the 9th century, and when, in 912, Neustria was ceded to the Normans by Charles the Simple, it was a large and important city. Under the dukes of Normandy, and particularly under William the Conqueror, it rapidly increased. It became the capital of Lower Normandy, and in 1346 was besieged and taken by Edward III. of England. It was again taken by the English in 1417, and was retained by them till 1459, when it capitulated to the French, in whose possession it has since continued. In 1793 the city was the focus of the Girondist movement against the Convention. Among the numerous celebrities to whom Caen has given birth may be mentioned Malherbe, Boisrobert, Huet bishop of Avranches, and Tannegui Lefebvre. Population in 1872, 39,415 in the city, and 41,210 in the commune.

See L'Abbé de la Rue, *Essais historiques sur la ville de Caen*, 1820–42; Mancel, *Histoire de la ville de Caen*, 1844; Vauthier, ditto, 1843; L'Abbé Daniel, *Embellissements de la ville de Caen*, 1842; Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. iii.; Macquoid's *Normandy*, 1874.

CÆRE (Καῖρε), called by the Greeks *Agylla* (Ἄγυλλα), which is probably an Etruscan name, a city of Southern Etruria, near the coast of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Its site is occupied by the modern Cervetri (*Cære vetus*), situated in the district of Civita Vecchia, about 32 miles from Rome. In the Virgilian legend of Æneas, Cære appears as the seat of the Etruscan king Mezentius; but the earliest fact in its genuine annals is its participation in an attack on the city of Alalia in Corsica. It afforded a refuge to the Tarquins on their expulsion from Rome, and it was afterwards chosen by the Romans as the securest hiding-place of their treasures during the Gallic occupation of their city. In the time of Strabo the city had become of little importance, and was even outgrown by the neighbouring village of *Aquæ Cæretanæ* It continued, however, to rank as a municipium, and in the 4th century of the Christian era had a "bishop" of its own; but in 1250 it was deserted by a large part of its inhabitants, who removed to what is now the village of *Ceri*. The chief building of modern date in Cervetri is the castle of the Ruspoli family, who are in possession of the seigniory From the inhabitants being admitted to the privilege of Roman citizenship, but without the right of suffrage, the "Cærite franchise" came to be a proverbial expression denoting disfranchisement. A large number of interesting Etruscan remains have been found in the tombs of Cære, among which may be specially mentioned paintings of high antiquity and inscriptions showing one of the sepulchres to have belonged to the Tarquin or Tarchnas family.

See Dennis, *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, vol. ii.; Visconti, *Antichi monumenti discoperti nel ducato di Cere*, 1836; Canina, *Descrizione di Cere Antica*, 1838; Griffi, *Monumenti di Cere Antica*, 1841; *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, vol. ii.; Noël des Vergers, *L'Étrurie et les Étrusques*, 2 vols. 1862–4; Aug. J. Hare, *Days near Rome*, 1875, vol. iii.; *Journal des Savants*, 1843, &c.; and various articles in the *Annali* and *Bulletino dell' Instituto di Corrisp. Archeol. di Roma*, especially 1869. 1873 and 1874.

CAERLEON, the *Isca Silurum* of the Romans, is situated upon the right bank of the river Usk, about 3½ miles N. of Newport in Monmouthshire. Its name appears to be a corruption of the Latin *Castrum Legionis*,[1] and there can be no doubt that the place was the station of the second Augustan legion, and ranked as a colony and capital of Britannia Secunda in the period of Roman dominion. The existing remains of ancient Caerleon still *in situ* are unimportant, consisting only of fragments of the city walls and a grass-grown amphitheatre (comprising an area of 222 feet by 192 feet), in which the tiers of seats are indistinctly visible. The hamlet on the opposite bank of the river preserves its Roman name of *Ultra Pontem*, and it is probable that the connecting bridge was a pontoon similar in character to that which survived to the close of the last century. The local museum is rich in objects of interest, collected (chiefly through the zeal of Mr J. E. Lee, the author of *Isca Silurum*), either in Caerleon or its immediate neighbourhood. It includes a tesselated pavement of much beauty brought from Caerwent, four Tuscan pillars which are thought to have supported a temple of Diana, a large number of inscribed and sepulchral stones, a series of coins from the time of Otho to that of Honorius, stone coffins, *amphoræ*, *antefixa*, amulets, enamels, and Samian ware of home and foreign manufacture. It is remarkable that on two inscriptions the name of Geta (the younger son of Severus) has been mutilated and partially effaced—evidence of the hatred in which the civil governor was held by his brother Caracalla. In the recent restoration of the Parish church (in style Early English, with traces of rude Norman) a good deal of Roman masonry was brought to light, and upon the hill side, which formed the burial place of the ancient city, fragments of urns and memorial slabs are even now often exhumed. Enough has been discovered to prove that Caerleon was a place of great importance in Roman times, but not enough to support the hyperbolical language of Giraldus Cambrensis (borrowed from Geoffrey of Monmouth) that its "splendid palaces, with their gilded roofs, once emulated the grandeur of Rome" (bk. ix. c. 12).

Although the chief historic interest attaching to Caerleon is derived from the impress left upon it by Roman occupation, it has also a less substantial claim to notice in connection with the romance of Arthur and the Round Table. It was hither the "blameless king" came at Pentecost to be crowned, and made high festival with the chieftains from Lothian and Orkney, from Gower and Carados. Here, too, if we follow the laureate's version, Arthur took counsel with "Dubric, the high saint" and Guinevere climbed—

> "The giant tower, from whose high crest, they say,
> Men saw the goodly hills of Somerset,
> And white sails flying on the yellow sea.
> (*Idylls of the King, Enid.*)

The lofty mound upon which this tower is said to have stood is close to the Roman amphitheatre, to which the name of Arthur's Round Table has been given. The tumulus is evidently artificial, and may perhaps have supported the keep of the castle mentioned in *Domesday*, the ruins of which, now limited to a solitary bastion on the river side, were very extensive even in Leland's time.

The grantee of Caerleon at the Norman Conquest was William de Scohies, and the lordship was subsequently enjoyed by the Crown and the great families of Clare and Mortimer. From the latter it devolved to King Edward IV., and in later times has been held by the Morgans of Llantarnam and the Howes, Lords Chedworth. The chief proprietor at the present time is Sir Digby Mackworth, Bart.

The ecclesiastical history of Caerleon reaches back to the first introduction of Christianity into Britain, when it was constituted the seat of an archbishopric. It sent a representative to the councils of Sardis (347 A.D.) and Rimini (359); and in the persecution of Diocletian during the previous century two of its citizens, Aaron and Julius, are said to have suffered martyrdom. The see was transferred to St David's in the 11th century, and at the present time Caerleon is included within the diocese of Llandaff. Some remains of a Cistercian priory may still be traced, but even the memory of Dubricius, the stout opponent of the Pelagian heresy, has perished with his dwelling-place. (C. J. R.)

[1] Nennius, writing about two centuries before Geoffrey of Monmouth, says (c. 56), "Bellum gestum est in urbe Leogis, quæ Britannice Cair Lien dicitur."

CAERMARTHEN. See CARMARTHEN.

CAERNARVON. See CARNARVON

CÆSALPINUS, ANDREAS (1519–1603), one of the most distinguished of the Italian natural philosophers of the Renaissance, was born at Arezzo in Tuscany in 1519. Of his family nothing is recorded, nor does he appear to have left any progeny, or to have been married.

We have no account of his life till we find him seated in the botanical chair of the university of Pisa, where also he studied, if he did not teach, anatomy and medicine. His first publication was entitled *Speculum Artis Medicæ Hippocraticum*, in which it were too much to expect he should have released himself from the shackles of his venerable guide; but he has left evident proofs, in a passage often quoted, of his having a clear idea of the circulation of the blood, at least through the lungs. In botany his inquiries were conducted on a more original plan, and their result was one of the most philosophical works in that science, issued from the press at Florence in 1583, in one volume quarto. The title-page is sufficiently arrogant in tone,—*De Plantis libri XVI. Andreæ Cæsalpini Aretini, Medici clarissimi doctissimique, atque Philosophi celeberrimi ac subtilissimi*; yet Cæsalpinus appears to have been the editor, and prefixed, in his own name, an elegant and learned epistle dedicatory to Francis de' Medici, grand duke of Tuscany. This book, now rarely to be met with, is not only the unacknowledged source from which various subsequent writers, and especially Morison, derived their ideas of botanical arrangement, but it was a mine of science to which Linnæus himself gratefully avowed his obligations. Linnæus's copy of the book evinces the great assiduity with which he studied it; he has laboured throughout to remedy the defect of which Haller complains of the want of synonyms, has subjoined his own generic names to nearly every species, and has particularly indicated those remarkable passages, at pages 13 and 15, where the germination of plants and their sexual distinctions are explained. In the former we trace the first rudiments of a natural classification of plants by the differences in their cotyledons, or, in other words, we find the origin of the natural systems of Linnæus and Jussieu; in the latter passage we detect the fundamental principle of the Linnean artificial system. Nor were these merely incidental suggestions of the author. He pursued his inquiries to a conclusion on which the existence of botany as a science depends, and which the no less eminent Conrad Gesner detected about the same time, though his ideas respecting it were not then made public. The principle to which we allude is the classification of plants by their parts of fructification alone. This was afterwards extended, by the greatest writers on the subject, as Ray and Tournefort, and more completely by Linnæus, to the discrimination of their genera by the same parts, more particularly considered and contrasted. To this more extensive conclusion, indeed, the principle directly and inevitably leads. Cæsalpinus used it himself with such success as to develop some of the most important characters for generic distinctions, such as the flower being superior or inferior with respect to the fruit; the heart of the seed situated at its summit or base; the seeds, or the cells of the seed-vessels, solitary or otherwise; the partitions of certain pericarps parallel or contrary to their valves. Linnæus remarks that Cæsalpinus, though the first systematical botanist, found out as many natural classes, or orders, as his followers. He did not indeed define well the philosophical limits of genera in the vegetable kingdom, and therefore his work cannot be regularly quoted throughout for generic synonyms. The want of plates of his own, and of references to other authors, renders, as we have already hinted, some of his names and descriptions unintelligible. Yet Linnæus has in manuscript filled up many blanks which he had been obliged to leave in his own *Classes Plantarum*, where the system of Cæsalpinus first assumed a synoptical form. The latter might probably have adopted a more clear and methodical mode of arranging and explaining the botanical part of his subject, had he not had in view the vague and desultory manner of Pliny, whom he closely imitates in the materials of his numerous chapters, as well as in his style of description. A small and unimportant *Appendix* to this work, of nineteen pages, appeared at Rome in 1603, which is of very rare occurrence, but may be found reprinted in Boccone's *Museo di Piante Rare*, p. 125. The *herbarium* of over 760 plants which he left is said to be still preserved at Florence.

Cæsalpinus having been settled at Pisa when the great Galileo first presumed to doubt the infallibility of the Aristotelian philosophy, and, most likely, at the time when that rising philosopher became professor of mathematics in the same university, we can hardly imagine him to have been free from the party-spirit which so disgracefully manifested itself there. He seems to have retained his professorship till 1592, when he removed to Rome in attendance on Pope Clement VIII. He died in 1603 at the age of eighty-four.

Cæsalpinus printed at Rome, in 1596, a quarto volume of above two hundred pages, entitled *De Metallicis*, dedicated to Pope Clement VIII. which, like his botanical publications, is now extremely rare. In the philosophy of this work Aristotle is his guide; in its method and composition, Pliny. A prefatory address to the pope declares it to have been undertaken in opposition to a certain treatise on the same subject, which, though written with diligence and elegance, contained many things inconsistent with the principles of philosophy, and subversive of the Peripatetic doctrines, and with the author of which, as being excommunicated by the holy church of Rome, no measures were to be kept.

The *Quæstionum Peripateticarum libri quinque*, published at Rome in 1603, diverge considerably from the pure doctrine of Aristotle, and by the emphasis laid on the universal and common intelligence inherent in matter, approximate rather to the pantheism of the Stoics.

CÆSAR, CAIUS JULIUS, was born July 12, 100 B.C., according to others in 102 B.C., of a family who for many years had held high offices in the state. He was the greatest man of the Roman or perhaps of all the ancient world. It is not without reason that his name has remained among us as the title of sovereignty, or that his memory survives as the standard of commanding greatness; yet the very completeness of his character makes it difficult to obtain a clear grasp of his individuality. In every relation of life he attained apparently without effort to the highest excellence, as a citizen, a politician, an orator, a general, a companion, a man of letters, and a far-seeing organizing statesman. Yet study will make it clear to us that his greatness has not been overrated, and the more we contemplate his position and his work, the less opportunity we shall find for blame or criticism. He entered into active life at a great crisis of his country's history. A strong national individuality, firmness, and unity of character and purpose had gradually won for Rome the supremacy of Latium, of Italy, and of the world. But the qualities which were able to acquire an empire were not able to govern it. The time was now passed when the senate presented an example of dignity and magnanimity, when a sense of law and justice and persistency of aim and object sufficed to extenuate a cruelty which knew no limit but the realization of its will. It was truer now than in the time of Horace that Rome was falling by the weight of its own greatness. The long struggle between the patricians and plebeians for political equality served rather to strengthen than loosen the cohesion of the state. But the nations which lay outside the city could not be assimilated without severe struggles. The equality of Latins and Italians with the citizens of Rome might be

won by the efforts of a demagogue, but could only be assured by an entire change of government. Failure to effect the purposes of government had diminished the sense of responsibility in the ruling class. Jugurtha had been able to discover that Roman virtue was accessible to bribes. The direction of provinces at once gratified and stimulated the avarice of statesmen. The riches of the world which were beginning to flow into the imperial city excited the desire for more. There existed at the same time the demoralization which accompanies the breaking up and abandonment of old principles of conduct, and an unsettled yearning for the adjustment of pressing difficulties. We may credit the Gracchi with a far-seeing grasp of the wants of their country, but they could not but appear to their contemporaries as mischievous revolutionists. Sulla attempted to give new strength and power to a system which had sunk into hopeless decay. Marius was inspired rather with a rough contempt for expedients which could never be successful, than with a patriotic desire to elevate the people from whom he sprung. The impotence of statesmen to understand or to regulate the age led to the employment of violence and bloodshed. A domestic enemy had forced the gates of Rome, and each political victory was sealed with the blood of the vanquished. The senate which had conquered the world was unable to defend itself; it could neither recover its former power nor bring into being a new constitution. It could not exercise the ordinary functions of government without entrusting to a citizen powers which might be turned against its own existence. It is difficult to imagine what would have been the destiny of a world from which the cohesive force which bound it together might at any time be removed. If Rome had perished in this crisis she would have left but a faint impress upon the nations who owned her sovereignty. The long reign of law and order, from which we derive the chief legacies which Rome has left to the modern world, was yet to come. That the newly-founded empire did not fall before the onslaught of an eastern despot, or break up into separate provinces governed by rebellious citizens, is due, as far as we can see, to Julius Cæsar alone. It is difficult to see how such a man could have been produced by the wants of any age, but there is no doubt that the course of future history was marked out in no slight degree by the genius and foresight of this single individual.

Cæsar displayed at the very outset of his career the same versatility, energy, and courage which distinguished him till its close. When ordered by Sulla to put away his wife, who was connected with the Marian party, he refused to obey, although he lost by the refusal his wife's dower, his priesthood, and his fortune. Although compelled to quit Rome to avoid the dictator's anger, he did not deprive his country of his services. His diplomacy served to obtain from Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, a fleet, which was used in the reduction of Mitylene, and by his personal bravery in the siege he won from Marcus Thermus the reward of a civic crown. He served in Cilicia against the pirates, whose extinction was to be the great glory of his rival, and either at this or at a later time (for authorities differ on this point) had an adventure with them, which displays his subtlety and resource. Taken prisoner by them at the island of Pharmacussa he sent the main body of his companions and attendants to seek his ransom. During his stay of forty days, he ingratiated himself with his captors, and promised them in jest that when once set free he would return and crucify them, and he kept his word. When he was released he armed some vessels of Miletus, found the pirates in the anchorage where he had left them, took them into Pergamus, and handed them over to the civil arm. When a student under Apollonius Molo at Rhodes, on the outbreak of the Mithridatic war, he passed, of his own accord, to the continent, drove the king's general from the province, and restored the shaken allegiance of the subject towns. A Roman citizen of birth was expected not only to be a general and a statesman but an orator. He must be practised in every branch of the art of government. Cæsar attained distinction in the forum with the same ease as he had won it in the field. He accused Dolabella of extortion in the provinces in 77 B.C., and Antonius of a similar offence in 76 B.C. In neither prosecution was he successful, but he gained in both a reputation for eloquence and public spirit. To perfect himself in oratory he sought the instruction of Apollonius before mentioned, under whom Cicero had also studied, and who had striven with little success to curb the extravagance of his redundant diction. Perhaps it is to him that we owe the massive and monumental eloquence, the pure and chastened taste of the *Commentaries*. The chronology of these events is uncertain, but in 74 B.C. Cæsar returned to Rome, and was elected pontiff and military tribune. Not untried in war and in affairs, tinged with Greek culture but not weakened by it, in the prime of youth and the fulness of fascination, he was fitted in every way to gain the favour of his countrymen, and to play his part in the game of politics, which required then, if ever, an open brow and secret thoughts.

For the next twelve years Cæsar, with the exception of a short absence in Spain as quæstor, remained at Rome. During the whole of this time he lent his assistance to the task of strengthening and reviving the democratic party, which had sunk very low after the death of Marius. He was thus brought constantly into connection with Pompeius, and it is difficult for us to determine whether Cæsar supported Pompeius because he perceived that his ends were those which he himself wished to gain, or whether Pompeius courted the democratic party for the purpose of his own aggrandizement. In 70 B.C. Pompeius, in conjunction with Crassus, repealed the Sullan constitution, and in the measures which were necessary for this purpose he had the full approval and support of Cæsar. The power of the tribunes was restored, that of the senate diminished. The control of the law courts, which Sulla had given back to the senate, and which had been abused to shield from punishment high-born plunderers of the provinces, was now divided among the senate, the equites, who were the great capitalists, and the tribuni ærarii, who represented a still more popular element. Cæsar in this conduct was true to the principles which animated his whole career, a desire to give equality to the citizens, and recognition to the subjects of Rome, and to obliterate as far as possible the scars of civil dissension. In 68 B.C. he lost his aunt and his wife, one the widow of Marius, the other the daughter of Cinna. In the orations which he pronounced over them in the forum, he was able to rehabilitate the reputation of the leaders of his party. At his aunt's funeral he caused busts of Marius to be carried in the procession, and the people were roused to recall at once the greatness of their general, whose memory had been so long proscribed, and the generous courage of his kinsman in restoring it. As the power of the senate became weakened, respect for the old safeguards of the constitution became less strong. It was therefore not unnatural, when Rome was suffering from the attacks of enemies whom she could not quell, that she should invest her former general with an extraordinary command, and seek in new expedients a remedy which the constitution had failed to supply. Such was the origin of the Gabinian and Manilian laws, the first of which conferred on Pompeius a command against the pirates of the Mediterranean, while the second gave him control of the Mithridatic war. Never had such power been concentrated in the hands of a single citizen. He was invested with absolute control for three years over the whole

of the Mediterranean Sea, from the Straits of Gibraltar to the innermost bays of the Levant, and over the coasts for fifty miles inland. Under him were twenty-five prætors of senatorial rank chosen by himself. He had ample authority for levying troops and raising money. By the Manilian law he obtained in addition command over the whole of the East, "so that there remained scarcely a spot of land within the wide Roman dominions that had not obeyed him." These laws were opposed by the friends of the senate and by those who still cherished respect for the old constitution of the city. They were supported by Cæsar and by Cicero, and were carried by the public voice. We need not see in this action of Cæsar's a desire either to get rid of Pompeius as a rival, or to earn future favour by present support; we may rather conclude that he saw more clearly than the statesmen of his time the growth of a new order and the decay of the old, and the necessity of fresh and even perilous expedients to meet wants which had not before arisen.

After the departure of Pompeius, Cæsar held the ædileship with Bibulus. His business in this office was to take charge of the public buildings, to repair the old, to furnish such new ones as were required, and to keep the multitude in good temper by a due magnificence in their national games. This office was to Cæsar the occasion of fresh triumphs. Bibulus supplied the money, but Cæsar showed how it might best be spent, and gained the whole credit of the generosity displayed. He decorated the forum,—that small space under the Capitoline hill, on which every successive master of Rome has for good or for evil left his mark. He built, either at this or at a later time, the basilica Julia, which has again come to light in our generation, the first of those imperial erections which were imitated by his successors, and which extended the long line of colonnades and halls of justice far beyond the narrow limits of the Septimontium. He built porticoes under the Capitol for the reception of works of art, the plunder of Grecian cities; and he struck a deeper chord in the hearts of his countrymen when by his order the trophies won by Marius from barbaric kings and peoples glittered one morning freshly adorned and gilded in the place from which they had been removed by Sulla. The defenceless city was terrified at the number of gladiators which he proposed to exhibit in the Great Games, and restricted him to three hundred and twenty pairs, but he made amends by arming them with accoutrements of silver, an act of magnificence remembered even in times when the city was sated with profusion.

In the following year, 64 B.C., he was concerned in measures which show the consistency of his political character. He supported the agrarian law of Rullus (which, as far as we know its provisions, proposed to settle the poorer citizens in the waste lands of Campania and elsewhere), because, although its provisions might be defective, its principles were good, and calculated to lessen the inequality between the different members of the state. Cicero may, with the responsibility which attached to him as consul, have been right in procuring its rejection as ill-digested and premature. Cæsar's support of the impeachment of Rabirius for the murder of Saturninus thirty-seven years before, was perhaps intended to show that party feeling should never be suffered to cover the commission of a crime, to assert again the principles of democracy which had been long unpopular, and also to deter young aristocrats from imitating the excesses of Sulla. These principles once asserted, there was no need to carry the prosecution to extremities. In the year following, 63 B.C., he was elected Pontifex Maximus, a signal mark of his popularity. This office placed him at the head of the state religion. Although he did not obtain it without bribery, yet we cannot believe that he would have been elected unless the people had felt confidence in the dignity and integrity of his character, and if he had been the frivolous and abandoned libertine which some historians represent him to have been at this time. De Quincey has remarked that we are presented with a touching picture of his home life on the morning of his candidature. His mother Aurelia accompanied him to the portico of the house, with a mingled feeling of hope for his success and fear for his safety, and he answered to her expressed anxieties that he would return a conqueror or a corpse. We may believe that to his mother he owed many of his most commanding qualities. Throughout her life he treated her with deep affection and respect, and we have abundant proof that Cæsar possessed to the full that strong family affection which always accompanies a noble nature, and which the Romans of that day have by some writers been so strangely supposed to have been without.

An event was at hand of sufficient seriousness to try the mettle of the strongest. The conspiracy of Catiline has perhaps been exaggerated by the vanity of Cicero; but allowing for this exaggeration, it threatened serious danger to the state, and it affords a conclusive proof of the impotence of the Roman government at this time. We shall find the closest parallel in the military pronunciamientos of modern Spain. Catiline had probably little design beyond obtaining the best places of government for himself and his friends at any cost. If Cæsar had joined this movement he might have mastered it and directed it to his own purposes; had he been an unprincipled adventurer he might have framed for himself combinations more likely to succeed. There is no proof that Cæsar was an accomplice in this villany. Probability is against it. What we do know is that on December 5th he spoke against the execution of the conspirators. In this we have evidence of his strong common sense and political foresight. He saw that it was bad policy to break the laws in order to punish their violation. He knew also that the dead alone come back to haunt the living. "If an adequate punishment," he said, "can be devised for these men's offences let it be inflicted; if their offence transcends all punishment, let us punish them by the laws of our country." It would have been well for Cicero if he had followed this advice. Such language was thoroughly consistent in the mouth of a man who had done his best to remedy the excesses of Sulla, from which he himself had suffered, and who had lost no opportunity of inculcating political moderation. The next year, 62 B.C., Cæsar was prætor. At the close of it Pompeius returned from the conquest of Mithridates, and quietly disbanded his army. The time had not arrived for Cæsar to lay aside the toga. In 61 B.C., at the age of forty, he assumed as proprætor his first important military command, and laid the foundation of a reputation as the greatest of generals, which should never be allowed to overshadow his higher merit as a statesman and the regenerator of his country.

Before Cæsar could leave Rome for his province it was necessary that he should clear himself from the load of debt which oppressed him, and this he was enabled to do by the assistance of Crassus. A charge of insolvency has been allowed to weigh too heavily upon the character of Cæsar, and has received too much importance as a motive for his actions. It can be accounted for by supposing an over-recklessness of means to gain important public ends, and a culpable carelessness in his private interests, which are not without a parallel in statesmen of modern times, whose character is above suspicion. We have little positive information about his campaign in the Peninsula, the main operations of which were carried on in Galicia and Portugal. Cæsar appears to have exhibited on a small field the same qualities which distinguished him in a large sphere. He was proclaimed imperator by his soldiers, was voted a