

nians. *Tacitus* * takes notice of the lenity of the *Germans*; and it is probable the case was the same in most other antient nations. The severe and rigorous treatment of this inferior order of men, seems to have prevailed only among the *Romans*, in the more degenerate times of their commonwealth, and during their monarchy. 'Tis from those corrupted ages of *Rome* that *Mr. Hume* has brought all his examples of the barbarous usage of slaves, except one; and this one, *viz.* the inhuman practice, among the *Greeks*, of expiscating the truth by the torture of slaves, will be found to make little for his purpose; for this practice was not confined to slaves: freemen were not exempted, where it was necessary, or other evidence could not be got: 'tis certain, at any rate, that it could not be frequent, as few cases would require it. Nay, in this respect, have modern times any advantage? Torture is allowed at present in almost all the countries of *Europe*. Was it not allowed, even in *Britain*, not very many years ago, though it is now happily abolished?

* *Dominum ac servum nullis educationis deliciis dignoscas. Inter eadem pecora in eadem humo degunt; donec aetas separet ingenuos, virtus agnoscat.—Caeteris servis, non in nostrum morem descriptis per familiam ministeriis, utuntur: suam quisque sedem, suos penates regit. Frumenti modum dominus, aut pecoris, aut vestis, ut colono injungit: et servus hactenus paret. Caetera domus officia uxor ac liberi exsequuntur. Verberare servum, ac vinculis et opere coercere, rarum.* *TACITUS* de morib. German. cap. 20. 25.

abolished? But whatever sanction may have been given at any period to such a cruel practice, we cannot surely imagine, that the distant possibility of being subjected to torture could have the least influence to prevent marriage*.

THAT the *Roman* slaves, as *Mr. Hume* affirms, were sometimes kept in *ergastula*, which may be translated work-houses, or houses of correction, cannot be denied; however, it is not probable that they were common, till latter and more corrupted times †: for as long as slaves lived in a familiar manner with their masters, and were not very numerous, such *ergastula* would be less necessary, and must have been introduced by the degeneracy of their manners. Even in the worst times, all the slaves were not confined in them: the better, and, no doubt, the far greater part were at liberty. *Columella* makes a plain distinction between the *soluti* and the *vincti*; these last must have been only the rascally part of the slaves, who deserved severer punishments. It was only for the correction of such vitious slaves, that *Columella* ordains

* By the *Roman* law, torture was allowed in civil cases, only when the truth could be found out in no other way; and, in criminal cases, there was no difference between slaves and freemen of lower rank: nay, in some cases, men of the highest rank were put to the question.

† I do not find, any where in *Livy*, what our author has quoted. *Partem Italiae ergastula a solitudine vindicant*: I suppose the word should be *servitia*, and not *ergastula*.

dains apartments to be built under ground. So far is he from supposing all the slaves to have been shut up in *ergastula*, and used severely, that, on the contrary, he advises masters to treat their slaves well; to see that their provisions be good; to suit their work to the health and strength of each individual; to take care of them when sick; and apply proper medicines for their cure; to admit them to familiarity; nay, sometimes to bring them to table; to suffer them even to jest; to applaud such as behaved well, and to reward them*. What can be kinder, or breathe a more gentle spirit? The same humanity is to be observed in *Varro* †; and both of them consider the practice of breeding from slaves as equally humane and profitable. 'Tis true, as Mr. *Hume* has remarked ‡, *Varo* is in this place treating of shepherds only; but from thence it cannot be concluded, that he did not approve of the humane usage of slaves in general, and did not in particular reckon breeding from them profitable in all cases.

As the number of slaves increased prodigiously in the latter times of the commonwealth, the *ergastula* became more common, and greater numbers were confined in them. In the servile war

we

* De re rustic. lib. 1. cap. 6, 7, 8, 9.

† De re rustic, lib. 1. cap. 17. lib. 2. cap. 10.

‡ P. 177.

we find, that *Eunus*, who, according to *Florus**, began the rebellion, raised a great army of slaves, consisting of no less than 60,000 Men. One of the methods by which he accomplished this, was by breaking open the *ergastula* in *Sicily*, and giving freedom to the slaves that were confined in them. His army however could not be entirely, probably the smallest part of it, was made up of such slaves as had been shut up in *ergastula*; it must have consisted of slaves of all kinds, who would crowd to him from all quarters, and abandon their masters, on an occasion which called them to liberty. Nor could 60,000 (though his army had consisted of none but such as had been confined in *ergastula*) have been near equal to the whole number of slaves in the south of *Italy* and *Sicily*. The *ergastula* therefore must only have been houses of correction for the worst sort of slaves.

THE power which *Roman* masters had over their slaves was despotic, and may appear frightful; but the exercise of it was commonly very gentle, and the power itself was not more absolute, than that which fathers had over their children. For, by the old *Roman* law, the *pater familias* had an equally unlimited authority not only over his children, but, in some cases, over his wife †; yet there

* Hoc miraculum primum duo millia ex obviis; mox jure belli, refractis ergastulis, sexaginta amplius millium fecit exercitum. FLORUS, lib. 3. cap. 19.

† See *Heineccii syntagma antiquitatum*, under the titles, *de patria potestate, et de nuptiis*.

there is no reason from hence to conclude, that this institution was prejudicial to the populousness of *Rome*. In the virtuous times of the commonwealth the power was seldom abused; and, if, in corrupted times, masters became more severe, laws were enacted to restrain their severity; at least, the emperors, not long after the establishment of the monarchy, began to look more narrowly into the behaviour of masters in their families, and to punish outrages committed by them on their slaves*. The emperor *Hadrian* banished a lady for her severity to her servants: It was a particular instruction given to the *praefectus urbi* (or the criminal judge) who had also the care of the police of the city of *Rome* in most articles, to hear and redress the complaints of servants against their masters †. The temples and the statues of the prince were places of refuge for slaves, from whence they could not be taken away by their masters ‡. By a rescript of *Antoninus Pius* ||, it was ordained, that such servants should be sold as had been ill treated. And whoever will examine the history of the *Roman* law, will find in general, that the emperors aimed continually at lessening that domestic power which the antient *Roman* citizens had been

* Vid. l. 2. D. de his qui sui vel alieni juris sunt.]

† Vid. l. 1. § 1.8. D. de officio praefecti urbi.

‡ Vid. § 2. inst. de his qui sui vel alieni juris sunt,

|| Vid. l. 2. D. eodem.

been authorized to exercise in their families, [till every thing was brought under the absolute power of the prince. Thus, even among the *Romans* themselves, the despotic power over slaves was restrained, after it was found to be dangerous.

FURTHER, not only does it appear, that laws were made to restrain the *Romans* from treating their slaves cruelly; but we have many documents even in latter times, that where the law did not regulate their conduct, they set bounds to it themselves, and often from affection treated their slaves with great humanity. Thus we find, that they gave them the best education, and taught them arts and sciences: nor is there any branch of learning, in which we do not find, that slaves were eminently skilled. Besides, their masters frequently manumitted them, and at that time they often got their *peculium*, by which means they had an opportunity of acquiring large estates. Nay, such was the affection of the *Romans* to their domestics, that they considered their *liberti* as part of their family, and hence were obliged to aliment them in their poverty; which, if they neglected to do, they forfeited their *jus patronatus*. They often ordered their remains to be deposited in the family sepulchre; and, after communicating this right of burial, they frequently subjoined a clause to the monumental inscription, *Ne de familia exeat*. If the patron had no children, he often left his whole

whole estate to his *liberti*, and generally gave them legacies, whoever got the bulk of the estate.

BESIDES the domestic slaves, the *Romans* had another kind, called *inquilini, coloni, et adscriptitii glebae*, who were upon a surer footing, being only bound to certain annual prestations, and to labour their master's lands; from which he could not remove them, nor raise their rents. Are these indications of an inhumanity; which could have any effect in preventing populousness?

INDEED interest, no less than humanity, must have prompted the *Romans* at all times to encourage their slaves to raise families.

WITH respect to all commodities whatsoever, it is commonly more advantageous to raise them up than to buy them. That this holds, with respect to slaves, is evident, from its having been thought profitable in *Italy*, even in times of the highest luxury. *Columella*, who lived at such a time, advises to breed from slaves; nay, to give rewards, and even to give liberty to such females, as were mothers of more than three children*.

POMPONIUS ATTICUS, a man of the greatest oeconomy among the *Romans*, had no slaves, but such

* Foeminis quoque foecundioribus otium nonnunquam et libertatem dedimus, cum complures natos educaissent: nam cui tres erant filii, vacatio: cui plures, libertas quoque contingebat. Haec enim justitia, et cura patris familias multum confert augendo patrimonio.

De re rustic. lib. 1. cap. 8.

such as were born in his own house. This is observed by his historian, as a mark of his good oeconomy*; he must therefore have thought it more profitable to breed than to buy. The same historian hath remarked, that the custom of buying slaves proceeded from an incontinent and luxurious taste. We cannot therefore infer with Mr. *Hume* †, that because *Atticus* is praised for his diligence in breeding, breeding was not the general practice. These praises only shew, that many of *Atticus's* rank acted in a different manner from him, and that he was not seduced by their example.

MR. *Hume* has remarked, that near all great cities, in all populous, rich, industrious provinces, few cattle are bred, because of the dearth of every commodity in such places; and of course, that the remoter and cheaper are the only breeding countries for cattle; and, by parity of reason, for men too ‡. This only shews, that such great numbers of slaves would not be bred in or near large cities, as in cheaper provinces; but it does

Z not

* Pari modo, artifices caeteri, quos cultus domesticus desiderat, apprime boni; neque tamen horum quenquam, nisi domi natum, domique factum habuit: quod est signum non solum continentiae, sed etiam diligentiae. Nam et non intemperanter concupiscere, quod a plurimis videas, continentis debet duci; et potius diligentia, quam pretio, parare, non mediocris est industriae.

CORN. NEP. in vit. Attici. cap. 13.

† P. 170.

‡ P. 167.

not prove, that many were not bred, even in *Rome* itself, many more in other places of *Italy*, or in other provinces, where provisions were cheaper: it does not at all affect small cities, or places where there was little luxury: it does not affect the more antient and simple ages: nay, it makes very little against the breeding of slaves even in *Rome* itself; for the *Romans* in times of their greatest luxury had little reason to discourage this practice, on account of the dearth of provisions, since, according to the *Dissertation*, the most necessary provisions were easily purchased at *Rome*, when luxury was very high. I grant, that the luxury of *Rome* was one of the chief causes, why *Italy* became less populous, not indeed because it rendered the breeding from slaves unprofitable, but on account of growing delicacy and debauchery of manners; in consequence of which, not only the former general practice of marrying, but the love of agriculture declined. And from the bitter reproaches which *Augustus* cast upon the great men of *Rome* for not marrying, it may be justly presumed, that marriage was less common among freemen than slaves; nor is it improbable, that while the masters gave full swing to their appetites, they would not suffer their slaves to commit the same disorders.

NOTWITHSTANDING what has been observed concerning the advantages which arose commonly from the breeding of slaves, it doth not follow, that

that it was in no case profitable to buy. On many occasions masters would find buying both necessary and advantageous; which may account for what Mr. *Hume* observes concerning the practice of the elder *Cato**, who though a very great oeconomist, is said † to have bought a great many slaves; for he bought them at the sales of prisoners of war, when they would certainly be cheapest, both because they had been most easily purchased, and would be most numerous. No wonder that a man of his frugality caught at such a cheap market. But there is no where the smallest hint, that he did not encourage his slaves to breed; the contrary may be inferred from what *Plutarch* tells, that he allowed a commerce between his male and female slaves. If he allowed it only at certain times, and upon certain conditions, this might arise from the austerity of his temper, and the severity of his manners: if he obliged them to pay for the liberty of commerce, this proceeded from too great a love of gain, which made a remarkable part of his character, and prompted him to seek profit in every thing. But from neither of these circumstances can it be inferred, that he did not intend to multiply his slaves by this intercourse: nay, his very covetousness is an argument, that he would design to increase his riches by their breed; and in order to render their breeding more convenient and advantageous,

* P. 172.

† *Plutarch*. in *Cato*. maj.

advantageous, it would be necessary to forbid all irregular amours, according to *Plutarch's* narration, and to suffer their commerce only at certain times, that the children might fall to be born at those seasons of the year, when the labour of the mothers would be least necessary.

Neither would those other restrictions mentioned by Mr. *Hume*, prevent slaves from breeding; for it is surely of little consequence to this effect, whether they were lodged under the same roof with the master* (as they might very well have been, if they were not too numerous) or in separate apartments; whether the male and female slaves were laid at a distance from one another or not†; whether they lived on board-wages‡, or which is more probable, had their stated allowance of provisions, as is common in many houses at present.

In like manner, it may be justly supposed, that the masters, from a regard to their own interest, would bear with many inconveniencies arising from the breeding of their slaves; which accounts easily for the precept of old *Hesiod*, whom our author quotes || to prove, that, in the opinion of the antients, married slaves were inconvenient. Some of the antients no doubt might be of this opinion: some people will gratify their inclination, in opposition

* Political discourses, p. 174.

† Ibid. p. 175.

‡ Ibid.

|| P. 174. *Hesiod. oper. et dier. lib. 2. lin. 23, 24, 220,*

position to their interest: humour, fancy, caprice, a just regard to elegance, and a false taste of refinement, have a mighty influence on all the affairs of mankind. Hence some of the antients might have chosen rather to buy at a dearer rate, and to want the profits arising from the breeding of their slaves, than submit to the trouble which attended it. This might have been the character of *Hesiod*. Poets often seek pleasure more than riches; but we must not make them a standard for the world. Indeed the passage from *Hesiod* proves not, either that the breeding of slaves was generally reckoned disagreeable or inconvenient in his days; or though it had been so, that mankind would not have generally submitted to it, for the sake of their interest. Perhaps too *Hesiod* meant only to caution against buying married slaves, and to advise to buy unmarried ones, who might afterwards have been suffered to breed or not, as best answered the masters conveniency, or suited his humour.

WE have said, that regard to interest would have a principal influence on masters, and that their management of their slaves would be chiefly governed by it: from whence it is necessary to conclude, that every one who had occasion for slaves, would buy or keep in his family, either males or females, according to the nature of the work in which he proposed to employ them, and according to his views of profit; and that he would

would keep neither males nor females he had no use for. On which account we need not wonder *, that among the slaves left by *Demosthenes's* father, who was a sword-maker, there should be mention of none but handicraftsmen, *sword-cutlers* and *cabinet-makers*, as our author translates the word *Κλεινοποιοί*, all males, except some chambermaids, who had been about his wife. What else could be expected from a man of such an occupation, who wanted only handicraftsmen for carrying on his business? By the same manner of reasoning it appears, that we ought not to infer, that the antient slaves did not breed, because *Cato*, when enumerating the slaves requisite to labour a vineyard or plantation of olives, makes mention only of one female, *viz.* the overseer's wife †. The reason is plain. Male-slaves being more robust, were fitter for country-labour, and there would be occasion only for a woman or two, to do any of those offices, for which women were more proper.

BESIDES, it deserves to be remarked, agreeably to what has been said in the *Dissertation*, that the antient world being chiefly employed in agriculture and other laborious arts, for which men were more proper than women, it may be expected, we should find many more male slaves than female; in consequence of which, many of the

* Polit. discours. p. 171.

† Ibid. p. 175.

the males might have wanted wives, and yet all the females have been breeders.

NEITHER would the masters be deterred from breeding slaves at home, because of those privileges and indulgencies to which the *Vernae* seem to have been entitled by custom; for besides the honesty, fidelity and attachment to the family, which might be expected from those who had been born and bred in it, the inconveniency of their pertness, if it really was thought one, might have been overbalanced by other advantages. But in truth our author * seems to have been mistaken in his conjecture on this article; for slaves were commonly more valued and esteemed on account of their pertness †.

OUR

* P. 169, 170.

† This seems plain from many other, as well as the following passages.

Eadem causa est cur nos mancipiorum nostrorum urbanitas, in dominos contumeliosa, delectet: quorum audacia ita demum sibi in convivas jus facit, si coepit a domino.—Pueros quidem in hoc mercantur procaces, et eorum impudentiam acunt, et sub magistro habent, qui probra meditate effundant: nec has contumelias vocamus, sed argutias.

SENECA de constant. sapient. cap. 11.

Cogita filiorum nos modestia delectari, Vernularum licentia: illos disciplina tristiori contineri, horum ali audaciam.

SENECA de provid. cap. 1.

Faber observes on the word *vernilitas*, that it signified a particular kind of urbanitas.—Urbanitas sed affectata, neque ingenua et liberalis.

OUR author has also recourse to the *Roman* law, to prove, that breeding from slaves was not common among the *Romans*; for he observes*, that it is expressly remarked by the writers of the *Roman* law, that scarce any ever purchase slaves, with a view of breeding from them: and, in the note which he has placed at the bottom of the same page,

he

liberalis. In confirmation of which, he quotes Pliny, Seneca, Quintilian and Petronius. He adds, Amabatur ista servulorum urbanitas sive dicacitas procax; et quaerebantur tales vel ex longinquis regionibus, ut Ægyptii, Mauri, Syri. Quod si non essent dicaces satis, ut docerentur et discerent esse, navabant operam heri. It appears from Suetonius (in August. cap. 83.) that the Mauri and Syri had a great reputation for this garrulity. Ludebat cum pueris minutis, quos facie et garrulitate amabiles undique conquirebat, præcipue Mauros et Syros. Those of Alexandria were also in high reputation for this quality; which explains the phrase convicia Nili in the Sylvae of Statius, Lib. 5. 5. 66.

Non ego mercatus Pharia de puppe loquaces
Delicias, doctumque sui convicia Nili
Infantem, linguaque simul salibusque protervum.

The following passage in Quintilian (instit. orat. lib. 1. cap. 2.) is a further proof, that slaves were in general not less esteemed, though they were pert and forward. Gaudemus (inquit) si quid licentius dixerint (viz. liberi nostri). Verba ne Alexandrinis quidem permittenda deliciis, risu et osculo excipimus.

Justus Lipsius explains the word verniliter in Seneca (de benefic. lib. 2. cap. 11.) Blande et cum adulatione, vox (inquit) a vernis, id est, servulis, qui fere blandiuntur; which shows, that the behaviour of the Vernæ was not disagreeably impudent, but rather flattering, to make their court the better, and render themselves more agreeable.

* P. 173.

he is pleased to cite the words of some laws from the *Corpus Juris*; none of which seem to confirm his hypothesis, or indeed to prove what he would deduce from them.

THE first text he quotes is from l. 27. ff. de hereditatis petitione. Ancillarum etiam partus, et partuum partus, quanquam fructus esse non existimantur, quia non temere ancillae ejus rei causa comparantur, ut pariant, augent tamen hereditatem. In order to understand this law, it is necessary in the first place to remark, that, among the *Romans*, the usufructus was a kind of personal servitude, or life-rent-right of use and enjoyment, by which a certain person, called the usufructuarius, different from the proprietor, had right to all the fruits and emoluments of whatever kind, that arose ordinarily from the fructuarious substance; whether these emoluments served only for supplying the mere necessities and wants, or increased the convenience and pleasure of life. For all such emoluments were comprehended under the term fructus; provided after production the substance of the fructuarious body remained entire. Thus the fruits of land were grass, corn, wine, oil, &c. those of houses were either the actual lodging in them, or their rent, if hired out to others; of ships, the sailing in them, or the freight; and of cattle, their brood, their milk, and their wool. To the full and unlimited use and enjoyment of all these emoluments the fructuarius had right, according

ording as his *ususfructus* was either of land, of houses, of ships, or of cattle. In the same manner, he who had an *ususfructus* of a slave, had full right to all the fruits and emoluments to be drawn from this slave. These, according to civilians, were the profits of his labour and industry, acquired either by setting him to work at home, or hiring him out for certain wages to the service of another. *In hominis ususfructu operae sunt, et ob operas mercedes.—Fructus hominis in operis constitit: et retro, in fructu hominis operae sunt**: i. e. the principal, the most considerable fruits of a man consist in his work, labour, industry and pains: and these on the other hand are included in *fructu* or *ususfructu*.

To these therefore the *ususfructuarius* had undoubted right.

BUT, besides these *operae* and *mercedes ob operas*, there were likewise the *partus ancillarum*; concerning which it was disputed among the civilians of old, whether the *partus ancillarum*, or the issue of a female slave, belonged to the *ususfructuarius*, i. e. the liferenter of the mother, in the same manner as the *foetus pecorum* belonged to the *ususfructuarius pecorum*.

THE question was determined in the negative: and for this determination *Ulpian* in different places of his writings assigns different reasons. In *l. 68. ff. de ususfructu*, he says, *Neque enim in fructu hominis*

* L. 3. 4. ff. de operis servorum.

hominis homo esse potest. The meaning of which is, That nature having produced all kinds of fruits for the use of man, man himself therefore could not make a part of these fruits, since he had a right to enjoy them. And thus we find this reason explained in *l. 28. § 1. ff. de usuris. Absurdum enim videbatur, hominem in fructu esse, cum omnes fructus rerum natura hominum gratiâ comparaverit.* This philosophy of the lawyers seems to be founded on the doctrine of the Stoics, who taught, that every thing in nature was produced for the use of man. *Omnia, quae sint in hoc mundo, quibus utantur homines, hominum causa facta esse et parata**. For from this sect the *Roman* lawyers borrowed most of their philosophical principles.

ANOTHER reason for the same determination is assigned by *Ulpian* in *l. 27. ff. de hereditatis petitione*, quoted by *Mr. Hume. Quia non temere ancillae ejus rei causa comparantur, ut pariant, i. e.* the issue of female slaves is not comprehended under, or reckoned among their fruits, because maids are not purchased principally for breeding. The chief design in buying or having them, is to set them at work, and by their work to make gain. The immediate view therefore with which slaves are purchased, is that they may labour, not that they may breed. Hence the profits of their labour belong to the *ususfructuarius*, but not their brood.

YET it would surely be absurd from hence to conclude,

* Cicero, lib. 2. c. 61. de nat. deor.

conclude, that masters might not have other views in purchasing female slaves; besides those which were *most immediate*. It would be yet more absurd to say, that those who had actually purchased them, at first perhaps with other views, would not, if they found it convenient, allow them to breed. 'Tis common now a-days to hire servants for certain definite purposes; yet, if they have time, they are usually put to other business. Besides, it deserves to be remarked, how cautiously *Ulpian* speaks: he says, *non temere*. Now, the idea which the word *temere* conveys at first, is that of rashness. And if the law might be understood in this way, 'tis surely true, that men, far from being rash, would be extremely cautious and circumspect, when they purchased slaves for breeding; and from hence it not only would not follow, that slaves were never purchased in this view, but the directly contrary would appear.

HOWEVER *Ulpian's* words can hardly bear this interpretation. His *non temere* must be understood, as if he had said, that men are very cautious, how they buy slaves for breeding; or, which is the same thing, that for the most part they do not; for he by no means says, that they never do purchase them in this view. In short, *Ulpian* can only intend to declare, that the *principal, chief, and immediate* view in purchasing female slaves was not to breed from them. This is very agreeable to the decisions of the lawyers concerning the *ususfructus*

ususfructus and *partus ancillarum*, and makes it a very strong reason, as in this respect there is a wide difference between men and other animals. For men often buy horses, mares, bulls, cows, and all sorts of cattle, merely and principally for the sake of a breed; but seldom or never purchase slaves on the same design. For though sometimes maids might be purchased for their beauty; yet, as the good qualities, either of mind or body, do not so constantly descend to the posterity of mankind, as those of brutes descend to their brood, a fine breed could seldom be the principal view in the purchase of slaves.

BUT that it ought not to be concluded, from either this, or any other law of the *Corpus*, that it was not usual among the *Romans*, to breed from female slaves; nay, that it was not only not unusual, but very common to do so, appears from the numberless places of it, in which the *partus ancillarum* are mentioned; from the many and various cases stated about them; and from the multitude of the questions proposed, and decisions given about their property in those different cases. Had not disputes been daily occurring of this kind, is it probable that the *Corpus* would have been replenished with such decisions? And could disputes of this kind have daily occurred, unless both the *ancillae* and the *partus ancillarum* had been very numerous? To cite particular passages would be endless. Almost every page contains some case, some

some example, or some determination about them; nay, *Ulpian* treating of what could be exacted by the rightful and true heir from him, who without any just title had seized on the inheritance, in this very *l. 27. ff. de hered. pet.* determines, that among other things, the *partus ancillarum* ought to be restored.

BESIDES, the *serviles cognationes*, the *serviles adfinitates*, and the *contubernia servorum*, are often mentioned expressly in the *Corpus*. Regulations are made, rules laid down, and questions determined as well about this *contubernium*, as about the lawful marriage of free citizens. And if it is an universal observation, which we may form upon language*, that where two related parts of a whole bear any proportion to each other, in numbers, rank or consideration, there are always correlative terms invented, which answer to both the parts, and express their mutual relation: as we have here a whole, and its two related parts, and correlative terms invented, which answer to both these parts, and express their mutual relation; I must, according to Mr. *Hume's* ingenious doctrine, infer, that since the *contubernia servorum* bore no proportion to the *nuptiae* or *connubia* of free *Roman* citizens, in rank or consideration, they must have borne a great proportion to each other in number; and from hence, that the issue of these *contubernia* or the *Vernae* were very numerous: for *contubernium*

* *Polit. discours.* p. 169.

nium was as constantly said of slaves, as *nuptiae* and *connubium* of free *Roman* citizens*.

FURTHER, this reason cannot shew, that the *Romans* used not to purchase slaves to breed from them, at the time to which the greatest populousness of antient nations is fixed in the *Dissertation*: for *Ulpian*, who assigns it, lived about the beginning of the third century, under the emperors *Septimius Severus*, *Antoninus Caracalla*, *Opilius Macrinus* and *Diadumenus*, *Alagabalus* and *Alexander Severus*; the last of whom was principally directed by his advice, and governed by his counsels, long after the establishment of that empire, which seems to have been one principal cause of the depopulation of *Europe*.

To understand how the other texts of the civil law, quoted by Mr. *Hume*, from the title *de Aedilitio edicto*, do not make much for his argument: 'tis necessary to observe, that the *Aediles*, who among other things had jurisdiction over the public markets,

* To say the truth, however ingenious such criticisms may be esteemed, fortune and chance seem to have had great influence on the formation and structure of language, reason, philosophy, and the real similitudes and distinctions of things too little. The term *Verna* might have been invented, because being more numerous, there were more frequent occasions to speak of the *Vernae*, than of the *empti*. After all, may not *emptus* be supposed the correlative to *Verna*; at least we find them opposed in the law: (§ 30. *instit. de legatis*) and I am mistaken, if the phrase, *Non verna sed emptus*, is not to be found somewhere in an antient author.

kets, and the goods sold in them, published an edict, by which they ordered those who sold slaves, to tell the buyers, *Quid morbi vitiumve cuique sit*. And if either they did not do so, or the slave was found to have faults, which the merchant had declared it had not, the *Ædiles* by this edict ordered the feller to receive back his slave, and restore the price to the buyer. It was therefore necessary to understand, what was meant by *morbis vitiumve*, in order to know in what cases the purchaser could return the slave, and force the merchant to restore the price. Now, in *l. 1. § 7. ff. de Ædilitio edicto*, we find a general definition of the word *morbis*: *Est habitus cujusque corporis contra naturam, qui usum ejus ad id facit deteriorem, cujus causa natura nobis ejus corporis sanitatem dedit*. And in the same place we are told, that *morbis* and *vitium* have not, in this title, a different, but the same signification. In *l. 1. § 8. eod.* this general doctrine is applied to slaves in particular; and we are informed by the lawyer, that every thing is reckoned *morbis* or *vitium*, *quod usum ministeriumque hominis impediatur*. In short, it appears, that *morbis* was called and reckoned whatever defect, either of body or of mind, hindered the slave from being useful, and from performing the service for which he was designed by nature.

FROM whence we conclude, that those bodily defects alone, are here understood, which could, and therefore ought to have been known to the feller,

feller, and, at the same time, disabled the slave either from working, or from propagating his kind: Hence we need not be surpris'd, that *spado*, in *l. 6. § 2. de Ædil. edict.* is said to be neither *morbosus* nor *vitiosus*. For though *spado*, as evidently appears from *l. 128. ff. de verborum significatione*, is a general term, used sometimes to denote all such as are incapable of generation, from whatever cause this inability proceeds, whether from nature, accident or design; yet in this place it is taken in a more limited sense, and signifies one, who either by disease, old age, natural infirmity, or from a wrong conformation of parts, was incapable of procreation. Such men may often be healthy, and strong enough in other respects, and very fit for labour. Hence the buyer could not, on pretence of the impotence of a slave of this sort, force the feller to receive him back, and to restore the price; because, if the slave looked well otherwise, the feller might well be supposed to be ignorant of this imperfection; because in some cases the buyer himself might be presumed not to be ignorant of it, as in that of old age, which he might easily be supposed already to know to be *effoeta*; because, at the same time the slave often was not by such an imperfection rendered less able to labour, which was his *principal* business; and, *lastly*, because the infirmity might be removed, either by an unexpected recovery of vigour, or by diet and medicine*.

B b

BUT

* A notable instance of this kind, very apposite to the present argument, may be seen in the *Medic. Essays*, vol. 1. art. 26.

BUT in *l. 7. eod.* we find that slave reckoned *morbofus*, who by mutilation had been made incapable of generation. For it was both the intention of nature, and of the purchaser, if he found it convenient, that slaves should propagate. Hence, however healthy and robust he might be in other respects, and however fit for working, such a slave might be returned as *morbofus*; for he laboured under a bodily defect, which, at the same time that it might, and ought to have been known to the seller, rendered the slave incapable of performing that service for which he was designed by nature, *viz.* of propagating his kind. Does this shew, that the *Romans* had little or no view of breeding from their slaves? Or can it be from hence inferred, that the *Roman* lawyers inculcate any such doctrine, That the impotence of a slave was only regarded, so far as his health or life might be affected by it; and that in other respects he was full as valuable? 'Twas much otherwise. For though, as it has been said already, the principal view in purchasing slaves, was to set them at work; yet to breed from them, was a view so common, that a slave, made by mutilation incapable of procreation, was not only not full as valuable as he would have been, had he not laboured under this defect, but might be returned to the seller, as useless, and of no value. For the word *morbofus*, the misapprehension or misapplication of which seems to have led Mr. *Hume* to quote these

these texts from the title *de Ædil. edict.* in support of his general position, must, in this title of the *Corpus*, never be understood as solely and immediately relative to health and strength of body, but must always be referred to the redhibition allowed and introduced by this edict. *Morbus*, as defined above, appears to have a quite different signification among the civilians on this title, from that which it has among physicians. For a slave might happen, in the eye of law, to be reckoned *morbofus*, though perhaps he was not only healthy, but extremely robust.

IN general, with regard to male and female slaves, this doctrine is to be held, that, though unable to propagate their kind, they are not in the sense of this title reckoned *morbofi*, unless the defect, from which this inability proceeds, be at least such as may be known to the seller. And from hence we may easily explain every law quoted by Mr. *Hume*.

THUS a woman is not reckoned *morbofa*, because she bears dead children, unless this proceeds from some apparent defect*. Such a woman might, perhaps, by physicians, be reckoned diseased, but, according to civilians, gave no room for redhibition; for she might, notwithstanding, be very healthy and fit for labour; the merchant might well be supposed ignorant of the defect, or at least of its continuance; and the death

* L. 14. p. ff. de Ædil. edict.

death of her offspring might be occasioned by many accidents, quite foreign to the mother's constitution.

In the same manner, a woman, who is barren by nature, is not reckoned *morbosa*: but if her barrenness proceeds from an external defect, or from a visible fault in her body, she is then reckoned *morbosa*. So also we find many particular and extraordinary cases stated in some paragraphs of the fourteenth law of this title, the decisions of which are founded on principles precisely the same with those already explained*. For in most of these cases the faults are visible and apparent, such as the seller either did or ought to have known. Again, it was the unanimous opinion of lawyers, and perhaps it was never doubted, that a woman with child was sound; and the reason assigned is, because it is the greatest and most important office of the sex, considered as such, to conceive and bring children to the full time. For, besides the usual recovery of vigour after child-birth, women in this situation are employed in one of those services, for which they were designed by nature; and by consequence could not, in consistency with the definition of *morbus* given above, be reckoned *morbosa*. They were then busied in what was both at that time, and is still reckoned the chief and most

* L. 14. § 1. 2. 3. 7. l. 15. ff. de Edil. edict.

most important business of females. It was, besides, a sure indication and strong argument of her soundness, if a woman had that talent which nature had peculiarly allotted to her kind; for those of the sex are usually observed to be most sound and healthy, who bear a great number of children. Does then this prove, that the offspring of women were not considered, when the mothers were purchased? Though it must be confessed, that she was reckoned sound, not on account of the value of her offspring; for what had the value of the offspring to do with the soundness of the mother's constitution? Nay, not only a woman with child, but even a woman in labour, *in ipso actu puerperii*, was reckoned sound; for besides that *accipere aut tueri conceptum* is expressly said to be the *maximum ac praecipuum munus foeminarum*, no man could buy a woman in this situation, and at the same time be ignorant of her condition.

FROM all these observations, it may be inferred, either that nothing can be deduced from the writings of the *Roman* lawyers, which tends in the least to support Mr. *Hume's* hypothesis; or that none of these writings affect the general question; or perhaps, that they help to destroy the truth of Mr. *Hume's* doctrine, and to support that of the hypothesis laid down in the preceding *Dissertation*. For surely some of these laws directly prove, that the *Romans* used to breed from their slaves.

This

This could be further demonstrated from several other texts, which it were easy to quote from this very title, and from many others in the *Corpus*. One thing I cannot omit, as it is indeed very remarkable, that the *dos* or dowry given to husbands with their spouses to help them to support the burdens of marriage, consisted usually, if not wholly, at least in a great measure, of slaves; who partly by their labour, partly by their brood, sufficiently answered the purpose. Every body knows, that the case is the same at this day in *America* and the *West Indies*: and that it was so among the *Romans*, is evident from the titles *de sponsalibus*, *de ritu nuptiarum*, and the other titles of the 23, 24 and 25 books of the pandects.

FROM what has been said hitherto it appears, that the antients did not treat their slaves so cruelly, as Mr. *Hume* hath imagined; and that it was agreeable to their interest and their customs to encourage them to propagate; in consequence of which it will be found, that as slaves in general were very numerous both among the *Greeks* and *Romans*, so the *Vernae* or home-born slaves were far more numerous than such as had been brought from foreign countries. This will add greatly to the force of all the foregoing arguments.

NOTHING is more evident, than that slaves were prodigiously numerous both in *Greece* and *Italy*. Almost every family had some: we read of many hundreds, nay thousands belonging to one man,

man. This great numerousness of slaves is sufficiently proved by many passages of Mr. *Hume's* discourse, where on the authority of antient history he speaks of immense multitudes of them.

IF then they were so numerous, methinks this single circumstance must go a great way to prove, that slaves were abundantly prolific. How else could they be so numerous in every period? How can it be supposed, that so many thousands, nay millions, were imported from foreign countries? This is an hypothesis almost impossible; however, impossible as it seems to be, it is necessary to maintain it, unless we allow, that the numbers of slaves were chiefly increased by their propagation.

ON the other hand Mr. *Hume* cites the authority of *Pliny* and *Plutarch**, who both take notice, how numerous *Barbarian* slaves were in *Italy*; from whence, and from this other circumstance, that the number of people increased not in *Italy*†, though there was a constant flux of slaves from the remoter provinces of the empire, he would infer, that the *Roman* slaves, so far from being prolific, could not even keep up the stock, without immense recruits from the provinces.

BUT this phænomenon may be easily accounted for, by comparing the antient and latter state of the *Romans*; from whence it will be evident, that if the people of *Italy* did not increase, notwithstanding

* P. 178.

† P. 168.

standing the great number of *Barbarian* slaves, this happened only in latter times; and that this stagnation ought to be derived from a source very different from this, that the slaves did not commonly propagate.

IN early times, the city of *Rome* and the *Roman* people increased greatly. Their simple and laborious life, their love of agriculture, the frequent transportations of people to *Rome* from the neighbouring states which they had subdued, occasioned this increase. But in the latter times of the commonwealth, and during the monarchy, agriculture and industry declined greatly, and the luxury and debauchery of the times hindered marriages. Of this *Augustus* complained heavily, and endeavoured to redress the evil by penal laws; but all in vain. The evil continued; nay, grew worse daily. For the corruption of their manners was too great to be curbed by laws. 'Twas from hence that the signal decay both of *Roman* citizens and of slaves proceeded. Recruits were therefore necessary for both, but especially for the latter, who decreased on a double account, both from the general depravity of all ranks, which could not fail to have some influence on slaves, as well as others: and likewise, as multitudes of them were continually manumitted, to keep up the number of the citizens. This custom of manumitting slaves was little practised in the more early, but came much into use in the latter times, and grew at length into such a grievance, that

Augustus

Augustus found it necessary to redress it, by making particular laws (*Ælia Sentia* and *Fusia Caninia*) to regulate the numbers, qualifications, and rights of those who were manumitted*. This is not only the natural, but the genuine account why such large recruits for keeping up the stock of slaves came to be necessary, and were actually imported from the provinces. But, however necessary they might be, the bad consequences of such importations would be visible: this would give occasion of complaint to some, others would give directions how to prevent the bad effects in particular cases. Hence we find *Pliny* complaining of the *mancipiorum legiones, et in domo turba externa* †; and *Plutarch* observing, that in the times of the *Gracchi* ‡, there was a great want of freemen over all *Italy*, while it abounded with prisons for *Barbarian* slaves. 'Tis hence also that we find *Varro* giving it as an useful advice for a family, not to buy too many slaves of the same nation ||. But none of these testimonies prove, that the greatest number of the slaves was born out of *Italy*, even in those degenerate times; on the contrary, we have the express testimony of *Appian* to prove, that the custom of purchasing *Barbarians*, was not the chief cause of

C c

the

* Vide Heineccii syntagma antiq. l. 1. t. 5, 6, 7.

† Polit. discours. p. 176.

‡ In Tib. Gracch.

|| Polit. discours. p. 176.

the increase of slaves, but that they had multiplied prodigiously by propagation, as they were totally exempted from military service*, while the number of the freemen had been greatly diminished, both by the direful effects of war, and by that oppression which the rich exercised over the poor, whom they deprived of their lands, and forced from their possessions and habitations.

As our author has not proved, that the greatest part of the *Roman* slaves were imported from foreign countries; so neither does he seem to have succeeded any better in his remarks on the *Greeks*. The names given to slaves in the *Greek* comedies, *Syrus*, *Mysus*, *Geta*, &c. †, will not afford a presumption, that at *Athens*, or other *Greek* cities, most of the slaves were imported from foreign nations; for many of the names of the slaves in the *Greek* plays are not of this kind: and though all of them were, how much does chance govern in such matters? It is very probable, I own, that many of the *Greek* slaves had been originally of *Barbarian* extraction; for doubtless the *Greeks* would rather have made slaves of the *Barbarians*, than of their own countrymen, and those who came first into *Greece*, might perhaps be named from the

* Ἐκ πολυπαίδειας δεραποντῶν ακινδυνως αυξομενῶν
διὰ τὰς ασρατείας.

APPIAN. de bell. civ. lib. 1.

† P. 170.

the countries from which they had been imported: but as probably they would transmit the same sort of names to their posterity, though born in *Greece*, we cannot conclude, that because a slave has such or such a name, himself was a native of this or that country.

UPON the whole matter, I apprehend, that we would not do well to conclude, that the names commonly given to the personages introduced into our dramatic performances, were the most common at the times when these pieces were composed. We might as well say, that *Stichus* was the most common name of a slave, or *Titius* of a freeman, because the *Roman* lawyers, when putting cases, and illustrating their doctrines by examples, commonly make use of these two names.

NEITHER does it appear from the authority of any antient writer, that all the *Greek* slaves were *Barbarians*. In particular, this cannot be deduced from any passage in *Demosthenes*; nor can I find it asserted in any passage of *Isocrates's* panegyric, which Mr. *Hume* hath quoted to prove it*.

WHAT has been said above, seems sufficient to invalidate any objections which may be started against our hypothesis, that in antient times slaves were generally allowed to propagate. But, besides, strong positive evidence may be brought to prove their fertility, and of course, that the *Vernae* were extremely numerous.

IN

* Polit. discours. p. 171.

IN this view it deserves to be remarked, that, among those antient monumental inscriptions which have been preserved, vast numbers are found to be inscribed * by slaves to the memory of their fathers, mothers, husbands, wives and children. Now we may be sure, that not one of many hundreds who had such relations, were at the trouble and expence of testifying their affection in that manner; and that there is not one of many thousands of those monuments which were erected for this purpose that have been preserved unto our times. This naturally leads us to conclude, that the marriages of the slaves were common: how else could there have been so many inscriptions of this kind?

A much stronger argument may be brought for the actual fertility of the slaves, and the vast numbers of *Vernae*, from the absurdity of supposing such an incredible number of them, as we find both in *Italy* and *Greece*, or the greatest part of them to have been purchased for money, or imported from foreign countries. Whence could such vast sums have been raised? Some of the *Romans* are said to have had 10,000; nay, some of them to have had 20,000 slaves †. At any rate there

* See the collections of *Gruterus*, *Reinesius*, *Fabretti* and *Muratorius*.

† Athen. Deipn. lib. 6. cap. 28. *Seneca* says of *Demetrius*, who had been made free by *Pompey*, Numerus illi quotidie fervorum, velut imperatori exercitus, referebatur. De tranquillitate, cap. 8.

there must have been several millions in *Italy*. Let us make a computation. It is observed of *Cato* the censor *, as an instance of his frugality, that he would never give above 1500 *drachmae*; or about 48 *l.* for a slave. This could not have been among the highest, it must rather have been among the lowest prices. But even at this rate one million of slaves would have cost the *Romans* in *Italy* more than 48 millions *Sterling*, and the importers from foreign countries half as much, allowing them even *cent. per cent.* of profit. In the same manner, reckoning half of the 400,000 *Athenian* slaves to be of full age, and each of them to be worth two *minae* †, which is the least value *Demosthenes* puts upon his father's slaves, they would have cost more than 1,200,000 *l.* Is there any reason to think, that a trade was carried on in antient times to an extent proportionable to so vast an importation? besides, what bad policy must it have been, to have encouraged the buying, and discouraged the breeding of slaves? The antients were sensible of this, and therefore encouraged breeding.

HENCE *Tibullus* when wishing for whatever was best for an husbandman, prays that his farm may be stocked with a crowd of *Vernae*, the surest sign of wealth and plenty.

Turbaque

* Plutarch. in *Cat. maj.*

† Some of them were worth five or six *minae*, thirty of them were not under three.

Orat. in *Aphobum.* 1.

*Turbaque vernarum, saturi bona signa coloni,
Ludet, et ex virgis extruet arte casas.*

TIB. eleg. lib. 2. eleg. 1. lin. 23. 24.

Horace represents them as numerous about the houses of rich men, as bees about a hive.

*Positosque vernas, ditis examen domus,
Circum residentes lares.*

HORAT. epod. 2. lin. 65. 66.

SACRED writ takes notice, that *Abraham** armed 318 trained servants, born in his own house †, to fight against *Chedorlaomer*, and some other princes, who had plundered *Sodom*, and carried *Lot* captive. This number of 318 comprehended only the males of full age, whom *Abraham* thought fit to carry along with him in this expedition. Perhaps he had others besides, whom he left at home: at any rate he must have had many females and young children unfit for war. All which shews how numerous the *Vernae* were in the east in the most antient times, and how careful the antients were to encourage the breeding of their slaves.

BUT if the institution of slavery tended so much to the populousness of antient nations, it may be asked, whence is it that it does so little service at present? are *Turky* ‡, and other countries, where slavery now prevails, so extremely populous? on the contrary, are they not almost quite void of people,

* Gen. xiv. 14.

† Expeditos vernaculos suos. edit. vulg.

‡ Political discours. p. 179.

people, and striking examples of the pernicious influence of slavery? are not such examples which are immediately before our eyes chiefly to be regarded? And when we behold such glaring instances of desolation in countries where slavery obtains at present, why should we imagine this institution must have had such a prolific influence in antient times?

ON this it is only necessary to observe, how easy it is to account from other principles for the scarcity of people in *Turky*, and other countries where slavery obtains at present. Modern slavery seems to be on a much worse footing than the antient. In particular, slavery in *Turky*, *Algiers*, *Tunis*, *Tripoli*, *Morocco*, and other *African* countries, is both very severe, and under bad regulations: if we add to this the oppression and bad policy of these governments in other respects, can we be surpris'd at their want of people? How can it be expected, that a *Turkish* policy should not render this vast empire a desert!

To conclude this account of slavery, since our author has referred* to the maxims of our planters; to such as are best acquainted with these maxims, it is referred, if many of the preceding observations are not confirmed by the practice in our *American* colonies? if the planters are not fonder of purchasing home-bred slaves, though at a dearer price, than of buying directly from *Africa*? if they

* P. 170.

they do not find them more useful for their work? if discouraging slaves to breed, on account either of dearth of provisions, or any other reason, was almost ever known among them? if on the contrary, the planters do not encourage the breed of slaves as much as they can, and will not often rather buy a mate, if it be necessary, than want the breed? if they do not find, that the slaves who are bred in our plantations are not more healthy, and agree better with the climate than the *Europeans*? if they are not more prolific, and serve better to increase our colonies? and finally, if the planters, instead of desiring such multitudes of slaves as are poured in upon them from *Africa*, have not been often deliberating about preventing the importation of *African* slaves altogether? According to good information, all these questions will be answered in the affirmative*.

* *As the antient slavery contributed to the populousness of the world, so it was accompanied with several other advantages: and though the Turkish slavery, like all other parts of their policy, is cruel and severe, yet a sight of it seems to have reconciled that able scholar and politician Busbequius to this institution, and brought him over to the opinion, that it was accompanied with greater advantages than disadvantages. He was ambassador from the emperor of Germany to Solyman about 200 years ago, when the Turkish empire was in a very flourishing condition: he was also a curious and accurate observer, much above the ordinary rate of travellers, and had better opportunities of knowing the true state of Turkey than others. I have therefore subjoined his words.*

Caeteroqui qui apud nos mendicant, apud eos serviunt: captum usu membrorum servum nihilominus herus alit, nec est

est ita debilitatus quisquam, quin operae ejus aliquod sit pretium. Memini me redimere non ignobilem militem Hispanum, qui ordines apud suos duxerat: quem cum membris omnibus ex vulneribus debilitatum Turca emisset, rationem tamen iniit, quomodo fructum ex eo caperet: trajecit eum in Asiam, ubi anserum greges aluntur, quibus pascendis operas ejus locabat, ex quo non contemnendum lucellum faciebat. Ac nescio an optime rebus nostris consuluit, qui servitutem primus sustulit. Scio servitii varia esse incommoda, sed ea commodorum pondere sublevantur. Si justa et clemens et qualem *Romanae leges* praescribunt, servitus, praesertim publica, maneret; non tot fortasse crucibus, neque tot patibulis opus esset ad coercendos, quibus praeter vitam et libertatem nihil est, quos egestas ad quodvis audendum scelus impellit. Libertas sine re non semper suadet honesta: non omnium ingenia inopem ferunt libertatem: nec omnes ita nati sunt, ut se regere et suo arbitrio recte uti sciant; melioris ductu atque imperio tanquam adminiculo opus habent, nullum alioqui peccandi finem facturi. ut sunt quaedam bestiae, quarum ferocitas semper metuenda sit, nisi vinculis aut robore coerceantur. Hic quidem mens imbecillior auctoritate herili gubernatur; herus servi labore vivit. Turcae, maxima, qua publice, qua privatim, e servitio emolumenta capiunt; rem familiarem fervorum operis praeclare tuentur; ideoque proverbio negant eum pauperem videri cui vel unicus servus sit. Sed et publice siquid molendum, transferendum, crudendum, aut minuendum sit, id fervorum opera et assiduitate consequuntur. Nos operum antiquorum magnificentiam nusquam assequimur, quid enim? manibus destituimur, hoc est fervili auxilio: ut taceam, quantum instrumentum fervorum doctrina et literae fuerint veteribus ad omnem scientiam adificandam. Sed tu haec animi causa dici a me puta. Turcicae quidem militiae fructus haud aliunde magis constat quam ex servis. Si miles Turca nihil aliud reportet e bello quam unum aut alterum mancipium, bene rem suam gessit,

tulit laborum praemium. Nam vulgare mancipium quadraginta aut quinquaginta coronatis aestimatur; quod si aetatis aut formae aut opificii accessione commendetur, duplicatur pretium: ex quo satis liquere arbitror, quantum compendium faciant cum undecunque quinque aut sex captivorum millia abducunt, quamque quaestuosae sint illorum depraedationes. Nec Romanos olim hoc lucrum sprevisse adverto, cum sectiones urbium universas viginti quinque aut triginta millium capitum distraherent et publicarent, ut eorum scripta testantur. Turcae quidem ex tali sectione plus minus decies quinquies centena coronatorum millia redigerent. Quanquam illi quidem a suae religionis hominibus jure belli abstinent, ab omnique capitis diminutione habent immunes.

A. Giffeni Busbequii omnia quae extant. Lugd. 1633. epist. 3. p. 160.

PART II.

SECTION I.

HITHERTO of slavery, or the domestic oeconomy of the antients. It will be necessary in the next place to inquire into their political situation; and first, to consider the maxims of their government in time both of peace and war, of which our author hath drawn as frightful a picture, as he had done before of the cruelty exercised towards slaves.

MR. *Hume* hath indeed admitted, that the equality of fortune which obtained among the antients, the small divisions of their states, and their love of liberty were circumstances favourable to populoufness.

populoufness*. But nothing can be imagined more unfavourable than the rest of their political maxims, as they are represented in the political discourse.

ACCORDING to our author, the antient republics were almost in perpetual war; the maxims of antient were more destructive than those of modern war, and battles were much more bloody and desperate in antient than in modern times; the maxims of the antients in time of peace were also more tyrannical, their factions keener and more inveterate, the fines they imposed more arbitrary and exorbitant, and their political institutions in general not so well calculated to preserve order and stability, as in modern times. For each of these particulars he hath offered his reasons: and upon the whole, he is not only inclined to believe, that modern policy is more favourable to populoufness than that of the antient, but entertains such an opinion of antient policy, as to affirm, that the police and government of the *Turks*, though he owns it to be not very favourable to industry and propagation, is preferable to that barbarous unsettled condition in which the *Thracians*, the *Getae*, and the *Illyrians* antiently lived †.

ONE would not perhaps wonder, that these and other barbarous nations; nay, that some of the *Greek* tyrannies should be drawn with such an horrible

* P. 210. 183. 184.

† P. 248.

rible aspect: but is it not surprising, that the most civilized states among the *Greeks*, in their most flourishing times, should make so woful a figure*! For what can we perceive in our author's representation of this celebrated country, the antient seat of the muses, and the mother of arts and sciences, but the most frightful images of desolation and confusion. Lands depopulated, cities plundered, citizens slaughtered! scarce any vestige of peace and security, or of wise and regular institutions! notwithstanding the learning, philosophy, and politeness of the *Greeks*, their factions are represented as more inflamed, their maxims of assassination more avowed, and party rage more fierce than among the *Iribs*, amidst massacre and rebellion! How does such a representation agree with the evidence of authentic history, which proves, that the *Greeks* flourished greatly in the arts of peace, and in numbers of people, from the days of the seven sages, till their states were subdued by *Philip of Macedon* and his successors?

DEMONSTRATION puts an end to all uncertainty, and forces the assent; but where the case is not capable of being demonstrated, plausible arguments may often be offered on both sides. This happens especially in political questions; for every political institution has both its advantages and disadvantages; and as either of these are represented in such manner, as to strike more forcibly on our

* P. 194, 195.

minds, the impressions we receive of the institutions themselves, are more or less favourable. It must be confessed, that there is sometimes an air of fierceness in antient governments, and that *Grecian* liberty may appear sometimes to deserve the appellation of licentiousness. The smallness of antient states, their near neighbourhood to one another, the equality of fortune among private citizens, their love of independence, their disdain of mercenary troops, and forwardness to fight their own battles, their aversion to the power of a single person, their hatred of tyrants, and their passion for the republican form of government, must at sometimes have given occasion to brisker battles, and raised up keener factions, in support of what they valued so much, than will be seen for a considerable time together among the spiritless subjects of arbitrary monarchs. Hence the frightful images of *Grecian* spirit and liberty! But this high disdain of arbitrary power, and ardent love of liberty, must have been accompanied with many advantages, much more than sufficient to overbalance any of those disadvantages which arose from the nature of these governments. In particular, it must have excited an extraordinary vigour, and inspired an undaunted resolution; from whence their battles, though keener, would not much alarm, nor give them much disturbance in their management of the ordinary affairs of life, which

they

they would pursue fearless, after a manner very different from that of modern times.

In nations under the dominion of arbitrary monarchs, the body of the people are not accustomed to war; few, except the tyrant's guards and Janizaries, are either allowed to have arms, or are capable of using them. Hence, frightened at every shadow, they are alarmed and disconcerted by the most distant appearance of danger. So far from behaving with the intrepidity of the antient artists and husbandmen, they are not even able to conceive it, or imagine how they could go on calmly in their ordinary affairs, in the face of danger and an enemy. Nay, a people blessed with liberty, under a government more happily poised than any of the antient republics, active and industrious, because secure under the protection of law, tenacious of their rights, and jealous of their independence, will hardly be able to form a notion of such intrepidity, if laying aside the exercise of arms, and imagining themselves secure by the wisdom of their constitution, they shall employ themselves wholly in the arts of peace.

'Tis impossible to form an exact comparison between the wars and factions which have happened in different ages, or make a just estimate of the destruction each of them has occasioned within the same periods of time, and an equal extent of country; yet it will not be difficult to produce a far more formidable list of civil wars, factions, and
devastations

devastations for modern times, than our author has done for the antient. But independently upon this, some general observations may be made, which will greatly invalidate the arguments in the *political discourse*, taken from the wars and factions in antient times.

THE mischiefs of war are often more terrible in appearance than reality, and the description is more dreadful than what was actually felt; especially if a multitude of bloody events, which only happened in succeeding ages, and in countries at a distance from one another, are collected together, and brought into one view. This is one evident reason, why the accounts of the direful effects of war in antient times appear so striking. Fancy is apt to hurry us on, and make us overlook the distance both of time and place; so that we contract the whole period and field of antient history, as it were into a small point. Besides, antient historians do not, like the modern, descend into a minute detail of all events, but selecting those which are more extraordinary, such as battles, seditions, conspiracies, and foreign conquests, present them to view in historical narrations, short and concise, compared with those of the moderns. Hence the transition from one remarkable event to another, in antient, is far more quick than in modern histories, where the attention of the mind is diverted, and the thread of the narration inter-
rupted

rupted by the minute detail of smaller and less considerable events.

THE numbers of those, who were killed or banished in the antient wars and factions, may have been magnified, as well as other numbers in antient authors. 'Tis probable in particular, that the confusions in the *Greek* republics are much augmented in the accounts of their orators. Can we think otherwise of what *Isocrates* says to *Philip*, "That it would be easier to raise an army in *Greece* at present from the vagabonds, than from the cities *,". This was only an hyperbolic way of speaking, and could not be agreeable to the truth of history: the whole number of these vagabonds, whom the orator is describing, could only have been about 20,000; for this was the number of the exiles, when *Alexander* ordered them to be restored. A number very inconsiderable, compared with those mighty armies which could have been raised at that time, in a country so populous as *Greece*, where all the citizens were soldiers. We find, that, about this very time, the *Greeks* agreed to raise eleven times as many as the whole number of vagabonds, to support *Philip* in his expedition against the *Persians* †.

BUT supposing that there is no mistake in the numbers of those who are said to have been killed in the antient wars, it ought to be considered, that

* *Politic. discours.* p. 197.

† This shall be proved afterwards.

that all the antient soldiers, nay, all the antients in general, being married, the loss of a much greater number, who had children to succeed them, would not be so much felt, as the death of a much smaller number in modern times, in which so many are unmarried.

ADD to this, that if we suppose a country to be populous at any particular time, such a country cannot well be rendered unpopulous by wars, unless there is some other source of decay. If affairs are wisely regulated in other respects, war will have but an inconsiderable effect, unless in some very extraordinary cases. Notwithstanding the civil wars in *Britain*, in the reign of *Charles I.* 'tis scarce to be doubted, but the country was as populous at the end of them; at least at the death of *Oliver Cromwell*, as it had been at the beginning of the war.

THIS may be illustrated by what our author has observed *, That "after plagues have swept away the third or fourth part of a people, in a generation or two the destruction is not perceived, and the society acquires their former number:" and that "the *Lues Venerea*, diffused every where, is perhaps equivalent, by its constant operation, to the three great scourges of mankind, war, pestilence and famine." From the same principles will it not follow, that the constant operation of a good constitution, and of

E c

maxims

* P. 160. 157. 158.

maxims which tended much to populousness, such as many of those of antient times are confessed to have been, would be more effectual to augment, than wars and insurrections, which happen only at particular times, to diminish the numbers of the people? And if *Switzerland*, according to our author's concession *, notwithstanding its inlisting its subjects into every service in *Europe*, is found to abound in people, merely by the force of its political institutions, and without possessing any advantage either of soil, climate or commerce; may we not justly infer, that the antient republics, which he acknowledges it resembles in its government and maxims, might have been much more populous than this modern republic, notwithstanding their frequent battles, since they possessed much greater advantages both of soil and climate?

BUT besides such general observations, if we go into a more particular detail, and compare different ages with one another, it will be difficult to shew, that modern ages have been happier than the antient in freedom from factions and wars. Nay, if we consider the many civil wars, occasioned by the disputed titles of princes, by their invasions of the rights of their subjects, by their struggles for arbitrary power, and by the fury of religious disputes (a thing but little known in antiquity), it will be almost a demonstration, that these civil and religious wars have been far
more

* P. 135. 186.

more destructive than the antient factions in popular states, on which so great stress is laid in the *political discourse*.

'Tis natural for us in *Britain*, who amidst all our foreign wars, have so long enjoyed the sweets of peace at home, to be much struck with such a list, as our author has given, of those who had been killed or banished by the different factions among the *Greeks*; yet upon a more accurate inspection, the case will not be found so dreadful, as it appears upon the first view. Taking our author for our guide, the number of those who were banished under the free governments, amounted only to 11,400, the number of the killed to 6060. In some cases the precise numbers are not mentioned; however it can scarce be thought they would much swell the account. Add to these 10,000 said to have been butchered in cold blood by *Dionysius* the elder, and 69,000 killed and banished by the tyrant *Agathocles*. This is the sum of the whole. Comparing therefore the two periods; in antient times we shall find about 100,000 killed and banished in a course of 60 years, in the free states of *Greece*, in *Syracuse*, *Gela* and *Ægesta* in *Sicily*, in *Sybaris* in *Italy*, in *Ephesus* in *Asia*, in the islands of *Corcyra* and *Chios*, and in *Cyrene*, states which were very populous; of which number *Dionysius* the elder alone killed half as many, and *Agathocles* killed and banished thrice as many as all the free states taken together. This is not an inconsiderable

siderable number to have been destroyed by factions and civil wars; but nothing near so great, as could have depopulated antient nations; nor is it at all considerable, in respect of those who have been banished, killed and massacred by civil and religious wars in some particular countries, within much shorter periods of time, during the space of about 200 years immediately preceeding the beginning of this century; as will be evident from the following examples.

IN the year 1492, 200,000 *Jewish* families were banished out of *Spain* on account of their religion*. And within little more than another century, in the year 1610, in the reign of *Philip III.* 900,000 *Moors* † were driven out of the same country

* *This was done in consequence of an edict published by Ferdinand V. Quo jubentur omnes Judaei, nisi velint Christiani fieri, Hispania excedere. They were allowed four months to dispose of their effects. Pulsa sunt hoc modo plus quam ducenta familiarum millia. Sed nihil, ut appendix Ursperg. habet, exportare iis licuit de auro vel gemmis, sed pro hisce ipsis mutare licuit vinum, victum, vestes, et alia ad iter necessaria.*

Calvinius ad ann. 1492.

Petavius, in his *Rationarium temporum*, where he mentions the taking of *Granada*, an. 1492, adds, Eodemque anno 171 familiarum millia Judaici generis in exilium abiire, quae ad 800,000 capitum fuisse dicuntur. And quotes as his authorities, *Nauclerus* and *Mariana*.

† *This is the number in Turselin's epitome, lib. 11. ad ann. 1610. He adds indeed, E quibus innumeri in Africam abiire, plurimi variis aliis locis dispersi fuere; non pauci commercia*
linguae

country on the same account. Such a remarkable instance of cruelty, folly and madness, is not to be paralleled among any of the antient nations.

What vast numbers must have been killed during those civil and religious wars in *France*, which lasted near 40 years, from 1562 to 1599! In the first battle, which was fought at *Dreux* in *Normandy*, anno 1562, 9000 were killed: how many must have perished in the rest of the battles and sieges, during

linguae tecti, et mutatis sedibus ignoti mansere in Hispania. But the number of those last who are said to have remained in Spain, must have been small, in comparison of the rest, who could not possibly have concealed themselves in this manner.

Doctor *Geddes*, in the first vol. of his tracts, printed at *London*, 1730, gives an account of this expulsion of the *Jews* and *Moors*, well worth the perusal of all sound Protestants and politicians. These two expulsions, were attended with many barbarous and cruel circumstances. Doctor *Geddes* observes, that the dispersion of the *Spanish Jews*, is reckoned by all of that nation and religion, to have been, both as to hardships, and as to numbers, nothing inferior to that which followed upon the destruction of *Jerusalem*; above 800,000 men, women and children, having been expelled out of *Spain* at this time. He observes further, that the *Spanish* historians are not agreed about the number of the *Moriscoes* that were expelled; some reckoning them a million, others 900,000; but most authors only 600,000. According to the archbishop of *Valencia's* computation (page 133) there were above 40,000 *Moriscoe* children born every year in *Spain*, from which it will follow, according to Mr. *Haley's* calculations, that there must have been more than 1,360,000 *Moors* in the whole kingdom.

during a course of so many years! Where can we find such an example of cruelty and destruction in antiquity, as the massacre which was begun at *Paris* on *St. Bartholomy's day*, *August 24. 1572*? According to *Davila*, more than 10,000 were killed in *Paris* alone on that and the following day; among whom there were 500 gentlemen and officers, who had come from all parts of the kingdom, to honour the nuptials of the king of *Navarre*. He adds, that, according to common report, no fewer than 40,000 Protestants perished in a few days on this occasion*.

BUT, as if *France* had not suffered sufficiently, and too little cruelty had been exercised during this distracted period, within less than a century, by the unhappy politics of *Lewis XIV.* more than a million of Protestants, according to the common computation, were driven out of *France*, or obliged to fly it in a few years, in consequence of the revocation of the edict of *Nantz*, in the year 1685.

So

* *Calvisius*, ad ann. 1572, takes notice, that *Charles ix.* in a letter to *Pope Gregory xiii.* boasted, that 70,000 of them had been killed in a few days; and quotes *Onuphrius* for his authority.

Thuan, after a detail of this horrible affair, adds: Proditumque à multis plus 30 hominum millia toto regno extincta; quamvis aliquanto minorem numerum credo, lib. 52.

According to *Turselin* in his epitome, ad 60 millia Parisiis cæsa traduntur.

So fatally was this celebrated monarch misled by his bigotry on this occasion*.

'Tis impossible to compute, how many perished by the wars in the *Netherlands*, excited by the tyranny and bigotry of *Philip II.* king of *Spain*; but 'tis certain, that these wars were very bloody and destructive. According to *Bentivoglio* †, the siege of *Ostend* alone, which continued three years, cost more than 100,000 lives. *Calvisius* † reckons a much greater number. Could we compute the number of those who were killed at each battle and siege, during so long a war ‖, together with the number of such

* The author of *Le Siècle de Louis xiv.* tho' a great admirer of this Prince, most justly condemns his treatment of his Protestant subjects, as cruel and impolitic. *Tome 2. chap. 32.* he confesses, that almost 50,000 families fled out of *France* in three years, and were afterwards followed by others; and that *France* lost about 500,000 inhabitants. *Tome 1. chap. 14.* he states them at more than 600,000. They have been commonly computed at a million or more. The same author asserts, *tome 2. chap. 32.* that there are still remaining letters under the *Marquis of Louvois's* hand, dated 1685, conceived in these terms, "sa majesté veut qu'on fasse éprouver les dernières rigueurs à ceux qui ne voudront pas se faire de sa religion; et ceux qui auront la fotte gloire de vouloir demeurer les derniers, doivent être poussés jusqu'à la dernière extrémité."

† *In his* Guerre di Fiandra.

‡ His words are, *In Ostenda perierunt obsidionis tempore, 72900 homines; Hispanorum obsidentium qui perierunt multo plures fuerunt. Sed eorum ratio iniri non potuit.*

‖ It lasted 42 years, from 1567, to 1609.

such as perished by the barbarous cruelties of the *Spaniards* committed in cold blood, to what an immense multitude would the whole amount.

AND though the civil wars in *Britain*, in the reigns of *Charles I.* and *II.* did not continue so long, and were not conducted with such fury on the part of the Protestants of either side; yet many more perished in them, than what are mentioned by our author in all the struggles between the nobles and the people in all the free states of *Greece*. *Mr. Rapin*, the most impartial writer of the history of *England*, though he declares expressly, that, without narrating the particulars of all the skirmishes and conflicts during the war, he will confine himself to some of the principal actions; and though he frequently satisfies himself, with taking notice in general, that many were killed, without mentioning the particular numbers; yet has given as many particular lists of such as were said to have been killed in different battles and rencounters, as amount to near 40,000. Undoubtedly the number was much greater, considering with what briskness these civil wars were managed on both sides, and how many battles and skirmishes were fought, and towns besieged, taken and re-taken, in so many different places. To all which we may add more than 100,000 Protestants killed in the *Irish* massacre alone*.

alone*. Upon the whole matter, it seems evident, that not only no argument can be drawn against the superior populousness of antiquity, from the antient factions and civil wars, but that the argument from this topic is altogether in favour of the antients †. Nor need we scruple to

F f assert,

* *Con a Mabony* an *Irish* Jesuit, in a book printed at *Lisbon* 1645, in which he exhorts his countrymen to kill all the Protestants in *Ireland*, has the following remarkable expressions as cited by *Dr. Geddes*. "My dear *Irish*, Go on and perfect the work of your liberty and defence, which is so happily begun by you; and kill all the Heretics, and all that do assist and defend them. You have, in the space of four or five years, that is, betwixt the year 1641, and the year 1645, wherein I write this, killed 150,000 Heretics, as your enemies do acknowledge, neither do you deny it: and, for my own part, as I verily believe, that you have killed more of them; so I would to God, you had killed them all."

Geddes's tracts, vol. 1. pag. 84.

According to the Earl of *Clarendon*, "This insurrection of the *Irish* spread itself over the whole country, in such an inhuman and barbarous manner, that there were forty or fifty thousand of the *English* Protestants murdered, before they suspected themselves to be in any danger, or could provide for their defence, by drawing together into towns or strong holds."

† The civil and religious factions of modern times, have been so prodigiously destructive, that as our author has mentioned nothing like them, so it will truly be found impossible to shew that there was ever any thing of the kind so destructive, before the establishment of the *Roman* empire. How bitter have been the effects of that dogmatic, cruel and persecuting

assert, that the struggles for arbitrary power, and the attempts of modern tyrants to enslave their subjects, together with the bigotry of modern times, and the dreadful persecutions which have happened on account of religion, may justly be numbered among the fatal sources of the want of people in *Europe* during the latter ages.

Thus it appears, that antient wars* were not near so destructive as those in modern times. In the same manner, it will be difficult to conceive, how the members of the antient republics could have been more oppressed in times of peace, than the subjects of our modern monarchies, most of which are absolute; yet our author has laid a considerable stress on this article, and taken notice of the large fines which were sometimes imposed upon individuals in an arbitrary manner under the antient aristocracies and democracies. No doubt,

secuting spirit which has infected the Christian, or rather the Antichristian church, and has discovered itself so dreadfully in the bloody maxims, and barbarous policy of Popery! Through this savage zeal, how many thousands, yea millions, have been harrassed, banished, and destroyed! How many of the deluded votaries, and emissaries of the court of *Rome*, have violated justice, broken through the most sacred engagements, and laid aside humanity! Of this, many authentic documents might be produced.

* Though, in the preceding pages, I have only spoken of civil and religious wars; yet, it does not appear, that there is any just reason to believe foreign wars to have been, upon the whole, less destructive in modern than in antient times.

doubt, particular instances may be given of impositions under the best governments; but it would be a paradox indeed, if republics, notwithstanding all their limitations and divisions of power, should be found to bear hardest upon their subjects. Where there was such a high spirit of liberty and equality, as appeared in the antient nations, fines can never be supposed to have been so frequent, or so grievous upon the whole, as the perpetual exactions of arbitrary princes, and their favourites, who may, and undoubtedly do impose heavier taxes upon their inferiors, with less danger, than the nobles or people under the antient republics could have done upon their equals. In short, as the warlike, active, and independent spirit of the antients had many advantages to balance the disadvantages to which it gave occasion; so there is no reason to believe these disadvantages to have been so great, as to afford any probable ground of rejecting those testimonies concerning the populousness of antient nations, against which there is no reasonable objection on other accounts.

BESIDES the preceding observations, it will be proper to take particular notice of an extraordinary remark, That there was not in *Italy*, at the time when the laws of the twelve tables were composed, much more order, tranquillity and settled police, than there is at present among the *Tartars*; which Mr. *Hume* would conclude, because
by

by these laws possession for two years formed a prescription for land, one year for moveables*.

THOUGH we could not make it appear, that there was no inconsistency between a settled police, and this law concerning prescription, from the situation and extent of the *Roman* territory at that time; from the division of the lands into the smallest shares; and from the simplicity of those days: a more accurate reflexion on the history of *Rome*, might not only convince us, that there was order, tranquillity and settled police; but also disclose perhaps the most pregnant symptoms of wisdom and conduct among the *Romans* long before this time. And it will serve not only to overturn Mr. *Hume's* position, but also greatly to confirm several observations which have been made in the foregoing *Dissertation* concerning the division of lands, if we shall mention particularly some institutions which were established among the *Romans*, long before the time of composing the twelve tables, and then shew from these laws themselves, that property was well secured by them.

'Tis needless to descend into a particular detail of the great exploits which they had already performed, or to make particular mention of the many illustrious men, whose uncommon *political* abilities, as well as bravery, had raised their country to so high a pitch of glory. The annals of
history

* P. 191.

history are filled with the remembrance of these facts; and it would be impertinent, as well as unnecessary, to recount them.

I shall only beg leave to cite a succession of elected princes, but elected with that wisdom and foresight, which shew a constant and determined plan, as each of them was endowed in a remarkable manner with those talents which fitted him for forming as well as supporting a new state, found in that situation, in which the *Roman* republic was found at the time of the accession of each succeeding prince to the throne. Indeed these very princes, by their wise laws and institutions, seem to have laid the foundation of the grandeur of that city, which afterwards became, by a steady adherence to these institutions, the mistress of the world.

NOT to mention all the particular religious institutions of *Numa*, the decorations of *Ancus*, and the civil establishments of *Servius*; consider only in a political view that system of religion which was introduced by *Numa*: for 'tis only in a political view, as an human institution, contrived by a legislator for producing certain effects, that it either can or ought to be considered. Consider it, I say, only in this view, and you shall find, that it served in a remarkable manner, not only to preserve integrity of manners, and subordination of rank among the *Romans*, but also to maintain peace and tranquillity in the state, and to prevent
those

those differences of sects, factions and opinions, which have, like fiends, infested modern times, and torn and distracted modern governments. Hence it is, that in the history of *Rome*, during a long period of 700 years, we hear only, I think, of one commotion on the score of religion.

THE institution of the *Census* by *Servius*, can never be sufficiently admired, and is another incontestable proof of the wisdom not only of that prince, by whom it was introduced, but also of the *Roman* people, who cheerfully submitted to so wise an institution. Were an attempt made to introduce such an institution into *Britain* at this day, with what opposition would it meet! what confusion would it raise! and into what a ferment would it throw the nation! Nay, notwithstanding all our boasted civility, politeness and wisdom, it may be greatly questioned, whether it would be possible, with all the address of which we are capable, to bring the people of *Britain* to submit to it.

* AGAIN, another proof of the existence of a wise and regular police among the *Romans* in the most early times, may be drawn from a view of that admirable connexion, which subsisted between those laws which related to the partition of lands, and those which regarded the order of succession

* See *L'Esprit des loix*, liv. 27. where the ingenious and judicious author prosecutes this connexion to its most remote consequences.

cession to estates. *Romulus*, we are informed by ancient historians, divided that little field, which, in his time, was called the *Roman* empire, among his people. Each particular family got a small portion to cultivate and improve: for, having almost as many people as he had acres, he was obliged by necessity to study mediocrity, and to make the shares extremely small. And, mediocrity being absolutely necessary for the well-being and subsistence of his little state, 'twas necessary to regulate the order of succession, so as to preserve it among the citizens, and to hinder any particular person from acquiring so great wealth, as would give him either superior eminence or greater influence than the rest of his fellows. Accordingly the order of succession seems to have been regulated chiefly in this view: for the partition of the lands, and the preservation of mediocrity among the citizens, seem to have been the true cause and original of all those rules of succession, which were in force till the time of the Decemvirs.

IN order therefore to preserve mediocrity, 'twas necessary that the portion which had been allotted at first to each particular family, should remain in the family to which it had been at first assigned; and that no family should acquire more than its own share. For this purpose, the *Romans* established by law two orders of heirs: those who were under the parental authority of the *paterfamilias*, and were called *heredes sui*, *their own heirs*. Secondly,

In

In default of these *heredes sui*, those who were most nearly related to the deceas'd by males, and were called *agnati*.

HENCE 'tis evident, that if the deceas'd left heirs of the first order, and his estate descended to them, it could never depart from the original family. For, if he left only one heir, this person alone succeeded to the whole estate: if he left more than one in the same degree of propinquity, the estate was divided equally among them all: and, as marriage in those incorrupted days was common, and the *Romans* were robust and healthful, heirs of this order would be, seldom wanting. But if at any time they did happen to fail, the law calling to the succession those of the second order, *viz.* the nearest agnates, the estate was still preserved in the original family, and could never grow to an enormous bulk.

BUT, as it was intended, that the estate of one family should never be annexed to that of another, it was hence necessary to exclude wholly from the succession those who were related to the deceas'd by females, and were called *cognati*: for these cognates belonged to another family, and would, if they had been admitted to the succession, have caused several estates to have been soon united in one family, and of course the eminence and influence of that family to have increased greatly.

ON this principle, children were excluded from succeeding to their mothers, and mothers were excluded

excluded from succeeding to their children. For the mother belonging to one family, and her children to another, had they been mutual heirs, the estate of one family should have been united to that of another.

FROM hence it appears plainly, that there was no reason to distinguish, whether the person who succeeded was male or female. Accordingly, females, as well as males, were admitted indiscriminately to the succession; for they belonged equally to the family: and if a female happened to succeed, no more property was vested in her single person, than would have been vested in that of a male, who should have happened to succeed in her place. If she married, the estate still continued in the original family, as represented by her person: and at her death neither her husband succeeded to her, nor indeed at the death of her husband did she succeed to him; for they were neither *agnates* nor *cognates* to one another: nor did her children succeed to her, as we have said already; for they were not her *agnates*. Her own *agnates* therefore succeeded to her, which made her estate descend to the very same persons, to whom it would have descended, if she had not interveened, and the estate had devolved immediately on that person, who would have succeeded to the deceas'd, if she had never existed. Thus the estate of each family was kept separate from that of his neighbour, and mediocrity was preserved.

BUT yet further, it follows from what has been said, that grandchildren by a son were allowed to succeed to their paternal grandfather, while those by a daughter did not succeed to their maternal grandfather. For 'tis plain, that grandchildren by a son continued still to make part of the paternal grandfather's family, and of course, on their succession, did not make the estate depart from the original family; whereas grandchildren by a daughter did not make a part of their maternal grandfather's family, but a part of that of their own father or father's father. So that, had they succeeded to their maternal grandfather's estate, since at the same time they succeeded to that of their paternal grandfather, in this manner the estates of two different families would have been united in the person of one *paterfamilias*, and the mediocrity been quickly destroyed.

THAT these rules of succession might remain in force, we may easily see it would be absolutely necessary, that no private citizen should have a power of altering the order of succession established by the public law, and of instituting an heir at pleasure. Accordingly we find, that the power of making a testament belonged to no private citizen before the laws of the twelve tables. For if each particular citizen had had a full power of leaving his estate, or disinheriting his lawful heirs, according as his caprice or whim might have dictated, the state of the republic might have been soon

soon totally changed, and an entirely new face of affairs been seen. If therefore at any time a citizen found himself in that situation, which required a particular destination of his estate, since by his own private authority he could not alter the public law, 'twas necessary to profer a bill to the people, who, if they found it *e republica*, by their legislative authority, gave their supreme sanction to his testament. Hence the *testamenta in comitiis calatis facta*, the only testaments that were in use before the laws of the twelve tables. As these testaments were really and truly laws, and could not be enacted without a great deal of solemnity, 'tis plain, that it would be only in extraordinary cases they could be in use; and that as the people themselves had in this way the tuition and guardianship of their own institutions, it could seldom happen, that the alterations made in any particular case could greatly affect, or tend to destroy that public order of succession, which was established, in order to preserve mediocrity of fortune among the citizens. For these were times of virtue, in which it would always be first considered, whether any bill was or was not *e republica*; so that the designs which the legislature had in establishing this extraordinary order of succession would be still preserved.

'Tis true indeed, that the *Decemviri* in one article receded from the antient disposition of the laws, and, by those of the twelve tables, gave

to

to each *paterfamilias* a full and ample power of disposing of his estate, by last will or testament, according to his own pleasure. But we must at the same time remember, that the same rules of succession *ab intestato* were still kept in force, and established by the Decemvirs, which had formerly taken place*. For this order of succession does not seem to have been one of those institutions which were imported into the *Roman* territory by those deputies, who were sent into *Greece* to bring home materials for composing a body of laws; but seems to have been, like the *patria potestas*, one of those native institutions, which had been in force long before, perhaps from the very infancy of their empire, and to have been only continued, and further enforced by the laws of the twelve tables. Therefore, though an overweening fondness for paternal authority, and for its unlimited extent, led the *Romans* to allow fathers either to institute or to disinherit those heirs, whom, by the most ancient disposition of their laws, they had full power to murder; we must not conclude, that they immediately made free use of this power. 'Twas much otherwise; the people at that time had a love of the republic, and, of course, of mediocrity of fortune. Their virtue did all, and the love of it hindered the people from counteracting the public law, and opposing the public good, by overturning those rules of succession, which were so necessary

* See L'Esprit des loix, liv. 27.

sary for preserving equality among the citizens, and harmony in the commonwealth.

By consequence, the legal succession usually took place, and the custom of making testaments did not grow common for a great number of years; so that still an equality of fortune was preserved, and the most eminent citizens were possessed of only a little spot. However testaments did at last become frequent; and, of course, that mediocrity of fortune, which is the basis of republican government, was soon destroyed. Some citizens became poor, others acquired immense possessions; ideas of riches and poverty became familiar, and cries for *agrarian* and *sumptuary* laws became violent. But the evil was become both so universal and so virulent, as to admit of no remedy. The republic was at last destroyed; and that so much sooner, as from confined ideas of natural equity, the *Praetors*, by their edicts, under the appearance of correcting, really undermined the public order of succession, which had been so wisely calculated for preserving the happiness and virtue of the people.

CAN we then say, that there was no order, tranquillity, or settled police among the *Romans* at that time, when they had formed such wise institutions, and enacted laws with a foresight, which may astonish many politicians, who have had the experience of 2000 years more than the legislators of that remote age!

BESIDES; the expulsion of *Tarquin*; the *Valerian* law

law *de provocatione*, justly esteemed the foundation of the liberty of the *Roman* people; the institution of the Tribunes; and the steadiness with which they adhered to every scheme contrived, and resolution formed for the preservation of their liberty, are evident marks of at least some degree of wisdom and policy, and plainly shew, that the situation of the *Romans* in those early days, before the composition of the laws of the twelve tables, was more peaceful, and themselves more civilized, than Mr. *Hume* seems to imagine.

BUT that there was a settled police and great order among the *Romans* at this time, appears especially from that inclination which they shewed on this very occasion, to amend their constitution, by introducing a new system of laws into their dominions; from the wisdom and sagacity with which they carried this scheme into execution; from their steadiness in pursuing their resolution, as well as their care in searching out, and docility in embracing whatever was most perfect among other nations; and, finally, from those fragments of the laws themselves, which have survived the *Roman* republic, and the ruins of time.

FREE from those prejudices, which attach an ignorant and barbarous people to their native institutions, the *Romans* having laid aside all admiration of their own laws, sent ambassadors abroad into foreign countries, to collect whatever they should find best constituted in other states, and to import

import their observations, and the wisdom they should learn, into their own country. These ambassadors having visited the most renowned states of *Greece*, and made accurate observations on different polities, returned with an ample collection, and store of wisdom and political knowledge. The state was no sooner provided in this manner with a plentiful stock of rich materials, on which to work, than ten men of the greatest abilities were appointed to select, arrange, and compile that body of laws, which conducted the *Romans* to universal empire, and was the root from whence afterwards sprang the most compleat and most perfect body of civil law the world has as yet seen. Neither did the *Romans* content themselves with the wisdom of those whom their own country could afford; for, as well in compiling as interpreting the laws*, the *Decemviri* used the assistance of *Hermodorus*, a celebrated *Ephesian*, who had been banished by his countrymen for his superior wisdom, abilities and worth; was an intimate friend of *Heraclitus*, the most humane perhaps of the wise men of old; and seems to have been the philosopher of those days, who was most remarkable for his skill in policy and legislation †. *Heraclitus* used to say of this man, That all the *Ephesians* deserved

* Strabo, lib. 14. p. 951. L. 2. § 4. ff. de origine juris.

† This appears from some letters of *Heraclitus* directed to him, which may be seen in *Stanley's* history of philosophy, vit. *Heracl.*

deserved to die, for having banished the best and most worthy of the citizens*. Other nations would perhaps have conceived an hatred, but the *Romans* shewed gratitude to their best benefactor. By public authority, they erected a statue to *Hermodorus*, to whom they had so great obligations †. Conduct so wise, and actions so uncommon, are irresistible proofs, not only of the wisdom, but of the regular police of the *Romans* in those days. How few modern nations have ever attempted so grand a scheme? How few have succeeded in the attempt, and carried their schemes into execution? When so plain instances of the wisdom and docility of the *Tartars* can be cited, then, and not till then, ought they to be compared with the *Romans*.

BUT it can be demonstrated from the peculiar situation of the *Romans*, that this law concerning *usucapio* was well accommodated to the circumstances of the times.

THE *Romans* had not as yet carried their conquests far; their territory was extended but a small way around the city; it was divided into the smallest shares; the people lived in a simple and frugal manner; their substance consisted chiefly in their slaves, their cattle, their instruments of agriculture, their arms, and a few household utensils

* Diogen. Laert. vit. philosop. lib. ix. c. 1. n. 2. Cicer. Tuscul. disput. lib. 5. cap. 36.

† Plin. hist. nat. lib. 34. cap. 5.

utensils necessary for a people living amidst labour and frugality; and they did not abound with that variety of moveables, which are found in commercial nations, nor with those gew-gaws and refinements with which their posterity became so well acquainted.

IN such circumstances, it would not be easy for one man to invade the property of another. People who have few things of which they can be deprived, will soon miss any of them which may happen to be taken away from them: and if taken away, it would be an easy matter to recover them in a little country, where almost every man was acquainted with his neighbour, and had a pretty accurate knowledge of the moveables of which he was possessed. Hence an year was time long enough for the *usucapion* of moveables. The same length of time continued to be the term for this *usucapion*, not only all the while the republic enjoyed its liberty, but also long after the establishment of the empire; and a time not much longer, *viz.* three years, was thought to be long enough in the days of *Justinian*. So that we may well be allowed to doubt, whether the tedious length of time required to give right to moveables in those nations, which are reckoned most civilized at present, be any mark of more order, greater tranquillity, and more settled police, than were at *Rome* in the days of *Julius* or *Augustus Cæsar*.

BUT if moveables could not be carried away, surely much less could immoveables be invaded without observation. A *Roman*, who maintained himself and his family by cultivating his little farm, would immediately and sensibly feel the want of it, and would take care to recover it speedily.

BESIDES, disputes about property and succession could be but rare, as the laws of the twelve tables were short and perspicuous, and the rules of succession accurately determined. Kindred and affinity were easily known, and the remembrance of them was among the *Romans* nicely preserved by those sacred rites and institutions, which were proper to each family; at which the whole family and kindred met; and to which no extraneous persons were admitted.

FURTHER, such was the situation of the *Roman* territory at this time, that it was not only not easy, but I believe I might say, almost impossible, not only to seize on the lands of another, but to encroach even on the marches, by which these lands were divided. For we must not imagine, that at this time estates were divided, as they are at present in most countries of *Europe*, by insignificant lines of no breadth. Between each farm there was left uncultivated a space, no less than five feet broad, which was distinguished by the name of *iter limitare*. This space was held sacred, being dedicated to the god *Terminus*, and of course

it

it could not be acquired by *usucapion*. Nay, it was accounted sacrilege, either to plow or to encroach on it*. In this manner was the property of each particular citizen distinguished, and kept separate from that of his neighbour. Shall we wonder then, that the *Decemviri*, when they had determined the boundaries of land with such precision, at the same time made the space of two years the time requisite for the *usucapion* of it? Shall we say, that there was nothing but barbarity and rudeness among the *Romans*, when so wise provisions were made by their laws? Further, the *terminalia*, which were celebrated yearly by sacrificing, and by surrounding the marches, kept a constant and certain remembrance of every man's property. Can modern times boast of institutions better calculated for promoting the design which the legislature has in view?

NAY, such anxiety and care did the *Romans* shew, in separating property, and preserving these marches, that, when their territory had become extensive, and their people more numerous as well as less virtuous, they enacted the *Mamilian* law for the tuition of this very *iter limitare*; which law enforced what had been enacted of old by the laws of the twelve tables.

BESIDES, this *usucapion* introduced by these laws, did not make property so fleeting and transitory,

* Dion. Halicar. lib. 2. Festus in voce *Termino*.

fitory, as one would at first sight imagine. 'Tis true, the time of possession was short: but the other requisites, without which it could not proceed, were so many, and of a nature so peculiar, that they could seldom happen to meet in any but the true and rightful proprietor. For, first, it was necessary, that the possessor should have *bona fides*, and should honestly and sincerely believe, that the thing possessed by him was really his own, and was transmitted to him either by the true proprietor himself, or somebody commissioned by him. Nay, it was not sufficient to have this *good faith* at the first acquisition of the property or possession; but it behoved to be continual and uninterrupted, during the whole currency of the year or two years*. In a state whose territory was narrow, and especially where estates were small, and every one knew what belonged to his neighbour, it would not be so easy a matter to preserve this *bona fides* continually, even for a single year or two. And the intervention of *ill faith* interrupted the *usucapion* immediately, and no doubt would effectually hinder many acquisitions in this way.

SECONDLY, It was necessary that the possessor should possess *ex justo titulo*, such as would have immediately transferred the property, if derived from the true proprietor. Hence not only open force and violence, but even fraud of all kinds was pretty much excluded.

THIRDLY,

* L. un. C. de usucap. transformanda.

THIRDLY, Not only the *good faith*, but also the possession behoved to be continual and uninterrupted. For, if before the lapse of the time required by law for completing the *usucapion*, the possessor should by any means lose his possession, all the past time availed him nothing. Nor was it necessary, that the true owner either should be the person who interrupted his possession, or should himself acquire it. 'Twas sufficient if this was done by any other: for the *usurpation*, or interruption of the possession, by whomsoever it was effected; operated equally in favour of all, who pretended to have any right to the thing in question*.

MR. *Hume* seems to imagine, that this law had an influence over all *Italy*. But we must remember the extent of the *Roman* territory at this time: it made only a very inconsiderable part of *Italy*; consequently a very inconsiderable part of *Italy* was affected by this law, and by the time of *usucapion* introduced by it. For it never took place *extra ditionem reipublicae Romanae*; it never obtained *in terris sociorum*, or in the provinces. These were much governed by their own proper laws, and, no doubt, had each their own rules about prescription. Indeed 'tis probable, though it cannot be peremptorily affirmed, that, after the *social* war, when all the *Italians* got the *jus civitatis Romanae*, the land in *Italy* was placed *inter*

res

* L. 5. ff. de usurpationibus et usucapionibus.

res mancipi, and might by consequence be acquired by *usucapion*. But at this time it can never be said, there was no order or settled police in *Italy*. With much less reason can it be said, that there was no order or settled police in *Italy* at the time when the laws of the twelve tables were enacted, since the *Roman* territory was then so confined.

BESIDES, Mr. *Hume* seems to have not observed the necessary distinction between *usucapion* and *prescription*, and to think, that the shortness of the time in *usucapion* was never corrected till the days of *Justinian*. 'Twas much otherwise. For as the *Roman* power was extended over a wide tract of country, and the law of *usucapion* did not take place *extra ditionem reipublicae Romanae*, hence things which lay without this limit, could not be acquired in this manner. For this reason, *possessio* or *praescriptio longi temporis* was introduced, by which the property of lands lying in the provinces, which were not capable of *usucapion*, might be acquired. Indeed most part of modern lawyers think, this *longi temporis possessio* was introduced by the emperors, in order to supply the defects of *usucapion*; however, tolerably good reasons might be brought to prove the introduction of it to have been earlier than that of the monarchy. This possession *longi temporis*, as it differed in many respects from *usucapion*, so especially in the length of time, during which it was required that the possession should be continued. Indeed

'tis

'tis uncertain, what precise length of time, though it seems probable, that immemorial possession was required at first; and that the duration of this possession was shortened by degrees, till it was at last reduced to the stated time of ten years in presence, and twenty in absence.

THUS we see how small a way the law of *usucapion* extended during the liberty of the republic, and especially at the time of the composition of the laws of the twelve tables. And we may infer, that there was not in *Italy* at that time so great rudeness and barbarity, as Mr. *Hume* would make us believe.

INDEED the preceding observations, which it was necessary to make, in order to set this part of his argument in a clear light, plainly demonstrate, that there was not only not barbarity, but even a most regular and well-ordered police among the *Romans* at this time, such as may make some modern nations not a little ashamed.

BUT our author seems to have conceived so sorry an opinion, not only of that period, when the laws of the twelve tables were composed, but also of all the more remote periods of antiquity, on account of what he supposes to have been fierceness and an unsettled condition, as to imagine * the age of "*Trajan* and the *Antonines* to have been " more populous than any of the preceding, and " the only period in which the western part of the " world

* P. 254.

“ world might possibly contain more inhabitants
 “ than at present, as the great extent of the *Roman*
 “ empire was then civilized and cultivated, settled
 “ almost in a profound peace, both foreign and
 “ domestic, and living under the same regular po-
 “ lice and government.” Thus all the charming
 scenes of more remote antiquity, like some fairy
 vision or magic enchantment, vanish at once; and
 instead of *Grecian* and *Roman* freedom and virtue,
 we are referred to an oppressive despotic empire,
 as the most fertile source of populousness.

FOR what reason should we so much degrade
 the times of liberty, or consider even the most
 flourishing period of the *Roman* empire, or the
 reigns of its mildest and most generous princes, in
 such an advantageous light! 'Tis true, *Trajan*
 and the *Antonines* were among the best of the em-
 perors. But what could the best emperors do in
 such a corrupted state! These princes did what
 they could to alleviate the miseries of the people,
 and make their chains more easy. But the time
 to set things on a right footing was past; tyranny
 was rivetted; all that could be done was only to
 moderate its fury. It was impossible to redress the
 grievances of an injured and oppressed world, sink-
 ing of itself by the depravity of its manners,
 and ripening fast for that destruction which at
 length was brought upon it by the inroads of the
 barbarous nations.

'Tis

'Tis the opinion of one of the greatest mo-
 dern authors*, That “ all extensive governments,
 “ especially absolute monarchies, are destructive
 “ to populousness; and contain a secret vice and
 “ poison.” The maxim is infallibly true, and
 what our author† has allowed concerning enormous
 cities, “ That they are destructive to society, be-
 “ get vice and disorder of all kinds, starve the
 “ remoter provinces, and even starve themselves,”
 may be affirmed with better reason of enormous
 and over-grown governments, especially if they
 are absolute monarchies.

IN particular, this maxim will be found true,
 with respect to the *Roman* monarchy, which was
 one of the most destructive and tyrannical that can
 well be imagined. Where do we read of such ge-
 nuine and undisguised tyrants; as among the *Ro-*
man emperors? Where can we find so great folly,
 madness or cruelty, as appears in the characters
 and conduct of the immediate successors of *Augu-*
stus? Nay, what was this celebrated *Augustus*
 himself; but a most cruel and treacherous sub-
 verter of the liberties of his country, who pro-
 scribed and cut off the best and most worthy of the
Romans; stopping at nothing, however wicked
 and unjust, to raise himself to the sovereign power;
 and afterwards betaking himself to more popular
 and moderate councils, rather from cunning and

I i

fear

* The author of *L'esprit des loix*, livre 23. chap. 19.

† P. 183.

fear of *Roman* bravery, and a dread even of the faint remainder of the antient spirit, as his character gives us just title to presume, than out of love to *Rome*? But he and his more immediate successors quite extinguished the *Roman* spirit and liberty. So that before the milder and more moderate emperors came to the helm, oppression and tyranny had been so deeply rooted, such cruelties had been exercised in *Rome*, the conquered provinces had been accustomed to such a slavish subjection, that the best princes could only give a little ease to the distressed people during their own time; but could never prevent the fatal effects of such an absolute and arbitrary power, exercised without any legal check or controul, by the emperor's ministers and favourites in *Rome*, and by their emissaries who were commissioned to the provinces.

FROM whence can we imagine so arbitrary and despotic an empire could produce such a populousness, as surpassed whatever had been seen in more antient times? Is it from the contemplation of such a government in itself, and of the consequences naturally flowing from its forms and constitution? In all despotic governments, whether under a *Turkish* or *Roman* emperor, or under such milder tyrants, as, though unlimited by the people, sometimes deign to set limits to themselves; peace commonly degenerates into indolence; order is nothing but the dread of the tyrant's power; as there

there is little security, industry seldom flourishes: nay, it is dangerous for any to be active or eminent, lest they become suspected, or awaken the jealousy or avarice either of the tyrant or of his ministers. But how can populousness be expected in nations destitute of industry and activity!

OR is it from the happy influence of other despotic governments, that we would conclude, the *Roman* empire to have been so extremely populous? Where are such examples to be found? or where can an instance be produced, from whence it will appear, that the number of the people actually increased under such an empire?

OR can we draw such a conclusion from the accounts that are given us by those authors who lived under the *Roman* empire? The best authorities and founder testimonies are on the other side, and represent both *Italy* and the provinces as in a declining state. We scarce need any stronger proofs of this, than what our author himself hath observed in his *political discourse*: for he hath admitted*, That though “all antient authors tell us that there was a perpetual flux of slaves to *Italy* from the remote provinces, — yet the number of people increased not in *Italy*; and writers complain of the continual decay of industry and agriculture.” He hath also taken notice †, That “there was much land uncultivated, and

* P. 168.

† P. 238, 239.

“ put to no manner of use” in the days of *Pertinax*; and that it was ascribed as a great praise to this emperor, that “ he allowed every one to take such land, either in *Italy*, or elsewhere, and cultivate it as he pleased, without paying any taxes.” He acknowledges likewise, “ That this corresponds very ill with an idea of extreme populoufness.” Now, the age of *Pertinax* approached very near to that period of antiquity which he pitches on as most populous; for *Pertinax* succeeded after the short reign of *Commodus*, the son of *Antoninus philosophus*. He hath further remarked from *Vopiscus* *, That “ there was in *Etruria* much fertile land uncultivated, which the emperor *Aurelian* intended to convert into vineyards, in order to furnish the *Roman* people with a gratuitous distribution of wine:” and confesses, that this was “ a very proper expedient to dispeople still farther that capital, and all the neighbouring territories.” He hath also admitted, that “ when the *Roman* authors complain, that *Italy*, which formerly exported corn, became dependent on all the provinces for its daily bread, they never ascribe this alteration to the increase of its inhabitants; but to the neglect of tillage and agriculture †.” Why therefore should we imagine such superior populoufness to have arisen from the *Roman* empire. If *Italy* itself declined in every thing that

was

* P. 239.

† P. 253.

was good, what may we imagine was the case of the provinces, wasted and plundered by rapacious governors?

BESIDES these documents of the languishing state of *Italy*, taken from our author himself, we have a strong proof of the declension of the world, and of the comparative scarcity of mankind under the *Roman* empire, from the testimony of *Plutarch* *, an author who had the best opportunities of being well acquainted both with *Grecian* and *Roman* affairs. Indeed Mr. *Hume* excepts both to the treatise in which this testimony is contained, on suspicion that it is not the genuine work of *Plutarch* †; and also to the manner in which *Plutarch* has declared his opinion. But neither exception seems well founded.

THE passage in *Plutarch* may be interpreted to signify pretty much what our author would have it *,

* De oraculorum defectu.

† Whatever suspicions our author may have entertained, that this little piece was not the genuine production of *Plutarch*, it has all the appearance of an antient work. According to *Suidas* (on the word *Lamprias*), *Lamprias*, the son of *Plutarch*, composed a catalogue of his father's writings. Which catalogue has been published several times, particularly by *Fabricius* in his *Bibliotheca Græca*. In it mention is made of the treatise, *De oraculorum defectu*: nor is that variety of opinions, which appears among the persons who are introduced as speakers in this dialogue, nor the difference between their opinions, and the opinions which prevail at present, a sufficient ground on which we ought to call in question its authenticity.

it*, "that the silence of the oracles may be ascribed to the present desolation of the world, proceeding from former wars and factions; which common calamity was more sensibly felt in Greece than in any other country, insomuch that the whole could scarce at present furnish out 3000 warriors, such as were sent to the battle of *Plataea* by the single city of *Megara*; the gods therefore, who affect works of dignity and importance, have suppressed many of their oracles, and deign not to use so many interpreters of their will to so diminutive a people †."

HERE we have a clear and express testimony, that there was a remarkable scarcity of people in the age of *Plutarch*, in comparison of more ancient times; and that this was especially sensibly felt in Greece ‡. Indeed *Plutarch* has not expressly assigned the extensive dominion of the *Romans* for the cause of this scarcity, but ascribes it to the former wars and factions; all which, Mr. *Hume* says, were quieted by the *Roman* arms.

BUT it is plain, *first*, that whatever *Plutarch* imagined was the cause of this depopulation of the world, his testimony concerning the truth of the fact is most express. *Secondly*, That however much he might have been convinced, that this was owing to the *Roman* empire, he had good reasons

* P. 257.

† De oraculorum defectu, P. 413, 414.

‡ Polit. disc. p. 256, 257.

reasons not to attack the *Romans* directly, or to ascribe the destruction of the world to *Roman* power. As he had lived long at *Rome*, had been well used by the *Romans*, and not a little favoured by one of the emperors, he might not have thought it proper, perhaps it might not have been safe, it might have looked like sedition, to assign the *Roman* empire for a cause of the decay of the world. He had reason therefore to express himself only in general terms; but we have no reason to suppose, that he had no view to those wars, by which the *Romans* subdued the world. These wars had been more destructive than any other. Those among the free states of *Greece*, and those between the tribes in *Gaul* and *Spain* often indeed let a little blood, sometimes perhaps pretty plentifully; but on the whole, did not do any very considerable harm: at least they were not near so destructive either as those other wars, in which the *Romans* with an unrelenting hand destroyed the *Italian* states and the nations in *Gaul* and *Spain*; or as the many bloody battles which were fought for power and dominion among their leaders, and which equally affected themselves, and the provinces and states they had conquered, viz. those between *Marius* and *Sylla*, between *Caesar* and *Pompey*, between *Caesar* and the remaining chiefs of the republican party, between those who put *Caesar* to death and the *Triumvirate*, and between *Antony* and *Octavianus*. Compared with these more destructive wars, the former

former wars among the free states were but little skirmishes; accordingly, while there were no other, *Greece* and the other provinces abounded in people. In truth, the most pernicious effect which attended them, seems to have been the disunion of these lesser states among themselves; for, by these divisions, all of them, in their different turns, fell a prey to *Roman* tyranny. It is scarce to be believed, that *Plutarch* had no view to such destructive wars, when he reflected on the destruction of the world, and the desolation of his country. I cannot therefore agree with our author in thinking*, “that *Plutarch*’s reasoning is directly contrary to the inference which is drawn from the fact he advances,” since he does not exclude the wars, by which the *Romans* wasted and destroyed the world. But though he had been mistaken in assigning the reasons of the fact, this would not invalidate the truth of the fact itself, which he affirms so expressly, and which indeed is so well established from all the histories of those times.

AGAIN, when *Plutarch* observes, that the calamitous desolation of the world was more sensibly felt in *Greece* than in any other country, it is not necessary to understand him, as if he meant to assert, that the *Greeks* were in a worse condition or were more cruelly treated by the *Romans* than other conquered nations. This seems to be the sense in which our author understands his words.

But

* P. 257.

But they are capable of this other interpretation, ‘that as the *Greeks* had been so numerous in preceding ages, had flourished so much, and had shewed themselves so far superior to the *Barbarians*, their present depopulation was more evident, more remarkable, and more sensibly felt.’ Indeed when we reflect upon the flourishing condition of *Greece* in antient times; on the number of fine cities with which it abounded; on the politeness, learning, and freedom of spirit, which so essentially distinguished its inhabitants from the rest of mankind; we must necessarily confess, that *Plutarch*’s observation is still true; and that the destruction, in which any of those states that flourished most of old are involved, is most remarkable, and most sensibly felt in *Greece* even at this day.

NOR is it necessary with our author to interpret *Plutarch* so strictly, as if there had been at that time only 3000 men in all *Greece* able to bear arms. Nothing more can be intended, than that the *Greeks* were dwindled into a diminutive nation, in comparison of what they had been formerly; and that in all their cities there were not perhaps 3000 good soldiers, such as the single city of *Megara* could have furnished in the *Median* war*. Thus *Plutarch*’s testimony is cleared from those

K k difficulties

* The word *οπλιταις* which is used by *Plutarch*, signifies such as were compleatly armed, or carried the heaviest arms, in whom the antients placed their greatest confidence.

difficulties which had so much perplexed our author*.

THESE testimonies of *Plutarch* and *Diodorus* are so full and express, and conclude so strongly against the happy influence of the *Roman* empire, that our author will not be found to have brought any thing so weighty on the other side: for we ought never to put the loose and rhetorical declamations of such a fiery passionate author as *Tertullian* †, or the flattering oration of the sophist

* This testimony of *Plutarch*, concerning the superior populousness of *Greece* and other antient nations, before the establishment of the *Roman* empire, is exactly agreeable to what we observed from *Diodorus Siculus*, p. 35th of the dissertation.

† In the treatise, *de anima*, cap. 30. *Tertullian* seems to have no intention of comparing the populousness of the world, under the *Roman* empire, with that of the period of antiquity which immediately preceded it, while the smaller republics were subsisting. The comparison is made between the age in which *Tertullian* lived, and the first ages, while mankind were wandering up and down in an unsettled, barbarous and uncultivated manner, before governments were regularly formed or firmly established. The argument he is treating, requires no more than that mankind should have increased greatly, and were much more numerous at that time, than at the beginning; which he observes was true, even according to profane history: and for this reason he argues, that since mankind have multiplied so greatly above what they were at first, and their numbers are so unequal in different ages, the living could not be produced from the dead, but a new soul must be produced at the formation of each body.

phist *Aristides**, in balance with the more cool and sedate judgment of *Plutarch*.

GREAT regard indeed would be due to *Strabo*, *Polybius* and *Pliny*, if their authority could be quoted, to support what our author infers from *Tertullian* and *Aristides*. But when the passages to which he refers are duly considered, this will be found not to be the case.

As for *Strabo*, it is evident, that in several places of his geography he takes notice, how much some mighty states were decayed in his age, and how much the number of their citizens was diminished †. This ought to have more weight, and is a clearer proof of his opinion on this subject, than a few passages, in which he pays a slight compliment to that empire under which he lived. For all, that he observes in his fourth book concerning

body. Such an argument has no relation to the *Roman* empire, but would have been equally good at any other period removed at a distance from the first ages.

* This oration, or encomium upon *Rome* and the *Roman* empire, may justly be called flattering; for the sophist seems to have aimed at no other thing, but to disparage antiquity, and prefer every thing in the *Roman* empire, to every thing that preceded. However he does not, either in the passage quoted by our author, or in any other part of his declamation, so far as I have observed, directly mention a greater populousness; but, tho' he had done it, the manner and visible design of the whole piece, is sufficient to shew how little stress is to be laid on his opinion concerning the advantages of the *Roman* empire.

† Dissertation, P. 35, 36.

ing those *Gauls* who lived in the neighbourhood of *Marseilles*, is only, that the superior power of the *Romans* had obliged some of the *Barbarians* to lay aside their arms, and to betake themselves to agriculture and the arts of peace.

As to what Mr. *Hume* observes concerning "the superior police of the *Romans*, with regard to the finances of *Egypt*, above that of its former monarchs*", "it is evident indeed from that passage of *Strabo* which he cites, that the revenues of *Egypt* amounted to a far larger sum than they had done in former times. But this is no certain sign, that the people were richer or more happy. This might, and in all probability did arise from hence, that the people of *Egypt* were burdened with more grievous taxes. Perhaps this was the reason, why "the town *Mareia* near *Alexandria*, which was formerly a large city, had dwindled into a village:" which our author observes † from *Athenaeus* (*lib. 1. cap. 25.*).

NEITHER can it be proved from *Strabo* and *Polybius*, that the *Greeks* were well treated by the *Romans* ‡. In reality, there was nothing but artifice and affectation in their seeming moderation. The *Romans* were not only a warlike people, but managed with much art and address. In odious cases, or when their interest, or the necessity of their

* *Polit. disc. p. 255.*

† *P. 255.*

‡ *Polit. disc. p. 257.*

their affairs required it, no people could better cover their oppression with specious appearances, or more dextrously affect to be gentle and equitable. They affected in particular an uncommon regard for the *Greeks*, and pretended to leave them in possession of their former laws and liberty. This is sometimes taken notice of by *Strabo*, *Polybius*, and other historians, who lived under their empire. But at bottom there was nothing sincere, as will be evident from the whole of their conduct taken together. 'Tis true, *Polybius* was able, by his interest with some of the great men of *Rome*, to alleviate the afflictions of his country, and to settle some good regulations, after the *Achaean*s were subdued*. Yet *Greece* was reduced to a *Roman* province, and governed by the arbitrary will of a *Roman* Praetor; in which state it continued till the reign of *Nero* †, who either through the advice of some of the good men who governed him in the beginning of his reign, or in some of his capricious humours afterwards, restored it to its liberty, or rather to an empty name of liberty. However empty as it was, the *Greeks* were not suffered to enjoy it long, being soon reduced to their former subjection by *Vespasian*. And though after the destruction of *Corinth*, and the settlement of the affairs of *Achaia*, they enjoyed

* *Pausanias in Achaicis.*

† *Ibidem.*

enjoyed a little respite from war; this was only a breathing time. *Greece*, like all the *Roman* provinces, was soon involved in all the calamities which attend a conquered people. What liberty was allowed the conquered nations, to live according to their own laws, and observe their ancient institutions, was only a shadow without the substance. The good effects of such a permission were far overbalanced by the oppression of the *Roman* governors. In short, the *Romans* were slaves themselves; and can we imagine the conquered provinces could have been in a better condition!

THE *Grecian* states fell into a languishing condition from the *era* of *Philip's* and *Alexander's* conquests. So fatal is the influence of a neighbouring monarchy, governed by able councils, when it intermeddles in the affairs of popular states, and by raising up factions among them, sets them in opposition to one another. 'Twas thus that *Philip* weakened the states of *Greece*, and laid the foundation of their ruin. But they declined far more speedily and remarkably after the *Roman* conquests. It would, therefore be not a little surprising, if so able and judicious an historian as *Polybius* should be found supposing, that "*Greece* had become more prosperous and flourishing after the establishment of the *Roman* yoke*." The passage referred to is so far from proving their riches or populoufness,

* Political discourses, p. 257.

populoufness, that it is introduced by *Polybius* to prove their poverty, and that all the goods of *Peloponnesus* were not worth 6000 talents, or 1,162,500 *l.* *Polybius's* words are; "For not to speak of those times, in which the affairs of *Peloponnesus* were entirely ruined, partly by the kings of *Macedon*, but chiefly by a series of civil wars: even in our days, in which all the states live in peace and good agreement, and imagine themselves to be so entirely happy, so great a sum (as 6000 talents) could not be made up out of all their goods, abstracting from the bodies*," meaning the price of the inhabitants, if they were sold for slaves. From which it is evident, that *Polybius* is comparing, not the condition of *Greece* before the days of *Philip*, with its condition in his own age; but the troubled and unsettled state of *Peloponnesus* during the *Achaean* wars, with that short breathing time it enjoyed, when these wars had just ceased. 'Tis natural for a people to think themselves very happy in the enjoyment of peace after destructive wars. This is all which is said by *Polybius*. For he is far from supposing, that the *Greeks* were happier, richer, or more populous, than they had been before the days of *Philip* the father of *Alexander*. How can we imagine that such a supposition would be found in a writer, who not only knew that a *Roman* army had ravaged *Achaia*, and dissolved the *Achaean* league, but was himself

* Lib. 2.

self an eye-witness of the barbarous destruction of *Corinth* *!

As for the passages quoted from *Pliny*, one of them rather makes against our author's hypothesis; for in it *Pliny* gives the preference to the antient world †. He admits indeed, that the *Roman* empire

* Strabo, lib. 8.

† Illud satis mirari non queo, interisse quarundem memoriam; atque etiam nominum, quae auctores prodidere, notitiam. Quis enim non communicato orbe terrarum, majestate Romani imperii profecisse vitam putet commercio rerum ac societate festae pacis, omniaque etiam quae occulta ante fuerant, in promiscuo usu facta? At hercule non reperiuntur qui norunt multa ab antiquis prodita: tanto priscorum cura fertilior, aut industria felicitior fuit, ante millia annorum inter principia literarum Hesiodo praecepta agricolis pandere orso, subsecutisque non paucis hanc curam ejus, unde nobis crevit labor. Quippe cum requirenda sint non solum postea inventa, verum etiam ea quae invenerant prisci, desidia intereptione rerum memoriae inducta, cujus somni causas quis alias quam publicas mundi invenerit? Nimirum alii subiere ritus, circaque alia mentes hominum detinentur, et avaritiae tantum artes coluntur. Antea inclusis gentium imperiis intra ipsas, ideoque et ingeniis, quadam sterilitate fortunae, necesse erat animi bona exercere: regesque innumeri honore artium colebantur, et in ostentatione has praeferebant, opem et immortalitatem sibi per illas prorogari arbitantes. Quare abundabant et praemia et opera vitae. Posteris laxitas mundi et rerum amplitudo damno fuit, postquam senator censu legi coeptus, judex fieri censu, magistratum ducemque nil magis exornare quam census: postquam coepere orbitas in auctoritate summa et potentia esse, captatio in quaestu fertilissimo, ac sola gaudia in possidendo; pessum iere vitae pre-

tia:

pire had produced greater inequality of fortune, greater riches, a more general peace, and had opened a more free communication among the nations. But his expressions are far from insinuating, that it had done service upon the whole, either by making men more happy, virtuous or numerous, or by advancing the best and noblest arts of life. On the contrary, he takes notice, that it had introduced greater luxury and vice: and which ought especially to be remarked, had made riches so necessary, that a family was esteemed a burden and a disadvantage, as it increased expence; and that the want of children, by lessening expence, added a dignity, and gave greater power and influence. An author of these sentiments cannot be supposed to have believed, that the *Roman* empire produced greater numbers of people than the antient governments.

L I have observed, As

tia: omnesque a maximo bono liberales dictae artes in contrarium cedere, ac servitute sola profici caeptum: hanc alius alio modo, et in aliis adorare, eodem tamen habendi quo eat spes omnium tendente voto. Passim vero etiam egregii aliena vitia quam bona sua colere malle. Ergo hercule voluptas vivere coepit, vita ipsa defuit. Sed nos obliterated quoque scrutabimur.

PLIN. nat. hist. lib. 14. in prooemio.

As the expression, voluptas vivere coepit, vita ipsa defuit, signifies, that the true taste of living was lost by the prevalence of sensuality; if *Pliny* intended to signify further, that voluptuousness abridged the term of human life, he could not be of opinion, that these latter refinements were favourable to populousness.



As to the other passage * quoted by our author, it proves nothing but the vanity of the *Romans*, who called the slavish subjection of the world to their empire humanity; and *cultior vitae usus*, imagining, like so many among the moderns, that their own times and manners were preferable to all that had gone before them. But neither from the contemplation of the nature and forms of their government, nor from the history of the times, will this appear to be the truth. On the contrary, the destruction of the world seems greatly owing to the ruin of the smaller governments, and the establishment of the *Roman* empire.

* Terra omnium terrarum alumna eadem et parens, numine Deum electa, quae coelum ipsum clarius faceret, sparsâ congregaret imperia, ritusque molliret: et tot populorum discordes ferasque linguas sermone commercio contraheret ad colloquia, et humanitatem homini daret, breviterque una cunctarum gentium in toto orbe patria fieret.

PLIN. nat. hist. lib. 3: cap. 5.

PART II.

SECT. 2.

THE humour of blaming the past, and admiring the present, is strongly rooted in human nature, and has an influence even on persons endued with the profoundest judgment and most extensive learning.

learning. Custom gives sanction to those manners which are most common, though perhaps the most ridiculous, and makes it difficult to form unprejudiced opinions concerning them. Do not mankind generally prefer the opinions, the arts, and the manners of the age in which they live to all others? Whether this inclination arises from vanity, or from a weakness and narrowness of mind, which renders it difficult for us to form distinct conceptions of distant ages, and of manners different from our own; the inclination itself is visible. 'Twas thus that the *Romans* imagined their empire had been serviceable to mankind; 'tis thus that so many among the moderns conceive so favourably of the benefits arising from trade and manufactures, as if in all cases, without exception, they contributed no less to render the world populous, than to add to the commodiousness of life. But in truth it will be found, that there may be such an extensive trade, and such a variety of manufactures, as will render the world less populous, and prevent the increase of mankind.

THIS argument has been partly considered already; and the effects of simplicity and refinement set forth in the *dissertation**; however, as it is a material part of the question, it will be proper to add a few other strokes, to obviate any objections that have been suggested in the *political discourse*.
BY

* P. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

By such a simplicity of life and manners, as is maintained to be favourable to populousness, is to be understood, not a savage fierceness or barbarity, or a total ignorance of arts, such as prevailed in the rude beginnings of nations, before societies were regularly formed; but such as is consistent with many improvements, nay, supposes the most necessary arts to be brought to a good degree of perfection. 'Tis such a simplicity as actually obtained among many antient nations, when every family carefully cultivated its own little field, and mankind were almost wholly employed in agriculture, and its attendant arts, being little acquainted with trade or merchandize, and entirely strangers to luxury or magnificence in living.

It would not be difficult to shew, that such a simplicity of life and manners would make a nation more virtuous, and by consequence more happy. But the debate does not turn on this point, nor do we inquire which of the two states, the simple or the refined, is most eligible in itself, or most suited to our taste at present, after we have been acquainted with the more refined; or which method is most effectual to inspire a slothful barbarous people in the neighbourhood of an opulent luxurious commercial nation, with the love of industry. The only question is, whether simplicity or refinement renders a country most populous? and whether a nation already addicted to pasturage and agriculture

agriculture (as many of the antient nations were) must not be more numerous by their industry of this kind, than most other commercial nations by their extensive trade and operose manufactures.

Now, viewing things in this light, the examples our author brings of antient simplicity, viz. that the only garb of the antients, both for males and females, was very simple*; that the city of *Athens* was fully as populous before the *Median* war, as at any time after it; that its citizens applied themselves to pasturage and agriculture, avoided an extensive trade, and were averse from long and distant voyages †; that the interest of money was high ‡, and the profits of trade great ||; that the navigation of the antients was very imperfect **; that their commerce consisted chiefly in the exchange of those commodities, for which different soils and climates were suited ††; and that the antient republics had a great resemblance to *Switzerland*, where there are the worst artists, and the least commerce, but the best agriculture in *Europe* ††. These, and other examples of this sort, not only make nothing against the hypothesis of the *dissertation*, but also prove in a remarkable

* Political discourses, p. 205.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

|| Ibid. p. 206.

** Ibid. p. 207.

†† Ibid.

‡‡ Ibid. p. 185. 208.

markable manner; that simplicity obtained in ancient times; and that the industry which was among the ancients, was chiefly directed, not towards the improvement and cultivation of manufactures, but to the most necessary arts, and in particular to the provision of food. So that this simplicity, and this sort of industry, must have been effectual to produce greater numbers of people.

It is true, that our manufactures, and all our more commodious methods of carrying on a more extensive trade, employ a great many hands. Were we to strike them all off at once, it would give a great check to every kind of business and labour; and cause multitudes of families to perish by want*: nor could we all of a sudden supply the place of these later inventions. But this proceeds wholly from our present customs and police; if other customs and another taste prevailed, we could gradually supply their places, and employ such hands as would be rendered idle, in a manner much more useful for multiplying our people, *viz.* in agriculture, and arts subservient to the provision of food, by which means we would both purchase more useful and substantial wealth, and distribute it in a more equitable manner.

HAD the ancients been either idle, or as much ignorant of agriculture, as they were of many of our improvements in trade and manufactures, our

* Political discourses, p. 210.

author's reasoning had been good. But this was not the case, they were both well skilled in agriculture, and it was their chief employment*.

OUR

* Besides the quotations from Columella, Cato, and Xenophon, in the dissertation, p. 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104. There is a passage in Pliny, which shows his sense of the state of agriculture among the ancients.

Dona amplissima imperatorum ac fortium civium, quantum quis uno die plurimum circumaravisset. Item quartarii faris aut heminae conferente populo. Cognomina etiam prima inde.—Fabiorum, Lentulorum, Ciceronum, ut quisque aliquod optime genus sereret. Juniorum familiae Bubulcum nominaverunt, qui bubus optime utebatur.—Agrum male colere, censorium probrum judicabatur.—Hinc et locupletes dicebant, loci, hoc est, agri plenos. Pecunia ipsa a pecore appellabatur. Etiam nunc in tabulis censoriis pascua dicuntur omnia, ex quibus populus reditus habet, quia diu hoc solum vestigial fuerat.—Rusticae tribus laudatissimae eorum qui rura haberent. Urbanae vero, in quas transferri ignominiae esset, defidiae probro:—Ergo iis moribus non modo sufficiebant fruges, nulla provinciarum pascente Italiam, verum etiam *annonae vilitas incredibilis erat*.—Quaenam ergo tantae ubertatis causa erat? ipsorum tunc manibus imperatorum colebantur agri (ut fas est credere), gaudente terra vomere laureato et triumphali aratore: sive illi eadem cura semina tractabant, qua bella, eademque diligentia arva disponebant, qua castra: sive honestis manibus omnia laetius prove-niunt, quoniam et curiosius fiunt.—At nunc eadem illa, vincti pedes, damnatae manus, inscripti vultus exercent: non tamen furda tellure, quae parens appellatur, colique dicitur et ipsa honore hinc assumpto, ut nunc invita ea, et indigne ferente credatur id fieri. Sed nos miramur ergastulorum non eadem emolumenta esse quae fuerunt imperatorum. Igitur de cultura

OUR author indeed seems to be of opinion *, that agriculture was but little known in the age of *Xenophon*, and represents *Xenophon*, as if he had said, that every man may be a farmer; that no art or skill is requisite; and that all consists in industry and attention to the execution. But *Xenophon* means only to say, what is certainly true, that agriculture is not so hard to learn as the other arts, to which long apprenticeships must be served, before one can practise them in perfection; and that partly by looking upon the labourers, partly by verbal instructions, one may soon know it so well, as even to teach it to another. So far is *Xenophon* from thinking, that no art or skill is requisite to make a farmer; that on the contrary he asserts not only, that agriculture is an art, but that one must be skilful in it, if he would have good crops. And from the manner of treating this subject in the *oeconomics*, it is evident, how much agriculture was studied by the

wiser
cultura agri praecipere principale fuit et apud exteros. Si-
quidem et reges fecere, Hiero, Philometor, Attalus, Arche-
laus: et duces Xenophon, et Poenus etiam Mago.—Cato—
D. Syllanus—M. Varro—Qui octogesimum primum vitae an-
num agens de ea re prodendum putavit.

Nat. hist. lib. 18. cap. 3.
Quippe fermo circa rura est, agrestisque usus, sed quibus vita
honorisque apud priscos maximus fuerit.

PLIN, nat. hist. lib. 18. cap. 1.
See also cap. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8.

* P. 209.

wiser and more learned part of mankind in the age of *Xenophon*.

NEITHER can Mr. *Hume* rightly infer *, from the account *Polybius* † gives of the numerous herds of swine in *Italy*, which frequently consisted of more than a thousand; that the north of *Italy* was then much less peopled, and worse cultivated than at present. For it evidently appears from the passage of *Polybius* itself, that these herds were extremely tame, and obedient to their keepers, who had accustomed them at the sound of an horn to run immediately each to his own keeper, and to follow him in an orderly manner. Hence, though they had no separate pastures, and though different herds mixed together, they might easily have been kept from doing harm, since the swine-herds had them so much under command. This relation, so far from “having the air of that oeconomy which is “to be met with in our *American* colonies,” or pointing out an uncultivated country, gives us reason to presume, that the peasants of those days employed about every thing that concerned agriculture, an art and industry unknown at present in *European* countries. And we may easily conceive, that many methods might have been invented for preserving their fields, however much they were improved by agriculture: in particular, they might have been secured by a pro-

M m

* P. 239, 240.

† Lib. 12.

per division of the farms, and by defending them with inclosures. In short, the herds of swine in those days, according to *Polybius's* description of them, might have been as easily hindered from straggling and from destroying inclosures, as the numerous flocks of sheep which are fed in *Britain* at present.

'Tis of such importance in the question, concerning the populousness of antiquity, to shew the true state and condition of agriculture, and the extent to which it had arrived in antient times, that our author has endeavoured to confirm his hypothesis by another argument, which, having been brought by a celebrated *French Critic*, in support of his own theory, *Mr. Hume* hath with great ingenuity* applied it to the present subject, and endeavoured to prove by it, that the earth was worse cultivated in antient than in modern times. It has been observed by *L'Abbe du Bos*, that *Italy* is warmer in the present age than it was formerly. *Mr. Hume* would extend this observation to other *European* climates; and account for this greater warmth of the seasons, by supposing that *Italy*, *Gaul*, and other countries are better cultivated, and therefore more populous than they were in antient times.

BUT is it either certain, that *Italy*, or other southern parts of *Europe*, are warmer than they were antiently; or, though they were warmer, is it

* P. 243, &c.

it a just consequence, that for this reason they must be better cultivated, and more populous than they were in antient times?

As the antients take notice of rigorous winters, which happened in some particular years, destroyed the trees, and caused rivers to freeze even in warmer climates, some such extraordinary severe seasons still continue to happen in the same countries, perhaps once in a century or oftner.

A. C. 401, the * sea is said to have been frozen during 20 days. If this relates to the *Euxine* sea, the whole of it lies between 42 and 46 degrees of latitude, and its northern banks are a degree farther south than the middle parts of *France*. But whatever sea is understood, we have undoubted evidence, that in the eighth century, about the 23d year of *Constantinus Copronymus*, there was so great a frost at *Constantinople*, which lies in about 41 degrees of latitude, and is farther south than the most southern point in *France*, that the *Euxine* sea was covered with ice in some places 100 miles from the shore; and that the ice was so strong, as to carry men and all other kinds of animals. *Theophanes*, who lived at that time, says, that he was an eye-witness of the mountains of ice which came rolling down by *Constantinople*; and that this frost was

* It is called the *Euxine* sea in the *Universal History*, lately published, but the *Chronic. Alexand. ad ann. Christi 401.* which is quoted for attesting this event, calls it only the sea.

was not only felt in that country, but in the northern, eastern and western regions *.

A. C. 821, the rivers in *Europe* were frozen so hard, as to bear loaded waggons for 30 days together †.

BUT to come to modern times, in the year 1709, the frost was so severe, as to destroy many vegetables, not only in the northern, but also in the southern parts of *Europe*. Even in *Italy*, most of the lemon and orange-trees, and a great many olive-trees perished. Birds and insects were destroyed in vast numbers; nay, many cattle, and even several men perished in the fields with cold. Mention is made of 60 near *Paris*, of some at *Venice*, and of 80 *French* soldiers near *Namur*. Some died aboard the ships that were on the coast of *Italy*; and several lost parts of their fingers and toes. Rivers were frozen in *England*, *Denmark*, *Germany*, *France* and *Italy*: nay, the sea itself on the coast of *Genoa* and *Leghorn* †. However, notwithstanding the rigour of this season, the frost in the year 1684, as it continued longer, is thought to have been more severe ‖. In short, there

* Theophan. chronograph. ad ann. Constant. 23.

† Hiems saevissima fuit hoc anno, adeo ut fluvii Europae glacie constricti plaustra onusta plusquam tricenis diebus ferrent.

Calvisius ad ann. 821.

‡ Jones's abridgment of the philosophical transactions, from 1700. to 1720. vol. 1. part. 2. p. 113; &c.

‖ Ibid. p. 117. In this cold winter, the waters of the *Thames*

there appears no good reason to believe, that there have not been as rigorous winters in modern, as were in antient ages.

SUPPOSING geography to be as imperfect as it was in the days of *Strabo*, and a writer who was born in *Sicily*, *Greece*, or the south of *Italy*, and was accustomed to the warmth of these countries, to describe the climate of *Gaul*, and of the northern parts of *Europe*, 'tis scarce to be doubted, but he would do it much in the same manner, as *Diodorus Siculus* or *Varro* hath done. Suppose also that he was banished from his native country to the western banks of the *Euxine* sea, and was in as melancholy an humour, and endued with as lively and as poetical a genius as *Ovid*: suppose him to sit down to bemoan his unhappy fate, to paint the wretchedness of his lot, and lament his banishment from his country, 'tis probable that he would give as dismal accounts of the climate, as *Ovid* has given us of that of *Tomi* *.

NEITHER

Thames were frozen to so great depth, that booths were erected, fires lighted, and meat dressed on the river.

* Our author (p. 245), quotes Mr. *Tournefort* to attest the fineness of this climate, in opposition to *Ovid*. But this gentleman does not appear to have been so far north as *Tomi*, and seems only to have seen the southern coasts of the *Euxine* sea. Besides, in his description of that part of the coast, from the mouth of the *Euxine*, as far as *Sinope*; he confesses, he never saw it, but in the finest season of the year; from which, and from some preceding observations of the excessive frosts of modern times, it will appear, that *Ovid's* description will not prove, that the antient seasons were colder than what may be still felt in our days.

NEITHER will it appear, that the temperature of climates has been altered by the culture of the earth, from what our author quotes from *Strabo**, “that north of the *Cevennes*, *Gaul* produces not “figs and olives; and the vines which have been “planted bear not grapes that will ripen;” for fruits are very different from corns, and other things which are necessary for the subsistence of man. Hence, while corn-fields were richly cultivated, the culture of fruits might have made slow progress from one country to another: so that the want of them might have been owing, not to want of heat, but often to the neglect of the inhabitants, and to their particular customs and opinions. The emperor *Domitian* published an edict, forbidding any more vines to be planted in *Italy*, and commanding many which were already planted in the provinces to be immediately rooted up†. Near 200 years afterwards, the emperor *Probus* allowed liberty to the *Gauls*, *Pannonians*, *Spaniards* and *Britons* to cultivate vines ‡, a privilege which they seem not to have fully enjoyed since the time of *Domitian*; nay, he employed his soldiers in time of peace, in planting vineyards. When peaches were first propagated in *Italy* and *France*, it surpris’d the world, that they could be brought to perfection

* P. 244.

† Philostrat. vit. Apoll. Tyan. lib. 6. cap. 17.

‡ Vopiscus in Prob. Eutrop. lib. 9. cap. 17.

perfection out of *Persia**. Besides, the richness of fruits does not always depend upon the heat of the climate. Those grapes which yield the most delicious wines that *France* affords, are produced in *Burgundy* and *Champagne* provinces, situated far towards the north of the *Cevennes*: yet the air of these provinces is neither so warm, nor so cherishing as that of *Montpelier*. Good figs may be produced 100 miles north of *Edinburgh*, which *Strabo* would have thought impossible; and even within the memory of man, how many places in *Scotland* were thought incapable of producing wheat, and the best sort of oats and barley, where they grow plentifully at present. In short, the production and perfection of fruits and grains depend on many other circumstances besides the warmth of the climate: and no argument can be drawn for less or greater heat, from examples of this kind.

BUT though it were certain, that *Italy*, and other southern parts of *Europe*, are now warmer than they were in former times; as Mr. *Hume* has well observed †, the consequence may not be necessary, that they are better cultivated. For, if the northern countries of *Europe* were antiently wilder and more woody, the colder winds that blowed from them might have affected the southern climates, and made them colder than they are now,

* Peaches are commonly reckoned *indigenae Persiae*.

† P. 253, 254.

now, after these woods have been felled; notwithstanding which, they might have been better cultivated and peopled in those antient times.

P A R T III.

In the preceding sections we have endeavoured to demonstrate, that modern institutions and modern manners are far less favourable to populousness, than those which obtained in antient ages.

HENCE it ought not to surprize us, that antient historians have given accounts of far greater numbers of people than are to be found in modern times. Nor do we seem to have any just title to reject their testimony on this ground, unless there are some other circumstances which render it incredible; nay, the accounts of antient historians appearing to be such as might be expected, if the hypothesis in the *dissertation* was true, serve both to confirm it, and also to render the testimonies themselves more credible.

It is not indeed pretended, that antient historians have fallen into no mistakes, that some of their computations are not too high, or that there is a perfect agreement among them in every number or minute circumstance. This is not necessary in an argument, which is not built upon a single testimony or two, but upon a series of them, given by such as lived in successive ages, and in different nations: all which agree in bearing witness

to

to the great populousness of antiquity. Such concurring testimonies of so many authors, sacred and profane; concerning so many countries, cannot be evaded by general insinuations, as if the accounts, by being ridiculous, lost all credit and authority*. Could we indeed demonstrate, from a comparison of antient and modern manners, that modern ages must be more populous than the antient, we should have reason to reject the most express testimonies: but when either it is quite otherwise, or the matter is at most only rendered doubtful, by arguments which seem to balance one another, we must not hastily reject the testimonies of historians. However, to obviate the force of any objections which have been proposed by Mr. *Hume*, it will be necessary to examine what he has thrown out on this head, and to subjoin some other calculations and authorities from the antients, besides those which have been already proposed in the *dissertation*.

As to *Egypt*, *Theocritus* celebrates *Ptolomy* for commanding 33,339 cities †; an additional proof of the great populousness of this fertile country in those days. 'Tis true, the number, or rather the manner in which the number is expressed by the poet, is somewhat singular ‡; but what reason have we to suppose, that this singularity was the

N n reason

* Political discourses, p. 213.

† Idyll. 17. lin. 82.

‡ Political discourses, p. 214.

reason of assigning it? *Theocritus* does not seem to have been one of those authors who wrote so loosely. Under the word *cities* the antients comprehended not only large walled towns, but the more noted villages. Of such cities there were in *Egypt* no fewer than eighteen or twenty thousand, according to antient historians. If to these we add the cities of those parts of *Phoenicia*, *Arabia*, *Syria*, *Libya*, *Æthiopia*, *Pamphilia*, *Cilicia*, *Lycia*, *Caria*, and the *Cyclades*, which *Ptolomy* also commanded, and which are enumerated by *Theocritus*, we will be disposed to do the poet more justice, and shall see a better reason for the number he hath assigned, than its singularity*. Such methods of expression are common to *Theocritus*, with *Homer*, and all other poets.

How can we suppose, with Mr. *Hume* †, that *Diodorus* would assign no more than three millions of inhabitants to *Egypt*, when he computes above 300,000 of free condition in *Alexandria* alone ‡. He could not but know, that there were a great many slaves besides. If we suppose them only twice as many, we have a city of near a million, which,

* Τρεῖς μὲν οἱ πόλιων ἑκατοντάδες ἐνδεδμηνται,
 Τρεῖς δ' ἄρα χιλιάδες τρισσαῖς ἐπι μυριάδεσσι,
 Δοιαὶ δὲ τριάδες, μετὰ δὲ σφισιν ἑνδεκάδες τρεῖς
 Τῶν πάντων Πτολεμαῖος ἀγάνωρ ἐμβασιλεύει.

Theocr. Idyll. 17. lin. 32.

† P. 214.

‡ Lib. 17. sect. 52.

which, according to Mr. *Hume's* interpretation, would contain a third part of all the inhabitants of *Egypt*. We must not therefore interpret *Diodorus* in this manner, but must suppose that the three millions he mentions were only the heads of families, or the males who were come to full age; and that all the inhabitants in the time of *Diodorus*, amounted to twelve millions, which is the hypothesis in the *dissertation* *.

If we examine our author's computations, concerning the number of inhabitants in *Greece*, we shall find not only, that he has reduced their number much below the true account, but also, that his computation has proceeded wholly upon an erroneous foundation.

We may observe in general, that though our author has reduced the whole inhabitants of *Greece* to a number not much exceeding what may be found at present in *Scotland* †; yet the *Greeks* may well be allowed to have been at least as numerous and as powerful a people as the *English*. The history and achievements of both nations would lead us to conclude them to have been far superior.

If we proceed even upon our author's own hypothesis, and compute the number of the *Athenians* at 284,000 ‡, supposing them to have been even the twentieth part of the *Greeks* (though they did

* P. 45.

† P. 230.

‡ Political discourses, p. 222.

did not possess one twenty third part of the country *) we shall find they were more than $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions; a number much greater than that assigned by Mr. *Hume*, viz. 1,380,000 †. Nay, supposing them to have been the twelfth part of the *Greeks* (though surely they did not bear so great a proportion) even at this rate the inhabitants of all *Greece* must have amounted to 3,408,000; a number more than double that of our author. But we cannot suppose, that the territory of *Athens* was much better inhabited than the other parts of *Greece*, since it was mountainous, and of course less fertile. Besides, its trade did not much increase the number of its people; for, according to *Herodotus*, quoted by Mr. *Hume* ‡, it was as populous before the *Median* war, as at any time after it.

AGAIN; Mr. *Hume*'s computation of the number of the *Greeks*, by which he makes them to have amounted only to 1,380,000, is founded upon the supposition, that those 230,000 *Greeks*, by whom *Philip* of *Macedon* would have been backed in his intended expedition against *Persia*, were all the free citizens throughout all the cities of *Greece*. But this supposition cannot possibly be true; for it can never be supposed, that *Philip* either would or could have carried away all the citizens or fighting men

* Dissertation, p. 56.

† P. 226. 227. 228.

‡ P. 205.

men of *Greece*. These 230,000* were only the auxiliaries which the *Grecian* states had decreed to *Philip* for his *Persian* expedition. 'Tis not probable, they would have decreed more than the fifth part of the citizens; at which rate the citizens in *Greece* amounted to 1,075,000; the number of free persons to 4,300,000; and supposing thrice as many slaves, the whole inhabitants amounted to 17,200,000. If the forces decreed to *Philip* made a fourth part, the citizens amounted to 860,000, the number of all the free persons to 3,440,000, and the whole number of the inhabitants to 13,760,000, which is much the same number with that in the *dissertation* †.

It ought to be remarked, that the *Lacedaemonians*, who were one of the most powerful states in *Greece*, decreed no auxiliaries to *Philip*, and of course must not be comprehended in the preceding computation; for they would receive no orders from the king, *et legem et regem contempserunt*. Hence the real number of the *Greeks* must have been greater, than that assigned above, by the whole number of the *Lacedaemonians*.

BUT, to come to our author's computations, with respect to the particular states of *Greece*.

'Tis needless to say any thing concerning the

* *Justin*, from whom this computation has been taken, calls them only 200,000 foot, and 15,000 horse, lib. 9. cap. 5.

† P. 56.

the form or extent of the *Greek* cities, about which our author has made several ingenious observations*. For our inquiry is not concerning the number of people in a city, but concerning the number of inhabitants in a whole state or territory.

WITH respect to *Athens* in particular, it is allowed, that all the inhabitants within the *Athenian* territory, who were of free condition, were only 124,000, being the quadruple of the number of 21,000 citizens and 10,000 strangers, mentioned by *Athenaeus*. But Mr. *Hume* will needs understand the 400,000 slaves mentioned by the same author, only of males come to full age; because the 21,000 free citizens, and the 10,000 strangers mentioned in the same passage, can be understood only in this manner. Agreeably to which hypothesis, he computes the slaves at 1,600,000; a number so great, that he imagines its improbability a sufficient reason for rejecting *Athenaeus's* testimony.

If it were necessary to interpret the passage of *Athenaeus* in this sense, our author would perhaps have reason to call his authority in question: for, according to this interpretation, the proportion of the slaves to such as were of free condition, must have been more than 12 to 1 †, which will
be

* P. 226. 227. 228.

† By some oversight, our author has stated it as 20 to 1. P. 223.

be reckoned by far too high. But there is no necessity to understand *Athenaeus* in this sense, or to suppose, that he distinguished the slaves, who were of so little account under the ancient governments, so scrupulously, either as the free citizens who alone had a voice in the public councils, or as the strangers who were so greatly honoured at *Athens*. 'Twas sufficient if he numbered them *en gros*. When the words of an author will bear it, we ought to interpret them, consistently with truth and probability. The *Greek* slaves were undoubtedly very numerous; few citizens wanted slaves altogether; and many citizens had great numbers. It is said that *Timarchus* had 10; that *Lysias* and his brother had 60 a-piece; and that *Demosthenes* had 52*. We may therefore reasonably presume, there were three slaves for every person who was free: but to suppose that they were 12 to 1, is too high an estimate. We must not therefore interpret *Athenaeus* in this manner, without any necessity.

If the slaves had been 20, or even 12 to 1, several of our author's arguments, to invalidate the testimony of *Athenaeus*, and to prove that there were not 1,600,000 slaves among the *Athenians*, might perhaps have been reckoned conclusive: as when he argues, that if there had been so great a number †, it would have been impossible to have kept them from frequent and dangerous insurrections;

* Political discourses, p. 223.

† Ibid. p. 222. 223. 224.

rections; yet this was very possible, for there was only one commotion, viz. that of the miners; — that there would have been a necessity for a very rigorous military discipline to keep them in awe; yet there was no such necessity: nay, the Athenians treatment of their slaves was extremely gentle and indulgent; — that the desertion of 20,000 during the Decelian war, could not have brought the Athenians to great distress; yet this was actually the case. — And that Xenophon, when he proposed a scheme for entertaining by the public 10,000 slaves, said, “Any one who considers the numbers we had before the Decelian war, will be convinced, that so great a number may possibly be supported;” a way of speaking altogether incompatible with the larger number of 1,600,000. But it agrees well with the real number of 400,000 mentioned by Athenaeus; for of these 400,000, only a fourth part, or 100,000 could be able to bear arms. So that deducting the 20,000 who deserted during the Decelian war, it would not be found so easy a matter to raise out of the remainder the number mentioned by Xenophon. Thus, as there is no necessity, from the passage in Athenaeus, to state the number of slaves so high, as Mr. Hume hath done; and as instead of being twelve or twenty times, they were only thrice as numerous as those of free condition, all these arguments fall to the ground at once.

NEITHER is the smallness of the *Census* a good argument

argument against the populoufness of the state of Athens. Our author hath observed, that both Demosthenes* and Polybius† state the *Census* of Athens at 6000 talents, or 1,162,500 *l.* and under this sum he would comprehend the whole value of lands, houses, furniture and slaves ‡. But this cannot be the meaning either of Demosthenes or of Polybius, nor is it possible to reconcile it to the circumstances of Athens. Counting only 200,000 slaves, at two *minae* each (which was the least value put upon any of the slaves belonging to Demosthenes’s father||) the slaves alone were worth more money. We must not therefore consider the *Census*, as comprehending the full value of lands, houses, furniture and slaves. Perhaps it is not easy to determine with precision what was meant by it; probably it was something like a valuation of yearly rents and profits, according to which a tax was to be imposed on the Athenians. Understanding it in this sense, the sum of 6000 talents was not a small valuation: for, supposing the Athenians to have been half a million in number, each of them would have had more than 2 *l.* per annum, which would have gone far to purchase necessaries amidst the antient plenty**. Besides, it is not

* De classibus.

† Lib. 2. c. 37.

‡ Political discourses, p. 224.

|| In aphob. 1.

** Dissertation, p. 126, &c.

at all probable; that the sum of 6000 talents was the full estimate of the real rents or profits of all the people of *Athens*. As it is usual in valuations made in order to the imposition of taxes, it would be much below the real value. Supposing it only a third, every inhabitant would have had more than 6*l.* a-year to spend, which is not much below what *Davenant** allots to every person in *England* in our expensive times. But be this as it will, it was impossible that 6000 talents could be the full value of the whole state of *Athens*; for not long before, there had been at one time about 10,000 talents in the *Athenian* treasury †; so that the inference from this topic does not seem to be well founded.

OUR author has affirmed ‡, that the *Athenians* brought yearly from *Pontus* 400,000 *medimni* of corn; that at that time they imported little corn from any other place; and that || *Attica* itself was so barren in corn, that it produced not enough to maintain the peasants. From whence he brings an argument against the populousness of the *Athenian* territory, since its whole inhabitants were maintained

* Essay upon the probable methods of making a people gainers in the balance of trade, *London*, 1699. p. 23.

In this essay, the author states 7*l.* 9*s.* 3*d.* a-head, as the yearly expence of all the people in *England*.

† Dissertation, p. 228.

‡ P. 226.

|| P. 227.

tained by so small an importation, added to the inconsiderable product which *Attica* yielded.

BUT (1.) *Demosthenes* says no more than this, that the *Athenians* brought scarce so much corn from all other markets together, as from *Pontus* alone*. Besides, these markets seem to have been only those with which the *Athenians* traded by sea †. They might, and probably did bring a much greater quantity by land from the neighbouring markets in *Greece*: for it appears to have been rather less expensive to bring corn by land, than to import it by sea, since navigation was either so imperfect, or so dangerous in those days, that, according to *Thucydides* ‡, the importation of provisions from *Euboea*, by a voyage about the promontory of *Sunium*, was more expensive than bringing them by land by the way of *Oropus* ||. (2.) Though *Attica* was represented to the *Roman* senate, by the *Athenian* ambassadors, as barren; yet, considering the circumstances in which they were placed, and the design they had of excusing themselves to the *Romans*, we ought to lay little stress on their representation; for they would represent their country as being at least as barren as

it

* Orat. adversus Leptinem.

† This is confirmed both by the signification of the word *ἐμποριον* used by *Demosthenes*, and by what follows in the passage.

‡ Lib. 7. cap. 28.

|| Political discourses, p. 207.

it really was *. (3.) Notwithstanding their representation, we may well be allowed to suppose, that *Attica* produced grain enough to maintain three fourths of the peasants. According to *Xenophon*, there were 10,000 houses or families in *Athens* †. Allowing therefore seven to each family, there were 70,000 *Athenians* who dwelt in the city: the remaining 430,000 ‡ were the peasants, who lived in the country. (4.) On this supposition 'tis easy to shew, that the *Athenians* had grain, brought in by sea and land together, enough to maintain those 70,000 who dwelt in the city and the remaining fourth part of the peasants, which together amounted to 177,500, and were unprovided for by the product of *Attica*. If to the 400,000 *medimni* brought in yearly from *Pontus*, we add about as much imported from all the other *ἐμπορία* together, and twice as much, which could have been more easily brought by land from the neighbouring

* Primi Athenienses introducti: ii, se, quod navium habuerint militumque, P. Licinio consuli et C. Lucretio praetori misisse exposuerunt, quibus eos non usos frumenti sibi centum millia imperasse: quod quanquam sterilem terram arent, ipsosque etiam agrestes peregrino frumento alerent, tamen, ne deessent officio, confecisse; et alia, quae imperarentur, praestare paratos esse.

Tit. Liv. lib. 43. cap. 6.

† Memorab. lib. 3:

‡ According to the dissertation, p. 55. the inhabitants of the whole territory of *Attica*, are computed to have been about half a million.

bouring markets in *Greece*, we shall find, that they had a quantity of grain sufficient to maintain these 177,500 people. For they had of grain alone more than one *Scotch*, or about $1\frac{1}{2}$ *English* pecks a-week to each of them *; no inconsiderable allowance, considering the plenty of fruits and of other provisions with which *Attica* abounded. (5.) So that upon the whole we cannot suppose, that the *Athenians* wanted food sufficient to maintain about half a million of people, the number assigned in the dissertation. Thus the testimony of *Athenaeus* is found to be consistent with the supposed barrenness of *Attica*, and with the importations of corn from *Pontus* and other places.

FROM the same principle on which Mr. *Hume* hath supposed, that the number of *Athenian* slaves amounted to 1,600,000, he computes the *Lacedaemonian* slaves at 3,120,000; a number so vastly great, that he concludes they could not have been maintained in a narrow barren country, such as *Laconia*, which had no trade. Indeed, had the number really been so great, his reasoning perhaps might have been just: but, as his calculation of the number of the *Athenian* slaves is founded on a wrong

* Many of the labouring people in *Scotland*, when they are put on board-wages, have no more a-week, than two *Scotch* pecks of oat-meal, for the whole of their maintenance.

One *Scotch* is to an *English* peck, as 1.47 to 1 nearly.

The *medimnus* contained 6.084 *English*, or 4.128 *Scotch* pecks nearly.

wrong interpretation of *Athenaeus*, for the same reason, that of the *Lacedaemonian* slaves is erroneous. If we form a calculation, on supposition, that the number of the *Lacedaemonians* of free condition bore the same proportion to that of their slaves, as 124,000, the number of the free *Athenians*, bore even to 1,600,000, the number of their slaves according to our author's interpretation of *Athenaeus*, we shall find, that they ought to be stated only at 2,012,903*. But if we calculate according to the just account, we shall find, that they ought to be stated only at 503,225, and all the inhabitants in the *Spartan* territory only at 659,225; a number which might have been well maintained by the product of their own soil, especially as the *Spartans* are known to have lived in a frugal and simple manner.

ACCORDING to *Plutarch* †, *Lycurgus* divided the whole *Lacedaemonian* territory into 39,000 lots or shares, one of which he gave to each of his 39,000 citizens. Every share yielded 70 *medimni* of grain to a man, 12 to a woman, with a suitable proportion of wet fruits (I suppose oil, wine, figs, &c.). Thus each citizen's family had at least 82 *medimni*, which was more than 9½ *Eng-*
lish,

* By some oversight they are made 3,120,000 in the *political discourse*, p. 225. a number vastly too great, even supposing that the *Lacedaemonian* slaves, were more numerous than those of the *Athenians* in proportion to the free citizens.

† In *Lycurg.*

lish, or 6½ *Scotch* pecks a-week. This was paid to the *Spartans* by the *Helotes*, and was a sufficient quantity of grain for all of free condition; and by supposing any the most moderate proportion between what these *Helotes* paid, and the whole product of the lands, you shall find, on a calculation, that there remained grain sufficient to maintain, not indeed the immense number of slaves mentioned by *Mr. Hume*, but 503,225, or even a greater number, which we have supposed it contained, agreeably to the testimony of antient authors.

FROM *Athens* and *Lacedaemon*, let us pass to *Thebes*, another capital city of *Greece*. Our author hath computed its citizens at no more than 6000*; for which I can see no reason, that can be offered from antiquity, but that *Epaminondas* took 6000 *Boeotians* to the battle of *Leuctra*, as we learn from *Diodorus* †; and that this levy was made up of such as were most fit for war, after a review of the *Boeotian* state. Does this shew, that there were no more than 6000 citizens in the whole state; or even within the walls of *Thebes*? Is it said, that *Epaminondas* carried with him all the fighting men in *Boeotia*? or can this be believed to have been possible? Can we suppose the number of the *Theban* citizens to have been so small, at a time when the *Boeotians* made so great a figure, when,

* *Political discourses*, p. 227.

† *Lib. 15. cap. 52.*

when, according to *Diodorus*, the *Lacedaemonians* who had 39,000 citizens * in the days of *Lycurgus*, and had for a long time been the most powerful people in *Greece*, began to be afraid, lest the *Thebans* should obtain the chief influence, as *Boeotia* abounded in cities, and their inhabitants were men of valour †. It was at this very period, as *Diodorus* hath observed, that the *Athenians* refused to assist the *Thebans*, for this very reason, because they were inferior to none of the states of *Greece*, either for courage, strength, or numbers of men †. How could this have been the case, if their citizens amounted only to 6000?

'Tis this opinion concerning the populousness of *Boeotia*, which has misled our author in two other cases, and made him imagine it difficult to reconcile the accounts of *Xenophon*, and some other antient authors, though in themselves they are perfectly consistent.

PHLIASIA is said by *Xenophon* to be a small city, though it contained 6000 citizens †. Nor is there the least inconsistency here; for a city which contained no more than 6000 citizens, was in *Greece* accounted only a small one. Upon the

* Plutarch in *Lycurg.*

† *Diodor. Sic. lib. 15. sect. 20.*

‡ Το γὰρ ἔθνος τὸ τοῦ πλειθεῖ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἢ ἄνδρειοι κατὰ πόλεμον ἔθνος τῶν ἑλληνῶν ἔδοκει λείπεισθαι. *Ib. § 26.*

|| *Political discourses, p. 227.*

same principle it is easy to reconcile *Xenophon*, who says, that *Sparta* is one of the cities of *Greece* that has the fewest inhabitants *, with *Plutarch*, who says, that it had 9000 citizens †: for on a comparison we may infer, that *Thebes*, or any other of the capital cities of *Greece*, contained many more than this number of citizens; an inference entirely agreeable to the truth of history.

ALL the *Ætolians*, able to bear arms in *Antipater's* time, are made by *Mr. Hume* to have been only 10,000 men †. But *Diodorus*, whose authority is quoted to prove the fact, gives this account of the matter ||; that, when *Antipater* and *Crateus* entered *Ætolia* with 30,000 foot and 2500 horse, the *Ætolians* resolving to act upon the defensive, and not to risk their all on the uncertain chance of one battle, raised an army, consisting of 10,000 of their most vigorous citizens. With this army they took the field, and encamped on high and inaccessible grounds, that they might not be obliged to come to a decisive battle, and at the same time might hinder the enemy from plundering at large, and from penetrating into those mountainous places, whither they had conveyed their wives, children, and old men, with their most valuable goods. Now, 10,000 men were suf-

P p ficient

* *Xenoph. de repub. Laced.*

† In *Lycurg.*

‡ P. 228.

|| *Lib. 18. cap. 24.*

ficient for annoying and harrassing the enemy in this manner. Have we any reason from thence to conclude, that the *Ætolians* had only 10,000 citizens able to bear arms? 'Tis plain from *Diodorus*, that they had many more; for we are told, that, while they abandoned their weaker and more defenceless cities, they put strong garrisons into those which were defensible. And it is evident, that this would require a great number of the best of their citizens.

As little reason is there to interpret *Pausanias* as our author has done, as if he had said*, that all the *Achaean*s able to bear arms, in the days of *Polybius*, even when several manumitted slaves were joined to them, did not amount to 15,000; for *Pausanias*'s representation of the circumstances of *Achaia* leads to a very different conclusion. According to his account†, an *Achaean* army was raised, consisting of 14,000 foot and 600 horse, and was made up of slaves as well as freemen. Perhaps too a proclamation had been issued out, that all the citizens, who were fit for war, should enlist in the army. But all the citizens did not obey the order. The circumstances of the time shew evidently how this happened; for this army was raised, when the *Achaean*s were divided into three factions, one which was attached to the *Romans*, another which was attached to the *Macedonians*,

* Political discourses, p. 226.

† In Achaicis.

donians, and a third which was attached to neither, but declared for the independency of *Greece*. It was raised, when ignorant, unexperienced and violent leaders were advanced to govern the state; immediately after the *Achaean*s had been overcome by the *Romans* in a great battle, in which they lost their Praetor; when a victorious *Roman* army was in *Greece*, and marching directly to *Corinth*. In such a divided dangerous condition, we need not wonder, that no mighty army could be raised in *Achaia*. An army raised in these circumstances, could not possibly have contained all the freemen able to bear arms. According to *Polybius*, who knew their affairs best, the *Achaean* league might have marched 30, or 40,000 men, without any inconvenience*. This gives a more just idea of the populousness of *Achaia*; for no country can conveniently march all its fighting men; *Achaia* must therefore have had many more than 30,000 citizens. To suppose it had not even 15,000, is quite inconsistent with the history of a state, consisting of so many different cities, which have been so justly celebrated for that heroic league into which they entered in defence of their liberty and independence. But what a poor defence could they have made, if all their cities, even with the addition of some slaves, could not have raised an army of 15,000 men!

THAT the *Romans* destroyed *Epirus*, and sold

* Political discourses, p. 228, 229.

150,000 of the inhabitants for slaves, is attested by *Livy**; but that these 150,000 were all the inhabitants of *Epirus* †, which is necessary for our author's argument, is wholly improbable. How secretly soever the *Romans* gave orders to their general *Paulus Æmilius* to plunder *Epirus*, and to dismantle its cities; and whatever care he might take to execute his orders with secrecy, it can scarce be believed, that he could have caught the whole people of *Epirus*. Multitudes of them must certainly have escaped. *Paulus Æmilius* himself was a good-natured man, and was greatly afflicted on receiving such cruel orders. If he plundered the country of its silver and gold, if he dismantled 70 cities, if he made slaves of 150,000 persons, he surely did enough. Humanity, policy, the impossibility of catching every person, and the madness of doing it, had it been possible, must have secured the escape of many thousands. Neither indeed is it probable, that the *Romans* could intend to render *Epirus* entirely desolate. To what purpose? 'Tis far more probable, they meant only to strike terror, and would perhaps suffer by far the greatest number to escape, who either remained secretly in the country, or soon returned to it after the *Romans* were gone.

It may appear surprising, and tend to give a diminutive

* Lib. 45. cap. 34.

† Political discourses, p. 220.

‡ Plutarch. in *Æmil.*

diminutive idea of antiquity, that a city of so extensive commerce, and of so great fame and splendor, as *Rhodes* is well known to have been, should have contained only 6000 citizens. 'Tis true, as our author has said*, it contained no more when it was besieged by *Demetrius*; only *Diodorus* mentions a thousand strangers besides †: a small number, it must be confessed, if there were really no more. However, we imagine, a satisfactory account may be given of this matter, without degrading antiquity, or rejecting the hypothesis in the *dissertation* (1.) It is not probable, that these 7000 who defended *Rhodes*, made the whole number of its citizens and strangers. For history informs us, that the first thing the *Rhodians* did upon this occasion, was to get rid of all such persons, as would be either useless or burdensom during the siege. Hence (2.) we may conclude, that many of the richest, softest, and most luxurious citizens, who had not fortitude and strength of mind sufficient to make them undergo the hardships of a siege, would fly before it began. Consider only what might be expected, if a city, such as *London*, inhabited by a wealthy and luxurious people, well provided with ships and other conveniencies for transporting themselves, was in real danger of enduring a siege. (3.) From hence it is probable, that the 7000 who remained in *Rhodes*, were only the bravest and most resolute

* P. 227.

† *Diod. Sic. lib. 20. cap. 84.*

part of its citizens, who may be supposed to have easily dispensed with the presence of such, as would have served only to consume provisions, and to damp the spirits of the rest; would perhaps have been perpetually assailing their ears with pitiful cries to surrender; nay, might have gone so far, as out of mere cowardice to have betrayed the city. Besides, they might have this farther in view, effectually to secure a great part both of their citizens, and of their riches, that if the city happened to be taken, they might be preserved from the violence of the enemy, and be reserved for better times. (4.) But after all, if these 7000 were in truth all the citizens and strangers in *Rhodes*, who were able to bear arms, thus much must at least be granted, that that state, which in antient times was possessed of the empire of the sea*, which enjoyed the most extensive commerce, and whose nautical laws have been not only celebrated for their equity, but are even a standard, and of great authority at this day, in all controversies relating to maritime affairs, seems to have contained an inconsiderable number of citizens. This, if it be true, greatly confirms the hypothesis in the *dissertation*, that the most extensive commerce does not necessarily produce so many people, as a careful and industrious attention to agriculture †.

FROM

* Strabo, lib. 14.

† As manufactures were less numerous, navigation was more

FROM *Rhodes* we pass to *Italy*.

As to those prodigious numbers which were engaged at the battle at *Siagra**, we apprehend, that the authority of *Diodorus Siculus* and *Strabo*, is sufficient to form a strong presumption of the very great populousness, not only of *Sybaris* and *Croton*, but also of all the southern parts of *Italy*, till some better reason is produced for rejecting the testimonies of these authors, than the greatness of the numbers assigned by them †.

To descend to a latter age, the forces which *Polybius* assigns to the *Romans* and their allies, between the first and second *Punic* wars, amounting to more than 700,000 foot and 70,000 horse ‡, shew the great populousness of *Italy* in that age. These were the fighting men of only a part of *Italy* ||. The account is taken from a kind of muster-roll, and has all marks of credibility. If it may be depended on, we must compute the inhabitants of *Italy*, who were of free condition, at 12 millions;

more imperfect, and commerce was less extensive in antient than in modern times; neither cities nor states could have then flourished so much by their means alone, as several have done, since the attention of the world has turned so much on the improvement of trade and the encouragement of manufactures.

* *Dissertation*, p. 58.† *Political discourses*, p. 213.‡ *Polyb. lib. 2.*|| Not above the third part, according to the *political discourse*, p. 215.

millions ; and reckoning thrice as many slaves, the inhabitants of all sorts will be found to be no fewer than 48 millions : or, if the proportion of three slaves to one free person shall be thought too high, considering the simplicity of the *Romans* in the more early ages ; by supposing them only two to one, the inhabitants of *Italy* were 36 millions : and as the bulk of *Italy* is to that of *England*, as three to two, *Italy* was thrice as populous as *England*. But, supposing the slaves to have been even three to one, and the number of all the inhabitants 48 millions, there will be an acre for every head ; which is more than some *Roman* consuls and dictators had to maintain their families, not very many years before that time *. This circumstance is a confirmation of the numbers marked by *Polybius*.

THIS account given by *Polybius*, is confirmed by the authority of *Diodorus Siculus*, who computes the number of these forces at near a million. For though his enumeration varies from that of *Polybius* †, yet it may be observed, that *Diodorus* computes them in round numbers ; that the variation is extremely small ; and that they both agree in assigning numbers very great. And though *Diodorus* plainly supposes, that *Italy* was not so populous in his time, as before the second *Punic* war, this circumstance can afford no suspicion against either his own testimony, or that of *Polybius* *.

* Dissertation, p. 118, 119.

† Political discourses, p. 216.

bius *. For there is no absurdity in supposing; what both from history and from the nature of things appears to have been the case, that the number of inhabitants in *Italy* was diminished in the time of *Diodorus* ; since the second *Punic* war, and those civil wars which followed it and brought along with them such destruction and devastation into *Italy*, are evident causes of decay.

IT is not necessary to consider the extent or buildings of the city of *Rome*, concerning which our author has made several curious observations †. For as the question is not concerning the inhabitants who dwelt within the walls of *Rome*, but concerning the whole number of the *Roman* people, it is of less consequence to inquire into the largeness of the city, or the extent of its walls at any particular period ; whether it was largest under the reign of *Augustus*, or before or afterwards ; what was the form of its houses ; whether they were high, and the inhabitants lived in separate stories ; whether there was much empty ground within its precincts ; whether it did not contain a greater number of inhabitants, of all sorts and degrees, comprehending freemen and slaves, *Romans*, *Italians*, and foreigners, under the emperors, than under the commonwealth ; what sort of *Canaille* those 200,000 were, who received corn by the public distribution

Q q

* Political discourses, p. 216.

† P. 230, &c.

distribution in *Augustus's* time*. For whatever may be said in answer to these questions, and whatever was the condition of the city of *Rome*, it appears pretty evident, that *Italy* declined greatly in industry and in numbers of people, after the establishment of the *Roman* empire.

SICILY is confessed by our author to have flourished greatly in antient times, and to have been much decayed in the days of *Augustus* †. He seems indeed to imagine those accounts, which are given of the numerous armies maintained by the *Dionysii*, to be entirely fabulous and fictitious; because *Diodorus Siculus*, as Mr. *Hume* apprehends, allows, that, even in his time, the army of *Dionysius* appeared incredible: and because it seems impossible that so great an army could be maintained in a country of so small extent, and of so little trade ‡. But I have not been able to fall on any passage of *Diodorus*, in which he seems to entertain the smallest doubt concerning the credibility of these accounts. On the contrary, I have met with one, where he mentions the great armies of *Dionysius* the younger, with other numerous armies of later times ||; and from thence brings an argument in support of what he says concerning the great populousness of more antient ages.

Besides,

* Political discourses, p. 234.

† P. 219.

‡ P. 217. 218.

|| Diodor. Sic. lib. 2. cap. 5.

Besides, 'tis well known that the *Syracusians*, and the inhabitants of some other cities which the *Dionysii* had subdued, employed themselves in trade and manufactures, not indeed according to the extensive plan of modern commerce, but according to the maxims and circumstances of these times. So that if we remember the great magazines of arms and other military engines, and the immense treasures which were laid up by *Dionysius* the elder, and reflect on the great fertility of *Sicily*, we may perceive how the *Dionysii* were able to maintain so great armies. Besides, Mr. *Hume* confesses*, that the *Dionysii* lived in a most enlightened age, and in an island with which the *Greeks* were well acquainted; and that the history of *Dionysius* the elder was written by *Philiſtus*, who was not only a man of great genius, but minister to that prince, and of course had good opportunity of knowing the true situation of his affairs. Nay, he even confesses that one would imagine, that every circumstance of the life and actions of *Dionysius* the elder might be regarded as authentic and free from all fabulous exaggeration: so that, upon the whole, it seems surprising that he should be found so doubtful of the truth of a history so well supported. Can such authentic accounts be invalidated, merely because we have not a particular estimate of the funds by which the *Dionysii* maintained their armies, or by an insinuation that they arose from the exaggerat-

* P. 217.

ted flattery of the courtiers, or perhaps from the vanity and policy of the tyrants themselves? Such falshood could never have remained undetected, unless the *Dionysii* had lived so long that the memory of the facts had been quite forgotten.

ACCORDING to the dissertation, *Gaul* was more populous before the days of *Julius Caesar* than it has been ever since: but Mr. *Hume* inclines to think, that it was not near so populous as *France* is at present *. In order to support his opinion, he not only brings arguments from the antient condition and circumstances of that country, but also offers objections against the computations of antient authors. However, on an examination we shall find, that his remarks are not sufficient to support his hypothesis. (1). The *Gauls* were antiently much more advanced in the arts of life than Mr. *Hume* imagines them to have been, when he compares them with their northern neighbours, † (I suppose the *Germans* are here understood) as is evident from the express testimony both of *Strabo* and *Caesar*, mentioned in the dissertation ‡. (2). We have

* P. 249.

† Ibid.

‡ P. 68. 69. 70.

I cannot find any passage in *Strabo*, in which he observes, "That though all *Gaul* was cultivated, it was not cultivated with any skill or care." The passage which seems to have been in our author's eye, is interpreted too unfavourably for the *Gauls*; for it does not relate to the whole, but only to some particular places of this country; as may be seen in the dissertation, pag. 69.

have no reason to conclude, that the *Gauls* were not antiently much advanced in the arts of life, because they travelled into this island for their education in the mysteries of the religion and philosophy of the *Druids* *. From hence it appears only, that the mode or tour of travelling in those days was different from that which is most common at present; that the *Gauls* had an high opinion of the antiquity, learning, and sanctity of our *British Druids*; or at most, that they were superstitious or enthusiastic; for it is not said that they travelled to *Britain* to learn the arts of life, but to learn the mysteries of their religion. So that I apprehend we have as little reason to conclude, that the *Gauls* were not well advanced in the arts of life, as we should have to infer, that the *British* were not at present much advanced in them, because they travel abroad into other countries. On the contrary, this custom seems to be rather a proof of the superior civility, politeness, and improvements of the people of this island above those of other nations. Indeed, we may well be allowed to say, that these other nations act unwisely in shewing so little curiosity to visit a people remarkable for their wisdom, their learning, their genius, their spirit, their trade, their liberty, and the excellency of their political constitution; and from intercourse with whom good sense and sound maxims are to be learned, if any where in *Europe*. But how can
the

* Political discourses, p. 249.

the custom of travelling be reckoned a mark of barbarity? Further, if the antient *Gauls* are concluded to have been but little advanced in the arts of life, because they were so superstitious as to travel into *Britain*, in order to acquire a perfect knowledge of the mysteries of their religion; what must we say of the present *French*, who, notwithstanding their boasted politeness and improvements, are deeply tinctured with a superstition of the same kind, and are still so foolish as to look for infallibility in an imaginary idol, framed by the weakness, pride, and ambition of man; and to imagine, like the antient *Gauls* *, that this sovereign pontif, or arch *Druid*, the head of their religion, and the *dernier resort* in all controversies, is not to be found in their own country? (3). If it be a certain sign, as undoubtedly it is, that a nation is considerably advanced in the arts of life, when a taste for contemplation and philosophy prevails, we have good authority to conclude, that the *Gauls* were curious inquirers into nature, that they studied astronomy, were not ignorant of geography, reasoned much concerning the divinity, and were persuaded, that the soul of man did not perish at death: *multa de sideribus, atque eorum motu, de mundi ac terrarum magnitudine, de rerum natura, de Deorum immortalium vi ac potestate disputant, et juventuti transdunt* †. Besides, it appears evidently, that

* Caes. de bell. Gall. lib. 6. cap. 13.

† Caes. de bell. Gall. lib. 6. cap. 14.

that they were acquainted with the language of that people, who had, first of all the *Europeans*, cultivated the arts and sciences, had carried philosophy to so surprising an height, and had produced so many works of taste, genius, and learning; for it is altogether improbable to suppose, that the *Greek* language was not understood among a people who used the *Greek* letters in almost all their public and private affairs *. And 'tis as improbable to suppose, that they could remain barbarous and unpolished, when they must have had such opportunities of improvement, by their acquaintance with the *Greek* authors. (4.) We can hardly believe, that the *Gauls* were quite ignorant of the arts of life, when their chief deity was *Mercury*, whom they believed to be the inventor of every art, and to preside over trade and merchandize †.

If, as our author observes ‡, equality of property had no place among the *Gauls*, we may remark, that a perfect equality had place no where; for

* In castris Helvetiorum tabulae repertae sunt litteris Graecis confectae.

Caes. de bell. Gall. lib. 1. cap. 29.

Neque fas esse existimant, ea litteris mandare, quum in reliquis fere rebus, publicis privatisque rationibus, Graecis utantur litteris.

Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 14.

† Deum maxime Mercurium colunt: — hunc omnium inventorem artium ferunt: — hunc ad quaestus pecuniae mercaturaeque habere vim maximam, arbitrantur.

Ibid. cap. 17.

‡ P. 250.

for there were wealthy and eminent citizens in all the antient republics. Besides, equality of fortune is but one circumstance; the populousness of antient nations did not depend on it alone; and there were many other sources, from whence vast multitudes of people might be derived*.

NEITHER are the wars among the *Gauls* † a stronger argument against their populousness, than these in other antient nations ‡.

As to our author's calculations concerning the numbers of the inhabitants of *Gaul*, I pretend not to find a perfect agreement between *Appian's* account of the number of those whom *Caesar* encountered, killed, or took prisoners, and the account given either by *Plutarch* or by *Paterculus* ||: or to answer for the consistency of *Appian's* testimony concerning the number of 400 nations or tribes which inhabited that country, with what *Diodorus Siculus* affirms concerning the numbers of people, of which these *Gallic* nations consisted **. Only we may observe, that the testimonies of all these historians agree, in assigning large numbers ††, and

* See the dissertation, p. 83, &c.

† See political discourses, p. 250.

‡ See appendix, p. 211, &c.

|| Political discourses, p. 216.

** Ibid. p. 249. 250.

†† According to *Paterculus*, (*lib. 2*). *Caesar* killed 400,000 of the enemy in his foreign wars. This number is much less than that which is assigned either by *Appian*, *Plutarch*, or *Pliny*. In particular *Pliny* mentions no fewer than *undecies centena*

and of course in supporting the opinion concerning the populousness of *Gaul*; and that computing on any reasonable supposition from the account of *Appian* and that of *Diodorus* joined together, the inhabitants of antient *Gaul* will be found not to have been more than three or four times as numerous, as the inhabitants of *France* at present; a proportion, which seems to have obtained in several other nations*.

AGAIN, it is certain, that there were three orders of men among the *Gauls*, viz. the *Druids*,

R r the

centena et nonaginta duo millia hominum occisa praeter civiles victorias. *Lipsius*, in his notes on the passage in *Paterculus*, is so confident that the number is greatly diminished in this author, as to ask, "can any one then doubt that DCCC should be read instead of CCCC?"

See *Dissertation*, p. 75. 76. *Appian. in Celticiis. Plin. nat. hist. lib. 7. cap. 25. Just. Lips. ad Vell. Pater.*

* Since *Appian* relates, that there were 400 *Gallic* nations, and *Diodorus*, that the greatest of these nations consisted of 200,000, and the least of 50,000; though we understand *Diodorus* to mean only the fighting men, we are not obliged to compute all the inhabitants of *Gaul* at much above 80 millions; for perhaps very few of these nations contained many above the smallest number. And as we may compute 20 millions in *France* at present, which is not equal in extent to the antient *Gaul*; even according to such a high computation, it will not follow, that *Gaul* was much more than thrice as populous as *France* is at present; which is not such an extravagant supposition, as our author may imagine. However, the *dissertation* proceeds on a more moderate computation, and states the inhabitants of *Gaul* at only about 40 millions, since 'tis scarce probable, that *Gaul* was peopled in as great a proportion as *Greece*, *Italy*, and some other nations.

See *Appian in Celticiis*, and *Diodor. Sic. lib. 5. cap. 25.*

the *Equites*, and the *Plebes*. All these seem to have been of free condition*. Now, if we compute the fighting men of *Belgium*, as in the *dissertation* †, at half a million, and suppose, that there was among the *Gauls* another order of men, who were not enlisted in their armies, the whole inhabitants of *Gaul* will be found to amount to 32 millions. But Mr. *Hume*, by supposing, that the *Gauls* had no domestic

* The *Druids* were consecrated to the service of religion, and, besides, had a chief direction in the management of civil affairs. The next order was that of the *Equites*, of whom *Caesar* says, That when occasion required, and any war broke out, *Omnes in bello versantur*, lib. 6. cap. 15. The last order was that of the *Plebes*, who seem to have been of inferior rank, tho' they were of free condition. And since in time of war, all the *Equites* took the field, on this account fewer of the *Plebes* would be enlisted in their armies: so that we may suppose, the great bulk of them would be left to labour the ground, or work at other employments. Indeed, in the *dissertation*, from a presumption, that there must have been slaves among the *Gauls*, as well as among almost all other antient nations, we were led to imagine, that the *Plebes* were no other than slaves, and of course, that they were never enlisted in the *Gallic* armies. But, on a more accurate examination, we have found reason to alter our opinion, and to believe, that there were actually slaves among the *Gauls*; and that the *Plebes*, or the greatest part of them, who are said to be *paene servorum in loco*, were only those among the people, who, though they were free, were of low condition; like the common people in *Greece*, *Rome*, and other countries. By this supposition, the hypothesis in the *dissertation*, is greatly confirmed, and several passages in *Caesar* are reconciled both to it and to one another.

† P. 71.

domestic slaves, makes their number amount only to 8 millions*. On this argument (1.) we must observe, that the institution of slavery was almost universal in antient times, and that it obtained in almost every nation. In particular, the *Germans*, the people neighbouring to *Gaul*, according to *Tacitus* †, had their slaves; a strong presumption, that there was a similar order of men among the *Gauls*. (2.) It appears, that the *Gauls* had domestic slaves, from what *Caesar* informs us was a common custom in *Gaul*, viz. that such as were either loaded with debts, or burdened with taxes, or oppressed by the injuries of the great, used to sell themselves for slaves to the *nobiles* ‡. (3.) But that the *Gauls* had domestic slaves, appears yet more evidently from another express testimony of *Caesar*, where, speaking of that trial which *Orgetorix* was to undergo, for having conspired against the liberties of the *Helvetii*, he has the following words: *Die constituta causae dictionis, Orgetorix ad iudicium omnem suam familiam, ad hominum millia decem, undique coegit; et omnes clientes, obaeratosque suos, quorum magnum numerum habebat, eodem conduxit* ||. Now, it may be remarked, that the word

* P. 251.

† De mor. Germ. cap. 20. 25.

‡ Plerique, quum aut aere alieno, aut magnitudine tributorum, aut injuria potentiorum premuntur, sese in servitutem dicant nobilibus. In hos eadem omnia sunt jura, quae dominis in fervos. De bell. Gall. lib. 6. cap. 13.

|| De bell. Gall. lib. 1. cap. 4.

word *familia* is, in its proper and original signification, used to express a family of slaves, subjected to the authority of one *paterfamilias**: at any rate it must be understood so in this place. So that these 10,000 who accompanied *Orgetorix*, can only be understood of slaves. (4.) If one man appears to have had so many, we may conclude, that the use of slaves was common among the *Gauls*, and that almost every free citizen had some. (5.) Hence it appears to be of little moment in this argument, whether the *Plebes* were or were not enlisted in the armies of the *Gauls*; for they must have had an order of men, who, by parity of reason, we must be allowed to suppose, were never admitted into their armies, since it was a constant maxim of antient policy, in almost every nation, never to enlist slaves, or to allow them the use of arms, unless on the most pressing occasions. (6.) If the *Gauls* had no domestic slaves, nor any order of men inferior to the *Plebes*; and if the *Plebes* were admitted indiscriminately into the armies enlisted in *Gaul*; it follows, that its inhabitants must be reduced to a number, which is altogether inconsistent with the accounts of the best historians,

* This appears from *Briffonius de verborum significatione in voce familia*; from *l. 9. ff. de jurisdictione*; from the title *de Edictio edicto*; from *l. 1. § 16.* and several other places of the title *de vi et de vi armata*; from both the rubric and the laws of the title, *Si familia furtum fecisse dicitur*; from *l. 195. ff. de verborum significatione*; and from numberless other places in the *Pandects*.

ans, and with the circumstances of the *Gallic* territory; for it was extensive, fertile, and I may add, well cultivated*. (7.) If we make the inhabitants of *Gaul* amount only to so small a number as 8 millions, we are reduced to this absurdity, that *Gaul* was not near so populous in proportion as other antient nations, though it was possessed of most of those sources which rendered those other nations populous.

THE preceding reasoning, I apprehend, is decisive; and is alone sufficient to invalidate most of the objections moved by Mr. *Hume* against the populousness of *Gaul*. In particular, there is no necessity to suppose that those 100,000 men, whom the *Bellovaci*, one of the nations of *Belgium*, could have brought into the field, were all noblemen †. For we grant that some of the *Plebes* might have been enlisted as well as the *Equites*. On any supposition whatsoever, 'tis not necessary to call them all noblemen, since *Caesar* does not call them *nobiles*, but *armata millia centum* ‡; and the term *nobiles* can be applied only to the more eminent and wealthy of all the freemen, especially of the orders of the *Druids* and *Equites*.

INDEED on this article it may be objected, that if the *Bellovaci* could have brought 100,000 men into the field; and if the proportion of the slaves to the free persons is made the same as that of 3

* Dissertation, p. 69, 70.

† Political discourses, p. 251.

‡ De bell. Gall. lib. 2. cap. 4.

to 1, it follows necessarily, that the whole people in the state of the *Bellovaci* must have amounted to 1,600,000; a number which is directly contrary to that of *Diodorus Siculus*, who affirms that the largest of the *Gallic* nations consisted of only 200,000 men, ἀνδρες; for at this rate we cannot compute the whole people in any the largest state of *Gaul* at more than 800,000. However, as 'tis impossible to determine precisely the proportion between the freemen and the slaves, probable suppositions might be made to reconcile the account of *Caesar* with that of *Diodorus*.

BESIDES the argument brought from the army of the *Bellovaci*, Mr. *Hume* has brought another from what *Caesar* relates concerning the *Helvetii*, in order to prove that *Gaul* was not so populous as is commonly believed*. According to *Caesar*, in the lists which he found in the *Helvetian* camp, the number of the *Helvetii*, who had abandoned their country, in order to conquer and take possession of some larger territory, was stated at 263,000 †; the fourth part of which, we may suppose, was able to bear arms: from whence Mr. *Hume* infers that their country was ill inhabited since it contained so small a number, though it was 240 miles in length, and 180 in breadth. But (1). since we have proved, that the *Gauls* had

* Political discourses, p. 251.

† De bell. Gall. lib. 1. cap. 29. By some oversight it is stated at 360,000 in the *political discourse*, p. 251.

had domestic slaves who were not enrolled, we shall find on a computation, that the whole *Helvetii* might have amounted to about a million; no inconsiderable number of inhabitants in a country which seems to have been barren and mountainous.

(2). Since *Orgetorix* had a family of about 10,000 slaves, how vastly numerous may we suppose the *Helvetian* slaves to have been, and of course how populous the state itself! Indeed the multitude of their people seems to have been one principal cause of their design to leave their country*. (3). Though these 263,000 had been the real number of all the *Helvetii*, we ought not to judge of the populousness of *Gaul* from the number of those who lived in a part of it which was so barren and mountainous, that the inhabitants had formed a design of abandoning it †. (4). A resolution so uncommon as that which the *Helvetii* formed, to abandon their country, is ever attended with many frightful ideas of its consequences, and is counteracted by that indolence, that anxiety, those prejudices, and that affection to a native soil, which are natural to most part of mankind. Hence we may well be allowed to suppose that the whole nation of the *Helvetii* could not be brought to go upon so hazardous an expedition; that *Caesar's* intelligence might have been

* Pro multitudine autem hominum, et pro gloria belli atque fortitudinis, angustos se finis habere arbitrabantur.

Caes. de bell. Gall. lib. 1. cap. 2.

† Caes. de bell. Gall. lib. 1. cap. 2.

been not perfectly exact; that therefore it was only a powerful colony which had entered into this resolution; that multitudes would chuse to remain in their own country; in particular, that the *Druids*, who were wholly exempted from war, were consecrated to the service of religion, were of so great influence, importance, and authority in *Gaul*, and seem to have been in so good a way at home, would not be hasty to set out on such an adventure, but would rather wait its issue; and of course, that we must augment the number of the *Helvetii*, by an increment equal to what we may reasonably suppose to have been the number of the *Druids*, and of those others who remained at home. If this was the case, we may easily see, why the number of the *Helvetii*, mentioned in the rolls, was so small. Thus those difficulties, which seem to attend the accounts of historians concerning antient *Gaul*, are found not to be insuperable; though it must be confessed, that they are the most puzzling which have occurred in our examination of this question.

OUR author proceeds next to consider the populousness of *Spain*, and seems inclined to think, that it was not so populous about 2000 years ago, as it is at present; because of the restless, turbulent, unsettled condition of its antient inhabitants*. But we have no reason to believe, that the *Spaniards* were of old more fierce and barbarous than many

other

* Polit. discourses, p. 251, 252.

other antient nations. 'Tis true, they are represented in this manner by the *Roman* historians, who seem to have accounted every thing, but a slavish subjection to their empire, barbarity. 'Tis thus that we find *Justin* concluding his 44th book. *Nec prius, perdomita provincia, jugum Hispani accipere potuerunt, quam Caesar Augustus, perdomito orbe, victricia ad eos arma transtulit, populumque barbarum ac ferum, legibus ad cultiorem vitæ usum traductum, in formam provinciae redegit.* So that it is reasonable to think, that what was called by the *Romans* fierceness, was only a zeal for liberty, and a spirit of independence; and that a tame submission to the injuries, insults and oppression of the *Romans*, was called *cultior vitæ usus*.

THUS much is certain from antient history, that *Spain*, like *Italy* and *Greece*, was antiently divided into a great many small and independent states; and we have shewed, that what is represented as barbarity, was not only not productive of desolation, but even contributed not a little to the populousness of the world. Now, what reason have we to imagine, that it could be productive of worse consequences in *Spain*, than in other countries?

ACCORDINGLY the *Spaniards* are represented as remarkably populous by antient authors; and in particular by *Cicero*, in that passage quoted by Mr. *Hume*, in support of his hypothesis; but which in reality makes against it. *Quam volumus*

S f

licet,

*licet, P. C. ipsi nos amemus: tamen nec numero Hispanos, nec robore Gallos, nec calliditate Poenos, nec artibus Graecos, nec denique hoc ipso hujus gentis, ac terrae domestico nativoque sensu Italos ipsos, ac Latinos, sed pictate, ac religione,— omnes gentis nationesque superavimus**. Instead of giving us a diminutive †, what an high idea does it give us of the populousness of antient nations? For since it is almost demonstrable, that *Italy* and *Greece* abounded with multitudes of people, we may reasonably infer, that the *Spaniards* surpassed the *Romans* in numbers; and that *Spain* was as remarkable for a superior populousness, as each of these nations for those particular qualities ascribed to them by *Cicero*. And as it is undoubted, that the *Gauls* were remarkable for their strength, the *Carthaginians* for their cunning, and the *Greeks* for their knowledge of the arts, what reason have we to reject the testimony of *Cicero* in the other case, and to give no credit to him, when he represents the *Spaniards* as chiefly remarkable for populousness †?

MUSCOVY,

* De haruspicum responsis orat. 30.

† Polit. discours. p. 252.

‡ We may observe, that *Gaul* was a country, as or nearly as large as *Spain*, and that the *Carthaginians* were masters of very large dominions. According to *Strabo* (*lib. 17.*) at the beginning of the third *Punic* war, they were in possession of 300 cities in *Libya*; and the city of *Carthage* consisted of 700,000 inhabitants, when it was destroyed by the *Romans*. From whence it appears, that *Cicero* is speaking
of

MUSCOVY, *Sweden* and *Denmark* are so ill-peopled at present, and so little is known about their antient state, that we have scarce any reason to believe, that they either were or could be much worse peopled of old, than they are at present*. *Poland* perhaps is better peopled than either it was in antient, or it could be expected to be in our times, considering the badness of its government; both because tillage seems to have been antiently but little known in these parts of *Europe*, and because of the vast fertility of its lands, which at present yield great crops, notwithstanding the many disadvantages under which it labours.

THE only country on the continent, of which we can with any certainty affirm, that it is more populous at present than it was antiently, is *Germany*: for, besides that agriculture was very much unknown among the old *Germans*, it is at present divided into a great many little states and principalities, a circumstance very favourable to its populousness; for each of these states has its own capital, and in many cases has only a small territory surrounding it: by which means, not only the lands around the capital, but even those which ly at a greater distance, are better cultivated and inhabited, than they either were of old, or could be

at

of the comparative populousness of *Spain*, and means to assert, not only that the *Spaniards* were very numerous, but that they were at least as numerous as other nations, in proportion to the extent of their country.

* Political discourses, p. 248.

at present, if the whole empire was subjected to the absolute authority of a single person. However, there is no reason to be so precise as our author *, and to determine, that it has twenty times more inhabitants than in antient times; for this proportion seems truly to be very high.

MR. *Hume* hath not made any conjectures concerning the numbers contained in *Egyptian Thebes*, *Babylon* and *Nineveh*, which he reckons too much involved in the obscurity of antient fables †. *Thebes* has been considered already ‡. And though we cannot affirm, that *Babylon*, one of the noblest cities which the sun ever beheld, was at any time fully inhabited, or peopled in proportion to its vast extent; yet, from the strain, in which both the sacred and profane authors of antiquity speak of it, we have the greatest reason to believe, that it contained a vast multitude of people.

WE shall finish this survey of antient nations, with a calculation of the inhabitants of *Nineveh*. It will not be improper to conclude with it, since it is built on no less authority than that of sacred scripture itself.

ACCORDING to the book of *Jonah*, there were 120,000 children in *Nineveh*, who could not discern between their right hand and their left hand ||.

Now,

* P. 248.

† P. 219.

‡ Dissertation, p. 43.

|| *Jonah* iv. 11.

Now, computing according to the proportion, which is, from the most accurate observations, found to be most consistent with truth *, and reckoning such as were too young to discern between their right hand and their left, to be all those who were below two years of age compleat, the inhabitants of *Nineveh* were 2,200,000; if they were all those who were below three, the inhabitants of *Nineveh* were more than 1½ millions; if all below four, above 1,100,000; if all below five, they were more than 900,000. Thus populous was this exceeding great city †, the capital of the east, in times of such remote antiquity.

IF Mr. *Hume* had reflected on the vast populousness of *Thebes*, *Nineveh*, and some other antient cities, he could never have been at so great a loss to understand that passage of *Aristotle* ‡, where the philosopher says, that, “a city cannot consist of so few inhabitants as ten, or of so many as 100,000 ||.” ’Tis plain, that the meaning of this passage cannot be, what Mr. *Hume* seems to apprehend, that there was no city in *Aristotle*’s time, which consisted of 100,000 inhabitants.

For

* Lowthorp’s abridgment of the philosophical transactions, vol. 3. p. 671.

† *Jonah* iii. 3.

‡ Political discourses, p. 240, 241.

|| Ουτε γὰρ ἐκ δέκα ἀνθρώπων γένοιτ’ ἂν πόλις ἕτε ἐκ δέκα μυριάδων ἐτι πόλις ἐστίν.

Arist. ethic. lib. 9. cap. 10.

For this great philosopher was too well acquainted with the history of mankind, and with the state of the world in his own time, ever to embrace so false an opinion. He is not here treating of the actual greatness of any city, that either had existed before, or was existing in his time, but is speaking of the numbers, which a well-ordered and regulated city ought to contain. The example of a city is brought to illustrate his doctrine concerning friendship, which *Aristotle* was of opinion could not be enjoyed in the most exalted manner, if one made choice of too many friends, because, in proportion as the number of one's friends is augmented, the just tone of the affection is destroyed, and its force too much weakened, by being divided among too many objects. In the same manner, a city cannot be rightly governed, if it contain too many inhabitants. This is the natural meaning of *Aristotle*, and I apprehend, his opinion is founded on good sense: for it seems plain, that a city might not only be more easily and better governed, and answer all the purposes of civil association better; but also, that its inhabitants would be more virtuous and happy, if it consisted of a smaller number than 100,000; and that cities consisting of a million, or half a million of inhabitants, are exposed to many disadvantages on this very account.

INDEED it may be said, that this objection lies as well against antient as against modern times.

For

For there were not only as great, but even much greater cities of old, than are at present. But we must remember, that the bulk of the antients were employed in cultivating the earth, and in providing what may be called the necessaries, rather than the delicacies of life. From whence it necessarily followed, that there was a vast plenty, and of course an almost inconceivable cheapness of every thing which was necessary for the subsistence of man.

BESIDES, the business, in which the antients were principally engaged, being simple, it would be long ere the taste of simplicity could entirely give place to that of luxury. So that great cities could not become destructive to populousness in antient times, so soon as they do at present. However, it must be confessed, that mankind being associated together in vast numbers, did even in antient times at last find out many inventions: and that by these the world was depopulated. From hence it appears, that modern cities and modern times have more powerful sources of depopulation within themselves, because of those numerous instruments of luxury, with which they are more abundantly supplied, than antient cities or antient times. So that they must sooner feel their bad effects, because the thoughts of their inhabitants are continually turned on improving former inventions, by finding out still newer and newer methods of heightening the elegance, delicacy and luxury

ry

ry of life. All this is exactly agreeable to the truth of history, and to the progress of human affairs. For great cities were first established, and of course luxury was first invented and carried to a great height in the east. So that there its bad effects were first felt. By it a new taste of life, a new set of manners, and an entirely new system of conduct were introduced; which ruined the eastern world. But, at this time, there was little communication between the east and the west; and while the *Asiatics* were wallowing in pleasure, a simple taste prevailed in *Europe*. However, no sooner was a communication laid open by *Alexander* and his successors, but especially by the *Romans*, than a similar taste of life, a similar set of manners, and a similar system of conduct were translated into the west. Of course the western world began immediately to decline in numbers of people. There was a total annihilation of simple manners. The world was overwhelmed with a corrupted taste, and has never been able to repair its desolation.

'Tis a true, though a trite saying of an antient sage, *Ne quid nimis*. For there seems to be fixed in nature a certain boundary, and just standard, by which every thing either is, or ought to be limited. Thus cities, by growing too large, become destructive; and empires, by being too extensive, become unweildy. Nay, the admiration of wisdom and virtue themselves, may grow excessive. We may be righteous over much, and
may

may make ourselves over wise. No wonder then, that there should be a just standard in elegance and magnificence, and that there should be a limit, beyond which the pursuit of beauty in sensible objects must become pernicious.

IN general, it must be confessed, that a taste of beauty, and a desire of grandeur in objects of this kind, must have been highly advantageous at first, and must have contributed greatly to render human life agreeable and commodious. But 'tis difficult to ascertain the proper boundary within which it ought to be confined in theory; 'tis much more difficult not to transgress it in practice. Happy should we be! happy should be society! could we find out and preserve that golden mediocrity, which in a great measure constitutes the peace and tranquillity of human life.

As this taste is natural to mankind, we can hardly suppose even the most wild and most uncultivated state, without some sort of refinement: for men can hardly be supposed to exist, and at the same time to have no more than what is absolutely necessary for the support of life. Of course we cannot go back to any age so distant, in which we shall not find some traces of this kind.

HOWEVER, if elegance comes short of the just standard, and is not as yet arrived at its proper maturity, human life must necessarily be deprived of the enjoyment of many conveniencies of which it is

T t

capable.

capable, and the manners of mankind must incline towards fierceness and superstition. If carried no farther than the just limit, it produces a more commodious method of living, gives rise to the invention of many true refinements, heightens the splendor and magnificence of society, tends to render mankind social and humane, begets mildness and moderation in the tempers and actions of men, and helps to banish ignorance and superstition out of the world; and thus far it contributes to the perfection of human society. But so soon as it o'erleaps the proper limit, it introduces effeminacy and softness among mankind, creates too keen an appetite, as well as inspires too constant a pursuit, and excites to an excessive enjoyment of sensual pleasure; it enervates both the mind and the body, makes men less sensible of true glory, and less desirous of true honour; it weakens their martial spirit; it renders them less capable of preserving, or of defending the liberties of their country; it excites an insatiable thirst of gold; and, by inspiring a slavish, dependent and venal disposition, paves the way to much dishonesty, to debauchery, to bribery, to corruption; nay even to impiety. From whence, as it happened both in *Greece* and *Rome*, the citizens being seduced by ambitious leaders, prove the instruments of sedition and of civil war, attended at last with the extinction of virtue, the loss of liberty, and universal ruin.

IN

IN short, it insensibly weakens the relish of intellectual and moral beauty; it makes men less concerned about their conduct in life, and so they may enjoy what is courted and pursued by the bulk of a luxurious age, makes them more regardless of preserving their integrity. It introduces numberless superfluities and wants, the satisfaction of which is preferred to the discharge of the most important duties. It must of course prevent marriage, give check to the increase of mankind, and hinder millions from ever seeing the light.

F I N I S.



