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PART THREE

MANKIND FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA TO ABOUT AD 500
CHAPTER XIII

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:
FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE
CHRISTIAN ERA TO c. AD 500

I. CENTRAL ASIA

The profound social and political convulsions in China at the end of the
Earlier Han dynasty inevitably made their repercussions felt beyond the
northern and western frontiers. From AD 16, during Wang Mang’s short
usurpation, the Protectorate of the Western Countries was abandoned by
Chinese troops and officials. The Eastern Hsiung-nu automatically regained
their independence; they tried to extend their authority over the most
easterly oases in central Asia, and they resumed their unceasing raids on the
Chinese frontier. But their military strength was now only a memory of the
past. The restored Han dynasty, though it confined military operations to
the indispensable minimum, found no difficulty in opposing the renewed
danger by means of its cunning diplomacy. In AD 48 eight Hsiung-nu clans
submitted to China, and were settled as foederati (to use a Roman term) on
the borders of Kansu and Shensi, as the Southern Hsiung-nu. Against the
remainder (the Northern Hsiung-nu) the Chinese invoked the aid of the
Hsien-pei, a proto-Mongol people of western Manchuria. The brief but
victorious Chinese campaigns in the Gobi desert (89–91), together with the
disaster inflicted on the Hsiung-nu by the Hsien-pei in 93, broke their power
for war. The old empire of Mao-tun was brought to an end by the Hsien-pei
in 155.

When China reconquered the Tarim basin through the efforts of Pan
Ch’ao (73–102), it regained control of the ‘cross-roads’ of Asia, dominating
the caravan routes between East and West and to some extent also those by
which Siberian gold came down into India. The political results were remark-
able, but still more so the effects upon commerce and art. For practically the
whole of the second century the Protectorate General of the Western Coun-
tries knit this area together into an administrative structure which was
flexible, but sufficiently tight; and this was the Golden Age of the great trade
along the silk-route between Lo-yang and Rome.

The period of most active intercourse of all kinds across the steppes and
the desert began to flag about AD 200. China was exhausted, and withdrew
within its frontiers. It became immersed in the internal struggles which
ended by splitting it apart; and this, combined with the simultaneous decay
of the Roman empire, caused a slackening in the caravan traffic in the
Tarim basin. The situation in the Gobi desert was not very different, since the Hsien-pei were unable to profit from the disintegration of the Chinese empire. A tribal confederation with scanty capacity for political organization, they could not take up the tradition of the great Hsiung-nu rulers, and their activity spent itself in the territory immediately surrounding them. Weak attempts to penetrate into Chinese territory (156–177) were easily beaten back, and they kept relatively quiet even during the critical period of the Three Kingdoms (220–280). In the second decade of the fourth century the Chinese barrier collapsed; but even then the Hsien-pei showed neither skill in exploiting the situation nor desire to do so. The first people to profit were the Hsiung-nu clans which had been for some time established inside the frontier; and when in the course of the fourth century the Hsien-pei took a part in dividing the spoils, the initiative came from enterprising single clans like the Mu-jung rather than from the tribal confederation. Only when a new people, the Juan-juan, made their appearance (402), did the Steppe kingdom assume a dynamic nature once more.

2. CHINA TO AD 589

The usurper Wang Mang (AD 9–23) plunged headlong into a whole series of agrarian, economic, fiscal, and administrative reforms. His aim was partly to increase the imperial revenue, partly to make the state conform in all respects to a fictitious ideal of classical antiquity, an ideal invented by the literati of his time and projected back into the past. Almost every aspect of public life was caught in this storm of reorganization: there was redistribution of land and a limit to the size of estates; creation of state monopolies; revision of the administrative divisions; and reforms in the state cult, in weights and measures, and in coinage. This frantic activity ended by antagonizing every class in society and shaking the very foundations of the state; at the same time China’s possessions in central Asia were lost, and the Hsiung-nu threat had reappeared. The social and economic upheaval eventually provoked a rising of the peasants of the Great Plain. This is the so-called revolt of the Red Eyebrows, which is much better known than that of Ch’ên Shêng at the end of the third century BC. These movements are found scattered throughout Chinese history; though generally put down with bloodshed, they are the most notable feature of the decline of the principal Chinese dynasties and herald their falls. All these rebellions fit into a certain pattern: they break out in the overpopulated territory of western Shantung, southern Hopei, and north-western Honan; and their immediate cause is activity by secret societies with a Taoist and magico-religious background. The revolt of the Red Eyebrows was ably exploited by legitimist circles, who succeeded first in bringing about a Han restoration and then in putting down the revolt itself.

The new dynasty of the Eastern (or Later) Han abandoned Ch’ang-an, built by the Western Han, and established themselves at Lo-yang in Honan.
Their policy was one of salutary retrenchment, of peace and reconstruction. At first they gave up any ambition to reconquer the imperial positions which had been lost. Later, when the political and social situation had been stabilized and the wounds of the civil war had been healed and forgotten, the urge to the West reappeared. But this time there was no considered and deliberate policy on the part of the imperial government: the initiative, and the strength of will behind it, were in the hands of the general Pan Ch’ao, the greatest proconsul China had ever sent to its colonial possessions. His labours lasted nearly thirty years (73–102), during which, with scanty means and without any backing from his government, he reconstructed the Chinese empire in central Asia. It was a long and wearying task, but its results were solid enough to cope with the great rebellion which followed Pan Ch’ao’s recall and death, and to guarantee China’s control of the silk-route practically throughout the second century.

Soon after the middle of the first century occurred the introduction of Buddhism, an event which was destined to have profound effects on the spirit of China and its neighbours. But it spread slowly, the Buddhist communities being at first confined to the lowest classes in the population. Only in the course of the second century were they fully organized by missionaries from India and central Asia.

Very soon the second Han dynasty declined like its predecessors. Once again the malignant disease spread from the feminine milieu of the court; at first from the families of the emperors’ wives, and then from the eunuchs of the harem. The court struggle centred on the factions of the eunuchs and of the officials and literati, while effective power slipped gradually into the hands of the army commanders in the provinces, who alone possessed effective forces. The familiar features of the dynasty’s fall now reappeared with the peasant revolt of the Yellow Turbans (184). This was put down, after a short but terrible war, by a supreme effort of all the political forces of the day—eunuchs, literati, army officers—who formed a temporary coalition in the face of social revolution. But then the struggle was transferred to the various army commanders. In 190 power fell into the hands of a rough and violent dictator named Tung Cho. He was murdered in 193, and the conflict now centred round two rivals, neither of whom could obtain decisive mastery, the general Ts’ao Ts’ao and the pretender Liu Pei, a distant cousin of the imperial house of Han. In 220 Ts’ao Ts’ao’s son deposed the Han and proclaimed the Wei dynasty, with its capital at Lo-yang.

But Liu Pei took similar action: he established himself in Szechwan, where he founded the Shu Han dynasty. Meanwhile Sun Ch’ien, governor of the South (a region which was still semi-colonial and scantily populated), also had himself proclaimed emperor, founding the Wu dynasty with the capital at Chien-k’ang, the modern Nanking. This was the period of the Three States (san-kuo; 220–280), a period of great adventures and warlike deeds. (Map X.) It was the favourite setting for the Chinese novel writers a thousand
years later, but it was also a period of great suffering for China. It saw marked shifts of population: the Chinese migration southward was accelerated, with the support of the new independent government of the South; and on the northern frontiers numerous Hsiung-nu clans came to settle, being brought in as auxiliaries by Ts’ao Ts’ao. In Wei, the strongest of the three states, all power passed into the hands of the Ssū-ma family after 239; in 263 this family put an end to the kingdom of Shu Han; and in 265 it ascended the imperial throne as the Chin dynasty. Its conquest of the Wu kingdom in 280 brought a temporary unification of China, under a dynasty remarkably barren in personalities and subject to incurable intestine quarrels.

After this reunification the imperial army was disbanded as a measure of economy. So the real masters of the state were the imperial princes, governors of provinces, and commanders of provincial armies, who contended for the guardianship of the fainéant emperors. A further factor of weakness was the antiquated and disorganized administrative system. In fact the one young and active force lay in the ‘federate’ Hsiung-nu clans who lived in northern Shensi and Shansi: the aristocracy which governed them was still semi-nomadic, but some of its members had received a cultural and administrative training in the ‘School of Young Nobles’ (k’o-čh’u-hsih) at Lo-yang and were therefore strongly influenced by Chinese civilization. Confronted with the obvious impotence of the Chin dynasty, some of these nobles conceived the idea of seizing the imperial crown. In 304 their chief Liu Yuan united the five tribes of the Southern Hsiung-nu into a single state under the name of Han, in an attempt to exploit the glorious memories of the now extinct dynasty. After his early death his son Liu Ts’ung (311–318) realized his father’s political programme by seizing Lo-yang in 311 and Ch’ang-an in 317; on both occasions a Chin emperor fell a prisoner to the rebels. But an imperial prince kept up resistance, proclaiming himself emperor at Chien-k’ang, and Chinese unity was once more smashed.

In the period 317–589 China developed along two divergent lines. In the North we find a series of ephemeral states, founded either by barbarian tribes or by individual adventurers of barbarian origin. There was fragmentation of a kaleidoscopic kind and a continuous change of rulers, the only exceptions being Fu Chien’s attempt at unification in the fourth century and the more prolonged rule (439–534) by the united empire of the proto-Turkish Tabgač. Beneath this highly disturbed political surface there developed and flourished a civilization which was fundamentally Chinese, though deeply imbued with alien elements of Western origin. The ruling classes were foreigners, and only at the end of the period did the old Confucian bureaucracy succeed in recovering control of the country. In the South, on the other hand, the imperial tradition was preserved, in a single state governed by five successive dynasties all purely Chinese. Culture remained entirely Chinese, and so did the governing class; some of its members were of local origin, but the majority were immigrants from the North. This Southern state brings
Byzantium irresistibly into one’s mind: there was the same refinement of manners, the same cold contempt for the ‘barbarians’, the same proud traditions in administration; and both civilizations underwent a very gradual decadence which in the early stages was accompanied by a remarkable resilience. A feature common to both North and South is the progressive spread of Buddhism. It penetrated the ruling classes and the court in the South; and for political reasons it received strong support from the government and was for some time regarded as a state religion by the barbarians in the North.

The political history both of the North and of the South in this period is complicated. We need to draw attention only to the essential points.

In the North the Hsiung-nu (the Han dynasty, afterwards called Early and Late Chao) were incapable of building a solid state and eventually destroyed one another in a crescendo of savagery and atrocities. Torn by internecine wars and the risings of exasperated peasants the dynasty was exterminated. For a brief time a Hsien-pei family called Mu-jung seemed to have gained the ascendancy from its basis in the North-East; but a few years later the whole of the North fell under the rule of Fu Chien (357–385). He was a Ti (proto-Tibetan) adventurer, kind and generous, a good general but an inept statesman. His empire extended its influence as far as central Asia; but the administration of this hastily-built and heterogeneous state was inefficient; and when a grandiose attempt to conquer the South came to grief in 383 the whole structure collapsed like a house of cards.

The ensuing period saw fragmentation and complete anarchy: Mu-jung, Ti, and Ch’iang (all proto-Tibetans) together with the Hsien-pei and Hsiung-nu, contended with varying fortunes for supremacy in north China, while the Juan-juan nomads were pressing in from the Gobi desert, and the Chinese of the South were attempting to regain their lost capitals. Amid this chaos there gradually came into prominence the proto-Turkish Tabgač, who for some time had ruled over a small state on the steppe on the northern frontiers of Shansi. In 398 they dealt a mortal blow to the Mu-jung. They held the Juan-juan and the southern Chinese in check, and from 418 they gradually unified the North, completing the process in 439.

The Tabgač (as a Chinese dynasty known as Wei) now governed the Northern area for a century; they engaged in many wars with the Southern dynasties, but they never made a serious attempt to conquer the South, perhaps because they remembered the disaster of Fu Chien. They protected Buddhism and fostered the arts: above all they helped to introduce the Western artistic influence which dominates the magnificent sculptures of Yün-kang and Lung-men. This dynasty, which imposed a firm rule on the country, took a long time to forget their own nomad origins, and kept the Turkish aristocracy in the key positions of government. But eventually, when the capital was transferred from northern Shansi to Lo-yang in 494, and when Tabgač language and customs were prohibited at court, they entered frankly upon the path of Sinization. The result was a reaction from the conservative
section of the proto-Turkish nobility and a complicated series of internal struggles with a variety of factors at work. The rivalry between the conservatives and the supporters of Chinese culture was resolved in 534 when the state fell apart into two sections: the party leaders, under the nominal cover of two feigned emperors, took up their headquarters, the one at Yeh in Honan, the other at Ch’ang-an. The Eastern Wei, as the state erected by Kao Huan, leader of the pro-Chinese faction, was called, was the weaker of the two. The last Wei emperors were deposed by Kao Huan’s descendants, but the dynasty created by the latter (northern Ch’i, 550–577) was eventually suppressed by the sister kingdom. In the north-west the Yü-wen family, the effective rulers of the western Wei empire, attempted to restore the Tabgač national state, but it was too late, since tribal unity of the Tabgač had by now broken down, and even when the Yü-wen themselves mounted the throne (northern Chou, 557–581), the objective could not be achieved. Although in 577 they succeeded in unifying the North, their dynasty was deposed only four years later by one of their ministers, Yang Chien, a typical bureaucrat of pure Chinese stock, who founded the Sui dynasty. In 589 the new dynasty put an end to the Southern empire, and finally restored Chinese unity after a break lasting more than two centuries and a half.

In the South the Chin, though increasingly feeble and incompetent, maintained themselves from 318 to 420. They owed their survival to the deeply-felt, though undeserved, devotion shown them by their officials and army leaders, who were ready to give their blood for an unworthy dynasty. On two occasions (356 and 416) their armies took the offensive northwards; great, though ephemeral, victories were won, and Lo-yang was for a time reoccupied. It was indeed remarkable what powers of revival still lay hidden in the South. Liu Yü, the victorious general of 416, deposed the Chin and founded the Sung dynasty (420–479), which succeeded in checking the threatening pressure of the Tabgač and under which south China made good progress in the economic field: it was at this time that there were laid the foundations of the fortune of Canton, based on the sea-borne trade with south Asia. The southern Ch’i (479–502) were compelled to give place to a branch of their own family, the Lüang (502–555), under whose rule the South enjoyed forty years of peace and prosperity, with Buddhism achieving remarkable advances. But the Lüang collapsed in a tremendous civil war, in which the western Wei intervened. The Southern empire emerged from this with considerable loss of territory and of inner strength; the blow had been a mortal one. The last of its dynasties, the Ch’en (555–589), was able only to prolong the agony of a state which had outlived its own vitality. The historical and practical justification for the existence of a Chinese national state in the South disappeared once the North had been unified by a Chinese dynasty. And when in 589 the Sui forces marched on Chien-k’ang they met with no resistance; the Southern bureaucracy went over to their brethren in the North, and Chinese unity was re-established without a blow being struck.
3. KOREA

Northern Korea (Chin. 'Chao-hsien', Korean 'Chosŏn') had been conquered by the Chinese in 108 BC. It was organized into four districts, and over a period of centuries it felt the influence of Chinese culture, which left an indelible mark upon the country. The excavations at Lo-lang (Korean 'Naknang') have shown how this Chinese province played a full part in the artistic achievement of the Han homeland. At the end of the first century AD Chinese domination was limited to the north-west coast, but in that one area it lasted down to the fourth century. The remainder of Korea, namely the southern section, had for long been divided between three tribal confederacies, the so-called Three Hab. The population here differed in many respects from that of the North: their culture was allied rather to the primitive culture of the south Asiatic countries, although later they too came under the influence of China. In 57 BC (according to the traditional chronology) there arose among them the nucleus of the state of Silla, which was destined to last as late as 935. A little later, in the inaccessible territories of the north-east, was formed the small kingdom of Koguryŏ, which lasted down to 668 and gave its name to the country. Its zenith was reached in the fifth century, when the northern part of the peninsula became united under the Koguryŏ kings, all trace of Chinese domination having by now vanished. Buddhism made its first appearance in 372, and a few years later it also reached the south.

4. JAPAN

In the first centuries of our era Japan slowly emerges from the darkness of prehistory. According to tradition the date of the empire's foundation is 660 BC, when the Emperor Jimmu, who came from the southern part of Kyūshū, established himself in Yamato near Ōsaka. The fact, but above all the date, cannot stand up to criticism. Yet the references to Japan in contemporary dynastic chronicles of China are consistent enough to allow the history of this period to be reconstructed in broad outline. In the first century BC the country appears to have been divided into numerous independent principalities (there were more than 100), one of which in AD 57 received an official seal from the Chinese emperor. There were further exchanges of ambassadors in 239 and 247. In this period the states seem to have been reduced to about thirty in number, under the suzerainty of Yamato (perhaps in the island of Kyūshū), which was governed by a queen. After 269 relations with China ceased, but they were resumed in 421, when Japan appears already united into a single state under the dynasty which rules even today. It seems that the unification should be placed in the first half of the fourth century, and that it was due to Yamato princes, who moved from Kyūshū to Hondō, although they preserved the original name of their state. It could be that one of these princes bore the name of Jimmu Tennō,
which the later chronicles (*Kojiki* and *Nihongi*) pushed back a millennium in the past.

To this period probably go back the most important characteristics which are always attributed to the dynasty in later times: its descent from Amaterasu, goddess of the sun, and the three royal symbols—the mirror, the sword, and the jewel. However that may be, the Korean chronicles tell us that in 369 Japan was strong enough to intervene in the affairs of Korea: the expedition then sent seems likely to be the one attributed by Japanese sources to the Empress Jingo Kogo. Through this action a Japanese protectorate was created over the little territory of Mimana (around modern Pusan), and it lasted down to 562.

Across Korea the cultural, social, and religious ideas of the continent began gradually to reach the archipelago. It was probably in the fifth century that the difficult task was first undertaken of adapting Chinese script to a language which was totally different from Chinese. In the fifth century the first Buddhist missionaries began to arrive, and the new religion set foot for the first time in the Japanese empire, which at that time comprised only Kyūshū, Shikoku, and the southern part of Honšū. Very soon Buddhism became the most passionately debated question of the day: it was both touchstone and excuse for the struggles among the great noble houses which were contending for supremacy at court (the Soga, Nakatomi, and Mononobe). In 538 a relic was sent to the capital by the Korean king of Paikche, and from that moment begins the official history of Japanese Buddhism. The obverse of the story is the beginning, slow at first but always gathering momentum, of the movement which later came to a head in the reforms of Shōtoku Taishi and those of the Taikwa period.

### 5. India

In the first decades of our era the history of northern India seems to have been dominated by movements of ‘barbarians’. As a matter of fact, these peoples arrived in India after having undergone a more or less thorough process of Iranization, and this resulted in an increase of the political and cultural influence of Iran. The case of the Śaka is typical; and even more direct was the Iranian influence exercised by the Parthians, whose invasion of India presumably took place in the first years of our era, and was promoted not by the Arsacids but by the turbulent nobility of the frontier districts. The best known of these sovereigns in India is the Gu(n)duvha of inscriptions, called Gondophernes in the legend of St Thomas the Apostle, whose martyrdom is said to have taken place in this king’s reign. The one result of the Parthian inroad was to transform the Śaka aristocracy into an anarchic feudal system run by Śaka and Parthians combined: this extended its influence to Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Moreover when the Śaka and Parthians of the Indus valley came under the Kuśāna rule, the Śaka Kṣatrapas
of Malwa maintained their independence for three centuries; although they were foreigners, they helped to establish Sanskrit as the secular literary language in India. The Kṣatrapa of Ujjain were conquered by the Guptas round about 400.

Meanwhile the Kuśāṇa, one of the five principalities set up by the Yüeh-chih in Bactria, were acquiring importance under their leader Kujula Kadphises. He not only unified his own people, but conquered Afghanistan and brought to an end the last surviving Greek kingdom in India, that of Hermaeus (c. AD 20). His son Wema Kadphises extended Kuśāṇa rule all over the Indus basin and as far as the western basin of the Ganges. The two Kadphises were succeeded, probably after some interval, by Kaniska, the greatest of the Kuśāṇa. The question of his date is one of the most complicated, important, and hotly debated in Indian history. Here we can do no more than mention the two main schools that hold the field: one makes him the founder of the so-called Śaka era starting in AD 78, the other puts his accession at a date (variously stated by different authors) in the second quarter of the second century. Whichever view one takes, it is clear that the kingdom of the Kuśāṇa preserved its power for about a century after Kaniska’s accession. It was a land complex which faced two ways and had two sorts of interest, since it held sway in both Transoxiana and India. By its nature, therefore, it was destined to become a channel for the passage of cultural and religious ideas between India, Iran, and central Asia. In its international atmosphere the Indo-Hellenistic and Indo-Roman art of Gandhāra could develop; Indian deities alternate with Iranian and Greek on the coins; trade flourished; and along the caravan routes and through the colonies of Indian traders in the Tarim basin, Buddhism penetrated into central Asia, and from there on into China, Korea, and Japan. In India the Kuśāṇa empire seems to have been gradually confined to the Punjab; in the third century the kingdom lost its territories across the Oxus and consequently its power to pursue further its cultural mission. Nevertheless under various dynasties (Kidāra, Little Kuśāṇa) it continued to perform the task of guarding the frontier against Iran.

The Sassanids made a brief appearance on this frontier in the third century, but their empire seems never to have crossed the limits of present-day Afghanistan, where a peculiar Irano-Buddhist form of art took shape. But in the fifth century the defences on the Indian frontier were broken down by the invasion of the Hephthalites (the Hūna of Indian texts). These barbarians conquered the Afghan country, and then poured into India. Initially they were checked by the Guptas, but they resumed their attack; and about 500 their king Toramāṇa held a considerable dominion in north-west India. It was short-lived, being overcome after a few years by an Indian counter-attack. But the great religious and cultural centres of the north-west, particularly those in present-day Afghanistan, never recovered from the Hephthalite ravages.
After Kuśāna supremacy had declined the Ganges valley remained divided among obscure local dynasties and the surviving aristocratic republics; the latter still existed in Rajasthan and the Punjab, but were beginning to disappear at the end of this period. Then for a time Magadha and Pāṭaliputra resumed their position as a factor of unity in Indian history. Chandragupta I founded the Gupta dynasty (320–c. 550), which achieved its greatest territorial expansion under Samudragupta (c. 335–375) and Chandragupta II (375–414). (Map XI.) Yet the Gupta empire was not remotely comparable with that of the Mauryas: it was confined to northern India, and although it stretched from sea to sea it did not include most of the Indus basin. South of the Vindhya mountains it bordered with the solid kingdom of the Vākāṭaka, which had emerged from the ruins of the Andhra régime and which preserved its independence throughout, keeping on good terms with its larger neighbour to the north. Under the Guptas Indian culture reached its full development and its climax; this is undoubtedly the classic period of Hindu India. Western influences were either eliminated or absorbed; and literature, art, and the various religions achieved a state of balance and internal harmony such as was never surpassed or even equalled in later times. But this Augustan age was short. Skandagupta (455–467) succeeded in repelling the first onslaught of the Hephthalites, but this victorious resistance cost the empire dear. It was weakened to the point of exhaustion, and after a gradual decline it dissolved in the first decades of the sixth century. In its last days the centre was moved towards Madhya Pradesh; and Pāṭaliputra in consequence ceased for all time to be the moral capital of northern India.

In the centre of the peninsula the kingdom of the Sātāvahana, founded at the end of the previous period in the region of Nasik, was for a time pushed south-eastwards by the expansion of the Śaka from Malwa. It was at this time that the Telugu-speaking districts on the east coast were conquered and annexed. The Sātāvahana or Andhra, as they are also called, reached their zenith under Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi (c. 106–130), when they took their revenge on the Śaka and reoccupied their original territory in the north-western Deccan.

The Sātāvahana kingdom, though it dissolved and finally disappeared about 220–230, had been a centre from which Aryan culture expanded among the Dravida of the Deccan. Literary work in Prakrit was strongly encouraged at the Andhra court.

In the south in the first century AD the strongest of the three traditional kingdoms was that of the Cola; then the hegemony passed to the Pāṇḍya. But in these centuries the history of the south is very obscure, and is almost exclusively literary. We know that trade with the Roman empire had assumed great importance in the economic life of the area, and perhaps also influenced artistic taste. Finds at the trading station excavated at Virapattanam (also called Arikamedu; probably the Poducē of Ptolemy) give us a most vivid picture of this traffic.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

To the north-east of the Three Kingdoms, in the hinterland of modern Madras, there came into being in the third century the Pallava kingdom at whose capital (Kaniṣṭha), Sanskrit literature, Buddhism, and Jainism flourished vigorously. In comparison with the untainted Dravidian culture found in the Three Kingdoms of the far south, the Pallava state became the main centre through which Aryan outlook and culture spread to the foot of the peninsula.

The history of Ceylon in this period has mainly a local interest. It was only later that the island played an all-important role in the diffusion of Buddhist ideas in south-east Asia. During the first centuries AD Ceylon retained its independence, and developed its own civilization without more than relatively limited contact with India. For the time being attempts at infiltration, both warlike and peaceful, by the Tamils of the mainland were held off. The capital at this time was Anuradhapura, the ruins of which are the most impressive memorial of ancient Ceylon.

6. SOUTH-EAST ASIA

At the beginning of our era there are to be seen in south-east Asia the first signs of a massive movement, which eventually allowed these regions to be pervaded by Indian art, religion, and institutions, even to the point of creating a ‘Greater India’ beyond the Seas. It is a movement to which neither names nor distinct phases can be attached, but it was mainly due to the growth of sea-borne commerce in the hands of Indian merchants. This penetration of ideas and customs did not bring about a political colonization. Instead there came into being a number of native states, whose political and social structure was Indian and who were imbued with Indian culture. Neither now nor later, therefore, was there any hint of dependence upon the Indian kingdoms, even of an indirect or theoretical kind. The governing classes were the local aristocracy, which had a fair measure of Indian blood resulting from inter-marriage with the newcomers: it regarded itself, justly so, as an Indian aristocracy, and followed the religious and social usages of India.

One example is the Pyu kingdom, of proto-Burman speech, which was founded in the middle valley of the Irrawaddy in the third century. Another is the Bhnam kingdom (the Fu-nan of the Chinese) which appeared on the lower Mekong at the outset of the third century: it lasted down to the sixth century, and gave place first to the Chén-la kingdom, and then to the great Khmer empire of Cambodia, perhaps the main centre of Indian civilization in this region. At the same period (late second century) there came into being the Champa kingdom on the sea-board of the South China Sea, in the lands which today form the southern republic of Vietnam: the history of this Hindu state is one of constant struggle against pressure from the Annamites (modern Tonkin was a Chinese province from AD 44), in other words against Chinese civilization pressing down from the north. More scanty is evidence
on Indonesia, where inscriptions date back no farther than the early fifth century AD.

7. PARTHIA

a. The Arsacid Period

In 20 BC Phraates IV, king of the feudal Parthian state, had restored to Augustus' general Tiberius the standards captured at Carrhae in 53 and such prisoners as survived. He sent his own sons and grandsons to Rome to learn Roman culture, and a brief entente between the two powers ensued. This was especially marked in the reign of Phraates V, whose mother Musa, his co-ruler, had been an Italian slave presented to Phraates IV by Augustus. The policy of his successor, Vologeses, was similar, but this king had been educated at Rome and was consequently foreign to his country's ways. He was deposed, his place being taken by Artabanus III (AD 10–40), an Arsacid on his mother's side though born in Iran. In his reign the tension with Rome was renewed; it was due not only to the imperialist ambitions of the two powers, and to the Parthian spirit of nationalism, but to the fact that the two cultures were so different from each other. The Romans supported a pretender, Tiridates III, who had lived in Rome, and later there were several further incidents. Artabanus wanted to secure the Armenian throne for one of his sons, but was opposed by Tiberius; and the Parthian king resumed the attempt in 34, when the Iberians, incited by Rome, made their own king's brother, Mithradates, ruler of Armenia. After the death of Artabanus III the succession was contested between Vardanes, the son of his body, and his adoptive son Gotarzes. Both claimants were anti-Roman, but Rome's prestige in Parthia seemed to revive for just a moment when Gotarzes, though victorious, provoked such discontent among his subjects by his cruelty that they recalled the son of Vologes I (Mihrdat or Meherdates) from Rome. Yet in 49 this prince was put away by Gotarzes, who had him mutilated. Soon afterwards three brothers belonging to the reigning house of Atropatene succeeded each in obtaining a kingdom: Vologaesus I secured the throne of Parthia, Pacorus that of Atropatene, and Tiridates that of Armenia without seeking investiture by Rome. Domitius Corbulus was now sent out by Nero, and in 59–60, aided by the struggle of the Hyrcanians against Parthia, he overran the whole of Armenia. At first Tigranes, great-grandson of Herod of Judaea, was put in as king; but later Corbulus reached an understanding with Tiridates, who in 66 came to Rome to receive his investiture. At this point there began a fresh period of more peaceful relations between Rome and Parthia, the latter taking advantage of the situation to extend its influence towards India.

Armenia was once more a cause of discord in the days of Trajan and Osroes. Trajan invaded and reduced Armenia to the status of a province; he then pushed down into Persia and captured Ctesiphon (1115). But after his death
Hadrian made peace with Osroes, and made Armenia an independent kingdom again. For the same reason again trouble broke out in the time of Marcus Aurelius and Vologaesus III, the latter of whom had turned out the Roman vassal Sohaemus and tried to put his brother Pacorus in Armenia (161). The Roman nominee regained his throne, and the Parthians, defeated at Europus, saw the palace of Ctesiphon destroyed and Seleucia put to flames.

The next period of crisis, in the time of Vologaesus IV and Septimius Severus, had a similar outcome. Severus' objective was the defence of Nisibis and revenge on the Parthian king for the support given to his rival Pescennius Niger. He sacked Ctesiphon, and once more made Armenia a client state of Rome (199). Action was renewed, first by Caracalla and then by Macrinus, against the Arsacid Artabanus V, still on account of Armenia, where the anti-Roman Tiridates had ascended the throne. This time however the war ended with the defeat of the Roman troops near Nisibis, and Rome had to recognize Tiridates as a client king.

b. The Sassanid Rule

The southern provinces of the Parthian kingdom had been the cradle of the Achaemenids, and it was in one of these, Persis (Fars), that the national tradition of Iran and the Zoroastrian religion had been preserved most pure and stubborn. From there came Ardashir, who led a revolt against Artabanus V, defeated him in a pitched battle in Susiana (224), and two years later succeeded in taking Ctesiphon (26 September, 226, the beginning of the Sassanid era). Becoming master, King of Kings, of all the Arsacid territories, he was the founder of the Sassanid dynasty, so called from Sāsān, the half-mythical ancestor of his house; and he claimed to be the descendant of the Achaemenid kings. We know this from the 'book of the deeds of Ardashir, son of Papak'; this was published in its present form only in the seventh century, but the fact is confirmed by Sassanid bas-reliefs placed alongside those of the Achaemenidae. The new dynasty at once secured support from the Persian people, whose pride had never allowed them to regard the Arsacids as a dynasty belonging to their own nation; and support also came from the priestly class. Indeed its decided policy of nationalism was the characteristic of this dynasty, which for four centuries withstood every attack from both civilized empires and nomad tribes. Its nationalism was political and cultural alike: it was imbued with fervour for the Zoroastrian creed, which became a regular state religion of the Iranian race and was intolerant of all attempts to import foreign ideas and beliefs.

Ardashir, who according to tradition founded many new cities, was concerned to rid himself of all opposition from the Arsacids, one member of which house, Khosrev, king of Armenia, was claiming the Parthian succession. Ardashir had him murdered, and then tried to take possession of Armenia,
even at the cost of attacking the Roman districts. He pushed into Mesopotamia as far as Hatra, and later laid siege to Nisibis and Carrhae; but he was driven back.

The attempt was resumed, this time with success, by his son Shahpuhr I (Sapor: 241–272). Initially he was defeated by Gordian III, in a war lasting from 242 to 244, but in the peace concluded with Philip the Arab, Shahpuhr obtained Armenia. He returned to the attack on Roman territories from 251 to 259, when he took Dura-Europus, attacked Edessa, and in 260 succeeded in capturing the Roman emperor Valerian who had come to the city’s help. Valerian’s successor Gallienus failed to secure his release, and the Roman prisoners were put to work on the building of aqueducts, bridges, and new cities in Khuzistan: meanwhile the much-vaunted victory was magnified on his bas-reliefs which survive to this day. Nevertheless Shahpuhr failed in an attack on the state of Palmyra, and ended by making an alliance with its queen Zenobia against Rome. Mention will be made later of the support given by Shahpuhr to the preaching of Mani, the founder of the new syncretistic religion called Manichaeism, which combined the doctrines of Christ, Zoroaster, and Buddha. Later the Magi reacted: Mani was crucified, and his doctrines were made illegal (273).

King Bahram II (276–293) fared badly in a new war with Rome. The emperor Aurelius Carus took the field against him, occupied Armenia and northern Mesopotamia, and pushed down as far as Ctesiphon, beneath the walls of which he died in 283. The struggle continued with varying fortunes against Numerian and Carinus in the ensuing months; and in 293 the Persians under their new king Narseh (Narsetes: 293–302) succeeded in recovering Armenia. But they were forced to formal surrender of that district, together with Mesopotamia and the lands east of the Tigris, when Galerius Maximianus mounted a vigorous offensive against them (296–298).

During his long reign (309–379) Shahpuhr II resumed the conflict with Rome, which now took on a religious character. Up till now the Parthians had been tolerant of the Christians, who in escaping the Roman persecutions were entering their dominions in great numbers. But in Constantine’s day to be a Christian became synonymous with being a Roman, and furthermore his rival Tiridates of Armenia himself became a Christian. Shahpuhr II in 342 then began to persecute the Christians, having first renewed the struggle against Rome from the outset of the reign of Constantius II and then carried it on practically without a break. In his first attempt, during which he besieged Nisibis, he was not successful: he compelled the king of Armenia to pay tribute, but he could not obtain full possession of Armenia. In 345 he met with still more serious reverses, being defeated at Singara and suffering the loss of his son as a prisoner. A second and a third time (346 and 350) he failed before Nisibis, and in 360 he had to face an attack by the emperor Julian, who was resolved to finish the issue once and for all. But Julian, though he won marked successes, had to abandon the siege of Ctesiphon and vainly
sought a pitched battle: on 27 June he died of wounds. With him ended
the great Roman offensive against the Parthians, since the new emperor
Jovian preferred to make peace, surrendering Nisibis, Armenia, and Georgia.
Rome did return to the attack against the later Sassanids; Shahpuhr III,
for example, was compelled to conclude a treaty with Theodosius I and
surrendered Lesser Armenia. But under his successor Bahram IV (388–399)
Armenia was divided into two parts, the larger as a vassal of the Parthians,
the smaller a vassal of Rome. Yezdegert (399–420), who showed such
tolerance in religion that he was opposed and later probably removed by the
clergy, entered upon close relations with Byzantium; and Procopius tells us
that Arcadius entrusted him with the guardianship of his family.
A few decades later (outside the scope of this volume) the new Nestorian
schism took firm root in the Persian country, where the local Christian Church
fully embraced its doctrines.

8. THE ETHIOPIAN REGION

A note may be added here on the Ethiopian region. In the introduction to
Part II it was shown how southern Arabian peoples had founded settlements
in Ethiopia and how Graeco-Ptolemaic trading posts had been formed by
their side. At this time the capital city of those posts was one of the southern
Arabian colonies named Axum: it is first mentioned in a source from the
first century AD (the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*), but it reached its greatest
prosperity in the third century AD when it succeeded in acquiring control
even of the south Arabian territory from which the colonists had come. In
this period its foreign policy included interest in both the Arabian and the
Syrian region, and there is record of an agreement reached with Zenobia.

This Ethiopian state of Axum was on unfriendly terms with its northern
neighbours, the Nubians of Meroë, with whom Nero had established a
connection. In this direction too the Axumites were able to extend their
hegemony, aided by similar aggressive action by the Roman empire from
Egypt. Decius’ action against the Nubians and Blemmyes is an example of
the latter tendency; he was followed by Diocletian, who in 297 attempted to
expel the Nubians from the Dodekaschoinos.

During the fourth century Axum under its king Amida and his son Ezana
succeeded in suppressing Meroë. Ezana was converted to Christianity by
St Frumentius and spread the new religion over the Ethiopian territory.
Even after its political collapse, Axum remained the religious capital of the
country.

9. THE ROMAN EMPIRE

a. To AD 192

The successors of Augustus, Tiberius and the rest, each had his own
history and the experience he had thereby acquired; and each was friendly
or hostile to particular men and particular classes. But in principle they knew
the features of three imperial systems which, like patterns for the future, had
been instituted one after another at the dawn of the imperial period.
First there was Caesar’s system: he had been dictator for life and had con-
centrated all power and responsibility into his own hands without making
the senate his partner; moreover he set himself, without prejudice, to give
equality in political status to all parts of the empire. Then there was the
system of Augustus, who appeared to express precisely the senate’s will, and
who exalted Italy above the provinces, as well as showing a preference for
the West. Thirdly there had been the régime of Marcus Antonius, a King of
Kings on the oriental model, God on earth, and disposer of the provinces
in his own autocratic way, a manner almost feudal. It was logical therefore
that each ruler should either show decided preference for one of the three
types of empire, or, faced with the difficulty of striking a balance between the
opposing forces, should attempt to combine the old features in a novel
manner and even bring new principles into play.
For the opposing forces existed and could not be ignored. The empire
itself (Map XII) was formed out of two parts which were different in
tradition and culture, in race, and in aims: one was Greek or Hellenized, the
other Italian or in process of Romanization. One or other might be preferred;
or the two could be regarded as partners, proceeding towards a joint dominion.
Then there was the opposition resulting from the relation between Italy
and the provinces. This could either be perpetuated, leaving Italy in a
privileged condition and limiting grants of citizenship to the minimum; or
one could try to remove the distinction altogether, and be lavish with con-
cessions of this kind. Differences of opinion were also possible on political
and social objectives. Some might want a constitution of a definite type,
aristocratic or plutocratic, or popular, or mixed (the knights in alliance with
one of the other two factions): others on the contrary might attempt to
subordinate all class interests to the uniformity imposed by the emperor.
Either the organization and forms of the old republican magistracies and
constitutional elements could be preserved with the senate at the head; or
they could be supplanted by bureaucratic officials and by the Consilium of the
Princeps. The armed forces, whether the legions on the frontiers or the
praetorian guard stationed in Italy, could either be allowed to take a concrete
part in political life, or their interference could be resisted. Again, one could
favour a policy of peace and consolidation, or go in for military action to
enlarge the bounds of the empire farther and farther afield; and one could
aim at rigid economic arrangements which would keep the state’s budget
in balance and no more, or alternatively seek to build up reserves for special
undertakings. Then one could be open and tolerant towards the new religious
ideas of the day, or take a rigid stand on the traditional beliefs; one could
accept, with some reserve, oriental views of the deification of dead emperors,
or lay direct claim to have veneration and cult accorded to emperors in their
lifetimes. Finally the imperial succession could be guaranteed by dynastic means, or by adoptions, or by an elective system.

These are only some of the problems these emperors faced, and the results can be seen behind the variations and contradictions of early imperial history. There was not only a continual switch from one type of emperor to another—an Augustan, a Caesarian, an Antonian, a mixture of two or more types, or a definite innovator. We also see clearly, even in the disordered pattern of Roman history, a slow but continuous progress towards particular solutions of the various problems. It was not so much the Caesarian conception as the Antonian, the conception of the absolute ruler, 'Dominus et Deus,' which became gradually more dominant and finally triumphed under Diocletian and Constantine. The attainment of political equality between provincials and Italians was a slow and retarded process, but it reached completion under Caracalla. The Caesarian conception of a universal Roman culture exerting its influence outside the frontiers of the empire got caught up in the universal culture implicit in Christianity. His other idea, an intimate fusion of the two worlds, the Greek and the Italian, in which the governing classes would be generally bilingual, was, broadly speaking, achieved in the cultural sphere; but politically it was never successful, and the distinction between East and West was more marked than ever in Diocletian's system.

The measures of autonomy granted within the provinces, particularly from the time of Hadrian onwards, enabled large areas of the empire to become semi-national units, tending to split off from the centre, although the degree of Romanization they acquired was the more lasting for being spontaneously accepted. A final tendency of the period arose from the two fundamental, though inevitable, failings of the Augustan plan, an inadequate army, and finances which availed only to put the regular budget into balance. These were factors which led slowly but surely not only to a situation in which the empire could not be extended any farther, but to one in which no effective resistance could be offered to the pressure of 'barbarians' on the frontiers, especially as the attackers were themselves largely Romanized and had actually been used by Rome to defend itself against further invaders.

The alternation of the different types of imperial régime was more formidable and more obvious in the first century of the empire, down to the death of Domitian. In this period nostalgia for republican forms of government still found relatively numerous adherents; the clash between the various imperial systems was more marked, especially when rulers of Antonian or autocratic type, like Caligula, Nero, and Domitian, came to power, since they were regarded as devils by the senatorial class and the writers who belonged to it; and there was less restraint on the conflict between the various forces which claimed the right to choose and proclaim new emperors—the senate, the provincial armies, the praetorians, and the people. The crisis of the years AD 68–69, in which four emperors were proclaimed at practically the same time by different groups of legions and praetorians, is clear evidence
of the warlike fury shown by the contending parties; and one may add the open or secret assassination of several emperors, and the use of one method after another to secure the succession. Almost all these emperors indulged in heavy expense on public works, on shows, and on distributions to the people; but all too often they ran into trouble because their finances were insufficient. Moreover the army, though adequate to secure the frontiers in time of peace, had no forces large enough for reserve or manœuvre. It could not push into territory beyond the frontiers: it could not even securely defend the frontiers which were threatened, unless forces from other fronts were withdrawn. An example can be seen as early as Augustus' day, when the unfortunate expedition of Varus between the Rhine and the Elbe compelled the assumption of the defensive policy which Tiberius vigorously maintained. Later stable defence works had to be erected along the whole frontier, the so-called limes with its entrenched forts, beginning with Claudius and extended by Vespasian and Domitian. Claudius in fact was the only one of these emperors who achieved noteworthy conquests: he operated on the Danube, in Thrace, and in Britain, in the last of which his conquests were later expanded by Nero and by Vespasian and his sons. The Parthian actions of Caligula and Nero ended with failure to compromise, as did the wars of Domitian against the Dacians. As early as Nero's time we find the first examples of those transplantations of barbarians into Roman territory to defend the frontier (in this case the Danube frontier), which were later to prove so perilous. To all this must be added the birth and development of a religious crisis, brought about by Jewish and Christian propaganda and by the reaction of the Roman state. First apparent in Claudius' time, this crisis led to bloodshed and violence under Nero and Domitian.

The eighty-four years from 96 to 180, from Nerva's election to the death of Marcus Aurelius, are a period of calm in the struggle between the various systems of government. It was not that any one system had prevailed against all the others, but that a more stable equilibrium had now been reached among the claims of the opposing interests, since all the parties wanted to achieve a synthesis in the manner most beneficial to the common good and best adapted to the bent and aims and powers of the empire as a whole. This was also the period in which the work of Romanization, in part of the empire, was made most intense, and that in which the greatest cultural and political harmony was attained between East and West, with all provinces being gradually raised in status as Caesar had originally planned.

It is typical of this period that two emperors, Trajan and Hadrian, were born in Spain, Marcus Aurelius was partly of Spanish origin, and Antoninus Pius of Gallic. Moreover since no emperor from Nerva to Pius had a son to succeed him, each was inevitably forced on to the system of adoption, in contrast to the dynastic system practised by the Flavians. Nevertheless Marcus Aurelius returned to the dynastic principle, when he left his throne to his son Commodus. Foreign policy underwent many phases. Trajan
sought to extend the empire in Dacia, Arabia, and Parthia; and Marcus spent seventeen of his nineteen years of rule in war against the Parthians, against barbarian invaders from the north, and against the rebel Avidius Cassius. Hadrian, on the other hand, followed by Pius, and later by Commodus too, preferred a peaceful policy, renouncing conquests, attending to consolidation at home, and protecting the empire against foreign attacks by means of fortifications (Pl. 59, a) and diplomacy. Trajan, like Nerva before him, had attached importance to the primacy of Italy, and organized the system of Alimenta for poor children in an attempt to solve the agrarian and pauper problems of Italy. Antoninus Pius stayed permanently in Rome.

Hadrian on the other hand journeyed continually over the provinces to learn their needs. He insisted on bringing them into equality with Italy, granting Roman citizenship with a lavish hand, and founding new towns in every district as bases for civilization and spread of Roman culture. He even divided Italy, as if it were one of the provinces, into a number of districts with a ‘consular’, dependent on himself, at the head of each. The army had been decimated by Trajan’s wars, and its effective strength could not be restored. Hadrian decided on a complete reorganization on new principles, which made it more firmly regional in character: in other words in each province he made use of local recruits, who had greater practical knowledge of the country, and whose patriotism was readier since they were employed in defence of their native lands. It is true that this system increased the centrifugal forces which each province owed to its racial composition and its history. But where these natural tendencies were left to develop freely, without any compulsion or levelling policy promoted by the Roman government, they led to the creation of provinces which were almost nations. Indeed the administration, defence, and economy of every province was so organized that each led something like an autonomous life, adapted to its ethnic composition and the opportunities of the region; and each was allowed to develop spontaneously a definite type of Roman culture peculiar to itself, possessing thereby its own civilization, both national and Roman, at once. It is undoubtedly this decentralizing work above all which made it possible later for many of the western and north-eastern districts, when they separated themselves from the empire, to retain permanently a patina of Latin culture. This was indelible because it was of natural formation and had been freely fused with the innate ways of life found among the various peoples.

Meanwhile the relation of Rome to the new world of Christianity was growing in importance. There was increased friction in Trajan’s time, tolerance under Hadrian and Pius, moderate rigidity of policy under Marcus Aurelius.

But during the reign of Marcus’ son Commodus (180–192) there was an apparent return to the Neronian pattern, with an emperor who admired Antonius and bent all his energy to secure the sympathies of the praetorians and the people. So the opposition of the senate broke out violently once more,
and there was a renewal of conspiracies. In one of them Commodus met his death.\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{b. The Severan Age}

In 193 two emperors in Rome were murdered, after eighty-seven and sixty-eight days of rule, leaving three claimants to the empire of whom two were eliminated by the victorious third, the Semitic African Septimius Severus. It was he who gave his name to the thirty years or so which followed, together with his next successor but three, a ruler of Syrian origin called M. Aurelius Severus Alexander. The latter was assassinated in 235 by the Thracian Iulius Verus Maximinus, with whom the period of ‘anarchy’ begins.

The Severan age is mainly characterized by the growth of violent intervention from both praetorians and legionaries, concerned both to set up emperors and cast them down. A further feature is the renewal of attempts to found a permanent dynasty, in which the moving forces were a series of energetic women, Iulia Domna, Maesa, and Soaemias, ready for every hazard on behalf of the infant rulers they were supporting.

In this period too the process of political advancement of the provinces at the expense of Italy reached fulfilment, with emperors of provincial origin collaborating to that end with great Eastern jurists like Papinius, Paul, and Ulpian. The climax came in 212 with the famous ‘Constitutio Antoniniana’, promulgated by Caracalla, under which Roman citizenship was granted to \textit{all peregrini}, that is to say, with few exceptions, to all communities throughout the empire.\textsuperscript{6} This brought Caesar’s idea to its final and inevitable conclusion. The precise and immediate aims of this edict were several. It unified legal forms, and so gradually suppressed local law when this could be done. It imposed a uniform system of taxes and increased the yield. Finally it was designed to create an imperial unity in the name of Rome, with Roman language and Roman law, and so to bring together into a single outlook, culture, and even race those peoples which were still to some extent held apart by barriers of race and history.

This period saw great military activity, made necessary by the fact that economic difficulties had complicated the task of frontier defence. Caracalla fought the Rhaeti and Danubian peoples; but the main wars were those of Septimius Severus, and of Caracalla too, against the Parthians. As we have seen, however, it was precisely in these years that the new dynasty of the Sassanids conquered the Arsacids; their powerful spirit of nationalism and their revival of the religion of Zoroaster gave the Parthian empire an energy it had not possessed for many a day.

In matters of religion these emperors, who for the most part came from distant provinces like Africa (Septimius Severus and Macrinus) or the East, were inclined towards the introduction of new and exotic cults into Rome, and were therefore tolerant of religious propaganda. Eventually under
Elagabalus the dynasty made a genuine and peculiar effort at syncretism, in an attempt to invent a universal religion which would include all others, even Judaism and Christianity.

c. Third-Century Crises

Despite the astonishing ‘recoveries’ which various emperors were able to effect in the vast imperial edifice of Rome, it was obvious that this edifice was betraying serious cracks, to which the general state of crisis and the parabolic descent of Roman fortunes bear witness. To give an adequate account of this crisis it may be useful to put forward a number of particular problems, which will be treated more fully in the following chapters to show how each one developed.

In the republican period Italy was successfully unified politically and became in effect a nation. But most statesmen had continued to regard Rome’s possessions outside Italy as foreign dominions which formed a source of political power. Caesar and the better among his successors saw the need to relieve the provinces from their position of being simply exploited countries and to elevate them gradually to the level of Italy. This was the process concluded by the ‘Constitution’ of Caracalla. At the same time, however, for a number of concurrent reasons, the general economic condition of the provinces became more flourishing than that of Italy. Now particularly under Hadrian and Marcus Italy lost even its political and military pre-eminence, while the areas on the periphery attracted more and more of the affairs and life of the empire. Meanwhile the frontier armies with their pronunciamentos were exercising their influence in the appointment of emperors, who were increasingly of non-Italian origin.

So the dualism which Caesar and some of his successors had tried to overcome was made more acute than ever. The two parts of the empire, one Latin or Latinized, the other Greek or Hellenized, differed in traditions, temper, race, way of life, and spiritual outlook; and the hostility which each successive dynasty could show to one part or the other, together with the separatism induced by the civil wars, made the division deeper than ever before. This led first to an administrative and political split between the two parts of the empire, and later to a definite separation.

In every region Rome had tried to found cities, as political and administrative centres: this conformed to its own tradition, which was reinforced by the example set by Hellenistic states. The cities assisted in the collection or exaction of tribute, in the recruitment of legionaries, in promoting commerce, and in spreading Roman language, legal forms, and civilization: their magistrates used normally to acquire Roman citizenship. Romanized towns of this kind were gradually differentiated from the country around them, which was slower in giving up relatively archaic native usages and habits. But with the general decline in the empire’s economy the towns lost their vitality and began to decay, partly because the state claimed that the municipal
magistrates should still be responsible for the payment of their districts’ tribute. Since no one was prepared any longer to submit himself to holding a magistracy, Rome first resorted to the appointment of imperial curatores, and then cast the responsibility on to groups of well-to-do inhabitants, who were thus gradually reduced to poverty. Meanwhile in the country districts imperial domains grew in size, and latifundia emerged once more; the familiar result was to reduce the small agricultural owners to the status of a proletariat, who eventually were held by the large owners of the so-called patrocinia as free serfs, performing the same functions as slaves had done in republican days. In the outcome the land was overworked and became barren; and hordes of famished coloni, even as early as Antoninus Pius’ time, revolted en masse, abandoning their lands and taking to brigandage. The state meanwhile was having to meet vast expenses with a half-empty treasury. It resorted to heavier taxation, abnormal impositions on the well-to-do, and confiscation of the property of those guilty, or supposedly guilty, of maiestas. The result, from the time of Marcus Aurelius onwards, was a crop of provincial rebellions.

The spread of latifundia led to a closed economy once more, in which consumer goods were directly exchanged among country people. But the state and the cities continued to make use of a monetary economy, so that relations between city and country became more difficult, as did the payment in money of tribute to the state. The situation was made worse by the monetary crisis; and this had a number of causes. Precious metals were going abroad to pay for exotic luxury goods; the mines were yielding less, this factor being only temporarily alleviated by the possession of the mines of Transylvania, eventually abandoned; and there was vast public expenditure to be met from normal budgets, made worse in periods of famine and civil war. The government resorted to the subterfuge of a managed currency, by reducing its weight and debasing the alloy. But this only led to inflation, while the good alloys were hoarded and disappeared from circulation. The poorer classes, salaried workers and soldiers, claimed their pay in terms of raw materials.

Augustus had reduced the number of effectives in the army, making good his loss by the long terms of service of his paid volunteers. But now their recruitment became another source of difficulty, because both pay and pensions were so obviously small. It was now only the country people, from depressed areas, who presented themselves to the legions. Italians disappeared from the ranks, and later even from commands: then Hadrian linked the levy with regional service. So the interests of particular regions, protected by their own people, came to be regarded as more important than those of the central government and of Italy; and the consequences, in the event of military pronunciamentos being made in favour of new emperors, were exceedingly grave. The normal armies, too, were scarcely large enough to garrison the frontiers in time of peace; but even after the costly construction of so many military roads it was always slow and expensive to transfer
reinforcements to meet emergencies, and in any case such a course meant denuding another frontier of its garrison. The construction of the *limes* was the plan to which the government, especially in the period from Domitian to Marcus, resorted to meet this failing. But its cost was very high, and it too proved inadequate where an enemy did succeed in passing this single barrier and Rome had no strong body of troops immediately available on the spot to stop the leak. The result was the gradual adoption of a very dangerous practice. First, supposedly friendly barbarian tribes from beyond the frontiers were paid for their help in defending Rome’s line; then such tribes were transported as auxiliaries into Roman territory, a course which made the barbarians all the more anxious to cross the imperial frontiers. It should also be noticed that the frontier troops, as well as taking on an increasing number of barbarian auxiliaries, began to make the organization of their regiments more like that of the very barbarians whom they had to fight, and to adopt arms and tactics similar to those of their enemies. Finally cavalry became superior to infantry, and in consequence foreign mercenaries in addition to the Illyrians and Moroccans were indispensable: Germans, Arabs, and Iranians who had grown up with horses.

On the non-material side the most worrying problems were those of legal forms and religious observances. For a long time past it had been the duty of pro-magistrates, and in later days of imperial governors, to face the delicate task of laying down rules to govern the juridical relation between citizens and provincials, although the provincials might have varied traditions and levels of civilization and be continually passing through the different phases of Romanization. The method used at first was that a governor promulgated an edict at the beginning of his term of office: later he had to apply the ‘edictum perpetuum’, which was compiled by Salvius Julianus under Hadrian.

Even the edict of Caracalla, which gave citizenship to everyone, did not remove the difficulties, because the adoption of Roman law throughout the empire could be neither immediate nor universal. There were endless obstacles and reasons for resisting it, and there had to be a number of temporary compromises. The result was the appearance of two distinct legal trends. One is seen in the Latinized provinces of the West, when it led later, after the barbarians had settled there, to Romano-German Law. The other, in the Hellenized Eastern provinces, gradually went on to found the Law called Romano-Byzantine. In Egypt the tendency was to compromise between the two.

The faiths and cults of conquered peoples were tolerated by Rome, provided they did not go out of their way to make converts for their gods among Roman citizens. Rome could thus reach a *modus vivendi* even with the Jews, who were monotheists and consequently hostile to the imposition of the cults of Dea Roma and the deified emperors. This form of compromise was for some time a protection to the early Christians, who were not yet clearly distinguishable from the Jews. But from Nero’s reign the difference between...
the two faiths got recognized. Moreover it was established that Christianity started with a man who had been condemned as a rebel against the Caesars, and it was therefore not the traditional religion of a subject people, of which the practice was authorized as such. Indeed it was clearly setting out to make converts throughout the world, and was rapidly spreading not only, as had at first been the case, among the lower orders of society, but even among the upper classes of Roman citizens and members of the government. So there arose the serious problem, political as well as legal, whether the Christians ought to be punished and made to abjure their faith, or whether they should be tolerated: different answers were given in different periods, not only by the central government but also by provincial governors abroad. Meanwhile the new faith was spreading ever more widely, gaining glory from the persecutions (more or less sporadic at first) and by the numbers of martyrs it could boast. Its progress was most rapid in the Eastern provinces, more moderate in Italy, and slowest in the West. It could no longer be either ignored or concealed.

Yet down to the end of the third century it encountered only intermittent interference. It was made supple and resilient by the form of its hierarchy, which was constructed to fit the administrative units of the empire. Its quiet but relentless penetration became more challenging every day.

Although the general crisis of the empire had its repercussions upon culture, resulting in an obvious decline in literary and artistic work, yet the Christians gave the impression of possessing a vitality which was continually becoming more active and productive. This appeared in their theoretical and practical arguments, in their propagandist, apologetic, theological, and literary writings, and in the artistic development seen in their places of worship and burial. It was now clear that this new world, with its ideas which surpassed national boundaries and which aimed at making all men equal, was gradually but inexorably detaching itself from the existing body politic: if it were neither absorbed nor destroyed, it might create a state within a state and become an enemy of the utmost danger. So although several emperors through inertia or patience continued to exert toleration, others like Elagabalus and later Gallienus attempted to absorb Christianity within a religious syncretism, the life of which proved short, and others planned to exterminate it by bloody persecutions. Of those the first which assumed a really general character was that of Decius, the last was that of Diocletian.

d. The Barbarian Invasions

The crucial moment in this great crisis which threatened to bankrupt the empire was reached in the so-called period of 'military anarchy' (235–268), when all the northern tribes from across the frontier attacked the empire simultaneously. The anarchy had begun when the ex-herdsman Maximinus Thrax was acclaimed by his fellow-soldiers and took his place as emperor (235–238) without troubling to secure ratification by the senate and without
even coming to Rome. He directed the wars against the Germans, Dacians, and Dalmatians, and persecuted the leading figures in the Christian Church.

In thirty-three years of anarchy the Roman world was now ruled by a confused collection of emperors of every sort of origin. One was set up against another by legionaries on the frontiers, by the praetorians, by the senate, or by the people. Some took colleagues or tried to set up ephemeral dynasties. Often their authority spread no farther, and they were recognized over only a limited area. Most of them in the end were deposed or murdered, after they had made their contribution to the exhaustion of the empire’s military and economic strength by intestine wars. Their brief and turbulent reigns were weighed down with other cares. Persia was pursuing a policy of formidable expansion, set in motion by the new nationalist dynasty of the Sassanids, which at some moments pressed as far as Antioch with its armies. Meanwhile on the northern frontiers there was pressure from the barbarians, who at several points succeeded in devastating invasions of the Roman provinces.

Few of these rulers managed to reign for any number of years, and even fewer could achieve anything worth recording. Gordian III (238–244) carried out a victorious counter-attack on the Persians. Philip the Arab was tolerant towards the Christians, and defeated the Carpi on the Danube. Decius (247–251), an emperor born in Illyricum, which was still almost closed to Christianity, deceived himself into thinking that he could obliterate the religion altogether; but he then saw the error of his ways. He was eventually the first Roman emperor to fall in battle against the barbarians (this time the Goths). Valerian (252–260) entrusted his son Gallienus, whom he made his colleague, with the defence of the West, against the Franks and Alemanni on the Rhine (who had reached Mauretania and Ravenna respectively), and against the Marcomanni, Quadi, Goths, and other Danubian peoples. Valerian himself took the field in the East against the Persians, but was made a prisoner by treachery. Gallienus was now left as sole emperor. He changed his father’s policy towards the Christians, showing toleration once more, and undertook military reforms and the fortification of cities, such as Mediolanum and Verona, which were threatened by German raids. But he had to contend with a formidable number of rivals, who sprang up in every part of the empire, while he found the majority of provinces, in the East as well as the West, being detached from his rule by movements of independence. At the same time the regions which remained loyal (Italy, Narbonensis, the Danube provinces, and Africa) had been largely plundered by the barbarians: the Alemanni reached the walls of Mediolanum, and the Goths penetrated into Greece and Asia Minor.

The two destructive agents, secessionist movements and barbarian thrusts, had a close relationship to each other. The barbarian raids, which the short-lived rival dynasts of Rome, consuming wealth and human lives in their internal struggles, seemed incapable of withstanding, were mainly provoked
by causes of an obvious kind. The barbarian populations had increased, and they were pushed forward by other barbarians pressing on their heels. The moment for advance was favourable since the Roman frontier forces were depleted and Rome found difficulty in reinforcing any point that was attacked. A further factor was the practice, first put into force on a large scale by Marcus Aurelius, of employing against the barbarians bands of their own kinsmen who had been transplanted on to Roman soil: these were later frequently ready to make common cause with invaders who had been attracted by the legendary wealth of the empire.

In these difficulties of organizing defence against attacks from barbarians in the north and Persians in the east the threatened areas naturally took measures for their own protection, the central government being incapable. For example one of the army commanders on the Rhine and in Belgica, M. Cassianus Postumus (later backed up by C. Aesuvius Tetricus), was acclaimed by his troops; but instead of attempting to acquire the whole empire, he organized Gaul, Britain, and Spain as a separate unit, his aims being to halt the Germans and restore to his lands the prosperity which Rome seemed no longer able to secure for them (258–273). The same function was assumed in the East, against the Persian and Gothic dangers, by the kingdom of Palmyra. Its rulers were Septimius Odenathus, and later his son Vaballathus under the tutelage of his mother Zenobia (Batzabbai): after the defeat and capture of Valerian they organized the defence of a vast region extending from the Bosphorus to Egypt, and gave it an autonomous existence.

Certainly the empire, and above all its economy, seemed to be in ruins. Plagues and wars, both foreign and domestic, were raging; whole provinces had been lost; the population was dwindling and the fields were being deserted, with a return to primitive methods of agriculture and the destruction of hydraulic works; trade was paralysed and the currency was inflated. Everything combined to render conditions of life terrifying to all. They had become altogether intolerable to the mass of the poor and to the agricultural wage-earners, who took to brigandage and piracy; but even the people who had been well-off were oppressed by the treasury, by the heavy burdens of municipal office, and by violent exactions at the hands of the troops and plunder by the bandits, which caused repeated damage to their estates.

e. The Reorganization of the Empire under ‘Illyrian’ Emperors

To this general collapse of the Roman world there came a reaction, which led to a complete reorganization of the imperial system. The credit belongs to a group of ‘Illyrian emperors’, so called because several of them came from Illyricum (278–305); Decius had been their precursor. The first was Claudius Gothicus (268–270), who turned the Alemannic hordes out of Italy and the Goths out of Cyprus and Pamphylia; at the same time part of the Gallic empire, namely Spain and Narbonensis, returned into union with the empire
of Rome. Aurelian (270–275) was the new champion of the imperial doctrine of absolutism; he built the great wall round Rome for its defence, restored the circulation of the currency, and tried like Elagabalus in earlier days to impose a new syncretist religion of sun-worship; but the Christians rebelled against this move, and later in his last days he decided to persecute them. But his chief concern was the defence of the empire: he recovered such parts of the Gallic empire as were still independent, and also the kingdom of Palmyra; he also defeated the Iuthungi in Rhaetia, and the Vandals and Sarmatians on the Danube. Later he was compelled to evacuate Dacia, creating instead two small provinces called Dacia on the right bank of the Danube. Finally he prepared an expedition against Persia, which was cut short by his death.

Probus (276–282) also deserves mention. He was challenged by many rivals and saw clearly that agricultural work would be upset if he raised more troops. He therefore made use of the system of defending the frontiers by employing the barbarians themselves, and made his soldiers fortify cities, repair roads, and put canals in working order. He defended Gaul from devastation by the Franks and Alemanni, the Balkans from the Vandals, Sarmatians, and Scyths, and Egypt from the Blemmyes. His murder prevented an attack on Persia.

Carus (282–283) was another upholder of absolutist theory, and he attempted to found a dynasty by leaving the West to his son Carinus and the East to Numerian. But both were overcome by the usurpation of Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus (284–305), an ex-freedman from Dalmatia who had spent his entire life in the army. He was convinced that the empire was too large for rule by one man, and that with two Augusti there must be two further collaborators called Caesars, who would be designated for the succession and avoid further usurpations. In 285 therefore he chose M. Aurelius Maximianus as his colleague or Augustus and gave him the West; then in 293 he created two Caesars as well, C. Flavius Valerius Constans and C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus, the one as collaborator in the West, the other in the East. (Pl. 76, a.) Diocletian was an extreme absolutist and champion of theocratic rule. He intended the whole life of the empire to depend on these ‘tetrarchs’, through the intermediary of the ‘consilium principis’ and a bureaucracy of officials. To the tetrarchs were subordinated all the provinces, now divided into as many as a hundred units, but grouped into twelve ‘dioceses’ (six in the East and six in the West). (Map XIII.) To regulate the finances he instituted a general census of the population to take place every fifteen years, together with an ‘indictio’ or ascertainment of the returns of all property. He also restored the soundness of the currency by a new issue of gold coins. He attempted to fix maximum prices for about a thousand types of foodstuffs and other merchandise, hoping to overcome the rising cost of living; but this measure had later to be rescinded. For eighteen years he tolerated Christianity: then for casual reasons, which are largely unknown
to us, he launched four fierce edicts against the Christians, and from 304 to
312 they were persecuted with bloody ferocity. He increased the legionaries to
about 420,000 men and the auxiliaries to 150,000: the number of legions was
raised to sixty-eight, of which forty-six were placed on the frontiers, sixteen
in four groups of four were local reserves, and the remaining six were a
general reserve of a second order. In war the Augusti and their respective
Caesars collaborated, and the military activity of the tetrarchy was of some
importance.

In the West there was action in Gaul against the brigand bands known as
'Bagaudae', on the Rhine frontier against the Burgundians and Alemanni,
and Roman troops actually crossed the Rhine to fight the Franks: there was
also war against the Mauretani in Africa. In the East, Mesopotamia and
Armenia were won back, and a treaty was concluded with the Parthians in
297: fighting also took place in Syria, and the rebellious city of Alexandria
was recovered. In the North the Rhaetians were defended against the
Germans; fortifications against the Sarmatians, Marcomanni, and Quadi
were erected along the Danube; and there was fighting in Illyricum.

On March 1, 305, Diocletian and Maximian abdicated, leaving their two
halves of the empire to the two Caesars, who now became Augusti. But
quarrels broke out over the appointment of new Caesars, and subsequently
over the succession to the Augustus Constantius when he died. Disappointed
in their hopes, Constantine, son of Constantius, and Maxentius, son of
Maximian, created complications which led to the breakdown of the tetrarchic
system, and to bitter struggles among a large number of rivals.

f. The Age of Constantine

Once again one man after another succeeded to supreme power, and one
government policy succeeded another with chaotic results. An example is the
diverse treatment accorded to the Christians after 305. In the West they lived
in peace, but in the East they continued to be persecuted by Galerius, who
decreed toleration only just before his death in 311; and his decree was
promptly annulled by his successor Maximinus Daia. In this year, 311, the
surviving claimants were four in number, all determined to gain mastery
over the others, Licinius and Maximinus Daia in the East, and in the West
Maxentius in Italy and Constantine in Gaul. The struggle between the two
last, both of them pagans, began in 312, and was determined when Constantine
won two victories near Rome, at Saca Rubra and the Milvian bridge, in the
latter of which, tradition tells us, he received aid from the God of the
Christians, promised to him in a vision or a dream. He then reached agree-
ment with Licinius at a conference in 313, and both decided to institute
toleration of the Christians, whose numerical importance, far greater in Italy
than in Gaul, Constantine had now perceived. Soon after this Maximinus
was defeated in Thrace and took his life by poison.
There was an apparent return to the diarchy originally desired by Diocletian, with Constantine in the West and Licinius in the East. But the choice of Caesars to complete the organization—the young sons of Constantine, Crispus and Constantine II, on one side, and Licinius, the child of Licinius, on the other—showed that both Augusti were following an undiluted dynastic policy. Soon after this the first period of disagreement between the two began, but a peaceful settlement was reached in 315; and during the ensuing entente the first Constantinian reforms were carried out in the West. The general policy was to reduce the number of legionaries, with recourse once more to barbarian ‘foederati’ for frontier defence; to improve the finances by devaluing the coinage and substituting forced levies for the abnormal collection of tribute then ruling; and to guarantee the continuity of particular professions by making them hereditary by law. Then the contest between the two Augusti broke out once more, mainly on account of their different religious policies. Licinius was oppressing the Christians, while Constantine showed them favour and was anxious to free them from the difficulties created by the schism. War broke out, and in 323 Licinius was forced to surrender: he was sent into exile and committed suicide. Constantine remained as sole ruler, and elected his third son Constantius II as an additional Caesar. He had now become sovereign of the East as well; and in future days he preferred this region, where he also saw that the Christians formed the majority of the population. That decided him to make Christianity the state religion and to institute an aggressive policy of ‘Caesaro-papism’. He was determined at all costs to preserve the unity of the Church, and in 325 he had the Arian views condemned at the Council of Nicaea. In 326, by the application of his own laws, he had his son Crispus and his wife Fausta sentenced to death, after which he left Rome, preferring to reside in the East; and there in 324 he consecrated—and dedicated in 330—the new capital of Constantinople (previously called Byzantium). New military and financial reforms then followed, and fresh measures in the Caesaro-papist style, reversing what he had done before and reviving the dignity of the Arian bishops. This led to schism in the Christian world: the Eastern bishops adapted themselves to the fresh measures and accepted the renewed interference, but those of the West, led by the bishop of Rome, were firmly opposed to recognition of the emperor’s authority on dogmatic questions.

In the last decade of his reign (327–337) Constantine defeated the Goths and reinforced the defences on the Rhine and Danube frontiers. In 337, while he was preparing a military and diplomatic offensive against Persia, he died, baptized on his death-bed.

g. Late Developments and the Disintegration of the Empire

Renewed succession problems followed, for Constantine on his death-bed had enjoined that account be taken of his sons and of two grandsons. The two latter were quickly put out of the way; then Constantine II was defeated
by his brother Constans, who in 340 remained sole master of the West; but he in his turn was overcome by a Breton usurper named Magnentius. Up to this time Constantius II had been engaged with Persia, but he now intervened in the West, defeated Magnentius, and became sole master of the empire in 351. Until 359 Constantius remained in the West guarding the lines of the Rhine and Danube. He was at first supported by his nephew Gallus who secured nomination as Caesar; later, however, Gallus was executed and gave place to his brother Julian. For five years Julian fought the Franks and Alemanni with some success and in 357 utterly defeated them at Argentorata (Strasbourg), after which he reorganized the province. But in 361 he was proclaimed emperor, and had to face the armies of Constantius II in Pannonia, securing, however, the position of sole emperor when Constantius died. The two had diverged on religious policy as on other matters. Constantius II aimed to continue Constantine’s arrangements and had taken up the cause of the Arians: he went so far as to send the bishop of Rome into exile, and then persecuted the pagans. Julian, on the other hand, though baptized a Christian, got converted to pagan Neoplatonism. When he became emperor (361–363), he was tolerant of the Christians for a time, while he restored pagan temples and made one more attempt to launch on the world a teleological Platonist doctrine based on worship of the sun. But in the period which followed he began to exclude Christians from public affairs, and his governors exceeded his wishes and started persecutions. This let loose a violent reaction against Julian, who was already unpopular for his limitation of expenditure on the court and bureaucracy. But he died prematurely, at the age of 32, during a great offensive against Persia. So the dynasty of Constantine came to an end.

Julian’s place was taken by the Illyrian Flavius Iovianus, who annulled his decrees in favour of the pagans and concluded a far from creditable peace with Persia with the surrender of Mesopotamia and Armenia. His successor was Flavius Valentinianus I (364–375), who founded a new dynasty, meanwhile keeping the West for himself and setting up his brother Valens (364–378) in the East. Valentinian was tolerant of all religions, and in social policy was anxious to protect the lower orders (humiles) by posing as ‘defender plebis’. But he was compelled to take the field against the Alemanni in their home in Germany, to defend Britain from the Picts and Scots, to deal with a revolt in Mauretania, and to move over to the Danube to protect Pannonia. At his death power passed to his son Gratian, who had his half-brother, the four-year-old Valentinian II, as his colleague.

In the East the emperor Valens, who professed moderate Arianism, found himself in these years confronted with great dangers in the field. With great trouble he had held back the Persians, though compelled to cede them half of Armenia; and he was now surprised by a sudden barbarian attack on the Danube. This came from a section of the Visigoths, who were compelled to seek refuge in Roman territory because a great movement of tribes was
pressing them from the other side. The Huns from central Asia had crossed the Rha (Volga) in 374, and were pushing the Alans and the Ostrogoths before them. Valens gave the fleeing Visigoths shelter in Thrace; but very soon they became exasperated by the odious ways of the Roman officials and broke into revolt, aided by parties of Alans and Ostrogoths. The troops of the emperor, who fell beneath the walls of Adrianople in 378, were routed, and the Goths became masters of most of the Balkans.

To prevent further expansion by these barbarians, the Western emperor Gratian sent the Spaniard Theodosius, who was later raised to the position of Augustus, to take the place of the dead Valens in the Eastern provinces. Theodosius I (379–395) took the field against the Visigoths, and concluded a treaty with them, under which they remained in Thrace as foederati with the duty of defending the frontiers. In 380 Theodosius had a conference with Gratian at Sirmium; and this was followed by his edict of Thessalonica, confirmed by a Council in 381, which proclaimed the Nicene Christianity of the bishop of Rome to be the religion of the whole empire, and announced that Arians and pagans would be persecuted alike. This was the same line that Gratian had taken under the influence of Ambrosius, bishop of Mediolanum. It naturally provoked a senatorial pro-pagan reaction, led by Symmachus.

On Gratian's death in 383 his place was taken by the Spanish usurper Magnus Maximus, and a difficult and turbulent period began. Theodosius I was occupied with the pagan revolt and with a rebellion of the Antiochenes caused by fiscal exactions: he also had to concern himself with the threat of Persia, and consequently had to recognize the authority of Maximus in Britain, Gaul, and Spain, contenting himself with securing for Valentinian II, who still remained under his protection, the countries of Italy, Illyricum, and Africa. But Maximus, taking advantage of the discontent resulting from Valentinian's Arianism, succeeded in occupying Italy and threatened to invade Illyricum. At this point Theodosius took a hand, defeated Maximus at Aquileia (388) and had him executed, and once more placed all the West under Valentinian II, whose guardian was to be a pagan Frank named Arbogastes. But this general quarrelled with his pupil and had him murdered, transferring his support to a usurping rhetorician, Eugenius, who resumed the reaction against Christianity. Again Theodosius intervened, and the struggle took the shape of a civil war. Strongly supported by the Vandal general Stilicho, Theodosius defeated Eugenius at the Frigidus river (394) and then assumed sole control of the empire, extending his prohibition on pagan cults to West as well as East. But this last unification of the Roman world was short-lived, for in the following year Theodosius died, leaving the East to his son Arcadius under the guardianship of the Gallic praetorian prefect Rufinus, and the West to Honorius who was entrusted to the tutelage of the Vandal Stilicho. The division of the empire into two distinct parts, often at variance with each other, had for long been maturing: it was now
made definite, and the barbarians were the first to see how they could take advantage of it.

At the death of Theodosius I Arcadius was seventeen and Honorius ten: the real heads of the two empires were Rufinus and Stilicho. The latter’s aim was to reunite all the dominions into one, but before this the ambition of both rulers to acquire Illyricum created a perpetual state of discord. Each tried to tie the hands of the other by fomenting internal dangers, in particular by fostering rebellious subjects and promoting barbarian invasions. This state of affairs was just what the Visigothic leader Alaric wanted, and he made good use of it. He came down with his host to occupy Moesia and Thrace in 395, Macedonia and northern Greece in 397, and secured the recognition of the Visigoths as foederati and of himself as general of Illyricum. The Goth Gainas had been sent to Phrygia to fight the Ostrogoths, and it is entirely possible that it was Stilicho who induced him to reach an understanding with them instead and to occupy Constantinople, from which he was then expelled with his Arian barbarians by a rising of the Catholic population. From the other side, both before and after the deaths of the Empress Eudoxia (404) and of Arcadius (408—his successor was Theodosius II), Byzantium fostered and aided a number of troubles for the West. In 396–398, for example, the revolt of Gildo in Mauretania was supported not only by the Donatists but by Arcadius. But the affairs of the West were rapidly going to ruin. In 405 Alaric and his Goths advanced down to Mediolanum, though he was then defeated at Pollentia and Verona; in 405–406 Radagaisus with another Gothic army reached Florentia and was taken prisoner at Faesulae. But in 406, with the Huns who had entered Pannonia pressing at their backs, the Vandals, Alans, and Quadi invaded Gaul and infiltrated as far as Spain; in 407 the Picts and Scots from the island itself, with Saxons from Germany, occupied Britain, and Rome could offer no resistance to them. In the next year there was continuous discord between Stilicho and Honorius, though the emperor had married in succession two of his guardian’s daughters, and despite the fact that Alaric was preparing a fresh expedition. The result was a massacre of Stilicho’s adherents at Ticinum (Pavia), where Stilicho himself met his death at much the same time. The lowest point in the history of the Western empire was seen in 410, when Alaric succeeded in storming Rome and put it to sack for three days.

h. Survival of the Eastern Empire

At this point we must explain the chief reasons why Rome’s power crumbled and fell in the Western regions but survived in the East for another thousand years.

To all appearances the two areas still had common foundations: their law, their administrative system, the nomination of annual consuls, one for each part, and so on. But in reality each was following different roads and different
destinies. There was almost continuous discord between them, and conditions of life in the two were no longer comparable.

In the West and in the northern provinces population movements had assumed disastrous shape. The peasants, scattered over the countryside, beggared by fiscal exactions, and terrorized by barbarian raids, were taking to brigandage or seeking refuge inside city walls. But in their turn the curiales and the city workers, again to escape the fiscus, were leaving the towns, and sometimes escaping to live among the barbarians across the frontier. So the social and economic life of the cities was turned upside down, while in the country the only stable points offering a chance of survival were the villas on the great estates. These were owned by capitalists belonging to the senatorial class, and were defended by their own bands of armed men and coloni. They were organized as self-contained economies, consisting of a number of cells of feudal type, which had everything to gain if the state were weak and everything to lose if it were strong and firmly unified. These conditions helped the barbarians who found the cities ill defended, and the countryside largely depopulated and ripe for occupation. In the West another factor working for dissolution was the series of struggles between State and Church. The central government was fragile; and political ideas now favoured fragmentation of the centrifugal kind. There was no room for a unification of the nationes organized by Rome as overlord, an idea of recent origin which seemed foreign to the area. The centrifugal tendency was fostered by the rival empire of the East for its own advantage; for it wanted to weaken its adversary. But the chief reason for the weakness and decay was the excessive number of barbarians who had penetrated across the frontiers: some had come en masse as foederati; others were exceptional individuals who came as military leaders or ‘duces gentium’, and wanted to create principalities for themselves on Roman territory with or without the consent of the imperial government. This penetration was also working rapid changes in Roman culture. The barbarians did to some extent become Romanized by contact with Rome, but Roman citizens were also being barbarized and settling down to live at a lower level than in the past. As to religion, the barbarians were mostly Arians and the Romans Catholics, the difference leading to endless friction.

Compared with this very grave situation in the western and northern provinces, the provinces composing the Eastern empire were in a relatively privileged condition. Their economy was still flourishing on account of the progress made by industry and of the traffic by sea and caravan; their cities were luxurious; and the state was stronger both politically and militarily. The masses shared the government’s views on religious matters; and the concept of subordination to an imperial régime was firmly held, for although they had changed their masters, the people of this area had been accustomed to submit to this form of government for thousands of years past. Moreover the Christian bishops were ready to accept the Caesaro-papism of the
emperors. All these factors made the Eastern empire readier to withstand the barbarian invasions, and deterred the barbarians themselves from too easily embarking on the dangerous adventure of attacking it.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

1. Hermaeus has sometimes been dated nearly a century earlier. For discussion (with support for Professor Petech's date) see W. Otto, Realencyclopaedie, VIII (1912), col. 712.

2. It does not look as though the division between the Aryan culture of the Pallava and the pure Dravidian culture of the Tamil kingdoms was complete. Exchanges were already important between the two cultures although the Pallava had made Sanskrit the dominant language of their official records and had substituted it instead of Prakrit (Sanskrit was a language in general use, as the society that used it was present everywhere).

3. This appellation is not generally accepted by the countries in question, which have a good idea of their own cultural originality breaking out in the differences in their arts and literature in relation to the arts and literature of India, whatever the importance of their borrowings from the latter.

4. Avidius Cassius, who was given charge of all the Eastern provinces after his striking successes against Parthia in 165, was himself of Syrian origin. This brought him wide support in the East when he rebelled in 175, though he was quickly assassinated.

5. One event in the mid-second century which must not be overlooked is the disastrous plague which spread over the empire from the East in the years following 165.

6. Professor Ch. Th. Saracakis emphasizes that Caracalla’s edict (see Giessen Papyrus, 40) seems to have made some sort of exception for the class known as ‘dedicati’. For the way in which this may have been done (and the exception need not involve any significant modification of Professor Pareti’s statement) see A. H. M. Jones, Studies in Roman Government and Law (Oxford, 1959), pp. 129 ff.

   For a fuller account, see pp. 804 ff.

7. This was the peculiar privilege of those cities which had what were called ‘Latin rights’. The provinces also, of course, contained some cities (Roman colonies, and also ‘municipia’) in which all the freeborn inhabitants were Romans.

8. These first appear about the time of Trajan (c. AD 100).

9. These ‘fugitive’ peasants (and to some extent perhaps also artisans from the cities) are most significant of the economic distress of the period. Although suppressed by Maximian in 286 they are still active in Gaul a century later. See Cambridge Ancient History, XII (1938), p. 267; and for similar movements in other parts of the empire, M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (2nd edition, Oxford, 1957), p. 738.

10. The tradition is reflected in certain early coins.

11. Professor H. Hunger criticizes the use of this term (here and in other parts of this work) to describe the relation of the Church either to Constantine or to the later emperors of Byzantium. For Byzantium see Volume III of the History of Mankind. As regards Constantine’s position see the classic description by N. H. Baynes, ‘Constantine the Great and the Christian Church’, Proceedings of the British Academy, 1929.

12. Valens actually encouraged this settlement, because he hoped the Visigoths would support his Arian policy.
CHAPTER XIV

LANGUAGE AND WRITING

I. LANGUAGE

a. Chinese in Evolution

This period coincides approximately with the last stages of 'Archaic Chinese' and with the beginning of 'Ancient Chinese'. It is a transitional period to the Sui and T'ang pronunciations which have been preserved in the Ch'ieh-yün dictionary of 601. This will be discussed in the next volume.

The appearance of a foreign element in the vocabulary linked with Buddhism which had penetrated China from the first century AD must be noted. The translation of the sacred texts of the new religion from Sanskrit and from the various Prakrit and central Asian languages created a series of problems in morphology as well as syntax. The technical Buddhist terms were for the most part translated, others were transcribed; but few of the latter became part of the inherited vocabulary of the Chinese language. Syntax struggled between two opposed and irreconcilable ideals: a good Chinese style or the most faithful adherence possible to an original text which was completely different in syntactical outlook. As a result the earlier portions of the great corpus of Buddhist canonical writings (San-tsang) consist of very free translations, which often are more like paraphrases of the original Indian text; on the other hand they are nearly always couched in a sort of special jargon and in a style so little related to classical Chinese as to be almost unintelligible to non-Buddhist literati. As a result of these peculiarities Buddhist influence on the Chinese language was negligible in vocabulary, style, and syntax.

From the territorial point of view, Chinese language in its various dialects (about which little is known for this period) continued its slow but unceasing advance toward the south-west. It established full dominance in the plains and in the more fertile valleys, and pushed back the local languages into the hills, in zones that were ever poorer and more rugged. The earlier phases of this long-drawn process are little known, as practically no evidence can be extracted from the historical texts. We can only draw inferences from present-day conditions; but of course we have to keep in mind that the latter are the result of another 1,500 years of evolution after the period dealt with here.

The most important of these linguistic relics are Lolo and Moso in Szechwan and Yünnan, both belonging to the Tibeto-Burman group; Miao-tzū, a marginal language of the same group, in Kweichow and Yünnan; and Diao, of the Thai family, in Kweichow and Kwanghsi.

AA*
In this period Chinese became the language of culture in Korea and Vietnam. Its use as one of the commercial languages of central Asia is witnessed by documents found in the sands of the Tarim basin by English, Swedish, and French expeditions.

b. Languages in India

Sanskrit, having ceased to be a living tongue, continued to be the language of the Hindu religion and the medium and subject of classical education. It rapidly gained ground against the various Prakrit dialects as a literary language. The structure of its morphology and syntax is settled down to the smallest details by the devoted and assiduous work of the great grammarians of the Pāṇini school, of whom Patañjali was the most important. Towards the end of this period even some of the Buddhist schools adopted Sanskrit, though not without giving it a slight special tinge, resulting from peculiarities in syntactic usage, a new technical terminology, and preferential use of certain particles.

The so-called ‘hybrid Sanskrit’, distinct from Buddhist Sanskrit, was also employed in some of the Buddhist schools. Beneath its ungrammatical appearance, there was concealed a conscious effort to give literary dignity to a Prakrit dialect (perhaps a form of Ardhamāgadhi) by drawing it as close to Sanskrit as possible.

In this epoch Sanskrit gradually but completely replaced the Prakrit dialects as the language of epigraphy throughout all the Aryan-speaking areas; it came to be so used even in the Dravidian zone, though it never succeeded in dispossessing the local languages. It then began its triumphant expansion to the south-east. The first Sanskrit inscription in Indo-China may be the Vo Canh stele, possibly of the third century AD, although some authors would place it one century later.

Before the end of this period Sanskrit inscriptions are to be found in Cambodia, the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java, and Borneo. Sanskrit dominated the cultural and religious life of ‘Greater India’, until its collapse in the fifteenth century.

Inscriptional Prakrit yielded to Sanskrit and disappeared. For a long time the exception was the Prakrit of the Kharoṣṭhī documents of Niya. This was the language used in the community of Indian merchants who had settled in central Asia: in this case it was therefore a question of a language which was really spoken, almost completely free from literary elaborations. It should be noted that the Prakrit languages did not spread at all into south-east Asia.

The literary Prakrit languages, instead, survived either where their use was tied to a particular literary form, in which case they ended by becoming languages of art, or dead languages like Sanskrit, or where they had become the sacred language of particular religious schools.

Among the first category belong the Prakrit dialects used by specific
characters in Indian drama—women, servants, clowns, men of low caste, and so on, while kings and Brahmans speak Sanskrit. Śauraseni is the foremost such dialect, Māgadhi and Mahārāṣṭrī are less common. Mahārāṣṭrī on the other hand is employed also outside the theatre in epic poems such as the Gauḍavaḥo and in lyric anthologies such as the Sattasātī of Hāla. Paśācā, a north-western dialect not attested in drama, occupies a particular position since it was used for a great collection of stories, the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya.

The 'religious' Prakrits are local dialects which in time underwent varying degrees of artificial elaboration. The oldest of these, still very near to Sanskrit, is Pali, whose original home is doubtful. It became the language of a Buddhist school (Theravāda), and later, when it had ceased to be a living tongue, accompanied as the sacred language the expansion of Hinayāna Buddhism to southern Asia (Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos).

Another more advanced form is used in the Jain canon. The oldest parts of this canon, the only ones which are of interest here, are composed in Ardhamāgadhi ('half'-Māgadhi). Other dialects were employed by the two sections of the Jain community for their later canons.

c. Languages in Iranian Countries

When the diffusion of Greek and Aramaic had faded in these countries, the Iranian languages reappeared with new vigour: they were now reduced to two groups both called 'Middle Iranian'; one a western or Pehlevīk tongue and the other eastern. The western group appears in two dialect forms, Parthian and the true Middle Persian. Parthian, heavily influenced by Armenian, was spread over the north-west of the country, and is documented in the first century AD about the year 88 by the Graeco-Parthian parchment of A uraman, by inscriptions on coins, and later by documents of the Sassanid dynasty. The last were often written in two versions, Parthian and neo-Persian. Parthian was also used in Manichaean literature from the beginning of the third century.

Middle Persian proper (or Pārsīk) in the south-west of the zone was the real descendant of Old Persian, with infiltrations of Armenian, Syrian, and Arabian. It was the official language of the Sassanids from 226 onwards. It is attested first by inscriptions and then by papyri, and was used for both religious and profane literature, Mazdaean and Manichaean.

In the eastern group a number of dialects were at one time or another used in writing and officially: (1) Sogdian, which in time became the international language of central Asia, appears already in the fourth century in epistolary documents written in cursive letters which were found in the region of the 'Great Wall' (Touen-Houang); (2) the dialects of Khotan (or Śaka) and of Chorasmia, though no written evidence of them has yet been found for this period; (3) the Indo-Scythian, Kuśāna, dialect attested by coin inscriptions of the second-third centuries AD.
d. Semitic Languages

We now pass on to the northern Semitic languages. There was neo-
Hebrew which was used from the first century AD in the writing of the
Qumran sect and, between AD c. 190 and c. 500, in Mishnah, the Talmuds
and related treatises; it was nearer to the last spoken Hebrew than to the
purist form of the language and it was much influenced by Aramaic. In North
Africa there was neo-Punic, the last off-shoot of Phoenician, inscriptions in
which continue to at least the fourth century AD. But the predominant
language of the Middle East was Aramaic in its various forms. For instance
there was an Aramaic dialect in Palestine used for translations and para-
phrases in popularized versions of the Bible (Targum means translation)
and for re-editing the Mishnah with the additional sections (Gemara) which
comprised the so-called Palestinian Talmud. We can distinguish three
regional types of Palestinian Aramaic: (1) Judaean in the Qumran documents
and Targum earlier than AD 138; (2) Galilean, in the Jerusalem Talmud
from the School of Tiberias; (3) Samaritan in the Targum of the fourth
century. In addition we have (4) Nabataean-Aramaic found in recently dis-
covered documents and on second–third century graffiti from Sinai; and (5)
Palmyrean on inscriptions contemporary with the wars with Rome which
ended with Aurelian.

The typical north-eastern Aramaic was Syriac, used particularly in the city
of Edessa, which from the third century became one of the focal points for
the diffusion of the Christian faith.

Before passing to the southern Semitic or Arabian languages it should be
noted that in our period certain northern Arabs changed their homes. A new
wave of people was pushed forward north of the Nabataeans in the region
of Damascus where Arab graffiti are found alongside Greek. Written texts
for central Arabia begin with one of AD 128 from En Namara. Finally
when the Ethiopians, who had originally been immigrants from Arabia,
temporarily conquered the Yemen in the fifth century, there was no noticeable
linguistic change.

e. Egyptian Languages

A remarkable instance of the resurgence of a national language is found in
Egypt. During the Ptolemaic period there were three ethnic groups, native,
Hebrew, and Greek. Greek, which was numerically inferior, became dominant
and even succeeded in Hellenizing the Hebrew element. This position was
maintained even under Roman sovereignty, since the Romans, who formed
only a small, though politically dominant, force in the country, kept aloof
and abandoned any attempt to Latinize Egypt. Instead they regarded the
Greek citizenship of Alexandria as an essential stepping-stone before the
inhabitants received Roman citizenship, which was in any case very sparingly
granted before Caracalla’s edict.
Later when Christianity, spread by Hellenized elements, was sweeping over the indigenous Egyptians, it created a national missionary outlook of its own. In time the Egyptian language, in the new Coptic script derived from Greek (which was used instead of the old demotic), was responsible for a very remarkable literary output, mainly religious, in the last decades of the second century and throughout the third. The Egyptian language maintained its own clear character and full use until the Arab invasions. One of the most marked offshoots of this resurgence was the nationalistic spirit which characterized it. It was completely divorced from the world-wide Greek-Christian, Hellenized-Hebrew ambit.

The movement began, naturally enough, in Upper Egypt where the population was almost entirely indigenous, and it assumed various dialectical forms in particular regions.

f. Survival of Greek Dialects

Greek literary koiné, with an Attic and Ionic base, submerged its Achaeo-Doric competitor of western Greece, its victory being complete by about 50 BC. It still had to compete with the local speech of the Dorian islands of the Aegean, which was still alive in the imperial period. But the Attico-Ionic koiné ended by becoming the one language not only of literature but of common use.

How much this koiné was influenced by the old dialects in each of the affected areas remains to be clarified. On this question the evidence is slight, and scholars' conjectures very different. Thumb, for example, reduces the idea of a combination to its minimum, while Kretschmer gives it great weight. It is true that there are few modern dialects in the Greek world for which clear evidence can be gathered to connect them with the ancient dialects: examples are Tzaconian on the eastern coast of the Peloponnese, Maniot in the southern Peloponnese, and dialects of southern Italy, and the new colonies in Asia Minor. But the uniformity of the other dialects is probably a comparatively recent development. There is very little to prove the contention that about AD 500 the ancient Greek dialects, even in their derivative forms, were dead.

The variety of spoken koiné was, naturally, greater in the colonial areas. It must have been most marked in the new Greek settlements in Asia, where foreign words infiltrated, Greek locutions had new meanings, and non-Greek constructions were in use. It would vary too with the proportion of Greeks to barbarians, with the nature of the local languages, and with the use of koiné itself, which in some areas was used only for official and literary writing, in others for practical purposes.

But even in the imperial period there were reactions against literary koiné. The neo-Attic of the new Sophists took hold not only of the lexicographers of the second century and later, but also of good writers such as Lucian of Samosata. There were also more or less sporadic attempts, attested by
epigraphy, to write in Doric (especially Laconian), Ionic, and Aeolic, either out of archaism or through regional pride.

g. Vulgar Latin and its Survivals

It was certainly not impossible that there should have been a homogeneous literary and educated Latin language given the great diversity in origin, nature, taste, and culture of the Latin writers, who for many centuries came in increasing numbers from the provinces. But it is even more natural that the ‘common and daily speech’ (which soldiers and colonists from various parts of Italy, each with its own regional characteristics, introduced into the provinces, which again were ethnically and linguistically distinct), appeared there in very diverse forms.

So for example if the vulgar Latin of the Po valley was very different from that of the Oscan and Umbrian districts, far greater was the difference between the vulgar Latins of Belgica and Spain, when each country ceased to be bilingual and spoke its own ‘Latin’—a thorough mixture of Latin and the indigenous pre-Roman tongue.

There remain details of various kinds which give a less general idea of the variety of vulgar Latin over a wide range of space and time. Among these are the texts of authors who used a more popular language in their works, such as the comedians beginning with Plautus; the propagandist Christian writers who addressed the people; the didactic writers on agriculture; the Satyricon of Petronius; the grammarians and lexicographers who refer to the vulgar forms; inscriptions cut by common people, and Latin texts transcribed by uneducated copyists; Lastly reconstructions of the original vulgar Latin provided in glosses on neo-Latin renderings.

For it is clear that the modern neo-Latin dialects are only the continuation of those regional Latin dialects which history and race have allowed to continue and to develop through the centuries without great upheavals. This continuity was not possible, for example, in north-west Africa which was flooded by the Arab race, nor in those countries which had too many German immigrations. Elsewhere the results were neither uniform nor homogeneous since they depended on variables such as the numerical proportion between the Arab, German, and (later) Slav immigrants and the Romanized inhabitants, as well as the degree of integration achieved, the depth of Romanization in the region, the duration and extent of the invaders’ rule.

In other countries such as in the Italian peninsula, the greater part of southern Gaul, Spain (with the exception of the less Romanized Basque country), and in the Alpine belt now called Rhaeto-Romance the bands of immigrants were too thin in comparison with the Romanized inhabitants. The newcomers intermarried little, while they destroyed each other or were destroyed by the Byzantines, Franks, and Arabs. Therefore the earlier racial structure, except for some of the ruling aristocratic class, underwent less decisive modifications, and so the pre-Roman races survived in the main into
the succeeding centuries. In other regions such as Flanders, the modern Walloon countries, and some parts of southern Britain the racial mixture achieved a well-balanced compound, and this in time resulted in a balanced hybrid language. At the other end the flood of immigrants was so overwhelming as to make it almost impossible, except to linguistic experts, to detect the traces of Romanization however intense it may once have been.

The spread of Latin in Dacia, and the neo-Latin of modern Rumania, are separate questions. When Trajan conquered Dacia at the beginning of the second century AD he strengthened the indigenous population with a large number of colonists who were drawn from ‘all parts of the Roman world’. This resulted in a fairly rapid Romanization of the country, which lasted even when Dacia was lost politically to Rome in the third century. Although in fact Dacia was probably abandoned in 271, we need not take too literally a phrase in Vopiscus (Life of Aurelian) that the whole civil population was evacuated south of the Danube. At most it would only have been soldiers and officials. If the survival of Latin in Dacia is not mentioned in succeeding centuries, it is because writers did not mention Dacia at all. At any rate, even if Rumanian neo-Latin was derived wholly from the people who moved south of the Danube (and this is an incredible hypothesis), it would not alter the fact that this Balkan neo-Latin of modern times is linked with the language of the people from the Lower Danube who were deeply Latinized in the second and third centuries AD.

h. The Germanic Languages

From the beginning the Germanic languages connect more with the Celtic and Italic than with any other subdivisions of Indo-European. They can be divided for the earliest period into three types. The first can be called ‘north-east’ in the sense that the people who spoke it, the Goths, lived at one time in the north-east in Scandinavia (so ‘Göterland’); from there in the second century AD they descended by the valley of the Vistula and passed south-east to the coast of the Black Sea, dividing into Ostrogoths and Visigoths. This is attested by some inscriptions which may belong to the third century AD but the most important text which proves it is the Gothic version of the Bible by the bishop of Nicopolis in Lower Moesia, Wulfila or Ulfilas, who lived between 311 and about 383. We have some later documents of the sixth century from the Goths who moved into Italy.

The ‘northern Germans’, after their separation from the Goths, remained in the north and, as one would expect, spoke a language closely linked with Gothic speech. This is attested by a series of brief inscriptions, of which the earliest are from the third century AD, written in Runic letters.

The third or ‘western’ group in their peripheral areas south of the Danube and west of the Rhine were more intensely influenced by Latin, both in morphology and by the introduction of new agricultural and religious words. Evidence for this group in written texts is much later (see above Part I,
p. 791). But the earliest Germanic personal, religious, and place names recorded by ancient writers in some glosses on Caesar, Pliny, and Tacitus, and in numerous Latin and a few Greek inscriptions and papyri, belong to this group.

i. North Etruscan Linguistic Derivations

Unless one has a clear idea of the ancient North Etruscan dialects, of which Rhaetian was only one among many, one cannot grasp the essence of an isolated neo-Latin language which derives from those dialects. Equally it would be impossible to explain the small size of the area to which these dialects are reduced today, by infiltrations of Germanic speech to the south and by Celto-Italic speech to the north. The language in question is Ladin or Romansch, and the area where it is now spoken are the Grisons, the Dolomite valleys of the Upper Adige, and Friuli. The similarities between the speech of these three pockets are certainly based on racial affinities; and all these regions also escaped in varying degrees the sweeping influence of German and Celtic speech. It seems logical to think that the Ladin dialects are the survival of those spoken on the Alps before the German and Celtic immigrations, and are therefore related to the Latinized dialects spoken in Etruria.

Even in ancient times the Celtic infiltration on the North Etruscan dialects was strongest south-west of Lugano, less so in Sondrio, and least of all north-east of Bolzano. It is therefore easy to understand how this process continued in later generations through the agency of the Celticized cities in the Po valley.

The area of the western and middle Ladin dialects corresponds in fact with ancient Rhaetia, but excluding part of the Alpine foothills and also the great routes across the Alps through which foreign elements from the north and south had infiltrated.

The greatest difficulties concern Friuli. It has so many peculiarities to distinguish it from the Ladin of the Grisons or the Trentino. The probable explanation is that there was an intermediate racial element between proto-Etruscan and neo-Latin, namely that mixture of Illyrian and Venetic which is represented by the Euganei of ancient tradition. But this complicated question certainly cannot be tackled here, and we must simply note the fact that it exists.

j. Other Linguistic Groups

We must refer to the general information given in Part I and to the special material in Volume III for the penetration into Europe of Asiatic languages with the emigrations which began in the fourth century and were more fully developed in the fifth century and later. In the Avars, Huns, and Alans who carried them out Indo-European (Scythian) elements were mixed with other races, Caucasians, Mongols, and Turcoids.
In any case it is almost impossible to advance anything better than provisional and untested hypotheses because of the scarcity of ancient references, which are themselves often confused and equivocal, the lack of contemporary written material, and the racial admixtures among the migrant peoples.

Some general ideas of a largely hypothetical kind were also put forward in Part I about the languages of countries such as central and southern Africa, Armenia, and Oceania, and to them no further reference need be made.

2. WRITING

a. Writing and Writing Materials in China

By this time Chinese writing in its principles and forms was complete. No substantial modifications took place in this period with the exception of the creation of new characters, and the general adoption of chi'hai-shu, i.e., of the modern form of writing. The so-called 'grass script' was used at the same time—a cursive form which varied a great deal from one writer to another.

The art of calligraphy in this period boasts some of its most distinguished names, such as Wang Hsi-chih (321–379) and his son Wang Hsien-chih (344–388).

The writing followed the language wherever this became the 'medium of cultural life', for instance in Vietnam and Korea. So Chinese language and script, known in Japan from the fourth century, were adopted for official governmental use from 405. Subsequently Chinese characters were also employed to transcribe the Japanese language, but this is a development which lies outside the limits of our period.

In writing materials the great discovery was paper, which was made with cellulose from rags. Tradition attributes the discovery to Ts'ai Lun (d.114), who presented it to the emperor in 105. However it should be noted that in 1931 F. Bergman found at Edsin-gol a piece of rag-paper together with some pieces of inscribed bamboo; and the dating of the latter (according to Lao Kan) cannot be later than 98, so the paper must therefore be contemporary or very little older. As it is evident that paper was already being made in China and even being sent to such remote outposts of the western frontier on the edge of the desert, it seems probable that, as with the brush, the evolution of paper had been a long process in which Ts'ai Lun only symbolizes the official conclusion. Other datable fragments of paper documents have been found in central Asia: at Lou-lan (c.260), Niya (c.250–300), and Turfan (c.399).

Naturally it was paper alone that made the great development in calligraphy possible and which provided an easily accessible and cheap material instead of silk. But without printing and the possibility of duplication it provided, the introduction of paper was not altogether a happy event for the preservation of Chinese literary works, since paper was less durable than the parchment and papyri of the West. As a result no early Chinese manuscript
book has survived the ravages of time with the exception of the library that shortly after 1000 was immured in a cave at Tun-huang, and was opened by Sir Aurel Stein in 1907; the earliest dated manuscript in it belongs to 406.

b. Central Asian Writing

Many alphabets were used in central Asia in addition to Chinese; Kharoṣṭhī was used to transcribe a Prakrit dialect. There it was somewhat improved by a better notation of vowels; at the beginning it had made no distinction between short and long. The *Dutreuil du Rhins* manuscript, possibly of the second century, gives a unique example of a literary text of some length written in Kharoṣṭhī. The last tablets from central Asia in this alphabet are not later than the seventh century. Brahmi was used for Sanskrit and Prakrit texts, and (in a form derived from Gupta, itself a form of Brahmi) for Kuchean and Karashahri (pseudo-Tocharian), and Khotanese Saka, but central Asian Brahmi is attested only after the end of this period. The Greek alphabet survived among the Kuśāṇa, who used it on their coins to transcribe their own language. It was retained also on the coinage of the Hephthalites (fifth-sixth centuries); and we have fragments of texts in which a modified form of the Greek alphabet was used to write the true Tocharian, the language of Tokharestan in the north of modern Afghanistan. Later the Aramaic alphabet penetrated from Iran into central Asia and there it was adapted to write Sogdian; the enormous success of this language as the language of commerce from the Caspian to China assured the widest diffusion to the alphabet in which it was written, and from it the Uigur, Mongol, and Manchu scripts are derived.

c. Writing and Writing Materials in India

Of the two writings in use in India in the preceding period Kharoṣṭhī became rarer from the second century and the last inscriptions in the north-west of India belong to the fifth century.

Brahmi was altered and took on variant local forms from which Indian mediaeval scripts may well have been derived. The Śaka-Kuśāṇa form in the north-west was victorious in its competition with Kharoṣṭhī, and is found in use on central Asian texts. After an evolutionary phase (Andhra and Kṣatrapa inscriptions) it develops into the Gupta script, one of the most important stages in Indian palaeographic history. Farther south Brahmi was the origin of the script in the third-fifth centuries Pallava inscriptions and in the somewhat later Cālukya inscriptions. A further development from the Cālukya script is seen in the Telugu, Kanara, and Tamil alphabets, which have as a common characteristic the generally rounded form of their letters; but this was a local fashion, and had nothing to do with the material employed. In the end Brahmi, in its southern form, crossed the sea and from it derived the various scripts used in south-east Asia and in Indonesia from the end of this period onwards.
Copper plates (tāmrapattāra) and stone were the materials for inscriptions. As for manuscripts their Sanskrit name is pustaka, from the Iranian post meaning skin; but parchment, as far as we know, was never used in India. Apart from the textiles and vegetable fibres the use of which is vaguely implied by Strabo and Quintus Curtius, but for which there is no direct evidence, by far the most important material used in India has always been the palm leaf (tālapattāra) of which fragments have been found in central Asia going back to the first century AD. The plant used is Corypha umbraculifera Linn. or Borassus flabelliformis Linn. The leaves, written on both faces lengthwise, were laid one upon the other, and held together by a string which passed through one or two holes in the middle of the leaf. Wood tablets were not used on so large a scale as in central Asia—their use in India is quite incidental. However birch bark (Betula bhojpattā) was widely employed in Kashmir and the neighbouring countries. Paper appears in central Asia, to which it had of course been imported from China, and it was used for some of the fourth–fifth–centuries manuscripts in Gupta characters. But paper was not introduced in India until much later and then chiefly by the Muslim invaders.

Writing instruments in the north were for the most part the bamboo pen (iśīkā) and ink (maṣī). An iron point (śalakā), with which letters were engraved on the surface of the palm leaf, took the place of the pen in the south, and was sometimes used in the north as well.

d. Aramaic and its Derivations

The Aramaic alphabet established itself, not only in the Hebrew, Samaritan, Palmyrene, and Nabataean variations as in the preceding period, but also in new areas.

The writing known as Syriac derived, with frequent ligatures, from an Aramaic cursive script. It had its centre at Edessa and is first found on coins and inscriptions of the first century AD. It developed as the Christian Church in Syria grew in importance and spread as far as Mesopotamia, and acquired the name of estrangēlō or estrangelā writing, very probably because it was used for the transmission of the Gospel. In time it developed several regional forms especially in relation to the many Christian sects.

In the Iranian zone Pehlevik (Arsacid) and even more Pārsīk (or Sassanid Pehlevik) writing continued to be used. So-called Avestic writing, with its fifty signs, developed later from a mixture of the two with other additions.

The Sogd of eastern Turkestan, who pushed forward into north-west India (the Indo-Scythians) and into Mongolia, continued to develop a writing which was originally Aramaic: the earliest documents are of the second century BC. This writing spread over a wide area in the Middle Ages when Sogdian became the ‘lingua franca’ of central Asia. We have already spoken of the development of the Aramaic alphabet in India (see p. 377).

The Armenian alphabet according to tradition was derived from two
intentional inventions made to acquire sacred texts independent of the Greek and the Syrian Church: one invention was by a Syrian bishop, Daniel; the other, more decisive, invention was by Mesrop or Mastoc who was born in the fourth century and died in 441. In fact, however, it is not clear whether the Armenian alphabet of thirty-six signs derived from Greek or from Pehlevik, or whether, as is more probable, its creator took account of both models and added other elements.

According to tradition the same inventor also created the analogous writing called ‘Albanian’. The two Georgian scripts appear also to have derived from continuing developments in Pehlevik with additions from Greek: one was the ‘warrior’ writing which goes back to AD 300, the other was ecclesiastical. The former became the writing which passed into common use.

e. The Alphabets of Southern Arabia

The alphabets of southern Arabia are attested by many epigraphical documents: we know many varieties of these alphabets, the principal ones being Minaean, Sabaean, and Himyaritic. They seem to have descended from a common prototype nearest to Sabaean, which, in addition to twenty-two letters from Phoenician and Aramaic, has six additional consonants which the north Arabian alphabet represents by diacritical marks. The antiquity of these southern Arabian alphabets is in dispute because the chronology of the local kingdoms which employed them is inadequately known. These alphabets spread through the colonies which the southern Arabs set up for trade and in a bid for supremacy in the areas of Dedan, Hegra, and south-east of Damascus. In those regions three types of writing can be distinguished: Lihyânitic, Thamûdene, and Safaitic.

About the third century AD southern Arabian writing passed also to Ethiopia, where the Ethiopian alphabet presents such modifications as were needed to express the characteristic sounds of the local languages. Gradually the expansion of Coptic script in this region was halted, and its use reduced to small proportions.

f. The Latin Alphabet

In the first centuries of the empire the Latin alphabet, with its twenty-three letters, attained its most elegant form in the epigraphic texts of ‘capitalis epigraphica’; it then sank progressively from the fourth century. At the same time the elegant writing ‘capitalis libraria’ was being used for codices. But quicker and easier systems with cursive tendencies were coming into fashion as well: the ‘capitalis rustica’ or ‘actuaria’, both for writing in public deeds and for inscribing walls and tablets; the ‘capitalis semicursiva’ used on stone or in books; the archaic ‘semiuncialis’ of the third–fourth centuries; and the ‘uncialis’ which held the field from the third century onwards. Cursive proper in many variations—capitals, majuscules, and minuscules—made its
appearance, easy to write but not always so easy to read on account of the ligatures joining several letters together. This became the writing normally employed for documents at the time when the language was most widely diffused.

There was only one temporary modification in the number of signs: in the reign of Claudius new signs were adopted to express the consonant V, Ps, and the sound between U and I.

g. Runic and Ogam

There are several problems about Runic, Ogam, and Gothic scripts. The form of writing with which the Germans got acquainted was used first by the North Etruscans and Celts; and both these people derived their writing from the Phocaens. So the most probable view is that Runic letters were initially a Greek alphabet, which the Germans learned through the intermediary of these two peoples, and that Latin features were later added to it. But many characteristics of Runes, such as the preference for vertical and oblique lines, to the exclusion of the horizontal and rounded ones, are the result of the wooden material on which inscriptions were cut. The order of the twenty-four letters is peculiar. Since Runic writing was spread over an enormous area, from Scandinavia to the Danube valley and Rumania to the south-east, and to England and Ireland on the north-west, there are naturally many variants, of which the earliest can be classified into Germanic and Anglo-Saxon. The earliest texts seem to belong to the third or fourth centuries AD.

The fact is that Runes seem to presuppose a type of writing known as Ogam, employed by the Celts in Ireland and England on inscriptions from the fourth century onwards. This has twenty kinds of stroke, both single and in groups, and both perpendicular and oblique, above and below a straight line. These are the signs for letters, and they read either from bottom to top or from left to right.

In addition the Germanic Runes seem to be connected with the Gothic script which was used by Bishop Wulfila for his Bible translation in the fourth century. The script, however, could not have been evolved without direct knowledge and the use of Greek and Latin alphabets.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIV

1. Even today Sanskrit can be used in conversation between learned Indians from different provinces. But above all it had been, before the introduction of Persian followed by English, the one language which, throughout the whole of India, had been the object of a classical education. Without being known to all, it was the one language present everywhere and consequently the only definite instrument of communication between people of different mother-tongues whether Dravidian or composed of Prakrits differentiated by the lack of a classic form. This explains its success not only as the religious and literary

2. The distinction between 'hybrid Sanskrit' and 'Buddhist Sanskrit' is without doubt justified because hybrid Sanskrit, mixed with Prakrit forms, is not solely Buddhist but is found in secular epigraphy. For its part Buddhist Sanskrit is not always hybrid. It is so, however, in the earliest texts. The theory that hybrid Sanskrit was related to an effort to give literary dignity to a Prakrit dialect is not very likely. A Sanskrit which constantly abused the rules long recognized by purists could not pretend to any literary dignity. This Sanskrit is more likely to correspond to a transitional stage in the first centuries of its usage when it began to be used instead of Prakrits as the language of inter-provincial and international relations. (Cf. *T'oung Pao*, XLIII, 1–2, pp. 164 ff.)

3. There was not a 'collapse' of Greater India in the fifteenth century, but there were political disasters: these did not coincide completely with a cultural change which, beginning earlier, had substituted Pali for Sanskrit as the language of religious culture. Pali has since kept the position it had acquired in Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos.

4. The term Hīnayāna currently employed to describe the Buddhism of the School of *Theravāda* is injurious; it means: 'the inferior way to advance', or 'the inferior vehicle', and it has the disadvantage of not being precise enough, seeing that many different sects were lumped together under this name by their opponents (see Chapter XVII, p. 833).
CHAPTER XV

COMMERCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SCIENCE

I. ECONOMICS, TRADE, AND TECHNIQUES

a. China

Economic Reforms. Wang Mang’s short usurpation (AD 9–23, though in fact the real power was in his hands from 8 BC) was marked by a series of economic and financial reforms, which deeply convulsed Chinese society. In the resulting chaos Wang Mang’s régime and his reforms were shipwrecked and not much survived the storm.

And yet this attempt occupies an important place in Chinese history. From one point of view the word ‘reforms’ is a misnomer. Wang Mang did not want to innovate at all; on the contrary, his aim was to lead China back to the institutions of the earliest antiquity as described in the classics. But since this antiquity was for the most part a reconstruction by the Confucian literati in general and the ku-wen school in particular, the actual effect was one of startling novelties under an archaic garb.

His experiments with coinage will be mentioned in their context. In AD 6 he coined four new denominations of copper coins; at the same time he nationalized (against compensation) all gold in private possession, thus heavily penalizing the old Han nobility. Between AD 9 and 10 he increased the number of denominations to make twenty-eight in all. These coins were lighter than their nominal value and thus were meant to ensure a profit for the government. The new coinage met with disapproval and passive resistance from the mercantile classes, and in AD 14 it was changed for the third time. It must be recognized that these experiments, whose main purpose was fiscal, did not affect the farmers, i.e. the bulk of the people, overmuch, because they used very little money and merely carried on a small barter trade.

Conditions of land tenure had altered in the last years of the old régime with great loss to imperial finance because of the increase in large holdings, in tenancy, and in landless labourers who turned vagrant. In AD 9 Wang Mang proclaimed the re-establishment of the ching system, which according to Confucian tradition had been the rule in early Chou times. The unit (ching) was an area one li square, divided into nine equal squares. Of these, eight were given to as many farmer families. Each of them also cultivated one-ninth of the central square, the produce of which was handed over to the government as land revenue. The remaining ninth of the central square was for building purposes. The model farmer family was supposed to contain five persons and one male worker. Land was granted when a worker was twenty
years old, and withdrawn when he was sixty. In this utopian form the units were much too small: the system required an impossibly fertile soil and was only an antiquarian’s dream. Wang Mang, however, enacted it as a means of reducing large holdings and vagrancy. At the same time, in order to prevent any further concentration of land, he nationalized the soil and forbade it to be bought or sold. He also established a maximum amount of land (900 mou) which one family of up to nine males could hold. This meant that the possessions of wealthy land-owners were confiscated and that land ceased to have any market value. Private slavery was also abolished as such, and the slaves were turned into ‘private dependants’ (sū-shu). This measure chiefly hit the households of the great nobles, since private slave-holding in China was mainly domestic, and little if any land-slavery on the Roman pattern existed, though of course penal servitude was widespread and the state owned large numbers of such slaves. The social turmoil arising from these measures was such that after two years the prohibition against the sale of land and slaves had to be rescinded. Things rested here, except for a heavy tax imposed in AD 17 on all slave-owners. There probably had been no actual attempt at parceling the country into ching, and thus the main effect of this short-lived reform was to limit the size of holdings.

Taxation was increased, with the introduction of an income tax, reduction in the salaries of officials, and special levies on their savings.

Another group of reforms concerned state monopolies. Salt and iron monopolies went back at least to the times of the Ch’in dynasty, and although the Confucian literati protested against them, they were maintained. Wang Mang, pressed for money, added other monopolies: on liquor, on coinage (this existed already; perhaps it included also mining and smelting of copper), on the products of mountains and marshes (forestry, fishing, hunting, gathering of wild honey, etc.). These five monopolies (or ‘controls’, kuan, as they were called) resulted in the price of certain necessities being stabilized at a high level. They weighed chiefly on the lowest classes of the people, who were compelled to pay in order to obtain a licence to ply their usual simple trades, now covered by the monopolies. A sixth control was the so-called ‘Five Equalizations’, implying state control of price and distribution of staple goods (chiefly grain), coupled with state loans to farmers. It was an attempt which had precedents in the Warring States period and under the Former Han dynasty. As aptly summarized by H. H. Dubs, History of the Former Han Dynasty, p. 532, ‘at the imperial capital and at five other large cities... storehouses were built. In the middle of each quarter, the Master at each market was to determine a price for equalization for each of three grades of goods (high, middle, low). These prices were to apply to the five kinds of grains (hemp and similar seeds, glutinous millet, panicked millet, wheat, and beans), linen cloth and silk cloth, thread, and wadding. When any of these goods remained unsold in the market (as they were brought in by farmers), the office for equalization was to buy them at cost or at the market
price (provided that price was lower than the price for equalization), so that
the people would lose nothing by being compelled to receive a lower price on
the market. When the price rose above the price for equalization, the office
for equalization was to sell its goods at the price for equalization. Fluctuations
of prices in the market were thus to be prevented, merchants were not to be
allowed to corner goods or fleece the country people, and the farmers were
to be assured of a market for their goods. People who needed money for
sacrifices or for mourning ceremonies were to have what they needed lent
them, from the payments of the income-tax, without interest respectively
for ten days or three months. Others who needed money for working capital
were to be given loans, paying interest at 3 per cent per month.' This
curiously modern-looking scheme failed because its organization was too
crude, and because of mismanagement and corruption. As to the loans, their
rate (36 per cent per annum) was much higher than the usual commercial
one of 20 per cent, and they were therefore not popular.

On the whole, the 'reforms' of Wang Mang were meant chiefly for fiscal
purposes, and were achieved by confiscating the most profitable enterprises
on the one hand and by heavily taxing the poorer people on the other. No
wonder that they were resented by all classes and that, faced with general
revolt, Wang Mang had to rescind all of them in the winter of AD 22, without
however being able to save his throne and his life.

Trade with the West. In this period international trade in Asia north of the
Himalayas had as its objectives: the gold of Siberia, which was carried as far
as India; the horses of Ferghana, which during the second and first centuries
BC were in great demand in China, both as a luxury article and as mounts for
elite cavalry; various bronze objects produced chiefly in the metallurgical
centre of Minusinsk; and, last in time but of an ever-increasing importance,
Chinese silk. China had the monopoly of silk production and maintained it
during the whole of the period covered by the present volume. Silk became
known at Rome in the first century BC (the first reference being in Horace),
and it soon became very popular in the fashionable world of the city.

This trade was sharply intensified when, after the embassy of Chang Ch’ien
(114 BC), the Chinese entered into direct contact with the Western countries
(Hsi-yü), i.e. with the Indo-European peoples of the oases of the Tarim
basin and of Transoxiana. The Chinese name for silk (ssü, archaic pronunci-
ation siag) is perhaps the origin of the term Seres, by which the Westerners
(the first was Nearchus at the end of the fourth century BC) knew the
silk-trading (but not actually silk-producing) peoples of the Eastern countries.

Trade followed a few established routes, starting at Bactra (modern Balkh)
in the west and ending on the Chinese tānes in the east. The earlier direct
route (first century BC) followed the string of oases to the south of the Takla-
Makan desert, the Southern Route (nan-lu) of the Chinese. The cameos and
intagios at Niya and the frescoes of Miran show that one consequence of
this flourishing trade was a strong Hellenistic-Roman influence on the local artists. Slightly later the Northern Route (pei-lu) came into use, following the string of oases to the north of the Takla-Makan. There were also less frequented variants to these main routes, and the trade of the nomad tribes still followed its old route north of the T’ien-shan to the Caspian.

During the first centuries AD the Chinese more or less effectively dominated the eastern portion of the silk-route, through their outpost of Lou-lan (Krorainna of the Kharosṭhī texts), and the main commercial and military centre of Tun-huang (Drw’n of the Sogdian texts, Throāna of Ptolemy). The silk trade and its routes are known both from Chinese itineraries, and from the information gathered by the employees of the rich Macedonian merchant Maes Titianus and embodied in the geographical work of Ptolemy; there is a fair measure of agreement between the two sets of sources.

Sea trade between the Roman world and China was but an extension of the Indian trade. From the Coromandel coast the merchant ships followed the coast of the Gulf of Bengal, or else cut straight through it with the help of the monsoon, as far as Takola, i.e. Takuapa on the Malayan peninsula (now in Siamese territory). The peninsula itself could be circumnavigated, but more often it was covered by a short portage, after which navigation was resumed as far as Kattigara, the entrepôt of the Sinai, where the latter came to trade; Kattigara was in all probability situated at the mouth of the Mekong.

Trade on this route may be supposed to have been chiefly in the hands of Indians and Indonesians. But several Westerners went with it; one of them was the sea-captain Alexander, whose account is the basis of Ptolemy’s information. Another group of enterprising merchants posed as Roman ambassadors and in AD 166 were received as such at the Chinese capital Ch’ang-an. It was the only way to penetrate into the interior lawfully and with full official facilities. But the Chinese became suspicious of this embassy from King An-tun (Marcus Aurelius Antoninus) of Ta-ch’ in (the Roman empire), whose tribute consisted of such typically tropical products as ivory, rhinoceros horn, and tortoise-shells, quite evidently picked up in the Malayan peninsula.

This sea trade is well authenticated both from Chinese, Greek, and Latin literary texts, and from actual finds such as the beads found in the Johore river, a Roman lamp at Phong-tük in Thailand, Roman cameos and coins (of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius) at Oc Eo in the Mekong delta, and Syrian glass in the tombs of the Korean kings of Silla. At the other end of the route a Chinese Huai vase has been found in Rome and a ku vessel in the sea off Ostia, while another Chinese vase was unearthed in the south of England.

Thus the first two centuries AD were the first period in world history during which Eurasia may be said to have functioned (with many limitations) as one great commercial area. This did not happen again until the thirteenth century.
Currency. Wang Mang’s innovations in the coinage were no less radical than those he introduced in other fields. In AD 7 he introduced three new pieces (two knife-coins and a round coin), meant to circulate along with the 5-shu coin. In AD 9 he abolished the knife-coins and the 5-shu piece and introduced six types of round coins (ch’üan) and ten types of spade coins (pu). Further changes were made in AD 14 thus completely upsetting Chinese currency. In the end, people anxiously prayed for the return of the 5-shu coin. It was reintroduced after the fall of Wang Mang and remained the standard piece, or at least the basic unit, until about 600. Round coins of very large denominations were issued in the fifth century, but their importance in actual use was slight.

Owing to the shortage of copper in the troubled times after the fall of the Han, attempts were made to use a commodity money instead. Thus the Wei dynasty in 221 abolished copper and ordered that grain and silk should be used. The order was withdrawn in 227, but copper still continued to be scarce and bolts of silk became practically the currency of China for larger transactions during the period 200–600. The country was thus brought back to a sort of natural economy.

Other metals were scarcely used. Gold was not a medium of exchange. Iron coins appeared sporadically in the West, from about the beginning of the Christian era.

Ceramics and Goldsmiths’ Work; Japanese Ceramics. Apart from the ming-ch’i funerary statuettes, the most characteristic form in Han ceramics is the round hu vase and other types imitated as usual from bronze. Their area is more or less restricted to the territory of the two capitals, Ch’ang-an and Lo-yang. Some of the pieces have a glaze of lead silicate, possibly a technique imported from the West, which represents a great advance in ceramic art. Stoneware, too, progressed considerably. We may note the pieces found near Hong Kong, representatives of a local Southern Chinese school; also the Ch’ang-sha pottery, with its strong, coarse character. At Yüeh-chou or Chekiang a new centre appears toward the end of this period; it is the Yüeh pottery (grey stoneware).

But the most important event was the beginning of porcelain, which was brought about by an improvement in stoneware. The earliest record is a local tradition embodied in the Fou-liang-hsien-chih, which attributes the manufacture of a sort of porcelain-like ware to the town of Hsi-p’ing near Huai-yang in Honan, during the Late Han period (some think about AD 88). B. Laufer obtained actual specimens from tombs in Shensi near Hsien-yang and Hsi-an, of about the same date; the ware was of porcelain type, but with a coarse, dark body. Perhaps they represent the first experiments of potters toward porcelain.

The most famous manufacturing centre of modern ages is Ch’ing-tê-chên near the Po-yang lake, and its record, the Ch’ing-tê-chên t’ao-lu, refers to a
blue-green translucent ware produced near Wên-chou in Chekiang during the Chin dynasty (265–420). It was called Tung-ou ware and was much favoured for drinking tea. It is to be noted that early porcelain makers were consciously trying to imitate jade, and therefore their ware was blue-green. But the development of this technique into celadon and then into true porcelain lies outside the limits of the present volume.

Actual finds of Chinese gold work are rarer for this period than for the preceding one. What little remains shows, however, that the same techniques were still followed. Jewellery is more interesting: the objects found in the tomb excavated in the western suburbs of Canton in 1954 include silver hairpins, rings of gold and silver, and gold pieces used as amulets. Other ornaments are known only from paintings, chiefly from the Ku K’ai-chih scroll in the British Museum. The pu-yao, a gold ornament in the shape of a delicate crown with stalks springing out in spirals from floral buds, is an example. Leaf-shaped plaques in granular work have recently been excavated from Tun-huang. They continue the Han granulation, but their pattern dates them to this period.

Japanese pottery of this period (in which rice-culture and the use of metals began) takes its name from Yayoi, a site in Tokyo. Its style is different from the Jōmon ware, and is somewhat less refined from the artistic point of view. (Pl. 64, a.) The potter’s wheel makes its appearance, at least as an instrument for finishing the finer products. About the third century the Yayoi pottery gradually passes into that of the late Kofun period (megalithic). The clay figurines (hanriwa), found outside the sepulchral mounds (but associated with them), properly belong to the realm of art. (Pl. 64, b.)

b. India

*Trade with Imperial Rome.* Internal trade in India showed very much the same features as during the previous period, though it was subject to increased obstacles from the lack of a widely recognized paramount power such as the Maurya had been. But it is international trade that comes to the fore after the beginning of our era. India tended to become a link in an intercontinental net of trade-routes connecting the Mediterranean with eastern Asia. These routes were by land and by sea.

The land routes started mostly from Antioch, crossed Mesopotamia (where the fair at Batnae played an important regulating role) and Iran, and entered India through the Afghan countries. It was this rich trade that made the fortune of Gandhāra and generally of the Kuṣāṇa territories. There was apparently a close relation between the decay of the Roman trade after the second century and the collapse of the Kuṣāṇa power, just as a passing revival in the fourth century was contemporary with a last flickering of Kuṣāṇa rule. At the worst, when the Sassanids and Rome were at war and the route through Iran was temporarily closed, another way remained open for the Roman-Indian trade: from the northern shores of the Black Sea
and of the Caspian to Sogdiana, and hence by the famous trade route from Bactra to Taxila. But whatever route was followed, the Indian centres of the land trade were always Kāpišī (Begram in Afghanistan) and Taxila; in both places substantial archaeological evidence of commercial relations with the West has been unearthed. (Map XIV.)

Sea trade started from the Red Sea ports of Berenice and Myos Hormos, and at first followed the Arabian coast to the mouth of the Indus and down to the south Indian ports. But about the beginning of our era knowledge of the cycle of the monsoons became current among Egyptian and Syrian sea-captains in the Red Sea; classical writers (Pliny, N.H., VI, 100) attribute this discovery to Hippalus (late second or early first century BC), but it was undoubtedly knowledge that had been accumulating for a number of years. Thus it became safe to cross the Arabian sea directly from Aden to the Indian coast; the ships of the oriental subjects of Rome needed only to entrust themselves to the regular course of the monsoon. The two chief ports to which they sailed were Barygaza (modern Broach) in the north and Muziris (near modern Cranganore) in the south.

Barygaza was the chief port for the trade with northern India, whose merchants flocked there. As such it appears in the handbook of an unknown Levantine sea-captain, the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, of the second half of the first century AD.3 Bronze statuettes, coins, and other material remains of Roman trade have occasionally come to light in the wider hinterland, but no excavations have as yet been carried out at or near Broach.

Farther down the coast, Muziris was at the same time an outlet for the merchandise of south-western India, an entrepôt on the sea route to the Far East, and the terminus of a land route which crossed the southern tip of the peninsula; this road avoided circumnavigation of the stormy Cape Comorin, and at the same time led through the beryl mines, whose produce was much in demand in the Roman empire. This route was at one time much frequented, as is shown by the numerous hoards of Roman coins found in the area. Muziris may have contained a substantial colony of Roman traders; the Tabula Peutingeriana places a Templum Augusti in that region, and Tamil texts of the first centuries AD depict ‘sturdy Mlecchas (Westerners) with sinewy round arms and high shoulders, wearing garlands of leaves and flowers round their necks, the ends of their garments hanging loose on both sides, moved to and fro in exuberant spirits, drunk with sweet toddy, through the streets with storeyed buildings, wide and sandy as river-beds, of that prosperous and ancient city, and unmindful of the cold drops of the drizzling rain’ (Nedumalvādaī, 29–35). As a scene in the harbour it could hardly be bettered. From other contemporary Tamil sources we hear of Western mercenaries in the pay of local princes.

On the other side of the peninsula the foremost of those ports open to foreign trade (the ἐμπόρια νόμιμα of the Periplus) was Poduce (Πωδοῦκη), a couple of miles south of Pondicherry. The city itself was washed away
by the river but its outskirts (modern Arikamedu or Virapattinam) and a part of the harbour were excavated by French, Indian, and English archaeologists and have yielded a fairly clear idea of what a Roman-Indian trading post looked like. The main buildings appear to have been factories and magazines for the production and storage of the fine cloth (musseline), which was exported to the Mediterranean. Roman imports were mainly represented by statuettes, vases (chiefly Arretine), and wine amphorae, some of which still maintain a sticky deposit on the ground, due to the resin with which the heavy Greek and Italic wines were dressed.

This brings us to the object of this trade. Rome imported costly items, such as beryl and other precious and semi-precious stones, cloth, pepper, cinnamon and other spices, ivory, etc. What it could supply in exchange (wine, glass wares and pottery, bronzes, etc.) was far less valuable, and insufficient to make up the commercial balance. Hard cash had therefore to be exported, and accordingly hoards of Roman coins are quite common both in the extreme north-west (terminus of the land route) and in the far south, where the principal ports were situated. Pliny (VI. 101) complains that the Eastern trade cost Rome about 50 million sesterces annually.

The frequency of the various coin issues shows that the Roman-Indian trade, on both land and sea routes, was very lively during the first two centuries of our era. It decreased with the decline of the Roman empire, the establishment of the Sassanid kingdom, and the increasing insecurity of the routes during the third century. It experienced a short-lived revival during the fourth century, and eventually peters out at the end of the fifth century. But while it lasted, it played a great historical and cultural role, both in itself and as an intermediate step toward the Far East. During the first two centuries of our era there existed a south Eurasian commercial unity, which was revived (except for the short interlude of the Pax Mongolica in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries) only with the coming of European sailors and traders after 1498.

**Currency.** From the numismatic point of view, India at the beginning of this period is divided into two great regions. In most of the country the old Indian coins and weight standards still linger on. The devices, however, begin to include short inscriptions, and thus we have scattered coins of local rulers, and above all a substantial series of coins issued by the aristocratic republics of northern India. The second region is represented by modern West Pakistan. It was the seat of several mints working for foreign rulers. The Śaka and Parthian conquerors continued the coinage of the Indo-Greeks in all its essential aspects, but with clumsier execution and an increasingly Indian element in the artistic taste. The Kuṣāṇas introduced a great novelty into India: they were the first (with the exception of some isolated coins of the Bactrian Greeks) to strike gold. Their gold coinage is influenced by that of Rome; Roman coins are found with great frequency in India, but chiefly around the ports and the beryl mines in the far south and in the Kuṣāṇa
dominions in the north-west. The new gold coin was struck by Wima Kadphises on the standard of the Roman aureus (8.035 gm.). Roman influence was seen also in other coinage, and some copper coins closely imitate issues of Augustus. For a time Greek regained its ascendancy and under Kaniska the legends on coins were again in Greek or in Iranian written in Greek characters; but Brahmi and Kharoṣṭhī legends also sometimes occur. With the decline of the Kuṣāṇa empire Greek, no longer understood as a language and increasingly corrupt as a script, disappeared from the coins. The devices on the coins of Kaniska and Huviṣka are interesting: they reflect the eclectic tendencies of those rulers and feature Greek, Graeco-Egyptian, Iranian, Vedic, and Brahmanic gods, the Buddha, and perhaps even the Dea Roma.

The Śaka Kṣatrapas, who ruled from the first to the fourth century of our era, minted silver with Indo-Greek standards and type, and their coins have the rare distinction of regularly bearing the name of the ruler and the date (in the Śaka era of AD 78).

Further south, the Andhra kingdom (first century BC to third AD) struck coins mostly of lead, or of a peculiar alloy of copper, very different in all respects from the northern types.

In numismatics, as in other fields, Gupta rule marked a period of unification, of absorption or rejection of foreign elements, and of high technical skill. Gupta coinage was at first gold and copper only. At the beginning the gold coins followed the Roman standard and even bore a Roman name: dināra (denarius). But in the middle of the fifth century another class of gold coins appeared, which were an archaizing revival of the ancient Indian weight standard; they are called suvarṇa in the inscriptions and represent the coins of the same name (weight 9.48 gm) prescribed in the Dharmaśāstras. Silver appears at a late date, after the Gupta conquest of the Kṣatrapa kingdom in Malwa; it is at first a local coinage of that country and continues the coinage of the Kṣatrapas in type and weight. From there it spread to the rest of the empire, although it remained differentiated in two diverging types. Copper is rather rare; from the beginning it is purely Indian and owes little to foreign influence. Workmanship is usually high. At the height of Gupta power, gold and silver coins are marked by great elegance and refinement, and some of them are real works of art. With the decline of the dynasty, however, they decayed very rapidly and in the sixth century were totally worthless from the artistic point of view. The coinage of Hindu India never recovered from this decline.

Agriculture. Agriculture, the livelihood of the majority of the people, was not made the subject of theoretical research by Indian authors. Nor do the inscriptions allow us to give an account of land tenure and connected subjects, as it is possible to do for southern India in the ninth–thirteenth centuries. We know only that irrigation played an important part in the Ganges valley, but above all in the south. Water control in the deltas of the southern rivers
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was a complicated and large-scale undertaking; it was made possible only by the existence of large and well-settled states, which were able to command and to co-ordinate the efforts of the local people. The barrages (anicut) and canals of the south were a model for all the neighbouring countries, as far as Indonesia, where the technique of rice-growing by artificial irrigation, although indigenous, was probably stimulated and influenced by the south Indian model. Of local agricultural conditions, chiefly in the great Gupta empire in the north, we know next to nothing. Some information can be gleaned from the account of the Chinese pilgrim Hsüan-tsang; but his journey is later than the chronological limits set to the present volume.

**Ceramics and Jewellery.** Indian pottery of this period is mainly represented by the Roulettéd ware, found in south India only and datable with some certainty, because it is found at the Roman trading station of Arikamedu together with Arretine vases of the first half of the first century BC. The Roulettéd ware belongs therefore to the first and second centuries AD. The most usual shape is a dish with a beaked rim and two or three concentric rings of roulettéd pattern on the flat interior bases; this pattern is almost certainly derived from the Mediterranean. (Fig. 8.)

In western India the most common type is the red polished ware, which bears a strong technical resemblance to the Samian vases, although most of the forms are purely Indian.

In the north, the later levels at A hicchatrā have yielded a red ware with red or brownish slip. The vessels bear stamped symbols, which are similar to those found on the coins of the same period. This pottery forms a remarkably homogeneous series with but minor differences, and it lasts until the Muslim invasions (twelfth century AD).

Kuṣāṇa pottery is found in many sites in the Punjab and the Ganges-Jamma Doab; it bears symbols of a religious character, such as the Three Jewels, the Svastika, etc.

Indian theoretical treatises on jewels (Ratnasāstra) are later than the period under consideration. The jewellery of ancient India is known from two sources: actual finds and representations in sculpture.

The jewellery of this period is mainly represented by the abundant finds at Taxila. As one would expect, strong Hellenistic influence is felt, ranging from outright copies (bronze figure of Harpocrates, bust of Dionysus) to more or less Hellenized local produce (bracelets, pendants, ear-rings, anklets, girdles, etc., mostly of gold, and some interesting ivory combs). Another influence is the nomad art of the steppes with its rhythmic patterns of vegetable and animal forms. The Kuṣāṇa domination was highly conducive to the blending of Hellenistic, Indian, and central Asian elements in the jewellery of north-western India. But apart from Taxila, no jewels of this period have as yet been unearthed from Indian soil. Thus the jewellery of the Gupta period, which is closely influenced by Gupta art and so shares
with it a climax of refinement at the end of this period, is known only through reproductions on the clay figurines of Ahicchatrā, and above all in the early frescoes of Ajanta; the latter reveal an increasing popularity for the use of precious and semi-precious stones. Jewellery was worn by court ladies in great quantity, the emphasis being placed on quantity rather than on quality, and it tended to cover the parts of the body left exposed by the very scanty clothing.

Ivory carving merits special treatment. The produce of the Indian dantakāras was much appreciated abroad, as shown by the fine ivory statuette of a

Fig. 8. Rouletted ware (after a photograph).

Yaksinī (perhaps a mirror handle) found at Pompeii and therefore earlier than AD 79. It is not only a fine piece of carving, but the elaborate ornaments with which the sensuous feminine body is covered gives us perhaps the best available idea of a rich ensemble of jewellery of the first century of our era. Not less finely worked are the fragments of ivory toilet-boxes, probably of the third century AD, found in the hidden store-room (customs-house?) at Begram in Afghanistan. Their delicate, sophisticated, and exquisite workmanship belongs to a very high artistic level and is closely connected with the Mathura school of sculpture.

It must also be remarked that the technique of the Sanchi sculptures
c. Rome

Agriculture under the Empire. In the imperial period Italian agriculture completely lost its superiority over that of the provinces. The methods used in Italy had now spread abroad, as had also the types of crops which were sown, one cause being the assignment of lands to veterans. Moreover all the provinces had now been made self-sufficient in their agricultural output, by cutting down the areas previously under marshland, forest, and semi-desert. So the lands which had earlier been little cultivated and relatively unproductive, such as Africa, Spain, and Gaul, had become valuable, while the lands of Italy, Sicily, and Greece were no longer the most important. Every type of agricultural system was employed, the choice depending on the nature of the adjacent markets, which consisted in the many towns of various size designed by Rome. In the areas nearest the towns there was a cluster of gardens and orchards for the production of vegetables and fruit which would have perished if transported over long distances; and there were also more substantial agricultural undertakings designed for intensive cultivation of cereals, wine, and oil, which could be carried to the neighbouring cities without excessive cost or trouble. At a greater distance more intensive systems of cultivation would flourish, woods and pasture being interspersed with narrow agricultural lands to feed the rural population. So the production and sale of agricultural products responded to local demand, which was regular and was not extended over long distances. Prices were stable; there was no over-production if harvests were good, or under-production if they were bad. Direct relations existed between farmers and consumers, between the country and the city. The people of both classes were harmed by the vicious behaviour of the fiscus rather than by the ups and downs of their relations one to another.

The old methods of peasant working still survived. They were supervised by the pater familias assisted by one or more slaves, and in the seasons of sowing and harvest by a number of free-born wage-earners who did similar types of work. These old methods were perpetuated by the distribution of land to veterans, and also by the organization of the colonate on the great latifundia, both private and imperial. In the past a feature of latifundia had been the large-scale use of slaves, whether the estates had been managed directly by their proprietors or by means of vilici or appaltatores (as normally the case on domain or imperial lands); and the slaves had been trained to specialized work. In this period the tendency was to divide the estates up into small sections, all of them under supervision of conductores, and to entrust them to the work of individual families of semi-independent coloni, who were bound to pay over a part of the produce and to put in a fixed number of days on corvée work. On the latifundia, therefore, there was a
return to the small agricultural undertaking, run by families with non-specialist labour.

The improvement of agriculture in the various provinces was of course partly due to the more general use of implements of a specialized and developed kind. Ploughs of various types were developed according to the nature of the soil and the system of agriculture envisaged; and there were harrows, rakes, hoes, shovels and spades, hatchets of metal or wood to deal with the more tender plants, instruments for threshing and sifting cereals, baskets, buckets, and so on. In some cases we find regular agricultural machines of a more complicated sort gaining a wide measure of acceptance: for instance the reaping machine which Pliny says was used in Gaul, and which had metal teeth and was drawn by animals; or the wine-press with a screw (cochlias); or the water- and wind-mills.

[Town Planning and Housing:* Like Julius Caesar before them, the emperors accepted that municipalities were the basis of social life and administration, and so wherever conditions permitted they founded new colonies and towns. The skill and understanding of the Romans, both in selecting sites and planning the towns, are shown most strikingly by their survival into modern times: in Italy and the western provinces, where such policies were especially applied, many towns were created whose street-plans even today indicate their Roman origins. (Pl. 59, b.) The typical Roman town-plan was derived partly from earlier Greek traditions and partly from their own experience in laying out large military encampments. In its purest form, it was a strictly geometrical design, in which two main streets intersected at right angles, and around these was laid out a network of lesser streets dividing the city into a series of uniform rectangular areas and building-blocks. It is seen most clearly where the builders were able to create a completely new city. The town of Aosta, founded in 24 B.C as the colony of Augusta Praetoria, was divided mathematically into sixteen rectangles, each of which was further divided into four; the surrounding town-walls took the form of a larger but similarly-proportioned rectangle. (Fig. 9.) In the Trajanic colony of Timgad in North Africa, one of the best preserved Roman towns, the same precision can be observed. But such perfection could not always be achieved; the plans are sometimes changed to meet the difficulties of a site or to include an earlier settlement.

Roman architects sought to avoid any appearance of monotony by adding secondary features; colonnaded streets, arches and gateways, or ornamental sculpture and fountains could help to soften the sense of geometrical rigour. But by such systematic planning they were able to provide the buildings and amenities that were, for the Romans, of the very essence of city life: the solemn central forum with its temples and public buildings for local magi-
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strates and senate; an adequate drainage system and plentiful water-supply; public baths and theatres; and shops and open markets under official control.

Within a Roman town, private houses followed a variety of patterns. In Italy, where our information is fullest, the earliest houses are of a low-built, spreading form of one or two storeys, which were centred round an open hall (*atrium*) and a colonnaded garden (*peristyleium*). (Pl. 6o, a, b) (Fig. 10.) These houses are best known from Pompeii, but they were fashionable also in Rome,
and were of a style well suited to the aristocracy and municipal classes of the early empire. In the provinces, housing seems to have kept to local traditions, improved and embellished to suit the prosperity of the times. It was not long before the increasing wealth and social changes in the empire were reflected in architecture. The richest classes began to build luxurious villas with surrounding gardens, often in the countryside or by the sea. But in the largest towns, where space was expensive and a large population of labourers and small craftsmen needed housing, there begins to appear the new style of building known as insulae, which were large apartment houses divided into many shops and small flats. Some areas of poor-class tenement housing in this style had existed in Rome from early times; but the new technique of brick-and-concrete architecture had made a revolutionary change, and after the great fire in AD 64 Nero took the opportunity to rebuild Rome systematically in the new style. Of the many cities where these insulae were built, our best knowledge comes from the harbour town of Ostia. It is vividly clear how with new building methods spacious apartment houses of five storeys or more could be designed; the insula, which had previously been a ramshackle tenement in a slum, was now converted into a safe, pleasant, and almost fire-proof structure. The words in which the historian Tacitus refers to the opponents of Nero’s scheme, who defended the unsafe and often insanitary city quarters as they had been before, have a certain ironical flavour to modern readers. This new utilitarian architecture reflected the changed social conditions; it supplied economical housing for a new population who found that only the cities supplied them with their employment and their amusements.]

Artisan Work and Industry. Under the empire very large areas were linked together by regular communications into a peaceful union. In these favourable conditions the industrial organization of Hellenistic times could hold its own in the East, and it became possible to widen and strengthen a similar development in Western countries, along the three recognized systems—work in the household, artisan labour, and large-scale industry. The rapid Romanization of the West, with the emigration of a number of Italians, required a large production of relatively cheap goods; and a great variety were in fact made locally, each city becoming a marketing centre. At first these goods were imitations of the current Italian product, but later they acquired certain local characteristics and even sometimes a reputation for fine work, so that eventually there was a demand for exports to Italy itself, from Gaul and Germany for example.

Household production traditionally was found most in country districts. The families there wanted to be self-sufficient, and to give continuous occupation to the agricultural workers, both slave and free, with labour which was complementary to their agricultural activities in the periods when there was little or no work to be done in the fields. We find these conditions on
large and small estates alike: on all of them there was practically a closed economy, in which every sort of article was made, from bread to spun cloth, from furniture to clothing, together with shoes, baskets, rough pottery, bricks, tanned hides, and the more simple utensils of wood or metal.

But in all the towns this kind of production was replaced by artisan labour, and its products, for the most part cheap goods, were marketed over the surrounding country up to a fairly limited distance from the centre. These goods were the output of small factories and shops using mainly general labour, though sometimes there would be a few more specialized craftsmen; and since they were made without the use of machinery they did not take on a standardized appearance. They included utensils, furniture, leather goods, textiles, glass, jewellery, embroidery, scent, and cosmetics. We can also classify under this heading the groups of artisans who worked in villas at the centre of large estates.

These artisans formed new colleges, the shoemakers for instance, or the wine and vegetable merchants. The corporations still kept up their philanthropic ways, giving assistance to workers in time of need, uniting their members in religious and funeral societies, and possessing their own statutes, common funds, protectors, and patrons. Yet we find them increasingly controlled and shaped by the state. In the end the state came to organize all labour, in order to ensure supplies to the cities and the continuity of the necessary trades. Eventually Diocletian made certain professions hereditary by law, under three headings: (1) independent professions, relatively non-essential, but under supervision—the smiths (in metal, and timber), fullers, cloth-workers, innkeepers, boatmen, doctors, and veterinary surgeons; (2) corporations essential for food supplies—bakers for bread, merchants of oxen, pigs, and sheep for their meat, boatmen transporting grain and livestock (especially to Rome by river from Ostia), together with the baggers and dockers of grain; (3) corporations of large industries, independent or monopolized, monopolies being increasingly common in the later empire.

These larger industries often used slave labour and 'chain' methods of production. The following are worthy of mention: (1) the extraction and working of metals. Galleries or mines were dug, and from them the raw or worked material was removed. Silver working was relatively easy: the metal was extracted from argentiferous lead in Sardinia, Spain, Gaul, Epirus, Pannonia, and Dalmatia. Gold and lead came from Africa and Britain, copper was mined in Baetica, Lusitania, Aquitania, Narbonensis, and Britain. The alloying of bronze was also common, rolled or beaten or fused, and fairly advanced methods of soldering were known. The lack of bellows with safety-valves made iron-working very laborious: proper fusion was impossible, and the metal had to be reduced by heating to a spongy form and then hardened on the anvil and tempered in water. However in the course of the second century AD new double bellows made the production of proper steel possible for the first time. Raw iron was mined in Spain, Gaul, Noricum, and
other provinces; (2) the furniture industry; (3) textile and fulling industries, found in many parts of Italy (Pollentia, Tarentum, Canusium, etc.), Gaul, and Spain (Tarraco, Emporiae, Saetabis). They turned out cloth made of every sort of material and in all sorts of form, making use both of horizontal and of vertical looms, and then decorating the wares with the most varied finishes; (4) pottery. This was made throughout Italy (e.g. at Arretium, Mutina, Cales, and Cumae), in Gaul, and in Spain (at Saguntum). The most advanced type was the ‘sigillata’ ware, which was made with punches, and was painted and varnished, very delicately in early times but more roughly as time went on; (5) glass, manufactured in every district (Colonia Agrippinensis is mentioned among others) where suitable sand was available, and worked and ornamented to produce a variety of different articles. There was moulded glass and, since 40 or 30 BC, the recently invented blown glass (see the mention in Seneca); glass in imitation of cameos, or painted with ornamentation or a variety of scenes (the Sidonian glass is typical here), or decorated in barbotine style with the twisting threads, or dusted with gold, or iridescent. The articles comprised plate for windows or mirrors, embossed or fluted cups, and vessels with incised ornament or gold inlay (opus sectile), sometimes bearing graffiti or miniatures of people; (6) the manufacture of scent (used—or misused—even in wines or drinks, and on seats at the circus), chemical mixtures, beauty preparations, cosmetics, dyes, and medicines, now made easier owing to the existence of cheap glass vessels for mixing purposes; (7) jewel-working, including pierced or filigreed gold, incision or carving of semi-precious stones, and the setting of precious stones which have already been partially cut.

In the later empire industry tended to become monopolized. In early times, however, the only monopolies were mines of precious metals, mints, and salt-works (both for evaporated sea-water and for rock salt). Later, goldsmiths, weavers, dyers, and arms manufacturers (when working for the state) were added to the list.

Trade and Communications. The ruling classes, comprising the rich landed proprietors, took no interest in commercial affairs, and the body of traders belonging to the equestrian class or to lower orders in society were markedly left to operate on their own. One result was that commercial monopolies to suit the advantage of Roman citizens did not come into being; it is improper, apart from obviously exceptional examples, to speak of commercial motives exercising a compelling influence on Roman policy before imperial times. Carthage had been a strong contrast.

Nevertheless on their own initiative groups of Roman citizen traders, coming mainly from Campania, Magna Graecia, and the East, had already formed settlements of ‘conventus civium Romanorum’ at various parts of the Roman world, such as Narbo, Cirta, Vaga, Utica, Sicily, and Delos. They made their fortunes, and also contributed to the Romanization of the
Mediterranean countries; but meanwhile other merchants of provincial origin, particularly Easterners, were freely competing with them in Italy and the provinces alike. The founding of the empire meant the creation of a single vast political and social unit. There was a tendency to uniformity of metric, monetary, and legal systems; internal order was normally maintained, and the early emperors kept the peace with foreign powers; travel by sea was easy, and roads were continually extended and improved. (Map XV.) Moreover there was a minimum of state interference, while new industrial centres and markets were growing up, and the standard of living in the Western lands was rising to the level attained in the Eastern. All these factors were leading to an immense expansion of trade and commerce, not only inside but outside the frontiers. For the countries to north and east and south were slowly reaching some measure of economic equality with the Roman world. (Map XII.)

But Rome never went over to a real policy of mercantilism. Its landed proprietors were always of predominant importance, and trade was still chiefly internal trade. Imports from outside were almost entirely limited to luxury goods, paid for by the exportation of Roman gold and silver; so this trade did more harm than good to the economic development of the empire.

The main factors governing internal trade between province and province were the availability of supplies in one area to meet demands in others, and the cost of transport, which might or might not be economic. The main exporters of grain were North Africa, Egypt, Sicily, occasionally Spain and Britain, and the countries to the north of the Euxine; oil was abundant in Spain and Africa; wine in Gaul, Dalmatia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Sicily; salt meat in Gaul and Britain; smoked and salted fish in Spain, the Bosporus, the Pontus, and Egypt.

Among clothing materials, linen came from Egypt and Africa, cotton from Iran, and silk from China. Hides and leather were to be found in Illyricum, Asia Minor, Arabia, Spain, Gaul, and Britain.

The extraction of metals and minerals depended mainly on the emperor, who owned most of the precious metal mines. Gold came from Dacia, Moesia, Thrace, and Dalmatia, as well as from the older areas in Spain, Gaul, and Britain. There was argentiferous lead from Sardinia, Gaul, Dalmatia, Pannonia, Attic Laurium, and Epirus; tin from Britain; iron from Elba, Etruria, the Pyrenees, and Noricum; copper from Baetica, Lusitania, Aquitania, Narbonensis, and Britain; and lead from Spain, Africa, and Britain. The salt regarded with most favour was found in Italy at Ostia, Volaterrae, and Tarentum, at Gela in Sicily, and at Utica in Africa; and also on the eastern border of Egypt, and in Cyprus, Cappadocia, Phrygia, Thessaly, Illyricum, Epirus, Gaul, and Hither Spain. The marble most in demand came from Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, Iran, and Africa: precious stones from the East, Egypt, and in some measure from Scotland; timber from Africa and Syria, with more valuable woods from India, Iran, and the African caravans, which also carried ivory, a commodity also drawn from India.
Silphium came from Cyrene, papyrus from Egypt, parchment from Pergamum, spices from Iran and India. The main exporters of manufactured textiles were Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Asia Minor, Spain, and Gaul; of pottery Etruria and Gaul; of glassware Egypt, Phoenicia, and Gaul; of jewellery the East generally; of scents India, Phoenicia, Egypt, and Asia Minor. Slaves came from captures in war, but they were also brought from Eastern markets, to which they had been taken from India, Parthia, Syria, and Egypt; and they were also imported from the Black Sea and the German and British frontiers.

This commerce had certain general results for the Roman economy. In the first place, great trading centres, on the sea, or at the meeting of roads inland, became extremely wealthy. Secondly, Eastern merchants always had a lead over those from Italy and the Western provinces, and this lead became more marked as time went on. Thirdly, Italy's balance of trade was based on the import of foodstuffs and export of manufactured goods. Fourthly, we may note the importance of maritime trade, carried on by colleges of navi-
cularii through a number of stations which in the periods of fairly secure peace attained great popularity.5 (Pl. 61, a, b.) Finally, there was an increase in the number of banks providing capital, mainly for wholesale trade and especially in the Eastern provinces.

Commercial organization took on larger and more efficient forms. Rome, the major consumer in the empire, had a commercial structure proportionate to its size. Communications with its two great ports of Ostia and Puteoli were made easier; and there was a growing number of markets, some of them specialized, in particular districts of the city, while on the Aventine and in the forum business quarters were established, with porticoes containing booths, warehouses, shops, granaries, and slaughter-houses. Trajan even built a market for the sale of books. Over all Italy the organization of the capital was imitated, though of course in miniature, in the municipalities, such as Aesernia, Aletrium, Ariminum, Corfinium and many other places.

Archaeology has shown us, at Ostia, Puteoli, Athens, Ephesus, and Delos, the organization of big sea-board commercial towns; and it can also tell us something about what happened at smaller cities like Pompeii, Timgad, and Lepcis Magna. At Pompeii have been found an enormous number of small shops, often with workshops next door for the production of manufactured goods, and also a quantity of buildings to house merchandise sold wholesale and others of bazaar type for retail trade. Normally business in a given type of merchandise took place in a street reserved for that particular purpose, and the appropriate signs were depicted outside. But there were also itinerant hawkers, commission agents, and commercial travellers; and there was distinct specialization in the food trades, of which we have evidence in the names of their colleges. A bas-relief on the monument at Igel near Trier illustrates wholesale trade in cloth: the shops are laid out with the appropriate patterns, then there is the packing of the goods, and their transport by cart
or by boat. Reliefs from Noviomagus in the same area illustrate the river transport of casks of wine.

But the commonest means of getting local and retail wares to the agricultural districts was still the institution of markets and fairs at definite dates in the country towns. At the same time the imperial government promoted the rise of larger cities in all parts of the provinces, as an essential means of maintaining control and effecting Romanization. In them there was wholesale trade, sometimes accompanied by factories.

Decay of Commerce. The Roman state never adopted a regular and definite policy of mercantilism or gave any clear encouragement to trade: nor, before Hadrian’s time, did it develop state monopolies. Many of the reasons why trade eventually declined and became involved in formidable difficulties were connected with the financial policy of the empire, which was practically always short of money and often invented harmful ways of acquiring it.

A fundamental cause of the obvious decline was inflation of coinage. It was debased in weight and purity, and eventually became a token currency; it found no acceptance in foreign countries, where payment had to be made in precious metal at its face value. The result was a steep fall in the value of money, accompanied by failure of the banks or a rise in their interest rates; but there was a still steeper rise in the cost of essential goods. The state eventually tried to check this by fixed maximum prices, which always bring ruin to producers and merchants.

At the same time large estates were forming, each one becoming a closed economy; and because of the devaluation of the currency the soldiers had to receive their food in kind by means of requisitions. This upset the whole system of trade and exchange, by putting the middlemen out of business.

The system of tax-collection was another important enemy of trade, and it was harmful to the artisan class as well. Tolls and customs dues were maintained at every conceivable point; these had the effect of raising prices and so of gradually making long-distance trade impossible. Then in the third century the continual civil wars and barbarian raids, which interfered with free traffic on the roads, led to a revival of piracy on the sea, and also caused a withdrawal of liquid capital, which was hidden by its terrified owners in hoards underground. Add to this: extensive government interference; the wars on the frontiers, which limited imports from countries outside the empire; the lack of any guarantee behind this international trade, now that commercial treaties were mere words and offered no protection; the general tendency of every district to become self-sufficient with its own agricultural and industrial products, and to carry on only local trade within a narrow radius; and the way in which large-scale enterprises were increasingly falling into the greedy hands of oriental speculators.

The only period when healthy commerce seems to have revived for a few decades was that following the shrewd financial policy of Constantine.
a. China

*Medicine and Alchemy.* No Chinese medical text of this period appears to be extant and the evidence available is fragmentary. Some information can be gleaned about public health. Thus in the Later Han period there were seven epidemics between 37 and 50 AD, and five between 171 and 185. This led the physicians to differentiate between the various infective diseases and to classify their respective symptoms. Malaria, typhoid, cholera are recognized. Smallpox is first mentioned in connection with the Ma Yuan expedition to Chiao-chih (modern Vietnam) between AD 42 and 44. Already in the period 275–279 we hear of people who avoided members of a family struck by epidemic disease, in order not to be contaminated. Hua T'o, the patriarch of Chinese surgery, lived in the second century, and so did Chang Chung-ching, a great physician and the author of the *Shang-han-lun*, an essay on typhoid. The latter was also an ophthalmologist, and mentions several symptoms (lacrimation, exophthalmos, impairment of vision), which were considered, however, as local manifestations of general diseases.

Chinese alchemy is closely connected with Taoism, of which it represents one of the ‘technical’ aspects. Its aim is immortality. In its quest it starts from man as a unit, not even making a distinction between body and soul. It is based on the theory of the Five Elements (*tsou-hsing*: wood, fire, earth, metal, water) and of *yang-yin* (the two opposite but complementary principles of male-female, positive-negative, warm-cold, etc.). The body must be placed in harmony with the *tao*, acquiring its attributes, among them immortality. Alchemy (*lien-tan*, lit. ‘pill of transmutation’) is divided into the alchemy of prolonging life (*nei-tan*) and the alchemy of transmuting metals (*wai-tan*). It attempts to obtain immortality through a regulated and selective diet and the use as medicine of certain substances containing vitalizing qualities, such as cinnabar, gold, silver, jade, sesame Indicum, pine, peach, crane, fowl, tortoise; and recipes are compounded with them. The Chinese alchemist tried to make gold because this incorruptible substance was an ingredient of the elixir of immortality, and the Taoist was too poor to make use of natural gold. Alchemic gold was meant to be eaten, not to be spent. The philosopher’s stone (*chin-tan*) was also looked for; the basis was always cinnabar, i.e. mercury compounded with various other substances, but the texts are generally vague on the subject of quality, quantity, ingredients, and methods of composition.

The first references to alchemy go back to the end of the second century BC; the *Huai-nan-tsu*, although not dealing with alchemic operations, refers to the doctrine underlying the metamorphoses of minerals. Liu Hsing (79–8 BC), a profound student of alchemic lore, tried to make gold with the official support of the emperor, but failed and barely avoided execution. Afterwards
nothing more is heard about alchemy for nearly two centuries, perhaps because the prohibition was strictly enforced.

The first alchemic work actually preserved is the Ts'an-t'ung-ch'i by Wei Po-yang, the Taoist pseudonym of an unknown author who was living about AD 120–150. This short text, divided into ninety paragraphs, has the apparent form of an application of the cosmic theories of the I-ching, but actually it is a treatise on the preparation of the pill of immortality. It is done by heating together yang and yin in a hermetically closed vessel (the philosopher's egg of Western alchemy), at first on a slow fire and then on a blazing flame.

The classic text of alchemy is the Pao-p'u-tzü of Ko Hung (c. 281–361). It is a most important work from many points of view including that of philosophical thought. Its seventy chapters are grouped into two sections: Wai-p'ien (politics and government) and Nei-p'ien (the Taoist immortals, alchemy proper, exorcism, etc.). Ko Hung was a compiler, not an experimenter. The chief novelty in his work is the increased importance of silver.

The association with Taoism, and soon with its grosser aspects of charlatanry, was hurtful to the development of alchemy in China. Although in time it partly preceded Western alchemy, it was thoroughly despised by the Confucian ruling class and was never able to attain the status of a science and so develop into chemistry.

Knowledge of the Earth and Physics. Geology proper is a modern science, although in China between the second and fifth centuries some hazy ideas on the subject seemed to exist.

Mineralogy was purely descriptive and never theoretical. Still, the theory of the mutations of metal through meteorological and mineralogical exhalations is found already in the Huai-nan-tzü (122 BC), and goes back at least to 350 BC. As for classification, the Chinese script itself was conducive to it, at least within certain limits. Several mineralogical notions are found also in the various pharmacopoeias (pên-ts'ao).

But the one typically Chinese branch of this science is seismology. The Chinese list of earthquakes is the longest and most complete in existence, with precise data for 908 earthquakes beginning from 780 BC down to AD 1644. Chang Hêng (78–139) invented the 'earthquake weather-cock' (hou-fêng ti-tung-i), a sort of seismograph consisting of a bronze vessel with a domed cover containing a central column (essentially a pendulum). The latter would move laterally along tracks on the eight directions and was so arranged that it would operate a closing and opening mechanism. Outside the vessel there were eight dragon heads, each of them with a bronze ball in its mouth, and under each was a toad with an open mouth ready to receive it should it fall. The whole was meant to show the epicentre of the earthquake. But the idea was not pursued further and every trace of it was lost after the Han dynasty.

Chinese geographical knowledge in this period marked a rather slow advance in comparison with the great progress of the preceding period. It
often felt the harmful influence of religious cosmography, which centred around the legendary K'un-lun mountain, with the Western Countries added as a peninsula jutting out into the ocean. This was supposed to be surrounded by a circular continent, outside which lay another ocean. Several maps of this sort have been found in Korea, but they are very late. They draw most of their names from the Shan-hai-ching, and many others from the Yü-kung, Mu-t'ien-tzu-chuan, etc. Buddhist influence began also to be felt at the end of this period.

Hydrography, of paramount importance in a country like China, where so much depends on the river and on artificial irrigation, saw the reconstruction of the Shui-ching (‘Water Classic’) in the third century; it contains the names of 137 rivers. But far more important than the text is the commentary by Liu Tao-yüan (d. 527), a sober and trustworthy compilation.

Local topography came into existence in this period and was destined to have a very long and rich career. The first example is the Hua-yang-kuo-chih (historical geography of Szechwan) by Ch'ang Ch'ü (347).

Cartography was by now a real art. In AD 26 the Emperor Kuang-wu-ti, while campaigning against the rebels, is said to have opened and studied a large silk map of the empire. But the greatest step forward was made when in 116 Chang Hêng presented a map to the emperor which for the first time showed a net of co-ordinates: the squares, however, indicated not meridians and parallels but distances in li. Chinese maps were well orientated, but were based on itineraries and not on astronomical determinations; the latter was a step which Chinese science never took. The father of mediaeval Chinese cartography was P'ei Hsiu (224–271), a Minister of Works of the Chin dynasty. Cap. 35 of the Chin-shu gives a description of his methods, drawn from the preface to his great atlas Yü-kung ti-yü-t'u in eighteen leaves; it was of course a reduction of the Yü-kung to map form. It has not come down to us.

Physics never became a science in China, as it never grew beyond the empirical stage. The steelyard and the lever principle underlying it were well known, and we have old specimens, one of which goes back to the time of Wang Mang (c. AD 10). In the third century some notion of specific weight and displacement appears: an elephant is weighed by placing it on a boat, noting the boat's immersion and then loading it with known weights down to the same level.

Optics did not remain undeveloped. We have some hints in the Mo-ching about shadow and penumbra, definition of the focal point and inversion of the image, mirrors and their combinations, concave and convex mirrors. Burning mirrors were employed from a very early period (sixth century BC) for ceremonial purposes (kindling the new fire). Some of these observations are taken up again in Huai-nan-tzû. A mere piece of curiosity were the 'magic mirrors' discovered and constructed before the fifth century. When these bronze mirrors reflected the sunlight, the design in relief on the back of the
mirror became apparent in its smallest details: this effect was probably due chiefly to small differences in curvature.

The compass came into use very late, not earlier than about 1080. But the magnetic properties of iron were known at an early date. Wang Ch’ung in the Lun-hêng (AD 83) speaks of the ‘south-controlling spoon’ (ssû-nan-chih-shao), which, when thrown to the ground, came to rest pointing at the south. Probably it was a magnet carved in the form of a spoon, i.e. in imitation of the Great Bear, turning on the ground plate of the diviner’s board (shih). But for the Chinese of the first centuries of our era all this belonged to the sphere of geomancy and astrology.

Mathematics. The most significant Chinese work of this period on mathematics is the ‘Nine Chapters on the Mathematical Art’ (Chiu-chang-suan-shu), which existed, at least in embryo, in the first century BC. It ranges more widely and shows a more advanced knowledge of mathematics than the ‘Classic of Mathematics’ (Chou pei suan ching), which in this period received its commentary at the hands of Chao Ch’un-ch’ing (end of second century). The ‘Nine Chapters’ are intended for practical purposes and for dealing with applied problems which were the concern of the administration (land measurement, calculation of the capacity of granaries, planning of dykes and canals, taxation, and so on). Other important texts are the ‘Memoirs on the Traditions of the Mathematical Art’ (Shu-shu-chi-i), written by Hsü Yo about AD 190 and closely connected with Taoist magic; the ‘Mathematical Classic of Sun Tzû’ (Sun tsû suan ching, c.230); and the ‘Mathematical Classic of Chang Ch’iu-chien’ (Chang Ch’iu chien suan ching, c.500).

An important aid to the everyday use of arithmetic was the gradual acceptance of the abacus (suan p’an). It is a frame with twelve iron wires, on each of which seven balls can run. A transverse plank divides it into two unequal parts (two and five). Each of the balls in the upper part is worth as much as the five in the lower part, so that the complete column is equal to fifteen. Each column is equal to ten times the preceding one. In the form so described the abacus appears relatively late, but the Shu-shu-chu-i already mentions a more primitive form at the end of the second century. Probably the abacus was invented independently in China and in the West.

At a relatively early date Chinese arithmetic knew the taking of square and cube roots, and negative numbers; eventually it reached the Rule of Three, which appears in the Chiu-chang-suan-ching, that is to say a couple of centuries earlier than in India.

The development of algebra was handicapped by the absence of the sign for equality (=), and also of signs showing the exponents and powers. Moreover there was no ordinary algebraic notation; formulae were written out in full, in tabulated columns. The greatest advances in Chinese algebra came only under the Sung dynasty, very much later than the period covered here.

In the early centuries of the Christian era metrology was already com-
pletely decimal, at least for measurement of lengths. We find this already in the chapters on acoustics and on the calendar in the *Han-shu* (c. AD 100). Later the decimal system was extended to cover volumes and weights, but for the latter it was given official sanction only in 992.

Geometry continued to be purely empirical and descriptive. Particular study was given to the problems connected with the right-angled triangle, mainly for practical purposes like land-measurement; in this field Liu Hui did useful work with his studies of empirical solid geometry. The first Chinese evaluation of π was given at the beginning of our era by Liu Hsin in a volume measure prepared empirically for the usurper Wang Mang and still preserved at Peking: the figure arrived at is 3.154. The first calculations on this problem are those of Chang Hêng (c. 130). More precise results were obtained in the third century by Liu Hui, making use of inscribed polygons, and arriving at the figure 3.1459. The climax of the Chinese capacity for calculation was reached by Tsu Ch'êng-chih (430–501), with the figure \(\frac{355}{113}\), equivalent to 3.1416, a point attained in Europe only a millennium later.

In conclusion it may be said that mathematics, like all scientific studies in China, reflected the positive and practical character of the Chinese people. Their investigations were essentially directed towards practical applications, and there was none of the interest in pure mathematics which is found in Greece.

*Engineering and Agriculture.* In China engineering always remained on a practical level, without any connotation of theory. Some bits of early information are found in the *K'ao-kung-chi* (artificers' record) chapter of the *Chou-li*: the original was lost and the present one was compiled by the prince of Ho-chien (d. 130 BC). The larger works of mechanical engineering were as a rule connected with the imperial workshops (mostly called *shang-fang*); for the rest engineering was a family and hereditary craft.

Most of our information on mechanical appliances refers to mechanical toys, which were always much appreciated in China. A very famous example of such devices was the south-pointing carriage (chih-nan chi'ê), in which a figure was made, by the use of cog-wheels, always to point southward; it certainly had nothing to do with the compass. The ‘li-recording drum carriage’ (chi-li-ku-chê), a sort of hodometer, is mentioned in the fourth century AD and described in the *Sung-shu*. As perfected later, it beat a drum at every li and sounded a gong at every ten li; it was a simple problem of reducing cog-wheels. Among these toys there was one destined for a great future, if only the Chinese had guessed its practical use—cardanic suspension. Only known to Europe since the sixteenth century, it seems to be described in the *Hsi-ching tsan-chi* of the sixth century, which attributes it to Ting Huan (c. AD 180): ‘a perfume burner for use among cushions... a contrivance of rings which could revolve in all the four directions [i.e. the three...
directions of space], so that the body of the burner remained constantly level and could be placed among bedclothes and cushions'. In this connection we may mention a piece of charlatanry which shows an odd element of prophetic divination: about AD 320 Ko Hung speaks of a flying machine on the principle of the helicopter: 'Some have made flying cars [fei-ch'ē] with wood from the inner part of the jujube tree, using ox leather straps fastened to returning blades, so as to set the machine in motion' (Pao-p'iu-tzu, Nei-pien, 15, f. 39a). More solid than these dreams was the fact that an old Chinese toy, the kite, arrived in Europe at the end of the sixteenth century and became the ancestor of modern aviation.

Of simple machines in everyday use, we find that some of them were first manufactured in China. The folding umbrella is one of them, and Wang Mang caused several to be manufactured for magic purposes; some examples have been found in the Lo-lang tombs in northern Korea. The box-bellows (with double effect, like a double pump) was a most efficient instrument, still widely used. A humble but very useful contrivance was the wheel-barrow: the Chinese one, with the wheel in the centre of the box, is much more practical than ours, because the man merely pulls it and holds it in equilibrium, but carries no part of its weight. It was first invented about AD 231 by Chu-ko Liang, for logistic purposes; it was called wooden ox (nu-niu).

Cog-wheels are first mentioned in the Han period, and we possess a terracotta mould for a toothed bronze wheel of that epoch. They are the necessary prerequisites for the most typical Chinese hydraulic machine: the square-pallet chain-pump (fan-ch'ē). It consists of an endless chain carrying a succession of pallets which, passing upwards through a trough, draw up water. It may lift water up to 16 feet and can be worked by a treadmill, animals, or by a water-mill. Something like this is alluded to in Mencius VIa, 2, 3, but the first certain mention is in Hou Han-shu, Cap. 108, f.24b; the invention is attributed to the engineer Pi Lan, who died in AD 186. Watermills, with both horizontal and vertical axes, are found in China. They first appear in the first century AD, probably as an import from the West; oddly, they were chiefly employed for driving bellows, and seldom for grinding.

But engineering in China was fatally handicapped, in comparison with the West, by the lack of knowledge of some of the simple machines, such as the screw, and also of the crank (with the possible exception of the winnowing fan), and so it could never go farther than the so-called eotechnic stage.

Building engineering employed as its chief technique pisé and raw bricks in wall building. Baked bricks took their place during the Han period. The greatest and most famous feat of Chinese engineering is, of course, the Great Wall, which was formed in the years before 214 BC by connecting already existing stretches of wall. Its main purpose was administrative, fiscal, and, by making the passage of masses of nomad cavalry difficult, also military.

The Chinese road network was started by the first emperor Shih-huang-ti,
who in 220 BC caused two great postal routes (ch’ih-tao) to be built, radiating from the capital Ch’ang-an towards Ch’i and Yen to the east, and towards the lower Huai to the south-east. They were planted with trees and were paved with a sort of macadam; no traces of them are left. Several important roads were built under the Han dynasty. We may mention the one from Ch’ang-an to Szechwan; it was built, or at least broadened, about 120 BC, and crossed a very rugged tract of country. About one-third of its 430 miles consisted of wooden trestles over mountain streams, or high up on the rocks. The general rule was that road building was the concern of the central government: in practice the latter took care only of those roads which were necessary for the transport of taxes in kind.

Suspension bridges are first mentioned in the famous text of the Han-shu concerning the ‘Hanging Passages’ in the Hindu Kush. They are common in China, but it is impossible to settle their chronology. The greatest rope-bridge is that at An-lan in Szechwan: it has five spans, the greatest of which is 200 feet, the total being over 700 feet. Perhaps it was originally built by Li Ping in the third century BC, but it is renewed every year.

The most notable innovation in Chinese agriculture of this period was the ‘alternance field’ ( tai-t’ien) technique, introduced by Chao Kuo in the middle of the first century AD. It consisted in ploughing the furrow where in the previous year the balk had been, coupled with a careful weeding and lopping of the young plants. This procedure was tried first in the imperial domains, where it resulted in a double output per surface unit (mou); and then it was officially introduced throughout the empire. It seems, however, that its use did not last for more than a couple of centuries.

Astronomy. Chinese astronomy now begins to receive its first theoretical elaboration. The main texts are the ‘Memoir on the Calendar’ (Lü-li-chih) by Liu Hung (AD 178), and the ‘Discussion on the Celestial Sphere’ (Hsun-t’ien-hsiang-shuo) by Wang Fan (AD 260). From these works we know that at the end of the second century AD there were three schools of cosmological astronomy. The first, called Kai-t’ien (Heavenly Cover) maintained that both sky and earth were hemispherical, like inverted bowls. In other words there were two parallel cupolas, but the bowl of the sky was round, and the bowl of the earth square. This was a very archaic conception. The second school, Hsun-t’ien (Heavenly Sphere) conceived earth and sky as two concentric spheres (like the yolk in an egg). The third school, Hsiian-yeh (Infinite Empty Space), took the view that sun, moon, and all the stars float freely in the empty space. The heavens are not matter. It was this last theory which eventually prevailed. The Hsiian-yeh and Hsun-t’ien schools form the basis of later Chinese thought about astronomy, which is characterized by rigid adherence to the Ptolemaic conception of the spheres, by a strong observational bias, and by the absence of any use of applied geometry.

Starting from the catalogues of Shih Shen, Kan Té, and Wu Hsien men-
tioned above, Ch’en Cho at the beginning of the fourth century AD prepared a stellar map; and between 424 and 454 Ch‘ien Lo-chih made an improved planisphere. Both these are now lost. It should be noticed that the modern system of notation by right ascension and declination, in use since the time of Tycho Brahe, corresponds to that used by the Chinese, and not to the Greek system of ecliptic co-ordinates. The nomenclature was different from that used in the West; and many names are drawn from the bureaucratic hierarchy of the Chinese state.

In this period an instrument made its appearance which was destined to have a greater future in China than elsewhere, the clepsydra or water-clock. The first certain mention of it is found in the Lou-shui-chuan-hun-t‘ien-i-chi (‘Method of making an Armillary Sphere rotate by means of Water from a Clepsydra’), a work written by Chang Hêng in AD 90 of which we possess a fragment. Then there appeared the clepsydra with a float and an indicator, similar to the one at Alexandria.

The armillary sphere just mentioned was used not only as an instrument for observation, but as a planetarium (orrery or uranorama); it was fundamentally different from its European counterpart because of the system of co-ordinates, which in China was based on declination and the ecliptic. The first mention of it is in the Fa-yen (‘Discourses on Method’) of Yang Hsiung in AD 5, where its first appearance is put in 104 BC. But the earliest description is in the fragment of Chang Hêng referred to above. We are told of diopters, and of the sphere being moved by water and a system of gears, the probable intention being to follow the apparent movement of stars, perhaps like the method of modern telescopes.

In the calendar the ancient sexagenary cycle, derived from the combination of the 10 han and 12 chih, hitherto used only for days, came to be applied to years too; but it served only as a subsidiary to the normal means of calculation by years of emperors’ reigns, and did not become a substitute.

Knowledge of the mechanics of eclipses grew more elaborate: already in the third century Yang Wei could predict the whereabouts of the first and last contacts in these phenomena. About 390 Chiang Chi predicted whether they would be partial or total.

b. India

Medicine and Alchemy. Indian medicine (Āyurveda) reached its highest level during this period. Its classic theory is contained in two famous books. One is the Suśrutaśamhitā, in five sections (sthāna) and a supplement (uttaratantra); it goes back to the first centuries of our era. The other is the Carakasamhitā, in eight sections (sthāna); its editor Caraka is said to have been the court physician of Kaniṣkā, and lived therefore in the second century AD.7 Both works widely agree, and their body of knowledge and teaching is the same, except that Suśruta attributes much more importance to surgery than Caraka does. The so-called Bower MS from central Asia (fourth–sixth centuries),
written in corrupt Sanskrit, is quite separate, and it consists chiefly of pharmaceutical content (curative properties of garlic).

The main tenets of the classic theory of Indian medicine are as follows. The body, like the cosmos, is a compound of five elements (dhātu): void (ākāśa), wind (vāyu), fire (agni), water (jalā), earth (bhūmi). Of these, wind, fire, and water (the tridhātu) are the most active. Life depends on their harmonious interplay: illness is the effect of a disturbance of their equilibrium, in which case the three elements turn into the ‘three evils’ (trīdosa). Wind circulates in the respiratory or digestive canals and is divided into five ‘breaths’ (prāna), which represent the organic forces. Fire is in a liquid form and is represented above all by the bile (pitta), subdivided into five fires (agni). Water (ākāśman) is the common material of all serosities and liquid secretions; it too is divided into five classes. The various substances produced by the action of the three vital elements upon food are formed into organs by the actions of the wind. These organs are studied by direct anatomical observation on corpses, mostly prepared by a long immersion in water; but the knowledge of anatomy and of circulation is rather confused and vague. The network of vessels serves not only for the circulation of the blood, but also for that of the three dhātu; and some of them convey the vital principle (ojas). Pathology, as mentioned above, is based on the lack of equilibrium due to excitation or to scarcity of one or more dhātu. The causes of illness are due to environment, seasonal change, and (most important) food. Therapy is mostly empirical and symptomatic, great importance being attached to hygiene and dietetics. Pharmacology is chiefly vegetable and extremely rich in material. Surgery is fairly well developed. Its most daring operation is perhaps that of suturing wounds of the intestines by a curious process consisting in having the lips of the wound bitten by large ants, whose bodies are at once cut off. Their jaws act as organic sutures, which are more easily absorbed by the body than vegetable or animal threads. Other operations were for the stone (asmāri), embryotomy on a dead foetus, and cataracts.

This theory of Ayurvedic medicine was handed down through generations of physicians (vaidya), and is still widely followed in India today.

J. Filliozat has remarked that there are very interesting points of contact with the treatise Peri physeon in the Hippocratic Corpus. In addition, the general theory of illness expounded by Plato in the Timaeus, while devoid of any Greek antecedent, is exactly parallel to that of the tridosa, with its three elements represented by breath, bile, and phlegm. The classic texts of the Indian school are more recent, but their body of knowledge is earlier than Plato. An Indian influence (through Iran) on Greek medicine is quite probable, also because no Greek term is found in early Indian pharmacology, while a few Indian names have found their way into the Hippocratic Corpus: péperi (from pippali), pepper; kóstos (from kusta), Costus speciosus; ziggīberis (from śṛṅgavera), ginger; sakkharon (from šarkara), sugar.

Alchemy in India developed rather late, and then only in the wake of
medicine. One section of the Āyurveda (the theoretical body of medical knowledge) was supposed to be the rasāyana, 'path of the rasa', i.e. of the organic humour; it dealt with fortifying and rejuvenating drugs.

Later on the word rasa acquired the meaning of mercury, or elemental essence. On this slender basis alchemy was built up, with magical aims: levitation, construction of gold, immortality. The earliest and most famous alchemist was Nāgārjuna, quite distinct from the great Buddhist philosopher. His date is variously given as between the second and the tenth century, and it is even possible that there was more than one alchemist of this name. The Rasavaiśeṣikasūtra and the Rasaratnākara are attributed to him. The second work is in verse and treats, among other things, of chemical purification (śodhana) and of calcination (māraṇa).

Astronomy, Mathematics, Architecture. The great new feature about Indian astronomy in the first centuries AD was the Hellenistic and Roman influence, which reached the country over the many trade-routes. It is reflected most of all in certain technical terms: āpoklīma (ἀπόκλιμα) means 'declination'; ārkā from δέκαως; jyāṁitra from διάμετρον; līpta from λεπτόν, meaning 'a moment'; horā from ὥρα mainly in the sense of 'horoscope'. We suddenly find the solar zodiac of twelve constellations, with the same signs (raśi) as those used in Greece; this is a conception which was originally quite foreign to India. Equally unexpected is the appearance of astrology, a science unknown to the Vedic world but destined in later times to have luxuriant developments in India. It would be wrong, however, to speak of a Hellenization of Indian astronomy, which largely continued to follow its own lines sometimes with original results. For instance the application of trigonometry to astronomy is more evident in India than in Greece, and the movement of the equinoxes is explained by the Indian theory of libration rather than by Hipparchus' theory of the precession.

The five main writings of this period are known to us indirectly through the discussion of them by Varāhamihira in his Pañcasiddhāntikā at the beginning of the sixth century. They are the Paitāmaha Siddhānta, the oldest of the five, still very close to the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga, whose five-year cycle (yuga) it retains; then the Vāsiṣṭha Siddhānta; thirdly the Paulīśa Siddhānta, the name of which in all probability refers to Paul of Alexandria, and which already shows knowledge of an exact method for determining the length of a day and suggests an approximate method for calculating eclipses: fourthly the Romaka Siddhānta, or 'Roman System', where for the first time we find a great cycle, that of 2,850, probably the 19-year cycle of Meton of Athens multiplied by 150—the length of a year in the Romaka (365 days, 15 hours, 55 minutes, 12 seconds) is the same as that in Hipparchus and Ptolemy, as are various other calculations; and lastly the Sūrya Siddhānta, the only one of the five to be preserved, though even here we have it only as a later revision. Today the Sūrya is a short work of 500 verses in 14 chapters (adhiḥkāra),
written in a laconic and obscure style and designed, like all Indian manuals, to provide a mnemonic guide as a summary of what was taught orally. To establish a concordance of the movements of the sun and moon, the equinoxes, planets, and of apsides and nodes, the Sūrya Sīddhānta uses a ‘quadruple period’ (caturyuga) of 4,320,000 years, divided into four cosmic years. The synodical month is divided into thirty lunar days (tīthi), the length of which is smaller than that of solar days (sāvana); and it is worth noting that in practice mediaeval and modern chronology has made regular use of tīthi rather than of sāvana. The movement of the equinoxes, as has already been stated, is explained by a theory of oscillation, with a theoretical velocity of fifty-four sāvana a year. On this theory is based the determination of a fictitious era called Kaliyuga, which is employed in astronomical textbooks with a starting date at 18 February, 3102 BC. This is of course the result of calculations made in the early centuries AD, not of a tradition from pre-Vedic times. The movements of the five planets (Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn) are determined by the cosmic wind (marut); so the pneumatic theory has migrated from physiology to astronomy.

Late Vedic mathematics came to a halt in the centuries just preceding and following the beginning of the Christian era. Nevertheless this period saw the definitive completion of the numerical system, and a gradual transition to decimal notation and positional value of digits. The first epigraphic instance of positional value dates back only to 594; and the zero digit appears only in 683 on inscriptions of Cambodia and Sumatra and only in 870 in continental India. But positional and decimal value of digits is known to the Purāṇas in the fourth to fifth centuries.

Mathematics are now divided into arithmetic (pāṭigaṇita) and algebra (bijagaṇita). The former name derives from the sand-covered table (pāṭi) on which the four simple operations were performed. Its earliest monument is the Bakhshali manuscript, written in the eighth or ninth century, but with a content taking us back to the third or fourth. For the first time this contains the word for zero (bindu, point), and it shows knowledge of the Rule of Three.

Algebra has ancient origins, but it is difficult to form any clear idea of its development before Āryabhaṭa. It is still a much debated question how much it owed to Greek influence: various Indian writers have strenuously denied such influence in modern times. Perhaps one should speak of stimulus rather than influence.

However that may be, mathematics is primarily an appendage to astronomy, and all the five Sīddhānta (systematic manuals) on astronomy before Varāhamihira (c. 550), including those cited by that author, contain mathematical material. The first text we possess in its original form is itself part of an astronomical work, the Āryaśāsata of Āryabhaṭa, written in 499: this section, consisting of thirty-three stanzas, is called Gaṇita. It shows knowledge of the indeterminate equations of the first degree (a + by = c), provides a good
valuation of $\pi$ (3.1416), and suggests rules, though they are erroneous, for
determining the volumes of the pyramid and the sphere. Indian mathematics
reach their zenith with Brahmagupta (born in 598), but his work is outside
the limits of this volume.

The theory of Indian architecture (śilpa) is known chiefly through the
Mānasāra, a work in 70 chapters written in barbarous Sanskrit by an un-
known practising architect. It goes back, at least in its core, to the post-
Gupta age. It begins with an introduction (chapters 1–10) devoted mainly
to metrology. The main body of the work deals with architecture in its
widest sense (chapters 11–50), and the last part concerns sculpture. But
interspersed here and there we find rules concerning various related subjects,
such as engineering constructions of every kind, town planning, furniture,
and even wearing apparel. Architecture is said to have three main styles:
Nāgara, Vesara, and Draviḍa (chapter 18), and houses may have any number
of storeys up to twelve, although no actual example of such a tall building is
known from ancient India. The Mānasāra was followed by several later
treatises on this subject, but they do not concern us here.

Philology. Pāṇini and Patañjali reigned undisputed in Indian grammatical
studies throughout this period. They were sufficient for all uses over many
centuries. The first new works of their school, commentaries only, are not
earlier than the seventh century, and thus fall outside the limits set to our
study.

A reaction against Pāṇini took place at first in Buddhist and Jain circles,
since the language of their sacred texts responded to other requirements and
diverged to a greater or lesser extent from classical Sanskrit. And yet the force
of tradition was such that the non-Pāṇinean grammars were but pale imita-
tions of the grand old master; they shortened the matter, arranged it differ-
ently, but lacked any real originality. The earliest and the most popular of
the Buddhist Sanskrit grammars was the Kātantra of Śarvavarman; its
nucleus goes back to the first century of our era. Another Buddhist grammar
is that of Chandragomin (fifth–sixth century) which became the most popular
grammar in Nepal, and hence in Tibet. The Jain grammars all seem to be
later than this period.

The grammarians of Prakrit and Pali too are late. So are those of the
Dravidian languages; but one work may perhaps go back to this period, the
Tolkāppiyam, a Tamil treatise on literary expressions in which analysis goes
down as far as the single words and letters. It is a manual of rhetoric and of
grammar at the same time.

The beginning of Sanskrit lexicography goes back to the Nighaṇṭu, simple
repertories of nouns and verbs compiled on the Vedas. But the great diction-
aries of later ages responded to another necessity, that of supplying the poets
with rare or strange words, or with a large number of synonyms. Thus they
contain nouns and adjectives only, but not verbs, and are arranged by various
systems of subject-categories. Some fragments of an old dictionary are contained in the Weber manuscript, found in central Asia. But the earliest work still existing in its entirety is the Nāmalīṅgānuṣāsana or Amarakośa by Amarasiṃha, who wrote in the fourth, fifth, or sixth century. It is divided into three sections, and its semantic arrangement was the model for all the later collections of the same kind.

c. Rome

Scientific Encyclopaedias. In this period neither Greek nor Roman science, generally speaking, propounded many theoretical problems, but the work of publication which was done by the compilers of collections and manuals had its value. The public interest in this work, so far as Latin writing goes, is shown by the success of the earlier encyclopaedias put out by Cato and Varro.

In Tiberius' time A. Cornelius Celsus, probably a doctor, compiled a large manual, comprising five books on agriculture and eight on medicine, followed by others on the art of war, rhetoric, philosophy, and other subjects. It is written in a plain and agreeable style; and the part which has come down to us, which cites more than seventy authorities, shows the high degree of erudition which lay behind the work.

The natural encyclopaedia (Naturālis Historia) of C. Plinius Secundus (AD 23–79), although the author set himself a narrower task, is also the product of wide reading and accurate collection of factual data. It is in thirty-seven books, dealing with nature, the products of nature, and their derivatives or possible derivatives. It draws on earlier authors (146 Roman and 327 Greek are cited) rather than on direct observation, and in its theoretical sections it is a little more than a résumé of previous writing. The subjects include geography, mathematics, physics, anthropology, physiology, zoology, and botany, with a digression about the use of animal, vegetable, and mineral matter in artistic production. Where Pliny takes material from earlier systematic works he is relatively orderly and complete; there are more gaps where he has had to do the work of collection himself. But on any estimate his book is of great importance for the information it contains.

The 'Embroideries' or 'Marvels' of Sex. Iulius Africanus (second to third centuries) must also have had a certain encyclopaedic character. We possess fragments dealing with the natural sciences, medicine, magic, commerce, sailing, and the art of war.

Other writers met the demand for encyclopaedic learning with less highly organized work. There were the twenty books of Noctes Attīcae by Aulus Gellius (c. AD 170), which in a series of chapters without order deal with every sort of topic, physical and natural science, grammar, geography, and so on, with many citations of authorities; and the five books Rerum reconditarum by Psammetichus Serenus (fl. 193–234), who derived information from his vast private library of more than 60,000 volumes. Later, already
outside our period, there were similar works, much used in the Middle Ages: the Disciplinae (or 'Liberal Arts') of Martianus (Felix) Capella, who wrote in the first decades of the fifth century, and the Saturnalia of his contemporary, Macrobius.

Agriculture. Among particular sciences we may start with agriculture. Besides the encyclopaedic writings of Celsus and Pliny mentioned above, first place must be given to the Res Rustica of L. Iunius Columella (first century AD), a man of Spanish family who also knew the Eastern countries through his military service and had large estates at Albanum in Italy. His work has come down to us in twelve books, variously arranged: the tenth, on gardening, is in verse, and purports to complete Virgil's Georgics. The Res Rustica is a complete manual on agricultural economy and technique, with many precepts and a quantity of facts; these are mainly drawn from earlier authors (Greek, Roman, and Carthaginian), but owe something too to his personal experience, as we can see from the central themes. For Columella was used to the types of crop and to the system of slave labour found in Italy in his own day, and consequently attached supreme importance to the cultivation of vines and olives.

Q. Gargilius Martialis, who was born in Mauretania and died in 260, also wrote a book on agriculture, but he gave special attention to arboriculture, to medicines of vegetable origin, and to veterinary questions connected with agricultural operations. A number of extracts have come down to us, and they show that he used data provided by several previous writers.

There still survive fragments of a Greek book on agriculture by Vindonius Anatolius of Berytus. The Latin work of Aggenius Uricus, Commentum de agrorum qualitate, has survived entire; so has the Opus Agriculturae of Palladius Rutilius Taurus, a fourth-century writer who was probably a Gaul. Palladius wrote fourteen books (one being preface, twelve treating of cultivation in each of the months, and one in verse on the grafting of plants), and he drew mainly on his own observations rather than on previous writers.

Geography and Cartography. The great geographical works of Augustan times were followed by a series of sketches, which examine the various parts of the inhabited world and indicate their position, climate, conditions of life, and principal products. An example is C. Licinius Mucianus' description of his travels in Armenia, Lycia, and Syria, much used by Pliny in his Natural History. Tacitus' Germania, which deals with ethnographical questions, is not quite in this genre.

In the first century AD there was also the Chorographia of the Spaniard Pomponius Mela, three books of crisp description of the known world following the order of its coasts. There was also the Periplius Maris Interni by Menippus of Pergamum.

In the second century Julius Titianus wrote Provinciarum Libri in Latin,
and there were a number of works in Greek. The *Periplus Maris Erythraei* describes the harbours and trade of the Indian Ocean to the mouth of the Ganges and beyond; Arrian of Nicomedia wrote a *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, drawing partly on his own diaries of his voyages; and the *Periegesis* of Dionysius Periegetes, written in hexameters at the time of Hadrian, were still read and annotated in the twelfth century. From the second century we may also mention the *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* of C. Iulius Solinus, which contains a large number of anecdotes and curiosities.

Already in our previous period cartography in the classical world had followed two different systems: one came after the other, and eventually the two were amalgamated. The precursors of Dicaearchus had continued to depict the world as a flat circle, and they had used the few available measurements as the basis for drawing particular countries; in consequence there were enormous distortions, and also very marked variations between the different designs that were made. Dicaearchus altered all this. He traced a rectangular grid, based on one main parallel and one main meridian: his parallel went from the Pillars of Hercules to the Taurus, and then on to the Paropamisus, roughly corresponding to lat. 36° N.; and his meridian passed through Lysimachia, Rhodes, and Syene. Both lines were divided into stades; and within each rectangle he drew outlines, with measurements proportionate to such actual measurements as were known. Eratosthenes improved on Dicaearchus’ approximations, interesting himself mainly in the inhabited countries. He derived his data on latitudes from calculations through the gnomon, and by comparing angles of inclination of the sun’s rays to the horizon in various countries and the lengths of their longest days. Hipparchus took the process further, making use of astronomical co-ordinates of longitude.

In the Roman imperial period calculation and drawing could be more accurate and detailed. The countries were better known, and regular itineraries were measured; moreover in Augustus’ time the work of land-registration was accompanied by the drawing of appropriate maps; and astronomical computations became much commoner. On the basis of all this work Marinus of Tyre about AD 120 brought out a work accompanied by maps, known to us mainly from the citations and criticisms in Claudius Ptolemaeus. In this *Correctio Tabulae Geographicae* Marinus did his calculations of longitude and altitude in degrees instead of stades. His data were provided by the days taken over journeys, and were therefore not very exact. He calculated the length of the basic parallel to be 70,000 stades, instead of the previously accepted 90,000, and the length of the basic meridian to be 43,500 stades; he then made a grid on which the meridians (or their projection on to a cylinder) were parallel to one another, which led to serious distortions in his drawing of the more northerly and southerly countries.

Claudius Ptolemaeus, who was born in Egypt and flourished at the time of the Antonines, wrote an *Introduction to Geography* in eight books. In the first he was concerned with the foundations of geography—the dimensions
of the earth and systems of projection; in Books II–VII he gave co-ordinates for each of the places mentioned; and in Book VIII he dealt mainly with questions of astronomy and climate. Modern scholars are not agreed how far (if at all) Ptolemy himself was responsible for the twenty-seven maps which accompany the text in our manuscripts. It is beyond doubt, however, that the book was based on an immense amount of documentation, and that even though his frequently inadequate assumptions led him into certain errors and failures of method, his work is the climax of ancient geographical writing, bringing together the results of all previous research in this field at the moment when the Roman empire had reached its greatest extent.

Ptolemy calculated the circumference of the earth at 160,000 stades, on the basis of 500 stades to a degree. The size of the inhabited area was 80 degrees or 40,000 stades from north to south, and 180 degrees (instead of Marinus' 225) from east to west. He put two new projections on his map, the conic—with equidistant meridians, but later improved—and the so-called Homoetera.

Among Greek geographers of about AD 400 Marcianus of Heraclea is worthy of mention. A number of his works are lost, but we possess a Periplus Maris Externi in two books. Menippus of Pergamum wrote an epitome of a Periplus Maris Interni.

Latin geography of the fourth century has as its prominent figure Rufus Festus Avienus of Volsinii, who composed a Descriptio Orbis Terrae in 1,393 hexameters and an Orae Maritimae Liber about the western coasts of Europe. He drew largely on a Greek version of Himilco's ancient Carthaginian geography.

Very soon after this we get the collections of Itineraries, designed for use by traveller and trader, but also (as was mentioned earlier) for generals, on which the routes of the more important roads are listed with indications of stages, distances, and other information which might be useful on journeys. The data they provided were later transferred on to pictorial maps (Tabulae Pictae). The model must have been the catalogue of stations on Roman roads inscribed on the Golden Milestone, which Augustus set up by the Temple of Saturn in 20 BC. Complex itineraries must also have helped in the construction of the works by Marinus and Ptolemy mentioned above. We possess the Itinerarium Antonini, constructed in Caracalla's day, and the incomplete Itinerarium Maritimum which describes the sea-routes from Corinth to Carthage and from Rome to Arelate in Narbonensis; there is also an Itinerarium Alexandri, dedicated to Constantius II in anticipation of his war against Parthia and describing previous expeditions against that country. We know also of Itineraries which deal only with a single road: for example that from Gades to Rome, inscribed on some silver cups found at the watering-place of Aquae Apollinares (Vignanello); the one designed in 333 for the use of Christians making pilgrimage from Burdigala to Jerusalem, known as
Itinerarium Burdigalense or Hierosolymitanum; and another late fourth-century document, for use by a woman pilgrim going to the East, called Egeria or some such name. Painted itineraries must have been constructed quite early; the twelfth- or thirteenth-century ‘Peutinger Table’ derives from an original of the fourth century. Among ancient examples we possess one on the broken frame of a legionary’s shield, found at Dura Europus on the Euphrates.

Astronomy and Mathematics. The obstinate propaganda spread by the Chaldeans through all parts of the Roman world was aimed at merging astronomy with astrology and divination; and the struggle between this party and those who wanted to keep the two studies distinct lasted for a great part of the imperial period. Authors like Tacitus and the Elder Pliny are severely critical of astrology: L. Manilius, who wrote his Astronomica in the first half of the first century AD, is its strong supporter. Manilius’ first book deals with astronomy proper: all the rest is concerned with astrology, the action of the planets and constellations on the life of mankind, and is an attempt to formulate an absolute law governing the celestial and terrestrial worlds with immutable order. The treatment is not easy, but the poem contains several fine lyrical episodes, like that on Andromeda and Perseus in Book V.

The union of divination and astrology was expounded by Balbillus in Nero’s time, and during several centuries had a vogue in the theories of the neo-Pythagoreans. The most complete work on astrology which has come down to us from antiquity was composed as late as the fourth century, the Mathesis of the Neoplatonist Julius Firmicus Maternus. But the Christians rejected astrology, which was proclaimed anathema by the Councils of Laodicea in 366 and Toletum in 400. In particular they could not take the view that human destiny depended on the pagan gods who had been identified with the planets; and the fatalism of astrology was impossible to reconcile with the doctrine of man’s free will, which they upheld.

The work which tells us most about astronomical knowledge in the imperial period is, of course, the great Treatise on Mathematics or Great Mathematical Treatise on Astronomy (the work called Almagest by the mediaeval translators of its Arab text), composed by Claudius Ptolemaeus in the second century. This contains the ‘Ptolemaic’ system, the geocentric doctrine which held the field for fourteen centuries, until the work of Copernicus. Comprising thirteen books, which were completed by lesser authors, it is the work of an advanced mathematician, geometer perhaps rather than astronomer: and on any estimate it represents the greatest achievement of the ancient world in spherical astronomy and the experimental work connected therewith.

In mathematics and geometry, however, the output and progress of the imperial period is smaller than that of previous generations. About AD 100 Menelaus of Alexandria is a figure worthy of mention: besides work on astronomy, he wrote three books of Sphaerica, which have come down to us
in Arabic and in a twelfth-century Latin translation, the third book containing some elementary spherical trigonometry.

The first book of Ptolemy’s *Almagest* (period of Marcus Aurelius), besides its astronomy, expounds some practical principles of spherical trigonometry; and it contains some tables essential for this study.

Heron of Alexandria was a capable writer on mathematics and mechanics, but views about his date show variations of more than a century: some scholars put him in the first century AD (the more acceptable date), others in the third.8 For a long time he was regarded as the greatest mathematician of antiquity, but it was later realized that many of his theories derive from his predecessors and that his genius was not so much inventive as expository. He was director of the school of mechanics at Alexandria, the precursor in some sense of our polytechnics, and could therefore treat in an encyclopaedic manner of all branches of the wide discipline he professed. The titles of his writings include *Geometria, Geodesia, Stereometria, Mensurae, Liber Geoponicon*, *Metrica, Pneumatica*, and he also dealt with algebra. His Definitions and his commentary on Euclid are of a more theoretical nature. Towards the middle or end of the fourth century we have Pappus of Alexandria, who in eight books called *Collectio Mathematica* (the first two are mainly lost) gives a complete summary of everything Greek geometry had achieved. He also wrote commentaries on Euclid, Aristarchus, and Ptolemy.

Diophantus of Alexandria wrote thirteen books of *Arithmetica*, of which the first six have survived, and also a book about ‘polygonal’ numbers. The six books provide a full, but unsystematic, collection of problems about numbers, including indeterminate analysis. The algebraic formulae are more complicated than those used today, and are concerned only with supplying rational solutions to the problems: the algebraic calculus of the Arabs is probably derived from his form of calculus.

In the fourth century Theon of Alexandria was the most famous master. His school produced commentaries and editions of the works of the best-known mathematicians and astronomers, from Aratus through Euclid to Ptolemy.

*Mechanics*. We have kept the history of Mechanics for the present chapter, having omitted it from Part II. The subject was treated mainly empirically. With Archimedes we shall deal separately in discussing machines of war, but in other respects the theory of mechanics is not formulated in works written before the end of the first century BC. References in so-called ‘Aristotelian’ treatises are either heavily revised versions of authentic works of Aristotle, for instance the chapters on motion in *Physics*, or else are found in works which have long been recognized as spurious—later in particular than Posidonius—such as the *Mechanica, Peri Ouranou*, and *Peri Kosmou*, the last written in AD 67. In these pseudo-Aristotelian works is found the theory of levers; there is reference to the question of resistance by a weight;
uniform motion in a straight line is examined; there is application of the principle that velocity is directly proportional to a force and inversely proportional to resistance; it is shown that the velocity of a falling body is in proportion to its weight; and there is some understanding of the principle of inertia. In Heron, whom we have already shown to be not earlier than the first century AD, we find descriptions of simple machines of a fundamental type, with the conditions governing their equilibrium: they include the lever, windlass, pulley-block, wedge, screw, and pulley. Other works of his deal with the construction of robots, war machines, and so on.

The results of these pseudo-Aristotelian and Heronian works were transmitted, with translations and numerous Greek and Arabic commentaries, to fourteenth-century Western scholars and were the basis of further work.

Book VIII of Pappus’ mathematical work, mentioned above, is another fundamental feature of the history of mechanics in the fourth century. Parallel with the development in theoretical mechanics came one in the practical application of mechanics. This is seen particularly in the field of hydraulic power and its conveyance over distances; also in the use of pneumatic power to build pumps, organs, and water-clocks; and finally in the making of machines for war.

Natural Sciences and Medicine. Two general works on natural science from the imperial period may be mentioned first. In Pliny’s Natural History Books VIII–XI are devoted to animals, Books XII–XIX to vegetables, and Books XXXIII–XXXVII to minerals. Then there are the eight books of Quaestiones Naturales by L. Annaeus Seneca, who died in AD 65: they treat of the more important natural phenomena in astronomy, meteorology, physical geography, and so on.

Two writers called Appian dealt with zoology. The second-century Appian of Cilicia, in Marcus Aurelius’ time, wrote five books on fishing, with some vivid descriptions; and his namesake from Apamea, under Caracalla, wrote four books on hunting. In the period of Septimius Severus, Aelian of Praeneste produced seventeen books on the nature of animals, his aim being to show, with a large number of anecdotes, how animals possess sentiments, such as affection, love of justice, loyalty, jealousy, and hatred, which do not put them significantly below the level of mankind.

Botany was treated in the encyclopaedias of Celsus and Pliny, by Columella and Dioscurides in relation to agriculture and pharmacology respectively, and by Galen in his medical works. In the third century there was the agriculturalist Q. Gargilius Martialis, and in the fourth, Palladius. At the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries Marcellus Empiricus, perhaps a native of Burdigala in Gaul, was the author of a work De Medicamentis, which gave special attention to Gallic plants and their local names.

Under the empire Rome devoted great attention to the study of medicine, encouraging the growth of colleges like the schola medicorum on the Esquiline
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and of audi toria for teaching. Under Vespasian these institutions received grants from the state, and the speculation of Greek empiricists, so poorly thought of by Pliny, came to an end. Other schools opened up later in the West, at Massilia, Burdigala, Nemausus, Lugdunum, and Caesaraugusta.

For medicine in the first century the treatment by the encyclopaedists is again of importance. Celsius in Tiberius' time devoted eight of his books to a lucid treatment of medicine: he followed Hippocratic principles with some borrowings from other schools, and paid special regard to surgery (especially dental surgery) and the use of drugs. Pliny's Natural History, too, is full of references to physiology and to plants of medicinal value. Certain other scholars should also be remembered. The Stoic Athenaeus of Attalia founded the school of 'pneumatici'. They added to the four traditional elements a fifth called pneuma, which had its seat in the heart and was the principle of life, its excessive admixture with other elements being the cause of diseases. Athenaeus wrote a great work on medicine in thirty books, of which only fragments survive; and from him Claudius Agathinus, the eclectic student of hygiene, and Theodorus learned their medicine. Dioscurides must be mentioned for the pharmacology set out in his five books De Materia Medica; also Scribonius Largus, especially for his Recipes (Compositiones).

In the second century Rufus of Ephesus, a member of the dogmatic school, excelled in anatomy, the most important of his many writings being one on the names of the various parts of the body. Soranus of Ephesus, of the methodical school, was principally concerned with gynaecology, obstetrics, and pediatrics: his principal work is entitled The Diseases of Women, and he provides some invaluable diagnostic studies and suggested treatments. Marcellus of Side wrote forty books of Res Medicae in verse; and Aretaeus of Cappadocia, one of the pneumatici, devoted eight books (still preserved) to acute and chronic illnesses, prescribing some very simple remedies of a largely mechanical kind. But the most famous name in this period is that of Claudius Galenus of Pergamum, who lived at Alexandria and for some time also at Rome and Pergamum, and who studied philosophy and rhetoric as well as medicine. His vast scientific output included more than 400 writings in Greek, known to us from two catalogues drawn up by himself. They divide into seven groups, of which five are on medicine: anatomy, pathology, therapy, diagnosis, and prognosis; and his commentary on the writings of Hippocrates. Galen was concerned to collect, in a polemical spirit, everything known about medicine. He stressed the necessity of analysis: in his view disease was due to dislocations of particular organs, and the cure must be adapted to one's understanding of a particular illness. Experimental methods must be constantly applied and anatomical study pressed to the farthest possible point; every kind of dogmatism must be avoided. Yet in the decline in medical studies which followed the second century his advice was disregarded: his own statements were regarded as dogmas because of the enormous reputation he possessed.
From the third century we have Quintus Serenus’ Liber Medicinalis in hexameters, and the references to medicine in Q. Gargilius Martialis’ work on agriculture. From the fourth there are the compilation called Medicina Plinii, which collects all the data given by the Natural History; an accurate compendium by an admirer of Galen, Oribasius, the doctor of the emperor Julian; and the De Medicamentis of Marcellus Empiricus, written under Theodosius I, which is a work full of extravagant superstitions.

A note must be inserted here on surgical instruments, which in their simplest form (probes and needles) go back to much earlier times. In the first decades of the fourth century BC advanced and specialized types could be found in the Greek world, as we can see from the works of Hippocrates—probes of various kinds, knives both sharp and short, or convex in shape, rasps, trepanning saws, dentists’ clamps, spectacles, and so on. Similar instruments were known at an early date in Italy by Etruscan doctors, as can be seen from the specimens of pincers, spatulas, knives, and spectacles on show in the Perugia museum.

We know from the works of Celsus that doctors of the Roman period were acquainted with at least fifty types of instrument, including tools for extracting the roots of teeth, scalping instruments, pincers for bones, trepanning and other kinds of saw, catheters, and cystotomes; of many of them examples have been found in excavations, for instance at Pompeii (forceps, pincers, hooks, specula, probes, surgeons’ knives, etc.).

About the bandaging of wounds we have precise evidence both in Galen and on monuments, especially in the reliefs on Trajan’s Column.

The most characteristic side of Roman medicine under the empire, as in the previous period, was the importance attached to hygiene, which for a long time past had been shown by the construction of water services, including aqueducts and baths. Besides the ambulatoria of individual doctors, there grew up hospitals (baletudinaria), including particular institutions for soldiers, slaves, and poor people. The state provided sanitary arrangements for the court, and also for individual towns (where free attention was provided for poor persons registered on the list of those exempt from taxation). There were also army doctors in the legions and in the fleets, and these were exempted from ordinary military service. The hospitals had personnel (accensi) to give the necessary assistance, frictores for massage, and unguentarii to rub in ointment and perfume. In the fourth century special hospitals for Christians began to make their appearance.

Veterinary science had a place of its own. Important pages are devoted to it by Pliny and other encyclopaedists, also by Columella, Gargilius Martialis, and Palladius. There were also writings specifically concerned with the subject, especially those of Absyrtus and Pelagonius in the fourth century: these were followed by the anonymous Greek tract, translated into Latin, called ‘Mulomedicina Chironis’, which was put into more simple terms by Flavius Vegetius Renatus in his Digestorum artis mulomedicinae libri.
Besides medicine proper great advances were made in pharmacology. The first important name is that of Pedanius Dioscurides of Taurus, who lived about the middle of the first century AD and wrote five books De materia medica. This collects everything known on the subject, and remained a classic for many centuries. The author deals with medicines derived from animals, from about 600 vegetables, and from minerals. Book I is concerned with aromatics, vegetable oils and juices, resins, and balsams; Book II with remedies of animal origin (honey, milk, and fat), with edible vegetables, and garden produce; Books III and IV with herbs, roots, and seeds; Book V with wines and other drinks, and with mineral medicines. Book VI on poisons and antidotes (including animal poisons) is certainly spurious. A contemporary of Dioscurides was Scribonius Largus, who among other writings produced a recipe book (Compositions) in 271 chapters, derived mainly from Greek sources. Galen, of whose medical work we have spoken already, is also important in the history of pharmacology, not only for his writings on food juices, simple medicaments, and antidotes, but for his personal investigations into drugs. These took him on various journeys, and he tells us much about the trade in drugs, by both itinerant merchants and shopkeepers, who are also known to us from archaeological evidence at Pompeii and other places.

Another feature of the first century AD was the growth of alchemy, especially in Egypt and the East, from which it spread to other countries. Its devotees believed that metals extracted from the earth led a real life and then died; and that after their return to mother earth, and after a new period of gestation in which various substances might be mingled with them, they were born again. So the alchemists were confident that with the oven and the crucible, if the crushed ‘philosopher’s stone’ were added, base metals could be transformed into precious ones; and it was their fantastic experiments which accidentally and imperceptibly led to modern chemistry. The first alchemists, of whom some were mystics and others set out to mystify, claimed to derive their secrets from the writings of ancient divinities, such as Hermes Trismegistus (later identified with great biblical figures like Enoch, Adam, Abraham, or Solomon), or Egyptian gods like Ptah, Khnurn and Tiot. They put into circulation apocryphal works, attributed to some of the figures just mentioned, or to Agathodemon, Isis, Chimetes, Cleopatra, Moses, or Mary (whence the name bain-marie). The oldest among these spurious writings were probably those attributed to Democritus, produced in the first or second century AD. On the other hand, alchemistic papyrus recipes from near 300 AD indicate that the early alchemists were often forgers of rare products and not mystics.

Philology. One of the key figures in first century AD philology was the Latin Verrius Flaccus, who taught the grandsons of Augustus. He dealt with orthography, semantics, and lexicography. His De Significatu verborum studies all the most obscure words, propounds explanations, and builds a
regular storehouse of information about such subjects as language, culture, religion, politics, and law. The original is lost, but we have an epitome in twenty books prepared in the second or third century by Pompeius Festus, and a shorter one by Paulus Diaconus from the eighth century.

Q. Remmius Palaemon of Vicetia, the master of Persius and Quintilian, used the work of his most famous predecessors to compose an *Ars Grammatica*, which is novel in both its content and its outlook. It is no longer Stoic, but Alexandrine, in inspiration; and it gives an unusual degree of importance to syntax. This work was a model for everything written thereafter.

After these two classics came a succession of works on lexicography and grammar in the centuries which followed. Each is less original and more scrappy than the last, and grammar came to cover only the use of the literary language.

In the Greek world of the first century there was much attention paid to the construction of lexicons for particular dialects and particular authors, and for proper names. The *Glosses and Names* of Pamphilus of Alexandria (in ninety-five books) remained famous throughout antiquity; and to Pamphilus’ polygraph anti-Semitic contemporary Apion are attributed works on Latin dialect, Homeric glosses, the letters of the alphabet, and similar matters.

In the second century there was Apollonius Dyscolus, another writer in Greek, who produced books on pronouns, adverbs, and conjunctions, as well as on pronunciation, inflection, and prosody. His main contribution, however, was the construction of a theory of syntax which enunciated rules and exceptions, and attempted to explain them. These views dominated the ideas of several centuries.

There were many Latin grammarians in the second century. In the age of Hadrian, Terentius Scaurus studied prepositions, adverbs, and orthography, but above all the history of the Latin language. His contemporary Velius Longus wrote *De Orthographia* and *De Usu Antiquae Lecitioin*; Flavius Capel was a student of archaic and classical Latin and wrote *De Latinitate* and *De Dubiis Generibus*; Statilius Maximus produced a work called *De Singularibus* about words only used once; and there was Aulus Gellius who, against the generally accepted opinion, maintained that Greek and Latin were of independent origin.

The Latin writers worth mentioning in the fourth and fifth centuries are Nonius Marcellus, who in his *Compendiosa Doctrina* collected lexical and grammatical examples from Republican Latin; Aelius Donatus, who wrote a grammar (in two parts—elementary and advanced); and Flavius Sosipater Charisius, who also produced an *Ars Grammatica* in five books, dealing with grammar, metric, and style.

The Church Fathers were also led to engage in linguistic researches by their constant meditations on the sacred Hebrew writings and their translations into Greek and Latin: their work was designed to show how far Latin had been affected by Hebraisms and Graecisms.
[d. Mechanics in Antiquity*]

Theory. The ‘Mechanical Problems’ of Aristotle is the oldest theoretical work on mechanics, whether it was written by Aristotle himself, before 322 BC, or by Strato of Lampsacus, about 285 BC. The effect of the lever is here derived from the nature of the circle and the wheel, and it is then used for

![Diagram of mechanical devices]

**FIG. XI. Four of the five 'powers' combined.** The figure comes from a manuscript of Heron’s *Mechanics*. On the right is a screw engaging a toothed wheel, which turns a drum, which pulls a rope from a pulley, which pulls a lever, which lifts the burden. The burden A weighs 1,000 talents; the power available is 5 talents, but Heron has not been able to compute the effect of the screw. This is just a theoretical example, but all the elements were used in practice. The inscriptions are translated from Arabic.

Answering thirty-five questions about mechanics. The centre of gravity is not mentioned. The book knows the pulley and the wedge, but not the screw.

Archimedes (287–212 BC), mathematician and inventor, defined the centre of gravity and wrote on statics, treating the subject mathematically; fragments of these works are found in Heron’s *Mechanics*; preserved are the *Equilibrium of Plane Figures* and the *Floating Bodies*.

Heron of Alexandria, for whose date see above, wrote a work on mechanics, found only in an Arabic translation. He describes the five ‘simple powers’, that is the winch, the pulley, the lever, the wedge, and the screw. (Fig. XI.) He explains that a smaller power will balance or overcome a larger burden if it travels a longer way, or, as he puts it, takes more time. For the first three powers the dimensions cannot be enlarged infinitely, but we can move a

* By A. G. Drachmann.
weight of 1,000 talents with a power of five talents by three toothed wheels or three sets of pulleys or three levers. Instead of cog-wheels we can use ropes round drums. The example of the cog-wheels appeared as a separate work, the *Barilicus*; but it is nothing but theory.

Pappus (300 AD) treats of mechanics in his Book VIII; he is dependent on earlier authors, especially Heron.

**Practice.** Two great inventors lived during antiquity: Cresibius and Archimedes. Heron also seems to have been a capable inventor, though not of the same class. Cresibius (270 BC) founded the science of Pneumatics by proving that the air is a body; he invented the cylinder and plunger, the force-pump, the water-organ, the water-clock with all sorts of mechanical and pneumatic *parerga*, and several catapults and other war engines, which, however, did not live long. (Fig. 12.)

Archimedes invented the steelyard, the endless screw, and the water-snail; Oribasius and Tzetzes ascribe to him the invention of the *trispaston*, which elsewhere means a triple pulley; but the *trispaston* described by Oribasius seems to have been a geared winch (see below). The triple pulley was known to Aristotle.

Taking the five simple powers we find that the lever was used for wine- and oil-presses, either with just a winch, or with a winch and a pulley, or with a screw; the winch was used also for cranes, together with the pulley and, for heavy burdens, with a gear consisting of ropes round drums of different size. Pulleys were used also on ships. The wedge was used mostly for cutting out marble blocks, but Heron describes a perfume-press worked by wedges; it is pictured in Pompeii. The use of the screw was limited until a tool was found to cut a female screw in wood; it is described by Heron and may be his own invention. Then the screw was used first to work the lever of the press, next to press directly on the mass. For adjusting surgical *specula* and other instruments, brass screws were used, going through a smooth hole with a peg to engage the screw-thread.

The endless screw, which may have played a part in the defence of Syracuse contrived by Archimedes, is later found only in instruments and in the resetting machine of the surgeon Nymphodorus; in another resetting machine, that of Andreas, we find the screw moving ‘tortoises’, blocks running in grooves, first by means of a smooth hole and a ‘tooth’, later by a female screw.

Toothed wheels came into use late, because the true form of the teeth was not calculated till much later (1675 AD). Cresibius used toothed wheels and racks for the *parerga* of his clocks; Archimedes used a toothed wheel with a screw; the first mention of toothed wheels engaging each other at right angles is in Vitruvius, for the water-mill (see below). An astrological instrument, the Anticythera instrument, from the first century BC, shows a number of parallel wheels with triangular teeth engaging each other; it is unique. The intricate Automatic Theatre of Heron is worked by strings only.
The only power machine known to antiquity was the water-wheel, from the first century BC; it is described by Vitruvius. He wrote a textbook on architecture in 25 BC; the two last of its books deal with cranes and other engines of interest to the architect, who was also a contractor. We hear of the horizontal water-drum, which will lift water only to the height of its radius, and the water-snail, invented by Archimedes, which will lift water to greater heights; they were turned by men using their bare feet. Next there is

**FIG. 12. The pump of Ctesibius.** This manuscript figure comes from Philo's *Pneumatics*, App. 1, Ch. 2; it shows the pump invented by Ctesibius. The two cylinders, open at the top, are placed in two large 'pots', which must always contain water. The plungers are shown as I-shaped; the two I-shapes under them are the inlet valves. The outlet valves are not shown; according to the text they were placed in the 'bulges' from which the discharge pipes go up. The connecting-rods are hinged to the plungers and the handles. The two separate handles and the two separate discharge pipes show the age of the pump. From MS. Marsh 669, folio 2v, Courtesy of the Curators of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.
the tread-wheel, dipping into the water, with 'square bushels' on its side for scooping up the water and pouring it out at a height not quite that of its diameter. (Fig. 13.) For still greater heights a tread-wheel above the water with a bucket-chain was used. Then paddles were placed on the wheel with the 'bushels', so that it was turned by the stream, and next a toothed wheel was placed on its axle and connected with another toothed wheel on a vertical shaft that turned a mill-stone. The water-wheel then was gradually made to drive stone saws and hammers, and the undershot and overshot wheels succeeded the wheel in the current.

FIG. 13. Vitruvian water-wheel with paddles and square buckets. The diagram is made from Vitruvius, Book 10, ch. 5; it shows a wheel, driven by paddles, lifting water from a river by means of 'square bushels'. When two gear-wheels at right angles were added, the water-wheel became a mill-wheel, the first, and for many hundred years, the only power engine used in the Western world.

The gear-wheels at right angles most probably had round sticks for teeth; in Saalburg (about 250 AD) a lantern pinion has been found.

Windmills were unknown to antiquity; hot air or steam is used by Heron to move a few pneumatic toys of no importance.
Except for the water-wheel only the power of animals and men was used. The animals in a horse-walk turned grain mills; for big cranes the men worked inside treed-wheels like great squirrel cages. (Pl. 62.)

The elasticity of wood and horn was used in the bow; when larger engines, catapults, were invented, the elasticity was provided by two bunches of sinews, into which two strong wooden arms were thrust. They carried the string, which was drawn by a winch, and for greater catapults were supplemented with a pulley.]

NOTES TO CHAPTER XV

1. Information about this and other visitors to eastern lands comes from the geographer Ptolemy, often drawing on Marinus of Tyre (early second century AD—see below, p. 756). Maes, 'qui est Titarius' (Ptol. I, ii.7), was probably a Syrian, i.e. a 'Macedonian' settled in Syria, but his date is unknown: M. Cary, Classical Quarterly, 1956, pp. 130 ff., argues for the reign of Augustus.

2. It is extremely doubtful whether, as stated here, glazing technique was imported from the West. This was known to the Chinese already during the Yin (see Li Chi, The Beginning of the Chinese Civilization, Seattle, 1957, p. 16). (L. S. Vasilyev.)

3. The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea appears from the most recent research to be from the third century and not the first century.

4. See also Part II, p. 397, with note.

5. Including many stations on rivers, the Rhine and Danube above all, but also the Save and Drave, the Moselle, and of course the leading rivers of Gaul. Portage between the main waterways assumed importance and was probably the motive for certain well-known lines of fortification, e.g. the Clyde to the Forth, the Main to the Neckar, or the Dobrud-scha 'vallum' from the Danube to the sea: see U. Kahrstedt, Bonner Jahrb., 1940, pp. 62 ff. For grain carried by water between Gaul and Illyricum see a recently discovered inscription published by A. Pflaum, Libyca, 1955, p. 135.

6. Professor L. S. Vasilyev notes that Hua T'o, according to some sources, was familiar with skull trepanning: see J. Needham, Science and Civilisation in China (Cambridge, 1954), I, p. 204. For similar development in the contemporary Mediterranean world see below, p. 762.

7. Professor J. Filliozat notes that this treatise contains some much earlier teaching, going back to Atreyà (Part II, p. 418).

CHAPTER XVI

POLITICAL POWER AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

I. CHINA

After the Confucianization of the state during the Former Han dynasty, and after the reforms of Wang Mang had disappeared along with their author, the rule of the Later Han dynasty (22–220 AD) marked a period of calm, but also of stagnation and decay in the administrative field and of slow changes in the social structure.

In the main, the restored dynasty was content with maintaining and continuing the institutions of its ancestors. In the central government the changes were but few. The Three Dukes and the Nine Ministers were retained, but the post of the Counsellor (ch'êng-hsiang) was abolished, and the commander-in-chief (t'ai-wei) became a regular appointment and took over the functions of Prime Minister. The triad was completed by the resurrection of an old office, that of the ta-ssi-t'êu, who became an assistant of the t'ai-wei. But these changes had little practical importance, since the functions of the Three Dukes and of the Nine Ministers tended more and more to become purely honorific, and theirs were titles without power; actual administrative work tended to be concentrated in the five Secretariats (ts'ao). The latter were headed each by a secretary (shang-shu lang), assisted by six under-secretaries, shih-lang. As said above in Part II, the General Secretary (shang-shu ling) was practically the most influential official and the executor of the emperor's will. Since the high officials were recruited according to a fixed routine and therefore were too independent and also too closely knit a class, these posts of trust in the Secretariats were usually given to literati of lesser standing, or even to court eunuchs.

In the provinces the local commander-in-chief was abolished, and the troops of the inner provinces were reduced and placed under the direct command of the governor. For the rest, the Chinese infantry continued to hold its own against the mounted archer of the steppe, thanks mainly to its standard weapon, a powerful crossbow with a most ingenious and clever cocking device.

In financial administration the Privy Treasury of the emperor disappeared and all revenue flowed into the state exchequer; on the other side, the latter had now also to meet the ever-increasing expenses of the court.

Confucian officialdom remained at first paramount in the central admini-
stration. But its ascendancy was challenged first by the relatives of the empresses; the foremost instance is that of the Liang family (c.145–150). Much more dangerous opponents were the eunuchs. Emperors came to lean more and more heavily on them, in an effort to make themselves independent of the bureaucracy. The eunuchs owed everything to the emperor and, coming from low social strata, were usually free of entanglements with the cliques of high officials; but their control of access to the person of the emperor lent itself to many abuses and to wholesale corruption. Thus the second half of the second century AD was marked by savage and often bloody struggles at court between the eunuchs and the Confucian officials (who organized themselves into a regular party). In the end these court intrigues and conflicts merely served to destroy the authority of the central government and to transfer actual power to the commandants of the troops in the frontier provinces. After c.175 the latter fought for the real power over the heads of the impotent central government. Ts'ao Ts'ao emerged as the strongest, but was not strong enough to eliminate his adversaries; and the empire collapsed and split into three parts.

Neither the Three States nor the Chin dynasty, who for a short spell (280–317) ruled over the whole of the reunited empire, introduced any formal change in the administration. But the old structure was gradually emptied of any substantial meaning by the fact that the emperor usually granted the great offices of state to princes of the imperial family, for whom the actual administrative work was performed by substitutes (ch'êng-shih), usually literati. Hence an atmosphere of mutual suspicion and continuous bickering, which led not to a balance of power, but to inefficiency and stagnation. Military offices increased in number and importance. During the times of the Chin the central government was practically represented by the State Secretariat (shang-shu t'ai), headed by the shang-shu ling. Things came to such a pass that the great officers of the crown caused themselves to be given direction of the State Secretariat, with the title of tu shang-shu shih; this placed the State Secretary under their orders, and by this devious means the old situation was re-established in all but name.

At the same time the recruitment of the bureaucracy underwent a profound change. Proficiency in Confucian studies and selection by examination had become less important than membership of a group of influential families. After the fall of the Han, even the pretence of choice by examination was dropped, being formally replaced in 220 by the so-called 'Nine Classes and the Impartial and Just' (chiu-p'in chung-chêng), i.e. recommendation by government inspectors ('Impartial and Just') sent to the provinces to select suitable candidates. Out of their list, which was divided into nine classes, the government chose its future officials. Since the great families could exert the whole weight of their relations and money in influencing the inspectors, designations became limited to their class only, and had nothing to do with scholarship or merit. This meant the formation of a 'noblesse de toge' at the
very moment in which the imperial structure was on the verge of collapsing for more than two centuries and a half.

Shortly afterwards a new nobility was created, with many titles and ranks (from duke to baron); it took the place of the former bureaucratic ranks of Han times. Even before the Hsiung-nu invasion of 313–317 Chinese society was well on the way to a return to feudalism. It should be noted, however, that it was not the title that counted, but membership of an old and established family; a count of an old family was much more respected than a newly-backed duke. The ruling class, chiefly in South China after 317, became a close caste with all the characteristics of economic feudalism.

The social structure of the Later Han dynasty was at first marked by an easing of the social tension. The civil war and the massacres of the time of Wang Mang and of the Red Eyebrows revolt had eliminated many absentee land-owners and had made large areas of land available for the farmer. The trend towards the formation of large estates was sharply checked and for a time reversed. But this did not last. The long internal peace of the first and second centuries caused, it is true, a large increase of national wealth; but it also nearly doubled the population, which was still badly distributed between an over-populated Huang-ho basin and a thinly inhabited south. Pressure on the soil, pauperism, and indebtedness increased, and the concentration of land ownership in a group of great families started again and went on ever more rapidly.

Social tension reached breaking-point with the peasant revolt of the Yellow Turbans (184) and with the internecine wars of the provincial commanders at the end of the second century. The farmers, being exposed without defence to pillage and robbery by soldiers and brigands, abandoned the fields, absconded to the hills or swamps, and turned vagrants (liu-li-chia). The only haven of tolerable safety was for those who placed themselves under the protection of the great families; these had taken to self-defence by organizing their relatives and retainers into armed bands (chia-ping). Small cultivators joined them in the quality of ‘farmer guests’ (tien-k‘o). It is said that about AD 200 five-sixths of the population were thus under the protection of big land-owners. They were, however, not tied to the land like the coloni of the Roman world about the same time, but to the lord; and if their protector abandoned his seat and migrated in search of a quieter spot (as occasionally happened), they too went with him. This type of structure has been called, with some reason, ‘manorial economy’.

Thus the agrarian problem was becoming paramount in the general breakdown of Chinese society in the third century. The first Wei emperor Wu-ti tried to solve it by the first land regulation of which there is record in Chinese history (280). He limited the number of ‘farmer guests’ according to the official rank of their host (from a maximum of fifteen families to a minimum of one). Most important was a serious attempt to regulate the relationship of the farmer with the land he tilled. Within the local units (hsiang) the
soil was distributed among the peasant families according to definite rules; normally only adult males were entitled to a full share, youngsters and old men to something less. This measure met with temporary success; but most of the peasants did not venture to abandon the protection to which they were accustomed. Soon afterwards the barbarian invasion upset the whole organization and brought the earlier process to its logical conclusion. The free peasantry disappeared and were converted into clients (pu-chü; originally bodyguards) of the great landed proprietors. The only exception, at least in the early days, lay in the military colonies (t'un-t'ien) on the border, a good many of which had been founded by Ts'ao Ts'ai (c.190–220).

Commerce was regarded with suspicion and despised by the bureaucracy; it was restricted by governmental measures and was severely hit by the economic crisis of the third century. Under the Later Han the merchant class began to be affluent and to acquire economic importance, but this was not followed up. Land became once more the only established and recognized form of wealth, the more so because money had become very scarce and the country was lapsing back into a natural economy on a barter basis. In the same way there was no increase in the importance of towns. Practically the only cities in China were the capitals Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang (Fig. 15), with two or three others which were the former headquarters of the old feudal states. All of them were under the strict surveillance of state officials and were divided by walls or closed streets into quarters and wards, passage from one to another being strictly forbidden at night. There was no form of corporate life and the apt synthesis of Max Weber still holds good: 'in China a city was a place with officials and without local autonomy'. To this we may add that the China of this period was one of the purest examples of an agrarian state that ever existed.

2. INDIA

The institutions of the Greek and Iranian invaders of north-western India are little known. There is scarcely any material on the Greeks, except for some vague hints in the Milindapañha. It may be, as affirmed by Tarn, that their central and provincial administration was borrowed from Seleucid Asia, including the rise of quasi-autonomous cities. The Saka and the Parthians formed a very loose confederation of markedly feudal character. Coins and inscriptions show that its supreme head had under him a number of satraps (kṣatrapa). Greek titulature lingered on under the Parthians: Gondophernes had a stratega called Aspavarma, and the title meridarkha also occurs. On the other side the new offices of kṣatrapa and mahākṣatrapa were created, reviving old Persian institutions. We may, however, note the exaltation of the king's dignity, although his power over the aristocracy was very limited; he bore now the title of Great King of Kings (on the coins:
basileos basileon megalou in Greek, rājatirajasa mahatasa in Prakrit). The autonomous cities and other traces of Greek rule disappeared.

Republican states experienced a revival after the decay of Greek power. First the Yaudheya, Ārjunāyana, Rājanya, and Śibi reappeared in the lime-light in the second and first centuries BC, then the Mālava, Yaudheya, and Kuniṇḍa in the first and second centuries AD; the dedicatory legends on the coins of the Kuniṇḍas seem to refer to a theocratic state. All these republics were situated in the Punjab and Rajasthan. They were reduced into insignificance by the expansion of the Guptas. Their end was perhaps brought about by the headship of the state gradually becoming hereditary and the power of the assembly of the nobles disappearing.

The administration of the Sātavāhana was a continuation of the traditional system with some innovations. The āmāṭya took the place of the Mauryan mahāmāṭra; new offices were the minister (rājāmāṭya) and the administrative head of the army (mahāsenāpati). Another novelty was the changes in land revenue; it was derived from royal allotments on the villages and not from the usual share of agricultural produce of the cultivators.

Gupta institutions are relatively well known from inscriptions. The king made generous use of his sons, brothers, and relatives. The heir-apparent (yuvarāja) had his own separate establishment, and sometimes, when the king was old, took upon himself a large share of responsibilities (as did Skandagupta during the last years of Kumāragupta I). The higher officials seem to have been known under the general name of kumāramāṭya. Within their class there was no basic distinction between civil and military officers; we have instances of counsellors (mantrin) being promoted to become army commanders (mahābālādhiḥkṛta). There was some tendency for high office to become hereditary, but this was by no means the rule. In Vākāṭaka and Pallava administration there was at the capital a sort of central secretariat, whose chief (saravādhyakṣa) was charged with conveying the orders of the government to the provincial authorities. Routine business was transacted by each minister, but important matters were referred to the council, presided over by the king. When away from the capital, the king communicated his orders to the central secretariat through his private secretaries (rahasiniyukta). Other important officials, but with only court duties, were the chamberlains (pratihāra).

The army was commanded directly by the king, often assisted by the heir-apparent; but the head of the military administration was the mahābālādhiḥkṛta, corresponding to the mahāsenāpati of the Śatavāhana administration. The divisions were led, perhaps on a provincial basis, by generals (mahāsenāpati). The mahādaṇḍaṇāvāyaka were their subordinates. Chariotry having disappeared as a fighting army, the army included cavalry, infantry, and elephants. We know the titles of some officers in the cavalry (mahāāśvapati, and in the elephant corps (mahā)piḷupati. There was a separate police establishment (cāṭa, bhāṭa).
Revenue was partly in kind and partly in cash, and forests and mines were the property of the state; so were unclaimed waste lands, but their actual management and disposal were left in charge of the village in whose jurisdiction they were situated. Public morals in the provinces were subjected to the censorship of the \textit{vinayasthitishápika}. Learning and cult were supported by grants of villages (\textit{agrahāra}) to learned Brahmans and to Buddhist and Jain monasteries, such villages being placed under the management of \textit{agrahārikas}.

Foreign affairs were entrusted to a Minister of Peace and War (\textit{mahāsāndhivigrahika}), who appears also to have been in charge of relations with the feudatory states. The degree of dependency of the latter varied according to circumstances. Some of them (e.g. Rudradatta, a feudatory of the Gupta king Vainyagupta) enjoyed no financial autonomy, but had to get imperial sanction for their grants. Larger feudatories (e.g. the Parivrājaka Mahārāja) could do so without permission; and some of them had sub-feudatories of their own.

Provincial administration was well organized on a graded scale. The Gupta empire was divided into provinces (probably called \textit{dēsa}), under viceroy whose title is not known; they held wide administrative and even military powers. Provinces were divided into counties (\textit{bhukti}), in charge of governors (\textit{uparīka}) appointed directly by the emperor. The counties were divided into districts (\textit{vīśaya}), governed by \textit{vīśayapati}, appointed usually by the \textit{uparikas}, but sometimes by the emperor. Several seals of both \textit{bhukti} and \textit{vīśaya} have come down to us. The \textit{vīśaya} headquarters contained as the most important official a keeper of records (\textit{pustapāla}) with a staff of subordinates (\textit{ākṣapātaliṣka}) on the local level. There was a fair amount of decentralization, district authorities being consulted before the alienation of waste lands; the actual grants often bear their seals, apparently in token of registration. The \textit{vīśayapati} was advised by a municipal board (\textit{adhiṣṭhānādhihikarana}), or a district council (\textit{vīśayādhihikarana}). There were also rural boards (\textit{aṣṭakulādhihikarana}). They were headed by elders of districts (\textit{vīśayūmahattara}); and their most prominent members (\textit{puroga}) were the chief banker, the chief trader, the chief artisan, and the chief scribe. We do not know whether they were elected or nominated, but they certainly introduced, for the first time in India, an element of popular participation in provincial administration. This element was urban and not rural, and was dominated by business interests.

The basic unit of the state was, as usual, the village. Its headman (\textit{grāmika}) was assisted by elders (\textit{mahattara}). The latter took care of defence, police, works of public utility, and settlement of minor disputes; and it acted as the fiscal agent of the government. The \textit{mahattaras} were probably not elected, but came to be tacitly recognized as such by common consent on the basis of their age, experience, and character.

Towns were governed by officers who had the status of a \textit{kumāramātya}. They were government officials: the self-governing element is far less
conspicuous in the town than in the village. Town councils may have existed (at least halls for public meetings were provided for), but we have no actual mention of them on inscriptions.

Taxation was not too heavy. The traditional number of taxes was eighteen, but their complete list is nowhere given. The land tax was, as always, the mainstay of government revenue. It was collected in kind and cash and seems to have consisted of 16–25 per cent of the actual yield, according to the quality of the land. There were also octroi duties, part of which were assigned in lieu of salary to local officials, under the name of bhogakara. A sort of excise duty (bhūta-pratyāya) on manufactured goods was also levied.

Indian law was based on the Dharmaśāstras. Of the post-Maurya texts, the Yajñavalkya-smṛti and the Nārada-smṛti, and perhaps also the Brhadapati-smṛti, belonged to this period. The Yajñavalkya-smṛti marks a step forward toward a more systematic arrangement of legal materials, and developed settled rules of procedure (vyavahāra). Three kinds of proof are admitted: written documents, witnesses, and possession. Ordeal is also admitted, but only when other evidence is lacking. The Nārada-smṛti is based on Manu, but shows some original features, chiefly that judicial procedure is much more complex than with Manu and Yajñavalkya: judgement is pronounced by the sabhyas, i.e. the assessors of the judge, and the law of inheritance is more precise and detailed.

Indian (or Indianized) society abroad was organized on the same basis as that of the mother country. Merchants, refugees, and missionaries had exerted a deep cultural influence in south-east Asia. They penetrated into native society by slow stages, intermarrying with the local aristocracy. The latter, struck by the cultural superiority of the newcomers, accepted their theory of life, their religion and, up to a certain point, their social structure. Thus Campa in south Vietnam, Fu-nan in Cambodia, and the various states in Java were ruled by royal houses and aristocracies who were partly of Indian and partly of local descent, but in every case had Sanskrit names, worshipped Hindu gods, and broadly followed the precepts of the Dharmaśāstras. The social strata under them, however, were less and less touched by Hinduism the farther down one went in the social scale. But very few inscriptions belong to this period; so an account of the Indian society of Greater India really falls outside the limits set to the present volume. We may only note that the Gupta period in northern India corresponded to a definite and marked increase of Indian cultural (but not political) influence in south-eastern Asia.

3. POPULATION CENSUSES IN THE FAR EAST

In India there existed no system approximating to a census. Neither epigraphic nor literary sources give us any idea of the number of the population. Some modern attempts to determine it are based on purely arbitrary calculations and can be regarded as a complete failure.
In China, on the other hand, a census of the population was taken at more or less regular intervals; and we have even an original though fragmentary list of inhabitants from a village in the Tun-huang district on the north-west frontier. The chapters on geography in the dynastic histories and other sources have preserved the results of censuses of the early Chou period, of 684 BC; and of AD 57, 75, 88, 105, 140, 144, 145, 148, 156, 221 (partial), 280, and 464 (partial). In the various figures, whether complete or incomplete, there are very large oscillations between one census and another, due partly to mistakes in calculation, partly to the varying size of the territory under review, but above all to the employment of two different and irreconcilable systems in the taking of a census: sometimes every individual was counted, at other times only those on the lists of tax-payers, the latter method being preferred for simplicity’s sake in the periods of adjustment following great rebellions. Consequently comparison is always difficult. It appears, in any case, that only the figures relating to the censuses of AD 2 and 140 are comparable, being based on the same system and on the same area. These figures are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD 2</td>
<td>12,233,062</td>
<td>59,594,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>9,698,630</td>
<td>49,150,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are very low indeed and show a serious decrease in less than a century and a half, due partly to economic decline, but still more to a disastrous flood of the Huang-ho, which caused countless casualties and resulted in the river mouth being diverted a long distance towards the south. From an analysis of the rough figures by districts it seems that the population was in the early times concentrated in the Great Northern Plain, in the valleys of the Wei and the Fen-ho, and in Szechwan. Fukien is made to appear almost deserted, because it was largely inhabited by non-Chinese populations in a state of de facto independence. The Han-kou region, which today is very populous, also seems almost empty, and the reason here may be that before the great banking works carried out in the district it consisted of one enormous area of swamps. We can discern certain main currents of migration, from northern China towards the middle valley of the Yangtze-kiang and towards the estuary of the same great river. The population curve, in so far as it can be reconstructed, is remarkably even: after the heavy decrease mentioned above, the population seems to have become stabilized at about fifty millions down to the eighth century AD.

4. THE PERSIAN STATE UNDER THE SASSANIDS

In AD 224 the Sassanid dynasty, after deposing the Arsacids and taking their place, started on a powerful period in the history of their own house and of the
Persian empire. This was characterized by strong nationalistic and centralizing tendencies. The king concentrated in his own person the running of the army, administration, finance, and the direction of foreign policy, the last especially in relation to the great rival empire of Rome.

Down to the reign of Ardashir II (379–383) each king was, in the normal course of events, designated by his predecessor; but from that time on this process was replaced by a system of election from among the members of the royal family, operated by a college including the heads of the priesthood, the armed forces, and the scribes. The more energetic a king was, the greater his success in bringing affairs under a central control at the expense of the forces of feudalism.

To these powerful Sassanid kings was due the rigorous adoption of a modernized Zoroastrianism as a state religion: other religions were regarded as potential elements of separatism and no toleration was shown them. The kings also regarded it as their main mission to restore the empire’s prestige and cause its peculiar culture to be respected once more. The state offices were arranged in a hierarchy, beginning with the viceroy, drawn from royal princes and vassal kings: these were followed by other high posts at court, normally filled by members of seven powerful families, the majority of which were descended from the Arsacids. These upper classes derived their reputation from the part they played in war: and they possessed economic power in their own right as a result of large fiefs, on which they imposed taxes in addition to what the territories in question had to pay to the state. To protect themselves from any possible opposition from these magnates, the kings relied also on a number of lesser potentates (Vazurkan or ‘grandees’, and Āzātān or ‘nobles’): in return he gave them assistance against encroachments by the feudal lords, and entrusted them with official positions in the administration of the army. Moreover by granting an exclusive position to the Zoroastrian religion the king was assured of the loyalty of the priesthood, which also carried out important functions of a social and cultural nature (the so-called ‘purifications’ are an example). Besides this the priesthood had judicial duties, since the basis of legal tradition derived from the interpretation of the sacred scriptures.2

5. ROME

a. Power Structure

The Emperor. Augustus hoped that he had created a durable system of government, but although the imperial idea persisted, its form was continually changing in detail, and its final outcome was certainly not foreseen by its founder. A number of important factors were responsible for these changes of policy. In three-quarters of a century Rome had experienced many different conceptions of personal rule, each one meeting the more obvious needs of the moment, and each having definite support, at least in principle,
from past history. On two occasions, under Caesar and Pompey and under Antony and Octavian, there were duumvirates (derived from previous triumvirates) exercising more or less dictatorial power, one in each of the two distinct parts of the Roman world, the Greek half and the Latin half. Then there had been sole rulers of the whole empire: Caesar, dictator for life, and concentrating almost all powers and duties in his own person; and Augustus, the princeps, apparently deriving his powers from the senate, though in fact he too was head of the armed forces and assumed increasing independence and initiative in determining all public policy. But in addition, though this time only in the East, there had been Antony in his last years. He was raised to the level of a god and as King of Kings he had been ruler of a feudal empire, parts of which were divided among the members of his new divine family.

Each of the emperors who followed felt the influence of these predecessors. Some selected one of them as a pattern to fit their own tastes and beliefs; others tried to blend them all within a new formula; some again contributed such innovations as they believed were necessary or suitable for resolving the more urgent problems that they had to face. As early, therefore, as the Julio-Claudian régime, which ruled the empire down to 68, we find an alternation of policies, accompanied by continual evolution in the attitude of each individual emperor.

For example, Tiberius at his accession would have preferred a tripartite division of power, but he gave that up in fear of a military crisis, and later put into force the Augustan system, though he made it into a more genuine diarchy between senate and emperor. In the end, however, he came to rely increasingly on the praetorians and less on the senate, drifting into a lonely despotism which alienated him from his subjects.

Caligula, too, who at the outset had agreed that his powers be determined by the senate and had accepted the senate’s co-operation, gradually increased his tendency towards godlike absolutism, which he finally pushed to extremes. This happened under pressure from troubles within his family and from conspiracies, and under the realization of the treacherous part played by the senate during the trials of Tiberius’ reign.

Claudius, who had researched deeply into the recent constitutional history of Rome, seems to have genuinely desired to return to the conditions of Augustus’ later years. But in the end he, too, was driven in the direction of autocracy: he made more use of his own freedmen than he did of senate and knights, and he placed his reliance on the army—on particular on the praetorian cohorts to whom he owed his proclamation.

Finally Nero, though his teacher Seneca had tried to inculcate in him an admiration for Augustus, first found himself under the influence of his mother Agrippina and the financial expert and freedman Pallas, and later, as his personal experience widened, became increasingly attracted by the examples of Antony and Caligula. From the beginning of his reign he depended on
the support of the praetorians, but the value of this was lessened by the
conflict between their two commanders, Tigellinus and Faenius Rufus.

In 68–69 came the first crisis, brief but almost fatal. Each one of the ele-
ments, both civil and military, which mattered in the life of the empire
(senate, knights, people, praetorians, frontier armies, Italians, and provincials)
tried to find supporters for their rival interests among the various contenders
for the empire; and each of these claimants was following ideas of his own
and seeking his own advantage. Galba was proclaimed by the armies in
Spain, with support from Gaul, and tried to model himself on Augustus, but
forfeited the sympathy of the troops in Rome through parsimony and extreme
severity. Otho, who modelled himself on Nero, had the support of the
praetorians and the people of Rome, but tried to secure the sympathies of the
provinces as well. After him came Vitellius, who attempted to give effect
to the dominance of the frontier troops from Germany, even to the point of
‘Germanizing’ the praetorian guard.

With Vespasian, raised to power by the Eastern armies, we reach the
foundation of a new dynasty. It lasted less than thirty years, but its policy
was no more consistent than that of the earlier dynasties, and in the reigns
of each of its three rulers we can distinguish different phases. On Vespasian,
while he was still absent from Rome, the senate had imposed a line of conduct
of the ‘Augustan’ type and had codified his rights and duties. Yet when he
had made his position secure, he first gradually enlarged the scope of his
interference, and then revived in his own person the office of censor, accom-
panied by a growing centralization of public affairs into his own hands. He
made considerable use of knights and freedmen, and altered the composition
of the senate to suit his wishes, expelling any members he regarded as hostile
to his ideas. Then under Domitian, who was proclaimed by the praetorians,
we find a gradual return to the autocratic conceptions of Antony, closely
related to the increasingly serious opposition offered by the senatorial class.
To meet these he gave greater prominence to the consilium principis and to
equestrian and freedmen officials, while as the new Antonius he laid claim
in his lifetime to divine worship of ‘Deus et Dominus’.

The years from the death of Domitian in 96 to that of Marcus Aurelius in
180 are often called the period of the ‘Liberal Empire’, in the sense illustrated
by Tacitus. They represent a reconciliation between the powers of the ruler
and the liberties of the subjects, who for Tacitus mean essentially the members
of the senatorial class. It is true that these eighty-four years were in general a
period of greater tranquillity in the contest between the main elements in the
state, and consequently also in that between the rival systems of government
for which these elements stood. It was not that one element or system had
won a decisive victory over the others but that some fairly stable equilibrium
had been reached between the two powers which had been confronting each
other for more than a century: the central government with the emperor
at its head had been strengthened and at the same time a number of senatorial
prerogatives had been recognized. It is true that the senate, as we shall soon see, had practically nothing in common with the senate of the early empire, which had been largely composed of irreconcilable republicans. The main problem in the relations between the emperor and senate now consisted in that of the imperial succession, which the senate claimed should be governed by the principle of the adoption of the ‘best man’ (the Optimus), while the emperor started by favouring a semi-dynastic system, and later declared for a fully hereditary succession, which was realized with Commodus who succeeded his father. But there were many other very serious problems, to which Trajan and Hadrian, both of them provincials, gave more attention than their successors. It was a question of keeping the government’s programme in line with the new situation which was developing with growing clarity in the empire. In general one has the impression that after Hadrian’s death the central government of the ‘Philosopher Emperors’ became markedly less ready to cope with the changes which were taking place and with problems which were becoming more manifest every day. In this way the reigns of Antoninus Pius and (still more) Marcus Aurelius concealed beneath the figures of these two philosopher emperors, with all their moral and cultural excellence, a serious decline or even crisis in government which was not confronted in time. The crisis broke out at the moment of least resistance in the reign of Commodus, who came to power too young, without preparation or proper direction; and it was a crisis which was the logical outcome of the errors of previous reigns.

*The ‘Dominate’ and its Relations with the Army.* One of the main features of Roman imperial rule was the concentration of power in the hands of an emperor who controlled a standing army. This made permanent and empire-wide a system which had earlier been achieved at intervals and over limited areas by the grant of *imperium proconsolare maius*. But the firm tendency of most emperors from Commodus onward to assume a power which was absolute and autocratic—to pass, that is to say, from the ‘Principate’ to the ‘Dominate’—cannot simply be due to the fact that they regarded themselves as military emperors, created by and dependent upon the army. Other emperors, such as Caligula, Nero, and Domitian, had shown the same tendency much earlier, quite independently of any military origin or support for their power; on the other hand the tendency was not shared by generals who were specifically proclaimed by the army, like Trajan. Moreover, for more than forty years, from Septimius Severus to Severus Alexander, the army’s proclamations were not completely free: they were designed to support the regular succession of members of a single dynasty. The real period of chaotic tyranny by the armies started after Severus Alexander’s death.

At first then the Dominate came into being by stages separated by intervals. It was modelled on Caesar and Antony, or sometimes expressed the particular
views of individual rulers. Later it began to represent a fairly fixed policy, even when the emperor was as unwarlike as Elagabalus, or had not reached an age at which he could command armies, like Severus Alexander in his early years. So in the early period support from the armies was not the sole or even the main cause of the Dominate so much as a concomitant circumstance; and later on the army’s attitude may have embarrassed rather than strengthened the régime, since the dominus had to face opposition from counter-emperors, who could draw similar support from dissident groups among the forces.

Under the various emperors who succeeded one another the Dominate assumed a number of different forms; indeed some emperors, like Pertinax, or Balbinus and Pupienus, tried to return to the old ways of government. In fact, like all great phenomena in history, the Dominate was the result of a number of causes working together, some intermittently, others continuously. The following deserve special attention:

(1) Autocratic régimes of the past or of the contemporary kingdoms of the East were taken as models; and this influence was combined with the effect of a repetition of dynasties or near-dynasties exercised by persons who came to power more because they were related to earlier divi than because any acknowledged merits of their own could mark them out as optimi.

(2) There was an increasingly widespread conviction that to safeguard the dominion of Rome as ‘mistress of the world’, and to confront the problems and overcome the difficulties of the time, it was essential to concentrate all power in the hands of a single man. He must be a ‘monarch’, crowned with a mystic halo and supported by a rigid and hierarchical system of government. Such a system was regarded as indispensable for every sphere of human life, eventually including religion, where in any case the concept of a single and omnipotent God was continually gaining ground.

(3) Senatorial magistrates, with their republican tradition of equality, were gradually replaced by bureaucrats drawn from other classes of society and kept dependent on the emperor under close control. Meanwhile the composition of the senate itself had been radically altered, and it was now an assembly of courtiers, ready not only to bestow panegyrics on the ruler but to remove any unruly persons among its own members by use of the Lex Maiestatis.

(4) The imperial cult, which had centuries of history behind it but was now enhanced by fresh borrowings from the East, had led to the full-scale deification of emperors in their lifetimes. They were still generally pontifices maximi in the ancestral religion, and the Severi were also high priests of oriental cults.

(5) More and more power was centralized in the consilium principis, which as early as Hadrian’s day contained a preponderance of lawyers, and which Severus Alexander converted into a regular body for the formulation of all legislative proposals. At the same time the princeps, who was regarded as above the law, became more and more its real source through his constitutiones and other kinds of legislative pronouncements.
(6) Imperial power had been attained by an increasing number of men born in those districts where the concept of a God-king, or a king under divine tutelage and the patron of his people, had an age-long history and had taken deep roots.

(7) The emperor, as head of the army and supreme administrator in the state, possessed unchallenged control of the two main forces supporting the empire, soldiers and money. In fact he had his hands on a most formidable proportion of the empire's means of production, which were scattered throughout all the provinces and had come to him through conquest, confiscation, and inheritance.

It is true that even now, though among an increasingly smaller circle, men looked back with longing to the less autocratic period of the Principate, identified with the name of Augustus, and to a system of government based less on force and on the changing dictates of the domini.

At a time when the Dominate had not yet completely destroyed all senatorial aspirations for a share in the power, Philostratus in his Life of Apollonius of Tyana (a work commissioned by Julia Domna, the widow of Septimius Severus, and completed soon after 217) expressed in memory of the philosopher emperors of the second century the wish that all rulers should be philosophers and should avoid behaving as autocrats. Soon after 229, in a revision of his History, Dio Cassius inserted two speeches which purport to have been delivered before Augustus by Maecenas and Agrippa, but which really reflect Dio's own thought. He wants the emperor to avoid conducting himself like a Deus and giving equality of rights and duties to all peoples and districts of the empire: instead the ruler should preserve the ancient forms of the constitution, govern through the senate, put forward laws which the senate has formulated, display moderation and justice, and shun the use of autocracy and force. In these anachronistic discourses Dio gave shape to longings which by his time were wholly out of date, but which as a senator and the son of a senator he had derived from his study of imperial history. It is certainly wrong, in the present author's opinion, to conclude from his work that in his day there was still a powerful current of political opinion which was pro-senatorial and anti-absolutist.

By now we are dealing with isolated manifestations, which had no practical effects and evoked no complications. Again, from the time of the Philips, there is an oration, probably written by Nicagoras, which contrasts the more autocratic emperors of his generation with those who were more liberal. It prays for a government which is not always exercised arbitrarily through the force of the soldiers and commanders under its orders, but is dutiful, just, merciful, moderate, prudent, virtuous, and paternal: a government ready to curb the will of the soldiers, to avoid war by wise diplomacy, and to improve moral behaviour. Yet the orator no longer asks his ruler to collaborate with any other constitutional power. He is writing at a time when the soldiers were plundering the property of city-dwellers and country-folk alike, and of
the great owners of estates along with their *colonii*; a time when the military
pronunciamentos of the great crisis period in the third century were turning
public life into chaos, and when tyrants and wreckers were taking the place of
beneficient *domini*.

*The Period c.250–400*. Two dates can be taken as landmarks in the mid-third
century: the death of Decius in battle against the Goths in 251, and Valerian’s
capture by the Parthians as a prisoner of war in 260. By themselves these two
events would show the bankruptcy into which the empire had fallen; and it
was in this period that it was split into three sections by the establishment of
separate empires in Gaul and in Palmyra. The barbarians were pressing
simultaneously on several points in the *tēmes* which were no longer held;
and since the emperor could not be everywhere, individual generals made use
of their victories and of the regional outlook of their troops to further their
own aspirations to the purple. The methods of the armies were often out of
date, their numbers were inadequate, and their units were composed and
grouped on too much of a regional basis. The agricultural population was
oppressed and discontented. The Christians under persecution were tending
to shirk their civil and military obligations. Finally the population was declin-
ing under the impact of poverty and war—civil as well as foreign—quite apart
from the cataclysms which affected particular areas and a number of plagues
which were often of long duration and general throughout the empire.11

Even when the catastrophe was at its height there were efforts to stem the
tide. One example is the policy of Gallienus as soon as he could rescind his
father’s arrangements after the latter’s capture by the Parthians. He carried
out a reform of the army which included new developments in the use of
cavalry; he made the first attempt to separate military and civil powers,
hitherto granted to the same men; and he showed tolerance to the Christians.
His work of recovery was continued and intensified by the three great
Illyrian emperors who followed him.

One of these three, Aurelian, succeeded in reuniting the three divisions
of the empire. He checked barbarian aggression and improved Rome’s
defences, although he surrendered the now untenable province of Dacia
beyond the Danube. He strengthened the imperial power by undisguised
assumption of the position of divine *dominus*; and attempted to consolidate
internal unity by imposing sun-worship as the supreme religion.

After Aurelian’s murder there followed a curious interregnum, during
which legions, praetorians, and senate tossed from one to another the honour
of nominating the new emperor, who was eventually chosen by the senate
in the person of Tacitus. This however by no means represented a decisive
senatorial victory in the matter of imperial nominations, since from the
moment of the proclamation of Tacitus’ successor Probus all intervention by
the senate in these proclamations was finally brought to an end. Probus made
further advances on the lines indicated by Aurelian.
The task of reconstruction was firmly carried on by the third great Illyrian emperor, Diocletian, whose measures followed logically from what preceded, even though their outcome was often daring rather than profitable. He studied the needs of imperial defence, together with the precedents for a division of command between two emperors in association and for semi-dynasties built on adoption and on a system whereby selected successors were given training before they acceded to power. All this led him to create the so-called ‘Tetrarchy’. This was not a system erected at one moment: it came about gradually, or one might almost say empirically. For a time Diocletian reigned alone: then in March 286 he adopted Maximian and nominated him as Caesar to look after the defence of the West; then in November of the same year Maximian was raised to the status of Augustus; and finally in May 293 he adopted Galerius and made him Caesar, causing Maximian in the West to do the same for Constantius. The two Augusti and the two Caesars in association formed a single dynasty of the adoptive type, constructed hierarchically, the duties of leader being secured solely for the ‘Augustus senior’, who was called Jovius because his position corresponded to that of Juppiter on Olympus. The system was intended to allow the imperial power to be omnipresent, passing regularly from an Augustus to a Caesar once the latter had served his period of training; and it was thought that thereby usurpations could be prevented and that defence could be rendered speedy and effective against foreign and domestic danger alike. Other measures were intended to serve the same purpose, such as the reform and expansion of the army, the way provinces were split up and then regrouped into dioceses, the financial reforms, and the ruthless attempt to root out Christianity. But the experiment was not conclusive or even lasting. In 305 Diocletian ordained the abdication of himself and Maximian, and Galerius and Constantius became Augusti; Galerius who was Augustus Maior (or Jovius) then chose the two new Caesars, Maximinus Daia under himself in the East and Flavius Valerius Severus for Constantius in the West. In the East the new arrangement was uncontested, but in the West both Constantius’ son Constantine and Maximian’s son Maxentius had been disappointed in their hopes of becoming Caesars. So the West was troubled by discord and dynastic struggles; and these came to a head on the death of Constantius in 306. Valerius Severus became Augustus and Constantine was chosen as his Caesar, but they found themselves confronted by a rival pair, Maximian, who resumed power as Augustus, and his son Maxentius, whom he associated with himself as Caesar. Complications grew with Severus’ death in 307, since there were now four rulers including L. Domitius Alexander who was newly proclaimed in Africa.

In 307–308 Diocletian intervened as arbiter, and decided that in the West the new Augustus Licinius Licinius, now elected for the first time, should be the sole Augustus, aided by Constantine as Caesar, and that all other competitors should be removed. But this had no practical effect. In 311 the death of Galerius started a series of struggles for power in the East
between Licinius and Maximinus, while in the West the contest between Constantine and Maxentius still continued. After the elimination of Maximinus in the East and Maxentius in the West it seemed for a moment that the situation had returned to where it was in Diocletian’s early period between 286 and 293, with one Augustus (now Licinius) in the East and another (now Constantine) in the West. In fact, however, a period of collaboration between the two was followed by war, by the defeat of Licinius, and by the establishment of unified power in the hands of Constantine (323–337).

The institution of two Augusti, one senior to the other and each with his respective Caesar, had been given sanctity by Diocletian, who assumed for himself the title Jovius and gave Maximian the title Herculiuss; the former name evoked the idea of his own descent from the King of the Gods, while his adopted son entered the family of Hercules, the son of Jove and the greatest of the heroes. Constantine, on the other hand, the monarch of mankind, was as it were the reflection on earth of the heavenly King who had given him the victory, and whose religion had been adopted as the religion given preference by the state in order to give unity to Constantine’s subjects in the field of morals. It was for this reason that the emperor, who according to Eusebius liked to be called ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτός (i.e. ‘bishop of the Laity’ over against the ecclesiastical hierarchy) felt it right to concern himself with conflicts between Christian doctrines in so far as they might cause moral cleavage among his subjects, and with religious organization in so far as it impacted on the unity of the empire’s organization. In this way he came to take up a Caesaro-papist position; moreover when the empire once again had more than one emperor, its rulers could uphold different conceptions of Christianity from one another and so come into conflict.

When Constantine divided the power with Licinius in 317, his two sons Crispus and Constantius II were proclaimed Caesars, and also Licinius’ son, Licinius Lacinianus. After Licinius’ surrender and death a number of steps were taken. Constantine’s son Constantius II was made Caesar in 323–324, Crispus was removed from the scene in 326, another son, Constans, was made Caesar in 333, and Lacinianus was eliminated in 335. So in that year the only Caesars remaining were the three sons: there was a new type of tetrarchy, with only one Augustus and three Caesars. Constantine, therefore, while retaining general direction of the empire, assigned to each of the three the specific control of one portion; but he created two more districts, one for each of two grandsons, Delmatius and Hannibalianus. It is not easy to see what purpose Constantine thought could be served by all these persons and all these divisions when the moment for succession arrived: perhaps they were intended only as a ‘trial team’ for practice and eventual selection. However that may be, his arrangements did not prevent attempts by usurpers (Magnus Magnentius, for example), and after his death they led to a series of struggles to the death among his heirs who were all too reluctant to
introduce further reforms. In 340 we again find two Augusti, Constans in the West and Constantius II in the East; and religious conflicts resulted, since Constantius supported the Arians and was intolerant of paganism. After the death of Constans in 350 Constantius II once more held united power. He, too, chose a Caesar, his nephew Gallus; but the latter was put out of the way by Constantius’ brother Julian, who rebelled in 360 and after the emperor’s death in 361 united the whole empire under his own control. The brief reign of Julian, of which the main features were highly beneficial and often enduring administrative reforms and his meteoric restoration of paganism, closed the line of the ‘second Flavian’ dynasty, which had retained power since the time of Constantius I.

After Julian had died without leaving the throne to any member of his family, two emperors, first Jovian and then in 364 Valentinian I, were proclaimed one after the other by the troops. It was the latter who succeeded in founding a new dynasty, of Pannonian origin. He at once chose his brother Valens as full co-regent and as Augustus in the East, and later designated his son Gratian his successor and made him his own colleague in the West. On the death of Valentinian I in 375 there was a threefold division of power. Valens was still ruler of the East, and in the West the army associated with Gratian his four-year-old son Valentinian II.

On the death of Valens in 378 Gratian replaced him as Augustus in the East by the Spanish general Theodosius I, and on Gratian’s death this emperor made himself the protector of the young Augustus of the West, Valentinian II. He rid Valentinian of the usurper Magnus Maximus, who had earlier been recognized as ruler of the provinces of the extreme West. Then, however, Valentinian was murdered; and after the elimination of another usurper, Eugenius, who made a last short-lived attempt to restore paganism, Theodosius became master of the whole empire during the last months of his life. But fate willed that this last sole ruler should be the involuntary author of the empire’s final division into two. On his death in 395 he left the East to his son Arcadius, aged seventeen, under the guidance of the praetorian prefect Rufinus, and the West to his ten-year-old second son Honorius, supported by the general Stilicho. An attempt by Stilicho to preserve a unified policy in the two sections was a failure, and from that time on the division was beyond repair. Yet although the Eastern half still possessed enough vitality to survive for many centuries, the decay of the Western half could no longer be arrested. Its provinces were now at the mercy of barbarian inroads and devastations. In 395 the Goths under Alaric invaded Moesia and Thrace, pushed on into Macedonia and Greece in 397, and appeared in Italy in 402, with a further invasion under Radagaisus in the years beginning in 405. Finally in 410 they took and sacked Rome itself. In 406 the Vandals, Alans, Suevi, and Quadi penetrated into Gaul and Spain; and meanwhile the Huns were settling in Pannonia, and the Picts, Scots, and Saxons were taking possession of the Roman portions of Britain.
Roman Jurisprudence. [Our knowledge of Roman Law before the XII Tables is restricted to more or less informed conjecture. The XII Tables themselves, of which the traditional date is 451–450 BC, are founded on custom and did not set out to innovate. Perhaps even more than the substance the precision and terseness of the language show the high degree of skill and the experience of the draughtsmen and testify to a considerable preceding period of development. The Tables are a code but like other early codes they do not set out to give the law in full. To some extent the provisions concentrate on the less usual case and leave out some of the most obvious legal situations. This must cast doubt on the traditional view that under the early system of procedure, the legis actiones, the plaintiff had to sue precisely in the words of the statute. The provisions, though often harsh, show the remarkable early development of Roman Law. There is, for instance, already a distinction between deliberate and accidental killing; and a form of contract, stipulatio, is well established. Apart from the XII Tables, legislation played a minor role in the development of Roman private law; and the lex Aquilia, a plebiscite of 287 BC which regulated damage to property, is probably the only Republican statute of real importance. Development was mainly due to the edicts of the magistrates and the interpretation of the jurists. The main edicts were those of the urban and peregrine praetor though that of the aediles which was concerned with control of the streets and market place was important for the development of sale. No date can be assigned to the introduction of the praetors’ edicts though that of the peregrine praetor cannot be earlier than about 242 BC since it was probably only in that year that the office was created. Nor does it seem possible to disentangle the jurisdictions of the two edicts. Thus, the edict on robbery with violence which Cicero tells us was issued as a result of troubles in Italy was issued by the peregrine praetor in 76 BC; and the edict on fraud which so far as we know always included citizens was issued by the holder of that office in 66 BC. Strictly, the praetor could not legislate but could only declare that in certain circumstances he would give or refuse an action. This, of course, did not stop him from making drastic changes in practice in the law, as for instance in succession, but it did mean that in theory the old law continued to exist and to be mentioned by the jurists. Thus we have at times the curious spectacle of the same legal situation having in theory widely differing remedies, as for instance in the case of injuries to the personality; or slightly differing facts being required for a civil or praetorian action which covered in general the same ground, as for example in the case of the actions for cutting down another’s trees. Each praetor held office only for one year and each praetor issued his own edict. Naturally, it became usual to re-enact each year the main body of the preceding edict and this permanent part came to be known as the edictum tralaticium. Under the empire the edict became of less importance as a source of new law and eventually was revised and stabilized in its final form by the jurist Julian in the reign of Hadrian. The praetors were able to enforce their edicts because
they were in charge of legal procedure. Again it is not possible to distinguish the limits of jurisdiction of the prae tor urbanus and the prae tor peregrinus though the common opinion is that the former dealt with cases in which all the parties were Romans while the latter was responsible for those in which at least one of the parties was not a Roman citizen. Owing to the praetors the old formal system of procedure, the legis actiones, gave way to the flexible formulae. The credit for this is given to the peregrine praetor partly on the ground that it was in cases involving peregrines that a flexible system was most needed and it is often said that formulae were not available in cases between Roman citizens until the passing of the lex Aebutia of about 140 B.C. Accordingly, some of the most characteristic and important actions such as those which depend upon good faith—and this includes the important consensual contracts of sale, hire, partnership and mandate—are usually regarded as the creation of the magistrate. But, in fact, it has been shown that formulae were available in cases between Roman citizens long before the passing of the lex Aebutia. And there is no direct evidence that the peregrine praetor introduced the formulary system or was, indeed, mainly responsible for the important developments arising from that introduction. The praetors also developed the law very considerably by giving ad hoc actions (and in time in many situations these came to be taken for granted) where no remedy existed at civil law or under the edict. The evidence suggests that this practice which flourished in the empire was only in its infancy during the last years of the republic.

The jurists were the other main source of law. The first jurists were the pontiffs who among their other functions gave respon sa (replies to practical problems submitted to them) and this function passed virtually unchanged to the individual private jurist. The pontiff’s monopoly of jurisprudence was broken first by the XII Tables, then by the publication of the traditional formulary and the opening of the College of Pontiffs to plebeians by the lex Ogulnia of 300 B.C. The main importance of the jurists for the development was their interpretation of the XII Tables and other legislation and the edicts. It is often said that originally interpretation was very narrow but came to be relaxed in the course of time. There is, however, no real indication for this and rather, if anything, interpretation tended to become stricter. Thus, for instance, no legislation, so far as we can tell, before the lex Aequilia bothered to mention both male and female—the former was automatically taken to include the latter. It is only in this way that we can understand the XII Tables sufficing as a code. Indeed, there are early examples of deliberate misinterpretation in order to widen or change completely the scope of a provision’s application. Even in the last century of the republic there is evidence of greater flexibility of interpretation than later became the rule. No doubt there is some connection between the growing disinclination of the jurists to interpret provisions widely and the growth of praetorian ad hoc remedies—the jurists would no longer feel that they had to strain the
meaning of a provision so as to enable justice to be done. The republican jurist in addition to giving his opinion on particular cases and writing treatises had to advise how a will or contract should be framed in order to produce the desired effect. Draughtsmanship of this kind would indirectly be of importance in the development of the law since books were published in which the form of many of the problems discussed clearly derives from this cautelary jurisprudence.\(^7\) On the whole, the jurists of note of even the late republic were men of rank and to a great extent their decisions were followed because of their personal authority and not because of the reasons, if any, which they adduced. Augustus increased the authority of selected jurists by giving them the *ius respondendi*, that is, the right to give opinions publicly on the authority of the emperor. It is not clear what the precise legal effect of this was, though it would probably mean that Augustus would gain greater control over the law. Hadrian in some particular which is also uncertain altered the *ius respondendi* and there is no later trace of its existence.\(^8\) The time from about the beginning of the empire until just after the end of the second century is usually known as the classical period since it was the age in which Roman law reached maturity. The jurists now were not so much concerned with new concepts as with refining existing ones and fortunately they were very prolific in their writings. Their books fall into a number of classes. First of all, there were treatises on civil law which were usually named commentaries on Sabinus who was the first to write a systematic work on the civil law. The most important works in this group are Pomponius', Paul's and Ulpian's *Commentarii ad Sabinum*. Secondly, there were the commentaries on the edict—Gaius *ad edictum provinciale* was the earliest and the most famous were Paul and Ulpian *ad edictum*. Probably Julian's *Digesta* should be included in this group. Thirdly, there were books of discussion of practical or academic problems. The most noted of these were Papinian's *Quaestiones* and *Responsa*. And fourthly, there were elementary books intended for teaching of which the famous *Institutes* of Gaius (active during the reign of Hadrian) was probably the earliest. The teaching of law itself during the early empire seems to have been carried out in schools of which we know of two, the Sabinian and the Proculian. The former was probably founded by the jurist Cassius\(^9\) who was consul in AD 30, the latter by Proculus\(^10\) who was his contemporary. There was a great deal of rivalry between the schools and although differences in approach may be discerned one cannot trace any fundamental cleavage in their opinions.\(^21\) These schools seem to have died out after Hadrian. From the second century the great jurists such as Julian, Ulpian, and Papinian were increasingly occupied in official business.

New sources of law developed in the empire. In the later Principate *Senatusconsulta* for the first time had legislative force. More important, however, were the law-making powers of the emperor. Augustus himself did not assume legislative powers, but from the first the influence of the emperor
on legal development was very great and by the time of the jurist Gaius at the very latest it was recognized that he could make law. The means at his disposal were numerous. First, like other magistrates, he could issue edicts and since his sphere covered all the business of the state these might be on any subject. Secondly, there were the *decreta*, the sentences which he gave as judge either on appeal or as judge of first instance. As judge he could show considerable freedom of interpretation and could introduce new principles. Thirdly, there were the *epistulae* and *subscriptiones*, replies by the emperor to questions of law raised by officials or public bodies or by private individuals. These could cover all sorts of matters and though perhaps the majority had little influence, many did. In these the emperor could also introduce new law. Fourthly, *mandata*, which were instructions issued to officials and especially to provincial governors. A number of important principles, of which the most famous is the rule allowing soldiers to make wills without the formalities required of civilians, was introduced in this way. The great bureaucratic jurists, of course, would be for the most part the persons really responsible for development by these methods, just as in the republic it was primarily the jurists who were responsible for the edict.

The later third and fourth centuries are generally regarded as a period of decline. The line of great jurists died out with Ulpian who was murdered in 228. In AD 428 was enacted the ‘Law of Citations’ of Theodosius II under which legal disputes had to be settled by counting the heads of the five great jurists—Papinian, Paul, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Gaius—who were ranged on either side. If, of these jurists, the majority who had considered a particular point of law came to one decision, that view was to prevail. If they were equally divided in numbers between views, the view which had Papinian’s support was to prevail. If they were equally divided and Papinian had expressed no opinion, the decision was left to the judge’s discretion. This is a recognition of the lack of original jurists and it is often said that it marks the lowest point of Roman law. It should not, however, be regarded as pure innovation. There is very considerable evidence that it is simply imperial recognition of a practice which began shortly after the death of Ulpian. But Diocletian’s reign saw the publication of two unofficial collections of imperial constitutions, the *Codex Gregorianus* and *Codex Hermogenianus*. These in turn were to be influential for the publication of an official collection, the *Codex Theodosianus*, in AD 429. And this was to inspire the first *Codex Iustinianus* which itself probably suggested the feasibility of a complete codification of law and resulted in the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*.

Thus developed what is probably the greatest legal system ever known or, if that is too great a claim, at least a system of private law so refined, complex, and flexible that without too much difficulty it could be used as a basis for the law of mediaeval, Renaissance, and modern Europe. Roman criminal law, on the other hand, which tended to be ignored by the jurists until they had
become imperial officials, remained rather primitive and has been far less influential.*

The Emperor in Relation to the Legislative and the Judiciary. For a time Augustus, making use of his tribunician power, put plebiscites before the comitia, over which he exercised a confident control. Later he preferred to promote senatus consulta through the consuls, or to put out his own edicta, mandata, rescripta, and decreta. In the Lex de Imperio concerning Vespasian it is stated that Augustus, 'legibus solutos', had the right to take decisions on matters divine and human, public and private, in accordance with what the 'majesty' of the state required. The jurist Gaius\(^2\) asserts that beyond doubt the will of the princeps has the force of law; and in the Digest we find that an imperial constitutio 'has the power of law' and 'is law'. What is certain is that even the earliest emperors were regarded as having complete freedom to legislate, either by laws which received acclamation by the senate ('oratio principis in senatu habita'), or by edicta and mandata laying down new rules, or by edicta and decreta bringing about some modification in the traditional law.

In the period of the Dominate the situation is clear, but we also find this state of affairs being recognized as normal by the jurists of the second century. They keep on saying that the 'princeps is freed from the compulsion of the laws' and that 'his will has the force of law'. By Hadrian's time at latest the term 'constitutio principis' had come into general use to describe any type of imperial ordinance, the general binding force of which was therefore recognized. It was also in the time of Hadrian, under whom it became the custom to introduce the most famous legal writers into the consilium principis, that increasing use was made of rescripta, decreta, and orationes principis in senatu. At the same time the Praetor's law became a definite institution; and regulations were made about the ius publice respondendi which had been introduced under Augustus and named under Tiberius, and about the value attaching to the views of iuris periti and the responsa prudentium.

In lawsuits the normal procedure in the form of an arbitration, with its two stages in iure and apud iudicem, was fairly often supplemented as early as Augustus' day by the cognitio extra ordinem. In this the princeps, and later on his behalf the praetorian prefect, the iuridici, or in the provinces the governors, combined the functions of iudex and magistrate; in this way they gave judgement on their own after examining the circumstances of the case, without having to draw up a formula or nominate a iudex. At the same time appeal lay to the emperor or praetorian prefect against the judgement given by any iudex outside. Under Diocletian all justice was exercised in the emperor's name and administered by his officials—in the provinces by the praesides and in the capital cities by the praefectus urbi—though appeal still lay to the imperial consistorium, with the praetorian prefect and his deputies acting vice sacra in less important cases. Meanwhile the jurisdiction of
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praetors had long since disappeared; and to Constantius II and Constans was due a prohibition on the use of ‘formulary’ procedure.

Under Constantine criminal law, laid down by imperial edicts to be followed to the letter under pain of grave sanctions, became exceptionally severe. One field in which the government was least inclined to overlook transgression was that of religion, where laws were passed (for example by Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius), against various Christian sects which had been declared heretical, against apostates, and against the Manichaeans (who were regarded as dangerous magi).

The Decline of the Senate’s Power. Between Augustus’ day and the middle of the third century the senate gradually lost not only the greater part of its political importance but also the will to recover it. During the imperial period this importance was at its height in the early years of Tiberius’ Principate, when the senate inherited the electoral as well as legislative functions of the comitia. Yet already during Tiberius’ later years and in the reign of his successor Caligula the process of reducing the senate’s power and autonomy had set in, a process which was carried forward at an uneven pace but was never actually reversed. Various methods were employed. Hostile elements were removed from the body by ‘purges’ or judicial proceedings, being replaced by men from a different social class or new region, who had fewer ties with the traditional aristocracy and with the interests of the capital. Some of the senate’s functions were transferred to other assemblies such as the consilium principis; and the body’s prestige and importance were lowered by a reduction in the number of posts which senators could fill. In the sphere of legislation senatus consultum, when use was still made of them, became essentially a means of putting imperial projects into effect. In the choice and proclamation of emperors the senate was often anticipated by the legions or praetorians; and it was unable to establish the principle of choosing the ‘best man’ among its own members, because the succession was kept within a dynasty or secured in advance by adoptions. An attempt to upset the imperial form of government was no longer practicable, and consequently no such attempt was made at the most favourable moment, namely after the death of Domitian in 96. This despite the fact that as early as the first century there were several autocratic emperors, like Caligula, Nero, Otho, and Domitian, who were markedly anti-senatorial; in the second century Commodus began an almost unbroken series of such rulers; and in addition there were many emperors who, though less autocratic, still displayed an increasing tendency to take a generally harsher line with the senate.

Nevertheless throughout the first century attacks made by emperors on the senate still encountered firm and open senatorial resistance, both because every emperor had his critics and enemies and also because the old aristocratic element in the senate was still significant. Newly admitted members easily allowed their own attitude to be dictated by tradition, by the desire for
power, and by the interests of the old families, with whom they established ties of marriage. It was, of course, the literary and philosophical senators who were most given to living in a rhetorical version of the past and to praising its virtues; but this group grew gradually smaller, and many of its members began to find greater satisfaction in praising the present. The gradual extinction of these embers of republicanism was due also to the clever policy of the emperors from Trajan to Marcus Aurelius. By the time of Septimius Severus opponents of the emperor are no longer theorists attacking the imperial idea: they are supporters of alternative claimants to the empire. One might get the impression from histories based on the pro-senatorial and republican tradition, down to the time of the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, that the senate of the second and third centuries presented an effective counterweight to the imperial power. This, however, would be a complete illusion.

Of the years 193–217, for which our documentation is fullest, the following picture emerges. The senate contained few nobiles from the ‘eight families’ which had survived from republican days. There were many patricians, belonging to the aristocracy of plebeian origin which had been gradually created in the first and second centuries and which tended to intermarry with the nobiles. Finally there was a not unduly large group of novi homines, wealthy men but risen from the ranks of the knights or of lower classes in society, who held posts in the provinces, the army, and elsewhere.

This situation explains how the senatorial tradition continued to exist without involving a general decline in senatorial standards of service. It also explains the counterpart of this phenomenon, namely the way in which the general run of senators adapted themselves to circumstances and showed increasing conformity to the imperial régime and its changes. It is an exaggerated view either to regard the senate of the second and third centuries as a body which was still potent and for the most part anti-imperial, or on the other hand to treat it as having by now degenerated into a collection of weak-kneed courtiers.

It is equally sweeping to suppose that the increase in the number of provincial senators was creating a body of barbarians. Once again we can take as a basis the best-known period, that at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third. Of recorded senators about 43 per cent appear to be Italians, 32 per cent Easterners, 15 per cent Africans, and 8 per cent Westerners—mainly Spaniards, with very few men from the Gauls, Britain, Illyricum, or the Danube lands in general. So the great majority of senators still came from Italy or from the provinces of most advanced culture; and most of the provincials were undoubtedly descendants of Italians who had settled abroad. So the average rate of ‘barbarization’ of the senate cannot have been higher than that to be found in the most civilized classes and districts of the empire.

Under the Illyrian emperors, and to speak more precisely from Probus onwards, the senate lost its last political function, by now almost a dead
letter, that of ratifying the proclamation of new emperors. Although in later times it continued to recruit its members from the class of officials, it was practically superseded by the *consistorium sacrum*, and a parallel senate came into being at Constantinople. The senate therefore had now only a symbolic function, recalling its ancient duties of receiving and registering the legal enactments of the emperor; meanwhile the title of senator was still a coveted dignity conferred by the ruler on trusted persons. In the main they were ex-officials who had accumulated wealth and consequently had social and economic importance. Often they were owners of vast estates, living in their fortified villas defended by retainers, slaves and *colonii*, and lording it like feudal chiefs over the people in surrounding territory. Their position set them against the great masses of poor people, whom emperors like Valentinian I defended against their encroachments by creating *defensores plebis* in every city.

*The Equites and Lower Classes.* The equestrian class was gradually transformed and expanded as a number of Italians, who were Roman citizens, settled for business reasons in provincial towns and became part of the upper bourgeois class, filling magistracies and priesthoods in their cities, and providing a picked section of the army. It became the custom, too, to grant Roman citizenship and equestrian status to men who had done useful work in administration or on military service. So in the early days it was a question mainly of Italians who had settled in the provinces, had acquired the necessary wealth to attain the equestrian census, and had sometimes become the owners of substantial landed estates. But in later times the extension of the class came mainly from provincials who had been given citizenship and had then become knights in virtue of their census qualifications.

This was an open class, which was continually growing as the Roman citizenship, a necessary qualification for membership, was extended. It consisted of hard-working men, once members of the common people, who had earned credit in the public service, military or civilian. They were men of action, mainstays of Romanization, who constituted a picked class among the ‘citizens’ scattered over the Roman world. From Augustus’ day onward they were faithful adherents of the emperors: they could use them as devoted officials in posts which were gradually taken away from the senatorial aristocracy or which were answering new needs. These equestrian officials dependent on the emperor or operating under his control became so numerous and performed so many duties that very soon a special equestrian *cursus honorum* was created alongside the senatorial *cursus*. Moreover emperors could introduce favoured members of the equestrian order into the senate and so gradually modify its composition. It is true that there were emperors who preferred to strengthen the senate’s power and reduce that of the *equites*, and others who liked to work through freedmen and slaves—some of whom were given equestrian status. But the *equites* constituted one of the most significant
props to the imperial power; and their value was appreciated not only by autocratically minded rulers, but also by Claudius, Vespasian, Hadrian, and Marcus Aurelius.

Once it had become a regular custom to introduce knights into the senate, the policy of blending the two orders and obliterating the distinction between them was already there. But under Caracalla and Severus Alexander it was advanced further as the natural result of the general grant of citizenship, combined with a transformation in the senatorial class and frequent transfers, of a voluntary nature, from senatorial to equestrian rank. At the same time we find attempts by wealthy plebeians and freedmen to attain equestrian status, or at any rate to usurp or otherwise acquire the right to display the outward signs of equestrian rank, such as the use of the ‘gold ring’.

Naturally, however, the vast majority of the population in all parts of the empire was outside these two orders. The classes into which it was divided are often hard to distinguish, but in modern terminology we can speak of bourgeois (living in the country as well as the city), workers (both artisans and farm labourers), and proletarians or men without property (again both in the cities and in the countryside).

The bourgeoisie was composed of such higher groups among the free population as had not attained to membership of the two top orders. They were owners of lands or other real estate, members of all types of profession, shopkeepers, entrepreneurs, business managers, or high-grade employees—men whose economic and social positions permitted infinite gradations. Except for the owners of medium-sized farms, who lived on their estates, this class lived in Rome or in Italian or provincial towns. They were proud of their superior culture; and they had an affection for their own cities, showing ambition to enter office there and a willingness to bestow public largesse. It was largely to their zeal that these towns owed not only their prosperity and dignified appearance, but their high levels of culture and Romanization.

Free workmen included artisans operating on their own, and also wage-earners employed by city firms, by owners of large estates, and by mining undertakings. In the early centuries this class, though regarded as inferior to those so far mentioned, was able to fend for itself. Artisans were normally associated in collegia, which the state would recognize when it considered that a proper case for their existence had been made out, and to some of which it even showed favour, for example when they could assist in maintaining the corn supply. Colonii and miners too were mostly formed into groups under the direction of a manager or contractor (conductor) or bailiff (viticus).

But the living standards of all this class were entirely altered when the economic position of the empire worsened and the governmental system became more autocratic. Hereditary castes were now introduced, and affected the lives of large sections even of the upper classes. Probably the earliest example of such a caste was that of the municipal decuriones who were
trying to evade the financial burdens imposed on them as the persons responsible for making advance payments for the *fiscus* on behalf of their fellow-citizens and tax-payers. To prevent these evasions and also secure that *decuriones* should be recruited, the office was made compulsory and hereditary, the sons of *decuriones* being obliged to take on office and its burdens after the deaths of their fathers. The compulsory nature of these obligations was expressed in the description of *decuriones* as *curiae subiecti* or *submixi*.

But later, from Diocletian’s time, this system became a general feature of the ordering of society. To keep the various professions going they were gradually transformed into castes, membership of which passed compulsorily from father to son. This applied to state officials, army officers, and members of the colleges which were most essential to the maintenance of the civil and military *annona*, such as the *navicularii* and bakers (*coloni* will be discussed a little later).

Already in the republican period, not only Rome but other cities and smaller country centres had contained fairly large groups of persons without employment or means, and of men unfit for regular work. These men lived partly on casual employment, but mainly from bounty and assistance given them by the government (in later times by the emperors at Rome), and by the bourgeoisie and members of the upper classes at other times. At Rome this mass of ‘proletarii’ in need of assistance was reduced to between 200,000 and 250,000 in the time of Augustus. It was the portion of the *populus* which caused the government most concern; and at some moments its attitude might be critical, since its members were induced by their poverty to foment riots in the attempt to profit from their outcome. Sometimes the praetorian guard and the police of the city prefect and the *praefectus vigilum* had to be employed against them, but for the most part the government tried to anticipate and relieve their needs by money donations, distributions of food either free or at cut prices, and other forms of bounty. At the same time they sought to distract them with festivals, games, theatrical performances and pantomimes, races, gladiatorial tests, and representations of hunts and sea battles. In this way they instituted the *panem et circenses*, of which Juvenal speaks so much.

Meanwhile, however, the people’s political power, which had been significant in the republican period, was gradually removed altogether. Augustus led the way, and handed on the same policy to Tiberius, while at the same time the practice of legislating by plebiscite was being reduced almost to vanishing point. In the outcome, the popular assemblies, though they were not entirely abolished, were reserved for exceptional occasions and lost any real importance. The sporadic interventions by the people in politics were confined to the acclamation of emperors (who had normally been previously proclaimed by the senate or the army), or to riots, which were fairly easily suppressed by the praetorians.

We may add that as early as Augustus’ time *libertini*, or liberated slaves (called *liberti* in relation to their patrons) began to acquire increasing right
to take part in public life in the municipalities and in Rome itself. From the time of Claudius onwards we find imperial freedmen as powerful members of the secretariat of the Princeps or employed in such procuratorships as were not reserved for knights. In late republican times the sons of freedmen and even freedmen themselves had been unable to acquire the rights of free-born citizens (ingenui) by means of the 'ius aureorum anulum'; and during the empire there was added the possibility of restitutio natalium, which obliterated the original period of slavery and removed the man's bond to his patron.

[Although their influence was sometimes resented, freedmen played a vigorous role in the municipal society of Italy and the Western provinces. In establishing the imperial cult, Augustus created the annual boards of Augustales, a priesthood which was normally drawn from the important freedmen of a town; this was ostensibly to administer the cult of the emperor, but it was also a means of ensuring the loyalty of these men to the régime. They could not hold civic offices, but the religious duties gave them a comparable social prestige. The priesthhoods thus became coveted prizes for a wealthy freedman; and when the cost of providing games, spectacles, or even buildings became too large, his patron might help to defray the expenses. The freedman class thus was given a garb of respectability, but the part they played was an essential one in other ways and especially in economic affairs. While freeborn citizens preferred to own land and compete for public offices, freedmen were overwhelmingly numerous in banking, retail trades, specialized professions and the smaller crafts and industries. In Pompeii the main banker and public auctioneer was a freedman richer than many municipal magistrates. In a commercial town like Ostia, their power was still greater; here the Augustales formed a sort of aristocracy within the freedman class, and were organized into a wealthy corporation whose activities rivalled those of the city magistrates themselves. So long as manumission remained frequent, the cities of the empire were thus supplied with many talented men; even their foreign origins tended to be forgotten, and their sons, who were full citizens, would often desert business to become landowners and prominent members of the local bourgeoisie.]*
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Slavery and the Coloneate. Slavery under the empire, as in certain parts of the period beginning about 150 BC, undoubtedly reached substantial proportions in certain areas, though the figures must not be exaggerated. The phenomenon was not uniform in every area, but was particularly marked in the city of Rome. One reason lay in great wars of conquest, which provided enormous quantities of prisoners; and the decline which set in by gradual stages in the imperial period is clearly to be related primarily to the reduced number of regular wars of this kind, which were all too often replaced by defensive wars where it was not uncommon to find more Romans than their enemies being taken prisoner. The number of potential slaves, therefore,
went down, and eventually we find slaves being commonly replaced by free wage-earners on the imperial estates. But other factors, all of them connected with the growing frequency of manumission, were also contributing to reduce the slave population. Sometimes manumission was to the advantage of a patron, since he preferred to take his share in the profits a manumitted slave could earn. But the chief factor here was a higher conception of ethical and legal standards, allied with Stoic thinking, according to which all men are equal and slavery is contrary to natural rights. Christian ideas tended in the same direction. The Christians did not firmly oppose the use of slaves, but they obliterated any moral difference between slave and free, since for them all men were brothers and 'fellow servants' of God; and of this the main consequence was that slaves were treated more as part of the family.\textsuperscript{25,26}

Yet while this process was going on, the hierarchic distinction between rich and poor (honestiores and humiliores)\textsuperscript{27} was becoming increasingly harsh and anti-social under the later empire, and at the same time the caste system was being applied ruthlessly to the rural class of coloni or adspecticii. In the republican period, as we know for example from Cicero's description of Sicily, farmers were already being driven to abandon their fields by the unhappy treatment they were receiving from society.

Successive governments tried to check the process on account of its adverse effects on output and revenue. Most of our information comes from Egypt, but much of the same situation must have obtained elsewhere. Not only did the state make it a punishable offence for farmers to abandon lands they had rented; it also introduced the system known as 'capitatio fugitivorum', under which local communities were obliged to cultivate abandoned property and take over any charges it bore. We now enter on the process which led to serfdom. Capitatio was imposed on dediticii once the Constitutio Antoniniana had made a sharp distinction between this category and the section of the population to which citizenship was granted. Then from Valerian's time well-to-do families, to whom the state granted estates, were obliged to assume responsibility for rendering capitatio, in money or kind, in respect of any of their coloni who were unable to pay. Finally Diocletian's reforms imposed taxes on capita and iugum\textsuperscript{28} and were a strong incentive to the creation of hereditary castes. All this caused large landowners, with the agreement of the state, to protect themselves against the flight of their tenants by binding them to the soil, and making their occupation hereditary from father to son. So serfdom became an institution with state support, and Constantine among others laid heavy penalties on anyone who had harboured fugitive coloni.

b. Public Administration

The Central Administration. In the first centuries of the empire the central administration in Rome still comprised all the mechanism needed to look
after the life of the capital and the centralized management of other regions. The imperial secretariat, staffed originally by imperial slaves, but from Claudius' time by freedmen and from Hadrian's day by salaried knights as well, was continually made larger and more highly specialized in the regular and permanent services it provided. The assistants of the princeps for the discharge of all kinds of administrative tasks (including the management of imperial property) were called 'procuratores' or 'praefecti', the latter being the more important officials with command of troops. The praefectus urbi was a senator of consular rank with three 'urban' cohorts under his control, appointed originally to maintain order in the absence of the princeps but becoming a permanent official from the last years of Tiberius; his power was extended until he became a judge of first instance, and also of appeal in criminal and civil cases in a radius of a hundred miles from Rome. Also usually of senatorial rank were the presidents of the colleges (curatores) for the upkeep of temples and public buildings, of aqueducts, and of the Tiber banks and the drains.

The other praefecturae were held by men of equestrian rank. The praefectus classis was in command of the imperial fleet; the praefectus vigilum with seven cohorts looked after police work at night and the fire services; and the praefectus annonae had an organization in Italy and the provinces to supervise the corn supply. But the highest equestrian prefectures were those of the praetorian guard and of Egypt. The latter was the emperor's most important property, and its prefect saw to its administration, presided over criminal and civil jurisdiction, and controlled its defence.

The praefectura praetorio, sometimes exercised by a single prefect and sometimes by two, had 9,000 praetorian soldiers at its disposal, regiments of whom, under one of the prefects, would accompany the emperor as a bodyguard on campaigns. In both war and peace the prefect of the guard formed part of the consilium principis, and in time he took over criminal jurisdiction in Rome and adjacent areas.

Republican commanders and magistrates had chosen their own counsellors, and Augustus made use of this custom to create the 'consilium principis', later called the 'consistorium'. In early days this consisted of about twenty of his own relatives and other illustrious personages, called together whenever the princeps saw fit. Tiberius held more frequent meetings, and included men of equestrian rank and jurists: members of this type increased under Hadrian, when the presence of the praefectus praetorio became usual. The importance of the consilium was further enhanced under Septimius Severus, Caracalla, and Severus Alexander.

The old republican magistracies, when their duties were not, like those of the censorship, absorbed by the emperors, gradually became honorific posts, involving their holders in great expense. Election to them depended in the main on the emperor, who either designated directly or made a 'recommendation'. As early as Claudius' time the minor offices often remained
unfilled. The consulate lost its main functions, those in the military and judicial spheres, and retained only prerogatives of little political significance, with impressive outward trappings and costly burdens. The eponymous consuls, those who gave their names to the year, were those who entered office on 1st January—members of the imperial house and of other illustrious families—but they would remain in office for a short spell and give place to ‘suffecti’; and these in their turn would be replaced by a number of later pairs of consuls, who provided the emperor with consulares to employ as legates or in all kinds of curae and similar tasks.

In the later empire the military career became quite distinct from the civil. The latter was built up around a pyramidal hierarchy of bureaucrats, all dependent on the ‘dominus’, and among them it was not a man’s origin which would determine the job he was assigned; his past would confer on him a certain style and dignity from whatever point he started. So the ruler became head of the officia as well as of the consistorium. The officia were most in evidence in the imperial chancery, with a magister officiorum at their head and other persons whom we would call ‘ministers’ by his side. These were assisted by central bureaux (memoriae epistularum, libellorum, dispositionum, etc.), accompanied by a secret service of spies (agentes in rebus), who took, under Constantine, the place of similar organizations active in earlier periods, like the frumentarii suppressed by Diocletian.

The consistorium, corresponding to the earlier consilium principis, derived its name from the fact that its members had to remain standing in the presence of their sovereign. It included the quaestor sacri Palatii, who presided in the absence of the dominus, and the magister officiorum, who was also in command of the imperial guards. When the comitatus was revived as an institution, various comites also formed part of the consistorium, some of them being regular ministers, like thecomes sacrarum largitionum in charge of finance and the comes rerum privatarum who administered imperial property since the time of Septimius Severus.

Many modifications in the administrative machine naturally followed on the partition of the empire into two and on the divisions due to the ‘tetrarchic’ régime and its attendant circumstances, all of them leading to a multiplication of officials. The creation of a second capital at Constantinople (in addition to cities of imperial residence scattered through the empire) caused two senates to come into being, and a double set of certain older posts, such as the prefecture of the city and the presidency of the senate. Each metropolis had to have its police, corn supply, and judicial system; and each had its praetors and quaestors, the former now confined to preparing programmes for the games. The consulate, on the other hand, being by now entirely an honorific office of imaginary importance, remained a single institution for the whole empire: either the two emperors agreed on nominations or (from 396 onwards) nominations would be made in turn by the emperor of the East and the emperor of the West.

DD*
The Administration of Italy. Apart from the Alpine districts and the islands, practically the whole of Italy had Roman citizenship by the end of the republican period. Under the early empire it remained a district on its own, (Map XVI), distinct from the provinces, with a privileged status and unified organization, although the municipalities retained local autonomy. The older municipalities still had their traditional magistrates, and the colonies possessed duoviri; the later municipalities were governed by quattuorviri, two with jurisdiction and two with administrative duties only. Each of these towns had a curia with senators, and a territory divided up into pagi and vici.

But in the imperial period the municipia and colonies gradually drew nearer to one another in status, and each lost part of their autonomy. Criminal jurisdiction passed mainly into the hands of the central imperial machine, being exercised by the praefectus urbi up to a hundred miles from Rome and by the praetorian prefect for more distant districts. Municipal magistrates were allowed to deal with civil suits of minor importance; but Italy was
eventually divided into four districts, similar to the provinces, in which *consulares* in Hadrian’s day, and *iuridici* under Marcus Aurelius, were responsible for administering justice. As to finance, after a period of independence which frequently resulted in bankruptcy, the imperial government from the second century onwards imposed on each community a *curator*, whose duties became more complicated as time went on. Other *curatores*, apparently ten in number, were put in charge of whole districts: indeed under Caracalla, and later under Aurelian, we find examples of *correctores totius Italiae*.

Under Diocletian, Italy, together with Rhaetia and the islands, formed two of the ‘dioceses’, further subdivided into a number of districts (Map XIII): these dioceses were united by Constantine to form a *praefectura* along with Illyria and Africa. But all central and southern Italy, together with Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, comprised a diocese on its own, under the superintendence of the *vicarius Romae*.

*The Administration of the Provinces.* In the early empire the fundamental differences between Italy and the provinces was that in the former the inhabitants were all Roman citizens and in the latter the privilege was confined to small groups. The remaining provincials were still either free citizens of allied cities or ‘dediticii’ paying a capitation tax.

The inhabitants of self-governing cities were of varying status. Some of them already had Latin or Roman citizenship besides that of their own *polis*, but in Latin towns the majority of inhabitants had local citizenship only. Then there were metics, freedmen, and slaves. Office in all cities was normally confined to the propertied classes; and from the various categories of ex-magistrates were drawn the senators, divided into various grades, though special services by a man towards his fellow-citizens, such as the provision of public works, bounty, or relief measures, might also qualify him for membership of the senate. But city government was becoming gradually more difficult, since magistrates normally had to meet excessive expenditure and there were now few rich citizens willing to take on the responsibility and burden involved. Moreover the more the imperial government granted Roman or Latin citizenship and increased the number of provincial citizens through enrolment in the legions or discharge from other branches of the army, it was at the same time putting the richest of these citizens in a position to aim at posts in Roman service which exempted them from local obligations; other beneficiaries were forming the habit of expecting protection and assistance from Rome. Throughout the second century there was a continual search for ways of reviving the municipal spirit. Minimum age limits for magistracies were lowered; offices were opened to metics, or made obligatory; Latin rights were extended, which implied that ex-magistrates in the cities affected became Roman citizens; and other means were tried.

There was of course a complete change in 212, when Caracalla published
his constitution bringing all provincials except *dediticii* up to the level of Roman citizens. From that moment provincial towns, with a few exceptions like Sparta, Athens, or Alexandria, became almost identical with the Italian *municipia*: their new constitutions were modelled on those of Italy, including the system of imperial *curatores* for the control of their administrative machinery. While the nature of this machinery became more uniform, there were changes in the methods of electing *curiales*, or members of the local senates. The main functions of such bodies came to be the appointment of persons fitted to assume the risk of collecting the taxes due to Rome and to undertake liturgies. But it became clear that few men were voluntarily accepting decurionates and that the great majority were making efforts to avoid them. So under the later empire, from the time of Diocletian's introduction of compulsory hereditary castes, decurions as well as other people were compelled to transmit their office to their sons. Office had become essentially a burden rather than an honour, and justly earned the name of 'munus'. From other standpoints too these cities seemed to have lost the purpose they had served for so many centuries: the richer families were gradually retiring to their great 'feuda' on the land.

But under the empire there had also been a great transformation in the methods of governing the provinces themselves. In the Augustan organization the numbers of senatorial and imperial provinces were roughly equal: in the middle of the second century there were twenty-three imperial provinces and only ten senatorial. The ex-consuls and ex-praetors who governed senatorial provinces were still called proconsuls, but as a rule they had no military commands and their judicial authority was directed by imperial edicts. In any case the imperial procurators had intruded into senatorial as well as imperial provinces in order to manage imperial property and to collect tribute due to the imperial and military treasuries. Moreover the emperor had informers to report on the conduct of proconsuls, about which he could take a very stern line, and these informers had to be provided with a bureaucracy of knights, freedmen, and slaves.

In the imperial provinces, on the other hand, there were either senators (*legati Augusti pro praetore*) or knights (*praefecti* or *procuratores*), chosen by the emperor himself. He was responsible for fixing their terms of office, their duties, and the limits within which they could exercise discretion, while all the time he controlled their activity and gave them advice. In any case all provincial governors were now paid officials, with well-defined limits of authority and a continuous relationship with the home government, which may have slowed up their conduct of business but certainly made it more consistent and sure. Being well remunerated, governors were disinterested and efficient, showing fairness in their judicial methods and moderation in matters of taxation. They later had to pay frequent visits to the towns in their provinces to hold assizes and give assistance to the *legati iuridici* in charge of different districts: there they would hold enquiries, settle disputed points,
and gradually adapt local customs to Roman law. Against civil verdicts the provincials could appeal to Rome, to the emperor or the senate as the case might be; and criminal questions affecting Roman citizens had to be judged at Rome.  

We shall have more to say later about the moderation of the early imperial systems of taxation. In addition it is certain that the provincials were appreciative of the continual outlay of the emperors (Hadrian is the best example) on public works such as aqueducts, roads, and harbours, which furthered provincial interests. The system of provincial assemblies, which had been started by Caesar in Gaul and was later developed throughout the empire to foster the imperial cult, was made to serve other purposes in that it brought the people together and made their own national background seem worth while. For example at the annual meetings it became the custom to vote congratulations or censure in respect of an outgoing governor, thus giving the imperial government a valuable means of control over the behaviour of its officials.

With the development of the empire and the removal of the senate’s power the senatorial provinces of course disappeared and their administration became an absolute preserve of the dominus. Diocletian carried out an enormous reform in all provincial administration, reducing the size of the provinces and increasing their number from forty-eight to about a hundred. The mass of officials was greatly increased, but their work was speeded up and the defence of the frontiers was improved. Diocletian also united a number of provinces into a single diocese administered by a vicarius, an officer acting on behalf of the praetorian prefect (agentes vices praefectorum praetorii), and under the military control of a dux. By the end of the fourth century there were fifteen dioceses, but at this time there were still twelve: the East, Pontus, Asia, Thrace, Moesia, Pannonia, Italy, Africa, Spain, Vien condensed, Gallia, and Britain. Later the dioceses were further grouped together into four praefecturae, each under a praefectus praetorii; but with the disbanding of the praetorian cohorts this officer no longer had military duties, and instead looked after justice and public order, tax-collection, education, the postal service, and so on. So the four praefecti, in the East, Italy, Gaul, and Africa, had under them the vicarii of the dioceses; and under these again were the governors of the various kinds of province, with correspondingly various kinds of title —consulares, correctores, or praesides. Outside the system were the two capitals; also Asia, Africa, and Achaea, which were governed by proconsuls.

The Tribute. After he had carried out the necessary censuses and land surveys, Augustus regulated the finances of the empire. Roman citizens in Italy had been exempt from tribute since 167 BC, and Augustus preserved this immunity. But the measure of the resulting burden on the provincials was not increased indiscriminately by his successors; they preferred to work to a budget which was often too tight for the expenditure they had to meet in
maintaining the army and administering the provinces concerned. The *stipendium* imposed on provincials was collected through municipalities where they existed, and comprised two main taxes. The *tributum soli*, a land tax, was based on surveys which were started by Augustus and brought to perfection in Trajan’s time; and the *tributum capitis*, or poll tax, required regular census lists and the reporting of births at what today would be called register offices, a duty imposed on all parents by Marcus Aurelius. But these were not of course the only sources of revenue. The chief form of indirect taxation (*vectigalia*) lay in customs dues (*portoria*); there was a one per cent duty on public sales and a tax for the upkeep of roads and posting stations; and there was a semi-voluntary contribution called *aurum coronarium* for festivals and great occasions connected with the imperial house, though this was not always exacted and was sometimes in part reimbursed to the contributors. The 5 per cent inheritance tax (*vicesima hereditatum*), which went towards veterans’ pensions, was defined as payable by the Roman citizen population.

The revenues of senatorial provinces went to the *aerarium Saturni*; those from the imperial provinces to the provincial *fisci*, which came under the emperor. The latter also had at his disposal the *patrimonium*, into which flowed the returns from his own personal property and from that of the ‘Crown’, and the *aerarium militare*, employed for pensioning veterans.

One fundamental defect in this system was the unequal division of burdens between Italians and provincials. Another was that a budget was struck on a close balance between revenue and regular expenditure, no adequate margin being left for abnormal outgoings, so that when expenses of that kind were inevitable the funds in hand often very quickly proved insufficient and hard to replenish. Nor was it easy to meet such situations by increasing provincial taxes: the reaction might have been dangerous, and the government felt a sense of fairness and moderation towards its subjects. Already Tiberius, at the time of his accession, found all the treasuries in deficit and had to resort to unpopular economies, as well as reducing various protectorates to the status of provinces in order to get tribute from them. Caligula, despite heavy expenses met mainly from his *patrimonium*, must have left a fair balance, with the result that Claudius was able to undertake a large programme of public works. But the vast expenditure of Nero compelled him to augment his revenues by confiscations, eliciting legacies, imposing contributions on provincials, despoiling temples, and debasing the currency. When his reign had been followed by the disastrous civil wars of 69, Vespasian found the treasuries empty.

The new emperor calculated the minimum annual budget, and apparently arrived at the sum of 4,000 million sesterces. He made certain economies, but at the same time increased the *stipendium* due from various provinces, created new provincial territories, and laid claim both to the regular capitation payment made by the Jews and also to the value of public lands occupied
by individuals. Yet he too spent heavily on the corn supply and on building; and his son Titus had to meet extraordinary expenditure in relieving a number of public disasters. So Domitian inherited an almost bankrupt situation from his father and brother. This he met by tightening up tribute collection, and preventing evasion as well as unnecessary outgoings. He increased the revenue of the *patrimonium* from confiscations and legacies, and also had recourse to drastic methods which he later had to forgo, such as reducing the number of legionaries and compelling Italy to grow cereals in support of the corn dole.

The balance was not yet restored by Domitian’s death, nor was Nerva able to redress it during his brief reign. Nerva was careful in effecting economies and increasing the revenue, but he expanded the Italian relief programme with a new agrarian law and the institution of ‘alimenta’ (relief to poor children in Italy). His successor Trajan was therefore troubled by great economic difficulties down to about 104, and met them by selling a large part of the Crown property. Later, however, his Dacian war gave him possession of the mineral wealth of Transylvania, enabling him not only to increase the revenue but to embark on an unlimited programme of public works. So large was the latter that Hadrian on his accession quickly announced that he had inherited an unhealthy financial situation, and at the same time had to write off an enormous sum in credits which the *fiscus* was unable to collect. He reduced army and war expenses to the minimum, kept a vigilant control on income and outgoings, created new towns and gave a proper system of administration to existing ones, improved the management of imperial property, and arranged for a general revision of the finances every fifteen years. Only by these means could he balance his budget, give the Italians an increase in the benefits from the *alimenta*, and provide for the more urgent needs of the provinces, brought home to him in the course of his long journeys.

Antoninus Pius maintained equilibrium by careful management, control of revenues, and limiting public works, without being obliged to abolish any *liberalitates* (imperial bounty). But Marcus Aurelius found his finances burdened by the expense of continual wars, plagues, and cataclysms, as well as by the need to write off bad debts. He had to impose unpopular economies, exact extraordinary contributions from the provinces and municipalities, renew the sales of imperial property, increase the regular provincial tribute, revive taxes which had been previously abolished, and gamble with the purity of the coinage and its face value. All this had grave consequences, of which Marcus seemed unaware but which were soon to show their dangers. They affected the reign of Commodus, during which conditions were in any case complicated by famines and plagues, and rendered worse by the emperor’s unreasoning generosities.

Pertinax, who is said to have found only one million sestercis in the *aerarium*, made a sharp distinction between the personal *patrimonium* of the
emperor and the property of the Crown, and devoted attention to Italian agriculture in order to provide for the corn dole. But his reign was too short to lay the foundations of a healthy balance once more. The ensuing period of civil war made the situation much worse, and Septimius Severus had to adopt drastic remedies to regulate the currency and prevent financial collapse. He took over practically the whole management of state finances by reducing the part played by the aerarium; he created the new imperial treasury of the res privata, mainly from enormous political confiscations; he eased the supply of grain to the army by requisitioning foodstuffs and assigning land to the military; he created new outlets for trade; and he built up large stocks of corn to meet any emergency.

Caracalla’s Constitutio Antoniniana in 212, which effected a large increase in the number of citizens, had financial considerations in mind, even if there were other purposes besides. The fiscus profited from the annona imposed on farmers, and at the same time the capitation tax was still payable by the dediticii, who were excluded from the grant of citizenship. Caracalla tackled the financial situation in other ways. He increased the yield from certain taxes, debased and reformed the coinage, revived measures of economy, and restored the payment of aurum coronarium. At his death the treasuries were well stocked, but were then emptied again by the unparalleled extravagance of Elagabalus.

There was a fresh period of recovery under Severus Alexander. He regulated the flow of money, created some new regular taxes of an appropriate kind to meet the expense of maintaining and restoring public works, and increased the range of imperial manufactures and commercial enterprises. He was thus able to be generous with donatives and free distributions, as well as instituting fresh alimentary foundations and improving the economic status of the soldiers.

At this point, however, there supervened the financial chaos resulting from the civil wars. Maximin tried to meet it by confiscations, by the levy of extraordinary contributions, and by forced loans, all of which provoked violent opposition. The results of the monetary reforms attempted by Gordian III were short-lived; they were followed by problems encountered by Philip over the demobilization of troops and by the discontent and rebellion provoked when his brother Perseus, ‘rector Orientis’, imposed fresh taxes; then there were the expenses of the wars of Decius. So the empire was already bankrupt when under Gallus and Gallienus numerous revolts broke out in several parts of the empire, leading to its temporary dismemberment, to endless wars in which no quarter was given, and to an unhealthy condition throughout the economy. Gradually the ‘Illyrian emperors’ succeeded in checking the barbarians; Aurelian unified the empire once more, and was able to lay his hands on the wealth of the defeated Palmyra.

But the greatest of these emperors, Diocletian, carried out a radical financial reform, which for good or for ill had far-reaching importance in
determining the economics of the Roman world and of later generations as well. He caused an accurate general census to be undertaken of the whole population of the empire together with a detailed survey of all agricultural holdings, including their equipment, cultivable areas, and types of crops. Then, in order to meet the inescapable expenses of the annona, both military and civil, he gradually introduced a complete new system of taxation in kind, based on the relationship between the number of 'capita' of population and the area cultivated by each family group, account being also taken of the nature of the crop and the price it fetched locally. These complicated computations, which naturally had to be revised from time to time, enabled him to raise the essential revenue by annual apportionment of quotas payable by individual families, and to let each family know in advance what sum it would have to pay. The system was certainly not perfect, since apart from unavoidable errors in the survey and in calculation it fixed an agricultural tax in advance without any definite relation to what the lands would in fact be able to yield. Moreover the flight of peasants from the land became a regular phenomenon, and led to the coloni being converted into serfs. Later on the state effected economies by imposing heavy corvées on its subjects without payment or at cut rates (mumera), while it obtained other produce from domain land or imperial estates, which in the fourth century were even encroaching on the public lands of the cities.

At first the capitatio from all citizen-owned land was naturally collected by decurions, who were made responsible for the entire sum payable to the state. It was for this reason that the decurionate was made hereditary and compulsory. In an attempt to eliminate the hardships resulting from this system Valentinian I arranged for collection by the officia of provincial governors; but the state lost by this reform, and the earlier system was reintroduced. There is no doubt that the capitation system was often ruinous to the tax-payer, even though from the government's point of view it guaranteed the corn-supply in a way which saved it trouble.

But the state needed not only provisions in bulk but also money; and this it obtained from every other kind of taxation—such as duties on trade and industry, surtax on large estates, and aurum coronarium. Indeed Constantine's revolutionary reform of the coinage, based on the aureus, led eventually to friction between that portion of the population which found it more convenient to pay and be paid in kind and the other portion which preferred assessments in gold (adaeratio).

c. The Army, Navy, and Public Order

The Army under the Empire. The firmest support to the imperial power lay in the emperor's position as the recognized head of a regular standing army which defended Rome's territories. It was a paid army of professional volunteers, and gave the princeps the force needed to impose his will abroad
and at home. But for various reasons this military basis of his power was 
hardly ever brought brutally or immoderately out into the open. The princeps 
was temperate in the expression of his wishes, and most rulers showed 
political ability and a sense of responsibility. Moreover the modest size of the 
military budget imposed restraint; and in the early stages recruiting was not 
on a collective basis and was therefore less alarming.

Provinces which were peaceful, or which could not easily be attacked from 
outside, were denuded of troops even to an embarrassing extent, as Pliny 
the Younger asserts in writing to Trajan. Furthermore the lack of a reserve 
force in the early centuries made it necessary, in case of emergency, to 
deprive one or more frontiers of their garrisons in order to reinforce another. 
The same thing happened when frontier armies had to send forces to put 
down internal revolts, or, worse still, when they took part in contests between 
claimants to the empire. In early times this fortunately happened only at 
in frequent intervals—in the year 69, then after Domitian’s death, and then 
on the death of Commodus.

The fact that over long periods relatively small forces of defenders along 
the frontiers were normally able to maintain their positions, pushing Rome’s 
enemies back and even annexing portions of their territory, was due in part 
to the military efficiency and technical skill of Roman officers and legionaries, 
but in part also to the courage and ability of the emperors, who were often 
in command themselves. It also owed much to the measures taken to re-
force the action of the troops, such as the building of a fortified limes 
and of strategic roads, the employment of men and equipment well adapted 
to local conditions, with auxiliaries trained to mobile warfare in service beside 
the legionaries, or the formation of vassal buffer-states and alliances with 
barbarian tribes beyond the frontiers. By trade and other means an attempt 
was made to promote the prestige of Roman civilization abroad. Besides all 
this, the government was careful to take on only one war at a time, and by 
diplomacy would divide its enemies or postpone their action.

A standing army consisting of troops whose numbers were limited, but 
whose quality, training, and armament were on the highest level, was the 
most efficient instrument for a defensive system which had to be both 
permanent and also prompt to meet crises. It was a professional army with 
fairly long terms of service, corresponding to the most vigorous period of 
a man’s life, and was nothing like the conscript armies which Rome had 
abolished in Marius’ time. It was also designed for defence rather than for 
conquest; and since there was no longer a continual prospect of booty it was 
necessary to give the soldiers such minimum guarantee of a sufficient standard 
of living as would attract recruits from at any rate the poorer elements in the 
population.

The number of legions was the minimum required by the tasks they had 
to perform, and the maximum which the normal state budget would permit 
if there were to be no increases in tribute. Every year it was necessary to
recruit a number of men equivalent to the number being discharged, and care was taken to keep the number down by prolonging terms of service. Gratuities payable on discharge were met by a tax on inheritance received by Roman citizens: as such the tax was in early days paid mainly by Italians, who came to be almost permanently excluded from military service.

At the outset legionaries were forbidden to marry; but when they served over long periods in permanent military camps, near which ‘canabae’ of small traders gradually grew into regular towns, some form of concubinage became common, the issue being recognized at the time of a soldier’s discharge. As time went on, this allowed the government to attract soldiers’ sons to the army; and veterans were encouraged to settle down near their former camps, where the state would give them plots of land instead of gratuities. Later on, when Septimius Severus allowed serving soldiers to marry, the state had to recognize that there was an even greater need to assign them land which their families could cultivate. There were two corollaries to this. The legionary, who was now transformed into a peasant-soldier, had to be employed locally and not transferred to other sectors. Secondly, it was to the advantage of soldiers’ households that their pay should be in kind rather than in money.

*The Command*. Under the late Republic questions of command had time and again been settled by the decisions of political factions and of such leaders as happened to be in power. Under the Empire an attempt was made to secure a system, but it was impossible to adopt the simple method of selecting the man who seemed most suited for the job and had given proof of most experience and ability in the past. The vested rights of the senatorial, and later also of the equestrian, class were far too strong; so were the preferences shown by particular emperors for senators or *equites*. It became the tradition that, except in connection with the troops in Egypt, members of senatorial families filled the higher posts. They commanded the armies (sometimes containing as many as four legions) of the military provinces, and also the individual legions (as *legati*); and before this they had to hold, for one year or two, the post of *tribunus militum*. This latter did not involve independent command and in some cases senators might be excused; moreover since the tribunate was one of the stages in the senatorial *cursus honorum*, with largely administrative duties, it is clear that too many legionary commanders were without adequate training or proved ability.

Less important commands were normally filled by non-senators, that is to say by knights or by men of lower rank. In particular this applied to the sixty ‘centurionates’ in each legion (fifty-nine from Hadrian’s time), among whom only the senior centurion of the first cohort (*primipilus*) could rise to higher commands. Even when an *eques* was made a senator in reward for his military services, it was only to his sons (who became senatorial too) that access to higher commands was opened.
The emperor who finally opened the senior military posts to the equestrian order was Septimius Severus. Even, therefore, amid the anarchic outrages of armies struggling for the imperial power, the middle of the third century was the period in which 'merit' became a more important factor than social origin.

*Legionaries and Auxiliaries.* The strength of the army consisted in two complementary elements, legions and *auxilia*. The former were mainly organized as heavy infantry of the line; the latter were light troops, both on foot and on horseback, employed for such purposes as scouting, to act as outposts on the march, and to make the initial attack in battles. The regular armed forces fluctuated between 330,000 and 450,000 men: a significantly low figure in relation to the 6,000 miles or so of frontier which had to be defended, and to the 100 or so millions of inhabitants in the empire (of whom the army formed between 0.33 and 0.45 per cent). But the proportion was distinctly higher from the third century onwards, when the number of men in arms was increased and the population had gone down. A legion normally contained 5,000 to 6,000 infantry and 100 cavalry, divided into six cohorts or 60 centuries. There were 25 legions after the defeat of Varus, 30 under Trajan, 28 under Hadrian, 30 under Marcus Aurelius, and 33 under Septimius Severus. At the head of each legion was a delegate of the emperor or *legatus Augusti* (in Egypt a *praefectus legionis*); and he was assisted by six tribunes and 60 centurions, among whom the *centurio primipilus* was the most prominent.

The legions, distributed in various ways at different periods, were under the orders of the governors of frontier provinces. From the time when it became the custom for troops to winter in regular camps, each legion's camp was prepared by a *praefectus castrorum*, who also looked after living-quarters, supplies, transport, stores, arms and artillery, watch duties, and sanitation. When later permanent camps for more than one legion were built on the frontiers each camp had its *praefectus*; but its garrison was then reduced to a single legion when Domitian gave orders to this effect, in order to avoid the dangers due to large concentrations of troops.

Being accustomed to citizen armies, the government granted Roman citizenship to provincial recruits who did not already possess it. This, together with the pay and discharge bounties, was one of the attractions of enlistment, at any rate to the population of depressed areas and to proletarians or men in danger of sinking to that status. The system was one which provided soldiers at a reasonable cost, and brought men who might have been a source of disorder on to the side of order: it also brought a higher culture to certain provincials, who would later spread the Roman way of life.

But in the course of time, and by gradual stages, the recruiting system was organized differently. Soldiers who had served for a number of years on the same front, and had established personal ties there, were anxious to avoid
being moved; and young men from districts near the frontiers were attracted to the colours by the prospect of bettering their standard of life. All this had advantages for the state. It saved the expense of moving men about, profited from the attachment of recruits to their native country, and saw Romanization furthered in the process. Rome was also able to employ men who knew the ground and customs of the country of their service, and whose military organization could be varied in accordance with the type of enemy they had to encounter. This system was used first for the auxilia, but from Hadrian’s time it became common for the legions too.

Every time the value of money fell, pay had to be increased. Meanwhile the establishment of the military treasury on a permanent footing enabled soldiers who had completed their terms to be discharged more regularly without delays, and to have their gratuities paid in money or in land. The sources show that down to the crises of the third century the troops were reasonably well satisfied with their treatment, even though, especially during long periods of peace, they were employed on construction work as well as on their military exercises. They built camps, roads, forts, and other works on the limes, and also civilian works such as city walls and public buildings; and they had their own quarries, woods for timber, and brickworks.

Their major operation was in building the limes, a series of fortified works on the frontiers which became necessary once it was recognized that the great rivers, especially when frozen in winter, did not provide an adequate barrier; moreover large sections of the frontier did not follow the river lines. A limes was properly a frontier road, to defend which, with some variety as time went on, there would be created a complicated system of trenches, ditches, earthworks, and walls, with fortified posts and fortresses, look-out posts, and advanced blockhouses in enemy territory. Behind would be the regular castra for the main bodies of troops. On the northern frontiers fortifications of this kind were designed mainly in the period between Tiberius and the Antonines. In the East and in Africa their construction involved problems of water supplies and of policing the caravan routes.

Alongside each legion, and subordinated to the legionary legatus, was an approximately equal body of auxiliary troops, in turmae of cavalry grouped together in alae and centuries of infantry which together made up cohorts. They were officered in the main by Roman citizens, though sometimes by men of native birth. Their pay was less than that of legionaries and their terms of service (twenty-five years) were longer. On discharge they received Roman citizenship which could be transmitted to their children; their sons therefore could become legionaries. Each regiment bore the name of the country from which it had originated at the outset, but later its ranks were filled up from the country in which it was serving. In the course of the third century A.D., the cavalry became more important tactically than the infantry, and therefore got higher pay. Under Gallienus the most important dignitary of the empire was no more the prætorian prefect, the commander of the
Roman legions of infantry, but a general in charge of the imperial crack guard cavalry, the latter being usually destined to become the successor of the reigning emperor.

In Hadrian's day there began to appear a number of light irregular units with special organization. These 'numeri' were either infantry or cavalry, in strength varying between 500 and 1,000, and they used the equipment, tactics, and arms of the barbarian countries from which they were drawn: for instance, the cavalry might carry shock lances, or bows and arrows. These were straightforward mercenaries. They cost little, but were of great value for guerilla warfare, for the dangerous work of advanced patrols, or for encountering fast-moving bands of barbarian cavalry.

Defence and Police Forces. From the beginning of the empire there were special troops in Italy and Rome to deal with defence and public order, and to act as the emperor's bodyguard. These were picked men, Italians, and were better paid than the legionaries, with shorter terms of service (only sixteen years). The praetorian cohorts, nine or ten in number each consisting of between 900 and 1,000 men, were commanded by the praefectus praetorio or sometimes by two praefecti. At the outset they were all Italians, and it was only after 69 that particular emperors decided to bring in provincials as well. In time of peace they were quartered in the castrum praetorium, from which detachments were detailed in turn to guard the palatium and the emperor's person. In time of war strong contingents accompanied the emperor wherever he went, and formed the centre of the line in any battle where he was engaged. Senatorial tradition has constructed a murky legend about them, by generalizing unfairly from the violent part they played at certain convulsive moments of Roman history, such as the year 69 or in the aftermaths of the deaths of Domitian and Commodus.

From Hadrian's time the emperor also made use of secret informers called frumentarii, who were originally men responsible for requisitioning army food-supplies; and from Flavian times there were the German equites singulares, a small body of guards who like the rest were under the command of the praetorian praefecti.

Four cohortes urbanae, consisting of about 6,000 Italian volunteers, looked after public order and defence in Rome; and seven cohortes vigilum, recruited normally from freedmen, each protected two 'regions' of the city from fires and similar catastrophes.

Even in the republican period the fleet, as a permanent force, had not been of any great importance. When under the empire Rome became absolute mistress of the Mediterranean, the sea no longer being significantly troubled by pirate vessels and only in the Euxine containing a small non-Roman squadron, a navy was regarded as almost superfluous. As early as Augustus' day it became practically the emperor's private property, with three main bases, Forum Iulii, Ravenna, and Misenum, of which the first was soon
abolished. Crews were recruited from ex-slaves and imperial freedmen, and could receive discharge with Roman citizenship after twenty-six years' service. Under Vespasian the two remaining fleets, now regarded as state forces, found an additional source of recruits in the seaboard districts of the provinces and they were used on occasions to reinforce the land armies. Caracalla enrolled provincials for a twenty-eight year term. The fleets were commanded by praefecti and sub-praefecti of equestrian rank. In the third century they acquired importance again.

There were some lesser squadrons, also commanded by equestrian praefecti, which obtained crews from the more backward peoples. These combined with the armies in operations on the outer seas, the great lakes, and the rivers on the frontier.

*Weaknesses of the Army of the Early Empire.* Under the early empire the Roman army was never large, and it could not have adequate additions made to it in periods of emergency, mainly because its budgetary allocation was based on the assumption that the empire was to be defended rather than expanded. Its forces often had to be used in civil wars, and external dangers were growing; yet recruitment was becoming more difficult owing both to relatively unattractive conditions of pay, and also to the decline in the population and the necessity of cavalry, which made it necessary to adopt the dangerous expedient of employing barbarians. Rather than speaking of 'the extermination of the fittest' it is preferable to suppose a fall in the population of the Roman world and a rise in that of the non-Roman (both barbarian and non-barbarian), both factors causing outsiders to seek expansion at the empire's expense.36

In addition the arrangement of the legionaries on the frontier, protected by the fortified lines of the limes, eventually turned out to be less effective than had been supposed. When it came to the point, this was only a single barrier, even though a strong one; and when it was crossed by the enemy, either through a breach in the lines of fortifications or because a sector had been denuded of troops, the interior of the country was left uncovered. This led to repeated raids of provincial territory by the barbarians, increasing in frequency and making the provincials feel the need to wall their cities.

Throughout republican history from Camillus onwards Rome had shown vitality and creative genius in devising new military techniques, and had possessed armies capable of carrying out the most audacious operations of conquest. Under the empire the army did not show either the capacity for improving its methods or the standard of war potential which was required for a lasting policy of expansion. This fact is attested by the repeated instances in which first Augustus himself, and later Tiberius, Domitian, and Hadrian, gave up an operation before it was completed. Meanwhile the civil wars, which began in 69 and later became increasingly frequent (especially
in the third century) compelled Rome to put too much trust in the effective-
ness of the _limes_.

From Hadrian’s day there was some imitation of foreign techniques, such
as the mounted catafract, and it became the custom to employ the best
recruits obtainable from the frontier districts in their countries of origin.
This system was followed by Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius (the
latter of whom also made use of slaves and of barbarian auxiliary units).
It became a hard and fast rule when Septimius Severus recruited his soldiers
from peasants.

As early as the reign of Antoninus Pius Gothic movements started the
barbarian attacks, and to these were later added the civil wars, reaching their
maximum intensity in the middle of the third century. At this point Rome
needed some fundamental innovation to give the legionaries, who were
growing very little different from their enemies across the frontier, some
means of attaining decisive military superiority. Besides the inadequacy of
strength, there was by now a lack of inventive ability and will-power. Various
expedients were incapable of achieving decisive results. For example An-
toninus Pius attached importance to diplomacy and the support of vassals
on the periphery; Caracalla tried to revive the phalanx; the systems of _numer i_
and _vexillationes_ were developed; and the legionaries took over the arms and
cavalry tactics of the _auxilia_, which by this time were those of the barbarians.
Even now the government did not create a force for reserve and manœuvre,
which had become indispensable when several attacks from outside and more
than one internal struggle were taking place at the same time.

_Regional Recruitment_. Legionary recruitment underwent gradual changes, of
which the essential tendency is ascertainable. From Augustus to Caligula
Italians were in a distinct majority, though (as in later periods too) most
Italians were northerners. Such provincials as there were came mainly from
the most highly Romanized Western provinces and from the Eastern pro-
vinces with the most advanced Greek culture. In the ensuing period down
to 68, Italians and provincials are found in roughly equal proportions, with
the provincials including fewer men from Anatolia and more from the
Balkans. Between Vespasian and Trajan Italians are only one in five of the
provincials, the latter mainly coming from Gaul, the Danubian and northern
Balkan countries, Syria, and Asia. From Hadrian to the end of the third
century the Italians attested are less than one per cent of the provincials,
and the principal areas of recruitment were the Danube lands and the north-
ern Balkans, together with Africa, all countries suitable for recruiting efficient
cavalry soldiers.

Until Trajan’s time Western recruits normally served in legions stationed
in the Western provinces, except for Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Africa;
Easterners served in the Eastern provinces and Moesia; and Illyricum was a
hybrid zone where the two recruiting areas joined. From the time of Hadrian
local recruitment became more and more regular, except for the troops in Britain. For the praetorians (except for the brief period of Vitellius, who made use of men from Germany) it was normal down to the second century to employ Roman citizens from the older districts; but in a few instances as early as Caligula’s reign, and later with increasing frequency, it became the practice to transfer individual legionaries, who would mainly be provincials, into the praetorian guard. This practice was adopted wholesale by Septimius Severus, under whom praetorians were mainly chosen from Thracian and Illyrian legionaries, and were accompanied by the Legion II Parthica, a unit of similar composition stationed at Albanum.

Augustus attempted to raise the social background of his legionaries, who as far back as Marius’ time had been mainly drawn from ‘capite censi’. But the economic position he allowed them was not such as to enable him to fill their ranks without making use of ‘inopes et vagi’, as Tiberius complained. It was only by increasing provincial recruitment, and later making such recruitment the general rule, that the government was able to attract well-to-do persons into the legions and eventually to induce even members of the provincial nobility to come in. Yet by the time of Septimius Severus the social, and still more the cultural background of the legionary army had sunk significantly, as the result of large enrolments of men from the northern Balkans and Illyricum, men whose rough and lawless behaviour was deplored by Dio Cassius.

The gradual process of social and cultural decline was of course more evident among the auxiliary troops, and still more among the increasingly common units of foederati under their native officers and non-commissioned officers. The same was true of Hadrian’s numeri, of the Germans and Batavians in the imperial bodyguard, of the equites singulares employed by Trajan, Caracalla, and other emperors, and of the barbarians who from the time of Marcus Aurelius were paid by Rome, and sometimes even quartered in the frontier districts.

But another system, begun by Severus Alexander, was a further important factor in the ‘barbarization’ of the army. That emperor, in an attempt to restore the army, tried to revive the phalanx and enrol a legion of Italians; but at the same time he composed the main body of his troops of Illyrians, and was seriously concerned with the development of his cavalry, whom he enrolled not only from Rome’s old enemies the Parthians but also from the barbarians recently arriving from the North, the Alans and Goths. So he created a corps of mounted cataphracts in imitation of the Parthian horse and with arms captured from them. He took into paid service prisoners and refugees from Armenia, Osroene, and Parthia, and made use of a large number of Mauretanian mounted archers. Maximin added some German deserters, a class later employed freely by Pupienus and Balbinus as a bodyguard and for other purposes. Finally Gordian III took on an even greater risk by employing as mercenaries not only Germans but Goths; and they,
when Philip sent them back and refused their promised pay, provoked disastrous reprisals. By this time it can be clearly seen that deliberate barbarization of the army, even though on some occasions it helped to protect the frontiers, could in times of emergency lead to desertion by the 'barbarized' Roman army in collusion with the barbarians themselves.

Reforms of the Late Empire. The most important military reforms in the Roman world between about 250 and 400 can be summarized as follows.

Recruitment. It had now become the custom for sons of soldiers to enter the army. Diocletian, and Constantine after him, in connection with the general policy of compulsion they were applying to the creation of hereditary professions and castes, were concerned to prevent disintegration setting in here any more than in other spheres. They therefore ordained that soldiers' sons who were fit for service must adopt a military career, and by applying the new 'capitation' system of taxation required landed proprietors to send a given proportion of their coloni to the levy. These arrangements were extended to allow exemption upon payment of a sum adequate to provide a replacement; and recruits, together with their nearer relatives, were allowed remission from the 'capitation', a concession which was also in part granted to men after discharge.

Numbers. Here all that need be said is that Diocletian raised the number of legions from thirty-nine to sixty-eight, and that about AD 400 the army comprised about 500,000 men.

Distribution. The government at last came to realize that in addition to legions on the frontiers it was essential to have a force for reserve and manœuvres stationed at some appropriate points. This was designed partly to reinforce a threatened section of the frontier without denuding others, partly to meet internal dangers, and partly to enable the various members of the more complicated imperial organizations of this period (tetrarchies and so on) to make use of the new force to help them in their duties. On the one hand, therefore, there were still the frontier troops (limitanei), but about two-fifths of the legionaries and auxiliaries were quartered in various cities of the interior, where they made their level of discipline conform to the civilitas of their surroundings. These troops were regarded as a continuation of those which in the past had accompanied the emperor on his campaigns; they consequently acquired the name Palatini, or alternatively comitatenses from the fact that their leaders were comites. A further point is that the proportion of cavalry among them was markedly higher than in the past. This had inevitable consequences for tactics and strategy; though it was not enough to prevent Rome's great defeat at Adrianople in 378, achieved by irresistible cavalry charges of the Visigoths.

The Imperial Guard. After the battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312 Constantine disbanded the praetorians, and they are not heard of again. The post of praefectus praetorio lost its military duties and was divided among four
holders, becoming a civil office for directing the four Praefecturae into which the empire was divided.

Military Command. From the time of Diocletian military and civil governors were kept firmly separate from each other. The old senatorial and equestrian orders had lost all importance in both fields; and eventually, at any rate in theory, posts both in the military career and in the hierarchy of officia began to depend no longer on a holder's rank but on proved merit: 'dignity' corresponded to the grade a man had attained. At the head of the military forces were a magister peditum and a magister equitum; and below them were the duces of the limitanei and the comites of the comitatenses, all possessing commands which were exclusively military.

Meanwhile the limes was continually maintained. As late as the time of Valentinian I large works were being constructed on it, but instead of the continuous barrier of ditches, walls, and the like, the main feature now was a set of forts and camps with a rational lay-out.

At the same time an inordinately large use was being made of the dangerous though inevitable custom of employing barbarians introduced into imperial territory. Under Constantine they were allowed to attain the highest commands. The emperor Julian, in the criticisms he levelled at his great predecessor, was a sound prophet of the consequences soon to follow from this whole system.

6. POPULATION CENSUSES IN ITALY AND THE EMPIRE

It is a probable view that the full lists of the population of both sexes and all ages, compiled from declarations made by patres familiarum and guardians (and including childless men and widows), were the source from which was extracted a list of men fit to bear arms, who were then divided into classes and age-groups. Such censuses of the republican period as have come down to us are on this view based on men of military age, including (sometimes explicitly, sometimes not) the small number of orphans declared by their guardians to be reaching military age during the four years of the validity of the census. Moreover, apart from the censuses of the citizen population, the subject peoples who had not yet obtained citizenship must also have been numbered, mainly for fiscal, but partly also for military, reasons; and there must have been a census of Roman citizens living in the provinces—during the Mithradatic Wars we are told that 20,000 could be counted at Delos, and at least 80,000 in Asia. The last known republican census, that of 70–69 BC, gives us the figure of 910,000 men of military age. Yet the censuses recorded in the Res Gestae of Augustus give 4,063,000 for 28 BC, 4,233,000 for 8 BC, and 4,937,000 for AD 14. It is impossible that the number of Roman citizens was quadrupled in forty years, and it is therefore clear that imperial data reflect a different method of computation from those of the republican period. In our opinion the best explanation is that Augustus
included not only males of military age but all male citizens, including children and old men. This may enable us to estimate the number of Roman citizens of both sexes in Rome, Italy, and the provinces at about double the figures given by Augustus—without of course including slaves.

But for AD 14 the ‘Festi Ostienses’ give 4,100,900 instead of 4,937,000; and a similar difference is reflected by our sources on the last specifically reported census, that of AD 47, for which some authorities give 6,944,000 against Tacitus’ figure of 5,984,072. The most likely hypothesis appears to be that the higher figures for both AD 14 and AD 47 relate to the male citizen population of the whole empire, and the smaller to the male citizen population of Italy alone. Consequently the balance of 836,100 in AD 14, and 959,928 in AD 47, represents the male citizens in the provinces. If we add to the Italian figures a corresponding total for women, and a rough figure of one million for slaves, we get a global population of Italy amounting to between nine and nine-and-a-half millions in 14 and between twelve-and-a-half and thirteen millions in 47.

We therefore arrive at a figure approximately double that obtained by Beloch’s invaluable calculations; these were throughout on the low side. Moreover since every time one re-examines Beloch’s calculations of population of the Roman world in the Augustan age one reaches an answer which is at least twice as high (1,300,000 for Sicily instead of 600,000, or 10,500,000 for the Tres Galliae instead of 3,400,000), it is probably not far from the truth to put the total for the whole empire at 100 or 110 millions instead of the 54 million figure at which he arrived.

[This figure is hypothetical but need not be excessive for pre-industrial conditions. We know that Alexandria in Egypt, the largest city of Hellenistic times, contained 300,000 free citizens and about the same number of slaves and non-Greeks; while in Roman times Egypt excluding Alexandria had a population of 7,500,000. Under the empire, the largest city was Rome itself. Calculations can be made of its urban population based upon the figures for corn-distributions under Augustus, the total of corn-distribution under Severus, and by reckoning the population density within the known built-up area; the three methods independently agree upon a total of about 1,000,000 inhabitants or more, and the number of food-recipients in the later empire supports this high figure: see S. Mazzarino, Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo (Rome, 1951), pp. 232 ff. Next to Alexandria, Antioch in Syria and the city of Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, outside the Roman empire, were of a similar size, and the latter is known to have had 600,000 inhabitants. For other cities where we lack direct evidence, the area of city buildings may be used, especially when excavations have shown the type of architecture employed: Aquileia can thus be reckoned at well over 100,000, Ostia at 50,000, and Pompeii at 25,000 inhabitants. But estimates of this kind would be too low for north Italy and the northern provinces, where many and sometimes most citizens of a town lived in the surrounding countryside. Exact figures}
are unattainable, but a general perspective is not; these considerations would
tell rather against Beloch’s lower figures for the total citizen and non-citizen
populations of the empire.]*

This total figure was a maximum, and it then progressively declined.
From the first there was a powerful movement of emigration from areas
such as Italy and Greece towards other parts of the empire; later the pheno-
menon of growing depopulation became more general. There was a long
series of causes, sometimes acting in isolation in time and place, at other
times working concomitantly. For instance, manpower was destroyed by
foreign wars, and in some periods of the third century by civil wars as well.
Barbarian invasions and raids brought bloodshed, and to them were added
murderous descents on inhabited areas by pirates, brigands, and high-
landers. Then there were the devastations caused by prolonged and wide-
spread plagues and the advance of malaria; the malnutrition due to famine,
oppressive taxation, soil exhaustion, and the difficulty of securing the
necessities of life through trade once civilization had returned to the practice
of barter in kind; and finally there were voluntary birth-control, deliberate
abortion, and exposure of children.

Further evidence for a continual increase in the extent of deserted areas
comes from the practice of settling barbarian peoples on land left untilled:
in Augustus’ day we hear only of 50,000 Dacians settled near the Danube,
but the practice became increasingly common. It is not surprising, therefore,
that laws of Septimius Severus’ time deplore the ‘necessitas penuriae homi-
num’. Yet the size of this progressive reduction in the population must not
be exaggerated (see above p. 815).

* By M. W. Frederiksen.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVI

1. In Professor L. S. Vasilyev’s view two classes of dependants can be identified, (a) the
pu-ch’u, who were originally bodyguards of the nobles but were eventually issued with
land, (b) the dependent peasant proper, known as the pin-kho. He also calls attention to
the importance of slaves in this period, citing Wang Yi-tung, ‘Slaves and other com-
parable social Groups during the Northern Dynasties’, Harvard Journal of Asiatic
Studies, 1953.

2. On Sassanid organization see F. Altheim, Ein Asiatischer Staat, I (1954), Finanzenges-
gichte der Spätantike (1957).

3. Or so Tiberius said. The motives behind his show of reluctance at his accession cannot
be determined: our literary sources, especially Tacitus and Suetonius, represent his
behaviour as a complete sham, and it certainly became fashionable among new emperors
to make a bogus pretence that power was forced upon them. But it is fairly clear that
Tiberius tried, initially at least, to enhance the prerogative, as well as the prestige, of
the senate.

4. It may perhaps be doubted whether Nero’s reign, and his eventual fall, are to be explained
by supposing that he aimed at constitutional absolutism. Important reasons were (a) his
long-drawn-out attempt to divorce his wife Octavia, married to him for dynastic reasons,
(b) the horror caused by his murder of his mother, who had opposed the divorce, (c) his
Hellenizing cultural policy, and his own appearances in the circus and on the stage, (d) the faction struggles occasioned by the rise of Tigrillus at the expense of Seneca and Nero's other earlier advisers, and (e) (probably) acute financial stringency, partly the result of lavish state expenditure in Rome.

5. From Augustus' time the praetorian guard had been a force in politics: the years 68–70 saw the emergence of the provincial armies. The extent to which the generals, the lower officers, or the common soldiers provided the initiative for these disturbances has been much discussed: for a summary see G. E. F. Chilver, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1957, pp. 29 ff. Another feature of these years was the prevalence of discontent in the provinces, with Gaul, the Rhineland, and Judea breaking into open rebellion. See P. A. Brunt, *Latomus*, 1959, pp. 531 ff., 1960, pp. 494 ff., and the same writer's low estimate of the integrity of Roman provincial government in this period, *Historia*, 1961, pp. 189 ff.

6. The troops he put into the guard were, of course, not actual Germans, but legionaries (often Italian) from the German armies.

7. In this period several senators were introduced from the Western provinces, as well as from the Po valley of Italy. This probably reflects the growing wealth of the upper classes in those areas; and the process set the pattern for recruitment of senators, largely for political reasons, from the Eastern provinces too. For an analysis of the late first- and early second-century senate see M. Hammond, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1957, p. 74.

8. There was, of course, no mention of Antonius in Domitian's propaganda; but Domitian, after Caligula, was the first emperor who openly sought divine honours in his lifetime.


10. In the sense that they came from Roman families outside Italy, namely from Spain.

11. The plagues of this period were devastating, and were thought by contemporaries to be more terrifying than the barbarian invasions.

12. See above, p. 704, note 11.


22. There is some possibility that Gaius (a somewhat mysterious character, except that he can be shown to have lived in the second century AD) was speaking ironically. See Honoré, *op. cit.*, pp. 117 ff.

23. The developments described in this paragraph proceeded at a varying rate. For the composition of the senate see above, note 5, and the analysis, mainly relating to the Severan age, described in the latter part of the paragraph itself. As regards the functions of senators, it is true that the growth of the central administration caused a great increase, during the first century AD, in the posts open to knights; but even in the mid-second century there was no perceptible reduction in the posts held by senators, who had their earlier financial and administrative duties as well as the all-important commands in the military provinces.

25. It is impossible to agree with the brief account given of slavery under the empire. The author links the transition to other forms of exploitation with the declining role of slave labour, which in his view was the result of the fact that there were no longer masses of prisoners of war coming on to the slave markets, and that an improvement occurred in ethical norms as a consequence partly of Stoicism and partly of Christianity. Although this view is widespread, it is not supported by evidence from the sources. Not one of the Roman writers ever complained that the number of slaves was diminishing, or that slaves were becoming more expensive, as a result of the infrequency of wars. In their view the unprofitability of slave labour was mainly due to the unwillingness of slaves to perform more complex tasks and the necessity to provide continual supervision over their work. Attempts to increase their interest in the work they did by giving them various incentives did not prove very successful, and this led them to seek other forms of economic life that would be more effective than that based on slave labour exclusively. It should not be forgotten that even when wars again became frequent, from the end of the second century onwards, prisoners of war were more frequently made coloni rather than slaves. This in itself shows how unprofitable slave labour had become, independently of the supply of slaves and the price they fetched.

The certain change that took place in the treatment of slaves was not the cause but the consequence of the ever-growing unprofitability of slave labour. Moreover, this change was not by any means a general rule: at the same time as an easement occurred in the condition of some slaves, particularly those who occupied privileged positions, cruel laws were applied against other slaves (e.g., the well-known senatus consultum Silanianum, the effect of which was felt more widely under the Empire), and a number of writers express their contempt for slaves much more clearly than was the case under the Republic, when there were still traces of patriarchal relationships and so on.

Nor is there any support in the sources for the view expressed by the author that slave labour came to be replaced by hired labour. In the treatise of Columella the landless labourers, who played an important part in Cato's account and are still mentioned by Varro, are no longer to be found at all. The exploitation of slaves gave way, not to exploitation of workers, but of coloni and various other groups which fell into a state of dependence of some kind upon large landowners or tenants of imperial estates. (E. M. Shtaerman.)


It should be added that the provisions of the s.c. Silanianum of AD 10, whereby all the household of a murdered master were executed, were renewed as late as the sixth century by the Christian emperor Justinian I. As Brunt (cit.) has shown, the reproduction rate of US slaves in the early nineteenth century was far from low, and it is therefore dangerous to assume that the Roman slave population declined simply because wars of conquest were less common.

27. The legal origin of this distinction is obscure; it appears to start about the middle of the second century AD.

28. The iugum, supposed to be the minimum area of land to support a family, was the basis of Diocletian's land tax. It varied according to the nature of the crop and the productivity of the soil, but no other local conditions were taken into account.

29. For criticism of Rome's provincial government under the early Empire, see above, note 5.

30. Yet this practice was attacked, and apparently discontinued for a time, after a speech in AD 62 by Thrasea Paetus, a senator with a high reputation for virtuous ideals. His words (as recorded by Tacitus, Annals, XV, 20-1) are peculiarly revealing of the lofty contempt shown by early imperial senators towards the provincials.

31. Although in some provinces, Egypt for example, a simple poll tax was certainly levied, it has seemed to many scholars that tributum capitis was in most areas something different, namely a tax on property other than land. See J. Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung (2nd edition, 1884), 2, pp. 198 ff.
32. The structure of early imperial finance has been the subject of prolonged controversy. An alternative view is that all regular revenues, including tribute from the 'imperial' provinces, were formally due to the public treasury (aerarium Saturni), and that the emperor's fiscus was his private property, swollen by his vast accumulation of estates in the provinces. But in any case the emperor exercised a close supervision of all public finance, from Augustus' time on. See A. H. M. Jones, Studies in Roman Government and Law (Oxford, 1960), pp. 99 ff.

33. This view (which has been widely held) involves amending the text of Suetonius (Vespasian, 8), which gives 40,000 million sesterces as the sum needed to set the state to rights. Others believe that Vespasian referred not to the revenues but to a capital sum required for war damage, new building, and so on. See T. Frank, An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, V (Baltimore, 1940), p. 53, who calculates (probably too conservatively) that the total revenues in Vespasian's time were no more than 1,500 million sesterces.

34. In theory the whole Roman army was still enrolled by conscription (dilectus); and the system, to judge from complaints and some revolts, was rigorously applied to the recruitment of subject peoples into the 'auxiliary' units. But the legions, under the early Empire, were filled in practice by volunteers.

35. The number, in the first century AD, varied from 25 to 30 legions, or about 125,000–130,000 men.

36. The view that the population of the Empire declined progressively after the mid-second century, and that this decline was crucial, has been forcefully argued by A. E. R. Boak, Manpower Shortage and the Decline of the Roman Empire in the West (London, 1955). See, however, the criticisms of M. Finley, Journal of Roman Studies, 1958, pp. 156 ff.
65 Lacquered basket, Han dynasty, National Museum, Seoul.
Length 0.39 m.; width 0.18 m.; height c. 0.22 m.
(a) Front view
(b) Side view
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(a) Gandhāra: relief with warriors (the hosts of Maras attacking the Buddha)

(b) Amaravati: relief with warriors, elephants and walls
CHAPTER XVII

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY:
THE EMERGENCE OF CHRISTIANITY TO
THE FIFTH CENTURY

I. CHINA

Chinese thought during the Later Han, Three Kingdoms, and Northern Chin periods has little left of the freedom, intellectual curiosity, and variety of the early philosophy. Political conditions were not favourable. The authoritarian government of the Han had no use for anything except supine conformity to its own particular brand of Confucianism. The discussions between the schools of the Old Text of the Classics (kèu-wén; it was said to have been recovered from oblivion after the ‘burning of the books’ in 213 BC) and the New Text (i.e., the traditional one) was chiefly of a philological character. But it still bore consequences of weight in the interpretation of the classical texts and even exerted some political influence. Liu Hsin (46 BC–AD 23), the foremost representative of the Old Text School (and as such charged by his opponents with wholesale forgery) was closely connected with Wang Mang and his so-called reforms. The chief result of the Old Text movement was a purging of alien elements, such as the yin-yang speculations, from Confucianism. Apart from this, Confucian thought showed no real vitality.

Still later, after the middle of the second century AD, the political decadence and economic stress led thinkers to take refuge in various brands and nuances of pessimism. ‘Han thought was often disturbed, frequently apathetic, but seldom vigorous in the sense of being forward-looking and original’ (Cree). Philosophers now had little possibility of exerting any influence on government or of escaping from it; they took mostly to a sort of nihilism, i.e. an attempt to flee from reality. The one exception was Wang Ch’ung (c.27–97 AD), the author of the Lun-hêng, a strong and daring attack on the study of antiquity, on superstition and other matters; he was sharply deterministic or even mechanistic in his conception of life. But his influence was practically nil.

The escapism and nihilism of the years around AD 200 led as a matter of fact to almost complete barrenness in official Confucianism and to a revival of Taoism with some original features (hsüan-hsüeh; called Neo-Taoism by Feng Yu-lan). In its rationalistic aspects, it took the shape of commentaries on Chuang-tzû by Kuo Hsiang (d. c.312) and Hsiang Hsiu (c.221–300). They defined tao as equivalent to nothingness and maintained that every-
thing is spontaneously produced by itself. The non-action (wu-wei) theory is interpreted as allowing the natural abilities to exercise themselves fully and freely. Absolute happiness means transcending the distinction between things: it means absolute freedom. The pure sage lives according to himself but not according to others. The most picturesque representatives of Later Taoism were the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove, who in the second half of the third century AD gathered together for convivial conversations. 'They all revered and exalted the Void and Non-Action and disregarded the rites and law; they drank wine to excess and disdained the affairs of this world.' Their eccentricities were of course only a conscious protest against orthodox conformism. The foremost of the seven was Hsi K'ang (223–262). A love of nature, chiefly in its solitary aspects, was a common feature of this trend: later on it was to influence Chinese painting very deeply.

The official religion was rounded off on the lines sketched in Part II: it lost every remnant of a living faith and became a mere state ceremonial. Apart from the very rare sacrifice on the T'ai-shan, its most solemn rites were the imperial sacrifices to the Sovereign Earth, which after 31 BC became localized in the northern suburbs of the capital, and the imperial sacrifice to Heaven, localized in the southern suburbs. Of course here too we find a conscious following of the yin-yang pattern. The religious feeling of the masses could not be satisfied by these rites, however imposing. It was catered for chiefly by the development of Taoist religion (as opposed to philosophy) and by the rise of Buddhism.

Taoism absorbed the yin-yang elements expelled from Confucianism. Lao-tzu became an increasingly lofty and revered personality as the founder of a recognized religion. There were temples and a liturgy, and even a hereditary chief (the t'ien-shih of the Chang family in Szechwan), but no real clergy could be organized, and this was an incurable element of weakness. The main aims were practical and utilitarian, such as invulnerability, the prolongation of life or even immortality; and the means were of a magical kind, such as the elixir of long life, the philosopher's stone, etc. This sort of Taoism soon took political forms in the shape of secret societies, whose usual purpose was religious life and mutual help, but which could, and often did, become the originators and organizers of rebellion. Thus the famous farmer revolt of the Yellow Turbans in AD 184 was led by a Taoist society which employed magic for healing, held a conception of wrongdoing that was very much akin to the Western one of sin, and placed emphasis on public confession. As the influence of Buddhism increased, the Taoist religion borrowed from it a good many institutions and rites, and even the final form of much of its scriptures.

Buddhism was the first foreign religion to enter China. It was introduced during the first years of our era, being perhaps brought over the sea by Indian and Indonesian traders into the Yangtze-kiang valley, but immediately afterwards missionaries began to come in by the land route from the West,
even from as far as Parthia. The Buddhism they introduced was mainly that of *Mahāyāna*; the emphasis lay not on its philosophy, but on the moral, disciplinary, and salvational aspects. The new religion gave to the hard-pressed Chinese peasantry and despairing officials what was most needed at that particular moment: a sense of the futility and relativity (‘emptiness’) of the phenomenal world and a hope for the future; either *nirvāṇa*, or, more grossly, re-birth in one of the numerous paradises. When present life was a hell, Buddhism at least gave a hope of something better in the life after death, about which Chinese thought had never bothered to enquire. Thus the first Indian texts translated into Chinese were manuals of morals and of discipline (e.g. the *Sūtra* in forty-two articles). For much of this Taoism paved the way and supplied the technical terms; indeed the most interesting work of early Buddhist apologetic, the *Mou-tzū* of c. AD 200, employs Taoist terms and seems to consider Buddhism as another form of Taoism.

The new religion experienced tremendous growth, and during the period of North–South division (317–589) it was the one trend of thought that dominated Chinese spiritual life, first among the masses as a living religion, and somewhat later also among the higher classes and at the various courts as a philosophy of life. Soon it became utterly engrained in Chinese life and was hardly considered any longer as a foreign religion. Its main external characteristic was the existence of a monastic order, i.e. of a clergy. Monasteries became a centre of religious refuge, but also of flourishing economic interests, which contributed to an increasing hold by the new religion on the peasant masses.

2. INDIA

The shift of values in the Indian pantheon went on, slowly but unceasingly. By the time of the Guptas the old Vedic gods had become fossilized remnants of the past, and few people paid service to them. The new pantheon found its glorification in the *Purāṇa*, most of which belong to this epoch. They proclaim the glory of Brahmā, the creator (who remained an abstract figure and never enjoyed popular worship); of Viṣṇu, the preserver; and of Śiva, the destroyer. Puranic mythology replaced the Vedic one for the people.

Brahmanism was developing into Hinduism, and the latter began to crystallize into two main tendencies, Viṣṇuism and Śivaism. However, hostility between the two was seldom violent, and there was no mutual exclusion. The supreme God was worshipped in the form of Viṣṇu by some and in the form of Śiva by others, and that was all. Two essential elements are common to both faiths. One is emotional devotion (*bhakti*) to the god; it can lead to immediate contemplation of the deity (in Viṣṇuism) or to the merging and identification of the devotee with it (in Śivaism). The other is *prasāda*, the grace of the god that brings salvation to the devotee. The first historically recognizable shape assumed by Viṣṇuism is the *Bhāgavata* faith,
which began in the Mathura region and was connected with Vāsudeva-
Kṛṣṇa. The Besnagar inscription of Heliodorus, the Greek ambassador of
the Greek king Antialcidas (second century BC), proclaims his Bhāgavata
faith. Kṛṣṇa, at first a warrior god (so he appears in the Mahābhārata
later assumed a dominantly pastoral character. Mathura became a holy place,
as the theatre of his sport with the shepherd girls. By the time the Bhāgavad-
gītā was written, his identification with Viṣṇu was nearly complete.

The accretion of miscellaneous religious material around the central figure
of Viṣṇu was systematized during this period in the theory of the incarnations
(āvatāra), by which Viṣṇu descended on earth in various forms in order to
free it from some calamity or oppressor. The number of the āvatāra increased
until it was finally fixed at ten. According to the usual list (as finally settled
much later), the first three are theriomorphic (Fish, Tortoise, Boar). The
next two are half-human or human (Man-Lion, Dwarf). The next three are
heroes or gods identified with Viṣṇu (Parāsurāma, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa). The
ninth is the Buddha, whose role is to lead wicked men to perdition with false
doctrines. The tenth and last has yet to appear: it is Kalki, who will descend
on earth to destroy the wicked and to restore purity, a conception possibly
influenced by Iranian ideas. Of course the incarnations were particularly
well suited to artistic description and gave rise to a rich iconography.

Another element of the Gupta period is the figure of Lākṣmī (or Śrī), the
wife of Viṣṇu and the goddess of beauty and good fortune.

The very ancient god Śiva first became the centre of a definite religious
sect with the rise of the Pāṣupata (about the first century AD), which has
survived to the present day. But more important was the increasing popularity
of the cult of Śiva or Mahādeva. It became widely diffused in the north
(chiefly in Kashmir), but, the Guptas being Viṣṇuite, it is not surprising
that its main centre was rather in the south, mainly around Kañcipuram,
but also farther south. It was intimately connected with Dravidian beliefs
and with the Tamil poetry of the Nāyana. Later on, perhaps as the result of
a syncretism with a pre-Aryan idea, the phallus (liṅga) became Śiva’s symbol.
The god soon was associated with an originally independent mythological
cycle, that of the sakti, the energetic female principle. The legends of Śiva
now centred around his relation with his sakti Umā or Pārvatī, also called
in her terrific aspects Durgā and Kālī. Hence the unmistakable sexual
element in Śivaite lore: yet this element never became its main characteristic
to the same extent as the terrific god who destroys so that new life may arise.
Later on, Śivaism developed an independent school of philosophy, based,
not on the Vedas, but on the revelations of Śiva, the Āgamas, but it falls
outside the chronological limits of this volume.

Hinduism was carried by emigrants and refugees to Indonesia and to the
coastal regions of south-east Asia, where in this period a slow process of
Indianization was going on and a Greater India was taking shape. Śivaism
became the cult of the royal family in Fu-nan (Cambodia) and in Champa
(central Vietnam). But our information on religious conditions in Greater India before AD 400 is too scanty to allow any generalization.

Philosophical speculation went on steadily, and on the basis laid down in the preceding period the six classical systems (darśana) came into existence. Each of them centres round a main text (sūtra), which is usually very concise and obscure and lends itself to great latitude in interpretation. The sūtras go back to different ages that are in no way connected with the antiquity of the respective systems; the Sāṅkhya-kārikā is the most recent of them, although the Sāṅkhya school is among the earliest and its beginnings are evident already in some Upaniṣad. The six darśanas are the following.

(1–2) Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Sāṅkhya is a complete system of metaphysics, which postulates one primitive principle, the prakṛti (primordial matter). The latter consists of three constituents (guna), which partake of both the conception of modes of being and of forms: they are sattva (lightness, good, intelligence), rajas (passion, anger, energy), tamas (darkness, fullness, heaviness). The gunas are the foundations of knowledge, action, and rest respectively. The universe consists of the ever-changing relations and combinations in varying quantities of the three gunas. In front of the one prakṛti there are the individual souls (puruṣa), infinite in number. There is no communication at all between the puruṣas and the prakṛti, but the latter attracts the soul like a lode-iron, and the soul imagines itself to be drawn into the turmoil of nature; their relation is said to be similar to that of the girl-dancer and of the onlooker. The whole universe and its manifestations are unfolded through a series of twenty-five stages or truths (tattva) by this contact. Prakṛti is unconscious but dynamic, puruṣa is conscious but static. Salvation can be attained through the recognition of the absolute diversity of puruṣa and of the complex process evolving from prakṛti. The soul then returns to its state of purity and eternal untroubled isolation. God has no part in this, and Sāṅkhya is wholly atheistic.

Yoga in a wider sense is a psycho-physiological discipline associated with all sorts of philosophical theories. In its narrower sense, as one of the six classical systems of philosophy, it is supplementary to Sāṅkhya. It deals not with metaphysics, but with the psychological technique and discipline through which truth may be comprehended. Its aim is to reach the complete and final quiescence of all the functions and modes of the mind (citta-vṛtti-nirodha). This is achieved on the basis of a pneumatic theory, by controlling the breath of life and conveying it into the proper channels of the body through the complete control of mind and muscles, which can be achieved by a series of psycho-physical exercises. Yoga admits of a God, but only as an indifferent presence, which serves as the object of meditation.

(3–4) Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika. Vaiśeṣika is an atomistic theory. According to it, the world is real in itself; it is a conglomeration of smaller and smaller parts, ending in indivisible components called paramāṇu (atom). It is classified in six categories (padārtha): substance (dravya), quality (guna), action
(karman), generality (sāmānya), particularity (viṣeṣa), inheritance (saṃvaśāya). The souls (ātman) exist but are inert; their coming into activity depends on the contact with the organs of sense by the agency of an atomic, independent, eternal entity, the mind (manas). Salvation is attained when a knowledge of the padārthas causes the soul to return to its primitive inactivity, immobility, unconsciousness. Early Vaiṣeṣika was atheistic; but after the commentator Praśastapāda (fifth century) it came to recognize the existence of a God, who is the efficient creator of the universe out of the atoms existing ab aeterno. He is also the regulator of karman, whose automaticism, usually absolute in Indian thought, comes thus to be mitigated only in Vaiṣeṣika.

Nyāya is the theory of logic. It starts from the same premises as Vaiṣeṣika (reality of the universe, God, and the soul), but concerns itself almost exclusively with the sources of knowledge and the means for reaching them (pramāṇa). The sources of knowledge are four: direct perception (pratyakṣa), inference (anumāna), analogy (upamāna), authority (śabda, the Vedas). The mainstay of inference is the syllogism, which is not three-membered as with Aristotle, but consists of five propositions: premise (pratiṣṭhā), reason (hetu), example (udaharaṇa or dṛṣṭānta), application of the example to the argument under discussion (upanayya), conclusion (nigamana). The standard example of a syllogism is the following: 'There is fire in yonder mountain; for there is smoke in it; wherever there is smoke, there is fire, as in the kitchen; there is smoke in the mountain; therefore, there must be fire in it.'

(5-6) Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta, also called Pūrva-mīmāṃsā and Uttara-mīmāṃsā. These are in reality two faces of the same system originally aimed at interpreting the Vedas. Mīmāṃsā is really but a continuation of the Brāhmaṇas; it is not a philosophy, but a symbology of ritualism. For it, the source of all knowledge are the Vedas, which are existing 'ab aeterno'. The sacrifice is all in all, and Mīmāṃsā denies the existence of a creating God and maintains that the Vedic gods are mere names, mentioned only as an invitation to the sacrifice, which is valid in itself. The universe is real. The souls are bound to ceaseless transmigrations, from which only the sacrificial rite can free them through the complete destruction of karman.

Vedānta, on the contrary, is a complete monistic philosophy, reaching back to the Upaniṣads and giving rise to several most important schools in the Middle Ages, when it became by far the most important school of Indian thought. In early Vedānta the only reality is the ātman or brahman, who is ineffable and indefinable. The world is but a mirage and has no existence of its own. Of course the central problem (as in all monism) is to explain the relation existing between the absolute and the phenomenal world. And thus in later developments this monism came to be understood in various forms and nuances, which cannot concern us here. In its earliest aspects Vedānta is identical with the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and of the Bhagavadgītā, of which we have spoken already. At a later date its central text became the Brahma-sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa (third century AD); but they are only the mnem-
onic phrases (and sometimes single isolated catchwords, now incomprehensible) of an oral tradition that has been lost, and thus lend themselves to any sort of interpretation. The classical Vedānta, as a complete system, begins only with Śaṅkara (c.788–820), and thus its description cannot be included in this volume.

In addition to the six darśanas, minor trends of thought also existed. Such were the materialistic, agnostic, and fatalistic currents, survivals from the previous period. Then there were the philosophical theories of the grammarians about word and sound (śabda), and the speculations of the medical schools on microcosm and macrocosm; as we had occasion to point out elsewhere, Indian medicine had developed a well-balanced pneumatic theory.

Jainism was always a very conservative creed, and this prevented its expansion, but enabled it to survive in India to the present day. There was no noteworthy doctrinal evolution. What controversies there were, took place around minor points of discipline. Thus the results of the Pāṭaliputra council of the third century bc were not accepted by a part of the community, which under the guidance of Bhadrabāhu had taken refuge in the far south because of a long-protracted famine. Afterwards (first century AD) this led to a partition of the community which has lasted to this day. The followers of Śthūlabhadra and of the Pāṭaliputra council became the śvetāmbaras, wearing white robes. The descendants of the dissidents led by Bhadrabāhu became the Digambara, who wore no clothes at all (but later they had to abandon this peculiarity), and denied the authenticity of the texts of the other sect; the other points of difference were unimportant. Afterwards (fifth century AD) the śvetāmbaras codified their tradition in a canon (āgama) written in Ardhamāgadhī, a Prakrit dialect. The original texts, the purva (Skr. pūrva), being transmitted orally, were gradually lost, and the canon of the fifth century consisted of 12 āṅga (main texts), 5 upāṅga (Skr. upāṅga; subsidiary texts), 10 painna (Skr. prakārṇaka, i.e. varia) and 6 cheyasutta (Skr. chedasūtra), mainly on ritual. The Digambaras have no canon and rely on systematic treatises of a later period.

The case of Buddhism is quite different. It manifested quite early a lively intellectual activity and a capacity for change and adaptation, which made it a missionary creed and thus a world religion. A few of the early sects maintained their individuality and carried out a good deal of doctrinal and missionary activity (chiefly in central Asia) even in the Gupta period. Such were the Sarvāstivādin and the Sammitiya. But the most important of them were the Theravādin, who passed nearly unchanged through the ages with a conservative capacity which reminds one of Jainism. Having taken definite shape as far back as the third century bc, the sect spread to several regions of India, where it flourished for a long period; its limitation to Ceylon belongs to a later age. Theravāda doctrine remained very near to early Buddhism. It based itself on the theory of the twelvefold causal nexus (pratītya-samut-pāda), which describes the flowing of thought from one
experience to the next. The recognition of this process allows it to be stopped and to realize nirvāṇa. There is no Self. Human personality is but a compound of five ingredients (skandha): corporeity (rūpa), perception (vedanā), sensation (sāṃjñā), psychic coefficients (sāṃskāra; the traces left by the former karmā, which influence the character and disposition of man), and conscience (vījñāna). Here the problem presents itself: who is the sufferer of the consequences of karmā, if no self exists? This question was hotly debated by the various schools, but was more circumvented than solved by Theravāda. The great systematizer of Ceylonese Theravāda was Buddhaghoṣa (fifth century), a most fertile commentator, but not an original thinker. We can here only mention in passing the doctrinal activity of the Sarvāstivādin, which culminated in a magnum opus, the Abhidharmakośa of the younger Vasubandhu (c. AD 400—480?).

In a manner largely independent (as it seems) of the old school and their philosophical interests, a quite new way of looking at the Buddha and at the central points of his teaching came into being and formed the base for a development of Buddhism which is called the Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna). This is first adumbrated in the apodeictic statements of the Prajñāpāramitā literature, around the beginning of our era or even earlier. These works explained and propounded the need of, and the means of attaining, the highest degree (pāramitā) of a particular virtue. There were at first six of them: liberality (dāna), righteousness (śīla), endurance (ksānti), mental energy (vīrya), mental concentration (dhyāna), intelligence (prajñā). Later on four others were added. These supreme perfections of virtue are a necessary requisite for the attainment of Buddhahood. This was the core of Mahāyāna ethic.

But even more important were some dialectical elements included in the Prajñāpāramitā literature, to which a systematic elaboration was first given by Nāgārjuna, a rather mysterious personality who lived probably in the second century AD. His system, the Madhyamika (Middle One), consists in the consequent and pitiless ‘reductio ad absurdum’ of all existence, by means of a logical process. Nāgārjuna shows that no thing is existent ‘per se’; it exists only in so far as it can be brought into relation with other things. Its individuality is imaginary, conventional, apparent (sannvrtti); every thing is void (śunya), i.e. relative. 4 True knowledge is only that one which discovers the supreme identity beyond all opposites; in this identity sāṃsāra and Buddha are equivalent. Even thought itself is destroyed.

The Madhyamika position was carried one step farther by the Vijñānavādin or Yogācāra school, whose main representatives were Asaṅga and his brother Vasubandhu the elder (fourth century). According to them, the ultimate reality is not the destruction of thought, but thought itself, the absolute and luminous cosmic conscience. It is ālaya-vijñāna, the ‘store-knowledge’ from which, through a spontaneous manifestation, the individual series or chains of thought arise. This thought is not relative, it is creative. Things are but a
non-real projection of pure subjectivity; the latter is void (śūnya), not in itself, but in relation with its mode of manifestation, i.e. with its dichotomy of subject and object.

Thus Mahāyāna not only rejected the self, like the earlier schools, but also negated the reality of the universe and the existence of God. This was done by the processes of an ever-perfected and refined logic, of which the most famous master was Dāṇḍaka (c.470–530).

Mahāyāna not only developed an original philosophy; it became differentiated from the earlier schools and chiefly from Theravāda also on practical grounds, which can be polarized around two main problems. One was the aim of the Buddhist monk. For Theravāda it is the old goal of the arhat, i.e. of the man who obtains illumination and consequently enters nirvāṇa, being thus extinguished. For Mahāyāna it is the bodhisattva, i.e. the man who has obtained illumination and could enter nirvāṇa, but does not; out of compassion (karunā) for the other things he delays this final act and remains in the saṃsāra in order to lead others on the same path by his teaching and example—a fine and novel conception, to which non-Indian influence may have contributed to a certain degree. The other point of difference is the person of the Buddha. For the Theravāda he is the Master, the great Teacher, perhaps a super-man, but a man nonetheless. For Mahāyāna he becomes the symbol of the absolute; his historical figure fades away and gives place to his hypostasis, the Five Buddhas (Pañcatathāgata): Vairocana, Absobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amoghasiddhi, Amitābha, with a complex symbolism and a rigid but luxuriant iconography. From this beginning a bewildering Pantheon of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas developed, to which a solemn and rich cult was rendered with a colourful liturgy.

The followers of Mahāyāna claimed that theirs was the shortest way to release, and gave to their opponents (the Theravāda, Sarvāstivādin and cognate schools) the disparaging name of Little Vehicle (Hinayāna). Still, both belonged to the same faith; and in order to explain their coexistence, the theory of the double truth was invented in Mahāyāna circles. The Buddha’s revelation was on a twofold plane, a visible, conventional one (samyrtisatya) and a higher, absolute one (paramārtha-satya), Hinayāna corresponding to the former and Mahāyāna to the latter.

In the expansion of Buddhism in general and of Mahāyāna in particular a great role was played by the Kuśāna kingdom in the first centuries AD. With its tolerance and acceptance of all creeds, with the personal leanings of some kings (chiefly Kaniska) toward Buddhism, with its favourable geographic position astride the Hindu Kush, from the Syr-darya to the Ganges, it became the link between India and the outer world and the passage through which Buddhist missionaries brought their faith into central Asia. The oases north and south of the Tarim (Kucha, Karashahr, Kashgar, Khotan, Niya) became seats of flourishing schools both of Mahāyāna and of Hinayāna. Texts were translated and even compiled in the local Indo-European
languages (Kucheans and Karashahri, Khotanese Śaka). The central Asian communities in their turn played an all-important role in the introduction of Buddhism into China. The first missionaries to northern China came from the Tarim basin, and the prince of the early translators, Kumārajiva (344–413), was the son of an Indian minister; he was born in Kucha and studied in Kashmir, and was brought, rather against his will, from Kucha to China in 401. By the third century Buddhism had flourishing communities throughout China, and by the fifth century it was rapidly becoming the religion of the masses, especially in the north. In 372 Chinese monks first carried it to Korea, and thence it passed into Japan.

The expansion of Mahāyāna Buddhism in south-east Asia and Indonesia was not less imposing, although almost all the extant evidence refers to a later period and cannot be used here. In Greater India Mahāyāna was dominant; Hinayāna played a secondary role, but was seldom completely absent from the scene.

Foreign influences on Indian religious thought have been often supposed, but seldom demonstrated. One instance might be the Bodhisattva doctrine. The other may be a possible influence of the Gnostic schools of western Asia, penetrating in India through the Kusāna empire and giving birth toward the end of this epoch, to the Tantra movement. It is essentially the expression of the religious feeling of the lower classes and was absolutely esoteric in character. To put the case in the most general terms, it aimed at obtaining direct access to ultimate reality or pure consciousness by the medium of the latter's manifestations in the phenomenal world. These manifestations or ‘powers’ were represented mainly as feminine deities or symbols, and thus the Tantras largely resorted to a sexual symbolism even of crude aspects. This current was present in all the great religions of the time, Jainism excepted, and we have Viṣṇuite, Śīvaitc and Buddhist Tantras. But the chronology of this trend and the degree of its connexion (if any at all) with Gnostic thought are very debatable points.

3. PERSIA

We have already explained that the Arsacid kings of Parthia did not pursue a Zoroastrian religious policy of an exclusive kind. They inclined towards tolerance, and allowed syncretistic ideas. This was still their attitude towards religion in the first century AD, when the brother of Vologases I came to Rome in 63 and paraded the cult of Mithras. The last Arsacid kings showed more sympathy with the intolerance and exclusiveness of the Magi, and when they fell a similar tendency was shown by the first Sassanid king, Ardashir I, who came to the throne in 224. It was he who devised the idea of making Zoroastrianism a state religion.

But the implementation of this programme was for some time interrupted by the activity of Mani, the creator of a new religion. He was born in 215
of a family related to the Arsacids, and his father, Patek, had been a member of the Gnostic movement known as the 'Baptists'. It was said that his mission had been revealed to him by Parakletos (the Holy Spirit), whereby he became the Messenger or Apostle of Light, 'the seal of the Prophets'. This revelation was supposed to have taken place in 240–241, and it was at this time that he began his reforming propaganda. He claimed to be the last of the Apostles, after Adam, Buddha, and Christ, each of whom had been misunderstood by his successors and had revealed only a part of the Truth. When the twelfth millennium of the world's life was nearing its close, he proposed to reveal the Truth in its entirety. In reality he derived inspiration and ideas from each one of the prophets who had gone before him, or rather from the religions associated with those prophets, in the form which they had assumed after the lapse of time. In regard to Zoroastrianism, for instance, his system reflected the changes brought about by Zervanism, and also the influence of the Mithras cult, the priestly vestments of which were used in his ritual. But he also drew heavily on Gnostic doctrines. He maintained that human life was a temporary union of spirit and matter, good and evil, light and darkness. The human soul is a tiny particle of light, menaced, polluted, and made sickly by evil; but by means of the intellect it can recognize its own nature, attain salvation, and so contribute to the salvation of the God himself of which it is a part (the Saviour saved).

There are three basic ideas behind the religious reform of Mani (Manichaeanism). (1) Though other religions are directed essentially at specific and isolated groups of people, Mani's religion, which was designed to comprise and supersede the rest, was to be universal and also adaptable to the needs of individual nations (this gave rise to the various forms of Manichaeanism). (2) The new religion was to spread among the peoples by means of missionary work, begun by Mani himself and carried on by his disciples. (3) The faith must be established in writing, to prevent its essential portions being altered or distorted. To this end Mani published seven works: the first was the Shahbhuragan, dedicated to King Shahpuhr I (240–271), who had allowed him to preach the new faith in the belief that it might unify the thought of his people and bring their religions into a single whole (in 260 Mani accompanied his king on his campaign against Valerian); the others were the Living Evangelist, the Treasury of Life, the Tractatus, the Book of Secrets, the Book of Giants, and the Letters. To these should perhaps be added a Book of Conversations and Sermons and a work entitled Psalms and Prayers.

Mani also devised a complete soteriological cosmogony, partly based on earlier ideas. He conceived, for example, that the world's evolution had three stages. In the first the two eternal principles separated from each other: the principle of the Good or of the Father of Greatness (the Christian God the Father and the Mazdean Zerian), whose dominion was in the North, and in the South the principle of the Spirit of Darkness (corresponding to the Devil and to Ahriman). In the second stage the two principles mingled again, and
in the third they once more became separate. In the five dwellings of the God of the Good are intelligence, reason, thought, reflection, and will; and in the five abysses of the kingdom of Evil are the smoke which suffocates, the fire which devours, the wind which destroys, the water which poisons, and the darkness. Man passes through three processes which one after another give him some salvation; first, abstinence from many things, then a process of purification, and lastly worship of the divine being by prayer, fasting, and attendance at solemn feasts. The hierarchy of the faithful, in descending order, is composed of Apostles or Masters, Bishops, Priests, the Elect (who live a community life in temple-convents), and the Hearers or catechumens.

Among Mani's disciples Adda, Tomaso, and Herma were active in the East, Egypt, and Syria respectively, and it was largely due to their zealous missions that the religion made rapid ground. But it soon ran into serious difficulties as well. When Bahram I came to the Sassanid throne in 273 the Zoroastrian priests gained acceptance of their view that a state religion was essential. All output of art and literature had been in the hands of these priests, and they had been in charge of the interpretation of those sacred texts on which Persian culture was founded, as well as assuming decisive powers in social and legal matters. So it was of the first importance to them, materially as well as spiritually, that their own religion should be adopted by the state beyond all possibility of challenge. In their view there must be a single cult drawn up in accordance with ancient Persian tradition; and this was to be adopted by all without borrowings from outside. All religions which threatened to dissolve the religious unity of the empire must be stamped out, whereas Mani's policy would have brought such religions into a larger synthesis and so kept them alive. Mani was imprisoned and then martyred, his body being polluted and dismembered; and about twenty years later, in 297, his faith was for the first time persecuted in the Roman world as well, upon orders from Diocletian. Zoroastrianism as a state religion became one of the main principles of government for several of the later Sassanids, such as Hormizd, and the first three Bahram rulers. It was not in fact a pure form of Zoroastrianism. Some place was allowed to other deities of regional importance, such as Mihir (or Mithra), Anahita, Bahram, Adur, and Bedwxt, their introduction being due to Mani's great enemy Kartër, who was both chief Magus of Ahura Mazda and priest of the Fire. There were of course gradual stages in the process by which the Sassanids imposed a state religion and began to persecute others: for example, the Christians were still tolerated in the days of Hormizd II (302–309), but were persecuted under Shahpuhr II (309–379). But political reasons were in part responsible for this. In the interval Christianity had become the official religion of the Roman empire, and its adherents were seen as the supporters of a power which was Persia's enemy. Later on, when Yezdegert I (395–420) inclined to a policy of tolerance once more, he acquired the reputation of being a thoroughly wicked ruler.
4. RELIGION IN ROMAN IMPERIAL TIMES

During the imperial period the protocol of services connected with the official cult, on the lines laid down by Augustus, became increasingly different from the practices of personal religion. At Rome the priests both of the imperial cult and of the numerous miscellaneous divinities continued to perform their ceremonies, and the ever-increasing number of festivals in honour of these gods were held as before. There was the same regularity of ceremonies in the provinces, at any rate as long as the economic situation permitted. There they were carried out by the priests of the cult of Dea Roma and the deified emperors,\textsuperscript{6} to whom temples were set up in the chief cities, such as Ephesus, Miletus, Smyrna, or Lugdunum.\textsuperscript{7} Once a year a principal celebration was held in capital towns, to which delegates from all over the province came to sacrifice and so to attest their loyalty to Rome and the empire. To provide evidence of its loyalty every city would erect its own temple to Juppiter Maximus, the guardian of Rome, and every colony had its Capitolium in imitation of that in the metropolis.

In its own turn the Roman government would intervene to protect the most famous homes of the traditional cults in provincial cities, or to preserve and improve religious organizations. In Greece, for example, they modernized the Delphic Amphictiony, and also created the synedrion of Zeus Panhellenius with its seat at Athens.

But none of this was more than a formal demonstration of political loyalty and respect for tradition.\textsuperscript{8} It did little to touch the minds of either citizens or subjects, both of whom attended to such functions either because they were compelled or because they thought it was in their interest to do so.\textsuperscript{9} In every part of the empire, especially in the West, it was not really the official cults which were of serious interest to individuals so much as the old divinities which had been worshipped by their fathers: some of these retained their original names and cult practices, others had altered as the result of syncretism. Moreover some of the ancient shrines still survived and continued to draw their devotees. The people of Latium, for example, continued to worship Silvanus as their principal deity,\textsuperscript{10} as well as Juppiter and Hercules, and they still flocked to the temples of Lavinium, Antium, Aricia, Praeneste, and Tibur. In Gaul (as in north Italy, Britain and Spain), many native gods were worshipped, not only under their syncretistic names of Mars and Apollo, but under the names they bore of old, such as Teutates, Caturix, Dunatis, Rigismus (all these identified with Mars), or Boruo, Grannus, Siannus, and other names which were embraced under the single figure of Apollo.\textsuperscript{11}

While, however, these primitive native cults retained local importance in the West, being mainly worshipped by soldiers and traders abroad, there were quite a number of Eastern cults which had much more potentiality for expansion. Not only had they many more means of entry to various parts of
the empire, being carried by slaves, itinerant priests, Chaldeans, and the like, as well as by soldiers and traders; even more important were the attractive features of their ritual and the satisfaction they gave to the intimate longings of their catechumens. Many indeed were simply drawn to them by impressive and theatrical ceremonial of an orgiastic kind, which could even excite a state of ecstasy. Or again, there were mysterious performances in ‘mime’, depicting, for example, the death and resurrection of the god, or his entry to the underworld; and use was made of spectacular devices, such as play with lights, gorgeous clothing, or statues which spoke. There were miracle rites, such as healings, oracles, or divination; rites of violence, like the slaughter of bulls and rams or the drawing of entrails; and mystery rites like purification. Wild songs and dances would be performed, and many other means of attracting worshippers. Yet many came to these cults rather as a means of satisfying more exalted aspirations. They provided a direct relationship between worshippers and their gods, and gave tormented spirits a hope of attaining eternal happiness in another world. They proved the existence of everlasting life and the victory over misfortune and pain by pointing to the example of the dying and resurrected god. Finally they were addressed to all classes and all peoples, without any exclusiveness or differences of race and caste.

These cults, which attained their greatest diffusion and importance in the Severan period, were derived principally from Syria and adjacent areas. The divinities included Hadad of Heliopolis (Juppiter Heliopolitanus), Baal of Damascus (Juppiter Damascenus), Baal of Doliche in Commagene (Juppiter Dolichenus), Atargatis of Bambyece or Hierapolis (Dea Syria), Malakbal of Palmyra, and Baal of Emesa. This last was a nature god worshipped by Elagabalus, who celebrated his ritual marriage with the Carthaginian Tanit (Dea Caelestis). Besides these there were the cults of Teandrius and Manaf, which originated in Arabia; and a number of others were further consolidated, such as the Phrygian cults of Cybele and Attis which Claudius had brought in, or the Egyptian Isis and Osiris who received sanction from Caligula, and Serapis who was fully introduced by Caracalla. These forty years from the accession of Septimius Severus to the death of Severus Alexander, which we have described as the peak period, was one in which the rulers of Rome were Orientals or men with Eastern connections. It was at this time too that the syncretized cult of solar divinities acquired overriding importance in the religious ideas of individual emperors, a phenomenon which reached its climax under Aurelian half a century later. One such cult, that of Mithras, a divinity of Iranian origin, had entered Rome as early as Pompey’s day. He was God of Light and of the Sun, the ordainer of the world, and was identified with all the sun-gods of the classical world (Apollo, Helios, Jupiter, Serapis, and so on); but he became of paramount importance when the Babylonian conceptions of astronomy and astrology, after many thousand years of history, found new sponsors among the Chaldean pantheists and the
Stoics. For them the sun was the heart and life-giver of the macrocosm and of the microcosm too; for the human soul was a particle of the sun. As early as Septimius Severus’ reign the Augusta, Julia Domna, commissioned Philostratus to write a life of the mythical Apollonius of Tyana, priest of the Sun, a work which may be compared with the Gospels. Then Elagabalus, himself a Sun priest, tried to impose a monotheistic religion of the Sun on the empire, subordinating all other divine figures to his own god; and the same conception was carried on by Severus Alexander, who in his youth had been priest of the Sun at Emesa. But the solar cult with its syncretisms had also very great importance in the Balkan lands. If we can believe Origen, the emperor Maximinus Thrax regarded the sun as the Deus Maximus; and some time later Aurelian, whose mother was a priestess of the Sun, assumed the pontificate of this divinity himself and attempted to make his god the supreme god of the empire. This was a mirage which, even after the Christian faith had been victorious for so long, could still move the pagan soul of Macrobius when he composed his Saturnalia and his commentary on Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis in the full tide of the fifth century.

But for the more educated pagans the most attractive forms of religion were the more spiritual and refined ideas provided by the philosophers. Indeed apart from the atheistic Epicureans, who by C.A.D. 150 were decadent and kept at arm’s length, all schools liked to make a study of religious problems; and in so doing they moved continually nearer to one another, each doctrine taking on successive doses of contamination. The Platonists, and after them the Neoplatonists, attached great importance to the ‘demons’ which they interposed between God and the world. The Stoics, although they insisted on the moral purpose of human life, preached obedience to the fate laid down by the divinity which arranges and protects the cosmos. Similar tendencies were shown by the neo-Pythagoreans. All these philosophers inclined to belief in a supreme divinity, common to all peoples, who intervened in the life of nations and individuals through the intermediary of certain beings; and these beings were naturally identified with the numina of traditional religions, they in turn being syncretized on a variety of principles. It was also widely held by the philosophers that mystic surrender, profound feeling, and fervent faith could enable man to reach his God and obtain divine favour; and there was general belief in a divine providence, which came to the assistance of mankind and was often made manifest in miraculous ways.

The more lofty thinkers were studying the problem of intermediary beings and demonology from a philosophical and theological standpoint. But men who were more excited about practical results were comparing the conclusions of these theories with the old ideas about magic, miracle-working, and oracles. They claimed that a man who was initiated into divine secrets was enabled to be in communion with God, and they thus embarked on a fully-fledged doctrine, the so-called Pagan Gnosis, of ‘theurgy’ (occultism).
Chaldeans and their like, varying from inspired mystics to rascally busybodies, toured the world and approached people who were inclined to their own way of thinking. Their preaching and work was that of astrologers, magicians, and sorcerers; they laid claim to divine men’s thoughts and reveal secrets, to be learned in magic practices and understand the speech of animals, to heal sickness and avert cataclysms and plagues. In literature they have left their mark in Apuleius’ *Golden Ass* and in the fantastic life which Philostratus wrote about a genuine prototype of such people, namely Apollonius of Tyana. Under Constantine the philosopher Iamblichus wrote praises of the Chaldean Julianus, who had preached the ‘religion of the Fire’ in Marcus Aurelius’ day. Even the severe Neoplatonists who followed Plotinus, men like Porphyry and Iamblichus, put their trust in theurgy. They in their turn influenced the thought of Julian the Apostate.16

5. JUDAISM

After Pompey’s conquest and the loss of Jewish political independence pagan influence made headway even in Judaea; and as a reaction the most ardent forms of nationalism grew up, whose devotees at times attained a kind of religious and political exaltation. In addition the Jewish people were torn by other divisions, resulting from the formation of castes and parties which differed on the principles to be applied in interpreting the Law and on their attitude to the foreign ruler. The Sadducees were the highest priests, but their beliefs were rather conservative and in favour of an alliance with Parthia, and later of collaboration with the Romans. The Pharisees (‘separate’) were adherents of novel ethical ideas and ritual, and rigid observers of their interpretation of the Bible and oral tradition; they detested the Romans (though favouring peace) and jealously guarded any form of tradition belonging to the Chosen People.

But within Hebrew religion there existed another much deeper source of conflict, which can be observed in the sacred writings and at times gave rise to dramatic incidents and impressive dénouements. We refer here to the continuous struggle between ‘Legalism’ and ‘Prophetism’, the former term implying that scrupulous observance of a vast set of ordinances which is well known to us already, the latter the free response to an irresistible call from heaven to utter preaching, with the object of recalling one’s fellow-countrymen to the Lord’s service. Both these features are found in Judaism, and it is impossible to dwell on one at the expense of the other if one wants to have an exact conception of Jewish religion. Yet in the period preceding the teaching of Jesus, the adherents of ‘Prophetism’ were in religious and political opposition against the pro-Roman Jewish governments, while Legalism had gained the upper hand, and had become simply a set of external forms and an arid commentary on the Mosaic Law (we are told of 600 or more commandments or prohibitions collected by the Rabbis in their commentaries,
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so meticulous that any movement made by a devotee was in danger of being wrong). Apart from anything else the attitude involved a distortion of the Hebrew concept of religion, since the Law was not just a piece of legislation or set of statutes. The Law was the revelation of God’s will, to which the faithful must conform, and obedience to it meant fulfilment of the Covenant. So the Hebrew faith was less belief in a Truth than action in accordance with God’s word.

In recent years unexpected and unmistakable light has been cast on the state of Jewish religion by a series of fortunate discoveries in some caves in the Desert of Judah, a few miles from the north-west corner of the Dead Sea. Hidden in jars were documents of vast importance written on skins or papyrus in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek of the first century BC, and also some miscellaneous objects including coins. Even now the exploration of the district cannot be regarded as complete. We do not propose here to tell the exciting story of these discoveries or to attempt an analysis of the complex critical questions connected with them. The evidence is still too fluid, and not all the material has yet been edited. But it is essential to give a broad outline of some possible conclusions, following the close studies made by a number of scholars in this field, who have competed nobly with one another to further our understanding of the matter. The conclusions in question cannot be considered as absolutely definite, but they embrace what has become the consensus of opinion among many scholars. First we must catalogue the material at our disposal.

a. The Essenes

The existence and nature of the Essene sect have long been known from the evidence of Josephus, Philo, and Pliny, but the Dead Sea manuscripts and in particular the ‘Manual on Discipline’ (the rule of the community in question) have enabled us to penetrate the Essene world more deeply than before, and have made possible a better interpretation of other documents (the so-called Zadokite Fragments or Document of Damascus) which have been in our possession for a long time. The caves of Qumrân have also yielded several portions of the Bible, both in fragments and in entire books (in particular two copies of Isaiah and a number of parts of Daniel), which antedate by fully a thousand years the date of the earliest surviving Biblical manuscripts and, still more important, provide confirmation of the Masoretic text to which we referred in an earlier chapter. These copies also advance the possibilities of solving certain delicate questions concerning the authorship of these works and their dates of composition. Among the manuscripts were found several other religious texts of a non-canonical or apocryphal kind, which formed part of a single specialized library; and at another site, Murabba’at, there have emerged some historical documents, together with letters and contracts, which though interesting in themselves are of less value for our purposes here. Finally, the discovery of the documents
must be related to excavations undertaken on sites near the caves, which have revealed the existence of a collective settlement, similar to a monastery (including a dining-hall, scriptorium, and reservoirs for water), and also its cemetery, where about a thousand bodies were buried, belonging to men and women between the ages of 20 and 50. We have enough, therefore, to indicate the life and organization of a religious community which was created against a Jewish background and drew on the spiritual heritage of Judaism, but which was governed by its own rules and was in fairly open opposition to the official representatives of the Jewish nation. From its rise to its tragic end we can reconstruct the stages of this historical phenomenon and outline the ideals of those who inspired it, even though we cannot yet exactly identify the meaning of certain figures (such as the ‘Master of Justice’) nor always understand the reasons for some of the decisions the community took.

From the time of the Seleucid attacks on the Jews and the profanation of the Temple certain small groups became detached from the rest of the people. Their aim was to avoid contact with the infidel, and to enter upon a more perfect form of life, in full observance of God’s precepts. Among them there may have been descendants of ancient priestly families (the ‘sons of Zadok’, tracing their ancestry to a priest of the time of David and Solomon), who claimed to be the authentic guardians of Israel’s Covenant with God and regarded Hellenizers and followers of the Maccabees with equal detestation, believing that the latter no less than the former were to blame for forfeiting the rights of the nation’s true High Priest. Even when conditions in the country took a general turn for the better, these groups remained hostile to the new order and transformed themselves into regular sects included under the generic term ‘the Faithful of the New Covenant’. The organization they built for themselves has been described for us in the Document of Damascus; and some of the writings found in the Judah desert (such as the War of the Children of Light against the Children of Darkness, the Hymns of Thanksgiving, and various commentaries on the Bible) are typical of the literature which emerged from the charged atmosphere of religious exaltation surrounding this community. In contrast to the ‘Wicked Priest’ or ‘Father of Lies’, the members of the Covenant took as their hero the ‘Master of Justice’, the holy priest who was the legitimate heir of the Jewish religious reformers. He had been persecuted by the wicked, but was followed with enthusiasm by all those who had listened to his words and understood the commandments of Moses and the Master’s revelations concerning the Law. Very varied interpretations of this personage have been proposed, and he can still be fixed anywhere within a time-span of at least a hundred years (171–65 BC). But at all events it is certain that the author of the Commentary (or perhaps one should say Exegesis) on Habakkuk depicted this figure of the ‘Master of Justice’ with the prime intention of establishing the antithesis between the true and the false follower of the Covenant, between the legitimate beneficiary and the usurper,
Very similar to the one just described, and of the same date, was the 'Essene' movement: the word is of uncertain and much disputed etymology, and may mean 'saints' or 'silent monks' or 'healers'. We have argued that there was an Essene sect in the monastery recently discovered at Qumrân. About the rule there in force we are given minute information in the Manual on Discipline, where the regulations and forms of expression are very similar to those contained in the Document of Damascus. We see too that these monastic communities had reached an advanced stage of development. They required of their adherents complete detachment from the world, total sharing of property, celibacy, and meticulous observance of community regulations, which by now had become remarkably complicated and exacting. The ideal set before candidates for admission to the monastery was that they should seek God through obedience to his Law and should therefore return to the spirit and letter of the purest Mosaic system. This programme required that God for his part should choose his elect and give them his grace, but that the Children of Light in their turn should undertake to follow a plan of life requiring the practice of many virtues, with the discharge of various cult acts, submission to recognized superiors, and obedience to a series of precepts. A 'postulant' after a certain lapse of time would become a novice for two years, then there followed an examination and an admission ceremony, conducted with a solemn liturgy. The community was ruled by a hierarchy of senior persons, including a president, an inspector of work who was also the treasurer, a council of fifteen, and a priest at the head of each group of ten laymen; but the various sections of the Manual are not self-consistent on this subject. There were plenary meetings, at which many matters affecting the community life were discussed and decided by majority vote. Transgressions were punished according to the gravity of the offence by penalties ranging from expulsion to deprivation of a part of the offender's food: about thirty such offences are catalogued in the Manual, from lying to unseemly conduct, from fraud to the maintenance of a vendetta, and from yawning at meetings to grumbling about one's fellow-members. Nothing is ever said about regular sacrifices: indeed we are told that expiation of sin and giving pleasure to God are worth more than the flesh of victims. It was compulsory to anoint oneself with lustral water, to confess all sins, to take baths, and to wear white clothing. But although ritual purity is urged most strongly, it was none the less recognized that cleanliness without avails nothing unless there is health within.

But much more than by these and similar details the community of the Covenant was characterized by two features, which are made clear by the nature of the works composed in the monastery of Qumrân or incorporated into its library. One was the deliberate intention of preserving the group as an association of sacerdotal type: the 'Sons of Aaron' (or priests) have a place apart and are always given primacy, while the faithful are constantly called upon to protect the legitimacy of the chief religious office. The second
feature is the definite eschatological outlook imposed on the initiates in every department of their lives. Two forces, Good and Evil, are believed to affect mankind, and there is constant appeal to the eternal struggle between good and evil men, which is made the criterion for measuring and evaluating all present and past history and for drawing salutary lessons therefrom.

It was precisely the Sons of Darkness, the ‘Kittim’ (a term used generally for foreign peoples and nations, but applied particularly, in certain specific contexts, to the Romans), who after having seemed so menacing to the writer of the Habakkuk commentary in 65 BC eventually brought about the ruin of the community of Qumrân. During the terrible Jewish War which ended with the destruction of Jerusalem even the remote site in the desert near the Dead Sea was invested by Vespasian’s troops in May of AD 68; and the powerful building, within which a few fanatics may have attempted resistance, was destroyed. Yet its cultural heritage had been placed in safety before it was too late, collected into the jars which were hidden in almost inaccessible caves and destined to preserve the material for many centuries. Today, by a series of chances, the treasure has reappeared. It illustrates for us a singular aspect of late Hebrew religious thought and practice, though it provides specialists with a number of disturbing problems.

One of the most difficult of these, undoubtedly, concerns the eventual relationship between the Qumrân community and early Christianity. No full treatment of this question is possible here, much less a definitive answer, but this much may be said. The religious life of this sect on the Dead Sea was certainly on a high level. But no one of their writings is free from the Old Testament system: there is as yet nothing which foreshadows the message of Jesus, or which gives a picture of the personality and work of a Saviour who is at once human and divine. Yet this last is of the essence of the Christian Gospel.

b. Messianic Thought

A description of Hebrew religion is not complete without a few words on Messianic doctrine, one of the most interesting features as we come near to the Christian period. We need hardly say that the Hebrew concept of the Messiah was not consistent or unchanging. Moreover the evidence on this subject comes less from the Bible than from extra-canonical literature of the second century BC and later, literature which is not easy to interpret on account of the obscurity of its concepts and definitions. ‘Messiah’ is the transcription of a Hebrew word meaning ‘Anointed’, and it originally meant someone holy, a king or a priest or one of those who had a relationship with God. When the Hebrews first lost their independence in the Babylonian Captivity, they centred all their hopes on a better future and so gave the Messianic ideal a definite content, in that they looked forward to the reign of David and to the coming of an era of prosperity and power. At the basis of their hopes were national pride and hatred of the foreigner. But the Messianic idea
was not just political: it was also an expression of "a hunger and thirst after righteousness", and it involved the implementation of the Covenant hallowed between God and Israel. The essential point of this matter was a feeling that the Messiah must be something more than a man. He had to give full realization to the rule of the Law on earth, to restore the power of the Hebrews, and to subdue the Gentiles; for the Gentiles, being heathens, did not believe in the true God and did not practise righteousness. In this connexion we meet the word 'Saviour' in a number of writings, and this was in the future a typical Christian expression. But as yet it had a very worldly and material connotation, and we never find the claim that the Messiah is to be a victim to expiate sin. The Hebrews found it repellent and untenable to say that God's Elect, a man charged with a special mission and destined to restore glory to Israel, could be a man despised and, to all appearance, defeated.

In the course of the first century BC the expectation of a Messiah was spasmodic and fitful. Political conditions became more unhappy, and numerous false Messiahs arose, finding a large following among the people, and evoking currents of fanaticism. The Evangelists, among others, tell us how anxiously Jesus' contemporaries sought to know who was the Messiah, where he was operating, and what his task might be. In fact a variety of evidence makes it easy to see that in the religious sphere confusion and trouble were the rule in Palestine, and that this situation was responsible for the number of apocalyptic visions concerning the Kingdom of God. In those conditions any adventurer could achieve success, but the soil was also well prepared for genuine and earnest preaching of repentance and reform such as was brought by Christianity.

Certain historical facts remain to be added. When Jesus was born Judaea had a king of its own, namely Herod I, who was governing under Roman protection. Being a foreigner (an Idumaean), he sought to gain the favour of the Jewish people by rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem and by restoring the political unity of the area. In fact he was not a man without stature and sense of greatness, though he lacked moderation: he put three of his sons to death, but divided his kingdom among the remaining three. Herod died in the month of Nisan of 4 BC (but after the birth of Jesus, as we shall see later), and was succeeded by Archelaus, who attempted to gain the goodwill of Augustus and was rewarded with the title of Ethnarch. But after ruling for ten years he was deposed in response to general protests and was exiled to Vienna in Gaul. Meanwhile there had been a continual series of rebellions, and Varus, legate of Syria, was compelled to intervene with two legions. The Roman authorities showed extreme severity in the restoration of order, and then entrusted power to an equestrian procurator, who resided at Caesarea but came frequently to Jerusalem and stayed there for considerable periods. Even from non-Christian sources (Josephus) we know that one of these procurators, Pilate, was cruel and suspicious and that his contemptuous behaviour exasperated the Jews. Nor was there anything much to be hoped
for from an appeal to the procurator’s superiors, either to the legate at Antioch, who intervened only in extreme circumstances, or to ‘Caesar’ (the emperor) himself, seeing that approach direct to him was a lengthy process of uncertain outcome. An understanding of this situation throws light on many events in the history of early Christianity and on certain attitudes of political principle adopted in this period. To obtain this understanding we must give the historical phenomenon we have been discussing a more central place than it normally receives in any general picture of the Jewish state and society at the beginning of our era.

c. Relations between the Roman Government and Jewish Monotheism

The early history of Christianity and of its relations with the Roman state may be traced more clearly if we preface it with some similar evidence about the profession of Judaism.

It was explained earlier that at the outset, despite the conflict between Jewish monotheism and official polytheism, the Roman government tolerated the profession of Judaism by those who were Jews by birth, but prohibited it among Roman citizens who attempted to become Jewish converts. Under different periods of the empire this policy was often modified, especially when rulers were in power who exacted a greater degree of adherence to the imperial cult.

Augustus attempted to avoid friction, and endeavoured on the whole to maintain the friendship which had prevailed between Julius Caesar and the Palestine and Diaspora Jewries. He was satisfied if the Jews made sacrifices to Yahweh for the emperor’s safety and sent the emperor a present from time to time; meanwhile every Jew was allowed to send the traditional ‘didrachm’ to the Temple at Jerusalem, and the regular Sabbath meetings were tolerated. But the first troubles began at Rome, and in Palestine and Egypt, as early as Tiberius’ reign, resulting from the love of autonomy and the refusal of the Jews to stop proselytizing. An enquiry in AD 19 revealed that the number of these catechumens was at least 4,000, and all who refused to recant were punished. The able-bodied among them were sent to Sardinia to fight the mountain brigands, and the remainder went into exile.

Claudius restored full liberty for the Jewish cult at Rome. But the resulting influx of Jews to the city and the revival of proselytizing decided him to institute new measures as early as 41. These were postponed for some while, but a few years later there were riots among the Jews ‘impulsore Chresto’. These words of Suetonius imply quarrels between traditionalist Jews and the Christians who were removing themselves from the synagogues. The emperor’s answer, in 49, was to banish the Jews from the capital.

In Nero’s reign the Jews of the mother country revolted and the great war was declared. Rome under the leadership of Vespasian and Titus took Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple, but such Jews as had remained pro-Roman, or even had not resisted to the last, were given favourable treatment.
One reason for this was that the Jews of Alexandria had taken part in proclaiming Vespasian emperor. They were allowed to continue professing their national religion, and certain noble Jews were enabled to conduct a school for religious instruction on an imperial estate at Jamnia. Other persons, like the historian Flavius Josephus or King Agrippa and his family, could migrate to Rome and enjoy prestige and power: Agrippa’s sister Berenice lived for several years with Titus, the heir to the throne, as if she were his wife. At the same time the cult was given a number of general regulations; and after the fall of the Temple the customary didrachm had to be paid to the temple of Juppiter Capitolinus as a capitation tax on the Jewish race.

The Jews naturally used the relaxation of tension as an opportunity to resume proselytizing, and they eventually succeeded in converting certain members of the imperial house, such as the emperor Domitian’s cousins Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla, to whose sons the ‘dominus’ was intending to leave his throne. Domitian had never approved of his father’s lenient policy towards the Jews, and still less of Titus’ toleration of political interference by Berenice and her family. He therefore now reacted by persecuting the new converts (this is the event which has been mistakenly called Domitian’s persecution of the Christians), and by extreme severity in the collection of the fiscus Iudaicus, under which a personal examination could be made to identify those who attempted to evade it.

A new and important clash occurred under Trajan, when the communities of Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus, and a Palestinian minority rose against Roman rule to assist their co-religionists in Parthia in their fight against the Roman invaders. Against Hadrian all Palestinian Jewry revolted under Bar-Kochba (AD 132–135) when the emperor had taken measures against circumcision, planted a colony at Jerusalem, and given orders for the erection of a temple of Juppiter Capitolinus there. After their defeat Jews were forbidden to set foot in their former holy city; and there were prohibitions both on circumcision and on the study and observance of the Law.

But all these interdicts were lifted as early as the reign of Antoninus Pius. Two centuries later the emperor Julian (‘the Apostate’) allowed the rebuilding of the Temple, but the work was arrested by his death. Before the end of the fourth century, in the reign of Theodosius I, legal and economic restrictions at the expense of the Jews were beginning once more.

6. THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

a. Jesus and His Work

It is impossible to write a life of Jesus which conforms to modern conceptions of history. Very little about him can be established with any precision, since the earliest writers to concern themselves with reporting his actions and behaviour did not have interests which were strictly ‘historical’ in the modern sense of that word. They were simply trying to collect those sayings
of their Master and those episodes in his life which contributed most to the proof they were offering of the nature and purpose of his mission, centring their collection around certain main themes and following the literary conventions of their times.

We need not enter upon the endless discussions to which the chronology of the life of Jesus has given rise: we can remain satisfied if we obtain a fair approximation about the dates of his birth and death, and about the start and duration of his preaching. His birth may be set at the end of the Roman year 748 or 6 BC, the discrepancy being due to a well-known arithmetical error made by Dionysius the Less in trying to reconcile two accounts. The beginning of Jesus' preaching very probably followed the news of the Baptist's imprisonment. That would be when Jesus was aged 32 or 33, and the period of his public ministry was brief (two years and a few months at most), divided into two main phases with a crisis, involving the defection of many followers, coming in between. In the early period Jesus preached in Galilee and achieved astonishing successes. He healed a number of sick people, pronounced the famous Sermon on the Mount, and made use chiefly of parables to explain his thinking. He had no fixed headquarters, but moved about from one district to another, accompanied by his Apostles, whom he was educating in preparation for more important tasks.

In the second period the scene changes completely. Jesus moved to Judaea, the home of his chief enemies, who had decided that he was dangerous and were skilfully preparing a coup which would destroy him. In the end they were successful in having him convicted of sedition against the Roman power and in obtaining a sentence of death—a matter which was within the competence of the procurator alone, if he was resident at Jerusalem. The execution was carried out at a place called Golgotha, near the city, on the 14th of the month Nisan (roughly identical with our March), probably in the year AD 30.

Various formulae have been used to define the specific content of Jesus' teaching. Some have claimed the point of substance to have been his announcement that he was the Son of God and that God must be worshipped in truth and spirit, independently of any ecclesiastical ordinance. Others have spoken of Jesus as exclusively concerned with 'soteriology', the salvation of the individual human soul. Others again have regarded him as a preacher who was convinced that the end of the world was at hand: this school has given a narrowly eschatological interpretation to his pronouncements, and has consequently had to suppose that the Church was a device substituted by the disciples when they became convinced that their Master's visions had come to nothing. Finally there have been those who have evaluated Jesus' message simply in terms of the political problems of his day, seeing it as an assertion of the rights of the lower classes, or a manifesto in the class war, a message which was very soon deserted and twisted into something quite different. There are those too who deny him practically all claim to originality
and reduce the content of his work to ideas, beliefs, and practices already current in his day. Evidence for this view is thought to emerge when the few pages of text containing fundamental Christian doctrine are taken apart piece by piece, the texts themselves being allegedly nothing more than the result of a vast and complicated series of conspiracies and frauds.

What is genuinely novel in the words of Jesus is his definition of the relation between God and man, obtained through the revelation of a majestic plan from the mind of God, which comprised Creation and Redemption, Salvation and the final Glory. From man he demanded a response to the call through a life of faith and good works, together with a confident surrender to celestial providence and detachment from engrossing worldly cares. This explains his insistent invitation to repentance and conversion (metanoia, which means 'change of mind'), on the ground that the Kingdom of God is at hand. It explains too his precise assertions about the importance of his own person as the pivot of the new system and as the initiation of a period in history which would never come to an end in terms of time. In this way the national exclusiveness of the Jews was overcome by means of a spiritual interpretation of the promises made by God to his people. The old Covenant was replaced by a new one, open to any man who had faith in the Lord and his Messiah.

Yet one must at once add that, although Jesus preached penitence and transferred the central interest of human life to an existence after death, his was not the bitter form of asceticism which denies temporal values and contests the significance of society and of economic facts. We can see the contrary in his own conduct, so generous towards men's material needs, so unaffected in face of natural things, and so ready to share the aspirations of his people. The same appears in his words. In the new table of the Law (the Sermon on the Mount) he insists on renunciation and sacrifice, but in his teaching couples this with charity, with a lively appreciation of the brotherhood of Man, and with a communion of souls which allows all external differences to be overcome. Lastly, there appears most vividly in Jesus' words an echo of the revolt of a pure and noble spirit against all the formalism and hypocrisy which governs social intercourse. We see his contempt for the casuistries which smother the impulses of men's hearts and distort their sincere intentions of doing good. In short he gives us the highest possible ideal of individual and collective morality, and presents it by enunciating a few clear principles. These are personified in himself as a living model of goodness such as has very rarely been encountered in the history of the world.

It is this reason—the historical facts about its founder—which radically distinguishes the religion founded by Jesus from other religions current at that time, although it is clearly to be classified among the mystery religions on account of its charter of salvation and its initiatory rites. In the religion of Jesus faith rests above all on adherence to a person known to have really
existed and does not depend on some mythical personage. Moreover other mystery religions aimed at a physical union with God, an assimilation of the body achieved by various formal acts. Jesus, however, required in a special manner a transformation within, a purification of the heart. His response was to change the lives of individuals and of all mankind by regulating every action in accordance with the law of Love, and by making motive rather than achievement the test of an action's moral quality. This led Jesus to display great understanding even towards sinners (and he has been blamed on this account), but, even more important, it helped to reaffirm the superiority of spiritual values above the chance nature of external circumstances.

b. The Christian Apostolate

Although the Apostles were Galileans, they remained at Jerusalem even after Jesus' death, and the life of the young community felt itself dominated by two stupendous facts, the resurrection of their Master and the descent of the Holy Spirit on the first faithful band. To testify to what they had seen and to what they firmly believed, the Apostles began that course of preaching of which the Acts have given us a number of examples. The speeches of Peter reported there are obviously not a literal repetition of his words, but in their archaic Semitic style and the simplicity of the ideas presented they reflect a very early phase in the evolution of Christian thought. In this oral teaching very cautious formulae were used on the subject of Jesus: none the less Peter and the rest were several times summoned before the Sanhedrin to account for their statements. The hostility of the Jews to the followers of the new religion became increasingly implacable; and Herod Agrippa too, in order to please the Jews, took savage measures against the sect, including the execution of James (the Greater) and the imprisonment of Peter. In consequence there was a ready wish to break up the closed circle living at Jerusalem and to achieve greater success through settlement elsewhere. James 'the brother of the Lord' remained behind, but the centre of the movement was shifted to Antioch in Syria; and it was in that city that its adherents were first called 'Christians'. Linguistically the term is a curious one, because its suffix is Latin, rather than Greek as one would have expected from the place where the word originated ('Christioi' or 'Christikoi' would have been more natural). The suffix -anus means clientship, sonship, or adherence.

Evidence from the Acts itself is explicit in showing that internal conflicts had arisen between the various racial groups comprised within the community at Jerusalem, and that the new movement was becoming involved in the nationalistic and social disturbances which were provoked in the area by discontent at the inadequate government conducted by Roman officials. The Galileans were joined by portions of families which had earlier emigrated to Asia Minor and Egypt but had then returned to Jerusalem. These 'Hellenists', as they were generically called, were ignored by the Jewish Christian leaders
and put up a protest. The outcome was a general meeting, at which the Apostles declared that they were unwilling to be concerned any longer with administrative duties, since their sole task ought to be preaching and divine services. They therefore invited the whole meeting to choose seven learned and devout persons to undertake works of charity, and on the adoption of this proposal seven deacons were chosen, all of them with Greek names, a circumstance which suggests that the Hellenizing party had gained the upper hand. Among these deacons the first, named Stephen, deserves particular mention. He was stoned to death as the result of popular fury in AD 36, after an inspired speech on the divinity of Jesus; and one of those who was present and who took part in the stoning was Saul, a person upon whom all our attention must now be centred on account of the exceptional importance he later assumed in events related to Christian history.

The evidence about Saul’s life is drawn from autobiographical notes of a particularly graphic kind in the Pauline Epistles, and from information contained in the Acts of the Apostles. He was born at Tarsus, an important city in Cilicia, in the first years of the Christian era, and belonged to a Jewish family of the tribe of Benjamin; but his father had obtained Roman citizenship, and this was later to be of value to the son at appropriate moments. He had a profitable career open to him and was therefore given a serious education as a boy, entering the school of the celebrated Rabbi Gamaliel. Being zealous in the observance of the Mosaic Law (a Pharisee) he entered with enthusiasm into the attack on the Christians; but while he was on a journey to Damascus to carry orders for pursuing the persecution, he saw a vision and was converted. For three years he lived in the desert, then he made contact with Peter and the rest, after which Barnabas took him to Antioch. He now called himself Paul (his Roman cognomen), and carried out various apostolic journeys, in the course of which he visited Cyprus, the Troad, Macedonia, Greece, and Ephesus, often coming into conflict with the Jews. About AD 58 he returned to Jerusalem and was the cause of so serious a riot that he was put in prison and kept there for two years, during which time he continued to expound the Christian doctrine, including persons of high station among his audience. Finally this same Paul appealed to Caesar (the emperor), perhaps because he wanted some means of being transported to Rome and visiting the community there, which for long he had been anxious to get to know. We have little information about the rest of his life, but it is certain that later on he suffered martyrdom in Rome itself, the sentence being carried out by beheading in view of his citizen status.

Thirteen Pauline letters of varying length and importance have come down to us, all composed in the course of a dozen years (53–65) and addressed both to communities and to individual members of the faith. They have given rise to many arguments concerning their authenticity, their doctrinal content, the extent of their author’s influence on the religious environment of his day, and the degree of novelty he imported into the Apostolic teaching.
For our purposes it is enough to indicate the main lines of his thought, remembering at the same time that he proclaimed himself throughout to be Christ’s minister and that consequently, so far from supposing a conflict between the two, we ought to recognize a continuity of ideas. Paul should be regarded as the most intelligent, the most devoted, and the most enthusiastic among the servants of his predecessor.

In Paul’s judgement God’s plan for the world rests on two main pillars, the sin of Adam, first ancestor of mankind, and the Redemption of Christ, the new Adam who in his person comprises all humanity. The sacrifice on the Cross was therefore the pivot of the whole order of relations between God and man: though a stumbling-block to the Jews and a piece of folly to the Gentiles, it was a source of pride to the Christians and was what put such force behind them. But once the Redemption had been accomplished, it was man’s duty to take possession of the grace which had been put at his disposal with such generosity. This meant that he must enter upon a new life by clinging close to Christ and believing in the salvation achieved by Christ’s work. He must not put his trust in the Law, which if wrongly interpreted can be an important cause of sin. The new man must be guided by ideals of purity, chastity, zeal, and obedience, without allowing himself to be enmeshed in a set of barren precepts. All his actions should be inspired by an imputuous freedom; and he should take care to be directed by a sense of spiritual independence, which will bring him also a generous understanding of the various needs of other men.

Now that God has made manifest the mystery which was hidden for centuries, in putting into effect the plan expounded above, we cannot—so Paul goes on to say—have a conception of the further unfolding of history. But this does not mean that the return of the Lord (parousia) must necessarily happen soon; and we must not, during the period of waiting, neglect the duties of normal life. On the contrary, there is an institution which preserves and carries on the work of Christ, namely the Church, which occupies so great a part in Pauline doctrine. It is conceived of as being Christ’s mystical body, a living and carefully ordered organism in which each man co-operates in an harmonious distribution of duties, according to what God has disposed in his inscrutable but providential designs. The temporal authorities too discharge a valuable function, and for this reason the faithful must pray for them and must co-operate with all men alive, although in their hearts they must be severed from all earthly concerns. Paul’s attitude is wholly directed to promoting relations between Christians and non-believers. The Christians were to be an active and useful force in the time and environment in which they lived, in order that they might permeate society with a new spirit, and later, when the moment came, alter society’s institutions.

In conclusion, then, we may say that even after taking proper account of (though not interpreting literally) the terrible indictments he sometimes launches at pagan civilization—its literature, its government, and its morals—
yet Paul took a less pessimistic view of the future of the ancient world than is normally believed. Indeed, as a true inheritor of the Christian message, he examined and weighed up what was actual and concrete. Even among the Gentiles, he discovered, there was in secret a sense of waiting, which only in the fullness of Christ's time would be able to find satisfaction.

Confronted with this *Weltanschauung* in all its boldness, we inevitably ask ourselves how much of it was original and how much derived from the culture of the time. The enquiry is all the more legitimate in that Paul’s vocabulary is undoubtedly influenced by contemporary philosophical and religious movements. As anyone can readily perceive this is an important problem, since it takes us on to the more general question of the relationship between early Christianity and the ideas which were most widely current in the geographical and cultural area in which Christianity started and flourished. Ancient Christian writers themselves were the first to raise the question, and they gave two opposing answers. One party contemptuously rejected any possibility of contact, and regarded the supposed affinities as diabolical forgeries. The other party was content to establish parallels and discover resemblances, because they constituted a proof that Christianity was responding to the deepest and most healthy needs of the human spirit.

If we ignore purely external similarities, and also avoid hasty conclusions, it still seems correct to recognize that not only the language but the rites of Christianity were adapted from contemporary forms. But this is a very different thing from saying that they were derivative. Adaptation was the product of a deliberate wish to employ the best methods of expression available at the time, forms which were most suited for ensuring that Christian teaching was understood and accepted by a wide public. Even the figure of Christ as it emerges from Paul’s writings is not modelled on the type of celestial redeemer previously known to Eastern religions; apart from anything else Paul was too good a Jew to abandon his Jewish outlook completely when he became a Christian. Moreover Paul strenuously opposes all Gnostic interpretations of the Gospel, of the kind which admitted a multiplicity of intermediate beings and saviours between man and his God. But in the actual process of confuting his adversaries he liked to make use of their terminology and to show himself to be in the current of Hellenistic religious vocabulary, although the meanings of the words he borrowed were radically altered in order to give expression to the truth of his new doctrine.

He had discovered a principle of interpretation which was far more exalted than that derived from ‘wisdom’ based on reason. He had found an explanation of the mysteries of historical reality in a cause hitherto unknown. The wisdom of the sages, though his words censured and rejected it, was in this way given a different set of values by means of *epignosis*, the light that comes through faith.
c. *The Canonical Gospels*

Discussions on the historical value of the sources relating to Christian origins started comparatively recently, in the mid-eighteenth century: for long centuries before that there was no doubt about the divine inspiration of these writings and therefore about their age and authenticity. But once they had embarked on the path of criticism, investigators and 'exeges' could not be halted. They advanced the most daring hypotheses, created a variety of schools and standpoints, and arrived at largely negative conclusions. But their work laid the foundations of a genuine critical enquiry, which clarified a number of points and uncovered what may be called the 'prehistory' of the historical books of the New Testament. Everyone in fact would now agree that originally there was a system of oral teaching, which was conducted according to definite rules and was used by Christian preachers to expound their good tidings to hearers from different races and classes. The moment came, however, when they wanted to put this evidence into writing, and they therefore prepared a number of short books, still with the purpose of spreading the Gospel and narrating the words and doings of Jesus, in order to show who he was. Only later was this material elaborated and put into shape by the composition of the Gospels as we have them today. This composition followed certain structural rules of literature, namely the forms used by Rabbinical writing24 of the period. We can see this by comparisons with contemporary and later Jewish writing, which explains how our Evangelists worked.

None of them set out to compose a history of Jesus, that is to say a complete biography with an ordered chronology. Each wanted to present the case from his own particular visual standpoint and to underline things which might be of most interest to a particular class of reader: this they did by adapting themselves to the mentality and speech of their audience. Their mode of composition necessarily awakes many misgivings in the modern critical mind; but no such misgivings will ever impair the documentary value of the Gospels as sources, since they conform perfectly to the geographical and social background of their narratives and are in full harmony with the methods of reasoning and exposition current at the time. The details of their narratives must not be interpreted *stricto sensu* in matters of precise chronology and topography. What interested the authors was the religious basis of their story; their task was to edify the faithful and convince them that Jesus was the Messiah. Nevertheless it is not out of the question to use the data collected in the Gospels to reconstruct the chronology and incidents of Jesus' life, to follow the progress of events, and so to form a precise notion of what occurred at that particular time and place in history.

We may take it as established, then, that the Gospels we possess are the outcome of a fairly long process of elaboration. But to define more closely the significance of their value as history it should also be added that they are
an abbreviated version of what Jesus said and did, and of the recollections of him in the minds of the earliest communities. What was put down in writing was what most struck contemporaries—the salient points and the most vigorous phrases—for it is inconceivable that the brief pages of the Evangelists contain everything spoken by a preacher who spoke every day over more than one year. (This holds good even if we admit that Jesus often repeated himself, for obvious reasons, in his discourses, and also that he preferred an ‘aphoristic’ form because it was more incisive and easy to remember.) We can explain in this way how many sentences got scattered; that is to say how they were not included by the Canonical Evangelists but are found elsewhere, for instance in extra-canonical sayings or in St Paul; and we can understand how the various Evangelists’ accounts of the same theme can show formal differences, despite the care they took to adhere faithfully to the Master’s words. The Sermon on the Mount is an example: Matthew’s version must be a summary of the original,²⁵ but Luke has the imprecation ‘Woe to you’, which is not in Matthew; and some of the descriptive features are different. Successive critics are left free to flounder in their conjectures, but it is possible to overcome the various difficulties by employing intelligent principles of source-criticism.

The oral teaching which was the starting-point of testimony about Jesus must originally have been conducted in Aramaic. Soon, however, it was translated into Greek, that being the language most widely employed in all the Mediterranean world. The Greek of the Gospels, like that of other New Testament writings, is the Keiné or common tongue, the language of everyday use and speech rather than the literary language of Atticizers. It is not our task to enter upon the complex philological problems which the text and its transmission present to scholars. (If we remember that thousands of manuscripts survive, subdivided into various families and classes, and that besides these there are fragments and citations in the Fathers of the Church, it is easy to understand the labour involved in establishing the most exact version.) Instead we should consider more closely the writings which hitherto we have called en bloc the ‘Gospels’; and at the start we should note that the corresponding Greek word means the ‘good news’ preached by Jesus, but passed into current usage to denote the books containing his collected sayings and the narrative of facts related to his life. (Pl. 63, a.)

Many collections or perikopai (strictly ‘sections’ or ‘paragraphs’), compiled for particular purposes and never completed, soon started to circulate on the subject of Jesus. Of these, in the course of the slow and delicate process of creating a ‘Canon’ of sacred books, four were selected to make up what in general (by ‘antonomasia’) is called the ‘Gospel’, which is one in substance but fourfold as edited. Among the four there is a further distinction normally made between the first three, known as the ‘Synoptic Gospels’ because of their very obvious affinities of content and form, and the fourth Gospel, which is attributed to the Apostle John. (Pl. 63, b.) The authors of the Synoptic
Gospels (the term was first introduced into scholarly vocabulary in the eighteenth century) are Matthew, Mark, and Luke. They undoubtedly drew on common written sources, since otherwise the verbal correspondence would be inexplicable; but it is difficult to identify these sources or to define the nature of each writer's dependence. The identity of their general arrangement and of the material they used has not prevented each Synoptist from imprinting a markedly personal character upon his work. Mark is the most shapeless, his Gospel consisting of separate sections pieced together without precise logical or chronological connections; but it is full of picturesque details, and it emphasizes the Humanity of Jesus (in other words the traces of oral preaching are still extremely evident). In Matthew, on the other hand, one notices the didactic character: he groups Jesus' teaching into several series of parables and into discourses concerned with the same subject, and he is still closely tied to the Jewish background (this author had collected in Aramaic the logia or sayings of Jesus before composing in Greek the Gospel we possess). Lastly there is Luke, a real writer, elegant and cultivated, who arranges his material with concern for literary style; moreover, since he is addressing the Gentiles, he never forgets to lay special stress on things which might be of special interest to them.

About the dates of composition it is impossible to be precise. But careful examination of several features makes it probable that Matthew (in Greek) is earlier than AD 70, since he does not allude to the fall of Jerusalem, a matter which was so important to a Jew like himself that he could not have passed it over in silence. Mark, who reproduces in part the teaching of St Peter, must have composed about 60; and Luke, whose optimistic view about the Gentiles would surely have been shaken by the Neronian persecution, probably wrote about 63. Luke was also a doctor, and some traces of his knowledge can be found in the text: it is interesting to see the large space he devotes to Jesus' childhood, a subject ignored by the others. We should not forget that Luke was also the author of another important work on Christian origins, the Acts of the Apostles, which he wrote directly after his Gospel and then broke off for reasons unknown to us. The Acts are divided into two parts, one centred round Peter and the church at Jerusalem, the other wholly devoted to Paul. The latter part contains passages written in the first person plural, because the author was present at the facts he narrates, though for other sections he may have made use of documents and oral information. Luke shows evidence of remarkable literary ability, and even of historical objectivity if the concept is used in the limited sense defined above in relation to this type of writing.

On the Fourth Gospel it is enough to say that it has little material in common with the others and also that there is a different background to the action it describes. When the writer has spoken of the beginnings of Jesus' preaching in Judaea, he passes rapidly over what his predecessors have said about the apostolate in Galilee, and then dwells at length on the journeys to
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Jerusalem and in the regions of the south. Moreover in the whole work there is a loftiness of thought very different from the ‘aphoristic’ form of the other Gospels; and whereas in them the character of Jesus as the Messiah is only adumbrated, in John it is explicitly asserted and defended in a profound piece of thinking. This Gospel, then, is the demonstration of a particular doctrine, the one plainly announced in its preface. The proof is given in a series of facts and discourses, set down in accordance with a thesis or idea which runs through them all. But in addition to all this it provides a number of most valuable legal, topographical, and chronological details, which make it an historical document of the greatest significance. It contains priceless evidence, and is also a work full of humanity and warmth.

d. The Apocrypha

The very keen interest of the early Christians in the life of Jesus and the Apostles explains the origin and diffusion of the so-called ‘Apocrypha to the New Testament’. These are a form of religious literature vastly inferior to that of the authentic writings, but one which has some value as an indication of the aspirations and views current at the time. They also provided an inexhaustible source for artistic representations and pious traditions in later ages. The term ‘apocryphal’ did not then have the pejorative sense inseparable from it today: it simply denoted a sacred and mysterious writing, the meaning of which was inevitably hidden from most readers because it was reserved for the initiated. For this reason many of these compositions were for a long time regarded as inspired, and found their way into the Canons. Eventually, however, their miracle-mongering character and obvious exaggerations, combined with their defects of style, led to their expulsion; and this served to emphasize the amount of falsification which had led to their composition.

The most important apocryphal Gospels include the following: (a) the Gospel of the Hebrews, written in Aramaic and translated into Greek and Latin; it was closely related to St Matthew’s Gospel and on various occasions gave prominence to James ‘the brother of the Lord’, the representative of that Christianity which strictly observed Jewish practice; (b) the Gospel of the Egyptians, evidently inspired by Gnosticism, and known to the masters of the Christian school at Alexandria; (c) the Gospel of Nicodemus, which contains the Acts of Pilate and the account of Christ’s descent to the underworld (on Pilate there is a complete literature, designed to vindicate him and make him a witness to the truth of Christianity); and (d) the Gospel of Thomas, discovered in Coptic translation recently. Then there are the Gospels of Christ’s childhood, the most important being the Proto-Gospel of James. Of the texts mentioned so far there survive extensive fragments, including (b) and (d) completely, from translations in a variety of languages. Almost fifty other apocryphal works, Gospels, Epistles, Acts, Apocalypses,
and so on, usually of a heretical and Gnostic nature, have now been found (in Coptic) at Al-Hammadi in Egypt. Some other apocryphal Gospels are only vaguely mentioned, and there is no means of describing their features.

The very scanty reliable information about the lives of the various Apostles was supplemented in the second and third centuries by a number of apocryphal Acts, which are a sincere reflection of beliefs widely current among contemporary Christian circles of a popular kind. They contain valuable extracts from prayers, discourses, and rites used in religious services at that time; and in this respect they deserve all the attention which scholars have given them (together with the documents mentioned above) in reconstructing their origins and the history of their texts with patience and acumen, and in separating early material from later additions. The main Acts of which we have evidence are those of Paul (composed by a priest in Asia Minor before 150 and comprising three distinct parts), of Peter (containing the famous stories of Simon Magus and of ‘Quo Vadis?’), of Andrew, of Thomas (concerning his apostolate in India), and of Thaddaeus (with the correspondence between Jesus and King Abgar of Edessa). There was also an Epistula Apostolorum, written in the middle of the second century, which contained Christ’s revelations to the Apostles after his resurrection; and a number of Apocalypses, the earliest being those of Peter (before 150) and Paul (more than a century later).  

We have made incidental reference to the Canon of inspired books, which was gradually laid down by the authorities of the Church. Harnack drew attention to the fact that the distinction between Canonical and non-Canonical books of the Bible first appeared at Rome, and that even Eastern manuscripts offer readings of the text which were current in the Roman community. This is easily explicable if every church received a standard text from Rome and corrected its own readings accordingly. Despite this, however, the determination of the official Canon was a slow process, and we cannot follow it in detail here. If we comb the citations of the Bible by Christian writers of the early centuries, we get a valuable indication of the books accepted by that time. We can show by this means that there was a collection of New Testament works in existence as early as the beginning of the second century, and that St Irenaeus cites or alludes to every book of our New Testament except the very short Third Epistle of John; and this Epistle is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria about AD 200. Yet down to the fifth century there were still doubts about certain books—the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistles of James and Jude, and above all the Johannine Apocalypse (Revelation). It was this last work which evoked the greatest opposition: St Cyril of Jerusalem and the Apostolic Canons still found difficulty about it, and St Jerome refers to doubts surviving in the East. These uncertainties are explained by the absence of any official decision and by the abuse of certain texts (like Hebrews
and the *Apocalypse*) by heretics. In time various councils drew up the lists of Canonical books in both Old and New Testaments, and we also find catalogues of this kind in pontifical letters and documents, though the documents are not official and can only serve as an indication of the most reliable and accepted traditions. Special mention should be made of the famous ‘Muratorian Fragment’, which obtained its name from the great Modenese scholar Lodovico Antonio Muratori, who published it in 1740 from an eighth-century manuscript preserved in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. This is a second-century document containing the oldest list of New Testament books. It enters, though with some reserves, certain books which were decisively rejected later on. But we get the same degree of uncertainty from authors like Tertullian and Origen, who thought that works such as the *Shepherd* of Hermas were inspired but said nothing about other books now considered Canonical.

The question of the transmission of an authentic text and of the translations of the Scriptures is a delicate matter for many believing Christians, because it involves the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible. The earliest Latin translations of the New Testament were made about the middle of the second century in Africa, because from the outset the African Church had a marked stamp of Latinity, which is not encountered even in the Church of Rome. Indeed in the churches of Rome and of other Western cities the Greek element was predominant among Christians, and the earliest literary writings produced by them are all in Greek. The translations follow their Greek original (for the Old Testament this means the Septuagint) unduly literally, so as not to alter the sacred text in any particular. They therefore sounded harsh to Latin ears; and they contained many neologisms and syntactical innovations, drawn freely from the popular use of the language. In general they are documents of that ‘Christian Latin’, which according to recent studies by the Nijmugen school (Schrijnen and Mohrmaann) had very different features from the ‘profane’ language because of the generous use made of technical terms needed to express the content of the new faith and its ritual. Though in the past people spoke vaguely and incorrectly about a translation called ‘Italian’, the distinction now made is between two interdependent forms, the African and the European, the latter being attested from the middle of the third century. It is, however, difficult to determine how the two forms of text got transmitted, for in later times they influenced each other and also suffered infiltrations from outside. Eventually every text had to give way before the translation by St Jerome, known as the ‘Vulgate’, which was vastly superior to all others in elegance and lucidity. Yet even this text got corrupted by inexpert copyists and wrong readings (there are actually 3,000 manuscripts of it in existence), and at the present time a number of careful scholars deserve great credit for their laborious work in reconstructing Jerome’s original form and so giving the Vulgate an edition which conforms to the requirements of modern criticism.
e. The Letters of the Apostolic Fathers

After the writings which later found their way into the Canon of inspired biblical books, the oldest Christian literature comprises a group of works by the authors commonly known as 'Apostolic Fathers'. None of them has great profundity of doctrine, but all are marked by a lively faith in Christ; for the authors still retain the memory of him, and are anxiously awaiting his Return.

At the end of the first century a bishop of Rome named Clement wrote a letter for use by the Christian community at Corinth, designed to end the quarrels which had once more broken out in that church. The document acquired more importance than the occasion which had provoked it, on account of the invaluable evidence it contains. Apart from information about the lives of the apostles Peter and Paul and about what happened to the Christians during Nero's persecution, the letter tells us about the structure of the Church, the powers of ecclesiastics, and the return of sacred ceremonies. It also indicates that members of the Church were adopting a very friendly attitude to the Roman government, despite the harsh treatment they had recently undergone at the emperor's hands. Clement must have been of Jewish origin and was a man of some culture: his writings show an excellent knowledge of the Old Testament, but the influence of Stoic philosophy is also plain. As his name implies, he had contact with the aristocratic family of Flavius Clemens, Domitian's cousin, who had been put to death on a charge of Jewish practices and of atheism, his wife Domitilla being exiled to the island of Pandateria.31 'First Clement' (as this work is generally called) says nothing about the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. Yet the very fact of the letter's existence and its general tone—quite apart from the veneration with which it was regarded later, as attested in 170 by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth—show that from that time on the Roman community enjoyed a different status from all others and that it was conscious of a duty to concern itself with what was going on in the lives of all parts of the Christian world.

Clement of Rome was credited with other writings, which are later and of doubtful authenticity. There is another letter to the Corinthians, and more than one letter about virginity. Moreover the name 'Pseudo-Clement' is used to describe a long didactic novel, in which a man called Clement, after having sought the truth from various philosophers, is instructed by St Peter in the true doctrine. From this twenty homilies survive, containing Peter's discourses.

In epistolary form are various other writings of the Apostolic Fathers, such as seven letters of St Ignatius of Antioch, the letter of St Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and the so-called Letter of Barnabas.

When he was taken from Syria to Rome to meet martyrdom about 117, Ignatius directed various writings to the Christians of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, also one to his companion Polycarp, and
lastly one to the Roman community, full of reverence and praise for that body. In all his letters we can find a Christology based on conviction that Christ was both divine and human, and there are warm expressions of enthusiasm for a life of union with Christ, to be realized through martyrdom. But there is also a firm conception of the Church hierarchy, centred on a number of bishops in communion with the bishop of Rome.

There is little that is new in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, the only one of his letters which survives. But Polycarp's martyrdom at Smyrna on 22 February 156, soon after his return from a journey to Rome, deserves some mention. His journey was undertaken to discuss with Bishop Anicetus the delicate question of the date of Easter, a matter which was dividing Eastern and Western Christians from each other, both sides following authoritative though different apostolic traditions. The letter of the Smyrnaeans to the church at Philomelion in Phrygia describes Polycarp's resolute behaviour in warm and telling language. They report many of his answers, and put into his mouth a prayer, which is undoubtedly one of the earliest Christian liturgical formulae we know.

The name of Barnabas, St Paul's companion, is given to a letter (which in fact is more like a general theological treatise) composed at Alexandria in the third decade of the second century AD. It provides a crisp refutation of the Old Testament, and describes the effects of the divine adoption obtained through Baptism, which transforms created beings into temples of the Holy Spirit.

An excellent and very early example of primitive Christian letter-writing is the Didache, or 'Doctrine of Our Lord transmitted by the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles', discovered as lately as 1883 by a Greek Metropolitan bishop on a manuscript at Jerusalem. It is a short and composite work divisible into two main parts, one concerned with liturgical instruction, the other with disciplinary rules. It is valuable for the conclusion reached on Our Lord's parousia, but also for the abundant information provided about the life of Christians in the sub-apostolic period. The unknown compiler has put together various ecclesiastic rules, probably in use in Syria, concerning Baptism, the Eucharist, Penitence, the duties of charity and brotherly help, the functions of priests, and so on.

There is another short anonymous letter, addressed to a highly-placed pagan named Diognetus (unconvincing attempts have been made to attribute it to the apologist Quadratus, to Hippolytus of Rome, and to Clement of Alexandria). In clear style and with sincere conviction the writer describes the life of a Christian, justifies the late time of the Incarnation, and derides the folly of idolatry. Although he tells us that Christians live a life apart in the world and are strangers in every land, he also claims that they are the vital ferment among mankind and that by love and by wise and unselfish action in society they can, despite misunderstandings and persecutions, bring about the spiritual and temporal salvation of their contemporaries.
This concept is one of the keynotes of early Christian letter-writing, and is a significant indication of the attitude adopted by those who followed the new religion, in relation to the pagan society inside which they had to operate.

Finally there is a much larger work called the *Shepherd*, the significance of which is very obscure. Although it is normally classified with the Apostolic Fathers, it belongs rather to the apocalyptic genre. Parts of it may go back to the late first century, but the completed work is to be attributed to a Roman Christian named Hermas, brother of Bishop Pius, who was in office from 140 to 150. The author gives many autobiographical details and much useful information about the life of the community. But his main aim is to transmit the revelations he has received from an aged lady (the Church) and from an angel in the form of a shepherd (who is Christ); and with this to impart many precepts and illustrate various parables, especially designed to call his brethren to repentance in view of the terrible judgement which will shortly come upon them. The picture of the moral life of Christians of the mid-second century, as it appears in the pages of the *Shepherd*, is extremely sombre. Yet we must not forget that Hermas was a preacher of repentance and a pedantic moralist, one too who had himself been a grave sinner; and that he was consequently conditioned to pessimism. On the other hand his text proves the existence and activity of various Church institutions, which by this time have taken root. It also confirms what we know from other sources about the prevalence of well-to-do people and men of business in the social composition of the Roman community. These were men who did not think they ought to abandon their professions in order to follow Christian precepts; but they gave alms freely, and looked to Baptismal pardon to wash away their sins.

f. Rome and Christianity

We have already explained (pp. 546 ff.) how Rome was accustomed to pass decrees of the senate allowing conquered peoples to retain their own religions but prohibiting them from making converts among Roman citizens, the latter being always forbidden to adopt foreign cults of their own accord. We saw too that special difficulties were bound to occur with monotheistic races, who were intolerant of the polytheism practised by the Roman state. This last was the case with Jews and Christians, whom in early times Rome had no means of distinguishing one from the other.

The distinction was forced on them by various stages. First there were what Suetonius calls the riots 'impulsore Chresto', among the sects regarded as Jewish, which led Claudius to banish all concerned from Rome. Then there were the riots and hostility evoked by the Jews against the audacious preaching of Paul; and here, too, after various legal proceedings had taken their course in the East, the matter ended up before the courts in Rome itself. The period was already one in which the government had resumed serious attempts to check the entry of foreign religions and the number of citizens
who were becoming converts; even members of the aristocracy, such as Statilius Taurus, Lepida wife of Cassius, Thrasea, and Pomponia Graecina, were attacked on this charge. The Christians were a collection of persons who did not fit into any well-recognized group; their religion was new and was entirely distinct from the Jewish religion; consequently their cult could not be considered legal, not being covered by the various immunities granted to the Jews. So the new superstition was automatically illegal, and it was made all the worse by the fact that the Christians appeared to be followers of one who had been condemned and executed by Roman soldiers for political crimes against the 'majesty' of Rome (a crime more recently imputed to Paul as well). Moreover all Christian propaganda was directed at converting Roman citizens as well as other people.

Therefore no new legislation was required.\textsuperscript{33} The actual name of Christian—a man's confession that he was one—was enough to render him guilty under the laws already in force. We are told this continually by the sources, 'Christianos esse non licet . . . non licet esse eos'; and they add that Christians were condemned 'tamquam Christiani'. Tertullian too was later to write 'your sentences say no more than that they declared themselves to be Christians; there is no enquiry into specific crimes; the name itself is regarded as a crime'.

Moreover in the course of litigation and court proceedings involving Jews and Christians it was common to find the Jews, in the excitement of the mutual accusations, tendentiously charging the Christians with ordinary crimes and with engaging in debased and extravagant rites. These charges were readily accepted by the pagan mob, which knew nothing of the concrete facts about this exotic ritual, was disturbed by the secrecy of Christian meetings, and was always ready to see the spread of new religions as the main cause of moral depravity. This accounts for the fact that our sources constantly accuse Christianity of being a 'supersticio nova et malefica', 'superstitio exitabilis malefica', or 'superstitio prava'.

The sharp distinction between Jews and Christians now had a further effect. It meant that the Christians had no right to have been dispensed hitherto from sacrificing to the Dea Roma and the divinities of emperors. Yet as monotheists they could not perform these sacrifices, and non-observance became a very serious specific charge against those who refused. The danger was all the greater under those emperors who laid most claim to the performance of the cult.

All this helps to explain the sufferings of the Christians in 64. The great fire of Rome was in all probability due to accident, but the people were encouraged by Nero's enemies to blame the emperor himself, and as the days went by the charge was made more openly. Nero did not want to involve himself in argument or threats, which would not have availed to free him from suspicion. It may be too that he was advised by the pro-Jewish Poppaea and through her by the Jews themselves, whom the government now firmly
distinguished from the Christians for the first time. He diverted suspicion by accusing the Christians of being the real culprits, regarding them as a body of men so wretched that neither the senate nor the people would have any ground for objecting. All that was needed was to state and get it accepted (perhaps by decree of the senate) that to be a Christian, the follower of an illegal religion, was one and the same thing as to be guilty of crimes against the Empire and against humanity. This, rather than any specific Neronian law condemning and prohibiting Christianity, must be the ‘institutum Neronianum’ of which Tertullian speaks: the sources mention no such law either on this occasion or at a later time. Nero’s concern was not to institute and defend a persecution of a religious character, but to strike without delay at people who could be presumed to hate Rome and the human race, and to have been guilty of extremely serious crimes against the state. He did not want to get immersed in lengthy police enquiries into the possibilities of each defendant’s actual complicity in the disaster. He simply proposed to take summary action against those who on their own admission or on the testimony of others were shown to be Christians and who refused to prove the contrary by performing pagan sacrifices. In that case they belonged to a body of men who were generally regarded as criminal and who were in no position to show that they had not secretly committed this new crime in addition to others.

But the punishment of these alleged incendiaries of Rome led to such barbarities that in the end, despite its prejudices, even the mob was moved: ‘eventually they felt pity for them, because they were being massacred not for any public benefit, but in order to appease the savagery of a single man’ (Tacitus, Annals, XV, 44). It turned out, therefore, that Nero’s executions, from the moral standpoint, placed an obstacle rather than an incentive in the way of his immediate successors’ continuing a persecution which lay outside the religious struggle and was conducted with so little regard for justice and human feeling.

After Nero’s execution of Christians as incendiaries it is the opinion of many scholars that the first real persecution directed at citizens who became converts to the new faith took place about thirty years later, in Domitian’s time. But, as we have already noted, the literal sense of the sources, if we avoid forced interpretations, is that Domitian punished citizens who were adopting Judaism; and this is the unanimous view of the Jewish tradition. Acilius Glabrio, for example, was regarded as not only a ‘mollit rerum novarum’ but as an atheist and a follower of Jewish practices (Dio Cassius); and the same charges are made against Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla. To this view it is no objection that members of the families concerned, the Acillii and Flavii Clementes, either then or more probably somewhat later, were Christians rather than Jews:34 passage from one faith to the other was still quite normal in view of the affinity between them and the similar ways in which they were propagated. The First Letter to the
Corinthians of Pope Clement alludes to martyrs under Nero but not under Domitian. Christian sources, too, such as Hegesippus (recorded by Eusebius) and Tertullian, though they believed in an edict by Domitian against the Christians, state that he repealed it forthwith 'out of feelings of humanity'. This implies that no genuine Christian martyrs were known to have been condemned by that emperor.

The problem of the treatment of Christians, in fact, seems to have been faced for the first time in Trajan's day, from which period we possess a famous letter from the Younger Pliny as governor of Bithynia requesting the emperor's instructions, together with Trajan's reply.

If we read Pliny's letter carefully we can deduce that there was at that time no explicit law on the subject nor even a set of rules derived from traditional practice. Governors had a free hand and took full responsibility. Every governor therefore was guided by his own sense of law and humanity, by the accusations he received, by imperial complaints about illegal meetings, and by the whims of the mob. On this basis he could be extremely active and strict, or comparatively less so; and this explains why there are strong local differences between all the various persecutions, depending not only on the area affected but on the temper and views of the judges. Even more important is Trajan's reply. It shows first that there were no precise laws to be applied, but secondly that it would have been impossible to draft them, in view of the large number of different types of case that might be envisaged. One must still trust the judgement and common sense of the magistrate to lay down the rules and procedure to be followed from time to time. Nevertheless Trajan requires certain basic rules of law. Offences of thought, like the one in question, must not be sought out unless there is explicit information laid (on the responsibility of the informer); anonymous information must be rejected; and the indictment was to be cancelled if the defendant repented.

A great though temporary advance was made under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, in whose reigns Christians were not punished for their faith but simply if they transgressed state laws in some other respect. Marcus Aurelius, on the other hand, regarded as heresy the Christian idea that the true life is that beyond the grave, and felt that the fear this doctrine inspired in the weak was against the interests of society. He therefore returned to Trajan's practice of allowing information to be laid by individuals or groups (hence the pressure exercised on magistrates by the mob), of regarding propaganda as sufficient for a conviction, of condemning those who confessed, and discharging unharmed those who performed an act of recantation. His son Commodus, however, when he came under the influence of Perennis and the pro-Christian Marcia, told his governors not to yield to the pressure of the people, who enjoyed seeing bloodshed.

Septimius Severus was an eclectic in religion, and therefore began by showing toleration to the Christians. Soon, however, under the influence of his wife, Julia Domna, who was surrounded by mystics, Pythagoreans, and
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anti-Christian lawyers like Ulpian, he modified his policy—a further cause of this being the Jewish rebellion. He did not institute any new form of proceedings against Christians and Jews, but he made it clear that pagans who became converts to these religions should be punished. This, quite independently of his wishes, led to harsher treatment of Christians other than converts.

Elagabalus was the head of an oriental solar religion, both monotheist and syncretist in its outlook; and in his Elagabalian he had collected all the sacred and symbolic objects belonging to religions of diverse origin. His biography says that he wanted to concentrate in this temple ‘Iudaeorum et Samaritanorum religiones et Christianam devotionem’, so that ‘omnia culturarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret’.

Severus Alexander took a further step in this direction. He admired the controls employed by the Jews and Christians in their selection of priests, and set store by certain moral maxims associated with these religions. He therefore granted privileges to the Jews, allowed the practice of Christianity, and collected into a shrine effigies of the figures he thought were fundamental in the spiritual movements of the world—Apollonius of Tyana, Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, and Alexander. His counsellors are said to have dissuaded him from a proposal ‘Christo templum facere... eumque inter deos recipere’.

Very different a few years later was the behaviour of the harsh Thracian Maximin, who like later Illyrian emperors, coming as they did from parts of the empire where Christianity had yet made little headway, saw in it (and here the ultra-traditionalists in Italy were with them) a cause of the decline of Roman power. Maximin’s decision was not to revive the trials of ordinary Christians (though eventually they too were denounced by informers), but to strike a more direct and systematic blow by prosecuting those mainly responsible for propagating the faith, namely the bishops and priests. One response to this crisis was Origen’s Exhortation to Martyrdom, in which he implores his fellow-Christians not to let themselves be persuaded into sacrificing to the Sun god and taking oaths by the ‘Fortuna Maximini’, lest by these sacrifices they should give food to demons. This fresh persecution found victims in the highest ranks of the clergy, but it operated over only a very brief period and area, since few governors carried it out.

Among Maximin’s successors an important place belongs to Philip, who although he practised the traditional religion was tolerant of others. He allowed Christians to worship and to preach the faith, considered them fit to occupy public office, and was in correspondence with Origen, who was claiming in his preaching that in time all the empire would be Christian.

Special attention must be given to the religious requirement imposed on all Roman citizens in the empire by Decius. Large-scale action against the Christians began in this reign, being dictated by the growth of Christianity and the large proportion of Christians who were engaged in every field of
activity. In complete contrast to Philip's policy, Decius prescribed that every Roman citizen should make proof of his loyalty by sacrificing to the gods and the emperor's genius, before a commission which should give him an attested certificate. Undoubtedly one of the main purposes here was not so much to persecute monotheists as to compel the majority of those who adhered to their faith to enter upon a bargain: by performing a more or less symbolic action they would demonstrate precisely their compromised position. In many cases it was considered enough if the citizen burned a little incense on the altar (thurificati); no investigation was directed against people who managed to procure a certificate (libellus) without sacrificing (libellatici); and no savage measures followed that irreducible minimum of citizens who escaped the test by going into hiding. On the many libelli which have survived there is no specific reference to Christianity, nor to any demands that a person should recant his faith; and it is very unlikely that only Christians were required to make the loyal sacrifice, since we possess a libellus belonging to an Egyptian priestess of the god Petesuchus. The very fact that proceedings were suspended after a few months shows that there was no desire to press the matter to extremes. The government was satisfied with the broad success it had already achieved, since this seemed to guarantee the general loyalty of the citizen body in preparation for the military campaigns about to begin.

Our sources maintain that after four years of toleration Valerian in 257 launched his first edict against the Christians, and followed this with a second in 258, with the intention of gathering financial resources from the property of the condemned. Other causes doubtless existed, too, in particular the military difficulties created by quite a number of Christians who refused to sacrifice on service or even deserted the army. From what Cyprian says in connexion with the second edict it is clear that it was prominent persons who were chiefly attacked. Bishops, presbyters, and deacons were to be charged without further ado; senators, egregii viri, and knights were deprived of their posts and their property (and condemned to death if they were obdurate); matrons were exiled, also with confiscation of property; servants in the imperial household were put to hard labour on the emperor's estates. Christian burial-grounds were also confiscated. That the sufferers were fewer than might have been expected was due chiefly to Valerian's capture by the Persians shortly afterwards. His son Gallienus stopped the persecution and ordered the release of Christian property, sending the bishops copies of his rescript so that no one should encounter further trouble.

In the Eastern provinces, then ruled by the dynasts of Palmyra, we find in this same period the first attempt at an agreed policy between State and Church. It is true that the negotiations were conducted with a dissident Christian dignitary, namely Paul of Samosata. This state official and syncretist-minded bishop had been firmly rejected by two synods, which upheld the claims of his rival Domnus to the see of Antioch; and the controversy was again decided in favour of Domnus, so far as the bishop's house was concerned,
by Aurelian in the days when he was still friendly to the Christians. At the end of his reign Aurelian became hostile, and just before he was killed he issued an anti-Christian edict which scarcely had time to be put into practice. But by this time the importance of the Christians in the Roman world had become so great that an extreme decision was needed to avert the consequences of a dualism which inevitably led to periodical conflicts. A decision of this kind was taken by Diocletian. For nearly twenty years he had ruled the empire without seriously concerning himself with this situation, but he was now won over, probably by Galerius, who is said to have employed deceit and craft in his negotiations. It was now Diocletian's view that the only safe course was to take resolute action to root out Christianity and restore the traditional faith. On February 24, 303, his first decree was issued. This was apparently 'sine sanguine', ordaining that Christians should be sought out, and refrain from attending pagan rituals, on pain of exile and confiscation. Two edicts which followed were more severe, being designed to purge the army and the bureaucracy, and to confiscate Church property and the sacred books used for religious services: the penalty for those who resisted was death. The persecution must have been general, although Constantius did not apply it in the Gallic provinces. But its effect was not so much to strike a blow at the upper classes as to deprive thousands of persons of their livelihood and all too often of their lives as well, with an obvious risk of wrecking all services. The results could be seen in Rome as much as in Africa, and in Palestine (see Eusebius' Martyrs of Palestine) no less than in Asia Minor.

The futility of these cruel persecutions must have been recognized by Galerius himself. A few days before his death at Nicomedia, on April 30, 311, he issued an edict of toleration towards such Christians as had not been willing to return to paganism. Its words run 'Whereas very many persons persist in their obstinate ways, now therefore we, yielding to our own clemency, have felt it right to grant these persons too our pardon. We allow that there should be Christians once more and that they should hold their meetings, provided they do nothing contrary to our laws. In return the Christians must pray to their god for the well-being of our State.'

Before Galerius, however, there had been another act of toleration towards Christianity, especially at the time of the election of Pope Miliades in 311, when confiscated property was restored to the Church. This was done by Maxentius, the emperor who in history has been represented as the extreme defender of paganism and as succumbing before the 'Christian' Constantine.

Constantine was indeed the first emperor to comprehend the real elements of the problem, and the first to possess sufficient drive and perseverance to emerge from a blind alley and open up a new highway in the history of the Empire. In substance what he did was admittedly no more than his duty as a ruler who sought the good of the state, and this many of his predecessors had thought they were doing when they followed the old paths. But to reach his objective he adopted entirely new means. He included the Christians
among the active components of society and made them one of the most valuable elements in public life, seeing that they possessed a rich store of fresh and vital forces. This Constantine did neither from Machiavellianism nor from devotion, but because he had full consciousness of his mission and trusted in a divine assistance which could not fail him.35

\textit{g. The Martyrs.} The Christian apologetic tradition exaggerates when it speaks of innumerable martyrs in the persecutions, but some moderns exaggerate in an equally polemical way when they try to reduce the numbers to a few hundreds. It is beyond doubt that in the course of two-and-a-half centuries thousands and thousands of men and women, young and old, rich and poor, wage-earners and professional men, soldiers and artisans, priests and laity, Romans and non-Romans, offered up their lives freely and courageously for the freedom of their religious convictions. On the other hand these martyrs were only a small fraction of the Christian community, just as the persecutions, however widely spread, were only the moments of crisis, separated by long periods of toleration and mutual contacts. In these latter periods, since there was no explicit law which drastically prohibited the Christian cult, the two organisms, Christian and pagan, ecclesiastical and civil, spiritual and temporal, slowly encroached on each other and became assimilated each to each. On many occasions the execution of martyrs was not so much the result of edicts as of some outburst of popular indignation or of information laid by interested parties, either of which things might prompt or compel action by local magistrates; or they might simply want to get rid of some eminent persons whose behaviour was disagreeable to them.

Surprising though this may seem, the cult of martyrs among Christians certainly did not go back to a very early date: the first evidence for it comes from the mid-second century. Before this the Christians paid no more than the veneration due to all people after their deaths, something which even pagans normally bestowed. Indeed in this matter Christianity accepted most usages then in force: the exceptions were their avoidance of cremation and the fact that they took the day of a man’s death as a date to be recorded (calling it the \textit{dies natalis} because it was the beginning of the true life, whereas pagans regarded it as a day of ill-omen). It was from a collection of these dates that the first martyrlogies were formed, the best-known being the \textit{Depositio Martyrum} belonging to the Roman Church. The \textit{Acta Martyrum} are a different matter, being valuable historical sources in that they faithfully reproduce the official reports of cases before the courts. Since such reports were preserved in the archives, the Christians would take pains to obtain copies in order to read them at services celebrated on the anniversaries of martyrs’ deaths. These bare records were at least valid and authentic, but later on they would get filled out and embellished by the evidence of people who had been present at the martyrdom; or worse still by the addition of edifying legends, full of fantastic detail and lacking any foundation of truth.
This explains the origin of the many false stories, and also of the various superstitions connected with the cult of Saints. Among the earliest Acta (or Gesta) Martyrum three may be mentioned. The Acta of St Justin and his companions relate to men martyred in Marcus Aurelius' reign by order of the prefect Junius Rusticus. Then there are the Acta of the martyrs of Scilli in Africa (July 17, 180), the earliest Christian document from Africa in Latin and the earliest evidence about the history of the Church in that province. And thirdly there are the Acta of St Cyprian, who was put to death at Carthage on September 14, 258; these comprise three separate documents, his first trial concluding with his exile to Curubis, his arrest and second trial, and finally his execution. Then there are works called Passiones, which are not proper court records, but of which some have distinct historical and literary importance. For instance there is the account of St Polycarp's martyrdom mentioned above, and the story of the martyrs at Lyons in 177 and 178, contained in a long letter to the churches of Asia preserved in Eusebius' Church History. The Acta of SS. Carpus, Papillus, and Agatonice are another instance of this type: and finally there is the celebrated Passio of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, telling the story of these two women and of three catechumens (Saturus, Saturninus, and Revocatus), who were executed at Carthage on March 7, 202. Of this last there is a Greek version, but the original is Latin and may be from the pen of Tertullian. A large part of the work is Perpetua’s own autobiography, which is particularly moving, but there is much theological interest besides.

h. The Spread of the New Religion

The nobility of its doctrine was not the only cause of the growth of Christianity. Among other factors it was of prime importance that the Gospel was spread abroad in a very large area which had already been united politically and culturally by the Roman empire, and which possessed unified (or almost unified) laws, administration, language, and roads. This area was by now governed by emperors and magistrates whose origin gave them few ties with the conservative Roman tradition, and the empire was clearly tolerant of the spread of ideas. Jewish synagogues had been erected in some numbers in practically every district, and acted as the first focal points for the dissemination of the new faith. Finally the people in this great area were already conscious of a common desire to deepen and refresh their religious beliefs, partly as a refuge from the growing troubles which affected their lives.

One thing was of course quite fundamental, namely that the oral Apostolic preaching, which was a constant feature of the first generations of Christianity, emphasized the clear superiority of the word of Jesus over all other religious and ethical ideas, and the power of the Gospel to satisfy the longings of men’s souls. Christianity could be presented as a religion open to all, without any hidden grades of initiation or secrets which could only be revealed to small groups. Indeed it could be seen that it met the age-long
want of the lower orders by bringing together poor and rich in worship, in the agapé and in burial, and by making woman the equal of man, and slave of master.

The examples of superhuman devotion to the new faith provided by its martyrs were inspiring, and therefore undoubtedly helped to propagate the Gospel. Similarly the many generations of remarkable ‘missionaries’ never flagged in their zeal to preach the word in both speech and writing.

Hostile propaganda grew wearisome in its repetition of the old accusation that Christians were a bunch of superstitious criminals. (Fig. 14.) Anyone could get to know them directly and become conscious how false the accusations were and how cruel were the condemnations they produced. Men came to see the Christians in their proper light and found them, in the broad mass, to be a people who were not only normal but lived morally blameless lives. They were dutiful, kept away from worldly pleasures, and were devoted to their faith; the ceremonies for which they came together were proper occasions, concerned with worship and with funeral rites.

Another feature which helped Christianity was one due to the interest awakened among the poorer classes. This was provided by the social organization of Christian communities, with their sense of solidarity among human beings and the unselfish working of their relief measures for the needy. Jesus had said ‘Love your neighbour as yourself’; and his words were followed by the Church. The story in the Acts of the Apostles (iv. 32 ff.) is evidence of the deep feelings of altruism and brotherhood which were to be found among the well-to-do Christians, when in obedience to the rule of Jesus they placed as much as they could of their property at the disposal of the twelve Apostles in aid of such of the faithful as were in need. In the following chapter (Acts v) we have the censure of those who evade, in whole or in part, this obligation of charity. In succeeding centuries it was in truth the general rule that rich catechumens, as well as actual Christians, should bestow a suitable part of their goods upon the community, or should be assessed for the payment of weekly or monthly contributions. Moreover as the numbers of the faithful increased it was the normal thing for donations to be fixed according to definite rules and then entrusted deliberately to the clergy for their alms-boxes (ареae, Tertullian, Apologia, 39, 1). These boxes provided regular subsistence for widows, orphans, sick persons, prisoners, and hospitals; and we are told that at Rome about 251 approximately 1,500 poor Christians were enjoying regular distributions. Besides these there were exceptional contributions to relief for war damage, or to families which had suffered ruin through persecution, plague, or other public calamity.

A final means of strengthening community life and widening the scope of propaganda lay in the steady improvement of the hierarchical structure of the Church, with its essential emphasis on a combination between communities with individual features and a unified organization of the whole.36

It is an easy generalization that the main lines of Christian propaganda
FIG. 14. The Blasphemous Crucifixion, from the Palatine, third-century graffito.
followed the roads marked out by trade and commercial expansion. (Map XVII.) The greater part of the audience was therefore composed of persons with whom merchants had previously been in contact and who were relatively accessible, that is to say the inhabitants of the great trading centres of the Mediterranean. Antioch in Syria, Ephesus and other cities of Asia Minor, Corinth and Thessalonica, and Rome itself were the first bases for the religion’s rapid spread; from the end of the second century Egypt and Africa too contained important centres of Christian life and preaching; and the periods of peace which the Church enjoyed between about 180 and 250 enabled Christian minorities, of economically powerful persons, to come into being in all the main cities of the recognized world. Nevertheless the intensity of the advance varied from region to region as it grew in the course of time, and only patient study of all the evidence surviving in literature and inscriptions can enable us to fix the proportion of Christians existing in particular districts and periods. In the East the religion expanded fairly early even into outlying and unimportant areas, while in the north-west and in the northern Balkans the spread was for a much longer time confined to the main towns.

But equally important with the number of converts was the average type of person entering the community, the class to which he belonged, and the social influence he could exercise. We must remember here that the second century had seen the early Jewish nucleus converted into a Graeco-Roman one, and also that many people had joined from what today would be called the bourgeoisie—professional men, artisans, managers, merchants, and small farmers. Although the religious fervour and moral purity of the Christian community may have declined, its social importance had grown to the point at which eventually the state could not ignore this powerful organization living inside its territorial borders.

There were few trades in which a Christian was absolutely forbidden to engage. The normal principle was to let each man continue in the profession he was following before his conversion, provided he gave up any dishonest practices, curbed any undue desire for enrichment, and so forth. It was a special question whether a Christian should be allowed to serve in the army or hold public office, but most Christian authors answered this too in the affirmative (so Tertullian’s extravagances on the subject must not be taken as the general rule). It is therefore entirely reasonable to depict the Christian communities of the second and third centuries as composed of hard-working peaceful people, who were anxious to be sure of the morrow and found in religion a complement to the morality of their personal lives. Although in theory the distinction between believers and pagans continued (the former being the ‘tertium genus’ of mankind alongside Jews and Gentiles), in practice everything favoured a meeting and understanding between them. We have already shown that martyrs were in total a very small group compared with the incalculable number of Christians who lived their lives without any necessity of facing the final test, and who actually found means
to be a positive force in their environments by working and producing like their contemporaries. In its basic ideas, it is true, Christianity was subversive of the established order, for it proclaimed the equality of all men and the vanity of temporal concerns in comparison with celestial values. Yet in fact it admitted social distinctions as inevitable, and for centuries tolerated slavery (although improving the lot of the slave). It also recognized the beauty of work, adding here a duty to act virtuously; and the Christian took an interest in business, if for no other reason because wealth made charity easier and allowed greater assistance to be given to the needy.

In the early years of the second century we have evidence of Christians at Jerusalem, Damascus, Antioch, Caesarea, Tyre, Sidon, Iconium, Ephesus, Colossae, Laodicea, Hierapolis, Smyrna, Pergamum, Sardis, and Philippi, as well as in certain districts of Arabia, Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, and the Troad. Farther west they are found at Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens, and Corinth, and sporadically in Crete, Dalmatia, and other provinces. Lastly there were the churches at Rome, Puteoli, and Alexandria. By about 180 there were communities as well in Gaul (at Vienna and Lugdunum), Spain, North Africa (at Carthage and Madaura), southern Italy; and Egypt. The list of participants at the Council of Nicaea in 325 provides a complete picture of the spread of Christianity in the East at the beginning of the fourth century. For the West we must supplement this evidence from inscriptions and other texts, since the attendance from the western half of the Empire was very small. Ecclesiastical districts tended to be modelled on the administrative divisions of the empire, but in a number of places they went outside the political boundaries, as in Persia, Arabia, Armenia, and in Gothic territory. However we have little evidence about these Christian communities outside Rome’s dominions; they lived a harried existence, being persecuted by the local rulers both for reasons of foreign policy and because the upper class in question could not understand the faith. Yet the perseverance of the Church in these lands, the prosperity of local schools, and the emergence of a number of remarkable personalities, are all significant features worth recording.

. The Church Organization and the Councils

Already by about the end of the Apostles’ time Christianity was a ‘Catholic Church’ in the etymological sense of these two words: that is to say it was a visible association, organized, and universal in its outlook. The essential importance of the earliest ecclesiastical community, within the religious framework instituted by Christ, has become increasingly clear as the result of recent criticism, which completely reverses the earlier emphasis placed upon the individualistic outlook of the new religion. In fact the Church was the middle term, the indispensable intermediary between the faithful and their redeemer; and no action of salvation could be effective unless it was carried out within the Church. Again, Christian promises of a new Kingdom of God on earth could not be implemented without a religious society which
transcended the mere collection of persons possessing a common goal; such a society must become an ideal entity and its outlook must be essentially eschatological, directing all its activity with reference to the future. In precise Christian theory even the ecclesiastical hierarchy was not an end in itself. It was ordained to serve a ‘communion of saints’, the edification of the whole Body of Christ, and the creation of loving unity among believers. It was destined to survive all kinds of external and temporal forms. There are two aspects of the Church in primitive theory, the local community and the transcendent being, the ‘charismatic’ brotherhood and the organized society; and if we divorce these two aspects, still more if we make them antithetical to each other, we cannot any longer understand Christian origins, where lofty spiritual beliefs and concrete social actions were combined in a single harmonious whole.

To read the Acts of the Apostles is to see the importance of the ‘Twelve’ in the early ordering of the community. Their number, which was that of the old tribes of Israel, was proof of a clear belief in Jesus as the Messiah; and it symbolized the task, which Jesus had entrusted to them, of being witnesses to his resurrection and bearers of the faith confided to their charge. These twelve, having received powers of government and administration, proceeded to teach and perform cult rites. Yet very early we can distinguish in the sources two ways of understanding and carrying out the authority derived from God, namely the preservation of the faith and the performance of ritual services. In other words we must recognize that there was no constant use of ad hoc terms, and no precise correspondence between names and functions. The content of ecclesiastical power and the hierarchy employed by the faithful were variously conceived and interpreted according to the needs of the moment in different surroundings. But everyone knew well that a man acting ‘as one with authority’ must make use of his office not for his own advantage but to perform a service. Such men were ‘ministers’ in the Latin sense of the word.

Paul regarded himself as bishop of all the churches he had founded. He continued to direct them, passing from one to another; and in his absence there was only an ‘alter ego in loco’ left to carry out indispensable tasks. Yet in the church of Jerusalem and in the Eastern churches mentioned in the Johannine Apocalypse there is a bishop, who is the embodiment of the united community, residing on the spot and taking responsibility. We have already reached the general theory of the monarchical episcopate, which emerges clearly in the letters of St Ignatius of Antioch at the beginning of the second century. He outlines a precise conception of a bishop’s position and makes the various pastors the pivot in the working of particular churches. Very similar is the thinking of Cyprian of Carthage (mid-third century), who regarded each community as an organic unity governed by a local bishop with full powers.37 This bishop derives his authority from legitimate descent from the Apostles, through a regular process of succession.
At this point there arose the problem of relations between the various churches, since there was a pressing danger of fragmentation, a process damaging to Christianity from any point of view. The answer was given by (among others) Irenaeus of Lyons, who insisted that the Roman Church was pre-eminent and that all the faithful would do well to be in agreement with Rome if they wished to preserve intact the true faith handed down by the Apostles. In this way Rome became the witness, the mouthpiece, and the guardian of Christian tradition, not in virtue of priority of foundation (which it did not possess), nor because it was of Apostolic origin (which other illustrious churches could also claim), but as possessing something in greater measure than all the rest. This something was the doctrinal authority of its bishop, the surest weapon for confounding heretics and for establishing religious truth among all Christians. St Cyprian too recognized explicitly and fervently the ‘principalitas’ of the Roman Church, regarding it as the fountain-head of sacerdotal unity, that is to say as the archetype on which all churches were modelled. Yet he did not infer from this that Rome had the right to intervene in the affairs of other churches: he confined the Roman bishop’s action to the achievement of catholic unity. The other sees should conform to Rome’s method of procedure and look to it as a point of reference. For the ‘Cathedra Petri’ was not just a record and a symbol, but a present and working reality in the person of the Apostle’s successor.

Ignoring for the moment the intrusions of the civil authority in matters such as nomination of bishops, influence upon conciliar decisions, or grants of temporal power, we can still see the great events at the beginning of the fourth century clearly reflected in the field of ecclesiastical organization. The basic unit was still the bishopric of a city, but above this a growing authority belonged to the metropolitan who presided over a whole province; and from the end of the century onwards we also find patriarchs, who took charge of a number of provinces. Ecclesiastical districts inside the Roman empire tended to be modelled on the administrative divisions of the civil power; but there was no firm organization in outlying regions, and this made Christians tend to disperse at moments of attack by barbarians. The election of bishops was still in the hands of the clergy and city populations, but increasing importance was attained by the ‘colleges’, which in later times were indispensable for a new prelate’s consecration. In addition provincial councils became more frequent as conditions of life became more peaceful and communications more secure (before this time we have full information only about the Carthaginian councils in the mid-third century, which are said to have made decisions on the delicate position of ‘lapsed’ Christians and on the validity of baptism conducted by heretics). Dioceses were often disturbed by internal struggles, of which the most prolonged and intricate was the Antiochene schism of the third century. This last was brought about by doctrinal differences, conflict of personalities, and irregularities in procedure.
During the reign of Constantine the see of Rome was pushed into the background, but in the course of the fourth century it increased its authority and became an important centre of affairs. As if to underline the bishop’s title to priority a new phrase, ‘sedes Apostolica’, was introduced; this had never taken root earlier because the record of other Apostolic foundations was still fresh, but from that time on the title became the prerogative of Rome. The emperors too were eventually lavish with concessions. Gratian yielded to the bishop the title ‘pontifex maximus’, which had always been borne by his predecessors, and he put the police force at the bishop’s disposal for the execution of ecclesiastical sentences. Theodosius in an edict of 27 February 380, engaged himself to follow the religion ‘once taught to the Romans by the Apostle Peter and now proclaimed by the pontiff Damasus’.

Popes Damasus (366–384), Siricius (384–389), and Innocent I (as well as later Leo ‘the Great’, 440–461) were the main architects of this ‘theology of the primacy’ by making the weight of their doctrinal authority felt. They declared that no conciliar decision was valid without the approval of the bishop of Rome, ‘whose opinion should be asked before that of any others’. To almost every district too they sent ‘decretals’, letters replying to enquiries put to them by bishops on matters of ordinary administration. In these decretals they discussed questions of discipline and worship in a style which reveals complete awareness that their Apostolic power was supreme and that they exercised a right to which no one could any longer raise objection. Very soon their decisions began to be accepted as authoritative. They were put together in Canonical collections and eventually inserted in the Corpus Iuris Canonici. In all pontifical pronouncements on the primacy of Rome we find the notion that Peter is alive and at work in his Church, since the bishop of Rome is identified with him and when seated upon his chair can act as if he were Peter himself. The technical term used for this relationship was ‘vicarius’, which came to express the concept of substitution of persons between the Apostle and his successors.

Yet it was precisely this period which saw an accentuation of the difference between the two halves of Christendom, West and East; and many pontifical prerogatives and privileges granted to the Roman see were valid only in the western half. Inside this half there is a further distinction to be made between the area immediately subject to Rome (comprising the ecclesiae suburbicariae of Latium, Campania, Tuscany, Umbria, Picenum, Apulia, Calabria, and others) and the outer area divided among various metropoleis, such as Carthage, Aquileia, Milan, and Arles. Relations with the East became more strained every day, and the church of Constantinople claimed a patriarchal title which did not belong to it. It was of more recent foundation than other sees, and the claim could also foreshadow a dangerous primacy when exercised by bishops who were closely connected with the imperial court.

The first Oecumenical Council was held at Nicaea in 325 at the wish of the Emperor Constantine, who after his victory over Licinius wanted to give
a solemn manifestation of the religious unity obtaining in his dominions. More than 300 bishops assembled in this Bithynian city, brought there by the cursus publicus, and held their meetings in the halls of the imperial palace under the presidency of the emperor himself. An incidental reason for the assembly had been provided by a dispute which had broken out at Alexandria between the bishop and one of his priests named Arius, the matter at issue being the nature of the Son of God. Today, however, there is little interest in the doctrinal aspect of the long Arian controversy, since we accord Nicaea, and the councils which followed it, a specific position as ecclesiastical assizes, invested with very precise and substantial functions and powers. The governing principle of these councils may be described as episcopal oligarchy, as opposed to papal monarchy, even though the bishop of Rome was always present through his legates and though the legates were accorded a place of honour in the assembly. Yet it was also true that the final decisions had to be submitted to the pontiff and had no validity unless he promulgated them; and it was precisely during the Arian crisis that a conflict had to be resolved between the conclusions reached by tame councils of court bishops and the vetoes by Rome, sustained by the unshakable faith and iron will of St Athanasius of Alexandria. The Council of Tyre-Jerusalem in 335 is typical, as are those of Sirmium, Arles, Milan, Rimini, and Seleucia, but at Serdica in 343 the attempt to reconcile Catholics and Arians was a failure. It was recognized there, however, that the bishop of Rome could receive petitions from every part of Christendom and send the cases for examination by a synod. It was only when a fresh Oecumenical Council at Constantinople was summoned by the Emperor Theodosius in 381 that the Arian question could be regarded as resolved, with a complete victory for the dogma of consubstantiality of Father and Son which had been laid down at Nicaea.

j. Heresies

Distinctly earlier than political interference engendered by the Arian conflict Christendom had been troubled by ‘heretical’ movements, and we must now say something about their main course. Strict terminology should prevent us from starting with Gnosticism, since it is now accepted that this was much less a heresy than a general attitude to religious matters which was widespread between the end of the ancient period and the early centuries of the Christian era. But since the first development of ancient Christianity was heavily affected by the existence of this movement, it is essential to say a word about it and especially about the principal known exponents of the doctrine. The complexity and number of the different Gnostic systems make any reconstruction of their chief tendencies a difficult process. The best method of classification is still a geographical one, distinguishing the learned Gnosis, with its centre at Alexandria in Egypt, from the vulgar form which was common in Syria and Asia Minor. The one common element was a striving
after knowledge of divine mysteries, a knowledge to be acquired not through speculation but through a revelation given by heavenly powers to those who were prepared to receive it in a mystical initiation. This divine communication, which was transmitted by secret messages, was destined to lead to a vision of God and to transform a man in a way that offered him salvation. Yet for the Gnostics the true God was ineffable, and his perfection was unattainable. To bridge the gulf between God and the world they conjured up a complicated mythology and peopled the Universe with intermediate beings. Gnostics also emphasized the dualism between spirit and matter, despising matter and longing to free the soul from it, to enable the soul to reach a higher world. But the dualism in Gnosis remained insuperable, and the problem of evil was always the first and most serious problem it had to solve. They multiplied intermediate beings (aeons) and attributed the creation to an inferior god (demiourgos), but neither these nor their other expedients enabled them to overcome the difficulty; and pessimism became the result of the irreducible antagonism between Light and Darkness, Good and Evil. Nevertheless in those times of restlessness and enquiry complicated speculations of the kind we have outlined were agreeable, because they seemed to satisfy the need for initiation into something higher and for discovering the mysteries of life. So Gnostic doctrines spread widely and exerted a powerful pull on popular imagination, as also on the intellects of the pagan and Christian élite.

About 125 the Syrian Basilides took up residence at Alexandria, and in the same period there was born in that city the greatest and most influential of all second-century Gnostic thinkers, by name Valentinus. The importance of Basilides is his daring theory of pain, which he regarded as exclusively the result of sin. Consequently the martyrs, and even Christ himself, had suffered in expiation of sins they had earlier committed. He also conceived a system of emanations, extending for eight grades down from the Father, who was not begotten; and he supposed that there were at least 365 heavens, born from the unions between different angels.

Valentinus migrated from Egypt to Rome, and there he taught for about thirty years. He took care to reconcile, at least in appearance, his own doctrine with that of the community, and he therefore spoke rarely of the mysteries of Gnosis. His literary output is enormous and shows the extraordinary richness of his imagination. In addition he exercised, as head of his school, a remarkable influence on both streams of thought, Italian and Eastern, into which his followers were divided. He peopled the invisible world (pleroma) with a number of pairs called aeons, each of which generated the next (The Deep and Silence; Cognition and Truth; Logos and Life; Man and Church; and so on). The thirtieth aeon (Sophia) fell when it gave birth to the world, that is to a confused and amorphous mass with all the results one would imagine, such as Sin and Evil.38

One of the most controversial points concerned the figure of Christ. The
Gnostics looked on him as the heavenly being who had come to reveal the true God and purify man from the matter that clings to him. For Christians he was above all else the Saviour who had suffered for all mankind; but the Gnostics contested the efficacy of his passion and undermined one of the pillars of the Christian conception by regarding the passion as merely an appearance (this is the theory called 'Docetism'). Equally unacceptable by Christians was the distinction drawn between different categories of men (the pneumatici, who were sure of salvation; the psichichi, who might or might not attain to the faith; and the hylici, who were the majority and who were destined to perdition). This created a grading among the faithful and did not render the benefits of redemption accessible to all.

Finally we may mention the biblical exegesis undertaken by Ptolemy and Heracleon, which took its start from John’s Gospel and ended by rejecting the letter of that work completely in order to find in it simply a number of hidden meanings. Ptolemy has also left a Letter to Flora, explaining the value to be attached to the Mosaic Law. About Bardesanes of Edessa (second half of second century) it is hard to form a judgement, since it is disputed whether he was a heretical Gnostic or simply drew on some portions of Gnostic doctrine; in any case his influence is greater in the history of culture than of religion.39

Another convert to Gnosticism was Marcion, the son of a bishop, who was born at Sinope in Pontus but took up residence at Rome about 140. His considerable wealth and organizing ability enabled him to achieve rapid and marked success. He intensified the opposition between Law and Spirit which was already to be found in Paul, and eventually both repudiated the Old Testament and denied any value to the greater part of the Gospels, in an attempt to uphold a dualism between the supreme God and the inferior demiourgos on the one hand and the God of Evil on the other. Christ was the manifestation of the Good principle, but his manhood was only apparent. Marcion took pleasure in pointing out all the ‘Antitheses’ or apparent contradictions between different passages in the Bible, since he believed that they provided confirmation of his dualist views and also put the Jews in the worst possible light. Moreover the Apostles, all except Paul, were for him the followers of the demiourgos and not of Christ; and from this he concluded that it was essential to found a new Church for the small number of the elect, those who must live as ascetics and stand closely united in their new faith while awaiting salvation. Despite its inconsistencies Marcionism found a large following, because it simplified the exceedingly complex genealogies of the Gnostics and set out a small number of ideas which were both clear and accessible. But Marcionism in turn was later superseded by Manichaeism.

Of quite another type was Montanism, the heresy called ‘Cata-Phrygian’ from its earliest centre of diffusion. About the middle of the second century a neophyte called Montanus, quickly followed by two ladies named Priscilla
and Maximilla, began to prophesy and to claim that they saw a number of visions and fell into trances. These effusions of the Spirit, which were not uncommon elsewhere in early Christendom, were held to prepare the way for the Kingdom of the Paraclete, which would follow the Kingdoms of the Father (the Old Testament) and the Son (the hierarchy of the Church). It would be manifested in a celestial Jerusalem, which Montanus assured his hearers was about to descend from heaven and come to rest in a plain near the town of Pepusa, where he assembled his disciples. But when their expectation came to nothing, the Montanists organized themselves into a Church and spread widely in Africa and Gaul, though they had little following at Rome. Other features of Montanism included rigorous asceticism, condemnation of second marriages, a call to fasting, and a suggestion that property should be held in common. The Catholic clergy roused powerful opposition to the movement, which was condemned by a number of councils. For a brief period it had seemed really dangerous, on account of the fervour inspiring it and the fact that it was one of the last echoes of the early Christian belief in the end of the world.

To complete this rapid survey of the earliest heresies we must also mention those directly related to the person of Christ. For brevity’s sake they may be put into two groups, the Adoptionists and the Monarchianists. Representatives of the former included Theodotus, a leather-worker of Byzantium, another Theodotus who was a banker at Rome, a man called Asclepiodotus, and later one called Artemon of whom nothing is known. The second group was founded by Noetus of Smyrna, and among later members was Praxeas, who after being condemned at Rome migrated to Africa and was attacked by Tertullian in a celebrated pamphlet. The position of the Adoptionists is easy to understand, given the widespread view of antiquity that there were men who for their virtues had been adopted by gods. But it was a view that left the true divinity of Christ hopelessly compromised. Monarchianism, the heresy of the ‘unique principle’, was quite obviously derived from the rigid monotheism of the Jews. But this view too was fraught with damming consequences, which are summed up in a lapidary phrase of Tertullian, ‘Praxeas has exiled the Paraclete and crucified the Father’ (hence the custom of calling them Patripassians).

Monarchianism based on philosophical reasoning was carried to extreme conclusions by Sabellius at the beginning of the third century. He is credited with statements of the following order: ‘The Word is the Son and the Father, that is to say apart from the name there is only one Being. . . . The One God can be called both Father and Son.’ By these means the precise conception of the Trinity and the notion of Christ as both Man and God got lost, and his specific function as Redeemer, achieved through his Incarnation, was distorted. Yet one thing must be underlined, not from the dogmatic but from the more broadly cultural standpoint, about this multiplicity of theories and deep conflict between schools which we find between about 150 and
250 AD. This is the keenness of interest in speculative thought, combined with the influence exerted on Christian theology by classical philosophy. We should also note the uncertainty in the use of terminology, and the numerous errors made in the interpretation of the sacred books by many of those who tried to handle them.

k. The Greek and Latin Apologists

The view taken of the Christians by both educated people and the populace in the second century was mainly one of incomprehension accompanied by great contempt. So a number of writers, called Apologists, tried in this period to make known to the pagans the ground for their faith and to clear their brethren of the serious charges made against them. They appealed to the general laws of the Roman empire about matters of religion, and attempted to demonstrate the absurdity of many things in which their adversaries believed, by pointing to the immorality of the ancient gods and to the superiority of Christianity both in doctrine and in personal and social ethics.

The Christian Apologies were addressed to rulers, magistrates, or the people at large. They varied in length and nature according to the personal character of the authors and the time at their disposal: they could be erudite or straightforward, didactic or dialectical, satirical or hortatory, violent or serene. During the fifty years between 130 and 180 nearly a dozen Apologists are known, such as Quadratus, Marcianus, Aristides, Athenagoras, Tatian, Melito of Sardis, Theophilus of Antioch, and Miltiades. But the greatest of all was St Justin, who was born in Palestine about 100 and was converted to Christianity after various experiences in philosophy. He later moved to Rome, where he opened a free school and later suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius. In his two Apologies he is the champion of a type of Christianity 'ante litteram': the logos spermaticos illuminates the pagans and shows them the way to the full revelation of the truth made actual in Christ. He was also very conciliatory of the political authorities, in contrast (for example) to Tatian, who was most bitter in his attacks on everything produced by classical civilization and was practically a rebel against the laws of the state.

In addition the Apologists' writings are full of interest for the amount of information they provide about the life of Christian communities, and about Church organization, pious practices, the moral weaknesses of many members, methods of worship, and so on.

In the course of the second century another form of Christian literature began to appear. This too was polemical, but it was directed not at the external enemies of the faith but at those who fought it from within, the so-called 'heretics'. This term is derived from the Greek word for 'choice', since heretics were those who selected a portion of the truth from the treasury of revealed Christian doctrine, and therefore went outside the rule or canon laid down by the authorities of the Church. In actual fact there was for a long time no clear separation between orthodoxy and heresy since the former
gained its precision through dialectical argument with the latter; and in the majority of cases heresy at the outset did not present itself as a deliberate movement of separation, but rather as an attempt to deepen and interpret what existed already. The delicate process of selection and assimilation occupied several centuries before the majestic and harmonious edifice of Christian theology was fully built. But this period is important not only from the standpoint of the history of thought but because of the human interest attaching to the personality of the protagonists, with the intimate drama of their thoughts, the keenness of their disputes, and the multiplicity of views and doctrines they produced.

Here we shall mention only the chief authors of polemics against the heretics, though it should be noted that many other writers of the early centuries (historians, Apologists, and theologians) contain important and valuable information about the various exponents of heretical movements, together with attempts to confute their errors. The greatest champion of the Catholic reaction was St Irenaeus, a native of Asia Minor: he later moved to Gaul, where he became bishop of Lyons during about the last thirty years of the second century. His most important surviving work is the *Adversus haereses* in five books, in which he not only demonstrates the errors of the Gnostics but lays great insistence on the conception of the Incarnation as the summit of divine intentions, designed to give mankind full possession of the life of God. For Irenaeus, Christ summarizes all humanity, being the centre of creation and the explanation of all the workings of providence. In this way the story of the world can be regarded as an educative process, bringing man to the highest ranks of perfection through the many manifestations of God’s redeeming love. But Irenaeus was also a great upholder of the value of tradition, as the guarantee that man is adhering to the faith that has been revealed. We have already seen the strength of the claims he makes for the continuity of the Roman bishopric (see above, p. 877).

For all his merits the theological speculation of Irenaeus is not greatly original, being confined almost entirely to references to the Scriptures. Greater heights of thought were reached in the so-called School of Alexandria which directed Christian doctrine into new channels by trying to show that the new religion was able to meet the widespread spiritual needs of the time, and by borrowing formulae and ideas from pagan philosophy to express the content of what had been revealed. The attempt was a bold one and was not free from awkward consequences. But Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen put serious preparation into the task they had set themselves, and for this reason their achievements are enduring.

Pantaenus was a native of Sicily, learned in Indian philosophy, who opened his own school in Alexandria in the last quarter of the second century. He imparted various religious notions to the faithful, and also to any Jews and pagans who wanted instruction on the subject. Clement was his pupil, a man born at Athens about 150, who had already taken up with a number of
philosophical schools and mystery religions. He pursued the teaching methods and the doctrines of Pantaenus for more than twenty years, his aim being to act as a sure guide to souls in their search for God and in the way to possess him: this was something they could achieve if they lived in accord with the precepts of true *Gnosis*, which meant revelation. To this end Clement also composed a number of writings, of which some survive. The *Protrepticus* is an exhortation to the Greeks, in twelve chapters. Then there is the *Pedagogy*, in three books, a long moral treatise teaching the way to comport oneself in the various circumstances of daily life without sacrificing one's religious duties. Thirdly the *Stromata*, in eight books, an untidy collection of notes on the nature of true *Gnosis*, on the relation between *Gnosis* and faith, and on the picture of the perfect Gnostic. Another interesting work is his homily entitled 'Quis dives salvetur', which does not take the well-known passage in the Gospels literally and displays great tolerance towards rich Christians.

Clement expressed the Christian faith with feeling and sincerity; he was also deeply concerned with morality, and showed respect for the Church and its sacraments. But his system is defective because he pushed the position of Christ as Redeemer too much into the background, losing it under a vague conception of an illuminating and educative force among mankind. He also uses allegory too much in his interpretation of the data in the Bible, constructing an artificial piece of exegesis on every word and incident. Yet one must recognize that this was the one way to get the Bible text accepted by the non-believers of his day.

From various standpoints Origen was very different from Clement. He was born a Christian, had much more sense of the duties belonging to the life of an ecclesiastical community, and had much wider and more diversified cultural interests. Even under his direction the school at Alexandria had no official status. It was more like a higher institute for sacred studies; and the same continued at Caesarea when Origen was compelled to leave his own city as the result of his excommunication by an episcopal synod (for ordaining a priest outside his own diocese). We shall say more about Origen's thought later on. Here it is enough to add a note about his successors in the Alexandrian *Didaskaleion*, which changed its organization and outlook after his departure, though it always remained a cultural centre of very great significance and distinction. Its teaching began with Dialectic (what we should call formal logic), which trained pupils to reason; then followed Geometry and Astronomy, which gave them rigour and precision, and the Natural Sciences, which taught them to classify, and so to admire God's creation. Then one passed to higher studies, divided into Ethics and Natural Theology. The explanation of the Holy Scriptures was the crown of this *cursus* of encyclopaedic education in which the constant concern was to give a religious tone to everything: science was not to be cultivated for its own sake, but only as a means of raising the student to the level of his Creator and so preparing men who were active and ready to defend their beliefs.
For two years the headship was held by Heraclas, an ex-colleague of Origen who had later abandoned philosophy in order to make himself into a rigid tutor of orthodoxy. When he was then made bishop of Alexandria, the direction of the school passed to another of Origen’s pupils, Dionysius, who, following the same path as his predecessor, was himself made bishop down to 264. He conducted a lively series of theological disputes with his namesake the bishop of Rome, since like all Origenists the Alexandrian Dionysius admitted some degree of subordination of the Son to the Father. Later on we have scanty references to the Alexandrian school, and the figures of its chief exponents, such as Theognostus, Pierius, Pietrus, and Achillas, do not stand out with any clarity. Later the one notable thinker was Didymus the Blind, but times had now changed and the heat of the Arian conflict had modified the local situation. Several defects in Origen’s system came to light, and a new cycle began both on the theological side and in the problem of relations between Christianity and classical culture.

In Alexandria it was the Hellenistic mentality which Christian thought had encountered and heavily absorbed. Its contacts were different in the towns of Syria and Mesopotamia, but not less important since those countries too were rich in cultural traditions. In this way the Christian religious message took on different forms of expression related to the place in which it was being unfolded; and the situation was complicated by a number of questions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction (such as the authority and precedence of the great patriarchal sees), as well as by the political interests of the Roman empire. This or that body of doctrine would win favour, for reasons which were not always clear (or at any rate not wholly so) and were not entirely the result of speculative thought. The main representative of the trend running counter to that of Alexandria was the so-called School of Antioch in Syria. When Antioch too became Graecized, the role of bulwark of the old native theology current among the Eastern churches was taken over by Edessa, a metropolis of religion and letters in the Euphrates valley and a point of contact between Semites and Westerners. But the time came when even the survival of this theology at Edessa was rendered impossible by the hostility of the emperors at Constantinople, who had political reasons for favouring the Alexandrians. At this point representatives of the Antioch school took refuge at Nisibis, outside the borders of the empire. There they strengthened their position by establishing relations with the Arabs, and for many centuries they exerted a generally beneficial influence.

The main point of divergence lay in the different principles adopted by the two schools over biblical exegesis. In contrast to the Allegorism of Alexandria, which sacrificed the text in order to discover in it some more hidden and spiritual meaning, the prevailing tendency at Antioch was one which may be called historico-grammatical. This was based on solid hermeneutic principles, and was designed to give the maximum value to the letter of the text, without any frills and fantasies. We know little of Antioch’s
cultural life before the end of the third century, but at that moment a personality of real significance made himself felt. This was Lucian, a native of Samosata educated at Edessa, who was eventually martyred at Nicomedia in 312. He became the centre of a group of churchmen, bound to one another by close ties, who are known as Conelcianists. They ultimately occupied all the main episcopal sees, with Eusebius at Nicomedia, Maris at Chalcedon, Menofas at Ephesus, Theognis at Nicaea, and Leontius at Antioch. But Arius too was one of their number and this may be enough to show the general lines of their theology.

The chief work of Lucian was to edit a text of both Old and New Testaments. This was called 'Lucianean' after its author, but it was also known as the 'common' text because it circulated so widely in the East. By matter-offact methods and constant attention to the sacred writings Lucian presented explanations which were the outcome of patient research and were free from mystical ventures. Yet his teaching aroused great enthusiasm, perhaps because there was need for a return to clarity and precision after the over-daring flights of fancy achieved by the Alexandrians. But it seems that Lucian, following a local tradition which had previously had its greatest exponent in Paul of Samosata, did not explicitly recognize the divinity of Christ. He would not allow the Son of God the same nature as that of the Father, but regarded the Son as being adopted by God and equipped with exceptional qualities. It may be that this idea, in the form Lucian expounded it, was not an error of dogma but simply a judgement which happened to diverge from what was commonly accepted. It caused great trouble none the less, and a campaign of criticism was unleashed with rapid and unparalleled violence.

The earliest Christian writers in Latin who attained any literary dignity were Tertullian and Minucius Felix, both of them Africans living at the end of the second century. Almost to the middle of the fourth century the principal Christian literature in Latin came almost exclusively from African authors, and for another century after this the contribution of the district was still very marked.

The apologetic works of Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus are distinguished from those of Greek writers of a slightly earlier date by the legal support he gives to his arguments and by the violence of his invective. This invective is too rhetorical to be convincing, and in general Tertullian's position is strained, although he had undoubtedly qualities as a controversialist and was completely sincere in his passion as a converted Christian, jealous to preserve in its purity the faith he had attained. Besides the Apologeticus and ad Nationes he wrote a long list of works: the de praescriptione Haereticorum, adversus Marcionem, ad Scapulam, adversus Praxeum, de Baptismo, de paenitentia, de spectaculis, de patientia, de cultu feminarum, ad uxorem, de fuga in persecutione, de pudicitia, and de pallio. For the most part these are lively works which touch on very real problems. They show signs of their
author's rigid moralism, the quality which towards the end of his life took him outside orthodoxy into the sect of the Montanists. But they also reveal a high level of classical culture, which despite Tertullian's repeated protests that he wanted nothing to do with the fruits of pagan thought yet allowed him to twist his language into the expression of ideas previously unknown and so to forge a new vocabulary.

Minucius, in his dialogue *Octavius*, reveals a completely different character. Although he defends the Christians from false charges and criticizes superstition, he presents a Christianity without Christ, one which is confined to the basic elements of divine justice and natural ethics. Minucius is an elegant writer, but he clings too closely to his classical models and has none of that vigour which despite everything made Tertullian so great.

In the mid-third century another convert, Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (see above p. 876), a man who had also given proof of organizing ability, of apostolic charity on many occasions of calamity, and of understanding for sinners in time of persecution, was able to make a not inconsiderable contribution to literature by publishing thirteen treatises and more than eighty letters. The titles include *ad Donatum*, *ad Demetrianum*, *de Lapsis*, *de Dominica oratione*, *de habitu virginit*, *de opere et eleemosyn*is, *de Bono patientiae*, and *de Catholicae Ecclesiae unitate*. Quite apart from the immense importance of these as historical sources, and even if we ignore the full contribution they make to dogmatic and disciplinary questions, they are quite admirable for their stylistic elegance, balanced periods, and the gentleness and lofty harmony which the author's personality has imprinted throughout their pages.

Another African, Arnobius, a late convert to Christianity, wrote very differently (c.AD 300). The style of his seven books *adversus Nationes* is pompous and classical in manner; there is no deep Christian feeling behind his violent polemics against the pagans; but his satire can be effective and he is capable of vivid illustration. More learned and more serene was his pupil the 'Christian Cicero', Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius. He again was an African, the author of seven books entitled *Divinae Institutiones*, a systematic presentation of Christianity, and also of the *de Opificio Dei*, the *de Ira Dei*, and an important historical account *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, the reliability of which is not affected by the writer's preconceived thesis. Lactantius lived at the moment of transition between the persecutions and the later favours bestowed on Christianity by the state. He saw that the new religion was a precious feature of civilization and was therefore conscious of its more humane and beneficent aspects. He expressed these views in a finished prose style, though in the search for the elegant phrase he often falls flat. His doctrine too is lacking in depth, though he has clear ideas about theology and ethics.

A further polemic against the pagans was the *de Errore profanarum religionum* of the Sicilian Firmicus Maternus. But by now (in the second
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half of the fourth century) the main themes of Christian writers had altered, by reason of the changed spiritual background, the development of dogma, and the needs of pastoral teaching. We have reached the golden age of patristic, which saw an exceptional flowering of genius: these were men who combined culture with piety, mastery in writing with the sincere resolve to help their contemporaries through education. In this way not only did the heritage of Christian thought expand miraculously, but literature too had a remarkable revival: even in this part of human activity the new faith could exercise its refreshing power. We need not list all the authors who flourished in this period. A few words about the leading names will give us a clear idea of the type of writing then in vogue and its distinguishing features.

Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers, after being exiled to the East by the Emperor Constans II on account of his opposition to Arianism, brought back to his own country a cultured and polished vocabulary of a kind unknown before in the West, although his own writings (de Trinitate, de Synodis, contra Constantium, and a number of sacred hymns) use involved forms and archaic language. But the bringing of Greek Christian thought to the Latin world was even more effectively the work of St Ambrose. In 374 (he died in 397) he was suddenly elected bishop of Milan by the people, having gone there as civil governor to take part in the assembly; and he quickly found it necessary to build up an ecclesiastical culture on the Greek model. His main works, apart from several lengthy letters, are on oratory, exegesis, and dogma; and something is said about his hymns on p. 928. Titles include Exameron, de Virginitate, de officiis Ministrorum, de Mysteriis, de Excessu fratri, contra Auxentium, and de obitu Theodosii. All his writings have great historical interest, because of the abundance of references to events of his time, but what also emerges most clearly is the author's humanity. He passionately longed to bring moral perfection to his hearers; he was fully conscious of the prerogatives of a bishop, believing them valid even against the highest political authorities; and his noble spirit revolted against social injustice. A judgement on him as a writer is made difficult by our text, which in many cases is a later elaboration of Ambrose's own words based on notes or stenographic reports of his discourses. In general, however, he was cultivated, elegant, and lively; and just as he was always concerned above all else to exalt the ethical ideal of pagan sages in the light of Christianity, so too he brought back to life the language and style of classical writing.

The arduous process whereby the Christians absorbed the culture of earlier times found its greatest practitioner in St Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus). He was a Dalmatian who had lived at Trier and did most important biblical work at Rome, but who then took refuge in a hermitage at Bethlehem, where he died in 419. As a controversialist he was quick to take offence, but he was a man of rigid moral standards and an untiring scholar. He gave Christianity of the period around 400 what it lacked, a Latin translation of the Bible which was satisfactory from every standpoint. Yet in his opinion
this laborious philological work on the Holy Book could not be an end in itself: it had the didactic aim of teaching the spirit of the Christian religion by way of the letter, in order to derive good rules for practical conduct. This explains his continual representation of arguments between Cicero and Christ, of which we find an echo in his *Letters*; and these works are interesting for other reasons, both for their historical references and because they are often regular treatises on asceticism and spiritual guidance. They give great charm to the character of their author, which is full of humanity and intense feeling. Lastly we must mention Jerome's historical works, his *Chronicon*, *de Viris Illustribus*, certain *Lives*, and a number of writings against the heretics of his day. It is right to emphasize the linguistic and stylistic excellences of the author, who had so keen a sense of Latinity but could combine the purest classicism with his spiritual vigour and achieve an original synthesis which was both admirable and productive.

But superior to all earlier Fathers in genius and culture, and in the experience he had endured in relation to the problems he confronts, was Aurelius Augustinus, the greatest doctor of the Latin Church. We shall deal later with his life and philosophical thinking (p. 903), but must say something here about his contribution to literature. To understand their meaning and value we must follow the writings of Augustine step by step, since there are few other authors whose writing expresses so dramatically the stages in his turbulent intellectual and religious experience. Every work, however short and however much confined to particular subjects, has an important place in the evolution of his thought. The vast mass of his writings makes a summary impossible, and we must be content with indicating Augustine's themes. Above all there were the polemics against a number of heretics, the Manichaeans, Donatists, Pelagians, and Arians. The order is both chronological and logical, if we remember that he first confronted questions about God and the universe, then those about the Church and salvation, then passed to Man and freedom, and closed the cycle with the problem of Man, God, and the Redeemer. Next come his works of exegesis and teaching; then his enormous output on theology and philosophy, followed by his moral and pedagogical writings; and finally there is his 'opus magnum et arduum', the *de Civitate Dei*, an encyclopaedia of Apologetic and doctrine. To these must be added his *Sermones, Epistulae, Retractiones*, and a number of scattered works. One is left astonished at the capacity of this one man, who in addition attended to the affairs of his diocese and of the African Church, administered justice, concerned himself with the spiritual well-being of his friends, ministered to the poor, and so forth. Psychological subtlety, acuteness of speculation, an ardent faith, and zeal for the right cause, all these are qualities to be found in his writings, and even now we have not included his clarity, objectivity, and learning. He is able to adapt his form to his content, availing himself of all the resources coming to him from a consummate knowledge of literature. At the same time he gave his work a personal stamp, which in no
way detracts from the elegance and compactness of his style, but yet is better able to express the intensity of feeling in his soul. In other words he is always sincere and convincing as a writer, even though he borrows heavily from rhetorical schemes laid down by the schools and is full of reminiscences from the Bible. Nevertheless, just because his writing is so personal, it is lacking in any order imposed from outside; it is rich in digressions and does not appear to exhaust his themes. Unity in his work must be sought rather in the way he radiates outwards from a central idea. One must always progress upwards from the incidental point which caused Augustine to direct his pen to the general principles to which he repeatedly comes back in his adventurous arguments and which he illustrates with warmth of emotion and even anguish.

1. Byzantine Caesaro-papism and Arianism

The definitive phase of Constantine’s imperial organization saw the triumph of the monarchical idea, supported politically by a hierarchy of lay imperial officials, and also by a hierarchy of churchmen under the leadership of bishops belonging to the triumphant new monotheistic religion. It was the continuous aim of this emperor to prevent his unified system from breaking up, either through the creation of a dualism such as that which later operated with fatal consequences between laity and clergy, or by the dissolution of religious unity as the result of theological disputes. Yet these disputes were inevitable, above all in Constantine’s time the ‘Arian’ controversy. This started about 320 at Alexandria, in the form of a strictly theological argument related to the person of Christ. In the early centuries two sets of doctrine had made their appearance, one at Alexandria the other at Antioch, both tending to subordinate the Son to the Father, although not denying to the Son his exceptional function in the ‘economy’ of the Redemption. Arius, who was born in Libya, a cultivated and serious-minded priest, said something in a sermon which displeased his bishop Alexander and brought on himself condemnation at the hands of the local synod. In other districts, however, Arius was warmly received, and in this way the movement began to spread and bring itself to the attention of the political authorities. At this time the Emperor Constantine, having defeated his colleague Licinius, had emerged as sole emperor, and was tending to push the centre of gravity of his state farther and farther to the East. It was a good moment for summoning an Oecumenical Council, to show the world the value of imperial protection to the Church, and at the same time to clarify a number of doctrinal and disciplinary points which had not yet been defined with sufficient precision. In this way the causes of conflict might be removed.

In May of 325 the Council met at Nicaea. So far as Arianism was concerned, it established the doctrine of ‘consubstantiality’ (Homoousia) of the Son with the Father, in contrast to the Arian view of the relationship as one of
'similarity' (Homoeousia). As a result Arius was sent into exile as a heretic and his followers were removed from any bishoprics they were holding.

But very soon Constantine changed his policy. There may have been family reasons for this, but the real force was a political one, as is proved by the succession of emperors who from that time on were friendly to Arianism. They could not ignore the fact that an oligarchy of bishops at court, ready to obey the political power, was an instrument of government of a kind not provided by the popular mass of Catholics, who were led by bishops out to defend their own independence in religious affairs. So although the new bishop of Alexandria, Athanasius, made himself a rigorous defender of Nicene Catholic orthodoxy, we enter upon a period of many decades marked by a giddy round of councils, protests, condemnations, exiles, and definitions, tending first in one direction and then in the other.

By now, however, Constantine had decided on a policy of supporting Arianism, and this was later followed by his son Constantius II. In 335 a council was held at Tyre at Constantine's wish, to rehabilitate Arius and condemn Athanasius. In 337 both Constantine and Arius died. When the struggle for the imperial succession was over, the victor, Constantius II, thought he could complete his restoration of political unity in the empire by restoring moral unity through the imposition of Arianism. A series of councils was held at Arles, Milan, Rimini, Sirmium, and Seleucia, at which the will of the dominus prevailed and a number of the orthodox (such as Hilarius of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Dionysius of Milan, and Eusebius of Vercellae) had to go into exile. Even the bishop of Rome, Liberius, was compelled, by the use of actual force, to retire to Beroea; but a few years later, exhausted by his labours, he pledged himself to lay down an anodyne formula, and was allowed to return to his see. Meanwhile, however, the Arians were splitting up into various parties, ranging from the moderates, like Basilius of Ancyra, to the very extreme 'anomians' such as Aetius, who by now had little that was Christian in their thought.

m. Julian's Attempt at Pagan Restoration

On the death of Constantius II the new ruler, Julian, also possessed unified political power. He had by nature an aversion from Christianity, but to this he added disgust at the endless doctrinal conflicts among the Christians and at the way the imperial power was caught up in them. He wanted to go back in history to the early ideas of Constantine, when Christianity was no more than a tolerated religion and paganism was still the religion of the state.

Hence his twofold action, for the restoration of paganism and the disintegration and abasement of Christianity. To attain the latter aim he stopped all favour for Arianism and even brought Athanasius back from exile. With this move he administered a set-back to the party which did not possess the support of the masses; indeed, to prevent the excesses of the orthodox party, their main spokesmen, and even the bishops returning from exile, undertook
the task of pacification. But at the same time Julian fomented their quarrels. He recalled the African Donatists, much beloved by the humiliores; he removed Christian teachers from the schools on the ground that they were incompetent to explain the texts of pagan literature; he cancelled privileges granted to the Christians; and he put into circulation once more all the polemic and accusation directed against them by the Jews, and by Celsus, Porphyry, and others.

On the other hand the paganism he proposed to restore was certainly not the paganism of Augustus' day. It had been largely altered by theurgical ideas and Oriental influences, designed to meet the new needs of the human spirit and the religious innovations introduced by the two men who inspired Julian's policy, Maximus of Ephesus and Julianus of Athens. Moreover these cults, partly from conviction and partly in order to compete successfully, were beginning to imitate the Christian hierarchy and social work. Priests, each of whom attended to the cult of all the gods, were subordinated to the emperor as pontifex maximus. Austerity, religious preaching, the giving of alms, and even some ceremonies and ritual (such as initiation and penitence) were being copied from Christian practice.

But by now Julian's attempt could only be artificial. Victory over the Persians was intended to bear witness to protection and power of the ancestral gods. When this failed and Julian died, the whole undertaking came to an end, though it had brought ruin to thousands and led to violence its author had never intended.

n. The Triumph of Catholicism

With the death of Julian and the accession of Valentinian and Valens the pagan restoration collapsed and Christianity resumed its progress. But at the same time the Arian controversy revived, though in a minor key, in a number of centres. Even at Milan Ambrose as bishop had to face certain obdurate Arians, who were supported by the Empress Justina.

Yet broadly speaking the triumph of the Catholic Church had been achieved by the end of the century. It was sealed in 380 by an edict of Theodosius I imposing the Nicene Creed; and this was proclaimed by an Oecumenical Council convoked by the same emperor at Constantinople, which declared as valid the faith professed by Damasus at Rome and by Peter at Alexandria. Peter had succeeded Athanasius, who had died after a long period of exile in Gaul, where he had introduced monasticism, a practice hitherto unknown in the West though fairly widespread in Egypt.

The Arian affair occupied fully sixty years of the middle of the fourth century, and had repercussions and effects of various kinds in every territory of the Roman empire. If we are to make a complete judgement upon it, we must take account of two factors, the religious or theological aspect, and that related to politics and Church organization. On the first aspect the point to notice is that beyond the various formulae lay two conceptions of divinity.
One was a cold, philosophical, and distant conception of the supreme God, on the Greek model: the other was the more original Christian conception of the Father who was the mysterious giver of life. Here the victory of Catholicism was of advantage to all later progress in the elaboration of doctrine and philosophy. As to the second aspect, it is clear that Arianism gave Caesaro-papism its first test and showed the unhappy consequences that flow from state absolutism when it is applied to personal beliefs and extended to the field of ecclesiastical organization. In its own turn the Church hierarchy, with certain laudable exceptions, showed itself to be lacking in moral energy and unaware of its duties.

But the decline of paganism was given official and decisive recognition during the rule of Gratian (367–383) and Theodosius I (379–395), the latter being the colleague who was originally chosen by Gratian to govern the East but who gained control of the West as well after Gratian’s death. It was in this period that the old priestly colleges had their immunities suppressed, and that the dignity of pontifex maximus, renounced by the emperors, became a prerogative of the popes. The senate, despite the prayers of Symmachus, removed the statue of Victory. And finally Theodosius ordained the closing of pagan temples and the abolition of their priesthoods, a speech in opposition by Libanius proving of no avail.

The last restoration of paganism was that undertaken by the rival emperor Eugenius (392–394), who had been proclaimed by the Gaul Arboigastes after his destruction of Valentinian II, and was in the paradoxical position of receiving support from both barbarian soldiers and traditionalist Romans. But the attempted restoration was futile and short-lived, as well as being confined to a small area. After Eugenius had been defeated by Theodosius on the Frigidus the official condemnation of paganism became final.

The condemnation could take effect more easily in the populous towns than in the villages and countryside. It naturally did not root up every cult which had thousands of years’ history behind it. We can prove the contrary from ancient evidence like that from Maximus at Turin, and also from inescapable survivals of the ancient gods in the cults of saints who took their places: such saints gradually established connections with hilltops, woods, fountains, and caves, the last refuges of pagan worship. It is an open question whether the actual name ‘pagan’ was coined to distinguish the followers of the ancient religion because they survived only in the pagi, or whether it was intended to mark the contrast with the Christians who formed the ‘militia Christi’.

0. The Conflict between Rome and Constantinople

The bishopric of Constantinople had no right whatever to claim parity with the other great metropolitan sees in the ancient Church. Still less was it in a position to compete with Rome, which boasted an exceptional tradition doubted by no one hitherto. On the other hand it is easy to understand how
emperors ruling or residing in the East found it useful to push the bishop of
their capital into prominence. He was almost invariably going to be subservient
to their wishes, and made an excellent instrument in their hands, especially
as he had influence on his fellow bishops. A good instance of this situation
is found at the Council of 381, when Theodosius as emperor, though defend-
ing orthodoxy against the last Arian efforts at resistance, decided at the same
time that the bishop of Constantinople was entitled to ‘a primacy after the
bishop of Rome, since his city was a second Rome’. This opened a very wide
door. It made a city’s political position the test of the importance of its
ecclesiastical see, disregarding any other type of claim and preparing the
way for Byzantium to exercise oecumenical jurisdiction directly the older
Rome should have lost all political significance.

The situation became even more complicated at the beginning of the
fifth century, when John Chrysostom, a man who was both high-minded
and obstinate, became bishop of Constantinople and intervened forcefully
in court affairs and in the lives of rich Christians in the city. At least twice
he was sent into exile, at the instigation of the Empress Eudoxia and despite
the protests of his devoted admirers among the faithful. This shows clearly
that the performance of Church business in that city was now wholly depen-
dent on the interests of the state, and that even doctrinal orthodoxy was a
matter secondary to the need to win the sympathy of certain influential
representatives of the clergy.

Imperial policy was often determined by the conflict between the see of
Byzantium and the great sees of Alexandria and Antioch, a conflict which
varied in severity but was never far below the surface. Rome would take part
in the exercise on occasions, though usually as a moderating and balancing
force.

Without going outside the limits of this volume we may sum up the position
by saying that every new event made the conflict more fundamental. The
dependence of the bishop of Constantinople upon his ruler became more
emphatic, and the Byzantine clergy in general had to serve political needs.
The result was a Caesaro-papist system of mutual responsibility, which
though damaging to religion brought no small gain to the state and was one
of the reasons why the Roman imperial organization in the East could survive
so long.

The Roman bishop, on the other hand, eventually controlled every activity
which went on in his city, and acquired such superiority to every other
power that in later days he was able to dispose of thrones in western Europe.
Pope Leo, in the mid-fifth century, in his wise and courageous action on
behalf of the city when it was menaced by the barbarians and possessed no
civil organization, almost seems like a mediaeval pontiff. Rome, he declared,
had been ‘founded anew by the Apostles, and was destined to be head of an
empire which was truly universal’. This explicit pronouncement on Rome’s
mission shows the conception of history which then prevailed and the
interpretation given at that time to the spiritual and temporal primacy of the 'Eternal City', even when confronted with the 'New Rome' on the Bosporus.

7. GRAECO-ROMAN PHILOSOPHY

a. Stoicism

Philosophers at Rome in the first century of the empire did not lead a peaceful existence, especially the Stoics, who mostly held republican views. Their propaganda against despotism provoked reprisals from a number of emperors, such as Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, Vespasian (who banished all philosophers from Rome in 71), and Domitian—that is to say chiefly, but not exclusively, those who were tending in the direction of the Dominate. This state of affairs, combined with the small interest shown in philosophy by the Italians of those days, helps to explain why, after an initial period in which the figure of the Spaniard Seneca stands out, these studies and speculations were largely left to Greeks and Orientals. Even such Westerners as remained in the field eventually very often wrote in Greek. Moreover the general tendency was for thinkers to concern themselves with moral and religious questions rather than with the improvement of methods of thought.

L. Annaeus Seneca the Younger (c. AD 4–65) belonged to the Stoic school, the one which was the most numerous in the first century AD. It counselled and taught its adherents to be indifferent to the external world and to uphold a rigid code of morals. By this time Stoicism was less of a philosophical theory than a guide to a noble life, in which a man was prepared to sacrifice himself to avoid departing from his ideals. Seneca’s work showed partiality towards eclecticism and was written in a forceful, though somewhat artificial and rhetorical style. Like other Stoics he was concerned with practical ethics, which he treated in all its aspects in twelve dialogues. He also wrote, on similar subjects, the Ad Neronem de Clementia, the De Beneficiis, the Naturales Quaestiones and the Epistulæ Morales, the last two addressed to one Lucilius.

Two other famous Stoics of this period, both of whom wrote in Greek, were also Westerners, namely L. Annaeus Cornutus of Lepcis and C. Musonius Rufus of Volsinii. Cornutus was the teacher of Persius (see below p. 921) and was exiled by Nero: he wrote in both Greek and Latin, and there survives a Theologia Graeca containing historical, allegorical, and etymological explanations of myths (the scholia to Persius and the very late Disticha Cornuti are not his). Musonius was twice exiled, once by Nero, the second time probably by Titus; and each time recalled, first by Galba and then by Titus himself. His writings, consisting of both discourses and letters, are lost; but his work lay less in them than in his very flourishing school, which was attended by both Lucan and Persius. A pupil of his, named Pollio, composed the Thoughts of Musonius, a work still read in the fifth century.
At the turn of the century lived Hierocles of Alexandria, described as 'vir sanctus et gravis', from whom there survive on papyri large parts of a work on the guiding duties of life entitled *Elementary Ethical Theory*.

Epictetus of Hierapolis in Phrygia (c. AD 60–140), the manumitted slave of a freedman of Nero, was a pupil of Musonius and maintained a school at Rome until he was banished by Domitian to Nicopolis in Epirus. He was a pure Stoic, hostile to eclecticism; his curriculum consisted of logic, reading of philosophical works, and practice exercises in which the pupils criticized their master. He did not publish his writings, but we know of his ideas and methods from his devoted pupil Arrian of Nicomedia, who wrote eight books called the *Diatribes of Epictetus* (four have survived), twelve books of *Homilies*, and an *Encheiridion* which was later re-edited by the Christians and subjected to commentary in the Middle Ages.

Dio Cocceianus, later nicknamed Chrysostomus, from Prusa in Bithynia (c. AD 40–115), started by being hostile to philosophy but later became a champion of Stoicism. He made long journeys in the north-eastern provinces of the empire (writing a *Getica*, which has been lost). He had been exiled by Domitian, but was recalled in 97. In his *Diatribes* he tackled serious social and political problems; then he held municipal offices in Bithynia (his *Bithynian Orations* belong to this period); in 105 he was again in Rome, but is last heard of once more in Bithynia in 110–111, when he was put on trial before the Younger Pliny. Of his seventy-six *Orations* the earliest (such as the Rhodian and Trojan) are artificial pieces of rhetoric belonging to the period of his activity as a Sophist; the others were written in his Stoic period (such as the *Diogenic Orations*, the *De Regno*, the *Olympian Oration*, the *Political Questions*, and the *Euboean Oration* on poverty). An admirer of ancient Greece and a critic of Rome, he possessed a style which for all his attempts at polish remained heavy. But he tried to equal the Attic orators (see again below p. 932).

Kebes in his *Pinax* or *Tabula*, a first-century work anticipating Lucian-described a picture on view in a temple, and drew from it a complete alle, gorical interpretation of human life, imagined as a city with bastions (man's duties) all round it. This work circulated widely from the second century onwards, and is a mixture between Stoic thought and that of the Platonists and Pythagoreans.

The last name in this list of Stoics is that of the emperor Marcus Aurelius (121–180), who from his boyhood days, when he heard the orators Herodes Atticus and Fronto, was a follower of the Stoics Apollonius of Chalcidon and Junius Rusticus. We possess some of his Latin letters to Fronto, but for his own satisfaction he wrote the *Meditations* (*ta ei is heauton*), which have survived in a small collection composed between 166 and 174. This is a marvellously intimate work, consisting not so much of confessions as of daily reflections and thoughts which have been noted down. No special attention has been paid to style or language, but the sensibility and sincerity are such as to *GG*
make this one of the most exquisite pieces of writing which appeared before the triumph of Christianity. In the *Meditations* we can see not only the melancholy that besets the ‘philosopher’ emperor, but the whole complex spiritual condition of the most highly educated part of the contemporary pagan world.

b. Other Schools

The Peripatetic school still had a few representatives, but we know little more of them than their names.

Among Epicureans may be mentioned Diogenianus (second century) who wrote attacks on the Stoic teaching of Chrysippus, and Diogenes Laertius of Cilicia who wrote a *History of the Philosophers*. The latter is a pedestrian work but it is immensely valuable to us: it contains a list of the principal philosophers in each school, with brief notes on their lives (including anecdotes), their works, and their basic ideas.

The Sceptics and Cynics, who survived into the third century, included one or two men of importance. Favorinus of Arelate in Gaul (born c. 70–80, died under Antoninus Pius) was taught Greek by Dio Chrysostom and Epictetus, was a friend of Plutarch, and master of Herodes Atticus, and kept a school of rhetoric and philosophy at Rome. His *Pyrrhonian Speeches* survive in ten books (one for each *Tropos* of Aenesidemus), and are directed to the conclusion that all judgement must be suspended. Sextus Empiricus (end of second century) wrote three books called *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (*Pyrrhoneioi hypotyposeis*), and a surviving work entitled *Sceptical Commentaries*. The latter is a repertory of all the innumerable arguments, sometimes serious, sometimes captious and childish, which can be directed against dogmatic philosophy and against the teaching of any form of science. Finally there was Oenomaus of Gadara (second–third century), from whom there survive fragments of a work entitled *The Showing-up of Quacks*, an attack on oracles.

In contrast there was a marked development in neo-Pythagorean theories. About Apollonius of Tyana there is such an accumulation of legend that one ends by doubting the reality of his existence (supposedly AD 4–96). The earliest references to him are found in Lucian and Libanius, but the story goes that his *Bios* was created by Damis and Moiragernes, whose work was advanced further by Philostratus in the third century, under orders from Julia Domna; and only Philostratus’ *Life* has come down to us. In it Apollonius is described as a Sophist and Pythagorean, a moral and religious reformer, a worker of miracles during journeys which took him between India and Gades, a friend of philosophers and of Vespasian, and an enemy of Domitian. Neo-Pythagoreans, and Neoplatonists, too, set him up as a figure in challenge to Christ, and in doing so provoked counter-attacks by Christian writers like Eusebius and Lactantius. Many of his works are cited, both on religion (*De Sacrificiis, Theologia*), and on oracles and prophecy (*De Divinatione Astrologica*); but they are all of doubtful authenticity. We are apparently
better informed about his letters, from references in Philostratus and Photius, and from a separate collection of seventy-seven documents; but there are so many incorrigible contradictions here that they are probably all forgeries by various authors.

From Moderatus of Gades (first–second centuries) we possess fragments of two books called *Pythagorean Teaching*. Nicomachus of Gerasa (early second century) is known to have written on mathematics and philosophy (a *Manual on Harmony*, and the *Arithmeticé Eisagoge*). Finally, Numenius of Apamea in Syria maintained in his various treatises (*The Departure of the Academy from Plato, The Good*, and so on) that Platonic thought was fundamentally identical with that of Pythagoras, Moses, the Brahmins, the Eastern Magi, and the Egyptians. He also believed that there were three Gods, one superior God who was independent of matter, one in between, and one below who was himself the World.

For Latin neo-Pythagoreans see below.

c. The Platonists

But the school which was destined to produce most writing and to make greatest progress towards new ideas was the Academic or Platonist school. We can ignore lesser figures, who are little more than names to us, and dwell for a moment on Mestrius Plutarchus of Chaeronea (45–117 or later). Plutarch was a pupil of the theologically-minded Academic Ammonius. He studied deeply in medicine, mathematics, rhetoric, and other subjects, journeyed widely, and had a number of illustrious friends, including some at Rome; later he returned to his birthplace at Chaeronea and lived there with a small group of pupils, becoming in his old age a priest of Apollo at Delphi. The *Suda* tell us that he had been consul and had taught Trajan, also that later on he was made general superintendent of Achaia, but all this is very doubtful. He was a great reader and assimilator of knowledge, and his output in Greek was vast (the catalogue made by Lamprias comprises 227 titles); much of it (though not all works attributed to him are authentic) has survived. The normal division of it is into *Moralia*, which are popular writings on subjects like rhetoric and philosophy, and historical works. With the latter (Plutarch’s *Lives*) we shall deal in Chapter XVIII, though they too have great interest from the standpoint of moral philosophy. The *Moralia* are sometimes in the form of ‘diatribes’ or alternating discussions, sometimes dialogue, and sometimes ordinary treatises. They may be classified by subject as follows:

*Religion*—De Superstitione, De Iside at Osiride, De Sera numinis vindicta, De Pythiae oraculis, De Demone Socratis, etc.

*Metaphysics*—De Anima.

*Physics*—Quaestiones naturales, De primo frigido, etc.

*Psychology*—De sollertia animalium, Bruta ratione uti, De esu carnium.
**Hygiene**—De tuenda sanitate, De ira cohibenda, etc.

**Ethics**—Amatorius, De tranquillitate animi, De fortuna, De garrulitate, De fraterno amore, De amore prolis, Praecepta coniugalia, etc.

**Education**—De liberis educandis, De recta ratione audiendi, etc.

**Philosophical doctrine**—Platonicæ quaestiones, Non posse suaviter vivere secundum Epicuri præcepta, Adversus Colotem, De Stoicorum repugnantiae, etc.

**Philology and Literature**—De Herodoti malignitate, Comparatio Aristophanis et Menandri.

**Music**—De musica (Pythagorean in outlook).

**Politics**—Praecepta gerendae republicae, De unius in republica domino, Ad principem ineruditum, etc.

**Aetiology**—Quaestiones Romanæ, Quaestiones Graecæ, etc. Various spurious works have also found their way into the Plutarchian collection, mainly because they deal with themes similar to those of the authentic works. Plutarch was a lover of his Greek mother country, but no less of its Roman conqueror; he was an Academic, but had eclectic tendencies. His work was published widely and was very easy to read, being resolutely free from any form of purist mannerism. He has been indeed one of the most widely read authors in the literature of the world, because his writings are among the noblest and most complete examples of 'humanity' in the world of imperial Rome.46

d. **The Emergence of Neoplatonism**

The Platonic philosophers of the second century gradually abandoned moral questions for those of religion, metaphysics, and theosopy, thereby entering the orbit of the syncretist tendencies of the period. From Platonism they passed to Neoplatonism. Albinus, who taught at Smyrna and was in 151 the master of Galen, has left fragments of a work on Plato's Dogmas, drawing markedly on Peripatetic and Stoic, as well as Academic, doctrine. From Atticus, a commentator on Plato who was alive about 175, we possess part of a commentary on the Timaeus. Theon of Smyrna discoursed on Plato's mathematical ideas, and wrote on astronomy. A special place belongs to Celsus, who wrote the first Platonist polemics against Christianity. We learn of his theory of the 'True Word' from citations by Christian Apologists and especially from the full refutation of it made by Origen in his Contra Celsum about the middle of the third century.

These hesitating advances reached fruition with Plotinus of Lycopolis in Egypt (204–270), the champion of a new set of philosophico-religious ideas normally known as Neoplatonism. He was the pupil of Ammonius Saccas, and from 244 lived in Rome surrounded by numerous disciples and admirers. He left a number of writings, put together hastily, without much attention to style, clarity, or grammar: these were arranged in six novenas or Enneads, concerned respectively with ethics, the world, government, the soul, the
reason, and the nature of being. Plotinus believed that man must separate himself from worldly things, which in those years were so full of pain and confusion, and look towards the after-life. He arranged the gods in a graded hierarchy, with a single and abstract God at its head. Man through thought must unite himself with God and live with him. The intelligence can purify itself by crossing over the sensible world to the non-sensible; and where intelligence fails man can substitute intuition, or ecstatic rapture in the vision of God. Plotinus’ religion was not lacking in either faith or enthusiasm. But it remained a conception of the learned and the initiated, something which could not be understood by the common man, who was meanwhile being fired by the sacred doctrines of Christianity, so simple and yet so lofty.

Porphyry of Tyre came first under the influence of Origen and Cassius Longinus (the author of Was Homer a Philosopher? and works on rhetoric and grammar). Later, during the six years 263–269, he was taught by Plotinus. He wrote many works, among which we may mention his philosophical studies on Thucydides and Homer, a History of Philosophy in four books, and a Life of Pythagoras; later he produced An Introduction to Knowledge of the Intelligible, On Abstinence from Flesh, Philosophy from the Oracles, and On the Images of the Gods. He was continually trying to transform Neoplatonic theory into theosophy and religion, and claimed that divination provided means for a permanent relationship with the divine world. In his fifteen books Contra Christianos, of which we possess only fragments, he set this faith up as a challenge to Christianity, whose Apologists regarded him as a formidable enemy.

Iamblichus of Chalcis in Coelesyria (c.280–335), was a pupil of Porphyry who maintained a school in his own city. His main work was a Life of Pythagoras, which offered a form of Neoplatonism bereft of any rational foundation, and reliant instead on a fantastic ecstasy and unending revelation of the gods, in which everything consists of speech with an infinite number of good and evil spirits in a world where miracles abound. There is attributed to Iamblichus, though it is not certainly authentic, a work called De mysteriis (of the Egyptians), which sets out to make known all the inhabitants of the invisible world and the means of evoking them through signs and mysterious rites. This is a typical product of the extreme religious ideas of the non-Christian Hellenic world.

In this setting of ecstasies and men possessed with spirits a number of spurious works of a ‘Pagan Gnostic’ nature were circulated under the names of the actual pagan divinities, like Hermes Trismegistus, allegedly the author of the Libri Hermetici. Similar were the Paimandres and the dialogue of ‘Asclepius’ with King Ammon.

The last resistance of philosophy and pagan religion against the victory of Christianity naturally found its greatest champion in the Emperor Julian, the so-called Apostate. Much of his literary work is concerned with philosophico-religious subjects, or with devotion and meditation (To the Sun-
King, reflecting the ideas of Iamblichus, and To the Mother of the Gods), or with polemics against Christianity. We know the content of the first of his three books against Christianity from the ten books which Cyril wrote in reply. With great learning and bitter sarcasm Julian set out to prove that the moral and religious ideas of the Bible were inferior to those of the Greek philosophers. Elsewhere, in his Caesares (or Saturnalia, or Symposium), he puts into the mouth of Silenus, as an improvised judge of the various emperors, a severe criticism of the pro-Christian Constantine. Other works treat of moral philosophy, for instance the Misopogon, in which he lashes luxury in a series of attacks, and the Contra Cynicos. His other writings include his Orations (two insincere and conventional panegyrics of Constantius II, and a sincere eulogy of the Empress Eusebia), and a lost historical work on his campaigns in Gaul. There are also about seventy letters, which are sometimes extraordinarily realistic and dramatic; for instance that written in 361 to the Athenians to justify his rebellion against Constantius.

Gradually Neoplatonism lost its main centres of activity one by one, including its famous home in Syria. In the East the only schools which held out for a time were those at Alexandria and Athens. In the former the instructress was Hypatia, daughter of Theon, a woman learned in philosophy and mathematics, who had taught Synesius. But at the beginning of the fifth century she was murdered by the people in a riot stirred up against her by the Christians. The Athenian school survived beyond the chronological limits of this volume under a series of scholars from Nestorius to Proclus. It attempted to improve and widen its work by adding to mathematics and theurgy the study of psychology, dialectic, and the allegorical and pedagogical analysis of texts.

Latin literature in general remained untouched by the more advanced speculation of the Greek neo-Pythagoreans and later of the Neoplatonists also, though it naturally felt the influence of both. We can appreciate such influence as early as the second century in parts of the writings of the ‘Magus’ Apuleius: for instance in his unfinished De Platone et eius dogmate, where Platonic doctrine is markedly distorted; in his De Deo Socratis and De mundo: and also in the mathematico-astrological ideas contained in his Naturales quaestiones.

Cornelius Labeo in the third century was profoundly learned about the various religions of antiquity and tried by means of physical, allegorical and historical interpretations to enoble and unite them into a single Neoplatonist conception (which drew down on him the attacks of Christian polemic). His works were entitled De dis Penatibus, De oraculo Apollinis Clarit, Fasti, De dis animalibus, and Explanatio disciplinae Tagetis et Bacitidis (on Etruscan augury).

Three of the last Latin Neoplatonists also deserve mention. Julius Firmicus Maternus of Syracuse, before he became a Christian and delivered his attacks on dying paganism, had been a Neoplatonist. As such he wrote,
between 335 and 337, eight books entitled *Mathesis*, in which he tried to bring ethics into line with the astrological ideas he had absorbed from his reading. Parts of this work already show the influence of Christian conceptions.

e. *Christian Philosophy. Origen and St Augustine*

Calcidius’ commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus* alludes to Christian works, for instance to the Hexapla of Origen. This commentary, dedicated to a certain Hosius (who may have been the famous bishop of Corduba in the first half of the fourth century), was engaged in polemics and exegesis, in theological studies and preaching, then was condemned for being ordained as priest outside his own see, but died as a martyr at Tyre. The aims of his ‘apostolate’ in cultural matters he expressed in the following terms, ‘Nowadays, under the guise of *Gnosis*, heretics are rising up against the Church of Christ, and piling up volumes of commentaries, in which they pretend to interpret the texts of the Evangelists and Apostles. If we remain silent and do not set true and sound dogmas against them, they will get possession of hungry souls; for if these souls find no sound nourishment, they throw themselves eagerly upon these forbidden foods, which are impure and abominable.’ So he presented a general picture of reality, starting from the conception of a good God, the Creator of all spiritual beings. Yet between the world and this immutable and unapproachable God he set the *Logos*, consubstantial with the Father but subordinate to him, the pattern of all created things. These things partake also of matter and may allow themselves to be perverted by it and be satisfied with their existence as it stands. In this way they fall into sin. It is essential to free oneself from corporeal things and gather oneself together, in order to return into participation in the Goodness of God; and in this task of making himself perfect every man can take as his pattern and example the events in the life of Christ. Through this striving after purification all reality goes progressively forward to the final ‘apocatastasis’, which with an end to the punishment of sinners will see the triumph of the good.

The philosophy of Origen emerges mainly from his work in four books entitled *De Principiis*, which have come down to us in a Latin version. It occasioned much controversy, for it involved many dangers for orthodox doctrine; and it is not free from internal contradictions. Yet both for the motives which inspired it and the language in which it is expressed it remains a bold and important achievement, carried out with disinterested enthusiasm by a man who wanted to give a rational basis of support to the Christian religious message.

At the beginning of the fifth century (and here we are compelled by logical necessity to go beyond the limits of our period) Augustinus of Hippo, a man of wider personal experiences and much greater genius, embarked once more on the course marked out by his predecessors and formulated the highest philosophical synthesis attained by ancient Christianity. Born at Tagaste in 354, Augustine studied in various schools and passed through
many currents of thought at Carthage, Rome, and Milan, down to the moment of his conversion to Catholicism in 386. He then returned to his home town, but could not realize his dream of a life of study accompanied by a small band of friends; instead he was called to govern a diocese and found himself involved in polemic against the heretics. He died in 430 at a moment when his city of Hippo was being besieged by the Vandals, a people who were engaged in putting a speedy end to Roman civilization in Africa.

The writings of Augustine are very numerous and varied, including works of apologetic, pastoral, polemical, exegetical, and theological character. Four titles at any rate must be mentioned, the Confessions, De vera religione, De Trinitate, and De Civitate Dei. Yet Augustine was not a systematic thinker and he did not always hold the same opinions on the greatest problems of philosophy throughout the long course of his work.

He began with a phase of scepticism, and then derived from the Neoplatonists an awareness of the need to escape from the sensible world. After this, by a continuous struggle and increasing depth of inward thought, he strove to attain Truth—or God—by greater knowledge of himself. A true enquiry, he believed, makes it necessary to transcend all finite things and encounter the real Being, who is the giver of life and fountain of good. This Being is found to be in the closest contact with the human soul: it is he who gives light to the mind and it is he alone who can satisfy that desire for well-being and peace which is ingrained in individuals and also in societies throughout history.

There exist no obstacles of a metaphysical kind to prevent the process of a return to God. So even Evil is not an entity deriving from some principle which exists: it is simply the absence of Good. Man’s will is not wicked because it has been weakened by sin or vitiated by nature, even though it is true that every good action already requires divine grace to put it into effect, a grace which is given freely according to principles unknown to us.

The task of philosophy, after determining the end of existence (namely God), is to make all men realize the possibilities of their being and to put all things in their places. By this means there will be a universal order of peace and joy, in which it is still God whom we serve first of all, but in which the other activities of man find a way to develop themselves and acquire a positive (and not ‘indifferent’) value of their own. Indeed history, which is guided by Providence, proves that the antagonism between the two Cities (societies) of good and of bad men can be overcome by the realization of a just state, one that is supported by Christian religious ideals and is also directed to the good of humanity in the temporal sphere.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVII

1. Violent hostilities took place on various occasions in the south of India between Viṣṇuites and Śivaites, particularly in the persecutions of the Śivāite King Cola which led Rāmānuja to exile himself in Mysore for nine years.
2. The localization of important Śivaite centres in Kashmir and in the south (not only around Kañcipuram but even farther south, Māmallapuram, Cidambaram, Madura, etc.) is final, but the flowering of Śivaism was very great in the west too where Kāliddāsa contributed to it, and where it is attested by the monuments at Ellora and Elephanta.

3. It would be interesting to note from the point of view of scientific history that the theoretical conceptions at the base of Yoga rest on the physiological pneumatic doctrines of the Āyurveda and on a psychology of the unconscious. In this theory psychic acts leave latent but active impressions in the individual which govern his subsequent situations, and which can be methodically chosen by the discipline of action and meditation to guide the individual to given situations, including liberation from mundane attachments, and salvation.

4. One can be more precise in explaining the burden of the assertion that all is empty, by saying that it is a question of being ‘devoid of existence of a thing’s own right’ (svabhāvasiṁśya); this means that things have no existence or essence by themselves or in themselves, no absolute consistency of their own (which is why Stcherbatsky called them ‘relative’). Things not being natural autonomous beings are reduced to images surrounding the fundamental reality (paramārtha-satya), the essential existence.

5. The elaborating movement of the Tantras appears mostly to correspond with a formalization of rituals and religious practices associated with the beliefs of various religions—Śivaite, Viṣṇuite, Buddhist; beliefs recorded in the canonical and instructional literature which contains the edifying legends (Jātaka, Purāṇa, etc.). Tantra is practically synonymous with Āgama. The general character of the Tantra and Āgama do not tend towards sexual symbolism. That is limited to certain sects. Their general feature is to prescribe a ritual, linking rites properly so called, and formulae (mantra); this ritual being different from Vedic ritual in having as its crowning achievement the attainment of salvation (mukti), rather than the Vedic ritual which essentially aims at procuring prosperity (bhūkti).

6. Emperor worship in its earliest phase still had a definite connexion with the divinity it honoured. A distinction should be drawn in this respect between the East, where the tradition of the Dea Roma was strong, and the West, where in certain of the imperial provinces, such as Tarracensis, the emperor was acknowledged as Deus praestans (R. Etienne, Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien, Paris, 1958, Bibl. des Écoles françaises Athènes et Rome, 191, pp. 374–5). Nor was the worship of the Divi accepted immediately; it did not become widespread until the reign of Vespasian. The worship of Rome did not extend to all the provinces until Hadrian’s time. But in Tarraconensis it was associated with the worship of the deified emperors and of their living successors. (Robert Etienne.)

7. This enumeration takes too much account of the East and passes over the very active centres of Tarragona and Merida; provincial emperor worship was not established in the senatorial provinces of Narbonensis, Baetica, and Proconsular Africa until Vespasian’s reign. (Robert Etienne.)

8. The empire transfigured the concept of loyalty, by centring it upon the emperor—the August One. The Lares of Augustus became the ‘august’ Lares and the Apollo of Augustus became the ‘august’ Apollo; Augustus was also appended to the title of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. No property, real or ideal, was denied to the emperor; every god and goddess was decked with the epithet of augustus, which conferred increased authority without altering the original significance. Thus the whole pantheon united to acclaim the imperial divinity, so that under the empire the real religious centre of a city was the temple dedicated to the imperial worship. (Robert Etienne.)

9. We entirely dissociate ourselves from this political, realistic, and pessimistic view of emperor worship; or rather, we maintain that its manifestations should be examined in their chronological perspective. It is incorrect to say that it began as an expression of political loyalty and respect for tradition. On the contrary, it would not be improper to speak of it as a form of ‘imperial mysticism’. Though Augustus and Tiberius objected to some manifestations of it, which they considered to be ill-timed or dangerous, the fact
remains that the provincial population believed in certain divine symbols: the palm-tree, rising from the imperial altar at Tarragona, contributed to the mystique of victory, and the emperor on his coinage announces his eternity, just as his presence was felt in the cities he founded and his virtues perpetuated for praise by his deification. Later on—chiefly as a third-century development—the individual sank back into the collective, and impersonal sovereignty found expression in the triple concept of Rome, the Divi, and the Augusti. Persons were gradually making way for institutions; the foundations of the state were defined and given expression in the titles of priests and public officials alike. The state had become an object of worship, and at that epoch, naturally, political loyalty gained precedence over mystical fervour. (Robert Etienne.)


11. In point of fact there was a limit to this fidelity to the native worship, in Gaul and elsewhere in the Celtic territories. Most of the local divinities were dubbed Augustus, which paved the way, so to speak, for their official recognition. Epona, one of the most revered goddesses of Gaul, is sometimes referred to as Epona augusta. Although not many Gallic divinities were admitted to the Augustan pantheon, their subjection to its influence must not be overlooked. (Robert Etienne.)

12. Stress should again be laid here on the links between oriental forms of religion and the worship of the emperors—illustrated, for example, by the taurobolic altars at Lectoure (R. Etienne, ‘La chronologie des autels tauroboliques de Lectoure’, in Gascogne gersoise, archéologie, histoire, économie, Auch, 1960, pp. 35–43), particularly on December 8, 241, by the city fathers in honour of the emperor Gordian, the Empress Sabina Tranquillina, and the whole divine house (C.I.L., XIII, 511 = I.L.S., 4126). It should also be noted that in this city of the Lactorates a certain Valeria Geminia observed the Blood Feast of the primitive myth by dedicating the vies of Eutyches (C.I.L., XIII, 510 = I.L.S., 4127) and that once on the day set aside for the imperial worship she took part in a tauroboly in honour of the emperor (C.I.L., XIII, 518 = I.L.S., 4128). The same clergy and the same worshipper are thus present at ceremonies held for two different purposes; this unity transcends the differences between the two religious calendars and bears witness to the cementing influence of the imperial religion in the Roman world. (Robert Etienne.)

13. This ‘catholic’ aspect of the congregation is not confined to the eastern religions. Financial, social, and legal differences were swept away in the emperor worship. Anyone could be a votary of the imperial divinity; the priesthood and the religious communities were open to the rich and to the humble without distinction; the augustales, in particular, rescued freedmen from the contempt attaching to their origin and condition. (Robert Etienne.)

14. Serapis may rather be said to have been introduced by Septimius Severus, after being associated under Commodus with the theology of imperial victory. The triumphal arch at Lepcis Magna, erected to honour the family of Severus, depicts the Capitoline triad with the emperor enthroned as Juppiter Capitolinus in a replica of the Serapis of Bryaxis; indeed, from the year 204 onwards, Serapis was the favourite form of portrayal for emperors, as on the arch of the money changers (argentarii). It must be remembered that when Septimius Severus visited Egypt in the year 200, his curiosity was aroused by the worship of Serapis (Script. Historiae Augustae, V. Sec., 17). The ideology of the sovereign as a god upon earth reaches its culmination with Septimius Severus-Serapis; the divine apotheosis is no longer reserved for the person of the emperor, but extends to his whole family group. The solar, Serapidian aspect of Septimius Severus is strengthened by his Jovian character. A Tripolitanian inscription (Inscript. of Roman Tripolitania, 295) is addressed to ‘the benevolent Lar of Severus, my sun, born of Juppiter’. In the Septizonium, a monument dedicated to the seven planets and completed at the end of 203, the emperor occupies the central niche, in the place of the sun-god, and in the pose of the cosmocratic god, which resembles that of Serapis. At this stage Serapis was promoted to the rank of tutelary deity of the imperial family. Caracalla took
the sobriquet of ‘philoscrapis’, and during his reign he made a zealous display of devotion to the Alexandrian divinities; but his father had pointed the way and in this respect the son was merely a follower. (Robert Etienne.)

15. Despite all evidences of syncretism, the sun-worship of the Severi masked a rivalry between Sol-Serapis and Sol-Baal which has been suggested as an explanation of the enmity between Caracalla and Geta. Geta was the first to issue coins in the name of Sol-Baal, and he was undoubtedly the favourite of his mother, Julia Domna, daughter of the High Priest of Baal at Emesa. Not until Geta had been murdered was Caracalla’s Serapian empire able to express itself freely. The triumph of Baal, prepared by Julia Soemias and Elagabalus after the death of Caracalla, might be regarded as the revenge of the Syrian worship. The accession of Severus Alexander would also seem to have marked a return of Serapian orthodoxy, in a setting of religious equivalence. In any case, this emperor adorned the temple of Isis and Serapis in a befitting manner (Script. Historiae Augusta, V. Sev. Alex., 26. According to Roman Imperial Coinage, IV, 2, forty-eight designs of coins illustrate his devotion to the sun. (Robert Etienne.)

16. It is very important to grasp more precisely the attitude of Julian the Apostate towards the gods. Though regarding himself as chosen by God for his position as leader of the empire, he never fell into the excesses of oriental mysticism, as his pagan and even his Christian predecessors had done. His rejection of the deification of rulers is exemplified by his attitude towards the monarchical ceremony then customary at court and the honours which the populations of the towns through which he passed were eager to lavish on him, by his refusal of the title of dominus et deus which his forerunners had accepted, and by his ironical manner when the dead emperor was to be deified. The ruler is no god, but he must imitate God by following the purest Platonic tradition, for he has to show by his actions that he is really the elect of the gods. Divinity is in him the source of morality. Helios had given Julian a programme: ‘It is necessary that thou seest, that thou cleanse the earth of all these impieties, and that thou call upon my name, with those of the goddess Athena and all the other gods’. He was pontifex maximus, he became the head of the pagan Church, and his portraits show him with the stephané of the archiereus. So Julian should not be represented as a rationalist in the same sense as Libanius. For him, reason was a means of access to mysticism; he was very close to the early Neoplatonists in his way of thinking; Plotinus, too, had argued against theories that exaggerated the mystic aspect of power. But he never felt called upon to choose between the cause of Hellenism and that of Rome, for to him the Romans were a Hellenic race and the sun swayed the destinies of Rome as of Greece. The gods venerated in Rome were identified with the sun, so there could be no dispute between the Hellenistic and Roman tendencies in the empire. Above all, the designs of Julian the Apostate had nothing in common with the theocratic systems of Egypt or Assyria. (Robert Etienne.)

17. At any rate of the Legalists, who may be regarded as a pro-Roman faction.

18. Professor Brezzi’s account of the ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ is close to that of A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Sect of Qumrân (Oxford, 1961, translated from an earlier French edition). There are, of course, several points still argued among scholars. For instance, among many attempts to identify the sect, the view is still held that they were Zealots, i.e. nationalists and revolutionaries, rather than Essenes (who were pacifistic): see (e.g.) G. Roth, The Discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford, 1958).

19. This view is defended by Dupont-Sommer in an appendix to his book.

20. The coin evidence which has been used to support the date AD 68 is not entirely conclusive, and some scholars believe that the site was destroyed in Bar Kochba’s rebellion (AD 132–135).

21. Although some scholars claim to have found allusions to the personality and work of a crucified mediator and leader of a sect.

22. It has often been believed that Clemens and Domitilla, together with the other members of the aristocracy at this time, were Christian. See, however, pp. 864 ff.

23. In describing the history of Christianity, there is a manifest tendency on the author’s part not only to demonstrate the absolutely exceptional nature of Christian teaching
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(for example, by comparison with the Essenes and the members of the Qumran community, or with the Hellenistic and Roman philosophical systems of the time), but also to clear it of any taint of suspicion that it was in opposition to the Roman government and the existing order. It is not fortuitous that the author attempts to sow doubt in the reader’s mind as to the canonical character of the *Apocalypse* of John, which was a strongly anti-Roman work. Nor is there any justification for the author’s denial of the fact that Christianity originated and at first spread among the lower oppressed classes: the references to the fact that already at an early date Christianity was accepted by individual members of the nobility, in the first place is not founded on completely reliable evidence, and in the second place does not refute the clearly social orientation of early Christianity, as an ideology of the labouring poor. Nor does the author mention the ‘heresies’ which appeared as a result of dissatisfaction on the part of the democratic elements in the Christian communities at the modifications introduced by members who joined them from the upper classes. Thus he does not even mention Commodianus, who expressed with unusual vigour the hatred of the popular masses for their oppressors.

The author links Christianity exclusively with Judaism, dismissing all other influences upon it on the grounds that they only introduced the terminology employed by the Christian writers. Like any other doctrine that has captured the minds of millions, Christianity absorbed those ideas that had previously appealed to various classes and social groups and which had arisen in their midst as the fruit of their attitude towards different phenomena in their environment. If this had not been so, the success of Christianity and its victory over other religious and philosophical tendencies would be inexplicable. (E. M. Shtaerman.)

24. And surely also (as Professor Heichelheim points out) by Hellenistic and Latin authors.

25. This original was very probably the Aramaic or Hebrew version provided by the early *Gospel of the Hebrews*: see below.

26. It is commonly held that Mark drew on Peter’s oral recollections when the Apostle took up residence in Rome near the end of his life.

27. A recently discovered papyrus fragment (now in the British Museum) makes it likely that ‘John’ used a lost Gospel which was as old as the Synoptists. For John itself the earliest evidence is a small papyrus fragment (in Manchester) of c. AD 100.

28. Among apocalyptic works should now be added the *Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* of which a recently discovered Greek text has been published as *Pap. Bodmer X* (ed. M. Testuz, Cologne, 1959).

29. As Dr E. M. Shtaerman points out, one reason for misgiving about the *Apocalypse* is likely to have been its bitterly anti-Roman character.

30. Moreover it used excellent Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the second century AD.

31. This inference is questionable: the name (cognomen) Clemens was extremely common among Roman citizens of the period.

32. Now known also from other finds.

33. Although Professor Pareti’s views at this point take account of most recent literature, it may be worth calling attention to discussion of the legal questions by H. Last, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1937, pp. 80 ff., and by A. N. Sherwin-White, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1952, pp. 199 ff.

34. I.e. that the Catacombs near Rome contain a *Domitilla* and a *Aelianum* (Acilius Glabrio, consul AD 91, is also supposed to have been a Christian); but see P. Styger, *Die Antiken Katakomben* (Berlin, 1933).

35. Dr E. M. Shtaerman insists that the changes of policy described in this section were not due simply to the whims of particular emperors. Yet Professor Pareti did not intend to imply anything of the kind. Probably Dr Shtaerman is right in maintaining that the strength of the Christian communities, ‘harbouring widely different elements of the opposition’, was responsible for the violence of the reaction under Decius and Valerian, as contrasted with previous periods.
36. A further factor, as Professor F. M. Heichelheim notes, was the attraction which Christian theology exercised over intellectuals, especially after c. AD 150.

37. Cyprian, who was put to death by the Roman government in 258, is described by Dr E. M. Shtaerman as 'the founder of potent episcopal authority'. He was concerned with the treatment of 'lapsed' Christians, with the question of baptism of heretics, and with the unity of the Church. Yet it appears misleading to regard the resulting controversies as part of the issue of the authority of bishops—much less, though Dr Shtaerman seems to hint this, as part of a conflict between rich and poor. For Cyprian's writings see p. 888.

38. A whole library of mainly Valentinian writings has lately been discovered at Al Hammadi in Egypt: see W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (London, 1958), with full bibliography on these and related finds.

39. An acute analysis of this remarkable figure was made by F. C. Burkitt, *Cambridge Ancient History*, XII (1938), pp. 496 ff.

40. *Forse . . . non un errore dogmatico, ma un giudizio divergente da quelli più comunemente accolti*. The distinction has no doubt often been useful to benevolent inquisitors.

41. See above p. 704, note 11.

42. The Donatist schism began as a protest against the hurried election in 311 of a bishop of Carthage who had, it was claimed, given in to the secular powers and surrendered Christian texts. After prolonged negotiations the issue was submitted to a synod of Gallic bishops, who adjudicated against the Donatists. They continued their protest: Constantine in 316 condemned them and confiscated their property, but he later relented and his successors continued to show them tolerance. The schism survived into the fifth century, and was of concern to Augustine. An interesting feature is the support given to the Donatists by the *circumcelliones* (or Agonistics), a populist group which embraced fugitive slaves and other poorer elements. The ecclesiastical issues were consequently often subordinated to the class struggle.

43. Julian himself had undergone the bloody Mithraic ceremonies of the *taurobolium*; see above, pp. 838 ff.

44. To this there were important exceptions. Seneca, for example, believed that the best form of government was 'ideal kingship', and criticized Caesar's murderers for not understanding this (*de Beneficiis*, II, 20, 3). His *de Clementia* (addressed to Nero near the beginning of his reign) sets out the qualities which distinguish the just king from the tyrant, in a manner followed by many later writers (e.g Dio Chrysostom under Trajan—see below). In fact some scholars have described the Stoicism of this period as the 'official philosophy of monarchy'. It remains a problem why Stoics like Helvidius Priscus attacked 'good' emperors like Vespasian. For discussion of this and kindred questions see Ch. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome* (Cambridge, 1950) pp. 124 ff.

45. For Seneca's career and other writings, see below, pp. 919, 930, 967 ff.

46. On Plutarch's *Lives*, which he wrote as a contribution to ethics more than to history, see below, p. 942.
CHAPTER XVIII

LITERATURE AND ART TO c. AD 500

I. LITERATURE

a. China

Chinese poetry of the Later Han period (23–220) is at first a continuation of that of the Former Han. The *fu* is almost the only cultivated form, and all the great littérateurs, such as the historian Pan Ku (32–92) and the astronomer Chung Hêng (78–139) delighted in it. But erudition more and more took the place of lyric feeling; and the *fu* became, and remained, a court poetry in every sense.

A contact with music, which was so intimately connected with the ancient Odes but had been practically lost with the Elegies of Ch’u and with the *fu*, was re-established through the work of the Imperial Music Office (*yüeh-fu*), which had to supply the tunes and the words for songs on ceremonial occasions. For this purpose it delved into the rich treasure of anonymous folk poetry, and did not spurn even foreign motifs (mostly of central Asian origin). This led to the rise of a new kind of poetry, meant at first to be sung and not recited, although the importance of the words soon overcame that of the tune. It employed a new verse of popular origin, in five syllables, which later became the most widely used metre of Chinese prosody. The *yüeh-fu* poetry grew very popular during the Three Kingdoms period and under the short-lived unification of the empire by the Chin. Some of the best poets of the epoch of turmoil (the Chien-an period, 196–219) which accompanied the fall of the Han were indeed Ts’aot Ts’ao and his sons Ts’ao P’ei and Ts’ao Chih, the founders of the new Wei dynasty. A place of honour is also occupied by Ts’ai Yen, a woman who was carried away by the Hsiung-nu and had to stay with them for twelve years; she related her experiences in her poems ‘on the measure of the Hsiung-nu horn’, which are among the gems of Chinese lyric. The contents of these poems were strongly influenced by the pessimism of the age and by Taoism, as expressed chiefly by the group of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove. One theme which originated with them was wine, and the spiritual (more than material) enjoyment it gave to thinkers who were withdrawn from a world run mad. This poetry reached its summit after the barbarian invasion of the North, with T’ao Yüan-ming (365–427). We cannot deal with him here; suffice it to say that the wine poems became one of the most outstanding features in Chinese literature.

Historiography followed in the track set down once and for all by Ssû-ma Ch’ien. The outstanding production of this period was the History of the

* The passages within square brackets were contributed by Professor Pierre Grimal, to supplement the original text, after the death of Professor Pareti.
(Former) Han dynasty (Han-shu) by several members of the Pan family, headed by Pan Ku (32–92).

Apart from history, prose mostly took the form of the essay, the interest of which is at least as much philosophical as literary. The best prose writer of the Later Han is perhaps Wang Ch’ung (c. 27–96), whose Lun-hêng, with its corrosive and destructive criticism of all and sundry, reminds us forcibly (as pointed out by Demiéville) of the nearly contemporary Lucian of Samosata. The new philosophy of the Chien-an period also gave rise to a natural, delicate prose, unstilted, and devoid of affectation.

In the meantime the new religion, Buddhism, confronted by other problems and other trends of thought, developed for its translation from Indian languages an original prose style of its own, not very far from the colloquial speech of the day, and intended for a much wider circle of readers than the classical prose. Beginning with the fourth century this new style began to exert its influence even among non-Buddhist writers. The latter, however, being drawn almost exclusively from court circles, during most of this period patronized a highly artificial style, the symmetric prose (p’ien-wen), in which clarity of expression was sacrificed in favour of alternate sentences of four or six syllables, balanced expressions, and a constant use of allusions to classical texts. After the fourth century literary prose became a game to be played and understood by connoisseurs only.

b. Indiā

This period is marked by the victorious advance of Sanskrit as the written language of the court and of official documents on the one hand, and of secular literature on the other. This did not take place without a stubborn contest with the local Prakrits. The only advantage of the latter, confronted with a sacred language spread all over India, was their quality as spoken tongues. When the Prakrits lost contact with the spoken word and became just another half-dead and highly artificial language, their fate was sealed. By the end of this period the secular literature of Aryan India was almost wholly couched in Sanskrit.

In making this statement we leave out of consideration the dharmaśāstra literature; it is too closely connected with religion in its social aspects to be a case in point. A better example for the secular progress of Sanskrit is represented by the drama. Its origin is still a controversial point, the influence of the Greek stage being asserted or denied on equally strong (or feeble) grounds. One element in favour of a connexion with Greece is the name of the curtain, yavanikā, i.e. the Greek ‘cloth’. This is, however, a merely external element, and on inner grounds a connexion with or derivation from the dialogue hymns in the Vedas is possible and likely. The most balanced opinion seems to be that ‘the Sanskrit drama came into being shortly after, if not before, the middle of the second century BC, and that it
was evoked by the combinations of epic recitations with the dramatic moment of the Krṣṇa legend' (Keith).

At the beginning of Indian drama we find the name of the great Buddhist poet Asvaghōṣa (second century AD), who was also the author of three dramas discovered in central Asia. They are religious in content and already show the most peculiar characteristic of Indian drama, namely the rule that the language should differ according to the social status of the characters of a play. Kings and Brahmans speak Sanskrit, persons of lesser status and all women various kinds of Prakrit.

Bhāsa seems to be slightly later (third century?): thirteen plays attributed to him were found in 1912 in southern India. If the attribution is sure (not all doubts have yet disappeared), they show a dramatist of no mean powers, chiefly in those plays (e.g. Svapnavāsavadatta, Cārūdatta), of which the subject matter is drawn not from epic but from current story literature. Bhāsa’s Sanskrit is already of classical purity, conforming on the whole with Pāṇini’s rules.

An isolated place belongs to the legendary figure of King Śūdṛaka, very variously dated, but perhaps a fourth-century writer. His Mrčha-kaṭika is the most pleasant, vivacious, and realistic product of India’s dramatic literature. It is written in a simple and effective style, and gives a direct and clear-cut picture of life in that period.

We may close this rapid sketch with the name of Kālidāsa. This greatest of Indian poets was also a playwright of the first order. He wrote little in this field, but one of his three plays, the Sākuntala, is one of the greatest dramatic works of all time.

Dramaturgy found its theoretical codification in the Nātyaśāstra of Bhārata, probably earlier than Kālidāsa.

The writers of fables, in which amusement is always coupled with a moral intent, indulge in a peculiar process on ‘House that Jack built’ lines: a character in a story may support his statements by relating another fable, which is therefore enframed in the first one. A character in this secondary fable may do the same, and the process can be carried very far. The simplest and earliest work of this kind is the Pañcatantra, the original core of which seems to go back to this period. It was exceedingly popular in India and its fame soon over-stepped the boundaries of the sub-continent: in the sixth century it was translated into Pehlevi and thence, somewhat later, into Arabic and Syriac. Another tradition of tales was represented by the Brhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya (fifth century?), written in a Prakrit language, the Paisāci; it is lost, and we can gain an idea of its contents only from later compilations. The question of the relation of this literature to Aesop and the Greek fables has been keenly debated, but the issue remains open and is not likely ever to be definitely settled.

Indian lyric oscillated for a while, in its choice of language, between Sanskrit and Prakrit. An early anthology of Prakrit poems has come down to
us, the *Sattasāt* of Hāla (third or fourth century). It is bucolic poetry of a simple and tender nature, portraying mainly the simple joys of love, wedded life, and motherly affection in the villages of the Deccan.

But here, too, Sanskrit soon won the field. Sanskrit poetry seems to have started from the lyrical portions of epic. It soon took the form of artistic poetry (*kāvya*), subjected to severe rules and employing an elaborate set of rhetorical ornaments (*ālambkāra*). This brought in its wake a certain artificiality and almost baroque luxuriance, though from this the greater poets were able to steer clear. The chronology here is very vague, but at least we have one fixed point: one of the earliest *kāvya* poets, the Buddhist Asvaghōsa, was a contemporary of Kaniṣka and therefore lived (according to the chronology here adopted) around the middle of the second century AD. He is the author, among other works, of two poems: the *Saundarananda* and the *Buddhacarita*. The latter, a life of the Buddha in thirteen cantos (fifteen more are preserved in Chinese translation), is a piece of fervent and deeply felt religious poetry, with charming imagery, and a simple and somewhat archaic style. But Buddhist religious poetry soon died out. We need only mention in passing Āryasūra, the author of the *Jātakamāla*, a collection of legends on the former lives of the Buddha. It is in prose, intermingled with verse, written in a careful and polished Sanskrit. Āryasūra was the first to make consistent use of long nominal compounds, a device the abuse of which was to become an unpleasant feature in later works.

Of court poetry of the Gupta age we have two fair examples in the panegyric (*prasāsti*) of Samudragupta inscribed on the Allahabad pillar and composed by Hariśena (c. 350) and in Vatsabhaṭṭi's inscription in the temple of the sun at Mandasor, written in 473-474. Hariśena's work reveals a poet of some merit, fully conversant with the rules of *ālambkāra* and enjoying his struggle against serious difficulties.

Even the date of India's greatest poet Kālidāsa is highly uncertain and keenly debated, opinion ranging over a span of nearly one thousand years. The bulk of the available evidence points, however, to the Gupta period, possibly to the reign of Chandragupta II, i.e. about 400 AD. Great as a playwright, Kālidāsa is even greater as a *kāvya* poet. His works are the *Kumāra-sambhava* (eighteen cantos, only eight of which are genuine) on the birth of Kumāra, the god of love and son of Śiva and Pārvati; the *Raghuvaṃsa* (nineteen cantos), a collection of biographies of some thirty kings of the race of Raghu; the *Rūsamhāra* (six cantos), a description of the six Indian seasons, marked by some superb descriptions of natural phenomena; and, perhaps his crowning achievement, the *Meghadūta*, a short lyrical poem of slightly more than 100 verses, in which a Yakṣa requests a cloud to carry his message of passion to his faraway beloved. Kālidāsa is a sovereign master of Indian poetical style, conversant with all the technicalities of his art, and yet completely free from the extravagances and artificialities which mar the works of later *kāvya* authors. In the words of A. B. Keith, he prefers
suggestion to elaboration. His Olympian serenity, removed from the contingencies of life, reminds one of Goethe, to whom he shows a striking spiritual affinity. Kālidāsa represents the fullest maturity of Indian poetry, between the archaism of Asvaghoṣa and the decadent preciousness of later poets.

The Dravidian literatures begin independently and come only very gradually under the influence of Sanskrit literature in subject matter, aesthetic outlook, and technique. Early Tamil literature, the only one which goes back to this period, is classified by tradition under the head of three successive Sangam, or societies of learned men, patronized by the Pāṇḍya kings in the farthest south. They are endowed with impossibly long lives, and absurdly high numbers of members. A conservative estimate places them in the thousand years between 500 BC and AD 500; but none of the works now extant belongs to the centuries before our era. Of the first Sangam nothing is left. Of the second, only a grammatical treatise, the Tolkāppiyam. The bulk of the production of the third Sangam is included in three anthologies: Pattuppāṭu (Ten Idyls), Eḻuttokai (Eight Collections), Patinenkilkaṇṭākku (Eighteen Minor Didactic Poems). The best and most famous piece included in the third collection is the Kuṟal, comprising eleven sections of ten couplets each; it is a collection of aphorisms on every possible aspect of social life. Apart from the three anthologies, we have three epics on south Indian themes, already touched in subjects, metres, and vocabulary by northern influence: Silappadikāram, Maṇimēkalai, and Siṭṭakacintāmaṇi. It is interesting to note that Tamil literature, and chiefly the idylls, has several stray references to the Westerners (Yāqūnas) frequenting south Indian ports in the heyday of Roman-Indian trade during the first two or three centuries of our era.

c. Persia

We said something in the appropriate context about the Gātha which go back to Zarathustra, but given the complex way in which the Avesta was created we have preferred to reserve references to its later editions for this single point in our story. Parsee tradition, preserved in the tenth-century Pehlevīk work known as Dēnkart, attributes the first collection of the sacred texts (the Gātha) to a supporter of Zarathustra named Viśtasp. Of this it is supposed that Darius III (the king defeated by Alexander) had two copies made. (Darius, we are told, revived the cult of Anāhītā and the use of sacred statues, and there is actually an allusion to a statue of this king in the Yašt dedicated to the goddess Ardoī Sūrā Anāhītā.) About the copies there is further evidence in the Book of Artāk Virās. One was destroyed in the burning of Persepolis after it had been stormed by the Macedonian victor; the other was carried to Greece and there translated. To this a notice in Pliny (Nat. Hist., XXX, 1, 4) is relevant: he speaks of one Hermippus the follower of Callimachus who (in the third century BC) set down the work of Zarathustra in two million lines.
Later, in the time of the Arsacid Vologaesus III (AD 148–190), a new collection is said to have been made of all texts concerning Zarathustra; evidently this was the work of the Magi, and was done in Persian Aramaic. Then, after the Sassanids had come to power, Ardashir III (377–383) is credited with causing the priest Tausar to undertake a final edition of the sacred texts in twenty-one nask. Of this the Dēnkart gives us a brief summary. The twenty-one writings were divided into three groups—gāsān (the revelation), dāt (legal and moral literature), and hātāk mānsārih (liturgical ritual). From all this only about a quarter survives, unevenly distributed among the three groups:

(1) Yasna: seventy-two chapters of prayers, celebrations, and divine services. These include the Gātha of Zarathustra (capp. 28–34, 43–51, 53) in archaic language, and also a single Yasna (capp. 35–41), of which the language is similar: all the rest is in late language and in a monotonous priestly style.

(2) Visprat (=all the Judges), twenty-four chapters of formulae to complete the Yasna.

(3) Kuartak Apestak, the ‘small Avesta’ for use by the profane, consisting of litanies, prayers, hymns, and benedictions (twenty-one prayers being addressed to individual divinities).

The loss of the rest of the collection is attributed to the Arabs. The Zend (or Zand) was the literature expounding Zoroastrianism in Pehlevik, on the basis of a literal translation of the Avesta into that language.

As well as these sacred texts from the Avesta we know of other Persian literary documents. Popular literature took shape at this period, and some of its products were still used in the tenth or eleventh century by Firdūsī in the Shāhāmeh (Book of Kings), one example being the epico-religious legend of Göderz (Gotarzes, AD 40–51). Linguistic considerations give a similar Late Arsacid date for the earliest editions of certain novels transmitted in later texts, for instance the religious ballad called The Tree of Babylon and the short epic romance entitled History of Zarēr.

The use of Greek came to an end with the Sassanids, the last Greek text being one by Shahpuhr I (241–272). The established language was now Medo-Persian or Pārsīk, which forms a bridge between the ancient language of the Achaemenids and modern Persian. Several of the Sassanids, such as Shahpuhr I, Shahpuhr II, and Ardashir II (see above) were thought well of by religious tradition, and historical inscriptions of them have been preserved. A famous inscriptional text (in Greek, Medo-Persian, and Parthian) commemorates Shahpuhr I’s achievements, among them his victory over the Roman emperor Valerian; and there is a text in Medo-Persian and Parthian relating to Narses II (293–302).
d. Greek and Latin

The Epic. In the bilingual world of letters during the earlier part of this period Latin poetry was much more prolific and rewarding than Greek. Greek epic was written during the first three centuries, but it has gradually got lost: in any case, whether mythological or historical in type, it must have been a poor affair. Mythological poetry included the *Heroicae Theogamiae* by Peisander of Laranda (in sixty books), and the Dionysiac poems of Dionysius of Samos and Soterichus of Oasis; on historical subjects there were Arrian’s twenty-four books on Alexander, and the thirty books of an *Antoniniade* (on Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius) by Gordian I.

In the fourth century the influence of sophistic brought about a final flowering of Greek epic. Historical and eulogistic work included the poems of Callistus on Julian’s Persian Wars, and the works of Eusebius and Ammonius on Gainas. We know more about the mythological type, represented by the *Gigantomachia* of Claudian. Quintus Smyrnaeus, probably still in the fourth century, wrote fourteen books of *Posthomerica* (which survive), narrating what happened between the end of the *Iliad* and the return of the Achaeans to their homes. The material is drawn more from pictures than from original poems, but his stylistic models are the archaic and classical epics. The versification is faultless, the style is simple and not unduly epigrammatic, and the handling of the plot is well proportioned. What is missing is poetical inspiration and inventive fancy: the characters lack personality, the descriptions dramatic force, and the episodes cohesion.

Nonnus of Panopolis in Egypt, for all his shortcomings, was a distinctly better poet. At the end of the fourth century he wrote an enormous work in forty-eight books called ‘Dionysiaca’, the central motif being the combat of the heroes against the Giants of India, representing Hellenism against barbarism. Into this narrative the poet introduces a large number of fables, and passes from episode to episode in a style which is bombastic, rhetorical, and epigrammatic. Despite this he has a wealth of fancy and vivid colour; his versification is forceful and sonorous; and he makes daring use of surprising neologisms in his diction. His epic is the last spontaneous product of the union between Hellenistic Greece and Asia, coming from the very gateway to Byzantium’s Middle Age.

Latin epic of the first century AD, both the verse histories of the type written by Lucan and Silius and the rhetorical myth on Statius’ model, is distinctly better than anything produced in Greek at this period.

[Latin epic composition was then dominated by Virgil, and much that was written in that form followed his manner, which was regarded as classic. Side by side with his influence, however, was another school, bent upon bringing fresh blood into the epic, both in its form and its subject-matter. We connect this attempt with the name of Lucan.

Lucan (M. Annaeus Lucanus, of Corduba, AD 39–65) was the nephew of
Seneca and, like him, imbued with the Stoic philosophy. He belonged to the same generation as Nero, and became the latter’s friend and constant companion after his uncle had introduced him into the imperial palace. He had been a child prodigy, and soon won a place in the circle of youths who surrounded the emperor and assisted him in his literary and musical activities. Lucan is a typical example of the spirit of the ardent generation, passionately interested in philosophy and art, which saw the last years of the Claudian dynasty. Like many of his contemporaries, he was drawn into the catastrophe that involved the elite of the senatorial class in the year 65. He took part in Piso’s conspiracy against Nero and though he denounced his accomplices when the conspiracy was betrayed he was forced to commit suicide at a very early age.

[The only one of his works to have come down to us is Pharsalia, an epic in ten cantos, but unfinished. Its real title is Bellum Civile (Civil War), and its theme the struggle between Caesar and the Republican Party, which began in 49 BC and ended in victory for Caesar. It seems strange to us nowadays that this subject should have been chosen by a poet on terms of close friendship with Nero, who owed his throne to Caesar’s success; and we hardly feel that Lucan could have handled it in a spirit of independence. And yet, perhaps with the rashness of youth or perhaps because Nero himself made a great show of broad-mindedness regarding what already belonged to ancient history, Lucan had the audacity to side with the republicans against Caesar. His Stoic principles led him to consider civil war as an episode in the fated course of events, a symbol of the periodical cosmic conflagration proclaimed in the doctrine of Chrysippus. Caesar thus becomes the instrument of Destiny, and it is possible to censure the man himself without regretting the developments he brought about. Contrasted with Caesar is the figure of Cato, symbolizing the human conscience, which rejects all compromise and maintains its liberty in defiance of Destiny, by willingly accepting death. This turns the epic into a tremendous tragedy with a cosmic setting. Its actors are the helpless toys of Fatum, and the gods take no hand in the matter. Hence there is no supernatural element in Pharsalia and this, again, differentiates it strongly from the Aeneid. It is more tragic than the earlier work, because it leaves less scope for human free-will to influence history. Less ‘human’, too, for there is little tenderness or pity in it. Lucan is carried away by his own inner logic, despite his attempt to be objective, and ends by developing an enthusiastic admiration for Cato and expressing himself in explicitly republican terms. Tradition has it that this spiritual development was hastened, if not caused, by a quarrel with Nero, who is said to have grown jealous of Lucan’s talent.] That is why Pharsalia is usually considered to have been composed in two distinct periods. The first three books, before his quarrel with Nero, deal with the opening of the Civil War in a manner relatively friendly to Caesar: in the remaining seven, published after Lucan’s death, passionate republicanism gains the upper
hand. The whole work (incomplete when the poet died) is Livy’s narrative put into epic form: it is a medley of rhetorical speeches and pathetic descriptive scenes, and throughout the story we see casus intervening in human affairs.

The other epic poets of this period were all disciples of Virgil.

C. Valerius Flaccus Setinus Balbus spent about twenty years (c. 70–90) on his Argonautica, which won little popularity, although it is undoubtedly superior to many contemporary poems. The material is drawn from Apollonius Rhodius, but it is in part abridged and in other places interspersed with fancies of the poet’s own or elements from other sources. Flaccus was influenced not only by Virgil but by the rhetorical schools. He showed a fondness for pathetic episodes, and handled them with skill.

Ti. Catius Silius Italicus, whose family may have originated at Italica in Spain, was taught by Stoic philosophers, but became consul in 68 and was a supporter of Vitellius. In the years following 92 he published the seventeen books of his Punica, a work about the Hannibalic War. This too is the Livian narrative reduced to epic, with the insertion of frequent episodes of divine intervention together with some brilliant passages describing scenery and a number of rhetorical speeches. Many sections are imitated from Homer and Virgil, such as the descriptions of funeral games, journeys to the lower world, battle pieces, and catalogues of peoples.

P. Papinius Statius (c. 55–100), a native of Neapolis but son and pupil of a poet from Velia, devoted himself first to Silvae, then between AD 79 and 91 to the twelve books of his Thebais, and finally after 95 to his Achilleis, which was broken off in the tenth book by his death. The Thebais tells once again the story of the Seven against Thebes, ignoring the many times it had found favour in the past. It is a poem without poetic fire. It follows the Aeneid too slavishly, is crammed to excess with divine intervention and divine personification of human beings, and is tinged throughout with rhetoric. In the Achilleis the main subject is still more heavily diluted, and even in the tenth book the hero has not reached Troy. Briefly mentioned should be the fragments from a Latin epic about the war between Octavian and Antony which were rediscovered at Herculaneum.

Although a certain amount of epic, of both the historical and the mythological type, still continued to be written in later years, the genre can now be regarded as worked out. For fanciful narrative it was superseded by the romance.

Tragedy. In tragedy, too, at any rate in the early empire, Latin work was much more notable than Greek. Tragedians still existed in the Greek world, such as Philostratus (I), who wrote forty-three tragedies and fourteen comedies in Nero’s time, or Isagoras, or Antiphon of Athens. We also hear of Romans, like Asinius Pollio or the Younger Pliny, writing tragedies in Greek as an exercise. All these works are lost, and the loss may not be all that grave.
It is certain that down to the third century the old Athenian plays were still recited, though abridged to become simple recitatives, the choral and sung passages being cut. New tragedies must have been written mainly to be read rather than acted, and by the time of Libanius reading was to become tragedy’s only function.

There were still, however, some reputable works of Latin tragedy, which became more independent of Greek tragedy than in the preceding period. The poet expresses his own political and philosophical ideas, stitches together some religious and moral disquisitions, and puts into the mouths of his characters a number of rhetorical speeches, which are then interspersed with moving lyrics.

L. Annaeus Seneca the Younger (c. AD 5–65), son of the Seneca who wrote on rhetoric, was born at Corduba and migrated to Rome. After he had held the early posts in a senator’s career he was exiled to Corsica, where he remained for part of Claudius’ reign (41–49). He returned at the wish of Agrippina and became tutor to Nero, but then fell into disgrace and retired into private life. He committed suicide after having been implicated in the Pisonian conspiracy. He was a versatile writer, and besides his plays he composed philosophical dialogues, letters, and satire. Eight of the nine tragedies ascribed to him are certainly his (the only one about which there is reasonable doubt is the Hercules Oetaeus), and together they form the only complete set of works which has come down to us from a Roman tragedian. The Hercules Furens is inspired by Euripides, but both the plot and some of the episodes have been substantially altered. The Phoenissae consists now only of two fragmentary episodes. The Medea contains a number of scenes not in Euripides, and probably drew on the lost work of Ovid bearing the same name. The origins of the Phaedra cannot be traced with any confidence; but the Oedipus is based on Sophocles’ play, though with considerable abridgement and revision. The differences between the Agamemnon and Aeschylus’ work, especially at the beginning and end, may derive from an intervening play by Livius Andronicus. With the Thyestes we have no model for comparison, since all earlier tragedies of this name have been lost. So far as their plots and dialogues go, Seneca’s plays could certainly have been recited on the stage, as we know was done for plays of similar type by Pomponius Secundus. But it is also beyond doubt that they could not have been understood or appreciated by a popular public, but only by a select class of persons. This means that they must mainly have been used for public readings, in halls for declamation. Their influence on mediaeval and modern literature was enormous.

The manuscripts are certainly wrong in attributing to Seneca a tragedy called Octavia, the only surviving example of a praetextata (tragedy on a Roman subject). It is concerned with the unhappy life of Octavia, daughter of Claudius and Messalina, who was compelled to marry Nero, and was then put to death in banishment after having been supplanted by Poppaea. The
tragedy alludes by ‘post eventum’ prophecy to Nero’s death; it therefore cannot have been written earlier than 68, and by then Seneca was no longer alive.

Of Publius Pomponius Secundus, who lived under Tiberius and Claudius, we are told that he wrote tragedies, one at least of which was a praetextata, and that he engaged in controversy with Seneca. His tragedies caused riots to break out in the theatre. More praetextatae, on the subject of Cato Uticensis and on one of the Domitii, were written by Curatius Maternus in Vespasian’s time, and we know the names (but very little else) of other Latin tragedies. But by now this form of poetry seems to have exhausted itself as far as the West is concerned.

In the fourth century the sources speak once more of tragedy in Greece, the authors including Andronicus of Hermopolis, Apollinaris of Laodicea (who wrote comedy too), and Synesius. But their works were beyond doubt written for declamation in schools, following the custom described by Libanius. Performances, which Christians and priests were forbidden to attend, were still given in the theatre; but these, as we said earlier, were largely improvised scenes, which could give delirious pleasure to people whose taste was easily satisfied.

Comedy. We have little to go on about comedy in Greek, simply a few names of authors, including some like Germanicus Caesar and the emperor Claudius who were famous politically. Nor is our information about Latin comedies any better. M. Pomponius Bassulus of Aeclanum (between AD 50 and 100) translated Menander and wrote some comedies of his own. Vergilius Romanus started by writing comedies of Menander’s type, then turned to Aristophanic composition, and finally devoted himself to mimiambics. Lastly there was Annianus in Hadrian’s time, who is said to have written ‘Fescennines’, ‘Judicra carmina’, and ‘Falisca’, which are probably all the same kind of composition.

What is certain is that the public of imperial times preferred mime and pantomime to comedy. We can tell what Greek mimes of this period were like, partly from references in ancient texts to writers such as Niscostratus and Alciphron, but still more from the fragments found on Egyptian papyri. Among other discoveries there is a ‘hypothesis’ of a mime for eight characters, with the title Chariton, dealing with the liberation of a courtesan whom an Indian prince is about to sacrifice to the moon. This is a prose parody of Euripides’ Iphigeneia in Tauris, with some verse and musical notation scattered through its pages. Papyri have also revealed a scene from a work called Moicheutria, inspired by a mime of Herondas, in which a slave is saved from a mistress who has condemned him to death. Then there is a fragment of Euripos and Sarapas concerning a festival of Cronos, and a number of other works.

But throughout the empire, as we know from the diatribes of philosophers
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and from imperial interdicts, the general public developed a passion for ‘pantomimes’, which were mimic dances to musical accompaniment, based on plots commonly derived from mythology. These were composed not only by Greeks (such as Pylades, Bathyllus, Lucianus, Libanius, and Corycius) but by Latins too: we know, for example, of ‘fabulae salticae’ written by Lucan.

In the last phase of the empire Latin comedy underwent a new and curious development, in which the comedies of Plautus were turned into prose with rhythmic clausulae. This was probably done simply for purposes of declamation. We have an example in the Querohus, a prose adaptation of the Aulularia by an anonymous Gaul; and we know that the same was done to the Amphitruo.

Satire. Even in Horace’s later period Latin satire was no longer a spirited attack on personalities, and it had lost its contact with daily life. In the hands of Persius and Juvenal it became even more abstract and rhetorical. Sometimes however, its content became fuller, as in the ‘Menippean’ satire used by Seneca, Petronius, and Demetrius of Troezen. In addition the iambic side of satire gave place to epigram: Martial’s poems, for instance, were justly called ‘abbreviated satires’.

A. Persius Flaccus (34–62), a man of equestrian family from Volaterrae, spent the whole of his very short life between his school and his books, leaving the latter to his master, the philosopher Cornutus, after his death. His six satires were published posthumously. The prologue and the first satire are in the style of Lucilius and Horace, treating literary criticism without much originality. The remaining five are impersonal pieces of philosophizing about customs; they derive from the school rather than from real life, being flat and somewhat shallow.

D. Iunius Juvenalis of Aquinum (55/60–c. 140) began his active life with a creditable military career; then for twenty years or so he occupied himself with rhetoric at Rome; then he held municipal offices at Aquinum; finally he returned to Rome. Not much confidence can be placed in the story that he was exiled under Hadrian. His sixteen satires were composed between 98 and (at earliest) 126. Although he wrote at a time when free speech was allowed, and although he was of an impassioned character and had promised his readers to treat of all kinds of human action, he made it impossible for himself to deal with contemporary matters by deciding to mention only people who were dead. His satire, therefore, seems flat directly one sees that it looks to the past, mainly indeed to the period of Domitian, the emperor Juvenal detested. But it is also often exaggerated and artificial, containing sententiousness and artificial pathos, even though the breadth of his personal experience at times gave greatness to his verse. His various themes include an attack on the mythical type of epic, the vexations of city life, Domitian’s court, the miseries of clients; and there are various philosophical subjects, as well as an onslaught on women.4
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We now pass to writers of Menippean satire. One example of bitter parody is the Menippean piece of prose and verse satirizing the death of Claudius, which tradition has identified with the 'Pumpkinification of Claudius' allegedly written by Seneca. We also know, mainly from Tacitus, of a particularly refined Roman noble named Petronius, who had been proconsul of Bithynia and then consul, and who was called by Nero his 'arbiter elegantiarum'. Though Nero's friend he was prosecuted as an accomplice in the Pisonian conspiracy, and committed suicide after sending the tyrant a letter accusing him of his crimes. This is the personage to whom we should ascribe authorship of one of the finest pieces of imperial literature, a great Menippean work in prose and verse, which our manuscripts describe as Satirae or Satiricon. Only small portions remain, perhaps belonging to books XIV–XVI. This was a fanciful romance, of which both the prose and the verse sections were composed in a most agreeable style. The surviving fragments describe a spectacular feast at the house of an exceedingly wealthy freedman named Trimalchio, and they describe the background in vivid, colourful, and also biting terms.

The Greek work of Demetrius of Troezen must have been another example of Menippean satire. He wrote in early imperial times, and dealt with philosophical criticism by way of parody.

*Lyric Poetry.* In Greek literature the favourite form of lyric was still the epigram; and the collections gradually grew larger, starting with the work of Philippus in the time of Caligula, who was followed by Diogenianus in Hadrian's day. Collections were also made of special types of epigram; Strato of Sardis, for example, assembled a number of poems about boys, and included with them several pleasing efforts of his own. These lyrics were mainly concerned with love, but some too are hymns to the gods. We also know of several poets' names from inscriptions. There were still epigrammatists of note in the fourth century, like Palladas of Alexandria, whose 150 surviving epigrams are sometimes gay and sometimes bitter. Then there were the *Anacreontea*, slight pieces of verse on continually recurring topics, which were designed to be sung at banquets. Many of these were composed in the second and third centuries, but still more in the fourth.

Latin lyric was much more extensive and important. The *Silvae* of Statius were written between 88 and 95, in five books of which the last is unfinished. These are occasional poems, congratulations on births of children and on birthdays, *epithalamia*, invitations, comfort to invalids and celebrations of their recovery, dirges and condolences to the afflicted, gratitude for presents, panegyrics to emperors, and descriptions of festivals and other events or of magnificent buildings and statues. This sort of purpose gives a number of them a marked degree of spontaneity and directness, even though the ideas they contain are repeated time and again. In others the futility of the subject blocked any inspiration, and Statius' skill in handling verse was no substitute.
Yet throughout the collection one is struck by the pleasant and clear-cut pictures of Roman life.

M. Valerius Martialis (44–104) came to Rome from Bilbilis in Spain, and had to adapt himself in the capital to living as a poor 'client' of well-to-do 'patrons', who were also Spaniards (of the type of Seneca or Quintilian). After he had attained a relatively comfortable existence and some degree of reputation, he became poor again and set out on his wanderings, first to Forum Cornelii, then to Rome again, and finally back to Bilbilis where someone gave him the cottage in which he died. His earliest epigrams, like those of Statius, were written only for occasions: the Liber spectaculorum describes the games inaugurating the Flavian Amphitheatre in AD 80, and his Xenia and Apophoreta in 84–86 are epigrams to accompany the gifts and invitations which used to be exchanged at the festival of the Saturnalia. But the real Martial is to be found in the twelve books of 1,200 Epigrammata which he wrote between 85 and 102. His three preferred metres are the choliambus, the hendecasyllable, and the elegiac couplet. He was a poet who lived in the midst of the world, observing what he saw; so his poems speak of everything and of every type of person, and he touches on their humorous side with an astonishing measure of variety. He knew earlier literature, both Greek and Roman, in his own genre, but he is no imitator: even when he takes ideas from other people he transforms them. The power and clarity of his expression are often inimitable: his verse, though he polished it with the most delicate care, looks as if it were turned out impromptu; he never gives way to rhetoric, and mythology is excluded from his list of subjects. There are only two things to offend us in this marvellous poetry: one is Martial's excessive servility, the other the obscenity which pervades his pages.

A number of other lyric poets were writing at the end of the first and beginning of the second century. There have also survived some largely anonymous pieces, of varying purpose and poetical value, from the late second and the third centuries, such as the Perseigitium Veneris, the Vesvae iudicum, or the sententious work known as the Dicta Catonis. With these may be classed the De concubitu Martis et Veneris of Reposianus and the elegies of Pentadius.

The fourth century, however, is marked by a strong group of lyricists. The African poet Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius, prefect of Rome in 329 and 333, wrote verse panegyrics of Constantine. He also composed 'figured' poems (Technopaignia), which are mostly palindromic verses capable of being read equally from the top or the bottom, or sometimes verses forming a pattern.

Decimus Magnus Ausonius (c. 310–395), was a Gallic rhetor, who taught Gratian and Paulinus, was a friend of Symmachus, and became consul in 379. He wrote much 'occasional' verse of every kind, largely devoid of poetical inspiration but important for its content. There were 120 epigrams,
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an *Ephemeris* describing life from morning to evening, *Parentalia* on the deaths of relations and friends, *Epitaphia heroum, Caesares, Ordo nobilium urbiun, Ludus septem sapientium, Idyllia* (the delightful piece called *Mosella*, written in 371, stands out among this group), *Epistulae*, and perhaps also the *Periochae Homeri* (partly prose, partly verse). In general the poetry of Ausonius shows the influence of the 'Neoterics' of the golden age, but it certainly did not receive the polish they had given to their work. What we feel throughout is a tone of friendliness, tenderness, and even paganism.

But if Ausonius was a Christian who thought like a pagan, Claudius Claudianus was a pagan outright: 'pervicacissimus paganus' Orosius called him later, and there is only the barest allusion to the fact that he professed Christianity at all. He was born at Alexandria, and in his early days wrote in Greek; but most of his poetry was done in Latin after he migrated to Rome in 395. He died soon after 404, while still a young man. The more important among Claudian's poems are largely concerned with contemporary events, and are written under the influence of passionate affection for Honorius and Stilicho and passionate hatred of Rufinus and Eutropius. But he also composed poems on mythological subjects, such as the *De Rapitu Proserpineae*, written in the years 395–397 but left unfinished; this contains a description of the Sicilian spring of considerable lyrical merit. His minor works include poetical letters, epigrams, and descriptive pieces about animals, places, and so on.

Finally we should mention the two books of elegiacs by Claudius Rutilius Namatianus, a Gaul who was *praefectus urbi* in 414. These are noteworthy for their content and deep patriotism. Rutilius' *De reeditu suo* describes a journey from Rome to Gaul along the coast.

*Pastoral and Story-telling*. Certain Latin bucolic poems have come down to us, written by a Sicilian poet called T. Calpurnius Siculus (having been adopted by the famous Calpurnius Piso who conspired against Nero). Seven poems are preserved under his name, but he probably also wrote two pieces celebrating Nero's musical talent and his policies, and also a *Panegyric of Piso* said to be the work of a poet who was young and poor. The *De ruralibus* of Septimius Serenus, who lived in Hadrian's day, were probably also pastoral poems; and included in the collection of Calpurnius are two pieces of the same type written by Nemesianus, who lived about 284 and will be mentioned later as a didactic poet.

Among writers of fables in verse we may mention an Oriental who wrote in Latin and an Italian who wrote in Greek. Phaedrus, a Thracian slave freed by Augustus, composed much more than the five books of *Aesop's Fables* transmitted by our manuscript, as we know from three prose collections made in the Middle Ages. In his first book, written before 31 BC, Phaedrus began by translating Aesop; but in later books he inserted more and more fables of his own, and he also shows increasing independence in his
style. The work we possess has been re-edited in various ways, particularly as regards the ‘Morals’ which accompany the fables at their beginning or end: these are often ill suited to the fables in question, and in several editions they actually contradict them.

Valerius Babrius, an Italian resident in Asia, wrote before the end of the second century; his ten books of fables were still intact at the time the Suda were compiled. Many of these fables still survive in verse (123 on a single manuscript), and many others in prose paraphrase. The language contains some curious Ionisms; the style is that of sophistic writing; the metre is the choliambus, quite elegantly handled. Babrius derives his fables from all kinds of source—Aesop, the philosophers, and various story-tellers—but he has also added much of his own.

Finally there was a collection of poetic fables by the pagan Avienus in the fourth or fifth century. Drawing on Babrius’ material he put forty-two fables of Aesop into fairly pure Latin elegiacs. The collection was used as a school text and consequently suffered much re-editing and interpolation.

Didactic poetry is represented by a few Latin writers of the first century AD, some Greeks in the second century and early third, and finally some more Latins from the second to the fourth. M. Manilius, whose origin is unknown (possibly a provincial), was a writer at the time of Tiberius. His five unfinished books of Astronomia show a lofty, though at times nebulous, conception of the absolute law which governs the celestial and terrestrial worlds and gives them eternal order. The treatment is difficult, but it is often illuminated by polished lyrical episodes, like that of Andromeda and Perseus in Book V. Claudius Caesar Germanicus (15 BC–AD 19), the adopted son of Tiberius, wrote some comedies as a young man and also an Aratea. This last was based on the Phaenomena of Aratus (previously translated by Cicero), but Germanicus altered the format; for example he substituted an invocation to Tiberius for the original invocation to Zeus and added a section called Prognostica which he did not find in Aratus. Here too we should mention Book X of Columella’s De Agricultura, which he put into verse without any poetic inspiration: the book is the one devoted to arboriculture, written with the laudable intention of completing the Georgics of Virgil.

Among Greek didactic poets of the second and third centuries we may first mention Dionysius Periegetes, who wrote a Periiegesis of the world in 1,187 hexameters, published in Hadrian’s day. In later centuries this was a standard treatise on geography, and as such was transmitted also in two Latin versions by Avienus and Priscian. It received a Greek commentary by Eustathius as late as the twelfth century.

Oppianus of Cilicia (c. 192–212) followed his father into exile on the island of Malta and died at a very early age soon after his recall by Caracalla in 211. He left five books of a poem on fishing, the Halieutica, most elegant in diction, style, and metre, but wholly derivative in content. Oppian is also credited with a Cynegética in five books and with a work on bird-catching
(Ixeutica), of which the former survives entire and the latter in a summary; but they are in fact the work of a Syrian writer from Apamea, whose style, metre, and language are very different from Oppian's and greatly inferior in quality. This Pseudo-Oppianus (sometimes called Oppianus II) also drew all his information from books, and much of it is absurd. Another writer of this period, this time on medicine, was Marcellus of Side, who wrote forty-two books of Iatrica in Marcus Aurelius' day: of these only fragments survive.

In Latin, Terentianus Maurus and Juba wrote at the end of the second century on metric. In addition Nemesianus, whom we mentioned above, was the author of poems called Cynegetica, Haliutica, and Nautica, from the first of which 325 lines are preserved, datable to 283/4.

But the most flourishing period of Latin didactic and learned poetry was the fourth century, and the work which stands out was that of the pagan Rufius Festus Avienus of Volsinii, who lived around AD 360 and is possibly identical with a proconsul of Achaea of that name. His renderings of Livy's history and Virgil's myths into iambics are now lost, but he also once again translated the Phaenomena and Prognostica of Aratus (into 1325 and 533 hexameters respectively), making use of earlier translations but also adding erudite data of his own. Besides this he drew on Dionysius' Periegesis, not without some misunderstanding, for a Descriptio orbis terrae in 1,393 hexameters; and another Greek Periplus, based largely on data supplied by Hymilco the Carthaginian, was his source for an Orae maritimae liber about the western and southern coasts of Europe (from this there survive 700 trimeters on the coasts from Britain to the territory of Massilia).

Sacred Poetry. On the pagan side we need only mention a number of anonymous 'Orphic' poems which happen to have survived. The most notable examples are the Argonautica, supposedly spoken by Orpheus and including a number of ritual hymns and prayers, and the Lithica, which describe the propitiatory and amuletic properties of precious stones.

Among Christian sacred poems we must pass over the ancient liturgical hymns, of which too little is known. Our account may start from Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea in Syria and the well-known founder of the heresy bearing his name. He wrote various exegetical works on the Scriptures and thirty books against the Neoplatonist Porphyry, but also some paraphrases of the Bible in verse. A Sacred History to Saul's day is cited by our sources, and we actually possess the Paraphrases of the Psalms, a strange medley of Biblical texts and reminiscences of Homer.

From Gregory of Nazianzus (died c. 380) we possess some moral and religious 'poems' for the young. These are divided into historical and theological poems, the most important of the former being an autobiographical work of about 2,000 lines. He also left some 'epitaphs' and ninety-four gnomic 'epigrams' in a great variety of metres, including two examples of
accentual (as opposed to quantitative) verse. All these are full of fine sayings, lengthy pieces of reasoning, and subtle distinctions, but they are, in the opinion of the present author, almost wholly devoid of poetic inspiration.

We should also mention a few epigrams by Claudian to his God, and ten hymns by Synesius in Doric dialect and anacreontic or logaoedic metre. All the latter are inspired by a deep mysticism, though some are addressed to Christ, and others, written before his conversion, to the pagan gods.

Christian Poets. The remains of ancient Christian poetry in Latin are very scanty. In the first place it was not much in the nature of the practical Roman to express in poetry the new ideas and sentiments and way of life conveyed by the Christian message. Secondly poetry at that time was used in the liturgy; and liturgies were still composed in Greek for Western as well as for Eastern Christians. We may pass over the few references to Church hymns and canticles in Latin, and also over the earliest metrical inscriptions, in order to say something at greater length about the more important poets.

Commodianus of Gaza (probably the African rather than the Palestinian town of that name) began as a pagan, then became a Jewish proselyte, and was finally converted to Christianity. He lived in the West and wrote in Latin. His poetry is rugged but effective: despite his learning it was to the populace that he addressed his hexameters, which are a mixture of accentual and quantitative versification. His *Carmen apologeticum adversus Iudaes* was probably written about 250, because it seems to allude to the Decian persecution and the appearance of the Goths on the Danube, although some scholars date the poem much later. It admonishes both Jews and pagans with severity, and is a succinct though imprecise exposition of doctrine with a manifestly polemical purpose. There is marked satirical power behind it, animated though it is by genuine religious feeling. Against the same opponents Commodianus wrote for the benefit of Christian catechumens eighty acrostic poems, which are collected into two books under the title *Instructions*.

C. Vettius Aquilinus Iuvencus, a Spanish poet writing about 330, composed a paraphrase of the Gospels in verse, following first Luke and then Matthew. The action in these *Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor* never comes to life in dramatic form, though the poet is faithful to the text and writes in smooth verses reminiscent of Virgil.

Somewhat earlier, at the beginning of the fourth century, though certainly after his conversion to Christianity, L. Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius composed eighty-five distichs on the fable of the phoenix (*De ave phoenice*), which he took as the symbol of the Christian soul (for other writings of Lactantius see p. 888).

Hilarius of Pictavium (Poitiers) is the first Latin hymnographer we know (c. 315–367; see above p. 889). Of his hymns to be sung in church we possess those for morning and evening, and fragments of three others about the
Redemption. Damasus (306–384, Pope from 366) has left sepulchral epigrams for martyrs’ tombs which he had restored, some dedicatory verses for sanctuaries, a few hymns for saints and martyrs, and a prose-verse composition about virginity. Proba, wife of the praefectus urbi of 361 and authoress of a lost poem on the war between Constantius and Magnentius, produced a curious composition in Virgilian half-lines, entitled Cento ex Vergilio de fabrica mundi et Evangeliis: its 694 hexameters describe the Creation, the Fall, the Flood, and the Life of Christ. Ausonius’ Versus rhopalici are mere word-plays, in which each word has one syllable more than the last; they contain no echo of Christian thought. Finally there are two anonymous poems against the pagans, composed in Gaul during Eugenius’ attempted restoration of paganism in 394.

The real inventive genius in hymnography was St Ambrose (340–397; see above p. 889). His hymns, antiphonal chants, Horae, and Vigiliae were composed to meet practical needs of Church propaganda, but he found the way to create genuine works of art within the brief measure of his strophes. They have great variety as well as sincerity, avoid both abstruseness and banality, and succeed in conforming to high poetic standards without becoming precious. Many of the ‘Ambrosian hymns’ are undoubtedly his—for example Aeterne rerum conditor, Deus creator omnium, Iam surgit hora tertia, Veni redemptor gentium, and the hymn to Gervasius and Protasius: others, and above all the famous Te Deum, must be later.

But the greatest Latin Christian poet of this era is undoubtedly Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (348–after 405), a native of Caesaraugusta in Spain who after holding high offices retired to a life of meditation and published the seven books of his works in 404/5. Written under stress of deep emotion, Prudentius’ poetry is sometimes fanciful and impetuous, sometimes logical and compelling, but always genuinely lyrical and personal, even when its forms are traditional. In his style, too, though he is at times obscure, he is second only to Claudian. His themes are extremely varied. The Cathemerinon liber contains twelve hymns in nine different metres for given days and hours of the day; the Peristephanon has fourteen hymns for martyrs with horrifying descriptions of their martyrdom; the Apotheosis is a defence of the divinity of Christ; the Hamartigeneia is about the evil which is born of the human will; the Contra Symmachum is directed at paganism in general, and at Symmachus in particular over the restoration of the altar of Victory in the senate; the Psychomachia concerns the hesitation of the soul between Christian virtues and pagan vices. In these writings the lyrical element is blended with epic and dramatic features, and the descriptive power is sustained by the poet’s complete command of diction and metre. Enthusiasm and doctrine, vigour and grace, confidence in Rome’s destiny and admiration for nature as God’s work—all these qualities and sentiments are found in Prudentius; and they raise his work to the highest plane, even if on occasions he can be prōlix and rhetorical. In general the sensibility and artistic talent of this poet
are quite remarkable. They show what wealth Latin literature could still command, once both its inspiration and its forms had been given new life by Christian ideals.

It is a far cry from the violence of Prudentius’ poetry to the calm and composed verses of Meropius (Paulinus of Nola) which recall the Horatian and Virgilian models he employed. Meropius Pontius Anicius Paulinus (353–431) was a rich senator from Burdigala, who passed through the regular career of honours (becoming consul in 378), and was then baptized. For a long while he retired to a life of meditation, then from 394 he was bishop of Nola, in Campania, where he lived near the tomb of San Felice. His poems contain much information about his life and the events of his time. The Poetic Letters to his teacher Ausonius are written to justify his retirement into asceticism; and he also composed Epigrams on Damasus’ model, a nuptial song intended as a contrast to the songs written by pagans, and fourteen Carmina Natalicia to celebrate each birthday of his chosen patron Felix. There is a sameness about Meropius’ themes, and his verbosity is combined with a tendency to rest content with rhetorical devices. Yet the art is there, and amid his unmistakable reminiscences of classical poetry there is genuine religious enthusiasm.

Oratory and the Neo-Sophists. We have explained already how in the early imperial period Latin oratory, and later Greek oratory too, was mainly to be found only in suasoriae and scholastic controversies. It had been divorced from public life and the popular courts, and instead became the artificial form of eloquence provided in schools, or at banquets, and the audiences of magistrates. The orator of those days who wanted to call himself a ‘sophist’ had to be an encyclopaedia of learning, trained not only to perceive all tenable sides of every argument but to sustain them with dexterity and with the voice and gestures of an actor. Like the sophists of old he would travel from city to city declaiming at banquets the imaginary discourses of some ancient personality whose part he was playing, or engaging in discussions about his own views on philosophy and ethics, or delivering ceremonial orations, panegyrics, and palinodes related to fictitious and often paradoxical occasions.

The style and tone of the sophists predominated in almost every school in the empire, and sophistic rhetoric had a vast influence on the creation of a prevailing type of common culture. Almost every writer in every genre of literature succumbed to this culture and tried to propagate it further. [But this literature, though predominantly rhetorical, is not without its value. It has been shown that the schools of rhetoric, in which the Ciceronian tradition was preserved, made it their aim to teach young men the art of persuasion, and consequently to give them the habit of ‘putting themselves in someone else’s place’, which is the very essence of humanistic culture. (See The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a preparation for the Courts under the Early
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Empire, by Brother E. Patrick Parks, the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Sciences, Series LXIII, No. 2, 1945.) In any case they considerably accentuated the oratorical character of classical prose. One of the most typical bodies of writing from this angle is that of Seneca the Philosopher (whose life is described above, p. 919, and in note 3).

Seneca’s first prose composition was a consolation addressed to a patrician Roman lady named Marcia, who had just lost a son. Marcia was the daughter of the historian Cremutius Cordus, a senator belonging to the ‘Stoic’ opposition, which had been disapproved by Sejanus; and it is by invoking the Stoic principles that Seneca tries to comfort the bereaved mother. At this period philosophy was no longer confined to the schools, as a source of material for dialectical exercises; it had been brought in to help people in practical life. This intention is displayed in the greater part of Seneca’s surviving philosophical writings, which include few purely theoretical treatises. In fact, that description only applies to the Naturales Quaestiones he wrote in his old age—and even those were an attempt to interpret the laws of the universe and thus elucidate the intentions of the divine Providence which was the supreme law of the Sage.

This first consolation was followed by two more, one addressed by Seneca to his own mother, Helvia, to comfort her in her grief for her son’s banishment. The other, dedicated to Claudius’ freedman, Polybius, who had just lost his brother, is really an attempt at ingratiating by which Seneca hoped to induce the all-powerful minister to plead for him and have him brought back from exile. For the most part, however, Seneca’s treatises take the form of ‘dialogues’ which can fairly be described as ‘exhortations to philosophy’. Soon after his return from banishment, Seneca advised his father-in-law Paulinus, then Prefect of the Annona (Minister of Food Supply), to ask permission to retire and lead a life of contemplation. Seneca himself seems to have intended to devote himself entirely to philosophy. But he was driven in another direction by Agrippina’s wishes and the pressure of life in Rome, and he was soon entrusted with heavy responsibilities. He thereupon resolved to govern the empire according to Stoic principles, and of the ‘dialogues’ he wrote at this time for a younger friend, Annaeus Serenus, Prefect of the Vigiles, the earlier ones show great optimism. In his treatises On the Constancy of the Wise Man and On Tranquillity of Soul, Seneca admits the possibility of leading a life of wisdom without renouncing the world of action. Gradually, however, his confidence is undermined by experience. In the dialogue On Leisure, he reverts to more pessimistic ideas, and is forced to acknowledge that political life compels a man to make compromises which are inconsistent with virtue. As time goes on, his inner experience is whetted still further and his conscience becomes more clamorous. When, after the premature death of Serenus, he becomes the spiritual adviser of another of his younger friends, Lucilius, his guidance takes a more direct line. Instead of formal treatises, he usually resorts to letters. Most of the Letters to Lucilius have
survived, and they constitute one of the most moving documents left to us by the pagan world in spiritual matters. They are genuine letters, written by one friend to another, yet they form a progression by which Lucilius is gradually led to a perception of spiritual truths, and then to the firm possession of them. It is here that Seneca puts forth his most ‘modern’ ideas—his assertion that even slaves have their human dignity, his condemnation of violence in every form (including the cruelties of the circus), his almost mystical aspiration for direct union with God, his serene acceptance of death, etc.

The rhetorical aspect of Seneca’s writings is always in evidence, the dominant feature of his ‘art of persuasion’; but he made it his aim to break away from conventional methods, and introduced innovations, liberating himself from the Ciceronian style which in those days had an iron grip on the majority of schools. We are told that he had many pupils, and for a time he was the idol of the young. In the next generation, however, Quintilian led teaching back on to more traditional lines. Still, it would be unjust to rank Seneca purely and simply with the ‘sophists’ and ‘rhetoricians’. The demands of conscience and the inner life meant more to him than sheer virtuosity, which was the great concern of the writers associated with the ‘second Sophistic’. This latter was at first represented in Rome itself by foreign philosophers, Orientals, such as Euphrates—a friend of the younger Pliny and a bitter enemy to Apollonius of Tyana—who treated moral preaching as though it were a branch of art.]

There was of course some reaction against this movement especially in the early stages, and even later there were a few artists of merit who stood out as exceptions, to say nothing of Christian literature. An early Greek reaction is probably to be found in the anonymous treatise On the Sublime (wrongly attributed to Longinus, but datable in the opinion of the present author to the first century AD) which requires all orators to have a proper sense of grandeur. The acute and well-reasoned observations of this admirable writer are evident allusions to the neo-Sophistic school in its early days. At Rome a reaction was attempted by both Quintilian and Tacitus, but on very different lines from each other.

M. Fabius Quintilianus from Calagurris in Spain had studied at Rome and returned there in 68 until his death in 95/6, being first a paid state professor of rhetoric and then the tutor of Domitian’s young cousins. In his lost work De causis corruptae eloquentiae he attributed the decline of oratory to the fashion for empty declamation on fictitious and futile themes. His Institutiones Oratoriae, on which he spent the years between 68 and 95, deal with the education of an orator, the composition and structure of a speech, the choice of arguments, elocution, and the moral and practical aims of a perfect orator. Quintilian was an admirer of Cicero, though he was still an eclectic in his tastes and doctrines: a great gulf separates him from the writers of suasoriae.

The same problem of the decay of oratory was faced by Cornelius Tacitus in his Dialogus de Oratoribus a little later than 96. This is a conversation
imagined to have taken place in the year 74 between the supporters of the old, intermediate, and modern forms of oratory; and the suggested cause of degeneration is tyrannical government. Much of this dialogue is a masterpiece of dialectic. It is composed in a clear, crisp, Ciceronian style, different from that of Tacitus’ historical works because it is employed for a different literary genre.

But these counter-attacks, whether by Greek or by Latin writers, could do nothing to check the neo-Sophistic movement, which during the first and second centuries obtained complete mastery in the literatures of both languages. A few examples follow.

From the many works of Dion Cocceianus of Prusa (Dio ‘Chrysostom’, 40–c. 115, whom we mentioned as a philosopher in the preceding chapter) there survive seventy-six orations, from two periods of his life. The earlier, such as the Rhodian and Trojan speeches, are pieces of rhetoric on imaginary themes, and can be classified as sophistic: the later are important for understanding the ideas and the life of the second century AD and belong to Dio’s Stoic period, including the ‘Diogenic’ speeches, the Olympic and Euboean, the Political Questions, and speeches On Kingship and On Poverty. Next comes Nicetas of Smyrna, who flourished in Nerva’s period, and who betrays the connexion between the sophistic trend and the bombastic Asianic school of oratory found at an earlier period. An indirect pupil of Nicetas (by way of Scopelianus) was Antonius Polemon of Laodicea, who later became head of the Smyrna school in the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. Contemporary opinion regarded Polemon as one of the real glories of his times, but the two surviving examples of his speeches, which are for two Marathon runners, are grotesque by modern standards.

One of the most famous Sophists was Herodes Atticus of Marathon (c. 103–179), consul, friend and teacher of emperors, one of the richest men of his time, and a noted builder of public works in Greece and Italy; but his oration On the State seems from its surviving fragments to have been of little significance. One of his pupils was P. Aelius Aristides (129–189), son of a priest of Hadrianu Thera in Mysia. After a long period of study with several teachers and after many travels (he was at Rome in 155–156) he spent seventeen years as a sick man partly at Smyrna and partly at Pergamum. Fifty-five of his speeches have survived, some for particular occasions (such as the Panathenaic, or the Praise of Rome), others of a scholastic type, including exercises on imaginary themes of literary criticism and politics. He also wrote treatises on rhetoric. He was a learned man, who knew the Attic classics well especially from the linguistic standpoint, and was a clever dialectician; but he wasted much of his culture and ability on a distressing form of rhetoric, in which he mingles the most specious arguments with serious ones and devotes himself to words rather than to ideas. We should also mention Maximus of Tyre, who had pretensions as an academic philosopher in the time of Commodus and composed his philosophical ideas into a number of
ornamental stanzas. Forty-one Dialexeis survive on these lines, containing a medley of absurdity and truth, set out with the greatest affectation and verbosity.

Roman oratory and rhetoric in this period starts as something rather more serious, but before long it rivalled Greek in its emptiness. Pride of place belongs to the Gratiarum Actio (or Panegyric of Trajan), delivered in the senate in AD 100 by C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus (the Younger Pliny—see below p. 948). It was long when delivered, but has come down to us in an even longer version which he elaborated later, and comprises eulogies on all the events of Trajan’s early years, combined with continual attacks on Domitian.

There have survived two collections of nineteen long and 145 short orations on fantastic themes, wrongly attributed by some sources to Quintilian and by others to Postumus Junior. Yet a third collection contains about fifty items, which are probably of the early second century and are attributed to a certain Calpurnius Flaccus.

But the greatest monstrosity of Latin sophist was M. Cornelius Fronto (c. 100–after 175), a rich African who taught Marcus Aurelius and Verus; he was a senator, and became consul in 143. He won great repute as an orator and letter writer, and composed some historical and antiquarian sketches, as well as a Consolatio. The letters he exchanged with the emperors and with his friends are of a quite depressing futility; the same applies to some declamations which have survived, such as the Praises of Smoke and Dust or the Praise of Negligence. Fronto was interested only in erudition and collecting rare words. His mind was full of old quotations, but what was lacking was thought, even though he had Marcus Aurelius as a friend.

These neo-Sophists, though they were given an exaggerated reputation, were mediocre figures, but among them were a few persons of more considerable stature; Lucian was one and so to some extent was Apuleius. Lucian of Samosata in Syria (c. 125–192) learned Greek late, after which he toured round the Mediterranean as a Sophist, staying for longer periods in two places, first at Athens from 165 to 185, and then in Egypt where he became a court official until his death. Of the eighty-two works attributed to him the authentic ones may be divided into those written before and after his residence in Athens. In his early period, after a few declamations in the prevailing fashion on imaginary and empty themes (The two men called Phalaris, In praise of the fly, and so on), his treatises became more serious and artistic, his dialectic more agile, and his language more supple (the works of this period include The Dream, The defence of portraiture, and The way to write History). But the real Lucian is the polemical and satirical writer of his later years. The comic dialogues and parodies of this period mock unmercifully the rascally and childish rhetoricians, the dogmatic philosophers, the bogus moralists, the untenable myths and creeds, together with the literary absurdities of his day—exaggerated Atticism, wild work on grammar, dreary novels, and grotesque tragedies. In the philosophy, religion, and ethics which
lie behind his satire he came increasingly under the influence of the Cynics, the Epicureans, and the New Comedy; but he is essentially a great humorist with a biting wit, a supple style, and a brilliant command of fancy. In him dialogue takes on a fresh and easy flow, and the polemical pamphlet attains a lively pungency which it would be difficult to surpass.

L. (?) Apuleius of Madaura in Numidia (c. 125–170) studied dialectic, music, mathematics, and philology in his home town, and also at Carthage, Athens, and Rome, learning to speak and write equally in Greek and Latin. He was initiated into various cults and mysteries. When he returned to Africa he became involved in a serious charge of fraud, connected with a rich elderly widow whom he had married. Later on we find him made sacerdos provinciae and honoured with statues at Carthage. Tradition called him a magician: certainly his complex nature and culture enabled him to write as a poet, novelist, philosopher or theosopher, naturalist, and mathematician. Many of his speeches are lost, but we can judge him as an orator and rhetorician from the Apology which he wrote in his defence against the charges connected with his marriage, and which does much to tell us about the systems of magic current in his day. We also possess the Florida, a collection of excerpts from twenty-three speeches, some written for actual occasions, the rest on imaginary themes. Apuleius is still a sophist after the archaizing manner of Fronto. But he has much more breadth of vision than most sophists, his works are more varied and interesting, and his style is loftier and more personal (on Apuleius' Golden Ass see p. 950).

After Lucian Greek sophist continued its decline into emptier and more fantastic pieces of nonsense, with its erudition becoming increasingly disorganized and often a sham.

In the third century we meet the second of the Philostrati of Lemnos, who lived at Athens and then, from 211 to 244, at Rome. This Philostratus was the author of letters and of the Lives of the Sophists, and he was the essential inventor of the story of the Sophist and magician Apollonius of Tyana, whom he depicted as a rival to Christ. Then there was the third Philostratus, nephew to the second, who probably wrote the Heroicus, containing lives of heroes in a rural setting, and the Icones, an imaginative description of sixty-four pictures in a villa. Mention must also be made of Claudius Aelianus of Praeneste, who prided himself on being able to speak Attic like an Athenian and published elegant descriptions of 'curious' matters in science and scholarship under the titles The Nature of Animals and Miscellaneous stories, as well as writing a number of letters and two lost works on Providence and Divine Evidence. Between 193 and 228 appeared the Deipnosophistae of Athenaeus of Naucratis, an account of an imaginary banquet attended by twenty-nine diners—jurists, poets, grammarians, philosophers, rhetoricians, doctors, and musicians. This is almost an encyclopaedia of sophistic learning, though it is valuable too for its description of settings and its citation of continuous passages from literature.
Also in the second and third centuries there were writers who collected 'preparatory exercises' (*progymnasmata*), and there appeared several treatises on rhetoric, some more complete than others. Hadrianus Alexander, son of Numenius, wrote a *General Rhetoric* and a book on *Figures of Thought and Speech*. Aelius Theon of Alexandria wrote *Rhetorical Hypotheses* and *Researches into Syntax*, as well as collecting exercises. Hermogenes of Tarsus, an infant prodigy of Marcus Aurelius' day, astonished the world with his speeches, and later wrote *Progymnasmata*, together with works on *Composition, Style, and The Method of Eloquence*, providing a complete series of prescriptions, definitions, and examples. Apsines of Gadara, who became consul under Maximin, wrote a work called *Techne*; Menander of Laodicea produced a tract on *Epideictic Speeches*; and Cassius Longinus (220–273), the teacher of Porphyry and counsellor of Zenobia, a man later executed at Rome, was a philosopher, lexicographer, and author of a *Treatise on Rhetoric*.

There was a regular renaissance of Greek rhetoric and sophistic in the fourth century, with Athens as the main centre of its production. Libanius (c. 314–393) was born at Antioch and became professor at Athens, Nicaea, Constantinople, and finally (from 354) at Antioch itself. He was a friend of the Emperor Julian (himself a considerable writer) and taught important Christians like John Chrysostom, Theodorus, Basileius, and Gregory Nazianzenus, as well as such pagans as Ammianus Marcellinus. He himself was a convinced pagan, and was distressed at the neglect and scorn shown for the ancient religion. He wrote treatises and scholastic models, but there is more spontaneity and information in his sixty-five orations on topics of the day, including panegyrics, court speeches, descriptions of towns, speeches to the emperor, and speeches in defence of pagan temples. Equally important are his 1,605 letters to every class of person on every kind of topic. Although he was a schoolmaster who lived on erudition and the little happenings in his school, and although as an orator and dialectician he was commonplace, he is still a genuine character with a certain appeal.

Himerius of Prusa (c. 315–386) spent most of his life as master of a flourishing school at Athens. His eighty speeches, of which twenty-four survive entire, are concerned with school subjects and particular occasions. They are not impressive either for their ideas or for their dialectical skill, being a collection of fancies, mythical traditions, and poetical quotations, strung together in a mannered, ornamental, and melodious style.

A much superior writer was Themistius of Paphlagonia (310/20–390/5), who kept a school at Constantinople from 347 but also rose to the highest offices in the state (he was prefect of the city in 384) and was the tutor of Flavius Arcadius. An ardent pagan, he begged the emperors to allow religious freedom, but to no avail. In his school he dealt with ethical questions among others. He has left us an abridged but clear *Paraphrase of Aristotle* and thirty-five speeches, some official and others occasional. The most noteworthy are the speech to Flavius Iovianus on *Religious Toleration*, the
Sophist (an apology for his life), and the speech on Humanity. His writings are important for their content, but their style too, though ornate and academic, is not lacking in grace and power.

In the Latin world too the fourth century was a flourishing period for rhetoric and oratory. From court speeches of the eulogistic kind there survive twelve extremely servile Panegyrics, some from the end of the previous century and all of them written in Gaul. They are modelled on the style of Cicero and are in the genre of Pliny’s Panegyric to Trajan; for the most part they are in a reasonably pure and smooth classical Latin. Some of them are anonymous, others bear the names of Eumenius, Nazarius, Mamertinus, and Drepanius Pacatus; and they are addressed to various emperors, from Maximian to Theodosius.

But the most eminent figure in this branch of literature was Q. Aurelius Symmachus (340–405), proconsul of Africa in 373–375; praefectus urbi in 384/5, consul in 391. Eight of his orations, all of the panegyric type, survive as a single ‘corpus’. Symmachus, too, was a devoted pagan, and his letters, which are of great interest, show how he implored in vain for respect, or at least toleration, to be extended to the old religion of Rome’s ancestors.

In the Latin part of the empire the fourth century also produced several writers of more or less elementary works on rhetoric. Aquila Romanus wrote De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis, which was used, with additions, for a work of the same name by Julius Rufinianus. Messius Arusianus published Exempla elocutionum in 395; and a little before 400 C. Chirius Fortunatianus produced three books Artis Rhetoricae in the form of questions and answers.

Historical Writing. Historians, both in Greek and in Latin, were conspicuous in the first two centuries of the empire.

a. Latin

C. Velleius Paterculus had a long and gallant military career which was crowned by his participation in Tiberius’ triumph in AD 12. He was engaged on the preparation of a history from the Civil Wars down to Tiberius, but in 29 he composed, on the spur of the moment, a short historical work as a compliment to a friend who had been designated consul. This is his Historia Romana in two books, which have survived with some gaps. The style is ungainly, and Velleius’ attempts at the pointed phrasing of post-Augustan prose are seldom successful. The history is extremely cursory from the origins of Rome down to Tiberius, but he spreads himself more fully on Tiberius himself and, without allowing too much detail to emerge, attacks the critics of his emperor’s achievements and methods of government, thereby providing us with an excellent corrective to the account of Tacitus. For the early history Velleius uses a variety of sources; and he includes sections on literary and cultural history, and on the colonies and provinces, which were unusual in historians of the period.

The contemporary work of Valerius Maximus, nine books on Facta et
dicta memorabilia composed between about 28 and 31, had very different purposes. He aimed at providing rhetoricians with a collection of facts, sayings, and historical examples: they are drawn from every kind of source, and compiled with some attention to style. Probably very similar were the Historiae diversae exempla Romana collected by an anonymous author (probably of Augustan date) and later abridged by C. Titius Probus.

Probably to Claudius' time belong the ten books of Historiae Alexandri Magni by Q. Curtius Rufus. This work has no historical value of its own, and includes statements which are incredible and reasoning which is absurd. It is written in an easy and agreeable style by a rhetorician who wanted to compose a pleasant work on an historical subject of the semi-romantic kind.

Much Latin historiography of this century has been lost; such as the memoirs and autobiographies of Tiberius, Claudius, Vespasian, and Domitian, and also of Agrippina, Domitius Corbulo, L. Antistius Vetus, Suetonius Paulinus, and Vipsanlus Messalla. There were biographies of Cato Uticensis by P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus, of Thrasea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus by Junius Arulenus Rusticus, and of L. Annius Bassus by T. Claudius Pollio. There were monographs on the Civil Wars by A. Cremutius Cordus, on the German wars down to Nero's time by Aufidius Bassus (continued by Pliny the Elder's twenty books on the same subject), by Fabius Rusticus on the British wars, by M. Antonius Iulianus on the Jews, and by Pompeius Planta on the year 69. But more considerable works have also perished, such as the Histories of Cluvius Rufus, consul about AD 40 and governor of Hither Spain in 68, and the Universal Chronicle of L. Cornelius Bocchus, probably a Lusitanian, on whom Pliny the Elder drew for his work The Marvels of Spain.

Cornelius Tacitus (c. 55–c. 120), who perhaps came from Interamna,9 studied rhetoric when young and then in 78 married the daughter of Agricola, the conqueror of Britain. He pursued the public career of a senator under Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, became consul under Nerva in 97, and in 100 took on the defence of the province of Africa against Marius Priscus. After that he devoted himself solely to his literary publications (for the Dialogus de Oratoribus see p. 931 above).

The De vita et moribus Iulii Agricolae belongs to 98, the beginning of the reign of Trajan, and its style still shows signs of Ciceronian influence. It is a eulogistic biography of Tacitus' own father-in-law, telling the story of his achievements in Britain (with long digressions on geography and ethnology) and contrasting his virtues with the vices of Domitian (who was now dead). The short work ends with a fine passage addressed to the dead Agricola.

To the same year 98 belongs the Germania, or De origine, situ, moribus, ac populis Germanorum, a work written in rhetorical style with Sallustian undertones. Tacitus uses the original sources, both oral and written, to deal first with the region in general—its boundaries, climate, and products, and the military, religious, political, and private life of its inhabitants—and then with individual peoples. The work was written at a time when Trajan was
consolidating Rome's possessions in Germany, and it seeks to make better known the country and tribes against which Rome was fighting and to give his readers an idea of the right policy to adopt. Sometimes too Tacitus, following a technique which was becoming increasingly common, idealizes the primitive customs of the barbarians to point a contrast with the advanced but corrupt customs of his own people.

Tacitus had planned a history of the emperors, dividing the work in a way which departed from chronological order. First would come the emperors from Galba to Domitian (69–96), then those from Tiberius to Nero (14–68), thirdly Nerva and Trajan (96–117), and finally the rule of Augustus (27 BC–AD 14). But he was able to complete only the first two parts of this work. His Historiae covers the period from 69 to 96 in fourteen books, of which there survive only the first four and part of the fifth, dealing with the events of 69 and part of 70. This work was written between 104 and 109. The Annales or Ab excessu divi Augusti, written some ten years later, run from AD 14 to 68. From them there survive Books I–IV, parts of V–VI, and Books XI–XVI, the last section being incomplete at its beginning and its end; this gives us almost all the reign of Tiberius and parts of the reigns of Claudius and Nero.

Tacitus made use of all available written sources—documents, the Acta Diurna, proceedings of the senate, tracts, memoirs, autobiographies, and regular histories. He also drew on personal recollections by himself and others, especially for later events. We should know more about his use of sources if we could decide with certainty, and in detail, the reasons for the parallels between passages in the Histories and three other texts, namely Plutarch's Lives of Galba and Otho, Suetonius' biographies, and the History of Dio Cassius. These parallels sometimes amount to verbal correspondence, and would seem to prove not only the use of common sources but the actual transcription of them, even by Tacitus, with what in many cases is close adherence to their words. There are other reasons for thinking that Tacitus' research was not particularly scholarly, especially over details.

He was a passionate aristocrat and convinced admirer of free institutions, detesting tyrannically-minded emperors; and his long experience of men and life had led him to put a pessimistic interpretation on human actions. Being richly endowed with the power to construct hypotheses about the psychological reasons for the behaviour of his characters, he tended unconsciously to turn these hypotheses into factual data, and managed to extract from the sources information which best accorded with his own largely a priori beliefs. He was a supreme master of dramatic exposition of a kind that impresses and even fascinates the reader; and this makes his histories, while immensely interesting, also extraordinarily suggestive. They must therefore be used with quite exceptional caution. His undertaking to write 'sine ira et studio' must be regarded with the fullest reserve, and his prejudice and character too often make his judgements excessively rosy or gloomy.

His style is both intimate and powerful. Refinement in rhetoric is in his
case combined with daring efforts at dramatization and epigrammatic brevity. His language is highly coloured and poetical, and possesses an astringency which is all his own (though in other respects he was influenced by Thucydides and Sallust).\textsuperscript{11}

C. Suetonius Tranquillus (c. 75–c. 140) was already a man of note in Trajan’s reign and became a high official in the Imperial Archives, the ‘scrinium a studiis’, and thereafter \textit{ab epistulis Latinis} to Hadrian. Later, however, he devoted himself entirely to his literary work. We possess no clear idea of his lost work, especially of the \textit{Prata}, which may have been a systematic encyclopaedia, or possibly just an assembly of miscellaneous pieces of research. We do not know if certain other writings formed part of the \textit{Prata} or were separate works, though the former seems more probable. These include the \textit{De naturis rerum}, \textit{De animantium naturis}, \textit{De anno Romanorum}, \textit{De notis}, and \textit{De Roma et institutis legibusque Romanorum}.

In the \textit{De viris illustribus} Suetonius made use of all kinds of authors and documents to write the lives of Roman literary figures from the time of Cicero to that of Domitian, divided into poets, orators, historians, philosophers, grammarians and rhetoricians. We know something of its contents under each of these heads from Jerome and later biographers, who drew heavily on Suetonius’ work.

On the other hand his eight books \textit{De vita Caesarum}, published between 119 and 121, have survived almost entire. These contain Lives of the twelve emperors from Caesar to Domitian. The information is largely anecdotal and of very varying value, drawn from every possible source without even the minimum of discrimination. It is then put, with little critical sense or psychological insight, into a stereotyped scheme which Suetonius borrowed from his biographies of literary figures. The standard paragraphs in each Life are therefore ‘forma, habitus, cultus, mores, civilia, bellica, studia’. The work has no artistic finish, but it is valuable because excellent and unusual sources are often used and because the political prejudices behind it are less factious and one-sided than those of other authors.

In Hadrian’s time (more precisely in 116/17) the African poet and professor of rhetoric, P. Annius Florus, wrote his \textit{Epitome de Tito Livio bellorum omnium} in two books, interpolating data from Sallust and Caesar into those provided by Livy. This is a careless, rhetorical, and poetical work, which was very popular in later centuries. In the same period or slightly later Justinus composed his epitome (mentioned in Part II) of the \textit{Philippica} of Pompeius Trogus; and L. Ampelius wrote an historical and geographical handbook for schools under the title \textit{Liber Memorialis}, designed to instruct pupils ‘quid sit mundus, quid elementa, quid orbis terrarum ferat, vel quid genus humanum peregerit’.

The last great attempt to write a complete Roman History in Latin was made by Gnaeus Licinius at the time of the Antonines. Using Livy, but supplementing and correcting his account from other sources, he wrote
thirty-eight books, from which there survive only a few fragments of the latter portion, mainly referring to events of the years 165, 108, and 78 BC. These make us greatly regret the loss of the remainder. It is a disputed question whether the surviving fragments come from Licinianus' original work or from an epitome.

There were numerous continuators and imitators of Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*, but they have unfortunately been lost almost without exception. One of the most important was Marius Maximus, possibly to be identified with the consul of 223 and 232, who wrote biographies of the more outstanding emperors from Nerva to Elagabalus, omitting the minor figures. He was very painstaking in transcribing documents and ransacking the *Acta Urbis*, but was too fond of scandal and legend, and becomes tedious on account of long-windedness. Aelius Iunius Cordus, who was still alive at the time of the Philips, wrote the lives of the 'obscurer' emperors omitted by Marius Maximus, and also of the later emperors, from Elagabalus to Gordian III. He was often satisfied with frivolities and gossip, and goes into the most trivial details.

In contrast the work of the so-called *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* has been preserved almost intact. This is a 'corpus' of the lives of the emperors from 117 to 284, attributed by our manuscripts to six different authors, Aelius Spartanus, Julius Capitolinus, Vulcacius Gallicanus, Aelius Lampridius, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus, who are said to have lived in the period of Diocletian and Constantine. This traditional view of the *Scriptores* has been challenged in various ways, and we cannot here refer to all the discordant views. Given the uniformity of style many scholars suppose that the 'writers' never existed, and that the lives were written *en bloc* at a later date (some say in the age of Julian, others in the reign of Theodosius, others at some point between the two): at one or more other dates there was a further process of re-editing. It is worth noting that most of the documents contained in these lives are beyond doubt forgeries, often of the clumsiest kind.

If we leave aside biographies, Latin historical work of this period (the fourth century included except for Ammianus) mainly consists of simple epitomes adapted to a lazy public and containing little of interest. In the time of Constantius II, Aurelius Victor, an African who was prefect of Rome in 389, wrote a well-informed work with some imprint of personality about it, which was called the *Caesares* and dealt with the emperors from Augustus to AD 360. To this an unknown scholar added two short prefaces, designed to complete the story and make it an 'Historia tripertita': one is called *Origo gentis Romanae*, the other *De viris illustribus urbis Romae* (from Romulus to M. Antonius). There is also an *Epitome de Caesaribus* covering imperial history from Augustus to the death of Theodosius in 395: this follows Victor's *Caesares* at its outset, but is by a different author.

Eutropius, the *magister memoriae* of Valens (364–378), wrote ten short books
called Breviarium ab urbe condita, for which he drew on Livy, Suetonius, an imperial chronicle, and his own recollections. This was a work much read: it was several times translated into Greek and often added to (from Paulus Diaconus onwards). Also for the use of Valens was Rufius Festus' Breviarium (rerum gestarum populi Romani), based for the earlier sections on Livy or an Epitome of that historian,\textsuperscript{12} with the addition of some other sections badly constructed and badly put together. A Livian Epitome was also used by the pagan Julius Obsequens for a Liber prodigiorum covering the years 190–12 BC, although the record of prodigies in Livy begins at the year 249.

We may finally mention the first of the historical scholars in the rich Sicilian family of the Nicomachi, the only one who falls within the limits of this volume. This was Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, vicarius of Africa in 377 and quaestor sacri Palatii to Theodosius I, to whom he dedicated an historical work with the title Annales.

But the most important Latin historical work of the fourth century was that of Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 330–400), a Greek of Antioch, who after a long and gallant military career, during which he got to know many people, lands, and types of human being, finally retired and devoted himself to writing thirty-one books of Res Gestae, a continuation of the Histories of Tacitus from 96 to 378. The surviving books are XIV–XXXI, covering the years 353 to 378, and they show Ammianus to have been a genuine historian, shrewd at understanding men and events, well informed, and unprejudiced and balanced in his judgements—for example on Julian, whose virtues and defects he appreciates equally. He avoided being overwhelmed by rhetoric, although his style is often obscure and bizarrely Tacitean, and although he inserts into his history a number of curious excursuses on geography, physicomathematics, philosophy, religion, and social matters, which are neither very original nor very accurate, and are collected from every kind of source. A portion of Ammianus’ history, relating to Constantinople, was re-edited about 390 by a pagan, and interpolations were later made by a Christian editor. This constitutes the first of two fragments known as the Anonymus Valesianus.

b. Greek

Flavius Josephus of Jerusalem (37–c. 100) was an anchorite in his youth, but then sided with the pro-Roman section of the Pharisees. In 64 he came on an embassy to Rome, where Poppaea thought well of him. In the Roman-Jewish War he was taken prisoner, and he remained in Titus’ camp during the siege of Jerusalem. Later he lived at Rome, having been made a Roman citizen, and died in Trajan’s reign. His plan was to make known the history of the Jews in the Graeco-Roman world, in ancient as well as in modern times. He therefore wrote first (between 70 and 79) seven books On the Jewish War (then just completed) with a preface on the earliest contacts between Rome and Judaea. Then, before 94, he composed twenty books of Jewish
Antiquities, from the creation of the world down to AD 66. He dwelt at length on the most recent history, for which his narrative, though tendentious, is extremely valuable, and drew on the Bible for the remainder. When his two works were greeted with disbelief and criticism by certain Greeks, notably by Apion, Josephus went on to write his Contra Apionem, in which he demonstrates the antiquity of the Hebrew people, brings together references to them from ancient Greek writers, and defends the Jewish Law against attacks by Greeks. The style of Josephus has rhetorical flourishes, but one must bear in mind that he wrote in Hebrew and then translated his works into Greek with the help of a friend.

A man of opposing views, an anti-Roman 'zealot' named Justus from Tiberias, wrote a hurried chronicle from Moses to Herod Agrippa II (down to AD 100). Josephus deplored the tendentious character of this work, which appeared slightly before his death.

The rest of Greek historical writing from the first century AD, before we reach Plutarch, is almost entirely lost, but some of these writers deserve a mention. We may start with Claudius, who before he became emperor in 41 had devoted himself to historical and grammatical studies, and had composed in Greek twenty books of Tyrhenica and eight of Carchedoniaca. In Latin he wrote the early part of a Roman history from the death of Caesar, resuming it again in forty-one books from the restoration of Augustus. He also wrote an autobiography in Latin.

Then there was the Samaritan Thallus, a freedman of Tiberius, who produced three books on chronology with synchronisms between the histories of Greece, Rome, the Orient, and Judaea. This was much used by Christian chronographers. In addition we find a series of writers of local history, Teucer on Cyzicus, Hippocrates on Sicily, Memnon on Heraclea, Apion on Egypt, Theagenes on Macedonia, and so forth.

From Plutarch we possess forty-six 'Parallel Lives' in pairs, and also four on their own (Artaxerxes II, Aratus, Galba, and Otho), all written between 105 and 115. We know, however, that others existed and that the author had still more in mind. Varro and Cornelius Nepos had already made comparisons between illustrious Romans and foreigners, but Plutarch limited his scope to generals, statesmen, and legislators. The pairing, sometimes successful but sometimes forced, was emphasized by the writing of a Comparison at the end of each one. The Lives were published by the author directly he had them ready, the degree of elaboration depending on the number of sources he had available. When earlier writers provided him with a large number of anecdotes he stretched them out over practically the whole of the Life in question; when the anecdotes were few, he dwelt more on the historical events connected with his hero. Since he was a great reader and took many notes, it is difficult to reconstruct his precise sources: they are more numerous in the Greek Lives (although many citations may be derived at second hand from earlier biographies), less numerous in the Roman. Plutarch's purpose was more
moral than historical: he wanted to edify, though he is often silent about the defects of his heroes, and also to produce a psychological analysis of a set of 'characters', a difficult enough task when he had to use anecdotes of any sort of value and from any sort of source. The Lives of Plutarch are a great mine of information for the historian, information which is good or bad according to the value of the sources he was using.

Flavius Arrianus of Nicomedia, a prosperous Roman citizen, was a pupil of Epictetus and set himself to publish his master's theories. But after the death of his master, whom he compared with Socrates, he became a second Xenophon and passed from philosophy to soldiering. He served in various provinces, was consul in 130, and afterwards governor of Cappadocia when it was menaced by the Alani, this being the period in which he wrote his works on geography and tactics. Then we find him at Athens, holding important municipal posts; during old age he was still able to hunt, and must have been generally affluent. Many of the historical works of Arrian's Athenian period have been lost: the Lives of Timoleon and Diocles of Syracuse, eight books of Bithynica from the origins to 75 BC, his personal memoirs entitled Alanica, and his Parthica down to the time of Trajan (in seventeen books). What survives is, first, his work On India, written in Ionic dialect in imitation of Herodotus, and based mainly on the Periplus of Nearchus; secondly the Anabasis of Alexander, for which he used Ptolemy and Aristobulus, attempting to compare them critically; and thirdly the Succession to Alexander, known to us from a résumé by Photius. Although his style is commonplace, his language, like Lucian's, is one of the better examples of Attic during this period. We have already spoken about his epic poetry.

Appian of Alexandria was advocatus fisci at Rome under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, then a procurator down to the time of Marcus Aurelius. A great admirer of the empire, he wrote a vast Roman History in twenty-four books, divided on the lines adopted by Pompeius Trogus into sections related to each of the peoples conquered by Rome. In this way it got split into a number of separate monographs piled one on top of another, which in certain portions were even given irrational titles. There survive only fragments of Books I–V, with Books VI–IX and XI–XVII entire. Throughout the work there is no serious attempt to explain the dominion of Rome. The form is simple, and shows no sophistic influence.

Phlegon of Tralles, a freedman of Hadrian, composed a collection of Olympic victors and chronological data in sixteen books. These were later reduced to eight and used by Julius Africanus.

Herennius Philon of Byblus, born about 70, wrote various historical works which have since been lost: The Reign of Hadrian, Important cities and men (a work in thirty books, much used by the lexicographers Stephanus of Byzantium and Hesychius), Paradoxical Stories (about contradictions among historians), and a History of the Phoenicians in nine books of which Eusebius preserves fragments. In this last work he gives a Euhemerist explanation of
Phoenician mythology, adducing a supposed work by Sanchoniathon of Tyre, a probably non-existent or apocryphal writer assigned to the period before Homer.

Cassius Dio Cocceianus (c. 155–235) may be regarded as the last great Greek historian before the age of Justinian. Born at Nicaea in Bithynia and descended from Dio Chrysostom, he was a senator and advocate in Rome, praetor in 194, and companion of Caracalla on his campaigns of 211–217. In 218 he was imperial commissioner at Smyrna and Pergamum, then governor in Africa in 224, and consul in 229. He spent his last years in Bithynia, having withdrawn from public life. His first work was a monograph on Commodus, written in 194. Then he put in hand his *Roman History* for which he collected material between 200 and 209, elaborating it down to 221 and returning to it once more after 229. Of its eighty books those numbered XXXVI–LX (68 BC–AD 47) and LXXIX–LXXX (Caracalla to Elagabalus) have survived in entirety: for the rest there are extracts made by order of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and the works based on Dio by Xiphilinus and Zonaras (eleventh and twelfth centuries). Dio tried once again, by comparing the versions given by earlier writers, to reconstruct a sound and reasoned history: he took the work of Thucydides as his model, though he could not begin to approach it. His style is notable for the clarity and agreeable nature of his exposition, which becomes tiresome only in his oratorial passages and in his lists of prodigies. The better part of the work, naturally, is that which concerns events near his own day.

Aelius Herodianus, an official at Rome, wrote the history of the successors of Marcus Aurelius down to 238, drawing mainly on his personal recollections, though he was also familiar with Dio and other historians. He was remarkably impartial, and was knowledgeable about men and political parties; but he is less careful in his references to chronology, geography, and warfare. Herodian's language is easy and his style presentable, but he too is a writer who wearyes one with an excess of discursive and sophistic passages.

P. Herennius Dexippus was an Athenian who took part in the defence of Athens against the Heruli in 269. He wrote a *History of the Successors of Alexander the Great, The War against the Scythians* (his personal reminiscences), and an *Historical Chronicle*. This last was used by Eusebius, who also drew on a chronicle by the Neoplatonist Porphyry (mentioned earlier for his philosophy).

Pagan Greek historiography in the fourth century, apart from a few autobiographical narratives like the lost commentaries of Julian on the Gallic War, was the work of court panegyrists. This applies both to short lives of emperors (these too are lost) and also to the writings of Eunapius of Sardis (346–after 414), a pagan pupil of Neoplatonists and rhetoricians, who kept a school of rhetoric himself and wrote fourteen books of chronicles continuing Dexippus from 270 to 404. This work, the *Historical Records*, is written in pompous style, its central part, even more pompous than the rest, being five
books of eulogy dedicated to Julian, which was widely used by Zosimus, though only fragments survive today. Eunapius also wrote a series of twenty-three *Lives of Sophists and Philosophers* (his own contemporaries), a peculiarly wordy and futile piece of work.

*Christian Chronographers* Hippolytus, whose *Philosophoumena* were mentioned earlier, and who is said to have been martyred in the Decian persecution, wrote a concise *Chronicle* from the origin of the world to 234. This is preserved in part in Armenian, and was an important source for later Chroniclers.

The *Chronographia* of Sextus Iulius Africanus (died c. 240) are in five books from the origins of the world to AD 221, with synchronisms between the Bible story, which is taken as a base, and the events of the pagan world. The work has survived in fragments. According to Africanus the world was destined to last 6,000 years; Christ had come to earth in the year 5,500, and therefore there would be 500 years of the world’s life after his birth. The considerable use made of this work by Byzantine historians has enabled scholars to give a satisfactory reconstruction of it both in its general lines and also in some of its details.

Eusebius, born at Caesarea in Palestine between 260 and 265, was so devoted a pupil of Pamphilus that he took his name just as if he had been his adopted son. He learned from his master a veneration for Origen and a love of erudition. He became bishop of his own city about 313, and died some time before 340, after having taken an active part in the theological struggles which disturbed Christianity after 325. He was present at councils and important religious ceremonies, and has left descriptions of them in his writings. The latter include, first, some commentaries on the Bible with revisions of the sacred text; secondly some apologetic works, such as the *Contra Hieroclem*, and the *Contra Porphyrium* in twenty-five books; but thirdly and most important his histories, which have gained him the honourable title of ‘Father of Ecclesiastical History’. His service was in fact confined to the labour of collecting material. He enriched his own text with many extracts from earlier authors, and also cited passages which would undoubtedly have been lost if he had not reported them. For this reason his pages are particularly precious and represent an inexhaustible mine of information.

He composed a *Chronological Canon* and an *Epitome of World History of Greeks and Barbarians*. The latter has two parts, the first a date-table for the history of particular peoples, the second a set of chronological rules and synchronisms, from 2016 BC, in which he interweaves sacred and profane history together very closely. The original Greek is lost, but it can be constructed on the basis of the Latin version (with additions) by Jerome, and of two other versions, Armenian and Syriac; help is also given by the chronological work of Syncellus, though all these various texts show noticeable
variations between one another. The same idea inspires two other works of Eusebius, the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, where with his customary erudition he illustrates his thesis that Christianity has crowned all that was good in the ancient world, whether pagan or Jewish, and that we cannot therefore deny its truth or condemn the religion which has been revealed. Other historical works of Eusebius include *The Martyrs of Palestine*, *The Acts of the ancient Martyrs*, and a *Life of Constantine*, the last a sickening piece of eulogy including a number of documents which some have held to be spurious. These works, and more particularly the *Ecclesiastical History* which we come to next, have always been the subject of lively argument; and even now it cannot be said that scholars have reached agreement upon their degree of reliability.

The *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius consists today of ten books covering the period from the birth of Jesus down to 323. But it was composed in sections and not as a single work. First came Books I–VII and an early edition of Book VIII, taking the story down to the events of 312; then Book IX, published in 315; and Book X, together with a revision of the whole work, came out in 324. The manuscript tradition itself reveals the alterations which were made. These revisions led to inconsistencies in the author’s judgements, and sometimes serious ones, since he changed his opinions accordingly as particular persons fared in relation to Constantine, who remains the guiding star of the whole work. The *Life of Constantine* presents even greater difficulties: it is not a genuine biography, but (as we indicated above) a eulogistic speech in four books, with sixteen documents inserted which purport to come from the imperial chancellery and other archives. The *Life* too had two editions, since it had to be brought up to date in the light of the political situation and the fortunes of its protagonist. But the most striking thing is the difference in the tone of this work as compared with the *History*. Facts are presented in different ways in the two Eusebian works, and there is no doubt that the *Life* is not so much an historical narrative as a piece of apologetic, shot through with pure invention. The two documents, however, are quite certainly authentic as transcribed: there has been no tampering.

Eusebius’ conception of history and politics started with an ingenious idea. He would not use theoretical arguments for defending Christianity but take his stand on history, showing what struggles and what victories the religion had undergone and what glorious traditions and forms of organization it had achieved. Yet the undertaking required powers which Eusebius did not possess. The disparity between his promise and performance accordingly led to contradictions, incoherence, disorder, and arbitrary judgements, of the kind found so often in the *History* despite the sincere enthusiasm and religious ardour which inspired it. Moreover the author was convinced that there was a parallelism between Christianity and the Roman empire: he made that empire, especially as governed by the absolute monarchy of Constantine’s time, into the expression on earth of the government in
heaven, the rule of God. According to him the emperor was the new Moses leading the Christian people to salvation, and it is not surprising that he was impressed by the complete revolution which in the course of a few years had transformed Christianity from a persecuted faith to a religion actually promoted by the state. For the same reason he approved of Constantine’s ecclesiastical policy over the Arian controversy, disregarding the serious menace to religious freedom because he maintained that Constantine’s way provided the only means of safeguarding the true faith—or the faith Eusebius believed to be true.

Eusebius was openly hostile towards belief in the millennium. This too is to be explained by his conviction that any such belief contradicted his ideal, which was based on a longing for the establishment of God’s temporal Kingdom and for a religion which brought civilization through the support afforded it by the political authorities. This was the line imprinted by Eusebius on all his Church History, and it left an indelible mark on that branch of study for all time. Again and again histories were composed with the purpose of discovering external signs of Christian progress, despite the fact that this progress is something which takes place within, and cannot be in any way determined or measured.

After Eusebius the Latin tradition in Church History, with a few exceptions, turned to the compilation of chronological works. The so-called ‘Chronographer of 354’ is a handbook of chronology and history, comprising the official calendar, the consular Fasti down to 354, the tables for determining Easter between 312 and 411, the list of praefecti urbi between 254 and 354, the dates on which bishops of Rome and martyrs were buried, and the list of bishops of Rome down to Liberius (352–356). Down to 334 it has a chronicle of events in two different hands, and it also includes a chronicle of Rome to 324 and the Notitia Regionum of the same city.

The Church father Athanasius wrote a biography of St Antony the Great which was used as a model for Greek and Latin biographies and lives of saints during the Western and Byzantine Middle Ages.

The Latin version of Josephus, in part abridged and in part enlarged, may be the work of Ambrose, though it was for a long time wrongly called the edition by Hegesippus. Jerome has given us a Latin translation of the second part of Eusebius’ Chronicle, which he prolonged down to 380. He also made the first attempt at a history of Christian literature in his Viri Illustres, which was written in 392 and includes 135 authors from St Peter to Jerome himself. We should also mention his various lives of monks and saints, such as St Paul of Thebes and Malchus.

The Aquitanian Sulpicius Severus, a lawyer turned monk, has left us two books of Chronici composed in 403. These are a history of the Jews and Christians from Adam to AD 400, with especial emphasis on the earliest parts of sacred history and on events near to the author’s own day. The style is that of Sallust or Tacitus.
Finally there is Julius Hilarianus, bishop of Africa, who in 397 wrote *De mundi duratione* and on the date of Easter.13

**Letter-writing.** Letter-writing had a number of different aspects during the imperial period. Sometimes we find correspondence which really took place, even though it may have been edited at the time of publication, as Cicero’s had been: here the examples are Pliny and Fronto. In other cases the letters are fictitious, and serve either as the dressing for treatises, especially treatises on philosophy (as with Seneca) or as exercises in sophistic (as with Alciphrion, Julius Titianus, Philostratus, or Claudius Aelianus). Sometimes the latter as well as the former kind are arranged in complete collections. We have already noticed too the importance of ‘Epistulæ’ in the Christian world from the Apostolic period onward.

In Latin letter-writing the sophistic genre came later than the use of letters for treatises (see p. 930 on the Younger Seneca as a philosopher) or the genuine letters produced by the Younger Pliny. C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus (61/2–114) was born at Comum and was named C. Caecilius until his adoption by the Elder Pliny, who was his uncle. He was taught by Quintilian, and followed the full cursus honorum down to a consulate in 100 and a legateship in Bithynia in 111–113. On his death he left his books and a foundation for alimenta (upkeep of poor children) to the people of Comum. As a young man he had written poems described as ‘lusus et ineptiae’ and in 100 he composed the *Panegyric* to Trajan (mentioned above). But his main literary work was his twofold collection of letters, the nine books of letters to his friends written between 97 and c. 109, and his correspondence with Trajan. The letters to his friends are at once different from the letters of Cicero in that they were conceived and written with a view to publication. They enable us to get to know all sides of their author, at any rate in the way that he wanted to be known. More interesting from the historical standpoint are the 121 letters exchanged with Trajan, mainly during the governorship of Bithynia. Pliny turns to the princeps for his views on every kind of question; and Trajan replies clearly, briefly, and with judgement, though he is sometimes evasive. The style of the *Letters*, like those of Cicero, is simpler and more everyday than that of the *Panegyric*.

We have already alluded to the correspondence of Fronto with Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Verus. A contrast to him in style was Julius Titianus, who composed letters imagined to have been written by women—like Ovid’s *Heroides*. He was so successful in reproducing the style of Cicero’s *Letters* that he earned the nickname of ‘ape’.

Among Greek letters of sophistic type, we may mention the 108 written by Lucian’s friend Alciphrion of Athens between 160 and 190. They were intended to be like a series of little mimes reproducing the background of Athens in the fourth century BC, and as such they owe much to comic poetry. From Philostratus we possess seventy-three letters which are mainly scholar-
tic exercises, or love letters full of witticisms and little epigrams. Claudius Aelianus produced letters which imitate the rustic speech of peasants.

Once the fashion for this genre had started in sophist circles people started fabricating both single letters and whole collections, and attributing them to literary figures or philosophers or statesman of the past, such as Phalaris, Anacharsis, Solon, Themistocles, Socrates, or Apollonius of Tyana.

Collections of letters, both genuine and fictitious, in both Greek and Latin, were much in vogue in the fourth century. The most interesting are those by a number of Fathers of the Greek Church (Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzenus, Gregory of Nyssa, Synesius, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus), and those by the pagans Libanius and Julian. The 159 letters of Synesius, written between 399 and 413, are full of facts and evidence, and are the most important document we possess on the political, economic, religious, and cultural condition of Cyrenaica at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century. Julian’s letters lay bare the tragic conflict which was never absent from that emperor’s mind.

In the Latin world of the late fourth century the most notable set of letters is that by the pagan Symmachus, collected by his son into ten books in 403–408. Even in Symmachus’ lifetime they were much sought after, and are a most valuable source of information about dying paganism. But still more remarkable are the forty-nine letters he wrote to the emperor when he was praefectus urbi in 384–385. These are collected under the title of Relationes, and the third of them, which is requesting the restoration of the altar of Victory in the hall of the senate, shows feeling and life of a kind that make it a real masterpiece: we may call it the last despairing cry of the pagan soul.

In Greek literature there is a fair amount of information about the treatment of myths and paradoxes. A work called Bibliotheca, which has survived in three books, is attributed by the manuscripts and by Photius to Apollodorus of Athens, but the edition we possess is certainly to be dated to the first century AD, two centuries later than his lifetime. It is a systematic exposition of the genealogies and deeds of gods and heroes, and it is not impossible that it is a late revision, containing substantial alterations, of an authentic work of Apollodorus called About the gods. We also possess a collection of Metamorphoses by Antoninus Liberalis (Antonine period), largely derived from Nicander.

As to paradoxes, a manuscript has preserved the so-called Paradoxographus Florentinus, written about AD 100, on the subject of Marvellous fountains, lakes and streams. We also know of some Paradoxa assembled by Aristocles and of a work on Earthquakes by Artemon of Miletus. In Latin there was the Marvels of Spain by Cluvius Rufus.

There are some writings in which myth and paradox are combined. Ptolemy Chennus of Alexandria (c. AD 100), among a number of works with strange titles, wrote a Paradoxical History and a New History, in both of which
he assembled mythical and paradoxical curiosities. Citations are also made from a poem of his called *Sphinx* and an epic poem called *Anthomerus*.

*The Novel.* Among Latin romances pride of place belongs to the *Satyricon* of Petronius which we discussed earlier. A more regular form of novel is to be found in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, which according to Augustine was also known as the *Golden Ass*. This tells of the adventures of one Lucius, who was transformed into an ass and after many changes of owner succeeded in getting back his human shape by devouring the roses intended for a festival of Isis. The theme is not new: we find its broad outlines in a short story by Lucian (or pseudo-Lucian) entitled *Lucius and the Ass*, and it seems that both writers derived it from another short work by Lucius of Patrae (AD 90?), which was known to Photius. But the Greek story was altered considerably by Apuleius. He put in new episodes and fables, some of which were his own and others derived from a great variety of sources, such as the famous story of Cupid and Psyche; and he handled the whole thing in the style he had made his own.⁴

Perhaps the earliest known Greek novel of this period is the Romance of Ninus (probably AD 50–100). This has a very rhetorical colouring but uses simple diction (like that of Diodorus), and it tells of the adventures in the love of Ninus for the renowned Semiramis. We know of this from papyrological finds, which have also revealed parts of a work entitled *The Loves of Metiochus and Parthenope*.

Antonius Diogenes, apparently at the end of the first century AD, wrote an imaginary journey called *On the marvels beyond Thule*: this was in twenty-four books, a summary of which is given by Photius. At the same time or perhaps rather later a lawyer's scribe, Chariton of Aphrodisias in Caria, wrote eight books describing *The Adventures of Chaireas and Callirrhoe*, the love story (full of anachronisms) of the daughter of the Syracusan Hermocrates, who lived in the fifth century BC. The work contains monologues, letters, and continuous passages quoted from Homer; its style is reasonably straightforward, though there is an obvious tendency to rhetoric and a striving after erudition.

The romantic plots of some of Lucian's shorter works we can pass over. Between 166 and 180 came the *Babyloniaca* of the Syrian Iamblichus, a work in thirty-nine books known from Photius' summary, and one which is notable for its psychological analyses and ingenious selection of characters. It tells how Rhodanies and the fair Sinonis were crossed in love and how they were then victorious over the king of Babylon.

Between 200 and 250 there were published the *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus. These were based partly on the legend of Penelope, and recounted the loves of Habrokomes and the fair Anthea, who were pledged in marriage but were then separated by a thousand adventures. Very similar in background and form is the anonymous *History of Apollonius of Tyre*, known to
us from a Christianized version in Latin, in which a prince of Tyre loses his wife and daughter but later finds them again and becomes king of Antioch, Tyre, and Cyrene.

Perhaps before the end of the second century Longus of Lesbos composed his pastoral romance of *Daphnis and Chloe*, whose adventures take place on Lesbos without much movement or great drama. The descriptions of scenery are charming, and many of the small episodes are graceful and true to life; but the characters in the story are unreal, and the love scenes show a decadent and highbrow kind of taste.

In the time of Aurelian, or perhaps as late as Diocletian, Heliodorus of Emesa wrote his *Aethiopica*, in which an Ethiopian princess named Charicleia and her lover Theagenes have a series of dramatic adventures—storms, brigands, persecution, and imprisonment by a jealous queen—but at last triumph when they are just on the point of being sacrificed. The plot is clever, the characters well handled, and the descriptions agreeable, but these virtues do not make up for the excess of erudition and the emptiness of the sophisticated ornamentation.

Still probably in the fourth century appeared *The Adventures of Leucippe and Cleitophon* by Achilles Tatius, in which Cleitophon tells of his own adventures and those of his beloved in a series of episodes which recall those in Heliodorus’ novel. It seems strange that this hotch-potch, in which the story is continually interrupted by descriptive scenes, speeches, and letters, should have been taken as a model of style throughout the Byzantine period.

It is true, however, that two extremely poor Latin works were equally popular, each of them a rehash of a Greek text. One was L. Septimius’ translation entitled *Ephemeris of the Trojan War*, written in the style and language of Sallust but in a flat matter-of-fact manner which makes the work most tedious. The story purports to be told by Dictys, a Cretan of remote antiquity, who took part in the Trojan War; and another participant named Dares of Phrygia is the supposed narrator in the other work, the *History of the Fall of Troy*, which was translated anonymously.

2. ART

a. China

The art of the Later Han (23–220), and Three Kingdoms (220–280), is a continuation of that of the Former Han, and, like it, is almost wholly a funeral art. The best relief work is found on the pillars that marked the entrance to the Spirit Road which led to the tomb of rich people. We may cite as an outstanding example those from the Shen tomb at Ch’ü-hsien in Szechwan. The decoration consists of mythological animals (tiger, dragon, phoenix). Many more sculptures of this kind, as well as gilt-bronze animal figures, are extant. So are large stone lions, the earliest (AD 147) in Shantung; this sort of stylized, heraldic animal of large proportions continued to be set
up in the Yangtze-kiang valley even later, throughout the period of division (317-589). They are often matched by winged, horned, and tiger-like creatures, which we conventionally call chimaeras; the earliest is that from the tomb of Kao I in Szechwan (209). Lions and chimaeras are the noblest guardians one can imagine for the imperial or princely tombs of old China.

The art of casting bronze mirrors reached perfection under the Former, and even more under the Later Han. At the side of an ever more fantastic geometric décor, we also find human figures, such as Taoist sages, etc.

For the architecture of this period we are still limited to literary remnants and drawings on funeral plaques. No actual buildings are left, and the results of recent excavations at Lo-yang are more important for the history of town planning than for architecture.

Painting consisted of frescoes on the walls of the imperial palaces and of portraits and scenes from the classics on silk. All these are lost, but we can gain a faint idea of them from the rough and sketchy imitations on pressed pottery tiles from tombs, as well as from decorated lacquers from the Korean tombs of Lo-lang (Pl. 65) and from Yang-kao-hsien in northern Shansi. Of lesser aesthetic value are the painted tombs, e.g. those at Liao-yang in Manchuria. Of course imitations for the use of the deceased were never carefully done, and they can only give an inadequate idea of what court painting of the Later Han period was like.

The elaborate tombs of Hsiao-t’ang-shan in Shantung have yielded a fair collection of specimens of that peculiar production of the Han period, the funeral stone. Even more refined are those from the Wu family shrines, also in Shantung.

As to the central Asian influence, it was intimately connected with Buddhism, which was percolating into China from the beginning of this period. But no Chinese work of art inspired by Buddhism is earlier than the fifth century; and so this influence, which revolutionized Chinese sculpture, must be left to be dealt with in the following volume.

b. India

The artistic, like the political, history of northern India is dominated during the first two and a half centuries of our era by the influence exerted by the foreign invaders: Greeks, Śakas, Parthians, Kuśāṇas. The Greek kingdoms left no trace (except for numismatics) in the artistic field; at least none has been recognized down to the present day, although this statement may possibly be subjected to revision in the near future. At Taxila, which was the main centre of Greek rule, only the foundations of the royal palace are still extant. The Śakas, too, passed unnoticed. The Parthians were more active, and to their dominance (first century AD) we owe the so-called First Temple in the Jandial site at Taxila; it shows a Mazdean form, coupled with Hellenistic decorative elements.

Then the Kuśāṇa came, and around the court of their kings an art arose
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that has been called by various names (Gandhāra, Indo-Greek, Roman-Buddhist); it can be best defined as a Graeco-Roman form for an Indian iconography. (Pl. 66, a) The subjects of the reliefs and statues, as far as they are not secular (royal) portraits, are always Buddhist. But here the Buddha (and this is the great novelty) is represented in human form; credit for this development is disputed between Gandhāra and Mathura art, but it was probably arrived at by both schools independently and at the same time. The Buddha images are imitated, in their anatomy and chiefly in their drapery, from Roman-Greek originals of the imperial period. We have Zeus-like Buddhas, Apollo-like Bodhisattvas (Pls. 67, a); to give an example, the head of the famous standing Buddha, formerly in the Guides’ Mess at Hoti Mardan, bears a striking resemblance to the Apollo of Belvedere in the Vatican. The inner development of this art is still under dispute, as is the complicated question of its chronology and its relationship with contemporary artistic currents in the Roman empire. It is certain that an earlier period (second and third centuries), in which the material was stone (blue schist), was followed by another (fifth century), in which the images were chiefly made of stucco. In the latter period the aesthetic ideal slowly changed toward an increased naturalism and spirituality of expression which is strongly reminiscent of European Gothic art (Pl. 68, a); the best examples are the stuccoes of Hadda in Afghanistan. At the same time the full-size statuary culminated with the two colossi of Bamiyan (Afghanistan): a Buddha image of 120 feet (fourth century) and another of 170 feet (fifth century) of which only the armatures, cut from the sandstone cliffs, are still preserved, while the features and drapery, modelled in clay mixed with straw, have long since crumbled away. But although the statues are still Gandhāra in their conception, the badly ruined remnants of paintings that decorate the top of the niche above the smaller Buddha are Sassanian in style, while other paintings point rather to India, and still others to central Asia. Bamiyan was indeed a cross-road of all the artistic currents of the East.

As Sassanid political dominance increased, so the artistic influence from Iran became paramount; and this same territory saw the rise of the Irano-Buddhist art (stucco of Fondukistan), in which there is nothing Indian beyond the subject.

The whole art of Gandhāra was essentially a foreign element on the fringe of India, exactly as it was a foreign element on the fringe of the Western world. It exerted a deep influence on Indian art, but far less directly than as a challenge to which India nobly responded in its own ways. Gandhāra was the typical product of the twin-bodied, twin-faced, twin-souled Kuśāna empire between Iran and India, and of the flourishing Indo-Roman trade that played an outstanding role in its economy.

As to Gandhāra architecture, little has survived except the ravaged core of some stūpas, e.g. that at Ali Masjid, or the pitiful remnants of the great stūpa of Kaniṣka at Shahji-ki-dheri near Peshawar.

II History of Mankind
A somewhat isolated position is occupied by the statues of Wima Kadphises, Kaniška, and Caṣṭāna found at Mathura but not belonging to the local school of art. In their rigid and hieratic expressiveness, the barbaric majesty of their quaint heavy central Asian clothing and accoutrement, they occupy a place apart, perhaps not devoid of Parthian influences (Pl. 67, b).

While the Kuśāna court and the mercantile circles around it patronized Gandhāra art, the Indian provinces of the empire witnessed the rise of a purely indigenous school, that of Mathura. It starts with massive and heavy statues of the Buddha, which appear to show a direct descent from the squat Yakṣas of Mauryan art. As said above, they are the first ones, together with the Hellenizing Buddhas of Gandhāra, to give human representation to the figure of the Buddha. Mathura soon outgrew this phase and developed a religious sculpture that was idealized and crystallized into a self-imposed abstraction of the elements of traditional iconography. It is an art more spontaneous, less artificial, perhaps more sympathetic and human than Gandhāra; and although not completely devoid of Hellenistic elements, its spirit and its technique are wholly independent of the West. Nor was its expansion confined to India. Ivory carvings in this style, portraying ladies at their toilet, have been found at Kāpiṣ̆i (Begram in Afghanistan); their glorious sensuality shows an art that has reached the climax of perfection in that particular material, both in technique and in inspiration (Pl. 69, a). With Mathura, and not with Gandhāra, Indian art starts definitely on its own original paths.

Outside the Kuśāna empire, in central and southern India, artistic activity did not wholly escape the ubiquitous Western influence, making itself felt either through the Kuśāna territory or directly from the sea and by way of the Roman trading posts on the coast. The territories concerned were mainly under the rule of the Andhras (first to third centuries AD). In the northwestern fringe of their kingdom the old type of architecture continued to produce its fine rock-cut caityas, culminating perhaps with the powerful structures of Karli. But creative artistic activity tended to shift to the eastern coast. Here between the mouths of the Krishna and of the Godavary, we find the most important group of early monuments in south India, those at and around Amaravati. The great stūpa of Amaravati has been destroyed, but its sculptural décor is partly preserved. The art of Amaravati at first avoided the human representation of the Buddha, but later, after the rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism, gradually accepted the great conquest of the north, the iconic representation. Its figures are heavy and massive; and drapery, although reminiscent of Gandhāra, has a new aesthetic value, based on the ordered rhythm of its undulating lines; rhythm characterizes also the composition of the reliefs and rises sometimes to dynamic and even frenetic movement (Pl. 66, b). The preference of these artists for complicated composition led to a consistent use of chiaroscuro and foreshortening motifs, with a decorative effect that exerted a profound influence on the later sculpture of south India.
In art, as in many other fields, the Gupta period (320–550 AD) reached a pinnacle of attainment. The Gupta renaissance rejuvenated the local schools; what grew up in the Ganges valley was the true classical art of India. Architectural monuments have suffered from the lapse of time and from Muslim destructions; they are rare and not very conspicuous. Such are, for example, some of the Ajanta caves, and chiefly the caitya of Cave XIX, with its extremely rich, almost baroque, ornamentation of foliate reliefs. But above all, architecture frees itself from cliffs and rocks and takes the form of free-standing temples, built in stone or brick. We may cite the caityas at Ter and at Chezarla, now reduced to Hindu temples, as well as two buildings at Sanchi, and the temple at Aihole in what was later Cālukya territory. The finest surviving temple of Gupta times is that of Deogarh (fifth century), consisting essentially of a cubic block of masonry surmounted by a pyramidal tower, and surrounded by four porticoes, with richly ornamented portals. Other temples of the Gupta period (Bhitargaon, Bhumara) are too ruinous to give us more than a glimpse of their original appearance.

Gupta sculpture shows an unexhausted luxuriant fantasy in the decorative panels of the temples. But it is with the free-standing statues that it reaches its climax. It continues both the Mathurā and the Gandhāra schools, but either rejects or completely assimilates all non-Indian elements. Gupta art is Indian through and through, and 'is marked by a finished mastery in execution and a majestic serenity in expression that have seldom been equalled in any other school of art' (B. Rowland). Its Buddhist figures (chiefly those from the workshops of Sarnath near Benares), with their truly classical composure, devoid of naturalism as well as of conventionalism, vie with Brahmanical and Jain images in giving the same supremely refined impression (Pl. 68, b).

Painting of the Gupta age seems to be concentrated rather at the end of the period (sixth century), when, politically speaking, the dynasty had lost its ascendancy outside Magadha. It too does not break with tradition, but achieves its culmination. It is chiefly represented by the frescoes of Ajanta (Caves I, II, XVI, XVII, XIX) and Bagh: later (and outside Gupta territory) there were Badami and Sittanavasal. Ajanta, with its frescoes of Buddhist subjects, portrays a refined world of gentlemen and of voluptuous beautiful women, through a perfectly adapted technique and with a psychological balance that is truly Olympian (Pl. 69, b). The lovely feminine figures of the royal fortress of Sigiriya in Ceylon are also influenced by Ajanta.

Gupta art was not only the climax of Indian art, but exerted a deep influence on the statuary and the architecture of the Greater India that was slowly coming into existence beyond the seas.15

c. Central Asia

The caravan cities of the Tarim basin, flourishing through the rich trade on the silk route from China to Parthia, India, and Rome, were subjected
to direct and indirect artistic influences coming from all these countries. These influences sometimes completely inspired the local artists, but much more frequently they intermingled and interacted, giving rise to a composite art that shows many aspects of originality and was capable in turn of influencing the neighbouring countries. All this belongs to a world long since dead, that of the oasis peoples of central Asia, speaking Indo-European languages and believing in Buddhism, and later in Manichaeism and Nestorian Christianity. The Turkization and Islamization of eastern Turkestan destroyed this flourishing civilization in the course of three centuries after 1000 A.D.; it was utterly forgotten and was only recovered for us by the great English, Swedish, German, French, Russian, and Japanese expeditions during the present century.

The art of central Asia seems to start with the first or second century A.D. In some sites (carvings at Niya, and chiefly the Miran frescoes (Pl. 70), third century) Roman influence is so strong as to render it likely that Romans or Romanized artists were at work in that lost corner of the world. Elsewhere (Qyzyl; also Rawak) the influence of Gandhāra and of the Irano-Buddhist art of Bamiyan is as strongly felt; but these centres belong already to the middle of the fifth century at their earliest, falling outside the limits of the present volume. Chinese influence, too, comes later, and the Persian begins in earnest only after the fall of the Sassanid empire and the Arab conquest. India, on the other hand, is present in Turkestan from the very earliest time, at first through Gandhāra and then by the direct influence of Gupta art and the paintings of Ajanta (frescoes of Dandan Oiliq).

d. Neo-Persian Art

For clarity's sake we are dealing briefly here with everything that seems to matter about the typical forms of art in the Persian zones from the Macedonian conquest to about A.D. 400. At first the direct rule of the Macedonians encouraged Hellenization in local art, and in some places imposed it, the process being more marked in the field of decoration. We find this more in the Eastern districts, where we should least expect it; and from these districts came many of the influences which affected India and China. In the Western districts there was a more complicated admixture of types and techniques, since the new Greek elements had there to contend with survivals not only from Iranian but from Mesopotamian culture, many of the larger cities of the Parthian kings' dominions (both ancient and modern foundations) being situated in Mesopotamia.

When by gradual stages they liberated themselves from the Seleucids, the Iranian countries preserved many of the artistic features they had borrowed from the Greeks, but they modified them fairly radically to suit their own tastes. At the same time a revival of native artistic traditions is attested in remains of art of Achaemenid type. This revival was in part accidental and spontaneous, but in part deliberate.
In architecture we find the old Babylonian technique of building in brick combined with the Greek construction of stone walls consisting of a core of irregular, unbleached stones with a facing of regular blocks. Much use was made of vaulting both in barrel shape and in domes. In palaces, too, the most typical feature is seen in the great domed throne-rooms (šuvān), sometimes more than 30 yards long and 20 wide, which are open on one side; they were sometimes used for summer and sometimes for winter residence. These are flanked by more modest buildings with two floors; or they may lie in the middle of a group of buildings arranged round a central court in a harmonious structural plan.

Greek influence, as we said earlier, is most noticeable and permanent in the decorative sections of buildings, where the walls are found covered with stone facings carved in relief (as at Hatra), or with coloured and painted stucco tablets (as at Ashur), or with frescoes (as at Dura Europus). The painted stucco became a more frequent feature in the Sassanid period. Important tombs usually consist of tumuli, or of rooms to which there is access by a corridor.

In sculpture we find busts (at Kish there are several copies of the same model arranged in the niches of a hall); and there are also masks, for instance at Hatra. But the commonest form is the relief. A typical example is the set of sculpture on the tomb of Antiochus I of Commagene (AD 34) at Nimrud Dag; and there are others with hunting and battle scenes, such as those on the palace at Ctesiphon. The figures assume once more the hieratic rigidity which had been characteristic of art in the Achaemenid period, and it was the rock carving of the Achaemenids, with their accompanying historical inscriptions, that the Sassanids tried to imitate and rival in their own monuments.

Another notable feature, especially in the Sassanid period, is the artistic work in gem-cutting (the incision of semi-precious stones) and in metal-carving. Cups, bowls, and other forms of silver vase were decorated, in relief or by incision, with human figures (especially kings) and ornamental and linear animals or plants, sometimes realistically designed and sometimes stylized. In the Arsacid period the pottery shapes are elegant, and a green or greenish-blue glaze becomes typical; Sassanid production shows a falling-off. The clay sarcophagi are of interest; they are made with a bright varnish and sometimes with plastic decoration on their lids.

Under the Sassanids glass moulding made progress as an independent art; and the same is true of the weaving of valuable cloth, which is decorated with geometric or plant designs.

e. The Graeco-Roman World

Architecture. The dangers arising from barbarian raids compelled the Romans, from the second century onwards, to confront once more the old problem of defending large cities with circuits of walls. These are sometimes
very large and imposing, like the walls constructed by Aurelian at Rome or the work undertaken at Byzantium/Constantinople first by Septimius Severus, then by Constantine, and later still by Theodosius. They display great variety of building systems in their towers, circular corridors, storehouses and so on, and equal variety of architectural forms in their gates. Of very great interest, too, are the remains of guard-posts and forts which strengthened the frontiers of the empire along the line of the fortified *limes*.

Temple architecture presents a contrast between different districts. In the West the commonest type was that which met Roman taste, either in rectangular shape or with buildings grouped round a central chamber. In Greece, even in work undertaken by Roman emperors, the old Hellenic methods were followed, for example a colossal temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens erected by Hadrian. In the East, on the other hand, new and fairly characteristic Graeco-Oriental methods made their appearance, as in the ‘baroque’ temple at Heliopolis (Baalbek), the great circular colonnades at Gerasa (Dierach) in Palestine, and the temple-grotto at Petra in Arabia.

Imperial palaces assumed very large proportions: they were vast enclosures with buildings inside. Severus and Celer, the architects of Nero’s enormous Golden House, and Rabirius, who built the Flavian palace, were Italians. Inside these great constructions, for instance in the palaces on the Palatine hill, there were temples, circuses, hippodromes, and so forth. Diocletian’s palace at Salonae (Split) is 206 metres long and 165 metres wide, with four gates, and looks from outside like a great fortress: the monumental buildings inside include a temple, porticoes, and a mausoleum. Hadrian’s villa near Tibur is even larger, and looks like a regular collection of architectural styles, including bold experiments in polygonal rooms and domed ceilings.

Basilicas for forensic purposes became larger all the time. Some contained enormous halls, of the kind still to be found in the basilica of Maxentius at Rome. Others—so Vitruvius tells us, and he is confirmed by the remains of the Flavian palace—were constructed in private houses and used for meetings and declamations. Sometimes libraries were placed in these basilicas, a practice which became increasingly common both at Rome and in the other leading cities of the empire.

To the earliest Imperial *Fora*, constructed by Caesar and Augustus, others were gradually added by later emperors; and *fora* in imitation of the Roman model were built in all districts, not only in the cities of the West but eventually in Greece as well (such as the imperial *Agorā* at Athens and the *Schola Romanorum* at Delos).

Theatres, too, were continually being built in the imperial period, both closed and open varieties, in every district from Gaul (Orange for example) to Crete (the Odeum of Gortyn), and Pamphylia (at Aspendus). But still commoner was the Roman type of ‘double theatre’ or amphitheatre used for gladiatorial shows. These were large elliptical-shaped buildings closed on the
outside with walls containing tiers of columns, while inside the arena was surrounded by steps supported on a set of substructures. The largest example is the Flavian amphitheatre (or Colosseum) at Rome (Pl. 71, a), but amphitheatres were soon being built in other parts of Italy—at Pola, Verona, Augusta Praetoria, Ferentinum, Casinum, Capua, Puteoli, and Pompeii, and also outside Italy (outstanding examples are at Vindonissa in the Helvetian country and at Sabratha in Tripolitania). There was a still further growth in the number of circuses and hippodromes in both Italy and the provinces, and the hippodrome at Constantinople, of which there are important remains, is said to have seated 100,000 persons.

Triumphal arches, too, became very numerous in every part of the empire. At Rome there were the arches of Claudius, Titus, Septimius Severus, and Constantine. In Italy arches are found at Tergeste, Spoletium, Beneventum (with extremely interesting ornamental reliefs dedicated to Trajan), Capua, and Canusium; and in the provinces they are found at Nemausus in Gaul (to Tiberius), at Thamugadi, Oea, and Theveste in Africa (to Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Caracalla, respectively), and in Greece at Athens (to Hadrian). Their forms vary according to the tastes of different periods and districts, but in general they developed from simple types of architecture and decoration to an increasing complication in both directions.

In addition the old practice of erecting commemorative columns saw a further development in the great sculpted columns covered from head to foot with reliefs. At Rome the first example is Trajan’s column, with its twenty-three spirals carrying a pictorial description of the Dacian Wars of 101–106; and this was imitated in 176 when the Antonine column was set up to depict the achievements of Marcus Aurelius against the Germans and Sarmatians. Outside Rome we find at Moguntiacum, as early as Nero’s reign, a sculpted column nearly 40 feet high, crowned with a statue of Jove. Then at Adamclissi in Moesia Trajan erected a magnificent monument 90 feet high, the Trpaeum Traiani, decorated with crude reliefs of provincial workmanship which seem to foreshadow the techniques and forms of medieval art (Pl. 72, a).

Road works have left traces in all parts of the Roman world, including bold constructions like the tunnel in the Furlo pass across the Apennines, which was executed in the time of Vespasian. Both literary and archaeological evidence attests the building of bridges across the great rivers, for example the bridge over the Danube erected by Trajan’s architect Apollodorus of Damascus.

The construction of aqueducts continued, and in the building of baths one emperor after another—Nero, Titus, Trajan, Caracalla, Severus Alexander, Gallienus, Diocletian, and Constantine—seems to have rivalled his predecessor with works of astonishing size and grandeur, which can be seen in their ruins today. But bath construction was also eagerly pursued by every municipality, and in some places, such as Lepcis in Trajan’s time, the baths
were of considerable proportions. In some of these bath buildings we find further examples of the bold forms of architectural construction mentioned earlier, for instance in the polygonal halls of Caracalla's baths at Rome or in the building (also at Rome) wrongly known as the 'Temple of Minerva Medica', which must have been a central portion of the baths of Gallienus.

Emperors and members of great families received large tombs of circular construction, like those of the Flavians, Hadrian (Pl. 71, b), and Caecilia Metella at Rome, or the tombs found at Attalia. More simple types were erected for the burial societies of the poorer classes—little buildings along the roads outside cities, or 'columbaria' with a large number of niches. But besides these we find some quite original constructions, which at times are the product of interesting local forms. We may mention here the small pyramid of Egyptian style which constitutes the tomb of C. Cestius at Rome, the tumulus at Neumagen in Belgica which depicts a ship carrying casks (Pl. 61, b), and the tomb at Poetovio in Pannonia which is decorated with remarkable bas-reliefs of Orphic significance.

The subterranean cemeteries used by the Christians, who in this matter followed a precedent set by the Jews and other Eastern peoples, have special features of their own. In early days they were constructed inside private burial grounds, like those of Priscilla, Lucina, and Domitilla, and were therefore protected by property rights; later they were coemeteria or dormitoria belonging to brotherhoods of the faithful. They consisted of galleries (ambulacra or criptae) dug in the rock, with separate rooms (cubicula) containing tiers of tombs (loci) (Plate 80). Each room had a rectangular aperture, which could be closed with a flat stone held in a vertical position. Some of the more important tombs were placed under arches (arcosolia), and eventually halls or chapels might be constructed for the funeral agapae and meetings of the faithful. Besides the enormous range of catacombs near Rome they are also to be found in a number of other districts: in central Italy at Chiusi, Sutri, Nepi, Bolsena, Otricoli, Vulci, and Anagni; in southern Italy at Suessa Aurunca, Pozzuoli, Naples, Nola, Canosa, Venosa, and Tropea; in Sicily at Messina, Taormina, Syracuse, Ragusa, Agrigento, and Palermo; in Sardinia; in France at Poitiers, Rheims, and Ste Victoire; in Germany at Trier; in Spain at Saragossa, Seville, and Elvira; in Hungary at Pécs; and in Egypt, Numidia, the Syrtes, Cyrene, and elsewhere. The Jews, some Christian heretics, and certain other religious sects, also had their catacombs. A typical example is an underground chamber with four arms (in the shape of a cross) datable to AD 259 at Palmyra.

Sculpture. A fondness for reliefs of historical character, and a special competence in executing them, are attested by the evolution of the art in a long series of examples during the first three centuries of the empire. From Tiberius' time we have the reliefs on silver vessels, especially those from Boscoreale, the incised cameo depicting the departure of Germanicus for
the East, and other unusual incised cameos like the Camée de France in Paris and the Gemma Augustea in Vienna; from the period between Claudius and Domitian there are the figured reliefs on triumphal arches; for the reigns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius the marvellous scenes which wind round their two columns (Pl. 73, a) (from Trajan’s time also the reliefs on the Rostra and on the Arch at Beneventum); and finally for Constantine’s reign there are the contemporary portions of the reliefs on his arch. After Trajan the figures begin to look more rigid, and the rendering of expression and feeling is less successful. Under Marcus Aurelius less detail is shown in landscapes, (Pl. 73, b), and with Constantine the emperor’s figure is detached from the crowd and takes on a hieratical attitude.

From the time of Hadrian and for a long period thereafter there is a large collection of carved sarcophagi of Roman workmanship. These carry mythical scenes and it is obvious that their distant ancestry lies both in Etruria and in Greece. Equally evident, however, are their Roman features. The spaces are filled with crowd scenes or personified types of deities, or with narrative pictures in continuous bands without any division into episodes; and there are often distinctive Roman subjects, such as legionaries fighting barbarians, magistrates with subject peoples, sacrifices, or marriage scenes. Later on, but still before the time of Constantine, the Christians, too, adopted this form of sarcophagus. At first they retained the pagan designs, but later selected such of these as were capable of being ‘allegorized’ on Christian lines (Pl. 74, b). Eventually they used scenes from the Bible, or Christian symbols like the Good Shepherd (Pl. 74, a). Here we may note that even for these early symbols the models used in early Christian art are still always pagan: the Good Shepherd, for example, is clearly derived from the Alexandrian Criophorus (the Bearer of the Ram), and saints and Apostles are equally clearly drawn from classical statues of philosophers and orators.

Portraiture remained one of the most typical departments of Roman sculpture. Fashions changed, and at some periods one finds, for example, a vogue for colossal statues like those of the Neronian age; attempts were also sometimes made to idealize characters and poses in heroic guise. Yet the heads of emperors, in regular statuary as well as on cameos (Pl. 76, a) and coins, retain throughout the period a magnificent realism; and it is often possible to use imperial portraits as a better means of getting to understand an individual’s psychology than is provided by biographies written by court historians (Pl. 75). This tendency towards realism is also very clear in the way women’s headdress is drawn to correspond with prevailing fashions, and in the particular treatment given to barbarian personages. The latter are found both on reliefs like Trajan’s column and in full-standing statues like the ‘Dacian’ of the Lateran Museum or the ‘German prisoner’ in the Loggia dell’Orcagna at Florence.

Yet outside Italy monuments so far discovered are enough to show, in sculpture as in architecture, the blending of native styles with those imported...
from Rome, and the consequent appearance of 'provincial' characteristics which help to clarify those found in later periods. We can begin to identify some of the features of Ibero-Roman art, for example in a curious statue of a priestess; or of Gallo-Roman art in the bas-relief of the stag-god Cernunnus (Pl. 72, b) or of Romano-British in a group depicting a lion and a stag; or of Romano-Dacian in the extremely peculiar reliefs of the Tropaeum Traiani mentioned earlier (Pl. 72, a). But we already possess evidence suggesting that the same situation existed in the Eastern provinces, for instance in Lycia and in the territory of Palmyra (where reliefs in many ways foreshadow the methods and styles of the Byzantine period).

We mentioned stuccoes in relation to the period covered in Part II: this art became very popular and attained great perfection during the first two centuries AD. It was used to cover the uneven stone and brick surfaces of walls and ceilings in both houses and tombs, and later in the Christian catacombs. Stuccoes were moulded on to cornices, friezes, or panels, and consisted of floral designs, mythical scenes, or impressionist landscapes. The fineness of their detail, which is at times extremely intricate, must have required a most delicate touch.

Painting and Mosaic. The early part of this period coincides with the last two 'Pompeian styles' of wall-painting, the Third (c. AD 14–63) and the Fourth (c. AD 50–79). The Third or 'Real Wall' style is simpler than the Second, using fewer and less vivid colours. The architectural designs in the painting have become a smaller proportion of the whole, and are used, together with a stylized decoration of flowers, to create rectangular panels, or friezes and wainscots (Pl. 76, b). The pictures in the middle are usually no longer landscapes but mythical scenes. In contrast the Fourth style, or 'Architectural Illusionism' (the Thermæ Stabianæ provide an example) tends to exaggerate the optical illusions which had been attempted in the Second style, and makes use of pavilions, niches, and the like. The architectural features become more slender, consisting of threadlike columns, arabesques, and what the Renaissance called 'grotesques', all in strident colours. This taste is also found in the Neronian Domus Aurea of the same period, which was decorated by Fabullus. Sometimes we also find a new method of painting, which Petronius, who deplored it, called the 'short cut' (compendiaria) and which we should call Impressionist. In this the painter confines his colours to large masses and does not attempt to delineate details; but with light and shade he makes an effort to depict the elusive appearance of moving objects. For later examples in portraiture see Pl. 78, a, b.

The lack of secure chronological references and our scanty knowledge of the phases in late-first-century pagan painting make it difficult to give any precision to the phases of Christian painting in the catacombs. This was painting in tempera on Impressionist lines, a tendency favoured by the special light conditions in which the artist was working; and there was a
preference for landscape backgrounds. Down to the time of Constantine its history can be approximately divided into two phases. The first corresponds roughly to the first half of the second century and includes the very graceful decoration on the ceiling of the crypt of Lucina in the cemetery of Callistus. It shows a fondness for shaded masses of bright and transparent colours, with delicate floral ornament and a number of features derived from pagan art. The second phase starts in the latter half of the second century, with a preference for even more distinctly Impressionist drawing and for a fusion of colours against an off-white background. Examples are the paintings in the Greek chapel of Priscilla (Pl. 77, a, b), and in the chamber of Coronatio in Praetextato.

In painting as in other arts one can detect regional styles in the various provinces. In those farthest to the East, as for example those from both the Synagogue and the Christian Church of Dura-Europus, those from elsewhere in Syria and in the underground chambers at Palmyra, we find methods and types of painting which foreshadow Byzantine art. In Egypt of the same period there is a series of stuccoes, and of paintings on cloth and wooden tablets, which are inserted in the coverings of mummies. The portraiture on these is of Hellenistic origin, but it was employed throughout the empire and possessed an astonishing realism.

Mosaics, too, had Hellenistic origins, and for a long time retained their original features, not only at Rome and in adjacent areas (such as the temple at Praeneste or Hadrian’s villa near Tibur), but also, through Roman influence, in the provinces (as in those found at Zliten in Tripolitania). They are delicately made out of tiny tesserae (as many as sixty to the square centimetre) of a great number of colours; and they depict exotic scenes, mainly of a ‘Nilotic’ or ‘genre’ variety (Pl. 43). But with the growing use of mosaics for paving very large halls the colours became less varied and the attention to detail diminished. Tesserae became larger, and instead of about 150 colours only three (white, black, and red) were normally employed: later there were only two (white and black). Designs, too, were gradually altered, and instead of making genuine pictures, which could rival painting, artists took to simple decoration, which often had to be executed along purely copybook lines. Larger spaces were left uniform as background, and designs were confined to borders and panels, with medallions in the corners, rosettes or stars in the panels, and occasional scenes in the middle. Among a very large number of examples, two, which contain portraits of poets, are worthy of note: one at Augusta Trevirorum with the figures of Ennius and Virgil, the other at Hadrumetum depicting Virgil among the Muses.

One of the earliest large Christian mosaics, derived from Roman models, was found near the cathedral at Aquileia.

In the first and second centuries we also find some daring experiments in opus sectile, or inlay in a variety of marbles. Examples are found in the Flavian palace at Rome, and there is another at Maxino portraying Romulus and Remus.
Local Changes. The fourth century saw a number of marked changes in artistic production resulting from certain environmental factors, chief among which were the transfer of the capital to Constantinople, the new ascendency of the Eastern provinces over the West, and the establishment of Christianity as a state religion. Art was also profoundly affected, especially in Greek districts, by the influence of the older ideas and techniques of the Orient, which had been stifled by Hellenism but not annihilated. In the West it was not so much Oriental and Byzantine influences as the growing barbarization that made itself felt, and there was a rapid development of regional styles, which hitherto had remained beneath the surface.

In architecture the recognition of the Church, and the consequent gradual decline and extinction of paganism, brought a need to provide a proper number of imposing homes for the new cult. No uniform method of temple construction was developed in the different parts of the empire, for one thing because the various architectural styles already in vogue were taken over for this new purpose. In many cases in East and West alike old temples, like the Parthenon at Athens, the Athenaeum at Syracuse, or one of the temples at Agrigentum, were made to serve, with appropriate adaptations, as Christian churches. Sometimes they were enlarged by the filling-in of the external columns, which were then included as an inset to the perimeter of the new church. At other times pagan temples were pulled down, and their materials were used to build churches. Another possibility was to make churches out of rooms in palaces or baths, as happened with the two Roman churches Santa Croce in Gerusalemme and Santa Maria degli Angeli, both later than the fourth century but cited here to illustrate the point. Generally, however, although modifications were made to meet the needs of the new cult, the new buildings were in shape the same as the rectangular basilicas of the pagans, with an entrance on the shorter side; or they took over the form of the basilical halls in palaces, which had *atria* in front of them. The various models therefore produced Christian basilicas with one nave, or three, or five. Santa Maria Maggiore and Santa Sabina, both Roman churches of the fifth century, have three: but there were five in the ‘Church of the Nativity’ at Bethlehem, the core of which goes back to the first half of the fourth century. There would be pilasters and columns holding up flat architraves or arches; and some churches had apses, either inside or outside the rectangular line of the basilica.

In other cases the Christian temple owed its shape to the fact that it was a replacement or copy of some circular pagan temple or hall, possibly a set of baths. Santa Costanza at Rome and San Sepolcro at Jerusalem, both of the fourth century, are of this kind. Some too had cruciform arms and a hemispherical dome, like the fifth-century Mausoleum of Galla Placidia at Ravenna; others were polygonal, a shape perpetuated in the various kinds of ‘Baptistery’.

In the East the origin of the architectural methods employed in certain
Byzantine churches, such as Santa Sophia, is not yet entirely clear. But it is becoming increasingly likely that one important influence came from the Oriental temples of previous generations, which we examined earlier.

Naturally the construction of large buildings and works of a practical nature, such as baths, aqueducts, roads, and cemeteries, proceeded regularly in the fourth century as before. But special importance attaches to the great villas of noblemen, the centres of large estates. One example is the famous *Villa del Casale* discovered near Piazza Armerina in Sicily. This is laid out in a most complex fashion and possesses a number of magnificent mosaic pavements and elegant colonnades.

The triumph of Christianity also brought a change in sculpture. This was more rapid in the East, where the features we call ‘Byzantine’ began to make their appearance. In the West the classical tradition was more enduring, but it was also distorted by ‘barbarian’ influences, sometimes affecting particular regions.

The tendencies of a general kind which contributed most to the transformation of Roman into Byzantine art were—in painting as well as sculpture—tendencies which had for a long time been manifest in the works produced in the Eastern regions of the empire. They include the pervading hieratical solemnity and impressive rigidity of their figures, symmetry and the standardization of iconographic types (Pl. 79, a), the isolation of figures in painting, the use of colour instead of plastic, and general stylization.

At Rome and in the West innovation and distortion came in more slowly. Gradually the standard types of preceding generations were altered, but a few artists were still capable of producing masterpieces in the old style. One example is the famous ivory diptych celebrating a marriage alliance between the Nicomachi and the Symmachi: this was carved between 392 and 394. The historical relief remained a remembered form, and examples were still made; but gradually there came a change. Figures became more rigid and less expressive, and bas-reliefs were made flatter on a raised surface. The figure of an emperor is detached from the throne of his subjects, as becomes a divine despot, and takes on a cold and formal appearance.

The same is true of Christian sculpture. The figure of Christ, once youthful and smiling, becomes stern and formal; and the sarcophagi, instead of animated scenes from the *Old* and *New Testament*, carry much more stylized reliefs, lacking any life. An example is a well-known porphyry tomb, once at Santa Costanza, on which the humna scenes are enclosed within large but rigid festoons of flowers and vine-leaf spirals.

Only the portrait was destined to retain its traditional features for a relatively long period after Constantine’s day, before it too became stiffer and less rounded. One or two key examples will illustrate the point: a cameo with the figures of Julian and Ceres, a head of Constans I with the motionless gaze of a hieratical ruler, and a colossal bronze statue from Barletta which some say represents Theodosius I (Pl. 79, b), others Theodosius II. In this
last the artist has used vast size and hieratical formalism to express the grandeur of a sovereign who requires reverence from his subjects.

The same tendencies were working in painting and mosaic, but the sharp distinction between colours now that mosaic stones were larger also imposed a simplification in design. Once again we find that the change came faster in the ‘Byzantine’ districts: in the West the contrast between pagan (or classical) and Christian forms is both slower and less complete. At the same time painting tends to give way to mosaic, which was better adapted for portraying the vast size of the scenes the triumphant Church required—and was also less perishable. Sometimes, however, a painter found a way of giving his picture an imposing quality which matched the great apsidal mosaics: take, for instance, the scene of Christ amid the Apostles, a mid-fourth-century fresco in the apse of a chamber in the cemetery of Domitilla.

Among large Christian mosaics we may mention the scenes adorning the vault of Santa Costanza at Rome, and the apsidal mosaic of Santa Pudentiana, executed at the time of Pope Siricius (385–398) and depicting the Preaching of Jesus. The Santa Pudentiana mosaic is the last real masterpiece of Romano-Christian art, magnificent in the pose of its figures, the harmony of its colours, and the depth of perspective. But the marvellous mosaics of the Villa of Piazza Armerina, vast and daring works of art which have no equal in the whole Mediterranean area, show how even at the end of the fourth century certain artists retained their skill, quite independently of any inspiration to be derived from Christianity.

3. MUSIC

During the Han dynasty the contact with the Western countries brought foreign tunes and foreign instruments into China; such was the p’i-p’a, a short lute with four strings and twelve frets. But Chinese music made little progress during the troubled centuries prior to the rise of the T’ang dynasty.

Indian theory of music during this period is known only from fragments included in the Purāṇas, from which no detailed picture can be gained.

In the area of Greek culture we see as early as the second century BC, from the evidence of the ‘Delphic hymns’ (Chapter XII), how archaism was the prevailing tendency behind the solo performance of nomoi, and how diatonic rather than chromatic scales were in fashion. But in raising the frequency of modulation there was also a tendency towards innovation, and it was music based on the latter tendency which gradually gained the upper hand.

It was during this period that people ceased to feel the quantities of the words they were singing. This is proved by the fact that it was found necessary to give written indication of the length of syllables, as is seen in the epitaph of Seikilos, which was found at Tralles and dates from the second century AD. Later documents with musical notations include three hymns of Meso-
medes, also of the second century (published in the sixteenth century), and a text from Oxyrhynchus which belongs somewhere between the second century and the fourth.

Christian writing was affected by the Jewish custom of setting to music all recited texts, even those written in prose. We find the Christians adopting this practice not only with the very numerous liturgical texts which derived from Jewish origins, but also with other writings coming from a variety of sources. Their scoring followed musical rhythm rather than syllabic quantities; but they also came under the influence of Graeco-Oriental culture in the East and of Graeco-Italian culture in the West, for example in their use of *accentus* and *concentus*.

Meanwhile the volume of writing on musical theory and the history of music was constantly growing. From the time of Augustus we have some notes by the Latin writer Vitruvius (V, 104), and from the first century AD two Greek works have survived, the *Problemata* of Pseudo-Aristotle and the *De Musica* of Pseudo-Plutarch. From the second century, besides certain allusions in Pausanias and in the *Onomasticon* (Book IV) of Julius Pollux, there are a number of treatises on the subject: the *Harmonica* of Claudius Ptolemaeus, the seven books *De Musica* by Aristides Quintilianus, the *Enchiridion Harmonicae* of Nicomachus of Gerasa, a work by Theon of Smyrna ("Mathematical aids to the reading of Plato"), and the *Eisagogae Harmonicae* of Gaudentius and Cleomeides.

The third century produced the Latin *De die natali* by Censorinus, and in Greek the fourteenth book of the *Deipnosophistae* by Athenaeus of Naucratis and the *Commentary on Ptolemy* by Porphyrius. Finally from the fourth century we have in Latin the *Commentary on Cicero's Somnium Scipionis* by Macrobius, and also three Greek works: the anonymous treatise which was edited by Bellermann in 1841; Baccheius' *Eisagoge technics mousices*; and the *Eisagoge Mousice* by Alypius, which contains notes on musical scoring.

### NOTES TO CHAPTER XVIII

1. Professor L. S. Vasilyev calls attention also to Liu Hsiang, one of the earliest masters of the Chinese short story.
2. See also above, p. 617.
3. Seneca the Philosopher, born at Corduba, was brought to Rome when only a few months old and brought up there together with his two brothers—all most carefully educated by their father, Seneca 'the Rhetorician' (see above, p. 617). The younger Seneca was born about the year 4 BC. He showed great precocity, and was attracted by philosophy to such an extent that in adolescence he took up Neo-Pythagorean practices. From these, however, he was dissuaded by his father, a sensible man who feared that his son's delicate constitution might suffer from the excesses involved. Seneca was never a man of strong health; he was acquainted with illness and pain, a fact which undoubtedly influenced his ideas and philosophical attitude. At the age of twenty he had to go to Egypt for reasons of health, and his career was thus interrupted for several years. On his return (about
AD 30) he soon made up for lost time and became celebrated for his eloquence—so much so as to arouse the jealousy of Caligula, who was at one time on the point of having him sentenced to death. Seneca was already one of the hopes of the senatorial party. At the beginning of Claudius’ reign the freedmen of the imperial household gained the upper hand and set up a tyranny in opposition to the senate. Seneca was among the victims of this ‘palace revolution’; accused of committing adultery with one of the royal princesses, (a sister of Caligula), he was banished to Corsica. He was recalled, however, when, after Messalina’s death and Claudius’ marriage to Agrippina, another palace revolution brought the Senate Party back to power. Agrippina made use of him to win support for her son, the youthful Nero, among the section of the public which had remained faithful to the senatorial oligarchy and the ‘liberal’ policy introduced by Augustus. She appointed Seneca as Nero’s tutor, and he was the real power behind the throne after Claudius died and was succeeded by Nero (AD 54). But Seneca did not prove to be the obedient tool for which Agrippina had hoped. Faithful to the programme of his own party, he got rid of the freedmen and of Agrippina herself. After her death, however, his influence began to decline. Nero was tiring of his early mentors and wished to exert his own authority. The empire turned away from liberalism. Seneca tried to leave the court, but Nero, still reluctant to displease the senators, would not let him go. Thereupon, Seneca joined the opposition, allowing the malcontents to make use of his name and perhaps relishing the thought that if the ‘tyrant’ were assassinated he might regain power. But the conspiracy was betrayed before it struck, and Seneca was too heavily compromised for Nero to spare his life.

Seneca was a prolific writer, and in addition to many philosophical treatises (see below, p. 930) he left tragedies, his authorship of which was questioned for a long time, but with no real justification. Modern critics have often declared that these tragedies are not real plays, but declamatory verse compositions which it would be impossible to perform on a stage. That opinion is now disproved. The tragedies were meant for stage performance, and they (and they alone) give us some idea of the nature of Roman tragic drama. This was directly derived from Hellenistic tragedy (see above, pp. 578 ff.) and laid considerable stress on spectacle, singing, and music. They were by no means ‘realistic’, but more in the nature of operas. Each ‘act’ opens with a kind of prologue, chanted by the chorus. Then come two or three scenes consisting of long speeches with very little action. Sometimes there is a more lively scene, between two characters, recalling the spirit of the *agon* which was such a feature of Greek tragedy.

Like all Roman theatrical works, Seneca’s tragedies draw simultaneously upon several different branches of Greek drama. His *Phaedra*, for instance, contains outright imitations of at least three separate models—Euripides’ *Hippolytus Veiled* (which, though now lost, can be reconstructed, at least in part), the same author’s *Hippolytus the Crown-bearer* (extant), and Sophocles’ *Phaedra* (lost). Seneca does not write in this way from lack of imagination, but in the attempt to put fresh life into a hackneyed subject; and does this very successfully. For example, the character of Phaedra, which Euripides handles very differently in his two plays (in *Hippolytus Veiled*, Phaedra seems to have been a ‘shameless’ woman who boldly demanded the love of Hippolytus; in *Hippolytus the Crown-bearer*, she is the victim of Aphrodite and dies of her torment yielding to it only in spite of herself) emerges in Seneca’s as a complex one, his heroine being at odds with herself, sometimes indulging her passion, sometimes determinedly resisting it, and killing herself in the end to preserve her honour and her freedom. Psychological analysis is thus carried a long way, and Seneca’s characters have their own moral universe which is quite different from that of Sophocles or Euripides, for instance.

We do not know at what period of his career Seneca wrote his tragedies. He is not likely to have intended them for his pupil, Nero, though the latter was, as we know, a fervent addict of the stage. They are generally assumed to date from his period in exile, or at least from a time when he had not completely worked out his philosophy, and was still sometimes attracted by Epicurean ideas. It is particularly curious to note that the ‘wisdom’ proffered by his choruses is very similar to that propounded by Horace—consisting of moderation, the happy medium, human considerations—and differs widely from the themes of Seneca’s philosophical treatises, which call for heroism, self-denial, and ‘elevation towards God’. It seems as though the theatre provided Seneca with an experience of moral life which he later absorbed into his philosophy. (Pierre Grimal.)
4. The interesting feature of Juvenal’s sixteen satires, from our point of view, is that they draw a picture of the Rome of that day as seen by a man resolutely hostile to every departure from the old national traditions. Juvenal’s unquestionable narrow-mindedness made him exceptionally alert to new developments in Rome, which was now the spiritual as well as the political capital of the Mediterranean world. Juvenal is infuriated by the changes taking place in religious views under the influence of the oriental beliefs, by the increase in luxury, by the emancipation of women, now determined to take their place in intellectual life and, even at the cost of provoking scandal, to achieve material independence, and by the improvement in the social status of freedmen—'new' citizens who have emerged from slavery by their own merits. He is furious and he says so; but if he had not been so, we should not have his testimony. As it is, his Satires remain as an invaluable document on daily life and morals in the age of the Antonines—provided we are not hoodwinked by an attitude which we may suspect to be occasionally subject to deliberate exaggeration.

At the same time, however, the attitude adopted by Juvenal was one that he shared with a great proportion of the population of the empire, especially the 'prvincials' in the average Italian municipium. Rome, the modern, cosmopolitan city, was far ahead of the smaller towns, with their old-fashioned, middle-class ideas. The gap is evident when we study provincial life from the inscriptions, and Juvenal throws a bright light on it; in this respect, too, his writings have outstanding documentary value. (Pierre Grimal.)

5. This satire, published under the Greek title of Apocolocyntosis, contains a violent criticism of Claudius, in which the writer is obviously seeking to revenge himself on the emperor who had banished him (see above, note 3). But this negative aspect of the work should not blind us to Seneca's true purpose; he is less interested in criticizing Claudius than in praising Nero by contrast. This little pamphlet was written just when young Nero came to the throne, after Agrippina had assassinated Claudius, and by describing the youthful ruler as the spiritual heir of Augustus, it won him the sympathy of the aristocracy (see above, p. 930). So this is a piece of political propaganda—a type of writing of which not very much has come down to us, but which is known to have been highly popular in Rome at all periods. Unfortunately, it usually took the form of short pieces, which were passed surreptitiously from hand to hand, and soon disappeared from circulation. This example survived, perhaps because its author was a famous man, but more probably because it was an item of official government propaganda. (Pierre Grimal.)

6. The Satiricon is the earliest prose romance to have survived from ancient times in reasonably complete form. The Greeks had historical romances, and also folk tales, known as 'Milesian tales' (after the city of Mileto, where the style seems to have been especially popular). The 'Milesian tales' were brought to Rome in Sulla's time, at the end of the republican period. The Satiricon seems to be a combination of the old national factura (see above, p. 584) and the narrative styles imported from the Orient. From the factura it derives its mixture of verse and prose (for instance, the portions that have survived include an entire epic poem on the Civil War, probably intended as a 'classical' counterpart to Lucan's Pharsalia); from the historical romance comes the actual plot, with its shipwrecks, abductions, and so forth; while the 'Milesian tales' are responsible for the interpolation of 'short stories', not always very skilfully embodied in the main structure. One such episode is 'Trimalchio's Feast', which has been preserved in full. Set in Campania, it gives a picture of everyday life in a small, southern Italian town which has been invaded by Orientals, some of whom have prospered there, while others can scarcely make both ends meet. We hear their speech, which differs appreciably from classical Latin and already foreshadows the turns of speech of the Romance languages. Petronius introduces us to a branch of literature intended for a lower-class public. (Pierre Grimal.)

7. Recent investigations concur in attributing the dialogue to the period between 105 and 107, when Tacitus was beginning to write his Histories. See K. Barwick, Der Dialogus de Oratoribus . . . (Leipzig, 1954); R. Syme, Tacitus (Oxford, 1958); J. Frot, in Revue des Études Latines, XXXIII (1955), pp. 130 ff. (Pierre Grimal.)
8. This view derives from the Christian apologists, and in particular from Eusebius of Caesarea; but it is entirely without foundation. The Life of Apollonius makes no mention of Christ. Apollonius was a real man, who lived in the reigns of Nero and Domitian and the people who are brought into his life-story actually existed. We know of some of them from other sources, and what Philostratus says about them is quite consistent with the other evidence. The story of Apollonius gives valuable information about spiritual life at the end of the first century AD, outside the Christian Church. It shows that the Pythagorean doctrines were still practised, with all their religious severity, and also that some thinkers, at least, were curious about spiritual life outside the Roman empire. One of the most important passages in the book describes Apollonius' voyage to visit the gymnosophists—the Brahmins of India—whom he regarded as his masters and the masters of Pythagoras. (Pierre Grimal.)

9. R. Syme, *Tacitus*, pp. 611–24, makes a strong case for believing that Tacitus came from Narbonese Gaul, perhaps from Vienne. Cisalpine Gaul (North Italy) is also a possibility.


11. Tacitus belonged to the class of senators of provincial origin who had been called by the Flavians to share the responsibilities of government. He shared the prejudices of the aristocracy, setting all the more store on his nobility because of its recent origin. In his historical writings he represents Roman policy as the pawn of rivalry between the nobility—alone entitled to govern the city—and the emperors, surrounded by their courtiers whom Tacitus clearly mistrusts. He interprets events as the effect of the passions to which his characters are a prey—Tiberius being a hypocrite, Nero a monster, etc. The course of history is dominated by Destiny, which finds expression in various very general tendencies, but does not affect minor developments. The *Annales* and *Historiae* are almost entirely concerned with events in Rome—in the city and at court. Economic matters and provincial happenings are seldom mentioned. It should also be remembered that Tacitus was writing in Trajan's reign and that his criticism of previous rulers was a way of flattering the emperor. But despite such reservations, no reader of Tacitus can resist the power of persuasion generated by his highly dramatic writing. (Pierre Grimal.)

12. A number of *Epitomes* (summaries) of the great historians were made in this period and later. The existing Epitome of Livy (the *Periochae*) probably belongs to the sixth century.

13. The author exaggerates the influence of Christianity in the third and fourth centuries, its victory being by no means complete in the latter. For some time afterwards pagan elements continued to occupy a leading place in literature and art, and at the end of the fourth century there developed in the Roman empire a bitter struggle between paganism and Christian teaching. The pagans were still so strong that it was not certain what the fate of Christianity would be. The radical changes that took place in the ideological sphere during the fourth century are attributable in the first instance to the economic and social changes that resulted from the crisis of the slave-owning mode of production. (N. I. Golubtsova.)

14. The aim—and the result—of the additions made by Apuleius to the tale of Lucius of Patras is to bring about the radical transformation of what had begun as a mere fantasy into a 'symbolical' romance. It must be remembered that Apuleius was not merely a rhetorician, that he was above all a philosopher, versed in the doctrine of Platonism as it was understood during that period—that is, as a doctrine involving belief in a world of demons who occupied an intermediate position between mortals and the primordial divinities, and who could be influenced by ἐναρμόσας action. Apuleius believed in magic and in all probability he practised it. He was an initiate of all the great religious mysteries, including those of the worship of Isis, which was then in great vogue. The *Metamorphoses* offered him a theme admirably suited to symbolic treatment. Isis was the 'Lady of becoming', the divinity who presided over earthly change. The story of the man who is changed into an ass, then restored to human shape by the favour of Isis, and subsequently initiated into the loftiest mysteries, which teach him the secret of the universe, is symbolic of the soul which emerges from the animal state and, thanks to Isis, comes to understand the purpose of creation. Within this wider framework the story of Eros and Psyche treats
the same theme, that of knowledge acquired through love, with the addition of gnostic elements and even, perhaps, of allusions to magic practices, such as the conjuring-up of demons by means of the lamp. (It will be remembered that Psyche, loved by a husband she never sees, who comes to her only by night, has the idea of concealing a lamp which she uncovers when he has fallen asleep. She thus discovers that she is loved by the God of Love. But the ‘sin of curiosity’ has terrible consequences for her; she has to pass through ordeals in which she is helped by the complicity of the gods; and finally she wins immortality and happiness.) The last book of the Metamorphoses, which describes the miracle wrought by Isis and the restoration of the ass to human shape, was added by Apuleius to the original story by Lucius of Patras. And so was the story of Cupid and Psyche. (Pierre Grimal.)

15. One can differ about Gupta art considered as the ‘climax of Indian art’ and as having exercised a profound influence on the art of south-east Asia. Pallava and other arts can be preferred to it. Moreover it is after the Gupta period that Indian influences are most marked in south-east Asia and the originality of the treatment of Indian themes in this so-called ‘Greater India’ is such that it is difficult to determine the Indian regions or periods from which they originated.
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Abu Howan, 'Thessalian' pottery finds at, 18
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Accadian language, 80
Achaecans, 7, 11, 27, 29, 67, 68
Achaemenid dynasty, 37, 39; astronomy, 144; influence in Central and Western Asia, 321; languages, 60, 80; and Parthia, 681-2; and Persia, 447-9; religion, 230, 231; writing, 88
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Adad-apaliddiu (Aramean prince), 19-20
Adad Nirari II (Assyrian king), 13
Adad Nirari III (Assyrian king), 20
adzes, 118
Aegean islands
' Cycladic' communities in, 6, 7; historical movements in, 22 ff.; Phoenicians and the area, 18; the tyrants in, 27
Aemilianus, Scipio: see Scipio, Aemilianus
Aeolians and Aeolian dialects, 6, 7-8, 66-8
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Aeschylus of Eleusis, 576-7
Aesclepius and the Aesclepieum, 151
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Africanus the Elder: see Scipio, Publius after-life, concepts of, the, 224, 227, 231, 235, 237, 243, 244
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agriculture, 110 ff., 117-21, 318, 382-7, 477, 728-9, 731-2, 748, 755: see also under entries for individual countries
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Ajryan Vaejo (the 'home of the Aryans'), 57
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Amorites, 13, 15
Amphictionies (Greek history), 196, 336, 451
Anatolia, 6-10, 37; alphabet, 96; coinage, 138; and the Hittites, 10; languages, 58, 59, 63; and Phoenicia, 15
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Apolloius Pergaeus (Apolloius Perge; Greek mathematician), 417, 414
Apolloius of Rhodes (Greek writer), 563
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Apulia (Italy), 30, 64
Arabia
alphabets, 716; trade, 135
Aramaic alphabet and language, 20, 60, 80-1, 93, 94, 715-16
Arameans (people), 13, 19-20, 22, 81, 194: see also Aramaic alphabet and language
Arcadia (Greek dept), 6, 8, 9, 27; colonizing by, 67; dialect, 67
Archilochus (Greek poet), 68
Archimedes (Greek mathematician), 60, 411, 414, 765-7 passim
architecture, 22, 126, 289-92, 295-6, 302-8, 634-8, 648-52, 732-5, 753, 952-9, 964: see also under entries for individual countries
archives and libraries, 102-3
Arctic region, 109
Ardašir (Persian king), 681-2
Ardsy (king of Lydia), 11
Argolis (Greece), 8, 27; dialect, 67
Argos (Greece), 26, 27
Arcia (Italy), 30
Arinimn (Italy), 72
Aristodenus (tyrant of Cumae), 30
Aristophanes (Greek dramatist), 581-2
Aristotle (Greek philosopher), 31, 424-5, 451, 470, 536-9, 765
Armenia, 37, 63, 64, 358-9, 680-3
armies: see military organization
Arminya: see Armenia
Armoric: see Brittany
Arsacid empire, 357, 680-1, 777, 957
art, 23, 284-5, 292-3, 300-6, 617-57, 956-7: see also under entries for individual countries
Artaxerxes II (king of Persia), 330, 331, 335-6
Artaxerxes III (king of Persia), 330
Artaxerxes IV (king of Persia), 330
artisan work, 735-7
arts and crafts, 139-40
Aryans (people), 36, 89; agriculture, 120-1
art, 286; and India and Ceylon, 40-2, 328
languages, 58, 62
Ascalon (Israel), 20
Ascani (people), 10, 63
Ashur (deity), 157-8
Ashur-baniapal (king of Assyria) 12, 15, 102-3, 144, 158, 184, 265, 266
Ashur-nasirip II (king of Assyria), 13, 15, 207
‘Asianic’ people, 59-60, 63
Asoka (Indian ruler), 327
Assuwa (anti-Hittite coalition), 9
Assyria
agriculture 118; and the Amorites, 13; architecture and building, 289; art, 289-
90; and the Babylonians, 13-15; and the Chaldeans, 13, 15; and conquered peoples, 194; cosmogony, 245; and Egypt, 6, 12, 13, 15; and the Elamites, 13; decline and fall of the empire, 13, 15, 22; finance and taxation, 204; and the Guti, 13; and the Hittites, 12-13; houses, 116; and the Kassites, 13; language, 80, 81; libraries, 102-3; and Lydia, 10; literature, 265-6; and the Medes and Persians, 37; and Mesopotamia, 12; effect of migrations on, 10; and the Mitanni, 6; as a militant state, 167-8; military organization, 207-8; the monarchy, 157-8; music, 310; political and religious power, 172; religion, 214-15; sculpture, 290; and the Semites, 13; ships, 132; and the Sidonians, 15; slavery, 188; and Urartu, 13; status of women, 186
astrology, 22, 142-4, 409, 410, 758
astronomy, 22, 142-5, 407-9, 748-9, 751-2, 758: see also under entries for individual countries
Astyages (king of Lydia), 37
Asyli (tribe), 28, 65, 75
Ateistine culture, 29, 65, 71, 99
Athens, 18, 334-7, 342, 470; origins of, 26
athletics, 193
Attica (Greece) 6, 8, 26; dialect, 66-9 passim
Attilla (king of the Huns), 324
Augustus (Roman emperor), 549-50, 800, 804, 817: see also Octavian
‘Aulic’ civilizations, 7
Aurelian (Roman emperor), 696
Aurelius, Marcus (Roman emperor), 687-8
Auruncii (people), 71
Ausones (people), 28, 71, 72
Australia, 85, 108-9
Avesta (Indian religious texts), 60
axes, 118
Aztecs, writing system of the, 100-1
Babylon, 15, 22, 37
Babylonia, 39; and the Assyrians, 13-15; astronomy and astrology, 144, 409-10; cosmogony, 245; and Egypt, 12; Hebrews exiled in, 21; houses, 116; and the Kassites, 6; language, 79, 81; libraries, 103; literature, 60; and Persia, 205; political and religious power, 172; religion, 214; and the Saites, 12; ships, 132; writing, 88
Bacchae (Corinthian ruling house), 26
Bacchylides, 69, 569, 657
Bactria, 322, 327, 329, 337, 356, 357, 466
Balkans, the migrations, 6, 9, 28, 33, 65; Alexander the Great and, 337
Baluchistani language, 61
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<th>Index Entry</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
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<td>Bantus (African people)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages, 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbarians, 44, 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages, 712–13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invasion of Rome by, 692–704 passim</td>
<td></td>
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<td>'barbaraphonoi': see Carians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barter, 35, 133, 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basques (people), 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastarne (tribe), 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baths, Roman, 651, 762, 959–60, 965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bee-keeping, 114</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Berber language, 49</td>
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<td>Berytus (Phoenicia), 15</td>
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<td>Beth-Shephem (Canaan), inscription finds at, 92</td>
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<td>Bible, the, 81; Books of, 21, 31, 216, 218, 221, 223, 224, 243, 257–64, 364, 559–61; Wuflilia's translation of, 79, 717</td>
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<td>'Blue' alphabet (Greek), 95–6</td>
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<td>Boğazkêyê (Hittite city), 58, 103</td>
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<td>Bolivia, 48</td>
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<td>'Books of the Dead' (Egyptian religious texts), 226</td>
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<td>botany, 420–1, 760</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>boustrophedon writing, 89, 98, 99, 100</td>
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<td>bows and arrows, 118, 435</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burial customs, 231, 237, 244, 647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese language, 83, 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushmen (African people), 49; language, 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business practices, 404–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butrium (Italy), 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byblos (Phoenicia), 15; Egypt captures, 12; text finds at, 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium, 699, 702; see also Constantinople</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar, C. Iulius and astronomy, 411; and Belgica, 79; and Britain, 77, 354; and the calendar, 411; consulate of, 497–9; effects of expeditions of, 416; and Gaul, 354, 501; and the Hebrews, 522; murder of, 355; and Pompey, 354; implementation of programme of, 499–503; policy for the provinces, 690; reforms of, 355; and the senate, 356; writings of, 604, 616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar, C. Octavianus: see Octavian calamus (writing instrument), 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar, the, 407, 409, 411, 749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callimachus (Greek historian and poet), 562–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callinus (Greek poet), 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia, 679; see also Khmer empire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambyses (Persian king), 12, 37, 39, 225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camels, domestication of, 114, 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania, 30, 98, 127, 307, 345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaan alphabet, 92; and Egypt, 20; and Greece, 15; Hebrews in, 20; religion, 242–4; writing, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappadocia, 7, 37; the 'Cappadocian tablets', 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capua (Italy), inscription finds at, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracalla (Roman emperor), 690, 692, 808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbo, Gnaeus Papirius (Roman statesman), 353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon 14 (archaeology technique), 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carchemish, 13, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carians (people), 9, 63, 65, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carintheia, 99, 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carneades of Cyrene (Greek philosopher), 543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathos, 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrhae, battle of, 449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carriages, 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage, 31–2; alphabet, 93; art, 293; coinage, 404; destruction of, 351; and the Etruscans, 30; explorations of, 135, 142; gold and goldsmiths' work, 127; industry, 140, 394; literature, 266–7; and metals trade, 35; disappearance of the monarchy, 163; and Persia, 37; and the Phocaenians, 26; religion, 244; conflict with Rome, 348–51; treaties with Rome, 30, 345; Punic scripts, 378–9; and Sicily, 31, 344; social impact of trade, 406; trade and trading posts, 135, 140: see also Punic Wars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cartography, 744
Carus (Roman emperor), 696
carving and engraving, 642–3; see also ivory carving; sculpture
Cassius, Avidius (Roman soldier), 355, 688
caste systems, 190–3, 444
catacombs (Christian cemeteries), 960
Catalonia, 33, 34
Catana, 29
Cato, Marcus Porcius (the elder), 350, 386, 387, 420, 421, 483–7, 547
Cattle, 111, 113, 114, 120–1, 384
Catullus, C. Valerius, 571–2, 574
Caucasian languages, 73, 82
cave dwellings and rock shelters, 115, 117
Celtiberians (people), 34, 78
Celts (people), 32–5, 65, 71, 76–9, 341, 643–4; art, 644; and Britain, 34, 77, 78; and Gaul, 32, 76 ff.; and Italy, 344; language, 58, 99, 373–4; pottery, 647; scripts, 717; sculpture, 647
centum group of Indo-European languages, 58
cereals, 35, 110–11, 112, 119–21
Ceres (deity), 119
Ceylon, 327, 328, 679
Chalcidice, 29, 66
Chalcolithic Age, 28
Chaldeans, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 37, 194; astrology and astronomy, 22, 144, 410–11; divination cult, 547, 548; language and writing, 59, 64, 80, 88; religion, 215
Champa kingdom (India), 679
Chandragupta (Indian ruler), 325–7, 440
Chang Ch‘ien (Chinese ruler), 321, 323
Ch‘ang-sha (China), archaeological remains at, 43
Chao state (China), 317
chariots, 42, 114, 129, 207, 208, 446
Ch‘i state (China), 44
Chin dynasty (China), 44, 317
Ch‘in state (China), 319–20, 431, 432, 434
Ch‘in Shih-huang-ti (Chinese emperor), 319–20
China, 42–5, 317–21, 667–74; agriculture and land reform, 318, 382–4, 748, 772–3; alchemy, 742–3; architecture, 952; art, 284–5, 617–18; astronomy, 143, 407–9, 748–9; bronzenwork, 28, 952; the calendar, 407, 409, 749; cartography, 744; development of cities, 173; coinage, 319, 401–2, 723; economic reforms, 719–20; engineering, 122; organization of the family, 185–6; finance and taxation, 435, 720; geography and geology, 743–4; glassmaking, 127; goldsmiths’ work, 391; horses, 721; houses, 116; and the Hsiung-hu (Huns), 320, 322; irrigation, 318, 382–3; jewellery, 724; languages, 82–4, 362–3, 375–6, 705–6; literature, 556–7, 910–11; mathematics, 145–6, 745–6; medicine, 148, 742–3; metallurgy and mining, 321, 387; meteorology, 409; military organization, 435–6; the monarchy, 161; music, 655–6, 966; optics, 744–5; painting, 952; physics, 744; politics and political theory, 172, 318–20, 429–38, 770–3; population censuses, 777; pottery and porcelain, 118, 125, 285, 388–9, 723–4; property and ownership, 181–2; public administration, 170, 770–3; religion and philosophy, 172, 509–15, 825–7; roads, 747–8; sculpture, 951–2; seismology, 743; ships and boats, 131; silk production, 387–8, 721; slavery, 189, 720; social conditions, 436–8; and the Steppes empire, 320; trade and trade routes, 719–23; writing, 101, 319, 362–3, 375–6, 713–14; See also Chou dynasty; Han dynasty; Shang dynasty
Ching, Duke (of China), 44
chiromancy, 143
Choni (people), 71
Chou, Duke of (China), 43, 161
Chou dynasty (China), 42; art, 284–5, 391; organization of the family, 185; language, 83, 89–91; mathematics, 145; the monarchy, 161; political and public administration, 170, 431; property and ownership, 181–2; slavery, 189; arts of war, 435; writing 89–91
Christianity
beginnings of, 847–96; art and architecture, 964–7; the catacombs, 960; chronographers, 945–8; Rome and the Christians, 688–704 passim, 846; the schism, 699
Chrysippus of Soloi (Greek philosopher), 540
Ch‘u state (China), 43, 44, 317, 319
Chuang, (king of Ch‘u), 44
Chuang, Duke of (Ch‘u, China), 122
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 499, 500, 503, 546, 551–2, 571
Cilicia, 7, 9, 59, 352
Cimbr (tribe), 79, 352, 491, 492
Cimmerians (people), 10, 11, 15, 36, 63
Cinna, Lucius Cornelius (Roman statesman), 353, 494
circumcision, 150
cities, development of, 173–8
city-states
Chinese, 323; Greek, 176–8, 196–7, 452
Civil War, the (Roman history), 502
Clazomenai, 11
Cleanthes of Assos (Greek philosopher), 540
Cleisthenes (Greek statesman), 26
Cleopatra, 355, 356, 504
Edom, language of, 81
education, 103-4
Egypt, 11. 49; agriculture, 119; alchemy, 763; domestication of animals, 114; and the Assyrians, 6, 15; astronomy, 144; caste system, 191-2; and the Chaldeans, 22; Cleopatra, 355, 356, 504; coinage, 404; cosmetics, 129; cosmogony, 245; education, 104; enamel and glass, 126, 127; and Ethiopia, 12; family organization, 186; and Greece, 24, 466-7; and the Hebrews, 20, 333; and the Hittites, 61; houses, 116; small industries, 394; organization of labour, 182-3; languages, 86-7, 708-9; law, 202; Libyan dynasties in, 11-12; mathematics, 146-7; medicine, 149-50; military organization, 63, 207; music, 310; and Palestine, 6; and the 'Peoples of the Sea', 10; and Persia, 37, 39; pharmacology, 152; and Phoenicia, 15, 19; political power, 171; polygamy and concubinage, 186; population censuses, 820; pottery, 125, 126; property and ownership, 178-9; religion, 171, 225-6; and Rome, 346, 354, 357; sculpture, 288; sea power, 341; and the Seleucids, 339, 341; ships, 131-2; slavery, 188; temple industries, 139; textiles, 124-6, 388; trade, 134, 397; writing and writing materials, 66, 88, 93, 102
Elamites, 13, 15, 194; texts of, 59, 60, 88
Election school (Greek philosophy), 250
elephants, domestication and war use of, 114, 129, 207, 446
Ellis (ancient region), 8, 67
Elymians, 28, 71, 76, 345, 343
embalming, 149, 150
Emilia (Italy), 28, 33
Empedocles (Greek philosopher), 151-2, 418, 529
enamels, 126
encyclopaedias, 754-66
engineering, 122, 302, 746-8; see also roads
Ennius, Quintus (Roman writer), 565-6, 579
Ephesus, 11, 27
Epic writing, 68, 69
Epicarmus (Greek dramatist), 68, 69, 71, 580
Epicureanism, 541-2, 552-3, 898
Epictetus of Samos (Greek philosopher), 422
Epictetus, dialect of, 67
Eratosthenes (Greek mathematician and astronomer), 411, 414, 416, 609
Erythrae, 27
Esarhaddon (king of Assyria), 12, 15, 265
Ethiopia 683; Egyptian occupation of, 12; language, 86, 378; and Persia, 37
Etruscans, 24, 26, 29-31, 65, 72; agriculture, 119, 385; alphabet, 97-9 passim; architec-
ture and building, 302-4; art, 301-6, 638-43; and Carthage, 30; and the Celts, 35; cities and city-states, 175, 197; and Cumae, 28-30, 342; education, 104; breakdown of the empire, 31; engineering, 302; games and athletics, 193; glass-making, 127; and Greece, 29-31; horses and war chariots, 114; houses, 117, 302; light industries, 140; irrigation, 122; jewellery, 128, 391; land reclamation, 112; languages, 72-4, 368, 712; and the Latins, 30; leagues of, 197; literature, 283-4; medicine, 152; metals and metallurgy, 123, 124; migrations of, 28-30; monarchy, 159-60, 163; music, 657; origins of, 49-51; as pirates, 135; pottery, 642; religion, 240-2; roads, 130-1; Rome and, 344-6 passim; sculpture, 304-5; temples, 304; tombs, 303; trade and trade routes, 36, 135-7, 140
Euboea, 6, 29, 66
Euclid (Greek philosopher), 413-14
Eudoxus of Chios (Greek astronomer), 413
Euganei (tribe), 28, 65, 75
Eupasture (Attic nobility), 26
Euripides (Greek dramatist), 577-8
ex-voto tablets, 151
Faliscan alphabet, 100
family, organization of the, 185-8
farming: see agriculture
Fasti Triumphales (Roman history), 75, 79
fertility cults, 42
feudalism, 11, 42-4, 161-2, 170, 182, 320, 432-4, 438
fibres, for textile manufacture, 388
finance and taxation, 204-6, 435, 741, 775-6, 803-9; see also under entries for individual countries
Finnish group of languages, 84
fish, trade in, 35
fishing, 18, 108-9
Flaccus, Verrius (Latin antiquarian), 763-4
flax, 124, 388
Florence (Italy), foundation of, 302
food and cooking, 108 ff., 118, 120-1, 137
Gabinius, A. (Roman governor), 498
Gaelic dialects, 77
Galatian language, 58
Galen (Graeco-Roman physician), 761, 763
Galicia, 34
Gallus, Gaius Cornelius (Roman poet and administrator), 574
games, Greek and Roman, 28, 193, 196, 272, 797
Gandhara (Persian satrap in India), 41, 325
Gascons (tribe), 78
Gathas (Zoroaster's writings), 37, 60, 230
Gaul
agriculture, 119; Celtic migrations into, 32, 33, 74, 76 ff.; Julius Caesar and, 354, 501; Roman conquest of, 348, 473

Gaza, 37

Gelon of Syracuse (tyrant), 342

geography, 141–2, 282–3, 414–16, 757: see also under entries for individual countries
geometric art, 294, 296, 298, 300
geometry: see mathematics and geometry
Georgian languages, 57

Germans, 79; and the Celts, 33, 77; language, 58, 374–5, 711–12; and Rome, 352

Getae (people), 62

Gezer (Canaan) 20; 'Alphabet of,' 94; Calendar of, 81, 92; inscription finds at, 92

Gimirrai (people): see Cimmerians
glass, 126–7, 293, 390–1, 737, 957: see also under entries for individual countries

Glauia, Gaius Servilius, 492

'gnomons', 145
gold, and goldsmith's work, 35, 123, 137–8, 195, 387, 391, 643

Gomer (people): see Cimmerians

Goths (people), 694–702 passim; Gothic script, 717

Gozan: see Tell Halaf

Gracchus, Gaius, 352, 488–90

Gracchus, Tiberius Sempronius, 486, 488

Great Mother cult, 185, 288, 526, 544, 572

'Great Seal script' (Shang dynasty; China), 90

Greece, 6–7; agriculture, 111–12, 119, 384–5; alphabets, 95, 97–9, 379–80; architecture, 634–5, 964; art, 621–38; astronomy, 144–5, 410–11; botany, 420–1; business practices, 404; caste and tribal systems, 192; coinage, 403–4; development of colonies and cities, 22–8, 141, 175–8, 333–7; and conquered peoples, 196–7; cosmogony, 247–8, 421–2, 529–30; economic and social systems, 183–5; education, 104; and Egypt, 12, 466–7; scientific encyclopaedias, 757–60 passim; empires of, 339–41; and the Etruscans, 29–31; games and athletics, 193; geography, 141–2, 416; struggle for Western Greece, 342–4; historians and historiography, 591–600, 941–5; and India, 337; industry, 139–40, 393–4; and Italy, 30; jewellery and precious stones, 391–2; organization of labour, 183; languages and dialects, 6, 7, 58, 62–9, 365–8, 709–10; law, 202–3; the Leagues, 431–2, 457, 469; libraries, 103; literature, 69, 561–617 passim, 916–18, 922 ff. passim; and Macedonia, 467–8; mathematics, 147, 413–14, 759–60; mechanics, 759–60, 765–7; medicine, 150, 418–20, 761; metals and metallurgy, 123; military organization, 168, 208–9, 462; the monarchies, 159–63, 460–3; music, 310–12, 656–7, 966, 967; fusion with oriental civilization, 356 ff.; painting, 627–9; the peninsula, 468–71; and Persia, 329–30, 381, 448–9, 451, 457, 458; pharmacology, 153, 763; philosophy, 153, 424–6, 764; and Phoenicia, 18, 19; politics, 450–7; pottery, 125–6, 389–90; property and ownership, 180; religion and philosophy, 231–7, 248–51, 525–43, 550–3; roads, 130, 398; and Rome, 344; and Rome-Carthage conflict, 348, 349; scents, 129, 392; science, 141; sculpture, 629–37; slavery, 189; textiles, 124, 388; the theatre, 280–2, 576–85, 918–20 passim; trade and commerce, 396–7; the Tyrrhenians, 165–7; veterinary science, 762; status of women, 202; writing, 91–2, 102; zoology, 420–1

Guatemala, 48

Guinea, language of, 87

Guti (people), 13

Guzana: see Tell Halaf

Gyges (king of Lydia), 10–11

Hadrian (Roman emperor), 687–8, 691

Hallstatt culture, 32–4, 76–7, 644

Hamath (Syria), 20

Hamitic languages, 49, 57, 86, 87

Hamitic peoples, 11, 75

Han dynasty (China), 317, 320, 321, 391, 433–6, 437, 513–14, 770–3

Hannibal (Carthaginian soldier), 348, 349, 481

Hanno (Carthaginian explorer), 87, 142

Harappā (Indus Valley civilization) 89, 391

Hatti: see Hittites

Hattusas (Hittite city): see Boğazköy

Hebrews, 20–2, 158–9; agriculture and pastoral life, 114; alphabet, 377; class divisions, 192; cosmogony, 246–7; and the Diaspora, 330–3, 521–5; education, 104; family life, 186–7; languages, 80, 81; law, crime and punishment, 200–1; literature, 559–60; medicine, 149; monarchy, 216–17; music, 310; and the Old Testament, 257–64; Persia and, 39; political and religious power, 171–2; polygamy, 186; religion, 215–25, 330–3, 521–5, 840–7; religious and political difficulties with Rome, 548; scent manufacture, 129; sexual morality, 187; slavery, 188; status of women 187: see also Semites

Hecataeus (Greek historian), 142, 283

Hellenic peoples 6, 9

'Helots' (serfs), 27, 334
Helvetii (people), 354
hepatoscopy (divination cult), 242, 265
Heracleides (Lydian dynasty), 10
Heraclitus (Greek philosopher), 250-1
Hernici people and dialect, 28, 69
Herod the Great (of Judea), 332
Herodotus (Greek historian), 10, 69
Hero of Alexandria, 765, 766
‘hexagrams’ (writing), 91
hieroglyphic writing, 48, 59, 66, 88-9, 96
Himeras (Sicily), 29, 68
Himilco (Carthaginian soldier), 142
Hinduism, 776
Hipparchus (Greek astronomer), 411, 414
Hippo Diarrhytus (N. Africa), 31
Hippocrates (Greek physician), 418-19
Hippodamus of Miletus (Greek architect), 176
Hipponax (Greek poet) 68
Hitites, 9; colonial settlements of the, 5, 6; empire dismembered, 9-10; hieroglyphics of the, 59, 88-9, 96; languages, 58
Ho languages (India), 61
hoe culture, 48, 110, 119, 384
Homero (Greek poet) 68, 561
‘Homoiol’ (Spaean ruling class), 27
homophones, 90
Honan (China), 42
honey, 114
Horace (Roman poet), 573, 589, 591
horses, domestication and use of, 47, 113, 114-16, 118, 129, 324, 438, 692: see also under entries for individual countries
Hottentots (African people) 49; language, 87
houses, 115-17: see also under entries for individual countries
Hsiung-nu (Huns; people), 85, 320-2, 323, 324, 439, 701, 702
Huan, Duke (of Ch’i; Chinese minister), 44, 122
Huns: see Hsiung-nu
hunting, 108-9
Hurrians (people) 5; language and writing, 59, 60, 88
huts: see shelters
hydraulic engineering, 122, 302
Hykos invasions, 20
Hyrcanians (people), 39
Hyrcanus, John (Jewish ruler), 331, 332
Iapyges (people), 65
Iberians (people) 33; alphabets, 94; art, 644-8; coinage, 646-7; language, 78; pottery, 645-8
ideograms: see pictograms and ideograms
‘Iguvium, Tables of’ (Umbrian language texts), 72
Illyrians, 6, 29, 30, 58, 64, 99, 501, 692
Imhotep (Egyptian god of medicine), 149
India, 40-2; agriculture, 111, 120-1, 728-9; alchemy, 750-1; architecture, 753, 953, 954; art, 286, 619-20; artisan labour, 140; astronomy, 143-4, 751-2; caste system, 190-3, 444; development of cities, 173; coingage and currency, 402-3, 727-8; cosmogony, 245; crime and punishment, 199-200; education, 103; family organization, 185; finance and taxation, 204, 775, 776; history (from Christian era to c. AD 500), 675-9; houses, 116; ivory carving, 730-1, 954; jewellery, 729-30; languages, 60-2, 363, 706-7; law, 199-200, 443-4, 776; literature, 254-6, 558-9, 911-14; mathematics, 146, 412-13, 752-3; medicine, 148-9, 417-18, 749-50; military organization, 445-7, 774; the monarchy, 160; music and musical instruments, 309-10, 656; philology, 153-4, 423-4, 753-4; political power and public administration, 169-70, 172, 440-5, 773-6; lack of population statistics, 776; pottery, 286-7, 389, 729; property and ownership, 181; religion, mythology and philosophy, 172, 515-20, 753, 776, 827-34; republican system, 164; science, 406-7; sculpture, 287, 953-4; slavery, 444-5; trade and industry, 133-4, 138, 392-6, 724-7; transportation, 129; untouchability, 191; status of women, 181, 200; writing and writing materials, 376-7, 714-15
Indo-European peoples, 6, 10, 28-9; languages, 57-62, 84; religion, 226-9
Indonesia, 680
Indus script, 89
Indus Valley civilization, 40; Alexander the Great and, 325
industry, 139-40, 392-5: see also under entries for individual countries
inhumation, 72, 79, 307
Ionians, 29; Ionic dialects, 6-8, 23, 66, 68, 69
Iran: see Persia
Iranic languages, 58, 60, 707
Ireland, 35
Iron Age culture, 50
iron and iron-working, 23, 44, 122-3
irrigation systems, 111, 121-2, 318, 382-3: see also under entries for individual countries
Isis (deity), 119
Isocrates (Greek rhetorician), 610
Israel, 13, 20-1, 159, 171; religion, 215 ff. passim: see also Palestine
Italy, 28; agriculture, 112, 385, 386; art, 300-2, 638-43, 652-4; and the Celts, 33; development of cities, 175-6; coingage, 404; First and Second Italici, 29, 69-71, 307
INDEX

goldsmiths' work, 127; and Greece, 24, 30; houses, 117; small industries, 128, 394; language and dialects, 28, 58, 69-72; medicine, 152; monarchy, 159; painting and mosaic, 654-5; population censuses, 819-21; pottery, 629, 641-2; roads, 399; and Rome, 344-7, 502-3, 802-3, 805; slavery, 189; and the Social War, 493; textiles, 388; and the trade routes, 36, 134-5, 397-8; tribal system, 197
ivory and ivory carving, 35, 730-1, 954
Italic languages, 368-71

Jainism, 42, 517-18, 753
Janaka (Indian king), 41
Janamejaya (Indian king), 41
Japan, 674-5; Jōmon and Yayoi cultures, 45, 324, 389; origins of, 45; pottery 324, 389
Jerusalem, 12, 20, 331; the Hebrews and the Temple, 522; Pompey and, 354
jewellery, 127, 305, 308, 391-2, 724, 729-30, 736, 737: see also under entries for individual countries
Jews: see Hebrews; Semites
Jimmu Tennō (Japanese emperor), 45
Jōmon culture, 45, 324, 389
Joshua (Biblical character), 20
Judah and Judaisms, 21, 159, 172, 217, 220, 524-5, 820-4
Judas Maccabaeus, 331
Jugurtha and the Jugurthine War, 352, 353, 490-1
Julius Caesar: see Caesar, C. Iulius

Kabeiros (people), 18
Kaldu (people): see Chaldeans
Karask culture, 47, 285
Karatepe, inscription finds at, 9, 59, 81
Karma (Indian metaphysics), 42
Kaskans (people), 9
Kassites (people), 21; and Babylonia 6;
writing, 59, 60, 88
Khabiru (people), 20
Khāravela (Indian ruler), 328
Khmer empire and language, 84, 679
Khoisan (people), 49
Khshathrita: see Phraortes
Khuwari languages, 61
Khwarezm, 323
kins, 126
Knossos (Crete), 66, 91
Kojiki (Japanese chronicle), 45
Korea
annexed by China, 320; language 85
Kossaei: see Kassites
Kuan-chung (Chinese minister), 44
Kučean language, 58
Kultepe, inscription finds at, 80
Kurgans (funeral mounds), 321
Kuru confederacy (India), 41
Kusāna (people), 322
Kybos (N. Africa), 31
Lachish (Palestine), inscription finds at, 81, 92
Laconians, 8, 29; language, 67, 68
'Ladin' dialects, 74
lake-dwellings: see pile-dwellings
languages, 51, 56-88, 362-80, 705-13: see also dialects; and under entries for individual countries and peoples
La Tène culture, 33, 647
latifundia (Italian estates system), 386, 481, 487, 491, 691, 731-2
Latin alphabets, 99-100, 716-17
Latin language and writing, 28, 71, 369-71, 380, 710-11, 763-4
Latin literature and drama, 564-87 passim
Latium and the Latins, 29-31, 69, 72; agriculture, 112, 119-20, 385, 386; art, 307, 308; bronework, 643; development of cities, 174; cremation, 239; industries, 398; literature, 284; and Rome, 344-7 passim, 473-5, 483; tribal system, 197: see also Latin alphabets; Latin language and writing; Latin literature and drama
law, 199-200, 776, 788-93, 802-5 passim: see also under entries for individual countries
Legalism (Chinese political theory), 318-20 passim, 429-32 passim, 434, 513
Leleges (people), 65
Lemnos (Greece), 18, 50
Leontini (Italy), 29
Lepidus, Marcus Aemilius (Roman triumvir), 355
Lesbos (Greece), 8, 26, 67
Levirate law (unique Hebrew practice), 187
libraries, 15, 102-3
Liburnians, 65, 76
Libya, 49; alphabet, 93-4; and Egypt, 11; and the Greeks, 24
Libya–Berber language, 87
Licinius, C. Flavius Valerianus (Roman emperor), 698-9
Ligurians, 28; agriculture, 120; and the Celts, 33; dialects and words, 74-6, 99; Phocaean and, 26
Linear scripts, A and B, 91
linen, 388
literature, 253-80, 555-617: see also under entries for individual countries
livestock, trade in, 133
Livius, Titus (Roman historian): see Livy
Livy (Roman historian) 33, 584, 606-7
Locri (Italy), 27, 344
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Loth (India), Indus script finds at, 89
Lo-yang (China), 43, 44, 127
Lucilius (Latin writer), 590
Lucretius (Roman poet and philosopher)
552-3: 588
Lucullus, Lucius Licinius (Roman soldier),
358, 359, 486, 498, 501
Lukku (people), 11
Lung-Shan culture (China), 42
Luvian texts, 59
Lycaonians, 59
Lycia and Lycians, 9, 11; alphabet, 97;
language, 63
Lycurgus (Greek orator), 27, 611-12
Lydia, 9, 63; alphabet, 96; and Cimmerians,
10; and Ephesus, 27; goldsmiths' work,
127; and Media, 37; as a Persian possess-
ion, 11; and Syria, 10
Lyki (people), 9
Lysias (Greek orator), 609

Macedonia, 6, 195, 459-60; coinage, 404;
division of, 350; the Macedonian Wars,
349-50; and Greece, 467-8; and Rome,
485, 486; and the Seleucids, 341
Madagascar, 85
Maecenas (people), 10, 63
Magadha (Indian kingdom), 41, 325-7
magic cults, 217, 225, 226, 242
magistrates, the (Rome), 474, 475, 477, 478
Magna Graecia, 24; agriculture, 385; and
Greece, 30, 343, 344; and Rome, 346; and
the tyrants, 27
Magnus Mater cult: see Great Mother
Mago (Carthaginian agricultural writer), 111, 387
Magyar language group, 84
Mahabharata (Indian epic), 41
Mainmir culture, 47
Mani and Manichaeeism, 682, 834-6
manuring of crops, 120
Marius, Gaius and the Marians, 352, 353,
490-2, 494, 496
Marcus Antonius: see Antonius, Marcus
Mark Antony: see Antonius, Marcus
markets, 136-7, 140-1
Maro, P. Vergilius: see Virgil
marriage customs, 185 ff. passim, 190
Marsigliana (Italy), inscribed tablet found at,
97
Massilia and the Massiliiotes, 32, 33
Massinissa (Numidian ruler), 481, 486
mathematics and geometry, 22, 145-8, 412-14,
745-6, 752-3, 759-60: see also under entries
for individual countries
matriarchal systems, 185
Maurya empire (India), 325

Maximian (C. Galerius, Valerius Maxim-
ianus; Roman emperor), 696, 698
Maximus, Magnus (Roman emperor), 701
Mayas (people), 100-1
mechanics, 765-9: see also under entries
for individual countries
Media and the Medes, 36-7; and Assyria,
15; and conquered peoples, 195; language,
58, 60; and Lydia, 11; monarchy, 158; and
the capture of Nineveh, 22
medicine, 148-52, 417-20, 742-3, 749-51,
760-3 passim: see also under entries for
individual countries
Megara (ancient city), 26
Megara Hyblaea, 29
Megarians (people), 29
Melanesians, 85
Melos (Greece), 8, 67
Memphis (Egypt), 12, 37
Menander (Greek rules), 327
Mencius (Chinese philosopher), 182
mercury, 123-4
Mermnadai (Lydian dynasty), 10
Merneptah (Pharaoh), 11, 20
Meroe (Sudan), 49, 87
Mesopotamia, 21-2, 37; agriculture, 111;
and the Arameans, 19; astronomy, 144;
and conquered peoples, 194; language, 80;
mathematics, 147; medicine, 149; and the
Phoenicians, 15; property and ownership,
179; roads, 130; trade, 134
Messapii (people), 65; alphabet 98; dialect
64
Mesessian dialect, 67
metals and metallurgy, 18, 19, 23, 35, 47,
122-4, 133-5 passim, 137-9, 183, 285-6,
321, 387-8, 736, 738: see also under entries
for individual countries
Metapontum, 29
metempsychosis in Indian religion, 42
meteorology, 409
Mexico, 48
Miletus (ancient city), 8, 27
military organization, 39, 208, 435-6, 439,
445-8, 450, 462, 476, 809-18: see also under
entries for individual countries
mills and milling, 120
Milyai (people): see Termilioi
Mimmerus (Greek poet), 68
Minoans, 6, 7, 8, 66, 68
Minusinsk, 47, 285-6
Mitanni (people), 5, 6, 88
Mithradates I (of Parthia), 357
Mithradates II (of Parthia), 357-8
Mithradates VI (of Pontus), 353, 354, 359
Mithradatic Wars, 353, 494, 699
Moab language, 81
Mohenjo-daro (Indus Valley), 89, 391
monarchy, early forms of, 157–63: see also under entries for individual countries
Mongolia and the Mongols, 47, 84–5
Mon-Khmer language, 84
monogamy, 186
monotheism, the Hebrews and, 21
Moors (people), 49
Morgetti (people), 71
Morocco as a Phoenician colony, 18
mortars and pestles, 120
mosaic, 637–8, 655, 963: see also under entries for individual countries
Moses, 20, 201
Mother Earth cult, 235
Mo- ti and the Moists (Chinese religion), 510–11
Motya (Sicily), 31
mules, 113
Munda culture, 40
Mundari language (India), 61
music and musical instruments, 309–12, 655–7: see also under entries for individual countries
Muska (people), 13
Myccenaean civilization, 7, 8; art, 23; houses, 116–17; and Phoenicia, 15–18; writing, 91
Mythia, 7, 9
mythology, 225–44 passim: see also religion
Nabopolassar (Babylonian king), 22, 37
Nabunidus (Babylonian king), 22
Naevius, Gnaeus (Roman poet) 564–5, 579
Nairi (people), 13
Nanda dynasty (India), 325–6
Napata (Africa), 12, 49
Naso, Publius Ovidius: see Ovid natural sciences, 420–2
Nature cults, 235, 243
Naucratis (Egypt), 24
Nebuchadnezzar I (king of Babylon), 12, 13
Nebuchadnezzar II (king of Babylon) 19–21
 necromancy, 143
Negroes, 48–9
Nicaragua, 48
Nihongo (Japanese chronicle), 45
Nineveh, fall of, 15, 37
Nippur (Babylon), library at, 103
nomads, 6, 36, 46, 109–10, 158, 321, 324, 438–9
nomes (Egyptian history), 11
Numa (king of Rome) 503
Numantia (ancient town), 350
Numidia, 490
numbers, theory of, 145
Octavian (Roman emperor), 355–6, 387, 504–6: see also Augustus
Octavianus, C. Caesar: see Octavian
Octavius, M. (Roman tribune), 488
Ogam script, 717
oil presses, 120
Old Hebrew alphabet, 93, 94
Old Persian script, 88, 263
Old Sinaic language, 80
Old Testament, the, 333; formation of, 257–64
Olympia, 18
oneiromancy, 143, 149
Opici people and dialect, 28, 71
optics, 744–5
oracles, 28, 234, 237, 295, 296
Orchomenos (Greece), script finds at, 91
Orphism, 237, 248, 249
Orthagorids, 27
Oscans (people), 29, 344; alphabet, 97, 98; language, 71–2, 369
Ovid (Roman poet), 575–6, 589
oxen, domestication of, 118, 129
Pacuvius, Marcus, 579–80, 641
'Painted Vase' peoples, 119
Pakistan, 42
Palace civilizations, 7, 23
palafitte: see pile-dwellings
palafitticoli (people): see pile-dwellings
'Palantine city', the (Rome), 31
Palestine
Chaldeans and, 22; and Egypt, 12; and the Hittites, 6; insularity of Jews in, 331–2; trade, 134: see also Israel
Palmira (ancient city), 81
Pamir (plateau, Russia), 47
Pamphylia, 8, 9, 352
Panaetius of Rhodes (Stoic philosopher), 541
Pancala confederacy (India) 41
Pandava (Indian history), 41
Paphlagonia, 7, 59
Papua, 47, 85
Pariksit (Indian king), 41
Parnemides of Elea (Greek philosopher), 142
Parsua (ancient kingdom), 36
Parthia, 64, 354–8 passim, 382, 449, 680–3, 952
Pataliputra (India), 325, 327, 391, 441
patricianal systems, 42, 185
patricians (Roman history), 192–3, 344, 471–8 passim: see also plebeians
patriotism, origins of, 111
Paulius, Lucius Aemilius (Roman soldier), 350
Pausanias (king of Sparta), 151
Peisistratus (Greek statesman), 26
Pelagians (people), 65
Pelisest (people): see Philistines
INDEX

Peloponnesian (Greece), 6, 336; dialects, 66, 68; Peloponnesian League, 27, 196, 334
‘Peoples of the Sea’, 10, 15, 86, 136
perfumes: see scents
Pergamum, 350, 352, 425
Pericles (Greek statesman), 334, 531
Perioci (Spartan subjects), 27
Peripatetics (Greek philosophy), 536–9
Persia, 36–40, 447–9; agriculture, 111; domestication of animals, 114; architecture, 126, 291–2, 957; art, 956–7; influence in Asia, 321; and the Chaldeans, 22; and conquered peoples, 195; cosmogony, 245; and Egypt, 37, 39; family organization, 187; finance and taxation, 205; glass moulding, 957; and Greece, 381, 448–9; 451, 459; houses, 116; and India, 41–2, 325; language and writing, 80, 94, 363; libraries, 103; literature, 60, 267–8, 914–16; military organization, 208; pottery, 957; public administration, 170–1; religion and philosophy, 39, 229–31, 447, 449, 520–1, 834–6; roads, 130; and the Sassanids, 777–8; scents and cosmetics, 139; sculpture, 292, 957: see also Iranian languages
Peru, 48
Perugia, inscribed cippos at, 74, 97
Pesara (Italy) inscription finds at, 74, 75
Petra (ancient site, Jordan), 81
Peucetians (people), 65
Pharaohs, rights and duties of the, 182–3
Pharisees, 331
pharmacology, 152–3, 417, 420, 763: see also under entries for individual countries
Phidon (king of Argos), 27
Pherecydes of Leros (Greek writer), 145
Philip II (of Macedon), 330, 336–7, 387, 451, 459
Philip IV (of Macedon), 348, 349, 350
Philippi, battles of, 355
Philistines, 11, 18, 158
Philolaus, 148
philology, 53–4, 423–6, 753–4, 763–4: see also under entries for individual countries
philosophy, 44, 248–51, 509–53: see also under entries for individual countries
Philoxenus of Cythra, 68
Phocaeans, 24–6, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34; alphabet, 98; dialects, 68
Phocians, 336
Phocylides (Greek poet) 68
Phoenix
agriculture, 111; alphabet, 93–5; art, 292–3; colonial administration, 15–19, 197; cosmogony, 246; economic system, 183; glass-making, 127; goldsmiths’ art, 127; and Greece, 18; hieroglyphics of, 88; houses, 116; language, 80–1; literature, 266; navigation and ships, 132; piracy, 18, 136; the purple dye, 125; religion, 242–4; scents and cosmetics, 129; and slave trade, 134; and Spain, 34; trade and trading posts, 18, 35, 133, 140; writing and writing materials, 88, 92, 102
Phraates II (of Parthia), 357
Phraates III (of Parthia), 354, 358
Phraates IV (of Parthia), 358
Phraortes (king of Media), 37
Phrygia, 7, 9, 10, 11; alphabet, 96; language, 58, 62–4
Phthiotis (Greece), 8, 67
physics, 744
‘Piacenza, the liver of’, 98
Pianellian culture, 29, 71
Piankhi (Ethiopian ruler), 49
Picenum, 28, 30, 33, 75, 98–9, 128, 346
pictograms and ideograms, 48, 87, 90, 91, 94, 100–1
pilidwellingis (palaiotites), 28, 34, 49, 74, 112, 113, 116, 117, 122, 130, 174, 175
Pillars of Hercules, 35
Pindar (Greek poet), 59, 569, 657
piracy, 9, 11, 18, 24, 135–6, 184, 189, 354, 400–1
Pisidians, 63
Plato, 141, 151, 410, 413, 422, 424; the Academy, 534–6
Plautus, T. Maccius (Latin writer), 585–6
plebeians (Roman history), 192–3, 344, 386, 406, 471–9 passim: see also patricians
plebs: see plebeians
ploughs, 111, 112, 119, 120, 121, 384
‘polis’ the (Greek city type) 23, 26, 176–8, 452–4, 463, 468–70
political theory, 429–38
Polycrates (tyrant of Samos), 27
polygamy and polyandry, 185, 186
Polynesian language, 85
Pompeius, Gnaeus (Roman statesman): see Pompey
Pompeius, Sextus (Roman sailor), 355
Pompey, (Roman statesman) 353, 354, 496–502 passim
population censuses, 776–7, 819–21: see also under entries for individual countries
porcelain, 723: see also pottery
Portugal, 34
potter’s wheel, the, 118, 126
pottery, 18, 35, 45, 50, 125–7, 285–7, 297–9, 305, 324, 629, 641–2, 723–4, 729: see also under entries for individual countries
poultry-breeding, 114
Prænestæ (ancient city), 72
Praesides (Crete) 66
Prakrit languages, 62
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precious and semi-precious stones, 127, 290, 727, 737
‘pre-Sabellian’ inscriptions, 65
Priene (Ionia), 11
Probos, Marcus Aurelius (Roman emperor), 696
Prodicus of Ceos (Greek philosopher), 532
Propertius, Sextus (Latin poet), 574–5
property and ownership, 178–82: see also under entries for individual countries
Propontis (Sea of Marmora), 24
Protagoras of Abdera (Greek philosopher), 424, 526, 531
Proto-Etruscan civilization: see Villanovan Proto-Venetian civilization: see Atestine
Psamtit I (Pharaoh), 12, 15
Psamtit III (Pharaoh), 37
Ptolemaeus, Claudius: see Ptolemy
Ptolemaic kingdom, 339, 341, 346
Ptolemy (Greek astronomer), 756–7, 881
Punic Wars, 348, 480–3: see also Carthage
Punic religion, 244
Punicum, 31
Punjab, the (India), 40, 41, 325, 327, 357
Pūrāṇas (Sanskrit literature), 41
Pygmies (African people), 49, 87
Pylos (Greece), script finds at, 91, 335
Pyrrhus (king of Epirus), 344, 346
Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans, 27, 104, 142, 145, 147–8, 151, 248–9, 410, 416, 528–9, 545, 549, 898–9
Pytheas of Massilia (Greek explorer), 79
Pyu kingdom, 679
Qatna, 15
Rameses III (Pharaoh), 11
Ravenna (Italy), 72, 394
Ras Shamrah: see Ugarit
‘Red alphabet’ (Greek), 95, 96, 98
reindeer, 113–14
reincarnation: see metempsychosis
passim: see also under entries for individual countries
republican systems, 162–5
Rhaeti (people), 75
Rhaeto-Roman languages, 74
Rhegium, 29
Rhodes, 9, 29, 67, 350
Rigvedic culture (India), 41, 61–2
roads, 129–31, 398–9, 747–8: see also under entries for individual countries
astronomy and astrology, 758; the barbarian invasions, 688–704; baths and hygiene, 651, 762, 959–60, 965; botany, 760; and Britain, 354, 700; conflict with Carthage, 348–51; caste system, 192–3; and the Christians, 688, 692–704 passim, 862–9; coinage, 479, 741; and conquered peoples, 195; the age of Constantine, 698–90; and Egypt, 348, 350; the Empire, 683–704, 695–8; survival of the Eastern Empire, 702–4; scientific encyclopaedias, 754–66 passim; engineering, 959, 965; finance and taxation, 741, 803–9; games, 797; and Greece, 344, 348–52 passim; and the Hebrews, 548; historians, 601–7; under the ‘Illyrian’ emperors, 695–8; small industries, 394–5; and Italy, 344–7, 369–71, 496–7; language, 369–73; law, 203–4, 788–93, 802–5 passim; literature, 283–4, 561–617 passim, 923 ff. passim; mathematics, 759; medicine, 152, 420, 760–2; metals and metallurgy, 387, 738; military organization, 476, 692, 781, 809–18; monarchical system, 159–60, 164; music, 657, 966; painting and mosaic, 641, 654–5, 962–3; and Parthia, 449, 680–3; pharmacology, 153; philology, 426; political power and public administration, 778–819; population censuses, 819–21; pottery, 308; Romanization of the provinces, 371–2; and Pythagoreanism, 545; religion, mythology and philosophy, 237–40, 525–45, 688–704 passim, 837–40; religious conflict with Constantinople, 894–8; roads, 131, 959, 965; sculpture, 308, 652–4, 960–2, 965–6; slavery, 487, 798–9; the theatre, 570–89, 584–91; tombs, 651–2, 960; town planning and housing, 731–5; trade and trading posts, 137, 397, 724–7, 737–42; veterinary science, 762; zoology, 760
Romulus (king of Rome), 503
rotation of crops, 120
Runic alphabet and script, 79, 717
Russia, 10, 36
Sabellians (people), 24, 334, 344; ‘Sabellic’ migrations, 72, 342, 344
Sabines (people), 29
Saceae (people), 322, 328; see also Šaka
Sacred War (354–346 BC; Greek history), 459
sacrifices, human and animal, 239, 243, 244
Sadducees, 331
Saguntum (ancient city), 348
Saites (people), 12
Šaka (people), 60, 728: see also Šaceae
Salamis (Greece), 26
Salentini (people), 65
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Sallust (C. Sallustius Crispus; Roman historian), 605
salt production, 35, 44, 737
Salus (Roman physician), 152
Samaria and The Samaritans, 21, 331
Samnites (people), 345-6
Samos (Greece), 27
Samoyed group of languages, 84
Samuel (biblical character), 158, 171
Sanskrit language and literature, 62, 363
Santali language (India), 61
Sardinia, 18, 28, 31, 348
Sardis (Lydia), 10, 11; battle of, 114
Sargon II (Assyrian king), 13, 21, 26-7
Sarmatians, 60
Sassanian dynasty (Persia), 681-3, 777-8, 957
satem group of languages, 58
Saturninus, Appuleius (Roman politician), 491, 492
Saul (biblical character), 158, 171, 217
scent, 128-9, 392, 736
Scepticism (Greek philosophy), 525-6, 542-3, 898
science, 141-54, 406-26, 742-63; see also entries for individual sciences and countries
Scipio, Aemilius (Roman soldier), 350, 485, 486, 489
Scipio, Lucius Cornelius (Roman soldier), 349
Scipio, Publius (Africanus the Elder; Roman soldier), 481, 482, 483, 486
sculpture, 285, 287, 288, 290, 292, 293, 299-300, 304-5, 629-37, 640; see also under entries for individual countries
Scylax of Caryanda (Persian explorer), 142
scythes, 120
Scythians, 15, 36, 37, 47, 60, 63, 357; language, 58
seismology, 743
Seleucid dynasty (Syria), 325-6, 339-40, 348, 356-7, 460, 463-6, 482
Selinus (ancient city), 29, 343
Semites, 13, 15, 32; alphabet, 93; language and writing, 57, 80-1, 86, 88, 364-5, 708; see also Hebrews
Semonides (Greek writer), 68
Seneca, Lucius (the elder; Roman rhetorician), 580
Sennacherib (Assyrian king), 15, 21, 172
Septuagint, the (Bible), 333
Sertorius, Quintus (Roman soldier), 353, 496-7
Servile War, 352, 386, 487, 488, 491
Sesostris (Egyptian ruler), 147
Severus, Septimius (Roman emperor), 681, 689-90
sexual offences, 187
Shalmaneser III (Assyrian king), 13
Shalmaneser V (Assyrian king), 13
shamanism, 439
Shang dynasty (China), 42, 47; art, 284-5; astronomy, 408; development of cities, 173; divination, 145; family organization, 185; goldsmiths' work, 391; language, 82; mathematics, 145; meteorology, 409; the monarchy, 161; writing, 89-91
Shansi (China), 44
Shantung (China), 44
Shekelesha (people), 11
shells as units of exchange, 182
shelters and huts, 115, 116, 117; see also cave-dwellings and rock shelters
Sherdana (people), 11
Sheshonk (Libyan chief) as Pharaoh of Egypt, 12, 18
Sicceons (people), 71
Sicily
agriculture and trade, 385, 386; colonial settlements in, 24, 39; and Carthage, 31-2, 344; and Greece, 30, 342-4; houses, 117
sickles, 120, 121
Sidiculans (people), 71
Siculi (dialect), 128
Sicyon (ancient site), 26-7
Sidon (Phoenicia), 15, 19
silk, 387-8, 721
Simuka (Indian ruler), 328
Sind (India) 41-2, 327, 357
slavery, 35, 125, 134-40 passim, 165, 183, 188-9, 203, 398, 444-5, 461, 487, 798-9; see also under entries for individual countries
'Small Seal script' (Shang dynasty), 90
Smyrna, 11, 68
Social War (Roman history), 493
Socrates, 531-3
Sogdiana, 323, 330, 337, 363, 466
Solomon, 159, 217
Solon (Greek statesman), 26
Sophocles, 577
Sophron of Syracuse (Greek dramatist), 580-1
Spain
Carthage and, 34; Celts in, 33, 77; language, 78; Phocaenians and, 26; Rome and, 353; see also Iberians
Sparta, 27, 163, 183, 334-6, 453, 454, 457-9
Spartacus (Roman rebel), 353, 386
spears, 118
spinning, invention of, 124
spirit cults, 230, 235, 237, 238
Steppe civilization, 45-7, 438-9; art, 618-19; and China, 320, 322; importance of the horse in, 113, 438; nomad warrior tribes, 6
Stoens (people), 75
Stoics, the (Greek philosophy), 539-41
Subartu (people): see Hurrians
Sudan language, 87
Sudás (Indian king), 41
Sulla, Lucius Cornelius (Roman soldier), 353, 490, 494-6
Sumerian language and writing, 57, 58
sun-dials, 145
Sun Shu-ao (Chinese minister), 122
surgery, 149, 150, 419, 420
Susa (Persia), 59, 339
Susiana, 37
Susians: see Elamites
Sybaris (ancient city), 27, 29
syllabic scripts, 91-2
Syracuse, 29, 68, 342, 343
Syria, 8; agriculture, 111; and Assyria, 13, 20; and the Chaldeans, 22; and Egypt, 13; Graeco-Mycenean outposts in, 9; and the Greeks and Seleucids, 464-5; hieroglyphics of, 59; and the Hittites and Hurrians, 5-6; houses, 116; language, 80, 81; Roman conquest of, 356; trade, 134

Tabulae Iguvinae (Umbrian texts) 98
Tagar I culture, 47, 286
Tagar II culture, 321
Tamil languages, 60, 328
Tanis (Egypt), 11, 12
Taoism, 511-13, 743, 825-7 passim
Tarentum (ancient city), 27, 29, 345, 346; alphabet, 98
Tarnisa (Lydia) 11
Tarquinius (archaeological site), 50
Tarquins (people), 30, 160
Tarshish: see Tartessus
Tarsos (Lydia), 11
Tartessus and Tartessian culture, 31, 33, 34
Tauri (people), 63
taxation: see finance and taxation
Tefnakht (Pharaoh), 12
Tehenu (Libyan tribe), 11
Tell el Amarna (Egypt), 9, 15, 20, 63, 88, 102, 127
Tell Halaf (Syria), 19, 81
Temenids (ruling house of Argos), 27
Temple, the (Jerusalem), 331
temples, 184-5, 196, 295-6, 304, 307, 958, 964
Termiloi (people), 63
Terracina (Italy), 31, 69
terracing (agriculture), 121
terracottas, 126, 288
terramare, 112, 117, 130, 174, 175
Terramaricoli (people), 28, 33, 49
Teutones (people), 79, 352, 491
textiles, 124-6, 387-8, 737

Thales of Miletus (Greek philosopher), 145, 147, 249, 410
theatre, the, 280-2, 576-91
Thebes (Egypt), 11
Thebes (Greece), 336, 454, 459
Thekel (people), 11
Theocritus (Greek poet), 587-8
Theodosius I (the Great; Roman emperor), 701-2
Theognis (Greek poet), 567-8
Theophrastus (Greek writer), 536, 539
Thessaly, 6, 8, 18, 67, 336
Thracians, 9, 387
Thraco-Prygjans, 6; languages, 62-4
Thucydides (Greek historian), 136
Tibet and Tibetan languages, 83-5
Tibeto-Burmans languages, 62, 705
Tibullus, Albiius (Roman poet), 574
Tiglath-Pileser I (Assyrian king), 13, 158
Tiglath-Pileser III (Assyrian king), 13, 21, 36
Tigranes (Armenian kings), 354, 359
tools, 118, 119, 384
tortoise-shells, inscriptions on, 89, 101, 145
town planning and housing, 731-5
trade, trade routes and trading posts, 18-19,
24, 35-6, 133-41, 395-8, 406, 466, 719-27: see also under entries for individual countries
Transbaikalia, 47
transportation, 129-31
Treaty of 509 (Rome and Carthage), 30
tribal system, 109, 157-8, 162, 192-3, 196, 197
triumvirate, the (Roman history), 355, 501, 502, 504
Troy, 8, 10
Tuaregs (people), 49
Tukulti Nimurta I (Assyrian king), 13
Tung Chung-shu (Chinese statesman), 513-14
Tursha (people), 11
Tuscany, 29, 302; dialects, 73-4; and the Etruscans, 73-4, 97
'Twelve Tables, Laws of the', (Roman law)
71, 344, 788, 789
tyrants and the tyrannies (Greek history), 26-8, 165-7, 342, 454-7, 461
Tyre (Phoenicia), 15, 19, 22
Tyrrha (Lydia), 11
Tyrrenhians, 30
Tyrtaeus (Greek poet), 68
Ugarit (Phoenicia), 8, 9, 12, 15, 18, 80, 92, 95
Ugro-Finnish languages, 57
Ukraine, 24, 26
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Umbrians, 29, 76; alphabet, 97, 98; language, 71–2, 369; and Rome, 344–6
Umbro-Romagna, 29
untouchability (India), 191
Upamitad (Indian philosophy), 42, 517
Urartu (ancient kingdom), 13, 59, 88, 194

Valens (Roman emperor), 700–1
Valentinian I (Roman emperor), 700
Varro, Marcus Terentius (Roman writer), 545–6, 590, 603–4
Vascones (people), 78
Vedas, and Vedic culture, 40–2, 50, 62, 103, 153, 344, 515–17
Velitrac (ancient city), inscriptions finds at, 72
vendettas, 186, 203
Veneti (people), 29, 33, 36, 64–5, 349; dialect, 64–5
Veneto (Italy), 30
Vercingetorix (Gallic chief), 354
veterinary science, 762
Vietnam, 320
Villanovan culture, 29, 34, 50, 71, 118, 301
Virgil, 566–7, 572, 588–9
Volsci (people), 72, 344, 345
Volterra (Italy), inscribed tablet at, 97

Wang Mang (Chinese ruler), 321; reforms of, 720–1, 825
‘Warring States’, the (Chinese history), 317, 420, 514
Washasha (people), 11
weapons, 118, 206, 208, 435, 446
weaving, 124–5, 737: see also textiles; wool
Wei state (China), 317, 318
Wen (Chinese ruler), 43
Wen, Duke, of Chi’i (Chinese minister) 44
wheel, introduction of the, 49
wine presses, 120
women, status of, 114, 186, 187, 200, 202: see also under entries for individual countries
wool, 124, 388
writing and writing materials, 42, 59, 60, 87–104, 362–80, 713–17: see also hieroglyphic writing; and under entries for individual countries
Wu (Chinese ruler), 43
Wufila and the Gothic translation of the Bible, 79, 717
Wu-sun (people), 322

Xanthus (king of Lydia), stele of, 63
Xenophanes of Colophon (Greek philosopher), 250
Xenophon (Greek historian), 533

Yahweh (in Hebrew religion), 158, 215, 217, 218, 219, 222, 224
Yayoi culture (Japan), 324
Yin-yang (Chinese philosophy), 417, 513
Yoga (Indian philosophy), 829
Yuèh state (China), 317–18
Yuèh-chih (people), 322–4 passim

Zagros (Persia), 59
Zakir (king of Hamath and Lu’ ash), 81
Zarathustra, 60, 229–30: see also Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism
Zeno of Kition (Greek philosopher), 539–40
ziggurat, 289
Zincirli, inscription finds at, 92
Zodiac, the, 144
zoology, 420–1, 760: see also under entries for individual countries
Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism, 37, 39, 172, 229–31, 447, 834: see also Zarathustra
"A book that is shut is but a block."
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