

kingdom (I. Sam. xvi.). Both in the united and in the divided kingdom the Hebrew kings were hereditary rulers, and heredity generally determined the succession in the ancient Greek kingdoms. The legends of the Tarquins indicate that the latest kings of Rome belonged to the same family, and that the kingdom was by way of becoming hereditary—but along with this process went the alienation of the Romans from kingly rule.

The regal period in the history of Rome falls into two sub-divisions—(a) the age of native Roman kings; (b) the age of the Etruscan dynasty (the Tarquins). See Pelham's "Outlines," Bk. I., ch. 3. It is a fairly safe conjecture that the monarchy was more oppressive in the second period than in the first, and that the Tarquins reproduced pretty closely the presentation of a king in I. Samuel viii. 11-18. Yet Rome grew great under Tarquinian discipline (Pelham, pp. 31-32),—very much as England became great under the Norman kings.

*The "Servian" Reforms.*—The arrangement of classes and centuries was originally made for military purposes only. (Pelham, pp. 32-35.) The assembly of *curiæ* (Pelham, pp. 20, 21) was the only assembly of the Roman people for any political purpose in the age of the kings. The so-called "Servian" Reforms no doubt gave Rome a more effective army, and thus would account, to no small extent, for the great rise of Roman power in the days of the Tarquins.

II. THE REPUBLIC.—"Libertatem et consulatum L. Brutus instituit." *Tacitus*.

I. *The Revolution.*—The Etruscan kings of Rome were confronted by an aristocratic opposition, and they sought to strengthen themselves against this opposition by giving places in the Senate and army to persons from classes and communities outside the old leading families of Rome, and even outside Rome itself. In the end it was the "new model army," their own creation, which overthrew their rule. In some way or other—chiefly, we may