**History Reading #5 – From Hannibal to Cato**

# Polybius
# The Histories

# p3 Book I

1 Had previous chroniclers neglected to speak in praise of History in general, it might perhaps have been necessary for me to recommend everyone to choose for study and welcome such treatises as the present, since men have no more ready corrective of conduct than knowledge of the past. 2 But all historians, one may say without exception, and in no half-hearted manner, but making this the beginning and end of their labour, have impressed on us that the soundest education and training for a life of active politics is the study of History, and that surest and indeed the only method of learning how to bear bravely the vicissitudes of fortune, is to recall the calamities of others.3 Evidently therefore no one, and least of all myself, would think it his duty at this day to repeat what has been so well and so often said.4 For the very element of unexpectedness in the events I have chosen as my theme will be sufficient to challenge and incite everyone, young and old alike, to peruse my systematic history. 5 For who is so worthless or indolent as not to wish to know by what means and under what system of polity the Romans in p5less than fifty-three years have succeeded in subjecting nearly the whole inhabited world to their sole government — a thing unique in history? 6 Or who again is there so passionately devoted to other spectacles or studies as to regard anything as of greater moment than the acquisition of this knowledge?

2 How striking and grand is the spectacle presented by the period with which I purpose to deal, will be most clearly apparent if we set beside and compare with the Roman dominion the most famous empires of the past, those which have formed the chief theme of historians. 2 Those worthy of being thus set beside it and compared are these. The Persians for a certain period possessed a great rule and dominion, but so often as they ventured to overstep the boundaries of Asia they imperilled not only the security of this empire, but their own existence. 3 The Lacedaemonians, after having for many years disputed the hegemony of Greece, at length attained it but to hold it uncontested for scarce twelve years. 4 The Macedonian rule in Europe extended but from the Adriatic region to the Danube, which would appear a quite insignificant portion of the continent. 5 Subsequently, by overthrowing the Persian empire they became supreme in Asiaalso. But though their empire was now regarded as the greatest geographically and

politically that had ever existed, they left the larger part of the inhabited world as yet outside it. 6 For they never even made a single attempt to dispute possession of Sicily, Sardinia, or Libya, and the most warlike nations of Western Europe were, to speak the p7simple truth, unknown to them. 7 But the Romans have subjected to their rule not portions, but nearly the whole of the world and possess an empire which is not only immeasurably greater than any which preceded it, but need not fear rivalry in the future. 8 In the course of this work it will become more clearly intelligible by what steps this power was acquired, and it will also be seen how many and how great advantages accrue to the student from the systematic treatment of history.

3 The date from which I propose to begin my history is the 140th Olympiad [220-216 B.C.], and the events are the following: (1) in Greece the so-called Social War, the first waged against the Aetolians by the Achaeans in league with and under the leadership of Philip of Macedon, the son of Demetrius and father of Perseus, (2) in Asia the war for Coele-Syria between Antiochus and Ptolemy Philopator,2 (3) in Italy, Libya, and the adjacent regions, the war between Rome and Carthage, usually known as the Hannibalic War. These events immediately succeed those related at the end of the work of Aratus of Sicyon. 3 Previously the doings of the world had been, so to say, dispersed, as they were held together by no unity of initiative, results, or locality; 4 but ever since this date history has been an organic whole, and the affairs of Italy and Libya have been interlinked p9with those of Greece and Asia, all leading up to one end. 5 And this is my reason for beginning their systematic history from that date. 6 For it was owing to their defeat of the Carthaginians in the Hannibalic War that the Romans, feeling that the chief and most essential step in their scheme of universal aggression had now been taken, were first emboldened to reach out their hands to grasp the rest and to cross with an army to Greece and the continent of Asia.

7 Now were we Greeks well acquainted with the two states which disputed the empire of the world, it would not perhaps have been necessary for me to deal at all with their previous history, or to narrate what purpose guided them, and on what sources of strength they relied, in entering upon such a vast undertaking. 8 But as neither the former power nor the earlier history of Rome and Carthage is familiar to most of us Greeks, I thought it necessary to prefix this Book and the next to the actual history, 9 in order that no one after becoming engrossed in the narrative proper may find himself at a loss, and ask by what counsel and trusting to what power and resources the Romans embarked on that enterprise which has made them lords over land and sea in our part of the world; 10 but that from these Books and the preliminary sketch in them, it may be clear to readers that they had quite adequate grounds for conceiving the ambition of a world-empire and adequate means for achieving their purpose. 4 For what gives my work its peculiar quality, and what is most remarkable in the present p11age, is this. Fortune has guided almost all the affairs of

the world in one direction and has forced them to incline towards one and the same end; 2 a historian should likewise bring before his readers under one synoptical view the operations by which she has accomplished her general purpose. Indeed it was this chiefly that invited and encouraged me to undertake my task; and secondarily the fact that none of my contemporaries have undertaken to write a general history, in which case I should have been much less eager to take this in hand. 3 As it is, I observe that while several modern writers deal with particular wars and certain matters connected with them, no one, as far as I am aware, has even attempted to inquire critically when and whence the general and comprehensive scheme of events originated and how it led up to the end. 4 I therefore thought it quite necessary not to leave unnoticed or allow to pass into oblivion this the finest and most beneficent of the performances of Fortune. 5 For though she is ever producing something new and ever playing a part in the lives of men, she has not in a single instance ever accomplished such a work, ever achieved such a triumph, as in our own times. 6 We can no more hope to perceive this from histories dealing with particular events than to get at once a notion of the form of the whole world, its disposition and order, by visiting, each in turn, the most famous cities, or indeed by looking at separate plans of each: a result by no means likely. 7 He indeed who believes p13that by studying isolated histories he can acquire a fairly just view of history as a whole, is, as it seems to me, much in the case of one, who, after having looked at the dissevered limbs of an animal once alive and beautiful, fancies he has been as good as an eyewitness of the creature itself in all its action and grace.8 For could anyone put the creature together on the spot, restoring its form and the comeliness of life, and then show it to the same man, I think he would quickly avow that he was formerly very far away from the truth and more like one in a dream. 9 For we can get some idea of a whole from a part, but never knowledge or exact opinion. 10 Special histories therefore contribute very little to the knowledge of the whole and conviction of its truth. 11 It is only indeed by study of the interconnexion of all the particulars, their resemblances and differences, that we are enabled at least to make a general survey, and thus derive both benefit and pleasure from history.

5 I shall adopt as the starting-point of this Book the first occasion on which the Romans crossed the sea from Italy. This follows immediately on the close of Timaeus' History and took place in the 129th Olympiad [264-261 B.C.]. 2 Thus we must first state how and when the Romans established their position in Italy, and what prompted them afterwards to cross to Sicily, the first country outside Italywhere they set foot. 8 The actual cause of their crossing must be stated without comment; for if I were to seek the p15cause of the cause and so on, my whole work would have no clear starting-point and principle. 4 The starting-point must be an era generally agreed upon and recognized, and one self-apparent from the events, even if this involves my going back a little in point of date and giving a summary of

intervening occurrences. 5 For if there is any ignorance or indeed any dispute as to what are the facts from which the work opens, it is impossible that what follows should meet with acceptance or credence; but once we produce in our readers a general agreement on this point they will give ear to all the subsequent narrative.

6 It was, therefore, the nineteenth year after the battle of Aegospotami and the sixteenth before that of Leuctra, the year in which the Spartans ratified the peace known as that of Antalcidas with the King of Persia, 2 that in which also Dionysius the Elder, after defeating the Italiot Greeks in the battle at the river Elleporos, was besieging[o] Rhegium, and that in which the Gauls, after taking Rome itself by assault, occupied the whole of that city except the Capitol. 3 The Romans, after making a truce on conditions satisfactory to the Gauls and being thus contrary to their expectation reinstated in their home and as it were now started on the road of aggrandizement, continued in the following years to wage war on their neighbours. 4 After subduing all the Latins by their valour and the fortune of war, they fought first against the Etruscans, then against the Celts, and next against the Samnites, whose territory was conterminous with that of the Latins on the East p17and North. 5 After some time the Tarentines, fearing the consequences of their insolence to the Roman envoys, begged for the intervention of Pyrrhus. (This was in the year preceding the expedition of those Gauls who met with the reverse at Delphi and then crossed to Asia.) 6 The Romans had ere this reduced the Etruscans and Samnites and had vanquished the Italian Celts in many battles, and they now for the first time attacked the rest of Italy not as if it were a foreign country, but as if it rightfully belonged to them. 7 Their struggle with the Samnites and Celts had made them veritable masters in the art of war, and after bravely supporting this war with Pyrrhus and finally expelling himself and his army from Italy, they continued to fight with and subdue those who had sided with him. 8 When, with extraordinary good fortune, they had reduced all these peoples and had made all the inhabitants of Italy their subjects excepting the Celts, they undertook the siege of Rhegium now held by certain of their compatriots.

10 The Mamertines had previously, as I above narrated, lost their support from Rhegium and had now suffered complete disaster at home for the reasons I have just stated. Some of them appealed to the Carthaginians, proposing to put themselves and the citadel into their hands, 2 while others sent an embassy to Rome, offering to surrender the city and begging for assistance as a kindred people. 3 The Romans were long at a loss, the succour demanded being so obviously unjustifiable. 4 For they had just inflicted on their own fellow-citizens the highest penalty for their treachery to the people of Rhegium, and now to try to help the Mamertines, who had been guilty of like offence not only at Messene but at Rhegium also, was a piece of injustice very difficult to excuse. 5 But fully aware as they were of this, they yet saw that the Carthaginians had not only reduced Libyato subjection, but a great part

of Spain besides, and that they were also in possession of all the islands in the Sardinian and Tyrrhenian Seas. 6 They were therefore in great apprehension lest, if they also became masters of Sicily, they would be most troublesome and dangerous neighbours, hemming them in on all sides and threatening every part of Italy. 7 That they would soon be supreme in Sicily, if the Mamertines were not helped, was evident; for once Messene had fallen into their hands, 8 they would shortly subdue Syracuse also, as they were p27absolute lords of almost all the rest of Sicily. 9 The Romans, foreseeing this and viewing it as a necessity for themselves not to abandon Messene and thus allow the Carthaginians as it were to build a bridge for crossing over to Italy, debated the matter for long, 11 and, even at the end, the Senate did not sanction the proposal for the reason given above, considering that the objection on the score of inconsistency was equal in weight to the advantage to be derived from intervention. 2 The commons, however, worn out as they were by the recent wars and in need of any and every kind of restorative, listened readily to the military commanders, who, besides giving the reasons above stated for the general advantageousness of the war, pointed out the great benefit in the way of plunder which each and every one would evidently derive from it. They were therefore in favour of sending help; 3 and when the measure had been passed by the people they appointed to the command one of the Consuls, Appius Claudius, who was ordered to cross to Messene. 4 The Mamertines, partly by menace and partly by stratagem, dislodged the Carthaginian commander, who was already established in the citadel, and then invited Appius to enter, placing the city in his hands. 5 The Carthaginians crucified their general, thinking him guilty of a lack both of judgement and of courage in abandoning their citadel. 6 Acting for themselves they stationed their fleet in the neighbourhood of Cape Pelorias, and with their land forces pressed Messene close in the direction of Sunes. 7 Hiero now, thinking that present circumstances were favourable for expelling from Sicily entirely the foreigners who occupied Messene, made p29an alliance with the Carthaginians, and quitting Syracuse with his army 8 marched towards that city. Pitching his camp near the Chalcidian mountain on the side opposite to the Carthaginians he cut off this means of exit from the city as well. 9 Appius, the Roman consul, at the same time succeeded at great risk in crossing the Straits by night and entering the city. 10 Finding that the enemy had strictly invested Messene on all sides and regarding it as both inglorious and perilous for himself to be besieged, 11 as they commanded both land and sea, he at first tried to negotiate with both, desiring to deliver the Mamertines from the war. 12 But when neither paid any attention to him, he decided perforce to risk an engagement 13 and in the first place to attack the Syracusans. Leading out his forces he drew them up in order of battle, the king of Syracuse readily accepting the challenge. 14 After a prolonged struggle Appius was victorious and drove the whole hostile force back to their camp. 15 After despoiling the dead he returned to Messene. Hiero, divining the final issue of the whole conflict, retreated

in haste after nightfall to Syracuse. 12 On the following day Appius, learning of the result of this action and encouraged thereby, decided not to delay but to attack the Carthaginians. 2 He ordered his troops to be in readiness early and sallied forth at break of day.3 Engaging the enemy he slew many of them and compelled the rest to p31retreat in disorder to neighbouring cities. 4 Having raised the siege by these successes, he advanced fearlessly, devastating the territory of the Syracusans and of their allies, no one disputing the open country with him. Finally he sat down before Syracuse and commenced to besiege it.

5 Such then was the occasion and motive of this the first crossing of the Romans from Italy with an armed force, an event which I take to be the most natural starting-point of this whole work. 6 I have therefore made it my serious base, but went also somewhat further back in order to leave no possible obscurity in my statements of general causes. 7 To follow out this previous history — how and when the Romans after the disaster to Rome itself began their progress to better fortunes, and again how and when after conquering Italy they entered on the path of foreign enterprise — seemed to me necessary for anyone who hopes to gain a proper general survey of their present supremacy.8 My readers need not therefore be surprised if, even in the further course of this work, I occasionally give them in addition some of the earlier history of the most famous states; 9 for I shall do so in order to establish such a fundamental view as will make it clear in the sequel starting from what origins and how and when they severally reached their present position. This is exactly what I have just done about the Romans.

14 An equally powerful motive with me for paying particular attention to this war is that, to my mind, the truth has not been adequately stated by those historians who are reputed to be the best authorities on it, Philinus and Fabius. 2 I do not indeed accuse them of intentional falsehood, in view of their character and principles, but they seem to me to have been much in the case of lovers; 3 for owing to his convictions and constant partiality Philinus will have it that the Carthaginians in every case acted wisely, well, and bravely, and the Romans otherwise, whilst Fabius takes the precisely opposite view. 4 In other relations of life we should not perhaps exclude all such favouritism; for a good man should love his friends and his country, he should share the hatreds and attachments of his friends; 5 but he who assumes the character of a historian must ignore everything of the sort, and often, if their actions demand this, speak good of his enemies and honour them with the highest praises while criticizing and even reproaching roundly his closest friends, should the errors of their conduct impose this duty on him. 6 For just as a living creature which has lost its p37eyesight is wholly incapacitated, so if History is stripped of her truth all that is left is but an idle tale. 7 We should therefore not shrink from accusing our friends or praising our enemies; nor need we be shy of sometimes praising and sometimes blaming

the same people, since it is neither possible that men in the actual business of life should always be in the right, nor is it probable that they should be always mistaken. 8 We must therefore disregard the actors in our narrative and apply to the actions such terms and such criticism 9 as they deserve.

**Book II**

38 In the first place it is of some service to learn how and by what means all the Peloponnesians came to be called Achaeans. 2 For the people whose original and ancestral name this was are distinguished neither by the extent of their territory, nor by the number of their cities, nor by exceptional wealth or the exceptional valour of their citizens. 3 Both the Arcadian and Laconian nations far exceed them, indeed, in population and the size of their countries, and certainly neither of the two could ever bring themselves to yield to any Greek people the palm for military valour. 4 How is it, then, that both these two peoples and the rest of the Peloponnesians have consented to change not only their political institutions for those of the Achaeans, but even their name? 5 It is evident that we should not say it is the result of chance, for that is a poor explanation. We must rather seek for a cause, for every event whether probable or improbable mustp337have some cause. The cause here, I believe to be more or less the following. 6 One could not find a political system and principle so favourable to equality and freedom of speech, in a word so sincerely democratic, as that of the Achaean league. 7 Owing to this, while some of the Peloponnesians chose to join it of their own free will, it won many others by persuasion and argument, and those whom it forced to adhere to it when the occasion presented itself suddenly underwent a change and became quite reconciled to their position. 8 For by reserving no special privileges for original members, and putting all new adherents exactly on the same footing, it soon attained the aim it had set itself, being aided by two very powerful coadjutors, equality and humanity. 9 We must therefore look upon this as the initiator and cause of that union that has established the present prosperity of the Peloponnese.

10 These characteristic principles and constitution had existed in Achaea from an early date. 11 There is abundant testimony of this, but for the present it will suffice to cite one or two instances in confirmation of this assertion. 39 When, in the district of Italy, then known as Greater Hellas,[6] the club-houses of the Pythagoreans were burnt down, 2 there ensued, as was natural, a general revolutionary movement, the leading citizens of each city having then unexpectedly perished, and in all the Greek towns of the district murder, sedition, and every kind of disturbance were rife. 3 Embassies arrived from most parts of Greece offering their services as peacemakers, p3394 but it was the Achaeans on whom these cities placed

most reliance and to whom they committed the task of putting an end to their present troubles.5 And it was not only at this period that they showed their approval of Achaean political principles; but a short time afterwards, they resolved to model their own constitution exactly on that of the League. 6 The Crotonians, Sybarites and Caulonians, having called a conference and formed a league, first of all established a common temple and holy place of Zeus Amarius[7] in which to hold their meetings and debates, and next, adopting the customs and laws of the Achaeans, decided to conduct their government according to them. 7 It was only indeed the tyranny of Dionysius of Syracuse and their subjection to the barbarian tribes around them which defeated this purpose and forced them to abandon these institutions, much against their will. 8 Again, subsequently, when the Lacedaemonians were unexpectedly defeated at Leuctra, and the Thebans, as unexpectedly, claimed the hegemony of Greece, great uncertainty prevailed in the whole country and especially among these two peoples, the Lacedaemonians not acknowledging their defeat, and the Thebans not wholly believing in their victory. 9 They, however, referred the points in dispute to the Achaeans alone among all the Greeks, 10 not taking their power into consideration, for they were then almost the weakest state in Greece, but in view of their trustworthiness and high character in every respect. For indeed this opinion of them was at that time, as is generally acknowledged, held by all.

p341 11 Up to now, these principles of government had merely existed amongst them, but had resulted in no practical steps worthy of mention for the increase of the Achaean power, 12 since the country seemed unable to produce a statesman worthy of those principles, anyone who showed a tendency to act so being thrown into the dark and hampered either by the Lacedaemonian power or still more by that of Macedon. 40 When, however, in due time, they found statesmen capable of enforcing them, their power at once became manifest, and the League achieved the splendid result of uniting all the Peloponnesian states. 2 Aratus of Sicyon should be regarded as the initiator and conceiver of the project; it was Philopoemen of Megalopolis who promoted and finally realized it, while Lycortas[8] and his party were those who assured the permanency, for a time at least, of this union. 3 I will attempt to indicate how and at what date each of the three contributed to the result, without transgressing the limits I have set to this part of my work. 4 Aratus' government, however, will be dealt with here and in future quite summarily, as he published a truthful and clearly written memoir of his own career; 5 but the achievements of the two others will be narrated in greater detail and at more length. I think it will be easiest for myself to set forth the narrative and for my readers to follow it if I begin from the period when, after the dissolution of the Achaean League by the kings of Macedonia, the cities began again to approach each other with a view to its renewal. 6 Henceforward the League continued to grow until p343it reached in my own time the state of completion I have just been describing.

41 It was in the 124th Olympiad that Patrae and Dyme took the initiative, by entering into a league, 2 just about the date of the deaths of Ptolemy son of Lagus, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy Ceraunus, which all occurred in this Olympiad. 3 The condition of the Achaean nation before this date had been more or less as follows. 4 Their first king was Tisamenus the son of Orestes, who, when expelled fromSparta on the return of the Heraclidae, occupied Achaea, and they continued to be ruled by kings of his house down to Ogygus. 5 Being dissatisfied with the rule of Ogygus' sons, which was despotical and not constitutional, they changed their government to a democracy.6 After this, down to the reigns of Alexander and Philip, their fortunes varied according to circumstances, but they always endeavoured, as I said, to keep their League a democracy. 7 This consisted of twelve cities, which still all exist with the exception of Olenus and of Helice which was engulfed by the sea a little before the battle of Leuctra. 8 These cities are Patrae, Dyme, Pharae, Tritaea, Leontium, Aegium, Aegira, Pellene, Bura, and Caryneia. 9 After the time of Alexander and previous to the above Olympiad they fell, chiefly thanks to the kings of Macedon, into such a state of p345discord and ill-feeling that all the cities separated from the League and began to act against each others' interests. 10 The consequence was that some of them were garrisoned by Demetrius and Cassander and afterwards by Antigonus Gonatas, and some even had tyrants imposed on them by the latter, who planted more monarchs in Greece than any other king. 11 But, as I said above, about the 124th Olympiad they began to repent and form fresh leagues. (This was about the date of Pyrrhus' crossing to Italy.)12 The first cities to do so were Dyme, Patrae, Tritaea, and Pharae, and for this reason we do not even find any formal inscribed record of their adherence to the League. 13 About five years afterwards the people of Aegium expelled their garrison and joined the League, and the Burians were the next to do so, after putting their tyrant to death. 14 Caryneia joined almost at the same time, for Iseas, its tyrant, when he saw the garrison expelled from Aegium, and the monarch of Bura killed by Margus and the Achaeans, and war just about to be made on himself by all the towns round, 15 abdicated and, on receiving an assurance from the Achaeans that his life would be spared, added his city to the League.

42 Why, the reader will ask, do I go back to these times? It is, firstly, to show which of the original Achaean cities took the first steps to re-form the League and at what dates, 2 and, secondly, that my assertion regarding their political principle may p347be confirmed by the actual evidence of facts. 3 What I asserted was that the Achaeans always followed one single policy, ever attracting others by the offer of their own equality and liberty and ever making war on and crushing those who either themselves or through the kings attempted to enslave their native cities, and that, in this manner and pursuing this purpose, they accomplished their task in part unaided and in part with the help of allies. 4 For the

Achaean political principle must be credited also with the results furthering their end, to which their allies in subsequent years contributed. 5 Though they took so much part in the enterprises of others, and especially in many of those of the Romans which resulted brilliantly, they never showed the least desire to gain any private profit from their success, 6 but demanded, in exchange for the zealous aid they rendered their allies, nothing beyond the liberty of all states and the union of the Peloponnesians. 7 This will be more clearly evident when we come to see the League in active operation.

56 Since, among those authors who were contemporaries of Aratus, Phylarchus, who on many points is at variance and in contradiction with him, is by some received as trustworthy, 2 it will be useful or rather necessary for me, as I have chosen to rely on Aratus' narrative for the history of the Cleomenic p377war, not to leave the question of their relative credibility undiscussed, so that truth and falsehood in their writings may no longer be of equal authority. 3 In general Phylarchus through his whole work makes many random and careless statements; 4 but while perhaps it is not necessary for me at present to criticize in detail the rest of these, I must minutely examine such as relate to events occurring in the period with which I am now dealing, that of the Cleomenic war. 5 This partial examination will however be quite sufficient to convey an idea of the general purpose and character of his work. 6 Wishing, for instance, to insist on the cruelty of Antigonus and the Macedonians and also on that of Aratus the Achaeans, he tells us that the Mantineans, when they surrendered, were exposed to terrible sufferings and that such were the misfortunes that overtook this, the most ancient and greatest city in Arcadia, as to impress deeply and move to tears all the Greeks. 7 In his eagerness to arouse the pity and attention of his readers he treats us to a picture of clinging women[9] with their hair dishevelled and their breasts bare, or again of crowds of both sexes together with their children and aged parents weeping and lamenting as they are led away to slavery. 8 This sort of thing he keeps up throughout his history, always trying to bring horrors vividly before our eyes. 9 Leaving aside the ignoble and womanish character of such a treatment of his subject, let us consider how far it is proper or serviceable to history. 10 A historical author should not try to thrill his readers by such exaggerated pictures, nor should he, like a tragic p379poet, try to imagine the probable utterances of his characters or reckon up all the consequences probably incidental to the occurrences with which he deals, but simply record what really happened and what really was said, however commonplace. 11 For the object of tragedy is not the same as that of history but quite the opposite. The tragic poet should thrill and charm his audience for the moment by the verisimilitude of the words he puts into his characters' mouths, but it is the task of the historian to instruct and convince for all time serious students by the truth of the facts and the speeches he narrates, 12 since

in the one case it is the probable that takes precedence, even if it be untrue, in the other it is the truth, the purpose being to confer benefit on learners. 13 Apart from this, Phylarchus simply narrates most of such catastrophes and does not even suggest their causes or the nature of these causes, without which it is impossible in any case to feel either legitimate pity or proper anger. 14 Who, for instance, does not think it an outrage for a free man to be beaten? but if this happen to one who was the first to resort to violence, we consider that he got only his desert, while where it is done for the purpose of correction or discipline, those who strike free men are not only excused but deemed worthy of thanks and praise. 15 Again, to kill a citizen is considered the greatest of crimes and that deserving the highest penalty, but obviously he who kills a thief or adulterer is left untouched, and the slayer of a traitor or tyrant everywhere meets with honour and distinction.[10] 16 So in every such case the final criterion p381of good and evil lies not in what is done, but in the different reasons and different purposes of the doer.

# Fragments of Book VIII

## I. From the Preface

1 It appears to me not to be foreign to my general purpose and original plan to call the attention of my readers to the vast scope of operations of the two states Rome and Carthage, and the diligence with which they pursued their purposes. 2 For who can help admiring the way in which, although they had on their hands such a serious war for the possession of Italy, and another no less serious for the possession of Spain, and though they were in each case both of them quite uncertain as to their prospects of success and in an equally perilous position, 3 they were yet by no means content with the undertakings on which they were thus engaged, but disputed likewise the possession of Sardinia and Sicily, not only entertaining hopes of conquest all the world over, but laying in supplies and making preparations for the purpose? 4 It is indeed when we come to look into the details that our admiration is fully aroused". The Romans had two complete armies for the defence of Italy under the two consuls and two others in Spain, the land forces there being commanded by Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio and the fleet by Publius Cornelius Scipio; 5 and of course the p449same was the case with the Carthaginians. 6 But besides this a Roman fleet lay off the coast of Greece to observe the movements of Philip, commanded first by Marcus Valerius and later by Publius Sulpicius, while at the same time Appius with a hundred quinqueremes and Marcus Claudius Marcellus with a land force protected their interests in Sicily, Hamilcar doing the same on the part of the Carthaginians.

2 I consider that a statement I often made at the outset of this work thus receives confirmation from actual facts, 2 I mean my assertion that it is impossible to get from writers who deal in particular episodes a general view of the whole process of history. 3 For

how by the bare reading of events in Sicily or in Spain can we hope to learn and understand either the magnitude of the occurrences or the thing of greatest moment, what means and what form of government Fortune has employed to accomplish the most surprising feat she has performed in our times, that is, to bring all the known parts of the world under one rule and dominion, a thing absolutely without precedent? 5 For how the Romans took Syracuse and how they occupied Spain may possibly be learnt from the perusal of such particular histories; 6 but how they attained to universal empire and what particular circumstances obstructed their grand design, or again how and at what time circumstances contributed to its execution is difficult to discern without a general history. 7 Nor for the same reason is it easy otherwise to perceive the greatness of their achievements and the value of their system of polity. 8 It would not be surprising in itself thatp451the Romans had designs on Spain and Sicily and made military and naval expeditions to these two countries; 9 but when we realize how at the same time that these projects and countless others were being carried out by the government of a single state, this same people who had all this on their hands were exposed in their own country to wars and other perils, then only will the events appear in their just light and really call forth admiration, and only thus are they likely to obtain the attention they deserve. 11 So much for those who suppose that by a study of separate histories they will become familiar with the general history of the world as a whole.

# III. Affairs of Greece, Philip, and Messenia

8 Upon arriving at Messene Philip proceeded to devastate the country like an enemy acting from passion rather than from reason. 2 For he expected, apparently, that while he continued to inflict injuries, the sufferers would never feel any resentment or hatred towards him.

3 What induced me to give a more explicit account of these matters in this and the previous Book, was, in addition to the reasons I above stated, the fact that while some authors have left the occurrences in Messenia unnoticed 4 others, owing either to their regard for the kings or their fear of them, have explained to us unreservedly, that not only did the outrages committed by Philip against the Messenians in defiance of divine or human law deserve no censure, but that on the contrary all his acts were p465to be regarded as praiseworthy achievements. 5 It is not only with regard to the Messenians that we find the historians of Philip's life to be thus biased but in other cases,6 the result being that their works much more resemble panegyrics than histories. 7 My own opinion is that we should neither revile nor extol kings falsely, as has so often been done, but always give an account of them consistent with our previous statements and in accord with the character of each. 8 It may be said that it is easy enough to say this but exceedingly difficult to do it, because there are so many and various conditions and circumstances in life, yielding to

which men are prevented from uttering or writing their real opinions.9 Bearing this in mind we must pardon these writers in some cases, but in others we should not.
9 In this respect Theopompus is one of the writers who is most to blame. At the outset of his history of Philip, son of Amyntas, he states that what chiefly induced him to undertake this work was that Europe had never produced such a man before as this Philip; 2 and yet immediately afterwards in his preface and throughout the book he shows him to have been first so incontinent about women, that as far as in him lay he ruined his own home by his passionate and ostentatious addiction to this kind of thing; 3 next a most wicked and mischievous man in his schemes for forming friendships and alliances; thirdly, one who had enslaved and betrayed a large number of cities by force or fraud; 4 and lastly, one so addicted to strong drink p467that he was frequently seen by his friends manifestly drunk in broad daylight.5 Anyone who chooses to read the beginning of his forty-ninth Book will be amazed at the extravagance of this writer. Apart from other things, he has ventured to write as follows. I set down the passage in his own words: 6 "Philip's court in Macedonia was the gathering-place of all the most debauched and brazen-faced characters in Greece or abroad, who were there styled the king's companions. 7 For Philip in general showed no favour to men of good repute who were careful of their property, but those he honoured and promoted were spendthrifts who passed their time drinking and gambling. 8 In consequence he not only encouraged them in their vices, but made them past masters in every kind of wickedness and lewdness. 9 Was there anything indeed disgraceful and shocking that they did not practise, and was there anything good and creditable that they did not leave undone? Some of them used to shave their bodies and make them smooth although they were men, and others actually practised lewdness with each other though bearded. 10 While carrying about two or three minions with them they served others in the same capacity, so that we would be justified in calling them not courtiers but courtesans and not soldiers but strumpets. 12 For being by nature man-slayers they became by their practices man-whores. 13 In a word," he continues, "not to be prolix, and especially as I am beset by such a deluge of other matters, my opinion is that those who were called Philip's friends and companions were worse brutes p469and of a more beastly disposition than the Centaurs who established themselves on Pelion, or those Laestrygones who dwelt in the plain of Leontini, or any other monsters."
10 Everyone must disapprove of such bitter feeling and lack of restraint on the part of this writer. 2 For not only does he deserve blame for using language which contradicts his statement of the object he had in writing, but for falsely accusing the king and his friends, and especially for making this false accusation in coarse and unbecoming terms. 3 If he had been writing of Sardanapalus or one of his companions he would hardly have dared to use such foul language; and we all know the principles and the debauched character of that king4 from the epigram on his tomb:

Mine are they yet
the meats I ate,
my wanton sport above,
the joy of love.

5 But in speaking of Philip and his friends not only would one hesitate to accuse them of cowardice, effeminacy, and shamelessness to boot, but on the contrary if one set oneself the task of singing their praises one could scarcely find terms adequate to characterize their bravery, industry, and in general the virtue of these men 6 who indisputably by their energy and daring raised Macedonia from the rank of a petty kingdom to that of the greatest and most glorious monarchy in the world. 7 Quite apart from what was accomplished during Philip's lifetime, the success achieved after Philip's death by the aid of Alexander indisputably established in the eyes of p471all their reputations for valour. 8 While we should perhaps give Alexander, as commander-in-chief, the credit for much, notwithstanding his extreme youth, we should assign no less to his co-operators and friends, 9 who defeated the enemy in many marvellous battles, exposed themselves often to extraordinary toil, danger, and hardship, and after possessing themselves of vast wealth and unbounded resources for satisfying every desire, neither suffered in a single case any impairment of their physical powers, nor even to gratify their passion were guilty of malpractices and licentiousness; 10 but all of them, one may say, proved themselves indeed to be kingly men by virtue of their magnanimity, self-restraint, and courage, as long as they lived with Philip and afterwards with Alexander. It is unnecessary to mention anyone by name. 11 And after the death of Alexander, when they disputed the empire of the greater part of the world, they left a record so glorious in numerous memoirs that while we may allow that Timaeus' bitter invective against Agathocles, the ruler of Sicily, however unmeasured it may seem, is justified — for he is accusing him as an enemy, a bad man, and a tyrant — that of Theopompus does not deserve serious consideration. 11 For after announcing that he was going to write about a king richly endowed by nature with every quality that makes for virtue, he charges him with everything that is shameful and atrocious. 2 So that either this author must be a liar and a flatterer in the prefatory remarks at the outset of his history, or he is entirely foolish and childish in his assertions p473about particulars, imagining that by senseless and far-fetched abuse he will insure his own credit and gain acceptance for his laudatory estimate of Philip.

3 Again, no one could approve of the general scheme of this writer. Having set himself the task of writing the history of Greece from the point at which Thucydides leaves off, just when he was approaching the battle of Leuctra and the most brilliant period of Greek history, he abandoned Greece and her efforts, and changing his plan decided to write the history of Philip. 4 Surely it would have been much more dignified and fairer to include Philip's achievements in the history of Greece than to include the history of Greece in that

of Philip. 5 For not even a man preoccupied by his devotion to royalty would, if he had the power and had found a suitable occasion, have hesitated to transfer the leading part and title of his work to Greece; and no one in his sound senses who had begun to write the history of Greece and had made some progress in it would have exchanged this for the more pompous biography of a king. 6 What can it have been which forced Theopompus to overlook such flagrant inconsistencies, if it were not that in writing the one history his motive was to do good, in writing that of Philip to further his own interests? 7 Possibly indeed as regards this error in changing the scheme of the work he might have found something to say for himself, if anyone had questioned him, 8 but as for the foul language he uses about Philip's friends I think he would hardly have been able to defend himself, but would have admitted that he sinned gravely against propriety. . . .

# Fragments of Book IX

## I. From the Preface

1 These are the principal events included in the above-mentioned Olympiad, that is in the space of four years which we term an Olympiad, and I shall attempt to narrate them in two Books. 2 I am not unaware that my work owing to the uniformity of its composition has a certain severity, and will suit the taste and gain the approval of only one class of reader. 3 For nearly all other writers, or at least most of them, by dealing with every branch of history, attract many kinds of people to the perusal of their works. 4 The genealogical side appeals to those who are fond of a story, and the account of colonies, the foundation of cities, and their ties of kindred, such as we find, for instance, in Ephorus, attracts the curious and lovers of recondite longer, 5 while the student of politics is interested in the doings of nations, cities, and monarchs. As I have confined my attention strictly to these last matters and as my whole work treats of nothing else, it is, as I say, adapted only to one sort of reader, and its p5perusal will have no attractions for the larger number. 6 I have stated elsewhere at some length my reason for choosing to exclude other branches of history and chronicle actions alone, but there is no harm in briefly reminding my readers of it here in order to impress it on them.

2 Since genealogies, myths, the planting of colonies, the foundations of cities and their ties of kinship have been recounted by many writers and in many different styles, 2 an author who undertakes at the present day to deal with these matters must either represent the work of others as being his own, a most disgraceful proceeding, or if he refuses to do this, must manifestly toil to no purpose, being constrained to avow that the matters on which he writes and to which he devotes his attention have been adequately narrated and handed down to posterity by previous authors. So omitting these things for the above and various other reasons, I decided on writing a history of actual events; firstly, because there is always

some novelty to them which demands novel treatment — since it was not in the power of the ancients to narrate events subsequent to their own time — and secondly, owing to the great practical utility of such a history, both formerly and especially at the present day, when the progress of the arts and sciences has been so rapid, that those who study history are, we may almost say, provided with a method for dealing with any contingency that may arise. 6 My aim, therefore, being not so much to entertain readers as to benefit those who pay careful attention, I disregarded other matters and was led to write this kind of history. 7 The best testimony to the p7truth of what I say will be that of those who study this work with due application.

## The Character of Hannibal

22 Of all that befel both nations, Romans and p51Carthaginians, the cause was one man and one mind — Hannibal. 2 It was he indisputably who had the management of the Italian campaign, and he also directed that in Spain through his elder brother Hasdrubal and afterwards through Mago, 3 these being the generals who killed the two Roman commanders in that country. 4 Besides this he managed affairs in Sicily, first of all through Hippocrates and subsequently through Myttonus the African, and he was likewise active in Greece and Illyria, threatening the Romans from these parts and keeping them alarmed and distracted by his understanding with Philip. 6 Such a great and wonderful product of nature is a man with a mind properly fitted by its original constitution to execute any project within human power.

7 But since the course of affairs has called our attention to the character of Hannibal, I think I am called upon at present to state my opinion regarding those peculiar traits in it which are the subject of most dispute. 8 For some accuse him of excessive cruelty and others of avarice. Now it is no easy thing to state the truth about him or in general about men who are engaged in public affairs. 9 For some say that men's real natures are revealed by circumstances, the truth being in the case of some brought to light by possession of power, even if they have hitherto managed to disguise it entirely, and in that of others by misfortune. 10 But I cannot myself regard this view as sound. For it appears to me that not in a few cases only but in most cases men are compelled to p53act and speak contrary to their real principles by the complexity of facts and by the suggestions of their friends. 23 There are many previous instances a consideration of which will show that this is so. 2 Take Agathocles the tyrant of Sicily. Do not all historians tell us that after showing himself exceedingly cruel in his first enterprises and in the establishment of his power, afterwards, when once he thought that he had securely attached the Sicilians to his rule, he became to all appearance the gentlest and mildest of men? 3 Again, was not Cleomenes of Sparta at once a most excellent king and a most cruel tyrant, and then again in private intercourse most urbane and courteous? 4 Now we can hardly suppose that dispositions so diametrically opposite existed in the same natures. The fact is rather that some princes are

compelled to change with the change of circumstances and often exhibit to others a disposition which is quite the opposite of their real nature, so that so far from men's natures being revealed by such means they are rather obscured. 5 And a like effect is usually produced by the suggestions of friends not only on generals, princes, and kings but on cities. 6 At Athens at least we find that during the government of Aristides and Pericles the state was the author of few cruel actions, but of many kind and praiseworthy ones, while under Cleon and Chares it was quite the reverse; 7 and again when the Lacedaemonians were supreme in Greece, all that King Cleombrotus did was done in the spirit of friendly alliance, but it was the reverse with Agesilaus; 8 so that the character of cities also changes with that of those who govern them. 9 And so with King Philip, when he had Taurion and Demetrius p55to act with him he was most wicked, but when he had Aratus and Chrysogonus he was most gentle.

24 It was very much the same, I think, with Hannibal. 2 He had to deal with circumstances of such an exceptional and complex nature, and his nearest friends differed so widely in character, that from his actions when in Italy it is very difficult to discover the man's real nature.3 As for what was due to the promptings of circumstance, that can easily be learnt from my preceding narrative and that which is to follow, but we must not ignore what he owed to the suggestions of his friends, especially as it is possible to get a very adequate notion of their nature from one single piece of advice. 4 At the time when Hannibal contemplated marching on Italy from Spain with his army, it was foreseen that he would be very hard put to it to feed the troops and keep them constantly provided with supplies, the difficulties of the march seeming almost insuperable both owing to the distance and to the numbers and savage character of the barbarous inhabitants of the intervening countries. 5 It seems that the difficulty was more than once discussed in the Council, and that one of Hannibal's friends, Hannibal surnamed Monomachus (gladiator), stated that he foresaw only one way by which it would be possible to reach Italy. 6 When Hannibal asked him to explain himself, he said he must teach his troops to eat human flesh and accustom them to this. . . 7 Hannibal had nothing to say against the boldness and usefulness of this suggestion, but he could persuade neither himself nor his friends actually to entertain it. 8 They say that the acts of cruelty in p57Italy of which Hannibal is accused were the work of this man, but in no less degree that of circumstances.

25 He does indeed seem to have been exceedingly fond of money, and so was his friend Mago who commanded in Bruttium. 2 I have been told about this matter both by Carthaginians themselves — for the natives of a place do not only know best, as the saying is, the direction of the wind, but the character of their compatriots — and more in detail by Massanissa, when he discoursed on the love of money displayed by Carthaginians in general and especially by Hannibal and by this Mago who was known as the Samnite. 5 Among other things he told me that while these two men had from their earliest

youth most generously shared all kinds of enterprises with each other and had each taken many cities both in Spain and Italy by force or by betrayal, on no single occasion had they both participated in the same enterprise, but had always manoeuvred more carefully against each other than against the enemy, so that the one should not be present when the other took a city, to avoid any differences arising between them from such causes and any sharing in the profits as they were of equal rank.

26 But that it was not only the suggestions of friends that changed and did violence to Hannibal's real nature but also the force of circumstances clearly appears from my narrative, both that which precedes and that which is to follow. 2 On Capua falling into the hands of the Romans all the other p59cities naturally began to waver in their allegiance, and were on the look-out for pretexts and occasions for going over to Rome. 3 Hannibal seems at this crisis to have been in great difficulty and doubt as to how to deal with the situation. 4 For he was neither able to keep watch over all the cities, far distant as they were from each other, if he started himself at one spot, with several hostile armies ready to intercept his movements, nor was he able to subdivide his force much, as he would then be easily overcome by the enemy owing to numerical inferiority and the impossibility of his being personally present everywhere. 6 He was therefore obliged to abandon openly some of the cities and to withdraw his garrisons from others, from fear lest if they transferred their allegiance he should lose his own soldiers as well. 7 In some cases he even allowed himself to violate the treaties he had made, transferring the inhabitants to other towns and giving up their property to plunder, thereby causing such offence that he was accused both of impiety and cruelty. 9 For as a fact these measures were accompanied by robbery of money, murders, and violence on no matter what pretext at the hands both of the departing and the incoming troops, everybody acting on the supposition that the citizens who were left behind were just on the point of joining the enemy. 10 All this makes it very difficult of pronounce an opinion on the real nature of Hannibal, as we have to allow for the influence of his friends and the force of circumstances. 11 But at any rate among the Carthaginians he was notorious for his love of money and among the Romans for his cruelty.

# VII. Affairs of Greece

## Speeches of Chlaeneas the Aetolian and Lyciscus the Acarnanian at Sparta

28 "Men of Lacedaemon, I am convinced indeed that no one would venture to deny that the slavery of Greece owes its origin to the kings of Macedon, 2 but the matter may be looked at thus. There was once a group of Greek cities in Thrace founded by the Athenian and Chalcidians, of which Olynthus was the most eminent and powerful. 3 Philip, by selling its inhabitants into slavery and making an example of it, not only obtained possession of the Thracian cities, but intimidated the Thessalians into submission 4 When, shortly afterwards,

he had defeated p67the Athenians in a battle he made a generous use of his success, not with the object of benefiting the Athenians, far from it, but in order that his kindness to them might induce others to obey his orders without resistance. 5 The prestige of your city still survived then and it seemed as if in time you would be the leading power in Greece. 6 Consequently, alleging as sufficient any pretext that offered itself, he came here with his army and inflicted great damage, cutting the crops and trees and burning the homesteads, and finally partitioning your cities and your territory, he signed part of it to the Argives, part to the Tegeans and Megalopolitans, and part to the Messenians, wishing to confer ill-merited benefits on all of them if by doing so he could only damage you. 8 He was succeeded by Alexander. That king again, because he thought there was left in Thebes a little spark of the Greece that once was, destroyed that city in the manner that you all, I take it, know.

29 "And as for the successors of Alexander, need I tell you in detail how they have they treated the Greeks? 2 For no one is so indifferent to facts as not to have heard how Antipater after his victory over the Greeks at Lamia treated the unhappy Athenians as well as the other Greeks in the harshest manner, going so far in his wanton and lawless violence as to appoint and send round to the different cities exile-hunters to catch those who had opposed or in any way offended the royal house of Macedon. 4 Some forcibly driven out of the temples and others dragged p69from the altars perished by torture, while those who escaped were expelled from the whole of Greece, having no single place of refuge except the territory of the Aetolian League. 5 And who is ignorant of the actions of Cassander, Demetrius, and Antigonus Gonatas, all so recent that the memory of them is quite vivid? 6 Some of them by introducing garrisons to cities and others by planting tyrannies left no city with the right to call itself unenslaved. 7 Leaving them aside, I will now pass to the last Antigonus, in case any of you, regarding his action without suspicion, consider themselves under a debt of gratitude to the Macedonians. 8 It was not for the purpose of saving the Achaeans that Antigonus undertook the war against you, nor because he disapproved of the tyranny of Cleomenes and desired to save Sparta. 9 If anyone entertains such a notion he must be very simple-minded. 10 But seeing that his own power would not be safe if you acquired the supremacy in the Peloponnesus, that Cleomenes was just the man to effect this and that Fortune was working for you splendidly, he came here actuated both by fear and envy, not to have the Peloponnesians but to cut short your hopes and humiliate your prestige. 12 So instead of affection for the Macedonians because they did not plunder your city when masters of it, you should consider them your enemies and hate them for preventing you more than once when you had the power of attaining supremacy in Greece.

30 "And regarding Philip's offences why need I speak more? 2 As for his impiety to heaven it is sufficient to cite his outrages on the temples at Thermi, and as for his cruelty to men

I need but mention his perfidy and treachery to the Messenians. . . . 3 For the Aetolians alone among the Greeks dared to face Antipater and demand security for the unfortunate victims of his injustice, they alone withstood the attack of Brennus and his barbarians, and they alone when called upon 4 came to fight by your side and help you recover your hereditary position of supremacy.

5 "I have spoken at some length on this subject, but as regards the present deliberation one may say that while it is necessary to draw up your decree and to vote as if you were deciding on war, as a matter of fact you need not look on this as war. 6 So far from the Achaeans being able to inflict any damage on your territory, I fancy they will be only too grateful to the gods if they can protect their own when encircled by foes, the Eleans and Messenians attacking them on one side owing to their alliance with us, and ourselves on the other. 7 As for Philip, I feel sure that his aggressiveness will soon cease with the Aetolians fighting him on land and the Romans and King Attalus at sea. 8 It is indeed very easy to conjecture what will happen from the past. 9 For if when he was at war with the Aetolians alone he was never able to subdue them, how with this combination against him will he be able to support the present war?

## XXII. HAMILCAR.

### FROM THE FIRST BOOK OF CORNELIUS NEPOS.

I. HAMILCAR the Carthaginian, the son of Hannibal, and surnamed Barcas, began in the first Punic war, but towards the end of it, to hold the command of the army in Sicily; and though, before his coming, the efforts of the Carthaginians were unsuccessful both by sea and land, he, after he arrived, never gave way to the enemy,[226] or afforded them any opportunity of doing him harm, but, on the contrary, often attacked the foe when occasion presented itself, and always came off with the advantage. Afterwards, though the Carthaginians had lost almost every place in Sicily, he so ably defended Eryx, [227] that there seemed to be no war going on there. In the meantime, the Carthaginians, having been defeated at sea, near the islands called Aegates,[228] by Caius Lutatius, the Roman consul, resolved on putting an end to the war, and left the settlement of the matter to the judgment of Hamilcar, who, though he ardently desired to continue in arms, thought it, nevertheless, necessary to submit to make peace, because he saw that his country, exhausted by the expenses of the war, was no longer in a condition to bear the pressure of it; but such was his feeling on the occasion, that he soon meditated, if the affairs of his country should be but in a small degree improved, to resume the war, and to pursue the Romans with hostilities, until they should indisputably obtain the mastery, or, being conquered, should make submission. With this resolution he concluded a peace, but showed such a spirit in the

transaction, that when Catulus refused to desist from hostilities unless Hamilcar, with such of his men as were in |416 possession of Eryx, should lay down their arms and quit Sicily, Hamilcar replied, that, though his country submitted, he himself would rather perish on the spot than return home under such disgrace, for that it was not consistent with his spirit to resign to his enemies arms which he had received from his country as a defence against enemies.

II. Catulus yielded to his resolution. But Hamilcar, when he arrived at Carthage, found the republic in a far different condition than he had expected; for, through the long continuance of foreign troubles, so violent a rebellion had broken out at home, that Carthage was never in such danger, except when it was actually destroyed. In the first place, the mercenary troops, who had served against the Romans, and the number of whom amounted to twenty thousand, revolted; and these drew the whole of Africa over to their side, and laid siege to Carthage itself. With these disasters the Carthaginians were so much alarmed, that they requested aid even from the Romans, and obtained it. But at last, when they were almost sunk into despair, they made Hamilcar general, who not only repulsed the enemy from the walls of Carthage, though they amounted to a hundred thousand men in arms, but reduced them to such a condition, that being shut up in a confined space, they perished in greater numbers by famine than by the sword. All the towns that had revolted, and among them Utica and Hippo, the strongest cities of all Africa, he brought back to their allegiance to his country. Nor was he satisfied with these successes, but extended even the bounds of the Carthaginian empire, and re-established such tranquillity through all Africa, that there seemed to have been no war in it for many years.

III. These objects being executed according to his desire, he then, by dint of a spirit confident and incensed against the Romans, contrived, in order more easily to find a pretext for going to war with them, to be sent as commander-in-chief with an army into Spain, and took with him thither his son Hannibal, then nine years old. There also accompanied him a young man named Hasdrubal, a person of high birth and great beauty, who, as some said, was beloved by Hamilcar with less regard to his character than was becoming; for so great a man could not fail to have slanderers. Hence it happened that Hasdrubal was forbidden by the censor of public morals |417 to associate with him; but Hamilcar then gave him his daughter in marriage, because, according to their usages, a son-in-law could not be interdicted the society of his father-in-law. We have inserted this notice of Hasdrubal, because, after Hamilcar was killed, he took the command of the army, and achieved great exploits; and he was also the first that corrupted the ancient manners of the Carthaginians by bribery. After his death Hannibal received the command from the army.

IV. Hamilcar, however, after he had crossed the sea, and arrived in Spain, executed some great undertakings with excellent success; he subdued some very powerful and warlike nations, and supplied all Africa with horses, arms, men, and money. But as he was meditating to carry the war into Italy, in the ninth year after his arrival in Spain, he was killed in a battle with the Vettones.

His constant hatred to the Romans seems to have been the chief cause of producing the second Punic war; for Hannibal, his son, was so wrought upon by the continual instigations of his father, that he would have chosen to die rather than not make trial of the Romans.

## XXIII. HANNIBAL.

I. HANNIBAL was the son of Hamilcar, and a native of Carthage. If it be true, as no one doubts, that the Roman people excelled all other nations in warlike merit, it is not to be disputed that Hannibal surpassed other commanders in ability as much as the Romans surpassed all other people in |418 valour; for as often as he engaged with the Romans in Italy, he always came off with the advantage; and, had not his efforts been paralyzed by the envy of his countrymen at home, he would appear to have been capable of getting the mastery over the Romans. But the jealous opposition of many prevailed against the ability of one. He, however, so cherished in his mind the hatred which his father had borne the Romans, and which was left him, as it were, by bequest, that he laid down his life before he would abate it; for even when he was exiled from his country, and stood in need of support from others, he never ceased in thought to make war with the Romans.

II. To say nothing of Philip,[229] whom he rendered an enemy to the Romans, though at a distance from him, Antiochus was the most powerful of all kings at that period; and him he so inflamed with a desire for war, that he endeavoured to bring troops against Italy even from the Red Sea.[230] As some ambassadors from Rome were sent to that prince, in order to gain information respecting his intentions, and to endeavour, by underhand contrivances, to render Hannibal an object of suspicion to the king (as if, being bribed by them, he entertained other sentiments than before); and as they were not unsuccessful in their attempts, and Hannibal became aware of that fact, and found himself excluded from the privy council, he went at a time appointed to the king himself, and, after having said much concerning his attachment to him and his hatred to the Romans, he added the following statement: "My father Hamilcar," said he, "when I was a very little boy, being not more than nine years old, offered sacrifices at Carthage, when he was going as commander into Spain, to Jupiter, the best and greatest of the gods; and while this religious ceremony was being performed, he asked me *whether I should like to go with him to the camp.* As I willingly

expressed my consent, and proceeded to beg him not to hesitate to take me, he replied, '*I will do so, if you will give me the promise which I ask of you.'* At the same time he led me to the altar at which he had begun to sacrifice, and, sending the rest of the company away, required me, taking hold of the altar, to swear |419 that *I would never be in friendship with the Romans,* This oath, thus taken before my father, I have so strictly kept even to this day, that no man ought to doubt but that I shall be of the same mind for the rest of my life. If, therefore, you entertain any friendly thoughts towards the Romans, you will not act imprudently if you conceal them from me; but whenever you prepare war, you will disappoint yourself unless you constitute me leader in it."

III. At this age, accordingly, he accompanied his father into Spain. After his father's death, when Hasdrubal was made general-in-chief, he had the command of all the cavalry. When Hasdrubal also was killed, the army conferred upon him the supreme command, and this act, when reported at Carthage, received public approbation.

Hannibal being thus made commander-in-chief, at the age of five-and-twenty, subdued in war, during the next three years, all the nations of Spain, took Saguntum, a city in alliance with the Romans, by storm, and collected three vast armies, of which he sent one into Africa, left another with his brother Hasdrubal in Spain, and took the third with him into Italy. He made his way through the forests of the Pyrenees,[231] he engaged, wherever he directed his course, with all the inhabitants of the country, and let none go unconquered. On arriving at the Alps, which separate Italy from Gaul, and which no one had ever crossed with an army before him, (except Hercules the Greek, from which achievement the forest there is now called the Grecian forest), he cut to pieces the people of the Alps who endeavoured to prevent his passage, laid open those parts, made roads, and put things in such a state, that an elephant fully equipped could walk where previously one unarmed man could scarcely crawl. Along this tract he led his army, and arrived in Italy.
IV. On the banks of the Rhone he engaged with the consul Publius Cornelius Scipio, and put him to flight. At the Po he fought with the same consul for the possession of Clastidium,[232] and expelled him from that place wounded and |420 defeated The same Scipio, with his colleague Tiberius Longus, came against him a third time at the Trebia; he came to battle with them, and put both of them to flight. He then passed through the country of the Ligurians over the chain of the Apennnines, directing his course towards Etruria. During this march he was afflicted with so violent a distemper in his eyes, that he never had the use of his right eye so well afterwards. But even when he was troubled with this malady, and carried in a litter, he cut off Caius Flaminius the consul at the lake Trasimenus, being caught with his army in an ambush; and not long after he killed the praetor Caius Centenius, who was occupying the forest with a choice body of troops. He then proceeded into Apulia, where the two consuls, Caius Terentius Varro, and Paulus

Aemilius, met him, both of whose armies he routed in one battle; the consul Paulus he killed, with several others of consular dignity, and among them Cnaeus Servilius Geminus, who had been consul the year before.

V. After fighting this battle, he marched towards Rome, nobody opposing him, and halted on the hills near the city. When he had lain encamped there some days, and was turning back towards Capua, Quintus Fabius Maximus, the Roman dictator, threw himself in his way in the Falernian territory. Here, though enclosed in a confined space, he extricated himself without any loss to his army. He deceived Fabius, a most skilful commander; for, when night had come on, he set fire to some bundles of twigs, tied upon the horns of oxen, and drove forward a vast number of those cattle, scattering themselves hither and thither. By presenting this object suddenly to their view,[233] he struck such terror into the army of the Romans, that nobody ventured to stir beyond the rampart. Not many days after this success, he put to flight Marcus Minucius Rufus, master of the horse, who was equal in power with the dictator, and who had been drawn into an engagement by a stratagem. While he was at |421 a distance, too, he cut off [234] Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, consul for the second time, in the country of the Lucanians, after he had been inveigled into an ambush. In like manner he caused the death of Marcus Claudius Marcellus, consul for the fifth time, at Venusia. To enumerate his battles would occupy too much time; and this one observation, accordingly, (from which it will be understood how great a general he was), will be sufficient, that, as long as he continued in Italy, none made a stand against him in a regular engagement, none, after the battle of Cannae, pitched a camp against him in the field.

VI. Being recalled, without having suffered any defeat, to defend his country, he maintained a war with the son of that Publius Scipio whom he had routed first on the Rhone, again on the Po, and a third time on the Trebia. As the resources of his country were now exhausted, he wished, by a treaty with him, to put a stop to the war for a time, in order that he might engage in it afterwards with greater vigour. He came to a conference with him, but the conditions were not agreed upon. A few days after this meeting, he came to battle with Scipio at Zama; and being defeated (incredible to relate! ) he made his way to Adrumetum, which is about three hundred miles [235] from Zama, in two days and two nights. In the course of his retreat, some Numidians, who had left the field in his company, formed a conspiracy against him; however he not only escaped them, but deprived them of life. At Adrumetum he assembled those who had survived the defeat, and, with the aid of new levies, drew together, in a few days, a numerous force.

VII. While he was most vigorously engaged in preparing for action, the Carthaginians made an end of the war by a treaty with the Romans. He had nevertheless afterwards the command of the army, and continued to act, as well as his brother Mago, in Africa, until the time when Publius Sulpicius and Caius Aurelius became consuls; for, during their term of

office, ambassadors from Carthage went to Rome, to thank the Roman senate and people for having made peace with |422 them, and to present them, on that account, with a crown of gold, requesting, at the same time, that their hostages might reside at Fregellae,[236] and that their prisoners might be restored. An answer was made them, by a resolution of the senate, that "their present was acceptable and welcome, and that their hostages should live in the place which they desired, but that they would not restore the prisoners, because the Carthaginians retained Hannibal, by whose acts the war had been occasioned, and who was the bitterest of enemies to the name of Rome, in command of the army, as also his brother Mago." The Carthaginians, on hearing this answer, recalled Hannibal and Mago home. When he returned, he was made praetor, [237] in the two-and-twentieth year after he had been appointed king; [238] for, as consuls are elected at Rome, so, at Carthage, two kings are annually chosen, retaining their office for a year. In that post Hannibal conducted himself with the same activity as he had exhibited in war; for he took care, not only that there should be money raised from new taxes, to be paid to the Romans according to the treaty, but that there should be a surplus to be deposited in the treasury.

In the year after his praetorship, when Marcus Claudius and Lucius Furius were consuls, ambassadors from Rome came again to Carthage; and Hannibal, supposing that they were sent to demand that he should be delivered to the Romans, went secretly, before an audience of the senate was given them, on board a vessel, and fled into Syria to Antiochus. His departure being made public, the Carthaginians sent two ships to seize him, if they could overtake him. His property they confiscated; his house they razed to its foundations; and himself they declared an outlaw.

VIII. In the third year, however, after he had fled from home, and in the consulship of Lucius Cornelius and Quintus Minucius, Hannibal landed with five ships in Africa, on the coast of the Cyrenaeans, to try if he could move the Carthaginians to war, by giving them hope and confidence in Antiochus, |423whom he had now persuaded to proceed with his forces to Italy. Thither he summoned his brother Mago; and, when the Carthaginians knew of the circumstance, they inflicted on Mago the same penalties as they had laid on his absent brother. When they had let loose their vessels, and sailed off, in despair of success, Hannibal went to join Antiochus. Of Mago's end two accounts have been given; for some have left on record that he perished by shipwreck, others that he was killed by his own slaves.

Antiochus, if he had been as ready to obey Hannibal's advice in conducting the war as he had resolved to be when he undertook it, might have fought for the empire of the world nearer the Tiber than Thermopylae.[239]Hannibal, however, though he saw him attempt many things imprudently, left him in nothing unsupported. He took the command of a few ships,

which he had been directed to bring from Syria into Asia, and with these he engaged the fleet of the Rhodians in the Pamphylian sea,[240] and though his men were overpowered in the struggle by the number of the enemy, he had the advantage himself in the wing in which he acted.

IX. After Antiochus was put to flight,[241] Hannibal, fearing that he should be delivered to the Romans (an event which would doubtless have come to pass, if he had given the king an opportunity of securing him), went off to the people of Gortyn, in Crete, that he might there consider in what place he should settle himself. But, as he was the most perspicacious of all men, he saw that unless he took some precautions, he should be in great danger from the covetousness of the Cretans; for he carried with him a large sum of money, of which he knew that a report had gone abroad. He therefore adopted the following contrivance; he filled several pots with lead, covering the upper part with gold and silver, and deposited them, in the presence of the leading men [242], in the temple of Diana, pretending that he trusted his fortune to |424 their honesty. Having thus deceived them, he filled the whole of some brazen statues, which he carried with him, with his money, and threw them down in an open place at his own residence. The Gortynians, meanwhile, guarded the temple with extreme care, not so much against others as against Hannibal himself, lest he should remove any thing without their knowledge, and carry it off with him.

X. The Carthaginian, having thus saved his property, and deceived all the Cretans, went into Pontus to Prusias, with whom he showed himself of the same mind as to Italy; for he did nothing but excite the king to arms, and animate him against the Romans, and seeing that he was not at all strong in domestic resources, he induced other princes to join him, and united warlike nations on his side. Eumenes, king of Pergamus, was at variance with Prusias, and war was maintained between them by sea and land, for which reason Hannibal was the more desirous that he should be crushed. Eumenes had the superiority on both elements, and Hannibal thought that, if he could but cut him off, his other projects would be easier of execution. To put an end to his life, therefore, he adopted the following stratagem. They were to engage by sea in a few days; Hannibal was inferior in number of vessels, and had to use art in the contest, as he was no match for his enemy in force. He accordingly ordered as many poisonous serpents as possible to be brought together alive, and to be put into earthen vessels, of which when he bad collected a large number, he called the officers of his ships together, on the day on which he was going to fight at sea, and directed them all to make an attack upon the single ship of King Eumenes, and to be content with simply defending themselves against others, as they might easily do with the aid of the vast number of serpents; adding that he would take care they should know in what ship Eumenes sailed, and promising that, if they took or killed him, it should be of great advantage to them.

XI. After this exhortation was given to the soldiers, the fleets were brought out for action by both parties. When the line of each was formed, and before the signal was given for battle, Hannibal, in order to show his men where Eumenes was, despatched to him a letter-carrier in a boat with a herald's staff; who, when he reached the enemy's line of |425 vessels, held out a letter, and signified that he was looking for the king; he was therefore immediately taken to Eumenes, because nobody doubted that there was something written in the letter relating to peace. The messenger, having thus made the king's ship known to his party, returned to the same place from which he had come. Eumenes, on opening the letter, found nothing in it but what was meant to ridicule him; and though he wondered as to the motive of it, and none could be discovered, yet he did not hesitate to come at once to battle. In the conflict, the Bithynians, according to the direction of Hannibal, fell all at once upon the ship of Eumenes. That prince, as he was unable to withstand their onset, sought safety in flight, but would not have found it, had he not taken refuge behind his guards, which had been posted on the neighbouring shore. As the rest of the Pergamenian ships bore hard upon the enemy, the earthen pots, of which we have previously spoken, began suddenly to be hurled into them. These, when thrown, at first excited laughter among the combatants, nor could it be conceived why such a thing was done; but when they saw their ships filled with serpents, and, startled at the strangeness of the occurrence, knew not what to avoid first, they put about their ships, and retreated to their camp upon the coast. Thus Hannibal, by his stratagem, prevailed over the force of the Pergamenians. Nor was this the only occasion; but often, at other times, he defeated the enemy with his troops on land, and with equally skilful management.

XII. While these transactions were taking place in Asia, it happened accidentally at Rome that certain ambassadors from Prusias took supper at the house of Lucius Quintius Flamininus, one of the consuls; and there, as mention was made of Hannibal, one of them observed that he was in the dominions of Prusias. This information Flamininus communicated the next day to the senate. The conscript fathers, who thought that they would never be free from plots as long as Hannibal was alive, sent ambassadors to Bithynia, and among them Flamininus, to request the king not to keep their bitterest enemy with him, but to deliver him up to them. To this embassy Prusias did not dare to give a refusal; he made some opposition, however, to one point, begging them |426 not to require of him [243] what was contrary to the rights of hospitality, saying that they themselves might make Hannibal prisoner, if they could, as they would easily find out the place where he was. Hannibal indeed confined himself to one place, living in a fortress which had been given him by the king; and this he had so constructed that it had outlets on every side of the building, always fearing lest that should happen which eventually came to pass. When the Roman ambassadors had gone thither, and had surrounded his house with a number of

men, a slave, looking out at a gate, told Hannibal that several armed men were to be seen, contrary to what was usual. Hannibal desired him to go round to all the gates of the castle, and bring him word immediately whether it was beset in the same way on all sides. The slave having soon reported how it was, and informed him, that all the passages were secured, he felt certain that it was no accidental occurrence, but that his person was menaced, and that his life was no longer to be preserved. That he might not part with it, however, at the pleasure of another, and dwelling on the remembrance of his past honours, he took poison, which he had been accustomed always to carry with him.

XIII. Thus this bravest of men, after having gone through many and various labours, found repose in the seventieth year of his age. Under what consuls he died, is not agreed; for Atticus has left it recorded in his chronicle that he ended his life in the consulship of Marcus Claudius Marcellus and Quintus Fabius Labeo; but Polybius says in that of Lucius Aemilius Paullus and Cnaeus Baebius Tamphilus; and Sulpicius in that of Publius Cornelius Cethegus and Marcus Baebius Tamphilus.

This great man, though occupied in such vast military operations, devoted some portion of his time to literature; for there are some books of his written in the Greek language, and amongst them one addressed to the Rhodians on the acts of Cnaeus Manlius Vulso in Asia.

Of the wars which he conducted many have given the history; and two of them were persons that were with him in the camp, and lived with him as long as fortune allowed, |427 Silenus and Sosilus the Lacedaemonian; and this Sosilus Hannibal had as his instructor in the Greek language. But it is now time to make an end of this book, and to give an account of commanders among the Romans, that, when the actions of both are compared, it may be the better determined which generals deserve the preference.

## XXIV. MARCUS PORCIUS CATO.

### FROM THE SECOND BOOK OF CORNELIUS NEPOS.

I. CATO,[244] born in the municipal town of Tusculum,[245] resided, when a very young man, and before he turned his attention to the attainment of office, in the territory of the Sabines, because he had an estate there which had been left him by his father. It was at the persuasion of Lucius Valerius Flaccus, whom he had for a colleague in his consulate and censorship, that he removed, as Marcus Perperna Censorius was accustomed to relate, to Rome, and proceeded to employ himself in the forum. He served his first campaign at the age of seventeen, in the consulship of Quintus Fabius Maximus and Marcus Claudius Marcellus. He was military tribune in Sicily. When he returned from thence, he attached

himself to the staff of Caius Claudius Nero, and his service was thought of great value in the battle near Sena, in which Hasdrubal, the brother of Hannibal, fell. As quaestor, he happened to be under the consul, Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, with whom he did not live according to the intimate connexion of his office; for he was at variance with him during his whole life. He was made aedile of the commons [246] with Caius Helvius. As praetor he had the province of Sardinia, from which, when he was returning |428 from Africa some time before in the character of quaestor, he had brought Quintus Ennius, the poet, an act which we value not less than the noblest triumph that Sardinia could have afforded.

II. He held the consulship with Lucius Valerius Flaccus, and had by lot Hither Spain for his province, from which he gained a triumph. As he stayed there a long time, Publius Scipio Africanus, when consul for the second time, wanted to remove him from his province, and to succeed him himself, but was unable, through the senate, to effect that object, even though he then possessed the greatest authority in the state; for the government was then conducted, not with regard for personal influence, but according to justice. Being displeased with the senate on this account, Scipio, after his consulship was ended, remained in the city as a private person.[247]

Cato, being made censor with the Flaccus above mentioned, exercised that office with severity; for he inflicted penalties on many noblemen, and introduced many new regulations into his edict,[248] by means of which luxury, which was even then beginning to germinate, might be repressed. For about eighty years,[249] from his youth to the end of his life, he never ceased to incur enmity in behalf of the commonwealth. Though attacked by many,[250] he not only suffered no loss of character, but increased in reputation for virtue as long as he lived.

III. In all his pursuits he gave proofs of singular intelligence and industry; for he was a skilful agriculturist, well-informed in political affairs, experienced in the law, an |429 eminent, commander, a respectable orator. He was also much devoted to literature, and though he had entered on the study of it at an advanced age, yet he made such progress in it, that you could not easily discover anything, either in Grecian or Italian history, that was unknown to him. From his youth he composed speeches. In his old age he began to write his Histories, of which there are ten books. The first contains the acts of the kings of Rome; the second and third show from whence each Italian state had its rise, for which reason he seems to have called the whole body of them *Origines;* in the fourth is related the first Carthaginian war; in the fifth the second; and all these subjects are treated in a summary way. Other wars he has narrated in a similar manner, down to the praetorship of Lucius Galba, who spoiled the Lusitanians. The leaders in these wars, however, he has not named, but has stated the facts without the names. In the same books

he has given an account of whatever seemed remarkable in Italy and Spain; and there are shown in them much labour and industry, and much learning.

Of his life and manners we have spoken more at large in the book which we wrote expressly concerning him at the request of Titus Pomponius Atticus; and we therefore refer those who would know Cato to that volume. |430

# Plutarch, "Comparison of Aristides with Marcus Cato"

**HAVING** mentioned the most memorable actions of these great men, if we now compare the whole life of the one with that of the other, it will not be easy to discern the difference between them, lost as it is amongst such a number of circumstances in which they resemble each other. If, however, we examine them in detail as we might some piece of poetry, or some picture, we shall find this common to them both, that they advanced themselves to great honor and dignity in the commonwealth, by no other means than their own virtue and industry. But it seems when Aristides appeared, Athens was not at its height of grandeur and plenty, the chief magistrates and officers of his time being men only of moderate and equal fortunes among themselves. The estimate of the greatest estates then, was five hundred medimns; that of the second, or knights, three hundred; of the third and last called Zeugitæ, two hundred. But Cato, out of a petty village from a country life, leaped into the commonwealth, as it were into a vast ocean; at a time when there were no such governors as the Curii, Fabricii, and Hostilii. Poor laboring men were not then advanced from the plow and spade to be governors and magistrates; but greatness of family, riches, profuse gifts, distributions, and personal application were what the city looked to; keeping a high hand, and, in a manner, insulting over those that courted preferment. It was not as great a matter to have Themistocles for an adversary, a person of mean extraction and small fortune, (for he was not worth, it is said, more than four or five talents when he first applied himself to public affairs,) as to contest with a Scipio Africanus, a Servius Galba, and a Quintius Flamininus, having no other aid but a tongue free to assert right.

Besides, Aristides at Marathon, and again at Platæa, was but one commander out of ten; whereas Cato was chosen consul with a single colleague, having many competitors, and with a single colleague, also, was preferred before seven most noble and eminent pretenders to be censor. But Aristides was never principal in any action; for Miltiades carried the day at Marathon, at Salamis Themistocles, and at Platæa, Herodotus tells us,

Pausanias got the glory of that noble victory: and men like Sophanes, and Aminias, Callimachus, and Cynægyrus, behaved themselves so well in all those engagements, as to contest it with Aristides even for the second place. But Cato not only in his consulship was esteemed the chief in courage and conduct in the Spanish war, but even whilst he was only serving as tribune at Thermopylæ, under another's command, he gained the glory of the victory, for having, as it were, opened a wide gate for the Romans to rush in upon Antiochus, and for having brought the war on his back, whilst he only minded what was before his face. For that victory, which was beyond dispute all Cato's own work, cleared Asia out of Greece, and by that means made way afterwards for Scipio into Asia. Both of them, indeed, were always victorious in war; but at home Aristides stumbled, being banished and oppressed by the faction of Themistocles; yet Cato, notwithstanding he had almost all the chief and most powerful of Rome for his adversaries, and wrestled with them even to his old age, kept still his footing. Engaging also in many public suits, sometimes plaintiff, sometimes defendant, he cast the most, and came off clear with all; thanks to his eloquence, that bulwark and powerful instrument to which more truly, than to chance or his fortune, he owed it, that he sustained himself unhurt to the last. Antipater justly gives it as a high commendation to Aristotle the philosopher, writing of him after his death, that among his other virtues, he was endowed with a faculty of persuading people which way he pleased.

Questionless, there is no perfecter endowment in man than political virtue, and of this Economics is commonly esteemed not the least part; for a city, which is a collection of private households, grows into a stable commonwealth by the private means of prosperous citizens that compose it. Lycurgus by prohibiting gold and silver in Sparta, and making iron, spoiled by the fire, the only currency, did not by these measures discharge them from minding their household affairs, but cutting off luxury, the corruption and tumor of riches, he provided there should be an abundant supply of all necessary and useful things for all persons, as much as any other lawmaker ever did; being more apprehensive of a poor, needy, and indigent member of a community, than of the rich and haughty. And in this management of domestic concerns, Cato was as great as in the government of public affairs; for he increased his estate, and became a master to others in economy and husbandry; upon which subjects he collected in his writings many useful observations. On the contrary Aristides, by his poverty, made justice odious, as if it were the pest and impoverisher of a family and beneficial to all, rather than to those that were endowed with it. Yet Hesiod urges us alike to just dealing and to care of our households, and inveighs against idleness as the origin of injustice; and Homer admirably says:—

"Work was not dear, nor household cares to me,
Whose increase rears the thriving family;
But well-rigged ships were always my delight,

And wars, and darts, and arrows of the fight:"

as if the same characters carelessly neglected their own estates, and lived by injustice and rapine from others. For it is not as the physicians say of oil, that outwardly applied, it is very wholesome, but taken inwardly detrimental, that thus a just man provides carefully for others, and is heedless of himself and his own affairs: but in this Aristides's political virtues seem to be defective; since, according to most authors, he took no care to leave his daughters a portion, or himself enough to defray his funeral charges: whereas Cato's family produced senators and generals to the fourth generation; his grandchildren, and their children, came to the highest preferments. But Aristides, who was the principal man of Greece, through extreme poverty reduced some of his to get their living by juggler's tricks, others, for want, to hold out their hands for public alms; leaving none means to perform any noble action, or worthy his dignity.

Yet why should this needs follow? since poverty is dishonorable not in itself, but when it is a proof of laziness, intemperance, luxury, and carelessness; whereas in a person that is temperate, industrious, just, and valiant, and who uses all his virtues for the public good, it shows a great and lofty mind. For he has no time for great matters, who concerns himself with petty ones; nor can he relieve many needs of others, who himself has many needs of his own. What most of all enables a man to serve the public is not wealth, but content and independence; which, requiring no superfluity at home, distracts not the mind from the common good. God alone is entirely exempt from all want: of human virtues, that which needs least, is the most absolute and most divine. For as a body bred to a good habit requires nothing exquisite either in clothes or food, so a sound man and a sound household keep themselves up with a small matter. Riches ought to be proportioned to the use we have of them; for he that scrapes together a great deal, making use of but little, is not independent; for if he wants them not, it is folly in him to make provision for things which he does not desire; or if he does desire them, and restrains his enjoyment out of sordidness, he is miserable. I would fain know of Cato himself, if we seek riches that we may enjoy them, why is he proud of having a great deal, and being contented with little? But if it be noble, as it is, to feed on coarse bread, and drink the same wine with our hinds, and not to covet purple, and plastered houses, neither Aristides, nor Epaminondas, nor Manius Curius, nor Caius Fabricius wanted necessaries, who took no pains to get those things whose use they approved not. For it was not worth the while of a man who esteemed turnips a most delicate food, and who boiled them himself, whilst his wife made bread, to brag so often of a halfpenny, and write a book to show how a man may soonest grow rich; the very good of being contented with little is because it cuts off at once the desire and the anxiety for superfluities. Hence Aristides, it is told, said, on the trial of Callias, that it was for them to blush at poverty, who were poor against their wills; they who like him were willingly so, might glory in it. For it is ridiculous to think Aristides's neediness imputable to

his sloth, who might fairly enough by the spoil of one barbarian, or seizing one tent, have become wealthy. But enough of this.

Cato's expeditions added no great matter to the Roman empire, which already was so great, as that in a manner it could receive no addition; but those of Aristides are the noblest, most splendid, and distinguished actions the Grecians ever did, the battles at Marathon, Salamis, and Platæa. Nor indeed is Antiochus, nor the destruction of the walls of the Spanish towns, to be compared with Xerxes, and the destruction by sea and land of so many myriads of enemies; in all of which noble exploits Aristides yielded to none, though he left the glory and the laurels, like the wealth and money, to those who needed and thirsted more greedily after them: because he was superior to those also. I do not blame Cato for perpetually boasting and preferring himself before all others, though in one of his orations he says, that it is equally absurd to praise and dispraise one's self: yet he who does not so much as desire others' praises, seems to me more perfectly virtuous, than he who is always extolling himself. A mind free from ambition is a main help to political gentleness: ambition, on the contrary, is hard-hearted, and the greatest fomenter of envy; from which Aristides was wholly exempt; Cato very subject to it. Aristides assisted Themistocles in matters of highest importance, and, as his subordinate officer, in a manner raised Athens: Cato, by opposing Scipio, almost broke and defeated his expedition against the Carthaginians, in which he overthrew Hannibal, who till then was even invincible; and, at last, by continually raising suspicions and calumnies against him, he chased him from the city, and inflicted a disgraceful sentence on his brother for robbing the state.

Finally, that temperance which Cato always highly cried up, Aristides preserved truly pure and untainted. But Cato's marriage, unbecoming his dignity and age, is a considerable disparagement, in this respect, to his character. For it was not decent for him at that age to bring home to his son and his wife a young woman, the daughter of a common paid clerk in the public service: but whether it were for his own gratification or out of anger at his son, both the fact and the presence were unworthy. For the reason he pretended to his son was false: for if he desired to get more as worthy children, he ought to have married a well-born wife; not to have contented himself, so long as it was unnoticed, with a woman to whom he was not married; and, when it was discovered, he ought not to have chosen such a father-in-law as was easiest to be got, instead of one whose affinity might be honorable to him.