

the majesty of the Roman commonwealth by maladministration. Punishment during the Republic was the interdiction or forbidding water, or fire, that is, a deprivation of the chief necessities of life, involved also a loss of citizenship.* A subsequent law extended the same punishment to any person who sheltered an interdicted person. But up to the time of Augustus the penalty was inflicted only on overt acts; freedom of speech was at any rate ostensibly preserved. Cassius Severus, however, a public slanderer, against whom the Epode of Horace is supposed to be directed, so irritated Augustus by his satire, that the latter caused the law of High Treason to be extended to include slander and libel. In so doing Augustus seems to have had general support, as the persons slandered had been the most prominent men and women of Rome. But Tiberius saw what a weapon had been placed in his hands, and the term *majestas* was extended by him to all acts and words which might appear disrespectful to the Emperor. As soon as this interpretation became established, the *delator* or informer began to flourish, and the hateful spawn begot its progeny, worse even than itself, during almost the whole of the first century of our era. The first man who reduced the matter to a science—the Titus Oates of the period—was one Romanus Hispo. Poor, unknown, restless, pandering to the severity of the Emperor, he soon made existence dangerous to the most illustrious. He obtained credit with one man—hatred from all others. He set an example which taught others how to become rich from being poor; to become feared from being despised; and how to be a pest first to others and finally to themselves. The first instance given of the accusations of Hispo was a charge brought by him against one Marcellus, that he had spoken disparagingly of Tiberius—a difficult charge to meet, as if he had spoken of him at all, and spoken truly, he could not help speaking disparagingly. Under succeeding Emperors, up to the time of Nerva, the evil grew, and all confidence, friendship, or friendly intercourse was destroyed. Diabolical plots were hatched to entrap unwary victims, and the mere suspicion that the Prince was unfriendly to a man was sufficient to secure ample evidence of any charge invented to meet the case. This state of matters continued during the reigns of Nero and his three successors. Vespasian and Titus checked the evil; but the brightness of their short reigns was gloomily eclipsed by the cruel and sanguinary despotism of Domitian. Under him informers again thronged the courts; they did not ply their trade secretly but openly; they infested all public haunts—the Forum, even the temples; and it needed the strong hand of Trajan to break up the nest of insolent ruffians who persecuted decent men. Among the chief of these scoundrels was one Marcus Regulus. He seems to have been especially obnoxious to Pliny, who mentions him several times, and always with expressions of bitter dislike. The following letter gives a graphic account of a passage between them, and is interesting as showing to what trials public men at Rome were subject:

C. Pliny to Voconius Romanus, greeting: Have you seen anybody more timid and humble than Marcus Regulus since the death of Domitian? Under him, he had committed crimes not less than under Nero, but more secretly. He began to be afraid lest I would be angry with him. Nor was he wrong: I was angry. He had been an accessory to the death of Rusticus Arulenus, and had exulted in it so openly that he recited and published a pamphlet abusing Rusticus, and even called him the "Stoic's ape." He adds, "Branded with the Vitellian scar." You know the eloquence of Regulus. He inveighed against Herennius Senecio [whose condemnation Metius Carus had procured] so vehemently, that Carus said to him: "What have you to do with my dead men? Do I interfere with either Crassus or Camerinus?" whom Regulus had accused under Nero. Regulus believed that I did not like these things; so much so, that when he recited his pamphlet he did not invite me. Besides, he remembered how dangerously he had attacked me before the Centumviri. I was defending Arionilla, the wife of Timon, at the request of Arulenus Rusticus. Regulus was prosecuting. We were arguing at one stage of the case over an opinion given by Metius Modestus, a well known man. He was then in exile, banished by Domitian. Says Regulus: Pray, Secundus, what do you think of Modestus? You see what danger I was in if I answered, Well; what dishonor if I said, Not well. I cannot say that anything else except the gods helped me. I will let you know, said I, what my opinion is, if that is the matter about which the Judges are here to decide. Again said he: But tell me, what do you think of Modestus? A second time I replied: Witnesses are usually examined as against those who are accused, not against those who are already condemned. A third time he asked: Now, what do you think, not of Modestus, but of the loyalty of Modestus? You ask, I said, what I think. Well, I think it is not proper even to ask about a matter concerning which judgment has been given. He held his tongue; I obtained praise and congratulation because I had not injured my reputation by any answer, possibly advantageous but dishonest, nor had I allowed myself to be caught in the toils of so insidious a questioning.

We would like to give the rest of the letter, showing how Regulus cringed afterwards to Pliny for forgiveness, but space forbids. All we

* In England the crimes which would come under *majestas* were more severely punished. Typical cases of the three classes of crime enumerated were Admiral Byng, Strafford, and James II.

can say is, that this same Regulus is described in another letter as having lost a son, whom he mourned in an insano way. He slaughtered the poor boy's harmless ponies, dogs, nightingales, parrots and black-birds around the funeral pyre; and after doing all that, he threatened to marry again; a proceeding which Pliny characterizes as both too early and too late—the latter on account of his age, the former on account of his mourning, and he adds:

Why do I say this, you ask; not because he says so himself, because a greater liar never stepped, but because it is certain that Regulus will do the very thing that ought not to be done.

Pliny survived Regulus, as appears from the second epistle of the Sixth Book. It is a curious fact that Martial praises Regulus to the skies; but Martial was a flatterer of Domitian, and his praises are a worse condemnation of Regulus than even Pliny's outspoken contempt. It is evident that Regulus was a type of the shrewd, insolent, fellow who thrives in days of rings and corruptions, and who, when better times come, goes back to his native abasement. The race is not dead yet.

PROFESSOR MARTIN'S PHYSIOLOGY.*

Being asked by a friend whether I could account in any general way for the enormous production of new books treating of the principles and foundations of different branches of science, literature and art, at the present day, I answered, that never before had such a multiplicity of *doctrinæ*, and a high appreciation of their co-relations, lent the combined knowledge of their phenomena to the elucidation of any one of them. It is not only owing to the dissection of knowledge and the tracing of its structures to their ultimate elements that we are enabled to concentrate the labors of a lifetime on a single organism or a single problem; but—and especially—to the recognition of the necessity of bringing to bear on one subject the knowledge derived from every other, the convergence of the *multa* to the *multum*. In Physiology we have a very striking example of this inter-action of the sciences. The chain of which it is a link seems endless. Psychology is day by day drawing more from its precepts; Metaphysics has long since confessed its obligations to it; the Moral Sciences, Herbert Spencer shows us, do the same; and the highest and most complex of all—Sociology—is most intimately connected with it; in fact, we may go so far as to say, is founded on it. For may we not regard Sociology as the Physiology of the nation, the framework of which is Ethnology, Climatic influences, and Politics, corresponding to Anatomy, Chemistry and Physics, the framework of the Physiology of the Individual? Of the sciences which aid the study of Physiology, too, the name is legion. When we turn over the leaves of Hermann, or read that, according to Fechner's psycho-physical law, *sensation increases proportionately to the logarithm of the strength of the stimulus*, we should run the risk of erring if we eliminated even the exact sciences.

The force of these remarks will be evident on the perusal of Dr. Martin's recently published work. *The Human Body* was, I have no doubt, looked forward to with anticipations of pleasure by all biologists; and a Master of Arts, Doctor of Science and Medicine, the fellow-worker of Huxley and pupil of Michael Foster, who had already gained fame as a writer, and enjoyed the advantages of a professorship at Johns Hopkins, might well merit such expectations. Yet I cannot help thinking, to many physiologists it must have been to a certain extent a disappointment; not so much, however, from Dr. Martin's faulty treatment of his subject, as from the vividness of these anticipations. The fact is, the work is intended, not for the advanced physiologist, but for those who are but entering upon the subject, and without any previous knowledge of even its basal propositions. For example: the author refrains from discussing contending theories, sometimes even on important subjects, *e. g.*, the histology of the liver and the malphigian corpuscles of the kidney; he devotes much space—in plates and text—to gross anatomy; does not enter sufficiently deeply into the minute anatomy of many important viscera; rarely points out the method by which conclusions are arrived at, such as pulse-tracings, electrical stimuli, &c.; and on one of the most important set of structures, of the functions of which there is still very much to learn, *viz.*, the mesenteric glands, his remarks are very meagre; the list might be lengthened indefinitely. Hence, we must not compare this work with Carpenter or Dalton, Foster, Hermann, or even Kirke. The first sentence of the preface explains its objects: "I have endeavored to give an account of the structure and activities of the human body, which, while intelligible to the general reader, shall be accurate, and sufficiently minute in details to meet the requirements of students who are not making Human Anatomy and Physiology subjects of special advanced study. Wherever it seemed to me really profitable, hygienic topics have also been discussed;" and under this heading Dr. Martin

* *The Human Body; an account of its structure and activities, and the conditions of its healthy working.* By H. N. MARTIN. Holt & Co. 1881.