and the high moral tone adopted by him in his writings was frequently made a subject of reproach against him; but there is no reason why he should not have reformed. In any case, his knowledge of his own former weaknesses may have led him to take a pessimistic view of the morality of his fellow-men, and to judge them severely. His model was Thucydides, whom he imitated in his truthfulness and impartiality, in the introduction of philosophizing reflections and speeches, and in the brevity of his style, sometimes bordering upon obscurity. His fondness for old words and phrases, in which he imitated his contemporary Cato, was ridiculed as an affectation; but it was just this affectation and his rhetorical exaggerations that made Sallust a favourite author in the 2nd century a.d. and later.

Editions and translations in various languages are numerous. Editio princeps (1470); (text) R. Dietsch (1874); H. Jordan (1887); A. Eussner (1887); (text and notes) F. D. Gerlach (1823- 1831); F. Kritz (1828-1853; ed. minor, 1856); C. H. Frotscher (1830); C. Merivale (1852); F. Jacobs, H. Wirz (1894); G. Long, revised by J. G. Frazer, with chief fragments of *Histories* (1884) ; W. W. Capes (1884); English translation by A. W. Pollard (1882). There are many separate editions of the *Catilina* and *Jugurtha,* chiefly for school use. The fragments have been edited by F. Kritz (1853) and B. Maurenbrecher (1891-1893) ; and there is an Italian translation (with notes) of the supposititious letters by G. Vittori (1897). On Sallust generally J. W. LöbelVs *Zur Beurtheilung des S.* (1818) should still be consulted; there are also treatises by T. Vogel (1857) and M. Jäger (1879 and 1884), T. Rambeau (1879); L. Constans, *De sermone Sαllustiano* (1880); P. Bellezza, *Dei fonti e dell' autorità storica di Sallustio* (1891); and special lexicon by O. Eichert (1885). The sections in Teuffel-Schwabe’s *History of Roman Literature* are full of information; see also bibliography of Sallust for 1878-1898 by B. Maurenbrecher in C. Bursian, *Jahres­bericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1900).

SALMASIUS, CLAUDIUS, the Latinized name of Claude Saumaise (1588-1653), French classical scholar, born at Semur- en-Auxois in Burgundy on the 15th of April 1588. His father, a counsellor of the parlement of Dijon, sent him, at the age of sixteen, to Paris, where he became intimate with Casaubon. He proceeded in 1606 to the university of Heidelberg, where he devoted himself to the classics.

Here he embraced Protestantism, the religion of his mother; and his first publication (1608) was an edition of a work by Nilus Cabasilas, archbishop of Thessalonica, in the 14th century, against the primacy of the pope (*De primatu Papae*)*,* and of a similar tract by the Cala­brian monk Barlaam (d. *c*. 1348). In 1609 he brought out an edition of Florus. He then returned to Burgundy, and qualified for the succession to his father’s post, which he eventually lost on account of his religion. In 1620 he published Casaubon's notes on the *Augustan History,* with copious additions of his own. In 1623 he married Anne Mercier, a Protestant lady of a distinguished family; the union was by no means a happy one, his wife being represented as a second Xanthippe. In 1629 Salmasius produced his *magnum opus* as a critic, his commentary on Solinus’s *Polyhistor,* or rather on Pliny, to whom Solinus is indebted for the most important part of his work. Greatly as this commentary may have been overrated by his contemporaries, it is a monument of learning and industry. Salmasius learned Arabic to qualify himself for the botanical part of his task. After declining overtures from Oxford, Padua and Bologna, in 1631 he accepted the professorship formerly held by Joseph Scaliger at Leiden. Although the appointment in many ways suited him, he found the climate trying; and he was persistently attacked by a jealous clique, led by Daniel Heinsius, who as university librarian refused him access to the books he wished to consult. Shortly after his removal to Holland, he composed at the request of Prince Frederick of Nassau, his treatise on the military system of the Romans *(De re militari Romanorum),* which was not published until 1657. Other works followed, mostly philological, but including a denuncia­tion of wigs and hair-powder, and a vindication of moderate and lawful interest for money, which, although it drew down upon him many expostulations from lawyers and theologians, induced the Dutch Church to admit money-lenders to the sacrament. His treatise *De primatu Papae* (1645), accompanying a republication of the tract of Nilus Cabasilas, excited a warm controversy in France, but the government declined to suppress it.

In November 1649 appeared the work by which Salmasius is best remembered, his *Defensio regia pro Carolo I.* His advice had already been sought on English and Scottish affairs, and, inclining to Presbyterianism or a modified Episcopacy, he had written against the Independents. It does not appear by whose influence he was induced to undertake the *Defensio regia,* but Charles II. defrayed the expense of printing, and presented the

author with £100. The first edition was anonymous, but the author was universally known. A French translation which speedily appeared under the name of Claude Le Gros was the work of Salmasius himself. This celebrated work, in our day principally famous for the reply it provoked from Milton, even in its own time added little to the reputation of the author. His reply to Milton, which he left unfinished at his death, and which was published by his son in 1660, is insipid as well as abusive. Until the appearance of Milton’s rejoinder in March 1651 **the** effect of the *Defensio* was no doubt considerable; and it probably helped to procure him the flattering invitation from Queen Christina which induced him to visit Sweden in 1650. Christina loaded him with gifts and distinctions, but upon the appearance of Milton’s book was unable to conceal her conviction that he had been worsted by his antagonist. Milton, addressing Christina herself, ascribes Salmasius’s withdrawal from Sweden in 1651 to mortification at this affront, but this appears to be negatived by the warmth of Christina’s subsequent letters and her pressing invitation to return. The claims of the university of Leiden and dread of a second Swedish winter seem fully adequate motives. Nor is there any foundation for the belief that Milton’s invectives hastened his death, which took place on the 3rd of September 1653, from an injudicious use of the Spa waters.

As a commentator and verbal critic, Salmasius is entitled to very high rank. His notes on the *Augustan History* and Solinus display not only massive erudition but massive good sense as well; his perception of the meaning of his author is commonly very acute, and his corrections of the text are frequently highly felicitous. His manly independence was shown in many circumstances, and the bias of his mind was liberal and sensible. He was accused of sour- ness of temper; but the charge, if it had any foundation, is extenuated by the wretched condition of his health.

The life of Salmasius was written at great length by Philibert de la Mare, counsellor of the parlement of Dijon, who inherited his MSS. from his son. Papillon says that this biography left nothing to desire, but it has never been printed. It was, however, used by Papillon himself, whose account of Salmasius in his *Bibliothèque des auteurs de Bourgogne* (Dijon, 1745) is by far the best extant, and contains an exhaustive list of his works, both printed and in MS. There is an *éloge* by A. Clément prefixed to his edition of Salmasius’s *Letters* (Leiden, 1656), and another by C. B. Morisot, inserted in his own *Letters* (Dijon, 1656). See also E. Haag, *La France protestante,* (ix. 149-173); and, for the *Defensio regia,* G. Masson’s *Life of Milton.*

SALMERON Y ALFONSO, NICOLAS (1838-1908), Spanish statesman, was born at Alhama la Seca in the province of Almeria, on the 10th of April 1838. He was educated at Granada and became assistant professor of literature and philosophy at Madrid. The last years of the reign of Isabella II. were times of growing discontent with her bad government and with the monarchy. Salmeron joined the small party who advocated the establishment of a republic. He was director of the Opposition paper *La Discusion,* and co-operated with Don Emilio Castelar on *La Democracia.* In 1865 he was named one of the members of the directing committee of the Republican party. In 1867 he was imprisoned with other suspects. When the revolution of September 1868 broke out, he was at Almeria recovering from a serious illness. Salmeron was elected to the Cortes in 1871, and though he did not belong to the Socialist party, defended its right to toleration. When Don Amadeo of Savoy resigned the Spanish crown on the 11th of February 1873 Salmeron was naturally marked out to be a leader of the party which endeavoured to establish a republic in Spain. After serving as minister of justice in the Figueras cabinet, he was chosen president of the Cortes, and then, on the 18th of July 1873, president of the republic, in succession to Pi Margall. He became president at a time when the Federalist party had thrown all the south of Spain into anarchy. Salmeron was compelled to use the troops to restore order. When, however, he found that the generals insisted on executing rebels taken in arms, he resigned on the ground that he was opposed to capital punishment (7th September). He resumed his seat as president of the Cortes on the 8th of September. His successor, Castelar, was compelled to restore order by drastic means. Salmeron took part in the attack made on him in the Cortes on the 3rd of January 1874, which provoked the generals into closing the