sometimes they deduced them from metaphysical speculations—the spirituality, unity, and activity of the soul—sometimes from its high ideas of things moral and intellectual. Is it possible, they asked, that a being of such excellence should be here imprisoned for a term of years, only to be the sport of the few pleasures and the many pains which

* *Tusc. Disp.* Lib. II. c. 3. Lib. III. c. 3.

chequer this mortal life? Is not its future destination seen in that satiety and disrelish, which attend all earthly enjoyments—in those desires of the mind for things more pure and intellectual than are here supplied—in that longing and endeavour, which we feel after something above us, and perfective of our nature? At other times, they have found arguments in the unequal distribution of rewards and punishments; and in our sighs over the misfortunes of virtue, they have recognized a principle, which points to a future state of things, where that shall be discovered to be good which we now lament as evil, and where the consequences of vice and virtue shall be more fully and regularly unfolded, than in this inharmonious scene. They have then looked abroad into nature, and have seen, that if death follows life, life seemingly emanates from death, and that the cheerful animations of spring succeed to the dead horrors of winter. They have observed the wonderful changes that take place in some sentient beings—they have considered those which man himself has undergone—and, charmed by all these speculations, they have indulged in the pleasing hope, that our death may, like our birth, be the introduction to a new state of existence. But all these fond desires—all these longings after immortality, were insufficient to dispel the doubts of the sage, or to fill the moralist with confidence and consolation. The wisest and most virtuous of the philosophers of antiquity, and who most strongly indulged the hope of immortality, is represented by an illustrious disciple as expressing himself in a manner which discloses his sad uncertainty, whether he was to be released from the tomb, or for ever confined within its barriers.

In the age of Cicero, the existence of a world beyond the grave was still covered with shadows, clouds, and darkness. "Whichsoever of the opinions concerning the substance of the soul be true," says he, in his first Tusculan Disputation, "it will follow, that death is either a good, or at least not an evil—for if it be brain, blood, or heart, it will perish with the whole body—if fire, it will be extinguished—if breath, it will be dissipated—if harmony, it will be broken—not to speak of those who affirm that it is nothing; but other opinions give hope, that the vital spark, after it has left the body, may mount up to Heaven, as its proper habitation."

Cicero then proceeds to exhaust the whole Platonic reasoning for the soul's immortality, and its ascent to the celestial regions, where it will explore and traverse all space—receiving, in its boundless flight, infinite enjoyment. From his system of future existence, Cicero excludes all the gloomy fables feigned of the descent to Avernus, the pale murky re-

gions, the sluggish stream, the gaunt hound, and the grim boatman. But even if death is to be considered as the total extinction of sense and feeling, our author still denies that it should be accounted an evil. This view he strongly supports, from a consideration of the insignificance of those pleasures of which we are deprived, and beautifully illustrates, from the fate of many characters distinguished in history, who, by an earlier death, would have avoided the greatest ills of life. Had Metullus died sooner, he would not have laid his sons on the funeral pile—had Pompey expired, when the inhabitants of all Italy were decked with wreaths and garlands, as testimonies of joy for his restoration to health from the fever with which he was seized in Campania, he would not have taken arms unprepared for the contest, nor fled his home and country; nor, having lost a Roman army, would he have fallen on a foreign shore by the sword of a slave*. He completes these illustrations by reference to his own misfortunes; and the arguments which he deduced from them, received, in a few months, a strong and melancholy confirmation.—“*Etiam ne mors nobis expedit? qui et domesticis et forensibus solatiis ornamentisque privati, certe, si ante occidissemus, mors nos a malis, non a bonis abstraxisset.*”

The same unphilosophical guest, who had asserted that death was a disadvantage, and whom Cicero, in charity to his memory, does not name, is doomed, in the second dialogue, *De Tolerando Dolore*, to announce the still more untenable proposition, that pain is an evil. But Cicero demonstrated, that its sufferings may be overcome, not by remembrance of the silly Epicurean maxims,—“Short if severe, and light if long,” but by fortitude and patience; and he accordingly censures those philosophers, who have represented pain in too formidable colours, and reproaches those poets, who have described their heroes as yielding to its influence.

In the third book, *De Ægritudine Lenienda*, the author treats of the best alleviations of sorrow. To foresee calamities, and be prepared for them, is either to repel their assaults, or to mitigate their severity. After they have occurred, we ought to remember, that grieving is a folly which cannot avail us, and that misfortunes are not peculiar to ourselves, but are the common lot of humanity. The sorrow of which Cicero here treats, seems chiefly that occasioned by deprivation of friends and relatives, to which the recent loss of his daughter Tullia,

* Juvénal, I think, had probably this passage of the Tusculan Disputations in view; in the noble and pathetic lines of his tenth Satire—

“*Provida Pompeio dederat Campania febres,*” &c.

and the composition of his treatise *De Consolatione*, had probably directed his attention.

The fourth book treats *De Reliquis animi Perturbationibus*, including all those passions and vexations, which the author considers as diseases of the soul. These he classes and defines—pointing out, at the same time, the remedy or relief appropriate to each disquietude. In the fifth book, in which he attempts to prove that virtue alone is sufficient for perfect felicity—*Virtutem ad beate vivendum se ipsam esse contentam*—he coincides more completely with the opinions of the Stoics, than in his work *De Finibus*, where he seems to assent, to the Peripatetic doctrine, “that though virtue be the chief good, the perfection of the other qualities of nature enters into the composition of supreme happiness.

In these Tusculan Disputations, which treat of the subjects most important and subservient to the happiness of life, the whole discourse is in the mouth of Tully himself;—the Auditor, whose initial letter some editors have whimsically mistaken for that of Atticus, being a mere man of straw. He is set up to announce what is to be represented as an untenable proposition: but after this duty is performed, no English hearer or Welsh uncle could have listened with less dissent and interruption. The great object of Cicero’s continued lectures, is by fortifying the mind with practical and philosophical lessons, adapted to the circumstances of life, to elevate us above the influence of all its passions and pains.

The first conference, which is intended to diminish the dread of death, is the best; but they are all agreeable, chiefly from the frequent allusion to ancient fable, the events of Greek and Roman history, and the memorable sayings of heroes and sages. There is something in the very names of such men as Plato and Epaminondas, which bestows a sanctity and fervour on the page. The references also to the ancient Latin poets, and the quotations from their works, particularly the tragic dramas, give a beautiful richness to the whole composition; and even on the driest topics, the mind is relieved by the recurrence of extracts characteristic of the vigour of the Roman Melpomene, who, though unfit, as in Greece,

“To wake the soul by tender strokes of art,”

long trod the stage with dignity and elevation.

Paradoxa.—This tract contains a defence of six peculiar opinions or paradoxes of the Stoics, somewhat of the description of those which Cato was wont to promulgate in the Senate. These are, that what is morally fitting (*honestum*) is

alone good,—that the virtuous can want nothing for complete happiness—that there are no degrees in crimes or good actions—that every fool is mad—that the wise alone are wealthy—that the wise man alone is free, and that every fool is a slave. These absurd and quibbling positions, the author supports, in a manner certainly more ingenious than philosophical. The *Paradoxa*, indeed, seem to have been written as a sort of exercise of rhetorical wit, rather than as a serious disquisition in philosophy; and each paradox is personally applied or directed against an individual. There is no precision whatever in the definitions; the author plays on the ambiguity of the words, *bonum* and *dives*, and his arguments frequently degenerate into particular examples, which are by no means adequate to support his general proposition.

De Naturâ Deorum.—Of the various philosophical works of Cicero, the most curious perhaps, and important, is that on the Nature of the Gods. It is addressed to Brutus, and is written in dialogue. This form of composition, besides the advantages already pointed out, is peculiarly fitted for subjects of delicacy and danger, where the author dreads to expose himself to reproach or persecution. On this account chiefly it seems to have been adopted by the disciples of Socrates. That philosopher had fallen a victim to popular fury,—to those imputations of impiety which have so often and so successfully been repeated against philosophers. In the schools of his disciples, a double doctrine seems to have been adopted for the purpose of escaping persecution, and Plato probably considered the form of dialogue as best calculated to secure him from the imputations of his enemies. It was thus, in later times, that Galileo endeavoured to shield himself from the attacks of error and injustice, and imagined, that by presenting his conclusions in the Platonic manner, he would shun the malignant vigilance of the Court of Inquisition*.

In the dialogue *De Naturâ Deorum*, the author presents the doctrines of three of the most distinguished sects among the ancients—the Epicureans, the Stoics, and the Academics—on the important subject of the Nature of the Divine Essence, and of Providence. He introduces three illustrious persons of his country, each elucidating the tenets of the sect that he preferred, and contending for them, doubtless, with the chief arguments which the learning or talents of the author himself could supply. Cicero represents himself as hav-

* Some of the advantages and disadvantages of the method of writing in dialogue, are stated by Mr Hume, in the introduction to his *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*, (London, 1779, 8vo,) a work apparently modelled on Cicero's *Nature of the Gods*.

ing gone to the house of C. Cotta the Pontifex Maximus, whom he found sitting in his study with C. Velleius, a Senator, who professed the principles of Epicurus, and Q. Lucilius Balbus, a supporter of the doctrines of the Stoics.—“As soon as Cotta saw me, ‘You are come,’ says he, ‘very seasonably, for I have a dispute with Velleius upon an important subject, in which, considering the nature of your studies, it is not improper for you to join.’—‘Indeed,’ said I, ‘I am come very seasonably, as you say, for here are three chiefs of the three principal sects met together.’” Cotta himself is a new Academic, and he proceeds to inform Cicero that they were discoursing on the nature of the gods, a topic which had always appeared to him very obscure, and that therefore he had prevailed on Velleius to state the sentiments of Epicurus upon the subject. Velleius is requested to go on with his arguments; and after recapitulating what he had already said, “with the confidence peculiar to his sect, dreading nothing so much as to seem to doubt about anything, he began, as if he had just then descended from the council of the gods*.”

The discourse of Velleius consists, in a considerable degree, of raillery and declamations directed against the doctrines of different sects, of which he enumerates a great variety, and which supposes in Cicero extensive philosophical erudition, or rather, perhaps, from the slight manner in which they are passed over, that he had taken his account of them from some ancient Diogenes Laertius, or Stanley†.—“I have hitherto,” says Velleius, “rather exposed the dreams of dotards than the opinions of philosophers; and whoever considers how rashly

* In the English extracts from Cicero *De Nat. Deor.* I have availed myself of a very good but anonymous translation, printed Lond. 1741, 8vo.

† In the Herculansia, (p. 22,) Sir William Drummond contends, at considerable length, that a work *On Piety according to Epicurus*, (Περὶ Εὐσεβίας κατ’ Ἐπικουρον,) of which a fragment has been discovered at Herculaneum, was the prototype of a considerable part of the discourse of Velleius. The reader will find a version of the passages in which a resemblance appears, in the Quarterly Review, (No. V.) where it is also remarked, “that Sir William seems to us to have failed altogether in rendering it probable that Cicero had ever seen this important fragment, the passages in which there is any resemblance, relating, without exception, to what each author is reporting of the doctrines of certain older philosophers, as expressed in their works; and the reports are not by any means so precisely similar as to induce us to suppose that Cicero had even taken the very justifiable liberty of saving himself some little trouble, by making use of another author’s abstract, from Chrysippus, and from Diogenes the Babylonian.” Schütz, the German editor of Cicero, enumerates some works, which he thinks Cicero had read, and others, which he seems to have known merely from summaries and abridgments. The following is his conjecture with regard to the writings of Epicurus:—“Epicuri denique κρητὶς δοξασ, ejus κατὰ οὐκὰν seu libros, de Judicio, item πρὸς ποταμὸν, et πρὸ ἰσοιστητος, non ex aliorum tantum testimoniis, sed ex suâ ipsius lectione ei notos fuisse, facile, tot locis ubi de eo agitur inter se collatis, intelligitur.” (Cicer. *Opera*, Tom. XV. p. 27.) Perhaps the treatise, Περὶ Ὀμοιοτητος, was a similar work to that, Περὶ Εὐσεβίας.

and inconsiderately their tenets are advanced, must entertain a veneration for Epicurus, and rank him in the number of those beings who are the subject of this dispute, for he alone first founded the existence of the gods, on the impression which nature herself hath made on the minds of men."

Velleius having concluded his discourse, (the remainder of which can now have little interest as relating to the form of the gods and their apathy,) Cotta, after some compliments to him, enters on a confutation of what he had advanced; and, while admitting that there are gods, he pronounces the reasons given by Velleius for their existence to be altogether insufficient. He then proceeds to attack the other positions of Velleius, with regard to the form of the gods, and their exemption from the labours of creation and providence. His arguments against Anthropomorphism are excellent; and in reply to the hypothesis of Epicurus concerning the indolence of the gods, he inquires, "What reason is there that men should worship the gods, when the gods, as you say, not only do not regard men, but are entirely careless of everything, and absolutely do nothing? But they are, you say, of so glorious a nature, that a wise man is induced by their excellence to adore them. Can there be any glory in that nature, which only contemplates its own happiness, and neither will do, nor does, nor ever did anything? Besides, what piety is due to a being from whom you receive nothing, or how are you indebted to him who bestows no benefits?"

When Cotta has concluded his refutation of Velleius, with which the first book closes, Balbus is next requested to give the sentiments of the Stoics, on the subject of the gods, to which, making a slight excuse, he consents. His first argument for their existence, after shortly alluding to the magnificence of the world, and the prevalence of the doctrine, is "the frequent appearance of the gods themselves. In the war with the Latins," he continues, "when A. Posthumius, the Dictator, attacked Octavius Mamilius, the Tusculan, at Regillus, Castor and Pollux were seen fighting in our army on horseback, and since that time the same offspring of Tyndarus gave notice of the defeat of Perseus; for P. Vatienus, grandfather of the present youth of that name, coming in the night to Rome, from his government of Reate, two young men on white horses appeared to him, and told him King Perseus was that day taken prisoner. This news he carried to the Senate, who immediately threw him into prison, for speaking inconsiderately on a state affair; but when it was confirmed by letters from Paulus, he was recompensed by the Senate with land and exemption. The voices of the Fauns have been often heard, and

deities have appeared in forms so visible, that he who doubts must be hardened in stupidity or impiety."

Balbus, after farther arguing for the existence of the gods, from events consequent on auguries and auspices, proceeds to what is more peculiarly the doctrine of the Stoics. He remarks,—“ that Cleanthes, one of the most distinguished philosophers of that sect, imputes the idea of the gods implanted in the minds of men, to four causes—The first is, what I just now mentioned, a pre-knowledge of future things : The second is, the great advantages we enjoy from the temperature of the air, the fertility of the earth, and the abundance of various kinds of benefits : The third is, the terror with which the mind is affected by thunder, tempests, snow, hail, devastation, pestilence, earthquakes, often attended with hideous noises, showers of stones, and rain like drops of blood. His fourth cause,” continues Balbus, “ and that the strongest, is drawn from the regularity of the motion, and revolution of the heavens, the variety, and beauty, and order of the sun, moon, and stars; the appearance only of which is sufficient to convince us they are not the effects of chance; as when we enter into a house, a school, or court, and observe the exact order, discipline, and method therein, we cannot suppose they are so regulated without a cause, but must conclude there is some one who commands, and to whom obedience is paid; so we have much greater reason to think that such wonderful motions, revolutions, and order of those many and great bodies, no part of which is impaired by the vast infinity of age, are governed by some intelligent being.”

This argument is very well stated, but Balbus, in a considerable degree, weakens its effect, by proceeding to contend, that the world, or universe itself, (the stoical deity,) and its most distinguished parts, the sun, moon, and stars, are possessed of reason and wisdom. This he founds partly on a metaphysical argument, and partly on the regularity, beauty, and order of their motions.

Balbus, after various other remarks, enters on the topic of the creation of the world, and its government by the providence of the gods. He justly observes, that nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that a world, so beautifully adorned, could be formed by chance, or by a fortuitous concourse of atoms*. “ He who believes this possible,” says he, “ may

* In his Dialogues on Natural Religion, Mr Hume puts two very good remarks into the mouth of one of his characters. Speaking of Cicero's argument for a Deity, deduced from the grandeur and magnificence of nature, he observes, “ If this argument, I say, had any force in former ages, how much greater must it have at present, when the bounds of nature are so infinitely enlarged, and such a magnificent scene is

as well believe, that if a great number of the one-and-twenty letters, composed either of gold, or any other metal, were thrown on the ground, they would fall into such order as legibly to form the Annals of Ennius. I doubt whether fortune could make a single verse of them." He quotes a very beautiful passage from a now lost work of Aristotle, in which that philosopher urges the argument that may be deduced from providential design, with more soundness and imagination than are usual with him. Balbus then proceeds to display the marks of deliberate plan in the universe, beginning with astronomy. In treating of the constellations, he makes great use of Cicero's poetical version of Aratus, much of which he is supposed, perhaps with little probability, or modesty in the author, to have by heart; and, accordingly, we are favoured with a considerable number of these verses. He also adduces manifold proofs of design and sovereign wisdom, from a consideration of plants, land animals, fishes, and the structure of the human body; a subject on which Cicero discovers more anatomical knowledge than one should have expected. Balbus also contends that the gods not only provide for mankind universally, but for individuals. "The frequent appearances of the gods," he observes, "demonstrate their regard for cities and particular men. This, indeed, is also apparent from the foreknowledge of events, which we receive either sleeping or waking."

Cicero makes Balbus, in the conclusion of his discourse, express but little confidence in his own arguments.—"This is almost the whole," says he, "that has occurred to my mind, on the nature of the gods, and that I thought proper to advance. Do you, Cotta, if I may advise, defend the same cause. Remember that in Rome you keep the first rank—remember you are Pontifex. It is a pernicious and impious custom, either seriously or seemingly to argue against the gods."

In the third book of this very remarkable work, Cicero exhibits Cotta as refuting the doctrines of Balbus. "But before I enter on the subject," says Cotta, "I have a word to say concerning myself; for I am greatly influenced by your authority, and your exhortation at the conclusion of your discourse, to remember I was Cotta, and Pontifex; by which, I presume, you intimated that I should defend the religion and ceremo-

opened to us!" P. 103.—Again, in mentioning that the infidelity of Galen was cured by the study of anatomy, (which was much more extended by him than it had been in the days of Cicero,) he says, "And if the infidelity of Galen, even when these natural sciences were still imperfect, could not withstand such striking appearances, to what pitch of pertinacious obstinacy must a philosopher in this age have attained, who can now doubt of a Supreme Intelligence!" P. 23.—See also Lactantius, *De Opificio Dei*.

nies which we received from our ancestors : Truly, I always have, and always will defend them, nor shall the arguments, either of the learned or unlearned, ever remove the opinions I have imbibed concerning the worship of the immortal gods. In matters of religion, I submit to the rules of the High Priests, T. Coruncanius, P. Scipio, and P. Scævola. These, Balbus," continues he, "are my sentiments, both as a priest and Cotta. But you must bring me to your opinion by the force of your reason; for a philosopher should prove to me the religion he would have me embrace; but I must believe without proof the religion of our ancestors."

The Pontifex thus professing to believe the existence of the gods merely on the authority of his ancestors, proceeds to ridicule this very authority. He represents the appearances of Castor and Pollux, and those others adduced by Balbus, as idle tales. "Do you take these for fabulous stories?" says Balbus. "Is not the temple built by Posthumius, in honour of Castor and Pollux, to be seen in the Forum? Is not the decree of the Senate concerning Vatienus still subsisting? Ought not such authorities to move you?"—"You oppose me," replies Cotta, "with stories; but I ask reasons of you."

A chasm here follows in the original, in which Cotta probably stated the reasons of his scepticism, in spite of the acts of the Senate, and so many public memorials of supernatural facts. "You believe," continues Cotta, "that the Decii, in devoting themselves to death, appeased the gods. How great, then, was the iniquity of the gods, that they could not be appeased, but at the price of such noble blood!—As to the voice of the Fauns, I never heard it; if you assure me you have, I shall believe you; though I am absolutely ignorant what a Faun is. Truly, Balbus, you have not yet proved the existence of the gods. I believe it, indeed, but not from any arguments of the Stoics. Cleanthes, you said, attributes the idea that men have of the gods to four causes. The first is a foreknowledge of future events; the second,—tempests and other shocks of nature; the third,—the utility and plenty of things we enjoy; the fourth,—the invariable order of the stars and heavens. Foreknowledge I have already answered. With regard to tempests in the air, the sea, and the earth, I own, that many people are affrighted by them, and imagine that the immortal gods are the authors of them. But the question is not, whether there be people who believe there are gods, but whether there are gods or not. As to the two other causes of Cleanthes, one of which is derived from the plenty we enjoy, the other from the invariable order of the seasons and heavens,

I shall treat on them when I answer your discourse concerning the providence of the gods."

In the meantime, Cotta goes on to refute the Stoical notions with regard to the reason and understanding attributed to the sun, moon, and stars. He then proceeds to controvert, and occasionally to ridicule, the opinions entertained of numerous heathen gods; the three Jupiters, and other deities, and sons of deities.—“You call Jupiter and Neptune gods,” says he; “their brother Pluto, then, is one; Charon, also, and Cerberus, are gods, but that cannot be allowed. Nor can Pluto be placed among the deities; how then can his brothers?” Cotta next ridicules the Stoics for the delight they take in the explication of fables, and in the etymology of names; after which he says, “Let us proceed to the two other parts of our dispute. 1st, Whether there is a Divine Providence that governs the world? and, lastly, Whether that Providence particularly regards mankind? For these are the remaining propositions of your discourse.”

There follows a considerable *hiatus* in the original, so that we are deprived of all the arguments of Cotta on the proposition maintained by Balbus, that there is a Divine Providence which governs the world. At the end of this chasm, we find him quoting long passages from tragedies, and arguing against the advantages of reason, from the ill use which has been made of it. He then adduces a number of instances, drawn from history and observation, of fortunate vice, and of wrecked and ruined virtue, in order to overturn the doctrine of *particular providence*; contending, that as no family or state can be supposed to be formed with any judgment or discipline, if there are no rewards for good actions, or punishment for bad, so we cannot believe that a Divine Providence regulates the world, when there is no distinction between the honest and the wicked.

“This,” concludes Cotta, “is the purport of what I had to say concerning the nature of the gods, not with a design to destroy their existence, but merely to show what an obscure point it is, and with what difficulties an explanation of it is attended.” Balbus observing that Cotta had finished his discourse, “You have been very severe,” says he, “against the being of a Divine Providence, a doctrine established by the Stoics, with piety and wisdom; but, as it grows too late, I shall defer my answer to another day.”—“There is nothing,” replied Cotta, “I desire more than to be confuted.”—“The conversation ended here, and we parted. Velleius judged that the arguments of Cotta were the truest, but those of Balbus seemed to me to have the greater probability.”

It seems likely that this profession or pretext, that the discourse is left unfinished, may (like the occasional apologies of Cotta) be introduced to save appearances*. It is evident, however, that Cicero intended to add, at least, new prefaces to the two latter books of this work, probably from suspecting, as he went on, that the discourses are too long to have taken place in one day, as they are now represented. Balbus says, in the second book, "Velut a te ipso, hesternum die dictum est†." Fulvius Ursinus had remarked that this was an inadvertence, either in Cicero or a transcriber, as the discourse is continued throughout the same day. That it was not owing to a transcriber, or to any inadvertence in Cicero, but to a design of altering the introductions to the second and third books, appears from a passage in book third, where Cotta says to Balbus, "Omniaque, quæ a te *nudiustertius* dicta sunt‡." Now, it is extremely unlikely that there should have been two such instances of inadvertency in the author, or carelessness in the copyist.

The work on the Nature of the Gods, though in many respects a most valuable production, and a convincing proof of the extensive learning of its author, gives a melancholy picture of the state of his mind. Unfitted to bear adversity, and borne down by the calamities of his country, and the death of his beloved daughter, (misfortunes of which he often complains,) Cicero seems to have become a sceptic, and occasionally to have doubted even of a superintending Providence. Warburton appears to be right in supposing, that Cicero was advanced in years before he seriously adopted the sceptical opinions of the new Academy. "This farther appears," says he, after some remarks on this head, "from a place in his Nature of the Gods, where he says, that his espousing the new Academy of a sudden, was a thing altogether unlooked for§. The change, then, was late, and after

* There was published, *Bononia*, 1811, *M. T. Ciceronis de Naturâ Deorum Liber Quartus: e pervetusto Codice MS. Membranaceo nunc primum edidit P. Seraphinus Ord. Fr. Min.*—This tract was republished, (*Oxonii*, 1813,) by Mr Lunn, who says in a prefatory note, that "he entertains no doubt, from the opinion of several of his friends, of this production being a literary forgery." Of this, indeed, there can be no doubt, as appears among various other proofs, from the minute account of the Jews.—"Sed etiam plures adhibere deos vel divos, a quibus ipsi regantur, quos nomine Elohim designare soleant, secundi ordinis," &c. (p. 12.)—There is some humour in the manner in which the Italian editor, in a preface written in the rude style of a simple friar, obtests that the work is not a forgery.—"Sed ne quis existimet, me ipsum fecisse hunc librum, testor, detestor, obtestor, et contestor, per S. Franciscum Assisium, me talem facere non posse, qui sacris incumbere cogor, nec profanis possum," &c.

† C. 29.

‡ C. 7.

§ Multis etiam sensi mirabile videri, eam nobis potissimum probatam esse philosophiam, quæ lucem eriperet, et quasi noctem quandam rebus offunderet, desertaque

the ruin of the republic, when Cicero retired from business, and had leisure in his recess to plan and execute this noble undertaking. So that a learned critic appears to have been mistaken, when he supposed the choice of the new Academy was made in his youth. 'This sect,' says he, 'did best agree with the vast genius, and ambitious spirit, of *young Cicero**.'"

It appears not, however, to have been, as Warburton supposes, altogether from a systematic plan, of explaining to his countrymen the philosophy of the Greeks, that Cicero became a sceptic; but partly from gloomy views of nature and providence. It seems difficult otherwise to account for the circumstance, that Cotta, an ancient and venerable Consul, the *Pontifex* of the metropolis of the world, should be introduced as contending, even against an Epicurean, for the non-existence of the gods. Lord Bolingbroke has justly remarked, "that Cotta disputes so vehemently, and his arguments extend so far, that Tully makes his own brother accuse him directly, and himself by consequence indirectly, of atheism.—'Studio contra Stoicos disserendi deos mihi videtur funditus tollere.' Now, what says Tully in his own name? He tells his brother that Cotta disputes in that manner, rather to confute the Stoics than to destroy the religion of mankind.—'Magis quam ut hominum debeat religionem.' But Quintus answers, that is, Tully makes him answer, he was not the bubble of an artifice, employed to save the appearance of departing from the public religious institutions. 'Ne communi jure migrare videatur†.'" Cotta, indeed, goes so far in his attack on Providence, that Lord Bolingbroke, who is not himself a model of orthodoxy, takes up the other side of the question against the Roman Pontiff, and pleads the cause of Providence with no little reason and eloquence.‡

In the foregoing analysis, or abridgment of the work on the Nature of the Gods, it will have been remarked, that two chasms occur in the argument of Cotta. Olivet enters into some discussion with regard to the latter and larger chasm. "I cannot," says he, "see any justice in the accusation against the primitive Christians, of having torn this passage out of all the MSS. What appearance is there, that through a pious motive they should have erased this any more than many others in the same book, which they must undoubtedly have looked upon

disciplinæ et jam pridem relicte patrociniū nec opinatum a nobis esse susceptum.
—(*De Nat. Deor.* Lib. I. c. 3.)

* Warburton, *Divine Legation*, Vol. II. p. 168. Ed. 1755. Warburton here alludes to Bentley—*Remarks on a late Discourse of Free-thinking*, Part II. Rem. 58.

† *Bolingbroke's Works*, Vol. VIII. p. 81. ed. 8vo.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 266, 278.

as no less pernicious?" Olivet seems inclined to suspect the Pagans; but, in my opinion, the chasms in the discourse of Cotta, if not accidental, are to be attributed rather to Christian than pagan zeal. Arnobius, indeed, speaking of this work, says, That many were of opinion that it ought to have been destroyed by the Roman Senate, as the Christian faith might be approved by it, and the authority of antiquity subverted*. There is no evidence, however, that any such destruction or mutilation was attempted by the Pagans; and we find that the satire directed against the heathen deities has been permitted to remain, while the chasms intervene in portions of the work, which might have been supposed by a pious zealot, to bear, in some measure, against the Christian, as well as the Pagan faith. In the first of them, the Pontifex begins, and is proceeding to contend, that in spite of Acts of the Senate, temples, statues, and other commemorations of miraculous circumstances, all such prodigies were nothing but mere fables, however solemnly attested, or generally believed. Now, the transcriber might fear, lest a similar inference should be drawn by the sceptic, to that which has in fact been deduced by the English translator of this work, in the following passage of a note:—"Hence we see what little credit ought to be paid to facts, said to be done out of the ordinary course of nature. These miracles are well attested: They were recorded in the annals of a great people—believed by many learned and otherwise sagacious persons, and received as religious truths by the populace; but the testimonies of ancient records, the credulity of some learned men, and the implicit faith of the vulgar, can never prove that to have been, which is impossible in the nature of things ever to be." At the beginning of the other and larger chasm, Cotta was proceeding to argue against the proposition of the Stoics, that there is a Divine Providence which governs the world. Now, there is a considerable analogy between the system of the ancient Stoics, and the Christian scheme of Providence, both in the theoretical doctrine, and in the practical inference, of the propriety of a cheerful and unqualified submission to the chain of events—to the dispensations of nature in the Stoical, and of God in the purer doctrine. To Christian zeal, therefore, rather than to pagan prudence, we must attribute the two chasms which now intervene in the discourse of Cotta.

In the remarks which have been now offered on this work, *De Naturâ Deorum*, I trust I have brought no unfounded or

* *Fuerint qui judicarent oportere statui per Senatum ut aboleantur hæc scripta, quibus religio Christiana comprobetur, et vetustatis opprimatur auctoritas.*—Arnobius, *Adversus Gentes*, Lib. III.

uncharitable accusation against Cicero. He was a person, at least in his own age and country, of unrivalled talents and learning—he was a great, and, on the whole, a good man—but his mind was sensitive, and feeble against misfortune. There are æras, and monuments perhaps in every æra, when we are ready to exclaim with Brutus, “That virtue is an empty name:” And the doubts and darkness of such a mind as that of Cicero, enriched with all the powers of genius, and all the treasures of philosophy, afford a new proof of the necessity for the appearance of that Divine Messenger, who was then on the eve of descending upon earth.

De Divinatione.—The long account which has been given of the dialogue on the Nature of the Gods, renders it unnecessary to say much on the work *De Divinatione*. This treatise may be considered, in some measure, as a supplement to that *De Natura Deorum*. The religion of the Romans consisted of two different branches—the worship of the gods, and the observation of the signs by which their will was supposed to be revealed. Cicero having already discussed what related to the nature and worship of the gods, a treatise on Divination formed a natural continuation of the subject*. In his work on this topic, which was one almost peculiar to the Romans, Cicero professes to relate the substance of a conversation held at Tusculum with his brother, in which Quintus, on the principles of the Stoics, supported the credibility of divination, while Cicero himself controverted it. The dialogue consists of two books, the first of which comprehends an enumeration by Quintus of the different kinds or classes of divination, with the reasons or presumptions in their favour. The second book contains a refutation by Cicero of his brother’s arguments.

Quintus, while walking with his brother in the Lyceum at Tusculum, begins his observations by stating, that he had read the third book which Cicero had lately written, on the Nature of the Gods, in which Cotta seemed to contend for atheism, but had by no means been able to refute Balbus. He remarks, at the same time, that the subject of divination had not been treated of in these books, perhaps in order that it might be separately discussed more fully, and that he would gladly, if his brother had leisure and inclination, state his own opinions on the subject. The answer of Cicero is very noble.—“Ego vero, inquam, Philosophiæ, Quinte, semper

* In the preface to the second book of this treatise, *De Divinatione*, Cicero, enumerating his late philosophical compositions, says, “Quibus libris editis, tres libri perfecti sunt *De Natura Deorum* * * que ut plene essent cumulateque perfecta, *De Divinatione* ingressi sumus his libris scribere.—(*De Div. Lib. II. c. 1.*)” In Lib. I. leg.

vaco. Hoc autem tempore, quum sit nihil aliud quod libenter agere possim multo magis aveo audire de divinatione quid sentias."

Quintus, after observing that divinations of various kinds have been common among all people, remarks, and afterwards frequently repeats, that it is no argument against different modes of divination, that we cannot explain how or why certain things happen. It is sufficient, that we know from experience and history, that they do happen*. He contends that Cicero himself supports the doctrine of divination, in the poem on his Consulship, from which he quotes a long passage, sufficient to console us for the loss of that work. He argues, that although events may not always succeed as predicted, it does not follow that divination is not an art, more than that medicine is not an art, because cures may not always be effected. In the course of this book we have a complete account of the state contrivances which were practised by the Roman government, to instil among the people those hopes and fears whereby it regulated public opinion, in which view it has been justly termed a chapter in the history of man. The great charm, however, of the first book, consists in the number of histories adduced by Quintus, in proof of the truth of different kinds of omens, dreams, portents, and divinations.—“*Negemus omnia,*” says he, “*comburamus annales.*” He states various circumstances consistent with his and his brother’s own knowledge; and, among others, two remarkable dreams, one of which had occurred to Cicero, and one to himself. He asks if the Greek history be also a fable.—“*Num etiam Græcorum historia mentita est?*” and, in short, throughout takes the following high ground:—“*Quid est, igitur, cur dubitandum sit, quin sint ea, quæ disputavi, verissima? Si ratio mecum facit, si eventa, si populi, si nationes, si Græci, si barbari, si majores etiam nostri, si summi philosophi, si poetæ, et sapientissimi viri qui res publicas constituerunt, qui urbes condiderunt; si denique hoc semper ita putatum est: an dum bestię loquantur, expectamus, hominum consentiente auctoritate, contenti non sumus?†*”

The second book of this work is introduced by a preface, in which Cicero enumerates the philosophical treatises which he had lately written. He then proceeds to state, that at the conclusion of the discourse of Quintus, which was held while they were walking in the Lyceum, they sat down in the library, and he began to reply to his brother’s arguments. His commencement is uncommonly beautiful.—“*Atque ego; Accurate tu*

* Hoc sum contentus, quod, etiamsi, quomodo quidque fiat, ignorem, quid fiat, intelligo.

† C. 88.

quidem, inquam, Quinte, et Stoice Stoicorum sententiam defendisti: quodque me maxime delectat, plurimis nostris exemplis usus es, et iis quidem claris et illustribus. Dicendum est mihi igitur ad ea, quæ sunt a te dicta, sed ita, nihil ut affirmem, quæram omnia, dubitans plerumque, et mihi ipse diffidens*." It is unnecessary to give any summary of the arguments of Cicero against auguries, auspices, astrology, lots, dreams, and every species of omens and prodigies. His discourse is a masterpiece of reasoning; and if sufficiently studied during the dark ages of Europe, would have sufficed, in a great degree, to have prevented or dispelled the superstitious gloom. Nothing can be finer than the concluding chapter on the evils of superstition, and Cicero's efforts to extirpate it, without injuring religion. The whole thread, too, of his argumentative eloquence, is interwoven and strengthened by curious and interesting stories. As a specimen of the agreeable manner in which these are introduced, the twenty-fourth chapter may be cited:—"Vetus autem illud Catonis admodum scitum est, qui mirari se aiebat, quod non rideret haruspex, haruspicem quum vidisset. Quota enim quæque res evenit prædicta ab ipsis? Aut si evenit quippiam, quid afferri potest, cur non casu id evenerit? Rex Prusias, quum Annibali apud eum exsulanti depugnari placeret, negabat se audere, quod exta prohiberent. An tu, inquit, carunculæ vitulinæ mavis, quam imperatori veteri, credere? Quid? Ipse Cæsar, quum a summo haruspice moneretur, ne in Africam ante brumam transmitteret, nonne transmisit? Quod ni fecisset, uno in loco omnes adversariorum copiæ convenissent. Quid ego haruspicum responsa commemorem, (possum equidem innumerabilia,) quæ aut nullos habuerunt exitus, aut contrarios? Hoc civili bello, Dii Immortales! Quam multa luserunt—quæ nobis in Græciam Româ responsa haruspicum missa sunt? Quæ dicta Pompeio? Etenim ille admodum extis et ostentis movebatur. Non lubet commemorare, nec vero necesse est, tibi præsertim, qui interfuisti. Vides tamen, omnia fere contra, ac dicta sunt, evenisse." One great charm of all the philosophical works of Cicero, and particularly of this treatise, consists in the anecdotes with which they abound. This practice of intermingling histories, might have been partly owing to Tully's habits as a pleader—partly to the works having been composed in "narrative old age." His moral conclusions seem thus occasionally to have the certainty of physical experiments, by the support which they receive from occurrences, suggested to him by his wide experience; while, at the same time,—

* C. S.

“ His candid style, like a clean stream doth slide,
And his bright fancy, all the way,
Doth like the sun-shine on it play*.”

De Fato.—This tract, which is the last of Cicero's philosophical works, treats of a subject which occupied as important a place in the metaphysics and theology of the ancients, as free will and necessity have filled in modern speculation. The dialogue *De Fato* is held in the villa of Cicero, called the Puteolan or the Academia, which was situated on the shore of Baiæ, between the lake Avernus and the harbour of Puteoli. It stood in the curve of the bay, and almost on the beach, so as to enjoy the breezes and murmurs of the sea. The house was built according to the plan of the Academy at Athens, being adorned with a portico and grove, for the purposes of philosophical conference†; and with a gallery, which surrounded a square court in the centre. “Twelve or thirteen arches of the Puteolan villa,” says Mr Kelsall, “are still seen on the side next the vineyard, and, intermixed as they are with trees, are very picturesque seen from the sea. These ruins are about one mile from Pozzuolo, and have always been styled *l'Academia di Cicerone*. Pliny is very circumstantial in the description of the site, ‘*Ab Averno lacu Puteolos tendentibus imposita littori.*’ The classical traveller will not forget that the Puteolan villa is the scene of some of the orator's philosophical works. I searched in vain for the mineral spring commemorated by Laurea Tullius, in the well-known complimentary verses preserved by Pliny; for it was defaced by the convulsions which the whole of this tract experienced in the 16th century, so poetically described in Gray's hexameters.” After the death of Cicero, the villa was acquired by Antistius Vetus, who repaired and improved it. It was subsequently possessed by the Emperor Hadrian, who, while expiring here‡, breathed out the celebrated address to his fleeting, fluttering soul, on its approaching departure for those cold and pallid regions, that must have formed in his fancy such a gloomy contrast to the glowing sunshine and animated shore which he left with so much reluctance.

The dialogue is held between Cicero and Hirtius, on one of the many occasions on which they met to consult concerning the situation of public affairs. Hirtius was the author of

* Cowley.

† Plin. *Hist. Nat. Lib.* XXXI. c. 2.

‡ At least so says Middleton, (Vol. III. p. 297,) and he quotes as his authority Spartian's Life of Hadrian, (c. 25.) Spartian, however, only tells, that he was buried at Cicero's villa of Puteoli—“*Apud ipsas Bajas perit, invisusque omnibus sepultus est in villâ Ciceronianâ Puteolis.*”

the Commentaries on the Civil Wars, and perished a few months afterwards, at the battle of Modena, in the moment of victory. The wonderful events which had recently occurred, and the miserable fate of so many of the greatest and most powerful of the Romans, naturally introduced a conversation on destiny. We have now neither the commencement nor conclusion of the dialogue; but some critics have supposed that it originally consisted of two books, and that the fragment we at present possess formed part of the second book—an opinion which seems justified by a passage in the seventeenth chapter of the second book, where the first conversation is cited: Others, however, refer these words to a separate and previous work on Fate. The part of the dialogue now extant, contains a refutation of the doctrine of Chrysippus the Stoic, which was that of fatality. "The spot," says Eustace, "the subject, the speakers, both fated to perish in so short a time, during the contest which they both foresaw, and endeavoured in vain to avert, were circumstances which give a peculiar interest to this dialogue, and increase our regret that it has not reached us in a less mutilated state*."

I have now enumerated what may be strictly regarded as the philosophical and theological writings of Cicero. Some of the advantages to be derived from these productions, have already been pointed out during our progress. But on a consideration of the whole, it is manifest that the chief profit accruing from them, is the satisfactory evidence which they afford of the little reason we have to regret the loss of the writings of Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and other Greek philosophers. The intrinsic value of these works of Cicero, consists chiefly in what may be called the Roman portion of them—in the anecdotes of distinguished Romans, and of the customs and opinions of that sovereign people.

We now proceed to the *moral* writings of Cicero, of which the most important is the work *De Officiis*. The ancient Romans had but an imperfect notion of moral obligations; their virtues were more stern than amiable, and their ardent exclusive patriotism restricted the wide claims of philanthropy, on the one hand, and of domestic duties, on the other. Panætius, a Greek philosopher, who resided at Rome, in the time of Scipio, wrote a book entitled Περὶ Καθηκόντων. He divided his subject according to the threefold considerations which he conceived should operate in determining our resolutions with regard to the performance of moral duties; 1. Whether the thing itself be virtuous or shameful; 2. Whether it conduce to

* *Classical Tour*. Vol. II. c. 11.

utility and the enjoyment of life ; 3. What choice is to be made when an apparent utility seems to clash with virtue. Cicero followed nearly the same arrangement. In the first book he treats of what is virtuous in itself, and shows in what manner our duties are founded in morality and virtue—in the right perception of truth, justice, fortitude, and decorum; which four qualities are referred to as the constituent parts of virtue, and the sources from which all our duties are drawn. In the second book, the author enlarges on those duties which relate to utility, the improvement of life, and the means employed for the attainment of wealth and power. This division of the work principally regards political advancement, and the honourable means of gaining popularity, as generosity, courtesy, and eloquence. Thus far Cicero had, in all probability, closely followed the steps of Panætius. Garve, in his commentary on this work*, remarks, that it is quite clear, when he comes to the more subtle and philosophic parts of his subject, that Cicero translates from the Greek, and that he has not always found words in his own language to express the nicer distinctions of the Greek schools. The work of Panætius, however, was left imperfect, and did not treat of the third part of the subject, the choice and distinction to be made when there was a jarring or inconsistency between virtue and utility. On this topic, accordingly, Cicero was left to his own resources. The discussion, of course, relates only to the subordinate duties, as the true and undoubted *honestum* never can be put in competition with private advantage, or be violated for its sake. As to the minor duties, the great maxim inculcated is that nothing should be accounted useful or profitable but what is strictly virtuous, and that, in fact, there ought to be no separation of the principles of virtue and utility. Cicero enters into some discussion, however, and affords some rules to enable us to form a just estimate of both in cases of doubt, where seeming utility comes into competition with virtue. Accordingly, he proposes and decides a good many questions in casuistry, in order to fix in what situations one may seek private gain with honour. He takes his examples from Roman history, and particularly considers the case of Regulus in the obligation of his oath, and the advice which he gave to the Roman Senate. The author disclaims having been indebted to any preceding writers on this subject ; but it appears, from what he afterwards states, that the sixth book of the work of Hecato, a scholar of Panætius, was full of ques-

* *Philosophische Anmerkungen zu Cicero's Büchern von den Pflichten.* Breslau, 1819.

tions of this kind: As, for example—If something must be thrown into the sea to lighten a vessel in a storm, whether one should sacrifice a valuable horse, or a worthless slave? Whether, if, during a shipwreck, a fool has got hold of a plank, a wise man ought to take it from him, if he be able? If one, unknowingly, receives bad money for his goods, may he pay it away to a third hand, after he is aware that it is bad? Diogenes, it seems, one of the three philosophic ambassadors who came to Rome from Athens, in the end of the sixth century, maintained the affirmative of this last proposition.

The subject being too extensive for dialogue, (the form of his other philosophical treatises,) the author has addressed the work *De Officiis* to his son, and has represented it as written for his instruction. "It is," says Kelsall, "the noblest present ever made by a parent to a child." Cicero declares, that he intended to treat in it of all the duties*; but it is generally considered to have been chiefly drawn up as a manual of political morality, and as a guide to young Romans of his son's age and distinction, which might enable them to attain political eminence, and to tread with innocence and safety "the slippery steeps of power."

De Senectute.—

"O Thou all eloquent, whose mighty mind
Streams from the depths of ages on mankind,
Streams like the day—who angel-like hast shed
Thy full effulgence on the hoary head;
Speaking in Cato's venerable voice—
'Look up and faint not—faint not, but rejoice'—
From thy Elysium guide us†."

The treatise *De Senectute* is not properly a dialogue, but a continued discourse, delivered by Cato the Censor, at the request of Scipio and Lælius. It is, however, one of the most interesting pieces of the kind which have descended to us from antiquity; and no reader can wonder that Cicero experienced such pleasure in its composition, that the delightful employment, not only, as he says, made him forget the infirmities of old age, but rendered that portion of existence agreeable. In consequence of the period of life to which Cicero had attained, at the time of its composition, and the circumstances in which he was then placed, it must, indeed, have been penned with peculiar interest and feeling. It was written by him in his 63d year, and is addressed to his friend Atticus, (who reached the same term of existence,) with a view of rendering to both the accumulating burdens of age as

* Lib. I. c. 30.

† Rogers, *Human Life*.

light as possible. In order to give his precepts the greater force, he represents them as delivered by the elder Cato, (while flourishing in the eighty-fourth year of a vigorous and useful old age,) on occasion of young Scipio and Lælius expressing their admiration at the wonderful ease with which he still bore the load of life. This affords the author an opportunity of entering into a full explanation of his ideas on the subject. His great object is to show that the closing period of life may be rendered, not only tolerable, but comfortable, by internal resources of happiness. He reduces those causes which are commonly supposed to constitute the infelicity of advanced age, under four general heads:—That it incapacitates from mingling in the affairs of the world—that it produces infirmities of body—that it disqualifies for the enjoyment of sensual gratifications—and that it brings us to the verge of death. Some of these supposed disadvantages, he maintains, are imaginary, and for any real pleasures of which old men are deprived, others more refined and higher may be substituted. The whole work is agreeably diversified and illustrated by examples of eminent Roman citizens, who had passed a respected and agreeable evening of life. Indeed, so much is said of those individuals who reached a happy old age, that it may rather be styled a Treatise on Old Men, than on Old Age. On the last point, the near approach of death, it is argued, conformably to the first book of the Tusculan Questions, that if death extinguish the soul's existence, it is utterly to be disregarded, but much to be desired, if it convey her to a happier region. The apprehension of future punishment, as in the Tusculan Disputations, is laid entirely aside, and it is assumed as a principle, that, after death, we either shall not be miserable, or be superlatively happy. In other respects, the tract *De Senectute* almost seems a confutation of the first book of the Tusculan Questions, which is chiefly occupied in showing the wretchedness of long-protracted existence. The sentiments put into the mouth of Cato, are acknowledged by Cicero as his own; but, notwithstanding this, and also a more elegant and polished style of composition than could be expected from the Censor, many characteristics of his life, conversation, and manners, are brought before us—his talk is a little boastful, and his sternness, though softened down by old age into an agreeable gossiping garrulity, is still visible; and, on the whole, the discourse is so managed, that we experience, in reading it, something of that complaisant respect, which we feel in intercourse with a venerable old man, who has around him so much of the life to

come, as to be purified at least from the grosser desires of this lower world.

It has been remarked as extraordinary, that, amidst the anxious enumeration of the comforts of age, those arising from domestic society are not mentioned by Cicero; but his favourite daughter Tullia was now no more, and the husband of Terentia, the father of Marcus Cicero, and the father-in-law of Dolabella, may have felt something on that subject, of which he was willing to spare himself the recollection. But though he has omitted what we number among its chief consolations, still he has represented advanced age under too favourable a view. He denies, for instance, that the memory is impaired by it—asserting, that everything continues to be remembered, in which we take an interest, for that no old man ever forgot where he had concealed his treasure. He has, besides, only treated of an old age distinguished by deeds or learning, terminating a life great and glorious in the eyes of men. The table of the old man whom he describes, is cheered by numerous friends, and his presence, wherever he appears, is hailed by clients and dependants. All his examples are drawn from the higher and better walks of life. In the venerable picture of the Censor, we have no traces of second childhood, or of the slippered pantaloons, or of that melancholy and almost frightful representation, in the tenth satire of Juvenal. But even persons of the station, and dignity, and talents of Cato, are, in old age, liable to weaknesses and misfortunes, with which the pleasing portrait, that Tully has drawn, is in no way disfigured:—

“ In life’s last scene, what prodigies surprise,
Fears of the brave, and follies of the wise !
From Marlborough’s eyes the tears of dotage flow,
And Swift expires a driveller and a show.”

The treatise *De Senectute* has been versified by Denham, under the title of *Cato Major*. The subject of the evils of old age is divided, as by Cicero, into four parts. “I can neither,” says he, in his preface, “call this piece Tully’s nor my own, being much altered from the original, not only by the change of the style, but by addition and subtraction.” In fact, the fine sentiments are Cicero’s—the doggerel English verse, into which he has converted Cicero’s classical prose, his own. The fourth part, on the approach of death, is that which is best versified.

This tract is also the model of the dialogue *Spurinna, or the Comforts of Old Age*, by Sir Thomas Bernard. Hough, Bishop of Worcester, who is in his ninetieth year at the date

of the conference, supposed to be held in 1739, is the Cato of the dialogue. The other interlocutors are, Gibson, Bishop of London, and Mr Lyttleton, subsequently Lord Lyttleton. After considering, in the same manner as Cicero, the disadvantages of old age, the English author proceeds to treat of its advantages, and the best mode of increasing its comforts. Many ideas and arguments are derived from Cicero; but among the consolations of advanced age, the promises of revelation concerning a future state of happiness, to which the Roman was a stranger, are prominently brought forward, and the illustrations are chiefly drawn from British, instead of Grecian or Roman history.

De Amicitia.—In this, as in all his other dialogues, Cicero has most judiciously selected the persons whom he introduces as speakers. They were men of eminence in the state; and though deceased, the Romans had such a just veneration for their ancestors, that they would listen with the utmost interest even to the supposed conversation of the ancient heroes or sages of their country. Such illustrious names bestowed additional dignity on what was delivered, and even now affect us with sentiments of veneration far superior to that which is felt for the itinerant sophists, who, with the exception of Socrates, are the chief speakers in the dialogues of Plato.

The memorable and hereditary friendship which subsisted between Lælius and the younger Scipio Africanus, rendered them the most suitable characters from whom the sentiments expressed on this delightful topic could be supposed to flow. Their mutual and unshaken attachment threw an additional lustre over the military glory of the one, and the contemplative wisdom of the other. "Such," says Cicero in the introduction to the treatise *De Republicâ*, "was the common law of friendship between them, that Lælius adored Africanus as a god, on account of his transcendent military fame; and that Scipio, when they were at home, revered his friend, who was older than himself, as a father*." The kindred soul of Cicero appears to have been deeply struck with this delightful assemblage of all the noblest and loveliest qualities of our nature. The friendship which subsisted between himself and Atticus was another beautiful example of a similar kind: And the dialogue *De Amicitia* is accordingly addressed with peculiar propriety to Atticus, who, as Cicero tells him in his dedication, could not fail to discover his own portrait in the delineation of

* "Fuit enim hoc in amicitia quasi quoddam jus inter illos, ut militie, propter eximiam belli gloriam, Africanum ut deum coleret Lælius; domi vicissim Lælium, quod etate antecedeat, observaret in parentis loco Scipio."

a perfect friend. This treatise approaches nearer to dialogue than that *De Senectute*, for there is a story, with the circumstances of time and place. Fannius, the historian, and Mucius Scævola, the Augur, both sons-in-law of Lælius, paid him a visit immediately after the sudden and suspicious death of Scipio Africanus. The recent loss which Lælius had thus sustained, leads to an eulogy on the inimitable virtues of the departed hero, and to a discussion on the true nature of that tie by which they had been so long connected. Cicero, while in his earliest youth, had been introduced by his father to Mucius Scævola; and hence, among other interesting matters which he enjoyed an opportunity of hearing, he was one day present while Scævola related the substance of the conference on Friendship, which he and Fannius had held with Lælius a few days after the death of Scipio. Many of the ideas and sentiments which the mild Lælius then uttered, are declared by Scævola to have originally flowed from Scipio, with whom the nature and laws of friendship formed a favourite topic of discourse. This, perhaps, is not entirely a fiction, or merely told to give the stamp of authenticity to the dialogue. Some such conversation was probably held and related; and I doubt not, that a few of the passages in this celebrated dialogue reflect the sentiments of Lælius, or even of Africanus himself.

The philosophical works of Cicero, which have been hitherto enumerated, are complete, or nearly so. But it is well known that he was the author of many other productions which have now been entirely lost, or of which only fragments remain.

Of these, the most important was the Treatise *De Republicâ*, which, in the general wreck of learning, shared the fate of the institutions it was intended to celebrate. The greater part of this dialogue having disappeared along with the *Origines* of Cato, the works of Varro, and the History of Sallust, we have been deprived of all the writings which would have thrown the most light on the Roman institutions, manners, and government—of everything, in short, which philosophically traced the progress of Rome, from its original barbarism to the perfection which it had attained in the age of the second Scipio Africanus.

There are few monuments of ancient literature, of which the disappearance had excited more regret, than that of the work *De Republicâ*, which was long believed to have been the grand repository of all the political wisdom of the ancients. The great importance of the subject—treated, too, by a writer at once distinguished by his genius and former

official dignity; the pride and predilection with which the author himself speaks of it, and the sublimity and beauty of the fragment entitled *Somnium Scipionis*, preserved from it by Macrobius, all concurred to exalt this treatise in the imagination of the learned, and to exasperate their vexation at its loss. The fathers of the church, particularly Lactantius, had afforded some insight into the arguments employed in it on different topics; several fragments existed in the works of the grammarians, and a complete copy was extant as late as the 11th century. Since that time the literary world have been flattered at different periods with hopes of its discovery; but it is only within the last few years that such a portion of it has been recovered, as may suffice, in a considerable degree, to satisfy curiosity, though not perhaps to fulfil expectation,

It is well known to many, and will be mentioned more fully in the *Appendix*, that owing to a scarcity of papyrus and parchment, it was customary, at different times, to erase old, in order to admit new, writing. To a MS. of this kind, the name of Palimpsest has been given—a term made use of by Cicero himself. In a letter to the lawyer Trebatius, who had written to him on such a sheet, Cicero says, “that while he must praise him for his parsimony in employing a palimpsest, he cannot but wonder what he had erased to scribble such a letter, except it were his law notes: For I cannot think,” adds he, “that you would efface my letter to substitute your own*.” This practice became very common in the middle ages, when both the papyrus and parchment were scarce, and when the classics were, with few exceptions, no longer the objects of interest. Montfaucon had remarked, that these obliterated MSS. were perhaps more numerous than those which had been written on for the first time†. But though in some cases the original writing was still visible on close observation, no practical use was made of such inspection till Angelo Mai published some fragments recovered from palimpsest MSS. in the Ambrosian library, of which he was keeper. Encouraged by his success, he persevered in this new pursuit, and published at intervals fragments of considerable value. At length, being called to Rome as a recompense for his learned labours, Mai prosecuted in the Vatican those noble researches which he had commenced at Milan; and it is to him we now owe the discovery and publication of a considerable portion of Cicero *De Republicâ*, which had been expunged, (it is supposed in

* *Epist. Famil. Lib. VII. ep. 18.* In palimpsesto, laudo equidem parsimoniam, sed miror, quid in illâ chartulâ fuerit, quod delere malueris quam hæc non scribere, nisi forte tuas formulas: non enim puto te meas epistolas delere, ut reponas tuas.

† *Mém. de l'Académ. des Inscriptions, &c. Tom. VI.*

the 6th century,) and crossed by a new writing, which contained a commentary by St Augustine on the Psalms*.

The work *De Republica* was begun by Cicero in the month of May, in the year 699, when the author was in the fifty-second year of his age, so that, of all his philosophical writings, it was at least the earliest commenced. In a letter to his brother Quintus, he tells him that he had employed himself in his Cuman and Pompeian villas, in writing a large and laborious political work; that, should it succeed to his mind, it would be well, but, if not, he would cast it into that sea which was in view when he wrote it; and, as it was impossible for him to be idle, commence some other undertaking†. He had proceeded, however, but a little way, when he repeatedly changed the whole plan of the work; and it is curious to perceive, that an author of so perfect a genius as Cicero, had similar advices from friends, and the same discouragement, and doubts, and irresolution, which agitate inferior writers.

When he had finished the first and second books, they were read to some of his friends at his Tusculan villa. Sallust, who was one of the company present, advised him to change his plan, and to treat the subject in his own person—alleging that the introduction of those ancient philosophers and statesmen, to whom Cicero had assigned parts in the dialogue, instead of adding gravity, gave a fictitious air to the argument, which would have greater weight if delivered from Cicero himself, as being the work, not of a sophist or contemplative theorist, but of a consular senator and statesman, conversant in the greatest affairs, and writing only what his own experience had taught him to be true. These reasons seemed to Cicero very plausible, and for some time made him think of altering his plan, especially since, by placing the scene of the dialogue so far back, he had precluded himself from touching on those important revolutions in the Republic, which were later than the period to which he had confined himself. But after some deliberation, feeling reluctant to throw away the

* Mai published the *De Republica* at Rome, with a preface, giving a history of his discovery, notes, and an index of emendations. It was reprinted from this edition at London, without change, 1823; also at Paris, 1823, with the notes of Mai, and excerpts from his preface; and *cura* Steinacker at Leipsic, 1823. To this German edition there is a prefatory epistle by Hermann, which I was disappointed to find contained only some observations on a single passage of the *De Republica*, with regard to the division of the citizens into classes by Servius Tullius. In the same year an excellent French translation was published by M. Villemain, accompanied with an introductory review of the work he translates; as also notes and dissertations on those topics of Education, Manners, and Religion, which he supposes to have formed the subjects of the last three books which have not yet been recovered.

† *Epist. ad Quint. Frat. Lib. II. ep. 14.*

two books which were already finished, and with which he was much pleased, he resolved to adhere to his original plan*. And as he had preferred it from the first, for the sake of avoiding offence, so he pursued it without any other alteration than that he now limited to six what he had before proposed to extend to nine books. These six were made public previously to his departure for the government of Cilicia. While there, he received the epistolary congratulations of his friends on their success†, and in his answers he discloses all the delight of a gratified and successful author‡.

Mai discusses at considerable length the question, To whom the treatise *De Republicâ* was dedicated. The beginning of the proœmium to the first book, which might have determined this point, is lost; but the author says, “*Disputatio repetenda memoriâ est, quæ mihi, tibi quondam adolescentulo, est a P. Rutilio Rufo, Zmyrnæ cum simul essemus, complures dies exposita.*” Cicero was at Smyrna in the twenty-ninth year of his age, and it is evident that his companion, to whom this treatise is dedicated, was younger than himself, as he says, “*Mihi, tibi quondam adolescentulo.*” Atticus was two years older than Cicero, and therefore could not be the person. In fact, there is every reason to suppose that the treatise *De Republicâ* was dedicated to its author’s younger brother Quintus, who, as we know from the proœmium of the last book, *De Finibus*, was with Cicero at Athens during the voyage, in the course of which he touched at Smyrna—who probably attended him to Asia,—and whose age suited the expression “*mihi, tibi quondam adolescentulo.*” Add to this, that Cicero, when he mentions to his brother, (in the passage of the letter above referred to,) that he meant to alter the plan of his work, says, “*Nunc loquar ipse tecum, et tamen illa quæ institueram ad te, si Romam venero, mittam§.*” The work in its first concoction, therefore, was addressed to Quintus, and, as the author, after some hesitation, published it nearly in its original form, it can scarcely be doubted that it was still dedicated to his brother.

The first book *De Republicâ*, which was one of those read by Cicero to Sallust and some other friends, in his Tusculan villa, is, as already mentioned, imperfect at the commencement. Not much, however, seems to be wanting, and a prologue of considerable length still remains, in which the author

* *Epist. ad Quint. Frat.* Lib. III. ep. 5 and 6.

† *Cælius ad Ciceronem, Epist. Famil.* Lib. VIII. Ep. 1. Tui libri politici omnibus vigent.

‡ *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. VI.

§ *Epist. ad Quint. Frat.* Lib. III. ep. 6.

(pleading, perhaps, his own cause) combats the opinions of philosophers, who, preferring a contemplative to an active life, blame those who engage in public affairs. To the former he opposes the example of many wise and great men, and answers those objections to a busy political life, which have been repeatedly urged against it. This prologue contains some good reasoning, and, like all the writings of its illustrious author, displays a noble patriotic feeling. He remarks, that he had entered into this discussion as introductory to a book concerning the republic, since it seemed proper, as prefatory to such a work, to combat the sentiments of those who deny that a philosopher should be a statesman. "As to the work itself," says he, addressing (as I have supposed) his brother, "I shall lay down nothing new or peculiar to myself, but shall repeat a discussion which once took place among the most illustrious men of their age, and the wisest of our state, such as it was related to myself, and to you when a youth, by P. Rutilius Rufus, when we were with him some days at Smyrna—in which discussion nothing of importance to the right constitution of a commonwealth, appears to have been omitted."

The author then proceeds to mention, that during the consulship of Tuditanus and Aquilius, (as he had heard from Rufus,) the younger Scipio Africanus determined to pass the Latin festivals (*Latinæ Feriæ*) in his gardens, where some of his most intimate friends had promised to visit him. The first of these who makes his appearance is his nephew, Quintus Tubero, a person devoted to the Stoical philosophy, and noted for the austerity of his manners. A remark which Tubero makes about two suns, a prodigy which, it seems, had lately appeared in the heavens, leads Scipio to praise Socrates for his abandonment of physical pursuits, as neither very useful to man, nor capable of being thoroughly investigated—a sentiment (by the way) which, with all due submission to the Greek philosopher, does little credit to his sagacity, as physical inquiries have been not only highly useful to mankind, but are almost the only subjects in which accurate science has been attained. Furius, Philus, and Rutilius, who is stated to have related the discussion to Cicero, now enter, and, at last, comes Lælius, attended by his friend, Spurius Mummius, (brother to the well-known connoisseur in the fine arts who took Corinth,) and by his two sons-in-law, C. Fannius and Q. Scævola. After saluting them, Scipio, as it was now winter, takes them to a sunny spot, in a meadow, and in proceeding thither the party is joined by M. Manilius.

"In this choice of his principal speakers, Cicero," as has been well remarked, "was extremely judicious and happy. It

was necessary that the persons selected should have been distinguished both as statesmen and as scholars, in order that a philosophical discussion might appear consistent with their their known characters, and that a high political reputation might give authority to their remarks on government. Scipio and Lælius united both these requisites in a remarkable degree. They were among the earliest of the Romans who added the graces of Grecian taste and learning to the manly virtues of their own ruder country. These accomplishments had refined and polished their characters, without at all detracting from their force and purity. The very name of the Scipios, the *duo fulmina belli*, was the symbol of military talent, patriotism, and magnanimity: Lælius was somewhat less distinguished in active life; but enjoyed, on the other hand, a still higher reputation for contemplative wisdom*.

After the party had been all seated, the subject of the two suns is resumed; and Lælius, while he remarks that they had enough to occupy attention in matters more at hand, adds, that since they were at present idle, he for his part, had no objection to hear Philus, who was fond of astronomical pursuits, on the subject. Philus, thus encouraged, proceeds to give an account of a kind of Orrery, which had been formed by Archimedes, and having been brought to Rome by Marcellus, its structure, as well as uses, had on one occasion, when Philus was present, been explained by C. Sulpicius Gallus. The application of this explanation to the phænomenon of the two suns is lost, as a *hiatus* of eight pages here occurs in the palimpsest. Probably, the solution of the problem would not, if extant, make a great figure in the *Philosophical Transactions*. But one cannot fail to admire the discursive and active genius of Cicero, who considered all knowledge as an object deserving ardent pursuit†.

* The above quotation is from the XL. Number of the *North American Review*, July 1823. It is highly creditable to the scholarship of our Transatlantic brethren, that the work *De Republicâ*, should on its first publication, have been the subject of an article in one of their principal literary journals, while, as far as I know, the reviews of this ancient land of colleges and universities, have passed over, in absolute silence, the most important classical discovery since the age of the Medici.

† I do not know that this distinguishing feature of the character of Cicero has been anywhere so well described as in the following passage of M. Villemain, in which he has introduced in this respect a beautiful comparison between Cicero and the most illustrious writer of his own nation. Talking of the digression concerning the Parhelion and Orrery, he admits it was little to the purpose, but he adds, "Peut on se défendre d'un mouvement de respect, quand on songe à ce beau caractère de curiosité philosophique, à ce goût universel de la science dont fut animé Cicéron, et qui au milieu d'une vie agitée par tant de travaux, et dans un état de civilisation encore dénué de secours, lui fit rechercher avec un insatiable ardeur tous les moyens de connoissances nouvelles et de lumières ?

"Cet homme qui avait si laborieusement médité l'art de l'éloquence, et le pratiquait chaque jour dans le Forum, dans le sénat, dans les tribunaux; ce grand orateur,

At the end of the *hiatus*, we find Scipio, in reference to Gallus's astronomical knowledge, which had been celebrated by Philus, relating, that when his father, Paulus Æmilius, commanded in Macedonia, the army being terrified by an eclipse, Gallus had calmed their fears by explaining the phenomenon—an anecdote, which, with another similar to it here told of Pericles, proves the value of physical pursuits, and their intimate connection with the affairs of life. This inference seems to have been drawn in a passage which is lost; and several beautiful sentiments follow, similar to some of those in the *Somnium Scipionis*, on the calm exquisite delights of meditation and science, and on the littleness of all earthly things, when compared with immortality or the universe. "Quid porro," says Scipio, in the most elevated tone of moral and intellectual grandeur—"quid porro aut præclarum putet in rebus humanis, qui hæc deorum regna perspexerit? aut diuturnum, qui cognoverit quid sit æternum? aut gloriosum, qui viderit quam parva sit terra, primum universa, deinde ea pars ejus quam homines incolant, quamque nos in exigua ejus parto adfixi, plurimis ignotissimi gentibus, speremus tamen nostrum nomen volitare et vagari latissime? Agros, vero, et ædificia, et pecudes, et immensum argenti pondus atque auri, qui bona nec putare nec appellare soleat, quod earum rerum videatur ei, levis fructus, exiguus usus, incertus dominatus, sæpe etiam teterrimorum hominum immensa possessio. Quam est hic fortunatus putandus, cui soli vere liceat omnia non Quiritium sed sapientium jure pro suis vindicare! nec civili nexo, sed communi lege naturæ, quæ vetat ullam rem esse cujusquam nisi ejus qui tractare et uti sciat: qui imperia consulatusque

qui même pendant son consulat plaidait encore des causes privées, au milieu d'une vie toute de gloire, d'agitations, et de périls, dans ce mouvement d'inquiétudes et d'affaires attesté par cette foule de lettres si admirables et si rapidement écrites, étudiait encore tout ce que dans son siècle il était possible de savoir. Il avait cultivé la poésie: il avait approfondi et transporté chez les Romains toutes les philosophies de la Grèce; il cherchait à recueillir les notions encore imparfaites des sciences physiques. Nous voyons même par une de ses lettres qu'il s'occupait de faire un traité technique de géographie, à peu près comme Voltaire compilait laborieusement un abrégé chronologique de l'histoire d'Allemagne. Ces deux génies ont eu en effet ce caractère distinctif de mêler aux plus brillans trésors de l'imagination et de goût, l'ardeur de toutes les connoissances, et cette activité intellectuelle qui ne s'arrête, ni ne se lasse jamais.

"Sans doute il y avait entre eux de grands dissemblances, surtout dans cette vocation prédominante qui entraînait l'un vers l'éloquence et l'autre vers la poésie; sans doute aussi la diversité des temps et des situations mettait plus de différence encore entre l'auteur Français de dix huitième siècle, et le Consul de la république Romaine: mais cette ardeur de tout savoir, ce mouvement de la pensée qui s'appliquait également à tout, forme un trait éminent qui les rapproche; et peut-être le sentiment confus de cette vérité agissait il sur Voltaire dans l'admiration si vivement sentie, si sérieuse, que cet esprit contemplateur de tant de renommées antiques exprima toujours pour le génie de Cicéron."—P. LXII.

nostros in necessariis non in expetendis rebus muneris fungendi gratiâ subeundos, non præmiorum aut gloriæ causâ adpetendos putet: qui denique ut Africanum avum meum scribit Cato solitum esse dicere, possit idem de se prædicare, nunquam se plus agere, quàm nihil cum ageret; nunquam minus solum esse, quàm cum solus esset.

“Quis enim putare vere potest plus egisse Dionysium tum cum omnia moliendo eripuerit civibus suis libertatem, quàm ejus civem Archimedes, cum istam ipsam Sphæram, nihil cum agere videretur, effecerit? Quis autem non magis solos esse qui in foro turbâque quicum conloqui libeat non habeant, quam qui nullo arbitro vel secum ipsi loquantur, vel quasi doctissimorum hominum in concilio adsint cum eorum inventis scriptisque se oblectent? Quis vero divitiorem quemquam putet, quàm eum cui nihil desit, quod quidem natura desideret? aut potentiorum quàm illum, qui omnia quæ expetat, consequatur? aut beatiorem quàm qui sit omni perturbatione animi liberatus?”

Lælius, however, is no way moved by these sonorous arguments; and still persists in affirming, that the most important of all studies are those which relate to the *Republic*, and that it concerned them to inquire, not why two suns had appeared in heaven, but why, in the present circumstances, (alluding to the projects of the Gracchi,) there were two senates, and almost two peoples. In this state of things, therefore, and since they had now leisure, their fittest object would be to learn from Scipio what he deemed the best condition of a commonwealth. Scipio complies with this request, and begins with defining a republic; “*Est igitur respublica res populi—populus autem non omnis hominum cœtus quoquo modo congregatus, sed cœtus multitudinis juris consensu.*” In entering on the nature of what he had thus defined, he remounts to the origin of society, which he refers entirely to that social spirit which is one of the principles of our nature, and not to hostility, or fear, or compact. A people, when united, may be governed by *one*, by *several*, or by a *multitude*, any one of which simple forms may be tolerable if well administered, but they are liable to corruptions peculiar to themselves. Of these three simple forms, Scipio prefers the monarchical; and for this choice he gives his reasons, which are somewhat metaphysical and analogical. But though he more approves of a pure regal government than of the two other simple forms, he thinks that none of them are good, and that a perfect constitution must be compounded of the three. “*Quod cum ita sit, tribus primis generibus longe præstat, meâ sententiâ, regium; regio autem ipsi præstabit id quod erit æquatum et tempera-*

tum ex tribus optimis rerum publicarum modis. Placet enim esse quiddam in re publicâ præstans et regale; esse aliud auctoritate principum partum ac tributum; esse quasdam res servatas iudicio voluntatique multitudinis. Hæc constitutio primùm habet æqualitatem quamdam magnam, quâ carere diutius vix possunt liberi; deinde firmitudinem."

In this panegyric on a mixed constitution, Cicero has taken his idea of a perfect state from the Roman commonwealth—from its consuls, senate, and popular assemblies. Accordingly, Scipio proceeds to affirm, that of all constitutions which had ever existed, no one, either as to the distribution of its parts or discipline, was so perfect as that which had been established by their ancestors; and that, therefore, he will constantly have his eye on it as a model in all that he means to say concerning the best form of a state.

This explains what was the chief scope of Cicero in his work *De Republica*—an eulogy on the Roman government, such as it was, or he supposed it to have been, in the early ages of the commonwealth. In the time of Cicero, when Rome was agitated by the plots of Catiline, and factions of Clodius, with the proscriptions of Sylla but just terminated, and the usurpation of Cæsar impending, the Roman constitution had become as ideal as the polity of Plato; and in its best times had never reached the perfection which Cicero attributes to it. But when a writer is disgusted with the present, and fearful for the future, he is ever ready to form an *Utopia* of the past*.

In the *second* book, which, like the first, is imperfect at the beginning, (though Mai seems to think that only a few words are wanting,) Scipio records a saying of Cato the Censor, that the constitution of Rome was superior to that of all other states, because *they* had been modelled by single legislators, as Crete by Minos, and Sparta by Lycurgus, whereas the Roman commonwealth was the result of the gradually improved experience and wisdom of ages. "To borrow, therefore," says he, "a word from Cato, I shall go back to the *origin* of the Roman state; and show it in its birth, childhood, youth, and maturity—a plan which seems preferable to the delineation of an imaginary republic like that of Plato."

Scipio now begins with Romulus, whose birth, indeed, he seems to treat as a fable; but in the whole succeeding development of the Roman history, he, or, in other words, Cicero, exercises little criticism, and indulges in no scepticism. He

* This first book occupied in the palimpsest 211 pages. Of these, 72 are wanting; but two short fragments belonging to this book are to be found in Lactantius and Nonius, so that about a third of the book is still lost.

admires the wisdom with which Romulus chose the site of his capital—not placing it in a maritime situation, where it would have been exposed to many dangers and disadvantages, but on a navigable river, with all the conveniences of the sea.—“*Quī potuit igitur divinitus et utilitates complecti maritimas Romulus et vitia vitare? quān quōd urbem perennis amnis et æquabilis et in mare late influentis posuit in ripā, quo posset urbs et accipere ex mari quo egeret, et reddere quo redundaret: eodemque ut flumine res ad victum cultumque maxime necessarias non solum mari absorberet sed etiam ad- vectas acciperet ex terrā: ut mihi jam tum divināsse ille videatur, hanc urbem sedem aliquando ut domum summo esse imperio præbituram: nam hanc rerum tantam potentiam non ferme facilius aliā in parte Italiæ posita urbs tenere potuisset.*”

—In like manner he praises the sagacity of the succeeding rulers of the Roman state. “Faithful to his plan,” says M. Villemain, “of referring all to the Roman constitution, and of forming rather a history than a political theory, Cicero proceeds to examine, as it were chronologically, the state of Rome at the different epochs of its duration, beginning with its kings. This plan, if it produced any new light on a very dark subject, would have much more interest for us than ideas merely speculative. But Cicero scarcely deviates from the common traditions, which have often exercised the scepticism of the learned. He takes the Roman history nearly as we now have it, and his reflections seem to suppose no other facts than those which have been so eloquently recorded by Livy.” But although, for the sake of illustration, and in deference to common opinion, he argues on the events of early Roman history, as delivered by vulgar tradition, it is evident that, in his own belief, they were altogether uncertain; and if any new authority on that subject were wanting, Cicero’s might be added in favour of their total uncertainty; for Lælius thus interrupts his account of Ancus Martius—“*Laudandus etiam iste rex—sed obscura est historia Romana;*” and Scipio replies, “*Ita est: sed temporum illorum tantum fere regum illustrata sunt nomina.*”

At the close of Scipio’s discourse, which is a perpetual panegyric on the successive governments of Rome, and, with exception of the above passage, an uncritical acquiescence in its common history, Tubero remarks, that Cicero had rather praised the Roman government, than examined the constitution of commonwealths in general, and that hitherto he had not explained by what discipline, manners, and laws, a state is to be constituted or preserved. Scipio replies, that this is to be a farther subject of discussion; and he seems now to

have adopted a more metaphysical tone: But of the remainder of the book only a few fragments exist; from which, however, it appears, that a question was started, how far the exact observance of justice in a state is politic or necessary. This discussion, at the suggestion of Scipio, is suspended till the succeeding day*.

As the *third* book of Cicero's treatise began a second day's colloquy, it was doubtless furnished with a proœmium, the greater part of which is now lost, as also a considerable portion of the commencement of the dialogue. Towards the conclusion of the preceding book, Scipio had touched on the subject, how far the observance of justice is useful to a state, and Philus had proposed that this topic should be treated more fully, as an opinion was prevalent, that policy occasionally required injustice. Previously to the discovery of Mai, we knew from St Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, that in the third book of the treatise *De Republicâ*, Philus, as a disputant, undertook the cause of injustice, and was answered by Lælius. In the fragment of the third book, Philus excuses himself from becoming (so to speak) the devil's advocate; but at length agrees to offer, not his own arguments on the subject, but those of Carneades, who, some years before, had one day pleaded the cause of justice at Rome, and next day overturning his own arguments, became the patron of injustice. Philus accordingly proceeds to contend, that if justice were something real, it would be everywhere the same, whereas, in one nation, that is reckoned equitable and holy, which in another is unjust and impious; and, in like manner, in the same city, what is just at one period, becomes unjust at another. In the palimpsest, these sophisms, which have been revived in modern times by Mandeville and others, are interrupted by frequent chasms in the MS. Lælius, as we learn from St Augustine, and from a passage in Aulus Gellius, was requested by all present to undertake the defence of justice; but his discourse, with the exception of a few sentences, is wholly wanting in the palimpsest. At the close he is highly complimented by Scipio, but a large *hiatus* again intervenes. After this, Scipio is found contending, that wealth and power, Phidian statues, or the most magnificent public works, do not constitute a republic, but the *res populi*, the good of the whole, and not of any single governing portion of the state. He then concludes with affirming, that of all forms of government, the

* Mai cannot exactly state how much of the second book is wanting in the palimpsest, but he thinks probably a third part; enough remains of it to console the reader for the loss.

purely democratic is the worst, and next to that, an unmixed aristocracy.

Of the *fourth* book only one leaf remains in the palimpsest, the contents of which seem to confirm what we learn from other sources, that it treated of Education and Morals. It is particularly to be regretted that this book has disappeared. It is easy to supply abstract discussions about justice, democracy, and power, and, if they be not supplied, little injury is sustained; but the loss of details relating to manners and customs, from such a hand as that of Cicero, is irreparable. The fifth book is nearly as much mutilated as the fourth, and of the sixth not a fragment remains in the palimpsest, so that Mai's discovery has added nothing to the beautiful extract from this book, entitled the *Somnium Scipionis*, preserved by Macrobius. The conclusion of the work *De Republicâ*, had turned on immortality of fame here, and eternity of existence elsewhere. The *Somnium Scipionis* is intended to establish, under the form of a political fiction, the sublime dogma of the soul's immortality, and was probably introduced at the conclusion of the work, for the purpose of adding the hopes and fears of future retribution to the other motives to virtuous exertion. In illustration of this sublime topic, Scipio relates that, in his youth, when he first served in Africa, he visited the court of Massinissa, the steady friend of the Romans, and particularly of the Cornelian family. During the feasts and entertainments of the day, the conversation turned on the words and actions of the first great Scipio. His adopted grandchild having retired to rest, the shade of the departed hero appeared to him in sleep, darkly foretold the future events of his life, and encouraged him to tread in the paths of patriotism and true glory, by announcing the reward provided in Heaven for those who have deserved well of their country.

I have thought it proper to give this minute account of the treatise *De Republicâ*, for the sake of those who may not have had an opportunity of consulting Mai's publication, and who may be curious to know somewhat of the value and extent of his discovery. On the whole, I suspect that the treatise will disappoint those whose expectations were high, especially if they thought to find in it much political or statistical information. It corresponds little to the idea that one would naturally form of a political work from the pen of Cicero—a distinguished statesman, always courted by the chiefs of political parties, and at one time himself at the head of the government of his country. But, on reflection, it will not appear surprising that we receive from this work so little insight into the doubtful and disputed points of Roman polity. Those questions, with

regard to the manner in which the Senate was filled up—the force of degrees of the people, and the rank of the different jurisdictions, which in modern times have formed subjects of discussion, had not become problems in the time of Cicero. The great men whom he introduces in conversation together, understood each other on such topics, by a word or suggestion; and I am satisfied that those parts of the treatise *De Republicá*, which are lost, contained as little that could contribute to the solution of such difficulties, as the portions that have been recovered.

But though the work of Cicero will disappoint those who expect to find in it much political information, still, as in his other productions, every page exhibits a rich and glowing magnificence of style, ever subjected to the controul of a taste the most correct and pure. It contains, like all his writings, some passages of exquisite beauty, and everywhere breathes an exalted spirit of virtue and patriotism. The Latin language, so noble in itself, and dignified, assumes additional majesty in the periods of the Roman Consul, and adds an inexpressible beauty and loftiness to the natural sublimity of his sentiments. No writings, in fact, are so full of moral and intellectual grandeur as those of Cicero, none are more calculated to elevate and purify our nature—to inculcate the *TU VERO ENITERE*, in the path of knowledge and virtue, and to excite not merely a fond desire, or idle longing, but strenuous efforts after immortality. Indeed, the whole life of the Father of his Country was a noble fulfilment, and his sublime philosophic works are but an expansion of that golden precept, *tu vero enitere*, enjoined from on high, to his great descendant, by the Spirit of the first Africanus*.

About a century after the revival of letters, when mankind had at length despaired of any farther discovery of the philosophic writings of Cicero, the learned men of the age employed themselves in collecting the scattered fragments of his lost works, and arranging them according to the order of the books from which they had been extracted. Sigonius had thus united the detached fragments of the work *De Republicá*, and he made a similar attempt to repair another lost treatise of Cicero, entitled *De Consolatione*. But in this instance he not merely collected the fragments, but connected them by sentences of his own composition. The work *De Consolatione* was written by Cicero in the year 708, on occasion of the death of his much-loved Tullia, with the design of relieving his own mind, and consecrating to all posterity the virtues

* *Somnium Scipionis.*

and memory of his daughter*. In this treatise, he set out with the paradoxical propositions, that human life is a punishment, and that men are brought into the world only to pay the forfeit of their sins†. Cicero chiefly followed Crantor the Academic‡, who had left a celebrated piece on the same topic; but he inserted whatever pleased him in any other author who had written on the subject. He illustrated his precepts, as he proceeded, by examples from Roman history, of eminent characters who had borne a similar loss with that which he had himself sustained, or other severe misfortunes, with remarkable constancy§,—dwelling particularly on the domestic calamities of Q. Maximus, who buried a consular son; of Æmilius Paullus, who lost two sons in two days; and of M. Cato, who had been deprived of a son, who was Prætor-Elect||. Sigonius pretended, that the patched-up treatise *De Consolatione*, which he gave to the public, was the lost work of Cicero, of which he had discovered a MS. The imposture succeeded for a considerable time, but was at length detected and pointed out by Riccoboni¶.

Cicero also wrote a treatise in two books, addressed to Atticus, on the subject of Glory, which was the predominant and most conspicuous passion of his soul. It was composed in the year 710, while sailing along the delightful coast of the Campagna, on his voyage to Greece:—

“ On as he moved along the level shore,
These temples, in their splendour eminent
Mid arcs, and obelisks, and domes, and towers,
Reflecting back the radiance of the west,
Well might he dream of GLORY *† !”

This treatise was extant in the 14th century. A copy had been presented to Petrarch, from his vast collection of books, by Raymond Soranzo, a Sicilian lawyer††. Petrarch long preserved this precious volume with great care, and valued it highly. Unfortunately a man called Convenoli, who resided at Avignon, and who had formerly been his preceptor, begged and obtained the loan of it; and having afterwards fallen into indigent circumstances, pawned it for the relief of his necessities, to some unknown person, from whom Petrarch never

* *Epist. ad Attic.* Lib. XII. Ep. 14.

† Lactantius, *Divin. Inst.* Lib. III. c. 18. Luendorum scelerum causâ nasci homines.

‡ Plin. *Hist. Nat.* Lib. I. *Pref.*

§ *De Divin.* Lib. II. c. 9.

|| *Tusc. Disput.* Lib. III. c. 28.

¶ Scharfii, *Dissert. de vero auctore Consolationis.* *Miscell. Lips. Observ.* 180.

*† Rogers' *Lines, written at Pastum.*

†† Petrarch, *Epist. Rer. Senil.* Lib. XV. Ep. 1.

could regain its possession. Two copies, however, were still extant in the subsequent century, one in a private library at Nuremburg, and another in that of a Venetian nobleman, Bernard Giustiniani, who, dying in 1489, bequeathed his books to a monastery of nuns, to whom Petrus Alcyonius was physician. Filelfo was accused, though on no good foundation, of having burned the Nuremburg copy, after inserting passages from it in his treatise *De Contemptu Mundi**. But the charge of destroying the original MS. left by Giustiniani to the nuns, has been urged against Alcyonius on better grounds, and with more success. Paulus Manutius, of whose printing-press Alcyonius had been at one time corrector, charged him with having availed himself of his free access to the library of the nuns, whose physician he was, to purloin the treatise *De Gloria*, and with having destroyed it, to conceal his plagiarisms, after inserting from it various passages in his dialogue *De Exilio*†. The assertion of Manutius is founded only on the disappearance of the MS.,—the opportunities possessed by Alcyonius of appropriating it, and his own critical opinion of the dialogue *De Exilio*, in which he conceives that there are many passages composed in a style evincing a writer of talents, far superior to those of its nominal author. This accusation was repeated by Paulus Jovius and others‡. Mencken, in the preface to his edition of the dialogue *De Exilio*, has maintained the innocence of Alcyonius, and has related a conversation which he had with Bentley on the subject, in the course of which that great scholar declared, that he found nothing in the work of Alcyonius which could convict him of the imputed plagiarism§. He has been defended at greater length by Tiraboschi, on the strong grounds that Giustiniani lived after the invention of printing, and that had he actually been in possession of Cicero's treatise *De Gloria*, he would doubtless have published it—that it is not said to what monastery of nuns Giustiniani bequeathed this precious MS.—that the charge against Alcyonius was not advanced till after his death, although his dialogue *De Exilio* was first printed in 1522, and he survived till 1527; and, finally, that so great a proportion of it relates to modern events, that there are not more than a few pages which could possibly have been pilfered from Cicero, or any writer of his age||. M. Bernardi, in a

* Varillas, *Vie de Louis XI. Menagiana*, Tom. II.

† *In Comment. Epist. Ad Attic. XV. 27.*

‡ *Eulogia.*

§ Mencken, *Præf. P. Alcyoni de Exilio*, Lips. 1707.

|| Tiraboschi, *Stor. dell. Letter. Ital. Part. III. Lib. III. c. 4. § 14.*—Ginguené thinks that Tiraboschi has completely succeeded in justifying Alcyonius. *Hist. Littér. d' Ital. T. VII. p. 254.*

dissertation subjoined to a work above mentioned, *De la République*, has revived the accusation, at least to a certain extent, by quoting various passages from the work of Alcyonius, which are not well connected with the others, and which, being of a superior order of composition, may be conjectured to be those he had detached from the treatises of Cicero. On the whole, the question of the theft and plagiarism of Alcyonius still remains undecided, and will probably continue so till the discovery of some perfect copy of the tract *De Gloria*—an event rather to be earnestly desired than reasonably anticipated.

A fourth lost work of Cicero, is his *Hortensius sive de Philosophia*. Besides the orator after whom it is named, Catullus, Lucullus, and Cicero himself, were speakers in the dialogue. In the first part, where Hortensius discourses, it was intended to exalt eloquence above philosophy. To his arguments Cicero replied, showing the service that philosophy rendered to eloquence, even in an imperfect state of the social progress, and its superior use in an improved condition of society, in which there should be no wrong, and consequently no tribunals of justice. All this appears from the account given of the *Hortensius* by St Augustine, who has also quoted from it many beautiful passages—declaring, at the same time, that it was the perusal of this work which first inspired him with a love of wisdom.—“Viluit mihi repente omnis vana spes, et immortalitatem sapientiæ concupiscebam æstu cordis incredibili*.” This dialogue continued to be preserved for a long period after the time of St Augustine, since it is cited as extant in his own age by the famous Roger Bacon†.

It was not till after the æra of Augustus, that works originally destined for the public assumed the name and form of letters. But several collections of epistles, written, during the period on which we are now engaged, to relatives or friends in private confidence, were afterwards extensively circulated. Those of Cornelia, the daughter of the elder Scipio Africanus, and mother of the Gracchi, addressed chiefly to her sons, were much celebrated; but the most ample collection now extant, is that of the Letters of Cicero.

These may be divided into four parts,—1. The *Epistolæ Familiares*, or Miscellaneous Correspondence; 2. Those to Atticus; 3. To his brother Quintus; 4. To Brutus.

The correspondence, usually entitled *Ad Familiares*, in-

* *Confess.* III. 4, and *De Vit. Beata.* præm.

† Tunstall, *Observations on the Epistles between Cicero and Brutus*, p. 20. Ed. London, 1744.

cludes a period of about twenty years, commencing immediately after Cicero's consulate, and ending a few months before his death. The letters which this collection comprehends, are so extremely miscellaneous, that it is impossible even to run over their contents. Previous to the battle of Pharsalia, it chiefly consists of epistles concerning the distribution of consular provinces, and the political intrigues relating to that constantly recurring subject of contention,—recommendatory letters sent with acquaintances going into the provinces—details to absent friends, with regard to the state of parties at Rome, particularly the designs of Pompey and Cæsar, and the factions of Milo and Clodius; and, finally, entertaining anecdotes concerning the most popular and fashionable amusements of the Capital.

Subsequently to the battle of Pharsalia, and during the supremacy of Cæsar, the letters are principally addressed to the chiefs of the Pompeian party, who were at that time in banishment for their adherence to the same cause in which Cicero had been himself engaged. These epistles are chiefly occupied with consolatory reflections on the adverse circumstances in which they were placed, and accounts of his own exertions to obtain their recall. In the perusal of these letters, it is painful and humiliating to observe the gratification which Cicero evidently appears to have received at this period, from the attentions, not merely of Cæsar, but of his creatures and favourites, as Balbus, Hirtius, and Pansa.

After the assassination of Cæsar, the correspondence for the most part relates to the affairs of the Republic, and is directed to the heads of the conspiracy, or to leading men in the state, as Lepidus and Asinius Pollio, who were then in the command of armies, and whom he anxiously exhorts to declare for the commonwealth, and stand forward in opposition to Antony.

There are a good many letters inserted in this collection, addressed to Cicero by his friends. The greatest number are from his old client Cælius, who appears to have been an admirable gossip. They are written to Cicero, during his absence from Rome, in his government of Cilicia, and give him news of party politics—intelligence of remarkable cases tried in the Forum—and of the fashionable scandal of the day. The great object of Cælius seems to have been to obtain in return, the dedication of one of Cicero's works, and a cargo of panthers from Asia, for his exhibition of games to the Roman people. Towards the conclusion, there are a good many letters from generals, who were at the head of armies in the provinces at the death of Cæsar, and continued their command during the war which the Senate waged against Antony. All of them,

but particularly Asinius Pollio, and Lepidus, appear to have acted with consummate treachery and dissimulation towards Cicero and the Senate. On the whole, though the *Epistola Familiares* were private letters, and though some private affairs are treated of in them, they chiefly relate to public concerns, comprehending, in particular, a very full history of Cicero's government in Cilicia, the civil dissensions of Rome, and the war between Pompey and Cæsar. Seldom, however, do they display any flashes of that eloquence with which the orator was so richly endued; and no transaction, however important, elevated his style above the level of ordinary conversation.

The *Epistola ad Atticum*, are also of great service for the History of Rome. "Whoever," says Cornelius Nepos, "reads these letters of Cicero, will not want for a connected history of the times. So well does he describe the views of the leading men, the faults of generals, and the changes of parties in the state, that nothing is wanting for our information; and such was his sagacity, we are almost led to believe that it was a kind of divination; for Cicero not only foretold what afterwards happened in his own lifetime, but, like a prophet, predicted events which are now come to pass*." Along with this knowledge, we obtain more insight into Cicero's private character, than from the former series of letters, where he is often disguised in the political mask of the great theatre on which he acted, and where many of his defects are concealed under the graceful folds of the *toga*. It was to Atticus that he most freely unbosomed his thoughts—more completely than even to Tullia, Terentia, or Tiro. Hence, while he evinces in these letters much affection for his family—ardent zeal for the interests of his friends—strong feelings of humanity and justice—warm gratitude to his benefactors, and devoted love to his country, he has not repressed his vanity, or concealed the faults of a mental organization too susceptible of every impression. His sensibility, indeed, was such, that it led him to think his misfortunes were peculiarly distinguished from those of all other men, and that neither himself nor the world could ever sufficiently deplore them: hence the querulous and plaintive tone which pervades the whole correspondence, and which, in the letters written during his exile, resembles more the wailings of the *Tristia* of Ovid, than what might be expected from the first statesman, orator, and philosopher of the Roman Republic. In every page of them, too, we see traces of his inconsistencies and irresolution—his political, if not his

* *Vit. Attici*, c. 16.

personal timidity—his rash confidence in prosperity, his alarm in danger, his despondence in adversity—his too nice jealousies and delicate suspicions—his proneness to offence, and his unresisting compliance with those who had gained him by flattery, and hypocritical professions of attachment to the commonwealth. Atticus, it is clear, was a bad adviser for his fame, and perhaps for his ultimate safety; and to him may be in a great measure attributed that compromising conduct which has detracted so much from the dignity of his character. “You succeeded,” says Cicero, speaking of Cæsar and Pompey, “in persuading me to keep well with the one, because he had rendered me services, and with the other, because he possessed great power*.” Again, “I followed your advice so punctually, that neither of them had a favourite beyond myself;” and after the war had actually broken out, “I take it very kind that you, in so friendly a manner, advise me to declare as little as possible for either party†.” Such fatal counsels, it is evident, accorded too well with his own inclinations, and palliated, perhaps, to himself the weaknesses to which he gave way. These weaknesses of Cicero it would, indeed, be in vain to deny; but *his* feelings are little to be envied who can think of them without regret, or speak of them without indulgence.

It is these letters, however, which have handed down the remembrance of Atticus to posterity, and have rendered his name almost as universally known as that of his illustrious correspondent. “*Nomen Attici perire,*” says Seneca, “*Ciceronis Epistolæ non sinunt. Nihil illi profuissent gener Agrippa, et Tiberius progener, et Drusus Cæsar pronepos. Inter tam magna nomina taceretur nisi Cicero illum applicuisset.*”

Perhaps the most interesting correspondence of Cicero is that with his brother Quintus, who was some years younger than the orator. He attained the dignity of Prætor in 693, and afterwards held a government in Asia as Pro-prætor for four years. He returned to Rome at the moment in which his brother was driven into exile; and for some time afterwards, was chiefly employed in exerting himself to obtain his recall. As Cæsar’s lieutenant, he served with credit in Gaul; but espoused the republican party at the breaking out of the civil war. He was pardoned, however, by Cæsar, and was slain by the blood-thirsty triumvirate established after his death. Quintus was a man of warm affections, and of some military talents, but of impatient and irritable temper. The orator

* *Epist. Lib. VII. Ep. 1.*

† *Ibid. Ep. 26.*

had evidently a high opinion of his qualifications, and has introduced him as an interlocutor in the dialogues *De Legibus* and *De Divinatione*.

The correspondence with Quintus is divided into three books. The first letter in the collection, is one of the noblest productions of the kind which has ever been penned. It is addressed to Quintus on occasion of his government in Asia being prolonged for a third year. Availing himself of the rights of an elder brother, as well as of the authority derived from his superior dignity and talents, Cicero counsels and exhorts his brother concerning the due administration of his province, particularly with regard to the choice of his subordinate officers, and the degree of trust to be reposed in them. He earnestly reproveth him, but with much fraternal tenderness and affection, for his proneness to resentment; and he concludes with a beautiful exhortation, to strive in all respects to merit the praise of his contemporaries, and bequeath to posterity an untainted name. The second letter transmits to Quintus an account of some complaints which Cicero had heard in Rome, with regard to his brother's conduct in the administration of his government. The two following epistles, which conclude the first book, are written from *Thessalonica*, in the commencement of his exile. The first of these, beginning, "Mi frater, mi frater, mi frater," written in a sad state of agitation and depression, is a fine specimen of eloquent and pathetic expostulation. It is full of strong and almost unbounded expressions of attachment, and exhibits much of that exaggeration, both in sentiment and language, in which Cicero indulged so frequently in his orations.

The second and third books of letters, addressed to his brother in Sardinia and Gaul, give an interesting account of the state of public affairs during the years 697, 698, and part of 699, as also of his subsisting domestic relations during the same period.

Along with his letters to Quintus, there is usually printed an epistle or memoir, which Quintus addressed to his brother when he stood candidate for the consulship, and which is entitled *De Petitione Consulatus*. It gives advice with regard to the measures he should pursue to attain his object, particularly inculcating the best means to gain private friends, and acquire general popularity. But though professedly drawn up merely for the use of his brother, it appears to have been intended by the author as a guide, or manual, for all who might be placed in similar circumstances. It is written with considerable elegance, and perfect purity of style, and forms an important document for the history of the Roman republic, as it affords

us a clearer insight than we can derive from any other work now extant, into the intrigues resorted to by the heads of parties to gain the suffrages of the people.

The authenticity of the *Correspondence between Cicero and Brutus*, has formed the subject of a literary controversy, perhaps the most celebrated which has ever occurred, except that concerning the Epistles of Phalaris.

It is quite ascertained, that a correspondence had been carried on between Cicero and Brutus; and a collection of the letters which had passed between them, extending to not less than eight books, existed for several ages after Cicero's death. They were all written during the period which elapsed from the assassination of Cæsar to the tragical end of the orator, which comprehended about a year and a half; and it appears from the fragments of them, cited by Plutarch and the grammarians, that they chiefly related to the memorable political events of that important interval, and to a literary controversy which subsisted between Cicero and Brutus; with regard to the attributes of perfect eloquence*.

This collection is mentioned, and passages cited from it, by Quintilian, Plutarch, and even Nonius Marcellus†, who lived about the year 400. After this, all trace of it is lost, till, in the fourteenth century, we find some of the disputed letters in the possession of Petrarch; and it has been conjectured that Petrarch himself was the discoverer of them‡. Eighteen of these letters, which were all that were then known, were published at Rome in 1470. Many years afterwards, five more, but in a mutilated state, were found in Germany, and these, in all subsequent editions, were printed along with the original eighteen. All the letters relate to the situation of public affairs after the death of Cæsar. They contain a good deal of recrimination: Brutus blaming Cicero for his dangerous elevation of Octavius, and conferring honours on him too profusely; Cicero censuring Brutus for having spared the life of Antony at the time of the conspiracy.

Now the point in dispute is, If these twenty-three letters be parts of the original eight books of the genuine correspondence of Cicero and Brutus, so often cited by Plutarch, Quintilian, and Nonius; or if they be the forgery of some monk or

* A few unimportant letters which had passed between these two great men, during Cicero's proconsulship in Cilicia, were included among the *Epistola Familiæres*, and are of undisputed authenticity. It does not seem clear, whether they ever formed part of the great collection of eight books, which contained the subsequent correspondence between Cicero and Brutus.

† Middleton's *Pref. to the Epistles of Cicero and Brutus*, p. 4. London, 1748.

‡ Tunstall, *Observations*, &c. p. 27.

sophist, during the dark ages which elapsed between the time of Nonius and Petrarch.

From their very first appearance, the eighteen letters, which had come into the possession of Petrarch, passed among the learned for original epistles of Cicero and Brutus; and the five discovered in Germany, though doubted for a while, were soon received into the same rank with the others. Erasmus seems to have been the first who suspected the whole to be the declamatory composition of some rhetorician or sophist. They continued, however, to be cited by every other commentator, critic, and historian, as the unquestionable remains of the great author to whom they were ascribed. Middleton, in particular, in his *Life of Cicero*, freely referred to them as biographical authorities, along with the *Familiar Epistles*, and those to Atticus.

Matters were in this situation; when Tunstall, in 1741, addressed a Latin Epistle to Middleton, written professedly to introduce a proposal for a new edition of Cicero's letters to Atticus, and his brother Quintus. In the first part of this epistle, he attempted to retrieve the original readings of these authentic treasures of Ciceronian history, and asserted their genuine sense against the corruptions or false interpretations of them, which had led to many erroneous conclusions in Middleton's *Life of Cicero*. In the second part, he denies the authenticity of the whole correspondence between Cicero and Brutus, which he alleges is the production of some sophist or scholiast of the middle ages, who probably wrote them, according to the practice of those days, as an exercise for his rhetorical talents, and with the view either of drawing up a supplement to the *Epistles to Atticus*, so as to carry on the history from the period at which they terminate, or to vindicate Cicero's character from the imputation of rashness, in throwing too much power into the hands of Octavius. Tunstall farther thinks, that the leading subject of these letters was suggested to the sophist by a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Brutus*, where it is mentioned that Brutus had remonstrated with Cicero, and complained of him to their mutual friend Atticus, for the court he paid to Octavius, which showed that his aim was not to procure liberty for his country, but a kind master to himself.

Middleton soon afterwards published an English translation of the whole correspondence between Brutus and Cicero, with notes; and, in a prefatory dissertation, written with considerable and unprovoked asperity, he attempted to vindicate the authority of the epistles, and to answer the objections of Tunstall. His adversary replied in an immense English work, of

more than 400 pages, entitled, "Observations on the present Collection of Epistles between Cicero and Brutus, representing several evident marks of Forgery in those Epistles, in answer to the late pretences of Dr Middleton: 1744."

It is difficult to give any sketch of the argumentative part of this famed controversy, as the merit of all such discussion consists in the extreme accuracy and minuteness of investigation. The main scope, however, of the objections, is thus generally exhibited by Tunstall in his Latin epistle. He declares, "that as he came fresh from the perusal of Cicero's genuine letters, he perceived that those to Brutus wanted the beauty and copiousness of the Ciceronian diction—that the epistles, both of Brutus and Cicero, were drawn in the same style and manner of colouring, and trimmed up with so much art and diligence, that they seemed to proceed rather from scholastic subtlety and meditation, than from the genuine acts and affairs of life—that when, both before and after the date of the letters to Atticus, several epistles had been addressed from Brutus to Cicero, and from Cicero to Brutus, it was strange that those which preceded the letters to Atticus should have been lost, and those alone remain which appear to have been industriously designed for an epilogue to the Epistles to Atticus—that such reasons induced him to suspect, but on looking farther into the letters themselves, he discovered many absurdities in the sense, many improprieties in the language, many remarkable predictions of future events, both on Brutus's side and Cicero's; but what was most material, a great number of historical facts, not only quite new, but wholly altered, and some even apparently false, and contradictory to the genuine works of Cicero."

Such was the state of the controversy, as it stood between Tunstall and Middleton. In 1745, the year after Middleton had published his translation of the epistles, Markland engaged in this literary contest, and came forward in opposition to the authenticity of the letters, by publishing his "Remarks on the Epistles of Cicero to Brutus, and of Brutus to Cicero, in a Letter to a Friend." The arguments of Tunstall had chiefly turned on historical inconsistencies—those of Markland principally hinge on phrases to be found in the letters, which are not Ciceronian, or even of pure latinity.

I must here close this long account of the writings of Cicero—of Cicero, distinguished as the Consul of the republic—as the father and saviour of his country—but not less distinguished as the orator, philosopher, and moralist of Rome.—"Salve primus omnium Parens Patriæ appellatæ,—primus in togâ triumphantum linguæque lauream merite, et facundiæ, Latiarumque

Literarum parens : atque (ut Dictator Cæsar, hostis quondam tuus, de te scripsit,) omnium triumphorum lauream adepte majorem ; quanto plus est, ingenii Romani terminos in tantum promovisse, quàm imperii*.”

IN the former volume of this work, I had traced the progress of the language of the Romans, and treated of the different poets by whom it was adorned till the era of Augustus. I had chiefly occasion, in the course of that part of my inquiry, to compare the poetical productions of Rome with those of Greece, and to show that the Latin poetry of this early age, being modelled on that of Athens or Alexandria, had acquired an air of preparation and authorship, and appeared to have been written to obtain the cold approbation of the public, or smiles of a Patrician patron, while the native lines of the Grecian bards seem to be poured fourth like the Delphic oracles, because the god which inspired them was too great to be contained within the bosom. In the prose compositions of the Romans, which have been considered in the present volume, though the *exemplaria Græca* were still the models of style, we have not observed the same servility of imitation. The agricultural writers of Latium treated of a subject in a great measure foreign to the maritime feelings and commercial occupations of the Greeks ; while, in the Latin historians, orators, and philosophers, we listen to a tone of practical utility, derived from the familiar acquaintance which their authors exercised with the affairs of life. The old Latin historians were for the most part themselves engaged in the affairs they related, and almost every oration of Cicero was actually delivered in the Senate or Forum. Among the Romans, philosophy was not, as it had been with many of the Greeks, an academic dream or speculation, which was substituted for the realities of life. In Rome, philosophic inquiries were chiefly prosecuted as supplying arguments and illustrations to the patron for his conflicts in the Forum, and as guiding the citizen in the discharge of his duties to the commonwealth. Those studies, in short, alone were valued, which, as it is beautifully expressed by Cicero, in the person of Lælius—“*Efficiant ut usui civitati simus: id enim esse præclarissimum sapientiæ munus, maximumque virtutis documentum puto.*”

† Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*

APPENDIX.

**" Some felt the silent stroke of mouldering age,
Some hostile fury, some religious rage :
Barbarian blindness, Christian zeal conspire,
And Papal piety, and Gothic fire."**

POPE'S Epistle to Addison.

APPENDIX.

IN order to be satisfied as to the authenticity of the works commonly called Classical, it is important to ascertain in what manner they were given to the public by their respective authors—to trace how they were preserved during the long night of the dark ages—and to point out by whom their perishing remains were first discovered at the return of light. Nor will it be uninteresting to follow up this sketch by an enumeration of the principal Editions of the Classics mentioned in the preceding pages, and of the best Translations of them which, from time to time, have appeared in the Italian, French, and English languages.

The manuscripts of the Latin Classics, during the existence of the Roman republic and empire, may be divided into what have been called *notata* and *perscripta*. The former were those written by the author himself, or his learned slaves, in contractions or signs which stood for syllables and words; the latter, those which were fully transcribed in the ordinary characters by the *librarius*, who was employed by the *bibliopola*, or booksellers, to prepare the productions of an author for public sale.

The books written in the hand of the authors were probably not very legible, at least if we may judge of others by Cicero. His brother Quintus had complained that he could not read his letters, and Cicero says in reply: “*Scribis te meas literas superiores vix legere potuisse; hoc facio semper ut quicumque calamus in manus meas venerit, eo sic utar tamquam bono*.”

But the works,—at least the prose works,—of the Romans were seldom written out in the hand of the author, and were generally dictated by him to some slave or freedman instructed in penmanship. It is well known that many of the orations of Cicero, Cato, and their great rhetorical contemporaries, were taken down by short-hand writers stationed in the Senate or Forum. But even the works most carefully prepared in the closet were *notata*, in a similar manner, by slaves and freedmen. There was no part of his learned compositions on which Cicero took more pains, or about which his thoughts were more occupied†, than the dedication of the *Academica* to Varro, and even this he *dictated* to his slave Spintharus, though he did so slowly, word by word, and not in whole sentences to Tiro, as was his practice in his other productions. “*Male mihi sit,*” says he in a letter to Atticus, “*si unquam quidquam tam enitar. Ergo ne Tironi quidem dictavi, qui totas perorchas persequi solet, sed Spintharo syllabatim*.”

This practice of authors dictating their works created a necessity, or at least a conveniency, of writing with rapidity, and of employing contractions, or conventional marks, in almost every word.

Accordingly, from the earliest periods of Roman literature, words were contracted, or were signified by notes, which sometimes stood for more than one letter, sometimes for syllables, and at other times for whole words. Funccius, who main-

* *Epist. ad Quint. Frat. Lib. II. Ep. 15.*

† *Epist. Ad. Attic. Lib. XIII. passim. ed. Schutz.*

‡ *Ibid. Epist. 25.*

tains that Adam was the first short-hand writer*, has asserted, with more truth, that the Romans contracted their words from the remotest ages of the republic, and to a greater degree than any other ancient nation. Sometimes the abbreviations consisted merely in writing the initial letter instead of the whole word. Thus P. C. stood for *Patres Conscripti*; C. R., for *Civis Romanus*; S. N. L., for *Socii Nominis Latini*. This sort of contraction being employed in words frequently recurring, and which in one sense might be termed public, and being also universally recognized, would rarely produce any misapprehension or mistake. But frequently the abbreviations were much more complex, and the leading letters of words in less common use being *notata*, the contractions became of much more difficult and dubious interpretation. For example, *Meit.* expressed *meminit*; *Acus.*, *Acerbus*; *Quit.*, *querit*; *Ror.*, *Rhetor*.

For the sake, however, of yet greater expedition in writing, and perhaps, in some few instances for the purpose of secrecy, signs or marks, which could be currently made with one dash or scratch with the *stylus*, and without lifting or turning it, came to be employed, instead of those letters which were themselves the abbreviations of words. Some writers have supposed that these signs were entirely arbitrary†, whilst others have, with more probability, maintained that their forms can be resolved or analysed into the figures, or parts of the figures, of the letters themselves which they were intended to represent, though they have often departed far from the shape of the original characters‡. Ennius is said to have invented 1100 of these signs§, which he no doubt employed in his multifarious compositions. Others came into gradual use in the manual operation of writing with rapidity to dictation. Tiro, the favourite freedman of Cicero, greatly increased the number, and brought this sort of tachygraphy to its greatest perfection among the Romans. In consequence of this fashion of authors dictating their works, expedition came to be considered of the utmost importance; it was regarded as the chief accomplishment of an amanuensis; and he alone was considered as perfect in his art, whose pen could equal the rapidity of utterance:

Hic et scriptor erit felix, cui litera verbum est,
 Quique notis linguam superet, cursumque loquentis,
 Excipiens longas per nova compendia voces||.

These lines were written by a poet of the age of Augustus, and it appears from Martial¶, Ausonius*†, and Prudentius, that this system of dictation by the author, and rapid notation by his amanuensis, continued in practice during the later ages of the empire.

Such was the mode in which most of the writings of the ancients came originally from their authors, and were delivered to those friends who were desirous to possess copies, or to the booksellers to be *perscripta*, or transcribed, for publication.

There exists sufficient proof of the high estimation in which accurate transcriptions of the works of their own writers were held by the Romans. The correctness of printing, however, could not be expected. In the original notation, some mistakes might probably be made from carelessness of pronunciation in the author who dictated, and haste in his amanuensis; but the great source of errors in MSS. was the blunders made by the *librarius* in copying out from the noted exemplar. There was the greatest ambiguity and doubt in the interpretation, both of words contracted in the ordinary character and in the artificial signs. Sometimes the same word was expressed by different letters; thus MR. MT. MTR. all expressed *Mater*. Sometimes, on the other hand, the same set of letters expressed different words; for instance, ACT. signified *Actor*, *Auctoritas*, and *Hactenus*. The collocation of the letters was often inverted from the order in which they stood in the word when fully expressed; and frequently one letter had not merely its own power, but that of several

* *De Pueritia Ling. Lat.* c. 1. § 10. Adamum scribendi atque signandi modum præmonstrasse primitus ratio ipsa persuadet.

† Lennep, *De Throne*, p. 77. Ed. Amsteld. 1804.

‡ Kopp, *Palæographia Critica*. Ed. Mannheim, 1817. 2 Tom. 4to.

§ Isidorus, *Originum*, Lib. I. c. 21. || Manilius, *Astronom.* Lib. IV. v. 197.

¶ Lib. XIV. Epig. 202.

*† Epigr. 138.

others. Thus AMO. signified *arimo*, because M had there not only its own force, but, as its shape in some measure announces, the power of *ni* also. Matters were still worse, when not only abbreviations, but signs had been resorted to. These were variously employed by different writers, and were also differently interpreted by transcribers. Some of these signs were extremely similar in form: it was scarcely possible to discriminate the sign which denoted the syllable *ab* from that which expressed the syllable *um*; and the signs of the syllables *is* and *it* were nearly undistinguishable; while *ad* and *at* were precisely the same. The mark which expressed the word *talis*, being a little more sloped or inclined, expressed *qualis*; and the difference in the Tironian signs which stood for the complete words *Ager* and *Amicus*, was scarcely perceptible*.

The ancient Latin writers also employed a number of marks to denote the accents of words, and the quantities of syllables. The oldest writers, as Livius Andronicus and Nævius, always placed two vowels when a syllable was to be pronounced long†. Attius, the great tragic author, was the first to relinquish this usage; and after his time, in conformity to the new practice which he had adopted, a certain mark was placed over the long vowels. When this custom also (which is stigmatised by Quintilian as *inceptissimus*†) fell into disuse, the mark was frequently misunderstood, and Funccius has given several examples of corruptions and false readings from the mistake of transcribers, who supposed that it was intended to express an *m*, an *n*, or other letter§.

In addition to all this, little attention was paid to the separation of words and sentences, and the art of punctuation was but imperfectly understood.

Finally, and above all, the orthography of Latin was extremely fluctuating and uncertain. We have seen, in an early part of this work, how it varied in the time of the republic, and it, in fact, never became fixed. Mai talks repeatedly, in his preface, of the strange inconsistencies of spelling in the Codex, which contained Cicero's work *De Republica*; and Cassiodorus, who of all his contemporaries chiefly cultivated literature during the reign of the barbarians in Italy, often regrets that the ancient Romans had left their orthography encumbered with the utmost difficulties. "Orthographia," says he, "apud Græcos plerumque sine ambiguitate probatur expressa; inter Latinos vero sub ardua difficultate relicta monstratur; unde etiam modo studium magnum lectoris inquirat."

In consequence of this dictation to short-hand, and this uncertain orthography, we find that the corruption of the classics had begun at a very early period. The ninth Satire of Lucilius was directed against the ridiculous blunders of transcribers, and contained rules for greater correctness. Cicero, in his letters to his brother Quintus, bitterly complains of the errors of copyists,—“De Latinis vero, quo me vertam, nescio; ita mendose et scribuntur, et veneunt||.” Strabo says, that in his time booksellers employed ignorant transcribers, who neglected to compare what they wrote with the exemplar; which, he adds, has occurred in many works, copied for the purpose of being sold, both at Rome and Alexandria¶. Martial, too, thus cautions his reader against the mistakes occasioned by the inaccuracy and haste of the venders of books, and the transcribers whom they employed:

“ Si qua videbuntur chartis tibi, lector, in istis,
Sive obscura nimis, sive Latina parum;
Non meus est error: nocuit Librarius illis,
Dum properat versus annumerare tibi*†.”

Aulus Gellius repeatedly complains of the inaccuracy of copies in his time: We learn from him, that the writings of the greatest Classics were already corrupted and falsified, not only by the casual errors of copyists, but by the deliberate perversions of critics, who boldly altered everything that was too elegant or poetical for their own taste and understanding††. To the numerous corruptions in the text of Sallust he particularly refers††.

* Kopp, *Palæographia Critica*.

† Quintil. *Inst. Orator*. Lib. I. c. 8.

‡ Ibid.

§ Funccius, *De Virili Ætat. Ling. Lat.* Pars II. c. 8. § 9.

|| *Epist. ad Quint. Frat.* Lib. III. Ep. 5.

¶ *Geograph.* Lib. XIII.

*† Lib. II. Ep. 8.

†† *Noct. Attic.* Lib. II. c. 14. *et passim*.

†† *Ibid.* Lib. XX. c. 6.

The practice, too, of abridging larger works, particularly histories, and extracting from them, was injurious to the preservation of MSS. This practice, occasioned by the scarcity of paper, began as early as the time of Brutus, who extracted even from the meagre annals of his country. These excerpts seldom compensated for the originals, but made them be neglected, and in consequence they were lost.

It seems also probable, that the destruction of the treasures of classical literature commenced at a very early period. Varro's library, which was the most extensive private collection of books in Italy, was ruined and dispersed when his villa was occupied by Antony*; and some of his own treatises, as that addressed to Pompey on the duties of the Consulship, were irretrievably lost. Previous to the art of printing, books, in consequence of their great scarcity and value, were chiefly heaped up in public libraries. Several of these were consumed in the fire, by which so many temples were burned to the ground in the reign of Nero†, particularly the library in the temple of Apollo, on the Palatine Hill, which was founded by Augustus, and contained all the Roman poets and historians previous to his age. This literary establishment having been restored as far as was possible by Domitian, suffered a second time by the flames; and the extensive library of the Capitol perished in a fire during the reign of Commodus‡. When it is considered, that at these periods the copies of Latin works were few, and chiefly confined within the walls of Rome, some notion may be formed of the extent of the loss sustained by these successive conflagrations.

From the portentous æra of the death of Pertinax, the brief reign of each succeeding emperor ended in assassination, civil war, and revolution. The imperial throne was filled by soldiers of fortune, who came like shadows, and like shadows departed. Rome at length ceased to be the fixed and habitual residence of her sovereigns, who were now generally employed at a distance in the field, in repelling foreign enemies, or repressing usurpers. While it is certain, that during this period many of the finest monuments of the arts were destroyed, and some of the most splendid works of architecture defaced, it can hardly be supposed that the frail texture of the parchment, or papyrus, should have resisted the stroke of sudden ruin, or the gradual mouldering of neglect.

But the chief destruction took place after the removal of the seat of empire by Constantine. The loss of so many classical works subsequently to that æra, has been attributed chiefly to the irruption of the northern barbarians; but it was fully as much owing to the blind zeal of the early Christians. Many of the public libraries were placed in temples, and hence were the more exposed to the fury of the proselytes to the new faith. This devastation began in Italy in the fourth century, before the barbarians had penetrated to the heart of the empire; and, in the same century, if Sulpicius Severus may be credited, Bishop Martin undertook a crusade against the temples of the Gauls§. St Augustine, St Jerome, and Lactantius, indeed, knew the classics well; but they considered them as a sort of forbidden fruit: and St Jerome, as he himself informs us, was whipped by an angel for perusing Plautus and Cicero||. The following or fifth century, was distinguished by the first capture of Rome, and its successive devastations by Alaric, Genseric, and Attila. In the latter part of the century, Milan, too, was plundered; which, next to Rome, was the chief repository of books in Italy.

Monachism, which, in its first institution, particularly in the east, had been so destructive of literary works, became, when more advanced in its progress, a chief cause of their preservation. When the monks were at length united, in a species of civil union, under the fixed rules of St Benedict, in the beginning of the sixth century, the institution contributed, if not to the diffusion of literature, at least to the preservation of literary works. There was no prohibition in the ordinances of St Benedict against the reading of classical writings, as in those of St Isidore: and the consequence was, that wherever any abbot, or even monk, had a taste for

* *Noct. Attic. Lib. III. c. 10.*

† Tacit. *Annal. Lib. XV. c. 38—41.*

‡ Joann. Sarisberienſis, *De Nug. Curial. Lib. VIII. c. 19.* Lursenius, *Dissert. De Bibliotheca Veterum, p. 297.*

§ Sulp. Severus, *De Martini Vita, c. 16.*

|| *Epist. XVIII. Opera.*

letters, books were introduced into the convent. We have a remarkable example of this in the instance of Cassiodorus, whose genius, learning, and virtue, shed a lustre on one of the darkest periods of Italian history. After his pre-eminent services as minister of state during the reign of Theodoric, and regency of Amalasu-
tha, he retired, in the year 540, when he had reached the age of seventy, to the monastery of Monte Casino, situated in a most delightful spot, near the place of his birth, in Calabria. There he became as serviceable to literature as he had formerly been to the state; and the convent to which he betook himself deserves to be first mentioned in any future history of the preservation of the Classics. Before his entrance into it, he possessed an extensive library, with which he enriched the cloister*; and subsequently enlarged it by a collection of MSS., which he caused to be brought to him from various quarters of Italy. There is still extant his order to a monk to procure for him Albinus' treatise on Music; which shows, that his collection was not entirely confined to theological treatises: while his work *De Artibus ac Disciplinis liberalium Litterarum*, is an ample testimony of his classical learning, and of the value which he attached to it. His library contained, at least, Ennius, Terence, Lucretius, Varro, Cicero, and Sallust†. The monks of his convent were excited by him to the transcription of MSS.; and, in his work *De Orthographia*, he did not disdain to give minute directions for copying with facility and correctness.

Thus, in collecting an ample library—in diffusing copies of ancient MSS.—in verbal instructions, written lectures, and the composition of voluminous works—he closed, in the service of religion and learning, a long and meritorious life.

The example of Cassiodorus was followed in other convents. About half a century after his death, Columbanus founded a monastery of Benedictines at Bobbio, a town situated among the northern Apennines. This religious society, as Tiraboschi informs us, was remarkable, not only for the sanctity of its manners, but the cultivation of literature. It was fortunate that receptacles for books had now been thus provided, as otherwise the treasures of classical literature in Italy would, in all likelihood, have perished during the wars of Belisarius, and Narses, and the invasion of Totila. It is in the age of Cassiodorus,—that is, the beginning and middle of the sixth century,—that Tiraboschi places the serious and systematic commencement of the transcription of the classics‡. He mentions the names of some of the most eminent copyists; but a fuller list had been previously furnished by Fabricius§.

In Gregory the Great, who was Pope at the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century, literature, according to popular belief, found an enemy in the west, as fatal to its interests as the Caliph Omar had been in the east. This pontiff was accused of burning a classical library, and also some valuable works, which had replaced those formerly consumed in the Palatine library. John of Salisbury is the sole authority for this charge; and even he, who lived six centuries after the age of Gregory, only mentions it as a tradition and report: “Fertur Beatus Gregorius bibliothecam combussisse gentilem, quo divinæ paginæ gratior esset locus, et major auctoritas, et diligentia studiosior||;” and again, “Ut traditur a majoribus, incendio dedit probatæ lectionis scripta, Palatinus quæcunque tenebat Apollo¶.” Cardan informs us, that Gregory also caused the plays of Nævius, Ennius, and Afranius, to be burned. That he suppressed the works of Cicero, rests on the authority of a passage in an edict published by Louis XI., dated 1473, and quoted by Lyron in his *Singularitez Historiques**†. St Antonius, who was Archbishop of Florence in the middle of the fifteenth century, is cited by Vossius as the most ancient author who has asserted that he burned the decades of Livy††. These charges have been strenuously supported by Brucker‡†, while Tiraboschi, on the other hand, has endeavoured to vindicate the memory of the pontiff from all such aspersions§†. Bayle

* Cassiodor. *Opera*.

† Petit-Radel, *Recherches sur les Biblioth. Anciennes*.

‡ *Stor. dell Letter. Ital.* Part I. Lib. I.

§ *Bibliotheca Latin.*

|| *De Nug. Cur.* Lib. VIII. c. 19

¶ *Ibid.* Lib. II. c. 26.

*† Tom. I.

†† *De Historicis Latinis*, Lib. I. c. 19.

†† *Hist. Critic. Philosoph.* Tom. III.

§† *Stor. dell Letterat. Ital.* Tom. III. Lib. II. c. 2.

has adopted a prudent neutrality*. Dendina† and Ginguenêt, the most recent authors who have touched on the subject, seem to consider the question, after all that has been written on it, as still doubtful, and not likely to receive any farther elucidation. It appears certain, that Gregory disliked classical, or profane literature, on account of the oracles, idolatry, and rites, with which it is associated, and that he prohibited its study by the clergy‡;—whence may, perhaps, have originated the reports of his wilfully destroying the then surviving libraries and books of Rome.

During the course of the two centuries which followed the death of Gregory, Italy was divided between the Greeks and Lombards, and was torn by spiritual dissensions. The most numerous and barbarous swarm which had yet crossed the Alps was the Lombards, who descended on Italy, under their king, Alboinus, in 568, immediately after the death of Narses. It was no longer a tribe or army by which Italy was invaded; but a whole nation of old men, women, and children, covered its plains. This ignorant and ferocious race spread themselves from the Alps to Rome during the seventh and eighth centuries. And although Rome itself escaped the Lombard dominion, the horrors of a perpetual siege can alone convey an adequate idea of its distressed situation. The feuds of the Lombard chiefs, their wars with the Greeks, who still remained masters of Rome, and at length with the Franks, (all which contests were marked with fire and massacre,) made a desert of the Peninsular garden||. Hitherto the superstitious feelings of the northern hordes had inspired them with some degree of respect for the sacerdotal order which they found established in Italy. Reverence for the person of the priest had extended itself to the security of his property, and while the palace and castle were wrapt in flames, the convent escaped sacrilege. But the Lombards extended their fury to objects which their rude predecessors had generally respected; and learning was now attacked in her most vulnerable part. Amid the general destruction, the monasteries and their libraries were no longer spared; and with others, that of Monto Casino, one of the most valuable and extensive in Italy, was plundered by the Lombards¶. Some books preserved in the sack of the libraries were carried back by these invaders to their native country, and a few were saved by monks, who sought refuge in other kingdoms, which accounts for the number of classical MSS. subsequently discovered in France and Germany**.

Amid the ruin of taste and letters in these ages, it is probable that but few new copies were made from the MSS. then extant. Some of the classics, however, were still spared, and remained in the monastic libraries. Anspert, who was Abbot of Beneventum, in the eighth century, declares that he had never studied Homer, Cicero, or Virgil, which implies, that they were still preserved, and accessible to his perusal††.

The division of Italy between the Lombards and Greeks continued till the end of the eighth century, when Charlemagne put an end to the kingdom of the former, and founded his empire. Whether this monarch himself had any pretensions to the character of a scholar, is more than doubtful; but whether he possessed learning or not, he was a generous patron of those who did. He assembled round his court such persons as were most distinguished for talents and erudition; he established schools and pensioned scholars; and he founded also a species of Academy, of which Alcuin was the head, and in which every one adopted a scriptural or classic appellation. This tended to multiply the MSS. of the classics, and many of them found a place in the imperial library mentioned by Eginhard. Charlemagne also established the monastery of Fulda, and, in consequence, copies of these MSS. found their way to Germany in the beginning of the ninth century††. The more recent Latin writers, as Boethius, Macrobius, and Capella, were chiefly popular in his age; but Virgil.

* *Dict. Histor. Art. GREGOIRE.*

† *Vicende della Letteratura*, Lib. I. c. 3.

‡ *Hist. Littér. d'Italie*, Tom. I. c. 2.

§ Bayle, *Diction. Histor. Art. GREGOIRE*. Rem. M. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp.* c. 45.

|| Muratori, *Antiquitates Italiae Med. Ævi*. Tom. III. p. 853. ed. Milan, 1741.

¶ Tiraboschi, *Stor. dell. Letterat. Ital.* Tom. III. Lib. II. *† *Ibid.*

†† Petit-Radel, *Recherches sur les Biblioth. Anciennes*, p. 53.

†† Eichhorn, *Litterargeschichte*, ed. Gotting. 1812.

Cicero, and Livy, were not unknown. Alcuin's poetical account of the library at York, founded by Archbishop Egbert, and of which he had been the first librarian, affords us some notion of the usual contents of the libraries at that time.—

“ Illic invenies veterum vestigia patrum ;
Quicquid habet pro se Latio Romanus in orbe,
Græcia vel quicquid transiit clara Latinis.”

Then, after enumerating the works of all the Fathers which had a place in the library, he proceeds with his catalogue.—

“ Historici veteres, Pompeius, Plinius, ipse
Acer Aristoteles rhetor, atque Tullius ingens ;
Quid quoque Sedulius, vel quid canit ipse Juvencus,
Alcuinus, et Clemens Prosper, Paulinus orator ;
Quid Fortunatus vel quid Lactantius edunt.
Quæ Maro Virgilius, Statius, Lucanus et auctor,
Artis grammaticæ vel quid scripsere magistri.”

But though there were libraries in other countries, Italy always contained the greatest number of classical MSS. In the ninth century, Lupus, who was educated at Fulda, and afterwards became Abbot of Ferrieres, a monastery in the Orleanois, requested Pope Benedict III. to send him Cicero *de Oratore* and Quintilian, of both of which he possessed parts, but had neither of them complete* ; and in another letter he begs from Italy a copy of Suetonius†. The series of his letters gives us a favourable impression of the state of profane literature in his time. In his very first letter to Einhart, who had been his preceptor, he quotes Horace and the Tusculan Questions. Virgil is repeatedly cited in the course of his epistles, and the lines of Catullus are familiarly referred to as authorities for the proper quantities of syllables. Lupus did not confine his care to the mere transcription of MSS. He bestowed much pains on the rectification of the texts, as is evinced by his letter to Ainsbald, Abbot of Prum, where he acknowledges having received from him a copy of the epistles of Cicero, which would enable him to correct the MSS. of them which he himself possessed‡.

It was a rule in convents, that those who embraced the monastic life should employ some hours each day in manual labour ; but as all were not fit for those occupations which require much corporeal exertion, many of the monks fulfilled their tasks by copying MSS. Transcription thus became a favourite exercise in the ninth century, and was much encouraged by the Abbots§. In every great convent there was an apartment called the *Scriptorium*, in which writers were employed in transcribing such books as were deemed proper for the library. The heads of monasteries borrowed their classics from each other, and, having copied, returned them||.—By this means, books were wonderfully multiplied. Libraries became the constant appendages of cloisters, and in Italy existed nowhere else. We do not hear, during this period, of either royal or private libraries. There was little information among the priests or parochial clergy, and almost every man of learning was a member of a convent.

But while MSS. thus increased in the monasteries, there were, at the same time, during this century, many counteracting causes, which rendered them more scarce than they would otherwise have been. During the Norman invasion, the convents were the chief objects of plunder. From the time, too, of the conquest of Alexandria by the Saracens, in the seventh century, when the Egyptian papyrus almost ceased to be imported into Europe, till the close of the tenth, when the art of making paper from cotton rags seems to have been introduced, there were no materials for writing except parchment, a substance too expensive to be readily spared for mere purposes of literature¶. The scarcity of paper, too, not only prevented the increase

* Lupi, *Epist.* 103. dated 855.

† *Ibid.* Ep. 91.

‡ *Epist.* 69.

§ Ginguené, *Hist. Litt. d'Italie*, Tom. I. p. 63.

|| Ziegel, *Hist. Rei Liter.* Tom. I. *Hist. Liter. de la France*, Tom. IV.

¶ Hallam's *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, Vol. III. p. 332, 2d ed.

of classical MSS., but occasioned the loss of some which were then in existence, from the characters having been deleted, in order to make way for a more favourite production. The monkish scribes were accustomed to peel off the surface of parchment MSS., or to obliterate the ink by a chemical process, for the purpose of fitting them to receive the works of some Christian author; so that, by a singular and fatal metamorphosis, a classic was frequently translated into a vapid homily or monastic legend. That many valuable works of antiquity perished in this way, is evinced by the number of MSS. which have been discovered, evidently written on erased parchments. Thus the fragments of Cicero's Orations, lately found in the Ambrosian library, had been partly obliterated, to make room for the works of Sedulius, and the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon; and Cicero's treatise *de Republica* had been effaced, in order to receive a commentary of St Augustine on the Psalms.

The tenth century has generally been accounted the age of deepest darkness in the west of Europe. During its course, Italy was united by Otho I. with the German empire, and was torn by civil dissensions. Muratori gives a detailed account of the plundering of Italian convents, which was the consequence of these commotions, and of the irruption of the Huns in 900*. Still, however, Italy continued to be the great depository of classical MSS.; and in that country they were occasionally sought with the utmost avidity. Gerbert, who became Pope in the last year of the tenth century, by name of Silvester II., spared neither pains nor expense in procuring transcriptions of MSS. This extraordinary man, impelled by a thirst of science, had left his home and country at an early period of life: He had visited various nations of Europe, but it was in Spain, then partly subject to the Arabs, that he had chiefly obtained an opportunity of gratifying his mathematical talent, and desire of general information. Being no less ready to communicate than eager to acquire learning, he founded a school on his return to Italy, and greatly increased the library at Bobbio, in Lombardy, to the abbacy of which he had been promoted. While Archbishop of Rheims, in France, that kingdom experienced the effects of his enlightened zeal. During his papacy, obtained for him by his pupil Otho III., he persevered in his love of learning. In his generosity to scholars, and his expenditure of wealth for the employment of copyists, as well as for exploring the repositories in which the mouldering relics of ancient learning were yet to be found, we trace a liberality, bordering on profusion.—“*Nosti*,” says he, in one of his epistles to the monk Rainaldo, “*quanto studio librorum exemplaria undique conquiram; nosti quot scriptores in aribus, aut in agris Italiæ passim habeantur*. Age ergo, et te solo conscio, ex tuis sumptibus fac ut mihi scribantur Manilius de Astronomiâ, et Victorinus. Spondeo tibi, et certum teneo quod, quicquid erogaveris, cumulatum remittam†.” Having by this means exhausted Italy, Silvester directed his researches to countries beyond the Alps, as we perceive from his letter to Egbert, Abbot of Tours.—“*Cui rei preparandæ bibliothecam assidue comparo; et sicut Romæ dudum, et in aliis partibus Italiæ, in Germaniâ quoque, et Belgicâ, scriptores auctorumque exemplaria multitudinæ numerorum redemi; adjutus benevolentia et studio amicorum comprovincialium: sic identidem apud vos per vos fieri sinite ut exorem. Quos scribi velimus, in fine epistolæ designabimus*.” This list, however, is not printed in any of the editions of Gerbert's Letters, which I have had an opportunity of consulting.

It thus appears that there were zealous researches for the classics, and successful discoveries of them, long before the age of Poggio, or even of Petrarch; but so little intercourse existed among different countries, and the monks had so little acquaintance with the treasures of their own libraries, that a classical author might be considered as lost in Italy, though familiar to a few learned men, and still lurking in many of the convents.

Gerbert, previous to his elevation to the Pontificate, had, as already mentioned, been Abbot of Bobbio; and the catalogue which Muratori has given of the library in that convent, may be taken as an example of the description and extent of the classical treasures contained in the best monastic libraries of the tenth century. While the collection, no doubt, chiefly consists of the works of the saints and fathers, we find Persius, Valerius Flaccus, and Juvenal, contained in one volume

* *Annali d'Italia*, Ad. Ann. 899, &c.

† *Epist.* 130.

‡ *Epist.* 44.

There are also enumerated in the list Cicero's Topica, and his Catilinarian orations, Martial, parts of Ausonius and Pliny, the first book of Lucretius, four books of Claudian, the same number of Lucan, and two of Ovid*. The monastery of Monte Casino, which was the retreat, as we have seen, of Cassiodorus, was distinguished about the same period for its classical library.—“The monks of Casino, in Italy,” observes Warton, “were distinguished before the year 1000, not only for their knowledge of the sciences, but their attention to polite learning, and an acquaintance with the classics. Their learned Abbot, Desiderius, collected the best of the Roman writers. This fraternity not only composed learned treatises on music, logic, astronomy, and the Vitruvian architecture, but likewise employed a portion of their time in transcribing Tacitus, Jornandes, Ovid's Fasti, Cicero, Seneca, Donatus the grammarian, Virgil, Theocritus, and Homer.”

During the eleventh century, the Benedictines having excited scandal by their opulence and luxury, the Carthusian and Cistercian orders attracted notice and admiration, by a self-denying austerity; but they valued themselves not less than the Benedictines, on the elegance of their classical transcriptions; and about the same period, translations from the Classics into the *Lingua volgare*, first commenced in Italy.

At the end of the eleventh century, the Crusades began; and during the whole course of the twelfth century, they occupied the public mind, to the exclusion of almost every other object or pursuit. Schools and convents were affected with this religious and military mania: All sedentary occupations were suspended, and a mark of reproach was affixed to every undertaking which did not promote the contagion of the times.

About the middle of the thirteenth century, and after the death of the Emperor Frederic II., Italy was for the first time divided into a number of petty sovereignties, unconnected by any system of general union, except the nominal allegiance still due to the Emperor. This separation, while it excited rivalry in arms, also created some degree of emulation in learning. Many Universities were established for the study of theology and the exercise of scholastic disputation; and though the classics were not publicly diffused, they existed within the walls of the convent, and were well known to the learned men of the period. Brunetto Latini, the teacher of Dante, and author of the *Tesoro*, translated into Italian several of Cicero's orations, some parts of his rhetorical works, and considerable portions of Sallust. Dante, in his *Amoroso Convito*, familiarly quotes Livy, Virgil, and Cicero *de Officiis*; and Mehus mentions various translations of Seneca, Ovid, and Virgil, which had been executed in the age of Dante, and which he had seen in MSS. in the different libraries of Italy †.

It was Petrarch, however, who, in the fourteenth century, led the way in drawing forth the classics from the dungeons where they had been hitherto immured, and holding up their light and glory to the eyes of men. While enjoying the reputation of having perfected the most melodious and poetical language of Europe, Petrarch has acquired a still higher title to fame, by his successful exertions in rousing his country from a slumber of ignorance which threatened to be eternal. In his earliest youth, instead of the dry and dismal works which at that time formed the general reading, he applied himself to the reading of Virgil and Cicero; and when he first commenced his epistolary correspondence, he strongly expressed his wish that their fame should prevail over the authority of Aristotle and his commentators; and declared his belief of the high advantages the world would enjoy if the monkish philosophy should give place to classical literature. Petrarch, as is evinced by his letters, was the most assiduous recoverer and restorer of ancient MSS. that had yet existed. He was an enthusiast in this as he was in every thing else that merited enthusiasm—love, friendship, glory, patriotism, and religion. He never passed an old convent without searching its library, or knew of a friend travelling into those quarters

* *Antiquitates Ratis Med. Ævi*, Tom. III. p. 818. The most valuable books of the Bobbian collection were transferred, in the seventeenth century, by the Cardinal Borromeo, to the Ambrosian library at Milan; and it is from the Bobbian Palimpsesti there discovered, that Mãi has recently edited his fragments of orations of Cicero, and plays of Plautus.

† Mehus, *Vita Ambrosii Camaldulensis*, p. 157. ed. Florent. 1769.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 183.

where he supposed books to be concealed, without entreaties to procure for him some classical MS. It is evident that he came just in time to preserve from total ruin many of the mouldering remains of classical antiquity, and to excite among his countrymen a desire for the preservation of those treasures when its gratification was on the very eve of being rendered for ever impracticable. He had seen, in his youth, several of Cicero's now lost treatises, and Varro's great work *Rerum Divinarum et Humanarum**, which has forever disappeared from the world; and it is probable that had not some one, endued with his ardent love of letters, and indefatigable research, arisen, many similar works which we now enjoy, would soon have sunk into a like oblivion.

About the same period, Boccaccio also collected several Latin MSS., and copied such as he could not purchase. He transcribed so many of the Latin poets, orators, and historians, that it would appear surprising had a copyist by profession performed so much. In a journey to Monte Casino, a place generally considered as remarkably rich in MSS., he was both astonished and afflicted to find the library exempted from the monastery into a barn, which was accessible only by a ladder. He opened many of the books, and found much of the writing effaced by damp. His grief was redoubled when the monks told him, that when they wanted money, they erased an ancient writing, wrote psalters and legends on the parchment, and sold the new MSS. to women and children†.

But though, in the fourteenth century, copies of the classics were multiplied and rendered more accessible to the world, and though a few were made by such hands as those of Petrarch and Boccaccio, the transcriptions in general were much less accurate than those of a former period. The Latin tongue, which had received more stability than could otherwise have been expected, from having been consecrated in the service of the church, had now at length become a dead language, and many of the transcribers did not understand what they wrote. Still more mistakes than those produced by ignorance, were occasioned by the presumption of pretenders to learning, who were often tempted to alter the text, in order to accommodate the sense to their own slender capacity and defective taste. Whilst a remedy has been readily found for the gross oversight or neglect of the ignorant and idle, in substituting one letter for another, or inserting a word without meaning, errors affecting the sense of the author, which were thus introduced, have been of the worst species, and have chiefly contributed to compose that mass of various readings, on which the sagacity of modern scholars has been so copiously exercised. In a passage of Coluccio Salutati's treatise *De Fato*, published by the Abbe Mehus, the various modes in which MSS. were depraved by copyists are fully pointed out‡. To such extent had these corruptions proceeded, that Petrarch, talking of the MSS. of his own time, and those immediately preceding it, asks, "Quis scriptorum incitæ medebitur, inertæque corruptenti omnia ac miscenti? Non quæro jam aut quæror Orthographiam, quæ jam dudum interit; qualiterunque utinam scriberent quod jubentur. An si redeat Cicero aut Livius, ante omnes Plinius Secundus, sua scripta religentes intelligent?" So sensible was Coluccio Salutati of the injury which had been done to letters by the ignorance or negligence of transcribers, that he proposed, as a check to the evil, that public libraries should be every where formed, the superintendance of which should be given to men of learning, who might carefully collate the MSS. intrusted to them, and ascertain the most correct readings§. To this labour, and to the detection of counterfeit works, of which many, from various motives, now began to be circulated, Coluccio devoted a considerable portion of his own time and studies. His plan for the institution of public libraries did not succeed; but he amassed a private one, which, in that age, was second only to the library of Petrarch. A considerable classical library, though consisting chiefly of the later classics, particularly Seneca, Macrobius, Apuleius, and Suetonius, was amassed by Tedaldo de Casa, whose books, with many remarks and emendations in his own hand, were inspected by the Abbé Mehus in the library of Santa-Croce at Florence||.

The path which had been opened up by Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Coluccio Salutati, in the fourteenth century, was followed out in the ensuing century with wonderful assiduity and success by Poggio Bracciolini, Filelfo, and Ambrosio Traver-

* Petrarc. *Epist. ad M. Varronem.*

† Mill's *Travels of Theodore Ducas*, Vol. I. p. 28.

‡ *Vita Ambrosii Camaldulensis*, p. 290. § *Ibid.* p. 291. || *Ibid.* p. 335.

sari, Abbott of Camaldoli, under the guidance and protection of the Medicean Family and Niccolò Niccoli.

Of all the learned men of his time, Poggio seems to have devoted himself with the greatest industry to the search for classical MSS. No difficulties in travelling, or indifference in the heads of convents to his literary inquiries, could damp his zeal. His ardour and exertions were fortunately crowned with most complete success. The number of MSS. discovered by him in different parts of Europe, during the space of nearly fifty years, will remain a lasting proof of his unceasing perseverance, and of his sagacity in these pursuits. Having spent his youth in travelling through different countries, he at length settled at Rome, where he continued as secretary, in the service of eight successive Pontiffs. In this capacity he, in the year 1414, accompanied Pope John XXIII. to the Council of Constance, which was opened in that year. While residing at Constance, he made several expeditions, most interesting to letters, in intervals of relaxation during the prosecutions of Jean Hus and Jerome of Prague, of which he had the official charge. His chief excursion was to the monastery of St Gal, about twenty miles distance from Constance, where his information led him to expect that he might find some MSS. of the ancient Roman writers*. The earliest Abbots, and many of the first monks of St Gal, had been originally transferred to that monastery from the literary establishment founded by Charlemagne at Fulda. Werembert and Helperic, who were sent to St Gal from Fulda in the ninth century, introduced in their new residence a strong taste for letters, and the practice of transcribing the classics. In examining the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, by the Benedictines, we find that no monastery in the middle ages produced so many distinguished scholars as St Gal. In this celebrated convent, which, (as Tenhove expresses it) had been so long the Dormitory of the Muses, Poggio discovered some of the most valuable classics,—not, however, in the library of the cloister, but covered with dust and filth, and rotting at the bottom of a dungeon, where, according to his own account, no criminal condemned to death would have been thrown†. This evinces that whatever care may at one time have been taken of classical MSS. by the monks, they had subsequently been shamefully neglected.

The services rendered to literature by Ambrosio of Camaldoli were inferior only to those of Poggio. Ambrosio was born at Forlì in 1386, and was a disciple of Emanuel Chrysoloras. At the age of fourteen, he entered into the convent of Camaldoli at Florence, and thirty years afterwards became the Superior of his order. In the kind conciliatory disposition of Ambrosio, manifested by his maintaining an uninterrupted friendship with Niccolò Niccoli, Poggio, and Filelfo, and by moderating the quarrels of these irascible *Literati*—in his zeal for the sacred interests, discipline, and purity of his convent, to which his own moral conduct afforded a spotless example—and, finally, in his enthusiastic love of letters, in which he was second only to Petrarch, we behold the brightest specimen of the monastic character, of which the memory has descended to us from the middle ages. Though chiefly confined within the limits of a cloister, Ambrosio had perhaps the best pretensions of any man of his age, to the character of a polite scholar. The whole of the early part of his life, and the leisure of its close, were employed in collecting ancient MSS. from every quarter where they could be procured, and in maintaining a constant correspondence with the most distinguished men of his age. His letters which have been published in 1759, at Florence, with a long preface and life by the Abbé Mehus, contain the fullest information that can be any where found with regard to the recovery of ancient classical MSS. and the state of literature at Florence in the fifteenth century.

It would appear from these Epistles, that though the monks had been certainly instrumental in preserving the precious relics of classical antiquity, their avarice and bigotry now rather obstructed the prosecution of the researches undertaken for the purpose of bringing them to light. It was their interest to keep these treasures to themselves, because it was a maxim of their policy to impede the diffusion of knowledge, and because the transcription of MSS. was to them a source of considerable emolument. Hence they often threw obstacles in the way of the inquiries of the learned, who were obliged to have recourse to various artifices, in order to draw classical MSS. from the recesses of the cloister‡.

* Roscoe's *Life of Lorenzo de Medici*, c. 1.

† *Epist. Lib. V.*

‡ Morhoff, *Polyhistor. Lib. 1. c. 7.* Lomeierus, *De Bibliothecis*, c. 9. § 2.

The exertions of Poggio and Ambrosio, however, were stimulated and aided by the munificent patronage of many opulent individuals of that period, who spared no expense in reimbursing and rewarding those who had made successful researches after these favourite objects of pursuit. "To such an enthusiasm," says Tiraboschi, "was this desire carried, that long journeys were undertaken, treasures were levied, and enmities were excited, for the sake of an ancient MS.; and the discovery of a book was regarded as almost equivalent to the conquest of a kingdom."

The most zealous promoters of these researches, and most eager collectors of MSS during the fifteenth century, were the Cardinal Ursini, Niccolo Niccoli and the Family of Medici.

Niccolo Niccoli, who was an humble citizen of Florence, devoted his whole time and fortune to the acquisition of ancient MSS. In this pursuit he had been eminently successful, having collected together 800 volumes, of which a great proportion contained Roman authors. Poggio, in his funeral oration of Niccolo, bears ample testimony to his liberality and zeal, and attributes the successful discovery of so many classical MSS to the encouragement which he had afforded. "Quod autem," says he, "egregiam laudem meretur, summam operam, curamque adhibuit ad pervestigandos auctores, qui culpâ temporum perierant. Quâ in re verè possum dicere, omnes libros fere, qui noviter tum ab aliis reperti sunt, tum a me ipso, qui integrum Quintilianum, Ciceronis nostri orationes, Silium Italicum, Marcellinum, Lucretii partem, multosque præterea e Germanorum Gallorumque ergastulis, meâ diligentia eripui, atque in lucem extuli, Nicholai suasu, impulsu, cohortatione, et pæne verborum molestia esse Latinis literis restitutos*." Several of these classical works Niccolo copied with his own hand, and with great accuracy, after he had received them†. The MSS. in his hand-writing were long known and distinguished by the beauty and distinctness of the characters. Nor did he content himself with mere transcription: He diligently employed himself in correcting the errors of the MSS. which were transmitted to him, and arranging the text in its proper order. "Quum eos auctores," says Mehus, "ex vetustissimis codicibus exscriberet, qui suo potissimum consilio, aliorum vero operâ inventi sunt, non solum mendis, quibus obsiti erant, expurgavit, sed etiam distinxit, capitibusque locupletavit." Such was the judgment of Niccolo, in this species of emendation, that Politian always placed the utmost reliance on his MS. copies‡; and, indeed, from a complimentary poem addressed to him in his own time, it would seem that he had carefully collated different MSS. of the same work, before he transcribed his own copy—

"Ille hos errores, unâ exemplaribus actis
Pluribus ante oculos, ne postera oberret et ætas,
Corrigit."

Previous to the time of Niccolo, the only libraries of any extent or value in Italy, were those of Petrarch, Coluccio Salutati, and Boccaccio. The books which had belonged to Petrarch and Coluccio, were sold or dispersed after the decease of their illustrious possessors. Boccaccio's library had been bequeathed by him to a religious order, the Hermits of St Augustine; and this library was repaired and arranged by Niccolo, for the use of the convent, and a proper hall built for its reception||. Niccolo was likewise the first person in modern times who conceived the idea of forming a public library. Previous to his death, which happened in 1437, he directed that his books should be devoted to the use of the public; and for this purpose he appointed sixteen curators, among whom was Cosmo de Medici. After his demise, it appeared that he was greatly in debt, and that his liberal intentions were likely to be frustrated by the insolvency of his circumstances. Cosmo therefore offered to his associates, that if they would resign to him the exclusive right of the disposal of the books, he would himself discharge all the debts of Niccolo, to which proposal they readily acceded. Having thus obtained the sole direction of the MSS., he deposited them for public use in the Dominican Monastery of St Marco, at Florence, which he had himself erected at an enormous expense¶. This library, for some time celebrated under the name of the *Bibliotheca Marciana*, or library of St Marc, was

* Ap. Mehus, *Pref. ad Epist. Ambros. Camaldulensis*, p. 33. ed. Florent. 1759.

† Ibid. p. 31.

‡ Ibid. p. 50.

§ Ibid. p. 44.

|| Ibid. p. 31.

¶ Roscoe's *Life of Lorenzo de Medici*, c. 1.

arranged and catalogued by Tommaso da Sarzana Calandrino, at that time a poor but zealous scholar in the lower orders of the clergy, and afterwards Pope, by the name of Nicholas V. The building which contained the books of Niccolò having been destroyed by an earthquake in 1454, Cosmo rebuilt it on such a plan, as to admit a more extensive collection. After this it was enriched by private donations from citizens of Florence, who, catching the spirit of the reigning family, vied with each other in the extent and value of their gifts*.

When Cosmo, having finally triumphed over his enemies, was recalled from banishment, and became the first citizen of Florence, "which he governed without arms or a title," he employed his immense wealth in the encouragement of learned men, and in collecting, under his own roof, the remains of the ancient Greek and Roman writers. His riches, and extensive mercantile intercourse with different parts of Europe and Asia, enabled him to gratify a passion of this kind beyond any other individual. He gave injunctions to all his friends and correspondents, to search for and procure ancient MSS., in every language, and on every subject. From these beginnings arose the celebrated library of the Medici, which, in the time of Cosmo, was particularly distinguished for MSS. of Latin classics—possessing, in particular, full and accurate copies of Virgil, Cicero, Seneca, Ovid, and Tibullus†. This collection, after the death of its founder, was farther enriched by the attention of his descendants, particularly his grandson, Lorenzo, under whom it acquired the name of the Medicean-Laurentian Library. "If there was any pursuit," says the biographer of Lorenzo, "in which he engaged more ardently, and persevered more diligently, than the rest, it was in that of enlarging his collections of books and antiquities. His emissaries were dispersed through every part of the globe, for the purpose of collecting books, and he spared no expense in procuring, for the learned, the materials necessary for the prosecution of their studies‡." In the execution of his noble design, he was assisted by Ermolao Barbaro, and Paulo Cortesi; but his principal coadjutor was Politian, to whom he committed the care and arrangement of his collection, and who made excursions, at intervals, through Italy, to discover and purchase such remains of antiquity as suited the purposes of his patron. An ample treasure of books was expected, during his last illness, under the care of Lascaris. When the vital spark was nearly extinguished, he called Politian to his side, and grasping his hand, told him he could have wished to have lived to see the library completed§.

After the death of Lorenzo, some of the volumes were dispersed, when Charles VIII. of France invaded Italy; and, on the expulsion of the Medici family from Florence, in 1496, the remaining volumes of the Laurentian collection were united with the books in the library of St Mark.

It being the great object of Lorenzo to diffuse the spirit of literature as extensively as possible, he permitted the Duke of Urbino, who particularly distinguished himself as a patron of learning, to copy such of his MSS. as he wished to possess. The families, too, of Visconti at Milan, of Este at Ferrara, and Gonzaga at Mantua, excited by the glorious example set before them, emulated the Medici in their patronage of classical literature, and formation of learned establishments. "The division of Italy," says Mr Mills, "into many independent principalities, was a circumstance highly favourable to the nourishing and expanding learning. Every city had a Mæcenas sovereign. The princes of Italy rivalled each other in literary patronage as much as in political power, and changes of dominion did not affect letters||." Eight Popes, in succession, employed Poggio as their secretary, which greatly aided the promotion of literature, and the collecting of MSS. at Rome. The last Pontiff he served was Nicholas V., who, before his elevation, as we have seen, had arranged the library of St Mark at Florence. From his youth he had shown the most wonderful avidity for copies of ancient MSS., and an extraordinary turn for elegant

* Mehus, *Pref.* p. 67.

† Avogradi, *De Magnificentiâ Cosmi Medices*, Lib. II.

"O mira in tectis bibliotheca tuis!

Nunc legis altisoni sparsim pia scripta Maronis,

Nunc ea quæ Cicero——" &c.

‡ Roscoe, *Life of Lorenzo*, c. 7.

§ *Travels of Theod. Ducas*, c. 1.

§ *Polit. Epist. Lib. IV. Ep. 2.*

and accurate transcription, with his own hand. By the diligence and learning which he exhibited in the schools of Bologna, he secured the patronage of many literary characters. Attached to the family of Cardinal Albergati, he accompanied him in several embassies, and seldom returned without bringing back with him copies of such ancient works as had been previously unknown in Italy. The titles of some of these are mentioned by his biographer, who adds, that there was no Latin author, with whose writings he was unacquainted. This enabled him to be useful in the arrangement of many libraries formed at this period*. His promotion to the Pontifical chair, in 1447, was, in the circumstances of the times, peculiarly auspicious to the cause of letters. With the assistance of Poggio, he founded the library of the Vatican. The scanty collection of his predecessors had been nearly dissipated or destroyed, by frequent removals from Rome to Avignon: But Nicholas more than repaired these losses; and before his death, had collected upwards of 5000 volumes of Greek and Roman authors—and the Vatican being afterwards increased by Sixtus IV. and Leo X. became, both in extent and value, the first library in the world.

It is with Poggio, that the studies peculiar to the commentator may be considered as having commenced, at least so far as regards the Latin classics. Poggio lived from 1380 to 1459. He was succeeded towards the close of the fifteenth century, and during the whole course of the sixteenth, by a long series of Italian commentators, among whom the highest rank may be justly assigned to Politian.—(Born, 1454—died, 1494.) To him the world has been chiefly indebted for corrections and elucidations of the texts of Roman authors, which, from a variety of causes, were, when first discovered, either corrupt, or nearly illegible. In the exercise of his critical talents, Politian did not confine himself to any one precise method, but adopted such as he conceived best suited his purpose—on some occasions only comparing different copies, diligently marking the variations, rejecting spurious readings, and substituting the true. In other cases he proceeded farther, adding *scholia* and notes, illustrative of the text, either from his own conjecture, or the authority of preceding writers. To the name of Politian, I may add those of his bitter rival and contemporary, Georgius Merula, (born, 1420—died, 1494); Aldus Manutius, (1447—1516); his son Paulus; Landini, author of the *Disputationes Camaldulenses*, (1424—1504); Philippus Beroaldus, (1453—1505); Petrus Victorius, (1490—1536); Robertellus, (1516—1567). Most of these commentators were entirely verbal critics; but this was by far the most useful species of criticism which could be employed at the period in which they lived. We have already seen, that in the time of Petrarch, classical manuscripts had been very inaccurately transcribed; and, therefore, the first great duty of a commentator, was to amend and purify the text. Criticisms on the general merits of the author, or the beauties of particular passages, and even expositions of the full import of his meaning, deduced from antiquities, mythology, history, or geography, were very secondary considerations. Nor, indeed, was knowledge far enough advanced at the time, to supply such illustrations. Grammar, and verbal criticism, formed the porch by which it was necessary to enter that temple of sublimity and beauty which had been reared by the ancients; and without this access, philosophy would never have enlightened letters, or letters ornamented philosophy. "I cannot, indeed, but think," says Mr Payne Knight, in his Analytical Essay on the Greek Alphabet, "that the judgment of the public, on the respective merits of the different classes of critics, is peculiarly partial and unjust. Those among them who assume the office of pointing out the beauties, and detecting the faults, of literary composition, are placed with the orator and historian, in the highest ranks, whilst those who undertake the more laborious task of washing away the rust and canker of time, and bringing back those forms and colours, which are the objects of criticism, to their original purity and brightness, are degraded with the Index-maker and antiquary among the pioneers of literature, whose business it is to clear the way for those who are capable of more splendid and honourable enterprizes. Nevertheless, if we examine the effects produced by those two classes of critics, we shall find that the first have been of no use whatever, and that the last have rendered the most important services to mankind. All persons of taste and understanding know, from their own feelings, when to approve and disapprove, and therefore stand in no need of instructions from the critic. But

* Berrington, *Literary Hist. of the Middle Ages*, Book VI.

whatever may be the taste or discernment of a reader, or the genius and ability of a writer, neither the one nor the other can appear while the text remains deformed by the corruptions of blundering transcribers, and obscured by the glosses of ignorant grammarians. It is then that the aid of the verbal critic is required; and though his minute labour in dissecting syllables and analysing letters may appear contemptible in its operation, it will be found important in its effect." It is to those early critics, then, who washed away the rust and canker of time, and brought back those forms and colours which are the subject of criticism, that classical literature has been chiefly indebted. The newly discovered art of printing, which was itself the offspring of the general ardour for literary improvement, and of the daily experience of difficulties encountered in prosecuting classical studies, contributed, in an eminent degree, to encourage this species of useful criticism. At the instigation of Lorenzo, and other patrons of learning in Italy, many scholars in that country were induced to bestow their attention on the collation and correction of the MSS. of ancient authors, in order that they might be submitted to the press with the greatest possible accuracy, and in their original purity. Nor was it a slight inducement to the industrious scholar, that his commentaries were no longer to be hid in the recesses of a few vast libraries, but were to be now placed in the view of mankind, and enshrined, as it were, for ever in the immortal page of the poet or historian whose works he had preserved or elucidated.

With Fulvius Ursinus, who died in the year 1600, the first school of Italian commentators may be considered as terminating. In the following century, classical industry was chiefly directed to translation; and in the eighteenth century, the list of eminent commentators was increased only by the name of Vulpius, who introduced a new style in classical criticism, by an amusing collection of verses, both in ancient and modern poets, which were parallel to passages in his author, not merely in some words, but in the poetical idea.

The career which had so gloriously commenced in Italy in the end of the fifteenth century, was soon followed in France and Germany. Julius Scaliger, a native of Verona, had been naturalized in France, and he settled there in the commencement of the sixteenth century. In that country classical studies were introduced, under the patronage of Francis I., and were prosecuted in his own and the six following reigns, by a long succession of illustrious scholars, among whom Turnebus (1512—1566), Lambinus (1526—1572), the family of the Stephenses, who rivalled the Manutii of Italy, Muretus (1526—1585), Causaubon (1559—1614), Joseph Scaliger (1540—1609), and Salmasius (1588—1658), distinguished themselves by the illustration of the Latin classics, and the more difficult elucidation of those studies which assist and promote a full intelligence of their meaning and beauties. Our geographical and historical knowledge of the ancient world, was advanced by Charles Stephenses—its chronology was ascertained by Scaliger, and the whole circle of antiquities was extended by Salmasius. After the middle of the seventh century, a new taste in the illustration of classical literature sprung up in France—a lighter manner and more philosophic spirit being then introduced. The celebrated controversy on the comparative merit of the ancients and moderns, aided a more popular elucidation of the classics; and as the preceptors of the royal family were on the side of the ancients, they promoted the famed Delphin edition, which commenced under the auspices of the Duke De Montausier, and was carried on by a body of learned Jesuits, under the superintendance of Bossuet and Huetius. Elegance and taste were required for the instruction of a young French Prince; and accordingly, instead of profound philological learning, or the assiduous collation of MSS., light notes were appended, explanatory of the mythological and historical allusions contained in the works of the author, as also remarks on his most prominent defects and excellencies.

Joseph Scaliger and Salmasius, who were French Protestants, found shelter for their heretical principles, and liberal reward for their learning, in the University of Leyden; and with Douza (1545—1604), and Justus Lipsius (1547—1606), became the fathers and founders of classical knowledge in the Netherlands. As the inhabitants of that territory spoke and wrote a language which was but ill adapted for the expression of original thought, their whole force of mind was directed to throwing their humorous and grand conceptions on canvases, or to the elucidation of the writings of those who had been gifted with a more propitious tongue. These studies and researches were continued by Heinsius (1592—1655), Gerard and Isaac Vossius (1577—1639), and Gronovius (1611—1671). At this period Schrevelius (1615—1664) commenced the publication of the *Classics, cum Notis*

Variorum; and in the end of the seventeenth century, his example was followed by some of the most distinguished editors. The merit of these editions was very different, and has been variously estimated. Morhoff, while he does justice to the editorial works of Gronovius and other learned men, in which parts of the commentaries of predecessors, judiciously extracted, were given at full length, has indulged himself in an invective against other *variorum* editions, in which everything was mutilated and incorrect. "Sane ne comparandæ quidem illi" (the editions of Aldus) "sunt ineptæ Variorum editiones; quam nuper pestem bonis auctoribus Bibliopolæ Batavi inducere cœperunt, reclamantibus frustra viris doctis." In the course of the eighteenth century, the Burmans (1668—1778), Oudendorp (1696—1761), and Havercamp (1684—1742), continued to support the honour of a school, which as yet had no parallel in certainty, copiousness, and depth of illustration.

In Germany, the school which had been established by Charlemagne at Fulda, and that at Paderborn, long flourished under the superintendence of Meinwerk. The author of the *Life of that scholar*, speaking of these establishments, says, "Ibi viguit Horatius, magnus atque Virgilius, Crispus et Sallustius, et Urbanus Statius." During the ninth century, Rabin Maur, a scholar of Alcuin, and head of the cathedral school at Fulda, became a celebrated teacher; and profane literature was not neglected by him amid the importance of his sacred lessons. Classical learning, however, was first thoroughly awakened in Germany, by the scholars of Thomas A' Kempis, in the end of the fifteenth century. A number of German youths, who were associated in a species of literary fraternity, travelled into Italy, at the time when the search for classical MSS. in that country was most eagerly prosecuted. Rudolph Agricola, afterward Professor of Philosophy at Worms, was one of the most distinguished of these scholars. Living immediately after the invention of printing, and at a time when that art had not yet entirely superseded the transcription of MSS., he possessed an extensive collection of these, as well as of the works which had just issued resplendent from the press. Both were illustrated by him with various readings on the margin; and we perceive from the letters of Erasmus the value which even he attached to these notes, and the use which he made of the variations. Rudolph was succeeded by Herman von Busche, who lectured on the classics at Leipsic. He had in his possession a number of the Latin classics; but it is evident from his letters that some, as for instance Silius Italicus, were still inaccessible to him, or could only be procured with great difficulty. The German scholars did not bring so many MSS. to light, or multiply copies of them, so much as the Italians, because, in fact, their country was less richly stored than Italy with the treasures bequeathed to us by antiquity; but they exercised equal critical acuteness in amending the errors of the MSS. which they possessed. The sixteenth century was the age which produced in Germany the most valuable and numerous commentaries on the Latin classics. That country, in common with the Netherlands, was enlightened, during this period, by the erudition of Erasmus (1467—1536). In the same and succeeding age, Camerarius (1500—1574), Taubmann (1565—1613), Acidalius (1567—1596), and Gruterus (1560—1627), enriched the world with some of the best editions of the classics which had hitherto appeared. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, classical literature had for some time rather declined in Germany—polemical theology and religious wars having at this period exhausted and engrossed the attention of her universities. But it was revived again about the middle of the eighteenth by J. Math. Gesner (1691—1761), and Ernesti (1707—1781), who created an epoch in Germany for the study of the ancient authors. These two scholars surpassed all their predecessors in taste, in a philosophical spirit, and in a wide acquaintance with the subsidiary branches of erudition: They made an advantageous use of their critical knowledge of the languages; they looked at once to the words and to the subject of the ancient writers, established and applied the rules of a legitimate interpretation, and carefully analysed the meaning as well as the form of the expression. Their task was extended from words to things; and what has been called *Æsthetic annotations*, were combined with philological discussion. "Non volui," says Gesner, in the Preface to his edition of Claudian, "commentarios scribere, collectos undique, aut locos communes: Non volui dictionem poetæ,

* *Polyhistor*. Lib. IV. c. 10.

congestis aliorum poetarum formulis illustrare; sed cum illud volui efficere poeta ut intelligatur, tum iudicio meo juvare volui juniorum iudicium, quid pulchrum, atque decens, et summorum poetarum simile putarem ostendendo, et contra, ea, ubi errasse illum a naturâ, a magnis exemplis, a decore arbitrarer, cum fide indicando." J. Ernesti considers Gesner as unquestionably the first who introduced what he terms the Æsthetic mode of criticism*. But the honour of being the founder of this new school, has perhaps, with more justice, been assigned by others to Heyne† (1729—1811). "From the middle of last century," it is remarked, in a late biographical sketch of Heyne, "several intelligent philologers of Germany displayed a more refined and philosophic method in their treatment of the different branches of classical learning, who, without neglecting either the grammatical investigation of the language, or the critical constitution of the text, no longer regarded a Greek or Roman writer as a subject for the mere grammarian and critic; but, considering the study of the ancients as a school for thought, for feeling, and for taste, initiated us into the great mystery of reading every thing in the same spirit in which it had originally been written. They demonstrated, both by doctrine and example, in what manner it was necessary for us to enter into the thoughts of the writer, to pitch ourselves in unison with his peculiar tone of conception and expression, and to investigate the circumstances by which his mind was affected—the motives by which he was animated—and the influences which co-operated in giving the intensity and character of his feelings. At the head of this school stands Heyne; and it must be admitted, that nothing has contributed so decisively to maintain or promote the study of classical literature, as the combination which he has effected of philosophy with erudition, both in his commentaries on ancient authors, and those works in which he has illustrated various points of antiquity, or discussed the habit of thinking and spirit of the ancient world." From the time of Heyne, almost the whole grand inheritance of Roman literature has been cultivated by commentators, who have raised the Germans to undisputed pre-eminence among the nations of Europe, for profound classical learning, and all the delightful researches connected with literary history. I have only space to mention the names of Zeunius (1736—1788), Jani (1743—1790), Wernsdorff (1723—1793); and among those who still survive, Harles (born 1738), Schütz (1747), Schneider (1751), Wolf (1757), Beck, (1757), Doering (1759), Mitscherlich (1760), Wetzel (1762), Georenz (1765), Eichstädt (1771), Hermann (1772).

While classical literature and topography were so highly cultivated abroad, England, at the revival of literature, remained greatly behind her continental neighbours in the elucidation and publication of the precious remains of ancient learning. It appears from Ames' *Typographical Antiquities*, that the press of our celebrated ancient printers, as Caxton, Wynkin de Worde, and Pynson, was rarely employed in giving accuracy or embellishment to the works of the classics; and, indeed, so late as the middle of the sixteenth century, only Terence and Cicero's *Offices* had been published in this country, in their original tongue. Matters had by no means improved in the seventeenth century. Evelyn, who had paid great attention to the subject, gives the following account of the state of classical typography and editorship in England, in a letter to the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, dated November 1666: "Our booksellers," says he, "follow their own judgment in printing the ancient authors, according to such text as they found extant when first they entered their copy; whereas, out of the MSS. collated by the industry of later critics, those authors are exceedingly improved. For instance, about thirty years since, Justin was corrected by Isaac Vossius, in many hundreds of places, most material to sense and elegance, and has since been frequently reprinted in Holland, after the purer copy; but with us still according to the old reading. The like has Florus, Seneca's Tragedies, and near all the rest, which have, in the meantime, been castigated abroad by several learned hands, which, besides that it makes ours to be rejected, and dishonours our nation, so does it no little detriment to learning, and to the treasure of the nation in proportion. The cause of this is principally the stationer driving as hard and cruel a bargain with the printer as he can, and the printer taking up any smatterer in the tongues, to be the less loser; an exactness in this no ways import-

* *De Luxurie Veterum Poet. Lat.*

† Eichhorn, *Litterargeschichte*, Tom. III. p. 569.

ing the stipulation, by which means errors repeat and multiply in every edition.* Since the period in which this letter is dated, Bentley, who bears the greatest name in England as a critic, however acute and ingenious, did more by his slashing alterations to injure than amend the text, at least of the Latin authors on whom he commented. He substituted what he thought best for what he actually found; and such was his deficiency in taste, that what he thought best (as is evinced by his changes on the text of Lucretius), was frequently destructive of the poetical idea, and almost of the sense of his author.

I have thought it right, before entering into detail concerning the *Codices* and editions of the works of the early classics mentioned in the text, briefly to remind the reader of the general circumstances connected with the loss and recovery of the classical MSS. of Rome, and to recall to his recollection the names of a few of the most celebrated commentators in Italy, France, Holland, and Germany. This will render the following Appendix, in which there must be constant reference to the discovery of MSS. and the labours of commentators, somewhat more distinct and perspicuous than I could otherwise make it.

LIVIVS ANDRONICUS, NÆVIUS.

The fragments of these old writers are so inconsiderable, that no one has thought of editing them separately. They are therefore to be found only in the general collections of the whole Latin poets; as Maittaire's *Opera et Fragmenta Veterum Poetarum Latinorum*, London, 1718. 2 Tom. fo., (to some copies of which a new title-page has been printed, bearing the date, Hag. Comit. 1721;) or in the collections of the Latin tragic poets, as Delrio's *Syntagma Tragediæ Latinæ*, Paris, 1620, and Scriverius' *Collectanea Veterum Tragicorum*, Lugd. Bat. 1620. It is otherwise with

ENNIUS,

of whose writings, as we have seen, more copious fragments remain than from those of his predecessors. The whole works of this poet were extant in the time of Casiodorus; but no copy of them has since appeared. The fragments, however, found in Cicero, Macrobius, and the old grammarians, are so considerable, that they have been frequently collected together, and largely commented on. They were first printed in Stephen's *Fragmenta Veterum Poetarum Latinorum*, but without any proper connection or criticism. Ludovicus Vives had intended to collect and arrange them, as we are informed in one of his notes to St Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*: But this task he did not live to accomplish†. The first person who arranged these scattered fragments, united them together, and classed them under the books to which they belonged, was Hier. Columna. He adopted the orthography which, from a study of the ancient Roman monuments and inscriptions, he found to be that of the Latin language in the age of Ennius. He likewise added a commentary, and prefixed a life of the poet. The edition which he had thus fully prepared, was first published at Naples in 1590, four years after his death, by his son Joannes Columna‡. This *Editio Princeps* of Ennius is very rare, but it was reprinted under the care of Fr. Hoeselius at Amsterdam in 1707. To the original commentary of Columna there are added the annotations on Ennius which had been inserted in Delrio and Scriverius' collection of the Latin tragic poets; and Hoeselius himself supplied a very complete *Index Verborum*. The ancient authors, who quote lines from Ennius, sometimes mention the book of the *Annals*, or the name of the tragedy to which they belonged, but sometimes this information is omitted. The arrangement, therefore, of the verses of the latter description (which are marked with an asterisk in Columna's edition), and indeed the precise collocation of the whole, is in a great measure conjectural. Accordingly, we find

* Evelyn's *Memoirs and Corresp.* Vol. II. p. 178. Second ed.

† Morhoff, *Polyhistor.* Lib. IV. c. 11.

‡ Thuanus, *Hist.* Lib. LXXXIV.

that the order of the lines in the edition of Paulus Merula is very different from that adopted by Columnna. The materials for Merula's edition, which comprehends only the *Annals* of Ennius, had already been collected and prepared at the time when Columnna's was first given to the world. Merula, however, conceived that while the great object of Columnna had been to compare and contrast the lines of Ennius with those of other heroic poets, he himself had been more happy in the arrangement of the verses, and the restoration of the ancient orthography, which is much more antiquated in the edition of Merula than in that of Columnna. He had also discovered some fragments of the *Annals*, unknown to Columnna, in the MS. of a work of L. Calp. Piso, a writer of the age of Trajan, entitled *De Continentiâ Veterum Poetarum*, and preserved in the library of St Victor at Paris. In these circumstances, Merula was not deterred by the appearance of the edition of Columnna, from proceeding with his own, which at length came forth at Leyden in the year 1695. The same sort of discrepance which exists between Columnna and Merula's arrangement of the *Annals*, appears in the collocation of the *Tragic Fragments* adopted by Columnna, and that which has been preferred by Delrio, in his *Syntagma Tragediæ Latinæ*.

H. Planck published at Gottingen, in 1807, the fragments of Ennius's tragedy of *Medea*. These comprehend all the verses belonging to this drama, collected by Columnna, and some newly extracted by the editor from old grammarians. The whole are compared with the parallel passages in the *Medea* of Euripides. Two dissertations are prefixed; one on the Origin and Nature of Tragedy among the Romans; and the other, on the question, whether Ennius wrote two tragedies, or only a single tragedy, entitled *Medea*. A commentary is also supplied, in which, as Fuhrmann remarks, one finds many things, but not much:—"Man findet in demselben *multa*, aber nicht *multum*."

Some fine passages of the fragments of Ennius have been filled up, and the old readings corrected, by the recent discovery of the work *De Republicâ* of Cicero, who is always quoting from the ancient poets. Thus the passage in the *Annals*, where the Roman people are described as lamenting the death of Romulus, stands thus in Columnna's edition:—

———"O Romole, Romole, *dicit* ß
Qualem te patriæ custodem dii genuerunt,
Tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras,
O pater, ô genitor, ô sanguen diis oriundum."

This fragment may be now supplied, and the verses arranged and corrected, from the quotation in the first book *De Republicâ*—

"Pectora pia tenet desiderium; simul inter
Sese sic memorant—O Romule, Romule *dicit*,
Qualem te patriæ custodem di genuerunt,
O pater, ô genitor, ô sanguen diis oriundum!
Tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras."

The fragments of the *Annals* of Ennius, as the text is arranged by Merula, have been translated into Italian by Bernardo Philippini, and published at Rome in 1659, along with his *Poesie*. I know of no other translations of these fragments.

PLAUTUS.

There can be no doubt that even the oldest MSS. of Plautus were early corrupted by transcribers, and varied essentially from each other. Varro, in his book *De Analogiâ*, ascribes some phrase of which he did not approve, in the *Truculentus*, to the negligence of copyists. The Latin comedies, written in the age of Plautus, were designed to be represented on the stage, and not to be read at home. It is

* *Handbuch der Classisch. Litteratur*. T. III. p. 31.

therefore, probable, that, during the reign of the Republic at least, there were few copies of Plautus's plays, except those delivered to the actors. The dramas were generally purchased by the *Ædiles*, for the purpose of amusing the people during the celebration of certain festivals. As soon as the poet's agreement was concluded with the *Ædile*, he lost his right of property in the play, and frequently all concern in its success. It seems probable, therefore, that even during the life of the author, these magistrates, or censors employed by them, altered the verses at their own discretion, or sent the comedy for alteration to the author: But there is no doubt that, after his death, the actors changed and modelled the piece according to their own fancy, or the prevailing taste of the public, just as Cibber and Garrick wrought on the plays of Shakspeare. Hence new prologues, adapted to circumstances, were prefixed—whole verses were suppressed, and lines properly belonging to one play, were often transferred to another. This corruption of MSS. is sufficiently evinced by the circumstance, that the most ancient grammarians frequently cite verses as from a play of Plautus, which can now no longer be found in the drama quoted. Thus, a line cited by Festus and Servius, from the *Miles*, does not appear in any MSS. or ancient edition of that comedy, though, in the more recent impressions, it has been inserted in what was judged to be its proper place*. Farther—Plautus, and indeed the old Latin writers in general, were much corrupted by transcribers in the middle ages, who were not fully acquainted with the variations which had taken place in the language, and to whom the Latin of the age of Constantine was more familiar than that of the Scipios. They were often puzzled and confused by finding a letter, as c, for example, introduced into a word which they had been accustomed to spell with a g, and they not unfrequently were totally ignorant of the import or signification of ancient words. In a fragment of Turpilius, a character in one of the comedies says, "Qui mea verba venatur pestis arcedat," now, the transcriber being ignorant of the verb *arcedat*, wrote *ars cedat*, which converts the passage into nonsense†.

The comedies of Plautus are frequently cited by writers of the fourteenth century, particularly by Petrarch, who mentions the amusement which he had derived from the *Casina*‡. Previous, however, to the time of Poggio, only eight of them were known, and we consequently find that the old MSS. of the fourteenth century just contain eight comedies§. By means, however, of Nicolas of Treves, whom Poggio had employed to search the monasteries of Germany, twelve more were discovered. The plays thus brought to light were the *Bacchides*, *Menæchmi*, *Mostellaria*, *Miles Gloriosus*, *Mercator*, *Pseudolus*, *Panulus*, *Persa*, *Rudens*, *Stichus*, *Trinummus*, *Truculentus*. As soon as Poggio heard of this valuable and important discovery, he urged the Cardinal Ursini to despatch a special messenger, in order to convey the treasure in safety to Rome. His instances, however, were not attended to, and the MSS. of the comedies did not arrive till two years afterwards, in the year 1428, under the charge of Nicolas of Treves himself||. They were seized by the Cardinal immediately after they had been brought to Italy. This proceeding Poggio highly resented; and having in vain solicited their restoration, he accused Ursini of attempting to make it be believed that Plautus had been recovered by his exertions, and at his own expense¶. At length, by the intervention of Lorenzo, the brother of Cosmo de Medici, the Cardinal was persuaded to intrust the precious volume to Niccolo Niccoli, who got it carefully transcribed. Niccolo, however, detained it at Florence long after the copy from it had been made; and we find his friend Ambrosio of Camaldoli using the most earnest entreaties on the part of the Cardinal for its restitution.—"Cardinalis Ursinus Plautum suum recipere cupit. Non video quam ob causam, Plautum illi restituere non debeas, quem olim transcripsisti. Oro, ut amicissimo homini geratur mos*†." The original MS. was at length restored to the Cardinal, after whose death it fell into the possession of Lorenzo de Medici, and thus came to form a part of the Medicean library. The copy taken by

* Osannus, *Analecta Critica*, c. 8.

† *Pref. ad Plautum*, ed. Lambini.

‡ *Epist. Famil. Lib. V.*

§ Bandini, *Catalog. Cod. Lat. Bibliothecæ Medicæ—Laurentianæ*, Tom. II. p. 243, &c.

|| Mehus, *Pref. ad Epist. Ambros. Camaldul.* p. 41.

¶ *Ibid.*

*† *Ambros. Camaldul. Epist. Lib. VIII. Ep. 31.*

Niccolo Niccoli was transferred, on his decease, along with his other books, to the convent of St Mark.

From a transcript of this copy, which contained the twelve newly-recovered plays, and from MSS. of the other eight comedies, which were more common and current, Georgius Merula, the disciple of Filelfo, and one of the greatest Latin scholars of the age, formed the first edition of the plays of Plautus, which was printed by J. de Colonia and Vindelin de Spira, at Venice, 1472, folio, and reprinted in 1482 at Trevisa. It would appear that Merula had not enjoyed direct access to the original MS. brought from Germany, or to the copy deposited in the Marcian library; for he says, in his dedication to the Bishop of Pavia, "that there was but one MS. of Plautus, from which, as an archetype, all the copies which could be procured were derived; and if, by any means," he continues, "I could have laid my hands on it, the *Bacchides*, *Mostellaria*, *Menachmi*, *Miles*, and *Mercator*, might have been rendered more correct; for the copies of these comedies, taken from the original MS., had been much corrupted in successive transcriptions; but the copies I have procured of the last seven comedies have not been so much tampered with by the critics, and therefore will be found more accurate." Merula then compares his toil, in amending the corrupt text, to the labours of Hercules. His edition has usually been accounted the *editio princeps* of Plautus; but I think it is clear, that at least eight of the comedies had been printed previously: Harles informs us, that Morelli, in one of his letters, had thus written to him:—"There is an edition of Plautus which I think equally ancient with the Venetian one of 1472; it is *sine ullâ notâ*, and has neither numerals, signatures, nor catch-words. It contains the following plays: *Amphitryo*, *Ainaria*, *Aulularia*, *Captivi*, *Curculio*, *Casina*, *Cistellaria*, *Epidicus*." Now, it will be remarked, that these were the eight comedies current in Italy before the important discovery of the remaining twelve, made by Nicholas of Treves, in Germany; and the presumption is, that they were printed previous to the date of the edition of Merula, because by that time the newly-recovered comedies having got into circulation, it is not likely that any editor would have given to the world an imperfect edition of only eight comedies, when the whole dramas were accessible, and had excited so much interest in the mind of the public.

Eusebius Scutarius, a scholar of Merula, took charge of an edition, which was amended from that of his master, and was printed in 1490, Milan, folio, and reprinted at Venice 1495.

In 1499, an edition was brought out at Venice, by the united labour of Petrus Valla, and Bernard Saracenus. To these, succeeded the edition of Jo. Bapt. Pius, at Milan, 1500, with a preface by Phillip Beroald. Taubman says, that "omnes editiones mangonum manus esse passas ex quo Saracenus et Pius regnum et tyrannidem in literis habuere." In the Strasburg impression, 1503, the text of Scutari has been followed, and about the same time there were several reprints of the editions of Valla and Pius.

The edition of Charpentier, in 1513, was prepared from a collation of different editions, as the editor had no MSS.; but the editions of Pius and Saracenus were chiefly employed. Charpentier has prefixed arguments, and has divided the lines better than any of his predecessors; and he has also strangled the scenes, particularly those of the *Mostellaria*, to greater advantage.

Few Latin classics have been more corrupted than Plautus, by those who wished to amend his text. In all the editions which had hitherto appeared, the perversions were chiefly occasioned by the anxiety of the editors to bend his lines to the supposed laws of metre. Nic. Angelius, who superintended an edition printed by the Giunta at Florence, 1514, was the first who observed that the corruptions had arisen from a desire "ad implendos pedum numeros." He accordingly threw out, in his edition, all the words which had been unauthorizedly inserted to fill up the verses. From some MSS. which had not hitherto been consulted, he added several prologues to the plays; and also the commencement of the first act of the *Bacchides*, which Laecaris, in one of his letters to Cardinal Bembo, says he had himself found at Messina, in Sicily. These, however, though they have been inserted into all subsequent editions of Plautus, are evidently written by a more modern hand than that of Plautus. Two editions were superintended and printed by the Manutii,

* Harles, *Supplement. ad Not. Literat. Rom.* Tom. II. p. 438.

1516 and 1522; that in 1522, though prepared by F. Asulanus, from a MS. corrected in the hand of the elder Aldus and Erasmus, is not highly valued*. Two editions, by R. Stephens, 1529 and 1530, were formed on the edition of the Giunta, with the correction of a few errors. These were followed by many editions in Italy, France, and Germany, some of which were merely reimpressions, but others were accompanied with new and learned commentaries.

To no one, however, has Plautus been so much indebted as to Camerarius, whose zeal and diligence were such, that there was scarcely a verse of Plautus which did not receive from him some emendation. In 1535, there had appeared at Magdeburg six comedies (*Aulularia, Captivi, Miles Gloriosus, Menachmi, Mostellaria, Trinummi*.) which he had revised and commented on, but which were published from his MS. without his knowledge or authority. The privilege of the first complete edition printed under his own direction, is dated in 1538.

The text and annotations of Camerarius now served as the basis for most of the subsequent editions. The Plantin editions, of which Sambucus was the editor, and which were printed at Antwerp 1566, and Basil 1568, contain the notes and corrections of Camerarius, with about 300 verses more than any preceding impression.

Lambinus, in preparing the Paris edition, 1577, collated a number of MSS. and amassed many passages from the ancient grammarians. He only lived, however, to complete thirteen of the comedies; but his colleague, Helias, put the finishing hand to the work, and added an index, after which it came forth with a prefatory dedication by Lambinus's son. On this edition, (in which great critical learning and sagacity, especially in the discovery of *double entendres*, were exhibited,) the subsequent impressions, Leyden, 1581†, Geneva, 1581, and Paris 1587, were chiefly formed.

Lambinus, in preparing his edition, had chiefly trusted to his own ingenuity and learning. Taubman, the next editor of Plautus of any note, compiled the commentaries of others. The text of Camerarius was principally employed by him, but he collated it with two MSS. in the Palatine library, which had once belonged to Camerarius; and he received the valuable assistance of Gruterus, who was at that time keeper of the library at Heidelberg. Newly-discovered fragments—the various opinions of ancient and modern writers concerning Plautus—a copious *index verborum*—a preface—a dedication to the triumvirs of literature of the day, Joseph Scaliger, Justus Lipsius, and Casaubon—in short, every species of literary apparatus accompanied the edition of Taubman, which first appeared at Frankfort in 1605. It was very inaccurately printed, however; so incorrectly indeed, that the editor, in a letter addressed to Jungerman, in September 1606, acknowledges that he was ashamed of it. Philip Pareus, who had long been pursuing similar studies with those of Taubman, embraced the opportunity, afforded by the inaccuracy of this edition, of publishing in Frankfort, in 1610, a Plautus, which was professedly the rival of that which had been produced by the united efforts of Taubman and Gruterus, and which had not only disappointed the expectations of the public, but of the learned editors themselves. Their feelings on this subject, and the *opposition Plautus* edited by Pareus, stimulated Taubman to give an amended edition of his former one. This second impression, which is much more accurate than the first, was printed at Witteberg in 1612, and was accompanied with the dissertation of Camerarius *De Fabulis Plautonicis*, and that of Jul. Scaliger, *De Versibus Comicis*. Taubman died the year after the appearance of this edition: Its fame, however, survived him, and not only retrieved his character, which had been somewhat sullied by the bad ink and dirty paper of the former edition, but completely eclipsed the classical reputation of Pareus. Envious of the renown of his rivals, that scholar obtained an opportunity of inspecting the MSS. which had been collated by Taubman and Gruterus. These he now compared more minutely than his predecessors had done, and published the fruits of his labour at Neustadt, in 1617. This was considered as derogating from

* Renouard, *Hist. de l'Imprim. des Aldes*. Tom. I p. 162.

† Muretus, in a letter dated about this time, (1581.) and addressed to his friend Paullus Sacratius, mentions, in the strongest terms of regret and resentment, that a Plautus, on the correction and emendation of which he had bestowed the labour and study of twenty-five years of his life, had been stolen from him by some person whom he admitted to his library. (*Epist. Lib. III. Ep. 28.*)

the accuracy and critical ingenuity of Gruterus, and insulting to the manes of Taubman.—“*Hinc jurgium, tumultus Grutero et Pareo.*” Gruterus attacked Pareus in a little tract, entitled *Asini Cumani fraterculus e Plauto electis electus per Eustathium Schwarzium puerum*, 1619, and was answered by Pareus not less bitterly, in his *Provocatio ad Senatum Criticum adversus personatos Parcomastigos*. From this time Pareus and Gruterus continued to print successive editions of Plautus, in emulation and odium of each other. Gruterus printed one at Wittenberg in 1621, with a prefatory invective against Pareus, and with the *Euphemia amicorum in Plautum Gruteri*. Pareus then attempted to surpass his rival, by comprehending in his edition a collection of literary miscellanies—as Bullengerus’ description of Greek and Roman theatres. At length Pareus got the better of his obstinate opponent, in the only way in which that was possible—by surviving him; he then enjoyed an opportunity of publishing, unmolested, his last edition of Plautus, printed at Frankfort, 1641, containing a Dissertation on the Life and Writings of Plautus; the Eulogies pronounced on him; Remarks on his Versification; a diatribe *de jocis et salubus Plautinis*; an exhibition of his Imitations of the Greek Poets; and, finally, the *Euphemia* of Learned Friends. Being now relieved of all apprehensions from the animadversions of Gruterus, he boldly termed his edition “*Absolutissimam, perfectissimam, omnibusque virtutibus suis ornatissimam.*”

I have now brought the history of this notable controversy to a conclusion. During its subsistence, various other editions of Plautus had been published—that of Isaac Pontanus, Amsterdam, 1620, from a MS. in his own possession—that of Nic. Heinsius, Leyden, 1635, and that of Buxhornius, 1645, who had the advantage of consulting a copy of Plautus, enriched with MS. notes, in the handwriting of Joseph Scaliger.

Gronovius at length published the edition usually called the *Variorum*. Bentley, in his critical emendations on Menander, speaks with great contempt of the notes which Gronovius had compiled. The first *Variorum* edition was printed at Leyden in 1664, the second in 1669, and the third, which is accounted the best, at Amsterdam, 1684.

The Delphin edition was nearly coeval with these *Variorum* editions, having been printed at Paris, 1679. It was edited under care of Jacques l’Œuvre or Operarius, but is not accounted one of the best of the class to which it belongs. The text was principally formed on the last edition of Gruterus, and the notes of Taubman were chiefly employed. The *Prolegomena* on the Life and Writings of Plautus, is derived from various sources, and is very copious. None of the old commentators could publish an edition of Plautus, without indulging in a dissertation *De Obscenis*. In every Delphin edition of the classics we are informed, that *consulturnum est pudori Serenissimi Delphini*; but this has been managed in various ways. Sometimes the offensive lines are allowed to remain, but the *interpretatio* is omitted, and in its place star lights are hung out alongside of the passage: but in the Delphin Plautus they are concentrated in one focus, “*in gratiam*,” as it is expressed, “*provectoris atatis*,” at the end of the volume, under the imposing title “*PLAUTI OBSCENA*.”

“And there we have them all at one full swoop;
 Instead of being scattered through the pages,
 They stand forth marshalled in a handsome troop,
 To meet the ingenuous youth of future ages.
 Till some less rigid editor shall stoop
 To call them back into their separate cages;
 Instead of standing staring all together,
 Like garden gods, and not so decent either*.”

What is termed the Ernesti edition of Plautus, and which is commonly accounted the best of that poet, was printed at Leipzig, 1760. It was chiefly prepared by Aug. Otho, but Ernesti wrote the preface, containing a full account of the previous editions of Plautus.

The two editions by the Vulpi were printed at Padua, 1725 and 1764.

The text of the second Bipontine edition, 1788, was corrected by Brunck. The

* *Don Juan*.

plan of the Bipontine editions of the Latin classics is well known. There are scarcely any annotations or commentary subjoined; but the text is carefully corrected, and an account of previous editions is prefixed.

In the late edition by Schmieder (Gottingen, 1804), the text of Gronovius has been principally followed; but the editor has also added some conjectural emendations of his own. The commentary appears to have been got up in considerable haste. The preliminary notices concerning the Life and Writings of Plautus, and the previous editions of his works, are very brief and unsatisfactory. There is yet a more recent German edition by Bothe, which has been published in volumes from time to time at Berlin. Two MSS. never before consulted, and which the editor believes to be of the eleventh or twelfth century, were collated by him. His principal aim in this new edition is to restore the lines of Plautus to their proper metrical arrangement.

With a similar view of restoring the proper measure to the verses, various editions of single plays of Plautus have, within these few years, been printed in Germany. Of this sort is the edition of the *Trinummus*, by Hermann (Leipzig, 1800), and of the *Miles* (Weimar, 1804), by Danz, who has made some very bold alterations on the text of his author.

Raly having been the country in which learning first revived,—in which the MSS. of the Classics were first discovered, and the first editions of them printed,—it was naturally to be expected, that, of all the modern tongues of Europe, the classics should have been earliest translated into the Italian language. Accordingly we find, that the most celebrated and popular of them appeared in the *Lingua Volgare*, previous to the year 1500*.

With regard to Plautus, Maffei mentions, as the first translation of the *Amphitryon*, a work in *ottava rima*, printed without a date. This work was long believed to be a production of Boccaccio†, but it was in fact written by Ghigo Brumelleschi, an author of equal or superior antiquity, and whose initials were mistaken for those of Giovanni Boccaccio. Though spoken of by Maffei as a dramatic version, it is in fact a tale or novel founded on the comedy of Plautus, and was called *Geta e Birria*‡. Pandolfo Colenuccio was the first who translated the *Amphitryon* in its proper dramatic form, and *terza rima*. He was in the service of Hercules, first Duke of Ferrara, who made this version be represented, in January, 1487, in the splendid theatre which he had recently built, and on occasion of the nuptials of his daughter Lucretia. The *Menechmi*, partly translated in *ottava* and partly in *terza rima*, was the first piece ever acted on that theatre. The Este family were great promoters of these versions; which, though not printed till the sixteenth century, were for the most part made and represented before the close of the fifteenth. The dramatic taste of Duke Hercules descended to his son Alphonso, by whose command Celio Calcagnino translated the *Miles Gloriosus*. Paitoni enumerates four different translations of the *Asinaria*, in the course of the sixteenth century, one of which was acted in the monastery of St Stephen's, at Venice.

There were also a few versions of particular plays in the course of the eighteenth century; but Paitoni, whose work was printed in 1767, mentions no complete Italian translation of Plautus, nor any version whatever of the *Truculentus*, or *Trinummus*. The first version of all the comedies was that of Nic. Eug. Argelio, which was accompanied by the Latin text; and was printed at Naples, 1783, in 10 volumes 8vo.

The subject of translation was early attended to in *France*. In the year 1540, a work containing rules for it was published by Steph. Dolet, which was soon followed by similar productions; and, in the ensuing century, its principles became a great topic of controversy among critics and scholars. Plautus, however, was not one of the classics earliest rendered. Though Terence had been repeatedly translated while the language was almost in a state of barbarism, Plautus did not appear in a French garb, till clothed in it by the Abbé Marolles, at the solicitation of Furetiere, in 1658. The Abbé, being more anxious to write many than good books, completed his task in a few months, and wrote as the sheets were throwing off. His translation is dedicated to the King, Louis XIV., and is accompanied by the Latin text. We shall find, as we proceed, that almost all the Latin authors of this

* Maffei, *Traduttori Italiani*, p. 8. Ed. Venez. 1720.

† *Ibid.* 70.

‡ Paitoni, *Biblioteca degli autor. Lat. Volgarezzati*, Tom. III. p. 118.

period were translated into French by the indefatigable Abbé de Marolles. He was unfortunately possessed of the opulence and leisure which Providence had denied to Plautus, Terence, and Catullus; and the leisure he enjoyed was chiefly devoted to translation. "Translation," says D'Israeli, "was the mania of the Abbé de Marolles; sometimes two or three classical victims in a season were dragged into his slaughter-house. The notion he entertained of his translations was their closeness; he was not aware of his own spiritless style, and he imagined that poetry only consisted in the thoughts, and not in the grace and harmony of verse."

De Coste's translation of the *Captivi*, in prose, 1716, has been already mentioned. This author was not in the same hurry as Marolles, for he kept his version ten years before he printed it. He has prefixed a Dissertation, in which he maintains, that Plautus, in this comedy, has rigidly observed the dramatic unities of time and place.

Mad. Dacier has translated the *Amphitryon*, *Rudens*, and *Epidicus*. Her version, which is accompanied by the Latin text, and is dedicated to Colbert, was first printed 1683. An examination of the defects and beauties of these comedies, particularly in respect of the dramatic unities, is prefixed, and remarks by no means deficient in learning are subjoined. Some changes from the printed Latin editions are made in the arrangement of the scenes. In her dissertation on the *Epidicus*, which was a favourite play of Plautus himself, Mad. Dacier attempts to justify this preference of the poet, and wishes indeed to persuade us, that it is a faultless production. Goujet remarks that one is not very forcibly struck with all the various beauties which she enumerates in perusing the original, and still less sensible of them in reading her translation.

M. de Limiers, who published a version of the whole plays of Plautus in 1719, has not rendered anew those which had been translated by Mad. Dacier and by De Coste, but has inserted their versions in his work. These are greatly better than the others, which are translated by Limiers himself. All of them are in prose, except the *Stichus* and *Zynummus*, which the author has turned into verse, in order to give a specimen of his poetic talents. In the versifications, he has placed himself under the needless restraint of rendering each Latin line by only one in French, so that there should not be a verse more in the translation than the original; the consequence of which is, that the whole is constrained and obscure. Examinations and analyses of each piece, expositions of the plots, with notices of Plautus' imitations of the ancient writers, and those of the moderns after him, are inserted in this work.

In the same year in which Limiers published his version, Gueudeville brought out a translation of Plautus. It is a very free one; and Goujet says, it is "Plaute travesti, plutôt que traduit." He attempts to make his original more burlesque by exaggerations; and by singular hyperbolic expressions; the *obscena* are a good deal enhanced; and he has at the end formed a sort of table, or index, of the obscene passages, referring to their proper page, which may thus be found without perusing any other part of the drama. The professed object of the table is, that the reader may pass them over if he choose.

A contemporary journal, comparing the two translations, observes,—“Il semble que M. Limiers s'attache davantage à son original, et qu'il en fait mieux sentir le véritable caractère; et que le Sieur Gueudeville est plus badin, plus vif, plus bouffon†.” Fabricius passes on them nearly the same judgment‡.

The *English* were early acquainted with the plays of Plautus. It appears from Holinshed, that in the eleventh year of King Henry VIII.—that is, in 1520— a comedy of Plautus was played before the King. We are informed by Miss Aikin, in her *Memoirs of the Court of Elizabeth*, that when that Queen visited Cambridge in 1564, she went on a Sunday morning to King's Chapel, to hear a Latin sermon, *ad clerum*; “and in the evening, the body of this solemn edifice being converted into a temporary theatre, she was there gratified with a representation of the *Azularia* of Plautus||.” It has been mentioned in the text, that, in 1595, there appeared a translation of the *Menachmi* of Plautus, by W. W.—initials which have

* *Curiosities of Literature*, Vol. I. New series.

† *Journal Historique*. Amsterdam, 1719.

‡ *Bib. Lat. Lib. I. c. 1. § 8.*

§ *Pref.* to Johnson and Steevens' *Shakespeare*, p. 96. 3d Ed.

|| Vol. I. p. 870.

generally been supposed to stand for William Warner, author of *Albion's England*. In 1694, Echar'd published a prose translation of the three comedies which had been selected by Mad. Dacier—the *Amphitryon*, *Epidicus*, and *Rudens*. It is obvious, however, that he has more frequently translated from the French, than from his original author. His style, besides, is coarse and inelegant; and, while he aims at being familiar, he is commonly low and vulgar. Some passages of the *Amphitryon* he has translated in the coarsest dialogue of the streets:—"By the mackins, I believe Phœbus has been playing the good fellow, and's asleep too! I'll be hanged if he ben't in for't, and has took a little too much of the creature." In every page, also, we find the most incongruous jumble of ancient and of modern manners. He talk- of the Lord Chief Justice of Athens, of bridewell, and aldermen; and makes his heathen characters swear British and Christian oaths, such as, "By the Lord Harry!—Fore George!—"Tis as true as the Gospel!"

In the year 1746, Thomas Cooke, the well-known translator of Hesiod, published proposals for a complete translation of Plautus, but he printed only the *Amphitryon*. Dr Johnson has told, that Cooke lived twenty years on this translation of Plautus, for which he was always taking in subscriptions*.

In imitation of Colman, who, in his Terence, had introduced a new and elegant mode of translation in familiar blank verse, Mr Thornton, in 1667, published a version of seven of the plays after the same manner,—*Amphitryon*, *Miles Gloriosus*, *Captivi*, *Trinummus*, *Mercator*, *Aulularia*, *Rudens*. Of these, the translation of the *Mercator* was furnished by Colman, and that of the *Captivi* by Mr Warner. Thornton intended to have translated the remaining thirteen, but was prevented by death. The work, however, was continued by Mr. Warner, who had translated the *Captivi*. To both versions, there were subjoined remarks, chiefly collected from the best commentators, and from the notes of the French translators of Plautus.

TERENCE.

The MSS. of Terence which were coeval with the age of the author, or shortly posterior to it, were corrupted from the same cause as the MSS. of Plautus. Varro says, that, in his time, the copies of Terence then existing were extremely corrupt. He is, however, one of the classics whose works cannot properly be said to have been discovered at the revival of literature, as, in fact, his comedies never were lost. They were commented on, during the later ages of the empire, by Æmilius Asper, Valerius Probus, Martius Salutaris, Flavius Caper, and Helenius Aero; and towards the end of the fifth century, Rufinus wrote a diatribe on the metres of Terence. Sulpicius Apollinaris, a grammarian of the second century, composed arguments to the plays, and Ælius Donatus commented on them in the fourth century. The person styling himself Calliopius, revised and amended, in the eighth century, a MS. which was long preserved in the Vatican. EUGRAPHIUS commented on Terence, again, in the tenth, and CALPURNIUS in the middle of the fifteenth century. GUINIFORTE delivered lectures on Terence at Novarra in 1430, and FILELFO at Florence about the same period†. Petrarch, too, when Leontius Pilatus, disgusted with Italy, returned to his native country, gave him a copy of Terence as his travelling companion,—a foolish present, as Petrarch adds, for there is no resemblance between the most gloomy of all the Greeks, and the most lively of the Africans. As Petrarch at this time seems to have cordially disliked Leontius, it is not probable that the copy of Terence he gave him was very scarce. All this shows, that the six plays of Terence were not merely extant, but very common in Italy, during the dark ages. One of the oldest MSS. of Terence, and that which was probably used in the earliest printed editions, was preserved in the Vatican library: Fabricius has described it as written by HRODOGARIUS in the time of Charlemagne, and as revised by CALLIOPUS†. Another MS. of Terence in the Vatican library, is one which, in the sixteenth century, had fallen into the possession of Cardinal Bembo. It had been revised by POLITIAN§, who wrote on it, in his own hand, that he had never seen one

* Boswell's *Tour to the Hebrides*.

† Ginguenê *Hist. Lit. d'Italie*, Tom. II. p. 290.

‡ *Bib. Lat. Lib. I. c. 3. § 4.*

§ *Polit. Epist.*

more ancient:—"Ego, Angelus Politianus, homo vetustatis minime incuriosus, nullum me vidisse, ad hanc diem, codicem vetustorem fateor." Its age, when Fabricius wrote, in 1698, was, as that author testifies, more than a thousand years, which places its transcription at the latest in 698. In this MS. there is a division of verses which is not employed in that above mentioned, written by Hrodogarius. Politian corrected from it, with his own hand, a copy which was in the Laurentian library, and collated with it another, which subsequently belonged to Petrus Victorius. After the death of Cardinal Bembo, this ancient MS. came into the possession of Fulvius Ursinus, and was by him bequeathed to the Vatican library*.

There is much uncertainty with regard to the *Editio Princeps* of Terence, and, indeed, with regard to most of the editions of his works which appeared during the fifteenth century. That printed by Mentelin at Strasburg, without date, but supposed to be 1468, seems now to be considered as having the best claims to priority†. The Terence printed by Pynson in 1497, was, I believe, the first Latin classic published in this country. The earliest editions of Terence are without any separation of verses, the division of them having been first introduced in the edition of 1487, according to the arrangement made by Politian from Cardinal Bembo's copy. Westerhovius, in the *prolegomena* to his edition, 1726, enumerates not fewer than 248 editions of Terence previous to his time. Though the presses of the Aldi (1517—21), the Stephenses (1529—52, &c.), and the Elzevirs (1635), were successively employed in these editions, the text of Terence does not seem to have engaged the attention of any of the most eminent scholars or critics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the exception of Muretus. The edition of Faernus, (Florence, 1565,) for which various valuable MSS. were collated, became the foundation of almost all subsequent impressions, particularly that of Westerhovius, which is usually accounted the best edition of Terence. It is nevertheless declared, by Mr Dibdin, "to be more admirable for elaborate care and research, than the exhibition of any critical niceties in the construction of the text, or the illustration of difficult passages." It contains the Commentaries of Donatus, Calpurnius, and Eugraphus, and there are prefixed the Life of Terence, attributed to Suetonius,—a dissertation of D. Heinsius, *Ad Horatii de Plauto et Terentio judicium*,—Evanthius, *De Tragœdiâ et Comœdiâ*,—and a treatise, compiled by the editor from the best authorities, concerning the scenic representations of the Romans.

Bentley's first edition of Terence was printed at Cambridge in the same year with that of Westerhovius. One of Bentley's great objects was the reformation of the metres of Terence, concerning which he prefixed a learned dissertation. The boldness of his alterations on the text, which were in a great measure calculated to serve this purpose, drew down on him, in his own age, the appellation of "slashing Bentley," and repeated castigation from subsequent editors.

Of the more recent editions, that of Zeunius (Leipsic, 1774) is deservedly accounted the best in point of critical excellence. There are, however, three German editions still more recent; that by Schmeider, (Halle, 1794,) by Bothe, (Magdeburg, 1806,) and by Perlet, (Leipsic, 1821;) which last is chiefly remarkable for its great number of typographical errors—about as numerous as those in one of the old English *Pearl Bibles*.

The plays of Terence being much less numerous than those of Plautus, translations of the whole of them appeared at an earlier period, both in Italian and French; The first complete *Italian* translation of Terence was in *prose*. It is dedicated to Benedetto Curtio, by a person calling himself Borgofranco; but from the ambiguity of some expressions in this dedication, there has been a dispute, whether he be the author, or only the editor of the version—Fontanini supporting the former, and Apostolo Zeno the latter proposition‡. It was first printed at Venice, 1583; and Paitoni enumerates six subsequent editions of it in the course of the sixteenth century. The next version was that of Giovanni Fabrini, which, as we learn by the title, is rendered word for word from the original; it was printed at Venice,

* Bandini, *Catalog. Bib. Med. Laurent.* p. 264. *Hawkin's Enquiry into Lat. Poet.* p. 200.

† Dibdin, *Bibliotheca Spenceriana*, Tom. II.

‡ *Minerva, o Giornal. de Letter. d' Ital.*

1648. A third prose translation, published at Rome, 1612, is dedicated to the Cardinal Borghese by the printer Zanetti, who mentions, that it was the work of an unknown author, which had fallen accidentally into his hands: Fontanini, however, and Apost. Zeno, have long since discovered, that the author was called Cristoforo Rosario. Crescimbeni speaks favourably of a version by the Marchioness of Malespini. Another lady, Luisa Bergalli, had translated in *versi sciolti*, and printed separately, some of the plays of Terence: These she collected, and, having completed the remainder, published them together at Venice, in 1733. In 1736, a splendid edition of a poetical translation of Terence, and accompanied by the Latin, was printed at Urbino, with figures of the actors, taken from a MS. preserved in the Vatican. It is written in *verso sciolto*, except the prologues, which are in *versi sdrucchioli*. The author, who was Nicholas Fortiguerra, and who died before his version was printed, says, that the comedies are *nunc primum Halicis versibus reddita**; but in this he had not been sufficiently informed, as his version was preceded by that of Luisa Bergalli, and by many separate translations of each individual play. A translation of two of Terence's plays, the *Andria* and *Eunuchus*, into *versi sdrucchioli*, by Giustiano de Candia, was printed by Paulus Manutius in 1544†. Three of Terence's plays, the *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, and *Heautontimorumenos*, were subsequently translated in *versi sdrucchioli*, by the Abbé Bellaviti, and published at Bassan in 1758.

It is not certain who was the author of the first *French* translation of Terence, or even at what period he existed. Du Verdier and Fabricius say, he was Octavien de Saint Gelais, Bishop of Angouleme, who lived in the reign of Charles VIII. This, however, is doubtful, since Pierre Grosnet, a French poet, contemporary with the Bishop, while mentioning the other classics which he had translated, says nothing of any version of Terence by him, but expressly mentions one by Gilles Cybile—

“Maistre Gilles nommé Cybile,
Il s'est montré très-fort habile :
Car il a tout traduit Terence
Ou il y a mainte sentence‡.”

The author, whoever he may be, mentions, that the translation was made by order of the King; but he does not specify by which of the French monarchs the command was given. His work was first printed, but without date, by Anthony Verard, so well known as the printer of some of the earliest romances of chivalry; and as Verard died in 1520, it must have been printed before that date§. It is in one volume folio, ornamented with figures in wood-cuts, and is entitled, *Le Grant Therence en François, tant en rime qu'en prose, avecques le Latin*. As this title imports, there is both a prose and verse translation; and the Latin text is likewise given. It is difficult to say which of the translations is worst; that in verse, which is in lines of eight syllables, is sometimes almost unintelligible, and the variation of masculine and feminine rhymes, is scarcely ever attended to.

The translation, printed 1593, with the Latin text, and of which the author is likewise unknown, is little superior to that by which it was preceded. Beauchamp, in his *Recherches sur les Théâtres de France*, mentions two other translations of the sixteenth century—one in 1566, the other in 1584. The first by Jean Bourlier, is in prose—the second is in rhyme, and is translated verse for verse. Mad. Dacier includes all the versions of the sixteenth century in one general censure, only excepting that of the *Eunuch* by Baif, printed 1573, in his *jeux poétiques*. It is in lines of eight and ten syllables, and was undertaken by order of Queen Catharine, mother of Charles IX. Mad. Dacier pronounces it to be a good translation, except that, in about twenty passages, the sense of the original author has been mistaken. It is remarked by Goujet, in his *Bibliothèque Française*, that if Mad. Dacier had

* Argelati, *Biblioteca de Volgarizzatori*, Tom. IV. p. 44.

† Renouard, *Hist. de l'Imprim. des Aldes*, Tom. I.

‡ *De la louange des bons facteurs en Rime*.

§ Sulzer, *Theorie der Schönen Wissensch. Terenz.*

been acquainted with the *Andrian*, by Bonaventure des Perriers, printed in 1637, she would have made an exception in favour of it also. Bonaventure was the valet of Margaret, Queen of Navarre, and after her death the editor of her tales, and himself the author of a collection in a similar taste. He wrote at a time when the French language was at its highest perfection, being purified from the coarseness which appeared in the romances of chivalry, and yet retaining that energy and simplicity, which it in a great measure lost, soon after the accession of the Bourbons. This version was one of Bonaventure's first productions, as, in the *Avis aux Lecteurs*, he says, "Que c'était son apprentissage:" he intended to have translated the whole plays of Terence, but was prevented by his tragical death. The same comedy chosen by Bonaventure des Perriers, was translated into prose by Charles Stephens, brother of the celebrated printers.

The Abbé Marolles has succeeded no better in his translation of Terence, than in that of Plautus. We recognize in it the same heaviness—the same want of elegance and fidelity to the original. Chapelain remarks, "Que ce traducteur étoit l'Antipode du bon sens, et qu'il s'éloignoit partout de l'intelligence des auteurs qui avoient le malheur de passer par ses mains." His translation appeared in 1659, in two volumes 8vo, accompanied by remarks, in the same taste as those with which he had loaded his Plautus.

About this period, the Gentlemen of the Port-Royal, in France, paid considerable attention to the education of youth, and to the cultivation of classical learning. M. de Sacy, a distinguished member of that religious association, and well known in his day as the author of the *Heures de Port-Royal*, translated into prose the *Andria*, *Adelphi*, and *Phormio**. This version, which he printed in 1647, under the assumed name of M. de Saint-Aubin, is much praised in the *Parnasse Reformé*, and the *Jugemens des Sçavans*. There were many subsequent editions of it, and some even after the appearance of the translation by Mad. Dacier. The version of the other three comedies, by the Sieur de Martignac, was intended, and announced as a supplement, or continuation of the work of M. de Sacy.

It still remains for me to mention the translation of Terence by Mad. Dacier. This lady was advised against the undertaking by her friends, but she was determined to persevere†. She rose at five o'clock every morning, during a whole winter, in the course of which she completed four comedies; but having perused them at the end of some months, she thought them too much laboured and deficient in ease. She therefore threw them into the fire, and, with more moderation, recommenced her labour, which she at length completed, with satisfaction to herself and the public. Her translation was printed in 1688, 3 vols. 12mo, accompanied with the Latin text, a preface, a life of the poet, and remarks on each of his pieces. She has not entered, as in her translations of Plautus, into a particular examination of every scene, but has contented herself with some general observations. This lady has also made considerable changes as to the commencement and termination of the scenes and acts; and her conjectures on these points are said to have been afterwards confirmed by an authoritative and excellent MS., discovered in the *Bibliothèque de Roi*‡. The first edition was improved on, in one subsequently printed at Rotterdam in 1717, which was also ornamented with figures from two MSS. There is yet a more recent translation by Le Monnier, 1771, which is now accounted the best.

The first translation which appeared in this country, and which is entitled "Terence in Englysh," is without date, but is supposed to have been printed in 1520. It was followed by Bernard's translation, 1598—Hoole's, 1670—Echard's, 1694—and Dr Patrick's, 1745. All these prose versions are flat and obsolete, and in many places unfaithful to their original. At length Colman published a translation in familiar blank verse, in which he has succeeded extremely well. He has seldom mistaken the sense of his author; and has frequently attained to his polished ease of style and manner. The notes, which have been judiciously selected from former commentators, with some observations of his own, form a valuable part of the work.

* Baillet, *Jugemens des Sçavans*.
 † Goujet *Bib. Fran.* Tom. IV. p. 436.

‡ *Mem. de Trevoux*, 1721.

LUCILIUS.

F. Douza was the first who collected the fragments of this satiric poet, and formed them into a *cento*. Having shewn his MS. and notes to Joseph Scaliger, he was encouraged to print them, and an edition accordingly came forth at Leyden, in 1697. It soon, however, became very scarce. A single copy of it was accidentally discovered by Vulpius, in one of the principal public libraries of Italy; but, owing to the place which it had occupied, it had been so destroyed by constant eaves-dropping from the roof of the house, that when he laid his hands on it, it was scarcely legible. Having restored, however, and amended the text as far as possible, he reprinted it at Padua in 1735.

LUCRETIIUS.

The work of Lucretius, like the *Æneid* of Virgil, had not received the finishing hand of its author, at the period of his death. The tradition that Cicero revised it, and gave it to the public, does not rest on any authority more ancient than that of Eusebius; and, had the story been true, it would probably have been mentioned in some part of Cicero's voluminous writings, or those of the early critics. Eichstädt*, while he denies the revisal by Cicero, is of opinion that it had been corrected by some critic or grammarian; and that thus two MSS., differing in many respects from each other, had descended to posterity—the one as it came from the hand of the poet, and the other as amended by the reviser. This he attempts to prove from the great inequality of the language—now obsolete and rugged—now polished and refined—which difference can only, he thinks, be accounted for, from the original and corrected copies having been mixed together in some of those middle-age transcriptions, on which the first printed editions were formed. The old grammarians, too, he alleges, frequently quote verses of Lucretius, which no longer compose parts of his poem, and which therefore must have been altogether omitted by the corrector; and, finally, the readings in the different MSS. are so widely different, that it is incredible that the variations could have proceeded from the transcribers or interpolators, and could have been occasioned only by the author or reviser of the poem.

But though not completely polished by the author, there is no ground for the conjecture, that the poem ever consisted of more than the present six books—an opinion which seems to have originated in an orthographical error, and which is contradictory to the very words of the poet himself.†

The work of Lucretius does not appear to have been popular at Rome, and the MSS. of it were probably not very numerous in the latter ages of the empire. It is quoted by Raban Maur, Abbot of Fulda, in his book *De Universo*‡, which was written in the ninth century. The copies of it, however, seem to have totally disappeared, previous to the revival of literature; but at length Poggio Bracciolini, while attending the Council of Constance, whither he repaired in 1414, discovered a MS. in the monastery of St Gal, about twenty miles from that city§. It is from the following lines, in a Latin elegy, by Cristoforo Landini, on the death of this celebrated ornament of his age, that we learn to whom we are indebted for the first of philosophic poems. Landini, recording the discoveries of his friend, exclaims—

“ Illius manu, nobis, doctissime rhetor,
Integer in Latium, Quintiliane, redis;
Et te, Lucreti, longo post tempore, tandem
Civibus et Patrie reddit habere tuis.”

Poggio sent the newly-discovered treasure to Niccolo Niccoli, who kept the original MS. fourteen years. Poggio earnestly demanded it back, and at length ob-

* *De Vit. et Carm. Lucret. Praef.*

† See Good's *Lucretius*, *Pref.* p. 99.

‡ *Lib. XV. c. 2.*

Eichstädt, *De Vit. &c. Lucret.* p. 65.

§ Barbari, *Epist. I. ad Poggium.*

tained it; but before it was restored, Niccoli made from it, with his own hand, a transcript, which is still extant in the Laurentian library*.

The edition published at Verona, 1486, which is not a very correct one, was long accounted the *Editio Princeps* of Lucretius. A more ancient impression, however, printed at Brescia, 1486, has recently become known to bibliographers. It was edited by Ferrandus from a single MS. copy, which was the only one he could procure. But though he had not the advantage of collating different MSS., the edition is still considered valuable, for its accuracy and excellent readings. There are, I believe, only three copies of it now extant, two of which are at present in England. The text of Lucretius was much corrupted in the subsequent editions of the fifteenth century, and even in that of Aldus, published at Venice in 1500, of which Avancius was the editor, and which was the first *Latin* classic printed by Aldus†. This was partly occasioned by the second edition of 1486 being unfortunately chosen as the basis of all of them, instead of the prior and preferable edition, printed at Brescia. In a few, but very few readings, the second edition has improved on the first, as, for example, in the beautiful description of the helplessness of a new-born infant—

“Navita, nudus humi jacet infans, indignus omni
Vitali auxilio,”—

where the Brescian edition reads *indignus*, instead of *indigus*. And again, in the fifth book—

“Nec poterat quenquam placidi pellacia ponti,
Subdola *pellicere* in fraudem, ridentibus undis,”

where the Brescian edition reads *pollicere*, instead of *pellicere*, which seems to be wrong. At length Baptista Pius, by aid of some emendations of his preceptor, Philippus Beroaldus, to which he had access, and by a laborious collation of MSS., succeeded in a great measure in restoring the depraved text of his author to its original purity. His edition, printed at Bologna in 1511, and the two Aldine editions, published in 1515, under the superintendence of Nevagero, who was a much better editor than Avancius, continued to be regarded as those of highest authority till 1563, when Lambinus printed at Paris an edition, prepared from the collation of five original MSS., and all the previous editions of any note, except the first and second, which seem to have been unknown to him. The text, as he boasts in the preface, was corrected in 800 different places, and was accompanied by a very ample commentary. Lambinus was succeeded by Gifanius, who was more a grammarian than an acute or tasteful critic. He amassed together, without discrimination, the notes and conjectures on Lucretius, of all the scholars of his own and the preceding age. Douza, in a set of satirical verses, accused him of having appropriated and published in his edition, without acknowledgment, some writings of L. Fruterius, which had been committed to him on death-bed, in order to be printed. His chief merit lies in what relates to grammatical interpretation, and the explanation of ancient customs, and in a more ample collection of parallel passages than had hitherto been made. The editions of D. Pareus, (Frankfort, 1631,) and of Nardius, (Florence, 1647,) were not better than that of Gifanius; and the Delphin edition of Lucretius, by M. Le Fay, has long been known as the very worst of the class to which it belongs. “Notæ ejus,” says Fabricius, “plene sunt pudendis hallucinationibus.” Indeed, so much ashamed of it were his colleagues, and those who directed this great undertaking of the Delphin classics, that they attempted, though unsuccessfully, to suppress it.

Nearly a century and a half had elapsed, from the first publication of the edition of Lambinus, without a tolerable new impression of Lucretius being offered to the public, when Creech, better known as the translator of Lucretius, printed, in 1695, a Latin edition of the poet, to whose elucidation he had devoted his life. His study of the Epicurean system, and intimate acquaintance with the works of Gassendi,

* Mehus, *Præf. ad Epist. Ambros. Camaldul.* p. 38.

† Renouard, *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Aldes*, Tom. I.

fully qualified him for the philosophic illustration of his favourite author. On the whole, however, Havercamp's edition, Leyden, 1725, is the best which has yet appeared of Lucretius. It was prepared from the collation of twenty-five MSS., as well as of the most ancient editions, and contained not only the whole annotations of Creech and Lambinus, but also some notes of Isaac Vossius, which had not previously been printed. The prefaces of the most important editions are prefixed; and the only fault which has been found with it is, that in his new readings the editor has sometimes injured the harmony of the versification. Lucretius certainly can not be considered as one of the classics who have been most fortunate in their editors and commentators. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he failed to obtain the care of the most pre-eminent critics of the age, and was thus left to the conjectures of second-rate scholars. It was his lot to be assigned to the most ignorant and barbarous of the Delphin editors; and his catastrophe has been completed by falling into the hands of Wakefield, whose edition is one of the most injudicious and tasteless that ever issued from the press. In preparing this work, which is dedicated to Mr Fox, the editor had the use of several MSS. in the University of Cambridge and the British Museum; and also some MS. notes of Bentley, found in a copy of a printed edition, which originally belonged to Dr Mead. In his preface, he expresses himself with much asperity against Mr Cumberland, for withholding from him some other MS. notes of Bentley, which were in his possession. It would have been fortunate for him if he had never seen any of Bentley's annotations, since many of his worst readings are derived from that source. By an assiduous perusal of MSS. and the old editions, he has restored as much of the ancient Latin orthography, as renders the perusal of the poet irksome, though, by his own confession, he has not in this been uniform and consistent; and he has most laboriously amassed, particularly from Virgil, a multitude of supposed parallel passages, many of which have little resemblance to the lines with which they are compared. The long Latin poem, addressed to Fox, lamenting the horrors of war, does not compensate for the very brief and unsatisfactory notices, as to every thing that regards the life and writings of the poet, and the previous editions of his works. The commentary is dull, beyond the proverbial dullness of commentaries; and wherever there was a disputed or doubtful reading, that one is generally selected, which is most tame and unmeaning—most grating to the ear, and most foreign, both to the spirit of the poet, and of poetry in general. I shall just select one instance from each book, as an example of the manner in which the finest lines have been utterly destroyed by the alteration of a single word, or even letter, and I shall choose such passages as are familiar to every one. In his magnificent eulogy of Epicurus, in the first book, Lucretius, in admiration of the enlightened boldness of that philosopher, described him as one—

“*Quem neque fama Deûm, nec fulmina, nec minitanti
Murmure compressit cœlum.*”

The expression *Fama Deûm* implies, that Epicurus could not be restrained by that imposing character, with which deep-rooted prejudice, and the authority of fable, had invested the gods of Olympus—a thought highly poetical, and at the same time panegyric of the mighty mind which had disregarded all this superstitious renown. But Wakefield, by the alteration of a single letter, strips the passage both of its sense and poetry—he reads,

“*Quem neque fama Deûm, nec fulmina, nec minitanti,*”

- which imports that the determined mind of Epicurus could not be controlled by the temples of the gods, which, if it has any meaning at all, is one most frigid and puerile. This innovation, which the editor calls, in the note, *egregiam emendationem*, is not supported, as far as he informs us, by the authority of any ancient MS. or edition whatever, but it was so written on the margin of the copy of Lucretius, which had belonged to Bentley, where it was placed, as Wakefield admits, *nude ascripta et indefensa*. In the second book, Lucretius maintaining that absence of splendour is no diminution of happiness, says,

"Si non aurea sunt juvenum simulacra per sedes, &c.
Nec citharæ reboant laqueata aurataque tecta."

But Wakefield, instead of *tecta*, reads *templa*, and justifies his reading, not on the authority of any ancient MSS., but by showing that *templa* is used for *tecta* by some authors, and applied to private dwellings! The third book commences very spiritedly with an eulogy of Epicurus:

"E tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen
Qui primus potuisti, illustrans commoda vitæ,
Te sequor, O Graiæ gentis decus!"

This sudden and beautiful apostrophe is weakened and destroyed by a change to

"O tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen."

The lines are rendered worse by the interjection being thus twice repeated in the course of three verses. In the fourth book, Lucretius, alluding to the merits of his own work, says,

"Deinde, quod obscurâ de re tam lucida pango
Carmina, Museo contingens cuncta lepore."

Here the word *pango* presents us with the image of the poet at his lyre, pouring forth his mellifluous verses, and it has besides, in its sound, something of the twang of a musical instrument. Wakefield, however, has changed the word into *pando*, which reminds us only of transcription and publication. Lucretius, in book fifth, assigns as the reason why mankind supposed that the abode of the gods was in heaven,

"Per cælum volvi quia nox et luna videtur,
Luna, dies, et nox, et noctis signa serena!"

This last word Wakefield has changed into *severa*, which greatly impairs the beauty of the line. *Noctis signa serena*, are the stars and planets; but if instead of these be substituted the *signa severa*, the passage becomes tautological, for the *signa severa* are introduced immediately afterwards in the line

"Noctivagæque faces cœli flammæque volantes."

I have only selected passages where Wakefield has departed from the usual readings, without support from any ancient edition or authoritative MS. whatever. The instances where, in a variation of the MSS. and editions, he has chosen the worse reading, are innumerable.

The first edition of Wakefield's Lucretius was printed at London in 1796; the second at Glasgow, 1813, which is rendered more valuable than the first, by a running collation in the last volume of the readings of the *Editio Princeps*, printed at Brescia; that of Verona, 1486—Venice 1496—the Aldine edition, 1500—and the Bipontine, 1783, which places in a very striking point of view the superiority of the *Editio Princeps* over those by which it was immediately succeeded. At the end of this edition, there are published some MS. notes and emendations, taken from Bentley's own copy of Faber's edition of Lucretius, in the library of the British Museum. They are not of much consequence, and though a few of them are doubtless improvements on Faber's text, yet, taken as a whole, they would injure the lines of the poet, should they be unfortunately adopted in subsequent editions.

Eichstädt, in his recent impression, published at Leipsic, has chiefly followed the text of Wakefield, but has occasionally deviated from it when he thought the innovations too bold. He had the advantage of consulting the *Editio Princeps*, which no modern editor enjoyed. He has prefixed Wakefield's prefaces, and a long dissertation of his own, on the Life and Poetical Writings of Lucretius, in which he scarcely does justice to the poetical genius of his author. The first volume, containing the text and a very copious verbal index, was printed at Leipsic in 1801. It is intended that the second volume should comprise the commentary, but it has not yet been published.

There is hardly any poet more difficult to translate happily than Lucretius. In the abstruse and jejune philosophical discussions which occupy so large a proportion of the poem, it is hardly possible, without a sacrifice of perspicuity, to retain the harmony of versification; and, in the ornamental passages, the diction is so simple, pure, and melodious, that it is an enterprize of no small difficulty to translate with fidelity and elegance.

In consequence, perhaps, of the freedom of his philosophical, and a misrepresentation of his moral tenets, Lucretius was longer of being rendered into the Italian language than almost any other classic. It was near the end of the seventeenth century, before any version was executed, when a translation into *verso sciollo*, was undertaken by Marchetti, Professor of Mathematics and Philosophy in the University of Pisa. Marchetti has evidently translated from the edition of Lambinus—the best which had at that time appeared. His version, however, though completed in the seventeenth century, was not published till 1717, three years after his death, when it was printed, with the date of London, under the care of a person styling himself Antinoo Rullo, with a prefatory dedication to the great Prince Eugene, in which the editor terms it, “la più grande, e la più bella poetica opera che nel passato secolo nascesse ad accrescere un nuovo lume di gloria ad Italia.” Public opinion, both in Italy and other countries, has confirmed that of the editor, and it is universally admitted, that the translator has succeeded in faithfully preserving the spirit and meaning of the Latin original, without forfeiting any of the beauties of the Italian language. It has been said, that such was the freedom and freshness of this performance, that unless previously informed as to the fact, no one could distinguish whether the Latin or Italian Lucretius was the original. Graziana, himself a celebrated poet, who had perused it in MS., thus justly characterizes its merits, in a letter addressed to the author:—“you have translated this poem with great felicity and ease; unfolding its sublime and scientific materials in a delicate style and elegant manner; and, what is still more to be admired, your diction seldom runs into a lengthened paraphrase, and never without the greatest judgment.” The perusal of this admirable translation was forbidden by the inquisition, but the prohibition did not prevent a subsequent impression of it from being printed at Lausanne, in 1761. This edition, which is in two volumes, contains an Italian translation of Pagnac’s Anti-Lucretius, by F. Maria Ricci. The editor, Deregni, indeed declares that he would not have ventured to publish any translation of Lucretius, however excellent, unless accompanied by this powerful antidote. There are prefixed to this edition historical and critical notices; as also the preface, and the *Protesta del Traduttore*, which had been inserted in the first edition.

Most of the French translations of Lucretius are in prose. Of all sorts of poetry, that called didactic, which consists in the detail of a regular system, or in rational precepts, which flow from each other in a connected train of thought, suffers least by being transfused into prose. Almost every didactic poet, however, enriches his work with such ornaments as spring out of his subject, though not strictly attached to it; but in no didactic poem are these passages so numerous and so charming as in that of Lucretius; and, accordingly, in a prose translation, while all that is systematic or preceptive may be rendered with propriety, all that belongs to embellishment, and which forms the principal grace of the original, appears impertinent and misplaced. The earliest translation of Lucretius into the French language, was by Guillaume des Autels, about the middle of the sixteenth century. The Abbé Marolles, already mentioned as the translator of Plautus and Terence, turned Lucretius into French prose: Of this version there were two editions, the first of which was printed in 1650. It was addressed to Christina, Queen of Sweden; and, as the author had been very liberal to this princess in compliment, he hoped she would be equally liberal in reward; but he was much deceived, and of this disappointment he bitterly complains in his Memoirs. Of this translation, Goujet remarks, that one is constantly obliged to have recourse to the Latin text, in order to comprehend its meaning*. It was a good deal amended, however, in the second edition, 1659, under circumstances of which the author introduces an account in the list of his works subjoined to his translation of Virgil. Gasendi, who had profoundly studied the system of Epicurus and Lucretius, having procured a copy of Ma-

* *Biblioth. Franc.* Tom. V.

rolles' first edition, he sent a few days before his death for the author, and pointed out to him, with his own hand, those passages in which he thought his translation defective, and also supplied him with a number of notes in illustration of the poet. The Abbé was thus provided with ample materials for the improvement of his work, and so pleased was he with his second edition, that he got a prohibition against reprinting the first introduced into the *Privilège* of the second. He inserted in it a *Discours Apologetique*, defending the translating and reading of Lucretius, and prefixed a dedication to M. Lamoignon, President of the Parliament, whom he now substituted for Queen Christina. Moliere having seen the first edition of Marolles' prose translation, was thereby induced to render Lucretius into French verse. His original intention was to have versified the whole poem, but he afterwards confined his rhymes to the more decorative parts, and delivered the rest in plain prose. As he proceeded with his version, he uniformly rehearsed it both to Chapelle and Rohaut, who jointly testified their approbation of the performance. But it was destined to perish when brought very near its completion. A valet of the translator, who had charge of his dress-wig, being in want of paper to put it into curl, laid hold of a loose sheet of the version, which was immediately rent to pieces, and thrown into the fire as soon as it had performed its office. Moliere was one of the most irritable of the *genus irritabile vatum*, and the accident was too provoking to be endured. He resolved never to translate another line, and threw the whole remainder of his version into the flames, which had thus consumed a part of it*. This abortive attempt of Moliere incited the Abbé Marolles to render the whole of Lucretius into verse. He completed this task in less than four months, and published the fruits of his labour in 1677. Rapidity of execution, however, is the only merit of which he has to boast. His translation is harsh, flat, and inverted; and it is also very diffuse: The poem of Lucretius consists of 7839 lines, and the version of not less than 12333†.

Lucretius was subsequently translated into prose by the Baron des Coutures. His version, printed at Paris 1685, is somewhat better in point of style than those of Marolles, but is not more faithful to the original, being extremely paraphrastic. A *Life of Lucretius*, drawn up from the materials furnished by Hubert, Gifanius, Lambinus, and other commentators, is prefixed, and to every book is appended a small body of notes, which shew that the author was better acquainted with his subject than Marolles. Still, however, the poem of Lucretius was not much known in France during the seventeenth century, either in the original or translated form. Chaulieu, one of the most elegant and polished poets of that age, was so little acquainted with the moral lessons which it inculcated, as to write the following lines:—

—————“ Epicure et Lucrece
M'ont appris que la Sagesse
Veut qu'au sortir d'un repas,
Ou des bras de sa maîtresse,
Content l'on aille à bas.”

At length La Grange translated Lucretius in 1768, and Le Blanc de Guillet in 1786. Brunet speaks highly of the version of La Grange, which he seems to think is the best in the French language, and he says that of Le Blanc de Guillet is *peu recherché*. Mr Good, in mentioning the various translations of Lucretius, does not allude to the production of La Grange, but speaks highly of the version of Le Blanc de Guillet. He is sometimes, he admits, incorrect, and still more frequently obscure: “On the whole, however,” he continues, “it is a work of great merit, and ranks second amid the translations of Lucretius, which have yet appeared in any nation.” Of course, it ranges immediately next to that of Marchetti. This version is accompanied with the Latin text in alternate pages. It is decorated with plates,

* Good's *Lucretius*, *Preface*.

† See Goujet, *Bibliothèque Française*, Tom. V. p. 18. Fabricius, however, says, that he does not know who was the author of this verse translation, and Mr Good, in the preface to his *Lucretius*, attributes it to one James Langlois, who, he says, translated not from the original Latin, but from Marolles' prose version.

illustrated by notes, and introduced by a comprehensive preliminary discourse, which contains a biography of the original author, drawn up from Gifanius and Creech, and also some general observations on the Epicurean philosophy.

The first attempt to transfer the poem of Lucretius into the English language, was made by Evelyn, the celebrated author of the *Sylva*. It was one of his earliest productions, having been printed in 1666. It was accompanied by an appendix of notes, which show considerable acquaintance with his subject, and there are prefixed to it complimentary letters or verses by Waller, Fanshaw, Sir Richard Brown, and Christopher Wasse. Evelyn commenced his arduous task with great enthusiasm, a due admiration of his original, and anxious desire to do it full justice. On actual trial, however, he became conscious of his own inability to produce, as he expresses it, "any traduction to equal the elegancy of the original," and he accordingly closed his labours with the first book. To this resolution, the negligent manner in which his specimen of the translation was printed, contributed, as he alleges, in no small degree. Prefixed to the copy in the library at Wotton, is this note in his own handwriting: "Never was book so abominably misused by the printer; never copy so negligently surveyed, by one who undertook to look over the proof-sheets with all exactness and care, namely, Dr Triplett, well known for his ability, and who pretended to oblige me in my absence, and so readily offered himself. This good I received by it, that publishing it vainly, its ill success at the printer's discouraged me with troubling the world with the rest." This pretended disgust, however, at the typography of his Lucretius, was probably a pretext. It is more likely that he was deterred from the farther execution of his version, either by its want of success, or by the hints which he received from some of his friends concerning the moral and religious danger of his undertaking. "For your Lucretius," says Jeremy Taylor, in a letter to him, dated 16th April, 1666, "I perceive you have suffered the importunity of your too kind friends to prevail with you. I will not say to you that your Lucretius is as far distant from the severity of a Christian as the fair Ethiopian was from the duty of Bishop Heliodorus; for indeed it is nothing but what may become the labours of a Christian gentleman, those things only abated which our evil age needs not: for which also I hope you either have by notes, or will by preface, prepare a sufficient antidote; but since you are engaged in it, do not neglect to adorn it, and take what care of it it can require or need; for that neglect will be a reproof of your own act, and look as if you did it with an unsatisfied mind; and then you may make that to be wholly a sin, from which, only by prudence and charity, you could before be advised to abstain. But, sir, if you will give me leave, I will impose such a penance upon you, for your publication of Lucretius, as shall neither displease God nor you; and since you are busy in these things which may minister directly to learning, and indirectly to error, or the confidences of men, who, of themselves, are apt enough to hide their vices in irreligion, I know you will be willing, and will suffer to be entreated, to employ the same pen in the glorification of God, and the ministries of eucharist and prayer."†

In 1682, Creech, who was deterred by no such religious scruples, published his translation of the whole poem of Lucretius. As a scholar, he was eminently qualified for the arduous undertaking in which he had engaged: but he wrote with such haste, that his production everywhere betrays the inaccuracies of an author who acquiesces in the first suggestions of his mind, and who is more desirous of finishing, than ambitious of finishing well. Besides, he is at all times rather anxious to communicate the simple meaning of his original, than to exhibit any portion of the ornamental garb in which it is arrayed. Hence, though generally faithful to his author, he is almost everywhere deficient in one of the most striking characteristics of the Roman poet—grandeur and felicity of expression. He is often tame, prosaic, and even doggerel; and he sometimes discovers the conceits of a vitiated taste, in the most direct opposition to the simple character and majestic genius of his Roman original. Pope said, "that Creech had greatly hurt his translation of Lucretius, by imitating Cowley, and bringing in turns even into some of the most grand parts."‡ It is also remarked by Dr Drake, "that in this version the couplet has led in almost

* Evelyn's *Memoirs*, Tom. I.

† Evelyn's *Memoirs and Correspondence*, Vol. II. p. 102, 2d edit.

‡ Spence's *Anecdotes*, p. 106.

every page to the most ridiculous redundancies. A want of taste, however, in the selection of language, is as conspicuous in Creech as a deficiency of skill and address in the management of his versifications.* The ample notes with which the translation is accompanied, are chiefly extracted from the works of Gassendi. A number of commendatory poems are prefixed, and among others one from Evelyn, in which he acknowledges, that Creech had succeeded in the glorious enterprize in which he himself had failed. Dryden was also much pleased with Creech's translation, but this did not hinder him from versifying some of the higher and more ornamental passages, to which Creech had hardly done justice, as those at the beginning of the first and second books, the concluding part of the third book, against the fear of death, and of the fourth concerning the nature of love. On these fine passages Dryden bestowed the ease, the vigour, and harmony of his muse; but though executed with his accustomed spirit, his translations want the majestic solemn colouring of Lucretius, and are somewhat licentious and paraphrastic. For this, however, he accounts in his Poetical Miscellanies, in mentioning his translations in comparison with the version of Creech. "The ways of our translation," he observes, "are very different—he follows Lucretius more closely than I have done, which became an interpreter to the whole poem. I take more liberty, because it best suited with my design, which was to make him as pleasing as I could. He had been too voluminous had he used my method in so long a work, and I had certainly taken his, had I made it my business to translate the whole."

The translations by Creech and Dryden are both in rhyme. That of Mr Good, printed in 1806, is in blank verse, and it may well be doubted if this preference was conducive to the successful execution of his purpose. The translation is accompanied with the original text of Lucretius, printed from Wakefield's edition, and very full notes are subjoined, containing passages exhibiting imitations of Lucretius by succeeding poets. The preface includes notices of preceding editions of his author, and the explanation of his own plan. Then follow a Life of Lucretius, and an Appendix to the Life, comprehending an analysis and defence of the system of Epicurus, with a comparative sketch of most other philosophical theories, both ancient and modern.

The translation of Mr Good was succeeded, in 1818, by that of Dr Busby, which is in rhyme, and is introduced by enormous *prolegomena* on the Life and Genius of Lucretius, and the Philosophy and Morals of his Poem.

CATULLUS.

The MSS. of Catullus were defaced and imperfect, as far back as the time of Aulus Gellius†, who lived in the reigns of Adrian and the Antonines; and there were *varia lectiones* in his age, as well as in the fifteenth century. There was a MS. of Catullus extant at Verona in the tenth century which was perused by the Bishop Raterius, who came from beyond the Alps, and who refers to it in his Discourses as a work he had never seen till his arrival at Verona. Another was possessed in the fourteenth century by Pastrengo, a Veronese gentleman, and a friend of Petrarch‡, who quotes it twice in his work *De Originibus*; but these and all other MSS. had entirely disappeared amid the confusions with which Italy was at that time agitated, and Catullus may, therefore, be considered as one of the classics brought to light at the revival of literature. The MS. containing the poems of Catullus was not found in Italy, but in one of the monasteries of France or Germany, (Scaliger says of France,) in the course of the fifteenth century, and according to Maffei, in 1425§. All that we know concerning its discovery is contained in a barbarous Latin epigram, written by Guarini of Verona, who chose to give his information on the subject in an almost unintelligible riddle. It was prefixed to an edition of Catullus, printed in Italy 1472, where it is entitled *Hertzichum Guarini Veronensis Oratoris Clariss. in libellum V. Catulli ejus concivis*:

* *Literary Hours*, No. II.

† Maffei, *Verona Illustrata*, Part II. p. 4.

‡ *Noct. Attic.* Lib. VII. c. 20.

§ *Ibid.* Part II. p. 6.

“ Ad Patriam venio longis de finibus exul :
 Causa mei reditûs compatriota fuit.
 Scilicet a calamis tribuit cui Francia nomen,
 Quisque notat turbas prætereuntis iter.
 Quo licet ingenio vestrum celebrate Catullum
 Quovis sub modio clausa papyrus erat.”

The first line explains that the MS. was brought to Italy from beyond the Alps, and the second that it was discovered by a countryman of Catullus, that is, by a citizen of Verona. The third line contains the grand *conundrum*. Some critics have supposed that it points out the name of a monastery where the MS. was discovered; others, that it designates the name of the person who found it. Lessing is of this last opinion; and, according to his interpretation, the line implies, that it was discovered by some one whose name is the French word for quills or pens, that is, *plumes*. The name nearest this is Plumatus, on which foundation Lessing attributes the discovery of Catullus to Bernardinus Plumatus, a great scholar and physician of Verona, who flourished during the last half of the fifteenth century*. This conjecture of Lessing was better founded than he himself seems to have been aware, as the second syllable in the name Plumatus is not remote from the French verb *hater*, which, in one sense, as the epigram expresses it—

“ Notat turbas prætereuntis iter.”

Lucius Pignorius, who thinks that these lines were not written by Guarinus of Verona, but that the MS. was discovered by him, also conjectures that it was found in a barn, since it is said in the last line, that it was concealed *sub modio*, and bushels are nowhere but in barns†. This is taking the line in its most literal signification, but the expression probably was meant only as proverbial.

The wretched situation in which this MS. was found, and the circumstance of its being the only one of any antiquity extant, sufficiently accounts for the numerous and evident corruptions of the text of Catullus, and for the editions of that poet presenting a greater number of various and contradictory readings than those of almost any other classic.

After this MS. was brought to Italy, it fell into the hands of Guarinus of Verona, who took much pains in correcting it, and it was further amended by his son Baptista Guarinus, as a third person of the family, Alexander Guarinus, informs us, in the *proæmium* to his edition of Catullus, 1521, addressed to Alphonso, third Duke of Ferrara. Baptista Guarinus, as Alexander farther mentions in his *proæmium*, published an edition of Catullus from the MS. which he had taken so much pains to correct, but without any commentary. This edition, however, has now entirely disappeared; and that of 1472, printed by Spira, at Venice, in which Catullus is united with Tibullus and Propertius, is accounted the *editio Princeps*. The different editions in which these poets have appeared conjoined, will be more conveniently enumerated hereafter: both in them, and in the impressions of Catullus printed separately, the editors had departed widely from the corrected text of Baptista Guarinus. Accordingly, Alexander Guarinus, in 1521, printed an edition of Catullus, with the view of restoring the genuine readings of his father and grandfather, who had wrought on the ancient MS. which was the prototype of all the others. It would appear, however, that the erroneous readings had become inveterate. Maffei, in his *Verona Illustrata*, points out the absurd and unauthorized alterations of Vossius and Scaliger on the pure readings of the Guarini.

Muretus took charge of an edition of Catullus, which was printed by the younger Aldus Manutius in 1558. This production is not accounted such as might be expected from the consummate critic and scholar by whom it was prepared. Isaac Vossius had commented on Catullus; but his annotations lay concealed for many years after his death, till they were at length brought to light by his amanuensis Beverland, who, by means of this valuable acquisition, was enabled to prepare the best edition which had yet appeared of Catullus, and which was first printed in London in 1684. His commentary was on every point profoundly learned.—“ Poetam,” says Harles, “ commentario eruditissimo, ita tamen ut inverecundiâ illi interdum haud cederet, illustravit.” Vulpinus published a yet better edition at

* *Sammliche Schriften*, Tom. I.

† *Symbol. Epist.* XVI.

‡ Part. II. p. 5.

Padua, in 1787, in the preparation of which he made great use of the *Ediſio Princeps*. In the notes, he has introduced a new and moſt agreeable ſpecies of commentary,—illuſtrating his author by parallel paſſages from the ancient and modern poets, particularly the Italian; not ſuch parallel paſſages as Wakefield has amaſſed, where the words *qui* or *atque* occur in both, but where there is an obvious imitation or reſemblance in the thought or image. He has alſo prefixed a diatribe *De Metris Catullianis*. In the year 1789, a curious fraud was practiſed with regard to Catullus. Carradini de Allio, a ſcholar of ſome note, published at Venice an edition, which he pretended to have printed from an ancient MS. accidentally diſcovered by him in a pottery, without a cover or title-page, and all beſmeared with filth. It was dedicated to the Elector of Bavaria; and though one of the moſt impudent cheats of the ſort that had been practiſed ſince the time of Sigonius and Annus Viterbiensis, it impoſed on many learned men. The credit it obtained, introduced new diſorders into the text of Catullus; and when the fraud was at length detected, the contriver of it only laughed at the temporary ſucceſs of his impoſture.

Doering, in early life, had printed an edition of the principal poem of Catullus, the *Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis*. Encouraged by the ſucceſs of this publication, he ſubſequenty prepared a complete edition of Catullus, which came forth at Leiſpic in 1788.

The *Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis*, the chief production of Catullus, was translated into Italian by Ludovico Dolce, and printed in 1588, at the end of a ſmall volume of miſcellaneous works dedicated to Titian. In the colophon it is ſaid, “Il fine dell' epitalanio tradotto per M. Lod. Dolce, in verſo ſciolto.” This *Epithalamium* was alſo translated in the eighteenth century, into *Ottava Rima*, by Pariotti, with a long preface, in which he maintains that the *ottava*, or *terza rima*, is better adapted for the translation of the Latin classics than *verſi ſciolti*. Ginguené, in the preface to his French translation of this *Epithalamium*, mentions three other Italian verſions of the laſt century, thoſe of Neruci, Torelli, and the Count d'Ayano, all of which, he ſays, poſſeſs conſiderable merit. He alſo informs us, that Antonio Conti had commenced a translation of this poem, which was found incomplete at his death; but it was accompanied by many valuable criticisms and annotations, which have been much employed in a Memoir inſerted in the transactions of the French Academy, by M. D'Arnaud, whoſe plagiarisms from the Italian author have been pointed out at full length by M. Ginguené, in his preface. Conti completed a translation of the *Coma Berenices* in *verſi ſciolti*, accompanied by an explanation of the ſubject, and learned notes, which was printed along with his works at Venice, in 1739. The *Coma Berenices* was alſo translated in *terza rima* by the Neapolitan Saverio Mattel, and by Pagnini in *verſi adruccioli*. At length, in 1805, M. Ugo Foſcolo, now well known in this country as the author of the Letters of Jacopo Ortis, printed at Milan a translation of this elegy, in blank verſe, under the title of *La Chioma di Berenice, poema di Callimaco, tradotto da Valerio Catullo, volgarizzato ed illuſtrato da Ugo Foſcolo*. The verſion is preceded by four diſſertations; the text is accompanied with notes, and followed by fourteen *conſiderazioni*, as they are called, in which the author ſeverely cenſures and ſatirizes the pedantic commentators and philologers of his country. Mr Hobhouſe, in his *Illustrations of Childe Harold*, ſays, that the whole lucubration, extending to nearly 300 pages of large octavo, is a grave and continued irony on the verbal criticisms of commentators. “Some of the learned,” he continues, “fell into the ſnare, and Foſcolo, who had iſſued only a few copies, now added a Farewell to his readers, in which he repays their praiſes, by expoſing the mysteries and abuſes of the philological art. Thoſe whom he had deceived muſt have been not a little irritated to find that his frequent citations were invented for the occaſion, and that his commentary had been purpoſely ſprinkled with many of the groſſeſt faults.”

The whole works of Catullus were firſt translated into Italian by the Abbot Francis Maria Biacca of Parma, who concealed his real designation, according to the affected faſhion of the times, under the appellation of Parmindo Ibichense, *Pastor Arcade*. The Abbot died in 1735, and his verſion was printed at Milan after his death, in 1740, in the twenty-ſiſt volume of the General Collection of

Italian Translations from the Ancient Latin Poets. The most recent Italian version is that of Puccini, printed at Pisa in 1805. It is very deficient in point of spirit; and the last English translator of Catullus observes, "that it is chiefly remarkable for the squeamishness with which it omits all warmth in the love verses, while it unblushingly retains some of the most disgusting passages."

The French have at all times dealt much in prose translations of the Classics. These did not suit very well for the epic poems, or even comedies or the Romans; and were totally abhorrent from the lyrical or epigrammatic productions of Catullus. A great deal of the beauty of every poem consists in the melody of its numbers. But there are certain species of poetry, of which the chief merit lies in the sweetness and harmony of versification. A boldness of figures, too—a luxuriance of imagery—a frequent use of metaphors—a quickness of transition—a freedom of digression, which are allowable in every sort of poetry, are to many species of it essential. But these are quite unsuitable to the character of prose, and when seen in a prose translation, they appear preposterous and out of place, because they are never found in any original prose composition. Now, the beauties of Catullus are precisely of that nature, of which it is impossible to convey the smallest idea in a prose translation. Many of his poems are of a lyric description, in which a greater degree of irregularity of thought, and a more unrestrained exuberance of fancy, are permitted than in any other kind of composition. To attempt, therefore, a translation of a lyric poem into prose, is the most absurd of all undertakings; for those very characters of the original, which are essential to it, and which constitute its highest beauty, if transferred to a prose translation, become unpardonable blemishes. What could be more ridiculous than a French prose translation of the wild dithyrambs of Atis, or the fervent and almost phrenzied love verses to Lesbia? It is from poetry that the elegies of Catullus derive almost all their tenderness—his amorous verses all their delicacy, playfulness, or voluptuousness—and his epigrams all their sting.

That indefatigable translator of the Latin poets, the Abbé Marolles, was the first person who translated Catullus in French. He was an author, of all others, the worst qualified to succeed in the task which he had undertaken, as his heavy and leaden pen was ill adapted to express the elegant light graces of his original. His prose translation was printed in 1653. It was succeeded, in 1676, by one in verse, also by Marolles, but of which only thirty copies were thrown off and distributed among the translator's friends. La Chapelle (not the author of the *Voyage*) translated most of the poems of Catullus, and inserted them in his *Histoire Galante*, entitled the *Amours de Catulle*, printed in 1690, which relates, in the style of an amatory prose romance, the adventures and intrigues of Catullus, his friends, and mistresses. The next translation, though not of the whole of his pieces, is by M. Pezay, printed 1771, who misses no opportunity of ridiculing Marolles and his work. It is in prose, as is also a more recent French translation by M. Noel, Paris, 1806. The first volume of Noel's work contains the *Discours Préliminaire* on the Life, Poetry, Editions, and Translations of Catullus; and the version itself, which is accompanied with the Latin text. The second volume comprises a very large body of notes, chiefly exhibiting the imitations of Catullus by French poets. Brunet mentions a translation still more recent, by M. Mollevaut, which is in verse, and proves that more justice may be done to Catullus in rhyme than prose.

An English translation of Catullus, usually ascribed to Dr Nott, was published anonymously in 1795, accompanied with some valuable annotations. He was the first to give, as he himself says, the whole of Catullus, without reserve, and in some way or other, to translate all his indecencies. This version adheres very closely to the original, and has the merit of being simple and literal, but it is meagre and inelegant: it is defective in ease and freedom, and but seldom presents us with any of those graces of poetry, and indeed almost unattainable felicities of diction, which characterize the original. While writing this, the poetical translation by Mr Lamb has come to my hands. It is also furnished with a long preface and notes, which appear to be tasteful and amusing. The chief objections to the translation are quite the reverse of those which have been stated to the version by which it was preceded—it seems defective in point of fidelity, and is too diffuse and redundant. No author suffers so much by being diluted as Catullus, and he can only be given with effect by a brevity as condensed and *piquant* as his own. Indeed, the thoughts and language of Catullus throw more difficulties in the way of a translator, than those of almost any other classic author. His peculiarities of feeling—his idiomatic delicacies

of style—that light ineffable grace—that elegant ease and spirit, with which he was more richly endued than almost any other poet, can hardly pass through the hands of a translator without being in some degree sullied or alloyed.

LABERIUS—PUBLIUS SYRUS.

The only fragment of any length or importance which we possess of Laberius, has been saved by Macrobius, in his *Saturnalia*. The fragments of Publius Syrus were chiefly preserved by Seneca and Au. Gellius, and the scattered maxims which they had recorded, were collected in various MSS. of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. They were first printed together, under the superintendence of Erasmus, in 1502, as revised and corrected from a MS. in the University of Cambridge. Fabricius published some additional maxims, which had not previously been printed, in 1550. Stephens edited them at the end of his *Fragments from the Greek and Latin Comic Poets*, 1564; and Bentley published them along with Terence and the *Fables of Phædrus*, at Cambridge, in 1726. An improved edition, which had been prepared by Gruter, was printed under the superintendence of Havercamp, from a MS. after his death. The most complete edition, however, which has yet appeared, is that published by Orellius, at Leipsic, 1822. It contains 879 maxims, arranged in alphabetical order, from which, at least as the editor asserts, all those which are spurious have been rejected, and several that are genuine added. A Greek version of the maxims, by Jos. Scaliger, is given by him on the opposite side of the page, and he has appended a long commentary, in which he has quoted all the maxims of preceding or subsequent authors, who have expressed sentiments similar to those of Publius Syrus.

The sentences were translated into *English* from the edition of Erasmus, under the following title: "Proverbs or Adagies, with newe Additions, gathered out of the *Chilades* of Erasmus, by Richard Taverner. Hereunto be also added, Mimi Publiliani. Imprinted at Lo'don, in Fleetstrete, at the signe of the Whyte Harte. *Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum*." On the back of the title is "the Prologue of the author, apologizing for his slender capacitie;" and concluding, "yet my harte is not to be blamed." It contains sixty-four leaves, the last blank. On the last printed page are the "Faultes escaped in printynge," which are seven in number. Beneath is the colophon, "Imprinted at London by Richarde Bankes, at the Whyte Harte, 1589." This book was frequently reprinted. James Elphinston, long known to the public by his unsuccessful attempt to introduce a new and uniform mode of spelling into the English language, translated, in 1794, "The Sententious Poets—Publius dhe Syrrian—Laberius dhe Roman Knight, &c. arraigned and translated into correspondent English Mezzure*."

CATO—VARRO.

It appears from Aulus Gellius, that, even in his time, the works of Cato had begun to be corrupted by the ignorance of transcribers. As mentioned in the text, his book on Agriculture, the only one of his numerous writings which survives, has come down to us in a very imperfect and mutilated state. A MS. of Cato, but very faulty and incomplete, was in possession of Niccolo Niccoli; and a letter from him is extant, requesting one of his correspondents, called Michelotius, to borrow for him a very ancient copy from the Bishop Aretino, in order that his own might be rendered more perfect. Most of the editions we now have, follow a MS. which is said to have been discovered at Paris by the architect Fra Giocondo of Verona, and was brought by him to Italy. Varro's treatise on Agriculture was first discovered by Candidi; as he himself announces in a letter to Niccolo Niccoli.

* Brüggemann, *View of the English Editions, Translations, &c. of the Ancient Latin Authors*.

† Mehus, *Præf.* p. 50.

‡ *Epist. Ad Ambrosium Camald.* Ep. 39.

The agricultural works of Cato and Varro have generally been printed together, and also along with those of Columella and Palladius, under the title of *Rei Rusticæ Scriptores*. There is no ancient MS. known, in which all the *Rei Rusticæ Scriptores* are collected together. They were first combined in the *Editio Princeps*, edited by Georgius Merula, and printed at Venice, in 1470. The next edition, superintended by Bruscius, and printed in 1482, has almost entirely disappeared. In many passages, its readings were different from those of all other editions, as appears from the annotations communicated from Rome, by Pontedera to Gesner, while he was preparing his celebrated edition*. Philippus Beroaldus corrected a good many faults and errors which had crept into the *Editio Princeps*. His emendations were made use of in the edition of Bologna, 1494, by Benedict Hector. Gesner has assiduously collated that edition with the *Editio princeps*, and he informs us, that it contained many important corrections. Though differing in some respects, he considers all the editions previous to that of Aldus, as belonging to the same class or family. The Aldine edition, printed 1514, was superintended by Fra Giocondo of Verona, who, having procured at Paris some MSS. not previously consulted, introduced from them many new readings, and filled up several chasms in the text, particularly the fifty-seventh chapter†. This edition, however, is not highly esteemed; "Sequitur," says Fabricius, "novi nec optimi generis editio Aldina:." And Schneider, the most recent editor of the *Rei Rusticæ Scriptores*, affirms that Giocondo corrupted and perverted almost every passage which he changed. Nicholas Angellus took charge of the edition published by the Giunta at Florence, in 1515. His new readings are ingenious; but many of them are quite unauthorized and conjectural. The Aldine continued to form the basis of all subsequent editions, till the time of Petrus Victorius, who was so great a restorer and amender of the *Rei Rusticæ Scriptores*, that he is called their *Æsculapius* by Gesner, and *Sospitator* by Fabricius. Victorius had got access to a set of MSS. which Politian had collated with the *Editio Princeps*. The most ancient and important of these MSS., containing Cato, and almost the whole of Varro, was found by Victorius in the library of St Mark; another in French characters was in the Medicean library; and a third had belonged to Franciscus Barbarus, and was transcribed by him from an excellent exemplar at Padua‡. But though Victorius had the advantage of consulting these MSS., it does not appear that he possessed the collation by the able hand of Politian; because that was inserted, not in the MSS., but in his own printed copy of the *Editio Princeps*; and Gesner shows at great length that Petrus Victorius had never consulted any copy whatever of the *Editio Princeps*§. Victorius first employed his learning and critical talents on Varro. Some time afterwards, Giovanni della Casa being sent by the Pope on some public affairs to Florence, where Victorius at that time resided, brought him a message from the Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, requesting that he should exert on Cato some part of that diligence which he had formerly employed on Varro. Victorius soon completed the task assigned him. He also resumed Varro, and attentively revised his former labours on that author||. At last he determined to collate whatever MSS. of the Rustic writers he could procure. Those above-mentioned, as having been inspected by Politian, were the great sources whence he derived new and various readings.

It is not known that Victorius printed any edition containing the text of the *Rei Rusticæ Scriptores* in Italy. His letter to Cervinus speaks as if he was just about to edit them; but whether he did so is uncertain. "Quartam classem," says Harles, "constituit Victorius, sospitator horum scriptorum: qui quidem num primum in Italiâ recensitos dederit eos cum Gesnero et Ernesti ignoro¶." As far as now appears, his corrections and emendations were first printed in the edition of Leyden, 1541, where the authors it contains, are said in the title to be *Restituti per Petrum Victorium, ad veterum exemplarium fidem, suâ integritati*. His castigations were printed in the year following, but without the text of the authors, at Florence. The Leyden edition was reprinted at Paris, in 1543, by Robert Stephens, and was followed by the edition of Hier. Commellinus, 1595.

* Gesner, *Pref.*

† See Maffei, *Verona Illustrata*, Part II. Lib. III.

‡ *Pref. Pet. Victor. in explicationes, suar. Castig. in Cat. &c.*

§ *Pref. p. 20.*

|| *Epist. Ad Marcel. Cervinum.*

¶ *Introduct. in Notit. Litt. Rom.*

At length Gesner undertook a complete edition of the *Rei Rusticae Scriptores*, under circumstances of which he has given us some account in his preface. The eminent bookseller, Fritschius, had formed a plan of printing these authors; and to aid in this object, he had employed Schoettgenius, a young, but even then a distinguished scholar. A digest of the best commentators, and a collection of various readings, were accordingly prepared by him. The undertaking, however, was then deferred, in expectation of the arrival of MSS. from Italy; and Schoettgenius was meanwhile called to a distance to some other employment, leaving the fruits of his labour in the hands of Fritschius. In 1726, that bookseller came to Gesner, and informed him, that Politian's collations, written on his copy of the *Editio Princeps*, had at length reached him, as also some valuable observations on the rustic writers, communicated from Italy by Pontedera and Faciolati. Fritschius requested that Gesner should now arrange the whole materials which had been compiled. Selections from the commentaries, and the various readings previous to the time of Victorius, were prepared to his hand; but he commenced an assiduous study of every thing that was valuable in more recent editions. At length his ponderous edition came out with a preface, giving a full detail of the labours of others and his own, and with the prefaces to the most celebrated preceding editions. Some of the notes had been previously printed, as those of Meursius, Scaliger, and Fulvius Ursinus—others, as those of Schoettgenius, Pontedera, and Gesner himself, had never yet seen the light. Though Gesner never names Pontedera without duly styling him *Clarissimus Pontedera*, that scholar was by no means pleased with the result of Gesner's edition, and attacked it with much asperity, in his great work, *Antiquitatum Rusticarum*. Gesner's first edition was printed at Leipzig, 1735. Ernesti took charge of the publication of the second edition; and, in addition to the dissertation of Ausonius Popma, *De Instrumento Fundi*, which formed an appendix to the first, he has inserted Segner's description and explanation of the aviary of Varro.

The most recent edition of the *Scriptores Rei Rusticae*, is that of Schneider, who conceives that he has perfected the edition of Gesner, by having collated the ancient edition of Bruschi, and the first Aldine edition, neither of which had been consulted by his predecessor.

Besides forming parts of every collection of the *Rei Rusticae Scriptores*, the agricultural treatises of Cato and Varro have been repeatedly printed by themselves, and apart from those of Columella and Palladius. Ausonius Popma, in his separate edition of Cato, 1590, has chiefly, and without much acknowledgment, employed some valuable annotations and remarks contained in the *Adversaria* of Turnebus. This edition was accompanied by some other fragments of Cato. These, however, were of small importance; and the principal part of the publication being the work on Agriculture, its sale was much impeded by Commellinus' full edition of the agricultural writers, published five years afterwards. Raphellengius, however, reprinted it in 1598, with a new title; and with the addition of the notes of Meursius. Popma again revised his labours, and published an improved edition in 1620. Varro's treatise, *De Re Rusticâ*, was published alone in 1545, and with his other writings, by Stephens, in 1569. Ausonius Popma also edited it in 1601, appropriating, according to his custom, the notes and observations of others.

Cato's work *De Re Rusticâ*, has been translated into *Italian* by Pagni, whose version was printed at Venice, 1792; and into *French* by Saboureux, Paris, 1775. I am not aware of any full *English* translation of Cato, but numerous extracts are made from it in Dickson's *Husbandry of the Ancients*.

Italy has produced more translations of the Latin writers than any other country; and one would naturally suppose, that the agricultural writings of those who had cultivated the same soil as themselves, would be peculiarly interesting to the Italians. I do not know, however, of any version of Varro in their language. There is an *English* translation, by the Rev. Mr Owen, printed at Oxford in 1800. In his preface, the author says,—“Having collated many copies of this work of the Roman writer in my possession, and the variations being very numerous, I found it no easy task to make a translation of his treatise on agriculture. To render any common Arabic author into English, would have been a labour less difficult to me some years ago, than it has been to translate this part of the works of this celebrated writer.”

SALLUST.

This historian was criticized in a work of Asinius Pollio, particularly on account of his affected use of obsolete words and expressions. Sulpicius Apollinaris, the grammarian, who lived in the reigns of the Antonines, boasted that he was the only person of his time who could understand Sallust. His writings were illustrated by many of the ancient grammarians, as Asper and Statilius Maximus. In the course of the ninth century, we find Lupus, Abbot of Ferriers, in one of his letters, praying his friend Regimbertus to procure for him a copy of Sallust*; and there was a copy of his works in the Library of Glastonbury Abbey, in the year 1240†. The style of Sallust is very peculiar: He often omits words which other writers would insert, and inserts those which they would omit. Hence his text became early, and very generally, corrupted, from transcribers and copyists leaving out what they naturally enough supposed to be redundancies, and supplying what they considered as deficiencies.

There appeared not less than three editions of Sallust in the course of the year 1470. It has been much disputed, and does not seem to be yet ascertained, which of them is the *Editio Princeps*. One was printed under the care of Merula, by Spira, at Venice; but the other two are without name of place or printer: It has been conjectured, that of these two, the one which is in folio was printed at Rome‡; and the other, in quarto, at Paris, by Gering, Crantz, and Friburg§. The Venice Edition is usually accounted the *Editio Princeps*||, but Fuhrmann considers both the Paris and Roman editions as prior to it. The Roman, he thinks, in concurrence with the opinion of Harles, is the earliest of all. The Hipontine editors style the Parisian impression the *Primaria Princeps*. Besides these three, upwards of thirty other editions were published in the course of the fifteenth century. One of them was printed at Venice, 1493, from the *Recension* of Pomponius Letus, who has been accused by subsequent editors of introducing many of the corruptions which have crept into the text of Sallust¶. There were also a number of commentaries in this century, by scholars, who did not themselves publish editions of the historian, but greatly contributed to the assistance of those who prepared them in the next. The commentary of Laurentius Valla, in particular, which was first printed at Rome in 1490, and in which scarcely a single word is passed over without remark or explanation, enriched most of the editions which appeared in the end of the fifteenth, and the beginning of the subsequent century*†. The first of any note in the sixteenth century, were those of Aldus, Venice, 1509, and 1521. Cardio, who published an edition at Antwerp in 1579, collected many of the fragments of Sallust's great History of Rome; and he amended the text of the Catilinarian and Jugurthine Wars, as he himself boasts, in several thousand places. The edition of Gruter, in 1607, in which the text received considerable alterations, on the authority of the Palatine MS., obtained in its time considerable reputation. The earliest *Variorura* edition is in 1649; but the best is that printed at Leyden, with the notes of Gronovius, in 1690. An immense number of MSS., and copies of the most ancient editions, were collated by Wasse for the Cambridge edition, 1710. He chiefly followed the text of Gruter, but he has added the notes of various commentators, and also some original observations of his own, particularly comparisons, which he has instituted between his author and the ancient Greek writers. The editions of Cortius (Leipsic, 1724), and of Havercamp (Amsterdam, 1742), are both excellent. The former, in preparing his work, consulted not less than thirty MSS., fifteen of which were preserved in the Wolfenbutter library. He also assiduously collated most of the old editions, and found some good readings in those of Venice, 1470—1493, and that of Leipsic, 1508. Most of the editions, however, of the fifteenth century, he affirms, are very bad; and, according to him, a greater number of the errors, which

* *Epist.* 104.† Warton, *Hist. of English Poetry*, Vol. I. Dissert. II.‡ Fuhrmann, *Handbuch der Classisch. Lit.*§ Dibdin, *Introduction to the Classics*, Vol. II. p. 197.|| Fabricius, *Bib. Lat. Lib.* I. c. 9.¶ *Ibid.**† *Ibid.*

had crept into the text of Sallust, are to be attributed to them, than to the corruptions of Pomponius Lætus. Curtius chiefly erred in conceiving that Sallust's conciseness consisted solely in paucity of words, so that he always preferred the readings where the greatest number of them were thrown out, though the meaning was thereby obscured, and sometimes altogether lost. The readings in Havercamp's edition are all founded on those of Wasse and Gruter. The text is overloaded with notes: "Textus," says Ernesti, "velut cymba in oceano, ita in notis natat." The various readings are separated from the notes, being inserted between the text and the commentary. In the first volume, we have the text of Sallust, and the annotations—in the second, the prefaces of different editors of Sallust—his life—the fragments of his works—and the judgments pronounced by ancient authors on his writings. The text of Teller's edition, Berlin, 1790, is formed on that of Curtius, but departs from it, where the editor conceived himself justified by the various readings of a rare and ancient edition, published at Brescia, 1495, which he had consulted. It is totally unprovided with *prolegomena*, or notices, with regard to the life and writings of the author, or his works; but there is appended to it a recension of the celebrated Spanish Translation, executed under the auspices of the Infant Don Gabriel, and a very full *Index Latinitatis*. The best of the recent German editions, is that of Lange, Halle, 1815. In this work, the editor chiefly follows Havercampus. His great object was to restore the purity of the text, which he believed to have been greatly corrupted by the rash and unauthorized alterations of preceding editors, more particularly of Curtius. Notes are subjoined, partly illustrative of Sallust's genius and talents, and partly of that portion of Roman history, of which he treated.

Sallust has been translated into *Italian*, by a Genoese of the name of Agost. Ortica, (Venice, 1518). The work of Ortica also comprehends a version of Cicero's fourth Catilinarian orations, and the supposed reply of Catiline. The style is barbarous, involved, and obscure, and in some passages nearly unintelligible. In point of style, the translation of Lelio Carani (Florence, 1580) is purer, but it is too paraphrastic, and has not always accurately expressed the meaning of the original. The version of Paulo Spinola (1564) was scarcely more happy. These three translations having become scarce by the middle of last century, and being defective in many of the most essential qualities of a translation, the Doctor Battista Bianchi, Professor of Latin at Sienna, undertook an improved translation, in which he attempted to imitate the brevity of Sallust, though he did not, like some of his predecessors, insert obsolete Italian words, corresponding to the antique Latin expressions adopted by his original. To this translation, first printed at Venice, 1761, there is prefixed a long and elaborate preface, in which the author discusses the historical and literary merits of Sallust, and enumerates the translations of his works which had at that time appeared in the different languages of Europe. After this follows the life of the Latin author. There are likewise annotations at the foot of the page, and an index at the end of the whole. The next Italian translation of any note which appeared, was that by Alfieri, which is considered in Italy as a masterpiece: His prose style, which was founded on that of the classic writers, qualified him admirably for the task.

There have been more translations of Sallust in *French*, than in any other language. It was translated, it is said, as far back as the reign of King John of France, who died in 1364. "Le Roi Jean," says Villaret, "ainsi qu'on l'a rapporté, avoit fait entreprendre des versions de quelques auteurs Latins, tels que Salluste et Tite-Live*." I do not suppose, however, that this translation was given to the press on the invention of printing. The first version printed was that of Baudoin, in 1617; which was succeeded, in the course of the same century, by the futile attempts of Cassagne and Du Teil. The version of the Abbé Le Masson, which appeared in the commencement of the ensuing century, was accompanied with a defence of the moral character of the historian. It was followed, in a few years afterwards, by that of the Abbé Thyvon, which, though it does not convey an adequate idea of the strength and sententious brevity of the original, is for the most part extremely faithful to the meaning of the author. Its deficiency in the former qualities, seems to have induced M. Dotteville to attempt a new translation, as he appears to be

* Villaret, *Hist. de France*, T. XI. p. 121.

always striving at terseness and conciseness of style. "His Sallust," says the most recent English translator, "like his Tacitus, is harsh and dry; and his fruitless endeavours to vie in brevity with either historian, are sufficient to prove, if such proof were needful, how absurd an attempt it is in any translator, for the sake of seizing some peculiar feature of resemblance, or some fancied grace of diction, to violate the genius of his native language." A similar criticism is extended, in the following paragraph, to the version of M. Beauzic, though it is admitted to be the most faithful and accurate that ever appeared in the French language. The translation of Dotteville was first printed in 1760, and that of Beauzic fifteen years afterwards. About the same time M. de Brosses, President of the Parliament of Dijon, published a History of Rome during the Seventh Century, which professes to be chiefly made up from the fragments of Sallust. The War of Jugurtha comes first in the historical arrangement—then follow the events which intervened between that contest and the Conspiracy of Catiline, taken from the fragments of Sallust, which are interwoven with the body of the narrative—and, lastly, the Conspiracy. The work, which extends to three volumes 4to, comprehends very full notes, and includes a life of Sallust, which, though written in an indifferent style, displays considerable learning and research. Although the version of De Brosses was generally accounted one of the best translations of the Classics, which had appeared in the French, or any other language, it does not seem to have been considered as precluding subsequent attempts. A translation by Dureau Delamalle appeared in 1808, and one by Mollevaut, yet more recent, which has gone through at least three editions. Still, however, many persons in France prefer the version of Dotteville to the more modern translations.

It would appear, that the writings of Sallust became known and popular in *England* soon after the revival of literature. A translation of the Jugurthine War, executed by "Sir Alexander Barclay, Priest, at the command of the Duke of Norfolk, and printed by Richard Pynson," in folio, was published as early as the reign of Henry VIII. It bears on the title-page—"Here begynneth the famous Cronycle of the Warre which the Romaynes had against Jugurth, usurper of the Kyngdome of Numidy: Which Cronycle was compyled in Latin by the renowned Sallust. And translated into English by Sir Alexander Barclay, Preest, at commandment of the right hye and mighty Prince, Thomas Duke of Northfolke." The volume is without date, but is supposed to have been printed about 1540. It was twice reprinted in 1557, and in one of these editions was accompanied with Catiline's Conspiracy, translated by Thomas Paynel. The version of Barclay, though a good one for the time, having become obsolete, not less than three translations appeared in the middle and end of the seventeenth century—one by William Crosse, and the other two by anonymous authors. These early translations are all "Faithfully done in English," according to the taste of the time, which, if the sense were tolerably rendered, was little solicitous for accuracy, and still less for elegance of diction*. In Rowe's translation, 1709, the sense of the author is given with correctness, but the style is feeble and colloquial. Gordon, better known as the translator of Tacitus, also translated Sallust in 1744. His version is accompanied with a series of discourses on topics connected with Roman history, as on faction and parties, public corruption, and civil wars. The Epistles of Sallust to Cæsar on Government, are also translated by him, and their authenticity vindicated. In 1751, Dr Rose published a new translation of the Catilinarian and Jugurthine Wars. "This translation," says Steuart, "is justly entitled to the esteem in which it has been held, and the author himself to considerable praise, for his endeavours to combine the advantages of a free and literal version. His chief defect proceeds from what constitutes the great difficulty in all classical translation—the uniting a clear transfusion of the sense with the ease and freedom of original composition. To the critical reader, this will be abundantly obvious, if he compare the version of Sallust with the original pieces of Dr Rose himself. In the speeches, too, where the ancient writers laid out all their energy, and in which they should be followed by a like effort of the translator, the author is cold and languid, and he rises on no occasion above the level of ordinary narrative." The most recent English translation is that by the author above quoted—1806, two volumes quarto. Two long Essays, with notes, are prefixed to it—the one on the Life, and the other on the Literary Character and Writings of Sallust.

* Stuart's *Sallust*, Essay II.

The Spanish translation of Sallust, executed under the auspices of the Infant Don Gabriel, has been much celebrated on account of its plates and incomparable typography. It was printed in 1772.

CÆSAR.

Lupus, Abbot of Ferriers, says, in one of his letters, that no historic work of Cæsar was extant, except his Commentaries on the Gallic War, of which he promises to send his correspondent, the Bishop Heribold, a copy, as soon as he can procure one*. The other Commentaries, *De Bello Civili*, and *De Bello Alexandrino*, of which he speaks as being also extant, were written, he affirms, by Hirtius. It thus appears, that though Lupus was mistaken as to the author of the work *De Bello Civili*, the whole series of memoirs now known by the name of Cæsar's Commentaries, was extant in the ninth century. About a century afterwards, Pope Gerbert, or Sylvester II., writes to the Archbishop of Rheims to procure the loan of a copy of Cæsar from the Abbot of Terdon, who was possessed of one, and to have it transcribed for him†. Cæsar's Commentaries are repeatedly quoted in the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais, a work of the thirteenth century, and in various other productions of the same period. It is probable, therefore, that copies of them were not very scarce in that age; but they had become so rare by the middle of the fifteenth century, that Candidi, in a letter to Niccolo Niccoli, announces the discovery of a MS. of Cæsar as a great event.

Andrea, Bishop of Aleria, took charge of the first edition of Cæsar, and an erudite epistle by him is prefixed to it. It came forth at Rome, from the printing-press of Sweyn and Pannartz, as early as the year 1469. Of this *Editio Princeps* of Cæsar, only 275 copies were thrown off; but it was reprinted at the same place in 1472. There were a good many editions published towards the end of the fifteenth century, most of which have now become rare. The first of the ensuing century was that of Philippus Beroaldus, (Bologna 1504). It was followed by the Aldine editions, (Venice 1513-19,) which are not so remarkable either for accuracy or beauty as the other early editions of the Classics which issued from the celebrated press of the Manutii. The first had seven pages of errata—"Mendis scatet," say the Bipontine editors. In the edition, 1666, there were inserted plates of warlike instruments, encampments, and the most celebrated places mentioned in Cæsar's campaigns, which became a common ornament and appendage in subsequent impressions.

Fulvius Ursinus published an edition of considerable note in 1570. Ursinus had discovered a MS. written in the middle of the tenth century, which he chiefly employed in the correction of the text. He is accused of having committed a literary theft in the publication of this work, it being alleged that he had received many annotations from Petrus Ciaconius, which he mixed up with his own, and inserted as such, suppressing altogether the name of the real author.

The next edition of any eminence, was that of Strada (Frankfort, 1574). This impression is remarkable for containing forty plates of battles, and other things relating to the campaigns of Cæsar; as also inscriptions, found in various cities of Spain. It is also distinguished as having been the prototype of Clarke's splendid edition of Cæsar, which Mr Dibdin pronounces to be "the most sumptuous classical volume which this country ever produced. It contains," says he, "eighty-seven copperplates, which were engraved at the expense of the different noblemen to whom they are dedicated. Of these plates, I am not disposed to think so highly as some fond admirers: The head of Marlborough, to whom this courtly work is dedicated, by Kneller and Vertue, does not convey any exalted idea of that renowned hero; and the bust of Julius Cæsar, which follows it, will appear meagre and inelegant to those who have contemplated a similar print in the quarto publication of Lavater's Physiognomy. The plates are in general rather curious than ably executed; and compared with what Flaxman has done for Homer and Æschylus, are tasteless and uninspired. The type of this magnificent volume is truly beautiful and splendid, and for its fine lustre and perfect execution, reflects immortality on the publisher. The text is accompanied with various readings in the mar-

* *Epist.* 37.† *Epist.* 8.

gin; and at the end of the volume, after the fragments of Cæsar, are the critical notes of the editor, compiled with great labour from the collation of ancient MSS. and former editions. A MS. in the Queen's library, and one belonging to the Bishop of Ely, were particularly consulted by Dr Clarke. The work closes with a large and correct index of names and places. It is upon the whole a most splendid edition, and will be a lasting monument of the taste, as well as erudition of the editor."

The best edition since the time of Dr Clarke's, is that by Oudendorp, printed at Leyden in 1737. This editor had the use of many ancient MSS., particularly two of the beginning of the ninth century, one of which had belonged to Julius Bongardus, and the other to Petrus Bellovacensis. "The preceding commentators on Cæsar," says Harles, "have all been eclipsed by the skill and researches of Oudendorp, who, by a careful examination of numerous MSS. and editions, has often successfully restored the true ancient reading of his author." He has inserted in his publication Dodwell's disquisition concerning the author of the books *De Bello Alexandrino*, and Scaliger's *Topographical Description of Gaul*. Morus reprinted this edition, but with many critical improvements, at Leipsic, 1790. He has illustrated the military tactics of Cæsar, from Ritter's History of the Gauls, and from the books of Guischarius, *De Re Militari Veterum*. The best modern German edition is that of Oberlin, (Leipsic, 1805). It is founded on the basis of those of Oudendorp and Morus, with additional observations, and a careful revision of the text. In the preface, those writings in which the faith due to Cæsar's Commentaries is attempted to be shaken, are reviewed and refuted; and there are added several fragments of Cæsar, as also those notices of ancient authors concerning him, which had been neglected or omitted by Morus.

Cæsar was first rendered into *Italian* by Agost. Ortica, the translator of Sallust. He says, in the preface, that his version was executed in a very hurried manner, as it was transcribed and printed all in the course of six months. Argelati could not ascertain the date of the most ancient edition, which was printed at Milan, but he thinks that it was as old as the fifteenth century*. This impression was followed by not fewer than twelve others, before the middle of the sixteenth century. A subsequent translation, by F. Baldelli, appeared at Venice, 1554. This edition was succeeded by many others, particularly one at Venice in 1595, quarto, of which Palladio, the great architect, took charge. He inserted in it various engravings of battles, encampments, sieges, and other military operations, from plates which had been executed by his two sons, Leonida and Orazio, and had come into his hands soon after their premature decease. He prepared the edition chiefly for the sake of introducing these designs, and thereby honouring the memory of his children. To this edition there is a preface by Palladio on the military affairs of the Romans, their legions, arms, and encampments. A splendid impression of Baldelli's version, accompanied with Palladio's designs, was thrown off at Venice in 1619. In 1737, a translation appeared at Venice, bearing to be printed from an ancient MS. of Cæsar, in Italian, which the editor says he had discovered, (*where he does not specify,*) and had in some few places corrected and modernized. Paitoni has exposed this literary fraud, and has shown, that it is just the translation of Baldelli, with a few words altered at the beginning of paragraphs. In some respects, however, it is a good edition, containing various tables and notices conducive to the proper understanding of the author.

We have seen that several translations of the Latin classics were executed by order of the French king, John. Charles V., who succeeded him in 1364, was a still warmer patron of learning, and was himself tolerably versed in Latin literature. "Tant que compètement," says Christine de Pise, in her *Memoirs* of him, "entendoit son Latin." By his order and directions the first *French* translation of Cæsar was undertaken†. But the earliest French translation of Cæsar's Commentaries which was printed, was that of Robert Gaguin, dedicated to Charles VIII. and published in 1485. Of the recent French versions the most esteemed is that by Turpin de Crisei, accompanied by historical and critical notes, and printed at Montargis, 1785.

* *Biblioteca degli Volgarizzatori*, Tom. I. p. 206.

† Villaret, *Hist. de France*, T. XI. p. 121.

The part of Cæsar's Commentaries which relates to the Gallic wars was translated into English as early as 1565, by Arthur Golding, who dedicated his work to Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burleigh. In 1696, a translation of the whole Commentaries was printed with the following title: "The Commentaries of Cæsar, of his Wars in Gallia, and of the Civil Wars betwixt him and Pompey, with many excellent and judicious Observations thereupon; as also, the Art of our Modern Training; by Clement Edmonds, Esq." The best translation is that by "William Duncan, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen, printed at London, 1755," with a long preliminary Discourse concerning the Roman Art of War.

CICERO.

Some of Cicero's orations were studied harangues, which he had prepared and written over previous to their delivery. This, however, was not the case with the greater proportion of his speeches, most of which were pronounced without much premeditation, but were afterwards copied out, with such corrections and embellishments as bestowed on them a greater polish and lustre than when they had originally fallen from his lips. Before the invention of printing had increased the means of satisfying public curiosity, as no oration was given to the world but by the author himself, he had always the power of altering and improving by his experience of the effect it produced at delivery. Pliny informs us, that many things on which Cicero had enlarged at the time when he actually spoke in the Senate and the Forum, were retrenched when he ultimately gave his orations to the public in writing*. Cicero himself had somewhere declared, that the defence of Cornelius had occupied four days, whence Pliny concludes, that those orations which, when delivered at full length, took up so much time at the bar, were greatly altered and abridged, when he afterwards comprised them in a single volume. The orations, in particular, for Muræna and Varenus, he says, seem now to contain merely the general heads of a discourse. Sometimes, however, they were extended and not curtailed, by the orator in the closet, as was confessedly the case in the defence of Milo. A few of the orations which Cicero had delivered, he did not consider as at all worthy of preservation. Thus, of the oration for Dejotarus, he says, in one of his letters to Dolabella, "I did not imagine that I had preserved among my papers the trifling speech which I made in behalf of Dejotarus; however, I have found it, and sent it to you, agreeably to your request." This accounts for many speeches of Cicero, the delivery of which is recorded in history, being now lost. It appears, however, that those which he considered deserving of his care, though they may be widely different from the state in which they were originally pronounced, came pure from the hand of the author, either in the shape in which he would have wished to have delivered them, or in that which he considered best adapted for publication and perusal. They were probably transcribed by himself, and copies of them multiplied by his freedmen, such as Tyro and Tyrannio, whom he had accustomed to accurate transcription. His orations had also the good fortune to meet, at a very early period, with a judicious and learned commentator in the person of Asconius Pedianus, a grammarian in the reign of Nero, part of whose Commentary was discovered by Poggio, along with other classical works, in the monastery of St Gall, near Constance.

All the orations of Cicero were not lost during the middle ages. Pope Gerbert, in one of his letters, asks from the Abbot Gesilbert a copy of the concluding part of the speech for Dejotarus; and he writes to another of his correspondents, to bring him Cicero's treatise *De Republicâ*, and the Orations against Verres, "Comitetur iter trum Tulliana opuscula, et de Republicâ et in Verrem†." Brunetto Latini, who died in 1294, translated into Italian the orations for Dejotarus, Marcellus, and Ligarius, which were afterwards printed at Lyons in 1685. These three harangues

* *Plin. Epist. Lib. I. Ep. 20.*

† *Epist. Famil. Lib. IX. Ep. 12.*

‡ *Epist. 87.*

§ *Trabocchi, Stor. dell. Litt. Ital. Tom. IV. Lib. III. c. 5. § 21. Maffei, Traduttori Ital. p. 41.*

being in a great measure complimentary addresses to Cæsar, and containing no sentiment but what might be safely expressed in presence of an unlimited sovereign, more transcripts had been made of them in Rome's tyrannical ages, than of those orations which breathed forth the expiring spirit of liberty.

Cicero was the idol of Petrarch, the great restorer of classical literature. He never could speak of him but in terms of deep and enthusiastic admiration. The sweetness and sonorousness of Tully's periods charmed his ear; and though unable to penetrate the depths of his philosophy, yet his vigorous fancy often soared with the Roman orator into the highest regions of imagination. Hence, while eager for the discovery of all the classics, his chief diligence was exercised in endeavouring to preserve such works of Cicero as were then known, and to recover such as were lost*. Petrarch received in loan from Lapo of Castiglionchio a copy of several of Cicero's orations, among which were the *Philippics*, and the oration for Milo. These he kept by him for four years, that he might transcribe them with his own hand, on account of the blunders of the copyists in that age. This we learn from the letters of Lapo, published by the Abbé Mehus. Coming to Liege when about twenty-five years of age, that is, in 1329, Petrarch remained there till two orations of Cicero, which he had discovered in that city, were transcribed, one by his own hand, and another by a friend, both of which were immediately transmitted by him to Italy. He was detained at Liege for some time by the difficulty of procuring even the worst sort of ink. Several other orations of Cicero were discovered by Petrarch in different parts of Italy.

Dominico Arretino, who was nearly contemporary with Petrarch, declares, in one of his works, entitled *Fons*, that he had seen eleven of Cicero's orations, and that a person had told him that he actually possessed and had read twenty of them†. It appears, however, that in the time of Cosmo de Medici those works of Cicero which were extant were very much corrupted. "Illorum librorum," says Niccolò Niccoli, speaking of some of the works of Cicero, "magna pars interitæ, ni vero qui supersunt adeo mendosi sunt, ut paulo ab interitu distent;" hence, in the middle of the fifteenth century, the discovery of a new MS. of Cicero was hailed as a new acquisition. At Langres, in a library of the monks of Clugni, in Burgundy, Poggio found the oration for Cæcina, which he immediately transcribed, and sent various copies of it to his friends in Italy. In the monasteries around Constance he discovered the two orations against Rullus, *De Lege Agrariâ*, and that to the people on the same subject; also the orations *Pro Rabirio*, and *Pro Roscio*. A note on the MS. copy of the oration in *Pisonem*, preserved in the abbey of Santa Maria, in Florence, records the fact of this harangue having been likewise discovered by Poggio‡.

A compendium of Cicero's treatise *De Inventione* was well known in the dark ages, having been translated into Italian, in an abridged form, in the thirteenth century, by a professor of Bologna. This was almost the first prose work which had appeared in the language, and was printed at Lyons with the *Ethics of Aristotle*, by Brunetto Latini, who also translated the first book *De Inventione*§. Lupus of Ferrieres possessed a copy of Cicero's *Rhetorica*, as he himself informs us||, but it was incomplete; and he accordingly asks Einhart, who had been his preceptor, for the loan of his MS. of this work, in order that his own might be perfected. Ingulphus, who flourished in England towards the close of the eleventh century, declares, that he was sent from Westminster to the school at Oxford, where he learned Aristotle, and the first two books of Tully's *Rhetorica*¶. Now, if the first two books of the *Rhetorica*, which are all that have hitherto been discovered, were used as an elementary work in the public school at Oxford, they can hardly be supposed to have been very scarce in Italy. From the jurisconsult, Raymond Superantius, or Sorranza, to whom he had been indebted for the books *De Gloria*, Petrarch received an imperfect copy of the tract *De Oratore*, of which the MSS., though generally incomplete, were by no means uncommon at that period. "Ab hoc

* *Epist. Ad Vir. Illust.* ep. 2. † Mehus, *Vit. Ambros. Camald.* p. 213.

‡ Ginguenê, *Hist. Lit. d'Italie*, Tom. II. Shepherd's *Life of Poggio*. Bordini, *Catal. Codic. Biblioth. Medic. Laurent.* Tom. II. p. 432.

§ Paitoni, *Bibliothec. degli Autor. Volgari*zati.

|| *Epist.* 1.

¶ Hallam's *Europe during the Middle Ages*, Vol. III. p. 524. 3d ed.

habui," says he, "et Varronis et Ciceronis aliqua: Cujus unum volumen de communibus fuit; sed inter ipsa communia libri de Oratore ac de Legibus imperfecti, ut fere semper inveniuntur." Nearly half a century from the death of Petarch had elapsed, before the discovery of a complete copy of Cicero's rhetorical works. It was about the year 1418, during the Popedom of Martin V., and while Poggio was in England, that Gerard Landriani, Bishop of Lodi, found in that city, among the ruins of an ancient monastery, a MS., containing Cicero's treatise *De Oratore*, his *Brutus* and *Orator*. He carried the MS. with him to Milan, and there gave it to Gaspar Bazizza. The character, however, in which it was written, was such, that few scholars or antiquaries in that city could read it. At length Cosmus, a young Veronese scholar, deciphered and transcribed the dialogue *De Oratore*. Blondus Flavius, the author of the *Italia Illustrata*, who had come in early youth from his native place, Forli, to Milan, transcribed the *Brutus*, and sent copies of it to Guarinus of Verona, and Leonard Justiniani, at Venice. By these means the rhetorical works of Cicero were soon diffused all over Italy. The discovery was hailed as a triumph, and subject of public congratulation. Poggio was informed of it while in England, and there awaited the arrival of a copy with the most lively impatience*.

The philosophic writings of Cicero have descended to us in a more imperfect state than his oratorical dialogues or orations. In consequence of the noble spirit of freedom and patriotism which they breathe, their proscription would no doubt speedily follow that of their author. There is a common story of a grandson of Augustus concealing one of Cicero's philosophic works, on being detected while perusing it by his grandfather, and though he received his gracious permission to finish it, the anecdote shews that it was among the *libri prohibiti*. The chief reading, indeed, of Alexander Severus, was the *Republic* and *Offices*†: But Alexander was an imperial phoenix, which never revived in the Roman empire; and we hear little of Cicero during the reigns of the barbarian sovereigns of Italy in the middle ages.

Petrarch procured an imperfect copy of Cicero's treatise *De Legibus*, from the Lawyer Raymond Sorranza‡, who had a most extensive library, and to whom, as we have just seen, he had been indebted for a MS. of the dialogue *De Oratore*.

No further discovery was subsequently made of the remaining parts of the work *De Legibus*. The other philosophical writings of Cicero were found by Petrarch among the books in his father's library, or were recovered for him by the persons whom he employed for this purpose in almost every quarter of Italy: "Abeuntibus amicis," says he, "et, ut fit, petentibus numquid e patriâ suâ vellem, respondebam,—nihil præter libros Ciceronis." Petrarch frequently quotes the treatise *De Firmibus*, as a work with which he was familiar. Leonard Arétine, however, has been generally considered as the discoverer of that dialogue, as also of the treatise *De Naturâ Deorum*§.

"There is no collection of my letters," says Cicero, in one of his epistles to Atticus; "but Tiro has about seventy of them, and you can furnish some more. I must look over and correct them, and then they may be published." This, however, never was accomplished by himself. After the revolution of the Roman state, the publication of his letters must have been dangerous, on account of the freedom with which he expresses himself concerning Octavius, and the ministers of his power. Cornelius Nepos mentions, that some of Cicero's letters were published, but that sixteen books of Epistles to Atticus, from his consulship to his death, though extant, were by no means in common circulation||. The reigns of the princes who succeeded Augustus, were not more favourable to freedom than his own; and hence the Familiar Letters, as well as those to Atticus, probably remained long in the cabinets

* B. Flavii, *Ital. Illust.* p. 346. ap. Meiners, *Lebensbeschreibung Berühmter männer*, Tom. I. p. 39. Ginguené, *Hist. Lit.* Tom. II. Pet. Victor. in *Castigat. ad Cicer. post castig. in Paradox.*

† Lemprid. in *Alex. Sev.* c. 29. "Latine cùm legeret, non alia magis legebat quam de Officiis Ciceronis et De Republicâ."

‡ *Epist. Senil.* Lib. XV. Ep. 1.

§ Clayton's *History of the House of Medici*, c. 3.

|| *Vit. Attic.* c. 16.

of the curious, before they received any critical inspection. The Letters of Cicero, however, were well known in the middle ages, and even in those times pains were taken to have accurate copies of them. Lupus Ferrariensis procured duplicates of Cicero's Epistles, in order to collate them with his own MSS., and thus to make up a correct and complete collection*. John of Salisbury cites two of Cicero's letters to Cato Cassius; one of which is now contained in the twelfth, and the other in the fifteenth book of the *Familiar Epistles*. In the Life of Julius Cæsar, which passes under the name of Julius Cæsar, and which was written during the middle ages, extracts are occasionally made from the *Familiar Epistles*. They had become scarce, however, at the time when Petrarch found a copy of them at Verona, a place where he little expected to make such a discovery†. This old MS., which Victorius thinks of the age of the Florentine Pandects, ultimately came into the Medicean library; and a copy which Petrarch had transcribed from it, was brought from Padua to Florence by Niccolo Niccoli, at whose death it was placed in the library of St Marc in that city‡. Several scholars who inspected both have observed, that the transcript by Petrarch differed in some respects from the original. It was also marked with various corrections and glosses, in the hand-writing of Niccolo Niccoli himself||. All the other MSS. of the *Familiar Epistles* flowed from this discovered by Petrarch, as we learn from a passage of Lagomarsinus, who speaks thus of the different codices of the *Epistole Familiæres*: "Quibus tamen ego codicibus non tantum tribuo, quantum uni illi omnium quotquot ubique terrarum, idem epistolarum corpus continentes, extant, vetustissimo, (et ex quo cæteros omnes qui usquam sunt tanquam e fonte ac capite manasse, et Angelus Politianus, et Petrus Victorius memoria prodiderunt,) qui Florentiæ in Mediceo-Laurentianæ Bibliothecæ XLIX. adservatur numero IX. extra notatus." There has been a good deal of doubt and discussion how these Letters first came to obtain the title of *Familiæres*. They are not so called in any original MS. of Cicero, nor are they cited by this name in any ancient author, as Aulus Gellius, or Priscian. These writers generally quote each book of the Epistles by the name of the person to whom the first letter in that book is addressed. Thus Gellius cites the first book by the name of the Letters to Lentulus, because it commences with a letter to him. Nor are the MSS. in which the appellation of the *Epistole Familiæres* is employed uniform in the title. In some MSS. they are called *Epistole Familiæres*, in others, *Epistole ad Familiæres*, and in a Palatine MS. *Libri Epistolarum Familiærum*.

Previous to the year 1340, Petrarch also discovered the *Epistles to Atticus**†, which had been missing for many centuries; and on perusing them, declared that he now recognized Cicero as an inconsiderate and unfortunate old man. He copied them over with his own hand, and arranged them in their proper order. The MS. in his hand-writing passed, after his death, into the possession of Coluccio Salutati, and subsequently became the property of Coluccio's disciple Leonard Aretine. Donatus, the son of Leonard, succeeded to it, and by him it was transferred to Donatus Acciaiolus. After his decease, it fell into the hands of an obscure grammarian, who gave it to Bartolomeo Cavalcanti, in whose library it was consulted by P. Victorius, and was afterwards bestowed on him by the owner. Victorius, highly valuing this MS., which he first recognised to be in the hand-writing of Petrarch, conceived that it would be preserved with greatest security in some public collection; and he accordingly presented it to Cosmo, the first Duke of Tuscany, to be deposited in the Medicean library††. With regard to the most ancient MS. from which Petrarch made the copy, it unfortunately was lost, as Petrus Victorius laments in one of his Epistles‡‡. "Utinam inveniretur exemplum, unde has ad Atticum descripsit Petrus, ut exstat illud, quo usus est in describendis alteris illis, quas Familiæres appellantur, de cujus libri antiquitate, omni veneratione digna, magnifice multa vereque alio loco predicavi." It thus appears, that the Epistles to Atticus were well known to Petrarch. Still, however, as they were scarce in the fifteenth century, Poggio, who found a copy, while attending the Council of Constantine,

* *Epist.* 69.

† Mehus, *Vit. Ambros. Camald.* p. 214.

|| *Pet. Vict. Epist.*

†† *Epist. ad Vir. Illust. Ep. I.*

‡‡ *Lib. VII.*

† Petrarch, *Epist. ad Vivos Illust. Ep. I.*

§ Fabricius, *Bib. Lat. Lib. I. c. 8.*

¶ Lagomarsini, *ad Poggii Epist. I. 189.*

†† Bandini, *Catalog. Bib. Laurent. p. 474.*

was considered in his own age as the discoverer of the entire collection of the *Epistles to Atticus*, and has been regarded in the same light by modern writers.

The three books of the Letters of Cicero to his brother Quintus, were found by an Italian grammarian, Casparinus of Bergamo, who died in the year 1431; and who some time before his death had taken great pains to amend their corrupted text*. That they were much corrupted, may be conjectured from what we know of the manner in which they were originally written, for it appears, from one of the Letters of Cicero†, that Quintus had complained that he could scarcely read some of his former letters. Now, when Quintus could scarcely read his brother's handwriting, what must have been the difficulties and mistakes of the *Librarius* by whom they were first collected and copied?

Cicero's translation of Aratus appears to have been extant in the ninth century. Lupus of Ferrières had an imperfect copy of it, and begs a complete copy from his correspondent Ansbald. "Tu autem," says he, "huic nostro cursori Tullium in Arato trade; ut ex eo, quem me impetratum credo, que deesse illi Egil noster aperuit, suppleantur."

Various editions of separate portions of the writings of Cicero were printed before the publication of a complete collection of his works. *The Orations*—the treatise *De Oratore*—the *Opera Philosophica*—the *Epistole Familiars*—and *Ad Atticum*, were all edited in Italy between the years 1466 and 1471—most of them being printed at Rome by Sweynhelm and Pannartz. The most ancient printing-press in Italy was that established at the Monastery of Subiaco, in the Campagna di Roma, by these printers. Sweynhelm and Pannartz were two German scholars, who had been induced to settle at that convent by the circumstance that it was chiefly inhabited by German monks. In 1467, they went from Subiaco, to Rome; after this removal, they received in correcting their editions, the assistance of a poor but eminent scholar, Giandrea de Bussi; and were aided by the patronage of Andrea, Bishop of Aleria, who furnished prefaces to many of their classical editions. Notwithstanding the rage for classical MSS. which had so recently existed, and the novelty, usefulness, and importance of the art which they first introduced into Italy, as also the support which they received from men of rank and learning, they laboured under the greatest difficulties, and prosecuted their undertaking with very inadequate compensation, as we learn from a petition presented, 1472, in their names, to Pope Sixtus, by the chief patron, the Bishop of Aleria. Their necessities were probably produced by the number of copies of each impression which they threw off, and which exceeding the demand, they were so encumbered by those left on their hands, as to be reduced to the greatest poverty and distress. The first book which they printed at Rome, was the *Epistole Familiars* of Cicero.

Alexander Minutianus, who published an edition of the whole works at Milan, 1496, in four volumes folio, was the first person who comprised the scattered publications of Cicero in one uniform book. Harles informs us, in one passage, that Minutianus did not consult any MSS. in the preparation of this edition, but merely collated the editions of the separate parts of Cicero's writings previously published, so that his work is only a continued reimpression of preceding editions; but he elsewhere mentions, that he had inspected the MSS. of the Orations which Poggio had brought from Germany to Italy*†. In the Orations, Minutianus chiefly followed the Brescian edition, 1433, which was itself founded on that of Rome. The work was printed off, not according to the best arrangement, but as the copies of the preceding editions successively reached him, which he himself acknowledges in the preface. "Sed quam necessitas prescripsit dum vetustiora exemplaria ex diversis et longinquis locis expectamus." "If we peruse Saxius," says Mr Dibdin, "we shall see with what toil, and at what a heavy expense, this celebrated work of Minutianus was compiled." De Bure and Ernesti are lavish in their praises of its typographical beauty. The latter says it is printed "grandi modulo, chartis et lite-

* Fuhrmann, *Handbuch der Classisch. Lit.* T. IV. p. 208.

† *Epist.* Lib. II. Ep. 15.

† *Epist.* 69.

§ Tiraboschi, *Stor. dell' Letterat. Ital.* T. VI. Part I. Lib. I.

|| Beloe, *Anecdotes of Literature and Scarce Books*, Vol. VI. p. 140.

¶ *Introduct. in Notit. Literat. Roman.* p. 47.

*† *Ibid.* p. 84.

ris pulchris et splendidis." The Aldine edition, which was published in parts from 1512 to 1523, is not accounted a very critical or correct one, though the latter portion of it was printed under the care of Naugerius. It would be endless to enumerate the subsequent editions of Cicero. That of Petrus Victorius, however, whom Harles calls *Ciceronis Æsculapius*, printed at Venice in 1534—37, in four volumes folio, should not be forgotten, as there is no commentator to whom Cicero has been more indebted than to Victorius, particularly in the correction and emendation of the Epistles. The edition of Lambinus, Paris, 1566, also deserves notice. Lambinus was an acute and daring commentator, who made many corrections on the text, but adopted some alterations too rashly. From his time downwards, Harles thinks that the editors of Cicero may be divided into two classes; some following the bold changes introduced by Lambinus, and others preferring the more scrupulous text of Victorius. Of the latter class was Gruterus, who, in his edition published at Hamburg, 1618, appears to have obstinately rejected even the most obvious emendations which had been recently made on the text of his author. The three editions of Ernesti's Cicero, (Lips. 1737, Hal. Sax. 1758—74,) and the three of Olivet's, (Paris, 1740, Geneva, 1758, Oxon. 1763,) are too well known to be particularized or described. Olivet did not collate MSS.; but he compared with each other what he considered as the four most important editions of Cicero; those of P. Victorius, Paulus Manutius, Lambinus, and Gruterus. In 1795, the first volume of a new edition of Cicero, by Beck, was printed at Leipsic, and since that period, three more volumes, at long intervals, have fallen from the press. The last volume which appeared, was in 1807; and along with the three by which it was preceded, comprehends the Orations of Cicero. The preface contains a very full account of preceding editions, and the most authoritative MSS. of Cicero. Ernesti's editions were adopted as the basis of the text; but the editor departs from them where he sees occasion. He does not propose many new emendations of his own; but he seems a very acute judge of the merit of various readings, and a judicious selector from the corrections of others. While this edition of Beck was proceeding in Germany, Schütz brought forth another, which is now completed, except part of the *Index Latinitatis*. There are few notes subjoined to the text; but long summaries are prefixed to each oration and work of Cicero; and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is introduced by an ample dissertation concerning the real author of that treatise. A new arrangement of the *Epistolæ Familiæres* has also been adopted. They are no longer printed, as in most other editions, in a chronological series, but are classed according to the individuals to whom they are addressed. The whole publication is dedicated to Great Britain and the Allied Sovereigns, in a long columnar panegyric.

There have also been lately published in Germany, several learned and critical editions of separate portions of the works of Cicero, particularly his Philosophical Writings. The edition of all his Philosophic Treatises, by Goersenz, which is now proceeding and already comprehends the *Academica*, the dialogues *De Legibus* and *De Finibus*, is distinguished by intelligent Prefaces and Excursuses on the periods of the composition of the respective Dialogues; as also on the design of the author in their composition.

The translations of Cicero are so numerous, that for the Italian translations I must refer the reader to Paitoni, *Biblioteca degli autori antichi Greci e Latini Volgarezzati*, Tom. I. p. 219; and Argelati, *Biblioteca degli Volgarezzatori*, Tom. I. p. 214. For French versions, to Goujet, *Bibliothèque Française*, Tom. II. p. 221; and, for English, to Brüggemann, *View of the Editions and Translations of the Ancient Greek and Latin authors*, p. 481.

FOR the benefit of those who wish to prosecute their inquiries into the subject of Roman Literature, I have subjoined a note of some of the most important Books which treat of the subject. An asterisk is prefixed to the titles of those works which have been consulted by me in the compilation of the preceding pages.

AIMERICHIUS.—*Specimen veteris Romanae Litteraturae deperdita vel adhuc latentis, seu Syllabus Historicus et Criticus veterum olim notis eruditionis Romanorum, ab urbe conditâ ad Honorii Augusti excessum, eorum imprimis quorum Latina opera vel omnino vel ex parte desiderantur.* Ferrara, 1784. 8vo.

“ This work is intended to give an idea of Roman literature, from the foundation of the city to the death of the Emperor Honorius. The preface, written by a friend of the author, gives an account of the manner in which the Romans lived, both in the capital and in the provinces, during this long period. The historical and literary Syllabus contains, under nine articles, a variety of literary matters. In the first, the Abbé Aimerichius gives us brief notices, and a critical review of the ancient Roman writers, both Pagan and Christian, whose works were extant in public or private libraries, before the death of the Emperor Honorius. In the second, we have the titles and subjects of several works which have been lost, but which have been cited or indicated by contemporary writers, or writers nearly such, whose testimonies are related by our author. The third contains an account of the most celebrated public or private libraries, that were known at Rome before the death of Honorius: and, in the fourth, we have the author’s inquiries concerning the pronunciation of the Romans, their manner of writing, and the changes which took place in their orthography. In the fifth, the Abbé treats of the magistracies that could not be obtained, either at Rome or in the provinces, but by men of letters, as also of rites and sacrifices, of luxury, riches, public shows, &c. In the sixth, he gives his particular opinion concerning the ancient literature of the Romans, and the mixture of the Latin and Greek languages which they employed, both in their conversation and in their writings. The seventh contains an indication of the principal heresies that disturbed the church, from the time of the Apostles to that of Honorius; and the eighth several memorable facts and maxims, not generally known, which belong to the literary, civil, military, and ecclesiastical history of this period. In the concluding article, the Abbé takes notice of the Latin works which had been lost for a considerable time, and shows how, and by whom, they were first discovered.”— From this account, which I have extracted from Horne’s *Introduction to the Study of Bibliography*, I regret extremely that I have had no opportunity of consulting the work of Aimerichius.

BLESSIG.—*De Origine Philosophiæ apud Romanos.* Strasburgh, 1770. 4to.

BECKMANNUS.—*Methodus ad linguam Latinam cum Tractatu de Originibus Lingua Latina.* 1608. 8vo.

***CASAUBON.**—*De Satyrica Græcorum Pœsi et Romanorum Satira libri duo, in quibus etiam Pœta recensentur, qui in utrâque pœsi floruerunt.* Halle, 1774. 8vo.

This treatise, which is one of the most learned and agreeable productions of Casaubon, is the source of almost everything that has been written by modern

authors, on the subject of the satiric poetry of the Romans. Casaubon traces its early history in the Fescennine verses, the Atellane fables, and the satires of Ennius and Lucilius, and vindicates to the Romans the invention of this species of composition, for which, he contends, they had no model in the poetry of the Greeks.

CELLARIUS.—*Dissertatio de Studiis Romanorum Literariis*. Halle, 1696. 4to.

CORRADUS.—*Quæstura—Partes duas, quarum altera de Ciceronis Vita et Libris—Altera Ciceronis Libros permultis locis emendat*. Lips. 1754. 8vo.

*CRUSIUS.—*Lives of the Roman Poets*. London, 1733. 2 Vols.

*EERHARDT.—*Über den Zustand der Schönen Wissenschaften bei den Römern*. Altona, 1801. 8vo.

This work was written by a Swede, and in the Swedish language. It contains, in its original form, a very superficial and inaccurate sketch of the subject; but some valuable notes and corrections accompany the German translation.

*FABRICIUS.—*Bibliotheca Latina, digesta et exacta diligentia Jo. Aug. Ernesti*. Lips. 1773. 3 Tom. 8vo.

The well-known and justly-esteemed *Bibliotheca* of Fabricius gives an account of all the Latin writers from Plautus to Marcan Capella. In most of the articles we have a biographical sketch of the author—a list of his writings—an account of the most authoritative MSS. of his works—of the best editions, and of the most celebrated translations in the modern languages of Europe.

FUEHMANN.—*Handbuch der Classischen Literatur, oder Anleitung zur Kenntniss der Griechischen und Römischen Classischen Schriftsteller, ihren Schriften, und der besten Ausgaben, und Uebersetzungen derselben*. Rudolstadt, 1809—10.

Two of the volumes of this work relate to Roman literature. It is chiefly bibliographical, containing very full accounts of the editions and translations of the Classics which have appeared, particularly in Germany; but there are also some critical accounts of the works of the Roman authors: these are chiefly extracted from Journals and Reviews, and, in consequence, the author frequently repeats the same thing in different words, and still more frequently contradicts himself.

*FUEHMANN.—*Anleitung zur Geschichte der Classischen Literatur der Griechen und Römer*. Rudolstadt, 1816.

An abridgment of the preceding work.

*FUNCCIUS.—*De Origine et Pueritia, De Adolescentia, Virili Ætate, et Senectute Lingua Latina*. Frankfort, 1720.

This is one of the most learned and valuable works extant on the subject of Latin literature. In the first tract, *De Pueritia*, the author chiefly treats of the origin and progress of the Roman language.

*GAUDENTIUS PAGANINUS.—*De Philosophia ap. Romanos Ortu et Progressu*. Pisa, 1643, 4.

A very dull and imperfect account of the state of philosophy among the Romans, from the earliest periods to the time of Boethius.

*HANKIUS. (MART.)—*De Romanarum Rerum Scriptoribus*. Lips. 1687. 4to.

The first part of this work contains a succinct account of the ancient Roman Annalists and Historians. The latter part relates to modern writers who treated of Roman affairs.

*HARLES. (TH. CHRIST.)—*Introductio in Notitiam Literaturæ Romanæ, imprimis Scriptorum Latinorum*. Noriberg. 1781. 2 Tom. 8vo.

This work of Harles, as far as it extends, is written on the same plan, and is much of the same description, as the *Bibliotheca* of Fabricius. It is not continued farther, however, than the Augustan æge inclusive.

*HARLES. (TH. CHRIST.)—*Brevior Notitia Litteraturæ Romanæ, imprimis Scriptorum Latinorum*. Lips. 1788. 1 Tom. 8vo.

*HARLES. (TH. CHRIST.)—*Supplementa ad Breviorem Notitiam Litteraturæ Romanæ*. Lips. 1788. 2 Tom. 8vo.

This work, and the preceding, are on the same plan as the *Introductio*; but bring down the history of Roman writers, and the editions of their works, to the latest periods. It is much to be regretted, that these works of Harles had not been incorporated into one; since, taken separately, each is incomplete, and collectively, they abound in repetitions.

*KLÜGELING. (C. F.)—*Supplementa ad Breviorem Notitiam Litteraturæ Romanæ*. Lips. 1817.

This Supplement to Harles, contains an account of the editions of the Classics which had appeared chiefly in Germany, subsequent to the publication of the *Brevior Notitia*.

KÖNIG.—*De Satirâ Romanorum*. Oldenburgh, 1796.

KRIEGER.—*Diatribæ de Veterum Romanorum Peregrinationibus Academicis*. Jenæ, 1704. 4to.

LEO (ANNIBAL DI).—*Memorie di Pacuvio*. Neapol. 1768.

MEIEROTTO.—*De Præcipuis rerum Romanarum Scriptoribus*. Berlin, 1792. folio.

*MÜLLER.—*Einleitung zu nöthiger Kenntniss und Gebrauche der alten Lateinischen Schriftsteller*. Dresden, 1747. 5 Tom. 8vo.

*MOINE D'ORGEVAL.—*Considerations sur le Progrès des Belles Lettres chez les Romains*. Paris, 1749.

*OSANNUS.—*Analecta Critica, Poësis Romanorum scænicæ reliquiis illustrantia*. Berlin, 1717.

This is a work of considerable ingenuity and research. It contains some discussion concerning the date at which regular comedies and tragedies were first exhibited at Rome; but it is chiefly occupied with comparisons between the Fragments of the ancient Latin Dramatists, and the corresponding passages in the Greek originals.

*SAGITTARIUS (CASP.)—*Commentatio de Vitâ et Scriptis Liv. Andronici, Nævii, Ennii, Cæcili, Pacuvii, Attii, Attitii, Lucilii, Afranisi, Catonis*. Altenburg, 1672.

This is a small volume of 110 pages, which has now become extremely scarce.

SAGITTARIUS (CASP.)—*De Vitâ, scriptis, editionibus, interpretibus, lectione, atque imitatione Plauti, Terentii, Ciceronis*. Altenburg, 1671.

*SCHOELL.—*Histoire Abrégée de la Littérature Romains*. Paris, 1815. 4 Tom. 8vo.

See above. Preface, p. xiii.

*TIRABOSCHI.—*Storia della Litteratura Italiana*. Modena, 1797. Tom. I. and II.

See above. Préface, p. xiii.

*VOSSIUS (GERARD).—*De Historicis Latinis Libri tres*. Lugd. Bat. 1651.

*WALCHIUS.—*Historia Critica Latina Lingua*. Lips. 1761.

*ZIEGLER.—*De Minis Romanorum*. Gotting. 1799.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

	Born. A.U.C.	Dies. A.U.C.
L. Andronicus		534
Nævius . . .		550
Ennius . . .	515	585
Plautus . . .	525	570
Cæcilius . . .		586
Terence . . .	560	594
Pacuvius . . .	534	624
Attius . . .	584	664
Lucilius . . .	605	659 ?
Lucretius . . .	658	702
Catullus . . .	667	708 ?
Laberius . . .		710
Cato . . .	519	605
Varro . . .	637	727
Sallust . . .	668	718
Cæsar . . .	656	709
Hortensius . . .	640	703
Cicero . . .	647	710

INDEX.

- AFRANIUS**, his Comedies, vol. i. p. 170.
Agriculture, advantages of Italy for, ii. 6—11.
Antias, Q. Valerius, Latin Annalist, ii. 74.
Antipater, Cælius, Latin Annalist, ii. 72.
Antonius, Marcus, character of his eloquence, ii. 117. His death, 119.
Arcesilius founds the New Academy, ii. 206.
Asellio, Sempronius, Latin Annalist, ii. 73.
Atellane Fables, i. 229.
Attius, his Tragedies, i. 214.
- Brutus**, his Historical Epitomes, ii. 107.
- Cæcilius**, his Comedies, i. 163.
Cæcina, his history, ii. 108.
Cæsar compared with Xenophon, ii. 94. His Commentaries, 95—101. His Ephemeris, whether the same work with his Commentaries, 101. His Anticatones, 102. His Analogia, 108.
Calvus, Licinius, his Epigrams, i. 322. His orations, ii. 181.
Carmen Sallare, i. 43.
Carneades teaches the Greek philosophy at Rome, ii. 211.
Cato, the Censor, his work on Agriculture, ii. 12—16. His Orations, 16. His work *De Originibus*, 18. On Medicine, 20—21.
Catullus, i. 271—320.
Cethegus, Marcus, an orator, ii. 110.
Cicero, his Orations, ii. 152. Compared with Demosthenes, 192. His works on Rhetoric, 193. *De Oratore*, 195. *Brutus*, 196. *The Orator*, 199. *Topica*, 200. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, inquiry concerning the author of, 202. His philosophical works—*De Legibus*, 223. *De Finibus*, 229. *Academica*, 232. *Tusculana Disputationes*, 236. *De Natura Deorum*, 243. *De Officiis*, 257. *De Senectute*, 259. *De Republica*, 263. His Epistles, 278.
Columna Rostrata, inscription on the, i. 46.
Cotta, his style of oratory, ii. 122.
Crasus, Lucius, character of his eloquence, ii. 120. His death, *ibid.* Compared with Antony, 121.
- Decemviral Laws**, ii. 184.
Dialogue, remarks on this species of composition, ii. 194.
- Eloquence, Roman**, commencement of, ii. 109.
Ennius, his tragedies, i. 67. *Annals*, 78. Translation of Euhemerus, 94.
Etruscans, their origin, i. 20. Their conquests, 26. Religion, 29. Arts, 35.
Eugubian Tables, i. 47.

INDEX.

Fabius Pictor, Latin Annalist, ii. 67—71.
Fratres Arvales, hymn of the, i. 43.

Galba, Sergius, an orator, ii. 110.
Gracchi, oratory of the, ii. 113.
Hirtius, his continuation of Cæsar's Commentaries, ii. 105.
History, Roman, uncertainty of, ii. 57—67.
Hortensius, his luxury and magnificence, ii. 124. His villas at Tusculum, Bañe, and Laurentum, 124, 125. Character of his eloquence, 127. His descendants, 130, Note.

Jurisconsults, Roman, account of, ii. 188.

Laberius, i. 323.
Lælius, his oratory compared with that of Scipio, ii. 111.
Latin Language, its origin, i. 32. Its changes, 45.
Laws, Roman, ii. 133—138.
Leges Regiæ, ii. 133.
Livius Andronicus, i. 54—58.
Luceius, his History of the Social War, ii. 107.
Lucilius, i. 238—245.
Lucretius, i. 250—271.
Lucullus, his patronage of learning, ii. 51.
Luscius Lavinius, i. 171.

Magna Græcia, its settlements, i. 50.
Mimes, their origin and subjects, i. 324.

Nævius, i. 58—62.

Pacuvius, i. 209.
Plautus, i. 96—163.
Philosophy, Greek, introduction of, at Rome, ii. 209.
Plebiscita, account of the, ii. 136.
Prætor, account of the office of, ii. 141.
Publius Syrus, i. 332.

Quadrigrarius, Claudius, Latin Annalist, ii. 73.

Sallust, his character, ii. 82. His Gardens, *ibid.* His conspiracy of Catiline, and Jugurthine war, 84—88. His Roman History, 92.
Satire, Roman, origin of, i. 232.
Senatusconsultum, what, ii. 137.
Sisenna, Roman Annalist, ii. 75.
Sulpicius, his worthless character, ii. 121. His style of oratory, 122.
Sylla, his library, ii. 50. His Memoirs of his Life, 77. His character, 78.

Terence, i. 175—206. Compared with Plautus, 206.
Theatre, Roman, its construction, i. 337—353.
Tirannio, his library, ii. 52.
Trabea, i. 173.

Varro, his farms and villas, ii. 25. His work on Agriculture, 28—34. *De Lingua Latina*, 34. Other works of Varro, 40.

FINIS.

A COMPLETE COURSE
OF
ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY.



E. LITTELL

Is preparing to publish a Complete Course of Ancient and Modern History, in a compact, elegant and cheap form. A Specimen and Prospectus willsoon be issued.



HE HAS LATELY PUBLISHED,

1.

Horne's Introduction to the Study of the Bible.

See Advertisement on a preceding page.

2.

The Museum of Foreign Literature and Science.

For a Prospectus of this Periodical Work see Advertisement on a preceding page.

3.

The Christian Observer for 1826.

4.

Diary of an Ennuyée.

Sad, solemn, soure, and full of fancies fraile,
She woxe; yet wist she neither how nor why:
She wist not, silly mayde, what she did aile,
Yet wist she was not well at ease, perdie;
Yet thought it was not love, but some melancholie.

Spenser.

5.

Memoirs of Mrs Siddons. Interspersed with Anecdotes of Authors and Actes. By James Beeson, Esq.

6.

Christianity and Literature : in a Series of Discourses.
By T. B. Balch, Pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Snowhill, Md.

7.

St Chrysostom on the Priesthood. Translated from the Original Greek ; with Notes and a Life of the Father. By the Rev. Henry M. Mason, Rector of St John's Church, Fayetteville, N. C.

8.

Bickersteth's Treatise on the Lord's Supper ; adapted to the Service of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. With an Introduction, Notes, and an Essay. By Gregory T. Bedell, A.M. Rector of St Andrew's Church, Philadelphia.

9.

Tales of the Wild and Wonderful.

10.

A Tour in Germany and some of the Southern Provinces of the Austrian Empire, in the years 1820, 1821, and 1822. By John Russell, Esq.

This is said to be the best work on Germany.

11.

The Works of Maria Edgeworth. Complete in 13 octavo vols. Fine edition, Price \$19.50.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FOURTEEN DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

19 Jul '56 LT
JUL 19 1956 LU

27 Apr '59 KK
REC'D LD
MAY 2 1959

16 Mar '61 LF
REC'D LD
APR 21 1961

2 Jun '61 GF
REC'D LD
JUN 1 1961

11 Oct '64 WC
REC'D LD

APR 27 '65 - 2 PM

LD 21-100m-2,'55
(B139s22)476

Ge.
University,
Berke.

YC 51886



